

VYTAUTAS MAGNUS UNIVERSITY

Arvydas KASČIUKAITIS

**THE IMAGE OF GOD AS FATHER IN THE OLD TESTAMENT,
HELLENISTIC, JEWISH LITERATURE AND UNDISPUTED
PAULINE LETTERS**

Doctoral Dissertation
Humanities, Theology (02 H)

Kaunas, 2015

UDK 231

Ka-501

The dissertation was prepared at Vytautas Magnus University, Faculty of Catholic Theology, Department of Theology, during 2009-2014.

Scientific Advisor:

Prof. Emeritus Dr. Ugo Vanni

(Pontifical Gregorian University, Faculty of Theology, Rome)

ISBN 978-609-467-134-0

VYTAUTO DIDŽIOJO UNIVERSITETAS

Arvydas KASČIUKAITIS

**DIEVO KAIP TĖVO ĮVAIZDIS SENAJAME TESTAMENTE,
HELENISTINĖJE, ŽYDŲ LITERATŪROJE IR
AUTENTIŠKUOSE PAULIAUS LAIŠKUOSE**

Daktaro disertacija

Humanitariniai mokslai, Teologija (02 H)

Kaunas, 2015

Daktaro disertacija rengta 2009– 2014 metais Vytauto Didžiojo universitete.

Mokslinis vadovas:

prof. emeritas dr. Ugo Vanni

(Popiežinis Grigaliaus universitetas, teologijos fakultetas, Roma)

CONTENTS

CONTENTS	5
INTRODUCTION	8
I. THE IMAGE OF GOD AS FATHER IN THE OLD TESTAMENT	16
1.1. The Statistic and Syntactic Data	16
1.1.1. The Hebrew Bible	16
1.1.2. Septuagint	19
1.2. The Image of God as Father in Different Text-Groups	21
1.2.1. Divine Fatherhood Revealed by ‘Father-texts’ and Filial Relationship	21
1.2.1.1. God as Father to Israel	23
1.2.1.2. God as Father to the Davidic King	40
1.2.1.3. God as Father to the Individuals	44
1.2.1.4. God as Father of the Orphans	52
1.2.2. Divine Fatherhood Revealed by Similes	53
1.2.3. Divine Fatherhood Revealed by Theophoric Names	56
II. THE IMAGE OF GOD AS FATHER IN STOIC LITERATURE AND PHILO	61
2.1. The image of God as Father in Stoics	62
2.1.1. Divine Fatherhood in Fragments of Cleanthes, Chrysippus, and Posidonius	63
2.1.2. Divine Fatherhood in Seneca	68
2.2. The image of God as Father in Philo	71
2.2.1. The Statistic and Syntactic Data	71
2.2.2. Divine Fatherhood Revealed by ‘Father-Texts’	76
2.2.2.1. The Function of ‘Father’ in the Most Recurring Phrase-References	76
2.2.2.2. The Function of ‘Father’ in Minor Phrase-References	87
2.2.2.3. The Function of ‘Father’ without Any Designation	92
2.2.2.4. The Other Specified References to ‘Father’	96
2.2.3. Divine Fatherhood Revealed by Filial Relationship	96
2.2.4. Divine Fatherhood Revealed by Similes	101
III. THE IMAGE OF GOD AS FATHER IN QUMRAN TEXTS AND INTERTESTAMENTAL JEWISH WRITINGS	108
3.1. God as Father in Qumran	108

3.1.1. The Minor References to the Divine Fatherhood	108
3.1.2. Divine Fatherhood Revealed by ‘Father-Texts’	110
3.1.2.1. The God’s Fatherly Characteristics in 1QH IX, 35b-36.....	110
3.1.2.2. God as Father in 4Q372 1 and 4Q460 9i.....	112
3.1.3. Divine Fatherhood Revealed by Filial Relationship	115
3.1.3.1. The Message of 4Q504 1, III, 4-7	115
3.1.3.2. The ‘Son of God’ Text: 4Q246, II, 1	116
3.1.4. Divine Fatherhood Revealed by Similes	119
3.2. God as Father in the Intertestamental Jewish Literature	122
3.2.1. Divine Fatherhood Revealed by ‘Father-Texts’	125
3.2.2. Divine Fatherhood Revealed by Filial Relationship	131
3.2.3. Divine Fatherhood Revealed by Similes	134
IV. THE IMAGE OF GOD AS FATHER IN THE UNDISPUTED PAULINE LETTERS	136
4.1. The Statistic and Syntactic Data	136
4.2. The Image of God as Father in the Individual Texts.....	140
4.2.1. The Fatherhood of God in the Initial Salutations	141
4.2.1.1. The Analysis of the Initial Salutations	142
4.2.1.2. An Excursus. The Initial Salutations in the Pastoral Letters	147
4.2.2. God as Father in the Thessalonian Correspondence.....	149
4.2.2.1. God the Father in the Adscriptions in 1 and 2 Thessalonians	150
4.2.2.2. Divine Fatherhood in the Introductory Thanksgiving in 1 Thess 1:3	153
4.2.2.3. Divine Fatherhood in the Wish-Prayers in 1 and 2 Thessalonians.....	160
4.2.2.3.1. A Double Reference to God as Father in 1 Thess 3:11-13.....	161
4.2.2.3.2. Divine Fatherhood in 2 Thess 2:16-17	168
4.2.3. God as Father in the Letter to the Galatians	174
4.2.3.1. A Threefold Reference to God as Father in Gal 1:1-5	175
4.2.3.2. God as Father in Gal 3-4.....	182
4.2.3.2.1. The Children of God in Gal 3:26-29	184
4.2.3.2.2. Divine Fatherhood in Gal 4:4-7.....	186
4.2.4. God as Father in the Letter to the Philippians	194
4.2.4.1. The Glory of God the Father in Phil 2:9-11	195

4.2.4.1.1. The Gift of God the Father	195
4.2.4.1.2. The Purpose of Christ's Exaltation.....	198
4.2.4.2. The Glory to God and Father in Phil 4:20	200
4.2.5. God as Father in the Corinthian Correspondence.....	202
4.2.5.1. One God, the Father in 1 Cor 8:4-6	203
4.2.5.2. God as Father in 1 Cor 15:20-28	208
4.2.5.2.1. The Structure and Line of Thought in 1 Cor 15:20-28.....	210
4.2.5.2.2. The Order of Events in 15:23-28.....	212
4.2.5.2.3. The Destruction of All Hostile Powers.....	214
4.2.5.2.4. The Reign of Christ and the Activity of God the Father	218
4.2.5.3. The Blessing in 2 Cor 1:3-4.....	230
4.2.5.4. 2 Sam 7:14 in 2 Cor 6:18.....	233
4.2.5.5. An Oath Formula in 2 Cor 11:31	236
4.2.6. God as Father in the Letter to the Romans	238
4.2.6.1. The Glory of the Father in Rom 6:4	238
4.2.6.2. Divine Fatherhood in Rom 8:14-17.....	239
4.2.6.3. A Wish-Prayer in Rom 15:5-6.....	245
CONCLUSIONS	249
RECOMMENDATIONS.....	255
ABBREVIATIONS	256
SOURCES AND LITERATURE	260

INTRODUCTION

Substantiation of the Research Problem. In Christianity the image of God as Father is perceived as a matter-of-course since the fatherhood of God is indissolubly associated with Jesus as his Son. This is the most important and exclusive characteristic of God's fatherhood, and it is usually underlined in scientific and spiritual literature. This is evident and undeniable fact, yet the conception of God as Father had a long history in various cultures before Christianity, especially in Semitic and Greek milieu, and there may be observed certain tendencies to ascribe the name Father to God. Therefore, in the nineteenth and the first half of twentieth centuries there have been some publications on this matter, among which C. Wittichen, *Die Idee Gottes als des Vaters* (1865), P. Baur, *Gott als Vater im Alten Testament* (1899), M-P. Lagrange, "La paternité de Dieu dans l'Ancien Testament," *RB* (1908), H. Godan, *Das Bild von Gott dem Vater im rabbinischem Judentum* (1941) may be mentioned. The more significant scientific breakthrough took place after the Second World War, when there have been published several studies on the fatherhood of God in larger religious contexts including the Old and New Testaments: J. Jeremias, *The Prayers of Jesus* (1958, 1967) and W. Marchel, *Abba, Père! La Prière du Christ et des Chrétiens* (1963, 1971). These two studies became a somewhat catalyst for further investigations, even more that after the Second Vatican Council the usage of diachronic and various synchronic methods in biblical field have been widely accepted by Catholic scholars. It is pointed out in the introduction of the document "The interpretation of the Bible in the Church" presented by the Pontifical Biblical Commission (1993) that "this more constructive attitude has borne fruit." The activity of Catholic researchers engaged other Christian scholars in deeper analysis of biblical texts, hence appeared more commentaries on biblical books and texts which were interpreted in different ways. Aside from various fragmentary studies and articles related to the theme of this dissertation, two publications about the image of God as Father in the Old Testament and early Jewish literature merit special attention: A. Strotmann, "Mein Vater bist du!" (Sir 51,10). *Zur Bedeutung der Vaterschaft Gottes in kanonischen und nichtkanonischen frühjüdischen Schriften* (1991), and A. Böckler, *Gott als Vater im Alten Testament. Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zur Entstehung und Entwicklung eines Gottesbildes* (2000). However, a summarizing study on various literature which may have had influenced the image of God as Father in the earliest writings of the New Testament, i.e. undisputed Pauline letters, seems to be needed. The researches done on the matter in Paul's authentic letters are published basically in articles; even

less has been done regarding Philonic literature. This need is especially important in Lithuania where biblical theology is relatively new branch of science.

Research Problem. God as a Father is variously portrayed in different literature. God as a Father is quite differently portrayed in various literature. Some aspects of the images coincide or overlap, in other cases they are visible through a specific prism, and thus bearing in mind the points of contact and differences between them, the work is subject to the following **Research Questions**:

1. What/who is the fatherhood of God in relation to in different literature?
2. How God as Father is presented in different text-groups?
3. How God as Father is portrayed to different 'addressee' groups?
4. What are the peculiarities of the image of God as Father in each analyzed segment of literature?

The Object of Research is the image of God as Father in the Old Testament, Hellenistic Jewish literature and undisputed Pauline letters.

The Aim of the Dissertation is to reveal the image of God as Father in the Old Testament, Hellenistic, Jewish literature and undisputed Pauline letters.

Research Tasks:

1. To reveal in a synthetic way the image of God as Father in the Old Testament.
2. To disclose how God as Father is portrayed in Stoic and Philonic writings.
3. To synthesize the image of God as Father in non-biblical early Jewish literature.
4. To reveal the image of God as Father in the undisputed Pauline letters.

The Methodological Basis of the Research is formed by following approaches:

1. *Interdisciplinary approach.* The image of God as Father is analyzed in the literature that is different according to its character.
2. *Analysis of different literature based on the same pattern.* The interpretation of the image of God as Father in the Old Testament, Philo, Qumran texts, and early Jewish literature has been done according to the identical scheme: 'father-texts', 'son-texts', and similes.
3. *Canonical approach.* The final canonical form of a biblical text (whether book or collection) is an authoritative expression of faith and rule of life, hence every single text must be interpreted in this light.
4. *Synchronic approach.* Biblical text is interpreted as it comes before the reader in its final state.

5. *Intertextual approach.* The analysis of a biblical text cannot be done properly without referring to other biblical texts where identical/similar patterns, ideas, and words are employed; therefore the summary can be done on the same grounds.
6. *Contextual approach.* Each biblical text ought to be primarily analyzed in its immediate contexts.
7. *Semiotic analysis on the narrative level.* This approach has been proposed by Algirdas J. Greimas, the founder of his School of Paris (1965). The analysis of a biblical text on syntactic grounds can retrace the different phases logically bound to each other, which mark the transformation from one state to another.

Research Methods. In this dissertation various methods have been employed to interpret texts in different literature:

The method based on a certain aspect has been used in all analyzed texts where God is portrayed as he is, acts or is/should be addressed to as a Father.

Statistical and syntactic empirical methods helped to better understand the peculiarities of the Old Testament, Philonic literature, and undisputed Pauline letters.

The systemic method has been used to analyze texts applying the same pattern to the Old Testament, Philo, Qumran, and early Jewish literature with a particular attention to the ‘addressees’.

The comparative method with regard to texts or terms has been employed interpreting many different passages.

The structural method has been basically used analyzing some Pauline passages.

Biblical exegesis has been applied to all individual Pauline texts.

The analytical-synthetic method has been used to summarize the data on various issues.

Scientific Novelty and Theoretical Significance of the Dissertation. The *same pattern* model has been created for the investigation the image of God as Father in different literature that allows one to better perceive the nuances of various text-groups. A thorough analysis of the image of God as Father in Philonic writings and the undisputed Pauline letters adds more credits to its fuller appreciation. The presentation of the image of God as Father in different literature in one study facilitates the perception of similarities and differences between early Christian writings and other literature of that time.

Practical Significance of the Dissertation.

The topic has not been analyzed yet in Lithuania, therefore this dissertation can contribute to the development of new insights in various theological disciplines and promote an interdisciplinary and interreligious dialogue. It also can be useful for students of theology as a practical example of biblical investigations.

Defended Claims:

- The analysis of the texts in the Old Testament, Hellenistic and Jewish literature employing the same pattern ('father', 'son' texts and similes) with a particular attention to the 'addressees' enriches the image of God as Father.
- Analysis of the image of God as Father in the Old Testament reveals similarities and differences in diverse text-groups.
- Stoic fragments add little to the image of God as Father.
- The image of God as Father in Philonic literature is miscellaneous and overall positive.
- Qumran and other early Jewish texts strongly underline God's fatherly role in the lives of individuals.
- The undisputed Pauline letters reveal certain peculiarities of the image of God as Father both to its content and the 'addressees'.

Structure of the Dissertation. The dissertation consists of introduction, four main chapters, conclusions, recommendations, abbreviations, and index of sources and literature. Three first chapters are subdivided into smaller units which are basically modeled according the same pattern. Since the dissertation claims to analyze and summarize data on the fatherhood of God in different literature, every single chapter or sub-chapter is dedicated to particular writings. Thus in the first chapter the texts of the Old Testament including the deuterocanonical books are investigated. The second and third chapters deal with the image of God as Father in Hellenistic and Jewish literature and both are divided in two sub-chapters because of diverse sources: Stoic literature and Philonic writings in the second chapter and Qumran texts and intertestamental Jewish literature in the third one. The last chapter analyzes the topic in different way through detailed examination of texts in each undisputed Pauline letter where God is portrayed as a Father. At the end of each chapter and sub-chapter, and with regard to the undisputed Pauline letters at the end of each analyzed letter, summaries are presented.

Overview of the Sources and Previous Research. The field of investigation in this dissertation is quite extensive and diverse therefore it seems opportune to overview the sources and previous research in the order of the analyzed literature.

1. The sources for investigation of the Old Testament are Elliger and Rudolph, *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (1990) and Rahlfs (ed.), *Septuaginta*, 2 volumes (1979). These editions are commonly accepted and used widely in biblical studies. The basic publications on God's fatherhood in the Old Testament are those of Jeremias, *The Prayers of Jesus* (1967), Marchel, *Abba, Père! La Prière du Christ et des Chrétiens* (1971), Strotmann, "*Mein Vater bist du!*" (Sir 51,10). *Zur Bedeutung der Vaterschaft Gottes in kanonischen und nichtkanonischen frühjüdischen Schriften* (1991), and Böckler, *Gott als Vater im Alten Testament*.

Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zur Entstehung und Entwicklung eines Gottesbildes (2000). Jeremias approached the fatherhood of God from thematic perspective: creator, authority, the election of Israel, the Exodus, infidelity of Israel, God's forgiveness. Marchel underlined the historical (the election of Israel, Covenant) and moral (prophets) character of God as Father. The contribution of Strotmann was very valuable as she started to discuss the theme earlier little investigated, i.e. the fatherhood of God in Sirach and other Greek books of the Old Testament. Another approach was taken by Böckler, who carried out a detailed analysis of Hebrew texts. Though the study of Byrne, *'Sons of God' - 'Seed of Abraham': a Study of the Idea of the Sonship of God of all Christians in Paul against the Jewish Background* (1979) is not directly related to the theme on God's fatherhood, yet it is important as sheds more light on God's fatherly characteristics.

2. The most exhaustive and organic edition of Stoic fragments has been published by Radice, Reale, von Arnim, *Stoici antichi. Tutti i frammenti* (1998), that is based on the earlier edition of *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta*, 3 vol. (1903, 1921), hence both has been used as the primary source. The references to Seneca have been taken from L. Senecae Annaei, *Ad Lucilium epistularum moralium que supersunt* (1914), L. Senecae Annaei, *De beneficiis libri VII. De clementia libri II* (1914), L. Senecae Annaei, *Dialogorum libros XII*, (1923). The theme of the divine and god(s) in general is not a marginal one in Stoic writings and this has been observed by scholars. Radice (and others), *Stoici antichi* (1998), assembled various aspects of god(s)' nature, characters, and their relationship with the human world. Nevertheless, the allusions to the divine fatherhood there are quite rare. Possibly this was the reason of the absence of a particular investigation in this field. This is also valid in Seneca's works. However, it should be noticed that the religious language of Seneca prompted certain suppositions/disagreements about his relationship to Christianity and Paul in particular. Thus, Sevenster, *Paul and Seneca* (1961), Scarpat, *Il pensiero religioso di Seneca e l'ambiente ebraico e cristiano* (1977), and Berry, *Correspondence between Paul and Seneca, A.D. 61-65* (1999). Seneca's conception of God with regard to Christianity has been also observed by Sevenster and also Rodriguez Navarro, *Seneca: religion sin mitos* (1969). According to the latter, the religious attitude of Seneca is a synthesis of three directions: familiar (different cults, God-movement), Stoic (God-Logos), and Jewish-Christian (God-Father).

3. Two bilingual Greek-English and Greek-French editions of complete Philo's works have been published: Goold, Colson, Whitaker, *Philo*, 10 vols. & 2 suppl. vols., (1929-1969) and Arnaldez, Pouilloux, Mondésert, *Les Œuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie*, 36 vols. (1961-1992). Both have been used in the analysis of the texts. For some comparative renderings of the Greek text in English also Yonge, *The Works of Philo: New Updated Edition. Complete and*

Unabridged in One Volume (1993) has been used. There have been much debated about the influence of Platonic and Stoic ideas on Philo's writings and their controversial coexistence with the image of a personal God on Philo's writings, thus Bréhier, *Les idées philosophiques et religieuses de Philon d'Alexandrie* (1950³), Pohlenz, *La Stoa*. (1967), Runia, *Philo of Alexandria and the Timaeus of Plato* (1986), Reydam-Schils, "Stoicized Readings of Plato's *Timaeus* in Philo of Alexandria," *SPA* 7 (1995). A brief survey on Philo's attempts to reconcile his philosophical knowledge with his native religious tradition on such key-points as repentance, the divine nature, human perfection and ecstatic vision has been done by Winston, "Judaism and Hellenism: Hidden Tensions in Philo's Thought," *SPA* 2 (1990). Panimolle, "La paternità di Dio nei documenti letterari dell'Antico giudaismo" in *DSBP* 1 (1992), approached this theme presenting the figure of God as Father in Philo under four headlines: the Father is God of the Bible; God is the Father of creation; God as a Father of the righteous and wise man; and God the Father who is good and generous.

4. As the basic sources for the reconstructed Qumran texts, the following publications have been taken: García Martínez, Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Study Edition*, 2 vol. (1997, 1998) and published texts in *The Discoveries in the Judean Desert (of Jordan)* series (DJD) and some other studies: Baillet, *Qumrân grotte 4, III (4Q 482 – 4Q 520)*, DJD VII (1982), VanderKam, Milik, "The First *Jubilees* Manuscript from Qumran Cave 4: A Preliminary Publication," *JBL* 110 (1991), Wacholder, Abegg, *A Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew and Aramaic Texts from Cave Four*, vol. 3 (1995), Larson, "460. 4QNarrative Work and Prayer" in Pfann, Alexander, *Qumran Cave 4, XXVI. Cryptic Texts, Miscellanea, Part 1*, DJD XXXVI (2000), Puech, "Fragment d'une Apocalypse en araméen (4Q246=pseudo-Dan^d) et le « Royaume de Dieu », " *RB* 99 (1992), Newsom, "Apocryphon of Joshua," in Brooke, *Qumran Cave 4, XVII. Parabiblical Texts, Part 3*, DJD XXII (1996). Until the publication of new fragments, there has been usually pointed out one text that refers to the fatherhood of God, namely 1QH IX, 35b-36 in the second part of the *Hodayot* scroll, which presents the collection of the hymns of praise of the Qumran community; for instance Jeremias, *The Prayers of Jesus* (1967) Marchel, *Abba, Père!* (1971), de Boer, *Fatherhood and Motherhood* (1974), Schlosser, *Le Dieu de Jésus* (1987), Strotmann, „*Mein Vater bist du!*“ (1991), Panimolle, "La paternità di Dio nei documenti letterari dell'Antico giudaismo" (1992). This only text has been given slightly different interpretations: as God's fatherly care for the members of community (Delcor), as readiness of God the Father to help in time of need (Jeremias), as God's fatherly tenderness and efficacious protection (Schlosser), as God's fatherly responsibility for the life of his creation (Strotmann). Unfortunately, there has no summarizing survey been done on this matter.

5. For the analysis of early Jewish literature, the edition of Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 2 vols. (1983-1985) that includes sixty five non-canonical documents from the intertestamental period with translations, introductions, and critical notes, has been used. As the authenticity and exact dating of those writings is rather problematic (according to diverse opinions ranges from circa 200 B.C. to A.D. 200), scholars are not unanimous taking or excluding one or another text. The above mentioned Jeremias (1967) pointed out some references to the divine fatherhood in the third book of Maccabees and Jubilees. Pokorný, *Der Gottessohn* (1971), indicated several 'son-texts' in the fourth book of Ezra and one more text in the Testament of Levi. Hengel, *The Son of God* (1975), referred to more 'son-texts' in Joseph and Aseneth and to one more text in the Prayer of Joseph. The already mentioned Byrne (1979) offered a much more detailed analysis as far as the divine sonship is concerned. He analyzed a number of different documents indicating the 'addressee' as a criterion. He referred also to some 'father-texts' which display God's relations with individuals. Schlosser (1987) presented more references to the divine fatherhood, but he approached them in a very concise way. Within his designated category, he indicated some texts in the Testament of Job and in Joseph and Aseneth as the anonymous or pseudonymous writings, in which the image of God as Father is attested both directly and by means of a simile. Strotmann has analyzed many texts mentioned above and investigated by other scholars. However, she completely omitted a number of documents, in particular those which deal with the divine sonship and that have been mostly proposed by Byrne. Nevertheless, their investigations have given way to summarize the image of God as Father in this literature.

6. For the analysis of the undisputed Pauline letters, a critical and widely accepted edition of Nestle-Aland, *Novum Testamentum Graece* (1993²⁷) has been used. There have been certain investigations done on the image of God as Father in Pauline corpus, yet on the level of fragmentary surveys, articles or summaries. Both Jeremias (1967) and Marchel (1971) were mostly interested in those passages where God is described as a Father in a proper sense (*Abba*). Some later surveys Fitzmyer, "Abba and Jesus' relation to God" (1985) and Barr, "Abba isn't Daddy" (1988) were also engaged in analysis of understanding the *Abba* with respect to Jesus and believers. Allmen, *La famille de Dieu. La symbolique familiale dans le paulinisme* (1981) approached this theme from rather philosophical position paying attention to the literary genre of the texts on the fatherhood of God belong to and the communitarian dimension of God's fatherhood. The communitarian character of the divine fatherhood in Paul's letters has been also highlighted by Penna, "La paternità di Dio nel Nuovo Testamento" (1999). However, similarly to Philonic literature, there remains a need to investigate and summarize the image of God as Father in the undisputed Pauline letters.

7. In the dissertation various commentaries on different books of the Old and New Testament as well as other literature with regard to particular issues have also been used which have facilitated the understanding of the analyzed texts.

I. THE IMAGE OF GOD AS FATHER IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

The literature pertinent to this theme generally accentuates the scarceness of the explicit data on the matter and usually refers to fifteen texts in the Hebrew Bible (HB) and to five more passages in the deuterocanonical books of the Old Testament according to Septuagint (LXX), in which the fatherhood of God is clearly expressed by appropriate terms.¹

1.1. The Statistic and Syntactic Data

1.1.1. The Hebrew Bible

The broadly used and in Semitic milieu commonly accepted anthropological term אב is the only word employed as the name for God in the HB in the sense of 'father'. In a proper physical sense this word has no synonyms and, above all, denotes a male parent; in a broader sense it also includes the figures of grandfathers, patriarchs and ancestors. The HB attributes manifold functions to 'father': commanding, instructing, rebuking, loving, pitying, blessing, and grieving. Besides, 'father' is presented as the head of a family to whom belongs also authority and honor. The metaphorical use of the word with a spiritual, honorific, and religious character is also fairly well attested,² and in this sense the aspects of respectability, authority, and protective concern are the most outstanding features describing the functions of 'father'.³ Those aspects are enriched by several other allusions to fatherly proximity and care⁴ that together

¹ Deut 32:6; 2 Sam 7:14; Isa 63:16 (twice); 64:7; Jer 3:4,19; 31:9; Mal 1:6; 2:10; Pss 68:6; 89:27; 1 Chron 17:13; 22:10; 28:6; Tob 13:4; Wis 14:3; Sir 23:1,4; 51:10.

² Generally, see אב in F. BROWN, S. R. DRIVER, C. A. BRIGGS, *Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977⁹, L. KOEHLER, W. BAUMGARTNER, *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros*, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1958, F. ZORELL (ed.), *Lexicon Hebraicum Veteris Testamenti*, Romae: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1984.

³ It is difficult to clearly distinguish the spiritual, honorific, and authoritative nuances the word has been granted in the examples attested in the HB because sometimes they imply both aspects: both the spiritual and honorific character (that is even better attested in connotation 'father and priest' in Judg 17:10; 18:19) can be discerned in the case of the prophets Elijah and Elisha who were granted the title of a 'father' not only by their pupils but also by the king (cf. 2 Kgs 2:12; 6:21; 13:14). Nevertheless, de Boer seems to exaggerate when he stresses this fact too much: "calling him 'father' is acknowledging the Fatherhood of the God of the prophet", P. A. H. de BOER, *Fatherhood and Motherhood in Israelite and Judean Piety*, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1974, p. 20. Both the authoritative and honorific aspects of metaphoric 'fatherhood' may be seen in a scene where David addressed Saul as 'my father' (cf. 1 Sam 24:11). Similarly, the authority of Eliakim who was declared by God to be a 'father' for the population of Jerusalem and house of Judah (cf. Isa 22:21), is undoubtedly connected to his protective mission. A certain sense of priority and spiritual fatherhood is attributed occasionally to men, who because of their occupation or way of life, were considered to be 'fathers', for example 'the father of those who dwell in tents and have cattle...the father of all those who play the lyre and pipe' (Gen 4:20-21).

⁴ According to their contexts Job 17:14: *if I say to the pit You are my father* reflects some vague nuance of closeness to what is called 'father' and Job 29:16: *I was a father to the poor* states the pattern of fatherly care and protection.

reflect some of the fundamental features which had their roots in daily life and were commonly accepted to describe the status and role of the earthly father.

A religious significance and value of this term is mostly seen through passages in which אבֹת (fathers) are positively or negatively depicted in a close connection to God. In particular, it is important to mention those texts in which God, called the ‘God of fathers’,⁵ gives his promises to ‘fathers’,⁶ considers them retrospectively as beneficiaries of God’s gifts,⁷ and/or makes known their previous fall and sins which are seen tightly connected to the present decadence of people.⁸ In those passages ‘fathers’ are viewed as protagonists, who clearly unite past to present, thus underlining the organic unity of the Israelites as a people who in the course of the history of salvation always stood in God’s presence and was led by him.⁹

As a theological term, this word haven’t gained greater recognition: the fact that only 15 passages explicitly employed אב as a designation for God reflects great discretion with which this term was used in relation to God – the HB mentions it elsewhere more than 1200 times. Taking into account the widespread use of this word in association with different deities in the ancient Near East and other countries,¹⁰ it is fairly clear that the mythological idea of ‘God-father-procreator’ of mankind and of certain individuals, so vital and prosperous to neighboring nations, was avoided, if not totally excluded from Israelite religion; this fact is primarily reflected by the restrained use of the name for God as a Father.¹¹

The grammatical form of אב employed for God varies in different passages and thus deserves a brief consideration. In most of the texts this term is combined with the preposition לֵאב (to, for 5x) and with the suffixes אבִי (my 3x), אבֵינוּ (our 3x), and אבֶיךָ (your 1x). Yet there are three passages that have the bare אב form. This means that in all cases, except its plain form,

⁵ Cf. Exod 3:15 (Exod 3:6 - God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob - the continuation between patriarchs and ‘fathers’); Deut 1:11.21; 4:1; 6:3; 12:1; 26:7; 27:3; 29:24; Josh 18:3; Judg 2:12; 2 Kgs 21:22; 1 Chron 12:17; 2 Chron 20:33; 24:18.24; 29:5 etc.

⁶ The principal object in God’s promises is ארץ (land) and the characteristic feature of these texts is that God is said שָׁבַע (swear) to give this land, cf. Exod 13:5.11; Num 11:12; 14:23; Deut 1:8.35; 4:31; 6:10.18.23; 7:8; 13:18; Josh 1:6; 5:6; Judg 2:1; Jer 11:5; 32:22 etc.

⁷ Cf. 1 Kgs 8:34.40.48 (par. 2 Chron 6); 14:15; 2 Kgs 21:8; Jer 7:7.14; 16:15; 23:39; Ezek 20:42; 36:28 etc.

⁸ Cf. 2 Kgs 17:14.41; 22:13; Isa 65:7; Jer 2:5; 3:25; 7:26 etc; Ezek 2:3; 20:4.18.24.27.30.36; Amos 2:4; Zech 1:2.4-6; 8:14; Mal 3:7; Ps 78:8.57 etc.

⁹ Cf. H. RINGGREN, אב, in *TDOT* 1, pp. 7-14; G. QUELL, πατήρ, in *TDNT* 5, pp. 961-63; E. JENNI, אב, in *TLOT* 1, pp. 1-10.

¹⁰ For God as Father in ancient Semitic and neighboring cultures, see MARCHEL, *Abba, Père! La Prière du Christ et des Chrétiens* (AnBib 19A), Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1971², pp. 29-41; RINGGREN, אב, pp. 2-6; de BOER, *Fatherhood and Motherhood*, pp. 15-17; J. POUILLY, *Dieu Notre Père. La révélation de Dieu Père et le « Notre Père »* (Cahiers Evangile 68), Paris: Cerf, 1989, pp.6-7; G. RAVASI, “Dio Padre d’Israele e di tutti gli uomini nell’Antico Testamento,” in *DSBP* 1, pp. 22-23; X. PIKAZA, “El Padre de Jesús y Padre de los hombres,” *EstTrin* 26 (1, 1992) 67-115, pp. 68-75; G. VANONI, „Du bist doch unser Vater“ (*Jes 63,16*): zur Gottesvorstellung des Ersten Testaments, Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1995, pp. 33-37; J. W. MILLER, *Calling God “Father.” Essays on the Bible, Fatherhood and Culture*, New York / Mahwah N.J.: Paulist Press, 1999, pp. 35-41.

¹¹ Nevertheless, some traces of Canaanite mythology can possibly be detected in Deut 32:6 in conjunction with Deut 32:18; cf. JENNI, אב, p. 11.

the term is grammatically employed to denote an active relation. This pertains not only to the suffixed forms but to the prefixed ones as well. The prepositional form **לִּאֲבִי** occurs, apart from our texts, only 8 times in the HB in the passages in which it is preceded by the verb **הָיָה** and can be explained in terms of presenting oneself, behaving as a father towards someone.¹² However, the pure grammatical forms without their particular context do not always reflect their real and full function and meaning in the sentence; this is evident in our case, because the divine fatherhood expressions in their contexts are directly or in the form of pronominal suffixes related to the people of Israel.¹³ Only in some cases God is portrayed as a Father to an individual or to a certain group.¹⁴ The predominant association of God as Father with Israel is not surprising, for, taking into account the dates of the other texts which speak of divine fatherhood in various ways,¹⁵ it becomes clear that God's fatherhood in the HB is primarily connected with Israel.

The texts, asserting divine fatherhood, offer another well discernible indication for their interpretation. It is a criterion of the speaking subject: God himself declares to be a Father and God is named or acknowledged to be a Father (9x). That God calls himself Father is not a common rule; the stronger accent falls on human initiative.¹⁶ It does not mean, however, that the revelation of God's fatherhood is somewhat vague and accidental as if it were construed of merely human attribution to God of certain terrestrial features of a human father. On the contrary, instead of continuously calling himself a father, God is presented in the most important passages as the Father *par excellence* not because he is said to be such but because of his relationship with Israel. For that reason he appears to be not an abstract father but the one whose fatherhood is grounded on very familiar relations: he calls the nation (my) son and the nation acknowledges him as (my) Father. It is also significant that the passages naming or acknowledging God as Father (6x) reflect the use of 'father' in a prayer context¹⁷ and thus show at least statistically the importance of that issue.

¹² Cf. ZORELL, *Lexicon Hebraicum Veteris Testamenti*, לִּאֲבִי + הָיָה – *se praestare*, in Judg 17:10; 18:19 2 Sam 7:14; Isa 22:21.

¹³ Those pronominal suffixes which are in the singular do not necessarily refer to some individual; in two cases *my* and once *your* (Jer 3:4.19; Deut 32:6) are clearly to be seen in connection with Israel. The other texts attesting God's fatherhood to Israel are the following: Isa 63:16; 64:7; Jer 31:9; Mal 1:6; 2:10.

¹⁴ To an individual cf. 2 Sam 7:14 (parallels in 1 Chron 17:13; 22:10; 28:6); Ps 89:27 (cf. Pss 2:7; 109:3 LXX); to a group Ps 68:6.

¹⁵ See below.

¹⁶ In fact, it seems that there are only two mutually independent texts: Jer 31:9 and 2 Sam 7:14 (parallels in 1 Chron 17:13; 22:10; 28:6) that clearly express God's self-revelation. The phrase in Mal 1:6: *If then I am a father*, is a bit ambiguous and may rather point to people's custom to appeal to God in this fashion than to God's direct speech. Similarly, the phrase in Ps 89:27: *He shall cry to me, You are my Father*, is better understood as an echo of mythological motives of the divine kingship or the language of adoption rather than explicit divine self-revelation.

¹⁷ Cf. Isa 63:16 (twice); 64:7; Ps 89:27. In Jer 3:4.19 the original prayer context for אֲבִי may be supposed because of the cultic connotations and controversies with idolatry which dominate in Jer 3.

1.1.2. Septuagint

The briefly examined Hebrew term is rendered by no less commonly conventional word πατήρ in LXX, which in the ordinary use of Greek primarily denoted the father of a family; additionally, as in the case of its Hebrew counterpart, its more extensive physical and metaphorical employment is attested as well. Moreover, in both cases there are similarities: earthly ‘father’ both in Greek and Semitic cultures was understood as the authoritative head of the family and had to be honored. This term could also have been applied to a certain man as a honorific title; in religious and theological field even more importance was acknowledged to πατήρ than to a ‘father’ in Hebrew culture.¹⁸

In many cases in which the Hebrew texts explicitly state divine fatherhood LXX translates them quite accurately (אבִּי 5x – εἰς πατέρα 5x; אבִּינוּ 3x – πατήρ ἡμῶν 3x; אבִּיךָ 1x – σου πατήρ 1x; אבִּי 3x – πατήρ μου 1x;), yet there are several instances in which the Greek version differs. In Isa 64:7 the Greek text omits the phrase ואתה יצרנו (and you are our potter) and in Jer 3:4 instead of בְּעַתָּה (*just now*) it reads οἶκος (*house*), - οὐχ ὥς οἶκόν με ἐκάλεσας καὶ πατέρα. The latter case, because of one letter (בַּעַתָּה), can be easily understood as a misreading of the Hebrew text or a mistake of the copyist; the omission in Isaiah, unfortunately, diminishes the strength of the expression which is elsewhere attested (cf. Isa 29:16; 30:14). Yet, the main divergence from the Hebrew text is the change of personal pronouns attached to πατήρ. In Mal 2:10 the pronominal suffixes (*us, our*) are rendered in LXX by ὑμῶν (*your*) and this was probably done achieve uniformity with preceding and subsequent contexts, which are dominated by *you* pronouns. The second instance is found in Jer 3. Both verses (v. 4 and v. 19) omit the pronominal suffix *my* and, this way considerably reduce the atmosphere of familiarity expressed in the Hebrew text.¹⁹ In addition, there is a passage in LXX which interprets Hebrew text of 1 Chron 29:10 in its own way: instead of בָּרוּךְ אַתָּה יְיָ אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲבִינוּ (Blessed are you, o Lord, the God of Israel our father) it is rendered in LXX as εὐλογητὸς εἶ κύριε ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραὴλ ὁ πατήρ ἡμῶν. As a result, one more quality to the fatherhood of God is added.

The use of πατήρ as a title for God in the deuterocanonical books of the Old Testament follows the pattern of the HB, - it is very rare²⁰ and its very existence is even more complicated because of three of a total of five occurrences which are found in the book of Sirach. The

¹⁸ Generally, see G. SCHRENK, πατήρ, in *TDNT* 5, p. 948ff.

¹⁹ It may be noted that the version of LXX in the book of Jeremiah differs from the HB in many instances and our reference to both verses is not an exception.

²⁰ In the deuterocanonical corpus of the Old Testament πατήρ is used 155 times. In the books of Wisdom, Sirach, and Tobit taken together this term occurs 89 times but there are only 5 occurrences that explicitly attest God's fatherhood.

problem is twofold: first, there are confusing textual witnesses; secondly, the authenticity of the Hebrew text is debatable (in particular regarding Sir 23:1.4). Nevertheless, it is considered that in the case of Sir 51:10, the Hebrew text should be given preference over the Greek version as it is more original; a possible interpretation of God as Father in the Hebrew text of Sir 51:1 אֲבִי אֱלֹהֵי (my God, my Father) is less favored and consequently ruled out of the investigation.²¹ In fact God's fatherhood in Sir 51:10 is attested both by the Hebrew manuscript אֲבִי אֱלֹהֵי (God you are my Father) and LXX ἐπεκαλεσάμην κύριον πατέρα κυρίου μου (I appealed to the Lord, the Father of my lord); the difference is that the Hebrew text is clearer and more emphatic: instead of simple statement there is an acknowledgment (my Father). The further two occurrences of πατήρ in Sir 23:1.4 are well attested only in the Greek version,²² and together with Wis 14:3, they are unique in the whole Old Testament because of their theological vocative use - πάτερ. Lastly, the Greek text²³ of Tob 13:4 repeatedly stress the importance of the collective and personal²⁴ conception of God's fatherhood: πατήρ ἡμῶν, while previous instances in Sir 23:1.4 and Sir 51:10H^B underline individual's claim to a more special relationship with Father: πάτερ...ζωῆς μου and אֲבִי אֱלֹהֵי. It is noteworthy, that in those few occurrences the title πατήρ is in a very close connection to κύριος,²⁵ which in LXX mostly stands for יהוה.²⁶ In contrast to the rest of the Old Testament, this is a noticeable difference, because God's name and 'father' are only twice coupled in the book of Isaiah;²⁷ all the other thirteen texts with אב for God completely avoid the tetragrammaton יהוה.

1. In addition to evident scarcity of explicit references to God as Father, the brief overview of the data given by the Hebrew and Greek texts offer some other conclusive remarks:

²¹ Cf. J. JEREMIAS, *The Prayers of Jesus*, SBT II, 6, London: SCM Press, 1967, p. 28, note 69; MARCHEL, *Abba, Père!*, pp. 68-71; J. A. FITZMYER, "Abba and Jesus' relation to God," in R. GANTOY (ed.), *A cause de l'évangile: Etudes sur les Synoptiques et les Actes offertes au P. Jacques Dupont, O.S.B. à l'occasion de son 70e anniversaire* (LD 123), Paris: Cerf, 1985, p.26 note 50; A. STROTMANN, „Mein Vater bist du!“ (Sir 51,10). Zur Bedeutung der Vaterschaft Gottes in kanonischen und nichtkanonischen frühjüdischen Schriften (Frankfurter Theologische Studien 39), Frankfurt: Verlag Josef Knecht, 1991, pp. 83-85.

²² Although Jeremias supposed the Greek text to be not very reliable (*ibid.*), the uncertainty about authenticity and originality of the Hebrew version do not allow us to speculate much on this subject. Additionally, Jeremias's opinion is based upon the argument that is rather questionable; there are also other indications in favor of the authenticity of theological πάτερ retained in Greek text; see STROTMANN, „Mein Vater bist du!“ (Sir 51,10), pp. 72-73.

²³ Unfortunately, the definition of God as Father in the Hebrew text of Tob 13:1-4 (4QTob^c) reconstructed and translated by Fitzmyer have not been found. For the reconstructed text see C. A. MOORE, *Tobit. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 40A, New York: Doubleday, 1996, pp. 286-287.

²⁴ It is noteworthy that in this prayer, which may be regarded with more or less certainty as independent liturgical composition, dominates abstract conception of God whose rule is absolute; our verse is a real exception because of the threefold attachment of the personal pronoun 'our' to God, Lord, and Father; cf. MOORE, *Tobit*, pp. 275, 283.

²⁵ In Sir 23:1.4 twice κύριε πάτερ; Greek text of Sir 51:10 has κύριον πατέρα; Tob 13:4 κύριος ἡμῶν καὶ θεός αὐτὸς πατήρ ἡμῶν; also 1 Chron 29:10 κύριε ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραὴλ ὁ πατήρ ἡμῶν.

²⁶ κύριος for יהוה in LXX is found more than 6000 times, for אֱלֹהִים nearly 190 and for shorter form אֵל 60 times.

²⁷ Isa 63:16 and 64:7 have אֲבִי יְהוָה and LXX in both cases translates as κύριε πατήρ ἡμῶν.

2. The HB avoids associating divine titles with אֱלֹהִים, whereas in LXX there is a tendency to keep close κύριος and πατήρ in a more or less fixed form in close association.
3. The role of the individual in relationship with the divine Father is more emphasized in the deuterocanonical books of the OT.
4. The immediate contexts of theological πατήρ employed in LXX are essentially prayers²⁸ which, similar to prayer contexts in the HB, indicate not only the importance of prayer and thanksgiving in Israel's relationship with God but also may serve as certain references to a cultic/liturgical background of calling God Father.

1.2. The Image of God as Father in Different Text-Groups

The statistic data and syntactic remarks merely present an outline of the image of God as Father in the OT. It is also quite obvious that those scarce occurrences of explicit references to God as Father in both the HB and LXX do not exhaust the theme of the divine fatherhood, but rather serve as direct testimonies to the Father's image. Therefore, in order to comprehend the significance and various aspects of God's fatherhood adequately, it is necessary to take into account not only the contents of the explicit texts in question but also the witnesses of other references that can be helpful for the formation of the conception of the divine Father as it is presented in the OT. There are a whole range of texts²⁹ in which certain aspects of God's fatherhood can be recognized as expressed in terms of filial relationship, comparisons,³⁰ and theophoric names.

1.2.1. Divine Fatherhood Revealed by 'Father-texts' and Filial Relationship

The relationships between God and man in the OT often represent different attitudes and responsibilities taken and understood by both sides. God's glorious and saving acts are frequently contrasted with the wickedness and infidelity of a man. This is even more evident when it is a matter of the whole people; in fact, a red thread of permanent tension between God and the nation is present in the whole history of Israel. Various texts, dealing with divine

²⁸ The only exception seems to be the context of Wis 14:3 that, despite evident addressing to God as πατήρ, is inserted in an extended reflection on the folly of idolatry.

²⁹ See, for instance, a list compiled by POUILLY, *Dieu Notre Père*, 1989, p.11. Apart from direct references to divine fatherhood he distinguishes three other text-groups, which also bear witness to it: God is compared to a father; God is compared to a mother; Israel or Israelites are called sons or children of God.

³⁰ According to Vanoni the distinction between explicit designations for God as Father and comparisons (as a father...so God) is not relevant theologically; cf. Vanoni, „*Du bist doch unser Vater*“, p. 39. Even if it may be true, it is important to observe individually (as a text-group) the contents employed in those comparisons because they allow an evaluation of the preferences and distinctions OT uses with regard to the figure of the divine Father. Furthermore, it is also significant for a future comparison of the terminology, which the apostle Paul employed for God as Father.

fatherhood have much in common with this theme; hence it seems more appropriate to consider the content of explicit 'father-texts' in connection with those texts which, although they do not entitle God as Father, continue to demonstrate his fatherly role by means of filial images.³¹ Those texts supplement the 'father-texts' with new details and so markedly contribute to a better comprehension of the conception of divine fatherhood. It cannot also be overlooked that filial relationships are not restrained, at least formally, to describing an exceptional God-people rapport. For this reason, the whole spectrum of those relationships in the Old Testament should be taken into consideration because of its valuable information which discloses other features of God's fatherhood.

On the linguistic-formal basis four groups may be marked out which are in one or another way (בן in the HB and υἱός in LXX³²) called son(s) of God: the people of Israel, the Davidic descendant, the just individual, and the fatherless ones. In all these cases the son(s) of God are in a close connection with divine fatherhood and so more or less reflect it. The fifth category of the texts in which son(s) of God also occur is beyond our consideration as it has no real relation to the fatherhood of God: they may signify the heavenly angels (cf. Job 1:6; 2:1; 38:7; Pss 29:1; 89:7; Deut 32:43 LXX) or the 'guardian' angels (cf. Dan 3:25-28). The sons of God colored with mythological connotations as presented in Gen 6: 1-4 probably refer to the sphere or class of gods and, consequently, are not considered for discussion.³³ In general, God's relationship to these divine heavenly beings reflects no idea of a true paternity; qualifying them as son(s) only indicates their classification.³⁴

³¹ The unification of two grammatically different text-groups ('father-texts' and 'son-texts') under one heading has been done because of several reasons: those texts in many cases present the same theme and do it in a similar way (especially regarding the relationship between God and his people); the different addressees in this unified group are well detectable; this argument based on the grammatical distinctions as regards the HB has already been dealt with by A. BÖCKLER, *Gott als Vater im Alten Testament. Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zur Entstehung und Entwicklung eines Gottesbildes*, Gütersloh: Chr. Kaiser/Gütersloh Verlagshaus, 2000.

³² According to Fohrer, there are two cases in LXX in which, instead of υἱός for בן other terms are employed. Thus LXX renders λαός for בני in Exod 4:23 and τέκνον for בן in Hos 11:1. The use of 'people' in Exod 4:23 may have been intended for religious or theological reasons, whereas the use of 'child' instead of 'son' in Hos 11:1 seems to have had no theological importance; cf. G. FOHRER, υἱός, in *TDNT* 8, pp. 353-354. Some other examples of the different rendering of בן in LXX may be added. Pokorný sees a double tendency in the translations of this Hebrew term by the authors of LXX. On the one hand, several references point to the leveling of the OT traditions: Ps 2:12 has in Aramaic נשקִיבֵר (kiss the son) and LXX renders it δρᾶξασθε παιδείας (embrace/take on the instruction/discipline); Deut 32:8; Job 1:6; 2:1; 38:7 (LXX) have ἄγγελοι for בני; Dan 3:92 (LXX) has ἀγγέλου θεοῦ for בְּרִאֲלֵהֶן in Dan 3:25. On the other hand, this term in the texts which may refer to the promised Messiah (Ps 2:7; 2 Sam 7:14) is retained in LXX as υἱός. This is also valid for Gen 22:12 and Jer 31:20 (LXX 38:20) where the title of υἱός is retained for Isaac in the first case and for Ephraim in the second. Moreover, in both texts their title is ὁ υἱός ὁ ἀγαπητός; cf. P. POKORNÝ, *Der Gottessohn: literarische Übersicht und Fragestellung* (Theologische Studien 109), Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1971, pp. 17-18.

³³ For the list of different opinions on the meaning of 'sons', see C. WESTERMANN, *Genesis 1-11*, Minneapolis: SPCK, London and Augsburg Publishing House, 1984, pp. 371-383.

³⁴ Cf. B. BYRNE, 'Sons of God' - 'Seed of Abraham': a Study of the Idea of the Sonship of God of all Christians in Paul against the Jewish Background (AnBib 83), Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1979, pp. 10-13.

1.2.1.1. God as Father to Israel

In the whole OT corpus that speaks of God's fatherhood, passages, in which the divine Father is portrayed as involved in relations with his people, occupy the most prominent place. The familiarity and uniqueness of the way he is related to Israel are represented mostly in 'Father-son' relationship that is at the core of the conception of divine fatherhood in the Old Testament.

The content of that relationship is not so uniform as to be standardized, but the prevalence of the Exodus motives there is quite noticeable. Israel is called seven times in singular as *my* son and *my* first-born in contexts that are in a very close relation to the Exodus event.³⁵ The echo of that event is also attested in some other texts that speak about *my*, *his*, *your*, *their* sons (and daughters). Furthermore, references to Israel's filiation are also found in the passages which present Israelites as sons from a more or less negative perspective: they are reproached but they are also called to return to their God.³⁶ Passages in the book of Wisdom in which the idea of sonship is expressed by the terms *παῖς* (Wis 2:13; 9:4; 12:7.20; 19:6) and *τέκνον* (Wis 16:21) should probably be also attributed to the 'son-texts'. The case with *τέκνον* is not problematic; the uncertainty remains translating *παῖς* because this word can both bear the meaning of a servant and of a child. The preferred translation of *παῖς* in the theological passages in LXX is that of servant; however, the contexts in which this term is employed in the book of Wisdom and its interchangeable position with *υἱός* allow it to be understood as a child or children of God respectively.³⁷ Although the 'son-texts' have much in common with the explicit 'father-texts',³⁸ the comparison of forms (Table 1) and contents (Table 2 and Table 3) reveals not only their similarities but also their differences.

³⁵ 'Exodus event' means not only the bare fact of people's delivery from Egypt, but also its consequences, such as the experience of a desert and the Covenant.

³⁶ Cf. K. LIMBURG, "La paternidad divina en el AT: algunas observaciones lingüístico-formales," in G. ARANDA et al. (eds.), *Biblia Exegesis y Cultura. Estudios: Estudios en Honor del prof. D. José María Casciaro* (CT 83), Pamplona: EUNSA, 1994, pp. 206-212. The texts with (my) son and (my) first-born are in Exod 4:22-23 (twice); Jer 31:9.20; Hos 11:1; Wis 18:13; Sir 36:11; with my, his, your, their sons (and daughters) in Deut 32:5.19; Isa 43:6; 45:11; Ezek 16:21; Jdt 9:4.13; Wis 9:7; 12:19.21; 16:10.26; 18:4; with *sons* in Deut 14:1; Hos 2:1; Esth 8:12^a (LXX); depicting sons in a negative sense Deut 32:20; Isa 1:2.4; 30:1.9; 63:8-10; Jer 3:14.22; 4:22.

³⁷ According to Jeremias, this term refers three times to the people of Israel in the book of Wisdom: Wis 12:7.20; 19:6, cf. J. JEREMIAS, *παῖς* θεοῦ, in *TDNT* 5, p. 678; similarly STROTMANN, „*Mein Vater bist du!*“ (Sir 51,10), p. 101. She, however, disagrees with Jeremias about the interpretation of *παῖς* in Wis 9:4 where she opts for *servants* instead of *children* on the basis of the incompatibility of the conception of divine fatherhood with the idea expressed by ἀποδοκιμάζω (throw out as the result of the test), though admits that the question is open; p. 104. Larcher, on the contrary, not only opts for "enfants de Dieu" in Wis 9:4 but also defines their meaning more precisely: instead of simply describing the just Israelites, they rather express the idea of mystical intimacy with God through wisdom and this, first of all, is valid for Solomon; cf. C. LARCHER, *Le Livre de la Sagesse ou la Sagesse de Salomon*, I-III, Paris: J. Gabalda, 1983-1985, II, pp. 572-573.

³⁸ Here are considered only those references, which clearly bear witness to the relationship between God as Father and the people of Israel: Deut 32:6; Isa 63:16 (twice); 64:7; Jer 3:4.19; 31:9; Mal 1:6; 2:10; Tob 13:4.

Table 1

‘Father-texts’	‘son-texts’	Forms
	Exod 4:22-23	command of God
	Deut 14:1	prohibition of God
Deut 32:6	Deut 32:5.19.20; ³⁹ Isa 1:2 ⁴⁰	rib
Jer 3:4; ⁴¹ Mal 1:6; 2:10 ⁴²	Isa 45:11 ⁴³	disputation/diatribes
Jer 3:19	Hos 11:1	historic accusation ⁴⁴
	Jer 3.14. ⁴⁵ 22	call to repentance
	Jer 4:22; ⁴⁶ Isa 30:9; ⁴⁷	indictment/accusation
	Ezek 16:21 ⁴⁸	
	Isa 1:4; ⁴⁹ Isa 30:1 ⁵⁰	‘woe’ oracle

³⁹ Cf. A. D. H. MAYES, *Deuteronomy*, NCB, London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1979, p. 380.

⁴⁰ The signs of trial and lawsuit genre are predominant in Isa 1:2-20 (23); cf. R. E. CLEMENTS, *Isaiah 1-39*, NCB, Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans – London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1980, pp. 28, 30; J. D. W. WATTS, *Isaiah 1-33*, WBC 24, Waco: Word Books, 1985, pp. 15-16; M. A. SWEENEY, *Isaiah 1-39 with an Introduction To Prophetic Literature*, FOTL 16, Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1996, pp. 66-67.

⁴¹ Jer 2:4-4:4 are called by Carroll as “discursive poems of false cults” in which 3:2-5 takes a disputation form; cf. R. P. CARROLL, *Jeremiah: A Commentary*, OTL, London: SCM Press, 1986, pp. 86, 143. It is difficult to define precisely the style or literary genre Jeremiah employed in those texts: the elements of rhetoric, nostalgia, disputation, and reproach are often interwoven. Holladay, for instance, sees a *rib* speech in the passage 3:1-2.4-5; cf. W. L. HOLLADAY, *Jeremiah 1: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah. Chapters 1-25*, Hermeneia, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986, p. 73.

⁴² Scholars disagree about the style employed by Malachi in his discourses: should it be understood as disputation, discussion, or diatribe? For a summing up of various opinions see D. L. PETERSEN, *Zechariah 9-14 & Malachi*, OTL, London: SCM Press, 1995, pp. 29-31.

⁴³ Cf. C. WESTERMANN, *Isaiah 40-66. A Commentary*, OTL, London: SCM Press, 1969, p. 165.

⁴⁴ HOLLADAY, *Jeremiah 1*, p. 74, prefers to call it a ‘declaration of Yahweh’, but neither this nor the ‘divine nostalgia’ proposed by P. C. CRAIGIE, P. H. KELLEY, J. F. DRINKARD, *Jeremiah 1-25*, WBC 26, Dallas: Word Books, 1991, p. 64, are very precise. In fact, both elements are discernable and thus Jer 3:19-20 presents a certain declarative regression and nostalgic rethinking of Israel’s historic past. Regardless of which definition would be more appropriate, the accusatory element in this verse is very clear. The similar but more intensely expressed situation is in Hos 11:1-4. The whole Hos 11 may be seen as a more or less coherent unit and called a historic-theological accusation; cf. H. W. WOLFF, *Hosea*, Hermeneia, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974, p. 193. Additionally, the evident contrast between the graciousness of God as Father and the wickedness of Israel in both Jer 3 and Hos 11 serves as a preamble to its accusation.

⁴⁵ In fact, v. 14 apart from the call to repentance also introduces also the oracle of salvation (vv. 14-18); it is put alongside v. 22 because of their identical initial phrasing.

⁴⁶ The style of the divine oracle may be described as complaint or lament, which in fact offers no hope, because the terms stressing the lack of understanding and the stupidity of the people seen in conjunction with vv. 19-21 emphasize the inevitability of judgment; cf. CRAIGIE, KELLEY, DRINKARD, *Jeremiah 1-25*, p. 79.

⁴⁷ Sweeney thinks that a dominating literary genre in Isa 30 is a prophetic instruction that does not exclude other elements: vv. 1-5 is a ‘woe’ oracle and v. 9 belongs to the instruction of Yahweh; cf. SWEENEY, *Isaiah 1-39*, pp. 393-394.

⁴⁸ The basic part of Ezek 16 (vv.2-43ba) is a variation of the oracle of judgment in which the accusation is presented in vv. 15-34; cf. L. C. ALLEN, *Ezekiel 1-19*, WBC 28, Dallas: World Books, 1994, pp. 232-233. The manner taken by the prophet to accuse Jerusalem is similar to a legal process at the gate of a city; cf. W. ZIMMERLI, *Ezekiel 1*, Hermeneia, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979, pp. 333-335.

⁴⁹ Basically, the function of a ‘woe’ oracle may be viewed under a twofold aspect: it is an exclamation of suffering (even lament) and/or some kind of warning. Sweeney prefers the latter interpretation and suggests to see a warning in v. 4; the reason is a rhetorical question presented in v. 5a whose intention is “clearly to convey to the people that

Isa 63:16; 64:7	Isa 63:8	communal lament ⁵¹
Jer 31:9	Jer 31:9.20; Hos 2:1; ⁵² Isa 43:6 ⁵³	oracle of salvation
	Esth 8:12 ^q (Add Esth E 1-24)	acknowledgement
Tob 13:4 ⁵⁴	Jdt 9:4.13; Wis 9:7; Sir 36:11	prayer
	Wis 12:7.19.20.21; 16:10.21.26;	meditations on the
	18:4.13; 19:6	history of Israel ⁵⁵

A visual comparison of the forms, which present the relationship between the divine Father and Israel in both text-groups (see Table 1) shows clearly that the image of those rapports taken as a whole is more negative than positive. It is noteworthy that such a picture prevails in the HB, while the forms of the later texts found in LXX are much more neutral. Both text-groups show similarities and correspondences of some points because of their similar or identical form. It may be noted however, that the ‘father-texts’ put in the form of disputation or diatribe are formally softer than the ‘son-texts’ in which accusations and ‘woe’ oracles give an impression of even deeper tension between Yahweh and his people. On the other hand, the oracles of salvation are more frequent in the ‘son-texts’; hence it is difficult to compare and evaluate the level of negativism or positivism of the relationship between God and Israel described in each text-group. Referring to the statistic data it can be claimed that the greater diversity of the employed forms and the bigger contrasts in the ‘son-texts’ broaden the understanding about the rather complicated and multifaceted positive as well as negative character of the ‘Father-Israel’ rapports in the OT.

they are responsible for their current misfortunes and that they are capable of ending their suffering by ending their apostasy”; SWEENEY, *Isaiah 1-39*, p. 76. According to Kaiser, the *Sitz im Leben* of the prophecy in its integrity (vv. 2-9) was the cultic situation; cf. O. KAISER, *Isaiah 13-39. A Commentary*, OLT, Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1974, pp. 6-7.

⁵⁰ Cf. KAISER, *Isaiah 13-39*, p. 282. According to Watts, the ‘woe’ oracle in vv.1-7 should be understood as a lament over rebellious children; cf. WATTS, *Isaiah 1-33*, p. 395.

⁵¹ Many scholars agree about the length and collective/communal character of Isa 63:7-64:11 as well as of its psalmic form, cf. WESTERMANN, *Isaiah 40-66*, p. 386; BONNARD, *Le Second Isaïe*, p. 444; WHYBRAY, *Isaiah 40-66*, p. 255.

⁵² Cf. WOLFF, *Hosea*, pp. 24-25.

⁵³ The debatable point is should one or two oracles be understood within Isa 43:1-7; cf. WESTERMANN, *Isaiah 40-66*, p. 115; P.-E. BONNARD, *Le Second Isaïe. Son disciple e leurs éditeurs*, Paris: J Gabalda, 1972, p. 135; R. N. WHYBRAY, *Isaiah 40-66*, NCB, London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott - Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1981, 1990³, pp. 81-82; J. D. W. WATTS, *Isaiah 34-66*, WBC 25, Waco: Word Books, 1987, p. 129. According to Westermann, the original *Sitz im Leben* of the oracle of salvation as such should be seen in Israel’s worship (it is of cultic nature). Second Isaiah adapted it: by putting God’s salvific message into a liturgical form, that was originally a lamentation, he combined the prophetic announcement and the cultic declaration of salvation thereby giving an answer to the people’s lament and assuring the granting of their prayer; *ibid.*, pp. 68-69.

⁵⁴ While the individual prayer of Judith is colored by motives of personal vengeance, the prayer in Tob 13 is more “psalm-like” and expresses gratitude in anticipation; cf. MOORE, *Tobit*, p. 282.

⁵⁵ A series of antitheses (elaborate comparison) presenting a theme of the Exodus (Wis 11-19) so highlights the contraposition between the punishment of Egypt and the rescue of Israel that the chosen people are even said to be benefited by the very things by which Egypt was punished; cf. D. WINSTON, *The Wisdom of Solomon. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 43, Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, 1979, p. 6.

Table 2

Image of God as Father	Image of the people	'Father-texts'
creator of Israel	foolish, ungrateful	Deut 32:6 exd ⁵⁶
	treacherous	Mal 2:10 ⁵⁷
	God's creature	Isa 64:7 ⁵⁸ exd
friend of youth ⁵⁹	unfaithful ⁶⁰	Jer 3:4 ex
giver of the land	treacherous	Jer 3:19 ⁶¹
savior, redeemer ⁶²	first-born ⁶³	Jer 31:9 ⁶⁴ exd

⁵⁶ The texts in Table 2 and Table 3, which speak of or echo the Exodus event are nonetheless listed separately to illustrate better how the figure of God as Father is presented in different text-groups and how it contrasts with the image of the people. Those texts are marked by 'exd'. The image of the divine Father as Creator of Israel plays in its context the role of an effective imperative to the people's religious-moral behavior; cf. A. BÖCKLER, *Gott als Vater im Alten Testament*, p. 299.

⁵⁷ The similar question *Is not he your father, who created you...?* is attested in Deut 32:6. The unifying motive between two questions *Have we not all one father? Has not one God created us?* in this verse is term 'one', which may also have been implied by Malachi as an imperative for the unity of the people who once had been created by the same God and Father; cf. PETERSEN, *Zechariah 9-14 & Malachi*, p. 196. The motive of unity is given high evaluation by Böckler: "Gott als Vater ist in diesem Text also ein Symbol für die Einheit der Gemeinde"; according to her, the creative aspect in this verse is less important; cf. BÖCKLER, *Gott als Vater im Alten Testament*, p. 331.

⁵⁸ The acknowledgement of the divine fatherhood is very similar here to Isa 63:16, yet, in the first case the emphasis is put more on God as a Father, and, in the second case, on the people of Israel as mere creature. Being a creature (cf. Ps 139) means belonging, trusting, taking refuge; cf. WESTERMANN, *Isaiah 40-66*, p. 397; BÖCKLER, *Gott als Vater im Alten Testament*, p. 289. Additionally, the invocation to the divine Father in Isa 63:16 was prompted by the people's wish to change their miserable state; in the case of Isa 64:7, first of all, it was done because of the misery of sin. Actually, these texts supplement each other: the real Father not only gives (redeems) but also forgives; cf. BONNARD, *Le Second Isaïe*, p. 456.

⁵⁹ Another possible translation is a 'teacher of my youth'; attributing to זר the role of the 'teacher' in this case rather underlines the educational activity of God as Father; cf. W. MCKANE, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Jeremiah*, vol. 1 (I-XXV), ICC, Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1986, p. 61; recently followed by BÖCKLER, *Gott als Vater im Alten Testament*, pp. 312-314.

⁶⁰ The reality of the infidelity of the Israelites, which is presented by a feminine metaphor, may point, because of ambiguity of the language, to religious, political or sexual activities connected with the cult of Baal, or even with all of them at the same time; cf. CARROLL, *Jeremiah*, p. 142. Seeing Jer 3:1-5 as the denouncement of Israel or some part of the people for their participation in a cult of fertility, their hypocrisy may be summed up in two points: first, there was their proper fault because they were waiting and seeking for such a possibility (v. 2); secondly, they wanted at the same time to equalize the Yahweh religion with fertility worship, i.e., to practice a syncretistic religion; cf. CRAIGIE, KELLEY, DRINKARD, *Jeremiah 1-25*, p. 52. Their syncretistic attitude is also emphasized by the word 'forehead' in v. 3 that may refer to a certain phylactery worn by a prostitute; it was a visible sign by which they were not ashamed; even more so, they refused to be ashamed both inwardly and outwardly; cf. HOLLADAY, *Jeremiah 1*, p. 115. The issue is not about the rejection of the divine fatherhood, for God is called the friend of youthful times (v. 4), but about the obstinate misunderstanding 'who was to be held a true God' (cf. Jer 2:27). That is why the Israelites were so impudent to talk to Yahweh in familial terms: they had been treating Yahweh as one among others.

⁶¹ This verse may reflect a certain universalistic view about God's fatherhood: all nations are sons of God amongst whom Israel has a privileged status; cf. CARROLL, *Jeremiah*, p. 152. Some scholars believe that the phrase בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים (*set you among my sons*) alludes to the adoption of Israel that anticipates the inheritance of the land; cf. M. WEINFELD, "The Covenant of Grant in the Old Testament and in the Ancient Near East," *JAOS* 90 (1970) p. 194. In the context of the whole chapter v. 19 may be seen as some kind of confirmation and ratification of the legitimacy of expression 'my Father' (v. 4); yet, in this case, the right to call God *my* Father is connected with the condition the Israelites were always to keep in mind and put in practice – *not turn from following me*.

⁶² The salvational, ransoming, and redemptive acts of God are attested in Jer 31:7-14.

⁶³ In the cases where texts give no particular description of Israel, the words, which are employed for the people (first-born, son(s), and children), are put under that column. Besides, both the images of the divine Father and Israel are not necessarily found literary described in the exact verse the texts point to. Sometimes they need to be viewed in a broader context.

redeemer	miserable ⁶⁵	Isa 63:16 exd
master to be honored ⁶⁶	[corrupted priests] ⁶⁷	Mal 1:6
educator	[wicked] ⁶⁸	Tob 13:4 exd

Table 3

Image of God	Image of the people	‘son-texts’
author of the Exodus	first-born	Exod 4:22-23 ⁶⁹ exd
	bearer of the Law	Wis 18:4 exd
	son	Wis 18:13 ⁷⁰ exd
	children	Wis 19:6 exd
rock ⁷¹	perverse, unmindful	Deut 32:4.18 exd

⁶⁴ This verse gives an explanation as to ‘why’ Israel may return from exile: it is because of God is his Father (this term serves as a trustworthy guarantee). That return was supposed to be an overwhelming event because of its character: everybody was included in the march of salvation (vv. 8-9). The vulnerability of the returnees and the images of the route they would have to pass through emphasize even more their dependence on the guidance of God and the providential nature of that journey. The juxtaposition of Israel and Ephraim as God’s first-born (v. 9) is not very clear: the interpretations vary depending on whether Israel is synonymous with Ephraim (also v. 20) or not. The mention of the ‘weeping’ of the Israelites (v. 9) is also debatable: was it to be prompted by the joy of their returning to the homeland or by the repentance because of their previous faults; cf. CARROLL, *Jeremiah*, p. 592; G. L. KEOWN, P. J. SCALISE, T. G. SMOTHERS, *Jeremiah 26-52*, WBC 27, Dallas: Word Books, 1995, p. 113; W. MCKANE, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Jeremiah*, vol. 2 (XXVI-LII), ICC, Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996, pp. 791-792, 799-800; BÖCKLER, *Gott als Vater im Alten Testament*, p. 276.

⁶⁵ There is no clear and satisfactory answer why the personages of Abraham and Israel are mentioned in v. 16. For the summary of opinions on this point and on the different interpretations of ‘our Father’ see BÖCKLER, *Gott als Vater im Alten Testament*, pp. 281-286. One of the possibilities is that they may have been introduced to emphasize hopelessness of the people: nobody could help them; cf. WHYBRAY, *Isaiah 40-66*, pp. 260-261.

⁶⁶ It may be that Malachi, putting in parallelism terms מִרְא (not in the sense of *fear* but *Ehrfurcht*) of God and his כְּבוֹד (*honor, glory*), wished to emphasize the great importance of honoring God; cf. BÖCKLER, *Gott als Vater im Alten Testament*, pp. 322-323.

⁶⁷ God’s fatherhood in this verse is expressed by ‘father’ without any prefix or suffix. Since there is no mention of the people of Israel, and the corrupted priests were the actual addressees of the divine message; they are put in brackets as those who at least partially represented Israel.

⁶⁸ The wickedness of the people is not stressed directly; v. 5 alludes to it as if it were a commonly known matter. The real image of the divine fatherhood in v. 4d is understood only keeping in mind the entire prayer (vv. 2-7). The second part of that prayer (vv. 5-7) enlightens v. 4d and, *vice versa*, the fatherhood of God reveals the full sense of vv. 5-7. The exceptional and very personal relationship between God and Israel presented in vv. 2-4 are concretized in vv. 5-7. Namely in these verses the aspects of the divine education and his unwavering fidelity explain God’s continuous turning to Israel. The first aspect is primarily expressed by *μαστιγὼν* and *ἐλεέω* which reflect the educational concept as tightly connected with penalty. This is also valid for the concept of fatherly love. Penalty in the wisdom context is even understood as the essential expression of the fatherly as well as of the divine love (cf. Prov 3:12). The second aspect of God’s fatherhood, his fidelity to Israel, is an integral part of the divine educational concept. The image of the divine Father, who punishes his child and has mercy, once again emphasizes the continuous character of their relationship: the disobedience of the child and the subsequent penalty can never exhaust the affection of the Father for his child; cf. STROTMANN, „*Mein Vater bist du!*“ (*Sir 51,10*), pp. 56-57. For detailed exegesis, see *ibid.* pp. 28-51.

⁶⁹ “Vv. 22-23 are an ingeniously compact preview of election, exodus, and triumphant proof-of-Presence”; J. I. DURHAM, *Exodus*, WBC 3, Waco: Word Books, 1987, p. 56. In addition, as Pharaoh’s son is a successor and shares his father’s power, so does Israel through its relationship to God as Father; cf. BÖCKLER, *Gott als Vater im Alten Testament*, p. 271.

⁷⁰ This verse stresses that Egypt acknowledged Israel as God’s son only after the death of Pharaoh’s first-born. In fact, such a declaration made by Egypt is not found in the Bible but is based on Exod 4:22-23 and is highly suggestive: it would have been enough to acknowledge the particular election of Israel to recover the favor of God; cf. C. LARCHER, *Le Livre de la Sagesse*, III, p. 1013.

creator of Israel	unmindful	Deut 32:18. ⁷² 19. ⁷³ 20
	God's creature	Isa 43:1-7 ⁷⁴ exd
	God's creature	Isa 45:11 ⁷⁵
gracious ⁷⁶	unfaithful, wicked ⁷⁷	Ezek 16:21
educator	rebellious ⁷⁸	Isa 1:2 ⁷⁹ [exd]
	foolish, stupid ⁸⁰	Jer 4:22 ⁸¹
	idolatrous	Hos 11:2-4 ⁸²

⁷¹ 'Rock' should probably be understood as a 'mountain', one of the divine appellatives of Baal, in this case a divine title, cf. MAYES, *Deuteronomy*, p. 383. The metaphor reflects the primitive religious experience of rocky localities as places for rescue and refuge where God was revealing his power and protection. Yahweh is called a 'rock' because of his righteousness (cf. Ps 18:31), his creative activity (Deut 32:18, cf. v.15; Jer 2:27), and his exceptional difference from pagan deities (Deut 32:31.37, cf. 1Sam 2:2; Isa 44:8; Ps 18:32). The summary of accusation contrasts the acts of the 'rock' to the infidelity in v. 5 and the ungratefulness in v. 6 of the people; cf. G. BRAULIK, *Deuteronomium II. 16,18-34,12*, Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1992, p. 228.

⁷² In this verse, the words used to describe the creative power of God, are יָרָא and הָיָא which mean to beget, to bring forth (LXX - γεννάω).

⁷³ Provocation or vexation in v. 19 may be seen as disappointment and grief which the divine Father experienced because of the dishonoring attitude of his people towards him; cf. S. R. DRIVER, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy*, ICC, Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1902³, p. 364.

⁷⁴ The emphasis put on God as creator in v. 1 and v. 7, apart from framing the oracle, has also a dynamic character: the creator of Israel in v. 1 becomes the creator of every single Israelite in v. 7. Moreover, if offspring in v. 5 are meant individual Israelites, which in v. 6 are called my sons and my daughters, then they carry a very personal character in the light of v. 7: every Israelite is a son or a daughter of Yahweh; cf. WHYBRAY, *Isaiah 40-66*, p. 83.

⁷⁵ It is noteworthy that in this case the creation of Israel (v. 11) is connected with a wider context of God's creative activity: God is both creator of man and the world (v. 12).

⁷⁶ A theme of God's graciousness dominates the preceding verses. The shift from your sons and your daughters (v. 20) to my children (v. 21) even more accentuates the exceptional character of the relationship between Yahweh and his people.

⁷⁷ The allegory or extended metaphor of a girl, Jerusalem, who being ungrateful and adulterous, misused and despised God's gifts, reaches its climax by associating her wickedness with the cult of Moloch (vv.20-22); cf. ZIMMERLI, *Ezekiel 1*, pp. 343-344; ALLEN, *Ezekiel 1-19*, pp. 232-233, 239. Additionally, the practices described and condemned in vv. 15-21 were not probably legated exceptionally to the Canaanite cults but might also have been imported from other countries (cf. v. 14); cf. W. H. BROWNLEE, *Ezekiel 1-19*, WBC 28, Waco: Word Books, 1986, p. 228.

⁷⁸ By the term 'rebel' that fits to describe both the 'parent-child' and 'king-subject' pattern, the author expresses the emotional and deliberate character of the revolt: the breaking of the filial relationship incurs its consequences as well; cf. WATTS, *Isaiah 1-33*, p. 17.

⁷⁹ The accusation in vv. 2-3 seems to have been mixed with the sorrow of Yahweh for the ignorance of the people. The statement about the people's lack of understanding is important: in fact, they need instruction and thus the accusation may serve as an instrument to change their situation; cf. SWEENEY, *Isaiah 1-39*, p. 74.

⁸⁰ The synonyms and antonyms in this verse offer a "crushing parallelism", and the seriousness of the accusation is well seen in the phrase *they do not know*. In order to know how to do good it is necessary to know Yahweh, because he is the source of ethical life; cf. HOLLADAY, *Jeremiah 1*, p. 163.

⁸¹ Because of the adopted terms, which are usually employed in the wisdom tradition, Holladay describes v. 22 as a "schoolmaster report", HOLLADAY, *Jeremiah 1*, p. 151. The real problem of the people is not their lack of intelligence but rather their unwillingness to adhere to a discipline imposed by God; cf. MCKANE, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Jeremiah*, vol.1, p. 105.

⁸² The divine fatherhood is not directly stated in these verses either in 'father' or 'son(s)' terms; despite that, it is reasonable to see vv. 2-4 as a direct development of v. 1 in which Israel is called 'my son'. In these verses the divine care and education concretize the fatherly love of God expressed in v. 1.

	chastened, beloved ⁸³	Wis 12:19-21; 16:10.21.26 exd
loving	miserable	Jer 31:20 ⁸⁴
	young, disobedient	Hos 11:1.3 ⁸⁵ exd
merciful	backsliding	Jer 3:14. ⁸⁶ 22 ⁸⁷
	restored ⁸⁸	Hos 2:1

⁸³ These references reveal two different aspects of divine education: the loving care and mercy of God and the punishment and judgment he exercised to train his people. While the latter aspect prevails in Wis 12:19-21, the more positive way of education is presented in Wis 16:10.21.26. The rescue of the sons of Israel from the disaster God himself allowed to happen (v. 10) still reflects the merciful but strict character of the divine Father (cf. vv. 5-12); the nourishment of the people with manna reveals not only God's love but also the ultimate task of their disciplining, - they had to understand that only the divine word preserves those who trust in him (16:26); cf. STROTMANN, „*Mein Vater bist du!*“ (Sir 51,10), p. 102. God's loving attitude towards his children is expressed in v. 21 by his metaphorical sweetness (γλυκύτης). The only other time this term occurs in LXX in Judg 9:11 – there it is employed in a proper sense.

⁸⁴ God's love for Israel in this verse is presented through a very strong metaphor of motherly love (רחם). The observation of Carroll that the divine “compulsive love” guarantees the future of the community (metaphorically described in vv. 15-20) is noteworthy, but naming God “Mother Yahweh”, because of the visceral image of his love for Israel, is inappropriate and insufficient (so McKane) as if fathers were not able to experience such a compassion (so Miller). Whatever translation in this verse is preferred in the case of *as I speak against or about him I do remember him still*, it adds one more point to the very emotional character of God's love; cf. CARROLL, *Jeremiah*, p. 600; W. L. HOLLADAY, *Jeremiah 2: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah. Chapters 26-52*, Hermeneia, Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989, pp. 191-192; MCKANE, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Jeremiah*, vol. 2, p. 802; MILLER, *Calling God “Father”*, p. 50. Regarding some philological uncertainty in rendering רחם by a motherly love/compassion see M. I. GRUBER, “The Motherhood of God in Second Isaiah,” *RB* 90 (3, 1983), pp. 352-353 and notes 4 and 6.

⁸⁵ The interpretation of Hos 11:1 depends much on the function and meaning of כִּי (when or because) and especially of מִן (from or since). A temporal interpretation of מִן that allows to postulate Israel's status of being son of Yahweh already at its time in Egypt had already been proposed by van Hoonacker and followed by Lagrange, cf. M.-P. LAGRANGE, “La paternité de Dieu dans l'Ancien Testament,” *RB* 17 (5, 1908) 481-499, p. 483. It is more probable however, that the election of Israel is interpreted here in terms of the already known father-adopted son analogy and the Exodus tradition. It seems that Hosea was the first who employed the term אהב (love) to interpret the election of Israel. Moreover, the adoption and rescue of Israel from Egyptian servitude are presented here as an exclusively and entirely gracious and decisive action of Yahweh. The young age of Israel means supposedly nothing more than its helplessness and incapability of any independent action and its ‘calling’ seen in the light of vv. 2-4 probably should be understood in a natural way as a purely fatherly and loving call; cf. WOLFF, *Hosea*, pp. 197-198; A. A. MACINTOSH, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Hosea*, ICC, Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997, pp. 437-438. Orrieux thinks that the accent in v. 1 should be put namely on the ‘calling’ of Israel; he underlines the significance of the divine call entitling it as a ‘vocation’: the people had been called by Yahweh, but did not answer, because they preferred to offer sacrifices to the Baals. According to Hosea, the idolatry was the principal sin the Israelites had been committing over and over again. Nevertheless, God's fatherly feelings were not diminished but rather more enkindled because he had taken the initiative; as his fidelity to Israel did not depend on the merits of the people so his love for Israel could not be quenched by the iniquities of the Israelites; cf. C. ORRIEUX, “La paternité de Dieu dans l'Ancien Testament,” *LumVie* 104 (1971) 59-74, p. 65-67. According to Böckler the real purpose of the ‘Father-son’ pattern is not to stress the fatherhood of God as such but to emphasize through it the disobedience of Israel; cf. BÖCKLER, *Gott als Vater im Alten Testament*, pp. 264-265. Davies opts for a rather prophetic interpretation of Israel's ‘calling’ from Egypt rather than the adoption idea; cf. G. I. DAVIES, *Hosea*, NCB, Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans – London: Harper Collins, 1992, p. 254.

⁸⁶ Whether this and the following verses intend a return from the exile or not is not very clear; cf. CRAIGIE, *Jeremiah 1-25*, p. 60; MCKANE, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Jeremiah*, vol.1, pp. 72-77.

⁸⁷ Jer 3:21-4:2 may reflect what the prophet wished to happen and how he appealed to his addressees to stimulate them to change their lives. The imaginative return is put in a certain order: recognition of God's authority (v.22); denunciation of false gods (v.23); recognition that much was lost without Yahweh (v.24); confession of sins (v.25), that opens finally the door to the possibility of a new life; cf. CRAIGIE, *Jeremiah 1-25*, pp. 64-66. Moreover, the employment of שׁוּב “permette di intrecciare topografia, storia e teologia: «ritornando» a Dio nella conversione, Israele «ritorna» nella sua terra e viene «restaurato» come nazione.” RAVASI, “Dio Padre,” in *DSBP* 1, p. 40.

		first-born	Sir 36:11 exd
holy One of Israel ⁸⁹		rebellious ⁹⁰	Isa 1:4
savior, redeemer		God's creature	Isa 43:1-7 ⁹¹ exd
savior		rebellious ⁹²	Isa 63:8 exd
master ⁹³	to be served	first-born	Exod 4:22-23 ⁹⁴ exd
	his possession	chosen, holy to God	Deut 14:1 ⁹⁵ exd
	his plan	rebellious ⁹⁶	Isa 30:1.9

⁸⁸ 'Not-my-people' was the last definition by which the covenant was supposed to be broken. Replacing 'my people' by future 'sons of the living God' means more than its simple return to a previous state. The living God is one who gives life (cf. Hos 6:2; 13:14) and in doing that he is clearly distinguishable from other gods (cf. Hos 2:10-12). Therefore, the definition 'sons of the living God' is a step forward: first, they will be the people of the true God because he has always been the source of life; secondly, they will exist by his life-giving power; cf. WOLFF, *Hosea*, p. 27; MACINTOSH, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Hosea*, p. 36.

⁸⁹ This is a distinctive title for Yahweh in Isaiah that, apart from stressing the holiness of God, declares that Yahweh is God for both kingdoms; cf. CLEMENTS, *Isaiah 1-39*, p. 31.

⁹⁰ The position held by Israel is described as continually opposed to do what is right, thus the chosen people are compared to criminals. The abandonment and despise of the Lord imply also the infringement of the Covenant and adherence to other gods; cf. WATTS, *Isaiah 1-33*, pp. 18-19.

⁹¹ It is important that God's creative action is explicitly combined with his historical intervention for the sake of his people. This is a step forward compared to Jer 31:7-14. As the creative terminology, so God's redemptive actions in the book of Isaiah, seen separately, are not rare; yet the only other instance of fatherly creative power and his redeeming activity is found loosely connected within Isa 63:7-64:11 (63:16 Father-redeemer; 64:7 Father-creator). The future return of the people does not lack the signs of its universality. As in sons and daughters the element of totality may be seen (so Bonnard), so the four geographical points from which the people are said to be brought back to their homeland may signify the total and definitive character of the return from the exile; cf. BONNARD, *Le Second Isaïe*, p. 140.

⁹² Recalling past favors (vv. 7-14), which was probably provoked by the delay of salvation and by the crisis of hope, the appeal to the words of Yahweh (v. 8) is noteworthy because of the double use 'my people, sons' which, consequently, may echo the double use of 'my first-born, my son' in Ex 4:22-23. Moreover, the Exodus event is explicitly mentioned in v.11ff.; it is obvious that the divine fatherhood as presented by Isaiah is first of all based on the historical lessons; cf. BONNARD, *Le Second Isaïe*, pp. 445-446. The image of good sons in v. 8, as Yahweh had always expected them, turns into a bitter negative reality in v. 10 – they rebelled against him (also Isa 64:4). The idea here is close to the mention of sons in Isa 1:2 – the rebellion of sons against their father was unimaginable, yet they did that. The election of Israel in vv.7-14 seems to be previous to the acts of salvation that began with the Exodus. The mention of the rebelliousness of the people (v. 10) may be conceived as a reference to the whole history of Israel; similar terms are also found in Pss 78:40; 106:33.43 where the confrontation between the redemptive acts of Yahweh and the ungratefulness of Israel is very clear; cf. WHYBRAY, *Isaiah 40-66*, pp. 257-258.

⁹³ In fact, God is explicitly entitled 'master' only in Mal 1:6 (מֶלֶךְ, in LXX - κύριος, Table 2); in Jer 3:14 (בַּעַל, in LXX - κατακυριεύω); in the other cases there are proper contexts which reveal the more or less dominant character of this idea.

⁹⁴ This form by which Moses was to address Pharaoh is a bit subtle: the metaphor of the divine fatherhood is set alongside of the realistic fatherhood of Pharaoh. But it is not only a literally device. "The conflict is over paternal power, and in the claim of the first-born the God of Israel and the king of Egypt have clashed in a head-on encounter"; B. S. CHILDS, *Exodus. A Commentary*, OTL, London: SCM Press – Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1974, p. 102.

⁹⁵ The prohibition to harm themselves should probably be understood as a veto to participation in a certain (resuscitation) ritual in which the death of fertility god Baal was mourned; cf. MAYES, *Deuteronomy*, p. 239; G. BRAULIK, *Deuteronomium. 1-16, 17*, Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1986, pp. 106-107.

⁹⁶ The nature of rebelliousness of the ruling circles in Jerusalem is very clear: whatever plans and decision they took, it was done without consulting with Yahweh. That means that the plan in question had not come from Yahweh and even for this very reason it was condemned to fail. The 'Father-sons' relationships depicted here are not those of protection and friendship: they are understood in terms of unconditional authority of the father and total obedience of his sons. Similarly, the description of the sons of God in v. 9 points to rather a primitive conception of relationship with Yahweh: childlike obedience to God; cf. KAISER, *Isaiah 13-39*, pp. 284-285, 294. The rebellious children are not only the king with political leaders but, supposedly, also the entire people as far as it were involved

of a king	sons and daughters	Wis 9:7
giver of the land ⁹⁷	children	Wis 12:7
avenger	beloved	Jdt 9:4.13
living, most high, most great	governed by very just laws	Esth 8:12 ^q (LXX) (Add Esth E 1-24)

The images of God as well as of the people in both text-groups (see Tables 2 and 3) have many features, which are identical or similar to the representation of God and the people in the rest of the OT. As regards the figure of God, those features neither can be viewed as the exceptional attributes of the divine Father nor are they a unique description God's relationship with his people. In fact, there are many passages in the OT in which God's creative and saving power, goodness, love, mercy, graciousness, forgiveness etc. for Israel are expressed or implied without any reference to him as Father or the description of the Israelites as his son(s).

The references to the images of God and his people confirm the previously noted multifaceted positive as well as negative character of their mutual relationship. Such a visual rendering, however, should not be viewed as exclusive or having very sharp formal limits; the presented textual references share the characteristics which can also be found in some other passages within both text-groups as well as in a wider context. This means, that the epithets employed for God can in some cases be taken interchangeably or given additional nuances; for instance, the title of a 'master' for God is rather a generic term and can be easily applied to more passages, but in the listed ones it takes the most characteristic position. To a certain degree this is also valid for fatherly love and mercy. In fact, the love and mercy of God are not separable from his fatherly pedagogy and education. Similarly, the definition of the people as unfaithful may in a broader sense be extended to the passages where it is called rebellious or backsliding.

A certain distinction between the texts in the HB and LXX has already been noticed in the evaluation of their forms (Table 1); the difference is even more evident in terms of their contents: in contrast to the HB the later books of the OT according to LXX, portray the image of the people almost always from a positive or neutral perspective.⁹⁸ The prevalence of the

in the revolt against the Assyrians. The revolt may be understood in a twofold way: against the Assyrians and against the plan of God; cf. CLEMENTS, *Isaiah 1-39*, pp. 243, 246.

⁹⁷ It seems that the author employing ἀποικία, that was usually used by Philo to describe the migration of the chosen people delivered from Egypt, wished to characterize the particular situation of Israel: they never had a proper native country (fatherland) and thus had to colonize the land in which their forefathers stayed as foreigners; cf. LARCHER, *Le Livre de la Sagesse*, III, p. 712.

⁹⁸ Surely this does not mean that the people had given up violations of the divine precepts. In spite of that, the relationship between the people and the divine Father in the Hellenistic period seems to have been viewed from a slightly different standpoint; notwithstanding various iniquities the people had been performing, God as Father was more praised and appealed to than feared because of his past salvational works. A good example is Tob 13:4-5: the author not only acknowledges and praises the fatherhood of God (πατήρ ἡμῶν) but also enumerates the future divine

negative aspect in the relationship between God and his people is due to the image of the people in the HB. It is evident that this image is shaped not only by attributing to Israel various pejorative terms, but also by making a sharp contrast between the goodness of God and the wickedness of the people. The statistic data on this quality, as in the comparison of the forms, are once more in favor of the 'son-texts'. In most cases the negative evaluation of the people is because of their iniquitous behavior with respect to God. There is little interest in a social sphere: the wickedness of the Israelites presented as a treachery is only once explicitly connected with God's fatherhood (Mal 2:10).⁹⁹ The iniquity of the people in some passages (cf. Isa 63:8ff; Jer 4:22) is colored by terminology that may also be attributed to a sphere of ethical behavior; however, the religious infidelity of Israel is the dominant negative issue in the 'Father-people' relationship. The unfaithfulness, being described by various terms and reflecting the lack of responsibility of the people, seemed to be the basic and determinant aspect that had always threatened the 'Father-people' rapport. Moreover, in many cases the wickedness of Israel is expressed not just by the mere accusation of its adhering to other gods; the given references in their contexts are usually associated to the participation of the Israelites in pagan religious cults thereby revealing the very concrete and visible reality of their unfaithful attitude. Such a syncretistic position was destructive to the 'God-Israel' rapports since it rejected *in praxis* the uniqueness and oneness of Yahweh, which was the very foundation of the Israelite religion. The reproaches and accusations in relation to this aspect reveal the deliberate character of the apostasy Israel was committing. The lack of understanding and stupidity of the people are presented not as the circumstances facilitating their guilt but as a real and continuous obstinacy because of their ignorance and forgetfulness of what God had done for them and what they were expected to be. Notwithstanding such a quite gloomy and pessimistic image, Israel is several times said to be the beloved son of God (Jdt 9:4; Wis 16:26). There are only a few other cases when the chosen people are pictured positively/ neutrally with regard to the divine Father; in reality Israel had no right to be considered as a worthy partner in the relationship offered by God. The enduring existence of that relationship had principally been based on the one-sided, responsible, and continuous initiative of God who despite anything treated Israel as his son in any case.

Portraying the negative picture of Israel and describing the positive image of the divine Father both text-groups share similarities and disclose differences. The 'father-texts' do mention God's mercy and his affection to Israel, however, they do not discuss it in depth remaining at a

actions as if they were already known: *he will afflict us for our iniquities...he will show mercy...he will gather us* (v. 5).

⁹⁹ Another possible reference might be Isa 1:2.4 seen in the context of the whole chapter.

somewhat elevated but less emotional level: more emphasis is put on the image of God as creator, redeemer, savior, and master. A subtler icon of God’s fatherhood is unveiled by the ‘son-texts’ which more explicitly affirm his fatherly mercy, graciousness, and love. These characteristics even more illumine the contrast between God and Israel and also facilitate the interpretation of other more strict qualities and actions attributed to God as Father. The Exodus motives being diversely expressed in various contexts occupy not the smallest part in both text-groups (cf. ‘ex’); therefore, it is not surprising that a significant number of references point to the image of God as creator, redeemer, and savior. The image of God as creator is not rare; some passages are so enriched by the terminology on creation that God’s choice of Israel, which was his voluntary act, is also presented as a real creation of the people (cf. Deut 32:6; Isa 43:1ff.; Mal 2:10). It has already been mentioned that some vague idea of the divine creative activity in the sense of ‘procreation’, as a relict of Canaanite mythology, may be detected in Deut 32:18 (cf. Jer 2:27); nevertheless, the definition of Israel as the first-born and son of God with respect to the Exodus event (Exod 4:22-23; Hos 11:1ff.) should be understood as a key to the creative aspect in those texts.¹⁰⁰ The universal creative power of God is emphasized greatly in Second Isaiah;¹⁰¹ the role of the divine Father as creator is quite significant there. God is the Father and the creator not only of the chosen people (Isa 45:11; 64:7, יצר, omitted by LXX in 64:7 and given a wider application to God’s creative activity in 45:11: ὁ ποιήσας τὰ ἐπερχόμενα), but he is also considered to be the creator of every Israelite (Isa 43:7, יצר [πλάσσω], ברא [ποιέω]) and of the rest of mankind (Isa 45:12, ברא [ποιέω]). It is noteworthy that in some texts the creation of Israel is presented in the wider context of the creation of the world. Although there is only one reference to this subject in our texts (Isa 45:11), two other passages confirm their similar pattern and semantic field.¹⁰²

Table 4

Isa	ארץ and שמים	נמה stretch out	עשה make	יצר form	ברא create
45:11f.	οὐρανός and γῆ	heavens	earth	Israel wider	man
		[στερέω]	[ποιέω]	[ποιέω]	[ποιέω]

¹⁰⁰ The *production* (קנה) of the people in Deut 32:6 should be understood in terms of redemption from the slavery in Egypt, for Israel, through that event, was called into being as a nation; cf. DRIVER, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy*, p. 354; similarly, “in that deliverance God created his people”; MAYES, *Deuteronomy*, p. 384.

¹⁰¹ In several passages God is pictured as the creator of heaven and earth (37:16; 40:12.26.28; 42:5; 45:18; 48:13; 51:6; 66:1-2).

¹⁰² It is valid, of course, only for the HB because LXX translates the same Hebrew term with different Greek words.

Isa	אֶרֶץ and שָׁמַיִם	נָטַח strech out	רָקַע spread out	יִצַּר form	עָשָׂה
44:24	οὐρανός and γῆ	heavens	earth	Israel	make all
		[ἐκτείνω]	[στερεόω]	[πλάσσω]	[συντελέω]
Isa	אֶרֶץ and שָׁמַיִם	נָטַח strech out	יָסַד found	עָשָׂה make	
51:13	οὐρανός and γῆ	heavens	earth	Israel	
		[ποιέω]	[θεμελιόω]	[ποιέω]	

The wider contexts of all three references unambiguously point to the salvation of the people that will come from God in one way or another. The motives of the return and restoration of Jerusalem are evident, though they lack an explicit and vivid description of the future comeback¹⁰³ as in Jer 31:8-9. In this particular passage their relation to the creation of Israel reminds both of its deliverance from Egyptian slavery and implies the atmosphere of the new Exodus. Therefore, the rescue of Israel and its return to the promised land is viewed not only as a manifestation of all-encompassing power of God,¹⁰⁴ but also as both a certain new creative act of God as well as the restoration of the ancient divine promises by which the land had been given as inheritance to the Israelites. The first Exodus had proved the exclusion and the creation of the people; the return from the Babylonian exile had to confirm the irrevocability of God's choice of Israel. Thus the divine Father, as the creator of Israel, is presented as taking the initiative in situations crucial for the people. Furthermore, he is explicitly called a savior and redeemer.¹⁰⁵

In the two of the three above-mentioned texts the creative activity of God is closely connected with his redeeming work.¹⁰⁶ In Isa 51:10-13 the combination of the motives of the

¹⁰³ The return from the Babylonian exile is mentioned only once in those texts (Isa 51:11).

¹⁰⁴ This is probably one of the reasons God as creator is so emphasized in the 'second' Isaiah.

¹⁰⁵ The statistic data of נָצַח (*redeemer*) in the book of Isaiah are as follows: as a noun (13x), verbal form (11x). The main concentration of this term is in Second Isaiah: as a noun (10x), verbal form (7x). In the first part of the book this term is mentioned only once: Isa 35:9. This term was originally used for legal affairs in the realm of a family. A function of go'el (a duty of some kinship) consisted mainly in repurchasing and redeeming what was in reality under jurisdiction of others but had previously belonged to the family. The salvific character of this term is primarily revealed in 'physical' redemption of those who had been obliged to sell themselves to a stranger (cf. Lev 25:47-52). The reacquisition of lost belongings of the family also reflects the liberating function of go'el: one's possessions and his freedom were in a close connection; cf. J. J. STAMM, נָצַח, in *TLOT* 1, pp. 288-291; Vanoni, „*Du bist doch unser Vater*“, p. 59.

¹⁰⁶ The answer, why Second Isaiah has chosen namely this term to describe the salvation of the Israelites from Babylon, probably lies in its specific meaning. Since this term underlines the bond of kinship, its employment in the religiously pessimistic atmosphere of the Babylonian exiles had to reassure them of the still existing relationship between Yahweh as go'el and his people. In this way the exiles were comforted and encouraged because they could rely on the obligation God had taken upon himself; cf. E. M. SCHULLER, *Post-Exilic Prophets*, Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1988, pp. 64-65.

Exodus (v. 10 redeemed) and the new Exodus (v. 11 ransomed)¹⁰⁷ in the context of the creation of Israel (v. 13) is another sign that Second Isaiah conceived the liberation from Babylon in terms of the first Exodus. The explicit collation of ‘maker’ and ‘redeemer’ (בָּרָא - λυτρόω) in Isa 44:24 almost puts an equality sign between them and once more confirms the way in which the creation of Israel must be understood.¹⁰⁸ At this point the interpretation on the deliverance of Israel in Wis 19:6ff. is very suggestive: the crossing of the Red Sea is seen in the context of refashioning of the whole creation. This creative act of God reminds of Gen 1 and manifests both radical disposability of the creation and absolute freedom of the Creator.¹⁰⁹ The total transformation of the universe that is portrayed in association with the deliverance of Israel may also be regarded as a type of God’s fatherly activity with regard to the life and death of the just man (Wis 2:12-20; 5:5).¹¹⁰ It means that the Exodus event was given a new universal and even eschatological dimension.¹¹¹

Since in Isa 44:24 and Isa 51:10-13 there is no mention of the divine fatherhood, they may be viewed as a certain bridge between the creative texts and the passages on redemption/salvation in which the fatherhood of God is attested.

The divine Father as a savior and redeemer occurs in Isa 43:1-7; 63:8.16; Jer 31:7-14. It is noteworthy that in the contexts of all three passages the redemption (בָּרָא, λυτρόω, ῥύομαι, ἐξαίρῳ) and salvation (יָצַו, σώζω, σωτηρία) of Israel are associated.¹¹² Such a parallel even more strengthens the definitive character of God’s responsibility for Israel, because the obligation of redemption undertaken by him (as goel) will be realized in the unmerited deliverance of the people bringing them to salvation.¹¹³ The interrelation of the texts attesting the creative activity of God as Father and his redemptive work presumably points to the understanding of the new Exodus¹¹⁴ in terms of a new divine creative act; such a supposition has its further substantiation in Isa 43:1-7. The references to the creation of Israel and every Israelite, framing this message of salvation (vv. 1.7), may be seen as a background in which the memory of the historical redemption from Egypt turned into the reality of the rescue from the

¹⁰⁷ The redeemed Israelites in v. 10 should not be confused with the ransomed ones in v. 11; while v. 10 refers to the deliverance from Egypt, v. 11 points to the liberation from the Babylonian exile; cf. WESTERMANN, *Isaiah 40-66*, p. 243.

¹⁰⁸ In this passage Second Isaiah “anchors the end of Israel’s history in its beginning”; STAMM, בָּרָא, p. 294.

¹⁰⁹ Cf. LARCHER, *Le Livre de la Sagesse*, III, pp. 1056-1057.

¹¹⁰ Cf. BYRNE, ‘Sons of God’ - ‘Seed of Abraham’, pp. 45-47.

¹¹¹ Moreover, this new salvific and creative activity of God is presented as following a natural way, i.e., without any destruction and confusing of the previous order as it will be the case in Wis 19:18ff.; cf. J. VILCHEZ LÍNDEZ, *Sabiduría*, Nueva Biblia Española – Sapienciales V, Estella (Navarra): Verbo Divino, 1990, pp. 455-456.

¹¹² Although the terms for redemption and salvation do not occur in the same verses their interrelation is obvious. The combination of saving and redeeming in the same verse is found in Isa 60:16; 63:9.

¹¹³ Cf. W. FOERSTER, G. FOHRER, σώζω, in *TDNT* 7, FOHRER, pp. 977-978.

¹¹⁴ For the interpretation of the divine ‘our Father’ in Isa 63:16 (he is mentioned along with Abraham and Israel) in the Exodus’ key, see BÖCKLER, *Gott als Vater im Alten Testament*, pp. 286-287.

Babylonian exile. The language of redemption in v. 1 is better understood as a 'prophetic perfect' which refers not so much to events of the past as to the certainty of the future. The description of God as savior and his willingness to pay a certain price as a ransom for Israel (vv. 2-4) well agree with the more detailed image of 'how' it will be done (vv. 5-6). Thus, the restoration of the exiles to their land, on the one hand, reminds of the experience of Egypt and is modeled upon it; on the other hand, it surpasses the past and becomes a new creative act of God. This way, the conception of redemption becomes very similar to that of the creation and most likely owes such an evolution to a deeper understanding of the universal creative activity of God.¹¹⁵

One more important characteristic of the divine fatherhood that is in a close connection with the ones discussed above is God's educational approach to his people.¹¹⁶ The divine education is presented in a pattern similar to human training:¹¹⁷ sometimes it is stricter, sometimes it is gentler. Whatever aspect prevails in one or another passage the main purpose of the disciplining of the chosen people remains the same: to teach them to obey their divine Father that they may know the true God and have life. The education of Israel was an inseparable part of its history; this is especially evident in the Exodus event and the experience in the desert.¹¹⁸ A certain re-evaluation of historical events and their hermeneutical interpretation is found in references to the divine fatherhood in the book of Wisdom. The whole of Wis 16 may be viewed as the interpretation of the Exodus motives on educational basis. Besides, the compassion and mercy of God throughout the history of Israel and to a lesser extent showed to the Canaanites (Wis 12:2-18) is conceived in Wis 12:19-22 as an example of proper behavior for a just man.¹¹⁹ Thus the Israelite history is reinterpreted in terms of the divine education and understood as the example from which the lessons of humanism have been continuously offered: the just man must be human.¹²⁰ Yet this divine humanism or philanthropy¹²¹ to be adopted had a religious

¹¹⁵ Cf. SCHULLER, *Post-Exilic Prophets*, pp. 68-69.

¹¹⁶ Although Quell unreasonably diminishes the divine creative activity presented by the potter (Isa 45:9ff.; 64:7), he is right in taking notice of the educational aspect the metaphorical image it contains; cf. QUELL, *πατήρ*, p. 971.

¹¹⁷ This is quite clear from the texts in which God's discipline is compared to the activity of a human father (Deut 8:5; Prov 3:12; Wis 11:10).

¹¹⁸ The desert or wilderness, apart from being associated with danger and death, is also given a positive evaluation in the OT: it was the place where God gave his Law. The donating of the Law was in itself a real act of pedagogy in the wilderness. The positive character of the experience in the desert is well reflected in the book of Hosea, in fact, it was the place where God spoke to Israel's heart (Hos 2:16). For a repetitive pattern Egypt-Desert-Canaan, its theological interpretation and manifestation of the divine pedagogy in the book of Hosea, see ORRIEUX, "La paternité de Dieu dans l'Ancien Testament," pp. 68-72.

¹¹⁹ According to Larcher, the author of the book of Wisdom appealing to his addressees actualized the past experience of Israel in the didactic-moralistic manner of Alexandrian exegesis without abandoning however the allegorical interpretation; cf. LARCHER, *Le Livre de la Sagesse*, III, p. 731.

¹²⁰ Cf. VILCHEZ LINDEZ, *Sabiduria*, pp. 342-343.

¹²¹ A term *φιλάνθρωπος* as a title for gods was used by various Greek writers. Later, in Middle Platonism and Stoicism *φιλάνθρωπία* was understood as an outstanding virtue. As a virtue for men it was the imitation of the divine goodness. This tradition is also seen in Hellenistic Judaism. Philo, for instance, held this title as a proper

dimension: the mention of the oaths and covenants given to the fathers reminds not only of the privileges and exceptional status of the people but also of their responsibility and obligation to remain faithful.¹²² The judgment expressed by verb κρίνω and associated with the divine mercy (v. 22) must be understood as a gift of God, since it is the light that comes from God (cf. Hos 6:5 LXX); this light, which passes judgment, reveals the divine justice that is also compared to the light (cf. Isa 59:9, LXX). It may be that the author of the book of Wisdom had in mind such a religious conception of judgment even when he applied it to the others, admittedly, gentiles (*when we judge*). If so, the expansion of the divine justice (or even Judaic religion) to the gentiles was to be effected in a way similar to that in which the divine Father had been treating the chosen people.¹²³

The creative, redeeming, saving and educational activity of the divine Father refers to the principal events in the history of Israel. In this case it is also appropriate to think about the protective power of God and to imagine him as an authoritative Father.¹²⁴ On the other hand, fatherly love and mercy, as the very foundation of whatever his action is, are also well attested. Analyzing the function of the divine Father in the history of Israel, Marchel came to the conclusion that the love and mercy of God reflected specifically in Deuteronomy and the prophets reveal the most profound character of the divine fatherhood in the OT.¹²⁵ As the fatherhood of God in the OT is not an abstract ideology: it is grounded on the historical experiences of the people. The engagement of God as Father in his relationship with Israel may be briefly summed up in a historic-theological sequence:

- God as Father and creator;
- God as Father in Israel's election and the Exodus;
- God as Father many times betrayed and rejected;
- God as Father many times appealed to for mercy;

attribute of God; God manifested his philanthropy (love) to people with justice and mercy. According to him, a real human philanthropy may reach its climax only when there is no separation between the love of God and that of man. In Hellenistic writings there is a constant comparison between the king of the kings and a terrestrial king; the latter was obliged to imitate the philanthropy of the celestial king. The justice of the king, accompanied by his generosity, was understood as one of the basic manifestations of kingly philanthropy. The author of the book of Wisdom certainly shared the ideas of the Hellenistic world. Although there is no mention of the king in Wis 12:18-19, the employed vocabulary may be found in some other Hellenistic writings; cf. U. LUCK, *φιλανθρωπία*, in *TDNT* 9, 108-110; G. SCARPAT, *Libro della Sapienza. Testo, traduzione, introduzione e commento*, I-II, Brescia: Paidea, 1989-1996, vol. 1, pp. 82-86.

¹²² According to Scarpat the divine fatherly love and his mercy to the Israelites attested in the 'son-texts' in the book of Wisdom are tightly connected with the idea of 'patto', that obliges to remain faithful to God; cf. SCARPAT, *Libro della Sapienza*, vol. 1, p. 88.

¹²³ Cf. SCARPAT, *Libro della Sapienza*, vol. 2, pp. 444-445.

¹²⁴ The point stressed by Ringrenn and followed by Jenni, cf. RINGGREN, 28, p. 18; JENNI, 28, p. 12.

¹²⁵ Cf. MARCHEL, *Abba, Père!*, pp. 56-61. Speaking strictly, there are not so many texts at our disposition in the book of Deuteronomy, which refer to the divine fatherhood by the images of the father or son. Such evaluation is probably made because of the overall image of a loving God in this book (cf. God's love in Deut 4:37; 7:8.13; 10:15; 23:6).

- God as Father who always forgives.¹²⁶

In fact, this historic-theological sequence reflects the role God as Father played in the course of the whole history of Israel. Obviously, the fatherhood of God was not just some additional element to the history of Israel, but rather the most clear and adequate expression by which God was understood as a protagonist in the life of the people. It may be even said that the repetitive pattern of this 'Father-Israel' relationship itself created and promoted the history of Israel with all its consequences.¹²⁷ The testimony to the fatherhood of God in the biblical tradition is already found at the very beginnings of Israel as a socio-political entity. The first theological aspect that is most often referred to in the texts stating God's fatherhood is that Israel was chosen from other peoples (cf. Deut 14:1; Hos 1:9; 2:4) and declared to be God's first-born son (cf. Exod 4:22-23). The idea of election is even more strongly underlined by God's self-revelation and declaration *for I am a father to Israel, and Ephraim is my first-born* (Jer 31:9).¹²⁸ The first step of historical manifestation/realization of that election was unquestionably the deliverance from Egypt that may be held as the basis for the further development of the conception of divine fatherhood in Israel.¹²⁹ The responsibility God took on himself by calling the people in Egypt to be his first-born and the deliverance following it were the very foundation of the mutual 'Father-son' relationship¹³⁰ whose various aspects were disclosed and realized in the history of Israel.

The biblical traditions with regard to the relationship between God and Israel often speak about God's initiative expressed through divine protection and care, yet these features are not unique in describing the nature of that relationship as if it were a one-sided position taken by God without serious responsibility on Israel's part. Generally, the responsibility of Israel in the OT is often expressed in terms of adhering to the Covenant since it was understood as one of the

¹²⁶ Cf. JEREMIAS, *The Prayers of Jesus*, pp. 12-15. It is said in a historic-theological sequence because of the way Jeremias arranged the biblical passages presenting the theme of the divine fatherhood. A similar scheme albeit skipping the theme of fatherly forgiveness had already been presented by S. R. DRIVER, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy*, ICC, Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1902³, p. 352; cf. also S. SABUGAL, "La paternidad de Dios en la literatura extrabiblica," *Salmanticensis* 32 (1985) 141-151, pp.144-145.

¹²⁷ A theological presentation of the divine fatherhood in the OT proposed by Schökel is very similar to the theological sequence set by Jeremias. Such a thematic grouping as redemption-education, sin-forgiveness, repentance-conversion, and finally fatherly forgiveness not only reflects the diverse stages the chosen people passed through, but also emphasizes the great importance the relationship God as Father to Israel played in the Israelite history; see L. A. SCHÖKEL, *Dio Padre*, Roma: Apostolato della Preghiera, 1994, pp. 23-57.

¹²⁸ These two statements belonging presumably to different periods of time and reflecting different contexts serve as an even more convincing indication of the importance of that idea and of its constant recall to memory.

¹²⁹ The understanding of God's saving action in that historical event as representation and manifestation of his divine fatherhood is "a profound revision of the concept of God as Father", JEREMIAS, *The Prayers of Jesus*, p. 13.

¹³⁰ At this point Marchel prefers to speak more about Israel's election and the Sinai Covenant than to point to a decisive role of the Exodus as the first visible stage in formation of the nation. He rather underlines the 'God-Israel' relationship as mutual belonging to each other for they constitute the religious and familiar unity between the two and, therefore, should be viewed as the ground and origin for the title of divine Father in the OT; cf. MARCHEL, *Abba, Père!*, pp. 51-52.

fundamental events that determined the history of the chosen people. In fact, the whole biblical history of Israel was marked by the lack of such responsibility and obedience to God. In the texts on divine fatherhood the responsibility of Israel is mostly expressed in prophetic sayings (cf. Tables). Those reprimands, accusations, and disputations usually are presented in a certain diptych whose content reflects a huge disproportion between God's fatherly love on the one hand, and the people's breaking of the Covenant on the other. The verdict of God, usually pronounced by prophets, not only emphasized that such a position and behavior could not and would not be tolerated, but also proclaimed future disasters for Israel. The understanding of historical events taking place as an inevitable result of the irreligious and immoral state of the people was rooted not only in prophetic circles; it is also reflected in prayer contexts where people acknowledge their faults and plead for the intervention of God.¹³¹ However, it did not mean that the difficult periods in the history of Israel, especially experienced in such socio-political disasters as exile, were not compatible with God's tenderness towards his people. In the helpless situation of the Babylonian exile the prophecies of Ezekiel and Second Isaiah were signals revealing God's nearness and his plans for the future of Israel. The motives of the new Exodus, besides strengthening the people's hope for the future, were both signs of testimony and confidence that Yahweh has always remained a Father to Israel. This theme along with the idea of divine pedagogy experienced by Israel in the course of its history is also repeated in the book of Tobit¹³² and Wisdom (see above). There are also other references which reflect this unchangeable decision of the divine Father. Apart from OT prayers, which generally plead for the divine mercy in a time of distress, there are others, which attest that the Israelites addressing God sometimes appealed to his divine fatherhood. The most prominent example of such explicit acknowledgement of God's fatherhood in a prayer is found in Isa 63:16; 64:7. In these passages the triple אֱלֹהֵינוּ (πατήρ ἡμῶν) both confesses the genuine and unique fatherhood of God and

¹³¹ In the individual sphere see, for instance, 'penitential psalms': Pss 6; 32; 38; 51; 102; 130; 143. In a collective sense, cf. Judg 10:10-15; 1 Sam 12:10; Jer 14:7-9.20-21; Ps 79; Ezra 9:10-15; Neh 1:6-7.

¹³² Weitzman (p. 53f.) finds a number of similarities between Deut 31-32 and Tob 12-13. The theme of the return from the exile is common both to Deut 31-32 and Tob 12-13. The latter is seen as a continuation of the earlier biblical narrative patterns. As far as Tob 13:5-6 speaks about the speedy return from the exile, Deut 31-32 serves as a "literary surety for this promise". Moreover, the author finds allusions to the pentateuchal stories in the book of Tobit that, being put together, may suggest the continuation of earlier biblical narrative patterns in Israel's exilic state. This way the "allusion to the Song of Moses at the end of Tobit intimates that this present will culminate in a finale also prescribed by the Pentateuch – with Israel soon returning to the land promised to it just as its biblical ancestors once did." (p. 61). S. WEITZMAN, "Allusion, Artifice, and Exile in the Hymn of Tobit," *JBL* 115 (1, 1996) 49-61. The dependence of Tob 13:2-7 upon some texts in Deuteronomy has also been observed by Strotmann. The role of the divine Father in Tobit 13, seen from the perspective of Deut 4:23-38; 30:1-10; 32:1-20, is very functional: his fatherhood is understood as a real hope and guarantee for the exiles to return to their land. At this point Deut 32:1-20 is very important: the history of Israel is interpreted in a 'Father-son' pattern and as far as the divine Father stands at its beginning, he could not definitely reject his people. The author of Tobit might have been animated by this passage to interpret the promise of God in Deut 30:1-10 as a possible turning of his face to the people again; cf. STROTMANN, „Mein Vater bist du!“ (*Sir 51,10*), pp. 44-56.

expresses hope for protection and salvation.¹³³ Similarly, some other direct as well as indirect appeals to the divine fatherhood in time of distress (cf. Jer 2:27; 3:4; Ps 89:27; Tob 13:4) illustrate the typical way undertaken by the Israelites to implore God to forgive their sins: even when they did not address to God as Father, they still appealed to the divine salvational events in which God's fatherhood had previously been manifested to them. Thus God has proven to be a real and true Father to Israel not only because he, in the course of the whole history, has confirmed his choice with incomprehensible love and mercy for the people.¹³⁴

1.2.1.2. God as Father to the Davidic King

There are only few texts in the whole OT that attest to the 'Father-son' relationship between God and the Davidic descendant. The field of these texts is very concentrated and differentiated: it is limited to some texts in the historical books (2 Sam 7:14; 1 Chron 17:13; 22:10; 28:6) and to some occurrences in the psalms (Pss 2:7; 89:27-28). The divine fatherhood in those passages (except Ps 2:7) is explicitly expressed by the term אב. Furthermore, all those references designate the Davidic descendant as בן (Ps 89:28 even as בכור [πρωτότοκος]).

The attribution to a king of the title of the 'son of God' in the OT shares the custom attested to both Mesopotamian and Egyptian cultures. Different solutions have been proposed to explain the nature of God's fatherly relationship with the king of the Israelites: adoption, vassal-relationship in terms of the covenant, and the echo of the ancient Near East ideologies of divine kingship. Since the father-son language in 2 Sam 7:14 is also connected with pedagogical motives, the relationship between God and the king may even reflect a master-disciple pattern.¹³⁵ The influence of the neighboring cultures on Israel can hardly be denied. The language of begetting in the ceremony of coronation or enthronement of the king of Israel in Ps 2:7 (cf. also Ps 109 LXX; Ps 89:27-28) may remind of the mythological conception of divine kingship and retain certain resemblance to the ancient Egyptian royal protocol. On the other hand, the language of the declaration of the sonship of the Israelite king in the same psalm (cf. 2 Sam 7:14) is similar to the adoptive or legitimating concepts in the Codex Hammurabi and, thus also gives an idea of how this sonship may be understood.¹³⁶ Nevertheless, there is no clear scholarly consensus which milieu (Egyptian, Mesopotamian, and Canaanite) and to what degree

¹³³ Cf. MARCHEL, *Abba, Père!*, p. 61.

¹³⁴ The last word about the divine fatherhood in the OT for Jeremiah is God's statement 'I must have mercy on him' (Jer 31:20) with the accent on *must*; cf. JEREMIAS, *The Prayers of Jesus*, p. 15.

¹³⁵ Cf. A. CAQUOT - PH. DE ROBERT, *Les Livres de Samuel*, CAT 6, Genève: Labor et Fides, 1994, p. 432.

¹³⁶ Cf. J.-B. DUMORTIER, "Un rituel d'intronisation: le Ps. LXXXIX 2-38," *VT* 22 (1972), pp. 188-189; H.-J. KRAUS, *Psalms 1-59. A Commentary*, Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1988, pp. 130-132; G. RAVASI, *Il libro dei Salmi. Commento e attualizzazione*, 3 vol., Bologna: Dehoniane, 1981-1984, vol.1, pp. 103-105.

influenced the Israelite conception of the king's sonship.¹³⁷ The uncertainty also remains regarding the pattern our texts reflect: whether it presents the concept of adoption or of legitimating.¹³⁸ Since the 'Father-son' language could equally be applied to partners in the legal matters of adoption, covenant, and royal grant it may well be that the relationship between God and the king reflects a covenant¹³⁹ or adoption formula that may not necessarily be linked to adoption as such,¹⁴⁰ because the fact of the sonship could also be established and confirmed by covenant and royal grants.¹⁴¹ The formal similarities to the Egyptian pattern must certainly be understood against the background of the Israelite religion. The Egyptian Pharaoh was understood as a son of God in a physical sense, whereas the sonship of the king in Israel was demythologized and conceived as a consequence of the divine election, adoption or legitimization.

The basic text in our theme is the dynastic oracle in 2 Sam 7:1-17 (v. 14). In this passage the divine fatherhood is directly related to the promise of everlasting dynasty, a theme that is also retraceable not only in parallel texts in 1 Chronicles but also in Ps 89. There are also other thematic connections such as chastening of the king in case of his failure to remain faithful to the commandments of the covenant (cf. Ps 89:31-33) and the unconditional guarantee of God to keep his promise (cf. Ps 89:34; 1 Chron 17:13); these aspects, however, are missing in other parallel texts of the 1 Book of Chronicles. The material in Ps 89 is very similar to 2 Sam 7:14ff;¹⁴² thematic connections are also quite visible with regard to Ps 2. Although all references associate the fatherhood of God with the establishment of an everlasting Davidic dynasty (except Ps 2:7), the Chronicler presents this theme reshaping the material of 2 Sam 7 to his

¹³⁷ For the brief survey see BÖCKLER, *Gott als Vater im Alten Testament*, pp. 204-211.

¹³⁸ See FOHRER, υἱός, in *TDNT* 8, pp. 350-351; H. DONNER, "Adoption oder Legitimation? Erwägungen zur Adoption im Alten Testament auf dem Hintergrund der altorientalischen Rechte," *OrAnt* 8 (1969), pp. 104-114; WEINFELD, "The Covenant of Grant," pp. 189-195; T. N. D. METTINGER, *King and Messiah: The Civil and Sacral Legitimation of the Israelite Kings*, Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1976, pp. 265-266.

¹³⁹ With the exception of Ps 89:27-28, the other references to the sonship of the Israelite king contain the structure of a binary formula of the covenant between God and his people *I will be your God, and you shall be my people* and thus point both to the *historical* character of the 'Father-king' relationship and the status of the king as representative of the people; cf. also J. SCHLOSSER, *Le Dieu de Jésus* (LD 129), Paris: Cerf, 1987, p.106. The concept of divine sonship of the king in this royal covenant should be viewed as an integral part of the basic principle of the sonship of the people in the Sinai covenant; cf. P. C. CRAIGIE, *Psalms 1-50*, WBC 19, Waco: Word Books, 1983, p. 67.

¹⁴⁰ The language of adoption of the Israelite king is appropriate insofar as it denotes his filial relationship with God as established by the will of God at a definite point of time. Although it would be not very exact to entitle the phrase *You are my son today I have begotten you* in Ps 2:7 as an 'adoption formula', yet its function, as "a performative utterance in establishing a legal relationship" (p. 267), corresponds to adoption concepts in Assyrians legal texts; cf. METTINGER, *King and Messiah*, pp. 266-267.

¹⁴¹ Cf. A. A. ANDERSON, *2 Samuel*, WBC 11, Dallas: World Books, 1989, p. 122. McCarter explains that the language in 2 Sam 7:14 and Ps 2:7 is borrowed from the sphere of transactions between some king and his loyal vassal, to whom the king granted some land or house. Those grants were made patrimonial and so permanent by means of the legal adoption of that vassal as a son of the king or lord; cf. P. K. MCCARTER, *II Samuel*, AB 9, Garden City: Doubleday, 1984, p. 207.

¹⁴² Nathan's oracle, as most scholars claim, is a *Vorlage* for Chronicler, but as far as concerns the question of Ps 89 the matter is more complicated; it is possible that both of them, though with different changes, stemmed from the common tradition; cf. ANDERSON, *2 Samuel*, p. 113.

theological purposes. The well-marked tendency to present Solomon as faultless and his reign as some fulfillment of the divine promises is quite evident in the dynastic oracle as well.¹⁴³ Furthermore, it is obvious that the original dynastic oracle underwent some evolution compared to 1 Chron 17:13; 22:10; 28:6. The relationship between the divine Father and the king, God's attitude towards Solomon and his dynasty¹⁴⁴ is presented as less affectionate but more exigent in every further passage of 1 Chronicles. There are five premises in 2 Sam 7:13-16 which define the character of the relationship between God as Father and the king: 1) the king will build a house for God; 2) God will be to him as a Father and he will be as his son; 3) the throne of the Davidic descendant will be stable forever; 4) he may fail, therefore may be punished by men but not rejected by God; 5) God will never call off his חסד (*kindeness, favor*, in LXX ἔλεος)¹⁴⁵ for him. The first text in 1 Chron 17:12-14 attests the 1), 2), 3), and 5); the theme of possible chastening of the king is absent in all three passages of 1 Chronicles. The second text in 1 Chron 22:10¹⁴⁶ repeats the 1), 2), and 3); there is no guarantee of God's perpetual חסד. The last text in 1 Chron 28:6-7 only attests the 1) and 2)¹⁴⁷ and puts 3) under condition: *if he continues resolute in keeping my commandments and my ordinances*. The reason why the phrase about the possible fault of Solomon was omitted and how this affects the contents of Nathan's promise is debatable. On the one hand, the partial omission of 2 Sam 7:14ff. in 1 Chronicles may be considered irrelevant since the principal emphasis is put on Solomon's obedience and there is no third possibility; either he obeys totally and thus the promise of God is fulfilled, or he fails and,

¹⁴³ The emphasis, put on various conditional elements in the Deuteronomistic history, served to refer to the failings of kings and to explain the fact of the Babylonian exile. The Chronicler, on the contrary, tries to present the reigns of David and Solomon in a somewhat elevated way as the unified event guided by God for the sake of the nation. To achieve this it was necessary to harmonize the tensions of his *Vorlage* as regards the conditional or unconditional nature of the divine promise. In this perspective the oracle is concentrated on the figure of Solomon who, being a son of David (first condition) and portrayed as obedient to all the precepts of God (second condition), is a certain realization of the eternal Davidic dynasty; cf. H. G. M. WILLIAMSON, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, NCB, London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott - Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1982, pp. 133-134. Similarly, S. JAPHET, *I & II Chronicles*, OTL, London: SCM Press, 1993, pp. 333, 335.

¹⁴⁴ The crucial shift from David to Solomon and his dynasty (cf. 1 Chron 22:10; 28:6) is already seen in the first reference: *your house and your kingdom* promised to David (2 Sam 7:16) becomes *my house and my kingdom* (1 Chron 17:14) in which Solomon will stand firm. This means that a real king is God who legitimates the human kingship.

¹⁴⁵ According to McCarter, v. 15 assures that the kingship, once given to David, will continue despite the behavior of the Davidic kings. If to see the חסד as a gift of God in the light of the royal grants to a loyal vassal (*pace* Weinfeld) it should consequently be understood as a favor that will continuously sustain the grant of kingship. The idea is similar to 'everlasting covenant' as in 2 Sam 23:5; cf. MCCARTER, *II Samuel*, p. 208. The renderings of חסד by *fidelity* and *grace* in this case join together because the text implies limited punishment God will mete out to the Davidic descendant; this means that the justice of God will be overtaken by his grace; cf. CAQUOT - ROBERT, *Les Livres de Samuel*, p. 433.

¹⁴⁶ This text is probably based directly on 2 Sam 7:13-14 and not on 1 Chron 17:12-14; cf. JAPHET, *I & II Chronicles*, p. 398.

¹⁴⁷ This passage contains some nuance describing the 'Father-son' relationship between God and Solomon. Instead of being declared as a son, Solomon is said to be chosen to be a son by God; thereby his election is undoubtedly emphasized, yet the intimacy is much more diminished.

this way, the hope of his dynasty also fails.¹⁴⁸ On the other hand, the real motive of this omission may be grasped only keeping its original context and meaning in mind. The promise given to David in 2 Sam 7:14-15 is unconditional, so it will not be changed even when the Davidic descendant fails; the omission in the promise to Solomon in 1 Chronicles changes its character and becomes conditional. Although the conditional nature of this promise is definitely expressed only in the last reference to the divine fatherhood (1 Chron 28:6), its conditional character is already foreseen in David's exhortation to Solomon (1 Chron 22:13) that directly follows the dynastic oracle.¹⁴⁹ The Chronicler did omit the promises of the divine perpetual *חסד* in the two last versions of the dynastic oracle, yet added the explicit condition: it does not mean that he felt disappointed or losing trust in God's grace and fidelity, rather he understood the fulfillment of that *חסד* in the unconditional obedience of the king to God. The fatherhood of God to the Davidic descendant thus exhibits a very functional character of 'to be' God's son (building the temple for God), his dependence upon the authority of the Father who is the true sovereign of Israel, and, despite the affectionate relationship with the Father, his responsibility for keeping the divine precepts.

References to the psalms put a bit more emphasis on the exceptional role of the king. The relationship between Yahweh and the king in Ps 2 are presented as very close and personal: *their* cords and *their* bonds (v. 3, with regard to the unity between God and the king), *my* king (v. 6), *my* son (v. 7, God's attitude towards the king).¹⁵⁰ The exclusiveness of that relationship is underlined even more by the power and authority the king will be endowed (v. 8); in fact, he will be empowered by the same authority with which Yahweh rules.¹⁵¹ The description of the king in Ps 89:27-28 is similar, yet even more majestic. The attribution to the king the rights of the first-born (*בכור*, *πρωτοτόκος*) reveals the supreme quality of his election and also implies the protective character of the divine fatherhood (cf. Exod 4:22-23). Furthermore, he will be the highest (*עליון*, *ὑψηλός*), a word that in the psalter is attributed exclusively to Yahweh. Such terminology is very close to the deification of the king. The delegation of the divine rule to the king almost puts the sign of equality between the action of Yahweh and that of the king.¹⁵² Nevertheless, the merely human aspect of the king is very clear: the divine sonship of the king

¹⁴⁸ Cf. WILLIAMSON, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, p. 136. He thinks that that omission does not reflect the author's tendency to avoid any possible fault admissible to Solomon. Braun agrees that this omission does not affect materially the meaning of the passage, but he thinks it was made because of the author's respectful attitude toward Solomon; cf. R. BRAUN, *1 Chronicles*, WBC 14, Waco: World Books, 1986, p. 199.

¹⁴⁹ Cf. JAPHET, *I & II Chronicles*, pp. 334, 490.

¹⁵⁰ Cf. METTINGER, *King and Messiah*, pp. 261-262.

¹⁵¹ Cf. RAVASI, *Il libro dei Salmi*, vol.1, p. 106. The mention of dashing of pottery (v. 9) in connection with nations (v. 8) is another sign of universal, judiciary power of the king; however, such an image is not exclusively Israelite: it is also attested in Egyptian and Mesopotamian texts; cf. KRAUS, *Psalms 1-59*, p. 132.

¹⁵² Cf. H.-J. KRAUS, *Psalms 60-150. A Commentary*, Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1989, p. 209; METTINGER, *King and Messiah*, p. 263.

was initiated at the definite point of time (Ps 2:7); he was chosen from the people and needs to be saved (Ps 89:20,27). The term בְּכֹרֶת (πρωτοτόκος), by which the king is endowed (Ps 89:28), in addition to pointing to a very exceptional relationship with God, also possibly defines the king as a “manifestly human being who belongs to the Lord.”¹⁵³ Moreover, the contexts in Ps 2 and Ps 89 well disclose the importance of the ‘Father-son’ language: the declaration of the divine sonship of the king guarantees his power, authority, and protection of God.¹⁵⁴ Although the language in both psalms points to a very familiar relationship between God and the king, the attention is paid not to his person but to his juridical function and authority that will be bestowed on him by God. Since the king is given the same titles as people (son, first-born) his role cannot be observed without the communitarian context of the people; hence he should be understood as the son of God insofar as he represents and embodies in his person that bond by which the people are connected with their God.¹⁵⁵

God as Father in all these texts appears mainly as the authoritative sovereign who installs his chosen king as his representative on earth. Three aspects are well discernible in this special relationship between God and the king. First, the declaration of the adoptive rapports gives the king a possibility to assure his authority and influence. This is some kind of guarantee for secure and legitimate rule. Secondly, the authority and power of the king totally depends on God and it is God who protects the king and gives him victory over his foes; hence this relationship not only underlines the responsibility of the king but also reveals the supreme authority of the divine Father and his engagement in the life of the nation. Thirdly, a theme of the severe disciplining of the king, as attested in 2 Sam 7:14 and Ps 89:33, is combined with God’s חֲסֵד (ἐλεος), which will never be taken away (2 Sam 7:15; Ps 89:34). This means that God’s fatherly discipline, even though expressed through negative images, is not simply positive but also unchangeably faithful and loving.

1.2.1.3. God as Father to the Individuals

The relationship between God as Father and individuals who, lead a pious and righteous life, is presented in the two books of the Old Testament (Sir 4:10; 23:1,4; 51:10; Wis 2:13,16,18; 5:5; 14:3) as well as in one psalm reference (Ps 73:15). The explicit reference to God as πατήρ appears in three occurrences in the book of Sirach (51:10H^B אב) and once in Wis

¹⁵³ METTINGER, *King and Messiah*, p. 264.

¹⁵⁴ Keeping in mind the covenantal framework of the Israelite religion, the authority of the king had to be understood not simply in terms of his personal exaltation but rather as his duty to rule according to God’s precepts without any tolerance to possible transgressions of them; cf. BYRNE, ‘Sons of God’ - ‘Seed of Abraham’, pp. 17-18.

¹⁵⁵ Cf. RAVASI, *Il libro dei Salmi*, vol.1, p. 105.

14:3. There is also one indirect, but clear reference to God as Father in Wis 2:16. In the other passages of this text-group the divine fatherhood is attested by filial terms.

The first text of the book of Sirach, Sir 4:10, is complex because of the different textual witnesses, which give a quite significant nuance to v. 10. This is especially true concerning the theme of the divine fatherhood in v. 10c. Thus LXX employs a comparison ἔσθι ὡς υἱὸς ὑψίστου (*you will be like a son of the Most High*), whereas the Hebrew manuscript has a direct statement בן יקראך ואל. The Hebrew text seems to be more authentic,¹⁵⁶ therefore, this reference should be understood as God's direct promise to one who treats the fatherless and the widows seriously as if they were one's own family. Such liaison between the divine fatherhood and social behavior is not often found in the OT.¹⁵⁷ Furthermore, this text is unique because it reflects parallels between the fatherhood of God and earthly paternity. The fact that this verse concludes the whole argumentation on one's correct attitude towards the poor, widows, and orphans (Sir 4:1-10) even more stresses its importance. In other words, God tends to be a Father to the individual as far as one accepts perseveringly¹⁵⁸ the duties and responsibilities of the earthly father. Moreover, he will be maintained by God to do his best (according to the Hebrew manuscript) as well as he will be loved by God in a way that exceeds even motherly love (according to LXX). Whichever translation is preferred, this second divine promise remains basically the same, namely, the man who wants to be God's son and accepts his invitation with all its contents will experience God's proximity.

The next three references to the divine fatherhood in Sirach have some common features not only with regard to their formal expressions but also to their contents.¹⁵⁹ This similarity is very clear in a double appeal to the divine fatherhood in Sir 23:1.4, which makes up part of the individual prayer¹⁶⁰ (Sir 22:27-23:6):

v. 1 - κύριε πάτερ καὶ δέσποτα ζωῆς μου.

v. 4 - κύριε πάτερ καὶ θεὲ ζωῆς μου.

In the epoch of LXX κύριος there was a term *par excellence* to call God or to appeal to him. It is employed in LXX for such Hebrew terms as יהוה, אלהים (אל), and אדון and it generally expresses

¹⁵⁶ Cf. STROTMANN, „*Mein Vater bist du!*“ (Sir 51,10). The opinions of scholars differ, however, with regard to the last part of this verse 10d: whether LXX with *and he will be more tender to you than a mother* or the Hebrew manuscript with *and he will be more kindly to you and will deliver you from the pit* is more authentic. The translation is borrowed from P. SKEHAN-A. DI LELLA, *Wisdom of Ben Sirah. A New Translation with Notes by P. W. Skehan. Introduction and Commentary by A. A. di Lella*, AB 39, New York: Doubleday, 1987, pp. 163-164.

¹⁵⁷ Cf. Ps 68:6 and possibly Sir 34:24. For an interpretation of the latter reference see STROTMANN, „*Mein Vater bist du!*“ (Sir 51,10), pp. 68-70.

¹⁵⁸ Cf. STROTMANN, „*Mein Vater bist du!*“ (Sir 51,10), p. 66.

¹⁵⁹ For the textual problems, see above 1.1.2.

¹⁶⁰ For some opinions on the attributes of the individual prayer see, STROTMANN, „*Mein Vater bist du!*“ (Sir 51,10), pp.78, 80.

power, greatness, and legitimate position of the lordship of the only God.¹⁶¹ This term, placed at the beginning of each verse in conjunction with other designations for God, emphasizes once more its privileged status and points out that other epithets for God should be interpreted as the contents of κύριος. As this term reflects several Hebrew divine designations, it does *per se* represent a quite comprehensive image of the many-sided divine activity in LXX. This is also valid for the book of Sirach, in which the strong¹⁶² as well as merciful and compassionate¹⁶³ aspects of κύριος are well attested.¹⁶⁴ Nevertheless, the strong side of the lordship of God is further explained and illustrated by δεσπότης which is subsidiary to κύριος and emphasizes his power and omnipotence.¹⁶⁵ Furthermore, the parallel position of δεσπότης/θεὸς also highlights the strong aspect of θεός. On the other hand, the invocation to God as πατήρ defines more exactly the merciful and generous image of κύριος. This mercy and generosity of God as Father should basically be understood in terms of his fatherly care and readiness to intervene for the sake of those who cry for his help.¹⁶⁶

Both strong and fatherly sides of κύριος are closely interwoven in the purpose of the prayer which is expressed through the pleading μὴ ἐγκαταλίπης με ἐν βουλήῃ αὐτῶν, which is further explained as protection against the sins of the tongue, lust, and illegitimate passion as well as an invocation to be educated in the pious life (Sir 23:2). The initial plea for ‘non-abandoning’ is important because, for the first time, it is clearly connected with the divine fatherhood. In the HB the corresponding term is עָזַב (*forsake, abandon*) which is rarely used in connection with God’s attitude to his people or their land.¹⁶⁷ In contrast, there are a lot of cases where an individual or the people are said to have forsaken their God.¹⁶⁸ Hence ‘non-abandoning’ becomes almost a synonym for fidelity and even more underlines God’s fatherly attitude/activity.¹⁶⁹

The divine education is often portrayed as both fatherly love and strict discipline in the OT.¹⁷⁰ In this instance it is attributed to κύριος. This means that the loving side of such

¹⁶¹ Cf. W. FOERSTER, κύριος, in *TDNT* 3, pp. 1053, 1081-1082.

¹⁶² Cf. Sir 43:5; 46:5; 47:5; 46:16; 50:17; 51:1

¹⁶³ Cf. Sir 2:11; 5:4; 47:22; 48:20; Wis 9:1.

¹⁶⁴ κύριε is the usual term in Sirach to invoke to God; cf. MARCHEL, *Abba, Père!*, p. 71.

¹⁶⁵ The relationship between κύριος and δεσπότης may be summed up as follows: “If κύριος is here a name for God, God is κύριος because He is τῶν πάντων δεσπότης.” K. H. RENGSTORF, δεσπότης, in *TDNT* 2, p. 46.

¹⁶⁶ Cf. STROTMANN, „Mein Vater bist du!“ (Sir 51,10), pp. 74-75.

¹⁶⁷ There are only six references in the HB: Gen 24:27; Ruth 2:20; Ezek 8:12; 9:9; Ps 71:11; 2 Chron 32:31. In two of these cases Gen 24:27 and Ruth 2:20 the term עָזַב is used in negative form to express God’s fidelity.

¹⁶⁸ This is very painfully presented in the book of Jeremiah: Jer 1:16; 2:13; 16:11; 17:13; 22:9. Also Deut 29:25; 1 Kgs 9:9; 11:33; 19:10.14; 2 Kgs 22:17; Isa 1:4; 58:2; Hos 4:10; 2 Chron 7:22; 12:1; 21:10; 24:24; 34:25.

¹⁶⁹ It is noteworthy that the same idea is presented in the Greek version of Sir 51:10: μὴ με ἐγκαταλιπεῖν ἐν ἡμέραις θλίψεως.

¹⁷⁰ Cf. Sir 30:1; Prov 3:12; 13:24; Tob 13:2-7; Wis 12:19-21; 16:10.21.26.

education is represented by πατήρ and the more strict disciplining activity is ascribed to δεσπότης.

The invocation to God as to δεσπότης/θεὸς ζῶης μου¹⁷¹ not only emphasizes the dependence of man on him¹⁷² but also refers to God's creative and preservative activity in the life of man. It seems that the issue about God as creator is far from being abstract; rather the attention is fixed on the divine continuous support which makes itself visible through fatherly care that an individual may experience in his/her life. Thus the aspect of creation serves as the background to underline the individual's confidence in the divine powerful preservation and care for him/her. Finally, the position of πατήρ, which is prior to that of δεσπότης/θεὸς in both verses, shows clearly that the basis for the relationship between God and the individual is not his divine power but his careful and merciful attitude.¹⁷³

The third reference to God as Father in Sir 51:10H^B has some textual uncertainties, yet the more favored translation is the one which renders יי אבי אתה כי אתה גבור ישעי in כי (God you are my Father hero of my salvation) as affirmative 'indeed, yes'.¹⁷⁴ Thus Yahweh is both a Father and a mighty savior to an individual, who after having survived mortal dangers, expresses his/her gratitude in prayer (Sir 51:1-12), which may be considered as "a declarative psalm of praise".¹⁷⁵ The influences of various biblical texts may easily be found in this prayer.¹⁷⁶ Sir 51:10H^B shares an evident structural and terminological similarity with Ps 89:27. Nevertheless, the prayer in Sirach reflects a different literary genre, context, and purpose compared to Ps 89. There is only one evident phrase that may be taken as a clear citation of Ps 89 - אבי אתה.¹⁷⁷

The literary genre and goal of Sir 51:1-12 also differ from the prayer in Sir 22:27-23:6; yet, the inner structure of Sir 51:10H^B is very similar to Sir 23:1.4. Three divine titles are put in the same sequence - Lord, Father, 'strong' One. Having in mind that יהוה is continuously

¹⁷¹ While in both verses πατήρ reflects the image of God, who is careful and ready to help, the function of δεσπότης/θεὸς despite their parallel position and subsequent identical wording ζῶης μου in the prayer, is not totally the same. The accent between these two terms is slightly different: θεός emphasizes not only the divine power but also the oneness of God who is κύριος. Thus in v. 1 the appeal is made to the divine Father who is ready to help and on whom depends one's life because he is δεσπότης; v. 4 explains with θεός the basis for the power of κύριος thanks to which the divine δεσπότης overcomes the power of human δεσπότης; cf. STROTMANN, „Mein Vater bist du!“ (Sir 51,10), pp. 75-76.

¹⁷² According to Marchel, 'master of my life' in v. 1 is a true recognition of the divine sovereignty over man's life; cf. MARCHEL, *Abba, Père!*, p. 73. On the other hand, v. 1 also indicates that the faithful should pray with filial confidence and willingness to obey to the commandments of God; cf. SKEHAN-DI LELLA, *Wisdom of Ben Sirach*, p. 322.

¹⁷³ Cf. STROTMANN, „Mein Vater bist du!“ (Sir 51,10), pp. 81-83.

¹⁷⁴ Cf. STROTMANN, „Mein Vater bist du!“ (Sir 51,10), pp. 86-87. See also the affirmative translation in SKEHAN-DI LELLA, *Wisdom of Ben Sirach*, pp. 561, 566.

¹⁷⁵ SKEHAN-DI LELLA, *Wisdom of Ben Sirach*, pp. 564.

¹⁷⁶ Cf. Sir 51: 8-11 and Gen 48:16; Exod 15:2; Ps 25:6; Prov 24:10; Zeph 1:15.

¹⁷⁷ For the differences between Ps 89:27 and Sir 51:10H^B see STROTMANN, „Mein Vater bist du!“ (Sir 51,10), pp. 87-89.

translated as κύριος in LXX, the later form of tetragrammaton in our verse (יְיָ as always in manuscript B) may be viewed as a general designation for God who is the only Lord and who is further defined more precisely as Father and savior. The pattern employed here is the same as in Sir 23:1.4: the merciful and strong side of God is emphasized with appropriate terms. Furthermore, the confidence in God as Father, who is ready to help, expressed in Sir 23:1.4 (ζωῆς μου) may also be seen in the suffixed form אבִי (my Father). In addition, the same suffix put to גִּבּוֹר יִשְׁעִי (hero of my salvation) both reflects the individual's acknowledgment of God's strength and also explains this strong side of God who is an accessible saving hero. Despite these similarities, there is a difference. In Sir 23:1.4 all divine titles are rendered in the vocative, whereas in Sir 51:10H^B only יְיָ may possibly have the sense of the vocative. אבִי and גִּבּוֹר יִשְׁעִי serve as a declaration and acknowledgement of God's fatherhood and his saving activity.¹⁷⁸ The different ways of the expression of God's fatherhood and his saving activity in those two appeals may also be related to their character. Sir 23:1.4 is a supplication for help, therefore it is not surprising that all Greek terms are rendered in the vocative; on the other hand, Sir 51:10H^B is a thanksgiving prayer that acknowledges and praises God's great works.

Obviously, both Sir 23:1.4 and Sir 51:10H^B, describing the personal relationship between God and man, reflect a traditional understanding of the divine fatherhood as it is manifested in the relationship between God and Israel. This is the same Father of Israel who becomes my Father and this is the same divine fatherly love that caused the election of Israel to be his son and also grounds the God-individual relationship. The transposition of well-known traditional ideas to the personal level of individual piety is a step forward showing originality in the invocation to God as Father in the book of Sirach.¹⁷⁹

The references to the divine fatherhood in Wis 2:13.16.18 and Wis 5:5 with their contexts address the same topic and share some common ideas: 1) the temporary joy of the wicked; 2) their odium for the just man; 3) the suffering of the just man; 4) the future reward/deliverance of the just man. Although the expression in plural υἱοὶ θεοῦ in Wis 5:5 is ambiguous and may equally point to celestial beings¹⁸⁰ as well as to just men, the similarities to Wis 2:13.16.18 permit some identification with the latter ones.¹⁸¹ In addition, the only direct psalm reference to the just man, who is a son of God, is in Ps 73:15 which also deals with the same subject. The prosperity of sinners in Ps 73 (vv. 3-12) and the hard life of the just (vv. 13-

¹⁷⁸ Cf. STROTMANN, „Mein Vater bist du!“ (Sir 51,10), pp. 90-93.

¹⁷⁹ Cf. MARCHEL, *Abba, Père!*, pp. 76-77.

¹⁸⁰ Cf. BYRNE, 'Sons of God' - 'Seed of Abraham', pp. 42-43.

¹⁸¹ Cf. STROTMANN, „Mein Vater bist du!“ (Sir 51,10), p. 103 and note 310. According to Strotmann, the indeterminate description of the just man in these verses and the mention of the end of the just in the plural may point to the collective meaning of what the just man represents. The just man thus is a type of all just men (p. 109 *pace* Larcher).

14.26)¹⁸² stand in clear contraposition with the end of the wicked. That means their destruction (vv. 18-20.27) whereas the just man will enjoy the proximity of God (vv. 23-28). The silent question that is posed in both passages is the same, ‘whether God respond to the obedience and trust of the suffering just man’.

Although the just man in Ps 73 is not explicitly called a son of God, this is obvious from דור בניך (v. 15 *generation of your children*) to whom he attributes himself. Namely this verse reveals the depth of crisis and desperation¹⁸³ of the just man as well as his steadfast attitude not to betray the generation of God’s sons.¹⁸⁴ This attitude is already the beginning of the turning point (v. 17) as coming back¹⁸⁵ to the initial affirmation with a deeper appreciation that *God is good to the upright* (v. 1). From v. 17 the divine enlightenment of the just man enables him to evaluate anew the outcome of the wicked, to understand his previous impatience and the present assistance of God.¹⁸⁶ Finally, the end or destiny of the just man is revealed by God (v. 17) and is already effective (v. 26) but will be fully realized in the future as his glory (v. 24) and as his union with God which cannot be interrupted even by physical death.¹⁸⁷

The filial relationship between God and the just man in Wis 2:13.16.18 is presented employing various terms, which describe well the contents of those rapports. Thus the just man calls himself a child¹⁸⁸ of the Lord and pretends to have the knowledge of God (γινῶσιν θεοῦ, v. 13); he boasts (ἁλαζονεύομαι) of God as his father and considers (μακαρίζω) that in the end of all the trials the just will be happy (v. 16). Finally, he believes that he is under the protection of God who will deliver him (v. 18). This description is put in the mouth of the wicked who eventually exaggerated what the just man might have intended in reality.¹⁸⁹ This is confirmed by the term ἁλαζονεύομαι that has a negative aspect, and, consequently, could not have been used by the just man in connection with God. Similarly, the parallelismus membrorum between ἁλαζονεύομαι and μακαρίζω attaches some false quality even to the latter phrase.¹⁹⁰ Such

¹⁸² Although the just man declares himself to be innocent (v. 13) he endures “serious bodily suffering” (v. 14); cf. KRAUS, *Psalms 60-150*, p. 88.

¹⁸³ According to Ravasi, the beginning of v. 15 *if I had said I will speak thus* may even be understood as “stavo quasi per dire...”; RAVASI, *Il libro dei Salmi*, vol. 2, p. 516.

¹⁸⁴ To betray the assembly of the sons of God would have been to deny God’s salvific activity for his people; so KRAUS, *Psalms 60-150*, p. 88.

¹⁸⁵ See, for instance, a structural diagram of the whole psalm in M. A. TATE, *Psalms 51-100*, WBC 20, Waco: Word Books, 1990, p. 234.

¹⁸⁶ Tate calls it a threefold reorientation, cf. TATE, *Psalms 51-100*, pp. 238-239.

¹⁸⁷ Cf. KRAUS, *Psalms 60-150*, pp. 91-92. It may be noted that the trial, experience, and future promises described in this psalm are not to be reduced to the purely personal level; rather the figure of the just man encompasses all the just in Israel; cf. TATE, *Psalms 51-100*, p. 235.

¹⁸⁸ For πᾶς see above 2.1.1. and also cf. LARCHER, *Le Livre de la Sagesse*, I, pp. 245-246.

¹⁸⁹ The falsity and merely apparent authenticity (as Jews) of sinners seems to be also expressed by κίβδηλος in v. 16; cf. H. G. LIDDELL-R. SCOTT, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (new rev. ed.), Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961, p. 950; also LARCHER, *Le Livre de la Sagesse*, I, p. 249; VÍLCHEZ LÍNDEZ, *Sabiduria*, pp. 163-164.

¹⁹⁰ Cf. STROTMANN, „Mein Vater bist du!“ (*Sir 51,10*), p. 108.

argumentation illustrates the position of the wicked who neither believed that God is a Father to the just man nor in anything else. The true boasting of the just man, however, if seen from a positive perspective, is based on his new personal religious experience of the traditional God of Israel who became a Father to him (v. 16).¹⁹¹ This fact is noteworthy because, on the one hand, it gives a further explanation of the 'Father-son' relationship between God and the just man stated in v. 13; on the other hand, it serves as a decisive stimulus for the prosecution of the just man presented in vv. 17-20. The argumentation in v. 13 and v. 16 is similar because God who is a Father to the just man is the reason for his joy (v. 16) and the just man has the knowledge of God as because of the fact that he is the child of God (v. 13). Although the wording in v. 13ff. echoes Isa 52:13 LXX and reflects the tradition of the suffering servant of God in Second Isaiah¹⁹² the expiatory role of the sufferings of the just plays no role in our text; the knowledge of God takes its place instead. This knowledge of God should probably be understood in terms of God's secrets (v. 22) whose content is the awareness about the very end of the just and the sinners.¹⁹³ The importance of one who gives this knowledge is very obvious: it enables the just man to face his fate with confidence in God because he knows not only that God is his Father but also that a reward awaits him after his death.¹⁹⁴

The image of God as Father, which the just man relies on and puts his hope in, is quite clear: namely God is a Father who can help and protect you. Yet the sinners use this conviction of the just man against him. They try to prove that the claimed 'Father-son' relationship between God and the just man has no basis in reality. The sinners' attack is quite simple: is it possible that God proves to be a Father of the just man even at the moment of his greatest weakness, namely death?¹⁹⁵ This is a question both of duration and dependability of the divine fatherhood and of the most existential problem for the just and the wicked.¹⁹⁶ The answer is not given immediately but it is 'yes'. In the following chapters the author of Wisdom concentrates on the fate of the just man and the sinners. The sign of the unbroken fatherly love for his child will not be the rescue from physical death but the rescue from the fate of the wicked on the day of his

¹⁹¹ Cf. SCARPAT, *Libro della Sapienza*, vol. 1, p. 156.

¹⁹² Winston even calls it "a homily based chiefly on the fourth Servant Song in Isa 52:12". WINSTON, *The Wisdom of Solomon*, p. 120.

¹⁹³ Cf. STROTMANN, „*Mein Vater bist du!*" (*Sir 51,10*), pp. 110-111.

¹⁹⁴ Cf. SCARPAT, *Libro della Sapienza*, vol. 1, p. 192. This knowledge of course does not exclude the religious-ethical aspect of a just man's life in praxis and its interior illuminative character due to which the just man understands himself to be a son of God; cf. LARCHER, *Le Livre de la Sagesse*, I, p. 244; VÍLCHEZ LÍNDEZ, *Sabiduria*, p. 163.

¹⁹⁵ The position of the sinners seems to be clear; if God is a Father he must save his son's life from the physical death they had been preparing. The author's intention might have been to present the importance of the divine education in the life of the just man; cf. LARCHER, *Le Livre de la Sagesse*, I, p. 250.

¹⁹⁶ At this point the way of argumentation in v. 13 and v. 16 is worth noting: there is the same parallel structure connected with *and* in both verses. Thus, v. 13 connects sonship and knowledge of God and v. 16 relates the divine fatherhood to the end of the just man; remarked by BYRNE, 'Sons of God' - 'Seed of Abraham', p. 41.

last judgment (Wis 3:6-10; 5:1-17) and the subsequent reward of immortality (Wis 2:22f.; 5:15f.) which finally forces even the sinners to acknowledge the just ones as the sons of God (Wis 5:5).¹⁹⁷

The last reference to the divine fatherhood as the invocation to God as Father in Wis 14:3 differs from the previous ones quite considerably. The difference lies in its literary form and the immediate context in which it is situated. Moreover, God as Father in Wis 14:1-7¹⁹⁸ has no clearly expressed relationships with any group.

This is the only instance in the OT in which πατήρ is associated with the term πρόνοια (*providence*)¹⁹⁹ which is found in Greek literature and was widely used by the Stoics. This term is further qualified by the term διακυβερνᾶω (direct, govern, v. 3). Because of its attributive and personal (σή) position with regard to the Father, πρόνοια loses its abstract significance and expresses the quality of a personal God who may be addressed and invoked to.²⁰⁰ The activity of the divine providence (as well as Father) is both described in terms of everyday life (steering the ship) as well as being based on biblical history. The author calls to mind two important events: the crossing of the Red Sea (v. 3)²⁰¹ and the story of Noah (v. 6). In fact, the latter example adds some new aspect (δικαιοσύνη in v. 7), which modifies the example of the crossing of the Red Sea. Admittedly, God has the power to save in every situation (v. 4), yet the rescue seems to be closely connected with the righteousness of the rescued ones.²⁰² Those two stories attest once more that the power of divine providence is not abstract and deterministic but is exercised for the sake of men. Even more, since the basis for the Exodus from Egypt was not God's power but his free love, so the activity of divine providence is also grounded primarily on this

¹⁹⁷ Cf. STROTMANN, „Mein Vater bist du!“ (Sir 51,10), pp. 112-114.

¹⁹⁸ The limits of this section seem to be proved by ἔξωλον that makes inclusion in v.1 and v. 7; so, M. GILBERT, *La critique des dieux dans le Livre de la Sagesse* (Sg 13-15), (AnBib 53), Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1973, p. 100.

¹⁹⁹ For the discussion on this term see Marchel, *Abba, Père!*, pp. 78-81. According to him, the meaning of *providence*, as employed in our text, is fundamentally different from the deterministic significance the Stoics ascribed to this word. The freedom of human actions in Wis 1:12-16; 2:23 and the overall conception of divine providence in the OT, though not expressed by the particular term, leave no place for fatalism. Marchel admits that the author of Wisdom used the contemporaneous terminology without adhering to any philosophical system.

²⁰⁰ Cf. STROTMANN, „Mein Vater bist du!“ (Sir 51,10), p. 131. She also assents to the opinion that the conception of divine providence is attested in the OT despite the absence of the specific term corresponding to πρόνοια and that this conception essentially differs from the stoic abstract principle. The providence of God in the OT primarily means the care of Yahweh for Israel and not the rule of the whole world. Nevertheless, Strotmann admits that the image of the ship and the pilot that was used in antiquity to express the governing of the universe by divine providence has a certain similarity to the Zeus-hymn of Cleanthes and are signs confirming the stoic Hellenistic influence on this passage. Differently from Marchel, she thinks that the Jewish concept of divine providence emerges namely from this passage (vv. 1-7) and that the current terminology of that time has been employed by the author of Wisdom to criticize the ideas about the activity and level of influence of divine providence (see, pp. 132-135).

²⁰¹ See GILBERT, *La critique des dieux dans le Livre de la Sagesse*, pp. 104-109.

²⁰² Cf. STROTMANN, „Mein Vater bist du!“ (Sir 51,10), p. 136. That the term δικαιοσύνη, in connection with Noah, is employed not accidentally is clear from Gen 6:9; 7:1; Sir 44:17. Furthermore, some texts allow to see in the figure of Noah the idea of the “remnant” (Ezek 14:20-22; more exactly Sir 44:17); cf. GILBERT, *La critique des dieux dans le Livre de la Sagesse*, pp. 112-113.

characteristic.²⁰³ The steering activity of divine providence in v. 3, which implies protection, care, and solicitude²⁰⁴ for those who are on board, may be seen as the further expression of God's fatherly affection.

Divine providence presents God as a strong, careful and active Father in the history of men. The allusions to the crossing of the Red Sea and Noah's rescue from the flood illustrate the absolute power and universal character of divine providence.²⁰⁵ On the other hand, these examples show the relationship between God as Father and Israel (the Red Sea) or, more precisely, the just ones (Noah's case), and prove that the manifestation of this universal divine providence finds its place in the concrete history of the Jewish people.²⁰⁶

1.2.1.4. God as Father of the Orphans

There is only one text (Ps 68:6) which reflects a very particular character²⁰⁷ of the fatherly relationship between God and a social group known as orphans. The idea of a special care for orphans and widows is not an invention of the OT but it rather follows a well-attested ancient Near East pattern. In fact, it was a privilege and even the duty of the king or monarch to preserve the rights of orphans. The notion 'orphans' most probably should be understood as those without a father (cf. Lam 5:3) and having no help (cf. Job 29:12). The texts referring to God's care for those fatherless ones usually attest to his royal office as well (cf. Ps 10; Ps 82; Ps 146).²⁰⁸ Furthermore, the rights of orphans and their protection seem to be the most important matter in the passages dealing with this theme. The same is valid for the combination widows-orphans.²⁰⁹ It seems that Ps 68:6 should also be interpreted in this context: God is a Father to the widows and orphans because he protects their rights.²¹⁰ The protection of the rights of the orphans by the divine authority served as a guarantee of their social status. Ps 68:6 is relevant because it gives the only explicit evidence of God as having a Father's relationship to widows

²⁰³ The manifestation of the divine love in the flood-story is not however so convincing.

²⁰⁴ Instead of 'providence' Strotmann suggests translating πρόνοια as 'Fürsorge', which according to her is a more natural reading in accordance with the more frequent meaning of προνοέω as used in everyday language; cf. Cf. STROTMANN, „*Mein Vater bist du!*“ (Sir 51,10), p. 138.

²⁰⁵ For the universal context opts Marchel, *Abba, Père!*, pp. 82-83; also LARCHER, *Le Livre de la Sagesse*, III, p. 792; WINSTON, *The Wisdom of Solomon*, p. 266; VILCHEZ LINDEZ, *Sabiduria*, p. 372. It is obvious that recall of the flood-story as a sign of the recreation of the world and mankind underlines the universal character of divine providence.

²⁰⁶ The point stressed by Strotmann; cf. STROTMANN, „*Mein Vater bist du!*“ (Sir 51,10), p. 139.

²⁰⁷ This is the only reference to God as Father employed in *status constructus* (Father of...) in the OT.

²⁰⁸ Cf. H. RINGGREN, מִיֹּרֵךְ, in *TDOT* 6, pp. 478-480; RAVASI, *Il libro dei Salmi*, vol. 2, pp. 378-379.

²⁰⁹ Cf. Exod 22:21; Deut 10:17-18; 24:17; 27:19; Isa 1:17.23; 10:2; Jer 5:28; 7:5f; 22:3; Ezek 22:7; Pss 10:16; 94:6; Job 22:9; 24:3; 31:17f; Prov 23:10.

²¹⁰ Cf. BÖCKLER, *Gott als Vater im Alten Testament*, p. 376.

and orphans.²¹¹ The presentation of this relationship in the context of the Exodus motives is not only unique but also reveals a more merciful and salvific rather than an authoritative image of the divine Father.

1.2.2. Divine Fatherhood Revealed by Similes

There are six comparative passages, which describe the activity or attitude of God with reference to the earthly father/man. These comparisons use either אָבִיךָ (Deut 1:31 [LXX ὥς]; 8:5 [LXX ὥς ... οὕτως]; Mal 3:17 [LXX ὁν τρόπον]) or אָבִי (Isa 66:13 [LXX ὥς ... οὕτως]; Ps 103:13 [LXX καθὼς]; Prov 3:12²¹²), and in LXX - ὥς (Wis 11:10).

The employed pattern in all of them (except Wis 11:10) is similar insofar as it follows the same scheme, namely human action/attitude is always connected with *son(s)*. The term that describes this action/attitude is always repeated with reference to God's activity in the same verse (except Prov 3:12). A visual presentation below offers an outline of the image of God as it is portrayed in different texts.

Table 5

Text	Term	Context	Activity	'Son(s)'	Time
Deut 1:31	man	desert experience	bear	people	past (present)
Deut 8:5	man	desert experience	educate	people	past (present)
Mal 3:17	man	just and wicked	spare	the righteous	future
Ps 103:13	father	hymn of praise	pity	individual	present
Prov 3:12	father	discipline lesson	reprove	individual	present
Wis 11:10	father	desert experience	test	people	past (present)

Although the explicit 'Father-son' relationship is only partly attested in these comparisons, the coupling of 'man-son' in a similar pattern also implies and reflects this relationship.²¹³ This is also confirmed by the common theme that they deal with (education: Prov 3:12 father; Deut 8:5 man; Wis 11:10 father) and their thematic connotations with the passages in which the divine fatherhood is attested (Deut 1:31 and Hos 11:1.3; Deut 8:5 and Wis 11:10; 16:20.26; Mal 3:17 and Ps 73:5; Wis 2:13.16.18).

²¹¹ Another reference, which connects divine fatherhood (without naming God as Father) with the theme of widows and orphans, is in Sir 4:10. See above.

²¹² There is a significant difference between the Hebrew text and its version presented by LXX. Though the latter deals with the same topic, yet it differs from the Hebrew text on two points: it is not a simile and there is no mention of a 'father'. It is the Lord who disciplines those whom he loves and scourges every son whom he receives.

²¹³ According to Böckler the 'man-son' formula instead of 'Father-son' pattern in Deut 1:31; 8:5 was probably employed because at the time when these comparisons had been recorded the language about God as Father had different connotations; cf. BÖCKLER, *Gott als Vater im Alten Testament*, pp. 352, 357.

The educational aspect dominates in three of the six texts. Deut 8:5 and Wis 11:10 have much in common. Firstly, the recall of the desert experience in both passages attests once again to the interpretation of Israel's past as divine pedagogy. This shows the didactic purpose of the argumentation. Secondly, the comparisons in both texts describe the relationship between God and his people. Moreover, the contents of this relationship are quite similar. The examination of Israel (Deut 8:2.16) and its disciplining (Deut 8:5) are those aspects which depict the nature of the relationship between God and Israel in Wis 11:9-10.²¹⁴ Furthermore, the water-miracle in both passages (Deut 8:15; Wis 11:4f.) also belongs to the framework of an examination of people.²¹⁵ The examination in the wilderness as it is presented in Deuteronomy was a good lesson for Israel, for it reminded them of their total dependence on God. One of the signs of disciplining²¹⁶ young Israel was the gift of manna which is associated with 'humbling' and 'testing' in Deut 8:2-3. This special gift was both a real divine invitation for Israel to accept its dependence on God and also the examination of a genuine disposition of the people.²¹⁷ The tested Israel had to realize that it is not self-sufficient and depends on God's word.²¹⁸ On the other hand, the miracle of manna and God's concern about the needs of the Israelites (v. 4) reveal the caring aspect of this education. The purpose of the divine education was the good of Israel (v. 16). Therefore it was in some sense precautionary to avoid the transgressions of commandments (v. 6) and even apostasy (v. 19).

The discipline of Israel in Wis 11:9-10²¹⁹ is presented through testing as in Deuteronomy. The manner of such examination reveals a more corrective aspect of the education. The terms παιδεύω (*instruct, discipline*, v. 9) and νοθετεύω (*warn, admonish*, v. 10) are clearly pedagogic concepts, which describe God's educating function. In LXX they express, however, more frequently a negative, behavior-correcting side of the education than its positive reinforcing aspect. Even if it is softened, the same pedagogy seems also to be intended in Wis 11:9-10. Nevertheless, the positive aspect of the divine pedagogy is not forgotten. The expression ἐν ἐλέει connected with παιδευόμενοι literally means *being disciplined/corrected in*

²¹⁴ The 'examination' in Deut 8:2.16 (LXX) is expressed by ἐκπειράζω (Wis 11:9 πειράζω) and 'education' both in Deut 8:5 and Wis 11:10 by παιδεύω.

²¹⁵ Cf. STROTMANN, „*Mein Vater bist du!*“ (Sir 51,10), pp. 121-122.

²¹⁶ This is a more neutral term (as well as education) to translate נסו. It also contains the negative idea of chastening and punishment. The context (both positive and negative vv. 2-4) does not allow it to be translated in a purely negative sense; cf. BÖCKLER, *Gott als Vater im Alten Testament*, p. 356.

²¹⁷ Cf. DRIVER, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy*, pp. 106-107.

²¹⁸ If to take נסו in the sense of 'experimenting', the test in the wilderness allows God to perceive better the inner readiness of the people to adhere to the Decalogue; cf. BRAULIK, *Deuteronomium. 1-16, 17*, p. 69.

²¹⁹ In fact v. 10 repeats the teaching of v. 9 and they correspond to each other; cf. VÍLCHEZ LÍNDEZ, *Sabiduria*, p. 315. For a graphic correspondence of vv. 9-10 see STROTMANN, „*Mein Vater bist du!*“ (Sir 51,10), p. 121.

mercy and is usually translated in a similar way.²²⁰ Yet there is another possibility to see it in the light of Hebrew חסד (for which it stands in LXX) and to translate as *kindliness, favor*. This way ἐν ἐλλεί expresses in our context God's affection for Israel as well as the permanence of this affection, i.e., his fidelity.²²¹

The third comparison with educational terminology (Prov 3:12) is part of the instruction that concentrates on trust in God and submission to his discipline (vv. 1-12). Because of its context, it differs from the first two significantly. This instruction neither recalls past events nor is related to any particular situation at the present. Due to its non-historical character it may have been applied in different situations and to different addressees. The address בְּנִי in v. 11 (cf. v. 1) introduces the immediate instruction, which serves as the basis for the comparison in v. 12. Such an address reflects a pattern of parental or scholastic education. Terms, describing the manner of the discipline in v. 12 (יָבַח, *reprove*, in LXX μαστιγῶν), are the same as in the disciplining of the Davidic king (2 Sam 7:14 יָבַח; Ps 89:33 LXX ἐν μάστιγι). The divine discipline in these texts is closely interwoven with divine חסד, which reveals the positive and loving aspect of this chastening. In a similar way the severe aspect of the divine education in Prov 3:12 (especially LXX) is completed by the assurance that God loves those people whom he chastises. Differently from 2 Sam 7 and Ps 89 this comparison presents the divine discipline as not conditioned by sinful behavior but as natural and even necessary. The love of God is, in this case, expressed through severe discipline.²²²

The other three comparisons belong to different traditions and are used employing diverse terms to express the activity of God. The comparison in Deut 1:31 seems to be closely connected with Hos 11:1f. In both cases God's fatherly activity is associated with the Exodus and these passages call to mind God's saving acts in the desert.²²³ The remembrance in this context, which presents the lack of the people's confidence in God (Deut 1:26-29) or their faithlessness and ignorance (Hos 11:2-3), emphasizes even more the failings of the Israelites. The divine activity in Deut 1:31 is compared to a son that is carried by God. The employed term נָשָׂא (*carry*) also has the aspect of care (cf. Exod 18:22; 19:4; Num 11:12; Isa 46:3.4). This picture is rendered in LXX in an even more tender way, namely, God is the one who carries

²²⁰ LARCHER, *Le Livre de la Sagesse*, III, "bien que corrigés avec miséricorde", p. 665; VILCHEZ LINDEZ, *Sabiduria*, "aunque fuera una corrección piadosa", p. 314.

²²¹ Cf. STROTMANN, „Mein Vater bist du!“ (*Sir 51,10*), pp. 124-125.

²²² According to McKane, LXX, employing μαστιγῶν not simply explicates the Hebrew term יָבַח, but emphasizes the necessity of suffering: "the meaning is that Yahweh inflicts pain on the son on whom he dotes." W. MCKANE, *Proverbs. A New Approach*, OTL, Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1970, p. 294. The suffering aspect in this comparison is also underlined by R. E. MURPHY, *Proverbs*, WBC 22, Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1998, pp. 20-21.

²²³ Although there is no explicit term for a 'desert' in Hos 11:1f., this is suggested by the context and the connotations with other texts in Hosea where this term is employed (cf. Hos 9:10; 13:5).

Israel in his arms as a nurse (τροφοφορέω). Thus the real meaning of God's attitude to Israel should be understood in terms of helpful and responsible care.²²⁴

The comparisons in Ps 103:13 and Mal 3:17 are similar insofar as their contexts underline the conditional nature of God's acting as a father/man. Actually this means that the divine answer depends on human behavior. Although Ps 103 praises divine forgiveness, the constant association of God's goodness with the fear of him (vv. 11.13.17) puts some limits on the situation. These limits seem to be set through the adherence of the divine commandments (v. 18). Thus God treats a faithful man²²⁵ as a father his son with responsible and protective love.²²⁶ The conditional character of the divine fatherhood in Mal 3:17 is clearer. This is seen in the prelude to the comparison in vv. 14-15 that deals with the theme of the actual position of the righteous and the wicked and also in v. 18 in which the future distinction of both groups will be emphasized even more.²²⁷ Thus the comparison in v. 17, standing at the center, gives the answer to the righteous regarding the way that they will be given their recompense. The reward to those who serve God with their correct behavior²²⁸ will be their salvation. The contents of this salvation are better expressed in LXX which translates חַמֵּל (*spare*) with αἰρεῖν (*choose*) this way explaining what it means for the righteous to be the possession of God. LXX suggests a meaning that the special 'exclusion' of the just reflects the movement from the people as a whole to individuals.²²⁹

1.2.3. Divine Fatherhood Revealed by Theophoric Names

The role of a personal name in ancient Semitic world is well-known and its importance hardly needs to be proven. The close relationship between the etymological significance of the name and the personality, power, material and spiritual wealth of its bearer together with its

²²⁴ Cf. BÖCKLER, *Gott als Vater im Alten Testament*, p. 350.

²²⁵ Ps 103 is clearly a hymn of an individual (cf. vv. 1.22), nevertheless, as Kraus observed, the individual in v. 12 "directly and contemporaneously includes himself in the community." KRAUS, *Psalms 60-150*, p. 292; cf. also RAVASI, *Il libro dei Salmi*, vol. 3, p. 72.

²²⁶ Cf. H. J. STOEBE, רָחַם, in *TLOT* 3, 1225-1230. He defines love as it is implied by this term in Ps 103:13 "a volition acknowledgment (or rejection) of paternity involving the resultant duties of providing security and protection for the child" (p. 1226). This definition was adopted and served as basis for the argumentation of BÖCKLER, cf. BÖCKLER, *Gott als Vater im Alten Testament*, pp. 341-342.

²²⁷ The theme about the affliction of the just and the injustice, prosperity of the wicked is neither new in the OT nor it is exceptional in connection with the divine fatherhood (cf. Ps 73:5; Wis 2:12-20).

²²⁸ In Mal 3:16 those who feared the Lord are the same righteous who serve him in vv. 14.17.18. Even if there was a standard practice in the ancient Near East giving preference to the son which served their parents, as is suggested in J. GREENFIELD, "Two Biblical Passages in the Light of Their Near Eastern Background – Ezekiel 16:30 and Malachi 3:17," *Eretz Israel* 19 (1982) 56-60, nevertheless, the 'serving' God in our context is not given not a comparative but a decisive value. It may be that this word implies faithfulness to the divine commandments; cf. BÖCKLER, *Gott als Vater im Alten Testament*, p. 359.

²²⁹ "Nicht mehr das gesamte Volk an sich ist Gottes Erwählte, sondern das Volk wird als die Summe seiner Individuen verstanden". BÖCKLER, *Gott als Vater im Alten Testament*, p. 360.

possible impact on others can be reckoned as the most basic aspects in the ancient understanding of personal names.²³⁰ The widespread phenomenon throughout the ancient Semitic world, even in the era prior to that of Israelite history, to employ theophoric elements in personal names is another credit to their importance. The names containing theophoric elements are also quite abundant in the Old Testament, and there is a considerable number of compounds that in place of the divine name use such kinship terms as אב (father), אח (brother) and עמ (uncle, kinsman).²³¹ This phenomenon is not limited to the Hebrew language and is also well attested in ancient Semitic onomastica. Accordingly, it refers to the common ground that extends beyond the limits of the national religions. Although the scholarship about the origin of kinship compounds in Israel and their theophoric interpretation is not unanimous,²³² there are no serious arguments that would be incompatible to see them as a reflection of ancient ideas as to “what the ordinary man conceived to be characteristics of his God.”²³³ It is possible that compound names in a certain sense might reflect so called domestic piety or religion²³⁴ in the pre-monarchic or early monarchic period of Israel.²³⁵ It is also plausible to think about the same situation in other Semitic religions, yet the significant differences between Hebrew and other Semitic compound names cannot be overlooked. The dissonances of content, which compound names reveal in the Hebrew Bible and in the rest of Semitic onomastica, provide evidence to suggest that the

²³⁰ In fact, these principal ideas are easily retraced in almost every biblical dictionary or encyclopedia, see H. BIETENHARD, ὄνομα, in *TDNT* 5, pp. 252-254; R. ABBA, “Name”, in *IDB* 3, pp. 501-502; P. van IMSCHOOT- L. A. BUSHINSKI, “Name”, in *EDB*, pp. 1604-1606; J. L. MCKENZIE, *Dictionary of the Bible*, Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1965, p. 603; A. S. van der WOUDE, עמ, in *TLOT* 3, pp. 1356-1357; L. MONLOUBOU, “Nom”, in *DEB*, p. 903.

²³¹ Fowler finds 1152 Hebrew theophoric names with various prefixes and suffixes in total, amongst which 58 with אב, 43 with אח, and 24 with עמ, see J. D. FOWLER, *Theophoric Personal Names in Ancient Hebrew. A Comparative Study* (JSOTSupS 49), Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988, p. 366. Vanoni (pace Jenni) refers to 40 personal Hebrew names containing אב, cf. Vanoni, „Du bist doch unser Vater“, p. 38 and note 131. According to Böckler, there are 31 lexically distinct proper nouns in the MT, which contain אב. They are employed in 44 different forms and are attributed to 63 persons (amongst them to 8 women); cf. BÖCKLER, *Gott als Vater im Alten Testament*, p. 163.

²³² See K. van der TOORN, “Ancestors and Anthroponyms: Kinship Terms as Theophoric Elements in Hebrew Names,” *ZAW* 108 (1, 1996) pp. 1-11. After having evaluated some different opinions, which deal with the theophoric character of Hebrew kinship names (pp. 1-4), the author suggests that the kinship terms *father*, *brother*, *uncle*, should be viewed from a perspective of ancestors’ cult. They have nothing to do with any gods but only deified ancestors, whose cult was an important part of the domestic religion of Iron Age Israel (pp. 5-11). See also BÖCKLER, *Gott als Vater im Alten Testament*, pp. 167-171. Albertz seems to be more moderated when he says that “divinized designations of kinship...perhaps derived originally from the ancestor cult, and denote family gods under the aspect of a close affinity, almost a blood relationship,” R. ALBERTZ, *A History of Israelite Religion in the Old Testament Period. Volume 1: From the Beginnings to the End of the Monarchy*, London: SCM Press, 1994, p. 97; see also QUELL, πατήρ, p. 967 and JENNI, אב, p. 7.

²³³ FOWLER, *Theophoric Personal Names*, p. 317 (it. his).

²³⁴ “D’une manière générale on peut donc admettre que chez les Semites, les noms théophores sont l’expression d’une simple religion personnelle; par suite ces noms peuvent fournir des indications précieuses sur la conception de la relation censée exister entre l’homme et son Dieu.” Marchel, *Abba, Père!*, p. 26, note 6. This point is also generally stressed by Albertz, cf. ALBERTZ, *A History of Israelite Religion*, pp. 95-96.

²³⁵ The compounds with the theophoric element אב were current predominantly in the pre-monarchic period and are rare after the exile; cf. FOWLER, *Theophoric Personal Names*, pp. 44-46, 367. The data: 27 persons (20 names) which had those names are attested in the pre-monarchic period, 24 persons (17 names) in the early monarchic time (Saul/David/Solomon); cf. BÖCKLER, *Gott als Vater im Alten Testament*, p. 164.

common ground of this phenomenon had been so strongly incorporated into Israel that even the conception of divinity expressed in those names reflected no incongruence regarding the character of Yahweh and the Israelite religion.²³⁶ The number of compounds combined with אב to be interpreted in a theophoric sense is open to discussion; nevertheless, at least in four nominal sentence-names God is undoubtedly named Father, i.e. אבִי־אֵל and אֵל־אבִי, יִי־אבִי and אֲבִיהֶּ.²³⁷ There are also other nominal sentence-names in which אב most likely retains its theophoric character: *my/the (divine) Father is help, peace, salvation, wall (protection), strength, goodness, king, glory, generous, exalted*. Despite some uncertainty in the interpretation of these compounds,²³⁸ these applications to the divine Father not only reflect the human attitude and aspirations towards God, but also may be viewed as the expressions of divine blessing, protection, and salvation for the man himself, his family or a larger group of people. Eventually, it would be improper to postulate only one-sided human expectations expressed by theophoric names without the presumable and active answer on God's part.

Certainly, it is difficult to assume an unambiguous conception of a plain personal relationship between God as Father and the individual in ancient Israel on the basis of theophoric names, yet this fact sheds some light upon the figure of God as Father as it was understood at that time, not only in the affairs of all people but also in the personal lives of its members.

* * *

Having reviewed the divine fatherhood on the basis of its presentation in different text-groups, there is a need to synthesize the image of God as Father as it is presented in the OT. Since some remarks on the syntactic data regarding the texts which explicitly attest to God's fatherhood in the HB and LXX have already been made, the following conclusive remarks can be made:

- 1) The main aspects of the divine fatherhood in the different text-groups and sub-groups.
- 2) The major distinctions and convergent ideas in these groups.

²³⁶ For the differences between Hebrew and other Semitic onomastica, see FOWLER, *Theophoric Personal Names*, pp. 278-318.

²³⁷ Fowler thinks that when two divine names or appellations are combined together they constitute a new term, then it is plausible to think of both of them as retaining their divine aspects. For example, Eliab should be understood as 'El is (divine) Father' and not as 'El is (a, like a) father', cf. FOWLER, *Theophoric Personal Names*, p. 30.

²³⁸ The ambiguity remains in the interpretation of אֲבִי־אֵל - *my Father is God* or *God is my Father*, and אֲבִיהֶּ - *my Father is Jah (YHWH)* or *Jah (YHWH) is my Father*. The function of 'yod' (*my*) in these and other theophoric compounds is also debatable, see QUELL, *πατήρ*, p. 969; RINGGREN, אב, p. 16; Marchel, *Abba, Père!*, pp. 26-28; Fowler, *Theophoric Personal Names*, pp. 71-73, 77-83, 107, 109; RAVASI, "Dio Padre," in *DSBP* 1, pp. 27-29; Vanoni, „*Du bist doch unser Vater*“, pp. 38-39, note 132.

1) It has already been noted that the largest group of references to the divine fatherhood in fact consists of two smaller groups called 'father-texts' and 'son-texts' which supplement each other and help to better conceive the image of God as Father. The decisive criterion to deal with these text-groups in a unified manner has been taken as the one with *whom* God as Father is in a relationship since it is clearly detectable both in 'father-texts' and 'son-texts'. Therefore the investigation has proceeded with differentiation of this united group (without drawing rigid grammatical limits between 'father/son-texts') into four sub-groups (people, king, individuals, orphans) to form a clear view about the 'Father/God-addressee/son' relationships in every sub-group.

The comparison of the forms and contents of the 'father-texts', on the one hand, and the 'son-texts' on the other, as far as they prove God's fatherhood to Israel, has disclosed both their similarities and differences. The largest difference in the presentation of God as Father to Israel is observed in the usage of the filial images in the deuterocanonical corpus of the OT. The 'father-texts' refer only to the one passage in the book of Tobit while the 'son-texts' point to sixteen references in four different books. Besides this significant *disproportion*, the deuterocanonical books portray this relationship from an almost exceptionally *positive or neutral* perspective. The most important similarity between these text-groups should be seen in their *historical portrayal* of the God-Israel relationship as based on the Exodus event. Another significant parallel in both text-groups is a colorful *contraposition* of unfaithful Israel (except deuterocanonical books) to the faithful and ready-to-forgive God. Beside this basic quality there are three aspects that are dominant in the relationship between God as Father and Israel and which best characterizing him as Father: his *creative, redeeming/saving, and educational* activity. It should be mentioned that these divine activities are presented as mutually interrelated and seen as the organic part of the people's history.

The main aspects of the divine fatherhood in the second sub-group, describing God's relationship to the Davidic king, may be formulated in a twofold way. Firstly, God's fatherhood is identified with his *authority* (not tyranny) that allows the king to participate in it acknowledging his own dependence on God. Secondly, the reference to God's severe yet fatherly disciplining of the king not only expresses his authority but rather reveals his proved attitude to the people of Israel: God as Father remains *faithful* to his promises even if the king fails (2 Sam 7; Ps 89).

The relationship between the divine Father and the individuals adds some new details to his fatherly image. Two main features of God emerge from the texts: the fatherly *merciful care* (Sirach) and his *saving and irrevocable faithfulness* towards the just (Wisdom, Ps 73). Finally, God is a Father of orphans insofar he is the *defender* of their rights.

The fatherhood of God in the 'comparison' text-group is mostly characterized by his *careful* and *educational* activity both towards the people and the individual. The aspect of his fatherly *saving and irrevocable faithfulness* for the righteous man is also found.

The divine goodness, generosity, help etc. as far as they may be recognized in the theophoric names reflect basically the *protective* side of the divine fatherhood.

2) The differences between the different text-groups need to be understood against the background of the events the texts call to mind and the addressees involved in the relationship with God. The evident time difference between the traditions presenting divine fatherhood with respect to the people and the king on the one hand, and the individuals on the other, reveals the preferences and tendency in the understanding of God as Father. It is evident that his *creative* and *redeeming* activities, which are the outstanding proofs of his fatherhood with respect to Israel, are not emphasized in the other texts-groups. On the other hand, despite the multifaceted relationship between God as Father and Israel as son in which the aspect of fatherly *merciful care* is attested, one nevertheless observes a kind of suppression of this facet by his more majestic images. It is particularly evident at the individual level that the *merciful care* of the divine Father is revealed as one of his basic characteristics. Furthermore, the divine *protection* and *assistance* found in all text-groups achieves its highest materialization at the individual level, i.e. it is valid and effective even in/after death. Despite the fact that the divine *authority* is one of the basic, fundamental characteristics of the divine fatherhood, the texts in the book of Wisdom suggest that the *mercy* and *care* of God as Father have priority over more powerful side of his nature.

There are many similar qualities of the divine fatherhood which are retraceable in every text-group. The principal convergent idea is that of associating the activity of the divine fatherhood with the *religious-moral behavior* of the people to whom he addresses. God as Father is never portrayed in an abstract sense. His *protection* is one of many fatherly qualities which are presented with different nuances in all text-groups. This quality is even more significant because of its stable character as it is presented in the OT, i.e., the fatherly protection is not only a temporary experience. Another more credited aspect of the divine fatherhood is his *educational* activity. This fatherly characteristic, that is so close to one of the essential qualities of the earthly father, is presented in the OT as the example to be followed even by men (cf. Wis 12:19-22).

II. THE IMAGE OF GOD AS FATHER IN STOIC LITERATURE AND PHILO

Both Stoic literature and Philo's writings have their exterior origin on the outside of the Palestinian religious-cultural world and share the highly Hellenistic cultural and philosophical tradition, obviously though not on the same level and quite differently. Generally speaking, the influence of the Greek (especially Platonic and Stoic) philosophical ideas²³⁹ on Philo's theological-philosophical framework can hardly be overlooked, nor can his adhesion to the Jewish tradition be underestimated.²⁴⁰ It is true that God for Philo was primarily God of the Pentateuch; however, many aspects in his doctrine on God show his dependence on various Greek philosophical schools and authors.²⁴¹ Likewise, the strong emphasis, which he has put on the creative and universalistic aspect of the divine Father, shows that this theme had been deeply influenced by the Greek philosophy. Philo's Greek philosophical attitude is well disclosed not only by the regular coupling of Father with the Maker, but also by employing the idea of the Father – the Creator of the universe, the latter being consecutively entitled the son of God.²⁴²

²³⁹ For the influence of Platonic and Stoic ideas on Philo's writings and their controversial coexistence with the image of a personal God see E. BRÉHIER, *Les idées philosophiques et religieuses de Philon d'Alexandrie*, Paris: J. Vrin, 1950³, pp.69-82. The author observes, however, that regarding the divine fatherhood one should speak only about the Platonic influence and not that of the Stoics (p. 74). Some explicit examples of Philo's use of Plato, Aristotle, Pythagoreans, and Stoics are also noted by F. H. COLSON, G. H. WHITAKER, *Philo*, I, 1991⁷, pp. xvii-xix. The contacts between Philo and the Stoic tradition have also been discussed by M. POHLENZ, *La Stoa. Storia di un movimento spirituale*, 2 vol., Firenze: «La Nuova Italia», 1967, vol. 2, pp. 199-215. Philo's large use of Plato, especially with regard to the creation theme, is well exposed in the study of D. T. RUNIA, *Philo of Alexandria and the Timaeus of Plato*, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1986. See also his more recent study on this topic "Was Philo a Middle Platonist? A Difficult Question Revisited," *SPA* 5 (1993) 112-140, as well as subsequent responses from a debate offered by D. Winston, T. H. Tobin, and J. Dillon in the same *Studia Philonica Annual* edition. For more recent proposal insisting on Philo's remaining highly influenced by the Stoic tradition, see G. REYDAMS-SCHILS, "Stoicized Readings of Plato's *Timaeus* in Philo of Alexandria," *SPA* 7 (1995) 85-102.

²⁴⁰ For a brief survey on Philo's attempts to reconcile his philosophical knowledge with his native religious tradition on such key-points as repentance, the divine nature, human perfection and ecstatic vision, see D. WINSTON, "Judaism and Hellenism: Hidden Tensions in Philo's Thought," *SPA* 2 (1990) 1-19.

²⁴¹ See RUNIA, *Philo of Alexandria*, p. 434f. Runia presents a compact outline on what points in the conception of God Philo may have depended on the Stoa, Aristotle and the Peripatetics, Plato and the Platonist tradition, the Old Academy and Neopythagoreanism. Besides, the background of Philo's doctrine on the divine powers is not very clear; he may have been influenced not only by the Jewish tradition but also by Plato (creative power), the Stoa and Neopythagoreanism (*ibid.* note 140).

²⁴² The idea of divine 'generation' of the universe in *De spec. legibus* I, 96 is pushed to the point that τὸ πᾶν is presented as ὁ υἱός. For the similar idea, cf. *De vita Mosis* II, 134. *Quod Deus*, 31: ὁ κόσμος νεώτερος υἱός θεοῦ; cf. *De ebrietate*, 30; *De spec. legibus* I, 41.

2.1. The image of God as Father in Stoics

Although the theme of the divine and god(s) in general is not a marginal one in Stoic writings,²⁴³ nevertheless the allusions to the divine fatherhood there are relatively rare.²⁴⁴ In the whole collection of ancient Stoic fragments²⁴⁵ there are merely thirteen texts²⁴⁶, in which God is entitled as the Father. These albeit incorporated and attested by later authors, have been attributed to Cleanthes²⁴⁷ and Chrysippus.²⁴⁸ The further reference to the fatherhood of God, in terms of his becoming a father by one's registering him as such (ἐπιγράφω), is attested in the fragment attributed to Chrysippus (*SVF* III 603 Philo, *De sobrietate*, 56). The idea of the divine fatherhood, however, as it is presented in this fragment, may hardly be ascribed to Chrysippus and rather reflects the Philonic concept of the divine sonship.²⁴⁹

Apart from these two representatives of the Stoic school of the fourth-third century B.C., there are likely no more references to the subject. Such a tendency seems to have remained in the Stoic movement of the second-first century B.C. The fragments of Posidonius, who was one of more famous representatives of middle Stoicism, add very little if anything at all to the image of God as Father.²⁵⁰

²⁴³ More than four pages are dedicated to assemble the various aspects of god(s)' nature, characters, and their relationship with the human world etc., in a well done index by R. Radice, see R. RADICE, G., REALE, H. VON ARNIM, *Stoici antichi. Tutti i frammenti*, Milano: Rusconi, 1998, pp. 1565-1569.

²⁴⁴ In fact, neither the above mentioned edition of Stoic fragments (R. Radice), being one of the latest and most exhaustive ones, nor other literature on Stoics, which have the index of concepts even mention the concept 'father' in connection with god(s). For instance, see M. ADLER, *Index verborum, notionum, rerum ad Stoicam doctrinam pertinentium*, Lipsiae: B. G. Teubneri, 1924, pp. 69-71. "Padre magnifico del hombre bueno...que se comunica al hombre" is the only reference to the divine fatherhood (Seneca, *De Prov.* 1, 5) in the index of concepts in E. ELORDUY, T. P. ALONSO, *El Estoicismo*, 2 vol., Madrid: Editorial Gredos S. A., 1972, vol. 2, pp. 400-401.

²⁴⁵ It is an intended edition of *STOICORUM VETERUM FRAGMENTA* (ed. H. von Arnim), 3 vol., Lipsiae: B. G. Teubneri, 1903, 1921, which has also been adopted (without critical apparatus) and reprinted in RADICE, REALE, ARNIM, *Stoici antichi. Tutti i frammenti*, Milano: Rusconi, 1998.

²⁴⁶ In some of those texts the formulation of divine fatherhood has been borrowed from Homer and consequently cannot be taken as a proper Stoic invention.

²⁴⁷ *SVF* I 527 Seneca, *Epist.*, 107, 10, *SVF* I 535 Plutarchus, *Quomodo adol. poet. aud. debeat*, 31E, *SVF* I 537 Stobaeus, *Ecl.* I, 1, 25, 3.

²⁴⁸ *SVF* II 101 Plutarchus, *Quomodo adol. poet. aud. debeat*, 31E, *SVF* II 187 Sextus Empiricus, *Adv. math.*, VIII, 70, *SVF* II 512 Philo, *Quod Deus*, 31, *SVF* II 908 Galenus, *De Hipp. et Plat. plac.*, III, 8, 317M, *SVF* II 1009 Aetius, *Plac.*, I, 6, *SVF* II 1010 Philo, *De spec. legibus* I, 34, *SVF* II 1021 Diogenes Laertius, *Vitae philos.*, VII, 147, *SVF* II 1061 Servius, *Ad Verg. Aeneid.*, X, 18, *SVF* II 1078 Philodemus, *De pietate*, 13, *SVF* II 1177 Plutarchus, *De Stoic. repugn.*, 1049A, *SVF* III 603 Philo, *De sobrietate*, 56.

²⁴⁹ Concerning the vocabulary used to describe a wise man, is typically Stoic, i.e. *of noble origin, rich, king, free, etc.*; cf. M. HENGEL, *The Son of God: the Origin of Christology and the History of Jewish-Hellenistic Religion*, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976, p. 54 and note 106.

²⁵⁰ As none of Posidonius' writings has survived, there is a certain difficulty in discerning his authentic ideas provided by other ancient writers. In the fragments attributed to Posidonius by Theiler, there are only three references to God as Father: F 29 Strabo, 4, 1, 7f., F 220 Diodor 37, 11, and F 353 Sextus Empiricus, 7, 127 – 134, see POSEIDONIOS (herausgegeben von W. Theiler), *Die Fragmente, I, Texte*, Berlin / New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1982, pp. 51, 171, 266. It is important to mention that the authenticity of the questionable fragments (as well as of many other Posidonic ones) is debatable: they had not been included in the earlier presented edition POSIDONIOS (eds. L. Edelstein, I. G. Kidd), *The Fragments*, Cambridge: University Press, 1972.

As regards the passages on filial relationship, there is not even a reference in Cleanthes' and Posidonius' fragments in which the terms υἱός or παῖς would be associated with God. It should be noted, however, that the idea of the divine sonship, expressed in terms of *mythological begetting* the divine, semi-divine, and mortal children of Zeus and of other gods, that was already been presented in Homer, is found in Crysippus' fragments as well.²⁵¹ Yet, apart from the bare fact of son(s)' being begotten by a certain divinity, these data offer no other idea *what* such divine sonship could mean. Von Martitz indicates two texts attributed to Cleanthes and Chrysippus which, together with some other references to later Stoic philosophers, present the idea of divine sonship as "suggested by doctrines of the unity of mankind".²⁵² Nevertheless the indicated fragments neither represent the pattern of filial relationship, nor do they give the real idea of the divine sonship. Thus, the phrase ἐκ σοῦ γὰρ γένος ἐσμέν (*for we are your descendants*) in *SVF* I 537 (Cleanthes' hymn to Zeus) is rather an acknowledgment of the divine creating power, which is the source of human existence, than a witness to the sonship of God in a strict sense. Even less related to the issue is the statement in *SVF* II 1022 (Crysippus) which does not proclaim any particular relation between God and man, except that which refers to the universe as divine substance. At this point there is only one reference worth noting that holds υἱός in clear connection with θεός. Yet, since it is attested in the already-mentioned *SVF* III 603 that belongs to Philo, *De sobrietate*, 56, it is not taken into consideration in this sub-chapter.

In Roman Stoicism it was Seneca, Paul's contemporary, who touched on this subject once more. Yet, in his abundant writings, as in Stoic literature in general, there are just few references to the divine fatherhood.²⁵³

2.1.1. Divine Fatherhood in Fragments of Cleanthes, Chrysippus, and Posidonius

The above-mentioned thirteen references in Cleanthes and Chrysippus along with three authentically doubtful fragments of Posidonius have some common features. The most evident similarity is a prevalent use of the combination father-Zeus (Jupiter).²⁵⁴ This is obviously not

²⁵¹ Cf. *SVF* II 622 (in general), *SVF* II 908, *SVF* II 1078, *SVF* II 1087.

²⁵² P. W. VON MARTITZ, υἱός, in *TDNT* 8, p. 337.

²⁵³ Apart from already mentioned *Epist.*, 107, 10, there are five other references explicitly naming God as Father: *De ben.*, II, 29, 4; III, 28, 2; IV, 8, 1; *Epist.* 110, 10; *De Prov.*, 1, 5. There are also two more passages in which God is said to be honored with gratitude as a Father (*De ben.*, IV, 19, 3) and is supposed to act as a Father towards good men (*De Prov.*, 2, 6). The references are taken from SENECAE, L. ANNAEI (ed. O. Hense), *Ad Lucilium epistularum moralium que supersunt*, Lipsiae: B. G. Teubneri, 1914; SENECAE, L. ANNAEI (ed. C. Hosius), *De beneficiis libri VII. De clementia libri II*, Lipsiae: B. G. Teubneri, 1914; SENECAE, L. ANNAEI (ed. E. Hermis), *Dialogorum libros XII*, Lipsiae: B. G. Teubneri, 1923.

²⁵⁴ Formally, out of seventeen references to God as Father the divine fatherhood is directly related to Zeus in ten fragments.

surprising because such a pattern had already been well attested by Homer. The identical wording of divine fatherhood Ζεῦ πάτερ Ἰδηθεῖν μεδέων (*o father Zeus ruling from Ida*), borrowed from his *Iliad* 3, 320 is mentioned in the Stoic fragments three times:²⁵⁵ in *SVF* I 535 (Cleanthes), *SVF* II 101 (Chrysippus), and in *SVF* II 187 (Chrysippus). Another evident Homeric quotation πατήρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε (*Odyssey* 18, 137) is found both in *SVF* II 908 (Chrysippus) and in F 353 (Posidonius). The mythological concept of ‘father’ is also presented in F 220 (Posidonius). Among the other names of deities such as Δία, Καπετώλιον, Ἑστία, etc. in this fragment, it is referred to the fatherhood of God in connection with the god of destruction Ἄρης. He is said to be the πατρώος of Rome, the city that also had its hearth goddess Ἑστία. Obviously, the idea of the universal God Zeus, whose prolific fatherhood, apart from being addressed in prayer, had presented a certain amalgamation of patriarchal attitudes and monarchy,²⁵⁶ passed down to the Stoics.

The strong side of the divine fatherhood, not to mention his productive nature, has already been intended not only by invocation Ζεῦ πάτερ Ἰδηθεῖν μεδέων but also by the phrase πατήρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε (*father of men and gods*), that has a certain similarity with the expression attested by Servius in *SVF* II 1061 (Chrysippus): *o pater, o hominum divumque aeterna potestas (Jupiter)*. If the latter reflects the Chrysippean thought, it illustrates the actuality of the Homeric ideas in the Stoic understanding of the paternal function of deity. The mentioning of the fatherhood of Zeus, upon whom depends fate of the Trojans and Greeks in F 29 (Posidonius), as well as the citation of Euripides (5 century B.C.), adds one more point to the divine Father-master’s image. The Father’s *governing* character may also be perceived in the Latin translation and interpretation²⁵⁷ of Seneca *SVF* I 527 (Cleanthes): *o parens celsique dominator poli (Jupiter)*. However, the image of procreating and ruling Father-Zeus is not a unique aspect of the divine fatherhood in the fragments of the ancient Stoics. The rest of allusions to it, except *SVF* I 537 (Cleanthes), are found in the texts which are ascribed to Chrysippus:

1. In *SVF* II 512 Philo, explaining the relation between time, that is merely God’s creature, and the unchangeable God as Father, explicates his being δημιουργός of time and cosmos for he is said to be the Father of time’s father - τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ πατήρ, which is more precisely defined as κόσμος.

²⁵⁵ In fact, the number ‘three times’ may be taken rather formally because as *SVF* I 535 so *SVF* II 101 refer to the same passage in Plutarchus, *Quomodo adol. poet. aud. debeat*, 31E.

²⁵⁶ Cf. SCHRENK, πατήρ, pp. 952-953.

²⁵⁷ The Greek text of the same fragment attested by Epictetus is a bit different and instead of the invocation ‘o parens’ has ὦ Ζεῦ. See below for Seneca.

2. According to *SVF* II 1009, the concept of the father-God had been acquired by contemplating stars, which were the cause of universal harmony. Thus πατήρ was understood as οὐρανός that pours out waters, which supply mother-earth with seeds to make it fertile.
3. In *SVF* II 1010 the reason-consequence argument is proposed to understand the essence of God: looking around and questioning about the reasons, which stand behind visible things, one may arrive at the notion of God as πατήρ καὶ ποιητής, as well as ἡγεμών of the cosmos.
4. In *SVF* II 1021 God is δημιουργός of the universe and ὥσπερ πατέρα πάντων. The universal divine fatherhood in the latter definition is further clarified as such not only in a static sense, but also as pervading every part of the universe.
5. In *SVF* II 1078 καὶ πατήρ καὶ υἱός are defined as the αἰθήρ, that encompasses ἅπαντα.²⁵⁸
6. *SVF* II 1177 attests a saving and creative function of Zeus. He is named σωτήρ²⁵⁹ καὶ γενέτωρ καὶ πατήρ of the personified goddesses Δίκης, Εὐνομίας, and Εἰρήνης.

It is evident that in the given fragments the fatherhood of God is closely associated with his creative power on the one hand, and his divine nature, as that is material on the other. The notion of God that is identical with the cosmos was already familiar to Cleanthes²⁶⁰ and Chrysippus continued the idea.²⁶¹ He describes the nature of God as αἰθήρ (*ether*) and πῦρ (*fire*);²⁶² the αἰθήρ is also ἡγεμών of the universe²⁶³ and ἅπαντα at the same time. Thus the designation of God as Father becomes very relative and hardly even discernible as it is presented in *SVF* II 1078: everything is ether, the Father and the Son at the same moment. The Chrysippean consideration about the *relative modes*, to which he has also attributed the categories of fatherhood and sonship, is attested in *SVF* II 403. According to him, the relativity with regard to the ‘father’ and the ‘son’ proves itself in the death of one of them, i.e. ‘father’ or ‘son’ as related categories cannot exist without one another. Hence, the difference of their ‘being’ is nothing more than the difference of their actual state but not of essence. The relativity of God’s paternal notion and his identity with the cosmos find their ultimate expression at the

²⁵⁸ It is clear by the context that here the matter has to do with father-Zeus: “Per lui tutto è etere, nello stesso tempo padre e figlio, mentre nel primo libro non nega neppure che Rea fosse sia madre che figlia di Zeus.” RADICE, REALE, ARNIM, *Stoici antichi*, p. 909.

²⁵⁹ It was a common custom in the Greek milieu to call gods ‘saviors’. They, and especially Zeus, in general were considered as men’s helpers in distress; the preservation and protection of particular cities and their citizens was also their prerogative; cf. FOERSTER, FOHRER, σώζω, in *TDNT* 7, FOERSTER, pp. 1004-1005.

²⁶⁰ Cf. J. B. GOULD, *The Philosophy of Chrysippus*, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970, p. 35.

²⁶¹ Cf. *SVF* II 1022, 1025, 1042, 1077. “In Chrysippus’ philosophy everything that distinguishes god from a material being has disappeared,” GOULD, *The Philosophy of Chrysippus*, p. 155-156.

²⁶² Though both *ether* and *fire* are used to describe the nature of god, while Cleanthes preferred to use *ether*, the latter concept was more privileged by Chrysippus (*ether* only once in *SVF* II 1077).

²⁶³ Cf. *SVF* II 634 and 644.

time of conflagration (a cyclic world-process culmination that gives a cycle of the world), when everyone and everything, including gods,²⁶⁴ is to be destroyed by fire/consumed by the eternal Zeus.²⁶⁵ This, however, does not necessarily mean that such identification must exclude any logical differentiation between God and matter. According to Sandbach there is the possibility of making a distinction between God as a basic principle, and God as a body, which embodies the characteristics of the previous one.²⁶⁶ Additionally, the Stoic doctrine of total *blending*, that is not the same as *fusion*, allows to see God occupying the same space as the world, while both retain their proper qualities. Thus God may have been conceived in terms of dynamic-controlling and unifying-cosmic πνεῦμά that penetrates the whole universe.²⁶⁷ Despite this confusing logic the God-cosmos remains to be considered as proper God-creator and originator at the same time: *SVF* II 574, 575 describe the cosmos as generated (γεννάω) by God. Our texts also give evidence to his standing at the origin and ruling of the world: so Father-God is δημιουργός, ποιητής, ἡγεμών, γεινέτωρ. All these creative characteristics along with the pantheistic-immanent, cosmological aspect of the divine fatherhood (ὥσπερ πατέρα πάντων) were not a novelty in the Greek world and add little to the image of Plato's Father-maker, artificer, and ruler.²⁶⁸ Although in all cases, except *SVF* II 1177, Chrysippus' Father-God is nameless, i.e. he is not associated with Zeus. This seems to be of little importance because his creative function is made plain in *SVF* II 580, 622.²⁶⁹ On the other hand, the names of gods including Zeus reflect their purely functional character: in *SVF* II 1009 Zeus and other gods constitute a group of gods who are different from other divinities because of their benevolence. In *SVF* II 1021 the variety of divine names reflects their diverse powers. Thus Ζεὺς or Ζήνα is the principle of life – ζῆν and the cause of everything Δία, for all comes into being through him δι' οὗ (cf. also *SVF* II 1062).

Several Chrysippean fragments witness to the relationships between God and the man: *SVF* II 1019 portrays God as well-disposed to the people; in *SVF* II 1116 God always and continually does well for everybody; in *SVF* II 1184 it is the essence of God to bring the even evildoers' intentions to the good end. Yet, only one mention in *SVF* II 1177, father of Δίκης,

²⁶⁴ Pohlenz points out that monotheism is irreconcilable with polytheism for the modern people but was not in question in ancient Greece. The popular religion that worshiped different gods had, according to him, the seed of truth and was even accepted by various philosophers. Hence, the polytheistic language of the ancient Stoics simply echoes this fact; in fact they understood divinity in a monotheistic way, though admitting the divine language for the different manifestations of the only primary Being; cf. M. POHLENZ, *La Stoa*, vol. 1, pp. 189-193.

²⁶⁵ Cf. *SVF* II 1049. According to *SVF* II 611 the cosmic fire corresponds to the substance of Zeus.

²⁶⁶ Cf. F. H. SANDBACH, *The Stoics*, Bristol: The Bristol Press, 1989, p. 73.

²⁶⁷ Cf. *SVF* II 532 and 1076; also SANDBACH, *The Stoics*, p. 75; M. ISNARDI PARENTE, *Introduzione a Lo stoicismo ellenistico*, Bari: Laterza, 1993, p. 85.

²⁶⁸ Cf. SCHRENK, πατήρ, p. 954.

²⁶⁹ Chrysippus defines him as σπερματικὸς λόγος (*SVF* II 580) and also makes use of the myth of the ἱερός γάμος of Zeus and Hera (*SVF* II 622).

Εὐνομίας, and Εἰρήνης, may possibly point out to God's involvement as the Father in the human sphere, taking the goddesses' names as representative of the divine activity in the world. In other cases the divine fatherhood is given no role in divine-human and human-human relationships and seems to remain on a somewhat mythological and abstract-creative level.

The invocation to Zeus as πάτερ in *SVF* I 537 (Cleanthes) reflects rather a different understanding of the divine fatherhood. In general, there dominates more religious than philosophic aspect the famous hymn to Zeus. According to its form and contents, it may even be perceived as personal confession of faith,²⁷⁰ in which traditional Stoic attributes of Zeus cannot diminish the value of the relationship that is established between God and the pious man.²⁷¹ Although the invocation to Zeus as the Father is found almost at the very end²⁷² (according to *SVF* II 537, 28-31), it is namely this part of the hymn that mostly discloses its religious character. Two vocatives Ζεῦ and πάτερ form its nucleus and serve as a complement of one another. The text of *SVF* II 537, 28-31 has undergone emendations and there is no unequivocal translation:

...Zeus immensamente buono...	...o Zeus, che tutto doni...	...o Zeus dispensatore di tutti i doni...
...sii benevolo verso noi uomini!	...libera gli uomini, che son tuoi,	...libera gli uomini
Togli, o padre, anche	da questa loro triste stoltezza, e	dalla rovinosa ignoranza;
dalla nostra anima l'oscurità della stoltezza!	rimuovendola dalla nostra anima fa' sì, o padre,	poi, o padre, scacciala dall'anima e fa sì
Dacci l'intelligenza e il buon senso,	che attingiamo la saggezza	che alfine si incontri la sapienza
tuo regale retaggio! ²⁷³	su cui tu ti reggi nel governare il tutto con la giustizia; ²⁷⁴	a cui tu stesso ti affidi per governare il tutto secondo giustizia. ²⁷⁵

²⁷⁰ Cf. POHLENZ, *La Stoa*, vol. 1, p. 217.

²⁷¹ Cf. ISNARDI PARENTE, *Introduzione a Lo stoicismo ellenistico*, p. 47.

²⁷² Apart from the affinity to Zeus being already stated right from the beginning: ἐκ σοῦ γὰρ γένος ἐσμέν. In *SVF* the last word for metric reasons is rendered by von Arnim as εἶς'. The other scholars emended it for γενόμεθα (Meineke, Zeller, Pohlenz). Isnardi Parente, however, thinks there are no really sufficient reasons to change the text; cf. M. ISNARDI PARENTE, *Stoichi antichi*, 2 vol., Torino: UTET, 1989, vol. 1, p. 248, note 85.

²⁷³ POHLENZ, *La Stoa*, vol. 1, p. 220. The original German translation is as follows: "...du allgütiger Zeus...sei gnädig uns Menschenkindern! Nimm auch das Dunkel der Torheit, o Vater, von unserer Seele! Einsicht gib uns rechtlichen Sinn, dein königlich Erbe!" M. POHLENZ, *Die Stoa. Geschichte einer geistigen Bewegung*, Band 1, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1948, p. 110.

²⁷⁴ M. ISNARDI PARENTE, *Stoichi antichi*, vol. 1, p. 250.

²⁷⁵ RADICE, REALE, ARNIM, *Stoichi antichi*, pp. 239-241.

Despite the differences in these translations, the thought is quite clear. The appeal to Zeus, followed by numerous titles, is further developed into confidence in the divine mercy and supplication of him as Father. Thus, the God of the universe is acknowledged as God who is not only benevolent and ready to intervene for the sake of prayer, but also as the one, whose gracious fatherhood²⁷⁶ opens a way to personal relationships. However, the personal relationships are highly questionable, first of all because of the immanent-pantheistic understanding of the Stoic godhead that annuls every possible rapport. Yet there is a second problem, which is clearly implied in another Cleanthes' fragment (*SVF* I 527), according to which no human act or attitude can change anything at all, because everything has its course, as it has been prescribed by divine fate. Hence, human freedom is reduced to man's choice to obey God willingly or unwillingly, though in any case the same end awaits the human. Accordingly a plea for γνῶμη being considered in terms of petition for knowledge and understanding to conform oneself willingly to the divine universal law, merely reveals the submissive and *a priori* non-creative character of those relationships. This leaves little space for the functionality of the divine fatherhood. On the other hand, this is the only passage in the ancient Stoa, in which the fatherhood of God is given some religious value.

2.1.2. Divine Fatherhood in Seneca

It has already been mentioned that Seneca, as one of the representatives of Stoicism in the Roman period, refers to the divine fatherhood quite rarely. The expressions, used by him to describe God as Father, reflect Stoic tradition, though at the same time show his more developed point of view about the 'Father-God-man' relationships. Thus, such phrases as 'unus omnium parens mundus est' (*De ben.*, III, 28, 2) and 'Liberum patrem, quia omnium parens sit...', (*De ben.*, IV, 8, 1ff.) clearly demonstrate their Stoic heritage, whereas the combination 'parens noster' is a novelty to Stoic phraseology. The associating 'parens noster' with God's gracious disposition to the people (*De ben.*, II, 29, 4) and his careful-protective attitude 'quidquid nobis bono futurum erat...in proximo possuit...nocitura altissime pressit' (*Epist.* 110, 10) seems to let in some fresh air into Stoic thought. This is also confirmed by 'parens magnificus...sicut severi patres durius educat' (*De Prov.*, 1, 5) and 'patrium deus habet...animum...fortiter amat...operibus doloribus, damnis exagitantur, ut verum colligant robur' (*De Prov.*, 2, 6), which both are connected with 'good men' and a stern educational activity of the divine Father. The modification of Cleanthes' hymn introducing 'o parens' (*Epist.*, 107, 10) instead of 'o Zeus and fate' as it is attested by Epictetus, adds one more point to Seneca's more religious understanding

²⁷⁶ Cf. POHLENZ, *La Stoa*, vol. 1, p. 218.

of the divine fatherhood. There is also a moral aspect in the false religiosity of Epicurus calling God as Father. Seneca replies that in order to honor God as Father, one should be grateful to him first of all (*De ben.*, IV, 19, 3). The moral aspect is even more visible in *De Prov.* 1, 5, in which a wise man becomes the son of God because of his moral identity with God.²⁷⁷ Although the so-called epistolary between Paul and Seneca has generally been evaluated as a falsification, and the contacts between those two outstanding men, as well as Seneca's closer acquaintance of Christianity, are highly improbable,²⁷⁸ there remains temptation to observe his references to God as Father as a certain parallel to a Jewish-Christian perception of the divine fatherhood. This is quite possible because of the titles God is endowed with by Seneca: the divine creator; the great creator, ruler, builder, and arbiter of the universe; he is the God who guides everything. Furthermore, this God is omnipresent and is near you, with you, and within you, he knows even the most secret human thoughts and comes into their midst; he is at hand to help everybody.²⁷⁹ There are also several Father-God texts which confirm this utmost personal image of the divine Father: the 'parens noster' in the context of *De ben.*, II, 29, 4 and *Epist.* 110, 10 may be taken as an expression of God's unique love to the people and his providential activity for their sake. Thus this makes possible the personal relationships with good men and with every single one of them in particular whom God as Father 'fortiter amat' (*De Prov.*, 2, 6). Though these formally religious ideas show some affinity with the biblical image of the divine Father in general and of the Christian in particular²⁸⁰, it should, however, be viewed with caution. The personal character of Seneca's Father-God is not his only characteristic: God is also *natura*, *fatum*, *ratio*, *mens universi*. Nevertheless, such titles of God as 'pars maxima mundi' (*Nat. quaest.* VII 30, 4), 'prima et generalis causa' (*Epist.* 65, 12), etc., point to a certain distinction between God as creative efficacy or exceptional primary being (*sui causa*) and the material world,²⁸¹ these Stoic

²⁷⁷ Cf. E. ELORDUY, *Seneca. I vida y escritos*, Madrid: Consejo, 1965, pp. 158-159.

²⁷⁸ For the problem of the Paul-Seneca correspondence see J. N. SEVENSTER, *Paul and Seneca* (NovTSup 4), Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1961, pp. 6-14. His verdict is very clear: "there is absolutely no historically reliable information pointing either to personal intimacy or to correspondence between Paul and Seneca." Though he admits that it is not possible to prove with absolute certainty the absence of whatever contact between them, nevertheless, as his last word he cites Barker: "there is of course not the slightest direct evidence in or out of Seneca that the philosopher was a Christian, had any relations with St. Paul, or any dealings with Christian whatever." (p. 14). A similar position is held by G. SCARPAT, *Il pensiero religioso di Seneca e l'ambiente ebraico e cristiano*, Brescia: Paidea, 1977, pp. 109-118. On the other hand, Berry in his recent study seems to have taken for granted the authentic character of the epistolary between Paul and Seneca. He even holds that that correspondence "forms a vital element to make a determination in regard to the original language used in the Epistles of Paul – whether Greek or Latin." P. BERRY, *Correspondence between Paul and Seneca, A.D. 61-65*, ANETS 12, Lewiston: Edwin Mellen, 1999, p. V.

²⁷⁹ Cf. SEVENSTER, *Paul and Seneca*, p. 36.

²⁸⁰ This has been quite emphasized by E. RODRIGUEZ NAVARRO, E., *Seneca: religion sin mitos*, Madrid: Syntagma, 1969, pp. 191-198. He even interprets 'parens mundus' (*De ben.*, III, 28, 2) as being an expression of nobility and containing the prerogatives of 'personality'; the world is thus a vehicle by which god endows people with his incomparable nobility; cf. p. 193. In summary, the religious attitude of Seneca according to him is some synthesis of three directions: *familiar* (different cults, God-movement), *stoic* (God-Logos), and *Jewish-Christian* (God-Father); cf. p. 197f.

²⁸¹ Cf. POHLENZ, *La Stoa*, vol. 2, p. 92.

immanent-pantheistic designations²⁸² hardly fit into the personal image of the Father-God. So, for instance, the invocation of God 'o parens' turns into a cold statement about the submission to the unalterable course of fate: 'ducunt volentem fata, nolentem trahunt' (*Epist.* 107, 10f.). Since Seneca most of all understood God in a typical Stoic immanent-monistic manner, i.e. God pervades the universe, he is everything and everything is God, it may well be that he himself was scarcely aware of the distinction between the personal Father-God and an impersonal, deterministic, and omnipresent divinity. This, consequently, shaped his conception of religion. Obviously, the immanent-pantheistic image of the divinity made the relations between God and the man nothing more than man's relationship with himself. They may be described in terms of one's striving to have 'animus emendatus ac purus' in order to reveal god in oneself and to live better. Hence, the prayer turns to be an instrument directed to this goal: to have 'men's bona' freeing oneself from egoistic desires. Accordingly, the real meaning and task of religion/philosophy as such, for Seneca, must have been to overcome the dominion of fortune, which finds its live expression in one's desires, in order to disclose to a lesser or greater degree the god who is inside man. This consequently had to lead to a tranquil life above and beyond terrestrial affairs.²⁸³ If so, the concept of the divine Father, albeit being the most religiously expressed among the Stoics, could not cross the limits of real 'othernesses'. It was left merely on the anthropomorphic level of figurative language: the love of the God, who is called 'Father', cannot change anything that has been prescribed by the God whose name is *fate*.

* * *

The designation of God as Father in the indicated Stoic fragments, considered quantitatively, is not of much significance. This is much more evident if one keeps in mind that five times they merely represent citations of Homer and once that of Euripides. Hence, the proper Stoic witness to the divine fatherhood is even less perceivable and regarding the content, is not very innovative. Nevertheless, the importance of the image of the *mythological prolific fatherhood* of Zeus that played a role in Stoic theological thought should not be ignored. This image was complemented by the idea of Platonic *Father-maker, artificer, and ruler*. Thus, in the Stoic theological framework, the creative and ruling power of the divine Father was well established. On the other hand, the image of God-Zeus as an all-permeating divine cosmic πᾶντα that consumes everything at the time of conflagration reflects a *pantheistic* conception of the divinity by ancient Stoics. Though god(s) in the Stoic philosophy are generally *benevolent*

²⁸² For the whole argument on the conception of God in Seneca as well as its differences in comparison with Paul see SEVENSTER, *Paul and Seneca*, pp. 26-43.

²⁸³ See SCARPAT, *Il pensiero religioso di Seneca*, pp. 31-56.

and God may even be called Father of all, there is little place left for real personal relationships between God and the man. It is obvious that neither Chrysippus nor Posidonius paid any attention to the religious aspect of the divine fatherhood. This is not surprising since the fragments, attributed to them, show their general disinterest in the religious-theological conception of God because the divinity, especially as it is presented in Chrysippean fragments, is mainly represented from the physical-logical point of view. The conception of Father-God, as Cleanthes and especially Seneca exposed it, demonstrates its more religious character. To be sure, these two Stoic representatives did not abandon their philosophical heritage, yet they pointed out the *possibility as well as the necessity* to speak even to a philosophical God in order to establish mutual relationships, which give man the chance to be heard and eventually to be helped. These two different and even contradictory in themselves sides of the Stoic approach to the divine fatherhood show that there is hardly any possibility to ascertain their clear and comprehensive position as regards not only conception of God as Father but also the God-man relationships and their quality.

2.2. The image of God as Father in Philo

The theme of God as Father occupies not a little place in Philo's writings and altogether represents some combination of philosophical and theological ideas. Because of its complexity and a large amount of references to the fatherhood of God, it is not intended in this paragraph to give an exhaustive presentation of the topic and a detailed analysis of every questionable reference. Instead, the methodological approach to the issue is that which has already been employed in dealing with the OT: after the statistic and syntactic overview, the accent is put on the functionality of God as Father, as it is depicted in the different text-groups.

2.2.1. The Statistic and Syntactic Data

In general, the term *πατήρ* in Philonic literature²⁸⁴ is vastly used: the total amount of references is 586,²⁸⁵ its application to God is also very well attested in many texts: about 160

²⁸⁴ The references to the texts is done using G. P. GOOLD, F. H., COLSON, G. H., WHITAKER, R., MARCUS, *Philo*, 10 vols. & 2 suppl. vols., Loeb, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1929-1962 (it is based on Cohn-Wendland-Reiter critical edition [1896-1930] with a few rectifications and improvements added).

²⁸⁵ According to the list given by Mayer there are 548 references to *πατήρ* in 39 of Philo's works; cf. G. MAYER, *Index Philoneus*, Berlin / New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1974, pp. 227-228. A more recent computer-aided statistic edition on Philo contains other 5 writings which were not included by Mayer: *De Providentia*, *Quaestiones et solutiones in Exodum*, *Quaestiones et solutiones in Exodum incertae sedis fragmenta*, *Quaestiones et solutiones in Genesin*, *Quaestiones et solutiones in Genesin incertae sedis fragmenta*; cf. P. BORGES, K. FUGLSETH, R.

times in one or another way connected with or stands for the notion of God.²⁸⁶ In addition, there are several texts, which present the idea of God as Father by a simile.²⁸⁷ Furthermore, the Latin rendering of the Armenian version of Philo's *Quaestiones et solutiones in Genesin et Exodum* gives a supplementary evidence to another 50 passages, which refer to divine fatherhood.²⁸⁸

The references to the fatherhood of God are attested in almost every writings of Philo.²⁸⁹ There is no specific concentration of the 'father-texts' in a particular book, yet it may be noted that the largest number is presented in *De opificio mundi* (14x). The grammatical forms and phrases in which the term πατήρ is employed are quite various, nevertheless, there are several more or less fixed patterns by which God's fatherhood is expressed in a more frequent way; this reflects the importance those statements play in the whole Philonic conception of divine fatherhood. The most recurring phrase-references with some modification²⁹⁰ are four:

1. ποιητής καὶ πατήρ (τῶν ὅλων),²⁹¹ (σμπάντων, πάντος, κόσμου).²⁹²
2. πατήρ (τῶν ὅλων),²⁹³ (πάντων, ἀπάντων, σμπάντων, ὄντων, γινομένων, γεγονότος, πάντος, κόσμου).²⁹⁴

SKARSTEN, *The Philo Index. A Complete Greek Word Index to the Writings of Philo of Alexandria. Lemmatised & Computer – Generated*, Trondheim: NTNU, 1997, pp. IX, 251-252.

²⁸⁶ Unfortunately, there are no statistics about the precise number of the term πατήρ used by Philo in connection with God; thus the number 160 has been approximately calculated by the author of this study. It may be reminded that two Philonic references to God as Father have been attributed to Chrysippean fragments *SVF* II 512 (*Quod Deus*, 31) and *SVF* II 1010 (*De spec. legibus* I, 34). The third reference having been incorporated into *SVF* III 603 (*De sobrietate*, 56) does reflect the Stoic terminology but not the conception of the fatherhood of God. The phrase πατήρ θεῶν τε καὶ ἀνθρώπων in *De spec. legibus* II, 165 is obviously just a free rendering of the Homeric πατήρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε (*Iliad* I, 544; *Iliad* IV, 68; *Odyssey* 18, 137), which was also well known to the Stoics. In addition, the reference to δημιουργός πατήρ τε in *De aeternitate*, 13 is a part of a longer citation of Plato, *Timaeus*, 41A; the subsequent paragraph *De aeternitate*, 15 with πατήρ, ποιητής, and δημιουργός is also based on *Timaeus* as well as *De opificio*, 21 in which πατήρ and ποιητής is said to be ἀγαθός. There is also one exact citation of Deut 32:6 in *De confusione*, 145 (οὐκ αὐτός οὗτός σου πατήρ) and a bit different rendering of Jer 3:4 in *De cherubim*, 49 (see below).

²⁸⁷ *Quod Deus*, 54; *De congressu*, 177; *De spec. leg. I*, 318; *De proemiis*, 167; *De aeternitate*, 83 ; *Quaest. et sol. in Genesin*, 1:55; 2:54.

²⁸⁸ See an indexed list of the divine attributes in R. MARCUS, *Philo*, Supplement II, 1987⁴, pp. 285-286. Among the text-references presented in the list to the Latin translation of the Armenian version there also are six passages which are attested in Greek fragments; therefore, the number of those latter ones are included in the number given above, i.e. about 160 Greek references.

²⁸⁹ There are no references to this theme in *De agricultura*, *In Flacuum*, and *Hypothetica*.

²⁹⁰ This means that the phrases in question are not necessarily self-complete: in certain cases they are part of a longer phrase that contains more divine attributes. Furthermore, the order of the employed terms is not the same in all references; in a number of passages it is inverted; in some cases there are other words placed in between.

²⁹¹ *De opificio*, 7, 10, 21, 77; *De posteritate*, 175; *De confusione*, 144, 170; *Quis rerum divinarum*, 98, 200, 236; *De fuga*, 84, 177; *De Abrahamo*, 9, 58; *De vita Mosis* I, 158; *De vita Mosis* II, 48, 256; *De Decalogo*, 51, 105; *De spec. legibus* I, 34 (*SVF* II 1010); *De spec. legibus* II, 6, 256; *De spec. legibus* III, 178, 189, 199; *De spec. legibus* IV, 180; *De virtutibus*, 34, 64, 77; *De proemiis*, 24, 32; *De vita contemplativa*, 90; 293; *Quaest. et sol. in Genesin*, 2:34.

²⁹² *De Abrahamo*, 58; *De proemiis*, 32 (σμπάντων); *De posteritate*, 175; *De Decalogo*, 51 (πάντος); *De vita Mosis* II, 48; *Legatio ad Gaium*, 115 (κόσμου).

²⁹³ In a lot of cases the phrase is used without ποιητής. *De opificio*, 72; *Legum alleg. II*, 49; *Quod deterius*, 147; *De ebrietate*, 81; *De confusione*, 63; *De migratione*, 46, 135, 195; *Quis rerum divinarum*, 110; *De fuga*, 69, 197; *De somniis* I, 37, 90; *De Abrahamo*, 121, 204; *De Decalogo*, 32; *De spec. legibus* I, 22; *De spec. legibus* II, 56; *De spec. legibus* III, 127; *Quaest. et sol. in Genesin*, 2:62; *Quaest. et sol. in Exodum*, 2:2, 2:26; cf. also *De virtutibus*, 214.

3. γεννήσας πατήρ.²⁹⁵

4. πατήρ καὶ ἡγεμών (πάντων, συμπάντων, πάντος, κόσμου).²⁹⁶

It is evident that the prevalent number of references to God's fatherly activity is connected with the function of his creating and begetting all things separately and everything as a whole; this underlines the universal character of the fatherly activity.²⁹⁷ To refer to God, Philo uses both θεός and κύριος; however, whereas in a number of passages πατήρ is linked to θεός there is no text in which πατήρ is connected with κύριος. Apart from two references²⁹⁸ to πατήρ and θεός where they are joined by καί there are more than 20 texts in which πατήρ (also connected with other attributes) functions as a designation for θεός.²⁹⁹ There are more texts in which πατήρ is coupled by means of καί with some other divine designations: αἰδῖος (eternal),³⁰⁰ ἀγενήτος (unbegotten),³⁰¹ αἴτιον (source),³⁰² κτίστης (creator),³⁰³ δημιουργός (maker),³⁰⁴ τεχνίτης καὶ ἐπίτροπος (architect and steward),³⁰⁵ βασιλεύς (king)³⁰⁶ δεσπότης (sovereign),³⁰⁷ ἐπίσκοπος (guardian),³⁰⁸ σωτήρ (savior),³⁰⁹ ἱλεως (merciful),³¹⁰ and ἀνὴρ (man).³¹¹ Though these

²⁹⁴ *De opificio*, 74, *Quis rerum divinarum*, 62, *De spec. legibus I*, 14, *De virtutibus*, 218, *Quod omnis probus*, 43 (πάντων, cf. also *De ebrietate*, 61); *De Decalogo*, 64 (ἀπάντων); *De cherubim*, 49, *De fuga*, 109, *De Abrahamo*, 75 (συμπάντων); *De cherubim*, 44 (δυντων); *Legum alleg. I*, 18 (γινομένων); *De ebrietate*, 30 (γεγονότος); *De plantatione*, 129, 135, *De confusione*, 175, *De vita Mosis II*, 24 (πάντος, so also πατήρ connected (καί) with other designations, cf. *De ebrietate*, 42; *De Decalogo*, 51; *De virtutibus*, 179); *De vita Mosis II*, 134, 238, *De Decalogo*, 134, *De spec. legibus I*, 96 (κόσμου).

²⁹⁵ *De opificio*, 84; *De cherubim*, 23; *De posteritate*, 135; *Quod Deus*, 47; *De plantatione*, 9; *De migratione*, 31; *Quis rerum divinarum*, 205; *De mutatione*, 29; *De somniis I*, 35, 181, 190; *De somniis II*, 26; *De spec. legibus III*, 189; cf. also *De cherubim*, 44; *De ebrietate*, 30; *Quis rerum divinarum*, 62.

²⁹⁶ *De opificio*, 135, *De mutatione*, 45, 127 (πάντων); *Quod Deus*, 19, *De somniis I*, 73, *De spec. legibus I*, 32 (συμπάντων); *De ebrietate*, 74 (); *De ebrietate*, 131, *De vita Mosis II*, 88 (πάντος); *De Decalogo*, 90 (κόσμου); *De spec. legibus I*, 34 (SVF II 1010).

²⁹⁷ The importance of this function with regard to the notion of 'fatherhood' is confirmed by a statement that the 'father' of the first man was God (*De virtutibus*, 204). See also *De fuga*, 51, 52 in which the fatherhood of wisdom (she is also called the daughter of God) is presented as her sowing and begetting (virtues) capacity.

²⁹⁸ *De Abramo*, 75; *De Decalogo*, 51.

²⁹⁹ *De opificio*, 74; *Legum alleg. I*, 18, 64; *Legum alleg. II*, 49, 67; *De cherubim*, 44, 49; *Quod deterius*, 147; *De posteritate*, 175; *Quod Deus*, 30; *De ebrietate*, 74; *Quis rerum divinarum*, 62; *De fuga*, 109, 114; *De spec. legibus II*, 198; *De spec. legibus III*, 189; *De proemiis*, 32; *Quod omnis probus*, 43; *Legatio ad Gaium*, 115; *De providentia*, 2:6.

³⁰⁰ *De virtutibus*, 214.

³⁰¹ *De virtutibus*, 218.

³⁰² *De ebrietate*, 61.

³⁰³ *De ebrietate*, 42; *De virtutibus*, 179.

³⁰⁴ *De aeternitate*, 13 (joined by τε); *De spec. legibus II*, 165.

³⁰⁵ *Quod Deus*, 30; cf. *De mutatione*, 29.

³⁰⁶ *De opificio*, 144; *Legatio ad Gaium*, 3.

³⁰⁷ *De confusione*, 170.

³⁰⁸ *De migratione*, 135.

³⁰⁹ *De spec. legibus II*, 198; *De proemiis*, 39.

³¹⁰ *De confusione*, 103.

³¹¹ *De cherubim*, 49; *Quod deterius*, 147; *De fuga*, 114; *De somniis II*, 273.

phrase-statements generally dominate when referring to God's fatherly image, the designation πατήρ is also used quite often without any further specification.³¹²

According to the data the main accent is put on the classical features of the divine fatherhood: either he himself is named, or he is coupled with the terms: creator, maker, ruler, etc. Even the pairing of terms in the minor references reflects this tendency. On the other hand, the fact that πατήρ is extensively used on its own without being associated with θεός gives us an impression that πατήρ, occupying the role of θεός (cf. *Quod omnis probus*, 43) may have been understood by Philo as not only interchangeable with the latter term,³¹³ but also standing at the very center of the Divinity, as it is explicitly stated in *De Abrahamo*, 121.³¹⁴ It is important that in the same paragraph πατήρ τῶν ὅλων is identified with the name ὁ ὢν, which God revealed to Moses (Exod 3:14: יהוה, ὁ ὢν in LXX). Philo's theory of the divine powers gives one more point to the understanding of θεός-πατήρ as exceptionally closely related concepts. According to him θεός is represented by his creative, beneficent, and gracious δύνάμις, while κύριος is characterized by his kingly, ruling, and punishing δύνάμις.³¹⁵ Such a division was also well known in the Jewish synagogue discussion regarding the relationship between the divine mercy and justice.³¹⁶ In the light of this fact, it may be worth noting that in Philo's writings the terms πατήρ and κύριος are never paired. This may have been done because of his acknowledgment of an intrinsic bond between πατήρ and θεός; hence, πατήρ likely represents not merely creative, but also more *kind* side of God. In addition, the references in which the divine Father is defined by

³¹² *De opificio*, 46, 56, 75, 89, 156; *De sacrificiis*, 42, 68; *Quod deterius*, 124; *De posteritate*, 146; *De gigantibus*, 12; *De sobrietate*, 56; *De confusione*, 63; *Quis rerum divinarum*, 119; *De mutatione*, 129; *De somniis I*, 141 (twice); *De Abrahamo*, 118, 125, 207; *De vita Mosis II*, 192, 210, 262, 288; *De spec. legibus I*, 41, 57; *De spec. legibus II*, 59; *De proemiis*, 166 (twice); *De vita contemplativa*, 68; *Quaest. et sol. in Genesis*, 4:51; *Quaest. et sol. in Exodum*, 2:49, 2:65.

³¹³ This is valid, above all, for the texts, which refer to the generating or creating power of the divine Father. Philo not only pairs 'father' with 'creator' or 'maker', but also puts the sign of equality between πατήρ and δημιουργός (*De ebrietate*, 30 : τὸν γοῦν τόδε τὸ πᾶν ἐργασάμενον δημιουργὸν ὁμοῦ καὶ πατέρα εἶναι) and πατήρ and ποιητής (*De Decalogo*, 64: πατήρ πάντων εἰς ὃ ποιητὴς τῶν ὅλων ἐστίν; see also parallelism between ποιητής and πατήρ in *De vita Mosis II*, 238 ; cf. also C. K. REGGIANI, R. RADICE, *La filosofia Mosaica*, CDP, Milano: Rusconi, 1987, p. 237) the latter seems to have become a functional synonym for θεός since Philo makes a clear allusion to the etymological derivation of θεός from τίθημι when he entitles the creative (ποιητής) power of the Father to be θεός because of its making and ordering everything; cf. COLSON, *Philo*, VI, 1984⁵, p. 63. Other good examples may be seen in Philo's interpretation of Jer 3:4: ὁ θεὸς καὶ οἶκός ἐστιν... καὶ τῶν συμπάντων πατήρ, ἅτε γεγεννηκώς αὐτά (*De cherubim*, 49); and: who else is sowing the good seed (virtues) save ὁ τῶν ὄντων πατήρ, ὁ ἀγέννητος θεὸς καὶ τὰ σύμπαντα γεννῶν; (*De cherubim*, 44).

³¹⁴ Philo arrives at this conclusion having previously observed (§§ 107-118) the biblical scene about the three messengers, who had been visiting Abraham (Gen 18) and, according to him, represented allegorically the Father with his two potencies: creativity and kingliness.

³¹⁵ Cf. *De cherubim*, 27; *De plantatione*, 86; *De sobrietate*, 55; *Quis rerum divinarum*, 166; *De Abrahamo*, 121; *De vita Mosis II*, 99.

³¹⁶ See generally SCHRENK, πατήρ, pp. 956-958. For a more detailed discussion on the issue see N. A. DAHL, F. S. ALAN, "Philo and the Rabbis on the Names of God," *JSJ* 9 (1, 1978) pp. 1-28, especially 1-11 and 26-28.

the attribute εἷς also underline his importance. From nine occurrences³¹⁷ it is three times directly applied to πατήρ, twice it precedes ποιητής καὶ πατήρ (καὶ δεσπότης), one time it defines πατὴρ ἀπάντων, one time it functions as the noun πρὸς τὸν ἕνα καὶ πατέρα, and twice it precedes the clauses ἕνα ἄνδρα καὶ πατέρα τὸν ἡγεμόνα θεὸν and ἕνα νομίζειν τὸν πατέρα καὶ ποιητὴν τοῦ κόσμου θεὸν thus clearly demonstrating the significance Philo attributed to the oneness of πατήρ.³¹⁸ Moreover, the fact that he introduced the figure of the divine Father into the interpretations of many biblical texts, which originally did not refer to it, shows his particular insistence on this theme.

The statistic data on the terms that denote filial relationship are not so abundant as in the case of πατήρ. Of total 291 references to υἱός and 230 to παῖς³¹⁹ there are only 20 references to υἱός and 2 to παῖς in which son(s) or children are linked to God or to the Father. Noteworthy, that among the ‘son-texts’ (υἱός) there are 6 citations of LXX, accordingly, the author’s proper innovation seems to be less tangible than in the ‘father-texts’.

The constant and almost identical wording of the phrase-references means that there may have been certain motives which prompted their usage. One of them has already been pointed out: the Platonic combinations ποιητής καὶ πατήρ τοῦ πάντος and γεννήσας πατήρ (cf. *Timaeus*, 28C, 37C, etc.) accepted later also by Peripatetics and Stoics certainly played a crucial role in their widespread use by Philo. The same should be said about the strong universalistic aspect attributed to the divine fatherhood (τῶν πάντων, etc.). On the other hand, since the biblical tradition occupied not the least place in Philo’s thinking, it is logical to admit its influence on his concept of God as Father. However, as far as regarding the terminology of the phrase-references, it must be conceded that it is not abundant in LXX; only the title ποιητής may have had some support for its use from LXX, in which this term regarding the divine creative activity is not unusual, though attested only in its verbal form.³²⁰ The other literary connections with LXX are quite scarce;³²¹ the Greek philosophical milieu therefore seems to have played the main role in Philo’s using the terminology of the phrase-references. Hence, the universal and creative aspects of the divine Father may be considered as basically founded on the Greek (especially Platonic) philosophical tradition.

³¹⁷ *De confusione*, 41, 43, 144, 170; *De fuga*, 114; *De Decalogo*, 64; *De spec. legibus I*, 14; *Legatio ad Gaium*, 115; *Quaest. et sol. in Exodum*, 2:2.

³¹⁸ It should be noted, however, that in *De confusione*, 41 and 43 it is λόγος that appears to be named πατήρ.

³¹⁹ The statistics presented by BORGES, FUGLSETH, SKARSTEN, *The Philo Index*, pp. 242, 312.

³²⁰ Cf. Gen 1:1, 7, 16, 21, 25-27, 31; 2:2-4, 18; 3:1; 5:1f.; 6:6f.; 9:6; Isa 37:16; 42:5; 45:18; Jer 39:17 (32:17 the HB); Jonah 1:9; Ps 99:3 (100:3 the HB); Prov Job 33:4; Eccl 3:11.

³²¹ For divine generation (γεννάω) cf. Deut 32:18; Isa 1:2; Pss 2:7; 109:3 (the HB 110:3); Prov 8:25. There is only one reference to God’s ruling spirit (πνεῦμα ἡγεμονικός) in LXX, cf. Ps 50:14, and one mention of the Lord’s universal character (τῶν ὅλων), cf. 2Mac 14:35.

2.2.2. Divine Fatherhood Revealed by ‘Father-Texts’

Although the above-pointed phrase-references do demonstrate the importance of the place they occupy in Philo’s conceptual understanding of the divine fatherhood, nevertheless, they reflect just a part of the activity he attributed to God as Father. The very fact that identical or almost identical phrases are found in different writings which touch upon diverse themes is a real sign of their standardized character and this consequently permits to consider them as certain clichés, which just seem to have been inserted into particular passages. Yet, their function cannot be completely leveled and should be evaluated due to their proper contexts.³²² Therefore, it seems to be of interest to note briefly their contextual similarities and particularities. On the other hand, the attention should also be paid to those texts in which the divine subject or object is specifically presented as πατήρ.

2.2.2.1. The Function of ‘Father’ in the Most Recurring Phrase-References

The most distinctive feature in the four largest groups of phrase-references is their universal character, which in many cases is closely associated with the divine creative activity, while the image of God as Ruler, which is paired with the Father, is not so frequent.

The phrase-references if taken as they are even without their particular contexts give already a certain explanation to their contents; yet, the diverse functions attributed to them in different texts disclose some other nuances of God’s being the Father and the Maker or Ruler. Since the issue regards the standardized expressions, it seems to be practical to observe them according to their active or passive functioning in a particular context. Certainly, all phrase-references with various qualifications, though without being visualized as they were above (τῶν ὅλων, πάντων, συμπάντων, etc.), are included in the list. The table below summarizes the activity of the divine Father.

Table 6

ποιητῆς	
καὶ πατήρ	cares (ἐπιμελέομαι) for his creation (<i>De opificio</i> , 10); is good (ἀγαθός) and therefore did not grudge (φθονέω) a share in his nature (φύσις) to οὐσία ³²³ (<i>De opificio</i> , 21);

³²² Certainly, this is not the only or exclusive way to deal with it. Panimolle, for instance, has approached this theme from a thematic point of view presenting the figure of God as Father in Philo under four headlines: “Il Padre è Dio della Bibbia; Dio è il Padre del creato; Dio, Padre dell’uomo virtuoso e sapiente; Dio Padre buono e munifico;” see PANIMOLLE, “La paternità di Dio nei documenti letterari dell’Antico giudaismo” in *DSBP* 1, pp. 73-79.

³²³ This term is translated ‘existence’ by COLSON, WHITAKER, *Philo*, I, p. 19; by C. D. YONGE, *The Works of Philo: New Updated Edition. Complete and Unabridged in One Volume*, Peabody: Hendrickson, 1993, p. 21, it is rendered

fashioned man (*De opificio*, 77);

did not make the teeth at birth like each of the other parts (*De spec. legibus III*, 199).³²⁴

πατήρ

τῶν ὅλων

it is he who created man in Gen 1:26 (*De opificio*, 72 and 74);

does not cease to create everything (*Legum alleg. I*, 18);

is sowing the good seed/virtues (*De cherubim*, 44);

produced from one of his powers (memory) a race that is very musical and able to compose hymns (*De plantatione*, 129);³²⁵

gave birth to everything (*De ebrietate*, 30);

begot and raised up (ἀνατέλλω) his eldest son who is also called a first-born (*De confusione*, 63);³²⁶

though having no need of any cooperation whatsoever he allows his subordinate powers to participate in his creative work (*De confusione*, 175);³²⁷

bestows (χαρίζομαι) the greatest gift (*De migratione*, 46);³²⁸

it is he who made everything in Gen 1:31 (*De migratione*, 135);

begot Virtue-Sarah who is ἀρχή of all things (*Quis rerum divinarum*, 62);³²⁹

‘substance’. So also ‘substance,’ by R. ARNALDEZ, *De opificio mundi*, OPA 1, Paris: Cerf, 1961, p. 155. The idea is that the ‘matter’ being without order, quality, and soul was a perfect recipient of the divine goodness and so became the passive cause of existing things.

³²⁴ Philo explains in the same paragraph that God knew very well it would have been superfluous and serve no purpose.

³²⁵ It seems that in this paragraph Philo wanted to call to mind one of Hesiod’s legends about sexual intercourse between Zeus and Mnemosyne and eventual birth of the nine Muses; cf. COLSON, WHITAKER, *Philo*, III, 1988⁵, p. 497. The function of this story is obviously to be seen in a larger context §§126-129, where the theme of praising God the Creator is dominant. As the idea to praise God is anchored and implied in creation itself (§§127-129), the hymns of praise (intoned by a pure intellect) but not sacrifices and oblations are the most adequate means to express gratitude to the Creator (§126). In this way the idea of the ‘temple’ in §126 that is probably an allusion to 1Kgs 8:27f. may be viewed in ‘conventional’ terms, as being identified even with a human soul; cf. R. RADICE, *La migrazione verso l’eterno*, CDP, Milano: Rusconi, 1988, p. 452, note 44.

³²⁶ Though there is no explicit indication in this text *who* may have been intended to be πρωτόγονος, there is no doubt that Philo here alludes to the Logos (cf. §§ 41 and 146). It may be noted that πρωτόγονος is not a usual term in LXX; it is used only in Mic 7:1 and Sir 36:11. Only in Sirach it is given its allegorical value: Ἰσραὴλ ὁν πρωτογόνῳ ὁμοίωσας.

³²⁷ Radice suggests that those infinite powers/ideas/angels (cf. §§ 171-175) reflect the same idea of the noetic world (heaven?) that is expressed in two different ways: as the world of ideas and the world of stars and angels; cf. RADICE, *La migrazione verso l’eterno*, pp. 519-520, note 73.

³²⁸ This gift is understood in terms of a particular ‘seeing’ (ὁράω) the divine works; this is accessible only to those who belong to the purest and most keen-eyed class. In fact, God’s gift that *enables one to see* should be understood in terms of a certain *possession prize*; cf. J. CAZEAUX, *De migratione Abrahami*, OPA 14, Paris: Cerf, 1965, p. 123, note 4. Such an allegorically interpreted prize was given to Moses when he was not allowed to enter the promised land but *was shown* it: there are realities that may be possessed yet they belong to the inferior level than those that may only be perceived by contemplation; cf. RADICE, *La migrazione verso l’eterno*, p. 531, note 24.

³²⁹ According to COLSON, WHITAKER, *Philo*, IV, p. 314, the term ἀρχή in addition to mean beginning/principle expresses also the idea of sovereignty that Philo connects with Sarah. The Philonic affirmation that Sarah-Virtue was begotten of God, the Father of all, and the subsequent quotation of Gen 20:12 as a proof text intend that “la

is conversing (διαλέγομαι) with his own powers (*De fuga*, 69),³³⁰
the world is a work of...; he brings all things to light showing their natures (*De Abrahamo*, 75);
does not grudge (φθονέω) any joy and rejoicing in his possession to be used by those who follow him and his will (βουλήμα) (*De Abrahamo*, 204);
holds earth and heaven firmly together, as well as water, air and everything that belongs to them (*De vita Mosis II*, 238);
delivered the laws to the assembled nation (*De Decalogo*, 32),³³¹
is the only Creator of the universe (*De Decalogo*, 64),³³²
warns the idolaters (*De spec. legibus I*, 22),³³³
created the seventh day (*De spec. legibus II*, 56),³³⁴
approved the slaughterers who acted out of piety and holy reverence for the one true God (*De spec. legibus III*, 127).³³⁵

γενήσας

πατήρ

begot a man (*De opificio*, 84);
appointed the order of stars (*De cherubim*, 23);
begot virtuous ideas in the soul (*De posteritate*, 135);
begot our mind (*Quod Deus*, 47),³³⁶
constituted (ποιέω) the Logos to be indissoluble bond of the universe (*De plantatione*, 9);
begot and rears up his virgin daughters (*De migratione*, 31),³³⁷
gave (δίδωμι) the Logos the gift to separate the creature from the Creator (*Quis*

virtù in quanto tale viene da Dio, ossia che è una grazia (un capovolgimento, dunque, della concezione dei Greci)”; R. RADICE, G. REALE, *L’erede delle cose divine*, CDP, Milano: Rusconi, 1981, p. 143, note 4.

³³⁰ The idea of God’s consulting the lower gods is attested in Plato, *Timaeus*, 41A, and may have served as a basis for the Father’s discourse with his powers in our paragraph. Alternatively, an idea of angelic collaboration in God’s creative activity was not extraneous to rabbinical exegesis as well; cf. E. STAROBINSKI-SAFRAN DE GENÈVE, *De fuga et inventione*, OPA 17, 1970, pp. 273-274, note 9.

³³¹ In both texts about delivering the Decalogue (Ex 20 and Deut 5), it is Moses who is said to have played the crucial mediating role between God and the people. In this paragraph, however, Philo seems to have intended a direct and divine-fatherly communication to the Israelites.

³³² This paragraph reflects Plato, *Timaeus*, 30E-43B.

³³³ The interpretation of Ex 20:23.

³³⁴ The creation of the seventh day is pictured in terms of ‘sowing’ (σπείρω).

³³⁵ Philo justifies killing a part of the people because of its idolatry in Exod 32:27-29.

³³⁶ Instead of more precise “For it is mind alone which the Father who begat it...” as in COLSON, WHITAKER, *Philo*, III, p. 33, the translation of C. MAZZARELLI, R. RADICE, *Le origini del male*, CDP, Milano: Rusconi, 1984, p. 445, “Il Padre che ci ha generati...” reflects rather a generic concept of creating; so also, a former English rendering has “Father, who created us...”; YONGE, *The Works of Philo*, p. 162.

³³⁷ They are also called God’s gifts of grace. Such a description of the divine grace is due to the Greek-Jewish syncretism, which is quite often found in Philo (cf. *De fuga*, 141; *De mutatione*, 53; *De Abramo*, 53f.); so RADICE, *La migrazione verso l’eterno*, p.529, note 16.

rerum divinarum, 205);

set (τίθημι) all things in place through his creative power (*De mutatione*, 29);³³⁸

begot the soul and will bring it back to metropolis (*De somniis I*, 181);³³⁹

begot his interpreters and attendant angels (*De somniis I*, 190);³⁴⁰

begot everything and takes care (ἐπιμελέομαι) of it by means of his providence (προνοέω) (*De spec. legibus III*, 189).

πατήρ καὶ

ἡγεμῶν

the human soul is from him (*De opificio*, 135);

evaluates human action (*De ebrietate*, 74);

cares (μέλω) for all creatures (*De mutatione*, 45).

The activity that is ascribed to the divine Father in these phrase-reference groups, as the outline makes it plain, is quite multifaceted; there is no specific fatherly characteristic particularly stressed in one or the other group except for the begetter-creator image that is predominantly offered by γεννήσας πατήρ. That this particular function plays an important role is clear from the references to it in different groups. In fact, this function together with the divine caring activity, that is another no less important fatherly quality, are more or less shared by all four groups. These two characteristics also dominate the references that do not deal directly with a human world. This way they underline both the dependency of everything created upon God and also the all-embracing caring character of the divine Father. God's creative activity is expressed by various verbs, predominantly γεννάω, and his caring attitude is portrayed by means of term containing the root μέλω. To the latter aspect should probably be also attributed the Father's involvement in the relationships with the human soul: he does not abandon it and can even bestow to it the gift of a particular 'seeing' of the divine works.

The Father's creations vary vastly: from his making everything to even the parts of a human body (cf. *De spec. legibus III*, 199). The human sphere is given particular attention: God is said to be involved not only in the creation of man but also of his soul and mind; it is he who is responsible for the existence of virtuous ideas in the human soul. Speaking strictly, the caring and providential (as in *De spec. legibus III*, 189) activity of the divine Father is to be understood

³³⁸ Admittedly, the creative power is more important than the kingly and beneficent powers, because through it God reveals himself as Father through it; cf. R. ARNALDEZ, *De mutatione nominum*, OPA 18, Paris: Cerf, 1964, p. 46, note 2. As Williamson observes, the creative power is not to be understood in terms of a separate being (Being); cf. R. WILLIAMSON, *Jews in the Hellenistic World. Philo*, CCWJChW, 1ii, Cambridge: University Press, 1989, p. 101.

³³⁹ The Father's role being connected with the idea of the imprisonment of the soul in the body is presented in terms of his compassion for the soul (οἶκτος), its release (λύω), its being conducted (παραπέμπω), and it is not being abandoned (ἀνίημι preceded by μή).

³⁴⁰ The interpretation of ὁ ἄγγελος τοῦ θεοῦ in Gen 31:11-13.

in connection with the whole creation: apart from the relationships between God and man's soul there is no further specification of them. This means that this characteristic, of itself very relational, is not given a full personal advance.

There are several texts that attest the role of God as Father in the ethical sphere: he warns (*De spec. legibus I*, 22), approves (*De spec. legibus III*, 127), and evaluates (*De ebrietate*, 74) human actions. Yet the most important connection between the divine fatherhood and the human moral behavior is found in a negation that the divine Father is jealous of what he possesses. The idea is stated both in *De opificio*, 21 and *De Abrahamo*, 204, but only in the latter passage this feature is associated with some human behavior, namely, the man who follows God and does his will (βουλήμα) has the possibility of attaining joy and rejoicing, which are considered God the Father's possessions.

There are more references to the divine fatherhood in which it plays no active role, i.e., either God's relationships with the world/man are presented in terms of their attitude/activity towards the divine Father or he is simply endowed with one or another title.

Table 7

ποιητῆς καὶ

πατὴρ

we are to be amazed at the powers of... (*De opificio*, 7);
 a sober reason acknowledges (ὁμολογέω) God to be... (*De posteritate*, 175);
 some people have no knowledge (ἄγνοέω) of... (*De confusione*, 144);³⁴¹
 it must be only one... (*De confusione*, 170);
 through wisdom the soul passes from the world to its... (*Quis rerum divinarum*, 98);
 the world should give thanks (εὐχαριστέω) to... (*Quis rerum divinarum*, 200);³⁴²
 our mind acts in a way similar to... (*Quis rerum divinarum*, 236);
 there are some who blaspheme... (*De fuga*, 84);
 is called a fountain (*De fuga*, 177);³⁴³
 Enosh set his hope (ἐλπίζω) on... (*De Abrahamo*, 9);³⁴⁴

³⁴¹ Those people ascribe many causes to existing things and assume many sources for the world's origin and existence. Kahn observes that Philo's argumentation is based on plural υἱοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων (Gen 11:5) and that in order to be similar to man in the singular (Logos) people must, differently from those constructors of the tower of Babel, become υἱοὶ ἐνὸς ἀνθρώπου (Gen 42:11, cited in §147); cf. J. G. KAHN, *De confusione linguarum*, OPA 13, Paris: Cerf, 1963, p. 176, note 25.

³⁴² It should be done continuously (συνεχῶς) and without ceasing (ἀδιασπάτως). Harl sees in §196-200 an implication of a three-leveled divine cult: Temple-cult, world-cult, and sage-soul-cult, in which is performed the ritual, cosmic, and spiritual liturgy respectively. The thanksgiving of the world (symbolized by the incense offering) is an example of the whole creation inasmuch as it represents its essential function; cf. M. HARL, *Quis rerum divinarum heres sit*, OPA 15, Paris: Cerf, 1966, pp. 135-136.

³⁴³ The 'Maker and Father' concludes the enumeration as to what/who may be given the notion of πηγή: mind, the reasoning habit and education, and the good and bad dispositions.

only the man to whom is given to see ... reaches the summit of happiness (*De Abrahamo*, 58),³⁴⁵

Moses enjoyed partnership (κοινωνία) with... (*De vita Mosis I*, 158);³⁴⁶

is a Lawgiver (*De vita Mosis II*, 48);³⁴⁷

the nation sang hymns to... (*De vita Mosis II*, 256);³⁴⁸

is the beginning of one of the Decalogue sets; parents imitate (μιμέομαι) his nature by begetting (*De Decalogo*, 51);

is revealed (ἐμφανίζω) through the number 7 (*De Decalogo*, 105);

some people allow their words too easily to dash on to... (*De spec. legibus II*, 6);

one has to turn his mind and speech to... (*De spec. legibus II*, 256);³⁴⁹

a male soul assigns itself (προσκληρώω) to... (*De spec. legibus III*, 178);

God is rightly named (ὀνομάζω) to be... (*De spec. legibus III*, 189);³⁵⁰

the Israelite people is the portion of (προσκληρώω) the Ruler and has been set apart from the whole human race as the first fruits (ἀπαρχή) to... (*De spec. legibus IV*, 180);³⁵¹

the Hebrews are dedicated (προσκληρώω) to... (*De virtutibus*, 34);

the people is a suppliant of the truly Existing who is... (*De virtutibus*, 64);

is the commanding general (στρατάρχης) of the people (*De virtutibus*, 77);

Abraham's, Isaac's, and Jacob's goal of life was to please (εὐαρεστέω) ... (*De proemiis*, 24);

a soul may rejoice in... (*De proemiis*, 32);³⁵²

the Therapeutae are presented by their virtue to... (*De vita contemplativa*, 90);

the Jews are trained from their infancy to acknowledge (νομίζω) one who is

³⁴⁴ There is no mention of the divine Father in Gen 4:26, yet Philo interprets the original 'Lord' by the formula 'Father and Maker of all'.

³⁴⁵ The capability of seeing (ὁράω) God here is attributed to the faculty of mind, that is called prudence, wisdom, intelligence (φρόνησις).

³⁴⁶ The contents of Moses' partnership or communion with the divine Father are described in the same paragraph: he was named 'god' (cf. Exod 4:16) and he was allowed to enter into the darkness where God was (cf. Exod 20:21). This way he was immersed into the archetypal essence of all existing things and could see the things a mortal normally cannot see.

³⁴⁷ An identification of the 'Father and Maker' of the world with its Lawgiver may mean that to obey nature and the Law is the same thing; cf. R. ARNALDEZ, et als., *De vita Mosis I-II*, OPA 22, Paris: Cerf, 1967, p. 212, note 2.

³⁴⁸ It is connected with the interpretation of the crossing of the Red Sea (Exod 15).

³⁴⁹ Philo adds this to the citation of the divine command not to invoke the names of other gods (Exod 23:13).

³⁵⁰ As Mosès notes, the 'Father and Maker' in this paragraph is employed as a proof argument for the existence of God; such a cosmological argument is also attested in *Legum alleg. III*, 97-99; *De spec. legibus I*, 33-35; *De proemiis*, 41-42; cf. A. MOSES, *De specialibus legibus III et IV*, OPA 25, Paris: Cerf, 1970, p. 178, note 4.

³⁵¹ There is no text in the OT in which the people of Israel would have been given the status of ἀπαρχή; the theme of the exceptional choosing of these people is attested in Deut 4:20; 7:6; 14:2; 32:9.

³⁵² According to one of Philo's schemes Abraham-Isaac-Jacob (Israel) symbolize three types of rewards a virtuous soul is granted and which correspond allegorically to every name: faith-joy-vision.

God... (*Legatio ad Gaium*, 115);
the Jews observed their customs in honor (τιμῇ) of... (*Legatio ad Gaium*, 293);
the order and harmony of the things necessitates the being of... (*Quaest. et sol. in Genesin*, 2:34);

πατήρ τῶν

δλων

mind may abandon... (καταλείπω) (*Legum alleg. II*, 49);³⁵³
the most perfect thing is the hymn of praise to... (*De plantatione*, 135);³⁵⁴
the right reason (ὁ ὀρθὸς λόγος) instructs to honor (τιμάω) ... (*De ebrietate*, 81);
the mind hopes to perceive (κατανοέω)... (*De migratione*, 195);³⁵⁵
speech should honor (γεραίρω)... (*Quis rerum divinarum*, 110);
God is the Father of Logos and ... (*De fuga*, 109);³⁵⁶
is the fountain of life (*De fuga*, 197);³⁵⁷
the heaven has to sing hymns in honor (τιμῇ) of... (*De somniis I*, 37);
Moses figuratively called the sun to be... (*De somniis I*, 90);³⁵⁸
is in the central place (*De Abrahamo*, 121);³⁵⁹
men celebrate the Day of Atonement propitiating ... with prayers so their sins might be forgiven (*De vita Mosis II*, 24);
the high priest is consecrated to ... (*De vita Mosis II*, 134);
a man because of his soul is closely related to... (*De Decalogo*, 134);
there are magistrates (fixed/moving bodies in heaven) of the one... which imitate (μιμέομαι) his governing (*De spec. legibus I*, 14);
the high priest is consecrated to... (*De spec. legibus I*, 96);
it has been left to... to be the King and God of gods (*Quod omnis probus*, 43);³⁶⁰

³⁵³ The fatherly non-abandoning theme has already been dealt with in Sir 23:1 (1.2.1.3.). Here the issue is also associated with the fatherhood of God, yet its nature is totally different because of the acting subject: it is the human mind that abandons the Father. The theme of abandoning God is not a new one; it is also attested in the OT, the novelty is that here this theme is for the first time explicitly connected with abandoning the divine Father.

³⁵⁴ This interpretation is based on the meaning of 'Judah' (to praise) in Gen 29:35.

³⁵⁵ In the allegorical interpretation of Abraham's leaving Haran his mind is said to have hoped to arrive at the universal Father's notion.

³⁵⁶ The high priest in *De fuga*, 109-110 is identified with the divine Logos (λόγος θεῖος). Such identification is plausible inasmuch as God speaks through the mouth of the high priest making him a mediator with men; cf. C. K. REGGIANI, G. REALE, *L'uomo e Dio*, CDP, Milano: Rusconi, 1986, p. 239, note 71.

³⁵⁷ Philo cites Jer 2:13 with some omission; instead of πηγὴν ὕδατος ζωῆς he directly renders πηγὴν ζωῆς. The direct association of the divine Father with Jeremiah's citation ties together three issues: the divine fatherhood, his being the fountain of life and his being abandoned.

³⁵⁸ Philo thus interprets Num 25:1. 4.

³⁵⁹ The 'central place' is the allegorical interpretation of the middle position among three men who had visited Abraham (Gen 18). On either side of the Father of all is said to be his creative and kingly powers.

³⁶⁰ In this paragraph Philo seems to have kept in mind a biblical phrase *See, I have made you like god to Pharaoh* (Exod 7:1) as he attributed to Moses an interpretation that the man being possessed by love of the Divine and serving only the One becomes a god to men. Man's being a 'god', however, is far from his being absolute since he

a mortal cannot be made in the image of... (*Quaest. et sol. in Genesin*, 2:62);³⁶¹
the mind of a proselyte is familiar with honoring (τιμή) the One and... (*Quaest. et sol. in Exodum*, 2:2);³⁶²
the road ends in (τελευτάω)... (*Quaest. et sol. in Exodum*, 2:26);³⁶³

γεννήσας

πατήρ

heaven and mind have the capacity to set forth the praises, hymns, and blessings of/for... (*De somniis I*, 35);³⁶⁴
the worthy man looking at creation loves to inquire about... (*De somniis II*, 26);

πατήρ καὶ

ἡγεμών

to render what is due to... (*Quod Deus*, 19);³⁶⁵
to serve (θεραπεύω)... (*De ebrietate*, 131);
Moses assigned himself (προσκληρώω) to... (*De mutatione*, 127);³⁶⁶
the sun is allegorically likened to... (*De somniis I*, 73);³⁶⁷
a hand-made temple dedicated to... (*De vita Mosis II*, 88);³⁶⁸
it is an excessive impiety to call to witness... on a false matter (*De Decalogo*, 90);
it is difficult to apprehend... (*De spec. legibus I*, 32);

cannot be god to the different parts of nature. Another aspect of Moses' 'godship' to Pharaoh is presented in *De mutatione*, 128-129: it was not only because of Moses' wisdom, but especially because of his interceding with God for Pharaoh and giving him a chance to repent, thus revealing the benevolent nature of being 'god'; cf. COLSON, WHITAKER, *Philo*, V, 1988⁵, p. 209. The title King and God of gods may have come from the Homeric πατήρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε, yet this idea is, as Petit rightly observed, also well attested in LXX: κύριε βασιλεῦ τῶν θεῶν (Deut 9:26); θεὸς τῶν θεῶν καὶ κύριος τῶν κυρίων (Deut 10:17); ἐξομολογεῖσθε τῷ θεῷ τῶν θεῶν... ἐξομολογεῖσθε τῷ κυρίῳ τῶν κυρίων (Ps 135:2-3); θεὸς τῶν θεῶν καὶ κύριος τῶν βασιλέων (Dan 2:47); M. PETIT, *Quod omnis probus liber sit*, OPA 28, Paris: Cerf, 1974, p. 172, note 1. For some examples of the use of 'god' or 'divine' with regard to men in Greek and Latin texts, see *ibid.*, p. 171, note 3.

³⁶¹ This is Philonic exegesis on Gen 1:27 καὶ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον κατ' εἰκόνα θεοῦ. Philo sees in this phrase two 'Gods' and resolves this question introducing the notion of the second God who is the Logos of the first One and in whose likeness man was made.

³⁶² The interpretation is based on being a 'sojourner' in Egypt (Exod 22:21).

³⁶³ Philo interprets the stumbling role of the Gentile gods (Exod 23:33) by using the being-on-the road image, which presents the status of the relationships between man and God; to complete the journey means to arrive at the Father of all. The notion of ὁδός in Philo, according to Terian, may symbolize the Law or virtue, philosophy or a mystical adventure. Philo was probably influenced by Jewish mystical or wisdom traditions; cf. A. TERIAN, *Quaestiones et solutiones in Exodum*, OPA 34c, Paris: Cerf, 1992, p. 277, note 2.

³⁶⁴ The translation of COLSON, WHITAKER, *Philo*, V, p. 313, reflects the idea of praising God: *hymns of praise... in honor of the Father who is the author of our being*. The rendering of Yonge seems to be more literal and emphasizes the provenience of those praises and hymns: *the praises... of the Father who created them*; YONGE, *The Works of Philo*, p. 368.

³⁶⁵ 'Father and Ruler of all' stands at the end of an enumeration some people would neglect to consider they were born for: for father, for mother, for wife, for children, for human race, for the universe, etc.

³⁶⁶ A description of the man who has not seen his kinship is a clear allusion to the blessing of Levi in Deut 33:19 (cf. also *De fuga*, 89).

³⁶⁷ Though Philo states clearly that in reality there can be nothing likened to God, he validates such a comparison citing Gen 1:27 and Gen 9:6 (man was made in the image of God); furthermore, God is the archetype of every light.

³⁶⁸ The §§ 84-88 is the interpretation of the requirements for the divine Tabernacle in Exod 26:1-14.

Looking at the presented outline statistically, it is obvious that the largest number of references to the ‘passive’ presentation of the divine fatherhood is associated with ποιητής καὶ πατήρ. This in turn may mean that namely this phrase-reference reflects the most standardized level of speaking of God as Father without a real intention to emphasize either his fatherhood or his creative power. As to the contents of this phrase-reference group as well as the other ones, the field of the application to the divine fatherhood is quite diverse. Yet the very data offer some thematic and lexical features, which help one to see the principal spheres in which the divine fatherhood was understood to play even a passive role.

There is a group of references, which might be called relatively neutral statements, as they present no specific relational aspect between God as Father and the (human) world in a particular context.³⁶⁹ To this category may be ascribed such statements as: ποιητής καὶ πατήρ – is the only one, God, the truly Existing, a fountain, a Lawgiver, the beginning of one of the Decalogue tables, he is revealed through the number seven, our mind acts in a way similar to him; πατήρ τῶν ὅλων – is the fountain of life, he is in the central place, no mortal can be made according to his image, he is said to be the sun allegorically; πατήρ καὶ ἡγεμῶν – the sun is likened to him, a temple is dedicated to him.

Speaking about relational references the distinction might be made between the association of the human and non-human world with the fatherhood of God. The distinction, however, is rather a formal one because both spheres are in a close connection. There are few references to the non-human world; their contents, however, are quite important as they reveal the significance of the cosmos in relation to the Father and the human world. Thus three references disclose the ‘cultic’ nature of the created: giving thanks to ποιητής καὶ πατήρ (world) and singing hymns and praising πατήρ τῶν ὅλων (heaven) and γεννήσας πατήρ (heaven). The other three references reveal the ‘demonstrative’ aspect of creation: it stimulates man to inquire about γεννήσας πατήρ (creation), allows one to arrive at the conception of ποιητής καὶ πατήρ καὶ ἡγεμῶν (world),³⁷⁰ serves as a proof for the existence of ποιητής καὶ πατήρ (the order and harmony of created things).

Though the relational aspect in the human sphere is more variable, the number of references presents some similar features, which may roughly be summarized under three headings: mental attitude and activity, speech, and belonging to the Father. To the first category belong statements, which contain the idea of admiring, acknowledging, perceiving, having

³⁶⁹ Certainly, this does not mean that those statements on their own say nothing about God-man/world relationships; the point is that that they are neither directly associated with the divine activity nor do they play any specific relational-passive role in a particular context.

³⁷⁰ The statements about the Father as the sun and its similarity to him should probably be interpreted in the same way.

knowledge of, rejoicing in, honoring, hoping in, pleasing the divine Father, etc. Apart from these positive aspects, there are also some negative ones: some people have no knowledge about their Father and Maker. The mind may abandon the Father of all. Philo seems to have tried both: to show human striving for having knowledge and perception of the divine Father, as well as to point out the difficulty and particular privilege to achieve it. It may be mentioned that in three cases the mental faculty is directly connected with honoring (τιμή, τιμάω) the divine Father.³⁷¹ Regarding speech by which one can express his adhesion to God, Philo tends to be cautious. In three cases of six he disapproves and warns against a too simplified verbal conduct with regard to the Father. To this may be also adjoined the statement that speech should honor the Father of all. The reference-category that deals with the theme of belonging to God as Father has the best-attested lexical basis: all four references contain the same verb προσκληρόω. The subjects, however, who are the portion of or assign themselves to the Father, are different: a male soul, Moses, the people, the Hebrews. There are two more references that do not seem to fit well into any of the three above-mentioned categories; yet their contents show some affinity to the theme of being the portion of God. The reason is that the divine Father is affirmed be the commanding general (στρατάρχης) of the people and that the road that represents one's struggle against impiety ends (τελευτάω) in the Father of all.³⁷² Additionally, although there is no specific and explicit description of the Father's assistance and concern for the people, this is clearly implied in the references to him as a Lawgiver and commanding general of the people.

Summarizing the results of both tables, it seems to be reasonable to touch one more time upon the quality of the relationships between the man/world and the divine Father, as they occupy the major part in the issue.

The most general characteristic of God as Father in his relationships with the man and the whole creation is his *positivism*. There is no phrase-reference text that presents him either acting severely or threatening some punishment in the future. The only moderate *negative* fatherly act is that of warning the idolaters. The fact that his creative activity embraces the universal as well as the human sphere relates of itself not so much to his relationships with the created. Yet, the figure of Logos, whom the Father begot (also called the first-born) and enabled to be the bond of the universe separating the Creator from his creation, and after whose image the man was created, shows not only God's superiority and otherness but also implies his

³⁷¹ There is one more reference (*De somniis* I, 37) in which the subject of honoring (the same term) the Father of all is not man but heaven. The Father of all is also to be honored (γεραίρω) by speech (*Quis rerum divinarum*, 110).

³⁷² The *going up* to the Father in this final sentence in the Greek fragment ἡ δὲ ὁδὸς ἐστὶν ἡ ἐπὶ τὸν πατέρα τῶν ὅλων τελευτώσα (*Quaest. et sol. in Exodum*, 2:26) means not only the very end of the journey but also implies its ultimate objective.

responsibility and concern for all created.³⁷³ Therefore, it is not surprising that both the cosmos and the man may enjoy the Father's care that is explicitly stated.

To the positive activity of divine Father the response of those, who stand in a relationship with him, is generally positive as well. This regards even the material world that not only serves as the passive reference to its Creator and Father, but also actively proclaims his glory in hymns and praises (heaven). The positive character of relations between the man and the Father is to be observed in a special way in biblical personages (Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses), whose life-purpose is stated to have been to please the Father. The relationship between the Israelite people (also called the Jews and the Hebrews) and the divine Father is portrayed from an exclusively positive perspective as well. The people's position in those relationships is mainly described in terms of acknowledging and honoring God. This is fully understandable because the people had been set apart from the human race as ἀπαρχή to the Father. Such approach is a novelty in comparison with the OT. Another considerable difference with the OT is that there is no mention of the people's idolatry and impiety. The negative acts such as like blaspheming, abandoning the Father, having no knowledge of him, etc., are attributed to individuals but never to people as a whole. In addition, such references are quite rare. In fact, the personal relationships with God as Father are portrayed from a rather one-sided human perspective: it is related with what the man (mind, soul) does, but there are few references to describe God's fatherly activity (he evaluates, warns). Yet, even those references contribute to the image of the divine Father, as they indicate a more sophisticated approach to him, and at the

³⁷³ Apart from a certain confusion in Philo's interpretation about the Logos as the second God in *Quaest. et sol. in Genesin*, 2:62 there is one more fluid point with regard to the fatherhood terminology. According to *De confusione*, 40-43 the man of peace may be considered only those who acknowledge the divine Logos that is 'the one man' mentioned in Gen 42:11. Radice suggests that an identification of Logos in Philo should be understood more in allegorical than theological and religious terms; hence the figure of 'God's man-eternal Logos' in *De confusione*, 41, 43 is merely an allegorical terminology of man's transforming into the eternal Logos; cf. RADICE, *La migrazione verso l'eterno*, pp. 501f., notes 23-24. Nevertheless, the question remains why λόγος is identified with or at least given the same position as divine Father in *De confusione*, 41: ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ἐπιγεγραμμένοι πατέρα οὐ θνητὸν ἀλλ' ἀθάνατον, ἀνθρωπὸν θεοῦ, who is further designated as the word of the Eternal (τοῦ αἰδίου λόγος ὦ ν). The term ἐπιγράφω is only four times used in connection with πατήρ. In *De confusione*, 41 it denotes the action of the men of peace with respect to the Father-Logos (they have registered as the only father...God's man...), in *De sobrietate*, 56 the Abraham's object is God (he has registered God as Father), in *De fuga*, 114 the untainted soul has registered as her husband and Father the all-sovereign God, and in *De somniis II*, 273 those who are orphans and widows to creation have registered God as their lawful father and husband. Furthermore, it may well be that the statement in *De confusione*, 43 καὶ ἕνα πατέρα τὸν ὀρθὸν τιμώντες λόγον alludes to the divine Logos in §41 since both of them make part of the same argumentation about 'the one man', even more that ὀρθὸς λόγος (*straight, right word*) is likely to be identified with πρωτόγονος υἱός in *De agricultura*, 51. It is interesting that in *De confusione*, 43 Philo speaks about honoring (τιμάω) the ὀρθὸς λόγος as it does in some other cases referring to the divine Father (cf. *De ebrietate*, 81; *De somniis I*, 37; *Legatio ad Gaium*, 293; *Quaest. et sol. in Exodum*, 2:2). On the other hand, it is difficult to grasp the exact meaning, which Philo may have intended to attribute to this term. For instance, the father-ὀρθὸς λόγος is also attested in *De ebrietate*, 81 where it is said to have taught those who honored education and ὀρθὸς λόγος (philosophy?) to honor (τιμάω) the Father of all. It is clear that, at least, in the first case the father-ὀρθὸς λόγος denotes a human capacity, but again the same terminology is employed in *De aeternitate*, 83: God is portrayed as the Father who steers the universe and cooperates for its preservation and management, acting in accordance with the ὀρθὸς λόγος (the divine right reason – Logos?).

same time reveal his benevolent and sharing character in giving permission to a particular person to see/perceive the divine works, i.e., to those who act according to the example of Abraham and Moses.

2.2.2.2. *The Function of 'Father' in Minor Phrase-References*

There are another twelve variations of the phrase-references, in which divine fatherhood is associated with some other title by means of καί. As the list of these phrase-references shows (see above), they are not numerous; seven of them are used only once. For that reason it is difficult to deduce anything much about the particular combination of πατήρ with the other title. Therefore, they could hardly be ascribed to the category of standardized expressions; instead, some of them should simply be viewed as synonyms of the above-mentioned more frequently recurring phrase-references. The creative activity of God as Father is vastly attested by ποιητής καὶ πατήρ and γεννήσας πατήρ, and in such a way is further embellished by twice occurring synonymous phrase κτίστης καὶ πατήρ which emphasizes the volitional and founding aspect of the creative process and at the same time highlights the supremacy of the Creator and the Father that is to be appreciated³⁷⁴ and revered.³⁷⁵ The Father-Creator theme is also expressed in three texts in which πατήρ is coupled with δημιουργός.³⁷⁶ It has already been noted at the beginning that in those three cases the idea of naming God as Father is just a repetition of the Homeric (*De spec. legibus II*, 165) and Platonic (*De aeternitate*, 13, 15) conception. The basic accent is put on the Father, who is the source and begetter of other gods and the whole world. Furthermore, he is supreme and unanimously acknowledged (ὁμολογέω) by all Greeks as well as barbarians.³⁷⁷ Philo's using of both κτίζω and δημιουργέω reflects his understanding of divine creation in terms of both, the biblical founding and the Greek fashioning of the universe. The best testimony to it is *De somniis I*, 76: in making (ποιέω) the things that had not previously existed

³⁷⁴ There are two possibilities to interpret the Greek text in *De ebrietate*, 42: 1) the κτίστης καὶ πατήρ of the universe is at its beginning (ἀρχηγέτης); 2) transposing κτίστης with ἀρχηγέτης: the κτίστης of the universe is its ἀρχηγέτης καὶ πατήρ; cf. COLSON, WHITAKER, *Philo*, III, pp. 341, 501. The second possibility seems to be a bit artificial; moreover, there is one more clear example pairing κτίστης καὶ πατήρ.

³⁷⁵ Cf. *De virtutibus*, 179.

³⁷⁶ There is one more text on this theme (*De ebrietate*, 30) in which the δημιουργός who made all/universe is said to be at the same time the πατήρ of whatever has been born. Also in the same sentence mother-knowledge (ἐπιστήμη) that had an intercourse with God is said to have been that of the maker (τοῦ πεποιηκότος). Thus the same creation-idea is expressed by three different terms: architect/creator, father, and maker.

³⁷⁷ This is stated in *De spec. legibus II*, 165. It is not clear, however, whether Philo thought that everybody was acknowledging one supreme God as the Father and Maker as being above everything else, or whether he just intended to point out that all people accepted the idea of some kind of a Father and Maker; cf. COLSON, *Philo*, VII, 1984⁵, p. 408.

God was not only δημιουργός but also himself a κτίστης.³⁷⁸ The use of τεχνίτης in the saying that θεός is πατήρ καὶ τεχνίτης καὶ ἐπίτροπος of heaven and the world, reflects one more Hellenistic aspect in the understanding of divine creation.³⁷⁹ Although being a more technical term, this title fits well into the pair with πατήρ, since it denotes a certain skillfulness and professionalism in the Father's creative activity, as it is confirmed by its verbal form in *De mutatione*, 29: everything was made through the creative power (that is called θεός) by ὁ γεννήσας καὶ τεχνιτεύσας πατήρ. God's description as τεχνίτης is additional to πατήρ and denotes merely a certain aspect of his continuous creative work,³⁸⁰ that is explicitly expressed in *Legum alleg. I*, 18: a real fountain of the things that come into existence is the πατήρ. Such an assertion is also confirmed by three different, yet thematically similar titles: the Father is combined with eternal, uncreated, cause. Hence the Father and the Creator, Maker, etc., or even saying He is the Creator, Maker, etc., is definitely grounded upon God who is αἰδῖος μόνος καὶ ὅλων πατήρ (*De virtutibus*, 214) who is repeatedly explained as ἀγενήτος καὶ πάντων πατήρ (*De virtutibus*, 218).³⁸¹ Therefore, He may rightly be named πάντων αἴτιον καὶ πατήρ (*De ebriate*, 61). While in the latter paragraph the Father and the cause of all things is related to a traditional *birth* theme,³⁸² the references in *De virtutibus*, 214, 218 describe the man's attitude towards him. According to Philo, Abraham's exodus and his wanderings express his striving for discovering the true God, who alone is eternal as well as the Father (§214) in whom he trusted (πιστεύω, §218).

The association of ἐπίτροπος with θεός and its being placed on the same level as πατήρ is a bit strange, since this term generally denotes not the top position but an office being entrusted by somebody else.³⁸³ However, it may be explained by the function which this term plays in the particular context. God's being the Father, Artificer, and Governor in *Quod Deus*, 30 underlines his supreme knowledge analogous to human affairs: all three of them must have knowledge of whom they give birth to, what they produce and the things they govern.

³⁷⁸ LXX never employs δημιουργός or δημιουργέω to describe God's creative activity, instead it uses κτίστης and κτίζω; for more examples of these terms and their verbal forms used in the Greek literature and LXX as well as for their differences see W. FOERSTER, κτίζω, in *TDNT* 3, pp. 1023-1028.

³⁷⁹ Whereas κτίστης with regard to God's creative power has a more substantial basis in LXX (8x, including twice in 4Mac), τεχνίτης is without any specification used only once in Wis 13:1; a divine subject in this case is only supposed. Noteworthy that both terms are used in the later writings of the OT: Jdt, Sirach, 2Mac. The only exception is 2Sam 22:32 in which the Hebrew term רֹכֵס (rock) is rendered in LXX by κτίστης.

³⁸⁰ In *De spec. legibus I*, 41 πατήρ and τεχνίτης function in a certain parallelism that describes the world's witnessing to God's existence: as the son speaks of the πατήρ, so does the work of its τεχνίτης.

³⁸¹ In *De Iosepho*, 265 Philo piles up ἀγενήτος, ἄφθαρτος, and αἰδῖος and even though these attributes are not explicitly connected with the term 'father', nevertheless, the phrase that precedes them and emphasizes the creature-status of the earthly father makes it quite clear.

³⁸² According to Philo it was the Father and the cause of all things of whom Sarah (virtue-loving mind) was born (interpretation of Gen 20:12).

³⁸³ It is never used in LXX in connection with God.

The idea of the fatherly authority is first of all implied by pairing twice πατήρ with βασιλεύς. The application of βασιλεύς in Greek and 𐤀𐤋 in the Semitic milieu to God was a widespread custom.³⁸⁴ Nevertheless, there is no text in the OT in which the kingship of God was directly associated with his fatherhood. In Philo's interpretation on the creation of the first man in *De opificio*, 144 it is emphasized not the ruling authority of the Father and King, but the man's seeking to please to (εἰς ἀρέσκειαν) him with his words and actions, following him in the paths made plain by virtues. Similarly, the second instance in *Legatio ad Gaium*, 3 does not present any particular authoritative image of the Father and King, except for qualifying him as τῶν ὅλων. Differently, however, from the first case here the divine subject is connected with the *suppliants' race*, which is said to have been taken as an inheritance (προσκληρώω) by πατήρ καὶ βασιλεύς and in a subsequent paragraph is called Israel. Philo, pointing to the privileged status of the Jewish people and calling it the *suppliants' race* may have also attributed to it the role of a certain intercessor with God.³⁸⁵ In any case, the *human-response-to God* aspect in this reference is strong enough. There is one more important reference to the kingship of God in *De providentia*, 2:2f., in which Philo explains kingship by the means of fatherhood: there is no better name for a king than 'father'. This means that the mentioned above terms explain each other reciprocally. Moreover, in the same paragraph the kingship and fatherhood are alluded to as the two most excellent things in nature, which God united in an indissoluble bond. Hence they reflect two sides of the divine activity: ruling (ἡγεμονικός) and caring (κηδεμονικός).³⁸⁶ A natural fatherly duty to care for one's offspring is alluded to in *Quaest. et sol. in Genesis*, 3:42 (Armenian); the divine Father and Maker's responsibility to care for the created things is attested in *De opificio*, 9-10; the parallelism between God the Maker's providence and care for the things he had made and the earthly father's responsibility for his children is presented in *De opificio*, 171.³⁸⁷ The much stronger aspect of the divine rule is presented by the fundamental oneness (εἷς) of God in *De confusione*, 170 that in turn requires the oneness of ποιητὴς καὶ πατήρ καὶ δεσπότης. This is the only case the fatherhood of God is associated with his absolute and unconditional power. Yet the statement stands on its own and does not refer to any relation between God and the rest of existence, thus giving no suggestion as to how and over whom he

³⁸⁴ See generally, βασιλεύς, in *TDNT* 1, H. KLEINKNECHT, pp. 564-565; G. von RAD, pp. 565-571.

³⁸⁵ Cf. A. PELLETIER, *Legatio ad Gaium*, OPA 32, Paris: Cerf, 1972, p. 62, notes 2 and 3.

³⁸⁶ One more explicit reference to the providential care of the divine Father in connection with his kingship is found in *De somniis* I, 140-141. There are several other texts which makes allusion to the ruling activity of God and his fatherly attitude (including his providence) without being explicitly stated by specific terms either with respect to the 'father', or 'king', see N. UMEMOTO, "Die Königsherrschaft Gottes bei Philon," in M. HENGEL, A. M., SCHWEMER (hrs. von), *Königsherrschaft Gottes und himmlischer Kult* (WUNT 5), Tübingen: Mohr, 1991, pp. 224-225.

³⁸⁷ Cf. P. FRICK, *Divine Providence in Philo of Alexandria*, Tübingen: Mohr, 1999, pp. 49-51. The conclusion of Frick at this point is that the image of human fatherhood (care) served for Philo to connect the idea of providence with God in a way to present God as Father, who takes "immanent care of his creation and humanity." (*ibid.*, p. 51).

might exercise his power as the Maker, Father and Master.³⁸⁸ The combination πατήρ καὶ ἐπίσκοπος discloses another nuance of the divine authority. This term is twice employed for God in LXX and in both cases in connection with wicked men accentuating God's power of control not only of their possessions (Job 20:29)³⁸⁹ but also of their hearts (Wis 1:6). A different connotation ἐπίσκοπος gains in *De migratione*, 135 where it stands in a certain parallelism with πατήρ: Moses is said to have rightly called God both πατέρα τῶν ὅλων καὶ ἐπίσκοπον τῶν γενομένων. The ἐπίσκοπος in this case is associated with the Father to express God's delight as he saw the things he had made (Gen 1:31), and in so doing to highlight his perfect insight.

Twice³⁹⁰ the divine Father is paired with σωτήρ. Notwithstanding the different contexts in which the phrase-reference is employed, its functioning is similar to the other references in which God is named σωτήρ. According to Philo the divine Savior is the preserver of mankind, true helper and defender who can save from physical distresses; it is a human soul, however, which has to strive with its passions and needs help, that is to be considered the most important sphere of God's saving activity;³⁹¹ this activity is most important in establishing a rapport between God and man.³⁹² This aspect is clear enough in our case in *De proemiis*, 39 in which πατήρ καὶ σωτήρ is portrayed as having pity (ἐλέεω) on Jacob (soul) and not grudging (φθονέω) to grant him a vision of Himself. The preservation-aspect is presented in *De spec. legibus II*, 198 in which πατήρ καὶ σωτήρ is a part of a longer phrase: there is one more divine designation (γεννητής) that is also connected with the Father and Savior by means of καὶ; σωτήρ is qualified by τοῦ τε κόσμου καὶ τῶν ἐν κόσμῳ. Namely to God, the Parent, Father, and Savior, is attributed the preservation of those who, as stated by the context, abstain from food and drink on the Day of Atonement. The content of that particular preservation is expressed in terms of divine sustaining and nourishing. The entire person and not only his noetic nature is thus considered as the object of the divine soteriology.³⁹³

The merciful character of the divine Father is presented by pairing him with ἔλεως in *De confusione*, 103. Notwithstanding, this adjective functions in our case as a title,³⁹⁴ its

³⁸⁸ According to Rengstorff, Philo followed a more general Greek usage of δεσπότης than that of LXX; cf. RENGSTORFF, δεσπότης, in *TDNT* 2, pp. 44-45.

³⁸⁹ It may be noted that in this case the ἐπίσκοπος stands for בן in the Hebrew text.

³⁹⁰ Not to mention Gen 38:11 that is alluded to in *Quod Deus*, 137 in which Philo designates Tamar's father as her only savior. The mention of divine impregnation she has received in the same paragraph may indicate that Philo interpreted her father in terms of God – Father. Moreover, he is named μόνος σωτήρ that seems to be a prerogative of God (cf. *De agricultura*, 80; *De confusione*, 93).

³⁹¹ This way the Philonic σωτηρία should be understood in terms of one's acquiring "a share in the divine forces by subduing the passions." FOERSTER, FOHRER, σώζω, in *TDNT* 7, FOERSTER, pp. 988-989.

³⁹² So A. M. MAZZANTI, "Σωτήρ e σωτηρία nell'esegesi di Filone di Alessandria," ASE 10 (2, 1993), p. 357.

³⁹³ Cf. MAZZANTI, "Σωτήρ e σωτηρία," p. 361.

³⁹⁴ *De confusione*, 103: ὁ δ' ἔλεως καὶ πατήρ τῶν καλῶν. At this point Yonge's translation is more literal: *but the merciful God and father of all good*; YONGE, *The Works of Philo*, p. 243.

subordinate position to the Father³⁹⁵ is confirmed by *De mutatione*, 129, in which ἵλεως δύναιμις is explicitly stated as belonging to the Father. The contents of God's fatherly mercy is expressed in terms of preventing people from a successful building the tower of Babel (Gen 11:3ff.). The accent is put on not allowing bitumen-mortar to become solid and to fortify³⁹⁶ the bricks-vices (cf. *De confusione*, 101); here is the fatherly mercy at play. The qualifying πατήρ τῶν καλῶν appears in Philo only once and denotes likely the Father's goodness/excellence taken as a whole.

The coupling of ἀνὴρ with πατήρ in *De cherubim*, 49 appears to be just a quotation of Jer 3:4 from LXX in which the term ἀρχηγός is here replaced by ἀνὴρ. The reason for such a substitution is not clear; Philo may have had an earlier rendering of this verse.³⁹⁷ Though there is only one explicit reference to God as ὁ θεὸς (LXX - ἀνὴρ) in the OT (Hos 2:18), nevertheless, the image of God as husband with regard to his people is not unfamiliar to the prophetic literature (Hosea, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Second Isaiah). It is made in various ways: metaphorically using both *husband* and *wife*; employing only one of these terms while in place of the other is used a synonymous word; using only synonymous terms.³⁹⁸ Generally, the *husband* metaphor in those writings is employed in connection with the theme of infidelity and harlotry of the chosen people that had been visible in its clinging to other gods. Since such an issue in real 'husband-wife' relationship has always been of great importance, it well reflects the level of intimacy that was required by God from his people.³⁹⁹ It could be that the biblical image of the 'God-Israel' familiar intimacy encouraged Philo to connect explicitly the divine Father and the husband. However, though he directly points to Jer 3:4 in *De cherubim*, 49, his interpretation demonstrates quite a different scope: instead of a legal, moral, and loving aspect the *husband* is viewed from a rather sexual-reproductive perspective.⁴⁰⁰ To achieve this, Philo takes up a the Stoic image of dropping divine seed (σπέρμα) into a human soul to describe 'God-husband' relationship with wisdom-virtue.⁴⁰¹ Similarly, the image of God who is husband and Father of

³⁹⁵ Obviously, this was kept in mind in another English rendering of ὁ δ' ἵλεως καὶ πατήρ τῶν καλῶν: *but the Father of excellence in His loving-kindness*; COLSON, WHITAKER, *Philo*, IV, 1985⁶, p. 65.

³⁹⁶ Philo most likely has deliberately changed the original order of the predicate in LXX text: instead of καὶ ἀσφαλτος ἦν αὐτοῖς ὁ πηλός Philo renders καὶ ἡ ἀσφαλτος ἦν αὐτοῖς πηλός. Kahn, after having briefly observed the rabbinic exegesis, concludes that both for Philo and rabbis this verse is interpreted as a fundamental perversion; cf. KAHN, *De confusione linguarum*, pp. 167-167, note 13.

³⁹⁷ Cf. COLSON, *Philo*, II, p. 483.

³⁹⁸ For other references see N. P. BRATSIOTIS, ὁ θεός, in *TDOT* 1, pp. 230-232.

³⁹⁹ I do not find it necessary to one-sidedly emphasize either legal or moral aspect of the intimacy between God and Israel: the legal and moral traditions of the Covenant (as well as of the ancient Near East) determining the behavior (especially sexual) in a family are intertwined with impulsive love that is not to be expected in a normal way.

⁴⁰⁰ That the image of God as husband is closely related to begetting activity is obvious in Philo's interpretation of Gen 29:31 in *De mutatione*, 132: *when the Lord saw that Lea was unloved, he opened her womb*. Philo assures that by this statement Moses wished to present God as the husband of virtue-loving mind.

⁴⁰¹ Philo builds his allegorical interpretation on four pairs of biblical personages: Abraham-Sarah, Isaac-Rebecca, Jacob-Leah, and Moses-Zipporah (*De cherubim*, 40-47). The central point is that these four women represent virtues whose pregnancy was operated directly by God himself. Regarding Philo's use and understanding of

the universe in *Quod deterius*, 147 is portrayed in terms of supplying the seed, birth and origin (σπορὰν καὶ γένεσιν) of/to all (ἀπάντων). Differently, this mention in *De fuga*, 114 presents no divine husband-activity; the description of a woman (apparently, the soul) who fits for the High Priest who is interpreted to be a λόγος θεῖος (*De fuga*, 108) culminates in a statement on her quality: she is the one who had registered (ἐπιγράφω) the all-sovereign God as her the only husband and Father. To a certain extent the latter case reflects the OT ‘God-husband’ pattern, since in both cases, harlotry is associated with polytheism and emphasis is put on divine husband’s oneness. Likewise, the last text in *De somniis II*, 273 describes God as a husband and the Father in terms of registering (ἐπιγράφω) him as such by those who in Deut 26:13 (that Philo quotes) are defined as orphans and widows. As in the previous case the biblical image is applied to express the servant-soul’s need to belong completely to God who, is its true/lawful (γνήσιος) husband and the Father.

The common feature in Philo’s references to divine husband and the Father is an amalgamation of their functions. In fact, the adjoining *husband* to *father* adds little to what the divine Father is expected to do. Divine activity is portrayed in a typically fatherly manner which is attested in other texts. Hence the ἀνὴρ seems to have been introduced to emphasize the further generating/begetting function of God as Father in his creative activity and postulating at the same time the intimacy it creates.

2.2.2.3. The Function of ‘Father’ without Any Designation

There are more than 30 references to the divine Father in which he is not given any further specification and which are dispersed in diverse books as well as employed in different contexts. The bigger part of those references attributes to the Father an active role; however, there is a number of texts presenting him in the objective-passive position. It may be noted that the figure of the Father in those objective-passive texts is quite often portrayed in the context of divine-sphere. Thus, according to Philo, the priesthood, that is a gift to a pious man, professes the service of the Father; to serve (δουλεύω) him is the most important thing: it is ranked even higher than freedom and kingship (*De spec. legibus I*, 57). The dignity of this idea is also confirmed at the higher level: there are some good souls/angels⁴⁰² which have not descended into bodies, but are in service (θεραπεία) of the Father (*De gigantibus*, 12). The invisible,

μυστήρια in this paragraph and elsewhere see different opinions presented by Radice in MAZZARELLI, RADICE, *Le origini del male*, p. 100, note 19.

⁴⁰² According to Nikiprowetzky there is no reference in Philo to disembodied souls or bad angels because both as a temporary imperfection, so also a definitive evil, are inseparable from the immersion into tangible reality; cf. V. NIKIPROWETZKY, “Sur une lecture démonologique de Philon d’Alexandrie, *De Gigantibus*, 6-18,” in G. NAHON, CH. TOUATI (eds.), *Hommage à Georges Vajda. Études d’histoire et de pensée juives*, Louvain: Peeters, 1980, p. 58.

spermatic, technical, and divine Logos is also affirmed to be duly dedicated to the Father (*Quis rerum divinarum*, 119). The divine powers (δύναμις), which strive for the road upward to the Father (*Quaest. et sol. in Exodum*, 2:65) present his centrality as well (*De Abrahamo*, 125). The divine sphere, however, is not exclusively oriented towards the Father, but also plays an important intermediate role between him and the human world. So, the Father's clemency (ἐπιείκεια) and kindness (χρηστότης) is the first of the three intercessors,⁴⁰³ which plead for reconciliation (καταλλάσσω) with him (*De proemiis*, 166). Souls in the service of the Father (cf. *De gigantibus*, 12) are employed by the Maker/Architect (δημιουργός)⁴⁰⁴ as ministers and servants in the administration of the affairs of the mortal. Their activity is portrayed in terms of moving between the Father and his children conveying his biddings to them and reporting their needs to him (*De somniis I*, 141).⁴⁰⁵ Another important feature in the objective-passive campus is the theme of imitating (μιμῶμαι) the Father.⁴⁰⁶ This is valid above all for the Logos who, being the eldest son and imitating the Father's ways, has shaped different species comparing them to the archetypal patterns of the Father (*De confusione*, 63). The intercessors (especially Moses), who mediate with God on behalf of those to be punished, imitate the merciful power of the Father, dispense punishment with moderation and a sense of kindness (*De mutatione*, 129). The ordinary people are also invited to imitate God: loyal children imitate the nature of the Father as far as they do what is excellent without any delay, as their most excellent deed is to honor (τιμῇ) God (*De sacrificiis*, 68). The honoring of God, as the most excellent expression of what man is able to do, is undoubtedly intertwined with his obedience of the divine commands and decrees. This is clear in Philo's interpretation of Rebecca as teacher who, following Father's ordinances, supplies water-wisdom to Abraham's servant as learner (*De posteritate*, 146).⁴⁰⁷ Actually Rebecca's story displays not only an exemplary human attitude towards God, but also discloses the educational character of the Father.

The active role of the Father in the non-human sphere is strongly associated with his authority. Thus, it was he who assigned the sovereignty over daylight to the sun (*De opificio*, 56). It is not the movements of heavenly bodies that give earth fertility; that happens at the

⁴⁰³ The other two are the following: the holiness of the founders of the nation (their supplications) and the reformation and improvement of those, who passed from a pathless wilderness to the road, which leads to pleasing God.

⁴⁰⁴ Although the terms 'father' and 'architect' could be paired in the given context (as it is done in PHILO, II, p. 451: *the Father and Creator*; cf. also *De ebrietate*, 30), it seems to be more precise to retain two subjects as they are syntactically separated.

⁴⁰⁵ Such an angelic movement is also mentioned in *De gigantibus*, 16. The idea of the angels/demons' mediating function between God and the mortal was already presented by Plato, *Symposium*, 202E. The difference is that in those mentioned cases, God is not said to be the Father; cf. COLSON, *Philo*, II, pp. 453, 502.

⁴⁰⁶ It becomes even more important, if we add to it the terminology of 'following' God and 'assimilation' to him, as it has been done by W. E. HELLEMAN, "Philo of Alexandria on Deification and Assimilation to God," in *SPA* 2 (1990), pp. 51-71. Moreover, he finds no particular distinction between the three (cf. p. 58).

⁴⁰⁷ An interpretation of Gen 24:17ff.; cf. COLSON, *Philo*, II, pp. 325-326.

bidding of the Father who needs no help and does it whenever he likes (*De opificio*, 46). The concrete and efficacious realization of the Father's bidding is provided by his power (δύναμις), namely on which depend the seasons and times of the year, and not on the sun, the heavens or the stars. It is the Father, who presides over the whole world and guides it according to his thinking (*Quaest. et sol. in Genesin*, 4:51).⁴⁰⁸ In such a universal context the importance of the seventh day is strongly emphasized: it was begotten by the Father alone (*De vita Mosis II*, 210); the Father invested the seventh day with dignity, extolling it and calling it holy (*De opificio*, 89), for the perfect (τέλειον) work (ἔργον) of the Father was made plain on the seventh day⁴⁰⁹ (*De spec. legibus II*, 59). This may be regarded as the birthday of the world,⁴¹⁰ which in turn, bears witness to God's existence, speaking of it as a son of the Father (*De spec. legibus I*, 41).

In the references concerning the relationships of the Father to the man as to the traditional biblical image of God as Father, who is involved in the people's history, prevails. Thus, despite the fact that the first people provoked anger of the Father by eating the forbidden fruit (*De opificio*, 156), the resulting punishment was not an evil on God's part, because the divine Father could not be the cause of evil for those born out of him (ἐκγόνοις, *De opificio*, 75). Moreover, he has not permitted the human race to be wholly devoured by grief, sorrow and burden,⁴¹¹ but mingled them with something of a better nature: the soul should sometimes enjoy tranquility. His will is (βούλομαι) that the souls of wise men should pass a larger portion of their time in contemplating what the world has to show (*De Abrahamo*, 207).

It is strongly emphasized the familiarity of Moses' relationship with the Father: the Father not only gave a share of his speech and answers to him as the most illustrious prophet (*De vita Mosis II*, 187, 192), but also confirmed his authoritative utterance not to store manna in the desert by destroying what had been left of it (*De vita Mosis II*, 262). When Moses had to depart from earth to heaven, he was summoned by the Father who changed his double being (composed of soul and body) into the single unity. He transformed his whole being into mind as pure as the sunlight (*De vita Mosis II*, 288). In biblical tradition Philo stresses Moses' mediating role: he remained on the mountain and supplicated the Father [for the nation] (*Quaest. et sol. in*

⁴⁰⁸ The last clause is not preserved in the Greek fragment; cf. MARCUS, *Philo*, Supplement I, 1993⁵, p. 327.

⁴⁰⁹ There are two versions of the completion of God's creative work in Gen 2:2: according to LXX it was done on the sixth day, according to the HB – on the seventh. Philo employs both 'six' and 'seven' to denote the transition from imperfection to perfection: in *De spec. legibus II*, 59 the seventh day (being an uncompounded number) is viewed as the light of the six days revealing as completed what had been produced. In *Legum alleg. I*, 4-5 the six days are presented as the period for creating mortals things, while the seventh day for producing those of divine species.

⁴¹⁰ The seventh day as *the birthday of the world* is referred to in all three paragraphs.

⁴¹¹ God is also the Maker of laughter and his being Isaac's Father (*Quod deterius*, 124) is to be understood as far as it means 'laughter'.

Exodum, 2:49).⁴¹² He was even interceding with God for Pharaoh, giving him many chances for repentance and change of mind since, according to God's will, those who are to be punished should be allowed to have mediators to intercede for them and to dispense the divine punishment imitating (ἀπομιμέσθαι) the merciful power (ἔλεως δύναιμις) of the Father in a more moderated and kindly way (*De mutatione*, 129).⁴¹³ In fact, not only Moses had the privilege of mediation for the people, it appears to have been extended even to the souls of the dead patriarchs as well. For instance, the Father has granted the privilege to the founders of the nation to hear their prayers for their sons and daughters, as he prefers forgiveness (συγγνώμη) to punishment (*De proemiis*, 166).⁴¹⁴

In general, when it is applied to the personal level, Philo's allegorical interpretation of biblical texts reaches its finale, i.e. to man/soul's relationships with God or the Father. In our case, there are four more πατήρ references, which confirm this aspect and add a new nuance to it, namely, the right personal relations with the Father enclose both present and future award. Accordingly, the miraculous appearance of the three messengers to Abraham in a human body is interpreted by Philo as Father's present recognition of Abraham's worthiness. This appearance allowed Abraham to perceive that worthiness in an even clearer way (*De Abrahamo*, 118). Moreover, Philo adapts well-known Stoic vocabulary: noble, rich, king, and free which he applies to Abraham. Thus Abraham's worthiness is his wisdom for he has registered (ἐπιγράφω) God as Father⁴¹⁵ and, having become his only son by such an adoption, he also became the possessor of the divine riches (*De sobrietate*, 56).⁴¹⁶ Likewise, the Father sows (σπείρω) in the God-loving soul the intellectual-spiritual rays⁴¹⁷ enabling (δύναιμις) it to behold (θεωρέω) the verities of wisdom (*De vita contemplativa*, 68). Finally, the Father will give not only the

⁴¹² Though the 'nation' is omitted in the Greek fragment, it is implied by ὑπὲρ ὧν; see MARCUS, *Philo*, Supplement II, pp. 95, 252.

⁴¹³ The theme of Moses' godliness being related to the divine fatherhood has already been mentioned in dealing with *Quod omnis probus*, 43 (above). For a comprehensive survey of Moses' calling 'god' in Philo, see D. T. RUNIA, "God the Man in Philo of Alexandria," *JTS* 39 (1988) 48-75. It may be noted that not only the controversial references but also the other texts that attest to Moses' godliness, do not imply any deification of him that could be understood in terms of sharing in the same nature of God (cf. *ibid.*, p. 60) and should be considered as relational; his being named θεός "is not co-extensive with God as supreme being, but is no more than one of His names." (*ibid.* p. 73). Since Moses' godliness is associated with both divine creative (beneficent) and ruling powers, he is a 'god' insofar as his life reflects powers and virtues similar to God's; cf. W. E. HELLEMAN, "Philo of Alexandria on Deification and Assimilation to God," in *SPA* 2 (1990), pp. 67-68.

⁴¹⁴ This interpretation is possibly founded on God's promise to remember his covenant with Jacob, Isaac, and Abraham (Lev 26:42), so COLSON, *Philo*, VIII, 1989⁵, p. 419. The same idea of remembering Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob is expressed in Moses' prayer to God in Exod 32:13.

⁴¹⁵ There is one more passage (except for *De confusione*, 41 in which this term is connected with 'father-Logos', but not God) in which this term is employed to denote God being registered as father (*De fuga*, 114). In both cases it is connected with a human and not a divine action.

⁴¹⁶ Three themes emerge from this description of Abraham as sage: a sage is rather a friend of God than his servant; a sage is the son of God; a sage is exceedingly rich; cf. RADICE, *La migrazione verso l'eterno*, p. 494, note 26.

⁴¹⁷ This idea echoes a number of pagan conceptions; cf. F. DAUMAS, P. MIQUEL, *De vita contemplativa*, OPA 29, Paris: Cerf, 1963, p. 129, note 2.

birthright of the elder, but also his whole inheritance (τὰ πατρῶα πάντα), as he did to Jacob, to one who does not despise toil (πόνος) and by continual progress, achieves his goal/arrives at his end (*De sacrificiis*, 42).

2.2.2.4. The Other Specified References to ‘Father’

There are just few references to the fatherhood of God in which πατήρ is qualified either by a personal pronoun or some other term, which is different from those, indicated in the phrase-references. Only twice does a personal pronoun specify the Father and in both cases it does not point to any specific relation, but points out cause and dependency on him. Thus Philo interprets Eden in *Legum alleg. I*, 64 as the divine wisdom that rejoices and exults glorying and priding itself only in God, its Father (αὐτῆς),⁴¹⁸ and observes in *De fuga*, 62 that a good thing tends to soar on high. Moreover, if it ever comes to the people, it is because of their Father (αὐτοῦ), who is very bounteous (φιλόδορος). The other three texts describe the beneficent and virtuous nature of God as Father in connection with man. Since He himself has a perfect nature (τῆς τελείας φύσεως), he sows and begets happiness in the souls (*Legum alleg. III*, 219)⁴¹⁹ and being rationally intelligent (λογικῆς συνέσεως), he takes care of both those who have reason and those who live a blamable life, giving them time for reformation (*De providentia*, 2:6). At the same time he is not transgressing his merciful nature (ἔλεων φύσιν). Man must abandon the belief that the universe is the primal God and that the movements of the stars are the cause of bad or good fortune; then, according to the paradigmatic traveling of Abraham, the mind, that gradually migrates (*De migratione*, 194), will come to the Father of piety and holiness (εὐσεβείας καὶ δσιότητος).⁴²⁰

2.2.3. Divine Fatherhood Revealed by Filial Relationship

As has already been mentioned above, there are only 22 references to the fatherhood of God, attested by terms υἱός and παῖς which are either explicitly connected with God/the Father or clearly refer to the divine sonship. Not a small number of texts in this group also belongs to a category of the ‘father-texts’,⁴²¹ which have been observed above, as well as to similes,⁴²² which will be dealt with in a following paragraph. Therefore, the number of the specifically genuine

⁴¹⁸ A clear allusion to Prov 8:30f.

⁴¹⁹ This is said in connection with the Lord’s begetting Isaac (laughter).

⁴²⁰ Though both terms are used in LXX they are associated with God only twice (cf. Isa 11:2; Wis 9:3).

⁴²¹ *De sacrificiis*, 68; *De ebrietate*, 30; *De sobrietate*, 56; *De confusione*, 63; *De vita Mosis II*, 134; *De spec. legibus I*, 41, 96.

⁴²² *Quod Deus*, 54; *De congressu*, 177; *De spec. legibus I*, 318 (twice); *De proemiis*, 167; *Quaest. et sol. in Genesin*, 1:55; 2:54.

‘son-texts’ diminishes to eight references. Thematically, there are four categories (including the ‘father-texts’) to which is applied the title of son(s) or children of God: Logos, the world, patriarchs, and those who live in the knowledge of God.

The explicit association of Logos with the divine sonship is attested in *De agricultura*, 51. The leitmotif of this paragraph lies in the quotation of Ps 22:1 (the HB Ps 23:1): *The Lord is my shepherd, I shall not want*. God is portrayed as the king and shepherd of everything and everybody that is divine and mortal. God exercises this rule in accordance with right (δίκη) and law (νόμος), setting over everything his ὁρθὸς λόγος and πρωτόγονος υἱός to govern all as a viceroy (ὑπαρχος) of the great king. Obviously, the right/true word and first-born son connected by καί denote the same Logos.⁴²³ There the reiterated emphasis is put on God, who rules through his Logos by repeating the same citation from Ps 22:1 whom the whole universe is invited to acclaim in §52. Thus, the image of God as Father in this passage is not only that of the king and shepherd, but also of one who gives a share in his governing power and enables the Logos to act on his behalf.⁴²⁴

The divine sonship of the world is indicated quite strongly. The part of *Quod Deus*, 31 in which God is spoken of as the Father of the world (that itself is portrayed as a father of time) has been attributed to Chrysippus (*SVF* II 512). There still remains the second part in which κόσμος is described as νεώτερος υἱὸς θεοῦ. It is perceivable by our senses and therefore is named αἰσθητὸς υἱός, while the superior position is assigned to the intelligent (νοητός) world that is supposed to be the elder son. This perceivable world is also given a title of μόνος καὶ ἀγαπητὸς αἰσθητὸς υἱός in *De ebrietate*, 30. Here the fatherhood of God is presented simply in his giving the divine seed to mother knowledge (ἐπιστήμη), which produces the tangible world. The κόσμος, however, is not static, but as the son of God plays a certain role with regard to the human world. As the son, he tells people (Moses) about the Father and as the work of the Father it relates about its Maker (*De spec. legibus* I, 41) and participates in the divine cult. Both in *De*

⁴²³ The title πρωτόγονος is also applied to Logos in *De confusione*, 63 and 146 (cf. §41).

⁴²⁴ According to Maddalena the Logos though not being totally identified with God is not, nevertheless, something outside God. The ‘being God as Father’ is similar to ‘being God as Logos’ so much that the only difference between two ways of ‘being God’ lies in the manifestation of the latter through the creation. Thus there is no ontological difference between them: the Logos is one with the Father; see A. MADDALENA, *Filone Alessandrino*, Milano: U. Mursia & C., 1970, pp. 298-317. Runia also suggests that God and the Logos are not actually separable; rather the difference between them is conceptual: the Logos may be regarded as that part/aspect of God, which stands in relation to creation. Yet, the Logos in itself is neither the Father nor the Creator: “it is God ποιητὴς καὶ πατήρ who creates, but he does so *at the level* of his Logos as place of the noetic world or *in the guise* of his creative power and *through the agency* of the Logos as instrument of creation. Through the doctrine of the Logos God can be said to be *immanent* in the universe which he created without the affirmation of his transcendence being put at risk.” RUNIA, *Philo of Alexandria*, p. 450.

vita Mosis II, 134 and *De spec. legibus I*, 96 the vestment of the high priest symbolizes⁴²⁵ the involvement of the world in the divine liturgy. This participation, however, is articulated in a somewhat different way. In *De spec. legibus I*, 96 υἱός is described as τὸ πᾶν (the whole universe) and is given simply the role of being at the service (πρὸς θεραπείαν) of its Maker and Begetter; whereas in *De vita Mosis II*, 134 υἱός (the world) is assigned to the function of an advocate (παράκλητος) to intercede with God for attaining the pardon of sins and the abundance of his goodness. The cosmos thus acquires a status of a certain mediator that functions in a way similar to that of the Logos.⁴²⁶

Philo also associates the divine sonship with three biblical patriarchs: Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob/Israel. Though the paradigmatic figure of Abraham and his exodus do not occupy the last place in Philo's writings, nevertheless, he portrays Abraham becoming the only son of God by registering God as his Father only once in *De sobrietate*, 56. Certainly, the divine sonship/fatherhood should be understood in terms of allegory: since the status of the friend of God is connected with wisdom (§55), in this sense Abraham is the only son of God, as he is the paradigm of a sage. The term μόνος is not to be overemphasized because it is also used in connection with the world.

A slightly more attention is paid to the figure of Isaac. In *De mutatione*, 130-131 the issue is about the birth of Isaac - he was a gift of God. This is not the only case in which Isaac's divine sonship is mentioned. It is also presented in *De somniis I*, 173 where Isaac is named υἱός and God is supposed to be his father who begot (γεννάω) him, and in *Legum alleg. III*, 219, where Isaac's sonship is alluded in the same way as in the previous reference, i.e., in terms of the divine begetting. Obviously, Philo was not interested in the personality of the patriarch: he concentrates rather on the interpretation of his name. Thus Philo explains that Isaac means laughter and joy (*Legum alleg. III*, 219), he is a synonym for the best of good emotions and joy: γέλως (,) ὁ ἐνδιάθετος (,) υἱὸς θεοῦ (*De mutatione*, 131). The interpretation of the last phrase depends on the place where one puts a comma. Colson takes γέλως ὁ ἐνδιάθετος as one phrase and translates "the Isaac who is the laughter of the heart, a son of God," hence interpreting 'a son of God' as some inner joy that God makes, arises in the soul of a peaceful man.⁴²⁷ Differently, Arnaldez, who isolates γέλως and unites ὁ ἐνδιάθετος υἱὸς θεοῦ translating it "mais le rire, le fils immanent de Dieu," hence attributing to this laughter the status of the Logos, in

⁴²⁵ For the differences in the symbolism of the high priest's vestment in *De vita Mosis II*, 117-135 and *De spec. legibus I*, 85-95 see COLSON, *Philo*, VI, p. 609.

⁴²⁶ So, BREHIER, *Les idées philosophiques et religieuses de Philon d'Alexandrie*, pp. 170-175. He concludes that the conception of mediators is tightly related to the innate difficulty of knowing God directly. Hence the right explanation of the doctrine of the mediators is possible only taking into account Philo's religiosity (p. 175).

⁴²⁷ Cf. COLSON, WHITAKER, *Philo*, V, pp. 208-211 and note 3 in p. 208.

which the man participates and through which he is saved.⁴²⁸ Whatever interpretation is opted for, it does not affect the Philonic conception of the divine fatherhood to a great degree. God is both the creator of joy as well as of the Logos and in *De mutatione* 131. In this way his beneficent character is presented in giving (δίδωμι) one or the other to peaceful souls. The difference is that of quality: if one were to opt for the second interpretation the description of the son of God as of the *immanent one* points to something that belongs to the divine reality in the particular way and therefore is more valuable.

The title 'son of God' is applied only once to Jacob/Israel. In his argument about the precedence (*De posteritate*, 63) that is expressed in terms of 'younger' and 'older' Philo points, as an example, to God's naming Israel πρωτόγονος υἱός in dignity and explains that Israel has the right, although being younger in age, to be called a first-born. The text to which Philo alludes is Exod 4:22 - τάδε λέγει κύριος υἱὸς πρωτότοκός μου Ἰσραήλ. The connection that Philo makes, however, is quite artificial and based solely on the etymological grounds, since in Exod 4:22 Israel signifies the Israelite people to be delivered from Egypt, while in our paragraph, the accent is put on the patriarch Israel/Jacob. Thus, in Philo's allegorical interpretation, the people of Israel as the son of God, gives up its place to Israel/Jacob who had stolen the right of primogeniture from Esau. The reason Philo stresses this patriarch in a particular way, is quite clear: according to Gen 32:31 he is said to have been convinced of having seen God. Therefore, *seeing God* is the core of the Philonic argumentation, since it implies the right and honor of primogeniture as well as a double portion of the inheritance. Undoubtedly, the figure of Israel/Jacob should be seen on the allegorical level as well, since Philo also calls him the earliest offspring (γέννημα) of the Uncreated. How important 'seeing God' is in Philo's interpretation is obvious in a similar passage in *De fuga*, 208. Though he does not associate the first-born Israel/Jacob with the divine sonship in this paragraph as in the previous case, he offers his version of what 'Israel' means and in what his advantage to Ishmael lies. So he gives a rather false translation of 'Israel' as *seeing God* and a modified rendering of 'Ishmael' as *listening to God* to prove his argument on the superiority of seeing God to listening to him.⁴²⁹ Notwithstanding, however, the importance Philo attributes to *seeing God*, it can only be understood as a relational knowledge. The comprehension of God's essence is not possible since he is not directly knowable in himself.⁴³⁰

In three paragraphs (*De confusione*, 145-147) the divine sonship is associated with the knowledge (ἐπιστήμη) of the only One, who is named in the preceding paragraph as the Father

⁴²⁸ Cf. ARNALDEZ, *De mutatione nominum*, pp. 92-93 and note 1.

⁴²⁹ Cf. REGGIANI, REALE, *L'uomo e Dio*, p. 275, notes 157-158.

⁴³⁰ Cf. RUNIA, *Philo of Alexandria*, p. 437.

and Maker of all. Hereby, Philo contrasts the lack of knowledge of God to the status of υἱοὶ θεοῦ who are living in the knowledge of him. Philo argues his thesis by the means of three texts of the book of Deuteronomy. It is interesting that he quotes those texts which refer to the status of the Israelite people: υἱοὶ ἐστε κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ (Deut 14:1); θεὸν τὸν γεννήσαντά σε (Deut 32:18); οὐκ αὐτὸς οὗτός σου πατήρ (Deut 32:6). Philo has probably chosen these references as his proof-texts merely due to their linguistic (Deut 14:1) and filial-thematic affinities to his argument. The biblical themes on the sinfulness and foolishness of people (Deut 32:5-6), their abandoning and forgetting God (Deut 32:18) their supposed participation in pagan cults (Deut 14:1), put forward the same idea: such attitudes and practices cannot be reconciled with the status of the sons of God. Since Philo's argument has a positive character, he seems to have simply excerpted the phrases from their contexts to support his idea of what sons of God are. Yet one cannot completely exclude the idea that Philo kept the original biblical contexts in mind, as to what behavior was to be avoided in order to be rightly called the sons of God (he passes from those who are ignorant §144 to those who have knowledge of God §145). Nevertheless he praises the Stoics and Epicureans because of their understanding of moral beauty as the only good.⁴³¹ There is also a certain aspect on how high the standards are in order to be called a son of God. In §§146-147 Philo twice repeats the same idea: if any/we have not become yet fit/worthy (§146 ἀξιόχρεως, §147 ἱκανός) to be named sons of God,⁴³² there remains the possibility of to be called sons of the Logos. Philo does not explain the nature of such insufficiency, but it may possibly be understood in terms of the level of knowledge of the one true God⁴³³ that none have reached yet. Since the allegorical divine sonship is directly conditioned by an adhesion to a monotheistic faith that is presumably followed by definite moral behavior,⁴³⁴ it points to the basic biblical principle as regards the relationships between God and man/people. The divine fatherhood implicit in these texts is presented as a theological postulate especially for his incomparable oneness and possibly for his requirements in the moral campus. At this point one should again call to mind the insistence on imitating God in *De sacrificiis*, 68

⁴³¹ Cf. KAHN, *De confusione linguarum*, p. 122f., note 3.

⁴³² The idea is that not everybody can reach this level; so translations of COLSON, WHITAKER, *Philo*, IV, p. 89: "But if there be any as yet unfit to be called a Son of God"; KAHN, *De confusione linguarum*, p. 123: "Mais cependant, s'il se trouve quelqu'un qui ne soit pas encore digne d'être appelé fils de Dieu"; RADICE, *La migrazione verso l'eterno*, p. 335: "E se anche ci fosse qualcuno che non è ancora degno d'essere chiamato 'figlio di Dio'". Williamson, however, opts for a slightly different interpretation, WILLIAMSON, *Jews in the Hellenistic World. Philo*, p. 125: "But even if as yet there is no-one who is worthy to be called a Son of God"; this translation apparently excludes everybody from claiming the title of the son of God. In fact, he puts the emphasis on man's necessity to act in accordance with the rule of the Logos to become the son of God (*ibid.*, p. 126). Thus, he seems to assign to the Logos a decisive role in the mediation of that issue.

⁴³³ This supposition is based on the fact that Philo contrasts 'sons of men' (§§142-144) with 'sons of God' (§§145ff.), where the first ones stand for polytheists and the latter for monotheists.

⁴³⁴ τὸ καλόν is translated by 'moral beauty', which by Kahn is rendered as "la vertu"; KAHN, *De confusione linguarum*, p. 123.

that is in turn tightly connected with honoring God; those who do this are called his obedient children (οἱ ὑπήκοοι παῖδες).

Several remarks may be added to this brief exposition. Firstly, Philo obviously is not very interested in the divine sonship of Israel, though he often makes mention of the OT passages and personages. Instead, he applies this metaphor at a cosmic level and at a personal sage-level thus revealing his affinity with the speculations of the Jewish wisdom and the Platonic-Stoic ideas.⁴³⁵ Secondly, the divine sonship, notwithstanding whom/which it is associated with, is described in a quite abstract manner suggesting a relationship of dependence (a logical rapport) and of spiritual sonship that should be understood in a figurative or allegorical sense.⁴³⁶ Finally, the divine sonship in the human sphere is closely related to the importance of the knowledge of the one true God (a monotheistic faith) that is also implied by the metaphor of seeing him and is even conditioned by it.

2.2.4. Divine Fatherhood Revealed by Similes

The data on this issue are not very abundant. There are only seven similes in which the divine fatherhood is portrayed either by earthly the images of ‘father’ or ‘son’. Noteworthy those four similes are just quotations of the OT: once Prov 3:11f. and three times Deut 8:5. It is also important to notice that those OT texts deal with the same *discipline* theme; Philo has obviously paid much attention to this aspect of the activity of the divine Father.

Philo quotes Deut 8:5 freely, yet not changing the principal idea: God acts as a man towards his son. Philo takes up this argument and in all three cases contrasts it to that of God is not a man (Num 23:19). Yet such contrasting is not the actual purpose as two most important principles regarding God are revealed: he is not a man, yet he disciplines/chastises (παιδεύω) man. In *Quod Deus*, 54 Philo does not go beyond this general observation. He simply adds that an anthropological language about God serves for one’s instruction and admonition. In *Quaest. et sol. in Genesin*, 1:55 and 2:54 he pushes his argument a bit further, connecting it with man’s inherent wickedness that may cause disobedience to and enmity with God. Hence man does need παιδεία (1:55), which may be understood even in terms of more severe chastening (2:54) to make man obey God voluntarily. Similarly, but somewhat stronger, the connotation discipline-obedience is expressed in *De congressu*, 177. The text of Prov 3:11-12 in this paragraph is quoted with some changes: instead of κύριος in v. 11, Philo uses θεός (as in the HB - יהוה); instead of παιδεύω in v. 12 (as in *Codex Alexandrinus*) he uses a stronger term as in v. 11 ἐλέγχω

⁴³⁵ Cf. HENGEL, *The Son of God*, pp. 55-56; also BYRNE, ‘Sons of God’ - ‘Seed of Abraham’, p. 59.

⁴³⁶ Cf. NIKIPROWETZKY, “Sur une lecture démonologique de Philon d’Alexandrie”, pp. 45-46.

(to rebuke, as in *Codex Vaticanus*).⁴³⁷ Philo uses this comparison as well as other biblical texts to prove his explanation on the profitability of affliction (§172ff.) and even its most radical form – slavery (§176). The accent is put on one's being made subject to and obeying commands. The reproaches and admonition are to be considered as very good issues, since through them the agreement with God leads to kinship with him: what relation can be closer than that of a father to a son, or a son to a father?⁴³⁸

The theme of spiritual kinship and pleasing God is also taken in *De spec. legibus I*, 318 and *De proemiis*, 167. However this is expressed in a different way. In *De spec. legibus I*, 318 Philo makes an allusion to Deut 13:19 when he speaks about doing what is pleasing (τὸ ἀρεστὸν) to nature⁴³⁹ and what is good (τὸ καλὸν), connecting this idea with being sons of God and quoting as a proof-text Deut 14:1.⁴⁴⁰ In fact, Philo makes use of the text which in LXX relates to a different issue and has different connotations: being sons of the Lord God in Deut 14:1 is directly associated with the prohibition to do harm to oneself, which probably performed in certain rituals of the god Baal. Such a connection is quite reasonable since the argument Philo deals with has to do with the necessity of punishing idolaters even though they may be relatives. Accordingly, it challenges the value of human kinship (§315ff.) supposing that spiritual kinship is the only real one.⁴⁴¹ Philo explains the status of sons of the Lord God in terms of their worthiness to have the right to rely on God's provision (πρόνοια) and care (κηδεμονία) as if he were the father (ὡς ἐκ πατρός). Moreover, the divine care (ἐπιμέλεια) is as superior to men's care as God, who bestows it, is superior to men. Pleasing God in *De proemiis*, 167 is to be viewed in the context of the promise of national restoration (returning from Greece and other parts of the world) and reconciliation with the Father (§§165-168). One of three *paracletes* mentioned in those paragraphs is said to be the reformation working in those who are returning

⁴³⁷ The observations of M. ALEXANDRE, *De congressu eruditionis gratia*, OPA 16, Paris: Cerf, 1967, p. 227, note 3.

⁴³⁸ Colson proposes several options for ὁμολογία: agreement, acknowledgment, covenant, which describe the normal relations between God and Israel; cf. COLSON, WHITAKER, *Philo*, IV, pp. 548-549. Alexandre also sees in this term a certain juridical aspect: it is as the first stage of the spiritual life. The idea of kinship (συγγένεια) with the divine was known in the philosophical field long before Philo (Pythagoreans, Plato, Cleanthes, Aratus). Philo's use of it is not homogenous: he employs it in the sense similar to his Greek predecessors, associates it with man's being allied to the Logos, describes it in terms of the divine gift to creation, applies it to the chosen people (consequently, the people is considered to be the heir of every good thing human nature contains); cf. ALEXANDRE, *De congressu eruditionis gratia*, pp. 227-229, note 4.

⁴³⁹ In LXX doing what is good and pleasing is ἐναντίον κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ σου. It is not clear why Philo substituted this phrase by φύσις. Colson thinks Philo did it because he saw in ἀρεστὸν and καλὸν Stoic phraseology; cf. COLSON, *Philo*, VII, p. 622; sceptically, Daniel, who appeals to the Philonic use of νόμος φύσεως in the same writing in the sense of the divine Law; cf. S. DANIEL, *De specialibus legibus I et II*, OPA 24, Paris: Cerf, 1975, p. 202, note 1.

⁴⁴⁰ He changes, however, the genitive of LXX υἱοί ἐστε κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ ὑμῶν to a dative υἱοί ἐστε κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ ὑμῶν.

⁴⁴¹ Cf. DANIEL, *De specialibus legibus I et II*, p. 200, note 4.

since they have been able to pass from pathless wilderness to the road. The end of that road is none other than pleasing (εὐαρεστέω) God just as sons please their father (καθάπερ υἱὸς πατρί).

The hitherto mentioned simile-references have much in common. First, they all allude to the divine fatherhood by means of a filial image thus drawing once more attention to the importance the 'son' terminology has in this campus. Second, they well illustrate the relationship between God as Father and man; the various aspects of this relationship in diverse references supplement each other. In fact, the discipline/chastening performed by the Father for the man's sake should be seen just as the first stage that leads to kinship with him; those who try to please God may achieve it.

The last simile-reference (*De aeternitate*, 83) portrays God as Father from a more moderate perspective yet points to some other valuable aspects. Philo alludes to the fatherhood of God in one of his arguments in favor of the eternity of the world.⁴⁴² Within this argument he points out that at present God surveys everything and as if he were a true father (οἷα γνήσιος πατήρ) he acts as the guardian (ἐπιτροπεύω) of all; he guides the charioteer's and pilot's course steering the universe. Furthermore, he cooperates with the sun, moon, etc., in all that is needful for the preservation of the universe and to its faultless management in accordance with ὁρθὸς λόγος. Strictly speaking, this is the only case, where Philo employs the image of a charioteer and pilot in a direct connection with the divine fatherhood.⁴⁴³ There are, however, more texts in which those images are used in close relation to God as Father and serve even as a certain substitute for him. However, although they stand in the same context and in parallel formulas, they are not assimilated to the figure of the Father.⁴⁴⁴ Likewise, in our simile two ways of the divine activity should be distinguished: God acts as a true father inasmuch as he is the guardian of everything, and he acts as the charioteer and pilot inasmuch as he conducts and steers the bark of the universe.⁴⁴⁵

⁴⁴² Philo argues against the Stoic doctrine concerning the periodical conflagration of the world basing his argument on the postulate of the Stoics themselves. As they commonly accept the idea of God as the soul of the world, Philo raises a rhetorical question: does the conflagration render God unemployed, inactive? To stop the perpetual motion of the soul would mean to destroy the soul itself, and this eventually means the death of God.

⁴⁴³ Apart from the clause reconstructed from Armenian to Greek in *Quaest. et sol. in Genesin*, 4:51.

⁴⁴⁴ Méasson indicates five more texts: *Quis heres divinarum*, 98-99; *De spec. legibus I*, 13-14; *De opificio*, 46; *Quaest. et sol. in Genesin*, 4:51; *De proemiis*, 36-40. The author observes that in all these cases there is a certain transition from the image of the Father to that of the charioteer. Only in the latter reference the order is inverted; see A. MÉASSON, *Du char ailé de Zeus à l'Arche d'Alliance. Images et mythes platoniciens chez Philon d'Alexandrie*, Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1986, pp. 59-62.

⁴⁴⁵ According to Méasson the double function of God as a charioteer and a pilot in Philo is similar to the division between the kingly and creative divine powers and represents the divine sovereignty and kindness respectively; cf. MÉASSON, *Du char ailé de Zeus à l'Arche d'Alliance*, pp. 123-124.

Summarizing the data on the image of God as Father, as it is presented in different text-groups and sub-groups, it seems opportune to proceed in a way similar to what has already been done with regard to the OT, i.e., 1) indicating the main characteristics of the divine fatherly activity in the different text-groups and sub-groups; 2) pointing out the distinctions and similarities in those texts with attention to the ‘addressees’ who stand in a relationship with the divine Father.

1) The ‘father-texts’ group, containing the largest number of references, has been approached separately. Its subdivision into four smaller units on a grammatical and statistic basis has been done because of their recognizable differences. Two main features of God’s fatherly image have been pointed out in the first and the biggest phrase-reference sub-group: his *begetting-creative* activity that is predominantly presented by γεννήσας πατήρ and πατήρ τῶν ὅλων, etc. (also naturally by the phrase itself ποιητὴς καὶ πατήρ that is largely attested) and his *providential care*. The whole world including its parts is the work of God as Father and the field of his caring activity. Although some other aspects of God’s fatherly activity, such as his cooperation with his powers, his giving reward to those who follow his will, etc., gain less attention in this text-group, the overall image of God as Father in his relationships with man and the whole of creation, is portrayed in a highly positive light.

God’s fatherly activity in so-called minor phrase-references is described in continuation with the previous sub-group. The importance of the divine *creative* aspect is once more emphasized and given some additional nuance by coupling πατήρ with κτίστης, δημιουργός, and τεχνίτης. The other three designations ἀίδιος, ἀγενήτος, and αἰτιον paired with πατήρ point clearly to *what* the basis of God as Father’s creatorship and his continuous creative work is. The divine *authority* (already implied in the very fact of God is named as a Creator) that is closely related to his *overseeing* and *care* is another characteristic, that is connected with the divine fatherhood: πατήρ καὶ βασιλεύς, δεσπότης, ἐπίσκοπος, ἐπίτροπος. The soteriological aspect of the divine fatherhood (πατήρ καὶ σωτήρ) expressed in terms of *preservation* and *assistance* to one’s soul, reflects the general pattern employed by Philo to describe God’s saving activity. To this activity may also be ascribed the coupling of the title Father with ἱλεως, since in the only instance the phrase attested to it presents God’s fatherly mercy as an impediment to the erection of the tower of Babel. He did not allow the bricks-vices to be fortified. As in the previous case, Philo is concerned with the human soul. This issue appears to be the central point in coupling the title Father with ἀνὴρ, in which the latter term seems to merely strengthen the idea of the *creative* activity of the Father and, at the same time, to postulate his more *intimate relationship*

with one's soul. In fact, in all cases in which the title Father is associated with other designations by means of *καί* they seem just to highlight the specific fatherly characteristic in a particular context.

The outstanding positive character of the divine activity also marks the texts in which the Father is not given any further designation and which may be summed up under these three categories: *fatherly authority*, *merciful goodness*, and *bounteousness*. The first aspect dominates principally the non-human sphere: the Father is a true sovereign of the world, hence everything depend on his command. The second characteristic is developed in the biblical field: the first people, patriarchs, Moses; by referring to the biblical stories Philo not only specifies the role of the divine Father in the people's history, but also gives an interpretation on what it is based. The last feature is transferred to an exclusively individual sphere: the right personal relationships with the Father include both present and future reward.

Some other references to the fatherhood of God, which did not fit into any of above-mentioned three sub-groups of the 'father-texts', have been entitled as the 'specified references'; they build up the fourth sub-group. The *beneficent* and *virtuous* nature of the Father is his basic characteristic in those texts.

The 'son-texts' group is not as large as the previous one. In addition, not a few texts with the filial image are also shared by the 'father-texts' and similes. The active role of God as Father is not overly stressed, since the accent is put more on the actions and behavior of those who are referred to as the son(s) of God or who claim to be sons of God. Nevertheless, such classical characteristics of the divine Father as his *creative/begetting* activity, *ruling* authority, and *beneficence* are still clearly detectable.

The image of the divine Father as presented by similes is strongly shaped according to the OT pattern. Philo's employment of Deut 8:5 (3x) and Prov 3:11-12 (1x) clearly illustrates his conception of both how the sons of God should act and how important the divine *disciplining* is. The idea of God's *providential care* for his sons is also presented as well as his *guardianship* of all in connection with the image of the charioteer and pilot.

2) God's fatherly activity is differently portrayed in respect to its 'addressees'. Alternatively, the activity or attitude of those 'addressees', who are said to be in a relationship with the Father, adds a more complete picture of the divine fatherhood. Therefore, it seems wise to summarize the relationships between God as Father and four most recurring 'addressee' groups: the divine sphere, the Logos, heaven and the world, man/soul.

To the divine sphere belong the powers and angels who are at the disposition of God as Father. The reciprocal activity between the Father and them may be described in terms of cooperation: the divine powers stand on either side of the Father who converses with them.

Moreover, the Father allows them to participate in his creative work, though, in fact, he needs no additional help or cooperation. Similarly, the angels he created and which are at his service, play a certain role as mediators between the Father and the mortal, making known God's decrees to men and bringing men's needs before God.

God as Father has constituted the Logos that is his eldest son (also called first-born) to be the indissoluble bond of the universe, giving to it the gift to separate the creation from the Creator. The Logos being dedicated to the Father and imitating his ways has shaped different species looking to the archetypal patterns of the Father. Furthermore, the Logos as first-born is enabled to govern all things like a viceroy of the great king and also to play a decisive role in the management and preservation of the universe. Although the scarce references to the Logos in connection with God as Father indicate that its role is primarily instrumental, yet it is difficult to state clear limits between God and his Logos keeping in mind the whole Philonic corpus. As to the image of God as Father in our texts, the above-mentioned cooperation aspect of the fatherly activity is quite evident.

The role of the universe in a relationship with God as Father, who has created, governs, and takes care of it, is not only passive: it stimulates the man to inquire about the Father, serves as a proof of his existence, and allows one to arrive at the conception of its Father-Maker-Governor ('demonstrative' aspect); it praises and gives thanks to the Father, participates in the divine cult (vestments of the high priests; 'cultic' aspect). The world as a younger son of God is also assigned a function as an advocate to intercede with Him in favor of men ('mediating' aspect). Finally, a part of the creation (fixed or moving bodies in heaven) imitates the governing of the divine Father.

The last 'addressee' group, i.e. the man/soul, is the largest in number and variety of aspects of both the divine and human activity. God as Father is the Creator of the man, his soul and mind. He is responsible for the existence of virtuous ideas in the human soul. Since he is good and not jealous, he sows happiness in men's souls and gives the man, who follows his will, a share in his possessions: joy and satisfaction. It is his will that the souls of wise men should contemplate what the world has to show. He is the savior of man and his soul in terms of his assistance, help, and preservation. Moreover, both present and future reward awaits those who love God and make progress in their lives: they are allowed to behold the verities of wisdom and will be given the whole inheritance of the divine Father. Even to those who live a blameworthy life he gives time for reformation. His disciplining can appear quite severe, nonetheless, it is very profitable. As a true father he provides for his children and takes care of them. On the other hand, man/soul is portrayed as admiring, acknowledging, perceiving, rejoicing, honoring, hoping, pleasing, etc. the divine Father. Similarly, the life-purpose of the biblical personages

(Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses) is noted to have been to please him. The people of Israel (the Jews, Hebrews), who is also called ἀπαρχή acknowledges and honors God. The idea of *belonging* to God is generally expressed by προσκληρώω. It is associated with different ‘addressees’ like the soul, Moses, the people/Hebrews. Another important idea is, incidentally, connected not only with men (especially Moses) but also with the cosmic sphere, and the Logos is that of imitating (μιμέομαι) the divine Father. This theme in connection with God (not only the Father) is vastly attested by Philo. Since the imitation of the divine powers and virtues is a constituent part in the process of assimilation to God, it becomes one more witness to God’s beneficent character as Father who allows and encourages creation to draw closer to him. Inasmuch as the imitation is concerned with divine virtues, the moral aspect of the divine fatherhood is evidenced as well. Very little is said about those who have no knowledge of their Creator and Father, do not control properly their speech with regard to him, blaspheme, and abandon him; the human response to God as Father is basically portrayed in a positive manner.

In summary, the *creative-begetting* aspect, as Philo presents it, is one of the most important characteristics in the activity of God as Father. It dominates not only two sub-groups of the ‘father-texts’ (major and minor phrase-references), but also appears to play an essential role in the ‘son-texts’, though is absent in similes. The divine creative activity that is noetic and continuous in nature is also *beneficent* because of the *goodness* of God, the Creator. The fatherly *goodness* and *beneficence* is also implied in the activity of the ‘addressees’: they praise and give thanks to him. Similarly, this fundamental characteristic should be seen in God’s fatherly *providence/provision* and *care*, attested to both in the ‘father-texts’ and the similes, but even more so since it is closely connected with the activity of God as Maker. On the other hand, the terminology of *providence/provision* and *care* points, according to Philo, to both the responsibility of God as Creator and the natural duty of the earthly father; the amalgamation of them is evident in the activity of the divine Father. God’s *cooperation* with his creation also expresses his *beneficence* and *concern* for it, especially in the favor of men, whose wish to imitate the Father’s virtues and belong to him points to the *intimacy* or at least the *nearness* of the Father. Even the fatherly *authority*, that is referred to in the ‘father’ and ‘son’ texts, may also be seen in the similes expressed in terms of *disciplining* (this theme appears to be exclusively confined to the similes), which does not alter the overall positive image of God as Father.

III. THE IMAGE OF GOD AS FATHER IN QUMRAN TEXTS AND INTERTESTAMENTAL JEWISH WRITINGS

The placing of Qumran texts and other Jewish literature in the same chapter is not completely accidental. The writings of both groupings reflect the influence of the wider Hellenistic world their authors experienced; this even permits to consider them as different forms of the same Hellenistic Judaism without making a sharp difference between their origins whether they are Palestinian or belong to the Jews of the Diaspora.⁴⁴⁶ Furthermore, their theological multilateral language reveals a higher level of *religious* understanding of God if compared to the one in Philo's writings where rather *philosophical* approach dominates.

3.1. God as Father in Qumran

The Qumran scrolls contain also a number of fragments, which belong to the apocrypha of the OT or appear to be certain paraphrases of the biblical stories additionally to the biblical passages of the OT and various texts appropriate to Qumran community life. The theme of the divine fatherhood in those parabiblical texts does not emerge frequently, nevertheless, there are several texts which either explicitly, by the pattern of filial relationships, or by a simile refer to God's fatherly figure. There are also several minor possible references to God as Father, which have less importance because of their fragmentary state.

3.1.1. The Minor References to the Divine Fatherhood

There are three fragments presented by Baillet in which the extant/restored term **אב** may originally have been attributed to God. The earliest of them *Words of the Luminaries*^a (4Q504 1, III) comes from the middle of the second century B.C., the *Ritual of Marriage* (4Q502 39) was possibly written in the beginning of the first century B.C., and the *Songs of the Sage*^b (4Q511 127 [4QShir^b 127]) at the dawn of the Christian era. All of them were presumably used in certain liturgical practices: the document 4Q504 1 has even been called as 'recueil d'hymnes liturgiques'; the 4Q502 may have been a part of a wedding ritual; finally, the 4Q511 shows a number of similarities to the *Hodayot* texts, even suggesting the idea of their common

⁴⁴⁶ Cf. L. I. LEVINE, *Judaism and Hellenism in Antiquity: Conflict or Confluence?*, Seattle / London: University of Washington Press, 1998, p. 26. As regards the Qumran community, it is not clear when the contacts with the larger Hellenistic world (dualism, angelology, determinism, the solar calendar, celibacy, etc.) took place (presumably at the beginning of the community's formation); at any rate, the fact of such a process is undeniable (*ibid.* p. 20).

authorship.⁴⁴⁷ The liturgical background of the latter document is somewhat uncertain and depends on what position one assumes towards the liturgical *Sitz im Leben* as regards the *Hodayot*, i.e. whether these hymns/psalms may also, apart from reflecting their strong individual character, be given communal interpretation.⁴⁴⁸ However, these fragments correspondingly to their small size and fragmentation do not contribute much to the understanding of the image of God. The reconstructed texts ²...toute être vivant...³ [...]l (est) [notre] père... (4Q502 39, 2-3) and ¹...notre père...²...Tu [ne] regardes pas...³...manquant... (4Q511 127, 1)⁴⁴⁹ may possibly be viewed as pointing to the divine fatherhood with a mind to their liturgical application.⁴⁵⁰

The last restored reference אבִי '...père...' (4Q504 1, III, 1)⁴⁵¹ is isolated, and only considering the fatherly image of God, portrayed by filial relationships in subsequent verses in the same column (lines 4-7), may be supposed to have originally been applied to God.⁴⁵²

There are also two fragments in the book of Jubilees dated between the middle of the second and first century B.C., which may have contained references to God as Father and to Israel as God's first-born as it is presented in the Hebrew text reconstructed by VanderKam. The fatherhood of God is made plain by employing the terms אב and בן (4QJub^a = 4Q216 1, 28) and בן בכור (4QJub^a = 4Q216 2, 20).⁴⁵³ However, actual definitions for God and Israel are not found in the surviving fragments and are merely restored on the basis of the critical edition of Ethiopic Jubilees prepared and translated by the same author.⁴⁵⁴

⁴⁴⁷ Cf. M. BAILLET, *Qumrân grotte 4, III* (4Q 482 – 4Q 520), DJD VII, Oxford : Clarendon Press, 1982, pp. 81, 137, 219-220.

⁴⁴⁸ For the problematic discussion about the author(s), the conception of 'I', and eventually the *Sitz im Leben* of the *Hodayot*, see S. HOLM-NIELSEN, *Hodayot. Psalms from Qumran*, Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget, 1960, pp. 316-348. The author believes there should have been more than one author of those psalms (p. 324), and insists on their liturgical use within the Qumran community (p. 348). Differently, Delcor, considers them individual thanksgiving songs (*Danklieder*) having been composed by the 'Teacher of Righteousness'. Regarding their *Sitz im Leben* he strongly criticizes the proposal of Bo Reicke (psalms were basically composed for the cult) and less that of Bardtke (the psalms served didactic purposes). Although the author finds no psalm endowed with a special cultic framework, he admits some of them as possibly sung during the night service in the Qumran community (reading the Scripture and praying). On the other hand, he does not exclude their role in the field of individual piety; see M. DELCOR, *Les Hymnes de Qumran (Hodayot)*, Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1962, pp. 19-26.

⁴⁴⁹ BAILLET, *Qumrân grotte 4, III*, pp. 91, 257. These fragments are not included in the recent and comprehensive edition of the Dead Sea scrolls prepared by F. GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ, E. J. C. TIGCHELAAR, (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Study Edition*, 2 vol., Leiden: E. J. Brill – Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1997, 1998.

⁴⁵⁰ Cf. STROTMANN, „Mein Vater bist du!“ (*Sir 51,10*), p. 330.

⁴⁵¹ BAILLET, *Qumrân grotte 4, III*, pp. 141-142.

⁴⁵² Noteworthy, that this restoration “[...] אבִי 1” is given no translation “I...[...].” in GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ, TIGCHELAAR, (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, vol. 2, pp. 1014-1015.

⁴⁵³ See J. C. VANDERKAM, J. T. MILIK, “The First *Jubilees* Manuscript from Qumran Cave 4: A Preliminary Publication,” *JBL* 110 (2, 1991) 243-270, especially pp. 256, 266f., 269.

⁴⁵⁴ Cf. J. C. VANDERKAM, *The Book of Jubilees*, 2 vols. (CSCO 510-511, *Scriptores Aethiopici* 87-88), Louvain: E. Peeters, 1989, vol. 2 (CSCO 511), pp. 6, 13.

3.1.2. Divine Fatherhood Revealed by 'Father-Texts'

Excluding the minor references to the divine fatherhood, there are only three texts, which explicitly name God as Father (1QH IX, 35, 4Q372 1, 16, and 4Q460 9i, 6).

3.1.2.1. The God's Fatherly Characteristics in 1QH IX, 35b-36

The reference to the divine fatherhood in 1QH IX, 35 in the second part of the *Hodayot* scroll which presents the collection of the hymns of praise of the Qumran community and may roughly be dated between the second century B.C. and first century A.D. is well-legible: אִמְתָּכָה יִבְנֵי אֱלֹהִים לְכֹל – *because you are father to all the [son]s of your truth* (line 35b).⁴⁵⁵ This reference used to be for a long time the only Qumran datum on this point.⁴⁵⁶ The phrase of confidence in God's fatherhood, a continuation and immediate explanation of *for my 35 father did not know me, and my mother abandoned me to you*, is just the beginning of a longer declaration of his fatherly-motherly attitude towards his sons and all creation: *You rejoice 36 in them, like her who loves her child, and like a wet-nurse you take care of all your creatures on (your) lap*. These words conclude the psalm whose beginning however is not so clear: it is disputable whether columns 8 and 9 should be viewed as one psalm or 1QH IX, 2-36 is to be taken as an independent unit.⁴⁵⁷ The definition of the characteristic feature of divine fatherhood in lines 35-36 may vary according to the accentuated expressions: the wet-nurse care for the members of community,⁴⁵⁸ the readiness of God the Father to help in time of need,⁴⁵⁹ his tenderness and efficacious protection⁴⁶⁰ to those who are faithful to him and, finally, his all-encompassing care for all his creatures. This last aspect implicitly points to the divine and fatherly authority that characterizes the rights and responsibilities of the earthly father of that period. Apart from these very obvious functions of the divine Father, a painstaking analysis of 1Q IX, 35b-36 and of its preceding context done by Strotmann sheds more light on God's fatherly figure. The following presentation is based on her investigation of this topic.⁴⁶¹

The statement that God is Father *to all the [son]s* of his truth (line 35b) finds its further explanation and development in line 36. It is very probable that this verse broadens the sphere of

⁴⁵⁵ If not stated otherwise, the Hebrew and English texts of this paragraph are taken from GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ, TIGCHELAAR, (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, vol. 1, pp. 182-183.

⁴⁵⁶ Cf. for instance JEREMIAS, *The Prayers of Jesus*, p. 19; MARCHEL, *Abba, Père!*, p. 86; de BOER, *Fatherhood and Motherhood*, p. 16; SCHLOSSER, *Le Dieu de Jésus*, p. 116; S. A. PANIMOLLE, "La paternità di Dio nei documenti letterari dell'Antico giudaismo," in *DSBP* 1, pp. 69-70.

⁴⁵⁷ For different opinions and the problematics of the individual and communal character of this thanksgiving praise-psalm (*Lehrerlieder, Gemeindelieder*) see STROTMANN, „*Mein Vater bist du!*“ (*Sir 51,10*), pp. 338-339.

⁴⁵⁸ Cf. DELCOR, *Les Hymnes de Qumran*, p. 223.

⁴⁵⁹ Cf. JEREMIAS, *The Prayers of Jesus*, p. 19.

⁴⁶⁰ Cf. SCHLOSSER, *Le Dieu de Jésus*, p. 116.

⁴⁶¹ For a detailed analysis see STROTMANN, „*Mein Vater bist du!*“ (*Sir 51,10*), pp. 340-359.

its application while explaining *how* the divine fatherhood affects the faithful ones, i.e., God is Father of the all creatures as well. Thus line 36 shows the distinction between two groups of addressees: on the one hand, God is Father to his faithful sons inasmuch as he presents himself as *loving* and as *taking care* of them because they are the part of his creatures; on the other hand, God's manifestation as Father to the rest of his creation is limited only to his *taking care* of it. Such a distinction of God's fatherly attitude does not contradict those groups but only makes more apparent the privilege of being ranked in the first category. Although a collective understanding of the divine fatherhood is explicitly stated, its individual dimension cannot be excluded. The statement in line 35 tells about one's abandonment by his father and mother, it is very personal, and possibly it is grounded on individual experience; therefore, it seems plausible to consider the acknowledgment of the divine fatherhood to be valid on the personal level as well.

A female presentation of the divine Father and his rejoicing over his children are not common in Jewish writings of that period; although female feelings and emotions are not totally foreign to the God of the OT. This is especially true about Isa 42:14; 49:15; 66:13; Jer 31:20. It is very probable that Isa 49:14-15 served as a *Vorlage* for 1QH IX, 36 as the theme of abandonment is also connected with מרחם. The divine guarantee in Isa 49:15 portrayed by a female comparison had to convince the exiles that, the deprivation of their state and their actual humiliating conditions that had been provoked by their sins, in any way did not mean the total rejection of Israel. Although God's fatherly faithfulness to his people is not expressed so explicitly in our text as in the use of מרחם of Second Isaiah, it could hardly be interpreted otherwise than as one's conviction that God is the only one he can trust. The description of God who is Father but rejoices as *eine Frau, die gerade geboren hat* (so Strotmann), in the light of Isa 49:14-15 and Ps 103:13 (also רחם) reveals both: the spontaneous and emotional love of God for the sons of his truth that has been expressed best in a motherly simile (cf. Isa 49:15), and his responsible and protective love referring to the pattern of the earthly father (cf. Ps 103:13). The fact that the fatherhood of God in 1Q IX, 35 is not directly connected with מרחם, as it is the earthly simile in Ps 103:13, may indicate that the dominant aspect of the divine mercy appealed to in 1Q IX, 34 is responsible self-commitment of father that prevails over his spontaneous yet faithful love. Nevertheless, the aspect of faithfulness of the divine Father in 1Q IX, 35b-36 due to the comparison with Isa 49:15 is expressed more profoundly by the image of mother. The comparison of God's activity with the functions of אימן discloses one more important aspect of the divine fatherhood: the care for all creatures including the sons of his truth consists in

nutrition and protection.⁴⁶² Thus the feminine presentation of the divine activity expresses his fatherly responsibility for the life of his creation once more. In addition, the image of a *wet-nurse* perfectly presents the level of everyone's weakness and dependence on God as Father.

Although the theme of divine education is not explicitly stated in connection with the fatherhood of God, and there is not even a particular term for it in 1Q IX, the divine reprimands (lines 9, 23, 24, 33), judgment (lines 9, 10, 31, 34), and afflictions (lines 9, 10, 12, 25) together with one's offense (line 13), and finally God's kindness and mercy (lines 10-13, 34) mentioned, enable us to discern some pattern already known in the OT: God afflicts and forgives; furthermore, the divine affliction is sometimes interweaved with his educative goal (cf. 2Sam 7:14; Prov 3:12). Since the theme of the divine fatherhood positively concludes the whole psalm, the image of God who rebukes, judges, and afflicts, but who is also a savior (lines 25-29), who has supported the suppliant from his youth (line 32) and has had pity on him (line 34), gradually turns into the image of the Father whose punitive activity finally proves to be his loving and responsible education.

3.1.2.2. *God as Father in 4Q372 1 and 4Q460 9i*⁴⁶³

The direct and explicit personal address to God as Father – אבִי is the distinctive feature of these two fragments. Furthermore, not only the phrases in which the divine fatherhood is stated אבִי ואֱלֹהֵי (Apocryphon of Joseph^b 4Q372 known also as *Psalm of Joseph*) and אבִי ואֲדֹנִי (Narrative Work and Prayer 4Q460) are similar, the both cases present the common theme of *non-abandoning* the one who prays: *My father, my God, do not abandon me into the hands of the nations* (4Q372 1, 16) and *for you have not abandoned your servant] my Father and my Lord. vacat* (4Q460 9i, 5-6). There also are some other similarities between these fragments: the texts that refer to the divine fatherhood belong to the psalmic poetry and possibly were used in the liturgy;⁴⁶⁴ on paleographic grounds both fragments may be dated to the late Hasmonean or early Herodian period; finally, they both present no specific signs of their Qumran sectarian

⁴⁶² Both of these features may also be retraced in Num 11:12 in which the context of 'eating' in the desert is coupled with God's promises to bring the people to the promised land.

⁴⁶³ In the preliminary concordance the numbering of the fragments of this document was different: our fragment was counted as fifth; cf. B. Z. WACHOLDER, M. G. ABEGG, *A Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew and Aramaic Texts from Cave Four*, vol. 3, Biblical Archeological Society, Washington, 1995, 344-347. The present numbering is given by E. LARSON, "460. 4QNarrative Work and Prayer," in S. J. PFANN, P. ALEXANDER, et al. (eds.), *Qumran Cave 4, XXVI. Cryptic Texts, Miscellanea, Part 1*, DJD XXXVI, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000, 369-386.

⁴⁶⁴ This is especially true for 4Q372 1.

provenience.⁴⁶⁵ The identity of those whose prayers are recorded and the occasions why they were created is not clear, yet they seem to be different in each case.

The speaking subjects in the *Narrative Work and Prayer* (4Q460) as a whole may point to either the patriarchs or kings or even some prophet.⁴⁶⁶ Such an uncertainty also remains in 4Q460 9i. Neither the prayer in the first part of this fragment (lines 2-6) in which one addresses God, nor the second part in which the addressee is Israel (lines 7-12) gives us any mention about the identity of the speaking subject. Moreover, since the *vacat* at the end of line 6 marks the end of the section, the speaking subject in the subsequent section may have not necessarily been the same as in the previous one. Nevertheless, there is a point that sheds some light on the issue in line 5: *for you have not abandoned your servant*. It would be more reasonable to see in the figure of עֶבֶד (*servant*) the individual who prays rather than Israel, which is only mentioned in the second part (lines 7-12), though the latter possibility in the sight of the OT⁴⁶⁷ cannot be excluded.⁴⁶⁸ In any case a further specification would be highly speculative. Since this fragment as well as others in 4Q460 shows similarity to the *Hodayot*⁴⁶⁹ it is plausible to think about its communal or personal liturgical application in the Qumran community.

The speaker of the poetic part of *Apocryphon of Joseph*^b (4Q372 1, 16-32) is more evident. Although there is no explicit mention of Joseph, his name has already been used in the first (narrative) part in lines 10 and 14. The latter reference in line 14 is particularly suggestive for it connects the figure of Joseph, who was consigned to hostile hands, with the beginning of the prayer: *and he cried out [and aloud]* (line 15) and *he called to God the Mighty to save him from their hands and he said: My father, my God, do not abandon me into the hands of the nations* (line 16). However, the identity of Joseph who cries for help is not instantly recognizable: does it indicate the favorite son of the patriarch Jacob (Gen 37:39-45) or should it be understood only as a figurative language denoting the northern tribes of Israel and their descendants (cf. Josh 16:1-17:8)? If one were to adhere to the latter possibility and to admit that *Joseph* who prays in the second part, is representative of the exiled northern tribes, then the first part of the fragment may be read in the Deuteronomistic historical key according to the scheme

⁴⁶⁵ Though there is a possibility to see another reference to the divine fatherhood in 4Q372 1, 26 יהוה אלהי ואב[ר]ך by reading ׀ instead of ׀, yet according to Schuller the restoration with ׀ is more likely. In a more recent edition of García Martínez there is no restoration in line 26: [...]...[.] ואב[ר]ך; GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ, TIGCHELAAR, (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, vol. 1, p. 736; cf. E. M. SCHULLER, "4Q372 1: A Text About Joseph," *RevQ* 14 (55, 1990), pp. 349-355, 365; LARSON, "460. 4QNarrative Work and Prayer," DJD XXXVI, pp. 370, 372, 382-3; E. M. SCHULLER, "The Psalm of 4Q372 1 Within the Context of Second Temple Prayer," *CBQ* 54 (1, 1992), pp. 67-70. In the latter article Schuller instead of *my father, my God* translates *my father and my God*.

⁴⁶⁶ Cf. LARSON, "460. 4QNarrative Work and Prayer," DJD XXXVI, p. 374.

⁴⁶⁷ Cf. Isa 41:8-9; 44:21; 49:3; Ps 136:22.

⁴⁶⁸ Cf. LARSON, "460. 4QNarrative Work and Prayer," DJD XXXVI, p. 383.

⁴⁶⁹ *Ibid.* p. 372.

sin-exile-return.⁴⁷⁰ This way the psalm is a real supplication of the people, which, having abandoned Lord's ways, try to recover God's confidence in the face of grief and suffering.⁴⁷¹ On the other hand, this psalm may reflect the post-exilic discussion within the different Jewish groups about who were the true descendants of Joseph and may have even been directed against the Samaritans.⁴⁷² The cry of individual or collective *Joseph* of the Second Temple period always shows a structural affinity close to the classical individual lament that possibly was given its actualization in the Qumran community: there is a plea (line 16), the theme of suffering (lines 20-21), and the confidence in the divine deliverance with the 'vow of praise' (lines 22-31).

The image of God as Father in both fragments is principally the same: both psalmists appeal to God's fatherly fidelity using the same term עִזַּב (*forsake, abandon*) plus a negation 'not' thus once more confirming this biblical aspect of God's fatherly image.⁴⁷³ In 4Q460 9i, 5 it is the only characteristic of the divine Father. As has already been pointed out, line 6 with אֲבִי וְאֵדִי concludes the section, so the juxtaposition *non-abandoning* to the fatherhood of God at the very end of the prayer underlines the importance of this fatherly characteristic as at least the psalmist understood it. The same fatherly aspect in 4Q372 1, 16 is given its further explanation in line 17: *do justice for me, lest the afflicted and poor perish*. As in the case of Sir 23:1 so also here the *non-abandoning* seems to have been understood as the first step of divine salvation, and more so since it is anchored on the invocation אֲבִי וְאֵלֹהִי that sets the tone for the whole prayer.

The double personal appeal to the Father and to the Lord אֲבִי וְאֵדִי (4Q460 9i)⁴⁷⁴ or God אֲבִי וְאֵלֹהִי (4Q372 1) probably reflects the two sides of the psalmist's experience: the *strong* hand of God by which he was saved or through which he is hoping to be saved and also God's fatherly disposition towards him that proves itself in *non-abandoning* him.⁴⁷⁵ The sixfold list of

⁴⁷⁰ Cf. SCHULLER, "4Q372 1: A Text About Joseph," pp. 367-370.

⁴⁷¹ Cf. J. V. ALLEGUE, "¡Abba Padre! (4Q372 1, 16). Dios como Padre en Qumrán," *EstTrin* 32 (1998), p.177.

⁴⁷² The dating of 4Q372 1 to the late Hasmonean or early Herodian period does not reflect the actual date of the composition of this psalm. According to Schuller it was probably composed circa 200 B.C. For a full discussion see SCHULLER, "4Q372 1: A Text About Joseph," pp. 371-376.

⁴⁷³ Cf. above with Sir 23:1 in chapter 1, 2.1.3.

⁴⁷⁴ As the beginning of line 5 is not preserved it is impossible to know whether אֲבִי וְאֵדִי should be taken as invocation or as a simple acknowledgment.

⁴⁷⁵ Schuller also speaks about the twofold 'strong-kind' aspect that may be drawn from *my father and my God* in 4Q372 1, 16. The author observes that the subsequent lines of the psalm give credit to such an interpretation: *strong* – "[your fin]ger is greater and stronger than anything in the world" (line 18); *kind* – "your mercies are abundant your kindness great" (line 19); SCHULLER, "The Psalm of 4Q372 1 Within the Context of Second Temple Prayer," p. 79. It is possible that a certain tendency to relate the theme of *non-abandoning* to the fatherhood of God in the late biblical literature (Sir 23:1; 51:10) and our cases (also observed by Schuller) reflects the growing understanding about the significance of such a characteristic as being proper to the fatherly attitude of God. This way the *non-abandoning* attitude in the logical order is the source of God's fatherly mercies and kindness and not vice versa.

adjectives in 4Q372 1, 29: *For God is great, holy, mighty and majestic, awesome and marvelous*⁴⁷⁶ may be viewed as a complementary to the designation of God as Father.⁴⁷⁷

3.1.3. Divine Fatherhood Revealed by Filial Relationship

There are merely two texts in which God's fatherly figure is presented by the pattern of filial relationships (4Q246 II, 1 and 4Q504 1, III, 4-7 [4QDibHam^a 3, 1]).

3.1.3.1. The Message of 4Q504 1, III, 4-7

The idea of Israel's uniqueness as God's son in this fragment is strongly highlighted by triple בן. The prayer enumerates God's works: 4 *We have [in]voked only your name; for your glory you have created us; 5 you have established us as your sons in the sight of all the peoples. For you called 6 [I]srael «my son, my first-born» and have corrected us as one corrects 7 his son.*⁴⁷⁸ The biblical motives of creation (ברא – in line 4 and Isa 43:1, 7) and disciplining (יסר – line 6 and Deut 8:5) the first-born (son) Israel (בני בכורי – line 6 and Exod 4:22) together with idea of adoption in these lines are quite evident and add actually nothing new to the biblical image of the divine Father.⁴⁷⁹ It is worth noting, however, that the two biblical aspects of the divine fatherhood, i.e. salvific (Exod 4:22) and educational (Deut 8:5) are juxtaposed. If the author did it deliberately, keeping in mind their proper contexts, he wished to fashion them as far as possible to express his confidence in the positive end of the God-Israel/community relationships. Since salvation (from misery as well), continuous care, and disciplining (including precautionary *In-Zucht-nehmen*⁴⁸⁰) were certainly held as the main activities of God the Father, the appeal to them in the light of Israel's fall⁴⁸¹ and of the divine anger⁴⁸² may have been

⁴⁷⁶ All these designations for God seem to be a certain widening of the biblical traditional formulation (cf. Deut 7:21; 10:17; Jer 32:18; Neh 1:5; 4:8; 9:32; Dan 9:4) from the deuteronomistic background; their adjoining does not violate the traditional presentation on the transcendence of God; cf. SCHULLER, "The Psalm of 4Q372 1 Within the Context of Second Temple Prayer," pp.72-75.

⁴⁷⁷ Cf. ALLEGUE, "Abba Padre! (4Q372 1, 16)," p. 182.

⁴⁷⁸ If not stated otherwise the English texts in this paragraph are taken from GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ, TIGCHELAAR, (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, vol. 2, p. 1015. In this translation יבנים that in the Hebrew text belongs to line 4 is transferred to line 5. Baillet's translation retains the original order: '4...Tu nous as créés, et de fils 5 Tu nous as donné le rang aux yeux de toutes les nations'. BAILLET, *Qumrân grotte 4, III*, p. 142.

⁴⁷⁹ For a wider consideration of Israel's creation, election, and disciplining see chapter 1.

⁴⁸⁰ Strotmann uses this phrase in connection with a precautionary aspect of divine education: do not allow the people to take a position opposite to God. The second aspect of that education is to let the Israelites know that God takes care and loves them; cf. STROTMANN, „Mein Vater bist du!“ (Sir 51,10), p. 334.

⁴⁸¹ This is suggested by lines 13b-17: 'so that evil would [over]take us in the last 14 days. Because [...] 15 and our kings, for [...] 16 to take [our] daughters [...] 17 and they acted pervertedly with [...]'.
⁴⁸² Lines 10b-11: *For that reason you have poured on us your rage 11 [and] your [jealousy]sy with all the intensity of your anger.*

prompted by the particular needs of the community on the day of the confession of sins.⁴⁸³ Thus, though this column of the document has no conclusion, the mention of God's justice at the end of fragment⁴⁸⁴ leaves a possibility to speculate about the positive end of this liturgical text.

3.1.3.2. The 'Son of God' Text: 4Q246, II, 1

The Aramaic fragment 4Q246 known as the *Aramaic Apocalypse* or 'Son of God' text has been subjected to lengthy discussions and controversial interpretations especially as regards the figure of the son of God which is attested in line 1 of the second column of the document: יְהוָה בְּרַחֲמֵי אֱלֹהִים יִקְרָא – *Il sera dit le fils de Dieu et le fils du Tres-Haut on l'appellera*.⁴⁸⁵ The English rendering of the Aramaic text: *He will be called son of God, and they will call him son of the Most High*.⁴⁸⁶ The dating of the document to the last third of the first century (circa 25 B.C.) being proposed before its publication by Milik, has been generally accepted by scholars.⁴⁸⁷ The second column, which contains our text, is well preserved but the first one is considerably damaged and it is really difficulty to interpret the text of the second column as it is closely connected with the first one. Despite this, a general scenario in both columns may be presented as follows. Column I: there are two personages and one of them interprets another's (king's) dream; the content of that interpretation is not very clear, yet it refers to the oppression that will come, the carnage in the cities, the kings of Ashur and Egypt, and the emergence of the one who will be great and will be called by this name. Column II: it seems to continue with the titles of the personage mentioned in the first column – he will be called the son of God and son of the Most High; then there will be a short rule of those who will crush everything until the people of God will arise and will establish peace; then (his, its = people?) kingdom will be everlasting, (he, it) will judge the earth; peace will be everywhere and (his, its) strength will be God himself and everybody will pay (him, it) homage; then there will

⁴⁸³ Cf. BAILLET, *Qumrân grotte 4, III*, p. 137. According to the author, the document 4Q504 1 was used in a liturgical service throughout the whole week; the text in our column would have been recited on Friday, the day of the confession of sins.

⁴⁸⁴ Line 20: *You are just for [...]*.

⁴⁸⁵ The first official publication of the entire document was done by É. PUECH, "Fragment d'une Apocalypse en araméen (4Q246=pseudo-Dan)" et le « Royaume de Dieu », *RB* 99 (1, 1992) 98-131. For the whole Aramaic text and its French rendering see *ibid.*, pp. 106-109.

⁴⁸⁶ The translation is taken from GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ, TIGCHELAAR, (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, vol. 1, p. 495. The other English renderings of this line are substantially the same; cf. F. GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ, *Qumran and Apocalyptic. Studies on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran* (STDJ 9), Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1992, p. 164; J. A. FITZMYER, "4Q246: The 'Son of God' Document from Qumran," *Bib* 74 (1, 1993), p. 155; J. J. COLLINS, *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature*, New York: Doubleday, 1995, p. 155; F. M. CROSS, "Notes on the Doctrine of the Two Messiahs at Qumran and the Extracanonical Daniel Apocalypse (4Q246)," in D. W., PARRY, S. D. RICKS (eds.), *Current Research and Technological Developments on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1996, p. 7.

⁴⁸⁷ Cf. GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ, *Qumran and Apocalyptic*, p. 162; PUECH, "Fragment d'une Apocalypse en araméen," p. 105; FITZMYER, "4Q246: The 'Son of God' Document from Qumran," p. 156; COLLINS, *The Scepter and the Star*, p. 154.

be a war in which God will battle on (his, its) side and will cast all the nations before him (it); then (his, its) sovereignty will be an everlasting sovereignty. Although the eschatological-apocalyptic character of the text is quite visible and have some parallels with biblical Dan 3:33; 4:31; 7:14; 7:27, scholars disagree on what extent the text may be dependent on Daniel and especially how the figures of the son of man in Daniel and the son of God in the *Aramaic Apocalypse* should be interpreted, as well as what they represent with regard to the people of the holy ones (Dan 7:27) and the people of God (4Q246, II, 4). These and other uncertainties⁴⁸⁸ in 4Q246 have prompted a whole range of different interpretations. They have been evaluated and even reciprocally criticized essentially by García Martínez,⁴⁸⁹ Puech,⁴⁹⁰ Fitzmyer,⁴⁹¹ and Collins.⁴⁹² There are arguments *for* and *against* every interpretation, yet the least probable of all appears to be the one which interprets it as the vision of the son of God and son of the Most High the figure of a certain Jewish Antichrist (so Flusser). There are four principal directions of interpretation:

1. The mysterious personage whom the honorific titles have been applied to is intended to be a historical Seleucid king, Alexander Balas, son of Antiochus Epiphanes (so Milik) or even Antiochus Epiphanes himself (so Puech). In this case the usurpation of the titles is seen in a negative sense; the people of God (col. II, 5-9) will be restored and guided by God himself or his angel. The third singular suffix from col. II, 5 onwards may refer to a certain personage in a collective sense.⁴⁹³
2. The son of God and son of the Most High is an eschatological heavenly personage, an almost divinized Messiah who through the power of God will bring salvation, judge the

⁴⁸⁸ García Martínez underlines three most important elements which one should clarify to understand the meaning of 4Q246: the uncertainty about the character of the future events (historical or apocalyptic); the identity of the mysterious personage who is given the titles (including how he is presented – positively or negatively); to whom refer the third singular suffix from II, 5 onwards (to the people or the mysterious personage); cf. GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ, *Qumran and Apocalyptic*, p. 168. Puech adds some more questions: “Qui parle? devant quel roi? Dieu, un roi païen, un davidide? Le personnage mystérieux est-il le/un fils du roi, un roi et lequel? un ange, l’Antichrist?”; PUECH, “Fragment d’une Apocalypse en araméen,” p. 123. Fitzmyer summarizes and speaks about the sixfold difficulty of interpreting the text: “(a) Who is the speaker and whom does he address? (b) Are the references to the ‘king of Assyria’ and to ‘Egypt’ and the plurals being used allusions to historical figures or situations, or are they references similar to ‘the Kittim of Assyria’ and ‘the Kittim in Egypt’ in another apocalyptic text, IQM 1.2.4? (c) If they are to be taken in an apocalyptic sense rather than in a historical sense, can one say to whom they refer? (d) Who is X, the person of whom the titles are used? (e) Is X to be understood in a positive or negative sense? (f) To who does the third singular masculine in 2,5-9 refer? Is it the ‘people of God’ (2,4) or X, the expected person?” FITZMYER, “4Q246: The ‘Son of God’ Document from Qumran,” p.167.

⁴⁸⁹ Cf. GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ, *Qumran and Apocalyptic*, pp. 168-172.

⁴⁹⁰ Cf. PUECH, “Fragment d’une Apocalypse en araméen,” pp. 123-125; see also his “246. 4QApocryphe de Daniel ar,” in G. BROOKE, et al. (eds.), *Qumran Cave 4, XVII. Parabiblical Texts, Part 3*, DJD XXII, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996, pp. 179-180.

⁴⁹¹ Cf. FITZMYER, “4Q246: The ‘Son of God’ Document from Qumran,” pp.167-170.

⁴⁹² Cf. COLLINS, *The Scepter and the Star*, pp. 155-157.

⁴⁹³ Cf. PUECH, “Fragment d’une Apocalypse en araméen,” pp. 127-130; also “Notes sur le Fragment d’Apocalypse 4Q246 – « Le Fils de Dieu »,” *RB* 101 (4, 1994), pp. 548-552, and “246. 4QApocryphe de Daniel ar,” in DJD XXII, pp. 181-183. It is possible to note that the author does not devote himself completely to such an interpretation; he also sees good reasons for the messianic explanation of the text.

earth etc. (third singular suffix col. II, 5-9). He is similar to the figure of Melchizedek of 11QMelch or to the son of man of Dan 7.⁴⁹⁴

3. The text speaks positively about the future Jewish ruler, perhaps of the Hasmonean dynasty, who will be a successor to the Davidic throne without, however, being envisaged as a Messiah. To him eventually should be attributed the activity described in col. II, 5-9.⁴⁹⁵
4. The text announces the coming of the Messiah whose divine sonship should be understood in terms of the biblical pattern: he is a human being who stands in a special relationship to God as a Davidic king.⁴⁹⁶

The first two interpretations add little to the concept of the divine Father in the fragments of Qumran. The last two are similar as they both interpret the son of God and son of the Most High in a historical and positive sense. The difference as to whether the titles reflect the messianic character of the future Davidic king or not⁴⁹⁷ changes nothing as regards his relationship to God, at least as the document presents it. The text gives us just one characteristic those relationships reflect: *the great God is his strength* (col. II, 7). If we accept that in col. II, 5-9 the third person singular is to be understood as the son of God, then the phrase *the great God is his strength* (line 7) pointing primarily to the king's power over the nations and their subjection (lines 8-9) may also be regarded as the focal point of his every activity: judging the earth in truth (line 5-6), assuring peace (line 6), and receiving homage from every province (line 7). The biblical pattern as it is presented in Ps 2 and Ps 89 is easily recognizable in the analyzed text. Likewise in the OT, in this current text the denomination of the king as the son of God reveals the dependence of his welfare and victories upon the divine authority.

⁴⁹⁴ Cf. GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ, *Qumran and Apocalyptic*, pp. 172-179. In a later publication the author defends his position yet recognizes that the term 'angelic' he used earlier to describe the nature of the eschatological messiah was not very appropriate, thus changes it to 'heavenly' which may mean human and heavenly at the same time as in case of Melchizedek; see the article in "Two Messianic Figures in the Qumran Texts," in D. W., PARRY, S. D. RICKS (eds.), *Current Research and Technological Developments on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1996, 14-40, esp. pp. 27-30.

⁴⁹⁵ Cf. FITZMYER, "4Q246: The 'Son of God' Document from Qumran," pp. 171-174.

⁴⁹⁶ Cf. COLLINS, *The Scepter and the Star*, pp. 163-169; cf. also CROSS, "Notes on the Doctrine of the Two Messiahs at Qumran," pp. 10-13. Collins observes that in an apocalyptic context the distinction between divine and human is somewhat fluid and the designations son of God and son of the Most High may imply that the entitled personage "is not an ordinary mortal." (p. 168).

⁴⁹⁷ At this point the citation of 2 Sam 7:14 in 4Q174, I, 11 [4QFlor] along with a new interpretative application of the divine fatherhood is very helpful: "I will be a father to him and he will be a son to me. This (refers to the) «branch of David», who will arise with the Interpreter of the law who 12 [will rise up] in Zi[on in] the [l]ast days...". GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ, TIGCHELAAR, (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, vol. 1, p. 353. Thus the identification of one to whom God promises to be a father with the 'branch' that in its turn is called the Messiah of Righteousness in 4Q252 [4QpGen] allows speaking about the future Davidic king (the son of God and son of the Most High) in messianic terms; cf. COLLINS, *The Scepter and the Star*, p. 164.

3.1.4. Divine Fatherhood Revealed by Similes

There are two texts in which the term אב is put into comparison (כאב): in one fragment God is explicitly compared with a father (4Q379 18, 4); in the other one the divine subject (4Q378 6i, 8) may only be supposed. These fragments belong to the two versions of the *Apocryphon of Joshua*^{a-b} (4Q378-379), which represent a certain example of the rewritten Bible and may be dated from the second (4Q379) to the late first (4Q378) century B.C.⁴⁹⁸ The simile in *Apocryphon of Joshua*^b (4Q379 18, 4) gives evidence to the fatherhood of God, also it bears witness to another important idea. Although the fragmentary sentence א ל[היית לי אבני]ן כאב א – *to]be for me, O o[ur] Lord, like a father*⁴⁹⁹ has neither a beginning nor a conclusion, its inner meaning is enough clear: one is appealing to this God of o[urs] to be/act towards him like a father. A plea to God to be/act as a father in favor of a certain individual is a real novelty compared even with the biblical image of the divine Father. The problem is that the fragment gives no further explanation about the *content* that had been meant by this appeal, i.e. what may have been addressed to as God's fatherly characteristic in a particular context. Nevertheless, there are some indications in the text, which in connection with line 4 may be useful with some suggestion: *I will trust in you* (line 3), *God your words I will guard* (line 5), *in the decr[ee] of Elyon you have given understanding* (line 6), *I will show trustworthy with [all] your words* (line 7). Newsom points out that the diction of lines 4-7 is evocative of the Ps 19 and Ps 119, and if the speaker is supposed to be Joshua the inspiration for the text may have been Josh 1:8 where the importance of Torah and the necessity to do all that is written in it is strongly stressed.⁵⁰⁰ The fatherhood of God in Ps 19 and Ps 119 is not referred to, yet the prayer's attitude towards God's words and statutes is stated in similar but more expressive way if compared to the fragment analyzed (especially Ps 119). Furthermore, the content of the prayer's appeal in Ps 19:12-13 is very explicit: to be cleared from hidden faults and protected from presumptuous sins. The plea in Ps 119 is even more persistent: the main accent is over and over again placed on the importance of one who is taught the divine statutes and given understanding of the divine precepts.⁵⁰¹ The traditional cry for salvation from the wicked, begging for the deliverance and life, is submitted and employed to weight of highlight these ideas. This enables one to suppose that the appeal to God to be/act as a father in our text may also have been intended in this sense, i.e., to teach his statutes and to give understanding to his words. If it is true, it will be the first

⁴⁹⁸ Cf. C. NEWSOM, "Apocryphon of Joshua," in G. BROOKE, et al. (eds.), *Qumran Cave 4, XVII. Parabiblical Texts, Part 3*, DJD XXII, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996, 237-288, pp. 237, 241, 263.

⁴⁹⁹ The Hebrew and English text has been presented by NEWSOM, "Apocryphon of Joshua," pp. 275-276.

⁵⁰⁰ Cf. NEWSOM, "Apocryphon of Joshua," p. 276.

⁵⁰¹ It may be noted that of 9 cases the form למדני (teach me) is employed in the OT the 7 are in Ps 119.

case God's fatherhood is so clearly associated with his teaching faculty.⁵⁰² The meaning of the simile כֹּאֵב in *Apocryphon of Joshua*^a (4Q378 6i, 8) is much more obscure than in the previous case. The occasion of the phrases in the manuscript as well as the identity of the speaker burdens the interpretation. As well as in 4Q379 the verse containing comparison is without a beginning and a conclusion: יִדְבֹּרְךָ [] מִה וְכֹאֵב לִבִּי יִדְבֹּרְךָ [] d[]mh and like a father would speak to his son.⁵⁰³ The other problem is the absence of the subject who is addressing his son. The preceding verses give no indication of the presence of the divine subject. The analysed verse is the last one in this fragment and seems to have little sense in connection with the preceding ones whose content consists of the references to *a prayer on behalf of our sins* (line 4), to *do not be like my brothers [who] go down* (line 5), to *your [gu]ilt*, and to *woe to you my brothers* (line 7). According to Newsom these pessimistic phrases may have been a part of a certain admonition, modeled in a manner similar to the Moses' discourse in Deut 1-3, and given by Joshua because of the people's reluctance to enter the land (Num 13-14). Such admonition probably consisted of the remembrance of the rebellions in the wilderness and served to motivate the people before they had to cross the Jordan.⁵⁰⁴ This does not yet resolve the problem of the subject in line 8 but it gives at least an idea of the possible context of our phrase. In the Moses' speech in Deut 1:31 there is a comparison whose subject is very clear: *and in the wilderness, where you saw how the LORD your God carried you, just as one carries a child*. This verse in Deuteronomy constitutes part of the recollection of reprimands to the people given by Moses because of its lack of confidence in God's promises and its reluctance to enter the promised land. If it is possible explanation of current fragment, the figure of the father who speaks to his son may have been intended to be God who accompanied his people in the wilderness and spoke to it through Moses. The trace of such *God's speaking to his people in the wilderness* tradition is also visible in a prophetic announcement (Hos 2:16). Some support for the hypothesis may perhaps be found even in the following fragment: *J for ever his deeds; for to its ages* (line 6). This abrupt verse stands between two statements (lines 5 and 7 see above), which both refer to the miserable situation of *my brothers*. If, as it has been suggested, the speaker should be understood as Joshua, line 6 may have served as a certain admonition that pointed to God's deeds, which endure forever. Thus *my brothers* is nothing more than a figurative expression of Israel which relationship with God is compared to filial 'Father-son' rapports. Another point for this interpretative line might be the similarity of vocabulary of 4Q378 compared with 4Q379 and 4Q460 in which the word 'father' clearly refers to the divine fatherhood, even though the terms

⁵⁰² The OT image of the divine Father who disciplines and corrects his son(s) *in praxis* may have already intended his fatherly teaching; nevertheless, there is no text in the OT that presents it explicitly.

⁵⁰³ NEWSOM, "Apocryphon of Joshua," pp. 247-248.

⁵⁰⁴ Cf. NEWSOM, "Apocryphon of Joshua," p. 247.

and parallels in these documents do not prove the dependence of one work on another.⁵⁰⁵ Thus, if the simile of the *father's speaking to his son* in our fragment refers to God as Father, it confirms the salvific and educational aspect of the divine fatherhood with which the desert experience had usually been connected.

* * *

Having made the distinction in this brief study between the 'father-texts' and the texts in which the divine fatherhood is presented by filial relationships as well as by a simile, we also find proof of the texts' different presentation of God's fatherly activity. This is quite obvious observing the specific characteristics with which the divine fatherhood is connected in different groups. The analyzed texts reveal three principal aspects how the image of God as Father is presented: his *educational* and *teaching* activity (4Q504 1, III, 4Q378-379), his *strength* (4Q246), and his *non-abandoning* position ('father-texts'). It is obvious that in all these texts the salvific aspect is kept in mind although not verbally expressed, yet the 'father-texts' deserve special attention. The analysis of the 'father-texts' shows that the *non-abandoning* attitude of God as Father towards the people or individuals is to be considered as his basic characteristic. This fatherly image is clearly expressed not only in 4Q372 1 and 4Q460 9i but also in 1QH IX. Whereas in the first two documents God is implored not to abandon or is declared as one who is not doing so, the *Hodayot* text highlights the importance of this fatherly characteristic describing it from a human point of view: *my mother abandoned me to you* (line 35). The real meaning of this complaint in the light of the subsequent acknowledgment in the same line *because you are father to all* is evident: God does not act in this way. The activity of the divine Father described in a motherly manner (line 36) even more emphasizes the magnitude of this fatherly aspect. In 4Q372 1 and 4Q460 9i the *non-abandoning* is directly explained as protection from enemies; in 1QH IX the protection as the inner quality of such a divine attitude is portrayed as God's fatherly responsibility for the life of his faithful and all his creation. The Qumran texts reveal another important point with regard to *who* stands in relationships with God the Father. The accent is put more on the individual(s) than on the people as in the HB. The plea of the individual *to]be for me, O o[ur] Lord, like a father* (4Q379 18, 4) has no parallels in the OT and shows the tendency to transfer the collective religious values (*O o[ur] Lord*) to the personal level. Yet the most significant feature is the manner one addresses God as Father. The very personal invocation *אֱלֹהֵי אָבִי* in 4Q372 1, 16 and acknowledgment or invocation *אֱלֹהֵי אָבִי* in 4Q460 9i, 6 not only bring a fresh air into the understanding of God's relationships with an individual but also add a new aspect regarding their contents. Since both addresses to the divine

⁵⁰⁵ The table of phrases and parallels in Hebrew see in LARSON, "460. 4QNarrative Work and Prayer," DJD XXXVI, p. 373.

Father are closely connected with his *non-abandoning* attitude, the personal invocation *my Father* gives even more evidence to the intimate characters of the relationship between God and man.

3.2. God as Father in the Intertestamental Jewish Literature

The title ‘intertestamental Jewish literature’ here is intended to mean the whole range of different Jewish extrabiblical writings (also often referred to as the apocrypha or pseudepigrapha) which are prior to/contemporaneous with the Pauline corpus or at least have their Jewish *non-Christian* origin in the first century A.D.: apocalyptic literature and related works, testaments, expansions of the Old Testament, wisdom and philosophical literature, prayers, psalms and odes. There are a good number of documents which fit into this time category and for which a *pre/non-Christian origin* (not necessarily the final composition) is proposed.⁵⁰⁶ Nonetheless, the exact dating of those writings is rather problematic; the span of time suggested by various scholars for some of them ranges from circa 200 B.C. to A.D. 200.⁵⁰⁷

Jeremias (1967) points out some references to the divine fatherhood in the third book of Maccabees (3 Mac 5:7; 6:3.8; 7:6) and Jubilees (Jub 1:24f. 28; 19:29); at the same time he observes that father-language in the Testament of Levi (TLevi 18:6) and Testament of Judah (TJud 24:2) may have been Christian interpolations.⁵⁰⁸ Pokorný (1971) indicates several ‘son-texts’ in the fourth book of Ezra (4 Ezra 7:2.27-31; 13:32.37-52; 14:9) and one more text in the Testament of Levi (TLevi 4:2) assuming the non-Christian character of both of them.⁵⁰⁹ Hengel (1975) refers to more ‘son-texts’ in Joseph and Aseneth (JosAsen 6:2-6; 13:10; 21:3; 23:10⁵¹⁰) and to one occurrence in the Prayer of Joseph (PrJos A 2-3). Moreover, he refers to such titles as ‘prince of the world’, ‘little Yahweh’ in 3 Enoch and ‘son of man’ in 1 Enoch,⁵¹¹ which might be important for the understanding of the divine sonship but are not relevant to the character of this study.

⁵⁰⁶ See J. H. CHARLESWORTH, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the New Testament. Prolegomena for the Study of Christian Origins* (SNTSMS 054), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985, pp. 41-43. Some of those writings, however, have undergone a Christian redaction and may contain a number of interpolations, for instance, the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (*ibid.*, p. 39).

⁵⁰⁷ For instance Testament of Job – 100 B.C.- A.D. 100; cf. R. P. SPITTLER, “Testament of Job,” in *OTP*, vol. 1, p. 833. Joseph and Aseneth – 100 B.C.-A.D. 200; cf. C. BUCHARD, “Joseph and Aseneth,” in *OTP*, vol. 2, p. 187. Prayer of Jacob – A.D. 100 to 400; cf. J. H. CHARLESWORTH, “Prayer of Jacob,” in *OTP*, vol. 2, p. 715.

⁵⁰⁸ Cf. JEREMIAS, *The Prayers of Jesus*, pp. 15f., 20f. note 37; followed by SABUGAL, “La paternidad de Dios en la literatura extraneotestamentaria,” pp. 148-150.

⁵⁰⁹ Cf. POKORNÝ, *Der Gottessohn*, p. 24f. The text which the author has referred to as TLevi 4:17, is in fact TLevi 4:2 according to H. C. KEE, “Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,” in *OTP*, vol. 1, p. 789.

⁵¹⁰ Hengel’s numbering follows the one of Philonenko. In Charlesworth’s *OTP* edition Bucharad has adopted the numbering of verses from Riessler; Philonenko’s numbers are given in parentheses instead.

⁵¹¹ Cf. HENGEL, *The Son of God*, pp. 43, 46-48.

Schlosser (1987) presents more references to the divine fatherhood, but he approaches them in a very concise way. Within a category designated by him as the anonymous or pseudonymous writings he points to some texts in the Testament of Job (TJob 33:3.9; 40:2; 47:11 with some reservation; 52:12) and in Joseph and Aseneth (JosAsen 12:8.13-15) in which the image of God as Father is attested both directly and by means of a simile, and in the third book of Maccabees: 3 Mac 5:7-9; 6:2-15; 7:6 (simile). The texts in the Sibylline Oracles (SibOr 3:296-297.726) which he also refers to,⁵¹² present God in terms of begetter instead of father in a strict sense (γενέτης or παγγενέτωρ is also employed in SibOr 3:275.550.604; 5:284.328.360.406.498.500). These texts may contain a certain aspect of the ‘father’ conception, yet they require a wider investigation. Among the pseudepigrapha Schlosser mentions the second fragment of the Apocryphon of Ezekiel (ApocEzek 2 [in 1 Clement 8:3]), Testament of Abraham (Tab A 20:12.13), Apocalypse of Moses (ApMos 32:1-2; 35:2-4⁵¹³) and Jubilees (Jub 1:24b-25; 19:29).⁵¹⁴

Byrne (1979) offers a much more detailed analysis as far as the divine sonship is concerned. He crosses through a number of different documents taking as a criterion the ‘addressee’; in many of the texts he detects either the *angelic* or *Israelite* usage of the divine sonship. The representatives of the first group he refers as to the ‘sons of heaven’ in the first book of Enoch (1 En 6:2; 13:8; 14:3 [also possibly in 39:1; 69:4-5; 106:5-6]), ‘like a son of God’ in the Testament of Abraham (Tab A 12:23f.⁵¹⁵), ‘sons of God’ in the Prayer of Joseph (PrJos A 7-8), and in Pseudo-Philo (*LAB*) 3:1.⁵¹⁶ Regarding the *Israelite* group he points to the Assumption of Moses (AsMos 10:3), 1 Enoch (1 En 62:11f.), 2 Baruch (2 Bar 13:9f.), 4 Ezra (4 Ezra 5:28; 6:58), the Psalms of Solomon (PssSol 17:30; 18:4), Jubilees (Jub 1:24b-25.28; 2:20; 19:29; 22.11 with some reservation), Pseudo-Philo (*LAB* 16:5; 18:6; 32:10), 3 Maccabees (3 Mac 2:21; 5:7f.; 6.1-15 especially vv. 3.8; 7:6), and the Sibylline Oracles (SibOr 702ff., 249 possibly).⁵¹⁷ He also refers to some ‘father-texts’ which display God’s relations with individuals: in connection with heavenly destiny after Job’s death in the Testament of Job (TJob 33:3.9.; 40:2; 47:11; 52:12) and regarding the transportation of Abraham’s soul to heaven in the Testament of Abraham.⁵¹⁸ Furthermore, he briefly discusses a number of texts in Joseph and Aseneth which attest the divine sonship (in the singular) of Joseph (JosAsen 6:3.5 [46:11.20];

⁵¹² Cf. SCHLOSSER, *Le Dieu de Jésus*, pp. 110-111.

⁵¹³ Apocalypse of Moses is the Greek version of the Life of Adam and Eve.

⁵¹⁴ Cf. SCHLOSSER, *Le Dieu de Jésus*, pp. 114-116.

⁵¹⁵ In Charlesworth’s *OTP* edition it is Tab (A) 12:5-6.

⁵¹⁶ See BYRNE, ‘Sons of God’ - ‘Seed of Abraham’, pp. 18-25. The author also suggests that the text in Jub 31:16 may have originally contained an expression such as ‘the companion of all the sons of God’ or ‘of heaven’ instead of ‘the companion of all the sons of Jacob’ as it is in the present text (*ibid.*, p. 22 note 50).

⁵¹⁷ See BYRNE, ‘Sons of God’ - ‘Seed of Abraham’, pp. 27-38.

⁵¹⁸ He seems to have alluded to Tab (A) 20:12-13 according to Charlesworth’s *OTP* edition.

13:10 [twice, 58:1.5]; 18:11 [68:19f.]; 21:4 [71:15]; 23:10 [73:4];) as well as (in the plural) of the faithful (16:14 [64:9]; 19:8 [69:18f.]) and, finally, points out two texts in the Testament of Levi (TLevi 4:2 [cf. 17:2]; 18:6.10-14).⁵¹⁹

The most investigative study on the divine fatherhood in the early Jewish literature including pseudepigraphal writings has been put forward by Strotmann (1991); it seems still to remain the most comprehensive survey on the matter.⁵²⁰ Strotmann divides writings in which the divine fatherhood is attested into two blocks: the apocalyptic and testament literature (Apocryphon of Ezekiel, Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, Testament of Job, Testament of Abraham) and the narrative literature, prayers and the fragments of the pseudo-Greek poets (Jubilees, Joseph and Aseneth, Life of Adam and Eve, 3 Maccabees, Fragments of Pseudo-Greek Poets, and Prayer of Jacob). Strotmann analyses many texts mentioned above by other scholars. However, she completely omits a number of documents, in particular those which deal with the divine sonship and have been mostly proposed by Byrne: 4 Ezra (Pokorný, Byrne), Prayer of Joseph (Hengel, Byrne), Sibylline Oracles (Hengel, Byrne), 1 Enoch, Assumption of Moses, 2 Baruch, Psalms of Solomon, and Pseudo-Philo (Byrne). The mentions in TLevi 4:2 (Pokorný, Byrne), TAb A 12:5f. (Byrne) are not taken into consideration either. On the other hand, Strotmann traces more references to the divine fatherhood in the Testament of Abraham (TAb B 7:20; TAb A 6:6; 9:7; 16:3), Joseph and Aseneth (JosAsen 11:13; 15:7.8), and the Apocalypse of Moses (ApMos 36:3; 37:4; 38:1.2). Moreover, she observes two false fragments of the Hellenistic authors Diphilus/Menander and Pythagoras⁵²¹ and also takes into consideration the Prayer of Jacob (PrJac vv. 1.4).

All documents or their parts (for instance a part of Sibylline Oracles) referred to by the scholars may be considered as roughly fitting into the time-category of our interest, though there cannot be any definitive affirmation, for, as has been already mentioned, the proposed date-limits vary considerably.⁵²²

According to the study of Byrne, there are many texts in different documents, which rather attest to the divine sonship than to the divine fatherhood, still it is worth to summarize the data of the image of God as Father as it is portrayed both in the 'father' and 'son-texts'.

⁵¹⁹ See BYRNE, 'Sons of God' - 'Seed of Abraham', pp. 47-57. He also sees TLevi 18:6f. and TJud 24:1ff. as having a Christian flavor, especially the latter (cf. *ibid.*, p. 55 note 185, p. 56 note 188).

⁵²⁰ See STROTMANN, „Mein Vater bist du!“ (*Sir 51,10*), pp. 143-329. See also a recension on this study presented by J. SIEVERS, “Angelika STROTMANN, ‘Mein Vater bist du!’ (*Sir 51,10*),” *Bib* 74 (1993) 420-423.

⁵²¹ The latter is not included into Charlesworth's *OTP* edition probably because it has no signs of Jewish origin.

⁵²² With the exception of the summary of Charlesworth according to which documents may be regarded as Jewish and pre-Christian, in CHARLESWORTH, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the New Testament*, pp. 41-43, also Byrne and Strotmann who touches the dating problem as they deal with every particular text.

3.2.1. Divine Fatherhood Revealed by 'Father-Texts'

Since Strotmann's analysis includes all the 'father-texts' mentioned by other scholars, the summary of this text-group is intended to present her insights.⁵²³

The invocation *πάτερ* in Apocryphon of Ezekiel 2 that is not a part of prayer but an invitation pronounced by God himself to turn back to him with a whole heart - ...καὶ εἴπητε· Πάτερ· ἐπακούσομαι ὑμῶν ὡς λαοῦ ἁγίου - shows certain textual and content similarities with some OT (LXX) texts: Isa 1:18f., Deut 30:1-10, Jer 3:10, Tob 13:6, Ps 102:10-13. However, there are two most important parallels: Isa 30:19 (only once a formula *λαὸς ἅγιος* is connected with *ἐπακούω* as in ApocEz 2) and Jer 3:19 (instead of turning back as in ApocEz 2 the invocation *πάτερ* is, in a somewhat inverted way, associated with the fact that people is not turning away from God). These two texts help to understand the fatherhood of God in terms of his *proximity* and *mercy*. The demand on God's side to invoke him as a Father reveals not only his love for Israel but, in the context of the people's sinfulness, his fidelity in his readiness to listen to (*ἐπακούω*) the people again as well. The invocation *πάτερ* thus may be understood as a certain modification of the absolute divine demand to turn to him with a whole heart, something that is hardly possible for any man. The childlike and sincere turn to him would already be returning back to God who would allow them to experience his fatherly pity.

There are 6 potential references to God as Father in the Testament of Job (TJob 33:3 τοῦ πατρός; 33:9 τοῦ πατρός; 40:2 πρὸς τὸν πατέρα; 47:11 τοῦ πατρός; 50:3 τῆς πατρικῆς δόξης; 52:12 τοῦ πατρός).⁵²⁴ If we accept all of them there are two evident addressees in relation with the fatherhood of God: Job (33:3.9; 40:2; 47:11; 52:12) and his daughters (47:11; 50:3; 52:12) to whom God grants personal protection and a share in his divine fatherly glory through their earthly father. The figure of Job seems to represent *typos* of the just man (as in the book of Wisdom 2-5). Therefore, it would be an exaggeration to insist on the particular relationship between God as Father and Job as man; alternatively, the divine fatherhood is neither given the universal character nor it is portrayed in terms of a more strict application towards Israel in this writing. There are two quite visible aspects of the fatherhood of God regarding Job and his daughters. Firstly, it expresses God's protection and help (TJob 33:3.9; 47:11) and secondly, it shows that God's will is to give his children a share in his glory and his reign (TJob 33:3.9; 50:3). The share in his reign is, however, promised only to Job. Moreover, Job is endowed with

⁵²³ Having thoroughly discussed every single document Strotmann offers a concise summary of what has been achieved in terms of the better understanding the characteristics and functions attributed to the divine Father.

⁵²⁴ 'Potential' because of different textual witnesses to all enumerated texts and a certain uncertainty regarding whom the term 'father' is applied: Job or God (as in TJob 47:11). The reference in 52:9 αὐτοῦ τοῦ πατρός is most probably to be interpreted as pointing to Job instead of God.

divine knowledge: he knows that his children are with God in heaven, also he granted the request that his wife and his friends could see those children in heaven. This fatherly and unconditional God's love towards Job is the reason for its further application to his daughters: Job is the middle element, functioning like a son of God thanks to which God does not withhold his fatherly love from his daughters.

According to the text more recently published by Schmidt⁵²⁵ there are five references to the divine fatherhood in the Testament of Abraham. Four occur in recension A (6:6 δόξα καὶ εἰρήνη παρὰ θεοῦ καὶ πατρός; 9:7 τοῦ ἀοράτου πατρός;⁵²⁶ 20:12.13 τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρός) and one in recension B (7:20 τῷ πατρὶ μου). The reference in TAb B 7:20 is quite uncommon; not because the addressee of the divine fatherhood is the archangel Michael but because he claims that God is his Father. The characteristics of God as a Father to Michael is more usual: on the one hand, the πατήρ μου emphasizes God's *creative* power with respect to the archangel; on the other hand, the pronoun μου reinforces both *physical and spatial proximity* that exists between God-Creator and the archangel Michael-creature that belongs to a heavenly sphere. The conception of the divine fatherhood in TAb A is essentially presented by the formula θεὸς καὶ πατήρ. This formula and ἀόρατος πατήρ are not directly connected with any personages; nevertheless, it is clear from the context that the addressee is Abraham. The characteristics of divine fatherhood correspond in fact to the behavior of an earthly father towards the child he loves. A certain dynamic may be detected going from TAb A 6:6 to 20:12.13. The definition of God as Father in a doxology (6:6) in the context of the remembrance of the visit of three men/angels at the oak of Mamre, and fulfillment of the promise of Isaac's birth in terms of δόξα καὶ εἰρήνη (coming down from God) reveal the attitude the divine Father always had towards Abraham: in the birth of Isaac he has proven his fidelity, love, and care for him. God as Father has revealed his glory, also he enabled Abraham to participate in his glory and εἰρήνη (may also be understood in terms of שְׁלוֹמִי that means well-being or even salvation offered by God. The latter is finally proved by his entry to paradise after death (20:12.13). Certainly, the complete piety and righteousness of the child are the prerequisites for enjoying God's fatherhood in TAb A 6:6 (as well as in TJob and TLevi). Yet, Abraham is not always portrayed in this light. He becomes disobedient because he does not want to die unconditionally (cf. 9:6.7), even if it is the will of God; however, the divine Father who is called invisible (ἀόρατος) remains faithful (9:7).

⁵²⁵ Cf. F. SCHMIDT, *Le Testament grec d'Abraham. Introduction, édition critique des deux recensions grecques, traduction* (Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum 11), Tübingen: Mohr, 1986. Naturally they are not found in Charlesworth's *OTP* edition.

⁵²⁶ According to Strotmann's analysis the reading ἀόρατος πατήρ in TAb A 16:3 is not original; instead of πατήρ there should have been θεός.

The level of his love towards Abraham can be judged from the fact that he does not impose any penalty on Abraham. Rather he patiently convinces him of the necessity of death.

In the book of Jubilees the fatherhood of God is referred to four times (Jub 1:24.25.28; 19:29). It is noteworthy that in all cases the 'son' terminology is also employed so a certain 'Father-son' structure is evident. There is one more text, Jub 2:20, which attests to the divine fatherhood by means of 'son' language. These references display both differences and similarities; they may also be assigned to two different groups: Jub 1:24.25.28 and Jub 19:29 with 2:20. The most evident similarity in all references is the association of the divine fatherhood with the sonship of Israel and the Israelites. Another similarity lies in the 'Father-son' structure, with the exception of 2:20, which is based upon the biblical 2 Sam 7:14a. However, if compared to the OT text, there is neither direct association between sin and penalty nor the motif of the divine Father's *non-abandoning*. Nevertheless, neither motif is completely absent, since they are implied by the context of 1:24f., and by the irrevocable promise of the Israelite sonship in 2:20 and 19:29.

The most significant difference between two 'fatherhood' groups within Jubilees is their different time references and the conditional or unconditional character. Regarding the the first group (1:24.25.28, the fatherhood of God conditioned by the conversion of Israel and Israelites to him, seems to be postponed to the end-times. God as their Father is portrayed from the perspective of eschatological salvation. And on the contrary, the other group (2:20; 19:29) has no future time indications for the divine promise to be a Father to Jacob/Israel, rather it is valid without restrictions for the whole history of Israel. Moreover, Israel had already been chosen even before its existence.

The addressee of the divine fatherhood is another important difference between both groups. The plural terminology of 'sons' in 1:24.25.28 implies all the children of Jacob/Israel as well as each individual Israelite. The references in 2:20 and 19:29 are rather different as they present an exclusively collective character of Israel as son and first-born of God.

The image of God as Father in connection with those addressees is revealed by a few words in 1:25. It is said that he would be acknowledged by all as Father in *uprightness* and *righteousness* and that he loves his children. The *uprightness* of the Father probably should be understood in terms of his reliability and fidelity, whereas, his *righteousness* reflects a Hebrew צדקה that implies his gracious and rescuing action towards the Israelites as children of God. His fatherly love for Israel in Jub 1 certainly implies that he does not abandon his people even if they sin, and he maintains his fidelity.

God as Father in Joseph and Aseneth is referred quite frequently. Six times God is named Father; once God is compared with an earthly father; seven times the title of a 'son of

God' is attributed to Joseph; once Aseneth is called a 'daughter of the Most High'; once the same title is attributed to the angel-repentance (μετάνοια); twice 'sons' are in the plural: they are sons of the Most High and of the living God.

God is explicitly called Father with various qualifications: JosAsen 11:13 [54:16] and 12:13 [56:16] ὁ πατήρ τῶν ὀρφανῶν (the Father of the orphans) 12:14 [56:19] πατήρ γλυκὺς καὶ ἀγαθὸς καὶ ἐπιεικὴς (sweet, good and kind Father) 12:15 [56:20] πατήρ γλυκὺς (sweet Father) 15:7 [61:15] πατήρ ἐστὶ τῆς μετανοίας (Father of repentance) 15:8 [61:15] ὁ πατήρ ὁ ὑψιστος (the Father the most High). The image of God as Father in these 'father-texts' is quite different because depends on the addressees towards whom God is supposed to act as a Father. In JosAsen 11 and 12 the addressees are converts/Israelites in general and Aseneth in particular. It is she who is the speaking/praying subject in these chapters. In JosAsen 15 the addressee of the divine Father is repentance (μετάνοια), a certain heavenly hypostasis like a wisdom in Prov 8:22ff., Sir 24, Wis 7:22ff. The speaking subject is the angel-prince who reports Aseneth of the acceptance of her prayer by God.

The image of God as Father in JosAsen 11 and 12 should be understood considering both the addressees and the intention of Aseneth's prayers. She never speaks exclusively about her God/Father but always considers him as the Father of a larger group of persons. This group in 11:13 and 12:13 is defined as the orphans, who should rather be understood not in a physical sense but as a category of faith-orphans as they deny their bodily parents and are hated by others because of their conversion to Jewry. However, it is not clear who are the addressees of the divine fatherhood in 12:14.15; they may be not only the orphans/proselytes but also the other ones who acknowledge the 'God of the Hebrews' (11:10) and the 'God of Joseph' (11:7); consequently, every Israelite may be one of them.

As regards the characteristics of the divine fatherhood, it is not the fatherly providing activity that stands at the center of JosAsen 11:13 and 12:13. The accent is put rather on the Father who rescues the child from dangers and guards him in security. The designation πατήρ τῶν ὀρφανῶν should also be understood in this sense. A little child is already *per se* marked by his helplessness and vulnerability. This is even more valid for those who are orphans in a real sense: without an earthly father they do need a helping and protecting divine Father. The protection and help of the fatherly God is expected during hate, distress and persecution, as the proselyte's turn to God. The references in 12:14.15 disclose a further aspect of God's fatherly attitude: his affectionate love for his child. This aspect is very clearly expressed by a comparison with the earthly father and a little child in 12:8; its full realization however is presented in 12:15 in terms of the heritage given by the Father. This last motif may also be seen in 15:7.8 as far as

the μετάνοια as a daughter of God may be regarded as sharing divine heritage. Sharing divine μετάνοια is based on its immediate proximity to God; he allows himself to be influenced by its intercessions. The basis for such a status of μετάνοια with respect to God as its Father is God's affectionate love for it (15:8) that is also in part justified because of its qualities.

The divine fatherhood in the Greek version of Life of Adam and Eve known as the Apocalypse of Moses is mentioned several times.⁵²⁷ Strotmann points to six passages (ApMos 32:2 ὁ πατήρ τῶν πάντων (*the Father of all*), 35:2 and 37:4 ὁ πατήρ τῶν ὅλων (*the Father of all*), 36:3 ὁ πατήρ τῶν φώτων (*the Father of lights*), 38:1.2 ὁ πατήρ. The authenticity of the father-name in two other references in 35:3 and 43:4 is quite doubtful both on formal as well as content grounds.

Though the divine fatherhood in ApMos is portrayed in different ways, all references to God as Father, except for 38:1.2, are associated with the creative motif that assumes two different forms according to the addressees of the fatherhood of God. The mention in 36:3 refers to an absolute dependence of the heavenly bodies on God; the references to the creation of the first people, in particular Adam, are found in 32:2; 35:2; 37:4. Admittedly, Adam and Eve are dependent on God their Creator; however, this dependence and the absolute obedience are interconnected with it and are also mixed with the *mercy* motive.

Three texts in which the divine fatherhood is portrayed with respect to Adam and Eve belong to chapters 31-37, which relate Adam's death and God's forgiveness, granted him. Given the fact that the fatherhood of God is three times attested in these chapters it is plausible to think of a special affinity of the divine forgiveness and his fatherhood. Moreover, each reference to God as Father in 32:2, 35:2 and 37:4 represents a step further on the way to God's final forgiveness of Adam. God's creative activity and his fatherly mercy cannot be dissociated. God created Adam after his image and endowed him with a special dignity with regard to the rest of creation; he must be merciful to him, moreover, since he is a Creator he is responsible for what he has created (cf. 31:4).

There is no trace of God's creative activity and his fatherly mercy in the last two references in 38:1.2. Here the addressee of the divine fatherhood is the archangel Michael. Whether it implies proximity to God is not clear. Strotmann thinks the best explanation of the double occurrence of ὁ πατήρ in this passage is to see it in terms of transition from the story of Adam in heaven, in which God's fatherhood and his mercy for Adam were connected, to the story of his burial.

⁵²⁷ It depends on the edition of the Greek version; see STROTMANN, „*Mein Vater bist du!*“ (*Sir 51,10*), p. 281.

There are just a few direct references to God as Father in 3 Maccabees (3 Mac 5:7 θεὸν αὐτῶν καὶ πατέρα; 6:3.8 πᾶτερ) and one simile (7:6 ὡς πατέρα).

Those four texts gradually reveal the ‘Father-son’ relationship between God and the Jews. This special relationship seems to have already been presented in 2:21 in the acceptance by God of the prayer offered to the supremely holy προπάτωρ. Yet this designation must not be overemphasized, because it normally means progenitor, ancestor and, eventually, in connection with God, his standing at the beginning of everything and everybody. The reference to God as Father in 5:7 is the first indirect request of the Jews for rescue before a threatening annihilation and therefore points to what the primary characteristic of the divine Father is in relation to the Jews. The association of πατήρ with θεός and κύριος in 5:7 displays both God’s powerful and merciful character; πατήρ seems to be closer to the latter one. Such a supposition is confirmed in a twice-repeated invocation to God as πᾶτερ in 6:3.8. The divine power and mercy here are again connected with the divine fatherhood, but with important differentiations. Above all the powerful side of God is portrayed in a very close association with his merciful side. In contrast to 5:7 the power of the divine Father is no longer described in an absolute manner, but expressed through the fixed-historical examples. This is a power that works in favor of Israel. It is not the divine power as such that is the basis for God’s intervention in favor of Israel. The real basis should be seen in God’s particular relationship to Israel that goes back to the election of Abraham, Jacob and the people as a whole. The invocation to πᾶτερ in 6:3.8 emphasizes the particular role of God as Father in protecting Israel.

The image of God as Father in a very short text of Diphilus/Menander, which is one of the two false fragments of the Hellenistic authors, is attested by πατήρ, which, according to Strotmann, stands in the middle position between two poles: κύριος and εὐρετής καὶ κτίστωρ. By the title κύριος that is qualified by τῶν πάντων is expressed the absolute dependence of all things on God, whereas εὐρετής καὶ κτίστωρ represent the divine inventive creatorship that is intertwined with his care (the object of the divine activity is ἀγαθά). It seems that ἀγαθά denotes in particular the good things in favor of man. Therefore, the Father, who should be honored (τιμᾶω), is in this context better understood as the creator of all good things *for man*. Moreover, his status of the creator, expressed through invention of those good things, emphasizes not so much his authority over them but rather his care for man.

In another false fragment, Pythagoras-citation, two important theses regarding God are announced right at the beginning: God is one, and he is not outside this world-order, but in it. Those are supported with various divine titles; the title πάντων πατήρ is also there. It is not clear what the expectations for the Father of all are; but according to the remaining titles, it seems that

the idea that God is immanent to the world is supported. However, since πάντων πατήρ is directly preceded by ἔργων ἀπάντων ἐν οὐρανῷ φωστήρ, it may suggest an idea of the divine fatherly activity in terms of preservation of the whole world. Yet, even if it is the Father who may be supposed to be the source for works in heaven (probably, heavenly bodies), little more can be said about his fatherhood apart from his sustaining activity. Since the titles-predicates for God in this fragment do not mention any idea of his standing at the beginning of the world, it is reasonable to conclude that πάντων πατήρ does not refer to God's creative activity. Rather, it expresses the already-mentioned supposition of his all-embracing sustaining role. This naturally includes the human sphere. Greater precision as to *how* God's fatherly sustaining or caring activity may have been exercised can hardly be reached.

At least four times in two verses the divine fatherhood is referred to in the Prayer of Jacob (PrJac v. 1 πάτερ; πατήρ; v. 2 πατέρα; πατέρα). The fifth mention of πατήρ in v. 1 is not quite certain. All references to God as Father in this prayer, except for an invocation at the very beginning πάτερ πατριάρχων, are further qualified by the terminology that emphasizes God's lordship and creatorship: πατήρ ὅλων; πατήρ δυνάμεων τοῦ κόσμου (v. 1); πατέρα τῶν ὅλων δυνάμεων; πατέρα τοῦ ἀπάντος κόσμου καὶ τῆς ὅλης γενέσεως (v. 4). The creative activity of the Father is even more accentuated by the threefold κτίστης in v. 2. The beginning of the prayer with πάτερ πατριάρχων sets the tone for the whole prayer and gives a solid theological ground for its understanding. The reference to Abraham in v. 5 may be seen as an inclusion with v. 1. Therefore, the lordship of God as Father over all powers (anyone may have been afraid of them), based on and emphasized by his status of the reator of all, highlights even more the importance of the relations he has with man. Furthermore, the reference to the first patriarch may point to the suppliant's expectations to be treated the same way as Abraham was, to whom God showed favor by giving the kingdom to him (v. 5). This means to treat him like his son. There is an important theological insight: only God, who is the Father of the patriarchs, and who is at the same time the Father of everything and everybody, may guarantee the affection man longs for.

3.2.2. Divine Fatherhood Revealed by Filial Relationship

There are several texts where the fatherhood of God is implicitly confirmed by a filial image. Some of them are mentioned only by Pokorný (4 Ezra 7:27-31; 13:32.37-52; 14:9). The common element in all these texts is the formula 'filius meus' pronounced by God. Twice 'filius meus' is associated with the messiah (7:27-31). Apart from the proximity between God and his son implied by the formula, it is difficult to conclude anything else about the divine fatherhood,

since no relations between God and ‘filius meus’ are presented. The only activity of God as Father may be presumably seen in the same text (7:27-31) where it is said that ‘filius meus’ will be revealed. The largest part of the ‘son-texts’ has been presented by Byrne; the summary therefore, as far as it is related to the divine fatherhood, follows his exposition.

The texts which refer to the sons of God (or heaven) in the plural in connection with angels (1 En 6:2; 13:8; 14:3 [also possibly in 39:1; 69:4-5; 106:5-6]); LAB 3:1 [these texts are based on Gen 6:2-4]; TAb A 12:5-6) do not present any particular relationship between the angels and God thereby giving no idea of his fatherhood. Similar is the reference to PrJos A in which Israel/Jacob is portrayed in terms of the chief angel and the first minister before the face of God (vv. 7-8) among the sons of God. These verses should be analyzed in connection with vv. 2-3 (mentioned by Hengel) where Jacob claims he is a man seeing God (as in Philo) and names himself the first-born.⁵²⁸ These passages say nothing about God as Father except perhaps something about his *generosity*, the characteristic frequent in Philo that explains why somebody may claim to be in his immediate proximity and even to see him. Being in the service of God is attested in another ‘son-text’ TLevi 4:2. God has heard the prayer of Levi that he be delivered from wrongdoing, that he should become a son (υἱός) and a servant (θεράπων) and a minister (λειτουργός) to him. The idea is of Levi’s participation in the divine liturgy. This is not however a goal in itself but serves to enlighten Israel through the knowledge given by God to Levi. The fatherhood of God in this text should be understood in the conventional terms of God’s favorable activity towards his people in which he allows certain mediators to have a share (similarly in Philo).

In several ‘son-texts’ the people of Israel is presented in clear contrast to the Gentiles: God as Father proves to be Israel’s savior and educator. In AsMos 10:3 and 1 En 62:11f. the sons of God (Israel) are portrayed in the context of eschatological vindication. God will act because of his sons he will save and clothe them with the garments of glory. Similarly, the contrast is made between God’s judgment of Israel and other nations: he has afflicted his sons because of their sins; however, they were chastised so that might be sanctified/forgiven (2 Bar 13:9f.). The distinction between Israel and other nations is also seen in his claim to be unicum tuum (4 Ezra 5:28) and first-born (4 Ezra 6:58). These two references situated in the context of Ezra’s complaint disclose the *affection* God has always had towards his son Israel. A mention of the sons of God in SibOr 702 stands on the same level. In the eschatological context their future is described in terms of the divine protection (703ff.). Moreover, the people will be astonished

⁵²⁸ According to Hengel this reference to Jacob should be interpreted in terms of “a supreme, pre-existent spiritual being (πνεῦμα ἀρχικόν) which takes human form and becomes the tribal ancestor of the people of Israel.” HENGEL, *The Son of God*, p. 48. Jacob is also called first-born in LAB 18:6.

how much the Immortal loves them. The eschatological images in TLevi 18:10-14 mention τέκνα αὐτοῦ (vv. 12-13) twice and prolong the theme of the final vindication of God's children. The important characteristic of the divine fatherhood in this passage is God's rejoicing over his children.

The remembrance of historical events, in which God proved his fatherly saving love to his sons (as in LAB 32:10f.), also serves to highlight the exceptional status of Israel. God's fatherly love for Israel, connected with the idea of its education, is also attested in PssSol 18:4. God's chastisement is acknowledged as part of a close relationship between God and Israel: ὡς υἱὸν πρωτότοκον μονογενῆ. The divine education implies ethical requirements; they are well expressed in PssSol 17:27 (Byrne 17:30) in connection with God's knowledge that πάντες υἱοὶ θεοῦ εἰσιν αὐτῶν. The role of religious-ethical demands to be God's son is strongly emphasized in LAB 16:5: it is the Law of the Most High that teaches the Israelites his ways, therefore, the recognition that only *si ambulaverimus in viis eius, erimus filli sui* highlights the *moral* aspect of the divine fatherhood with reference to his people.

Although there are many 'son-texts' in Joseph and Aseneth, they do not give much information about the fatherhood of God. All of them, with the exception of 16:14 [64:9] and 19:8 [69:18f.] refer to the divine sonship (in the singular) of Joseph. The reference in 16:14 [64:9] οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ ὑψίστου could simply refer to angels, yet, Byrne thinks it also may describe the faithful elect whose destiny is that of angels, i.e. eternal life. The second mention in the plural in 19:8 [69:18f.] οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ ζώντος θεοῦ, most probably refers to the faithful elect; the common feature of these two eschatological references is the endowment of the sons with privileges close to those of the angels. Regarding the fatherhood of God, it may be pointed out that both texts are associated with *life*. In the first text the sons are given the promise that they will not die forever; in the second reference God is called *living*, they will live in the secure city of refuge and God will reign over them forever. Hence, the activity of God as Father can be understood in terms of his giving life and refuge forever. This shows the value of their status as sons of God. The figure of Joseph, who is called the son of God in the remaining texts in this document, should be seen, according to Strotmann, as representing Israel. Similarly the figure of Aseneth who once is clearly named θυγάτηρ θεοῦ (21:4) represents the proselytes.⁵²⁹ Byrne also agrees that Joseph represents Israel in this document; he points out however, that the 'son-texts' on Joseph and the above-mentioned two texts in the plural share the same theme of 'sons' endowment with angelic qualities. Moreover, the motif in the texts with Joseph is, according to

⁵²⁹ Cf. STROTMANN, „Mein Vater bist du!“ (Sir 51,10), p. 256.

Byrne, of the vindication of the just man after his death.⁵³⁰ As a result God as Father is not only the Father of Israel but also of the just man; they both are valuable in the sight of God.

3.2.3. *Divine Fatherhood Revealed by Similes*

Among the mentioned references to the divine fatherhood there are three texts in which it is alluded to by a simile⁵³¹ (TLevi 17:2;⁵³² 3 Mac 7:6 [Byrne, Strotmann]; JosAsen 12:8 [55:18-22, Strotmann]).

Though there is no explicit mention of who is intended to be the man who will speak to God as to a Father (ὥς πατρί) in TLevi 17:2 the figure of the high priest should probably be identified with Levi. Strotmann draws several conclusions about the image of God as Father in this text: 1) the divine Father is here supposed to be God who demands obedience and expects the observance of his commandments and order from his child due to the natural relationships between father and son; 2) the fatherhood of God is the expression of the divine trust-creating proximity that enables the high priest to associate himself with God in a full manner. This is because in his priesthood he behaves like an obedient son who follows the commandments of his father with undivided heart (cf. 1 Chron 28:6-9).

The simile in 3 Mac 7:6 (ὥς πατέρα ὑπὲρ υἱῶν) should be seen in line with the ‘father-texts’ in the same document which gradually reveal the ‘Father-son’ relationship between God and the Jews. The fact that this simile comes out of the mouth of King Ptolemy (the former oppressor of Jews) emphasizes even more strongly the distinctiveness of the relationship between God and Jews: he has proven his fatherhood in protecting them continually (cf. 6:3.8). The whole activity of the divine Father is therefore absolutely reliable and testifies his unwavering fidelity towards his children in each situation.

The last reference to the fatherhood of God is presented by an extended simile in JosAsen 12:8, which describes it in terms of the affectionate love of the earthly father for his child: ὥς γὰρ παιδίον...οὕτως καὶ σὺ κύριε ἔκτεινον τὰς χεῖρας σου ἐπ’ ἐμὲ ὥς πατὴρ φιλότεκνος (*as a small child...so you Lord stretching out you hands to me as a father loving one’s children*). This fatherly affection is very profound: he is completely devoted to the needs

⁵³⁰ Cf. BYRNE, ‘Sons of God’ - ‘Seed of Abraham’, pp. 53-54.

⁵³¹ The summary on the image of God as Father as it is portrayed by similes is taken from the study of Strotmann.

⁵³² This is the only text among the Tetstaments of the Twelve Patriarchs that Strotmann has taken into consideration. In line with the majority of scholars she rejects the non-Christian origin of TLevi 18:6 and TJud 24:2; cf. STROTMANN, „Mein Vater bist du!“ (Sir 51,10), pp. 160-164. Charlesworth however insists on the ancient character of the Jewish elements which can help to understand better the conception of God as Father in early Judaism; cf. J. H. CHARLESWORTH, “A Caveat on Textual Transmission and the Meaning of *ABBA*. A Study of the Lord’s Prayer,” in J. H. CHARLESWORTH, M. HARDING, and M. KILEY (eds.), *The Lord’s Prayer and other prayer texts from the Greco-Roman era*, Valley Forge: Trinity Press International, 1994, p. 6.

of his child (in this case Aseneth). Though the simile starts with a description of a child's fear and running to his father, it does not mean that the father's love for his child is prompted by his request (or even by the returning back in a metaphorical sense of a sinner). Rather, the image of the earthly father is portrayed in terms of his unconditional affection for his child; therefore, the appeal to God, who is called Lord, by means of the fatherly simile points to the unconditional character of the divine fatherhood.

* * *

The brief overview of the early Jewish literature leads to some conclusive remarks:

1. The image of God as Father in the 'father-texts' as well as the 'son-texts' and similes is overall positive.
2. There may be noted a certain variety in using the bare word 'father' and its usage in conjunction with other terms as well as in employing the attributes which qualify him; that points to a rather multifaceted conception of the fatherhood of God.
3. The divine fatherhood embraces both the cosmic (creation and its sustaining/preservation) and the divine (angels, metanoia) sphere. In the human world, the addressees of the divine fatherhood are those who belong to Israel: the people in its integrity, the faithful elect, and the single just individuals.
4. In all text-groups God's fatherhood is associated both with the people and single individuals.
5. The characteristics of God as Father are quite various in different texts and fluctuate slightly with respect to one or another addressee-group: Israel or Jews enjoy God's fatherly *proximity*, *mercy* (including the motive of *rescue* and *protection*), *fidelity*, and *love* (some texts express it through *chastisement-education* pattern); the faithful elect are promised that they will *live with him and enjoy his refuge forever*; Job's daughters are assured of his *protection* and *help*; orphans/proselytes may rely upon the *rescue from danger* and his *affectionate love* (also Aseneth); single individuals benefit from his *forgiveness* (Adam) and are even admitted to having a *share in his glory and reign* (Job) or *in his glory and peace/salvation* (Abraham).

IV. THE IMAGE OF GOD AS FATHER IN THE UNDISPUTED PAULINE LETTERS

The Pauline corpus is a collection of thirteen letters in the New Testament. Generally, they are subdivided into three categories: there are at least seven undisputed Pauline letters (1 Thessalonians, Galatians, Philippians, Philemon, 1 and 2 Corinthians, and Romans), the so-called deutero-Paulines (2 Thessalonians, Colossians, and Ephesians), and the Pastorals (Titus, 1 and 2 Timothy). The enumeration of the indisputably authentic Pauline letters is provided in chronological order, which has been proposed by Fitzmyer.⁵³³ Such sequence and a tripartite division of the Pauline corpus does not certainly exclude other possible settings in regard to either Paul's authorship of the deutero-Paulines and the Pastorals (or some of them) or the date of their writing.⁵³⁴

4.1. The Statistic and Syntactic Data

In the Pauline corpus the term *πατήρ* occurs 63 times. First of all, in a way similar to the OT references, it denotes the earthly father,⁵³⁵ emphasizing his authority and responsibility for his children.⁵³⁶ The metaphorical use of the term is also attested; in all but one of the cases it is employed to denote the personages of Israel's history: patriarchs/ancestors,⁵³⁷ Abraham,⁵³⁸ and Isaac.⁵³⁹ In all the passages, in which they are referred to, they are portrayed in an exceptionally positive way; moreover, the fatherhood of Abraham to both uncircumcised and circumcised is depicted in the universal terms in Rom 4 and his tight interweave with his faith discloses its strong religious character. The only other reference to the metaphorical paternity apart from the listed above is with respect to the apostle Paul himself.⁵⁴⁰ In 1 Cor 4:15 he admits that the

⁵³³ See J. A. FITZMYER, "Paul," in *NJBC*, pp. 1335-1337.

⁵³⁴ See, for instance, K. H. SCHEKLE, *Paolo. Vita, lettere, teologia*, Brescia: Paideia, 1990, pp. 98-146; J. BECKER, *Paul. Apostle to the Gentiles*, Westminster: John Knox Press, 1993, p. 31; J. MURPHY-O'CONNOR, *Paul. A Critical Life*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996 (especially pp. 102-114, 180-184, 219f.), R. E. BROWN, *An Introduction to the New Testament*, New York: Doubleday, 1997, pp. 456-584. On this rather complicated issue and various opinions with regard to the chronology of Paul's life and the dating of his letters, see R. RIESNER, *Paul's Early Period: Chronology, Mission Strategy, Theology*, Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1998, especially, pp. 14-27 (a synthesis of modern opinions) and p. 322 (a synthesis of the author's position). See also C. J. ROETZEL, *Paul. The Man and the Myth*, Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999, pp. 178-183, who proposes a visual confrontation of some of the opinions (Bruce, Lüdemann, Jewett, and Roetzel).

⁵³⁵ See, generally SCHRENK, *πατήρ*, pp. 1004ff.

⁵³⁶ 1 Thess 2:11; Gal 4:2; 1 Cor 5:1; Phil 2:22; Col 3:21; Eph 5:31; 6:2,4; 1 Tim 5:1.

⁵³⁷ Rom 9:5; 11:28; 15:8; 1 Cor 10:1.

⁵³⁸ Rom 4:11.12 (twice).16.17.18.

⁵³⁹ Rom 9:10.

⁵⁴⁰ In addition, Paul is the subject in two texts among the references to an earthly father: 1 Thess 2:11 explicitly states that Paul and his companions dealt with the Thessalonians like a father with his children; Phil 2:22 points to

Corinthians may have had many guardians but not many πατέρας, because it was he who became their father⁵⁴¹, therefore stands with them in a unique relationship. This relationship shows his authority over them and also, it imposes on him a responsibility for their Christian way of life.⁵⁴²

The theme on the divine fatherhood in the Pauline corpus is undoubtedly not a marginal one as it is quite evident from the statistics on the theological use of πατήρ. In 42 cases (two thirds of the total amount) from total of 63 occurrences of πατήρ, this term is employed in connection with God or stands for the notion of God.⁵⁴³ In the undisputed Pauline letters, this term is theologically used 24 times. There is no particular concentration on the theological use of the word πατήρ in any of the letters, however, the usage of it in the letter to Philemon is restricted due to the initial salutation (Phlm 1:3). Grammatically, in the undisputed Pauline letters the usage of πατήρ in reference to God may be basically viewed from a threefold perspective:

1. πατήρ in connection with θεός (ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατήρ,⁵⁴⁴ εἰς θεὸς ὁ πατήρ,⁵⁴⁵ θεὸς πατήρ⁵⁴⁶).
2. πατήρ used without any qualification⁵⁴⁷.
3. πατήρ qualified by other words.⁵⁴⁸

It is statistically evident that two formulas in the first group ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατήρ (9x) and θεὸς πατήρ (9x) played a fundamental role in Paul's formulation of the expressions about God as Father. The expression θεὸς πατήρ is predominantly used in the initial salutations and it is employed without the article.⁵⁴⁹ It is not very clear whether this formula should be understood in terms of an asyndetic agreement⁵⁵⁰ or as an appositional anarthrous phrase;⁵⁵¹ in the latter case

the apostle Paul's paternity in connection with Timothy's cooperation with him: like a son with his father he labored for the sake of the gospel.

⁵⁴¹ Although the fatherhood of Paul is not explicitly stated, yet the phrase that follows πατέρας makes it quite clear: ἐν γὰρ Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἐγὼ ὑμᾶς ἐγέννησα.

⁵⁴² Cf. G. D. FEE, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, NICNT, Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1987, p. 185. On the double aspect of Paul's fatherhood - authority and affection over/to the believers in Thessalonica - see a recent article of T. J. BURKE, "Pauline Paternity in 1 Thessalonians," *TynBull* 51 (1, 2000) 59-80.

⁵⁴³ There is one more ambiguous reference to πατήρ in Gal 4:2 that is not included in the amount of 42 cases and which some scholars take as pointing to the divine fatherhood. It is included in the list of the texts on the fatherhood of God by D. von ALLMEN, *La famille de Dieu. La symbolique familiale dans le paulinisme*, (OBO 41), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981, p. XVI. The fatherhood of God in Gal 4:1-2 has also been strongly proposed by J. M. SCOTT, *Adoption as sons of God. An exegetical investigation into the background of ΥΙΟΘΕΣΙΑ in the Pauline corpus* (WUNT 2/48), Tübingen: Mohr, 1992, pp. 122-149.

⁵⁴⁴ 1 Thess 1:3; 3:11.13; Gal 1:4; Phil 4:20; 1 Cor 15:24; 2 Cor 1:3; 11:31; Rom 15:6.

⁵⁴⁵ 1 Cor 8:6.

⁵⁴⁶ 1 Thess 1:1; Gal 1:1.3; Phil 1:2; 2:11; Phlm 1:3; 1 Cor 1:3; 2 Cor 1:2; Rom 1:7.

⁵⁴⁷ Gal 4:6 and Rom 8:15 (ἄββα ὁ πατήρ); 2 Cor 6:18 (without the article); Rom 6:4.

⁵⁴⁸ 2 Cor 1:3 - ὁ πατήρ τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν.

⁵⁴⁹ According to Schrenk, the omission of the article before θεὸς πατήρ in initial salutations emphasizes rhythmic correspondence and solemnity; due to this omission 'father' is almost given the significance of a proper name; cf. SCHRENK, πατήρ, p. 1006f.

⁵⁵⁰ *Ibid.*

the original construction must have been θεὸς ὁ πατήρ. This way, the presented construction θεὸς πατήρ in accordance with εἷς θεὸς ὁ πατήρ (1 Cor 8:6) probably points to Paul's understanding of God's being a 'father' in a very proper sense, i.e. there is only one God and he is the Father.⁵⁵² Both εἷς θεὸς καὶ πατήρ and θεὸς πατήρ strongly underline the collective character of the addressees of the divine fatherhood. Thus, θεὸς πατήρ 6 times and ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατήρ 5 times are qualified by ἡμῶν. In addition, εἷς θεὸς ὁ πατήρ is also followed by ἡμῶν. The significance of the plural ἡμῶν lies in the fact that this is the only pronoun employed in the Pauline corpus in a genitive case in connection with the divine Father. It is equally important that in all the cases the phrase θεὸς πατήρ, when is followed by ἡμῶν, occurs in a standardized formula in the initial salutation – χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.⁵⁵³ It is worth mentioning that apart from the initial salutations (with an exception in adscription 2 Thess 1:1) θεὸς πατήρ is never followed by ἡμῶν in the whole Pauline corpus; instead, ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατήρ ἡμῶν is used. The coupling of God the Father with Jesus Christ in the opening formulas⁵⁵⁴ points to Paul's understanding them as being together the source of χάρις and εἰρήνη. Such a co-action of God the Father and Jesus Christ joined by καί finds its further confirmation and several new aspects in other examples: they are responsible (διὰ) for Paul's apostleship (Gal 1:1) and they are being prayed to make Paul's and Timothy's way straight (κατευθύνω) to the community in Thessalonica (1 Thess 3:11) and to strengthen (στηρίζω) them in every good work and word (2 Thess 2:16-17). Other texts that also contain ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατήρ, θεὸς πατήρ, and [ὁ] θεὸς ὁ πατήρ, show a similar tendency to portray God the Father in a very close connection with the Lord Jesus Christ. Such a close intimacy is undoubtedly due to Jesus as the Son of God, who is explicitly called twice: ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατήρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ;⁵⁵⁵ and once it is done in a shortened form τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ (2 Cor 11:31).

The usage of πατήρ without any further qualification is not as numerous as in the case of coupling God with Father and is limited to four texts in three letters.⁵⁵⁶ The Father in these texts

⁵⁵¹ See BDF §268; J. H. MOULTON – N. TURNER, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek. Vol. III Syntax*, Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1963, p. 206.

⁵⁵² It has been strongly emphasized by M. BUSCEMI, "Dio Padre in S. Paolo," *Antonionum* 76 (2, 2001), pp. 249f. and note 12.

⁵⁵³ Gal 1:3; Phil 1:2; Phlm 1:3; 1 Cor 1:3; 2 Cor 1:2; Rom 1:7. However, the use of ἡμῶν after πατήρ in Gal 1:3 is not well established because of the sharp division of the important manuscripts.

⁵⁵⁴ 1 Thess 1:1 does not follow the common pattern: though joining God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ by καί in the adscription the initial salutation lacks the explicit mention of the subjects from whom χάρις and εἰρήνη are supposed to come.

⁵⁵⁵ 2 Cor 1:3; Rom 15:6.

⁵⁵⁶ Although according to SCHRENK, πατήρ, p. 1008, n. 379, the phrase in Rom 6:4 διὰ τῆς δόξης τοῦ πατρὸς is merely an abbreviated form for "his, namely, Christ's Father", and consequently does not fit into this category, nothing confirms this suggestion since in the Pauline corpus there is no text in which πατήρ is followed by αὐτοῦ.

is predominantly portrayed in a passive manner, i.e., he is an addressee in two out of four texts: ἄββα ὁ πατήρ (Gal 4:6; Rom 8:15). Two other texts reflect the already-noticed collective aspect of the divine fatherhood – ἔσομαι ὑμῖν εἰς πατέρα (2 Cor 6:18)⁵⁵⁷ and also confirm the closeness of the rapport between the Father and Jesus Christ – ἡγέρθη ... διὰ τῆς δόξης τοῦ πατρός (Rom 6:4).

Only once πατήρ is qualified by other terms: τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν (2 Cor 1:3). This genitive completes the portrait of God the Father as far as he is presented in connection with other genitive determinations: he is the Father of Jesus Christ, our Father, and the Father of mercies.

The statistic data on the sonship terms may be summarized as follows: in the Pauline corpus there are 41 references to υἱός and 39 to τέκνον from which 25 and 6 references respectively are in connection with the divine sonship. In 28 references out of 31 that occur in the undisputed Pauline letters. It is noteworthy, that the divine sonship is applied to Jesus Christ in 15 cases⁵⁵⁸ of the total of 23 υἱός-references; only twice this term is employed in the singular in the same verse (Gal 4:7) to designate the sonship of Christians, whose status as children of God is also explicitly attested in the other υἱός/τέκνον-references.⁵⁵⁹ In addition, there are five other texts which also provide some idea for the concept of the divine fatherhood: the quality of the status of the children of God is expressed by the term υἰοθεσία.⁵⁶⁰ To be sure not all the ‘son-texts’ add much to the image of God as Father. A number of them simply mention the fact that Jesus Christ is the Son of God without any further development of the concept of the divine Father either by a verbal construction or by indicating some aspect of the relationship between the Father and the Son; they rather concentrate on the figure and the activity of Jesus Christ. These texts obviously exceed the limits of this investigation and are not taken into account.⁵⁶¹ Likewise, some texts, which refer to the collective divine sonship (including υἰοθεσία), emphasize more on the status of the children of God and its consequences rather than draw

Furthermore, such phrases as ὁ πατήρ τῆς δόξης (Eph 1:17) and especially ὅτι κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ πατρός (Phil 2:11) show their self-completeness in their contexts and require no further specifications. This is not a question *whether* the Father is referred to as the Father of Jesus Christ in a given text (he is indeed, as in many others) but *how* the phrase functions in the particular text.

⁵⁵⁷ It seems to be a free quotation of 2Sam 7:14 with some motives of 2Sam 7:8 and Isa 43:6 (cf. Jer 31:9 [LXX – 38:9]) and with important change of the αὐτῷ (2Sam) in the singular to the collective ὑμῖν.

⁵⁵⁸ According to HENGEL, *The Son of God*, p. 7, there are 15 references to υἱός θεοῦ which are in connection with Jesus Christ. To be more precise there are only four texts in which we find this explicit formula with or without the articles (Gal 2:20; 2 Cor 1:19; Rom 1:4; Eph 4:13). Nine times υἱός is qualified by the theological αὐτοῦ (1 Thess 1:10; Gal 1:16; 4:4.6; 1 Cor 1:9; Rom 1:3.9; 5:10; 8:29), once ἑαυτοῦ (Rom 8:3), once ἰδίου (Rom 8:32), and once τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ (Col 1:13). There is one more text in which Jesus Christ is named υἱός, and this is the only occurrence in the Pauline corpus (1 Cor 15:28) in which the Christological υἱός is employed in the absolute sense.

⁵⁵⁹ Gal 3:26; 4:6 (υἱοί); Phil 2:15 (τέκνα); 2 Cor 6:18 (υἱοί); Rom 8:14.19; 9:26 (υἱοί); Rom 8:16.17.21; 9:8 (τέκνα).

⁵⁶⁰ The subject of υἰοθεσία in Rom 9:4 is the Israelite people and in Gal 4:5; Rom 8:15.23 are Christians.

⁵⁶¹ Gal 2:20; 1 Cor 1:9; 2 Cor 1:19; Rom 1:3.9; 5:10.

attention to God as Father.⁵⁶² Yet, as several ‘son-texts’ are closely interrelated with the ‘father-texts’ in Gal 4 and Rom 8 it seems to be useful to refer to Gal 3:26-29 and Rom 8:14-17 as far as they are informative in respect of the fatherhood of God.

Some final remarks on the statistic and syntactic data:

1. In the undisputed Pauline letters the divine fatherhood is never alluded to by any comparison either in the ‘father-texts’ or in the ‘son-passages’.
2. The fatherhood of God is predominantly attested in a pair with θεός but never with κύριος.⁵⁶³
3. The divine fatherhood is strongly associated with the figure of Jesus Christ.
4. Only two addressee groups are pointed out in the genitive case in connection with God the Father: Lord Jesus Christ and Christians.
5. The ‘son-texts’ confirm the exceptional character of the divine fatherhood with respect to Jesus Christ and Christians (an exception is Rom 9:4 – υιοθεσία belongs to Israel as well).

4.2. The Image of God as Father in the Individual Texts

Before proceeding with a detailed analysis of the individual passages some methodological observations must be presented:

1. There are good reasons to proceed by grouping the references according to the grammatical criteria that are well discernible in the epistolary prescripts⁵⁶⁴ (especially the initial salutations) in which God is called [our] Father and is paired with Jesus Christ by means of καί,⁵⁶⁵ in formulas that explicitly refer to God as the Father of Jesus Christ,⁵⁶⁶ in formulas in which ‘God and (καί) Father’ is said to be our Father,⁵⁶⁷ and in two texts with ἄββα ὁ πατήρ.⁵⁶⁸ However, we prefer to briefly observe every single

⁵⁶² Gal 3:26; 4:5-7; Rom 8:14-17.19.21.23; 9:4.8.26; cf. Phil 2:15.

⁵⁶³ It is not, of course, valid for those texts in which κύριος does not designate θεός but functions as the title of Jesus Christ, as, for instance, in the initial salutations.

⁵⁶⁴ According to Aune there are two basic elements in the Pauline letter opening: the prescript (superscription, adscription, and salutation) and the thanksgiving; so, D. E. AUNE, *The New Testament in Its Literary Environment*, LEC, Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1989, p. 184. The term ‘prescript’ is not unanimously used however; some authors prefer to speak of the ‘opening formulas’ without attaching the introductory thanksgiving to them; they rather consider it a transitional element between the opening formula and the body of the letter.

⁵⁶⁵ The initial salutations, which explicitly point to the divine fatherhood (an exception 1 Thess 1:2), are presented with some variations in all undisputed Pauline letters. The references to 1 Thess 1:1 (adscription) and Gal 1:1 (superscription) have a similar formulation.

⁵⁶⁶ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (2 Cor 1:3; Rom 15:6; plus ‘of the Lord Jesus’ in 2 Cor 11:31).

⁵⁶⁷ Apart from ‘our Father’ in the initial salutations there are five more references: 1 Thess 1:3; 3:11.13; Gal 1:4; Phil 4:20.

⁵⁶⁸ Gal 4:6 and Rom 8:15.

reference in each letter⁵⁶⁹ following the letter-order mentioned above. To deal with the texts in question in such a manner seems to be more reasonable for several motives:

- a) Not all formulaic expressions on the divine fatherhood are independent from other ‘father-texts’ in the same passage, therefore treating them under different headings might burden the analysis and disrespect Paul’s thought.⁵⁷⁰
 - b) The semantic field of several texts advocates that it would be better to analyze them paying more attention to the other references to God as Father in the same letter rather than attending only to the grammatical similarities.⁵⁷¹
 - c) Such an analysis helps better to perceive the place and role of the divine fatherhood that is given in a particular letter.
2. Those ‘son-texts’, which add something to the image of God as Father will be observed along with the ‘father-texts’ in the respective letters.

4.2.1. The Fatherhood of God in the Initial Salutations

Although the initial salutations⁵⁷² in the undisputed Pauline letters do not vary much and have a quite similar wording, they are not totally identical; this fact points to their rather formulaic character demonstrating at the same time a certain freedom with which they have been employed in different letters.

In the letter to the Galatians (Gal 1:3) the important manuscripts are divided over several readings. The alternative reading to ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ⁵⁷³ in Gal 1:3 is ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ that has a very strong external support.⁵⁷⁴ The scholars are not unanimous and some commentators opt for a less traditional

⁵⁶⁹ An exception is the initial salutations, which will be observed together because of the identical or very close wording with regard to the fatherhood of God.

⁵⁷⁰ Obviously, it would be of no advantage to attribute to different groups and to investigate separately two references to God as Father which occur in the same sentence though grammatically they may be observed under two different headings: in 2 Cor 1:3 a genitive construction ὁ πατὴρ τῶν οἰκτιρῶν occurs in the same verse with ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. A somewhat different situation presents the self-complete salutation formula in Gal 1:3. Though it should be regarded as a particular device in the Pauline letters, however, since in the opening formula in Galatians (Gal 1:1-5) it is encircled by two other ‘father-references’ in v. 1 and v. 4, attention will be paid to this particular case in its entirety in the section devoted to the letter to the Galatians.

⁵⁷¹ For instance, Phil 4:20 may be counted among the texts with ‘God καὶ our Father’; instead it will be treated together with Phil 2:11 since they are the only references to God as Father in the letter (apart from the initial salutation) and they both speak about the Father’s δόξα. Similarly, the πάντα language in two ‘father-texts’ in 1 Cor 8:6 and 1 Cor 15:20-28 gives some suggestion about how Paul presented the image of God as Father to the Corinthians.

⁵⁷² They should not to be confused with other forms of greetings that also appear in the Pauline letters and represent a distinct literary form; see T. Y. MULLINS, “Greeting As a New Testament Form,” *JBL* 87 (1968), pp. 418-426.

⁵⁷³ Ⲙ, A, P, Ψ, 33, etc.

⁵⁷⁴ P⁴⁶, B, D, F, G, H, etc.

reading;⁵⁷⁵ the majority, however, accepts the usual phraseology ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν, that is well established in the other genuine Pauline letters. They usually point to Metzger's opinion that the stereotyped formula was altered by copyists because of the development of piety to Lord Jesus Christ.⁵⁷⁶

4.2.1.1. *The Analysis of the Initial Salutations*

A dual-part structure occurs in all Pauline initial salutations except for the 1 Thess 1:1, where both parts are coordinated by means of ἀπό, which by introducing the divine subjects, serves to elucidate the meaning of the contents of the greeting. Hence, the image of God the Father in the initial salutations depends both on the interpretation of the first part of the salutation (the contents) as well as on the value of the preposition ἀπό and the conjunction καί that are given in the second part (relational aspect). There is also another stylistic problem as there is no explicit verb employed in any of the initial salutations. Yet, instead of the indicative of the verb εἰμί which is usually implied in such cases, the optative seems to be more appropriate,⁵⁷⁷ especially, if one understands the formulaic salutation in terms of the apostle's confident wish or blessing⁵⁷⁸ and not merely as a simple declaration.⁵⁷⁹ In the NT, the optative mood expressing a wish is mostly attested in the Pauline corpus.⁵⁸⁰

The first part – χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη – is the shortest initial salutation in 1 Thess 1:1, and has exactly the same wording in all Pauline initial salutations (except the Pastorals) that differs considerably from the contemporary conventions of Greek letter writing.⁵⁸¹ The verbal infinitive form χαίρειν, which is typically used in pagan and even Jewish letters, including those

⁵⁷⁵ See, for instance, W. KRAMER, *Christ, Lord, Son of God*, SBT 50, London: SCM Press, 1966, p. 152 note 550; D. GUTHRIE, *Galatians*, CB, London: Nelson, 1969, p. 59; A. OEPKE, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Galater*, THNT IX, Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1973, p. 42; U. BORSE, *La lettera ai Galati*, NTC, Brescia: Morcelliana, 2000, pp. 68-69.

⁵⁷⁶ Cf. B. M. METZGER, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994², p. 520.

⁵⁷⁷ Even though Paul has never explicitly employed the optative of εἰμί in his letters; cf. MOULTON – TURNER, *Grammar*, pp. 298, 303.

⁵⁷⁸ For instance, the optative is used in LXX in a greeting in Dan 4:1; 6:26 (LXX) and in a blessing in Num 6:24-26. There are also three initial salutations with the optative in 1 Pet 1:2; 2 Pet 1:2; Jude 2. See also the argumentation of G. P. WILES, *Paul's Intercessory Prayers*, SNTSMS 24, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974, pp. 36-38.

⁵⁷⁹ This is the option of W. SCHRAGE, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*, EKK VII, Teilbd. 1, Zürich: Benziger Verlag / Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1991, p. 106. Ebeling admits that the optative fits better in our case, yet he questions whether the future indicative could not have been intended instead of the optative, since the salutation is oriented towards its final fulfillment that has already been inaugurated and offered; cf. G. EBELING, *La verità dell'evangelo. Commento alla lettera ai Galati*, SBD 7, Genova: Marietti, 1989, p. 42.

⁵⁸⁰ There are 38 examples of the optative expressing a wish in the NT and 29 of them are found in the Paul's letters; cf. M. ZERWICK, *Biblical Greek Illustrated by Examples*, SPIB 114, Roma: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1963, 1990⁵, § 355.

⁵⁸¹ Cf. J. M. LIEU, "Grace to You and Peace": the Apostolic Greeting," *BJRL* 68 (1985), p. 163.

in LXX,⁵⁸² is here substituted by the noun that is connected with εἰρήνη; most probably it is the translation of שלום/שָׁלוֹם that was commonly used as an introductory greeting in a conversation and in delivering a message;⁵⁸³ it also appears as a key term in the initial salutations, secondary greetings, and concluding formulas in the Aramaic epistolography carrying with it the idea of greeting, peace, and well-being.⁵⁸⁴ In the NT εἰρήνη denotes both a certain feeling/experience of peace/tranquility and a state of reconciliation with God; its most important and basic notion, however, is salvation of the whole person and it should be understood in the ultimate eschatological sense.⁵⁸⁵ As regards χάρις, there is no reference to it either in the OT or in the Jewish/Hellenistic letters; it is not employed in the epistolary opening/closing formulas,⁵⁸⁶ therefore, it should be regarded as an absolutely new element in the Pauline and the NT⁵⁸⁷ epistolary tradition. Many scholars think that Paul, though adhering to a Greek epistolary tradition, has deliberately substituted χαίρειν by χάρις because of a certain sound-conformity between χαίρειν and χάρις⁵⁸⁸ and the latter's use in the place in which there is traditionally supposed to be χαίρειν, in order to endow the customary Greek greeting with a Christian content.⁵⁸⁹ Others, still point to a Jewish salutation formula in the Syriac *Apocalypse of Baruch* (78:2),⁵⁹⁰ in which *peace* is in conjunction with *mercy*, and to its Pauline equivalent in Gal 6:16. The use of εἰρήνη...καὶ ἔλεος in the closing peace wish in Gal 6:16 is quite indicative, i.e. Paul

⁵⁸² Cf. 1Macc 10:18.25; 11:30; 12:6; 13:36; 14:20; 15:2.16; 2Macc 1:10; 9:19; 11:16.22; 27:34; Esth 8:12^a; also 3Ezra 6:8; 8:9. The closest example to the Pauline use on philological grounds is the initial salutation in 2Macc 1:1 where χαίρειν is associated with εἰρήνην ἀγαθήν.

⁵⁸³ Cf. Judg 6:23; 2Sam 18:28; 2Kgs 4:26. In all these cases שלום is rendered in LXX by εἰρήνη.

⁵⁸⁴ See J. A. FITZMYER, "Aramaic Epistolography," in J. L. WHITE (ed.), *Studies in Ancient Letter Writing* (Semeia 22), Chico: Scholars Press, 1982, pp. 33-36. There are also several texts in the OT which, are letters according to their literary genre and contain שלום in the initial greetings (Ezra 4:17; 5:7; Dan 3:31; 6:26). Fitzmyer notices that short formulas in which שלום is used alone (as, for instance in Ezra 4:17; 5:7) are "stereotyped abridgements of longer greetings" (p. 34). He distinguishes four longer שלום forms of the initial salutations and two more 'benediction' בִּרְכָה forms (one is found only in a secondary greeting) in which שלום is also included. See also LIEU, "Grace to You and Peace," pp. 164-166. A brief summary on the Aramaic and Jewish epistolography is also provided by AUNE, *The New Testament*, pp. 174-180.

⁵⁸⁵ Cf. W. FOERSTER, εἰρήνη, in *TDNT* 2, pp. 411-412.

⁵⁸⁶ The combination χάρις καὶ ἔλεος is mentioned in Wis 3:9 and 4:15, in a context that emphasizes God's concern for those who are faithful to him.

⁵⁸⁷ Cf. 1 Pet 1:2; 2 Pt 1:2; 2 John 1:3.

⁵⁸⁸ Cf. H. CONZELMANN, χαίρω - εὐχάριστος, in *TDNT* 9, p. 394;

⁵⁸⁹ Cf. C. K. BARRETT, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, HNTC, New York/London: Harper & Row, 1957, p. 22; GUTHRIE, *Galatians*, p. 59; E. BEST, *A Commentary on the First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians*, HNTC, New York/London: Harper & Row, 1972, p. 63; OEPKE, *An die Galater*, p. 45; H. D. BETZ, *Galatians*, Hermeneia, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979, p. 40; G. F. HAWTHORNE, *Philippians*, WBC 43, Waco: Word Books, 1983, p. 10f.; BORSE, *La lettera ai Galati*, p. 68; R. P. MARTIN, *2 Corinthians*, WBC 40, Waco: Word Books, 1986, p. 4; AUNE, *The New Testament*, p. 184; J. D. G. DUNN, *Romans 1-8*, WBC 38A, Dallas: Word Books, 1988, p. 20; B. CORSANI, *Lettera ai Galati*, CSANT 9, Genova: Marietti, 1990, p. 58; L. MORRIS, *The First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians* (rev. ed.), NICNT, Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1991, p. 37; D. B. CAPES, *Old Testament Yahweh Texts in Paul's Christology* (WUNT 2), Tübingen: Mohr, 1992, p. 63; T. GEORGE, *Galatians*, NAC 30, Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1994, p. 85; A. PITTA, *Lettera ai Galati*, SOC, Bologna: Dehoniane, 1996, p. 67.

⁵⁹⁰ In addition, the ⲕ text of the blessing in Tob 7:11 also combines ἔλεος with εἰρήνη.

was not ignorant of the Jewish use of such a combination. Accordingly, he may have changed it to the formula *χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη*,⁵⁹¹ so that it would function at the beginning of his letters as a blessing conveying the divine gift⁵⁹² or as an intercessory prayer.⁵⁹³ In LXX *ἔλεος* is mostly used for *חסד*; this is not a simple expression for God's gracious and faithful disposition towards Israel but it rather denotes his active and continuous engagement in that relationship.⁵⁹⁴ This term is more profound than *חן* (favor/grace) which is a more situational term denoting usually a unilateral, free (without any obligation of responsibility on both parts) and not necessarily long lasting attitude or activity⁵⁹⁵ and which is usually translated by *χάρις*⁵⁹⁶ the latter not being a theological concept in LXX.⁵⁹⁷ It is worth noting, that the verbal form *חנן* is used in benediction formulas both in the OT and Qumran;⁵⁹⁸ hence, it cannot be discounted that *חן/חנן* may have played some role in the Pauline use of *χάρις*.⁵⁹⁹ In any kind of motivation(s)⁶⁰⁰ for Paul's employing *χάρις* in the initial salutations the content of this term must be basically viewed from

⁵⁹¹ Cf. J.-F. COLLANGE, *L'épître de saint Paul aux Philippiens*, CNT Xa, Neuchâtel: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1973, p. 42; K. BERGER, "Apostelbrief und apostolische Rede. Zum Formular frühchristlicher Briefe," *ZNW* 65 (1974), p. 198f.; H. CONZELMANN, *1 Corinthians*, Hermeneia, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975, pp. 23-24, and notes 6 and 43; C. E. B. CRANFIELD, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (vol. 1, I-VIII), ICC, Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1975, 1990⁷, p. 71 note 3 (with some reservation); H. SCHLIER, *La lettera ai Romani*, CTNT, Brescia: Paidea, 1982, p. 75f.; F. F. BRUCE, *1 and 2 Thessalonians*, WBC 45, 1982, Waco: Word Books, 1982, p. 8; I. H. MARSHALL, *1 and 2 Thessalonians*, NCB, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans / London: Marshall Morgan & Scott Publ. Ltd., 1983, p. 49; T. HOLTZ, *Der erste Brief an die Thessalonicher*, EKK XIII, Zürich: Benziger Verlag / Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1986, p. 39; V. HASLER, *εἰρήνη*, in *EDNT* 1, p. 396; This seems to have been quite possible because the term *ἔλεος* was not Paul's favorite one. While *χάρις* is undoubtedly the Pauline term, *ἔλεος* apart from Gal 6:16 it is only used in Rom 9:23, 11:31, 15:9, once in Eph 2:4, and several times in the Pastorals: 1 Tim 1:2, 2 Tim 1:2.16.18, Tit 3:5. On the other hand, the separate use of *χάρις* in the final benediction in Gal 6 (v. 18) immediately follows the wish of peace *εἰρήνη...καὶ ἔλεος* (v. 16) and the combination of *ἔλεος* along with *χάρις* and *εἰρήνη* in the initial salutations in 1 and 2 Timothy (especially if one accepts Paul's authenticity of 2 Tim) make this explanation not completely convincing.

⁵⁹² Cf. WILES, *Paul's Intercessory Prayers*, p. 108ff.; LIEU, "Grace to You and Peace," p. 168; E. KÄSEMANN, *Commentary on Romans*, Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1980, p. 16; P. IOVINO, *La prima lettera ai Tessalonicesi*, SOC 13, Bologna: Dehoniane, 1992, p. 81; J. A. FITZMYER, *Romans*, AB 33, London: Doubleday, 1993, p. 239.

⁵⁹³ Cf. BETZ, *Galatians*, p. 40; MARTIN, *2 Corinthians*, WBC 40, Waco: Word Books, 1986, p. 4. According to Wanamaker, the Pauline initial salutations represent a formulaic prayer for those to whom he addressed his letters; see C. A. WANAMAKER, *The Epistles to the Thessalonians*, NIGTC, Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans / Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1990, p. 71; similarly, G. BARBAGLIO, *La Prima Lettera ai Corinzi*, SOC 16, Bologna: Dehoniane, 1995, p. 70.

⁵⁹⁴ Cf. R. BULTMANN, *ἔλεος - ἀνελεῖμιν*, in *TDNT* 2, pp. 479-481; MARTIN, *2 Corinthians*, WBC 40, Waco: Word Books, 1986, p. 4.

⁵⁹⁵ Cf. D. N. FRIEDMAN, J. R. LUNDBOM, H.-J. FABRY, *חנן*, in *TDOT* 5, pp. 24-25.

⁵⁹⁶ These terms are not interchangeable: only once *χάρις* is used for *חסד* (Esth 2:9), and twice *ἔλεος* for *חן* (Gen 19:19; Judg 6:17).

⁵⁹⁷ Cf. CONZELMANN, *χαίρω - εὐχαρίστος*, p. 389; cf. also B. RIGAU, *Saint Paul. Les épîtres aux Thessaloniciens*, EB, Paris: J. Gabalda et C^{ie} / Gembloux: J. Duculot, 1956, p. 352.

⁵⁹⁸ Cf. FRIEDMAN, LUNDBOM, FABRY, *חנן*, pp. 35-36. The most important example in the OT is Aaron's blessing in Num 6:24-26: so that God should be gracious to the Israelites (v. 25 - *חנן*) and should give them peace (v. 26 - *שלום*). Yet, while *שלום* is translated by *εἰρήνη*, *חנן* is rendered by *ἐλεέω* and not by *χαρίζομαι*.

⁵⁹⁹ Cf. U. VANNI, *Lettere ai Galati e ai Romani*, Roma: Paoline, 1967, p. 21; M. BARTH, *Ephesians* (vol. 1, 1-3), AB 34, New York: Doubleday, 1974, pp. 73-74; FITZMYER, *Romans*, p. 228.

⁶⁰⁰ Wiles observes that there was rather a whole Greek-Jewish-Christian background that prepared for the Pauline initial salutation; it may be quite misleading to suggest just a single source; cf. WILES, *Paul's Intercessory Prayers*, pp. 111f.

a theological perspective; Paul uses this term in his letters⁶⁰¹ to describe a dynamic, wholly generous, and eschatological act of God⁶⁰² that has resulted in the salvation event freely operated by him in Jesus Christ.

There is a number of blessings/peace wishes in the Pauline corpus in which *χάρις* and/or *εἰρήνη* are employed without being joined in one phrase as it is in the initial salutations. A majority of these blessings appears at the very end of the letters: *χάρις* that is mentioned in all final blessings in 8 cases is referred to be [our] Lord Jesus [Christ].⁶⁰³ The phrase *θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης* is usually found in the final wish of peace right before the concluding blessings.⁶⁰⁴ In this manner, *χάρις* and *εἰρήνη* seem to epitomize the essence of Paul's gospel referring to its cause and its effect.⁶⁰⁵ Therefore, it is quite evident that Paul did not intend to mean merely a simple greeting to express his wish for peace or well-being by using *χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη*; however, the purpose of the initial salutation to communicate joy cannot be underestimated as well as to refer to Paul's authority in imparting *grace* and *peace* on his addressees.⁶⁰⁶

A second quite standard element in the initial salutations is the phrase *ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς [ἡμῶν] καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* (8x). It seems to be erroneous to consider that the omission of it in 1 Thess 1:1 is affecting the conception of the greeting *χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη* in this letter and to postulate a certain evolution in the *meaning* of the initial salutation in the later

⁶⁰¹ See EBELING, *La verità dell'evangelo*, pp. 38-40 for a brief discussion of the possible sources for the use of *χάρις* by Paul in the initial salutations.

⁶⁰² See J. D. G. DUNN, *Jesus and the Spirit*, Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1975, pp. 202-205 for the notion of *χάρις* in the Pauline letters.

⁶⁰³ Cf. 1 Thess 5:28; Gal 6:18; Phil 4:23; Phlm 25; 1 Cor 16:23; 2 Cor 13:13; Rom 16:20; 2 Thess 3:18.

⁶⁰⁴ Cf. 1 Thess 5:23; Gal 6:16; Phil 4:9; 2 Cor 13:11; Rom 15:33; (see also 16:20); 2 Thess 3:16 (*κύριος τῆς εἰρήνης*); Eph 6:23. An exception is the peace wish in Phil 4:9 that is a bit far from the conclusion of the letter in its present form. Nevertheless, it is the only peace wish in the whole letter and may have served as the conclusion of one of the so-called 'component' letters (three original letters have been accepted by F. W. Beare, J. A. Fitzmyer, R. H. Fuller, H. Koester, E. Lohse, W. Marxsen, J. Murphy-O'Connor, W. Schmithals).

⁶⁰⁵ In the initial salutation this is likely intended even syntactically as the emphasis is put on *χάρις* by *directly* adjoining to it *ὑμῖν* and only then adding *εἰρήνη*.

⁶⁰⁶ Cf. SCHLIER, *La lettera ai Romani*, p. 77; V. P. FURNISH, *II Corinthians*, AB 32A, New York: Doubleday, 1984, p. 106. Certainly, Paul owes his authority to God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ who are the real senders of grace and peace; the apostle's authority has been strongly stressed by Berger who considers the NT letter as a certain apostolic-prophetic revealing discourse and he claims that the *epistolary prescript* permits one to regard the apostle as God's mouthpiece and a mediator of the divine gifts (cf. BERGER, "Apostelbrief," pp. 201-202, 219), the view criticized by M. E. THRALL, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians* (vol. 1, I-VII), Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994, p. 96. Her supposition, however, that the second part of the initial salutation (*ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς...*) has been adjoined to *χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη* in order to "give some structural balance to the lengthy address of writers to readers" in 2 Cor 1:1-2 (*ibid.*, p. 97) it is not convincing: this second part with some varieties is attested in all Pauline letters despite the diverse length of the superscriptions (simple or extended as in Rom) and adscriptions. The reference to 1 Thess 1:1 that has a short form of the initial salutation (indicated by the author as a certain proof for her supposition) helps a little if one accepts Paul's authenticity of 2 Thess: its superscription and adscription is identical to 2 Thess 1:2, which has a full-form initial salutation. And even if one considers 2 Thess to have not been written by Paul the question remains why those (presumably imitating Paul) who were responsible for editing the letter adjoined the second part of the greeting to the epistolary prescript without changing other elements in it to make it lengthier and get the entire structure more balanced as in the other Pauline letters? On the other hand, they could easily drop away the second part of the salutation in 2 Thess thus making the opening formula of both letters identical; but they did not.

letters in which the dispensators of *grace* and *peace* are explicitly named.⁶⁰⁷ On the other hand, it is obvious that the qualifying phrase is a key to a better understanding of the full religious dimension of such an unusual salutation. By referring to God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ Paul sought to elucidate in a precise way the source of those interrelated gifts by putting emphasis not only on them but also on their givers. The dispensation of χάρις and εἰρήνη in the full-form initial salutation grammatically depends on both: on God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ that are expressed by means of ἀπο as the common source. The terms that stand in a sequence ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου are not to be taken as mutually related and dependent on πατρός as if they were intended to explain God's fatherhood by means of a double sonship: of ours and of the Lord Jesus Christ.⁶⁰⁸ In fact, there are two subjects: God and the Lord. They are connected by καί and share the same preposition ἀπό; this indicates not only their common function but also their equal authority in dispensing their gifts.⁶⁰⁹ However, many commentators have questioned this grammatical indication, as they proposed to interpret καί in terms of ἐν/διὰ in accordance with a quite common Pauline idea about God's acting in/through Christ.⁶¹⁰ The conception of God as the ultimate source/goal and Jesus Christ as the means/agent is widely attested in Paul's argumentation within different letters and in diverse ways;⁶¹¹ it also occurs in his several extended epistolary prescripts.⁶¹² The Conzelmann's interpretation occupies the middle position that combines two elements: there is both a *theoretical* subordination of Christ to God (apparently in a sense of ἐν/διὰ) and a *practical* cooperation between them (καί) since looking from the perspective of salvation and faith the Father and Jesus Christ are in unity.⁶¹³ Yet again, it may well be that Paul intentionally put God the Father and Jesus Christ on the same

⁶⁰⁷ A fixed form of χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη in other initial salutations may hardly point to any change in its meaning.

⁶⁰⁸ See the initial salutations in the Pastorals whose wording eliminates such a possibility. Furthermore, Paul nowhere in his letters mixes the sonship of Jesus Christ with ours; the pattern 'our God and/the Father' is also attested in other places without mentioning Jesus Christ's sonship (cf. 1.).

⁶⁰⁹ Cf. E.-B. ALLO, *Saint Paul première épître aux Corinthiens*, EB, Paris: J. Gabalda et C^{ie}, 1934², p. 4; CRANFIELD, *Romans*, vol. 1, p. 72; HAWTHORNE, *Philippians*, p. 12; R. Y. K. FUNG, *The Epistle to the Galatians*, NICNT, Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1988, p. 39; MORRIS, *Thessalonians*, p. 192, note 2; CAPES, *Yahweh Texts in Paul's Christology*, p. 64; THRALL, *Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, vol. 1, p. 97; GEORGE, *Galatians*, p. 85.

⁶¹⁰ Cf. C. K. BARRETT, *A commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, HNTC, New York/London: Harper & Row, 1973, p. 56 (though he makes no distinction between God and Jesus as regards their belonging to the same order); BARTH, *Ephesians*, vol. 1, p. 73; W. TRILLING, *Der zweite Brief an die Thessalonicher*, EKK XIV, Zürich: Benziger Verlag/Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1980, p. 38; P. T. O'BRIEN, *The Letter to the Ephesians*, PNTC, Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans / Leicester: Apollos, 1999, p. 88 (he seems to have slightly changed his opinion because in his previous commentary on Philippians he has spoken about the blessings that flow "from the twin source of God our Father and our Lord Jesus Christ"; P. T. O'BRIEN, *The Epistle to the Philippians*, NIGTC, Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans / Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1991, p. 52); A. LINDEMANN, *Der erste Korintherbrief*, HNT 9/1, Tübingen: Mohr, 2000, p. 28.

⁶¹¹ See, for instance, the study of N. RICHARDSON, *Paul's language about God*, JSNTSupS 99, Sheffield: Academic Press, 1994, especially chapter 5, p. 240 onwards.

⁶¹² τοῦ δόντος ἑαυτὸν... κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρός ἡμῶν (Gal 1:4); δι' οὗ ἐλάβομεν χάριν καὶ ἀποστολὴν (Rom 1:5). It may also be noted that the formulation of the thanksgiving in 1 Cor 1:4 is immediately followed by the initial salutation (v. 3): Εὐχαριστῶ... ἐπὶ τῇ χάριτι τοῦ θεοῦ τῇ δοθείσῃ ὑμῖν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.

⁶¹³ Cf. CONZELMANN, *1 Corinthians*, p. 24.

level right at the outset of the letters not only to emphasize their co-action towards the faithful⁶¹⁴ but also to point at the exalted Lord's position that Jesus has taken after his resurrection⁶¹⁵ and possibly to call attention to the novelty of God's grace that Christians have been offered to experience in comparison with the Jewish customary blessings: it is the grace and peace of both the Father and Jesus Christ.⁶¹⁶ Furthermore, the phrase καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ discloses the relational aspect of God's fatherhood: the Father shares his authority with Jesus in dispensing his gifts to those who acknowledge the lordship of Christ.⁶¹⁷ Gnika even suggests that Paul employed 'our Father' in the initial salutations in which there is a reference to the Lord Jesus Christ since our status of the children of God is founded on the sonship of Jesus.⁶¹⁸ The pronouns in plural ὑμῖν and ἡμῶν should be understood in the same Christian sense; moreover, the combination πατὴρ ἡμῶν, almost certainly influenced by Jesus (cf. Matt 6:9), shows the already established Christian self-understanding as the children of God. Since πατὴρ ἡμῶν bears witness to the reality of a personal faith that was presumably shared both by the writer and by the reader⁶¹⁹ it also seems to be plausible to think about the functional aspect of this phrase in the greeting context, i.e. to encourage the unity in the Christian communities despite every kind of difference, whether it is on national, cultural or social grounds since they all belong to and may address themselves to the same God as Father.

4.2.1.2. *An Excursus. The Initial Salutations in the Pastoral Letters*

The initial salutations play the same role in all Pauline letters, though, in the Pastorals, a different word order for Jesus' name and title and a shift from 'our Father' to 'our Lord/Savior' put more emphasis on the role of Jesus Christ: χάρις ἔλεος εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ

⁶¹⁴ The functional aspect of pairing God with Jesus in the initial salutation has been strongly stressed by U. LUZ, "Der Brief an die Epheser," in J. BECKER, U. LUZ, *Die Briefe an die Galater, Epheser und Kolosser*, NTD 8/1, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998, p. 115: "Sie beschreiben Gott und Christus nicht, wie sie an sich sind, sondern bezeichnen sie in ihrem Verhältnis zu den Gläubigen." Longenecker is less categorical: "association of Christ with God is here principally functional in nature"; R. N. LONGENECKER, *Galatians*, WBC 41, Dallas: Word Books, 1990, p. 7.

⁶¹⁵ An extended superscription in Rom 1:4 seems to suggest it.

⁶¹⁶ According to Ebeling there is a certain chiastic correspondence between 'grace (a) – peace (b) – from (c) – Father (b') – Jesus (a')' intended by Paul in which grace is attributed to Jesus and peace to the Father; such a relation is often attested in Paul's letters. According to him, this does not mean that the issue here is about two different realities; it is rather that the chiastic structure emphasizes the unity of the only one reality, though differentiated in it; cf. EBELING, *La verità dell'evangelo*, pp. 40-41. Even though Ebeling's supposition of Paul's intentional chiasm is attractive, there is some doubt because those who wrote the epistle to the Colossians and 1 and 2 Timothy seem to have not understood it in the same way: the initial salutation in Col has a shorter form and in 1 and 2 Timothy it is supplemented by 'mercy'. Guthrie accurately observes that no distinction should be made between the grace and peace of Christ and that of God; cf. GUTHRIE, *Galatians*, p. 59; so also BEST, *Thessalonians*, p. 248.

⁶¹⁷ Cf. DUNN, *Romans 1-8*, p. 21.

⁶¹⁸ Cf. J. GNILKA, *Paulus von Tarsus. Apostel und Zeuge*, HTKNT (suppl. VI), Freiburg/Basel/Wien: Herder, 1996, p. 193.

⁶¹⁹ Cf. HAWTHORNE, *Philippians*, p. 11.

Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν (1 Tim 1:2; 2 Tim 1:2) and χάρις καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν (Tit 1:4).⁶²⁰ A dual-part structure in the initial salutation is retained identical in all Pauline letters; consequently, it must be interpreted in the same manner: it underlies the close co-action between God the Father and Jesus Christ, as they both are the source of the conveyed blessing. The omission of ὑμῖν in these initial salutations should obviously be understood in light of their formal personal character, since they are exclusively addressed to the individuals Timothy and Titus, differently from the rest of the Pauline corpus. Yet, the final blessings advocate an idea that these letters were expected to be heard by other believers too, as the use of the personal pronouns in the plural suggests (cf. 1 Tim 6:21; 2 Tim 4:22; Tit 3:15). It may be, that a singular personal pronoun in the initial salutations was deliberately omitted to avoid a certain inadequacy to the clearly collective idea that the initial salutations in the Pauline letters convey.⁶²¹ Thus, the salutation-blessing in the Pastorals is not to be conceived as limited to Timothy and Titus, more likely, it was supposed to have been extended to all to whom those letters were read. Accordingly, the divine fatherhood, which is only mentioned in the initial salutations in the Pastorals, seems to retain its communal character despite the absence of ἡμῶν that is adjoined to Jesus' titles. The contents of the greeting little differ from those in the other Pauline letters. Whereas χάρις and εἰρήνη in a bipartite formulation seem to agree theologically as a cause and its effect, a third adjoined element ἔλεος (1 and 2 Tim), which recalls Jewish blessings and greetings,⁶²² discloses the very motivation for the divine grace⁶²³ that is both the mercy of the Father as well as Jesus.⁶²⁴ God's mercy is not to be reduced to a mere attitude; it should rather be seen as his active appropriate conduct towards

⁶²⁰ Roloff supposes that the use of ἡμῶν with Jesus Christ in the initial salutations in 1 and 2 Tim may be explained by the fact that the liturgical language simply incorporated the already-known combination κύριος ἡμῶν with reference to Jesus (cf. 1 Cor 1:7f.; 5:4; 9:1; Rom 4:24; 5:1). According to him, in this shift it is hardly possible to see some conscious tendency to equate Jesus to God; cf. J. ROLOFF, *Der erste Brief an Timotheus*, EKK XV, Zürich: Benziger Verlag / Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988, p. 55 note 9. From a functional point of view the reference to Jesus as κύριος ἡμῶν in conjunction with God the Father emphasizes the relational aspect of his lordship: he is not only 'our' Lord but rather he has become a Lord 'for us' as he gave himself for our sins to set us free according to the will of God the Father (cf. Gal 1:4); cf. C. MARCHESELLI-CASALE, *Le lettere pastorali*, SOC 15, Bologna: Dehoniane, 1995, p. 86.

⁶²¹ Cf. J. D. QUINN, *The Letter to Titus*, AB 35, New York: Doubleday, 1990, p. 74.

⁶²² To the already mentioned examples in Syr Bar 78:2 and Tob 7:11 (codex 8) may be added Ps Sol 4:29; 6:9; 7:9; 9:20; 11:9; 13:11. For this reason some authors regard such a tripartite greeting as "a combination of Jewish and 'Pauline' formulas"; M. DIBELIUS, H. CONZELMANN, *The Pastoral Epistles*, Hermeneia, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972, p. 14.

⁶²³ Cf. ROLOFF, *Der erste Brief an Timotheus*, p. 59.

⁶²⁴ There is some fluidity among subjects on whom depends the noun ἔλεος in the NT epistles. In the Pauline letters except 1-2 Tim the subject is God (explicitly in Rom 9:23; 11:31; 15:9; Eph 2:4; Tit 3:5; most probably in Gal 6:16). In the rest of the NT epistles: subject is undefined (Heb 4:16; Jude 1:2); God (1 Pet 1:3); our Lord Jesus Christ (Jude 1:24); God the Father as well as Jesus Christ (2Jn 1:3). In 1-2 Tim ἔλεος is mentioned in the initial salutations and twice in 2 Tim 1:16.18. In the latter case it is the κύριος who is said to grant mercy, the title widely employed to designate Jesus Christ in Paul's letters; evidently, Jesus Christ is supposed to be the co-subject of 'mercy' in the initial salutations as well; cf. J. A. FITZMYER, κύριος, in *EDNT* 2, pp. 330-331.

the people. Its salvific aspect (including the verbal form ἐλεέω) is quite visible in the Pauline letters;⁶²⁵ in our case the tripartite formulation χάρις ἔλεος εἰρήνη in conjunction with God the Father and Jesus Christ as our Lord both underlines their unity in action and also highlights the revelatory character of Jesus' salvific work in presenting the Father's mercy.⁶²⁶

The material on the image of God the Father in the initial salutations may be summarized in a double way.

Firstly, from the theological point of view, the divine Father is the source of grace and peace, i.e. of the historic-eschatological event of salvation; he is active in every its phase (grace) and efficacious in its consequences (peace). He is the very source of blessings for the Christian communities as he freely and continuously empowers (grace) them with a true joy, peace, and salvation that proceed from the Christ-event. Evidently, the grace that is coming from God as his constant and active benevolence towards the believers bringing forth the salvation and peace was not understood by Paul in general terms; it was supposed to touch upon every part of human life changing attitudes and breaking barriers in a religious-cultural field (for instance, Jewish and Hellenistic Christians) as well as in the social sphere.

Secondly, from the relational point of view, God the Father in connection with Jesus Christ shares his authority with him as far as Jesus plays the equal role in granting grace and peace; with reference to Christians, he is their Father as far as he is the origin of their salvation and the source of every grace for their Christian life. It is noteworthy that the divine fatherhood is presented in a close association with Jesus Christ; the relationship between God the Father and the Christians is portrayed from a tripartite 'Father-Jesus-believers' perspective.

4.2.2. God as Father in the Thessalonian Correspondence

To be more precise, 2 Thess does not fit well in the category of the undisputed Pauline letters since the question of the authenticity of 2 Thess is quite complex. The traditional view that Paul wrote this letter has already been questioned in the eighteenth century and the debate on this matter has become even sharper at the end of the twentieth century. The main arguments against Paul's authenticity are: there are remarkable differences in vocabulary and style that is closer to the letters to the Ephesians and Colossians; references to Paul's life are less personal and his manner of addressing Thessalonians is not as warm as in 1 Thess; the signs which have to precede the coming of Christ (2 Thess 2:1-12) seem to contradict an idea of the unexpected character of this event (1 Thess 5:1-3). This way, 2 Thess may reflect rather a later Christian

⁶²⁵ As regards the salvation of Paul (1 Tim 1:13.16; also cf. 1 Cor 7:25), of others (Rom 11:32; Eph 2:4f.; Tit 3:5).

⁶²⁶ Cf. K. ROMANIUK, *L'amour du Père et du Fils dans la sotériologie de saint Paul*, (AnBib 15A), Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1974, p. 192.

community's period when the imminent Parousia has failed to be a matter of prime urgency and the person who wrote this letter did it according to the pattern of 1 Thess with adjoining of several apocalyptic elements. Thus, the date of writing 2 Thess should be postponed for the end of the century.⁶²⁷ On the other hand, it may well be that Paul himself wrote 2 Thess (as he insists in 2 Thess 3:17) but did it later when the situation in the Thessalonians' community was completely different from depicted in 1 Thessalonians. As Vanni suggests, the so called 'mystery of lawlessness' may be viewed not as a demonic initiative but rather as an ongoing God's project to destroy evil in a long and complicated historical process, which will be completed at the coming of Christ. Therefore, the apparent contradiction on this matter between 1 and 2 Thessalonians appears to be only superficial and cannot be assumed as a main argument for the pseudonymity of 2 Thess.⁶²⁸ In any case, since the references to the fatherhood of God in 2 Thess are very similar to those in 1 Thess with regard to their wording and literary genre, it seems to be reasonable to treat those texts together despite the continuing discussion on the authenticity of this letter.

4.2.2.1. God the Father in the Adscriptions in 1 and 2 Thessalonians

There are six references⁶²⁹ to the fatherhood of God in 1 and 2 Thessalonians. God as Father is mentioned in two adscriptions in 1 Thess 1:1 and 2 Thess 1:1 and in two prayers in 1 Thess 3:11-13 (twice) and 2 Thess 2:16-17. The reference to the divine fatherhood in the introductory thanksgiving in 1 Thess 1:3 has the same wording as in 1 Thess 3:13. In 1-2 Thess there is only one 'son-text' (1 Thess 1:10),⁶³⁰ which unfortunately does not add much to the image of God the Father, since the reference to Jesus as his (God's) Son whom he raised from the dead (ὁν ἡγέρειν ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν) merely echoes in the resurrection-statement of the pistis-formula that is in various ways mentioned in the other Pauline letters as well (see below on Gal 1:1-5).⁶³¹ Nevertheless, this text is informative inasmuch as it attests to a new understanding of God's fatherly function in giving life. Instead of giving life to the people, creation, etc., the divine Father has given life to his Son in terms of raising him from the dead.

⁶²⁷ Cf. U. VANNI, "Tessalonicesi (II lettera ai)", in NDTB, p. 1567; R. E. BROWN, *An Introduction to the New Testament*, New York: Doubleday, 1997, p. 593.

⁶²⁸ Cf. VANNI, "Tessalonicesi (II lettera ai)", in NDTB, p. 1567-1569.

⁶²⁹ Unless stated otherwise, from here onwards the number of references in single letters is given without including those in the initial salutations.

⁶³⁰ Two other texts that contain υἱός (1 Thess 5:5 twice and 2 Thess 2:3) do not fit into our 'son-texts' category.

⁶³¹ See R. F. COLLINS, *Studies on the First Letter to the Thessalonians* (BETHL 66), Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1984, pp. 253-261 for the analysis of the creedal formulation in 1 Thess 1:10.

The almost identical wording in both letters – τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ Θεσσαλονικέων ἐν θεῷ πατρὶ ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ (1 Thess 1:1 – there is no ἡμῶν;⁶³² 2 Thess 1:1) is a unique formulation with a preposition ἐν with respect to God the Father in the Pauline corpus,⁶³³ which is employed only once elsewhere in the NT, i.e. in the adscription in Jude 1:1 – τοῖς ἐν θεῷ πατρὶ ἡγαπημένοις.

The formula that is joining together God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ in 1 Thess 1:1 opens the earliest Pauline letter and should consequently be regarded as the most primitive formulation, which in the other letters is further developed by means of ‘our’, that is usually adjoined to the Father and appears mostly in the initial salutations. Such a combination in itself points to Paul’s and the primitive Christian community’s conviction that both God as the Father and Jesus Christ as the Lord are the common life-source of the church in Thessalonica. Therefore, the contents of this formulation is similar to that of the initial salutations, which express in even a clearer way what kind of benefits flow to the Christian communities from the Father and the Lord Jesus. Even though syntactically the phrase ἐν θεῷ πατρὶ καὶ κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ may be attached to the subsequent simplest-in-form salutation χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη in order to underline the co-action of God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ in conferring the grace and peace to the Thessalonians and to be in accordance with the flow of thought for the rest of the Pauline initial salutations. Yet, this appears rather implausible in light of a similar formulation in 1 Thess 2:14: τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν τοῦ θεοῦ τῶν οὐσῶν ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.⁶³⁴ Hence, the reference to God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ most probably qualifies the Thessalonians’ assembly/church. However, some uncertainty remains in a sense the preposition ἐν is to be understood with regard to τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ in ἐν θεῷ πατρὶ...Χριστῷ, the phrase that furnishes the ‘church of the Thessalonians’ with a religious dimension and clearly distinguishes it from both secular/political assemblies⁶³⁵ and the Jewish community. Some scholars believe that being *in* God the Father and Lord Jesus Christ reflects Paul’s idea of a

⁶³² Although some manuscripts κ, A, I etc., support the longer reading ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, this has undoubtedly been done to synchronize the initial salutation with a well-fixed salutation pattern in the other Pauline letters. Kramer notices that the same manuscript-group bears witness to longer readings in other places as well in order to be in harmony with the other Pauline texts (2 Thess 1:2 as a proof-case); cf. KRAMER, *Christ, Lord*, p. 151, note 549.

⁶³³ ἐν [τῷ] θεῷ is also used in 1 Thess 2:2; Rom 2:17; 5:11; Col 3:3; Eph 3:9; John 3:21; 1 John 4:15.16 (cf. ἐν αὐτῷ in Acts 17:28).

⁶³⁴ In addition, there is a clear distinction between the adscription and the initial salutation in 2 Thess 1:1-2 in which both formulas are employed. It implies that the first formula with ἐν was not provided with the function of a salutation formula.

⁶³⁵ Cf. A. L. MOORE, *1 and 2 Thessalonians*, CB, London: Nelson, 1969, p. 23; cf. also K. P. DONFRIED, *Paul, Thessalonica, and Early Christianity*, Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 2002, pp. 144-145.

personal relationship⁶³⁶ in a local-spatial sense:⁶³⁷ the church is assembled under the sign of God and Jesus Christ and is the work of God and the Lord (implying very intimate relationship),⁶³⁸ the Father with the Son is “the sphere in which the church exists”,⁶³⁹ the Christians live and act in God;⁶⁴⁰ to be *in* them means to be in the submission to God and Jesus and in the intimate communion with them.⁶⁴¹ The other group of scholars suggests that the preposition ἐν should be better understood in an instrumental/causal sense thus, conveying an idea of the Thessalonian community being founded/assembled by/through and dependent upon God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.⁶⁴² Despite the different opinions as to what might have been Paul’s original meaning, it is clear that by closely tying the Father and the Son⁶⁴³ with the Thessalonian community the apostle intended to show that they are in the midst of work: the *being-in-God* of the community does not exclude God’s acting to its benefit. Even though God is not described as ‘our Father’ in 1 Thess 1:1 (as it is in 2 Thess 1:1) and the relational aspect is not as evident as Paul’s concentration on the figure of God the Father,⁶⁴⁴ this does not exclude relationships between God and the community, which here, as well as in the above analyzed initial salutations, are portrayed from a tripartite perspective ‘Father-Jesus-believers’, and which naturally include the responsibilities on both sides. The existence of the community is primarily the work of God; the believers, for their part, are supposed not to simply enjoy their being-in-

⁶³⁶ So M. ZERWICK – M. GROSVENOR, *A Grammatical Analysis of the Greek New Testament* (4th rev. ed.), Roma: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1993, p. 613. Yet, he gives no further explanation as to what this personal relationship is supposed to resemble. Trilling observes that in 2 Thess the church is less seen as a spiritual community; instead, it is rather observed as the assembly of the faithful that stands *under* the divine authority and is bound by the apostle’s instructions; cf. TRILLING, *Der zweite Brief an die Thessalonicher*, p. 37.

⁶³⁷ It is usually intended to be similar to ἐν Χριστῷ; cf. MARSHALL, *1 and 2 Thessalonians*, p. 49.

⁶³⁸ Cf. RIGAUX, *Les épîtres aux Thessaloniciens*, pp. 350-351.

⁶³⁹ BRUCE, *1 and 2 Thessalonians*, p. 7.

⁶⁴⁰ Cf. MORRIS, *Thessalonians*, p. 36.

⁶⁴¹ Cf. S. LEGASSE, *Les épîtres de Paul aux Thessaloniciens* (LD Commentaires 7), Paris: Cerf, 1999, p. 64.

⁶⁴² Cf. BEST, *Thessalonians*, p. 62 (however, he admits that even though the preposition ἐν governs both God the Father and Jesus Christ, there may be a hint that the Thessalonians community stands in a particular relationship to Jesus Christ in terms of being his body); Holtz follows Best, though he admits that the use of ἐν in our phrase is analogous to its use in ἐν Χριστῷ; cf. HOLTZ, *Der erste Brief*, p. 38 and note 34; IOVINO, *La prima lettera*, p. 80 (in the manner Yahweh assembled the people of Israel in the OT); RICHARD, *Thessalonians*, pp. 41-42; J. MURPHY-O’CONNOR, *Paul the Letter-Writer* (GNS 41), Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1995, p. 50; A. J. MALHERBE, *The Letters to the Thessalonians*, AB 32B, New York: Doubleday, 2000, p. 99; DONFRIED, *Paul, Thessalonica*, p. 143 note 20, thinks that ἐν contains both incorporative and instrumental sense, i.e. the incorporation into God and Christ was possible because of God’s activity in and through Christ.

⁶⁴³ Evidently, it was not Paul’s intention to stress on the mutual relationship between God and Jesus Christ in our verse, but, as Best notices, even in this verse Paul’s conception about God as the Father of Christ cannot be excluded; so BEST, *Thessalonians*, p. 63.

⁶⁴⁴ Accurately observed by MALHERBE, *Thessalonians*, p. 99. Yet, his suggestion that ‘God our Father’ in 2 Thess 1:1.(2) “is part of the language Paul uses to describe fictive kinship, which is important for him in 1 Thessalonians...” (p. 380) and that is expressed by the term ἀδελφός both in 1 and 2 Thessalonians, may be accepted only with making some distinction. Undoubtedly, both family terms must be viewed in a metaphorical perspective to describe the relationships ‘God-believer’ and ‘believer-believer’; nevertheless, the word ‘brother’ is quite extensively used by Paul and should be regarded as a more technical term (as the vocative ἀδελφοί in 1 Thess 2:1.9.14.17; 3:7; 4:1 etc., and the other Pauline letters), therefore, the distinction should be made in terms of the different levels in Paul’s usage of ‘brother(s)’ and ‘God our Father’.

God but to live out their lives in the presence of the Divine,⁶⁴⁵ demonstrating the inseparable bond between the social (church/community) and the vertical (*in* Father-Jesus) dimensions that marks their Christian identity.⁶⁴⁶ Apparently, it is a bit artificial to insist on seeing some paraenetic aspect in this adscription, nevertheless, Paul may have had an intention to remind his co-believers of their quite exceptional status of being-in-God-the Father in the eyes of both Jews and pagans so that his instructions (1 Thess 4-5, cf. 2 Thess 2-3) might be willingly accepted. It seems that this aspect of *being-in-God* is more accentuated in the adscription of 2 Thess than in the first letter. The reason for such a supposition is a fairly awkward repetition of almost the same phrase on the divine fatherhood in v. 1 and v. 2. Undoubtedly, those two verses play quite different roles in the epistolary prescript (adscription and salutation) and this may have been the reason why the phrases were put side by side,⁶⁴⁷ yet, their immediate proximity may also point to the explanatory character of the statement in the initial salutation with regard to the phrase in the adscription. Since the divine initiative and the activity are explicitly expressed in the salutation, they permit one to see a certain indication to the Christian status in ‘being-in-God’ that is continually favored by the grace and peace flowing from God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.

4.2.2.2. Divine Fatherhood in the Introductory Thanksgiving in 1 Thess 1:3

A thanksgiving that introduces the body of a letter is a quite customary element in the Pauline letters.⁶⁴⁸ Yet, differently from the other letters the formulaic terminology of the introductory thanksgiving in 1 Thess is three times employed in the first part of the letter,⁶⁴⁹ it is not clear whether εὐχαριστοῦμεν τῷ θεῷ (1:2; 2:13) and εὐχαριστίαν ... τῷ θεῷ ἀνταποδοῦναι (3:9) should be understood as pertaining to the same thanksgiving period (a somewhat extended introductory thanksgiving) or whether they are separate thanksgiving formulations, which are only formally related to the introductory thanksgiving. Certainly, much depends on one’s

⁶⁴⁵ Cf. WANAMAKER, *Thessalonians*, p. 70.

⁶⁴⁶ Cf. G. L. GREEN, *The Letters to the Thessalonians*, PNTC, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans / Leicester: Apollos, 2002, p. 85.

⁶⁴⁷ This may have been done either to conform the initial salutation in 2 Thessalonians to the pattern of the other Pauline salutations (if it was not Paul who wrote it), so for instance TRILLING, *Der zweite Brief an die Thessalonicher*, p. 35, or to introduce a new formulaic phrase to clearly specify the origin of the already mentioned grace and peace in 1 Thessalonians (if it is a genuine Pauline letter). Alternatively, if one accepts Paul’s authorship of 2 Thessalonians it cannot be excluded that the short salutation formula in 1 Thessalonians is just an abbreviated form of the longer formulation that is used in the other genuine Pauline letters; cf. WANAMAKER, *Thessalonians*, pp. 71, 214.

⁶⁴⁸ It usually starts with a term εὐχαριστέω: εὐχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ μου (Phil 1:3; Phlm 4; 1 Cor 1:4; Rom 1:8), εὐχαριστοῦμεν τῷ θεῷ (1 Thess 1:2 [2:13]), εὐχαριστοῦμεν τῷ θεῷ πατρὶ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (Col 1:3), εὐχαριστεῖν ὀφείλομεν τῷ θεῷ (2 Thess 1:3). Once there is usage of a different formula χάριν ἔχω τῷ θεῷ (2 Tim 1:3), and twice εὐχαριστέω is substituted with a benediction formula εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (2 Cor 1:3; Eph 1:3 [1 Pet 1:3]). There is no introductory thanksgiving in Gal, 1 Tim, and Tit.

⁶⁴⁹ Most scholars generally accept a clear subdivision between chapters 1-3 and 4-5.

analytical approach to this letter (thematic, epistolary, rhetoric) and how one understands the overall structure of 1 Thess. Evidently, scholars set different limits: the introductory thanksgiving in 1 Thess is supposed to conclude at: 1:2-3; 1:2-4; 1:2-5; 1:2-10; 1:2-2:16; 1:2-3:10; 1:2-3:13.⁶⁵⁰ The majority of commentators opt for 1:2-10,⁶⁵¹ yet speaking of the introductory thanksgiving as of a particular literary genre in the Pauline letters (not only as a mere subdivision-category in the letter structure) the actual thanksgiving-formulation in 1 Thess seems to be found in 1:2-5, grammatically that is one sentence.⁶⁵² The reference to the fatherhood of God in this sentence is a part of the second out of three participial clauses, which all syntactically depend upon εὐχαριστοῦμεν in v. 2: μνείαν ποιούμενοι...(v. 2b), μνημονεύοντες...(v. 3), εἰδότες...(v. 4). The participle μνημονεύοντες (v. 3) introduces a causal clause, which contains precise information about the reasons for giving thanks to God for the Thessalonian community:⁶⁵³ μνημονεύοντες ὑμῶν τοῦ ἔργου τῆς πίστεως καὶ τοῦ κόπου τῆς ἀγάπης καὶ τῆς ὑπομονῆς τῆς ἐλπίδος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν.⁶⁵⁴ From a grammatical point of view, the internal structure of this clause is quite complicated and raises a number of questions:

⁶⁵⁰ See R. JEWETT, *The Thessalonian Correspondence. Pauline Rhetoric and Millenarian Piety*, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986, pp. 216-221 and pp. 68-78 for composed charts and a good summary on the outlines of 1 Thess construed according to different analytical approaches. See also analysis of Rigaux's and Johanson's outlines of 1 Thess (along with reference to Jewett) presented by A. VANHOYE, "La composition de 1 Thessaloniciens," in R. F. COLLINS (ed.), *The Thessalonian Correspondence* (BETHL 87), Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1990, pp. 74-83.

⁶⁵¹ Apart from the commentators mentioned by Jewett (Best, Bruce, Bornemann, Guthrie, Marxen, Marshall, etc.) one may add some other more recent ones (Holtz, Wanamaker, Richard, Green).

⁶⁵² The basic study on the Pauline thanksgiving pattern often referred to by other scholars is a monograph of P. SCHUBERT, *Form and Function of the Pauline Thanksgivings* (BZNW 20), Berlin: Töpelmann, 1939. According to his division of the Pauline thanksgivings into two types (type Ia contains six elements and type Ib has one additional element, while four items are identical in both types, see pp. 51-63) 1 Thess 1:2-5 belongs to the type Ia though the final clause to be introduced by ἵνα, ὥπως, or εἰς with the infinitive is initiated with ὅτι that is a mark of the type Ib. In his opinion the subsequent thanksgiving formulas in 2:13 and 3:9-10 are merely the repetitions of the first one; they serve to unify the entire thanksgiving section 1:2-3:13 (cf. p. 18) that at the same time constitutes the very body of the letter (cf. p. 26). P. T. O'BRIEN, *Introductory Thanksgiving in the Letters of Paul* (NovTSup 49), Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1977, who defends the wholeness of the introductory thanksgiving in 1 Thess which he considers to have been started at 1:2 and concluded with a wish-prayer in 3:11-13 (cf. pp. 144-145), he admits that the thanksgiving formulation in the section 1:2-10 ends "with the words of v. 5, 'with full conviction'" (p. 143 note 14). Murphy-O'Connor accepts Schubert's criteria of two types of the Pauline thanksgivings and consequently understands 1 Thess 1:2-5 as a thanksgiving formula; however, he rejects Schubert's claim that the second thanksgiving in 2:13 makes part of the introductory thanksgiving. Moreover, he underlines that Paul was more concerned with the contents than the form, therefore, according to him, the only fully consistent elements in Paul's thanksgivings are gratitude and its grounding; cf. MURPHY-O'CONNOR, *Paul the Letter-Writer*, pp. 58-60. Lambrecht rejects Schubert's division of the Pauline thanksgiving in two major types and proposes, on the grammatical analysis, a threefold structure to be valid for all Pauline introductory thanksgivings; even though he admits that vv. 6-10 may be regarded as pertaining in a loose way to the introductory thanksgiving; he indicates only 1 Thess 1:2-5 as fitting into that structure in a strict sense; cf. J. LAMBRECHT, "Thanksgivings in 1 Thessalonians 1-3," in R. F. COLLINS (ed.), *The Thessalonian Correspondence* (BETHL 87), Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1990, pp. 187-193.

⁶⁵³ Cf. SCHUBERT, *Form and Function*, p. 55; O'BRIEN, *Introductory Thanksgiving*, p. 146; LAMBRECHT, "Thanksgivings in 1 Thessalonians 1-3," p. 188.

⁶⁵⁴ There is no unanimous scholarly opinion on whether ἀδιαλείπτως, that according to both NA²⁶ and NA²⁷ belongs to v. 2 but is separated from it by a comma, qualifies μνείαν ποιούμενοι in v. 2 (so Rigaux, Holtz, Wanamaker,

- 1) whether three couples of double genitives and the christological genitive construction τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ should be understood subjectively or objectively;
- 2) whether ὑμῶν qualifies only the first genitive pair τοῦ ἔργου τῆς πίστεως or two other subsequent pairs as well;
- 3) whether τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is connected only with the last pair τῆς ὑπομονῆς τῆς ἐλπίδος or should be extended to all three;
- 4) whether the final phrase ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν should be taken in association with μνημονεύοντες or be rather understood as referring to the contents of the whole triad (what is done in the presence of God).

Three pairs of double genitives ‘of work of faith’, ‘of labor of love’, and ‘of steadfastness of hope’ show the importance Paul attributed to the triad πίστις, ἀγάπη, and ἐλπίς, which he also mentions in the other letters.⁶⁵⁵ In our case, they most probably function as subjective genitives⁶⁵⁶ referring to the vital role of faith in work, of love in labor, and of hope in perseverance. However, some uncertainty remains: whether Paul intended to emphasize the first members of the genitival pairs (work, labor, and perseverance)⁶⁵⁷ or the virtues that inspire them (faith, love, hope).⁶⁵⁸ The latter interpretation is more probable in view of the good news about the Thessalonians’ *faith* and *love* brought by Timothy to Paul (3:6) and a similar formulation in the introductory thanksgiving in the letter to Philemon (Phlm 4-5). Yet, it seems to be more reasonable not to go too far in attempting to break the internal bond that exists within every single genitival pair.⁶⁵⁹ Thus, for instance, it is evident that in the second pair *labor* qualifies *love*, it is no less true that only *love* gives the identity to *labor*.⁶⁶⁰

The pronoun ὑμῶν that stands in the emphatic position should most likely be regarded as qualifying not only the first but all three genitival pairs.

Morris, Iovino, Richard, Malherbe, Green, RSV, etc.) or μνημονεύοντες in v. 3 (so Dobschütz, Dibelius, Findlay, Frame, Friedrich, Bruce, NRSV, NIV, etc.). On this point Best accurately observes that despite whichever option is preferred it does not change the Pauline thought as it emphasizes the importance of ‘always’ in the main clause: Paul and his collaborators were always close to the Thessalonians in their prayers and thoughts; cf. BEST, *Thessalonians*, p. 66.

⁶⁵⁵ Cf. 1 Thess 5:8; Gal 5:5f.; 1 Cor 13:13; Rom 5:1-5; Col 1:4f.; Eph 4:2-5.

⁶⁵⁶ Opted by many commentators; cf. O'BRIEN, *Introductory Thanksgiving*, p. 147 and note 32. MOULTON – TURNER, *Grammar*, p. 211, translates them by “the sustaining patience which hope brings” and “work done from faith and love.”

⁶⁵⁷ Cf. WILES, *Paul's Intercessory Prayers*, p. 178.

⁶⁵⁸ With reference to τῆς ὑπομονῆς τῆς ἐλπίδος in association with τοῦ ἔργου τῆς πίστεως and τοῦ κόπου τῆς ἀγάπης, BDF §163 states that it “more likely expresses subjectively the patient hope which accompanies active faith and laboring love.”

⁶⁵⁹ IOVINO, *La prima lettera*, even interprets first two pairs as “l’opera che è la vostra fede” (p. 90) and “la fatica che è l’amore” (p. 91).

⁶⁶⁰ The nuance of ‘fatica, sforzo, stanchezza’ implied in κόπος has been strongly underlined by R. PENNA, *L’apostolo Paolo. Studi di esegesi e teologia*, Milano: Paoline, 1991, pp. 576-578. According to him, the birth of the church as it is described in 1 Thess 2:2.7-9.12 proceeds “da un amore costoso, dove il κόπος dà materia all’agape e questa dà forma a quello” (p. 578).

The translation of the phrase τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ that concludes the chain of the genitival construction mostly depends upon the role that is attributed to it with regard to the triad that precedes it: many commentators translate τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ as ‘in our Lord Jesus Christ’ thereby in this passage ‘Jesus Christ’ is considered to be the *object* of either our hope alone⁶⁶¹ or our love and faith as well.⁶⁶² The image of the divine Father in this clause (especially the relational aspect of it) depends on the part of the clause with which the last phrase ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν is associated. On one hand, if we connect it to the triadic genitival sequence,⁶⁶³ the phrase ‘in the presence of/before our God and Father’⁶⁶⁴ presents the divine Father as the One in whose presence the Thessalonians’ life was marked by their faith in Jesus Christ, love for Jesus Christ, and hope in Jesus Christ (the second interpretation) or without mentioning ‘Jesus Christ’ in the first two Christian activities (the first interpretation) is supposed to flow. It is obvious that according to the both interpretations Paul presents the relationship ‘Father-believers’ as a tripartite ‘Father-Jesus-believers’; the uncertainty is whether Paul intended this structure to be applied to each of the Thessalonians’ activities for which he was praising them (work of faith, labor of love, perseverance of hope) or only to the last one (perseverance of hope). In any case, the fact that the Thessalonians’ whole religious-moral life is regarded as inevitably running in the presence of the divine Father⁶⁶⁵ shows that Paul’s intention was to emphasize the moral-authoritative aspect of the fatherhood of God in a special way. On the other hand, if we associate ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν with μνημονεύοντες⁶⁶⁶ then the entire genitival sequence, which is encapsulated, appears to have little significance with respect to the image of the divine Father; instead of the Thessalonians and their activities it is Paul and his collaborators (the plural μνημονεύοντες) who are implied to

⁶⁶¹ Cf. BEST, *Thessalonians*, p. 70; O’BRIEN, *Introductory Thanksgiving*, pp. 147-148 and notes 32 and 33; BRUCE, *1 and 2 Thessalonians*, p. 12; WANAMAKER, *Thessalonians*, p. 76; RICHARD, *Thessalonians*, p. 47.

⁶⁶² Cf. RIGAUX, *Les épîtres aux Thessaloniens*, p. 367 (however, as to whether the genitive of subject or object is to be seen in ‘of our Lord Jesus Christ’ the author gives no precise answer because according to him “Paul n’a pas déterminé parce que les deux sens formaient pour lui un tout”); MOORE, *1 and 2 Thessalonians*, p. 26; HOLTZ, *Der erste Brief*, p. 43; LÉGASSE, *Les épîtres de Paul*, p. 81. Differently, IOVINO, *La prima lettera*, who though associating our phrase with the whole triad insists on understanding the phrase τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ in terms of the genitive of subject and thus renders it “del Signore nostro Gesù Cristo” (p. 85f.). The author explains that Jesus Christ is the active subject not because he himself believes, loves, and hopes but because he founds and motivates these virtues; cf. p. 94.

⁶⁶³ Cf. BRUCE, *1 and 2 Thessalonians*, p. 13; IOVINO, *La prima lettera*, p. 86; LÉGASSE, *Les épîtres de Paul*, pp. 81-82.

⁶⁶⁴ The formulation θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ ἡμῶν here and onwards is rendered by ‘our God and Father’ (so many commentators, RSV, NRSV, NIV, etc.) instead of ‘God and our Father’, however the emphasis is put on ‘our Father’.

⁶⁶⁵ Collins points out that the Christian existence in the *Zwischenzeit* (the time between the resurrection of Jesus Christ and our resurrection) for the Thessalonian church was the existence “in the presence of our God and Father”; R. F. COLLINS, “God in the First Letter to the Thessalonians: Paul’s Earliest Written Appreciation of *ho theos*,” *LS* 16 (2, 1991), p. 149.

⁶⁶⁶ Cf. BEST, *Thessalonians*, p. 70; MARSHALL, *1 and 2 Thessalonians*, p. 52; HOLTZ, *Der erste Brief*, p. 43; WANAMAKER, *Thessalonians*, p. 76; RICHARD, *Thessalonians*, p. 47; MALHERBE, *Thessalonians*, p. 107; GREEN, *Thessalonians*, p. 88.

have been involved in the relationship with God as Father.⁶⁶⁷ In this case the ‘Father-Paul/we’ (v. 3) rapport is a further continuation of the relationship ‘God-Paul/we’ expressed by εὐχαριστοῦμεν τῷ θεῷ (v. 2) while μνημονεύοντες...ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν (v. 3) marks a certain thematic development by presenting the contents of the prayers mentioned in the previous verse μνείαν ποιούμενοι ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν ἡμῶν (v. 2b).⁶⁶⁸ Because of the thematic proximity between 1:2b-3 they have been regarded by Wiles as a certain independent unit that, according to its literary genre, fits into the category of a prayer-report.⁶⁶⁹

Even though there are good theological reasons to adhere to the first interpretation,⁶⁷⁰ the association of μνημονεύοντες with ἔμπροσθεν appears to be more plausible because of a similar pattern in the thanksgiving formulation in 1 Thess 3:9.⁶⁷¹

1 Thess 1:2-3

εὐχαριστοῦμεν τῷ θεῷ ...

μνημονεύοντες ὑμῶν ...

ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν

1 Thess 3:9

εὐχαριστίαν δυνάμεθα τῷ θεῷ

ἀνταποδοῦναι ...

χαίρομεν δι’ ὑμᾶς

ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν

It has been stated that in light of the Pauline pattern of the introductory thanksgiving our clause, which starts with μνημονεύοντες, is dependent on εὐχαριστοῦμεν (as well as two others in v. 2b and v. 4). Yet it may be that μνημονεύοντες also refers to μνείαν ποιούμενοι, since these

⁶⁶⁷ Wiles takes up the interpretation ‘remembering before our God and Father’, yet he admits that there is some vagueness with regard to subjects who stand in the relationship with God (*pace* Dobschütz, Rigaux, Moore): it may be that “both Thessalonians in their actions, and the apostle in his prayers, stand ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ θεοῦ;” WILES, *Paul’s Intercessory Prayers*, p. 181 note 1.

⁶⁶⁸ The fact that v. 3 is strictly associated with the first participial clause in v. 2b led some scholars to set very narrow limits to the introductory thanksgiving. Jewett indicates in his above-mentioned list that it was H. Schürmann who limited it to 1:2-3; cf. JEWETT, *The Thessalonian Correspondence*, p. 69. This position has been retaken by IOVINO, *La prima lettera*, p. 85.

⁶⁶⁹ Cf. WILES, *Paul’s Intercessory Prayers*, p. 175f.

⁶⁷⁰ The only other time the phrase ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν is employed in 1 Thess 3:13 (and nowhere else either in the NT or LXX) where it is clearly associated with the *moral state* of believers as it is also in this verse if one accepts this interpretation. Furthermore, it cannot be overlooked that ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν forms a certain inclusion in the first part (or the extended thanksgiving) of the letter (1:3 and 3:13); this fact also gives some credit to this line of interpretation: Paul gives thanks for the Thessalonians who live a sound Christian life *in the presence of our God and Father* (1:3 refers to the present time) and prays for them that they may be found blameless *in the presence of our God and Father* at the time of Jesus’ parousia (3:13 refers to the future). Thus, the whole Christian existence is understood in terms of being *in the presence of our God and Father*; such an explanation also gives an additional nuance to the statement that the Thessalonian community is ἐν θεῷ πατρὶ καὶ κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ in 1:1.

⁶⁷¹ It may be noted that there is only one other shortened formulation ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ θεοῦ (Acts 10:4) in the NT. It is noteworthy that it is directly connected to εἰς μνημόσυνον, the noun that derives from μνημονεύω, which is also employed in 1 Thess 1:3.

terms belong to the same ‘memory’ group and have a similar meaning.⁶⁷² The ‘remembering’ before the divine Father of the Thessalonians’ praiseworthy life is what prompts Paul and his collaborators to give thanks for them and also to lift them up in their supplications.⁶⁷³ Since *μνημονεύοντες...ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν* is a unique combination in the NT and LXX it is difficult to grasp its exact meaning. It may be that Paul simply intended to underline the fact that they continuously think of their achievements and needs since his and his collaborators’ lives are marked by a pastoral care for others. The *remembering* before our God and Father in such a way does not differ much from their *acting* in his presence and it underlines Paul and his companions’ attitude. But it may also be that this *remembering* has a more specific meaning, which implies a certain prayer-like act, that was taking place in a collective-prayer context of giving thanks to God (the plural *εὐχαριστοῦμεν*)⁶⁷⁴ as the plural forms *μνείαν ποιοῦμενοι, μνημονεύοντες* (vv. 2b-3) seems to be employed. In such an interpretation, the emphasis falls more on the very act of *remembering* rather than on Paul/his companions’ set of mind. In any case, the basic characteristic in this passage appears to be the involvement in the religious-moral life of the faithful (though presented in a passive way, i.e. before whom may be evaluated their activities) whether from a worship perspective where God as Father is more observed as the subject before whom in a prayer-like way were remembered the Thessalonians’ achievements or from where he is more regarded as the moral authority in whose presence Paul and his companions carried out their mission. This is also confirmed by the subsequent vv. 6-10 that many scholars regard it as pertaining to the introductory thanksgiving. To begin with v. 4 onwards a theme is approached that recounts the story of the community: it has been chosen by God (v. 4), the coming of the gospel (v. 5), the missionaries’ conduct (v. 5), the acceptance of the message in words and in lives (vv. 6-7, imitation, example), and finally the widespread news about the Thessalonians’ faith (vv. 8-10). In fact, this story underlines and develops the statement in v. 3 that provides the theological focus of the thanksgiving⁶⁷⁵ and at the same time presents the very essence of the Thessalonians’ story/life (the triad). From this perspective, the phrase *remembering before our God and Father* acquires a central place in the whole passage 1:2-10 and once again confirms the idea that the divine Father’s depiction in this introductory thanksgiving should be perceived in terms of Him as the ultimate moral authority.

⁶⁷² In the introductory thanksgivings *μνημονεύω* is used only here; this is also the only case in the NT where *μνεία* and *μνημονεύω* are employed side by side. In the NT the noun *μνεία* is employed seven times: in six of them (except for 1 Thess 3:6) it is explicitly used in the context of a prayer (1 Thess 1:2; Phil 1:3; Phlm 4; Rom 1:9; Eph 1:16; 2 Tim 1:3).

⁶⁷³ Cf. WILES, *Paul’s Intercessory Prayers*, p. 177.

⁶⁷⁴ Cf. O’BRIEN, *Introductory Thanksgiving*, p. 146.

⁶⁷⁵ Cf. E. RICHARD, “Early Pauline Thought: An Analysis of 1 Thessalonians,” in J. M. BASSLER, (ed.), *Pauline Theology. Volume I: Thessalonians, Philippians, Galatians, Philemon*, Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991, p. 47f.

Some words may be added about the relational aspect of the fatherhood of God. Apart from the combination *μνημονεύοντες...ἐμπροσθεν* , which denotes an active rapport (we have opted for Paul and his companions), there is another quite customary Pauline qualification for God/Father, - *ἡμῶν* that in our case seems to acquire a more significant role because of a certain accumulation of the personal pronouns in vv. 2-5.

Table 8

	Paul and his collaborators	Thessalonians	God
v. 2	<i>ἡμεῖς</i> (implicit in <i>εὐχαριστοῦμεν</i>) <i>ἡμεῖς</i> (implicit in <i>ποιούμενοι</i>)	<i>περὶ ὑμῶν</i> (for you)	
v. 3	<i>ἡμεῖς</i> (implicit in <i>μνημονεύοντες</i>)	<i>ὑμῶν</i> (triad: faith, love, hope)	<i>ἡμῶν</i> (Father) <i>ἡμῶν</i> (Jesus)
v. 4	<i>ἡμεῖς</i> (implicit in <i>εἰδότες</i>)	<i>ὑμῶν</i> (election/choosing)	
v. 5	<i>ἡμῶν</i> (gospel)	<i>εἰς ὑμᾶς</i> (came) [ἐν] <i>ὑμῖν</i> (we were) <i>δι' ὑμᾶς</i> (for yor sake)	

The sequence of the personal pronouns is as follows: *ἡμεῖς* - *ὑμῶν* - *ἡμεῖς* - *ἡμῶν* - *ἡμεῖς* - *ὑμῶν* - *ἡμῶν* - *ἡμῶν* - *ἡμεῖς* - *ὑμῶν* - *ἡμῶν* - *εἰς ὑμᾶς* - [ἐν] *ὑμῖν* - *δι' ὑμᾶς*. Looking schematically, if one of implicit pronouns *ἡμεῖς*, are left out, there is a continuous alterations between ‘your’ and ‘our’ with two ‘our’ at the center and that qualify the Lord Jesus Christ and God the Father. Apparently, this alteration should be regarded as one of Paul’s stylistic peculiarities conditioned by the purpose of his argumentation.⁶⁷⁶ Yet, the reference to the divine fatherhood qualified by *ἡμῶν* (v. 3) in this sequence of the personal pronouns may have had some significance as it is unique in the field of the introductory thanksgivings.⁶⁷⁷ It may well be that Paul intended to draw attention to the unity between the missionaries and the Thessalonians by the explicit naming of God as ‘our’ Father as well as of Jesus Christ as ‘our’ Lord. The pronoun *ἡμῶν* in this case is undoubtedly understood in the inclusive Christian sense, i.e.

⁶⁷⁶ Similarly, in the others thanksgiving formulations; cf. *μου* – *ὑμῶν* (Phil 1:3-7; Rom 1:8-10) and *μου* – *σου* (Phlm 1: 4-6).

⁶⁷⁷ The only other reference to a collective ‘our God’ in the thanksgiving formulation is in 1 Thess 3:9, however, without mentioning the term ‘father’: *ἐμπροσθεν τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν*.

including both the missionaries and the Thessalonians.⁶⁷⁸ This may be true especially because of Paul's seemingly sharp distinguishing between 'our gospel' on the one hand, and 'your election/choosing' on the other; a fact that is mentioned in none of his introductory thanksgivings. Furthermore, the pronominal phrases *περὶ πάντων ὑμῶν* and *δι' ὑμᾶς*, which explicitly point to Paul's and his collaborators' readiness to pray/act for the Thessalonians' sake, frame the whole thanksgiving formulation (vv. 2-5) and thus, even more highlight the missionaries' and the Thessalonians' unity. Therefore, it may be that by referring to the divine fatherhood in this longest of his introductory thanksgivings Paul also wanted to explicitly express the ultimate motivation for his and his companions' conduct: their prayers and actions were inspired by their understanding of God as 'our Father'.

4.2.2.3. Divine Fatherhood in the Wish-Prayers in 1 and 2 Thessalonians

Two brief passages in 1 Thess 3:11-13 and 2 Thess 2:16-17, which refer to the divine fatherhood, have been defined by Jewett as homiletic benedictions (in terms of their *Sitz im Leben*)⁶⁷⁹ and later called by Wiles as wish-prayers.⁶⁸⁰ In both letters these prayers appear to be at the end of the respective chapters and conclude⁶⁸¹ longer units: 1 Thess 3:11-13 closes the first section of the body of 1 Thessalonians⁶⁸² (chp. 4 starts with *λοιπὸν οὖν* plus practical exhortations); similarly, 2 Thess 2:16-17 marks a division between the first and the second section of the body of 2 Thessalonians (chp. 3 starts with *τὸ λοιπὸν* plus a request to pray for Paul and his companions and then practical exhortations).⁶⁸³ The implicit paraenetic character of

⁶⁷⁸ In the analysis of the alteration of the personal pronouns 'we' and 'you' in 1 Thess, Vanhoye underlines the trilateral character of the interpersonal relationships 'missionaries-believers-God'; cf. VANHOYE, "La composition de 1 Thessaloniens," pp. 81-85. With regard to our v. 3 he explains that two personal pronouns 'our' qualifying the Father and the Lord "comprenant le «vous», de sorte que «notre Seigneur» et «notre Père» expriment ici une relation trilatérale qui unit à Dieu et en Dieu missionnaires et fidèles." (p. 84).

⁶⁷⁹ See R. JEWETT, "The Form and Function of the Homiletic Benediction," *ATR* 51 (1969), pp. 22, 34. For the variety of terms that were used to describe these and similar prayers, see *ibid.*, p. 18f.

⁶⁸⁰ WILES, *Paul's Intercessory Prayers*, dedicated a considerable place to the analysis of 1 Thess 3:11-13 (pp. 52-63) while merely indicated that 2 Thess 2:16f. fits into the same category (Appendix II, p. 299). This is quite understandable, as he has exclusively limited his survey to the indisputably authentic Pauline letters.

⁶⁸¹ JEWETT, "Form and Function," p. 24 enumerates the themes that were dealt with in the previous sections of 1 and 2 Thessalonians and are mentioned again in these prayers. Thus, with reference to 1 Thess 3:11-13: Paul's desire to return to Thessalonica (2:17-19; 3:10), the importance of love, good works, the apostolic example (1:3.6-7; 2:9-14), and the preparation for the parousia (1:10); with reference to 2 Thess 2:16-17: Christ's lordship (1:7-12), the love of God [Lord] (2:13-14), comfort about the eschatological fulfillment (2:1-12), and the importance of doing good works (1:3.11).

⁶⁸² Because of different opinions about the length of the introductory thanksgiving in 1 Thess (cf. 2.2.2.) some scholars (for instance Schubert, Jewett, Wiles, O'Brien) consider this prayer to be the conclusion of the extended introductory thanksgiving 1:2-3:13.

⁶⁸³ The subdivision between 2 Thess 2 and 3 is however not unanimously accepted. For different outlines of 2 Thessalonians, see several charts compiled by JEWETT, *The Thessalonian Correspondence*, pp. 222-225 and pp. 78-83. A concise summary on diverse opinions on this point has also been presented by O. MERK, "Überlegen zu 2 Thess 2:13-17," in O. MERK, *Wissenschaftsgeschichte und Exegese. Gesammelte Aufsätze zum 65. Geburtstag*, *BZNW* 95, New York/Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1998, p. 423.

the petitions in 1 Thess 3:12-13 and 2 Thess 2:17 is a sign that these prayers also play a transitional role⁶⁸⁴, which is to connect the indicative and exhortative parts of the letters.

4.2.2.3.1. A Double Reference to God as Father in 1 Thess 3:11-13

The wish-prayer in this brief passage is composed of two smaller units, each have two different subjects (Father/Jesus and Jesus) to whom the prayers are dedicated as well as two different groups of persons (missionaries and Thessalonians) for whose sake these prayers are made. The first wish-prayer has a simple ‘subject-optative-addressee’ structure; the second one follows the same pattern but it contains one more element (purpose/finality) that opens v. 13.⁶⁸⁵

The first wish-prayer (v. 11) - Αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ ἡμῶν καὶ ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς κατευθύνει τὴν ὁδὸν ἡμῶν πρὸς ὑμᾶς·

The second wish-prayer (v. 12) - ὑμᾶς δὲ ὁ κύριος πλεονάσαι καὶ περισσεύσαι τῇ ἀγάπῃ εἰς ἀλλήλους καὶ εἰς πάντας καθάπερ καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς ὑμᾶς,

The purpose/finality of the second wish-prayer (v. 13) - εἰς τὸ στηρίξαι ὑμῶν τὰς καρδίας ἀμέμπτους ἐν ἀγιωσύνῃ ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ μετὰ πάντων τῶν ἀγίων αὐτοῦ, [ἀμήν].

Despite a formal distinction between these two wish-prayers, they seem to have been created/combined by Paul *ad hoc* keeping in mind the needs of the missionaries and the situation of the believers expressed earlier in this letter. Paul and his companions’ pastoral concern for the Thessalonians should be seen as the *red line* that unites both prayers.⁶⁸⁶ This is achieved by

⁶⁸⁴ Regarding 1 Thess 3:11-13 (the whole prayer passage 3:9-13) Wiles observes that it not only summarizes the contents (Paul’s desire to visit the Thessalonians, the spiritual progress of the congregation, Parousia hopes) of the preceding chapters but also functions as a transition into a paraenetic section that follows it; cf. WILES, *Paul’s Intercessory Prayers*, pp. 52-53; similarly, O’BRIEN, *Introductory Thanksgiving*, p. 160f.; WANAMAKER, *Thessalonians*, p. 140; IOVINO, *La prima lettera*, p. 181; MALHERBE, *Thessalonians*, p. 211. As regards 2 Thess 2:16-17, see MERK, “Überlegen zu 2 Thess 2:13-17,” p. 424ff., who suggests that 2 Thess 2:13-17 plays a transitional role because of its connective character.

⁶⁸⁵ WILES, *Paul’s Intercessory Prayers*, calls them ‘petitions’: every verse (including v. 13 that begins with εἰς τό) according to him, starts as a new petition (pp. 54-55, 61) but he seems to ‘conceptually’ diverge from the adopted presentation (see JEWETT, “Form and Function,” pp. 20-22) on what the basic structure of wish-prayers is (p. 29ff.). Three of four components, i.e. God as a subject, a predicate in the optative, a noun or pronoun for those to be benefited occur in v. 11, therefore there is no reason to deprive it of the status of an individual wish-prayer. Besides, the examples provided by him (Rom 15:33; 16:20a) also lack the ‘additional benefit’ clause, which is the fourth element that may be expressed either by a purpose clause (ἵνα; εἰς τό) or by some additional clause (adjoined by καί) or a prepositional or adjectival phrase (*ibid.*); it appears in v. 13. Furthermore, the wish-prayer in 2 Thess 2:16-17 that is structurally identical to the first wish-prayer in 1 Thess 3:11 (subject-optative-addressee) also lacks the same fourth element. As regards the second wish-prayer in vv. 12-13, it is reasonable to regard vv. 12-13 as an individual wish-prayer that meets all other necessary structural requirements, i.e., there are two verbs in the optative, the addressees are expressed by the pronoun, and finally the ‘additional benefit’ introduced by εἰς τὸ στηρίξαι, even though the subject in v. 12 is said to be κύριος and not θεός (cf. also another prayer [the wish of peace] in 2 Thess 3:16: αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ κύριος τῆς εἰρήνης δώη ὑμῖν τὴν εἰρήνην).

⁶⁸⁶ In fact, v. 11 repeats and extends the idea stated in v. 10a: Paul and his companions were praying that they would see the Thessalonians face to face. Likewise, v. 12 takes up the theme of the Thessalonians’ need of the

means of the personal pronouns that play a unifying role and at the same time emphasize the importance of ‘you’ in the plural: the first wish-prayer ends up with ὑμᾶς; the second prayer begins with the same pronoun ὑμᾶς and concludes again with ὑμᾶς; this idea is emphatically repeated again by ἡμῶν at the beginning of the purpose clause. Within this strongly intertwined sequence the double coupling of ἡμῶν πρὸς ὑμᾶς (v. 11) and ἡμεῖς εἰς ὑμᾶς (v. 12) highlights the idea of unity between the missionaries and the Thessalonians even more. In this light, the significance of the theme of unity may also be plausibly recognizable in the fourfold ἡμῶν that qualifies twice θεὸς καὶ πατήρ and twice κύριος. The abundance of the plural personal pronouns and their sequence indicate that the contents of this passage, including the image of the divine Father, first of all, should be observed from a pastoral perspective; it seems correct to deduce that here the double employment of the formulaic expression θεὸς καὶ πατήρ ἡμῶν was probably prompted by Paul’s desire to underscore the caring and unifying aspects of the fatherhood of God, presenting thereby the very source of his own concern he showed for the Thessalonians.

The first wish-prayer addressed to both God and Jesus presents the divine fatherhood in terms of God’s active fatherly care, which is explicitly articulated in the predicate κατευθύναι τὴν ὁδὸν ἡμῶν πρὸς ὑμᾶς in which the verb in the optative κατευθύναι expresses both Paul’s wish and his confidence to God’s and Jesus’ active involvement in the realization of his mission. The term κατευθύνω, which is commonly used in LXX appears only three times in the NT and in each case functions as a theological/christological term.⁶⁸⁷ In our text the combination of it with ὁδός should be understood in a literal sense,⁶⁸⁸ i.e. as either the divine guidance of the missionaries to Thessalonica or the smoothing out of the difficulties that may have appeared in their way.⁶⁸⁹ Either way the importance of the decisive divine intervention/assistance that Paul was praying for⁶⁹⁰ seems to be also implied in the very position he assigned to αὐτός putting it at the beginning of the prayer. Some commentators point out that in the Hellenistic period αὐτός had lost its emphatic sense and, consequently, it is regarded as a transitional element marking

spiritual growth (especially in love) expressed in v. 10b in terms of growing in faith; cf. MARSHALL, *1 and 2 Thessalonians*, p. 99.

⁶⁸⁷ Apart from our case, in 2 Thess 3:5 the subject of κατευθύνω is Lord. The text in Luke 1:78-79 is quite complicated and it is not very clear who is intended to be under the enigmatic ἀνατολή (v. 78) which is followed by two phrases with the verb in the infinitive, one of which is τοῦ κατευθύναι τοὺς πόδας ἡμῶν εἰς ὁδὸν εἰρήνης (v. 79). Fitzmyer admits that the ‘dawning sense’ of the ἀνατολή may be applied both to God and to John the Baptist, yet according to him, the priority of Luke in this passage was to present Jesus as the Messiah; cf. J. A. FITZMYER, *The Gospel according to Luke (I-LX)*, AB 28, New York: Doubleday, 1979, p. 387.

⁶⁸⁸ Cf. W. MICHAELIS, ὁδός, in *TDNT* 5, p. 69; BDAG, pp. 532, 691.

⁶⁸⁹ Cf. BEST, *Thessalonians*, p. 147; MARSHALL, *1 and 2 Thessalonians*, p. 100; RICHARD, *Thessalonians*, p. 165. A metaphoric sense of κατευθύνω is hardly intended in this passage; *contra* IOVINO, *La prima lettera*, p. 177 note 120: “...riferito all’orientamento della vita illuminato della fede.”

⁶⁹⁰ RICHARD, *Thessalonians*, p. 172, notices that the use of the aorist optative highlights “the once-and-for-all character of the action.”

the change of the theme⁶⁹¹ and as a certain adaptation of the vocative ‘you’ that originally was used in worship,⁶⁹² some other scholars admit that in our prayer αὐτός still retains (some of) its emphatic force.⁶⁹³ The other references in the NT, in which the theological αὐτός is associated with θεός or κύριος appears in the front position, occur exclusively in the Thessalonian correspondence and in all cases but one they make part of the prayers that have the same ‘subject-optative-addressee’ structure.⁶⁹⁴ This fact confirms the supposition of Wiles that both αὐτός and δέ whether combined or used separately at the beginning of the NT prayers echo their original liturgical usage (with a note of majesty added to the subject).⁶⁹⁵ Accordingly, the usage of these terms by Paul in his prayers is not to be overemphasized as if it were a proper Pauline characteristic. Besides, associating them both with θεός and κύριος in the same letter (God in 1 Thess 3:11; 5:23; Lord [undoubtedly Jesus in this case] in 4:16) and especially in a similar wish-prayer, which has a reverse order (in 2 Thess 2:16-17 αὐτός is directly associated with κύριος in spite of the reference to θεός in the same phrase), diminishes the probability that Paul deliberately aimed at paying the attention to the role of θεός and κύριος in terms of ‘either-or’ in a particular context. In our prayer as well as in 2 Thess 2:16-17, where there is a compound subject, it is difficult to understand whether Paul intended αὐτός to be valid for the whole phrase or only for the first member of this prayer, that is ‘our God and Father himself’.⁶⁹⁶ At any rate, the position of αὐτός in its present context (in connection with v. 10) mostly stresses the need of the direct agency of God, which seemed to have been indispensable in those circumstances.⁶⁹⁷ Here, the function of the particle δέ in αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ ἡμῶν (v. 11) is also important. Many scholars accurately observe it as a transitional element that connects the wish-prayer with what precedes it;⁶⁹⁸ however, it may be that in this case it still retains some of its usual adversative force ‘but’, though in a very slight way. The previous reference to Paul’s incapability to visit Thessalonica, which was caused by the Satan’s hindrance (2:18)⁶⁹⁹ is more

⁶⁹¹ Cf. RIGAUX, *Les épîtres aux Thessaloniens*, p. 486; MOORE, *1 and 2 Thessalonians*, p. 59.

⁶⁹² Cf. BEST, *Thessalonians*, p. 146; HOLTZ, *Der erste Brief*, p. 141f.; LEGASSE, *Les épîtres de Paul*, p. 192.

⁶⁹³ Cf. BRUCE, *1 and 2 Thessalonians*, p. 71; MALHERBE, *Thessalonians*, p. 212. See also MOULTON – TURNER, *Grammar*, p. 40f.

⁶⁹⁴ Except for a statement in the indicative αὐτὸς ὁ κύριος...καταβήσεται (1 Thess 4:16) there are three references in the optative that in two cases start with αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ κύριος (2 Thess 2:16; 3:16) and once with αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ θεός (1 Thess 5:23).

⁶⁹⁵ Cf. WILES, *Paul’s Intercessory Prayers*, pp. 30-31.

⁶⁹⁶ The translation offered by HOLTZ, *Der erste Brief*, p. 140, “Er selbst aber, Gott, sowohl unser Vater als auch unser Herr Jesus...” cannot be accepted since it disjoins ‘God’ from ‘Father’, the fact that is well attested in other Pauline passages and because it seems to extend artificially the meaning of ‘God’ to the Lord Jesus. It has been precisely observed by MOORE, *1 and 2 Thessalonians*, p. 59, that such a statement would be quite unusual in Paul’s letters (2 Thess 2:16 is a close example) as he usually associates θεός with ‘Father’ but not with Jesus.

⁶⁹⁷ Cf. O’BRIEN, *Introductory Thanksgiving*, p. 161 note 108.

⁶⁹⁸ In our case, it is usually translated by ‘now’ or ‘then’ without any adversative force.

⁶⁹⁹ The adversative interpretation of δέ with reference to 2:18 has been admitted by MOORE, *1 and 2 Thessalonians*, p. 59, and more strongly favored by IOVINO, *La prima lettera*, p. 177.

plausible than the prayer-report (v. 10) where he accentuates his and his companions' desire to see the face of the Thessalonians. The transition from the missionaries' *wish* to the divine *action* (v. 11) marks a clear development of Paul's thought: despite their good intentions it is *namely* and *first of all* the divine Father on whom depends the success of the journey that was so desired by the missionaries.⁷⁰⁰ In such a perspective, the slightly adversative sense of *δέ* draws the attention to both the change of the acting subjects and also Paul's acknowledgement of the supreme pastoral role to God the Father that he shares with the Lord Jesus as it is explicitly shown by associating them by means of *καί* (for the second time in this letter, cf. 1:1) and the verb *κατευθύνω* in the singular.⁷⁰¹ On the one hand, it seems wrong to put too much emphasis on the divine nature of the Lord Jesus as if it had been Paul's primary intention in this passage,⁷⁰² on the other hand, it would be inadmissible to reduce the role of Jesus to the divine agency (God acts in/through him).⁷⁰³ Although the co-activity of the divine Father and the Lord Jesus is portrayed in this letter for the first time, their unity in function implies the same authority they share⁷⁰⁴ (Jesus as the glorified Lord as it has been admitted in the analysis of the initial salutation formula). In fact, Paul was praying to both God the Father and the Lord Jesus;⁷⁰⁵ the syntax he uses here implies the intimacy between the Father and Jesus; it is avoiding either complete separation between them or complete merging of the two in one.⁷⁰⁶ However, the main accent, as regards the relational aspect of the divine fatherhood in this prayer, falls not on the rapport of 'Father-Jesus' but on the 'Father/Jesus' relationship to Paul and his collaborators. Thus, the tripartite structure 'Father-Jesus-missionaries' resembles the pattern 'Father-Jesus-believers' in the initial salutations and the adscriptions in 1 Thess 1:1 and 2 Thess 1:1.

The reference to *before our God and Father* in the purpose/finality clause of the second wish-prayer is grammatically identical to that in the introductory thanksgiving (1:3); however,

⁷⁰⁰ Paul's confidence to God's activity in this letter is especially recognizable; cf. GNILKA, *Paulus von Tarsus*, p. 195.

⁷⁰¹ According to RIGAUX, *Les épîtres aux Thessaloniens*, p. 486, the position of God and Jesus in between two singular terms *αὐτός* and *κατευθύνει* point to their singular action. BEST, *Thessalonians*, p. 147, notices that "the singular may be used in Greek where two subjects are regularly thought of as together." Similarly, ZERWICK – GROSVENOR, *A Grammatical Analysis*, p. 617.

⁷⁰² Though Morris in his revised edition lessens the weight of the expression "full deity is ascribed to Him" reported in his previous commentary, nevertheless, he remains on a highly dogmatic level when he proposes that here we have "the kind of understanding of the nature of the Godhead" and repeatedly emphasizes that the present syntactic construction arose from Paul's perception of the full deity of Christ; cf. MORRIS, *Thessalonians*, p. 107 and note 36.

⁷⁰³ This is the position of WILES, *Paul's Intercessory Prayers*, p. 55 note 3; also COLLINS, *Studies*, p. 361. Similarly, HOLTZ, *Der erste Brief*, p. 142, explaining the unity between God and Jesus that is implied in the singular *κατευθύνει* prefers to speak about the 'identity of action' that results in God's action through Christ: "Christus hat an Gott teil, weil Gott durch ihn handelt."

⁷⁰⁴ MARSHALL, *1 and 2 Thessalonians*, p. 100, sees in our prayer the implications for the supreme position of the Lord Jesus alongside the divine Father.

⁷⁰⁵ The hypothesis of RICHARD, *Thessalonians*, pp. 165, 167-168, that the original prayer to God "who is our Father and that of our Lord Jesus" was modified "by a later scribe" to its present form with "and" has no textual support and since it is completely speculative it cannot be accepted.

⁷⁰⁶ Cf. J. A. HEWETT, "1 Thessalonians 3¹¹," *ExpTimes* 87 (2, 1975), p. 54.

its position in the present context adds a new nuance to it. It has been agreed that in the introductory thanksgiving the term ἔμπροσθεν should probably be associated with μνημονεύοντες; the *remembering ... before* placed in the context of the prayer probably expresses a certain act of recalling the mind of the Thessalonians' praiseworthy style of life. The religious-moral authority of the divine Father, before whom the human actions are evaluated, is evidently the basic characteristic that qualifies him in that passage. Similarly, in our prayer the phrase *before our God and Father* is directly associated with the Thessalonians' religious-moral status, though in a different way. Here, the reference to the fatherhood of God is closely connected to the subsequent phrase ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ that adds to it a clear eschatological flavor. Since the purpose/finality εἰς τὸ στηρίξαι ὑμῶν τὰς καρδίας ἀμέμπτους ἐν ἀγιωσύνῃ (v. 13) of the Lord's action (v. 12) is presented here as oriented firmly towards the *parousia* of the Lord Jesus, the reference to *before our God and Father* in this context acquires a certain judicial aspect. Therefore, in this case the adverb ἔμπροσθεν should be regarded in a more precise meaning that is 'in the presence of', which would be better than a simple 'before'; it expresses the idea of immediacy of one's 'being' before a certain subject.⁷⁰⁷ Yet, the implication of the judgment in the presence of the divine Father in this eschatological scenario⁷⁰⁸ is not the only aspect that characterizes the fatherhood of God in this text. The legal moral authority of the divine Father is not only portrayed in connection to Jesus' coming but seems to be implicitly extended to Jesus as well as it is explicitly stated in another text: ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ παρουσίᾳ (2:19).⁷⁰⁹ In that passage, the Lord Jesus performs a similar role to that attributed to God the Father in our prayer; in both texts the Thessalonians' life/behavior will be given its final evaluation at the coming of the Lord Jesus 'in the presence of' Jesus/Father. The difference between these references is that in the first case, the Thessalonians are presented in terms of their achievements, i.e. they are ἐλπίς, χαρά, and στέφανος καυχῆσεως of the missionaries, while in our prayer the emphasis is put on the process and the role of the Lord (v. 12) who is being prayed to lead the Thessalonians to such a finale (v.

⁷⁰⁷ The only other text in the NT in which this adverb is employed in connection with God (though not directly) and Jesus (as the son of man) in a similar eschatological judicial context is καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὁμολογήσει ἐν αὐτῷ ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀγγέλων τοῦ θεοῦ (Luke 12:8).

⁷⁰⁸ LÉGASSE, *Les épîtres de Paul*, p. 197, suggests that there is a temporal 'until' ("jusqu'à la parousie") and possibly motivational 'in view of' ("en vue de") nuance in the phrase ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ. Such an interpretation better suits the context as it makes easier the explanation of the purpose clause εἰς τὸ στηρίξαι..., which in this case is understood as referring to the present and not to the future. However, other texts that refer to ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ in association with Jesus (1 Thess 2:19; 5:23; 1 Cor 15:23) do not bolster this hypothesis. Therefore it seems more reasonable to remain with the idea that in this case ἐν indicates a "point of time when smth. occurs;" BDAG, p. 329.

⁷⁰⁹ This is even more strongly supported by the fact that the only other text in the Pauline corpus that combines ἔμπροσθεν with Jesus Christ is clearly eschatological: τοὺς γὰρ πάντας ἡμᾶς φανερωθῆναι δεῖ ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ βήματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ (2 Cor 5:10). In addition, the reference to Jesus as God's Son in connection with his salvific role at the time of his Parousia (1 Thess 1:10: *who rescues us from the wrath that is coming*) shows that for Paul the eschatological fulfillment was unimaginable without Jesus' active role in it.

13). If our supposition is correct, then in this prayer it is plausible to view the relationship ‘Father-believers’ in the wider terms of ‘Father-Jesus-believers’ in which Jesus plays a twofold role: he is the Lord (v. 12)⁷¹⁰ who is operative in the midst of the believers by causing them to abundantly increase⁷¹¹ in love for one another and for all men (εἰς πάντας) so that they⁷¹² may be resolutely established⁷¹³ *blameless in holiness*⁷¹⁴ in the presence of the divine Father; he is also the Lord, who alongside the Father, evaluates their life/behavior. The reference to the fatherhood of God in the judicial eschatological context is unique in the Pauline corpus⁷¹⁵ and has prompted some scholars to interpret its significance in terms of God’s loving acceptance of his children,⁷¹⁶ or as the message of comfort and hope,⁷¹⁷ or even as a certain indication that here Paul is not focusing on the end-time with its implications as much as he is on Lord’s

⁷¹⁰ Although there is no unanimous agreement whether God or Jesus is intended by κύριος in v. 12; the second possibility appears to be more likely in light of the immediate context (both in v. 11 and v. 13 it is Jesus who is explicitly called κύριος); so, Rigaux, Moore, Best, Bruce, Marshall, Wanamaker, Morris, Iovino, Richard, Malherbe, Green; differently, Holtz, Légasse.

⁷¹¹ By employing two synonymous terms πλεονάζω and περισσεύω (v. 12) Paul evidently wished to express the idea of ‘superabundance’.

⁷¹² In the OT לב and לבב are often used in a figurative sense to denote the innermost part of man, who is connected with and responsible for the *emotional, rational, and volitional* sphere of the human being as well as for his *religious-moral* conduct; cf. F. BAUMGÄRTEL, καρδιά, in *TDNT* 3, pp. 605-607. The figurative use of this term in the NT may be summarized under the same four categories as well; cf. J. BEHM, καρδιά, in *TDNT* 3, pp. 612-613. Since this term may be regarded as the center of the human personality, it is simply translated as ‘they’.

⁷¹³ στηρίζω literally means the setting up something so that it may remain immovable, i.e. to fix firmly, establish, support, therefore, its combination with καρδιά (so also 2 Thess 2:17; Jam 5:8), in our case, is the figurative language used to express the very purpose of the Lord’s activity (v. 12) as regards the Thessalonians. Theologically, ‘heart’ is a place where the relationship with God is realized in a positive as well as in a negative way and which serves as the basis for the religious life which, in turn, determines one’s ethical attitude and behavior (so A. SAND, καρδιά, in *EDNT* 2, p. 250), therefore, Paul’s wish to get them established in ‘blamelessness and in holiness’ also discloses their fragility: they really need the Lord’s help to arrive at that point. The term στηρίζω is rendered by ‘establish’ instead of ‘strengthen’ in order to put the emphasis not as much on the process itself (it does not exclude that the Lord ‘strengthens’ their hearts at the present time) but rather on the result that will appear at the Parousia. BRUCE, *1 and 2 Thessalonians*, p. 72, accurately asserts that the appearance of the Thessalonians before God at the eschatological coming of Jesus “will consummate their sanctification.”

⁷¹⁴ The interpretation of ἐν ἀγιοσύνη that is adjoined to καρδίας ἀμέμπτους is a bit problematic, as this prepositional phrase is unique in the NT as well as in LXX. The majority of scholars agree that ἀγιοσύνη is usually being used in association with God (so LXX) and it denotes the status of the subject rather than a certain process; therefore, in this text they interpret it in terms of the *status* of the Thessalonians at the coming of Jesus. A quite different proposal has been made by RICHARD, *Thessalonians*, pp. 166, 175-177, who insists on attributing ἐν ἀγιοσύνη to the realm of God; hence, it does not indicate the status of the Thessalonians but stands in apposition to ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ θεοῦ. Thus, the finality of the Lord’s activity (v. 12) in the midst of the Thessalonians is understood as establishing them as blameless “in the sphere of holiness” that is “in God’s presence” (p. 177). As attractive this interpretation is, it does not take seriously the reference to ἀγιοσύνη in 2 Cor 7:1. Even if this text were not Pauline, as the author seems to emphasize (p. 176), it would retain its value since it bears witness to the usage of this term in association with the human religious-moral sphere. Moreover, the question remains unanswered why Paul should have needed to repeat the same idea by means of the appositional phrase in the text where even without mentioning ἐν ἀγιοσύνη it is fairly clear that ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν cannot mean anything else but the very presence of the divine Father.

⁷¹⁵ The only other eschatological passage that refers to God as Father and in which there is also mentioned the coming of Jesus is 1 Cor 15:20-28. Yet, this passage gives no hint as regards to the final judgment.

⁷¹⁶ Cf. RIGAUX, *Les épîtres aux Thessaloniens*, p. 490. He also adds that naming God as Father in this text discloses the motivation and strength for the Thessalonians’ practice of holiness: they had to be inspired by love but not by fear.

⁷¹⁷ Cf. WILES, *Paul’s Intercessory Prayers*, p. 62.

assistance to the believers and their union with the divine Father.⁷¹⁸ Others refuse to see any softening of the concept of God as a judge or any specific meaning in qualifying God as Father in our text because of the formulaic and liturgical character of the phrase;⁷¹⁹ they emphasize the fatherly authority which the believers, as God's children, must obey in the fulfilling his will.⁷²⁰ Probably there is some truth in all these insights; however, it may be noted that since Paul's concern in this wish-prayer is quite pastoral it is namely from this perspective that the significance of the fatherhood of God has to be evaluated. The very objective of Paul's aspiration is the unblamable holiness of the believers in the eschatological presence of God and since they are expected to be 'holy' not merely in a moral/ethical field but rather in their whole life that is wished to be marked by the superabundance of love in which the whole Law is fulfilled,⁷²¹ it is possible to consider the goal of Jesus' activity (v. 12) in terms of his willingness to help the Thessalonians to conform a moral to the character of God, that is 'holiness', one of his primary characteristics in the biblical tradition.⁷²² Therefore, in this context it is possible to consider the reference of the fatherhood of God as Paul's wish to underscore God's caring attitude as far as he requires and expects that his children are worthy of their Father. Admittedly, it may seem to be too hypothetical to speak of the theme of imitation of God in this text; nevertheless, the moral authority of the divine Father, apart from the implications for the eschatological judgment, may also be regarded as the exemplary and final point of arrival for the Thessalonians.

The supreme pastoral care, in the first wish-prayer and the moral-judicial authority in the second one, ascribed to God the Father may at first glance seem to have little in common, especially since these faculties are said to be exercised on different groups (missionaries and Thessalonians). Nevertheless, at the beginning it has been observed that these prayers are closely intertwined (the plural personal pronouns); therefore, the presentation of the divine Father is not accidental either. As Paul's pastoral concern for the Thessalonians expressed concisely in v. 10 (to see them face to face and to provide what was lacking for their faith) stands at the core of both prayers, the decisive pastoral role that Paul attributes to the Father/Jesus in the first prayer (v. 11) indirectly affects the fate of the Thessalonians as well, insofar as Paul is zealous to contribute to their spiritual growth. Thus, God's fatherly care for the believers is made visible through the activity of the missionaries; the main accent is put on the initiative of God the Father and Lord Jesus. And so, the first prayer presents the Father/Jesus as

⁷¹⁸ Cf. RICHARD, *Thessalonians*, p. 166.

⁷¹⁹ Cf. BEST, *Thessalonians*, p. 151f.; MALHERBE, *Thessalonians*, p. 213f.

⁷²⁰ Cf. MARSHALL, *1 and 2 Thessalonians*, p. 102.

⁷²¹ Cf. HOLTZ, *Der erste Brief*, p. 146.

⁷²² Cf. WANAMAKER, *Thessalonians*, p. 144.

the remote origin for the Thessalonians' spiritual growth. At the end of the second prayer, the Father/Jesus are portrayed as those who evaluate their status of holiness. In the period between *now and then* the pastoral role of the Lord (Jesus) is even more emphasized; he is the one who is directly engaged in the process of the Thessalonians' spiritual growth and going towards the Father. It is obvious that in this passage the relational dimension is very important in understanding the image of God the Father. It may be summed up in two directions: 'Father-Jesus' and 'Father-believers'. As to the first aspect, the divine Father is portrayed as sharing his activity/authority with Lord Jesus both with regard to the present and the future; the divine fatherhood is highly christological in this passage. Similarly, his relationships with both missionaries and Thessalonians are presented in an exclusively christological perspective after the model of the already-known tripartite scheme 'Father-Jesus-believers'.

4.2.2.3.2. Divine Fatherhood in 2 Thess 2:16-17

The basic structure of this wish-prayer including the reference to God the Father is very similar to that in 1 Thess 3:11.

2:16a – Αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς καὶ [ὁ] θεὸς ὁ πατὴρ ἡμῶν⁷²³

2:16b – ὁ ἀγαπήσας ἡμᾶς καὶ δοὺς παράκλησιν αἰώνιαν καὶ ἐλπίδα ἀγαθὴν ἐν χάριτι,

2:17 – παρακαλέσαι ὑμῶν τὰς καρδίας καὶ στηρίξαι ἐν παντὶ ἔργῳ καὶ λόγῳ ἀγαθῷ.

The same three elements, that is, a compound subject (v. 16a), verbs in the singular optative, and an object (v. 17) occur here in the same order as they are in 1 Thess 3:11; this wish-prayer was likely to be intentionally modeled after the pattern of its counterpart in 1 Thessalonians. Yet, the divine Father, the reference to whom is here formulated in a unique way [ὁ] θεὸς ὁ πατὴρ ἡμῶν (it may be translated as 'God who is our Father'), is not only implored to act (v. 17) as that is the case in 1 Thess 3:11, but he is also given an additional qualification by means of the participial parenthesis (v. 16b). Though it is possible that in this verse the participles ἀγαπήσας and δοὺς could refer to the common function of the compound subject Father/Jesus,⁷²⁴ nevertheless, on the grammatical grounds it is more possible that they describe

⁷²³ Several manuscripts have θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ ἡμῶν (A, D², I, Ψ, etc.) instead of θεὸς ὁ πατὴρ ἡμῶν (8*, B, D*, F, G, 33, etc.). Apparently, the latter unusual formulation has been altered to a more familiar expression by the copyists. Since the article ὁ is absent before θεός in the manuscripts B, D*, K, 33, etc., it is uncertain whether it originally made part of the text; so METZGER, *A Textual Commentary*, p. 568f.

⁷²⁴ According to RIGAUX, *Les épîtres aux Thessaloniens*, p. 690f., there is no intrinsic difficulty to attribute these participles to the Father and to Jesus as Paul refers both to the 'love' of God (2 Thess 3:5; 2 Cor 9:7; 13:13; Rom 8:39; so also Eph 2:4) and of Christ (Gal 2:20; 2 Cor 5:14; Rom 8:35,37; so also Eph 5:2,25) as well as to the 'encouragement' of God (2 Cor 1:3; Rom 15:5) and of Christ (Phil 2:1). Rigaux also points out that the words' inversion (first Christ then God) appears also in Gal 1:1 and 2 Cor 13:13 and therefore has no particular

the activity of God the Father alone.⁷²⁵ While the objective/prayer of the principal clause is clearly oriented to the Thessalonians' present-future, the participial parenthesis describes the divine activity with respect to 'us' in the past and thus it may be easily excerpted without interrupting the flow of thought in this prayer.⁷²⁶ Therefore, the divine fatherhood may be observed under a double aspect: what God the Father has done for *us* (v. 16b) and what he is supposed (is prayed for) to do for the *Thessalonians* in association with Jesus Christ (vv. 16a.17). Undoubtedly, such an *objective* and *temporal* distinction is quite formal because the present-future of the Thessalonians is based on and depends on what God has done for *us*, including them, in the past; in our prayer this is well illustrated by means of repeating cognate terms *παράκλησις* and *παρακαλέω*, the former one indicates the way how the latter one is to be interpreted. Moreover, the repetition of this term, in the parenthesis that refers to God's activity, may be a sign of Paul's intention to put an emphasis on God as the ultimate source of *παράκλησις*⁷²⁷ as well as to underscore its permanent character;⁷²⁸ the prayer continues on that it may be further granted by both the Father and Jesus.

The activity of the divine Father in the past, obviously has consequences for the present for *us*, it is described in a double, yet, sequential way: first, he loved us (*ἀγαπήσας*) and consequently gave us the eternal comfort and good hope (*δοὺς...*). Scholars usually indicate several possible contents of God's love for *us*: Christ's incarnation (cf. John 3:16), his saving death (cf. Gal 2:20),⁷²⁹ and God's election/choice of the Thessalonians. Some modern commentators⁷³⁰ have strongly opted for the latter interpretation because of the way how Paul connects the divine *love* with the *election* of the Thessalonians (1 Thess 1:4 - εἰδότες, ἀδελφοὶ ἡγαπημένοι ὑπὸ [τοῦ] θεοῦ, τὴν ἐκλογὴν ὑμῶν; 2 Thess 2:13 - ἀδελφοὶ ἡγαπημένοι ὑπὸ κυρίου... εἴλατο ὑμᾶς ὁ θεός). Yet, this explanation is not fully convincing since the personal pronouns ὑμῶν and ὑμᾶς, which are employed in 1 Thess 1:4 and 2 Thess 2:13, refer to the

significance, especially since 2 Thess 2:13-3:5 is a highly christological section (in ten verses Christ is mentioned 8 times while God only three). It may be added that in two other cases, in which the verb *ἀγαπάω* describes the activity of Christ, it is used in the same participial aorist form as in our verse - *ἀγαπήσας* (cf. Gal 2:20; Rom 8:37). The christological interpretation of ὁ ἀγαπήσας...καὶ δοὺς has been presented by ROMANIUK, *L'amour du Père*, pp. 260-261. For the compound subject opt Moore, Best, Bruce, Marshall, Légasse, Malherbe (with hesitation).

⁷²⁵ According to TRILLING, *Der zweite Brief an die Thessalonicher*, p.131 the clause that starts with the participle in the singular ὁ ἀγαπήσας refers to God the Father and not to the compound subject Father/Jesus. He suggests that in this prayer the inversion of the subjects may have been done intentionally because of this clause. In addition, he points to a similar construction that immediately precedes our text (cf. 2:13-14). For God as the only subject of the participial clause also opt Wanamaker, Morris, Richard, Green.

⁷²⁶ The change of objects in the participial clause (v. 16 - ἡμᾶς; v. 17 - ὑμῶν) seems to bolster the line of interpretation with one divine subject, God the Father, who is given an additional description by means of the clause directly attached to him.

⁷²⁷ Some support for such a supposition is found in 2 Cor 1:3: ὁ πατὴρ τῶν οἰκτιρῶν καὶ θεὸς πάσης παρακλήσεως, and Rom 15:5: ὁ δὲ θεὸς τῆς ὑπομονῆς καὶ τῆς παρακλήσεως.

⁷²⁸ Cf. C. H. GIBLIN, "Three Monotheistic Texts in Paul," *CBQ* 37 (4, 1975), p. 249.

⁷²⁹ This interpretation has been favored by BEST, *Thessalonians*, p. 320; LÉGASSE, *Les épîtres de Paul*, p. 414.

⁷³⁰ Cf. RICHARD, *Thessalonians*, p. 359; MALHERBE, *Thessalonians*, p. 442; GREEN, *Thessalonians*, p. 331.

Thessalonians, whereas in our verse the pronoun ἡμᾶς refers to a larger group.⁷³¹ In addition, two other references to God's love in a verbal form in the Pauline corpus (2 Cor 9:7 and Eph 2:4) give no support to the idea of the *election*, but, on the contrary, provide more evidence for the interpretation, which associates the love of God for *us* with the event of Christ (cf. Eph 2:4-7). Therefore, it appears that the reference to God's fatherly love for *us* is not to be regarded as a certain indication of the specific status of the Thessalonians but should rather be understood in more general terms, i.e., as an expression of the Christian faith in God's saving activity in Jesus Christ⁷³² including Paul's personal experience (if he was the author of this letter).⁷³³ Once God's fatherly love is understood in association with the Christ-event, the subsequent qualification of him as the giver (δοῦς) should also be seen in the same light. The gifts that the divine Father bestowed on us (παράκλησιν αἰωνίαν and ἐλπίδα ἀγαθὴν) are said to have been given ἐν χάριτι;⁷³⁴ this adverbial phrase not only indicates a free and unmerited character of the divine gifts,⁷³⁵ but also points to the very ground on which they are based.⁷³⁶ Keeping in mind the previous supposition that by God's love it is meant his saving activity in Jesus Christ, it is reasonable to think that God's gifts, making his love visible to us, are supposed to be grounded on his grace that have been definitely revealed in and by Jesus Christ.⁷³⁷ The specified gifts seem to support this interpretation, as the combination of them with Christ in the Pauline letters shows (Phil 2:1: παράκλησις ἐν Χριστῷ; Col 1:27: ὃ ἐστὶν Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν, ἡ ἐλπίς τῆς

⁷³¹ This ἡμᾶς is not to be limited to Paul/author and the Thessalonians who he addressed; it rather denotes men in general.

⁷³² TRILLING, *Der zweite Brief an die Thessalonicher*, pp.131-132, states that "zu den Hauptstücken des christlichen Glaubens gehört, dass alles in Gottes Liebe seinen Grund und Ausgang hat (vgl. Röm 8,37-39)." It is a bit strange that Trilling points to Rom 8:37-39 to illustrate his thesis, since according to him the author of this letter by referring to the love of God "proklamiert nicht missionarisch Gottes Heilswerk in seinem Sohn" (p. 131). But, namely in Rom 8:39 the love of God is qualified by ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ; furthermore, the identical formulations ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ Χριστοῦ (v. 35) and ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ θεοῦ (v. 39) emphasize even more the indissoluble bond between God's and Christ's love. Moreover, in one of the answers to the rhetorical questions, which immediately precede those verses (v. 32), Paul refers to *not sparing* by God of his own Son but giving him up for all of us and, what is even more important, considers this event as the most prominent gift for us (*will he not with him also give us everything else?*). The connection between God's love for us and Christ's death for us in those verses is quite evident.

⁷³³ In fact, there is only one reference to the love that Paul experienced as personally shown to him, which is the love of the Son of God (Gal 2:20: τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντός με).

⁷³⁴ We accept that ἐν χάριτι, which is attached to the second gift and concludes the clause, is valid for both gifts and is to be taken in connection with δοῦς; so also, BRUCE, *1 and 2 Thessalonians*, p. 196; TRILLING, *Der zweite Brief an die Thessalonicher*, p.132; LÉGASSE, *Les épîtres de Paul*, p. 415 note 4; GREEN, *Thessalonians*, p. 332; differently (both with ἀγαπήσας and δοῦς), RIGAU, *Les épîtres aux Thessaloniens*, p. 691; BEST, *Thessalonians*, p. 320; WANAMAKER, *Thessalonians*, p. 271; MALHERBE, *Thessalonians*, p. 442. RICHARD, *Thessalonians*, p. 359, opts for a somewhat middle way: he states that 'grace' is related to both 'loved' and 'given', yet, he translates "God loved us and so through grace has given us...", thus, conveying the idea that 'through grace' it is directly associated with 'has given' and not with 'loved'.

⁷³⁵ It is emphasized by Trilling, Marshall, Green.

⁷³⁶ Cf. Rigaux, Best, Wanamaker. All three scholars agree that God's 'love for us' is also based on his grace/favor. The position taken in this study is different: since God loved us, he graciously bestowed his gifts on us, i.e. logically, as the divine gifts are based on God's grace, so his grace is the expression of his love for us.

⁷³⁷ The expression ἐν χάριτι appears, apart from our verse, only four times in the Pauline corpus (Gal 1:6; 2 Cor 1:12; Rom 5:15; Col 4:6). In two of them (Gal 1:6 and Rom 5:15), it is connected with Christ's salvific role.

δόξης; 1 Tim 1:1: ... Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ τῆς ἐλπίδος ἡμῶν). The divine *comfort*⁷³⁸ is *eternal* not in terms of its unending duration⁷³⁹ but rather in terms of its capability to transcend death thus, pointing to the final salvation.⁷⁴⁰ The adjective αἰώνιος may also refer to its source, i.e. it is originating from God⁷⁴¹ and is bound with his person and character,⁷⁴² which is presented here as his consoling help.⁷⁴³ Most likely, the *good hope* indicates the future life after death⁷⁴⁴ and clearly refers to the result that has been achieved with respect to us by the death and the resurrection of Jesus Christ. Hence, the Christ-event is presented as the ultimate expression of God's fatherly love for *us*. Many commentators⁷⁴⁵ emphasize the *encouragement* aspect of God's παράκλησις (as well as in παρακαλέω in the subsequent verse) because of the challenges (trials, distresses) Thessalonians had to face in this age. However, the implied differentiation between the general character of the Father's *eternal comfort*, which believers already possess (v. 16b) and the Father's and Jesus' activity for the sake of the Thessalonians expressed by παρακαλέω (vv. 16a.17) favors the *comfort* interpretation more.⁷⁴⁶ The *comfort* that the divine Father has given, which may be experienced by the believers in the present time, and the hope for the future life present the Christian existence in terms of the eschatological tension, which becomes even more acute when it is accompanied by the persecution and various afflictions as presented in this letter (cf. 1:4-6). Namely, in such a painful situation, the actualization of God's fatherly *comfort* in the Thessalonians' daily lives was of even greater importance.

The activity of the divine Father and Lord Jesus Christ for the sake of the Thessalonians (desired by Paul) is portrayed in terms of 'comforting' and 'strengthening' their 'hearts'.⁷⁴⁷ It seems to be plausible to assume that in the continuation of the preceding verse the phrase

⁷³⁸ For this verse BDAG, p. 766, prefers *comfort*, *consolation* to *encouragement* or *exhortation*. So also RSV, NRSV, etc.

⁷³⁹ Cf. BDAG, p. 33.

⁷⁴⁰ Cf. LÉGASSE, *Les épîtres de Paul*, p. 415.

⁷⁴¹ Cf. H. BALZ, αἰώνιος, in *EDNT* 1, p. 47. As this is the only Pauline (and also NT) text in which παράκλησις is qualified 'eternal' it is a bit difficult to see in it the allusion to the gift of the Holy Spirit as RIGAU, *Les épîtres aux Thessaloniens*, p. 691 is likely to admit.

⁷⁴² Cf. MOORE, *1 and 2 Thessalonians*, p. 110.

⁷⁴³ Cf. O. SCHMITZ, παρακαλέω and παράκλησις, in *TDNT* 5, p. 797. The aspect of 'confidence' may also be present in this gift; so TRILLING, *Der zweite Brief an die Thessalonicher*, p. 132.

⁷⁴⁴ The expression 'good hope' is unique in the NT and it was used in the Hellenistic world (cults of Demeter and Persephone) to refer to life after death; see P. OTZEN, "'Guttes Hoffnig' bei Paulus," *ZNW* 49 (1958), pp. 283-285. See also LÉGASSE, *Les épîtres de Paul*, p. 414 notes 5 and 6, and p. 415 note 1.

⁷⁴⁵ For instance, Rigaux, Best, Bruce, Marshall, Wanamaker, Malherbe.

⁷⁴⁶ Though GREEN, *Thessalonians*, p. 332, interprets this clause in the light of the Thessalonians' troubles, he also points out that the idea of 'comfort' also fits well into our context.

⁷⁴⁷ The verb στηρίζαι is not directly associated with καρδίας as it is παρακαλέσαι, yet, given the fact that its object in this verse is not explicitly expressed (it might be intended 'you') and that in a similar prayer in 1 Thess 3:13 as well as in Jam 5:8 it is connected with 'hearts', it appears to be reasonable to attach it to καρδίας in this case as well. In this text it retains the idea of 'strengthening' instead of 'establishing' as in 1 Thess 3:13 because here στηρίζαι καρδίας indicates the process in the believers' daily lives while in 1 Thess 3:13 it points to the final result to be achieved.

παρακαλέσαι ὑμῶν τὰς καρδίας refers to the divine *comfort* rather than the *encouragement* or *exhortation*, though they are also possible.⁷⁴⁸ In fact, the believers needed both the divine *comfort* to help them constantly enkindle their hope to remain faithful to the way they have accepted and also the divine *strengthening* so that they could actively express their commitment by a good moral behavior.⁷⁴⁹

Since the beginning (αὐτὸς δε) and the basic structure of this wish-prayer is identical to the one in 1 Thess 3:11, several observations may be done with reference to it:

- 1) The function of the particle δέ is the same as in 1 Thess 3:11, i.e. while connecting the wish-prayer with what precedes it, it also retains some of its adversative force. The wish-prayer in 1 Thess 3:11-13 develops the prayer-report in 3:10 so the prayer in 2 Thess 2:16-17 develops the paraenesis in 2:15 to stand firm and hold to the traditions. In both cases, these prayers reveal the need of the divine ‘Father-Jesus’ intervention to achieve the desirable result.
- 2) As it is not clear whether αὐτός refers to the compound subject or only to the first member, which in this prayer is ‘our Lord Jesus Christ’; the first position in the sequence of the Lord Jesus may imply that it is *namely* and *first of all* he who is engaged in the active *comforting* and *strengthening* of the Thessalonians’ hearts, while the divine Father is presented as the ultimate instance of the divine *comfort* and *hope*.
 1. The observations on the relational aspect of the divine fatherhood, which were made previously with respect to 1 Thess 3:11 (‘Father-Jesus’ and ‘Father-Jesus-believers’), are applicable here too.

To sum up, the figure of God as Father is presented in a quite similar way in both 1 and 2 Thessalonians as regards the structural position, their literary genre and formulaic wording of the texts referring to him.

On the syntactic level, it may be noted that in both letters the fatherhood of God is in one way or another directly associated with the term θεός, as if Paul wished to emphasize that God is ‘Father’ because of the very reason he is God. Furthermore, in all ‘father-texts’ (except for 1 Thess 1:3) the divine fatherhood is presented in a conjunction with the Lord Jesus (Christ) by

⁷⁴⁸ The combination παρακαλέω plus καρδία also occurs in Col 2:2; 4:8 and Eph 6:22. Indeed, in these texts the idea of ‘encouragement’ or ‘exhortation’ is more visible than that of ‘comfort’. Yet, the uncertainty remains since the subject in those sayings is Tychicus (in Col 2:2 as well, though he is not explicitly named; see 4:8), but not God or Jesus. Similarly, the subject of the phrase εἰς τὸ στηρίζαι ὑμᾶς καὶ παρακαλέσαι (1 Thess 3:2) is Timothy.

⁷⁴⁹ The phrase ἐν παντὶ ἔργῳ καὶ λόγῳ ἀγαθῷ does not point to any specific situation. The combination of ‘deed’ and ‘word’ is also found in Rom 15:18; Luke 24:19; Acts 7:22 (cf. also Col 3:17) and was a common expression in the ancient literature to denote good or bad deeds and words; cf. GREEN, *Thessalonians*, p. 333 notes 115 and 116. This point has been missed by GIBLIN, “Three Monotheistic Texts in Paul,” p. 249, who while heavily stresses the importance of faith in Paul’s admonition at the same time, undermines the significance of the Thessalonians’ moral conduct.

means of καί or the prepositional phrase (1 Thess 3:13) thus, making clear that in Paul's view the fatherhood of God was closely related to the person of Jesus.⁷⁵⁰

From the theological point of view, the figure of God the Father as the *principal protagonist* of the Christian community (whether its' being *in* him were understood in a local-spatial or instrumental/causal sense) is of great importance as it is presented at the very beginning of both letters.⁷⁵¹ The introductory thanksgiving in 1 Thessalonians and wish-prayers in both letters show that the divine Father is the one to whom the prayers may and should be addressed. In those prayers the image of God the Father varies due to the circumstances and needs of the supplicants. On the one hand, there is a clear reference to his *strong* side that is basically portrayed in terms of his *moral-authoritative supremacy* (1 Thess 1:3 and 3:13); on the other hand, his *soft* side is well presented by his *pastoral* activity (1 Thess 3:11) that is in fact based on his *loving/caring* attitude to men in general and the Thessalonians in particular (2 Thess 2:16-17). The divine *strong* side, however, is not to be overemphasized since God's fatherly *caring* position with respect to the religious-moral life of the Thessalonians may be detected even in the description of the eschatological scenario (1 Thess 3:13; see above). Moreover, the identical references to the divine fatherhood ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν (1 Thess 1:3 and 3:13) not only point to the divine moral authority but also form a certain inclusion of the first part of the letter (or the extended thanksgiving), which may also be a sign of Paul's confidence in the *caring* activity of the divine Father which, above all, is *his* prerogative. Namely, Paul and his companions are said to have remembered the irreproachable life of the Thessalonians before our God and Father as they gave thanks to him; this fact already includes the idea of the *caring* role that Paul attributes to God the Father with respect to the believers' achievements in their Christian life. Therefore, it is reasonable to think about the continuity of God's fatherly attitude until the eschatological final, when the believers will stand in his presence. In addition, the reference to God as [ὁ] θεὸς ὁ πατὴρ ἡμῶν ὁ ἀγαπήσας ἡμᾶς in the parallel wish-prayer in 2 Thess 2:16-17 emphasizes even more the *caring* aspect of the fatherhood of God. The reason for such a supposition lies not only in the very formulation of this reference but also in the fact that in this letter *namely* that presents the hard situation of the Thessalonian community (afflictions, sufferings); the principal place is occupied by the comforting, giving hope, and a loving aspect of the divine fatherhood.

⁷⁵⁰ COLLINS, *Studies*, p. 233f., observes that in half of the cases God is mentioned in 1 Thessalonians, where he is linked to Jesus Christ. According to him, such a broad use of the binary formula may indicate that Paul's understanding of God cannot be properly grasped without taking into consideration his appreciation of the Lord Jesus Christ.

⁷⁵¹ This image is even more strengthened in 2 Thessalonians by adjoining it to the initial salutation in its full form (with God [our] Father and Lord Jesus Christ).

It is also worth noting that in the wish-prayers, in which Paul/author is engaged in a prayer out of the pastoral motives, he acknowledges the principal and continuous role of the divine Father in every stage of the salvific Christ-event. Its basic phases are: a) he loved *us* and gave us *eternal comfort* and *good hope* in/by Christ's death and resurrection (2 Thess 2:16b); b) he is active in Paul's missionary work whose task is to proclaim Christ's gospel (1 Thess 3:11); c) he is active in the religious-moral life of the believers (2 Thess 2:16a.17); d) finally, he will evaluate their achievements at Christ's Parousia (1 Thess 3:13).

The relational aspect of the divine fatherhood with respect to Jesus Christ is undoubtedly visibly underlined by the grammar itself: they are perpetually coupled together. What is even more important, in those cases they are considered to be the compound subject that has the same function equally shared by both of them. This is done by means of one preposition (ἐν – 1 Thess 1:1; 2 Thess 1:1; ἀπό – 2 Thess 1:2)⁷⁵² and verbs in singular (1 Thess 3:11; 2 Thess 2:16a.17) that are valid for either subject. In fact, in every stage of the salvific Christ-event (indicated above as b), c), d), except for a)⁷⁵³) the divine Father and the Lord Jesus are portrayed as being engaged in the same function and presumably having the same authority. This means that the fatherhood of God is very christological in these letters and, *vice versa*; the Christology is highly theological. As regards the relationships between God the Father and the Thessalonians or Paul/missionaries or men in general they are completely *christologized*; the only text that does not fit into the tripartite scheme 'Father-Jesus-Paul/Thessalonians/men' appears in the introductory thanksgiving (1 Thess 1:3). In this text, the rapport is bipartite 'Father-Paul/we'.

Obviously, the main accent is put on the relationship 'Father-Jesus-Thessalonians'; as it seems to be implied in both letters by the adscriptions and the wish-prayers; this relationship may be regarded as a certain model of the larger 'Father-Christians' rapport, which even on a smaller scale contains the basic aspects of God's fatherly attitude and function.⁷⁵⁴

4.2.3. God as Father in the Letter to the Galatians

The references to the divine fatherhood in this letter including both 'father-texts' and 'son-texts' are contained in two passages: the opening formula 1:1-5 and a clearly defined text 4:1-7 (more precisely vv. 4-7). The reference to the children of God in 3:26, which thematically

⁷⁵² Even though Jesus Christ is not mentioned in conjunction with ἡμῶν θεὸς καὶ πατήρ 'our God and Father' in 1 Thess 3:13, nevertheless, as the parallel texts show, he may have been implied there (see above).

⁷⁵³ This is obvious because it was God who resurrected his Son Jesus from the dead (1 Thess 1:10).

⁷⁵⁴ COLLINS, "God in the First Letter to the Thessalonians," pp. 150-151, suggests that because of the way how the fatherhood of God is presented in 1 Thessalonians (he also points to 1:4 [ἡγαπημένοι ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ] and 4:9 [αὐτοὶ γὰρ ὑμεῖς θεοδόξατοι ἐστέ]) and the covenantal ideology that possibly underlies this letter, there is a possibility to consider the relationship 'God-Thessalonians' in terms of a covenantal relationship with him.

anticipates in 4:1-7, will be taken into consideration along with the latter passage, while the ‘son-text’ in 1:16 will be briefly observed together with the opening formula, since both 1:1 and 1:16 introduce the image of God as Father with reference to Paul.

4.2.3.1. A Threefold Reference to God as Father in Gal 1:1-5

In the letter to the Galatians, the fatherhood of God is mentioned three times in the epistolary prescript: in the superscription διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ πατρὸς (v. 1), in the initial salutation ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (v. 3), and in the christological statement κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν (v. 4). This is quite unusual in comparison with the other Pauline letters; therefore, the question then arises as to what may have been Paul’s intention on putting such an emphasis on the divine fatherhood right at the beginning of the letter. The fact is even more striking because in the whole letter there is only one other explicit reference to God as Father in Gal 4:6. There are two christological expansions in Gal 1:1-5 (v. 1c and v. 4), which are not found in the other Pauline letters. The phrase about Jesus’ resurrection (v. 1) echoes the so-called pistis-formula that is fully or partially attested in a number of the Pauline texts.⁷⁵⁵ The formula-like clause about Christ’s giving himself for our sins (v. 4) presents his death as an expiatory sacrifice⁷⁵⁶ and is similar to ‘Christ’s-death-for-us’ statements in the pistis-formula.⁷⁵⁷ In none of those formulas, however, except Rom 6:4, God is called Father as in our case.⁷⁵⁸ Certainly, from a purely functional epistolary point of view the christological statements and the concluding doxology are not necessary; they may be regarded as certain parentheses that may be left out without contravening the opening formula. Thus, the reference to God’s fatherhood at the end of the christological statement (v. 4) at first glance may seem to have little to do with the reference to God the Father in the initial salutation that is a standard element in the Pauline corpus. A different issue arises with ἀλλὰ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ πατρὸς that is syntactically connected to Παῦλος ἀπόστολος in the expanded

⁷⁵⁵ The complete pistis-formula consists of two statements: Christ’s death for (us) and his resurrection. Kramer distinguishes three variants of this formula in 1 Cor 15:3b-5, 2 Cor 5:15, and 1 Thess 4:14. The passages that mention Christ’s death for (us) are: 1 Cor 8:11; Rom 5:6,8; 14:15; cf. also Gal 3:13. The resurrection-statements in different forms occur in 1 Thess 1:10; 1 Cor 6:14; 15:12-20; 2 Cor 4:14; Rom 4:24; 7:4; 8:11; 10:9; Col 2:12; Eph 1:20; 2 Tim 2:8. For the whole argument, see KRAMER, *Christ, Lord*, pp. 19-44.

⁷⁵⁶ Cf. OEPKE, *An die Galater*, p. 45; BETZ, *Galatians*, p. 41.

⁷⁵⁷ See KRAMER, *Christ, Lord*, pp. 115-119. for the ‘giving up’ formulas. Strikingly, he did not mention Gal 1:4 in his survey.

⁷⁵⁸ In the other passages where the resurrection of Jesus Christ or his redemptive work is mentioned in connection with God it is always presented by means of θεός, or by a personal pronoun (for God), or by a ‘theological passive’. There are also several texts in which the divine fatherhood with regard to Jesus’ resurrection/death is implied by the image of υἱός: 1 Thess 1:10; Rom 1:4; 8:32 (cf. 8:3).

superscription (v. 1).⁷⁵⁹ The reference to Christ Jesus (Jesus Christ in Gal and Tit) is a standard element in all Pauline epistolary prescripts except for 1-2 Thessalonians; in those prescripts however, it qualifies Paul's status in a slightly different way: ἀπόστολος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ (1-2 Cor, Col, Eph, 1-2 Tim, and Tit [inverted order]), δοῦλος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ (Phil [in plural] and Rom), δέσμιος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ (Phlm). Ours is the only case, in which 'Jesus Christ' is governed by the preposition διὰ. The same preposition in the other epistolary prescripts introduces a second subject 'God': διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ (1-2 Cor, Col, Eph, and 2 Tim).⁷⁶⁰ It is likely that by introducing God the Father and Jesus Christ with a single preposition διὰ in Gal 1:1 Paul combined the idea of belonging to/being of Jesus Christ, expressed in his other letters, with his own awareness that he is indebted for his apostleship to God as the ultimate authority; yet, even here καὶ θεοῦ πατρὸς appears to be superfluous because in no other letter there is such a reference to the fatherhood of God.⁷⁶¹ Therefore, Paul probably had other reasons, as the comparison with other texts shows that neither Paul's self-presentation (his status) nor employed christological statements necessitate an explicit description of God as Father. One of his intentions⁷⁶² to once again pair God the Father with Jesus Christ by means of καί (v. 1) and point out to his decisive role in the salvation event (v. 4) may have been employed in order to highlight the centrality of God as Father in the initial salutation, in which he plays the same role as in all letters, and to draw attention to a highly theological dimension of χάρις and εἰρήνη. Looking at the 'father-texts' in Gal 1:1.3.4 it seems plausible to think that the most important aspect Paul wished to emphasize by portraying the image of God as Father was the relational one: in all three verses he is very closely associated with [the Lord] Jesus Christ. Their co-action has already been discussed in the initial salutations as being the source of grace and peace to the Christian communities. A similar co-action is also indicated in our v. 1 where Jesus and God the Father are connected by καί and governed by the same preposition διὰ in our case that should be interpreted in the 'originator'⁷⁶³ rather than in a 'mediating agent'⁷⁶⁴ sense. And though the

⁷⁵⁹ The noun ἀπόστολος is most likely to be better understood as retaining the passive-participial sense and thus syntactically more closely connected to the phrases that follow it than as a title of Παῦλος; in this case it is plausible to put a comma after 'Paul'; cf. H. SCHLIER, *Lettera ai Galati*, BSB 3, Brescia: Paideia, 1965, p. 28 note 4; F. MUSSNER, *Der Galaterbrief*, HTKNT IX, Freiburg/Basel/Wien: Herder, 1974, p. 45.

⁷⁶⁰ Instead of the 'will of God', there is a 'command of God' in 1 Timothy and Titus.

⁷⁶¹ There is only one more example in 1 Tim 1:1 that may be syntactically compared with our case: κατ' ἐπιταγὴν θεοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν καὶ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ τῆς ἐλπίδος ἡμῶν.

⁷⁶² There was another clearly pragmatic intention Paul undoubtedly had in mind by presenting the origin of his apostleship διὰ Jesus Christ and God the Father, who raised him from the dead, i.e., he appealed not only to the authority that stood behind his apostleship but presented his mission as essentially connected to the resurrection of Jesus Christ; cf. MUSSNER, *Der Galaterbrief*, p. 46; EBELING, *La verità dell'evangelo*, p. 26f.; CORSANI, *Lettera ai Galati*, p. 56.

⁷⁶³ BDF §223 (2): "The originator is probably also denoted by διὰ instead of the agent." So also J. L. MARTYN, *Galatians*, AB 33A, New York: Doubleday, 1998, p. 83.

preposition is not the same as in v. 3 (ἀπό), the impression is that Paul emphasizes the ‘Father-Jesus’ combination as being the co-source in the initial salutation so in a similar way he does in v. 1 by indicating ‘Jesus-Father’ as the co-cause of his apostleship.⁷⁶⁵ Moreover, in the same verse the Father is said to have raised Jesus from the dead and since this is the only resurrection-statement in the letter to the Galatians it is quite possible that Paul joined it to καὶ θεοῦ πατρὸς intending not only to accentuate the *giving life* as the most important mark of God’s fatherly identity⁷⁶⁶ but also to shed more light on the Father’s role in constituting his apostleship. Namely, he became an apostle by the agency of the risen/exalted Jesus Christ, and that means by the agency of God the Father because it was he who had raised Jesus from the dead and whom Paul encountered.⁷⁶⁷ This highly relational presentation of God as Father is further continued in v. 4 by a reference to Jesus’ activity κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν that is unique in the NT⁷⁶⁸ and was possibly used in the early Christian confession or liturgical formulations.⁷⁶⁹ The phrase accentuates the role of the divine Father with respect to Jesus’ self-giving in rescuing people from the evil age⁷⁷⁰ and so it draws the attention to the centrality of the fatherhood of God as the doxology confirms in the subsequent verse. It is difficult to say whether Paul by referring to the will of God in our phrase had in mind God’s eternal decree of salvation;⁷⁷¹ it is clear, however, that God’s will here is presented both as his sovereign decision over the existence of the evil age⁷⁷² and also as the crucial factor in Jesus’ salvific activity, i.e. it was neither the coincidence of any circumstances which could have arisen without the divine will nor somebody’s autonomous choice or ambition. As God is also said to be ‘our Father’, the loving disposition and fatherly concern should also be regarded as a part of his will; both of

⁷⁶⁴ The interpretation of the ‘mediating agent’ was adopted by Bonnard who depicted the role of Jesus (διδ) in terms of the unique instrument chosen by God; according to him every work of Jesus found its final explanation in God (he translated καὶ by ‘et done’); cf. P.-E. BONNARD, *L’épître de Saint Paul aux Galates*, CNT IX, Neuchâtel: Delachaux et Niestlé, 1972², p. 19. Similarly, LONGENECKER, *Galatians*, p. 5.

⁷⁶⁵ Cf. SCHLIER, *Lettera ai Galati*, p. 29f. and note 10; GUTHRIE, *Galatians*, p. 58; OEPKE, *An die Galater*, p. 44; VOUGA, *An die Galater*, HNT 10, Tübingen: Mohr, 1998, p. 18. According to Mussner the *Urheber* of Paul’s apostleship is Jesus Christ (διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ) behind whom stands God himself (καὶ θεοῦ πατρὸς); cf. MUSSNER, *Der Galaterbrief*, p. 47. This seems to be the point indicated also by Bruce as he considers the preposition διὰ before Jesus Christ and God the Father as pointing to a more general sense of agency. He excludes the possibility to interpret the phrase in terms of ‘from God the Father through Jesus Christ’; cf. F. F. BRUCE, *The Epistle to the Galatians*, NIGTC, Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1982, p. 73. Similarly, CORSANI, *Lettera ai Galati*, p. 55 and note 13.

⁷⁶⁶ Cf. MARTYN, *Galatians*, pp. 84-85.

⁷⁶⁷ Cf. W. THÜSING, *Per Christum in Deum. Studien zum Verhältnis von Christozentrik und Theozentrik in den paulinischen Hauptbriefen*, NA 1, Münster: Verlag Aschendorff, 1965, p. 169. Similarly, VANNI, *Lettere ai Galati e ai Romani*, p. 20.

⁷⁶⁸ The closest example is κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ (1 Pet 4:19).

⁷⁶⁹ Cf. PITTA, *Galati*, p. 69; VOUGA, *An die Galater*, p. 19; MARTYN, *Galatians*, p. 96.

⁷⁷⁰ There are two syntactic periods in the christological clause in v. 4 marked by δόντος ἑαυτὸν and ὅπως ἐξέληται ἡμᾶς. The phrase κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν probably refers to both of them.

⁷⁷¹ This is probably the case in Eph 1:5.9.11; cf. G. SCHRENK, *θέλημα*, in *TDNT* 3, p. 57.

⁷⁷² This point is underlined by MUSSNER, *Der Galaterbrief*, p. 52.

them have been manifested with regard to the obedience of Jesus to it as well as to those redeemed by Jesus Christ.⁷⁷³

Since Gal 1:1-4 briefly sums up the gospel of salvation as a continuing event (this is why Paul is the apostle) in which the role of the divine Father appears to be crucial, the unusual⁷⁷⁴ doxological ending of the prescript ᾧ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων, ἀμήν (v. 5) may be regarded as a worshiping acknowledgment to God the Father because of what he has done in Jesus Christ.⁷⁷⁵ The reference to the glory that particularly belongs⁷⁷⁶ to our God and Father⁷⁷⁷ calls to mind a praise to the God of Israel of which he is worthy (cf. Pss 29:2; 96:8) and also it possibly refers to the revelation of the Father's power⁷⁷⁸ in Jesus' redemptive work⁷⁷⁹ as the preceding verses seem to admit.

The divine fatherhood from a relational 'Father-Jesus' point of view in Gal 1:1-5 may be summarized as follows: the christological clauses in v. 1 and v. 4 (the latter containing a reference to the fatherhood of God) play an explanatory role with regard to the statements on the divine fatherhood (with καὶ [Lord] Jesus Christ)⁷⁸⁰ in v. 1 and v. 3 respectively. The portrayal of

⁷⁷³ Cf. ROMANIUK, *L'amour du Père*, p. 158. As regards the universalistic interpretation of ἡμῶν ("toute l'humanité", *ibid.*, note 33) it is far from evident (contrary to the author's claim) that Paul had in mind more than those who accepted Christ.

⁷⁷⁴ Scholars usually point out that the present doxology in a certain sense replaces a missing thanksgiving in which Paul usually thanks God on the account of the faithful and which could not have been appropriate because of a rather negative state of the community as described in this letter. Martyn's supposition (cf. MARTYN, *Galatians*, pp. 96, 106) that Paul inserted the liturgical doxology into the epistolary prescript to make clear that the context of worship was to be understood as a proper *Sitz im Leben* to read this letter. This is quite attractive but highly hypothetic; even though one may admit that the Pauline letters (or some of them) may have been read in the liturgical assembly, it may hardly have been prompted by a doxology (as in our case), especially keeping in mind the rather 'cold' character of Paul's argumentation in the verses that follow the doxology.

⁷⁷⁵ There is no unequivocal agreement among commentators on whether ἔστιν or εἶη should be better taken as a supplying verb in this phrase. Some scholars think it is quite unnecessary question because the doxology is performative in nature; so, for instance VOUGA, *An die Galater*, p. 20. In its actual context, however, it seems the present indicative ἔστιν fits better into this doxological statement as it refers to the glory of God after the description of his role in the salvific event realized by Jesus Christ; so MUSSNER, *Der Galaterbrief*, p. 52; FUNG, *The Epistle to the Galatians*, p. 42; PITTA, *Galati*, p. 70.

⁷⁷⁶ This is implied by the article before 'glory' - ἡ δόξα.

⁷⁷⁷ The relative pronoun ᾧ is not to be taken as a second christological clause as if it were parallel to τοῦ δόντος ἑαυτὸν in v. 4 (cf. identical phrase in Phil 4:20). Schlier observes that in Paul's letters the doxology often concludes the commemoration of the divine salvific works (cf. Rom 11:36; 16:27; Eph 3:21; 1 Tim 1:17); cf. SCHLIER, *Lettera ai Galati*, p. 36; so also BONNARD, *L'épître de Saint Paul aux Galates*, p. 22. The attribution of the identical statement to the κύριος (probably referring to Jesus) in 2 Tim 4:18 and to Jesus Christ in Heb 13:21 (cf. also 2 Pet 3:18) apparently reflects a certain fluidity-in-the-role that God and the exalted Jesus Christ occupied in the Christian worship.

⁷⁷⁸ The meanings of δόξα in the NT as well as in LXX are fluid and the distinction between divine 'honor', 'splendor', 'power', and 'visible radiance' is only artificial because they all express "the divine mode of being, though with varying emphasis on the element of visibility"; G. KITTEL, δόξα, in *TDNT* 2, p. 247f.

⁷⁷⁹ The association of the divine fatherhood and his glory in connection with Christ's death and resurrection is clearly stated in Rom 6:4.

⁷⁸⁰ The inverted order in v. 1 'Jesus Christ and God the Father' instead of 'God the Father and Jesus Christ' is evidently due to the logic of the additional clause that further qualifies the fatherhood of God by means of the participle τοῦ ἐγείραντος. On the other hand, considering the sequence of the provenience of Paul's calling to be an apostle, the order 'Jesus-Father' is quite logical: he became the apostle through the encounter with Jesus Christ who has been raised from the dead by God; cf. SCHLIER, *Lettera ai Galati*, p. 30. The fact of the encounter with the risen

the Father and Jesus as playing the same role and sharing the same authority in v. 3 and presumably in v. 1⁷⁸¹ was probably motivated by Paul's perception about the intimately harmonized rapport between God and Jesus that is implied in v. 4: it was both the Father's will and activity and Jesus' response to it by his self-giving for our sake. The image of the *life-giving, sovereign, and loving Father* in this epistolary prescript is explicitly and primarily disclosed by referring to Jesus Christ.

The other side of this relational aspect regards those who are able to qualify God as 'their Father'. Perhaps it was not absolutely coincidental that Paul placed the phrase about the self-giving of Jesus Christ ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν in the same v. 4 alongside with the notion about God as πατὴρ ἡμῶν. The christological clauses in v. 1 and v. 4, which summarize the salvific event effected by God the Father and/in Jesus Christ, seem to imply that the ἡμῶν qualifying the divine Father should be interpreted through ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν and not *vice versa*, i.e. the self-offering of Jesus Christ for 'our' sins endows the meaning of 'our Father' referred to in the OT and elsewhere with a new quality: now this phrase may be considered as a proclamation of our justification.⁷⁸² Moreover, since the redemption was understood as a rescue not from the material world but from the evil that dominated it⁷⁸³ Paul may also have implied by κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατὴρ ἡμῶν that the deliverance made it possible for people to live in conformity with the will of the divine Father.⁷⁸⁴ This way people have been integrated into the rapport 'Father-Jesus' thanks to which the conception 'our Father', which also occurs in many other initial greetings, is amplified and explained by the relationship 'Father-Jesus-we'; it seems that it has been Paul's intention to emphasize this fact as it is confirmed by another reference to the fatherhood of God in Gal 4:4-6.

Into the same scheme the 'Paul-Father' rapport also fits as it is presented in v. 1. It has already been mentioned that Paul, while qualifying God the Father as τοῦ ἐγγείραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν along with his calling to be an apostle, touched upon the core of his vocation as far as it implies his encounter with the resurrected Jesus. It is noteworthy that Paul in this letter portrays the relation between his apostleship and the will of God in a different way than he does in

Christ to be considered the very reason why Paul put Jesus Christ before God the Father is strongly emphasized by FUNG, *The Epistle to the Galatians*, p. 37.

⁷⁸¹ Cf. F. J. MATERA, *Galatians*, SPS 9, Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1992, pp. 38, 43. GEORGE, *Galatians*, p. 81, seems to exaggerate while describing the unity between God and Jesus in this verse as "essential and eternal" as if it was a conscious intention of Paul. It seems to be more precise to say that in this verse Paul spontaneously manifested his faith in the unity between Jesus Christ and the Father (so A. VANHOYE, *Lettera ai Galati*, LBNT 8, Milano: Paoline, 2000, p. 32), without trying to define the nature of that unity.

⁷⁸² J. BECKER, "Der Brief an die Galater," in J. BECKER, U. LUZ, *Die Briefe an die Galater, Epheser und Kolosser*, NTD 8/1, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998, p. 20: "Das „für uns“ ist Basis der paulinischen Rechtfertigungsbotschaft."

⁷⁸³ According to MARTYN, *Galatians*, p. 98, it is 'the new creation' (Gal 6:15) that stands opposite to 'the present evil age'.

⁷⁸⁴ Cf. BRUCE, *Galatians*, p. 76.

several other epistolary prescripts (directly),⁷⁸⁵ here it is said that it was Jesus' redemptive sacrifice for our sins according to the will of the divine Father, therefore, Paul's apostleship in this case may only be remotely connected to God's will. Nevertheless, as this is the only case in the Pauline epistolary prescripts, in which the divine will is associated with Jesus but not with Paul, it is likely that he wished to elucidate the genuine status of his apostleship (this is his only self-defense in the epistolary prescripts) formulated in v. 1 by διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ πατρὸς by presenting it as a part of Jesus' salvific and ongoing event that has taken place according to the will of the divine Father. If this supposition is correct than Paul seems not only to have claimed that his calling was not an accident and had its ultimate origin in God's will but also to have underlined that it was revealed to him by/through Jesus Christ. It is as if Paul wanted to emphasize that the rapport 'Father-he' is valid as long as it remains in the sphere 'Father-Jesus-he'.

This relationship, which has a clear tripartite structure 'Paul-Jesus-God', is repeatedly attested in vv. 11-12 and vv. 15-16, which seem to allude to the 'Jesus-Paul' encounter on the road to Damascus.⁷⁸⁶ Paul emphasizes that τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, which was proclaimed by him, was neither κατὰ ἄνθρωπον (v. 11) nor it was received παρὰ ἀνθρώπου but δι' ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (v. 12).⁷⁸⁷ The role of God⁷⁸⁸ in this matter is portrayed in terms of Paul's vocation (v. 15) and that is even more important for our survey as a revelation of his Son 'in Paul' (v. 16). Therefore, the allusion to the divine fatherhood in ἀποκαλύψαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ discloses a double relationship: 'Father-Son' and 'Father-Son-Paul'. The key term to understand this 'Father-Son-Paul' relationship is ἀποκάλυψις (v. 12) and its verbal form ἀποκαλύπτω (v. 16). The question often raised by commentators is whether the phrase δι' ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ should be understood as a subjective or an objective genitive because grammatically, it may be interpreted either way. There are arguments for both positions: understanding this phrase as an antithesis to παρὰ ἀνθρώπου in the same verse (as it is also the case in v. 1, where Jesus Christ is a subject in a parallel structure) the subjective genitive interpretation is plausible; alternatively, emphasizing the connection between this phrase and God's activity in revealing his Son in v. 16, the objective genitive interpretation is more logical. The modern opinion rather

⁷⁸⁵ διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ in 1 Cor 1:1; 2 Cor 1:1; Eph 1:1; Col 1:1; 2 Tim 1:1.

⁷⁸⁶ There are two other texts in 1 Cor 9:1 and 15:8, which mention Paul's vision of Jesus Christ. These passages, however, are not very helpful since the terms ἀποκάλυψις or ἀποκαλύπτω are not used there; instead, a more general term ὁράω is employed.

⁷⁸⁷ The structure of Paul's argumentation in these two verses is quite similar to that in v. 1: on the one hand, three negatives οὐ, οὐδέ and οὔτε, two of which are combined with prepositions that govern the term ἄνθρωπος; on the other hand a clear opposition ἀλλά coupled with διὰ is associated with Jesus Christ.

⁷⁸⁸ It is not clear whether the phrase εὐδόκησεν ὁ θεός in v. 15 was originally intended in the text because the important and diversified manuscripts (p⁴⁶, B, F, G, vg, it [diverse manuscripts], etc.) attest only to its short form εὐδόκησεν. In any case, the revelation of τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ in Paul in v. 16 undoubtedly points to God's activity.

favors the latter possibility putting emphasis on God's active role in revealing his Son (v. 16),⁷⁸⁹ however, speaking about the revelation itself as a manifestation of Jesus 'in Paul', the role of Jesus Christ cannot be reduced to the idea of him being merely passively revealed by God. Apparently, the revelation of Jesus 'in/to Paul' by God (v. 16) is not to be rigidly interpreted in terms of either internal or external vision⁷⁹⁰ because Paul may have not had such a clear distinction.⁷⁹¹ It is more likely that he intended to express the efficaciousness⁷⁹² of God's action on him through Jesus Christ.⁷⁹³ And since the goal of the revelation was aimed at preaching the Son of God to the Gentiles, which consequently resulted in Paul's apostleship, the revelation to him may be understood as God's gracious presentation of the salvific event performed by Christ, the eschatological savior of mankind (cf. Gal 4:4f.).⁷⁹⁴ It was the encounter with/experience of this savior that had an immediate impact on Paul's further life and enabled him to perceive the grace of God by which he said he had been called (v. 15). Thus, the relationship 'Father-Paul' in Gal 1:11-12.15-16 is presented as essentially rooted in and unconceivable without Jesus Christ: either way we interpret v. 12 (Jesus-revelator or Jesus-contents of the revelation) and v. 16 (external or internal vision) as Paul's experience of the fatherhood of God, which is based upon his experience of the resurrected Christ. The revelation of his Son 'in/to Paul' is presented as directly connected with God's good grace,⁷⁹⁵ i.e. it occurred when God considered it good and worthy⁷⁹⁶ to reveal his Son in/to Paul. That means that it was neither Paul's merit nor people's ambitions,⁷⁹⁷ but a free and active divine intervention in his life that enabled him to proclaim Jesus Christ. The revelation was a deliberate and purposeful action of God (v. 16: ἵνα) to make

⁷⁸⁹ Cf. MUSSNER, *Der Galaterbrief*, p. 68; BETZ, *Galatians*, p. 63; FUNG, *The Epistle to the Galatians*, p. 54; CORSANI, *Lettera ai Galati*, p. 83; MATERA, *Galatians*, pp. 55-56; MARTYN, *Galatians*, p. 144. Differently, for instance, LONGENECKER, *Galatians*, pp. 23-24.

⁷⁹⁰ It is not clear in which way the phrase ἐν ἐμοί should be understood: whether Paul intended a customary dative that may be simply translated 'to me' or was it his wish to denote a more profound idea of his inner experience. For the first option, cf. BDF §220 (1), BDAG, p. 329; OEPKE, *An die Galater*, p. 60f.; MARTYN, *Galatians*, p. 158. The second idea has been adopted by FUNG, *The Epistle to the Galatians*, p. 64.

⁷⁹¹ Cf. BETZ, *Galatians*, p. 71. LONGENECKER, *Galatians*, pp. 31-32, follows Betz yet he specifies ἐν ἐμοί as pointing to "the inward reality of Christian experience."

⁷⁹² The term ἀποκαλύπτω is not to be understood in Gal in terms of a simple 'revealing' or 'unveiling', it rather denotes the powerful divine *invasion* in the present evil age by sending Christ and his Spirit to it; so MARTYN, *Galatians*, p. 99.

⁷⁹³ At this point Ebeling observes that a philological question of how to interpret ἐν ἐμοί is not important to understand the Pauline flow of thought: the revelation to him was from *outside* and since it had an *internal* effect on him it urges him to *external* manifestations; cf. EBELING, *La verità dell'evangelo*, p. 94.

⁷⁹⁴ See D. LÜHRMANN, *Das Offenbarungsverständnis bei Paulus und in paulinischen Gemeinden* (WMANT 16), Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1965, pp. 73-81. Lührmann precisely observes that the revelation of Jesus Christ was not a simple revelation about Jesus' person as such but about the Son of God with implications of his salvific mission. According to Longenecker, Paul received not only a new understanding of Jesus Christ but also a new perception of what the divine strategy of redemption for this final age is; cf. LONGENECKER, *Galatians*, p. 31.

⁷⁹⁵ Syntactically the statement ἀποκαλύπτω τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐμοί in v. 16 depends on v.15: Ὅτε δὲ εὐδόκησεν [ὁ θεός]; so also MUSSNER, *Der Galaterbrief*, p. 83.

⁷⁹⁶ Cf. BDAG, p. 404.

⁷⁹⁷ Paul may have wanted to emphasize that his dependence on God would make him independent of men; so G. SCHRENK, εὐδοκέω, εὐδοκία, in *TDNT* 2, p. 741.

his Son recognized by the Gentiles. It must have left a deep soteriological impression on Paul's conception of the divine fatherhood.

It is quite evident that the conception of God as Father in vv. 15-16 is very close to the idea that is stated in the epistolary prescript in vv. 1-5: he is presented as playing a decisive role in the salvific Christ-event as well as in the apostleship of Paul. Still, there is a certain development in both fields. Firstly, with regard to Jesus, the Father's activity is not limited to the past (according to his will, he raised him from the dead) but has an ongoing effect in terms of the revelation of Jesus Christ in/to Paul. Paul's affirmation that all of this occurred and that he might proclaim Jesus to the Gentiles, undoubtedly, had its roots in God's will and good grace, therefore, it is plausible to suppose that this universalistic soteriological aspect is a proper characteristic of the divine fatherhood. Secondly, with regard to Paul, his apostleship is further explicated as having its fundament in a direct divine revelation; such a revelatory activity of God with respect to Paul gave both the authority to the contents Paul had to proclaim and also the legitimacy to his mission. Finally, the supposition, in which the initial salutation in Gal 1:3 should be regarded as the central statement on the divine fatherhood among two other references to it in the epistolary prescript, is given more support because of the dominating soteriological aspect in the activity of God in vv. 15-16 as well as in v. 1 and v. 4: theologically, it is concisely summarized in χάρις and εἰρήνη that come from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ (v. 3).

4.2.3.2. *God as Father in Gal 3-4*

The references to the divine sonship/fatherhood appear in a theological section of the letter (chapters 3-4)⁷⁹⁸ that deals with the theme πίστις-νόμος: these two chapters may be regarded as Paul's systematical proof for his understanding of justification through faith and freedom from the Law. In this section, scholars generally identify smaller units 3:23-29 and 4:1-7⁷⁹⁹ to which our references belong. Both passages have much in common: they begin with the pedagogical imagery of the Law⁸⁰⁰ and end up with the affirmation of the Galatians' being heirs;

⁷⁹⁸ Cf. A. PITTA, *Disposizione e messaggio della lettera ai Galati. Analisi retorico-letteraria*, Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1992, p. 40. He asserts that a tripartite literary-thematic structure corresponds to the model "storia (Gal 1-2), teologia (Gal 3-4) e morale (Gal 5-6)."

⁷⁹⁹ The limits of 4:1-7 are quite clear even from a literary point of view: it starts with Λέγω δέ that has an introductory function (cf. 3:15; 5:2.16; 4:21) and has a double inclusion by means of the terms δοῦλος and κληρονόμος that both occur in v. 1 and v. 7; so also, SCOTT, *Adoption as sons of God*, p. 121f.; VANHOYE, *Lettera ai Galati*, p. 105. The limits of 3:23-29 are not as clearly visible as they are in 4:1-7, nevertheless, the change in style in v. 23 ('we' instead of the description in the third person that dominated vv. 6-22) and a close structural and thematic similarity to the argumentation in 4:1-7 permit to consider it as a unit.

⁸⁰⁰ Despite the fact that νόμος is explicitly mentioned only in the first passage (3:23-24) it is implied by the images of guardians and trustees in the second text as well (4:2). Moreover, the image of the νήπιος who is under guardians and trustees (4:2) is analogically applied to those νήπιοι who are said to have been enslaved to the rudimentary elements (τὰ στοιχεῖα) of the cosmos (4:3); the guardians and trustees thus correspond to those elements of the

the key image in both texts is the divine sonship. Furthermore, the personal pronoun ‘we’ dominates both units replacing the descriptive style that finishes at 3:22, while ‘you’ concludes both texts by directly addressing the community to assure them that the previous exposition on God’s promises to Abraham, which were realized in Jesus Christ (cf. 3:6-22), is applicable to them as well.⁸⁰¹ The flow of thought in both passages may roughly be summarized as follows:

Gal 3:23-29

vv. 23-24 – we were imprisoned (past)
 v. 26 – you are all sons of God (present):
 ○ through faith (cf. also vv. 24b.25);
 ○ in Christ Jesus;
 v. 29 – if you belong to Christ, you are heirs according to the promise.

Gal 4:1-7

vv. 1-3 – we were slaves (past)
 v. 6 – you are sons (present):
 ○ by the redemption of Christ (v. 5);
 ○ through God (v. 7);
 v. 7 – if you are son(s) then you are heir(s) through God

The thematic *crescendo* ‘slaves-sons-heirs’ in both texts is evident; the references to the divine sonship/fatherhood do not appear until the second part of the passage (according to a chronological division),⁸⁰² which is introduced by the phrases ἐλθούσης δὲ τῆς πίστεως (3:25) and ὅτε δὲ ἦλθεν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου (4:4) which mark the shift from the past to the present time. However, the way the divine sonship/fatherhood is presented in each text is slightly different. Apart from the similarities in both passages there is a certain elaboration in 4:1-7, namely, the explicit contrast between slaves and sons, the language about enslavement to the ‘rudimentary elements of the cosmos’, and the sending of the Spirit into our hearts.

cosmos; so MARTYN, *Galatians*, p. 388. This way the νόμος under which Jesus was born (4:4) in order to redeem us from it (4:5) a double negative image is provided (4:1: νήπιος is no better than δοῦλος).

⁸⁰¹ Cf. BECKER, “An die Galater,” p. 58.

⁸⁰² The proposal of SCOTT, *Adoption as sons of God*, pp. 122-148, is that 4:1-2 should be read in a typological Exodus key (the heir – Israel that was a slave in Egypt, the father – God who redeemed it as his son from the bondage when the time between the promise to Abraham and the rise of the Mosaic law was completed; cf. 3:17) which has been ignored in some later commentaries and studies on the Galatians; for instance, H.-J. ECKSTEIN, *Verheissung und Gesetz: eine exegetische Untersuchung zu Galater 2,15-4,7* (WUNT 86), Tübingen: Mohr, 1996, pp. 226-227; BECKER, “An die Galater,” p. 61; VOUGA, *An die Galater*, pp. 98-99; MARTYN, *Galatians*, pp. 387-388; VANHOYE, *Lettera ai Galati*, p. 105. Though PITTA, *Galati*, p. 234, admits that the Exodus motives may be recognizable in 4:1-7, he disagrees with Scott on the possibility to interpret vv. 1-2 as a ‘type’ of the ‘antitype’ that would be identified in vv. 3-7. According to him, it is more probable that in this case we have to deal with another Pauline juridical example (as it also is in 3:15-18 and 3:23-29) which served him for the argumentative purposes and which he employed without paying too much attention to the accuracy of the correspondences between the example and its application.

4.2.3.2.1. The Children of God in Gal 3:26-29

Some scholars consider this brief section to be the very heart of Gal 3-4⁸⁰³ and of the entire letter.⁸⁰⁴ It starts with a new statement on the divine sonship/fatherhood; the wording of which allows one to see the subsequent verses as a compact unit framed by the parallel phrases in v. 26 and v. 28.

v. 26	πάντες γὰρ υἱοὶ θεοῦ	έστε διὰ τῆς πίστεως	ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ
v. 28d	πάντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς εἰς	έστε	ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. ⁸⁰⁵

Apart from the evident correspondences between these two verses, a certain development may also be seen in the conception of the divine sonship (υἱοὶ θεοῦ ... ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ → εἰς ... ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ); the material that stands in between plays an explanatory (v. 27)⁸⁰⁶ and illustrative (28abc) role with respect to these assertions.

The statement in v. 26 has been provided with different interpretations because of syntactic construction of the sentence: the phrase ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ may be seen as qualifier of τῆς πίστεως or υἱοὶ θεοῦ έστε. Thus, literally ‘through the faith in Christ Jesus’ the children of God may be those who believe in Jesus.⁸⁰⁷ Such an interpretation, however, does not gain much support in modern scholarship for various reasons⁸⁰⁸ and many notice a double clause in this statement: Galatians are sons of God *through faith* and *in Christ Jesus*. Yet, the relationship

⁸⁰³ Cf. BETZ, *Galatians*, p. 181.

⁸⁰⁴ Cf. R. MEYNET, “Composition et Genre Littéraire de la Première Section de l’Épître aux Galates,” in J. SCHLOSSER, (sous la direction; Congrès de L’ACFEB, Strasbourg 1995), *Paul de Tarse* (LD 165), Paris: Cerf, 1996, p. 64. According to his subdivision of the letter, the fact that the pericope 3:26-29 stands at the centre of Gal 3:1-5:1 indicates that it is also the centre of the entire letter.

⁸⁰⁵ The manuscript p⁴⁶ has διὰ πίστεως Χριστοῦ instead of διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ (v. 26). This alteration was probably done to clarify the meaning of the phrase. A similar amendment was also done with regard to έστε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ (v. 28), where p⁴⁶ and A read έστε Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, the latter have possibly been assimilated to v. 29; cf. METZGER, *A Textual Commentary*, p. 526.

⁸⁰⁶ BONNARD, *L’épître de Saint Paul aux Galates*, p. 77f. and note 1, attributes to the conjunction γὰρ in v. 27 a merely illustrative function as if the material in v. 27 were a kind of metaphor to illuminate the statement in v. 26 (so also CORSANI, *Lettera ai Galati*, p. 237). Even though one is not very willing to accept the interpretation of SCHLIER, *Lettera ai Galati*, p. 177, according to which it is namely the baptism (v. 27) that is to be regarded as the very ground for the believers’ status of the sons of God (the faith understood as a *means*, v. 26), nevertheless, the recalling to mind the baptism that is further explained by the statement that follows it (Χριστὸν ἐνεδύσαθε) is a clear reference to the experience the Galatians had in the past and which was the basis for Paul’s affirmation that they are the children of God. The intrinsic connection between the baptism of the Galatians (leaving aside the question of the role of their faith and the ritual itself) and their status of the children of God should not be ignored.

⁸⁰⁷ This is an interpretation of the early Church. Sustained by BYRNE, ‘Sons of God’ - ‘Seed of Abraham’, p. 171; with hesitation LONGENECKER, *Galatians*, pp. 151-152.

⁸⁰⁸ The v. 26 may hardly be understood in terms of ‘through the faith in Christ Jesus’ for a couple of reasons: a) the conception of ‘faith in Christ’ is presented in Gal by means of the objective genitive (cf. 2:16.20; 3:22); b) the only other time the phrase διὰ τῆς πίστεως occurs in this letter it is not followed by any further specification (Gal 3:14); c) in the other Pauline letters neither διὰ τῆς πίστεως nor διὰ πίστεως is qualified by the dative ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ (instead, it is done either by the genitive or is left without any qualification). The only exception might be τὰ δυνάμενά σε σοφίαι εἰς σωτηρίαν διὰ πίστεως τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ (2 Tim 3:15) but even in this case it is not absolutely clear that τῆς refers to ‘faith’ rather than to ‘salvation’; see also the arguments summarized by FUNG, *The Epistle to the Galatians*, p. 171.

between *faith* and *in Christ* is taken by scholars in a slightly different way: the children of God have gained their status being in Christ through Christ's faith,⁸⁰⁹ the very ground for their sonship is being in a new relationship with Christ Jesus, while faith should be observed as the condition⁸¹⁰ and means⁸¹¹ by which they achieved this position; and finally, there is no need to choose between two possibilities because they do not contradict each other: the believers become the children of God in Christ by means of faith in Christ.⁸¹² No matter which interpretation one prefers the connection between being 'in Christ' and the status of the children of God is more than obvious. The expressions in the following verses Χριστὸν ἐνεδύσαθε (v. 27), εἷς ἐστε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ (v. 28), εἰ δὲ ὑμεῖς Χριστοῦ (v. 29) explain and deepen even further the basic phrase ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ (v. 26) to affirm that they are heirs according to the promise given to Abraham (v. 29). Consequently, God may be called people's Father as far as they are in Christ Jesus. Yet, keeping in mind the whole passage, this being ἐν Χριστῷ is not very clear *per se* and may be interpreted in various ways: giving preference to the sacramental power of baptism that creates one's new relationship with Christ;⁸¹³ defining 'in Christ' as being incorporated in the body of Christ⁸¹⁴ (more underlining faith instead of the rite of baptism),⁸¹⁵ describing it as a mystical area, where Christ is a corporate and spiritual personality⁸¹⁶ or sphere of salvation in which the believers may feel free from sin and condemnations of the Law;⁸¹⁷ highlighting the intimacy of relationship between the Christian and Christ;⁸¹⁸ attributing to the preposition ἐν an instrumental value and thereby pointing out to Jesus' power and dominion upon which depends the whole Christian life.⁸¹⁹ Despite a bit different approaches there is also a clear constant idea that in order to be the children of God it requires continuous, active and dynamic Christ's activity in their lives. Accordingly, God is the Father to the believers insofar he accepts them as his own sons and daughters because of the new relationship with him created

⁸⁰⁹ Cf. MATERA, *Galatians*, p. 142. MARTYN, *Galatians*, p. 375, translates „through the faith that is in Christ Jesus“ and explains a bit further „whose faith elicited their own faith“. The supposition of MATERA, *Galatians*, pp. 142, 145 that here the faith is to be understood in terms of 'the faith of Jesus Christ' has no grammatical basis; his statement that "you are sons of God in the sphere of Christ through Christ's faith" is misleading since we are sons of God in/through the sonship of Christ (cf. Gal 4:4f.). Even HAYS, *The Faith of Jesus Christ*, who strongly favors the 'subjective' genitival interpretation of πιστεύω Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (Gal 2:16; 3:22; Rom 3:22), concedes that Gal 3:26 neither confirms nor disconfirms this line of interpretation; according to him, it tells us nothing about either the subjects whose faith is meant or the way how this faith accomplishes the result that is ascribed to it, i.e. the sonship of God (p. 156).

⁸¹⁰ Cf. MUSSNER, *Der Galaterbrief*, p. 262; BETZ, *Galatians*, p. 186.

⁸¹¹ Cf. SCHLIER, *Lettera ai Galati*, p. 177; FUNG, *The Epistle to the Galatians*, p. 171f.; ECKSTEIN, *Verheissung und Gesetz*, p. 219.

⁸¹² Cf. VANHOYE, *Lettera ai Galati*, p. 98.

⁸¹³ Cf. SCHLIER, *Lettera ai Galati*, p. 177.

⁸¹⁴ Cf. BRUCE, *Galatians*, p. 184.

⁸¹⁵ Cf. BETZ, *Galatians*, pp. 186-187.

⁸¹⁶ Cf. MUSSNER, *Der Galaterbrief*, pp. 261-262.

⁸¹⁷ Cf. ECKSTEIN, *Verheissung und Gesetz*, p. 220; similarly, VOUGA, *An die Galater*, p. 90.

⁸¹⁸ Cf. LONGENECKER, *Galatians*, p. 154.

⁸¹⁹ Cf. CORSANI, *Lettera ai Galati*, p. 237. He translates ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ as «per mezzo di Cristo Gesù».

and guaranteed by Christ who is at work. The tripartite scheme ‘Father-Jesus-believers’, which prevails in the letters to the Thessalonians, is also visible here.

4.2.3.2.2. Divine Fatherhood in Gal 4:4-7

These four verses belong to the well-defined passage 4:1-7 which thematically may be divided in three sections: the situation before Christ (vv. 1-3); the mission of God’s Son (vv. 4-5); and the effects of this mission (vv. 6-7). Differently from 3:26-29 here God as Father is portrayed both from Jesus and from the believers perspective. So, the term υἱός is applied to Jesus twice and four times to Christians (including υἱοθεσία). It is noteworthy that Jesus as God’s Son is qualified by αὐτοῦ, even in describing the Spirit’s sending, while the believers as υἱοί are without any qualification. Furthermore, God’s fatherhood is strongly underlined by the bilingual expression αββα ὁ πατήρ.

In this passage God as Jesus’ Father is described in terms of sending:⁸²⁰

v. 4 ...ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ...

v. 6 ...ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ...

Paul uses the same verb to denote both the mission of God’s Son and the activity of Son’s Spirit. The term ἐξαποστέλλω basically means *send out, send away*, but in our context it is better understood as “for fulfillment of a mission in another place”.⁸²¹ By employing the same verb to describe both missions, Paul possibly wished to emphasize the profound closeness between them: the gift of the Spirit is possible only because of the Son’s death. This rapport is even more evident in Gal 3: 13-14: *Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law by becoming a curse for us... so that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith*. In this verse, the preexistence of God’s Son is implied,⁸²² although, it seems that it may have not been Paul’s primary interest as he stresses the functional and not the ontological aspect of Jesus’ mission.⁸²³ In both cases the verb is in aorist and it is clear that Paul had in mind a specific time in history. Here the verbs contravene in imperfect in v. 3 where the conditions of long-lasting slavery are described. Yet, the question may be asked whether Paul assumed a concrete historical event or had something else in his mind. As regards Jesus, the answer is affirmative: God sent his Son born of a woman (implied Incarnation) entrusting him with a concrete mission as it is stated in

⁸²⁰ Not few scholars influenced by KRAMER, *Christ, Lord*, pp. 19-44, 187f., see here the pre-Pauline tradition and the so called ‘sending formula’; but see *contra* SCOTT, *Adoption as sons of God*, pp. 169-171.

⁸²¹ BDAG, p. 346 (1b).

⁸²² Cf. MUSSNER, *Der Galaterbrief*, pp. 272; strongly underlined by VANHOYE, *Lettera ai Galati*, p. 107; see also Rom 8:3, 1 Cor 8:6, 10:4, Phil 2:6-8. In addition, in v. 4, Paul describes Christ’s situation (born of a woman, born under the law) by the same word γίνομαι (strictly literally ‘become’) instead of using γεννάω that is more appropriate to describe one’s birth, even more that Paul uses it in the same letter 4:23.24.29.

⁸²³ Cf. LONGENECKER, *Galatians*, p. 170.

two purpose clauses which both start with subordinating conjunction ἵνα (v. 5). The situation of the sending of Son's Spirit, however, is slightly different, because there is no mention of a particular historical context (as for example Pentecost in the Acts of the Apostles). That fact that the Spirit has been sent to 'our hearts' and is crying⁸²⁴ 'Abba/Father' (v. 6) rather points to its continuous activity within believers than to a singular event.⁸²⁵ The initiative proceeds from the Father in both cases, though a slight difference may be seen: while Son's sending means his certain withdrawal from the Father followed by his return after the resurrection, the Spirit of the resurrected Jesus is a particular gift of the Father; there is no distance implied between him and the Spirit in this act of donation. Yet, these God's initiatives have been preceded by another one that is a logical basis for the two latter – the fullness of time (v. 4) that is at the disposal of the Father. A certain analogy may be seen between ὅτε δὲ ἦλθεν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου (v. 4) and ἄχρι τῆς προθεσμίας τοῦ πατρὸς (v. 2). The term προθεσμία⁸²⁶ basically denotes appointed day, fixed or limited time and was mostly used in the juridical and the administrative sphere. As προθεσμία is qualified by 'the father', it may mean that Paul was more interested in the application (v. 4) than in the image in v. 2⁸²⁷ and, thus, no matter what kind of physical and intellectual progress of a child may be, his liberty, nevertheless, completely depends on his father's will.⁸²⁸ The meaning of the noun πλήρωμα may depend on the context: which makes something full or complete, which is full of something, which is brought to fullness or completion, and the state of being full. The 'fullness' is used only here in Gal; in fact, it is a unique case in the Pauline corpus, where this term is preceded by a verb of movement ἔρχομαι and qualified by a temporal noun χρόνος.⁸²⁹ Vanhoye observes that in this solemn expression, which points to the exact moment in history, Paul combines the active (had come) and passive (fullness) metaphors of time.⁸³⁰ Therefore, *when the fullness of time had come* (v. 4) does not point to the end of some fixed time; rather it refers to a gradual and progressive maturity of history up to the level determined by the Father.⁸³¹ In fact, this neither understates the role of

⁸²⁴ Here Paul employs present participle κρᾶζον which refers to a continuous activity.

⁸²⁵ Betz, however, admits that "a number of problems in the text may point pre-Pauline tradition, perhaps from a baptismal context." BETZ, *Galatians*, p. 210, n. 81.

⁸²⁶ This term is *hapax legomenon* in the NT and is not used in LXX.

⁸²⁷ Rightly observed by BETZ, *Galatians*, p. 204; CORSANI, *Lettera ai Galati*, p. 256.

⁸²⁸ Cf. BONNARD, *L'épître de Saint Paul aux Galates*, p. 84.

⁸²⁹ Other references to πλήρωμα in the Pauline corpus are 1 Cor 10:26; Rom 11:12, 25, 13:10, 15:29; Col 1:19, 2:9; Eph 1:10 (qualified by τῶν καιρῶν). 23, 3:19, 4:13.

⁸³⁰ Cf. VANHOYE, *Lettera ai Galati*, p. 107.

⁸³¹ Cf. VANNI, *Lettere ai Galati e ai Romani*, p. 49. A worth noting observation of Scott who presents several parallels from Qumran writings in which 'fullness of time' coincides with the Messiah's coming; cf. SCOTT, *Adoption as sons of God*, pp. 161-162.

Christ whose coming makes that particular moment ‘fullness of time’,⁸³² nor denies free disposition of God who only knows the mystery of times.

In both missions (Son and his Spirit) not only God’s trinitarian image is detectable but also God as Father’s relationship with the believers through his Son and Spirit is stressed. The status of the children and heirs of God is granted only διὰ θεοῦ (v. 7).

An answer to the question about ‘how’ God becomes the Father to the people lies in a specific way in the term υἰοθεσία (v. 5) and the following verse “Ὅτι δέ ἐστε υἱοί, ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν κρᾶζον· ἄββα ὁ πατήρ (v. 6). The term υἰοθεσία (v. 5) is used five times in the Pauline corpus⁸³³ and nowhere else in the NT and in LXX. In the Hellenistic Greek it was one of the commonest juridical terms to denote an adoption and in the Greco-Roman world it meant ‘adoption as son’. Both Greek and Roman adoption primarily served to prevent the extinction of the family and to assure the cult of ancestors.⁸³⁴ Especially under the Roman Empire the adopted one acquired the status of a natural son as well as the right to inherit father’s goods. Paul probably employed this term due to its juridical value⁸³⁵ to explain the particular action of the Spirit, which establishes unparalleled intimacy with God, by means of analogy.⁸³⁶ Therefore, υἱοί in v. 6 are not simply God’s children in an abstract sense but in a very precise manner; they receive a new internal quality and new relationship with God thanks to his Son’s Spirit. However, the chronological or logical role of the Spirit with regard to the fact of adoption/sonship is the *crux interpretum*. Since the interpretation of ὅτι (v. 6) in a causal or declarative way on purely linguistic grounds is complicated and insufficient,⁸³⁷ the wider context of Paul’s argumentation is normally taken into account. Those who take ὅτι as causal (‘because’) usually give chronological or logical priority to the status ‘children of God’ with the following Spirit’s bestowal on them.⁸³⁸ On the contrary, those who interpret ὅτι as declarative (‘that’, ‘it is evident that’), refer to the priority of the gift of the Spirit⁸³⁹ or to the simultaneous character of both gifts (Spirit and sonship).⁸⁴⁰ But

⁸³² Cf. BRUCE, *Galatians*, p. 194.

⁸³³ Gal 4:5, Rom 8:15.23, 9:4, Eph 1:5.

⁸³⁴ See a thorough investigation on this issue in Greco-Roman milieu in SCOTT, *Adoption as sons of God*, pp. 3-57.

⁸³⁵ Cf. OEPKE, *An die Galater*, p. 97. Differently, SCOTT, *Adoption as sons of God*, p. 186, who after a long discussion concludes that this term “should be interpreted in light of the Jewish expectation of the divine adoptive sonship in the messianic time based on 2 Sam. 7:14”.

⁸³⁶ Cf. VANNI, *Lettere ai Galati e ai Romani*, p. 50.

⁸³⁷ Cf. ZERWICK, *Biblical Greek*, §419.

⁸³⁸ Cf. BONNARD, *L’épître de Saint Paul aux Galates*, p. 87; SCHLIER, *Lettera ai Galati*, p. 204; OEPKE, *An die Galater*, p. 133; BETZ, *Galatians*, p. 209f.; BYRNE, ‘Sons of God’ - ‘Seed of Abraham’, p. 184f.; FUNG, *The Epistle to the Galatians*, p. 184; MATERA, *Galatians*, p. 151; HAYS, *The Faith of Jesus Christ*, p. 99.

⁸³⁹ The conjunction ὅτι “is better understood as *that* you are sons (it is evident seeing that) God sent... “because” is difficult since sonship would follow the bestowal of the Spirit”; ZERWICK – GROSVENOR, *A Grammatical Analysis*, p. 571; cf. JEREMIAS, *The Prayers of Jesus*, p. 65, note 74; MARCHEL, *Abba, Père!*, p. 218.

⁸⁴⁰ Cf. VANHOYE, *Lettera ai Galati*, p. 109; PITTA, *Galati*, p. 242.

also, there is a certain variety of opinions, as for example Longenecker, who admits that though ὅτι is clearly causal, nevertheless, he sees no chronological or logical priorities. According to him, here, Paul stresses “the reciprocal relation or correlational nature of the sonship and the reception of the Spirit”.⁸⁴¹ In a similar way this verse is interpreted by Mussner, Vanni etc.⁸⁴² The latter interpretation seems to be more preferable as it is more adherent to Paul’s mind and explains better his unusual qualification of the Spirit – τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ. It seems that in this unique case in his letters⁸⁴³ Paul wanted to emphasize not only the intimacy between the Son and the Spirit but also the integrity of the nature of the sonship and the work of the Spirit.⁸⁴⁴ Furthermore, since it is underlined that God sent his *Son’s Spirit*, it may be deduced that the Spirit brings vitality of the risen Christ to the Christian’s:⁸⁴⁵ intellectual, moral and spiritual life, that is encoded in the term καρδιά,⁸⁴⁶ which may be viewed as man’s *theological place* where the positive or negative aspects of the encounter between God and man are realized. This encounter is the basis for further religious life and, consequently, determines man’s ethical attitude and behavior.⁸⁴⁷ Since man, even being a Christian, remains fragile and needs continuous God’s support,⁸⁴⁸ that is the gift of the Spirit that is able to relentlessly renew one’s life (cf. Ezek 36:26-27) and dispose him to an ongoing and always new relationship with the Father. The activity of the Spirit is strangely portrayed by the term κράζω which is not rare in the NT and is frequently used to indicate a loud cry in the contexts of illness or some danger. Paul employs it only three times (parallel text Rom 8:15 and 9:27 introducing a prophetic saying form the OT). The latter reference is intriguing because in LXX this verb is not used in the context of the cited prophesy, therefore, this may be a hint that Paul thought of a ‘prophetic’ activity of the Spirit in the Christian life.⁸⁴⁹ There are, however, more opinions on this issue: here this term denotes a solemn proclamation;⁸⁵⁰ acknowledgement and revelation of God’s

⁸⁴¹ LONGENECKER, *Galatians*, p. 173. As regards to the sonship, Fee speaks of relations between Christ and the Spirit in terms of the „cause“ and the „effect“; cf. FEE, *God’s Empowering Presence*, pp. 406-408.

⁸⁴² Cf. MUSSNER, *Der Galaterbrief*, p. 274f.; VANNI, *Lettere ai Galati e ai Romani*, p. 51; MARTYN, *Galatians*, p. 391, note 11.

⁸⁴³ In the other Paul’s letters there are only several other references which are thematically similar to our phrase: πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ (Rom 8:9), πνεῦμα υἱοθεσίας (Rom 8:15), τοῦ πνεύματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (Phil 1:19), τὸ πνεῦμα κυρίου (2 Cor 3:17).

⁸⁴⁴ Vanhoye suggests that it would have been insufficient to say that ‘God gave you the holy Spirit’ because it would have not expressed the filial character of the relationships. That is why Paul says ‘God sent his Son’s Spirit’; cf. VANHOYE, *Lettera ai Galati*, p. 109f.

⁸⁴⁵ Note the change you-we between ἔστε υἱοί and καρδιάς ἡμῶν. It may seem strange according to the context, but ἡμῶν is strongly supported by early and diverse witnesses p⁴⁶, **א**, A, B, C, D* etc.

⁸⁴⁶ BEHM, καρδιά, in *TDNT* 3, p. 612-613.

⁸⁴⁷ Cf. Rom 1:21-24, 2 Cor 4:6.

⁸⁴⁸ See the term καρδιά in wish-prayers 1 Thess 3:11-13 and 2 Thess 2:16-17.

⁸⁴⁹ Cf. BRUCE, *Galatians*, p. 200; PITTA, *Galati*, p. 243.

⁸⁵⁰ Cf. F.-J. LEENHARDT, *L’épître de saint Paul aux Romains*, CNT 2, VI, Genève: Labor et Fides, 1981² (1957¹), p. 122; FITZMYER, *Romans*, p. 501.

name and nature;⁸⁵¹ ecstatic acclamation;⁸⁵² pneumatic-inspired acclamatory prayer-cry,⁸⁵³ “urgent and sincere crying to God”;⁸⁵⁴ inspired and enthusiastic “brief ejaculatory utterance”;⁸⁵⁵ emotionally based “acknowledgment of the Father”.⁸⁵⁶ Though syntactically, it is the Spirit that cries out to the Father, yet, it seems more reasonable to interpret this cry as its active manifestation in the interiority of the believers (as in Rom 8:15)⁸⁵⁷ who acknowledge it gratefully and joyfully and testify to the Father about their sonship.

Apart from our text the expression $\alpha\beta\beta\alpha$ ὁ πατήρ is used only twice in the NT (Rom 8:15 and Mc 14:36). The term $\alpha\beta\beta\alpha$ (the transliteration of the Aramaic/Hebrew אבא)⁸⁵⁸ as a theological term is most probably an example of the “*ipsissima vox Jesu*”;⁸⁵⁹ moreover, it was Jesus himself who first used it to address the God.⁸⁶⁰ In itself it may mean ‘Daddy/father’ and denotes a certain intimacy between the children/grown up children and their father as it is suggested by its common usage in family sphere.⁸⁶¹ The contents of that intimacy should have varied dependently on children’s age: from simplicity and confidence to respect and responsibility,⁸⁶² without any opposition between affection and respect. The obedience and

⁸⁵¹ Cf. W. GRUNDMANN, κράζω, in *TDNT* 3, p. 903.

⁸⁵² Cf. E. KÄSEMANN, *Commentary on Romans*, Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1980, p. 228.

⁸⁵³ “dass Paulus hier an einem pneumatisch-inspirierten akklamatorischen Gebetsruf denkt”. U. WILCKENS, *Der Brief an die Römer*, EKK VI, 3 Teilbd., Zürich: Benziger Verlag / Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1978-1982, Teil. 2, p.137.

⁸⁵⁴ CRANFIELD, *Romans*, vol. 1, p. 399.

⁸⁵⁵ DUNN, *Romans 1-8*, p. 453.

⁸⁵⁶ T. R. SCHREINER, *Romans*, BECNT, Grand Rapids: Bakers Books, 1998, p. 426.

⁸⁵⁷ Moreover, the expression πνεῦμα...κράζον is not only *hapax legomenon* in the NT and the OT but also in the extrabiblical literature; cf. I. H., ZVONIMIR, *Liberi in Cristo. Saggi esegetici sulla libertà dalla legge nella lettera ai Galati* (Spicilegium Pontificii Athenaei Antoniani 27), Roma, 1986, p. 146f., note 360.

⁸⁵⁸ Since the study of JEREMIAS, *The Prayers of Jesus*, see especially pp. 57-65, there have been much appreciation as well as critics on different points: origin of the term, its historical setting, philological and semantic aspects. See, D. ZELLER, “God as Father in the Proclamation and in the Prayer of Jesus,” in A. FINKEL, L. FRIZZELL (eds.), *Standing before God. Studies on Prayer in Scriptures and in Tradition with Essays In Honor of John M. Oesterreicher*, New York: KTAV Publishing House, 1981, 117-129; J. A. FITZMYER, “Abba and Jesus’ relation to God”, in R. GANTOY (ed.), *A cause de l’évangile: Etudes sur les Synoptiques et les Actes offertes au P. Jacques Dupont, O.S.B. à l’occasion de son 70e anniversaire* (LD 123), Paris: Cerf, 1985, 15-38; SCHLOSSER, *Le Dieu de Jésus*, pp. 179-209; J. BARR, “Abba isn’t Daddy”, *JTS* 39 (1988) 28-47; M. R. D’ANGELO, “Abba and ‘Father’: Imperial theology and the Jesus tradition,” *JBL* 111 (4, 1992) 611-630; J. H. CHARLESWORTH, “A Caveat on Textual Transmission and the Meaning of ABBA. A Study of the Lord’s Prayer,” in J. H. CHARLESWORTH, M. HARDING, and M. KILEY (eds.), *The Lord’s prayer and other prayer texts from the Greco-Roman era*, Valley Forge: Trinity Press International, 1994, 1-14.

⁸⁵⁹ JEREMIAS, *The Prayers of Jesus*, p. 57; so also FITZMYER, “Abba and Jesus’ relation to God”, p. 35; SCHLOSSER, *Le Dieu de Jésus*, p. 203; CHARLESWORTH, “A Caveat on Textual Transmission”, p. 10; LONGENECKER, *Galatians*, p. 175; PITTA, *Galati*, p. 245; FEE, *God’s Empowering Presence*, p. 411. *Contra*, KÄSEMANN, *Commentary on Romans*, p. 228; ZELLER, “God as Father”, p. 123; D’ANGELO, “Abba and ‘Father’”, p. 615.

⁸⁶⁰ Cf. JEREMIAS, *The Prayers of Jesus*, p. 57; FITZMYER, “Abba and Jesus’ relation to God”, p. 23; CHARLESWORTH, “A Caveat on Textual Transmission”, p. 9. With some caution, BARR, “Abba isn’t Daddy”, p. 47.

⁸⁶¹ Jeremias notices that in the NT times even grown up children addressed their father *abba*. In addition, in the pre-Christian period this term was used to show respect while addressing old men; cf. JEREMIAS, *The Prayers of Jesus*, pp. 59-60.

⁸⁶² Barr points out that in Targums *abba* is on the lips of the adult sons and clearly means ‘father’ and not ‘Daddy’; cf. BARR, “Abba isn’t Daddy”, p. 37.

recognition of the fathers' authority may also be implicit in this term.⁸⁶³ Therefore, speaking theologically, the intimacy when one addresses the God as *abba*, according to Jesus example, should not be understood just as a one-sided childish naivety,⁸⁶⁴ but rather as expressing confidence and obedience, as well as, affection and respect. Certainly, the openness and immediacy are the basic characteristics for such a relationship. For Christians such an experience could not have been instantaneous as it had taken time to deepen their understanding of Jesus' words as well as to consciously realize their new situation in relation to Jesus and the Father. It was the activity of the Spirit of God's Son that they continually felt in personal and in community's life and that gradually introduced them to their new self-understanding as God's children, allowing them to invoke *abba* with the same intimacy as Jesus did.⁸⁶⁵

The bilingual expression $\alpha\beta\beta\alpha$ ὁ πατήρ, which functions as a double vocative,⁸⁶⁶ (Father! Father!) is obviously neither Jesus' nor Paul's invention (as it occurs in Mc 14:36); in Greek translation it was probably added by Greek speaking Christians,⁸⁶⁷ yet it is not very clear why this bilingual expression has been retained.⁸⁶⁸ One of the possibilities, why *abba* was left in use even in predominantly Greek speaking Christian communities, may have been their conviction that by retaining the word that was once used by Jesus they could be sure that they would have a share in Jesus' sonship.⁸⁶⁹ Many scholars agree that the fixed expression shows its liturgical character, but to be more precise it is difficult.⁸⁷⁰

For Christians the new intimate relationship with the Father is not a transitory characteristic; even more it opens the door to his possessions because their status of God's children means that they are also his heirs. This theme in Gal 3-4 (3:18 - κληρονομία, 3:29 - κληρονόμοι, 4:1 - κληρονόμος) is described in terms of the historically-logical process in which God is the very beginning/source as well as the final point: he freely granted inheritance to

⁸⁶³ Cf. SCHLOSSER, *Le Dieu de Jésus*, p. 207.

⁸⁶⁴ JEREMIAS, *The Prayers of Jesus*, p. 62, seems to press too much on the 'child' image "He spoke to God like a child to its father, simply, inwardly, confidently, Jesus' usage of *abba* in addressing God reveals the heart of his relationship with God". Jeremias' statement has been critically accepted by ZELLER, "God as Father", p. 124; G. VERMES, *Jesus and the World of Judaism*, London: SCM Press, 1983, p. 42; FITZMYER, "*Abba* and Jesus' relation to God", p. 35; CHARLESWORTH, "A Caveat on Textual Transmission", p. 9f. Barr's argument is strong enough: as in Greek there are diminutive words for 'father' πάπας or πάππας and they were used by contemporary authors, why are they absent in biblical Greek, even more in connection to $\alpha\beta\beta\alpha$? Instead, it is always used 'adult' πατήρ; cf. BARR, "Abba isn't Daddy", p. 38.

⁸⁶⁵ Cf. MARCHEL, *Abba, Père!*, pp. 171-174.

⁸⁶⁶ The term $\alpha\beta\beta\alpha$ ($\alpha\beta\beta\alpha$) is the emphatic form of $\alpha\beta$ and may function as vocative and the nominative ὁ πατήρ may serve as vocative too; cf. SCHLIER, *Lettera ai Galati*, p. 206, note 49; BETZ, *Galatians*, p. 211; LONGENECKER, *Galatians*, p. 174; BARR, "Abba isn't Daddy", p. 40. In our context it hardly may be rendered "(mon père! père!)" as suggests SCHLOSSER, *Le Dieu de Jésus*, p. 203f.

⁸⁶⁷ CRANFIELD, *Romans*, vol. 1, p. 400, admits that ὁ πατήρ was rather adjoined to put more emphasis, than for the explanation.

⁸⁶⁸ Cf. BETZ, *Galatians*, p. 211.

⁸⁶⁹ Cf. DUNN, *Romans 1-8*, p. 454.

⁸⁷⁰ For example, Marchel thinks that such a context might have been the liturgy of baptism; see, MARCHEL, *Abba, Père!*, pp. 177-179.

Abraham through the promise (3:18), which was not realized until the time he only knew (4:1-3), and then has been effectuated by the Son's redemptive mission and the work of his Spirit (4:4-6) and became accessible in Christ/through faith (3:26.29) 'through God' (4:7). Though the prepositional phrase διὰ θεοῦ (literary 'through God') has a strong reading support,⁸⁷¹ it seems a bit awkward as if it pointed to God as an instrument instead of a source,⁸⁷² nevertheless, it is not completely alien to Paul's manner of expression. In the very beginning of this letter (v. 1) Paul affirms that his apostleship is διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ πατρὸς (cf. also 1 Cor 1:9), therefore, in our case διὰ θεοῦ may be translated as "by the will of God"⁸⁷³ or even better as "the work of God".⁸⁷⁴ It may be added, that a full phrase κληρονόμος διὰ θεοῦ also points to God's gracious action (human endeavors or merits do not count) and serves to assure the believers that their status is guaranteed by God himself (there is nobody/nothing to be afraid of).⁸⁷⁵ Clearly, the inheritance in our text does not allude to the death of the Father as it may have been the case in common life, but to a present situation that will achieve its fulfillment in the future. The contrast between νῆπιός and κληρονόμος (4:1) is even more strengthened at the end of Paul's argument δοῦλος and κληρονόμος (4:7) and shows that the freedom given by God through his Son, and his Spirit both to Jews and to Gentiles is the fundament for their new lives. Already in the present the Christians are heirs as they are not enslaved anymore by any 'elements' that had oppressed Jews as well as Gentiles. They are adult, free and responsible children of God living with him in union; there is no mediation or limitation. This union with God as their Father is not only communal but also very personal: whereas in 4:3-6 pronouns/verbs are in plural, while the last statement is in singular: slave-son-heir,⁸⁷⁶ as if Paul wanted to emphasize the individual character of those changes which took place in one's relation to God. The vitality of Christ's Spirit permeates both community and individual actualizing in them who/what is Christ('s').⁸⁷⁷ Certainly, the inheritance has an eschatological dimension and what has begun in this life may be called as a guarantee for the future. It may be

⁸⁷¹ p⁴⁶, κ*, A, B, etc.

⁸⁷² That is why one better supported reading (of many) is rendered by copyists to be more congruous with Paul's mind θεοῦ διὰ Χριστοῦ ("[an heir] of God through Christ"), the Textus Receptus, following κ^c, C², D, K, P, etc. Cf. METZGER, *A Textual Commentary*, p. 526f.

⁸⁷³ ZERWICK – GROSVENOR, *A Grammatical Analysis*, p. 571.

⁸⁷⁴ BETZ, *Galatians*, p. 212; cf. BRUCE, *Galatians*, p. 201. The lack of the article before the term 'God' underscores its qualitative character: God is the author, he the cause; cf. SCHLIER, *Lettera ai Galati*, p. 206 and note 51.

⁸⁷⁵ Cf. LONGENECKER, *Galatians*, p. 175; VANHOYE, *Lettera ai Galati*, p. 111.

⁸⁷⁶ "It may be a rhetorical device of the diatribe style". BETZ, *Galatians*, p. 211 note 96.

⁸⁷⁷ Though in our text the heirs are not named as συγκληρονόμοι δὲ Χριστοῦ, as in Rom 8:17, nevertheless, they are probably implied; Cf. BRUCE, *Galatians*, p. 200.

compared to the ἀρραβών ('first installment') of the Spirit that God has given us (2 Cor 1:22, 5:5; in Eph 1:14 - ἀρραβὼν τῆς κληρονομίας ἡμῶν),⁸⁷⁸ it will continue endlessly in the future.

To sum up, this is the only Paul's encyclical letter and the only one in which God is named Father three times in the epistolary prescript. Right at the beginning of the letter the concentration of this term discloses apostle's perception how important the role of God the Father in his personal life as well as in the history of salvation is. Therefore, it is not strange that other references to God's fatherhood appear in so called autobiographical and doctrinal parts of the letter. Indeed, the epistolary prescript already contains two basic themes in which the image of God as Father appears: Paul's apostleship that is further developed in 1:15-16 and the redemption effectuated by Christ that is fully disclosed in chapters 3 and 4. The image of God as Father has already been observed from the theological and relational point of view and requires no further explanation. However, several remarks must be added.

Firstly, though the themes on Christ's redemptive act (his death according to the will of God and Father, his resurrection performed by God the Father) and Paul's apostleship (caused by God the Father) are apparently diverse, the explicit reference to God's fatherhood, keeping in mind similar texts in Paul's letters, in both cases is very unusual, and thus brings these themes closer. Furthermore, there is some similarity as regards Christ's role between the 'children of God' who are 'in Christ' (3:26) and Paul's apostleship which was caused by Christ and God the Father (1:1) and by the efficaciousness of God's action on him through Jesus Christ (1:15-16). The fatherhood of God expressed by terms of 'son' and 'father' gives evidence to the same pattern: 'God-Christ-children of God' (3:26) and 'Father/God-Christ-Paul' (1:1, 1:16).

Secondly, the role of God the Father is particularly emphasized in the context of the letter, where principal discussion is about the works of the law and slavery on the one hand, and faith and being 'in Christ' with subsequent freedom on the other. God the Father is the very *fundament of Christ's redemptive activity* and is *active* throughout all its stages: he decided when the fullness of time had come to send his Son (4:4), and thus revealed his glory in Jesus' redemptive work (1:5), he raised him from the dead (1:1) and gave us a possibility to become his children 'in Christ' (3:26) and thereby sent his Son's Spirit to our hearts, donating us completely new relationship with himself (4:6), making us his free children and heirs from now and onwards (4:7). God of Abraham, who once had given him a promise (3:18), finally revealed his true name in Christ by the Spirit crying in us *Abba* (4:6). From the relational point of view, the tripartite structure Father-Christ-believers/Paul is evident or implicit in all texts, which directly refer or allude to God's fatherhood. There is, however, a significant novelty in 4:6: by

⁸⁷⁸ Cf. VANHOYE, *Lettera ai Galati*, p. 111. According to Vanni, it also implies "una partecipazione al dominio sul mondo proprio di Cristo, costituito da Dio « erede di tutto » (Eb 1,2)." VANNI, *Lettere ai Galati e ai Romani*, p. 52.

referring to the Spirit of God's Son that is constantly active in Christians. Paul not only amplifies that structure, but also rounds up his presentation on how he understood the image of the Father in God-man relationship that was given a new impulse 'in Christ'. Thus, the structure is 'Father-Christ-Spirit-we-Spirit-Father'. The images of a natural family (child, guardians, father, father's appointed time, heir, inheritance) may be seen as used to metaphorically describe the family of God in which the Father occupies the central place. To be sure, the Father is not just the authority to whom the obedience of his children is in the first place; instead he is the Father who *is always open to a dialogue* without any prejudices and to whom his *children may appeal with confidence*.

Thirdly, the expression *according to the will of our God and Father* (1:4) is unique in the NT. As it has been noted it may refer to both phrases in the same verse: to Christ 'who gave himself for our sins' or/and 'to set us free from the present evil age'. God's fatherly role in Christ's salvific activity in this letter is indeed strongly emphasized, therefore there is no need to highlight it anymore; instead the idea Paul wished to underscore that the will of God and Father in relation to *our delivering from what is evil* (and that means freedom) is worth noting. Because it is the will of God and Father and not simply of God, the impression is that Paul wished to say something like this: according to the Father's will you are freed from any evil that oppresses you in your lives because of Christ's death; yet it is much more, you are called to a very particular dialogue with him (4:6) that allows you to comprehend his will and actualize it in your lives. The whole history of salvation, once initiated by the will of God, finds its conclusion in him, who is the Father to the children, who, according to his will, already have now and will have in the future a share of what belongs to the Father (4:7).

4.2.4. God as Father in the Letter to the Philippians

Apart from the initial salutation there are two more explicit references to God as Father in this letter and both of them occur in doxological contexts (in both cases the term πατήρ is connected to his δόξα). However, the reference in 4:20 is a clear theological doxological acclamation, but the phrase καὶ πάντα γλώσσα ἐξομολογήσεται ὅτι κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ πατρὸς in 2:11 is more a christological acknowledgement/confession though the very finale concludes on the theological note summing up the whole argument that Paul exposed in 2:6-11.

4.2.4.1. The Glory of God the Father in Phil 2:9-11

Many scholars usually denote the well-known passage 2:5(6)-11 as a hymn that had been in function even before Paul used it and thereby more or less observe it as a pre-Pauline or even non-Pauline material. Yet, whatever may have been a previous hypothetic pattern on which it was supposedly based, the ideas expressed in its present state point to Paul's convictions and reflect his Christology.⁸⁷⁹ This 'Christ hymn',⁸⁸⁰ may be divided in two parts, and the turning point is in v. 9. There is an evident shift from description of the activity of Christ Jesus who humbled himself and became obedient to the death on a cross (vv. 5-8) towards a following statement about God's approval of Christ's activity and his exaltation to the glory of God the Father.⁸⁸¹ In fact, there is the only one sentence in vv. 9-11 in the text in which the principal clause is Paul's assertion that God highly exalted Christ and bestowed on him the name that is above every name (v. 9). Syntactically, the following phrases *at the name of Jesus every knee should bend* (v.10), and *every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father* (v. 11) are governed by the subordinating conjunction ἵνα (in order that, so that) and refer to the double purpose/result of God's gift. Although at the beginning of Paul's argumentation (v. 9) God is not named 'Father', the final phrase εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ πατρός (v. 11) indicates that apostle had in mind namely God as Father. Therefore, in order to obtain a fuller image of God the Father in this text, it is useful to have more detailed analyses of the activity of God as it is described in the whole sentence.

4.2.4.1.1. The Gift of God the Father

In order to describe what God has done for Christ, Paul begins his argument with a double conjunction διὸ καὶ that has an inferential intensifying meaning⁸⁸² and is usually translated as 'a consequence', 'therefore', and 'therefore also'. The ideas the conjunction

⁸⁷⁹ Cf. G. D. FEE, *Paul's Letter to the Philippians*, NICNT, Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1995, pp. 43-46, 192 note 3. Interestingly, J. Murphy-O'Connor who stresses that this hymn has been quoted almost entirely by Paul, admits that there are several phrases which point to Paul's hand and one of them is namely 'to the glory of God the Father'; cf. J. MURPHY-O'CONNOR, *Paul. A Critical Life*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996, pp. 225-226.

⁸⁸⁰ An expression used for example by HAWTHORNE, *Philippians*, p. 79; R. P. MARTIN, *A Hymn of Christ: Philippians 2:5-11 in Recent Interpretation & in the Setting of Early Christian Worship*, Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1997, p. lxxiii. According to Martin it is not important whether this passage is understood as a hymn that is sung to Christ or a hymn about Christ; cf. note 73. Martin also defends the hymnic nature of this text (p.xliv ff.) that previously has been harshly criticized by Fee, who prefers to speak of it as of 'exalted prose' rather than a 'hymn'; cf. FEE, *Philippians*, p. 193 note 4.

⁸⁸¹ There is a clear difference on grammatical basis: while in vv. 5-8 dominate participial constructions are used, in vv. 9-11 the finite verbs are used, and the proper nouns are employed instead of pronouns; cf. O'BRIEN, *The Epistle to the Philippians*, p. 232.

⁸⁸² Cf. BDF §442 (12), §451 (5). Excluding case analyzed, in Pauline letters the conjunction καὶ follows διὸ more than five times (Rom 4:22, 15:22, 2 Cor 1:20, 4:13, 5:9).

express seem to explain divine motivation not only as God's sovereign and gracious act⁸⁸³ (as it obvious is), but rather as his response of approval/vindication to the fact that previously Jesus emptied and humiliated himself;⁸⁸⁴ hence the notion of a 'reward' is rather inadequate.⁸⁸⁵

Paul describes Christ's exaltation with a compound verb ὑπερυψώω (raise to the loftiest height), that is *hapax legomenon* in the NT. Most noteworthy about this term is that in the OT (LXX) it is exclusively related to God's super-exaltation.⁸⁸⁶ Therefore, it seems that in this particular case it denotes Christ's exaltation in a superlative⁸⁸⁷ rather than comparative sense. The idea is that Christ who humiliated himself voluntary was exalted by God to every possible degree; it is possible even to say that he was placed over everybody and everything.⁸⁸⁸ The preceding vv. 6-8 the final accent is on Christ's death as the climax of his self-humiliation (v. 8), suggest an answer *how* he was highly exalted; namely, he was risen from the dead by the Father⁸⁸⁹ and 'the name'⁸⁹⁰ was bestowed on him, and that explain the extent of his exaltation.⁸⁹¹ Obviously, it does not mean that Paul describes Christ's exaltation and bestowal as a series of one another following events; according to Paul, it is rather one decisive and unique act of the Father.⁸⁹² In order to describe how God gave Jesus' 'the name',⁸⁹³ Paul uses the term χαρίζομαι that is characteristic to him.⁸⁹⁴ Significantly, in other Pauline texts this term is used to describe God's activity and it refers to either his gifts (Rom 8:32, 1 Cor 2:12, Gal 3:18), or his forgiveness (Eph 4:32, Col 2:12-13), thus expressing free and gracious activity of God in the history of salvation. However, nowhere in LXX or the NT this term is employed in order to

⁸⁸³ Cf. J. GNILKA, *Der Philipperbrief*, HTKNT X/3, Freiburg/Basel/Wien: Herder, 1968, p. 125; COLLANGE, *Philippiens*, p. 95.

⁸⁸⁴ Cf. O'BRIEN, *Philippians*, p. 234; FEE, *Philippians*, p. 220. Other scholars speak even more rigidly: the self-humiliation inevitably leads to one's exaltation; cf. HAWTHORNE, *Philippians*, p. 90; R. FABRIS, *Lettera ai Filipesi. Lettera ai Filemone*, SOC 11, Bologna: Dehoniane, 2001, p. 137.

⁸⁸⁵ Differently to MacLeod who also speaks about God's vindication and approval of Christ's self-humiliation, yet still employs the term 'reward' though excludes the idea of merit of Christ's side; cf. D. J. MACLEOD, "The Exaltation of Christ: An Exposition of Philippians 2:9-11," *BibSac* 158 (632, 2001) 437-450, p. 439 and note 12.

⁸⁸⁶ Cf. Ps 96 (97):9 and a massive usage of this term in Dan 3:52, 54, 57-88. There is only one exception in Ps 36 (37):35 where it is used to describe the power of a wicked man.

⁸⁸⁷ In most cases where Paul uses compound words with ὑπέρ they express excess (cf. Rom 8:37, 1 Thess 5:13, 2 Thess 1:3).

⁸⁸⁸ Cf. GNILKA, *Der Philipperbrief*, p. 125; COLLANGE, *Philippiens*, p. 95; O'BRIEN, *Philippians*, p. 236; HAWTHORNE, *Philippians*, p. 91; FEE, *Philippians*, p. 221.

⁸⁸⁹ Certainly, Paul never explicitly speaks about Christ's resurrection as of exaltation; the only reference in 2 Cor 11:7 where he employs verb ὑψώω adds nothing to our supposition as it has no relation to Jesus. However, there are two texts in Acts 2:33 and 5:31 in which ὑψώω is used to denote the exaltation of Jesus by God. Noteworthy that in both cases in the preceding verses Acts 2:32 and 5:30 there are explicit statements about Jesus' raising up by God as if author viewed it as the very basis and the first step for/in Christ's exaltation.

⁸⁹⁰ FEE, *Philippians*, p. 221, translates "God highly exalted Christ by gracing him with 'the name'", so rightly emphasizing significance of the 'name' but unfortunately paying little attention to the resurrection event.

⁸⁹¹ Rightly observed by HAWTHORNE, *Philippians*, p. 91.

⁸⁹² Paul expresses this idea by employing two aorists ὑπερύψωσεν and ἐχαρίσατο that are coincident; cf. O'BRIEN, *Philippians*, p. 237 note 26.

⁸⁹³ The article τό before ὄνομα lacks in D, F, G and many minuscules but because of a strong external support p⁴⁶, κ, B, C etc. it has been retained in the text; cf. METZGER, *A Textual Commentary*, p. 546.

⁸⁹⁴ Of a total 23 references in the NT there are 15 cases in the Pauline corpus.

denote ‘to give the name’. Hence it may point to the unique relationship between God the Father and Jesus, even more, in the initial salutations the cognate term χάρις is syntactically connected to both God the Father and Jesus Christ.

This implicit unique relationship culminates explicitly in the description of the sublimity of the ‘name’ – τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ὑπὲρ πάν ὄνομα (v. 9) and its subsequent authority (vv. 10-11). There is still a debate between scholars about what Paul intended by the ‘name’ – Jesus or Lord. It is possible to notice that the name ‘Jesus’ is not only expressly mentioned ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ (v. 10) but also fits well into the whole argument: as this human name belonged to the one who humiliated and sacrificed himself, thus God declared it as the highest name to be acclaimed.⁸⁹⁵ This name provides the Church with a solid ground because its faith is a response to the precise historical event of Jesus of Nazareth⁸⁹⁶ whose name became a substitute for the divine name because of its proper meaning.⁸⁹⁷ The second opinion⁸⁹⁸ we adhere to, is supported by Paul’s language about Christ’s super-exaltation and super-name which seem to refer to something different than to the human name ‘Jesus’. Paul may have had in mind κύριος (as he clearly states in v. 11), and not ‘Jesus’ that is his proper name.⁸⁹⁹ This supposition is strengthened by the quotation from Isa 45:23 ὅτι ἐμοὶ κάμψει πᾶν γόνυ καὶ ἐξομολογήσεται πᾶσα γλῶσσα τῷ θεῷ which Paul applies to Jesus ἵνα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ πᾶν γόνυ κάμψη... καὶ πᾶσα γλῶσσα ἐξομολογήσεται ὅτι κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς...(vv. 10-11). It should be noted that in the wider context (Isa 45:18-25), it is κύριος (in Hebrew יהוה) who speaks about his divine uniqueness (he is the only one) and his universal lordship. Therefore, such an emphasis on the Lord/Yahweh to whom all must obey, validates the idea that Paul re-worked this pattern not accidentally, but intending to present the exalted Jesus as the one with whom God shares his name and consequently his absolute and universal lordship.

⁸⁹⁵ Cf. MACLEOD, “The Exaltation of Christ”, p. 443.

⁸⁹⁶ Cf. COLLANGE, *Philippiens*, p. 95.

⁸⁹⁷ Cf. R. J. BAUCKHAM, “The Worship of Jesus in Philippians 2:9-11,” in R. P. MARTIN, B. J. DODD (eds.), *Where Christology Began. Essays on Philippians 2*, Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1998, 128-139, p. 138 note 9. Author finds an interesting parallel between the full name of Jesus (in Hebrew Jehoshua) and Isa 45:21-22 (the proper context of Isa 45:23 to which Paul alludes) in which God is named a Savior (v. 21) and God who saves (v. 22); accordingly, in the analyzed passage in vv. 10-11, the meaning may be “at the name YHWH-is-Salvation every knee should bend,...and every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord (i.e., YHWH).”

⁸⁹⁸ Cf. HAWTHORNE, *Philippians*, p. 91; O’BRIEN, *Philippians*, p. 238; FEE, *Philippians*, p. 222; FABRIS, *Lettera ai Filipesi*, p. 138.

⁸⁹⁹ The phrase in v. 10 ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ is not to be translated as ‘at the name Jesus’ but ‘at the name of Jesus’ taking Ἰησοῦ as genitive and not dative. The idea is that ‘at the name which belongs to Jesus’; cf. HAWTHORNE, *Philippians*, p. 92; O’BRIEN, *Philippians*, p. 240.

4.2.4.1.2. The Purpose of Christ's Exaltation

The universal lordship God has given Jesus when super-exalted him and especially when bestowed his name on Jesus, is explicitly detailed in vv. 10-11. These two verses contain two symmetrical and coordinated phrases which both depend on ἵνα (v. 10). In the classical Greek as well as in the NT, it usually expresses purpose but sometimes may indicate a result. It seems reasonable to retain a double meaning⁹⁰⁰ because that is indicated by the content of these phrases.

The purpose expressed in the first phrase ἵνα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ πάν γόνυ κάμψῃ ἐπουρανίων καὶ ἐπιγείων καὶ καταχθονίων (v. 10) is quite evident as it has already been mentioned above. The absolute and universal authority of Jesus⁹⁰¹ as Lord leads inevitably to the homage paid to *him* or *his* worship⁹⁰², and is not to be understood as a ground for the homage paid to *God in the name of Jesus* as if his name were a certain *instrument* through whom God is worshiped.⁹⁰³ The intention of God the Father is that in one or another way *all* animate creation⁹⁰⁴ should obey Jesus who is Lord. Paul neither points to the exact time *when* it occur nor the way *how* it takes place, nevertheless, the fact that Jesus is already the Lord and the context of Isa 45:18-25 from which Paul borrows the language, give an impression that here he speaks in terms of the eschatology 'already' and 'not yet'. On the one hand, as the hymnal nature of the whole passage intends, Christians have already bowed their knees at the name of Jesus and thus paid homage to him (and still do it),⁹⁰⁵ but on the other hand, not the whole world (human and spiritual) accept his authority now and this will take place only at the very End (cf. 1 Cor 15:24f.). The same is also valid for the second phrase καὶ πάντα γλώσσα ἐξομολογήσεται ὅτι κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός (v. 11). Referring to some interpreters,⁹⁰⁶ ἐξομολογήσεται is

⁹⁰⁰ Cf. GNILKA, *Der Philipperbrief*, p. 127 note 108; COLLANGE, *Philippiens*, p. 95; O'BRIEN, *Philippians*, p. 239.

⁹⁰¹ In the whole hymn Paul only once uses name 'Jesus' and this may be his concern to tie closely the earthly Jesus and the exalted Lord.

⁹⁰² So also many interpreters. Indeed, the construction ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ ... κάμψῃ is unique and a preposition ἐν may also be interpreted in instrumental sense, yet the following phrase πάντα γλώσσα ἐξομολογήσεται ὅτι κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός does not allow this.

⁹⁰³ *Contra* THÜSING, *Per Christum in Deum*, p. 56.

⁹⁰⁴ The phrase *in heaven and on earth and under the earth* is ambiguous and may refer to the whole creation inanimate and animate, though, most likely, Paul intended only the latter; cf. O'BRIEN, *Philippians*, pp. 243-245. But it is also possible that the second phrase (v. 11) specifies the preceding one (v. 10) in a way that it refers to the human confessing that Jesus is Lord, while homage to him should be paid by the *whole* creation (v. 10); cf. FABRIS, *Lettera ai Filipesi*, p. 141.

⁹⁰⁵ According to COLLANGE, *Philippiens*, p. 95, the Church is "les prémices de la Nouvelle Création" and its obeisance to Jesus has already a universal sense. At this point O'BRIEN, *Philippians*, p. 239, rightly observes that 'universalism' will be achieved only in the eschatological future. So also J. SCHLOSSER, "La figure de Dieu selon l'Épître aux Philippiens," *NTS* 41 (3, 1995) 378-399, p. 397.

⁹⁰⁶ It is difficult to choose between them as both have a good external support: ἐξομολογήσεται (p⁴⁶, κ, B, etc.) and ἐξομολογήσεται (A, C, D, F, G, etc.). Both may be the result of scribal assimilation: first in line with κάμψῃ (v. 10), the second one in accordance to ἐξομολογήσεται (Isa 45:23); cf. METZGER, *A Textual Commentary*, p. 546.

understood as aorist subjunctive corresponding to κάμψη (v. 10) to future indicative ἐξομολογῆσεται. In this phrase the homage that should be paid to Jesus as Lord is even more emphasised than in the previous verse, Jesus Christ is explicitly called Lord and should be acknowledged/proclaimed⁹⁰⁷ in a liturgical assembly as the term ἐξομολογέω in LXX suggests.⁹⁰⁸ However, as in the preceding phrase, the categorical πᾶς (every) language leaves this God's purpose realized only to a certain extent postponing its final culmination to the end. The answer should be given to *how* this should or will take place. According to Hawthorne (taking ἵνα in v. 10 as introducing purpose), it is the purpose of God to reconcile every being he has created but probably this would be hardly ever achieved because it is possible that somebody in heaven, on earth and under the earth would not gladly and voluntarily acknowledge the authority of Jesus Christ; even so, God would never compel anyone to do this against one's will.⁹⁰⁹ This interpretation contradicts another one which stresses necessary, forceful and eschatological subjugation of the enemies of Christ to his authority.⁹¹⁰ Such description of the end is presented by the text of Isa 45:24 and by the terms Paul employs in describing the end in 1 Cor 15:24-28: καταργέω (make ineffective, annihilate), ὑποτάσσω (subject, subordinate). If ἵνα expresses purpose and result both, we may presuppose that Paul may have thought about God's purpose only in positive terms (as of ideal plan of God) but his personal experience led him to the deduction that the persisting opposition to Jesus Christ leads to inevitable subjugation of all creation, otherwise God would not be all in all (cf. 1 Cor 15:28). The purpose-result of God does not conclude with Christ's exaltation but decisively is oriented to his fatherly glory as the final phrase indicates εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ πατρὸς (v. 11). This phrase is to be read in connection to the preceding acknowledgement/proclamation, ὅτι κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς and is to render 'that Jesus Christ is Lord, *to* the glory of God the Father' and not '*in* the glory' as if Jesus by his exaltation would have returned to his Father's glory, i.e., his preexistent state.⁹¹¹ Nor even the last phrase should be connected to ἐξομολογήσεται and understood as a direct praise of God the Father. It is that 'every tongue proclaim/acclaim to the glory of God the Father that Jesus Christ is Lord';⁹¹² however, a natural flow of Pauline argumentation that 'every tongue acknowledge/proclaim that Jesus Christ is Lord, *to* the glory of God the Father' is more

⁹⁰⁷ ἐξομολογέω means "to declare openly in acknowledgement, profess, acknowledge", BDAG, p. 351 (3). KRAMER, *Christ, Lord*, p. 76, uses the term *homologia* for the 'acclamation' and stresses its liturgical character; acclamation and adoration go together.

⁹⁰⁸ Cf. FABRIS, *Lettera ai Filippesi*, p. 141 note 84.

⁹⁰⁹ Cf. HAWTHORNE, *Philippians*, p. 94.

⁹¹⁰ Cf. R. P. MARTIN, *Carmen Christi: Philippians ii. 5-11 in Recent Interpretation and in the Setting of Early Christian Worship*, Cambridge: University Press, 1967, p. 262; O'BRIEN, *Philippians*, pp. 243, 250; FEE, *Philippians*, p. 224; MACLEOD, "The Exaltation of Christ", p. 447.

⁹¹¹ Cf. ZERWICK, *Biblical Greek*, §78, 108; MOULTON – TURNER, *Grammar*, p. 256; MARTIN, *Carmen Christi*, p. 273.

⁹¹² Cf. SCHLOSSER, "La figure de Dieu", pp. 394-395.

appropriate on syntactic and theological grounds.⁹¹³ It is clear that ὅτι κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ πατρὸς sums up the argument presented in vv. 9-11, and most probably it should be regarded as the focal point of the entire hymn. Everything what Christ does, is to the glory of the Father. In Pauline letters, apart from our text, the genitival construction (of God) with reference to εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ is attested five times⁹¹⁴ but only in two cases Christ is mentioned with reference to God's glory (Phil 1:11, Rom 15:7). However, in both cases 'to the glory of God' is associated with the conduct of Christians and not directly with Christ.⁹¹⁵ Therefore, this is the unique Pauline text in which the glory of God the Father *consists in the fact* that Jesus Christ is the Lord with all prerogatives this title embraces and thus anticipates the belief of the growing Church that God has been glorified in Jesus (cf. John 13:31).

As the final phrase εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ πατρὸς is not qualified by any other word (ἡμῶν or τοῦ κυρίου) it is not evident to *whom* God is primarily meant to be the Father. In the examined passage 2:9-11 God's activity is clearly directed to Jesus, hence it is obvious that the accent is put on the Father-Christ relationship, he is particularly the Father of Jesus. Christ's exaltation and lordship discloses a new aspect in God's fatherhood to Jesus because by his gracious grant God revealed his fatherhood in terms of uniquely and fully shared his own authority. Moreover, this authority of Jesus becomes a distinctive sign of the glory of the Father; in this case the glory of God is his supreme fatherly characteristic whereas the unconditional characteristic of Jesus is his lordship (cf. 1 Cor 8:6). Namely, Christ's lordship finally reveals God as Father, in particular as his Father.⁹¹⁶ On the other hand, the universal and eschatological acknowledgement of Christ's lordship contains a wider dimension, namely, in/through Jesus God becomes a Father to Christians⁹¹⁷ or even to all animate creation. Specifically, Jesus Christ the Lord is the foundation and bridge between the Father and everyone at the present time, as well as at the very end (1 Cor 15:24-28).

4.2.4.2. *The Glory to God and Father in Phil 4:20*

The isolated doxological statement in v. 20 τῷ δὲ θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ ἡμῶν ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων, ἀμήν seem different from the preceding argumentation in which commercial language in terms of Paul's and subsequently Philippians' needs (vv. 10-19)

⁹¹³ Cf. MARTIN, *Carmen Christi*, p. 272; O'BRIEN, *Philippians*, p. 250.

⁹¹⁴ εἰς δόξαν καὶ ἔπαινον θεοῦ (Phil 1:11), εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ (1 Cor 10:31), εἰς τὴν δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ (2 Cor 4:15), εἰς τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ (Rom 3:7), εἰς δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ (Rom 15:7).

⁹¹⁵ In Qumran לְכַבֵּד that is equivalent to εἰς δόξαν is not rare and refers to the glory of God from human (what people have to do) as well as from divine (God's activity for his proper glory) perspective; cf. SCHLOSSER, "La figure de Dieu", p. 391.

⁹¹⁶ Cf. O'BRIEN, *Philippians*, p. 251.

⁹¹⁷ Cf. THÜSING, *Per Christum in Deum*, p. 58.

dominate. Actually, both of them should be understood as the culmination and the response to what God has done for Paul through Philippians' generosity, and will⁹¹⁸ do for Philippians as well (vv. 18-19). It is important to note, that those two verses (vv. 18-19) became as a motive of the doxology (v. 20) because here Paul assertively speaks about the present and future satisfaction of his and community's needs, and it is the reason why to glorify God. God who is⁹¹⁹ given praise is not only Paul's God (as he claims in v. 19 ὁ θεός μου) but is *our* God and Father; in this praise Paul unites himself to Philippians' community which is to experience God's care *according to his riches in glory in Christ Jesus*. This final phrase κατὰ τὸ πλοῦτος αὐτοῦ ἐν δόξῃ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ (v. 19) has been interpreted differently: locally, eschatologically, adverbially, adjectivally.⁹²⁰ We prefer to the local-relational interpretation, where, τὸ πλοῦτος is specified by the double ἐν which refer to the sphere of God's proper activity (ἐν δόξῃ) that becomes operative in so far as Philippians remain united to Christ Jesus (ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ). Verbally the doxology (v. 20) is almost identical to that in Gal 1:4-5. In both cases the glory is given to 'our God and Father' though in Gal 1:5 it is expressed by the personal pronoun ὧ. The motives *what* God is praised *for*, differ. In Gal 1:5 our God and Father is glorified for what he has done in Jesus Christ, whereas the doxology in Phil 4:18-20 expresses the response to God's care for Paul and Philippians. Alongside Gal 1:5 there are other three doxologies in Pauline corpus which have similar vocabulary (Rom 11:36; 16:27; 1 Tim 1:17), and the glory is ascribed to God. Strikingly, but there is one reference in Pauline letters (Rom 16:27) where God is glorified explicitly 'through Jesus Christ'. Unfortunately, many scholars agree,⁹²¹ that the unusual vocabulary (Rom 16:25-27) of the long doxology presume it is a later addition done by Paul's followers⁹²² and reflect a more developed Church tradition. This is confirmed by later NT writings where the glory is given to God 'through Jesus Christ' (1 Pet 4:11; Jude 1:25), to God and the Lamb (Rev 5:13), or even only to Jesus Christ (2 Pet 3:18; Rev 1:6). Noteworthy, the term δόξα is used twice (v. 19 and v. 20) in the analyzed text, and it is possible to discover a twofold relational aspect. As the riches of God are and will be accessible 'in Christ Jesus' who specifies the preceding phrase 'in glory', so, *vice versa*, it is possible to think about the glory given to God through/in Christ Jesus. Thus, he becomes the central figure in God's donation and people's response to it by means of doxology: God's riches-his glory-

⁹¹⁸ In v. 19 the reading *and my God will fully satisfy every need of yours* taking πληρώσει as the future indicative is strongly supported by p⁴⁶, κ, A, B, etc., instead of the aorist optative πληρωσάι, with an idea of the wish-prayer *may my God fully satisfy*. For the first option, see FABRIS, *Lettera ai Filipesi*, p. 266 note 60, FEE, *Philippians*, p. 449 note 2; for the second, see WILES, *Paul's Intercessory Prayers*, p. 104, HAWTHORNE, *Philippians*, p. 208.

⁹¹⁹ As there is no verb in the sentence, it is most likely understood in the present indicative tense as also in Gal 1:5 (cf. 1 Pet 4:11).

⁹²⁰ See O'BRIEN, *Philippians*, p. 548.

⁹²¹ See FITZMYER, *Romans*, p. 42.

⁹²² Cf. SCHEKLE, *Paolo. Vita, lettere, teologia*, p. 143.

*Christ Jesus-people-Christ Jesus-the glory of our God and Father. The glory, particularly ascribed only to our God and Father, will never end as it is clear from the phrase εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων that is unique to the NT.*⁹²³ The closing ἀμήν concludes the whole doxology spontaneously, also it may be understood as the final word to the last phrase; whatever happens or no matter what people will do, the glory to God and Father lasts forever.⁹²⁴

To sum up, despite of various adversaries in Philippi, and despite the fact that Paul was in prison (cf. 1:7.13), the letter Paul wrote to the community is very friendly and exhortative. Paul's relationship with the community is very strong and grounded on mutual confidence and cooperation (even in material needs). Yet, the most important thing is the role Christ plays in Paul's life and thought; it is very evident in this letter. For him *living is Christ and dying is gain* (1:21), he desires *to depart and be with Christ, for that is far better* (1:24), he regards *everything as loss because of the surpassing value of knowing Christ Jesus* (3:8). Therefore, both texts about the divine fatherhood have highly christological background. As it has been presented in the text analysis, Jesus Christ is the 'bridge' between the people and God the Father. Moreover, he is the *reality* in/through which *God's glory becomes operative* and reaches its full dimension. It is important to mention this specific doxology is the only one in the NT where the glory is given to God who is the Father.⁹²⁵ Obviously, the glory that is ascribed to God the Father in both texts is particularly his, and this is *a specific characteristic of his fatherhood* what prompts people as his children to give him praise forever. Since the second doxology ends the letter (it is just before the concluding salutations) it may be considered as the final response of Paul and community for what 'our God and Father' has done in Christ Jesus for them and for their actual status they have been granted with.

4.2.5. *God as Father in the Corinthian Correspondence*

The Corinthian correspondence is vast and complicated⁹²⁶ and this especially concerns the second letter in which the most problematic sections are 6:14-7:1 and 10-13. Whether the latter section contains fragment of the lost "tearful" letter or is a remnant of one more letter ('E'), is not clear. A possibility that 10-13 was an integral part of 2 Cor ('D') from the beginning is also discussed. Anyway, two of three references to God as Father in 2 Cor appear in these sections. There are six references to God as Father in these letters. According to the literary

⁹²³ Cf. Gal 1:5; 1 Tim 1:17; 2 Tim 4:18; 1 Pet 4:11; Rev 1:6.18, 4:9-10, etc.

⁹²⁴ Cf. FEE, *Philippians*, p. 455.

⁹²⁵ 'Glory' is not mentioned in a doxology to 'the God and Father of the Lord Jesus' (2 Cor 11:31).

⁹²⁶ In two preserved letters there are references to at least two more letters. These four letters are usually indicated as 'A' – lost letter (1 Cor 5:9), 'B' – 1 Cor, 'C' – lost "tearful" letter (2 Cor 2:3-4; 7:8-9), and 'D' – 2 Cor.

genre they appear in the particular texts and may be classified as a creedal like formulation (1 Cor 8:6), an apocalyptic-eschatological text (1 Cor 15:24), a blessing (2 Cor 1:3, twice), a quotation of the OT (2 Cor 6:18), and an oath (2 Cor 11:31).

4.2.5.1. *One God, the Father in 1 Cor 8:4-6*

The reference to one God who is the Father (εἷς θεὸς ὁ πατὴρ) stands at the core of Paul's argumentation on the food sacrificed to idols (8:1-13). In Corinthian community the concrete problem is a certain opposition of two groups because of their different approach to sacrificial food. On the one hand, there are 'strong ones' for whom eating food sacrificed to idols causes no problem as they have knowledge that the idols are nothing or do not exist in reality. On the other hand, there are those for whom, because of their 'weak conscience', such practice becomes the cause for their defilement. Moreover, the example of the 'strong ones' may even encourage the 'weak ones' to act them against their conscience and for Paul this is intolerable. Thus, Paul's argument in this chapter is quite clear: we have knowledge, yet it is love but not knowledge that builds up. As there are other believers who do not have such knowledge we should not boast about or freely overuse it, but to treat them with love in order to avoid defiling their weak conscience.

This chapter may be divided in three well-defined sections: the fact that we all possess knowledge (8:1-3), the content of that knowledge (8:4-6), and finally, the practical consequences for those whose knowledge is not so perfect (8:7-13).⁹²⁷

Paul specifies the content of that knowledge appealing to one God, the Father.

The argument Paul proposes may be presented as follows:

v. 4 – thesis: *we know*

that there is no idol in the world/an idol is nothing in the world (ὅτι οὐδὲν
εἰδωλον ἐν κόσμῳ)

that there is no God but one (ὅτι οὐδεὶς θεὸς εἰ μὴ εἷς).

vv. 5-6 – antithetical explanation:

v. 5 – concession – for even if/for if indeed (γὰρ εἴπερ)

there are so-called gods (λεγόμενοι θεοὶ),

as indeed there are many gods and many lords (θεοὶ πολλοὶ καὶ κύριοι
πολλοί),

⁹²⁷ This chapter may also be viewed under another aspect, i.e., there is a theoretical part about knowledge (8:1-6), and the practical conclusions of the use or overuse of that knowledge (8:7-13). At any rate, the smaller units (vv. 1-3 and vv. 4-6) in the first part are clearly visible; cf. A. DENAUX, "Theology and Christology in 1 Cor 8,4-6," in R. BIERINGER, (ed.), *The Corinthian Correspondence* (BETHL 125), Leuven: Leuven University Press-Peeters, 1996, 593-606, p. 595.

v. 6 – apodosis – *but* (ἀλλὰ) *for us*

there is one God, the Father (εἷς θεὸς ὁ πατήρ),
one Lord, Jesus Christ (καὶ εἷς κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός).

Paul starts his argument taking anew the idea of knowledge that apparently was very important for some Corinthians and which has already been expressed in v. 1 (γνώσις).⁹²⁸ This knowledge is strictly monotheistic and leads to further explanation: there are people who believe that many gods and lords really exist (pagans), and who know that those gods and lords in reality do not exist as they believe in one God, the Father and one Lord (Christians). Here the problem arises in Paul's argument in v. 5. As in v. 4 he clearly states that there is only one God, the question is how to understand his concession that there are many gods and many lords in v. 5b? Are those deities and lords just a fuller explanation of his premise about existence of so-called gods in heaven or on earth or they represent diverse entities? There is no unequivocal answer. According to Héring, the gods in v. 5ab are nothing else but powerful angels whom people adore and sometimes call 'gods'. The difference between them and the lords in v. 5b is rather functional as they also are angels who hide behind the political powers (in Rom 13 they are expressed by ἐξουσία).⁹²⁹ Senft divides them in two groups: so-called gods in heaven in v. 5a are the same many gods mentioned in v. 5b and they represent traditional divinities while the so-called gods on earth refer to divinized humans, heroes, and princes.⁹³⁰ Fee also thinks that the gods designate traditional deities who sometimes are also referred to as lords, but the lords, according to him point to the divinities of the mystery cults.⁹³¹ In Collins' opinion, here Paul speaks about natural realities, i.e., the gods are have been created by God, like as the stars, sun, fire etc., though some people worshiped them as gods; the lords are simply divinized humans (as emperors).⁹³² Finally, explaining this argument, Barbaglio proposes that Paul did not intend to describe the difference between the gods and lords as they are merely synonyms.⁹³³ Perhaps, there is no need to adhere to one or another interpretation but rather to accentuate the real threats that those deities or divinities may produce. It should be noticed that the focal point in v. 5 is Paul's statement about 'so-called' gods. Such qualification helps him to deny any possibility of existence of any deity except one God. Therefore, 'many gods and many lords' in v. 5b

⁹²⁸ Here Paul retakes οἶδαμεν (cf. v. 1) and though he does not use the term γνώσις, (as in v. 1) it is evident that he has in mind namely it (as in v. 7 γνώσις).

⁹²⁹ Cf. J. HERING, *La première épître de saint Paul aux Corinthiens*, CNT VII, Neuchâtel: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1949, p. 65.

⁹³⁰ Cf. CH. SENFT, *La première épître de saint-Paul aux Corinthiens*, CNT 2, VII, Neuchâtel: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1979, p. 110.

⁹³¹ Cf. FEE, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, p. 373.

⁹³² Cf. R. F. COLLINS, *First Corinthians*, SPS 7, Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1999, p. 314.

⁹³³ Cf. BARBAGLIO, *La Prima Lettera ai Corinzi*, p. 400 note 96. Also he thinks that Paul added word 'lords' in v. 5b to make a perfect antithesis between 'many gods and many lords' and 'one God and one Lord' in v. 6; *ibidem*.

apparently fall into the same category. To be sure, this is not just an artificial play of words for Paul because he knew well the religious milieu he lived in and the particular circumstances of some Corinthians who formerly were pagans. The pagan cult did exist and some ‘divinities’ like angels or demons in Paul’s way of thinking were real as well. Thus, he wants to protect the Corinthian believers and make them free from any superstition: whatever name is given to existent or non-existent reality, those are neither gods nor lords (cf. Gal 4:8). They may be the gods and lords only subjectively as far as people, including Christians because of their former pagan experience, believe in them.⁹³⁴ But for Christians of ‘weak conscience’ the danger may be not just a matter of their psychological misbalance but also very existential one because those gods or lords may appear to be “*objective forces of evil which bring destruction, disintegration, and pain.*”⁹³⁵ Therefore, Paul continues his argument about one God and one Lord with even more strength.

With a contrast used at the beginning of v. 6 (ἀλλὰ), Paul finally comes to the core of his whole argument and gives an answer to *why* many gods and lords are only ‘so-called’ and *who* are the true *one* God and *one* Lord. There is a certain parallelism between formulations in v. 6a and v. 6b:

εἰς θεὸς ὁ πατὴρ	ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα	καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτόν,
εἰς κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός	δι’ οὗ τὰ πάντα	καὶ ἡμεῖς δι’ αὐτοῦ

Despite evident resemblances, the prepositions used disclose Paul’s genuine intention. He makes a clear difference between one God and one Lord as the latter stands in the middle position: ἐξ οὗ – δι’ οὗ – δι’ αὐτοῦ – εἰς αὐτόν.⁹³⁶ Hence, God, the Father is the source and goal while Lord Jesus Christ is the mediator. There have been various proposals about the origin of the expressions used in this verse and its possible influence to Paul. Many scholars argue that εἰς θεὸς owes to the Jewish background, especially to *Shema* (Deut 6:4), and that the prepositions ἐκ, διὰ, and εἰς with τὰ πάντα are used, possibly show the influence of Stoicism and Philo.⁹³⁷ On the other hand, even the formulation in v. 6 has its roots in various traditions; it is

⁹³⁴ This view is widely accepted by scholars. For example, cf. F. F. BRUCE, *1 and 2 Corinthians*, NCB, London: Oliphants, 1971, p. 80; FEE, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, pp. 372-373; BARBAGLIO, *La Prima Lettera ai Corinzi*, p. 399; DENAUX, “Theology and Christology in 1 Cor 8,4-6,” p. 600.

⁹³⁵ A. C. THISELTON, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, NIGTC, Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans / Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 2000, p. 633 (italics his).

⁹³⁶ According to Richardson, such pattern is widespread in smaller and larger sections of Paul’s writings. He describes it as “a ‘theological *inclusio*’” (italics his); cf. RICHARDSON, *Paul’s language about God*, p. 301.

⁹³⁷ Cf. H. CONZELMANN, *1 Corinthians*, Hermeneia, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975, p. 144; SENFT, *La première épître de saint-Paul aux Corinthiens*, p. 111 and note 16; P. PERKINS, “God in the New Testament: Preliminary Soundings,” *TToday* 42 (3, 1985) 332-341, p. 338; RICHARDSON, *Paul’s language about God*, pp. 296-297; PENNA, R., “La paternità di Dio nel Nuovo Testamento,” *RdT* 40 (1, 1999) 7-39, p. 10; THISELTON, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, p. 635; BARBAGLIO, *La Prima Lettera ai Corinzi*, p. 403.

possible that in actual form it has been created by Paul himself.⁹³⁸ According to the Fee right observations, despite various interpretations whether this sentence is a pre-Pauline formulation with its roots in Hellenistic Jewish Christianity, or if it is created *ad hoc* by Paul himself, in any way it meets his argument so precisely, that the question of the origin here becomes irrelevant.⁹³⁹

This is one of three monotheistic texts in the undisputed Pauline letters (cf. Gal 3:20; Rom 3:29-30). Another one is in 1 Tim 2:5, and it is important as well both theologically and christologically as its vocabulary is very close to the formulation of Gal 3:20, though different accent can be noticed.⁹⁴⁰ All texts as the one analyzed call God as uniquely one, but only in the analyzed text, God is named as ‘the Father’. Moreover, since ‘the Father’ stands in parallelism with ‘Jesus Christ’, the latter is implicitly qualified as his Son.⁹⁴¹ The relational character of this verse is also emphasized by a sequence of personal pronouns: ἡμῖν – ἡμεῖς – ἡμεῖς. Therefore it seems that a further interpretation of the text should proceed by keeping it in mind. One of the crucial words here is τὰ πάντα which in parallel is associated with both: God, the Father and Lord Jesus Christ. Should it be interpreted in terms of the whole of creation, all things⁹⁴² or may it contain a bit different aspect? Richardson’s answer is affirmative. He suggests that in connection with God τὰ πάντα indicates his creative work, but in relation to Lord τὰ πάντα points to God’s salvific activity through Christ.⁹⁴³ However, such interpretation is doubtful for several reasons. Firstly, the logic of parallelism ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα – δι’ οὗ τὰ πάντα and ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτόν – ἡμεῖς δι’ αὐτοῦ does not allow this, because in both cases τὰ πάντα is changed to ἡμεῖς.⁹⁴⁴ Secondly, it is impossible to neglect that God’s creative activity is clearly associated with Christ in Col 1:15-17 (ὅς ἐστιν εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου, πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως...τὰ πάντα δι’ αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτόν ἔκτισται), even if it is possible to accept that this letter is deutero-Pauline.⁹⁴⁵ Therefore, as many other scholars agree, there is no possibility to deny that Paul’s argumentation should be understood from a double cosmological and salvific perspective. In contrast to false gods (v. 5) he affirms that the real unique God is the Father and

⁹³⁸ Cf. DENAUX, “Theology and Christology in 1 Cor 8,4-6,” pp. 604-605.

⁹³⁹ Cf. FEE, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, pp. 373-374.

⁹⁴⁰ There is a phrase ‘one mediator’ in both texts, but as in Gal 3:20 the mediator is Moses, he is said to be *not one*, while in 1 Tim 2:5 the man Christ Jesus is exclusively *one* mediator between God and humankind.

⁹⁴¹ Cf. C. H. GIBLIN, “Three Monotheistic Texts in Paul,” *CBQ* 37 (4, 1975) 527-547, p. 534; FEE, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, p. 374; DENAUX, “Theology and Christology in 1 Cor 8,4-6,” p. 601.

⁹⁴² Cf. BDAG, p. 784, and many scholars.

⁹⁴³ Cf. RICHARDSON, *Paul’s language about God*, p. 297.

⁹⁴⁴ Pace BARBAGLIO, *La Prima Lettera ai Corinzi*, p. 401.

⁹⁴⁵ As also cannot undervalue two other texts in which God’s creative activity through Christ ‘through whom/him’ is clearly stated (cf. Heb 1:2; John 1:3).

the Creator of all things,⁹⁴⁶ and Lord Jesus Christ is the only one through whom all things come to be,⁹⁴⁷ and our existence (not as much in ontological but rather soteriological terms)⁹⁴⁸ is through Jesus Christ and for/unto⁹⁴⁹ the Father.⁹⁵⁰ Because of the unique role of Jesus Christ as the one Lord, therefore it is important to assume that the cosmological protology and soteriological eschatology are coherent.⁹⁵¹ As Paul strikingly replaces τὰ πάντα by ἡμεῖς and employs no verbs (v. 6), it is possible to conclude that he probably wishes to emphasize the relational aspect between the Father, Jesus Christ, and the believers⁹⁵² as it better suits his entire argumentation. Obviously, Paul does not state clearly that God is the Father of Jesus Christ⁹⁵³ in this passage, thus some scholars maintained that ‘the Father’ here is purely viewed from a *creative* perspective,⁹⁵⁴ even more - both in the biblical (OT) and philosophical (Stoic) traditions such an idea is strongly confirmed. However, this is *the only text* in which Paul describes God as Father with reference to the creation. Moreover, in the Pauline letters God’s fatherhood is frequently associated with the lordship of Jesus insofar as he has been raised by the Father and in his lordship God is primarily revealed as the Father of Christ⁹⁵⁵ and consequently of Christians.⁹⁵⁶ Therefore, keeping in mind the whole context (8:1-13), it appears that for Paul the *creative* aspect in the text analyzed most likely serves to underline the exclusive relationship between one God/one Lord and Corinthians. Both groups of the believers (‘strong’ and ‘weak’), to the exclusion of whatever gods and lords, depend ultimately only on the Father and Jesus

⁹⁴⁶ There is another reference to God as Creator in 1 Cor 11:12 (τὰ δὲ πάντα ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ) and most likely God and not Christ is intended by κύριος in Rom 11:33-36 (ἐξ αὐτοῦ καὶ δι’ αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα).

⁹⁴⁷ Collins also does not take δι’ οὐ τὰ πάντα “as referring exclusively to God’s salvific work through Christ.” COLLINS, *First Corinthians*, p. 320.

⁹⁴⁸ It seems that Paul deliberately emphasizes “we” because he perfectly knew that “we” also are part of the whole creation. According to Capes τὰ πάντα describes every aspect of creation including the living and the dead; cf. CAPES, *Yahweh Texts in Paul’s Christology*, p. 60.

⁹⁴⁹ Fee rightly observes that we are not only heading to God the Father but that “our very existence is for his purposes.” FEE, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, p. 375. Paul takes this idea again in 1 Cor 15:28.

⁹⁵⁰ According to this interpretation the preexistence of Christ is surely implied though it is not the main concern in Paul’s argument; cf. CONZELMANN, *1 Corinthians*, p. 145; CH. WOLFF, *Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther. Zweiter Teil: Auslegung der Kapitel 8 - 16*, THNT VII/2, Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1982, p. 6; CAPES, *Yahweh Texts in Paul’s Christology*, p. 59; SCHRAGE, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*, Teilbd. 2, p. 224; J. LAMBRECHT, *Collected Studies on Pauline Literature and on the Book of Revelation* (AnBib 147), Roma: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2001, p. 65; *contra* RICHARDSON, *Paul’s language about God*, p. 298.

⁹⁵¹ Similarly, THISELTON, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, p. 638; cf. also CONZELMANN, *1 Corinthians*, p. 144. See also the interpretation on 1 Thess 3:11-13.

⁹⁵² According to Giblin “the very absence of the verbs stresses both a dynamic *personal direction* of a divine character and also a *communitarian perspective*, not a process as such.” (italics his); GIBLIN, “Three Monotheistic Texts in Paul,” p. 535.

⁹⁵³ Yet, he may have had this idea in mind; cf. WOLFF, *Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther. Zweiter Teil: Auslegung der Kapitel 8 - 16*, p. 7; SCHRAGE, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*, Teilbd. 2, p. 242.

⁹⁵⁴ For example, cf. CONZELMANN, *1 Corinthians*, p. 144; SENFT, *La première épître de saint-Paul aux Corinthiens*, p. 111; LINDEMANN, *Der erste Korintherbrief*, p. 192.

⁹⁵⁵ See the interpretation on Phil 2:9-11. See also COLLINS, *First Corinthians*, pp. 317-318.

⁹⁵⁶ Cf. BARBAGLIO, *La Prima Lettera ai Corinzi*, p. 404; PENNA, “La paternità di Dio nel Nuovo Testamento,” p. 11.

Christ.⁹⁵⁷ Thus, the tripartite structure ‘Father-Jesus-believers’ is confirmed once again. Furthermore, the redemption initiated by the Father and effectuated in Jesus death is the basis of Corinthians’ behavior. As Jesus died also for the brother who is ‘weak’ (v. 11), thus founding a unity between all brothers,⁹⁵⁸ so those who are ‘strong’ must have the same attitude towards other brothers, namely love (v. 1) and unity (v. 13). Hence, Paul’s argument about God’s unique fatherhood, Jesus’ unique lordship, and their unity in redemptive activity becomes a paradigm for the relationships between believers.

In summary, Paul does not refer to ‘one God’ as to a certain philosophical abstract but he presents him as ‘the Father’ thus proposing that this is God’s proper name. As ‘the Father’ he is not merely *the source and goal* of everything and everybody, his fatherhood is revealed through Jesus’ sonship, and made operative within Christian community, *promoting love and unity*. Hence the eschatological language that is inherent to Paul’s argument finds its application in a concrete situation: eschatology and ethics cannot be separated.

4.2.5.2. *God as Father in 1 Cor 15:20-28*

This is one of the most amazing and much discussed passages in the first letter to the Corinthians and, despite the fact that there is only one reference to ‘God the Father’ (15:24), the whole passage is oriented to him and to the consummation of everything and everybody in him. Our text constitutes the part of a larger argument about the future resurrection from the dead, which is the main theme of the entire chapter. This chapter was probably written as an answer to the crucial question and misunderstanding of the fate of the dead by some faction. Paul’s rhetorical question (15:12) raises another question in its turn, namely, *what* those ‘some of you’ had in reality denied. It seems, that the matter was not concerned with general resurrection,⁹⁵⁹ rather it dealt with ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν in the proper sense. The vv. 35-38 seem to highlight the Corinthians’ objection to corporeal nature of such a resurrection⁹⁶⁰. Even though the main reason for the negation may have been their attitude to the certainty of such a possibility,⁹⁶¹ the concern of the apostle in explaining a ‘spiritual body’ of the resurrection, involves their probable

⁹⁵⁷ “...as they share the exclusive right.” J. F. M. SMIT, “1 Cor 8,1-6: A Rhetorical *Partitio*. A Contribution to the Coherence of 1 Cor 8,1-11,1,” in R. BIERINGER, (ed.), *The Corinthian Correspondence* (BETHL 125), Leuven: Leuven University Press-Peeters, 1996, 577-591, p. 586.

⁹⁵⁸ Strongly emphasized by GIBLIN, “Three Monotheistic Texts in Paul,” pp. 536-537.

⁹⁵⁹ Cf. J. N. VORSTER, “Resurrection Faith in 1 Corinthians 15”, *Neotestamentica* 23 (1989), p. 293; A. C. THISELTON, “Realised Eschatology at Corinth”, *New Testament Studies* 24 (1977/78), pp. 523-524. Thiselton also admits that there is no evidence for the Corinthians’ belief in a general resurrection, but he hesitates about the point of view of deniers mentioned in 15:12: it is uncertain if there were among them those, who completely denied a general resurrection, or not.

⁹⁶⁰ Cf. FEE, *First Epistle*, p. 715.

⁹⁶¹ Cf. D. J. DOUGHTY, “The Presence and Future of Salvation in Corinth”, *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 66 (1975), pp. 75-76; VORSTER, “Resurrection Faith”, p. 295.

doubt on this matter as well.⁹⁶² To give a clear and exhaustive answer, *why* the Corinthians had questioned the resurrection of the dead, is hardly possible.⁹⁶³ However some implications may be drawn from the context of the whole letter. It seems that the core of Corinthians' problematic way of thinking and behaving was their understanding of themselves as of πνευματικοί. It is probable that such an understanding was related to their experience of the Spirit (chapters 12-14) combined with the interest to wisdom and knowledge (chapters 1-4; 8-10). It emerges that the experience of speaking in the tongues of angels (13:1) was not extraneous to them and probably served as a basis for regarding themselves as having already obtained heavenly existence. This enabled them to participate in the dominion of the exalted Christ over the world. Their understanding of the saving event as a revelation of the hidden wisdom of God (2:6-12) led them to believe to be in a state of salvation, that had nothing to do with worldly affairs.⁹⁶⁴ Furthermore, their overemphasized or spiritualized eschatology mixed with Hellenistic dualism had led them to a false anthropology and free ethical behavior. Briefly, the Corinthians' faith, having abandoned the future hope of redemption is still to come, and putting a too weighty accent on present and ultimate spiritual experience, it had lead them away from the significance of the present world and even from the appreciation of their bodily existence.⁹⁶⁵

This chapter may be divided in three main parts which coherently represent Paul's argumentation. The first part (vv. 1-11) presents the commonly held ground of the death and resurrection of Jesus as a platform for further argumentation. The second part (vv. 12-34) generally can be viewed as dealing with the *fact* of the resurrection of the dead. The third part (vv. 35-58) explains *how* (in what form) the resurrection will take place.⁹⁶⁶ It can be maintained that the argumentation in the second part consists of three interrelated sections (vv. 12-19, vv. 20-28, vv. 29-34). This part can be described as a literary unit, based on similarities in syntax, style, vocabulary, and semantics. The chiasmic pattern A B A gives more evidence to this unity as well as to the position of the verses under consideration:

⁹⁶² Cf. BARBAGLIO, *La Prima Lettera*, p. 798.

⁹⁶³ Cf. J.-N. ALETTI, "L'argumentation de Paul et la position des Corinthiens: 1 Cor 15,12-34", in L. De Lorenzi, a cura di, *Résurrection du Christ et des chrétiens (1Co 15)*, Rome 1985, pp. 79-80.

⁹⁶⁴ Cf. G. D. FEE, "Toward a Theology of 1 Corinthians", in *Pauline Theology*, vol. 2, (David M. Hay, ed.), Minneapolis 1993, p. 45. The overestimation of the Spirit with its negative consequences for the present can be seen in the understanding of the Lord's Supper (10-11) and the enthusiastic use of glossolalia (14); cf. BECKER, *Paul*, p. 204.

⁹⁶⁵ Cf. THISELTON, "Realised Eschatology", p. 512; FEE, *First Epistle*, pp. 10-12; FEE, "Toward a Theology of 1 Corinthians", pp. 37-38. It does not mean that the body in Hellenistic conception is necessarily viewed as an evil or negative power (Gnostic viewpoint), it can be regarded as the transitory element belonging to creation such as it is determined to pass away (Hellenistic dualism in general). Because of its temporality the body has no part in final salvation. Therefore, the immorality or asceticism puts no ethical obligation on the person; cf. BECKER, *Paul*, p. 213.

⁹⁶⁶ It is also possible to observe the whole chapter as consisting of two parts of a diptych: vv. 1-34 *fact* of eschatological resurrection, and vv. 35-58 the bodily *character* of it; cf. J. HOLLEMAN, *Resurrection and Parousia: A Traditio-Historical Study of Paul's Eschatology in 1 Corinthians 15*, Supplements to Novum Testamentum, Leiden/New York/Köln 1996, p. 40.

A = vv. 12-19 if there is no resurrection of the dead (v.13a)

if the dead are not raised (v.16a)

B = vv. 20-28 affirmation of resurrection of Christ and the dead

A' = vv. 29-32 if the dead are not raised (v.v. 29b and 32c).⁹⁶⁷

It is clear that vv. 20-28 not only stand in the centre of this part, but that the positive affirmation framed by hypothetical consequences constitutes the very core of Paul's argument.⁹⁶⁸

4.2.5.2.1. The Structure and Line of Thought in 1 Cor 15:20-28

This section is usually divided in two sub-units (vv. 20-22 and vv. 23-28) with the following subdivision of verses: 1) v. 20 thesis and vv. 21-22 explanation; 2) vv. 23-24 thesis and vv. 25-28 explanation.⁹⁶⁹ Such division of the section is widely accepted, yet the close connection between two parts should not be ignored. The fact that v. 23 mentions Χριστός as ἀπαρχή (as in v. 20) for developing the second thesis does not diminish the closeness between v. 22 and v. 23.⁹⁷⁰ Rather this is to be understood as a wider explanation about the order of resurrection of the dead (it is based upon ἀπαρχή Χριστός), further deepening (may serve as a thesis) the events of the end (τέλος).

In fact, the first part of the section (vv. 20-22) is not of much difficulty to identify because of the double antithetical parallelism.⁹⁷¹ The common subject in Adam-Christ analogy is ἄνθρωπος meaning that in these two 'men' and under their active influence the whole story of mankind is set in motion.⁹⁷² It is important to mention that Paul speaks about resurrection of Christ as well as of the dead employing the divine passive (v. 20 ἐγήγερται and v. 22

⁹⁶⁷ This chiasm is adopted from ALETTI, "L'argumentation de Paul", p. 64. The chiastic structure of this part was also proposed by J. LAMBRECHT, *Pauline Studies. Collected Essays*, Leuven 1994, p. 126. With some reservation this chiasm accepts C. E. HILL, "Paul's Understanding of Christ's Kingdom in 1 Corinthians 15, 20-28", *Novum Testamentum* 30 (1988), p. 299, note 6. Fee admits that A-A' certainly has the similarity of form, but the nature of argumentation in vv. 12-19 and vv. 29-34 is different; cf. FEE, *First Epistle*, p. 736, note 1.

⁹⁶⁸ These verses may be considered not only as central, with regard to the material, but from a semantic point of view as well; cf. ALETTI, "L'argumentation de Paul", p. 66.

⁹⁶⁹ Cf. LAMBRECHT, *Pauline Studies*, p. 129.

⁹⁷⁰ Holleman precisely observes that the closeness of these verses can be supposed, because the argument in vv. 12-23 is based on belief in Christ's resurrection, but it is not necessary to make a decisive break between vv. 23-24 (according to him vv. 24-28 constitute the third set of 'additional' arguments); cf. HOLLEMAN, *Resurrection and Parousia*, 41. The grammatical structure of this one sentence is clear: τῷ γα... ἐπειτα... εἴτα (the question is not how to understand the final εἴτα). Moreover, the resurrection of the dead in vv. 20-23 and the defeat of death as a final enemy v. 26 are interrelated: the resurrection of the dead is the basis for the destruction of death, consequently, opens the way for God to be all in all. It seems to be this point Paul wishes to emphasize.

⁹⁷¹ Observed by many authors, cf. FEE, *First Epistle*, p. 749; BARBAGLIO, *La Prima Lettera*, p. 787; HILL, "Christ's Kingdom", p. 300; ALETTI, "L'argumentation de Paul", p. 72; C. K. BARRETT, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, London 1968, p. 351 and "The significance of the Adam-Christ typology for the Resurrection of the dead: 1Co 15,20-22.45.49", in De Lorenzi, a cura di, *Résurrection*, pp. 99-122; de BOER, *The Defeat of Death*, p. 110.

⁹⁷² Cf. BARRETT, *The First Epistle*, p. 351; BARBAGLIO, *La Prima Lettera*, p. 787.

ζωοποιηθήσονται). This appears even more important when one takes into account the verses which precede our section (there the divine passive is regularly used with reference to the resurrection of Christ (ἐγήγερται, vv. 12, 13, 14, 16, 17). Verse 15 states it explicitly that it was God who raised Christ therefore we have to keep in mind not only christocentric but even more theocentric character of Paul's argumentation.

There have been several attempts to analyze the whole material (vv. 24-28) in the light of concentric chiasmic structure based upon linguistic patterns, which may be applied to these verses. In Hill's proposal⁹⁷³ it is underlined the defeat of death as v. 26 is at the center of the chiasmic structure.⁹⁷⁴ Regardless that linguistic indicators in the structure are evident, it has been criticized by Lambrecht on the basis of clauses, which together with their verbs have grammatical differences and the correspondence of parallel verses is not perfect.⁹⁷⁵ Anyhow, this chiasm at least discloses one of the *basic* aspects of Paul's concern in the whole section vv. 20-28: the death of death is inevitable as a consequence of Christ's resurrection. It has to be noted that a chiasmic parallelism exists between v. 24b and v. 28b, as well as between v. 24c and v. 28a, which the author prefers to call an inclusion:⁹⁷⁶

v. 24b ὅταν παραδιδῷ τὴν βασιλείαν τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρί,

v. 24c ὅταν καταργήσῃ πᾶσαν ἀρχὴν καὶ πᾶσαν ἐξουσίαν καὶ δύναμιν.

v. 28a ὅταν δὲ ὑποταγῇ αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα,

v. 28b τότε [καὶ] αὐτὸς ὁ υἱὸς ὑποταγέσεται τῷ ὑποτάξαντι αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα

These parallels show that the argumentation proceeding in vv. 24-28 is framed from one side by the deliverance of the kingdom to the Father (παραδιδῷ - ὑποταγέσεται) and from another side by destruction of all enemies and subjection of all things (καταργήσῃ πᾶσαν - ὑποταγῇ...πάντα). It may be supplemented that from the literary point of view vv. 24-28 do constitute a small unit framed by relational terms as Paul calls Christ (v. 20.23 twice) 'Son' (v. 28) and God 'Father' (v. 24).⁹⁷⁷ There is another analogous parallel structure similar to that of Lambrecht's : a = 24b, B = 24c-26, B' = 27-28a, a' = 28bc. This is a proposal of Aletti, who identifies it thanks to implied personages and vocabulary:

- vv. 24-26, *destruction* of all enemies

⁹⁷³ See HILL, "Christ's Kingdom", p. 300.

⁹⁷⁴ Cf. W. B. WALLIS, "The Problem of an Intermediate Kingdom in 1 Corinthians 15. 20-28", *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 18 (1975) 229-242. In vv. 24-28 he also sees the chiasmic structure (p. 242) similar to that of Hill; yet at the center of the structure he places not only the defeat of death as Hill does (v. 26), but also the subjugation of all things (v. 27a).

⁹⁷⁵ Cf. J. LAMBRECHT, "Structure and Line of Thought in 1 Cor 15, 23-28", *Novum Testamentum* 32 (1990), pp. 146-147.

⁹⁷⁶ Cf. LAMBRECHT, "Structure and Line of Thought", p. 151.

⁹⁷⁷ Cf. COLLINS, *First Corinthians*, p. 550; SCHRAGE, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*, Teilbd. 4, p. 175.

- citation of Ps 110:1;
- vv. 27ff., *subjection* of all creation
- citation of Ps 8:6.⁹⁷⁸

These parallels reveal that the emphasis is put on the action of Christ and God. Having begun with the resurrection of Christ, this action must arrive at its full awareness of God's being all in all. The active reigning of God and Christ is marked by the abolition of death and the subjection of all things. Hereby several remarks on the structure can be made:

1. The entire section is based upon the resurrection of Christ that gives way to future events. Since Christ is ἀπαρχή the resurrection of the dead is assured, the end is initiated, the destruction of enemies and subjection of powers is possible, and God's being all in all is finally determined.
2. The emphasis on totality, which illustrates the all-inclusiveness of God's rule, is very strong in the whole section: on the one hand it is connected to life (v. 22), and on the other, to destruction and subjection (vv. 24-28).
3. The destruction of death is emphasized thanks to its position in the argumentation and its logical connection to the resurrection of the dead: as far as death is not defeated, the kingdom cannot be delivered to God the Father and he cannot be all in all.
4. The flow of Paul's thought shows his *theocentric* perspective: the resurrection of Christ is the first and determinative stage that inevitably leads to the future resurrection of the dead, the abolition of death, the subjection of all, and definitive God's sovereignty in the universe.

4.2.5.2.2. The Order of Events in 15:23-28

By setting forth the order of events which lead to the very end, Paul insists that God is at work. The resurrection of the dead is linked with his salvific plan and events are unfolding in a process according to his will. According to the logic of this argument, the reality and certainty of the future resurrection requires some specifications *when* it will take place. This explains why Paul insists that believers must be raised: they are ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ (v. 22) who are the first-fruits of their resurrection. Paul introduces the order of the final events: ἕκαστος δὲ ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ τάγματι· ἀπαρχή...ἔπειτα...εἶτα τὸ τέλος (vv. 23-24). The term τάγμα in classical Greek is used in military sense to denote bodies of troops, while in later Greek its use is more popular: it can be applied to any sort of class or group or is even used in temporal sense of sequence. This term

⁹⁷⁸ Cf. ALETTI, "L'argumentation de Paul", p. 73. There are two ways of expressing the reign, the destruction (negative aspect) of all enemies and subjection (positive aspect) of creation.

apart from this passage is employed nowhere else in the NT and, though it may be viewed as denoting a fixed sequence of events, it more likely retains its basic locative sense as well.⁹⁷⁹ The first in this order ('rank') is said to be Christ. In fact, the first event has already occurred, Christ is raised, thus subsequently the second one also must take place later *ἔπειτα*... ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ αὐτοῦ. The repetition of the term ἀπαρχή (v. 23) reveals both chronological priority⁹⁸⁰ and christological orientation: the second in this order will be οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ.⁹⁸¹ The parallel passage⁹⁸² however shows that *ἔπειτα* standing in enumeration can be understood in a simple sequential sense and does not necessarily point to strict chronology, rather it links these events.⁹⁸³ Nevertheless, in our case *ἔπειτα* retains the chronological significance because of its relation to the future παρουσία. The fact that τάγμα is linked to the ambiguous expression *ἔπειτα* ...εἶτα τὸ τέλος (the latter term is usually translated as 'the end'⁹⁸⁴) opens the way to speculations about several presumable orders of the final events. The ambiguity of the phrase raises questions concerning the nature and duration of Christ's kingdom and the possibility of two resurrections. The answer depends on *how* εἶτα in connection with τέλος is understood: whether it refers to a chronological order of events or it merely denotes logical sequence. If the former, it implies time span between the Parousia and the end, if the latter, it points to a merely logical aspect of the same event. Some scholars propose chronological order: there is time span between the Parousia and the end. Thus this period of undetermined duration is marked by the active reign of Christ, who destroys all his enemies and subjects, everybody and everything to him, and only then he will deliver the kingdom to God the Father.⁹⁸⁵ Other commentators reject (with some variations) such possibility and observe the Parousia and the end as more or less simultaneous events. The active reign of Christ, according to them, has already begun with his resurrection and exaltation.⁹⁸⁶ For the logical sense of εἶτα many other commentators affirm that

⁹⁷⁹ Cf. BARRETT, *The First Epistle*, p. 354; FEE, *First Epistle*, p. 753, note 32; BARBAGLIO, *La Prima Lettera*, p. 825, note 139.

⁹⁸⁰ Cf. HILL, "Christ's Kingdom", p. 307.

⁹⁸¹ Cf. CONZELMANN, *1 Corinthians*, p. 270. Apart from temporal priority and causal connection, implied by the term ἀπαρχή, Conzelmann also mentions an 'inherent precedence' of this word which means 'the first in honor'.

⁹⁸² 1 Thes 4:16-17: καὶ οἱ νεκροὶ ἐν Χριστῷ ἀναστήσονται πρῶτον, ἔπειτα ἡμεῖς... ἅμα σὺν αὐτοῖς ἀρπαγρῶμεθα ἐν νεφέλαις.

⁹⁸³ Hill maintains that both *ἔπειτα*... εἶτα are merely sequential and mark sequences of thought or events, and not necessary periods of time. Thus, according to him, Paul hardly had in mind that the *Zwischenreich* takes place between the coming of Christ and the τέλος, even if the latter is understood as 'rest'; cf. HILL, "Christ's Kingdom", p. 308.

⁹⁸⁴ BDAG, p. 998 (2a): "the last part of a process". The basic meaning of this word in the NT, according to Balz, refers to the end of the world. It is noteworthy, that in classical Greek this term points to finality, completion; cf. BALZ, *Exegetical dictionary of the New Testament*, vol.3, pp. 347-348.

⁹⁸⁵ Cf. WENDLAND, *Le Lettere ai Corinti*, pp. 277-278; BRUCE, *1 and 2 Corinthians*, p. 147; WALLIS, "The Problem of an Intermediate Kingdom", pp. 230-232, 242; L. J. KREITZER, *Jesus and God in Paul's Eschatology*, *Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series* 19, Sheffield 1987, pp. 138-139, 145, 147, 155, 163.

⁹⁸⁶ Cf. BARRETT, *The First Epistle*, p. 356; CONZELMANN, *1 Corinthians*, pp. 270-271; VORSTER, "Resurrection Faith", p. 302; CARREZ, "Résurrection et seigneurie du Christ", pp. 130-132; HILL, "Christ's Kingdom", p. 310.

there are only two *τάγματα* and thereby only two resurrections. Thus the resurrection of the dead designates the point of arrival, the goal, the end which is expressed by victory over the last enemy death, and the deliverance of the kingdom to God the Father.⁹⁸⁷ The simple translation of *τέλος* as the ‘end’⁹⁸⁸ does not reflect its full meaning, because, apart from its reference to the end of history, it also contains some purposeful force, which allows one to perceive the dynamics of the reality of Christ’s resurrection that tends to be fully realized. Therefore, on the one hand, it certainly describes the end of history, and on the other hand, it points to the completion of Christ’s salvific work as well.⁹⁸⁹

4.2.5.2.3. The Destruction of All Hostile Powers

Deliverance of the kingdom to God the Father will not take place until all hostile powers *πάσαν ἀρχὴν καὶ πᾶσαν ἐξουσίαν καὶ δύναμιν* are brought to the end (*καταργήσῃ* – destroyed).

This is the first time Paul uses this terminology to designate these spiritual rules, authorities, and powers. Similar descriptions of these hostile powers are also found in other places of the Pauline corpus.⁹⁹⁰ These terms in themselves can be observed as neutral and it is difficult to distinguish the shades among them, but when used in conjunction with one another, they clearly refer to malevolent evil spirits or powers.⁹⁹¹ It is suggested that these powers possess a cosmic dimension: their empires are among the heavenly hosts and they control the lives of individuals, as well as the whole course of the universe.⁹⁹² They can be seen as an

⁹⁸⁷ For example, cf. SENFT, *La première épître de saint-Paul aux Corinthiens*, p. 199; WOLFF, *Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther. Zweiter Teil: Auslegung der Kapitel 8 - 16*, p. 181; FEE, *First Epistle*, pp. 753-7544; BARBAGLIO, *La Prima Lettera*, p. 825; LINDEMANN, *Der erste Korintherbrief*, p. 346; SCHRAGE, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*, Teilbd. 4, p. 171; J. PLEVNIK, *Paul and the Parousia: An Exegetical and Theological Investigation*, Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 1997, pp. 127-128.

⁹⁸⁸ The term *τέλος* in the NT is used 37 times in various ways. Paul used it in the sense of *reverence* due to someone Rom 13:7; in the sense of *goal or destiny* Rom 6:21-22 (the *τέλος* of sin is death, eternal life the *τέλος* of sanctification); 2 Cor 11:15 (*τέλος* of false apostles will correspond to their deeds); Phil 3:19 (their *τέλος* is destruction); in the sense of *fulfilment* Rom 10:4 (*τέλος γὰρ νόμου Χριστός*); in *adverbial* position 1Thes 2:16 (but God’s wrath has come upon them *εἰς τέλος*); 2 Cor 1:13 (I hope that you *ὥς τέλους* will understand).

⁹⁸⁹ The translation of Senft and Carrez seems to be more appropriate: ‘achevèment’; cf. SENFT, *La première épître de saint-Paul aux Corinthiens*, p. 198; M. CARREZ, “Résurrection et seigneurie du Christ: 1 Co 15, 23-28”, in De Lorenzi, a cura di, *Résurrection*, pp. 127-140. Fee also insists on the purposive character (the goal to be achieved) of this term; cf. FEE, *First Epistle*, p. 754, note 39.

⁹⁹⁰ See Rom 8:38; Col 1:16; 2, 10; Eph 1:21; 3:10; 6:12.

⁹⁹¹ Cf. FEE, *First Epistle*, p. 754, note 41; BARRETT, *The First Epistle*, pp. 357-358. While Barrett thinks that Paul uses an apocalyptic scheme, where God is understood as rightful king of the universe, and therefore the reconquest of it from the evil powers must be accomplished by Christ, Fee, on the contrary, downplays the apocalyptic nature of the whole passage (p. 752, note 30).

⁹⁹² Cf. G. H. C. MACGREGOR, “Principalities and Powers: The Cosmic Background of Paul’s Thought”, *New Testament Studies* 1(1954), p. 19; J. Y. LEE, “Interpreting the Demonic Powers in Pauline Thought”, *Novum Testamentum* 12 (1970), pp. 54-55; M. BLACK, “Πᾶσαι ἐξουσίαι αὐτῷ ὑποταγῆσονται”, in *Paul and Paulinism. Essays in honour of C. K. Barrett / M. D. Hooker and S. G. Wilson*, ed./, London 1982, p. 76. Macgregor points out that for Paul these demonic intelligences are much more than the ‘devils’ of the Gospels interfering in human affairs. Lee, on the contrary, holds that the cosmic powers in Pauline thought and the demons in the Gospel

assembly of cosmic forces which thwart God's plan of salvation as well as the authority and rule of Christ.⁹⁹³ For better perception of these conceptions in Pauline thought, several attempts have been made to look for their existence both in the Jewish and Hellenistic religious and philosophical milieus.

Conzelmann states that demonology in the apocalyptic picture of the world, has a standard position and ascribes these evil powers to Jewish demonology. In his opinion, Paul has no concern or interest in differentiating the classes of these spirits. He holds that Paul used these descriptions in a non-mythological sense, because they are combined with existential concepts.⁹⁹⁴

The Hellenistic philosophical background and its religious ideas, especially Gnostic astral religious beliefs according to Macgregor and Lee, are of great importance in Paul's thought. Both authors argue that apart from this passage, there are another astrological terms, used in Pauline and deutero-Pauline letters, in particular κοσμοκράτορες and στοιχεῖα (the first term is employed in Eph 6:12 and the second in Gal 4:3.9; Col 2:8.20). The first term is used in the Hellenistic mystical writings. It also occurs in Gnostic writings and even in rabbinical literature and denotes the seven planets as astral deities, determining the human fate. The second term describes the elements, constituting the physical world (each one of them has its god) and thereby is used to denote these elemental deities and spirits, which enslave man, but which in Paul's language are *weak and beggarly* (Gal 4:9). Though Macgregor denies the possibility that Paul could believe that human fate is dependent on these astral deities, he admits that it certainly was an experience of new pagan converts. In our case and in similar passages, Paul admits the existence of these astral forces, but denies their divinity and holds them in virtue of Christ's death and resurrection, as already rendered powerless but not yet utterly destroyed. The believers are freed from the slavery to weak, elemental forces but the final cosmic victory will be achieved only at the time of the Parousia.⁹⁹⁵

narratives can be equated, though ought to be used in a different context. Black adds that the designation of the terms as 'cosmic' does not necessarily exclude the 'powers' of earthly kingdoms.

⁹⁹³ Cf. SENFT, *La première épître de saint-Paul aux Corinthiens*, p. 199; CARREZ, "Résurrection et seigneurie du Christ", p. 132; BARBAGLIO, *La Prima Lettera*, p. 827.

⁹⁹⁴ Cf. CONZELMANN, *1 Corinthians*, p. 272, note 85. As an example he points to Rom 8:38. In this passage (vv. 38-39 constitute one verse), however, other scholars find not only existential concepts but also technical astrological terms to describe the ascension and declination of heavenly bodies - ὕψωμα and βάθος (v. 39). Another two terms in v. 38 - ἐνεστώτα (things present) and μέλλοντα (things to come) also can be understood as a reference to the present and future position of a star; cf. MACGREGOR, "Principalities and Powers", p. 23; LEE, "Interpreting the Demonic Powers", pp. 62-63.

⁹⁹⁵ Cf. MACGREGOR, "Principalities and Powers", pp. 20-24; LEE, "Interpreting the Demonic Powers", pp. 60-62. Lee compares Paul's use of the terms στοιχεῖα and νόμος (Gal 2:19 with Col 2:20; Gal 3:23 with Gal 4:3; Rom 8:3 with Gal 4:9) and suggests that for Paul to live under the law is the same as to be enslaved by the elemental spirits of the universe.

Lee also investigates the cosmic powers from the Jewish apocalyptic background and states that dualism between the present age and the age to come (1 Cor 2:6.8; Eph 1:21; Gal 6:15; 2 Cor 5:17) alludes to the Jewish apocalyptic world view. The concept of cosmic dualism in Israel became pessimistic due to the Babylonian and Persian influence and the Jewish hope for deliverance from the futility of this world, consisted in the expectation of the transformation of the whole cosmos into the kingdom of God.⁹⁹⁶ It may be that Paul, describing evil powers such as *angelos*, *dynamis*, *exousia*, was acquainted with this dualistic apocalyptic background and, by employing such terminology, stressed the deliverance of Christians from these powers of the present age.⁹⁹⁷

Black observes that in the Qumran community a similar angelology was highly developed, but despite the general cosmic character, it has no common elements with the abstract Pauline terminology.⁹⁹⁸ He states that Paul and Peter certainly did not invent these terms but took them from an already existing tradition. In three passages (1 Cor 15:24-27; Eph 1:20-21; 1 Pet 3:22) and Ps 110:1 there is a common element: all three associate Christ's ascension and sitting at God's right hand, and his victory over his enemies with the destruction or subjection of angelic powers, which function as man's archenemies. Moreover, these passages are based on combination of Ps 110:1 and Dan 7:26-27. In our case τέλος and the destruction of the fourth kingdom in Daniel was developed by Christians and interpreted as the destruction of every kind of rule, authority and power.⁹⁹⁹

These observations of the background of Paul's terminology make clear that the apostle probably used material both known to him as well as to the Christian community. Paul acted in this way in order to assure them that the inevitable victory of Christ's death and resurrection has the cosmic consequences. Together with the death and resurrection of Christ, every belief in human dependence on spiritual authorities and powers, be it of the Jewish or Hellenistic origin, as ruling and determining man's fate became senseless. As a matter of fact, the battle is already won, the sovereignty of Christ over all is actual and dynamic - the final destruction of these powers is in process.

The word Paul employs here (καταργέω) is usually translated as 'destroy'.¹⁰⁰⁰ This is a Pauline word and always (one exception 1 Cor 13:11) has as subject God or Christ.¹⁰⁰¹ Because

⁹⁹⁶ The allusions to a new world or new aeon are clear in 1 Enoch; 4 Ezra 7:11-14, 51.

⁹⁹⁷ Cf. LEE, "Interpreting the Demonic Powers", pp. 56-58.

⁹⁹⁸ Cf. BLACK, "Πᾶσαι ἐξουσίαι αὐτῷ ὑποταγῆσονται", p. 78.

⁹⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 74-75.

¹⁰⁰⁰ This translation is adopted by RSV, NRS, NIV. NAS translates 'abolished'. BDAG p. 525 (3): "to cause something to come to an end or to be no longer in existence."

¹⁰⁰¹ Cf. BALZ, *Exegetical dictionary of the New Testament*, vol.2, p. 267. From 27 occurrences in the NT this word is used 22 times in the Pauline corpus and can mean 'make ineffective', 'destroy', 'annul', 'render powerless'.

of the connection of the verb καταργέω to the cosmic powers, there is some possibility to translate this term in the sense that these powers are to be ‘dethroned’ but not actually annihilated. It is stated in several passages that the very mission of Christ is to reconcile the κόσμον (2 Cor 5:19), therefore this term may imply not only the human world but the whole universe as well.¹⁰⁰² Consequently, Lee suggests that God’s purpose in Christ is not actual destruction but rather the restoration of these cosmic powers into their original nature.¹⁰⁰³ The problem of such translation lies in the fact that the same verb is used in v. 26 in relation to death. The question rises if it is Paul’s intention to say that death will be ‘rendered ineffective’ but not actually destroyed.¹⁰⁰⁴ Or may it be assumed that in the first case (v. 24c) Paul implies not the annihilation of hostile powers but their disarming and in the second case (v. 26) he speaks about the actual destruction of death? In such interpretation one has to allow the possibility that the same word καταργέω in the same passage is employed with double meaning. According to Barrett, Paul has used this word in the sense ‘to rob of efficacy’ and so makes the allusion that death, even after its destruction, continues to exist as an instrument of punishment in the hand of God.¹⁰⁰⁵ Barbaglio opts for the middle way: he suggests that the annihilation should be understood as not referring to cosmic powers, but to their negative influence on history (v. 24), while death is better understood as annihilated (v. 26).¹⁰⁰⁶ Yet, there are also good arguments to see this second ὅταν (when) clause as referring also to the defeat of death (v. 26), and thus to understand the rulers, authorities and powers (v. 24) as reflecting the reality of this final enemy.¹⁰⁰⁷ Conzelmann insists on the restoration of the fallen angels is out of the question. Paul thought about the real removal of the enemies, therefore, the ‘subjection’ (vv. 25.27) should be understood as nothing but annihilation.¹⁰⁰⁸ Notably, that elsewhere in this letter this word is employed in the passages which deal with the realities that are ‘made ineffective’ *eschatologically* and belong to the age, which is passing away.¹⁰⁰⁹ Therefore, it may be that καταργέω (v. 24) implicate the sense of ‘destruction’ thus preparing way for its further use (v. 26).¹⁰¹⁰ However, the tension in this and the following verses remains because Paul never speaks

¹⁰⁰² The idea about reconciliation and gathering up all things whether on earth or in heaven through Christ and in Christ is presented in Col 1:20 and Eph 1:10.

¹⁰⁰³ Cf. LEE, “Interpreting the Demonic Powers”, pp. 66-67.

¹⁰⁰⁴ It would be a contradiction: if death is not destroyed, then it still exists - men must die. Additionally, death and sin are interwoven (1 Cor 15:56; Rom 5:12).

¹⁰⁰⁵ Cf. BARRETT, *The First Epistle*, p. 358.

¹⁰⁰⁶ Cf. BARBAGLIO, *La Prima Lettera*, pp. 826, 829, note 154.

¹⁰⁰⁷ Cf. FEE, *First Epistle*, p. 754. He holds that the subsequent argument from Scripture makes it clear.

¹⁰⁰⁸ Cf. CONZELMANN, *1 Corinthians*, p. 271, note 80.

¹⁰⁰⁹ 1 Cor 1:28 (ἵνα τὰ ὄντα καταργήσῃ); 2:6 (τῶν ἀρχόντων τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου τῶν καταργουμένων); 13:8 (contrary to love προφητεῖαι καταργηθήσονται, γνώσις καταργηθήσεται); 13:10 (τὸ ἐκ μέρους καταργηθήσεται); 13:11 (Paul about himself - κατήργηκα τὰ τοῦ νηπίου).

¹⁰¹⁰ Cf. de BOER, *The Defeat of Death*, p. 121.

about the ‘destruction’ of cosmic powers. Rather he does speak of their subjection.¹⁰¹¹ Moreover, it is stated that *in him [Christ] all things were created...* εἴτε θρόνοι εἴτε κυριότητες εἴτε ἀρχαὶ εἴτε ἐξουσίαι all things have been created δι’ αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν’ (Col 1:16). It may be that the traditional motif of subjection of all powers to Christ, in our case is guided by Paul’s primary interest not merely to assure the certainty of the resurrection of the dead, but to emphasize “the power of Christ’s resurrection”¹⁰¹² and thus is interpreted as their destruction along with the defeat of death which is denoted as the last of them.¹⁰¹³

Because of shortage of a clearly expressed subject for καταργήσῃ some ambiguity remains, concerning who is responsible for the destruction of all hostile powers: God or Christ. It is more probable that Christ is subject because of the parallel double *when*. In the second *when* clause the unexpressed subject of παραδιδῶ (deliver) is clear - Christ. It would be a bit strange to change the subjects in two parallel clauses (if God were considered as subject) without otherwise mentioning it.¹⁰¹⁴ On the contrary, Heil opts for the theocentric explanation of the whole passage. Following the text backwards from the presupposition that vv. 25-28 should be interpreted in a theocentric way, he transfers God as subject to καταργήσῃ in v. 24c.¹⁰¹⁵ This is, however, by no means clear. Even if God as subject in v. 25b were considered for θῆ (put) as he suggests, the double change of subjects in v. 24b, v. 25a (Christ) and v. 24c, v. 25b (God) seems to be unlikely and complicated.¹⁰¹⁶ The natural reading of this part with Christ as subject appears to be more appropriate.

4.2.5.2.4. The Reign of Christ and the Activity of God the Father

The predominant theme which characterizes the reign of Christ in our text is the destruction of all enemies and the subjection of all things. The *end* firstly is characterized as the time *when Christ delivers the kingdom* to God the Father. Paul rarely speaks about the βασιλεία,¹⁰¹⁷ but when he does, it is traditionally called the *kingdom of God*.¹⁰¹⁸ The allusion to the *kingdom of Christ* (v. 24) is unique in Paul’s undisputed letters, but in other two letters the

¹⁰¹¹ See Eph 1:21-22; Col 2:10. In these passages Paul uses the word ὑποτάσσω. The same word is employed in the parallel passages 1 Pet 3:22 and Heb 2:8.

¹⁰¹² PLEVNIK, *Paul and the Parousia*, p. 138.

¹⁰¹³ Cf. SCHMITHALS, “The pre-Pauline Tradition”, p. 373.

¹⁰¹⁴ Cf. LAMBRECHT, *Pauline Studies*, p. 136; FEE, *First Epistle*, p. 754, note 40.

¹⁰¹⁵ Cf. U. HEIL, “Theologische Interpretation von 1Kor 15, 23-28”, *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 84 (1993), p. 34.

¹⁰¹⁶ Cf. HOLLEMAN, *Resurrection and Parousia*, p. 59, note 6.

¹⁰¹⁷ In this letter this word is used another four times apart from our verse but always in relation to God; cf. 4:20 (the kingdom of God is in power); 6:9-10 (twice - unrighteous will not inherit the kingdom of God); 15:50 (flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God).

¹⁰¹⁸ Cf. Gal 5:21; Rom 14:17; 1Thes 2:12; 2Thes 1:5; Col 4:11.

kingdom of Christ is also mentioned (Col 1:13 and Eph 5:5).¹⁰¹⁹ The *meaning* of this kingdom of Christ is explained in the following verses by employing a cognate word βασιλεύειν to describe Christ's actual reigning. Such an interchange of subjects may be understood as a reflection of Paul's christological soteriology, which means that God's authority is manifested in the present lordship of Christ.¹⁰²⁰ The way Paul speaks about the kingdom of God also shows the tension between 'already' and 'not yet'. On the one hand, the apostle describes this kingdom as something to be received in the future (1 Cor 6:9-10; 15:50; Gal 5:21), on the other hand this kingdom is alluded to as already present in the Christian community (1 Cor 4:20; Rom 14:17). This observation leads to the suggestion that if the kingdom of God is already inaugurated by the present lordship of Christ, and at the same time is dynamic within the community of believers¹⁰²¹, it is also on the way to its full realization (futuristic character). Thus Paul may speak about its deliverance to God the Father. The handing over the kingdom by the Son is mentioned only in our passage. The temporary character of Christ's reigning (kingdom) is hardly emphasized by Paul, even though it is vaguely expressed by ἄχρι οὗ (until, v. 25), the apostle rather accentuates the final goal of salvation who is God the Father. Just as all things proceed from the Father through Christ and our existence depends on him (salvation as well), so does this totality tend towards (εἰς) God as its goal (cf. 1 Cor 8:6).¹⁰²² Therefore, it is not necessary to see any sharp contrast between the reign of Christ and that of God. Apparently, Paul does not underline its' separation, but, appealing to (or reworking) Ps 110:1 (LXX 109:1) and Ps 8:7, confirms the completeness of Christ's salvific work.¹⁰²³ Paul carries on his argument to explain *how* it will be that all the enemies of Christ are destroyed, *why* Christ is able to do this and *what means* this total subjection in relation to the *end*.

Christ's active reigning and the subjection of all things to him should be understood as contemporaneous and coextensive, which means that, while Christ reigns, the subjection is also underway. However, the final destruction of the last enemy and the final subjection of all to God lie in the future, at the time of the *end*. Paul's argument is based on his interpretation of two above-mentioned scriptural passages: Ps 110:1 (LXX 109:1) and Ps 8:7.

It is widely accepted that Ps 110 is a pre-exilic psalm composed for a Davidic monarch in Jerusalem. The king, according to this psalm, reigns with the power and authority of YHWH, and is assured that God will defeat his enemies, thereby, pointing out that the authority and

¹⁰¹⁹ Col 1:13 ... εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ Eph 5:5... ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ; cf. 2 Tim 4:1 and 4:18.

¹⁰²⁰ Cf. FEE, *First Epistle*, p. 754, note 42.

¹⁰²¹ Cf. SCHRAGE, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*, Teilbd. 4, p. 175.

¹⁰²² Barrett observes that this does not point to the difference of status but implies different roles and operation ad extra; cf. BARRETT, *The First Epistle*, p. 357.

¹⁰²³ Cf. JANSEN, "1 Cor. 15. 24-28 and the Future of Jesus Christ", p. 545.

power of the king depends on YHWH.¹⁰²⁴ Supposedly, even in pre-Christian times this psalm was regarded as referring to the Messiah, but not of the kind as Jesus turned out to be.¹⁰²⁵ Ps 110 is one of more often cited or alluded text of the NT comparing with any other texts of the OT.¹⁰²⁶ The importance of this psalm, however, depends not only on the registration frequency in the NT, but on the manner it is used as well, because generally it occurs in the passages expressing rich christological sense.¹⁰²⁷ The texts, in which the reference is made to this psalm, show its various functions. Out of all the references to Ps 110:1 in the NT and early Christian literature, 11 times it illustrates the glory or vindication of Jesus, 10 times it serves to support christological titles, and 10 times it describes the subjection of powers to Jesus. This most frequently used passage in early Christian literature is related to the image of someone who is sitting at God's right hand (Ps 110:1b)¹⁰²⁸, and often only this part of the verse is cited or alluded to.¹⁰²⁹ The citation of both parts of this psalm in the NT occurs as well¹⁰³⁰, and though in our passage only the second part is alluded to, the first part may also be implied by Paul because of its immediate connection to the reigning of Christ - *δεῖ γὰρ αὐτὸν βασιλεῦειν*.¹⁰³¹ In its christological use in the NT, in most cases this psalm refers to Christ's *present* heavenly exaltation at the right hand of God in virtue of his resurrection and ascension. There is some supposition that though only v. 1 is alluded, the context of the whole psalm is intended. Though Callan believes that Ps 110:1 refers to the idea that Christ will assume the full sovereignty only in the future, at the time of the final judgment (be it the case of the combination of Ps 110:1 with Dan 7:13 as in Mark 14:62; or the allusion to Ps 110:1 alone),¹⁰³² nevertheless Hill points out that this psalm was also used in polemical situations with the Jews (for instance in Mark, Matthew, Acts), since in these cases the examination of the context would have been indispensable. The multiple citations of v. 4 in Hebrews suggest that christological reflections on the psalm were not necessarily confined only to v. 1. He holds that though the citation of v. 2 - *κατακυρίεψε ἐν μέσῳ τῶν ἐχθρῶν σου* is absent from the NT, it may well have been assumed and read in conjunction with v. 1, implying the regal power exercised *before* the final defeat of

¹⁰²⁴ Cf. D. M. HAY, *Glory at the Right Hand*, Psalm 110 in Early Christianity, SBL Monograph Series 18, Nashville 1973, pp. 19-20. On the allusions to this psalm in Jewish literature of the intertestamental and early Christian periods see pp. 22-27.

¹⁰²⁵ Cf. T. CALLAN, "Psalm 110. 1 and the Origin of the Expectation That Jesus Will Come Again", *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 44 (1982), p. 625.

¹⁰²⁶ There are 33 quotations or allusions in the NT and 7 in other Christian writings before the middle of second century; cf. HAY, *Glory at the Right Hand*, p. 15; CALLAN, "Psalm 110. 1 and the Origin of the Expectation That Jesus Will Come Again", p. 625.

¹⁰²⁷ Cf. KREITZER, *Jesus and God in Paul's Eschatology*, p. 146.

¹⁰²⁸ Cf. HAY, *Glory at the Right Hand*, pp. 45-46.

¹⁰²⁹ Cf. Rom 8:34; Col 3:1; Eph 1:20; 1 Pet 3:22; Heb 1:3; 8:1; Mark 14:62; 16:19; Luke 22:69; Acts 2:33.

¹⁰³⁰ Cf. Matt 22:44; Mark 12:36; Luke 20:42-43; Acts 2:34-35; Heb 1:13; 10:12-13.

¹⁰³¹ Cf. de BOER, *The Defeat of Death*, p. 117.

¹⁰³² Cf. CALLAN, "Psalm 110. 1 and the Origin of the Expectation That Jesus Will Come Again", pp. 628-633.

the enemies. According to him the resonances of v. 2 could be picked up in the idea of our passage that Christ must rule for the course of time before he definitely destroys all enemies.¹⁰³³

In our passage this psalm is combined with another one, namely Ps 8:7. It seems that such association of scriptural passages was done according to the methods of rabbinical exegesis, because here, according to the sixth rule of Hillel's system, the *analogy* is employed. This indicates that this passage of the OT is explained by means of another in which analogous traits can be found.¹⁰³⁴ Such a combination of Ps 110:1 and Ps 8:4-6 is also found in Eph 1:20 – 2:10; 1 Pet 3:21-22; Heb 1 and 2; Phil 3:20-21; Rom 8:34ff. The very accent in such association is put on the glorified Christ's present status or on his lordly function. Such an association of these two psalms expressing the present elevated position of Christ is rooted in the faith, which is represented in the NT and was kept up at least to the second century.¹⁰³⁵ It is significant that Ps 8:7b (it is cited in v. 27a) also occurs in the christological context in Heb 2:8; Eph 1:22 and 1 Pet 3:21b-22 (may be alluded). Thus these psalms were evidently used in the early church as christological proof texts. In all these three passages the common element is the connection of Ps 110:1 and Ps 8:7b with the exaltation of Christ over principalities, powers, or angels. Another similarity with our passage consists of the mention of Christ's resurrection both in Eph 1:20-23 and 1 Pet 3:21b-22.¹⁰³⁶ The parallel line of thought also can be seen in Heb 10:12-13. It seems that the author of Hebrews also implies that the subjugation of the enemies has already begun, because after the self-sacrifice of Jesus and his enthronement at God's right hand, Christ *since then has been waiting until his enemies would be made a footstool for his feet*. The similar combination of Ps 110:1 (Heb 1:13) and Ps 8:7 (Heb 2:8 ff.) shows that both Paul and the author of Hebrews emphasize the total subjugation of all enemies.¹⁰³⁷

Such a textual convergence points to the possibility that Paul was working on the already traditional platform, presumably familiar to his readers,¹⁰³⁸ though modifying it according to his particular purpose.

¹⁰³³ Cf. HILL, "Christ's Kingdom", pp. 315-317.

¹⁰³⁴ Cf. D. COHN-SHERBOK, "Paul and Rabbinic Exegesis", *Scottish Journal of Theology* 35 (1982), p. 128. Barrett also thinks that in our case Paul's allusion to Ps 110, 1 leads him "(by the exegetical device *gezerah shawah*) to a similarly worded passage in Ps. viii. 7"; BARRETT, *The First Epistle*, p. 358.

¹⁰³⁵ Cf. HILL, "Christ's Kingdom", p. 313.

¹⁰³⁶ Cf. de BOER, *The Defeat of Death*, p. 117.

¹⁰³⁷ Cf. HOLLEMAN, *Resurrection and Parousia*, p. 64.

¹⁰³⁸ Cf. SCHMITHALS, "The pre-Pauline Tradition", pp. 371-378; de BOER, *The Defeat of Death*, pp. 118-119. Both authors try to reconstruct the tradition, which could lie beyond Paul's message (especially Schmithals). It is interesting, while de Boer claims that Paul rather than citing the OT refers to communal traditions, and v. 27a is taken from the christological creed or hymn (p. 118), Schmithals, on the contrary, insists on Paul's authentic use of v. 27a, that is, this verse comes from Paul's hands (p. 376).

In vv. 25-26 Paul explains what he intended by his statement in v. 24 about the kingdom of Christ and the destruction of all hostile powers. Though v. 26 is not introduced by any conjunction, nevertheless, it is in close connection with v. 25 and provides an answer to v. 24.

It was stated above that there is a probability of Paul's use and modification of traditional material. Nonetheless it well may be that Paul paraphrased the Scripture freely¹⁰³⁹ by changing and employing additional words and thus doing his own exegesis – *midrash as paraphrase*.¹⁰⁴⁰ At any rate it is obvious that in using traditional material he paraphrased but not actually cited the original text (presumably LXX) to express his own ideas.

It is obvious that Paul departs from the version of LXX on several important points. First of all, the first part of v. 1 in LXX is not mentioned but reinterpreted by Paul: there is no longer the direct discourse (κάθου, imperative), but an allusion to the psalm is introduced by γὰρ. Thus instead of passive sitting at the right hand of God, the kingdom of Christ mentioned in v. 24b in this verse is presented as active reigning which must continue (necessity) thanks to two active verbs in the present δεῖ and βασιλεύειν. The term δεῖ has various aspects but in LXX, Josephus, and the NT it is generally related to the personal will of God and points to the decree or plan of God. In the apocalyptic perspective, this word implies an apocalyptic order,¹⁰⁴¹ but more probably it points to God's plan and purposes as they are manifested in Scripture, though not necessarily in relation to their exact fulfillment. One must remember that Paul's argument deals primarily with the resurrection of the dead and thus with the final defeat of death. The *necessary* reigning of Christ, which began with his resurrection, *must* achieve its very peak – destruction of death.¹⁰⁴² After having stated that Christ *must* continue to reign, Paul specifies this active role by ἄχρι οὗ θῆ. This conjunction with the aorist can be translated as “until the time when”,¹⁰⁴³ and shows another reworking of the text of LXX. While the original text has ἕως ἄν (until) and points to the final victory, the ultimate goal of God's activity, this change in our text probably refers to the temporary limitation of Christ's rule.¹⁰⁴⁴ The addition of πάντας in Paul's allusion to Ps 110:1 is probably influenced by the use of Ps 8:7 (v. 27a) and is based on the supposition that

¹⁰³⁹ Cf. HAY, *Glory at the Right Hand*, p. 36. In early Christianity it was acceptable to paraphrase the scriptural passages according to one's own purposes.

¹⁰⁴⁰ This type of Midrash-exegesis admits a loose use of the original text; cf. J. NEUSNER, *What is Midrash?*, Philadelphia 1987, p. 7.

¹⁰⁴¹ Conzelmann thinks that here Paul makes allusion to it; cf. CONZELMANN, *I Corinthians*, p. 272.

¹⁰⁴² Lambrecht follows the thought of Weiss that Christ must reign because it is revealed by God in Scripture; LAMBRECHT, *Pauline Studies*, p. 132. In a similar way Barbaglio suggests that Paul 'ex Sacra Scriptura' proves that Christ's reigning is the part of God's plan prophesied in Ps 110:1; cf. BARBAGLIO, *La Prima Lettera*, p. 827. But it seems unnecessary to disconnect the reigning of Christ from the theme of the entire section. In Paul's argumentation, Christ is not presented as ruling abstractly, but he must reign for some *purpose*.

¹⁰⁴³ BALZ, *Exegetical dictionary of the New Testament*, vol. 1, p. 19.

¹⁰⁴⁴ Cf. CONZELMANN, *I Corinthians*, p. 272, note 92; LAMBRECHT, *Pauline Studies*, p. 132.

these two psalm texts interpret each other.¹⁰⁴⁵ Moreover, it is a probability that Paul modified his text because these two psalm verses are observed as paired prophecies.¹⁰⁴⁶ At any rate, Paul's version of these two psalm verses has much in common: both v. 25 and v. 27a are introduced by γὰρ instead of direct discourse; there is a change of grammatical persons: the first person of θὼ is changed into the third one θῆ and instead of the second person ὑπέταξας Paul again uses the third ὑπέταξεν. This change of persons creates some exegetical problems because it is not clear *who* was intended by Paul to be the subject of θῆ and ὑπέταξεν. In order to understand the relation of the reigning of Christ to the destruction of death, the first difficulty to be resolved is the identification of the subject of θῆ¹⁰⁴⁷ in v. 25. It seems to be the major change in Paul's version of this verse. This change acquires greater importance because nowhere in more or less parallel passages in which Ps 110:1 is alluded can we find such a grammatical change.¹⁰⁴⁸ It seems that Paul had something in mind consciously changing the grammatical persons of this term.

First of all, it should be noted that a consensus on this matter among scholars has not been achieved. There are good arguments for either possibility.

Those who believe that God should be the subject of θῆ put forward the following arguments: it is clear that in the psalm God is the subject who puts all things under the feet of his Messiah; in v. 28 it is clearly stated that God is the subject, likewise in Ps 8:7 who has subjugated all things to Christ;¹⁰⁴⁹ Paul harmonized Ps 110:1 and 8:7 ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ (in both), therefore, it is impossible that on the one hand the subject would be Christ and on the other God (in v. 27a);¹⁰⁵⁰ apart from these arguments psalm 110:1 in primitive Christianity, though oriented christologically, was understood with God as the subject. The Pauline tradition in Eph 1:20-22 also combines Ps 110:1 and Ps 8:7 with God as the subject.¹⁰⁵¹

Those who defend a christocentric explanation of this verse, point out that grammar itself is in favor of such an interpretation and the reader does not expect that Christ, who was subject of βασιλεῦεν in the same sentence, could be substituted by God without any warning.

¹⁰⁴⁵ Cf. HAY, *Glory at the Right Hand*, p. 37.

¹⁰⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 36-37.

¹⁰⁴⁷ In LXX this term more than in a quarter of occurrences has God as subject; cf. BALZ, *Exegetical dictionary of the New Testament*, vol. 3, p. 356.

¹⁰⁴⁸ Apart from our passage, there is only one passage in the NT, where this aorist in subjunctive of τίθημι is employed - John 15:13.

¹⁰⁴⁹ These are the main points which Fee considers most accented by those, who take God as subject; cf. FEE, *First Epistle*, p. 755.

¹⁰⁵⁰ This is the opinion of Maier presented in LAMBRECHT, *Pauline Studies*, p. 136.

¹⁰⁵¹ Cf. HEIL, "Theologische Interpretation von 1Kor 15, 23-28", p. 31. The theocentric explanation of this verse is also postulated by BRUCE, *1 and 2 Corinthians*, p. 147; BARRETT, *The First Epistle*, p. 358; de BOER, *The Defeat of Death*, p. 117; WALLIS, "The Problem of an Intermediate Kingdom", p. 236; HOLLEMAN, *Resurrection and Parousia*, p. 59.

The text of Ps 110:1 is not cited but reworked (especially $\theta\omega-\theta\eta$), therefore, Paul using Scripture could intend to express his own ideas. This verse not only explains ($\gamma\alpha\rho$) preceding the v. 24, but in some sense is already paraphrased in v. 24c where the subject is Christ. The subject of $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ is also Christ because from the entire argument (v. 27 τοῦ ὑποτάξαντος αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα and v. 28 ὑποταγέσεται τῷ ὑποτάξαντι αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα) emerges that $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ refers to Christ.¹⁰⁵²

Taking these considerations into account it may be said that a christocentric interpretation of this verse may still hold valid. First of all, Ps 110:1 and Ps 8:7 have undergone *unequal* elaboration: Ps 8:7 is closer to Paul's version than Ps 110:1 and the identical reworking or adopting of the final part of these two verses ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ cannot be a decisive argument for identical subjects. If Paul adopted and adapted the common tradition of primitive Christianity, the fact that in Ps 110:1 the grammatical person is changed from the first to the third one is *unique* and very strange.¹⁰⁵³ The grammatical structure of this sentence, pointing to Christ as the subject, cannot be overlooked.

With Christ as the subject his reigning is characterized as the replacement of all enemies under his feet, that is, while Christ rules, he himself is an active protagonist. To begin with v. 24c the active role and at the same time the task of Christ is well defined: he destroys all hostile powers which in vv. 25-26 are described as enemies and death. Though the replacement of all enemies under his feet *per se* does not point to their destruction (Paul deals with scriptural passages or with material based on them), the entire section vv. 24-26, nevertheless seems to reflect his intention:

v. 24 καταργήση → v. 26 ἐχθρὸς + καταργεῖται ← v. 25 ἐχθρὸς

The convergence of these two terms καταργήση and ἐχθρὸς in v. 26 clearly shows the climax – the defeat of death. Thereby death is personified. According to de Boer Paul clarifies to the Corinthians that: death along with principalities, authorities, and powers known to them should be in the same list; because death is in the list, it is an enemy as other powers. So by the reigning of Christ death, it is to be destroyed along with other powers, principalities and authorities. This description of death as a cosmic inimical power, which must be destroyed by Christ's reigning, represents the crucial modification of a common christological tradition which

¹⁰⁵² Cf. LAMBRECHT, *Pauline Studies*, p. 137. As concerns the use of $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ instead of $\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\upsilon$ Lambrecht points out that it can be explained as a loose Hellenistic Greek; also cf. CONZELMANN, *1 Corinthians*, p. 273; FEE, *First Epistle*, p. 755; HÉRING, *The First Epistle of Saint Paul*, p. 168; ORR, *1 Corinthians*, p. 333; CARREZ, "Résurrection et seigneurie du Christ", p. 134; ALETTI, "L'argumentation de Paul", p. 73; BARBAGLIO, *La Prima Lettera*, p. 828. These scholars also opt for Christ as subject.

¹⁰⁵³ As Schmithals points out, the temporal limitation of Christ's reigning and the change of subject from God to Christ marks the "new beginning within the tradition". SCHMITHALS, "The pre-Pauline Tradition", p. 376.

was familiar to the Corinthians.¹⁰⁵⁴ Death is not only designated as an enemy, but it is to be destroyed ‘as the last enemy’, therefore, the enemy par excellence, because in it is concentrated the totality of enmity to God and man. Death is primarily an adversary of God, because its κέντρον is ἁμαρτία (v. 56) which is incompatible with and opposed to God. Death is also a historical power and its realm expands over the whole existence of man. The victory over death does not consist in the fact that man could escape the power of death, but in its very defeat¹⁰⁵⁵. The fact that the defeat of death is the main claim of Paul’s argumentation appears evident from his use of scriptural passages. Not only does the position of v. 26 between two scriptural texts highlight the importance of this verse, but also the addition of πάντας to Ps 110:1 in v. 25 making a correspondence with πάντα in v. 27a. In fact, the entire inclusiveness of Christ’s reigning was already foreseen in v. 24c with double πᾶσαν and emphasized with πάντας in v. 25. On the other hand, πάντα...ὑπέταξεν in v. 27a shows that nothing is outside the saving power of Christ, even the destruction of death cannot be excepted.¹⁰⁵⁶ The grammar of v. 26 which describes the destruction of death is somewhat puzzling; καταργεῖται is in the present-passive. This fact can be understood as Paul’s looking at the process as a whole,¹⁰⁵⁷ and as assurance that the defeat of death is *certain* and has already begun.¹⁰⁵⁸ The fact that the same word is used in v. 24c in relation to the destruction of hostile powers (καταργήσῃ) admits that Christ is also “thought of as the *agens* of the passive in v. 26”.¹⁰⁵⁹ The resurrection of Christ has already marked death’s destruction, but here Paul is concerned with the final victory over death, which will take place at the End-time, when Christ comes again and the dead rise to life¹⁰⁶⁰. This is the main focus of Christ’s reigning, because it is not complete until death is overcome; everything is still in process and God’s salvific plan is not fully realized yet. The *necessary* resurrection of the dead, therefore, shows the final stage of Christ’s temporal rule and the fulfillment of his work: he *can* hand over the kingdom to God.

The vv. 27-28 beginning with the paraphrase of Ps 8:7b are introduced by another γὰρ thereby pointing to a continued explanation. As in the case of v. 25 the problem consists in the

¹⁰⁵⁴ Cf. de BOER, *The Defeat of Death*, p. 121. He finds an interesting parallel to underline the importance of death’s defeat in this passage, namely 1 Cor 15:5-8. In the enumeration of Jesus’ appearances to the disciples there is some order: to Peter, εἶτα to Twelve, ζῆντα... ζῆντα... εἶτα... ἔσχατον to Paul. Similarly, in our section vv. 23-26 - ζῆντα... εἶτα... ἔσχατος death. He holds that just as the appearance to Paul marks the conclusion of the series of appearances of Christ, so also the destruction of death marks the conclusion of the whole process (p. 125).

¹⁰⁵⁵ Cf. CONZELMANN, p. 1 *Corinthians*, 274.

¹⁰⁵⁶ Cf. SCHMITHALS, “The pre-Pauline Tradition”, p. 376; BARBAGLIO, *La Prima Lettera*, p. 830.

¹⁰⁵⁷ Cf. BARRETT, *The First Epistle*, p. 358.

¹⁰⁵⁸ Cf. de BOER, *The Defeat of Death*, p. 122. It is interesting that the same word (as participle) is employed in the same letter 2:6 καταργουμένων (present passive) in relation to the σοφίαν and to ἀρχόντων of this age.

¹⁰⁵⁹ LAMBRECHT, *Pauline Studies*, p. 139. For another view (divine passive) see HEIL, “Theologische Interpretation von 1Kor 15, 23-28”, pp. 32-33.

¹⁰⁶⁰ The destruction of death is concomitant with the final destruction of hostile powers (v. 24c); cf. CARREZ, “Résurrection et seigneurie du Christ”, p. 135.

lack of clearly expressed subjects. The main point of scholarly dispute is v.27a in which the subject of ὑπέταξας in Ps 8:7b (LXX) is God. The diversity of translations reflect the existence various possible interpretations: ‘God has put’ (RSV, NRSV), ‘He has put’ (NAS, NIV). Those scholars who consider that in v. 25 the subject of θῆ is God, in this case naturally choose God,¹⁰⁶¹ and similarly many of those who see in v. 25 the subject to be Christ defend that position as well.¹⁰⁶²

Lambrecht strongly defends the Christocentric interpretation and, by subtle analysis of the verb tenses, tries to prove that Christ as the subject must be understood in v. 27a ‘Christ ὑπέταξεν...under His own feet’ and in v. 27b ‘when Christ εἴπη (shall have said - subjunctive aorist which possesses a futurum exactum meaning) all things are subjected to me’.¹⁰⁶³

According to Aletti’s opinion the whole passage vv. 24c-28a reflects the two aspects of Christ’s kingdom - destruction of all enemies vv. 24c-26 and subjection of all creation to Christ vv. 27-28a. The parallel between v. 25 and v. 27a seems to require that Christ must be understood as the subject in v. 27a, but because in v. 27c and v. 28b the subject is God, the interpretation in v. 27a remains somewhat ambiguous. Such uncertainty, however, does not change the point of the passage in his opinion.¹⁰⁶⁴

Analyzing the possible solutions Fee lays down arguments for both positions of interpretation. In favor of Christ as the subject he points out (including the argument of Lambrecht) that it would be the natural flow of thought (vv. 24-26). The past tense of ὑπέταξεν (v. 27a) in this case is explained by εἴπη (v. 27b with future meaning) and refers only to the eschaton. The conjunction ὅταν in v. 27b thus agreeing with ὅταν in v. 24 acquires its natural sense in the context. In this case Christ as subject would be read with ὑπέταξεν and εἴπη. The difficulty in this interpretation lies in v. 27c: after Christ’s saying that ‘all things have been subjected to me’ in v. 27b, the expression ‘of course excepting Him who subjected all things to Him’ in v. 27c anticipates v. 28b and thus, according to Fee, is parenthetical and awkward. Taking God as the subject in v. 27a would, with the comment on the psalm, move Paul’s argument onto v. 28 which explains that the One, who has subjected all things to Christ, is God. This position is strengthened by the fact that the rest of the passage after v. 27a seems to be the

¹⁰⁶¹ For example, Bruce, Barrett, Senft, de Boer, Wallis, Heil, Richardson, Holleman, Lindemann.

¹⁰⁶² For example, Conzelmann, Wolff, Héring (hesitantly), Carrez, Lambrecht, Plevnik, Collins, Barbaglio, Schrage. Fee, however, tends toward the first interpretation (God).

¹⁰⁶³ For detailed argumentation see LAMBRECHT, *Pauline Studies*, pp. 138-140. The translation of ὅταν δὲ εἴπη with future reflexive meaning “when he has (shall have) said” is suggested by M. ZERWICK,- M. GROSVENOR, *A grammatical analysis of the Greek New Testament*, Roma 1993⁴, p. 529. It is the choice of NAS as well. On this matter (translation of v. 27b) in his more recent article, Lambrecht admits that it “remains... it must be conceded, somewhat uncertain”. LAMBRECHT, “Structure and Line of Thought”, p. 151.

¹⁰⁶⁴ Cf. ALETTI, “L’argumentation de Paul”, p. 73, note 22.

interpretation of Ps 8:7. Some difficulty in this interpretation consists in the usage of ὅταν in v. 27bc; it is a bit strange to refer to the psalm that has just been ‘quoted’ in such a way.¹⁰⁶⁵

It seems that some explanation of the subjects in vv. 27-28 can be drawn by going back from v. 28b and then from v. 27c in which the subjects are clear. The fact that in these two verses the verb ὑποτάσσω which has God as the subject twice and is predominant (6 times, in v. 24 and v. 26 Paul used καταργέω), favors suggestion that in v. 27a God should be implied as the subject.¹⁰⁶⁶

First of all it should be noted that in these two verses the use of the tenses of the verb ὑποτάσσω presents the subjection of all things to Christ as both past (v. 27) and future (v. 28) reality. One of the possible explanations of this tension is to admit that in the whole passage Paul tries to combine the christological claim of Jesus’ resurrection and exaltation (for instance, the resurrection of Christ and the subjection of all things to him are expressed by two *perfects in passive* ἐγήγερται in v. 20 and ὑποτέτακται in v. 27b) with its soteriological application in reality, especially as it pertains to the issue at hand - physical death. Death is still active and, despite of the resurrection of Christ, believers continue to die, therefore, it may well be that Paul wants to make clear to Corinthians (presumably to the pneumatics) that *ultimate* soteriological application of Christ’s present exaltation lies for them in the future.¹⁰⁶⁷

Following the line of argumentation as presented above, Paul puts an emphasis on πάντα (it begins the sentence) further explaining *why* Christ is able to overcome all the enemies, especially death. Thus the reigning of Christ is presented as guaranteed by God’s power because He πάντα ὑπέταξεν to Christ and it means that God acts through Christ. In v. 27bc Paul comments on Ps 8:7b and not only prevents the possible misapprehension of the use of πάντα¹⁰⁶⁸ but also prepares the argument for v. 28 in which the twofold final act of subjection is fully expressed: ὅταν δὲ ὑποταγῇ αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα can serve as a new way of saying ὅταν καταργήσῃ πᾶσαν...(v. 24c) and αὐτὸς ὁ υἱὸς¹⁰⁶⁹ ὑποταγήσεται τῷ ὑποτάσσοντι...as synonymous to ὅταν παραδιδῷ τὴν βασιλείαν τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ (v. 24b). The destruction mentioned in v. 24c and then protracted on to v. 26 with clear expression as to *who* the last enemy is, means that the total

¹⁰⁶⁵ Cf. FEE, *First Epistle*, pp. 757-758.

¹⁰⁶⁶ In addition, the statement in v. 27a with God as subject can be observed as a preparation of v. 28: when it is said that everything is subjected to Christ, that naturally does not mean that God will subject himself to Christ, the opposite is the case, namely, Christ will subject himself to God; cf. HEIL, “Theologische Interpretation von 1Kor 15, 23-28”, p. 33.

¹⁰⁶⁷ Cf. de BOER, *The Defeat of Death*, p. 123.

¹⁰⁶⁸ Paul’s exegesis of v. 27ff. is similar to a rabbinic one. It can be called *direct and explicit exegesis dispelling confusion* about the scriptural verse; COHN-SHERBOK, “Paul and Rabbinic Exegesis”, p. 120.

¹⁰⁶⁹ This is the unique case of such absolute use in the Pauline corpus. Kreitzer admits that this expression may be dependent on ὁ θεὸς in v. 28c; cf. KREITZER, *Jesus and God in Paul’s Eschatology*, p. 159. Conzelmann is uncertain: “is this an aftereffect of the phrase τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ?”; CONZELMANN, *1 Corinthians*, p. 275.

subjection of all to Christ has reached its very peak (both verbs in v. 24c and v. 28a are in aorist subjunctive). Thus the defeat of death as the last enemy means life - resurrection of the dead (cf. vv. 50-55). The final subjection of all things to Christ, that is coincident with the destruction of death and the resurrection of the dead, shows that the reigning of Christ has achieved its climax and he can deliver the kingdom to God the Father - in v. 28b it is expressed by ὁ υἱὸς ὑποταγῆσεται. Many official versions and exegetes understand the phrase in the passive and thus translate 'the Son will be subjected', but it is also possible to understand it as reflexive and to translate 'the Son will subject himself'.¹⁰⁷⁰ This seems possible because of the word ὑποτάσσω, that until now has been translated 'to subject'. This verb is cognate of the noun τάγμα and literally means 'to rank or order under',¹⁰⁷¹ implying *relationships* and some idea of mutual dependence, availability, or obedience.¹⁰⁷² This act of delivering the kingdom and self-submission or subjection of the Son to God effectively marks the End.¹⁰⁷³ As it was already noted 'the End' is a purposive term. The section vv. 24c-28a shows the 'events' which lead to it and take place at its occurrence. The destruction of death in the whole argument is emphasized as a necessary condition ἵνα ἢ ὁ θεὸς [τὰ] πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν. The exact meaning of this phrase is not clear, but certainly it should not be viewed in Hellenistic pantheistic terms, denoting that God and 'all' are identical, thereby postulating the total confluence of God and creation without any distinction. As the context of this phrase is about reigning and subjecting, it may seem that it primarily expresses the supremacy of God's will in everything and everybody and his total sovereignty, in which prevail relations of power.¹⁰⁷⁴ Yet, as the nearest parallels, in which the combination of πάντα and πᾶσιν is used, are found in deuterio-Pauline letters in the contexts that deal with the world of people¹⁰⁷⁵, it is not arbitrary to presume that God's being 'all in all' in our text should also be primarily viewed from this perspective, even more that πάντα language in 1 Cor 8:6 gives way to 'people' language (ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτόν). Keeping in mind the whole argument in 1 Cor 15:12-34 such an interpretation seems to make sense. On the other

¹⁰⁷⁰ Cf. ZERWICK, - GROSVENOR, *A grammatical analysis of the Greek New Testament*, p. 529; BARRETT, *The First Epistle*, p. 360; BARBAGLIO, *La Prima Lettera*, p. 830.

¹⁰⁷¹ For this reason de Boer translates it 'to subordinate'; cf. de BOER, *The Defeat of Death*, p. 115.

¹⁰⁷² Cf. CARREZ, "Résurrection et seigneurie du Christ", pp. 135-136.

¹⁰⁷³ Fee points out that the subjection of the Son to the Father is *functional* and refers to his salvific work; cf. FEE, *First Epistle*, p. 760. Bruce suggests that the temporary reign of Christ comes to an end "in its present phase, but only to merge in the eternal kingdom of God"; BRUCE, *1 and 2 Corinthians*, p. 148. Jansen thinks similarly and appealing to Rom 10:9 and Eph 1:20f., states that the cessation of Christ's lordship is contrary to Paul's hope, expressed in 1 Thes 4:17; cf. JANSEN, "1 Cor. 15. 24-28 and the Future of Jesus Christ", p. 546.

¹⁰⁷⁴ Cf. CONZELMANN, *1 Corinthians*, p. 27; BARBAGLIO, *La Prima Lettera*, p. 831; similarly, SCHRAGE, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*, Teilbd. 4, p. 187. Barrett thinks that this phrase must be understood not metaphysically but soteriologically. It does not express the loss of distinctiveness between God and mankind; cf. BARRETT, *The First Epistle*, p. 361.

¹⁰⁷⁵ Col 3:11 with reference to Christ: ἀλλὰ [τὰ] πάντα καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν Χριστός, and Eph 1:22-23 referring to the body of Christ that is the church: τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν πληρουμένου.

hand, it is very probable that here Paul has in mind the redemption of the whole of creation as well. In 1 Cor 8:6 Paul states that τὰ πάντα are ‘through’ Christ and in Rom 8:21 is said that αὐτῇ ἡ κτίσις will *obtain the glorious liberty of the children of God*, so even if in our passage the main focus is on the world of people, the redemption of the cosmos is certainly implied.¹⁰⁷⁶ Two other texts in deutero-Pauline letters in which πάντα language is used confirm that: through Christ *all* things were created, in him *all* things are held together, and through him God was pleased to reconcile *all* things to himself (Col 1:16-20); it is God’s εὐδοκία and οἰκονομία τὰ πάντα ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι in Christ (Eph 1:9-10). On the one hand these references present Christ as reconciler and restorer of the universe, and on the other hand, it is plain that this is God’s will and εὐδοκία (a great pleasure) that the redemptive work of Christ includes the whole of creation. It is not incompatible that the subjection of πάντα to God the Father may also imply the idea of reconciliation and restoration of creation. In our passage the defeat of death is presented as the final act in healing and restoring the universe and this, indeed, will mean that God is all in all. That will be a gift of life that will last forever.

In summary, although God the Father is only once mentioned in 15:20-28, his activity is evident in every stage in the history of salvation.

From the theological point of view, it is God the Father who raised Christ from the dead (v. 15 and theological passive v. 12.13.14.16.17.20) and, thereby, enabled him to reign and destroy all hostile powers/enemies. It may be said that doing so, God inaugurated his kingdom, which in present may be called the ‘kingdom of Christ’, and will completely become the ‘kingdom of God the Father’ at the very End. Nevertheless he subjected everything to Christ, yet remains active during the whole process of salvation and restoration (cf. v. 28). He finally is the ‘Goal’ and the ‘End’ of everybody and everything in one or another way.

From the relational point of view, God is primarily the Father of Jesus Christ who is his Son in the unique and absolute sense (ὁ υἱός). The activity of the Father and the Son during the rule of Christ is closely interrelated. By subjecting to Christ all things, God *establishes his authority* over everything and everybody and, vice versa, by destroying everything that opposes to God, Christ brings to completion the kingdom of God, i.e. the sovereign dominion of the Father. As the main accent in Paul’s argument is put on the resurrection of the dead/defeat of death, the future kingdom of God is to be understood as the ‘kingdom of life’. Thus those who belong to Christ, thanks to his final victory over death (Christ is subject in v. 26), will enjoy the fullness of life that flows from the Father, through Christ to them. Again here is a clear tripartite

¹⁰⁷⁶ Cf. SANDERS, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, p. 474. This choice is possible because the last word πασιὺ that may be understood either as neutral or masculine and some scholars opt for the latter; cf. CARREZ, “Résurrection et seigneurie du Christ”, p. 138; de BOER, *The Defeat of Death*, p. 126.

structure ‘Father-Christ-believers’. In what sense God will be a Father to a renewed universe is difficult to say, but most likely it means that the divine project/purpose, set in the creation and realized through/in Christ as his Son, has reached its goal.

4.2.5.3. *The Blessing in 2 Cor 1:3-4*

The blessing at the beginning of 2 Cor instead of an introductory thanksgiving is unusual to Paul’s authentic letters¹⁰⁷⁷ and raises a question about its purpose. It is widely accepted that Paul was influenced by the Jewish liturgical blessing, but does it function as a thanksgiving to God as in his other letters? There is no unanimous answer, but it seems plausibly to state that both thanksgiving and blessing formulas contain ideas of praise and gratitude¹⁰⁷⁸, the latter being a personal experience of God’s gifts for which Paul blesses Him.¹⁰⁷⁹ The limits of the entire pericope are under discussion because of ‘comfort’ vocabulary (vv. 3-7) and the theme of danger (vv. 3-11),¹⁰⁸⁰ but the proper blessing is undoubtedly found in vv. 3-4. There is one sentence in Greek which may be thematically divided in two parts: v. 3 declares *who* God is and v. 4 describes *what* He does.

The reference to God as Father appears in v. 3 in a chiasmic structure ‘a b b a’: Εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ πατὴρ τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν καὶ θεὸς πάσης παρακλήσεως.¹⁰⁸¹ As there is no verb in this phrase, it should be supplied with either indicative ‘is’ (blessed is God) or with optative ‘be’ (blessed be God). If we understand this phrase as an isolated exclamation, expressing what has already been known and is true of God, we should opt for ‘is’,¹⁰⁸² but if the accent is put on the position where the blessing stands and its liturgical background, we should probably opt for ‘be’.¹⁰⁸³ Whatever choice is made “the distinction may be to some extent unreal; the invocation of blessing is blessing”.¹⁰⁸⁴

God in v. 3 is described in a threefold manner: the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of mercies, and God of all comfort.

¹⁰⁷⁷ The identical wording of the first phrase Εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ appears also in Eph 1:3 and 1 Pet 1:3.

¹⁰⁷⁸ On the matter see O’BRIEN, *Introductory Thanksgiving*, pp. 234, 237-239.

¹⁰⁷⁹ Cf. J. LAMBRECHT, *Second Corinthians*, SPS 8, Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1999, p. 22.

¹⁰⁸⁰ Major part of exegetes opt for a longer section, cf. O’BRIEN, *Introductory Thanksgiving*, p. 236; FURNISH, *II Corinthians*, p. 108; THRALL, *Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, vol. 1, pp. 98-99.

¹⁰⁸¹ Cf. LAMBRECHT, *Second Corinthians*, p. 18.

¹⁰⁸² Cf. O’BRIEN, *Introductory Thanksgiving*, p. 240; FURNISH, *II Corinthians*, p. 108.

¹⁰⁸³ Cf. MARTIN, *2 Corinthians*, p. 7; CH. WOLFF, *Der zweite Brief des Paulus an die Korinther*, THNT VIII, Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1989, p. 19; see the concise argumentation in THRALL, *Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, vol. 1, pp. 100-101; P. BARNETT, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, NICNT, Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1997, p. 68.

¹⁰⁸⁴ C. K. BARRETT, *A commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, HNTC, New York/London: Harper & Row, 1973, p. 58.

It is undoubtable that God is the Father of Jesus in Paul's mindset, but in our case we have unusual formulation ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ that appears only two more times in authentic Pauline letters 2 Cor 11:31 (with several omissions) and Rom 15:6.¹⁰⁸⁵ Paul many times uses ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ, yet, the genitival construction is usually ended with ἡμῶν.¹⁰⁸⁶ This means that *for us* God is *both* God and Father. Whether Paul intended the same in reference to Christ, i.e. 'God of Jesus Christ' and 'Father of Jesus Christ' or only 'Father of Jesus Christ' is not clear. On the one hand, on syntactic grounds there is little need to separate 'God' from 'Father' with reference to Jesus Christ, even more that the absence of the second article before 'Father' does not suggest this.¹⁰⁸⁷ From the theological point of view, the idea that Christ will deliver the kingdom τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρί (1 Cor 15:24) and subsequent statement that the Son himself will also be subjected (or will subject himself) that God may be all in all (1 Cor 15:28) may be an indication that in our verse Paul tries "to avoid any implication that Christ, as κύριος, is some kind of independent deity."¹⁰⁸⁸ On the other hand, it is true that here Paul is not interested in Jesus' personal religion¹⁰⁸⁹ and probably he had no intention to highlight the difference between God and Christ as Lord in our context of consolation. Furthermore, this blessing is a substitute for the introductory thanksgiving and in Col 1:3 there is a certain parallel without the conjunction καὶ between God and Father: Εὐχαριστοῦμεν τῷ θεῷ πατρὶ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Keeping in mind the Jewish liturgical background of this blessing, it seems more preferable to observe it as a christianized reformulation: God of the OT is now also known as the Father of Jesus Christ¹⁰⁹⁰ and translate καὶ as *even* or omit it altogether.¹⁰⁹¹

The second predicate qualifying God ὁ πατὴρ τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν is the unique occurrence in both Testaments. In the OT (LXX) the expression τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν is always used with reference to God¹⁰⁹² and corresponds to רַחֲמִים which in Hebrew expresses motherly loving feeling and tender mercy. Apart from the OT the idea about divine compassion/mercy was current in the contemporary Jewish worship.¹⁰⁹³ In the NT the only other occurrence of τῶν

¹⁰⁸⁵ Apart Eph 1:3 and 1 Pet 1:3.

¹⁰⁸⁶ Cf. 1 Thess 1:3; 3:11.13; Gal 1:4; Phil 4:20.

¹⁰⁸⁷ Cf. E.-B. ALLO, *Saint Paul seconde épître aux Corinthiens*, EB, Paris: J. Gabalda et C^{ie}, 1937, p. 7; P. E. HUGHES, *Paul's Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, NICNT, Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1962, p. 10; WOLFF, *Der zweite Brief*, p. 20; BARNETT, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, p. 68 note 18.

¹⁰⁸⁸ THRALL, *Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, vol. 1, p. 102. Moreover, see Eph 1:17: ὁ θεὸς τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ πατὴρ τῆς δόξης.

¹⁰⁸⁹ Cf. BARRETT, *A commentary*, p. 58; FURNISH, *II Corinthians*, p. 109.

¹⁰⁹⁰ Cf. BARRETT, *A commentary*, p. 59.

¹⁰⁹¹ Cf. FURNISH, *II Corinthians*, p. 109; BARNETT, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, p. 69.

¹⁰⁹² See Pss 25:6; 50:3; 68:17; Isa 63:15.

¹⁰⁹³ Cf. O'BRIEN, *Introductory Thanksgiving*, p. 241, who refers to Qumran writings 1QH 10:14; 11:20.

οἰκτιρμῶν with reference to God is in Rom 12:1.¹⁰⁹⁴ The context of the whole passage (vv. 3-11) discloses the real meaning of this phrase: the Father is ‘the source of compassion/mercies’ and he proves it as ‘compassionate/merciful Father’¹⁰⁹⁵ by means of his actual comfort in affliction (vv. 3-4).¹⁰⁹⁶

Paul rounds off the image of God the Father with the third predicate θεὸς πάσης παρακλήσεως that is also unique in the Old and New Testaments. In no other Pauline letter we find such concentration of the term παράκλησις and its cognate verb παρακαλέω as in 2 Corinthians and especially in 2 Cor 1: 3-7.¹⁰⁹⁷ Such density is obviously a sign that these words play the key role in an extended blessing vv. 3-7 (or vv. 3-11). The word-group has a range of meanings which may vary or even overlap in different contexts: ‘to beseech’, ‘to appeal’, ‘to exhort’, ‘to comfort’, and ‘to console’. In the present context dominates the theme of affliction, sufferings, and deliverance, therefore the most appropriate translation seems to be ‘comfort/to comfort’ with an allusion to “the total messianic comfort and deliverance”.¹⁰⁹⁸ This supposition is even more plausible taking into account that ‘comfort’ becomes abundant *through* Christ (v. 5). God is the source of ‘all’ comfort in ‘all’ affliction (v. 4) and it means its fullness in Him¹⁰⁹⁹ as well as in His activity.¹¹⁰⁰

God’s activity in v. 4 is expressed in a dynamic way (by a present participle ὁ παρακαλῶν). The usage of a participle clause to describe God’s activity is attested both in the Old and New Testaments, especially in liturgical contexts,¹¹⁰¹ but the only other reference to God as ὁ παρακαλῶν (both in LXX and NT) is in 2 Cor 7:6 (comforting the downcast). Such statistic scarcity even more underlines the active and dynamic role of God the Father in ‘all’ Paul’s/others affliction.¹¹⁰² The present participle ὁ παρακαλῶν may also be an indication that affliction is continuous and God’s comfort is always available (cf. 7:4-6). This comfort may be

¹⁰⁹⁴ This term in plural is also used in Phil 2:1 (οἰκτιρμοί) and Heb 10:28 (οἰκτιρμῶν), but without reference to God.

¹⁰⁹⁵ Pace O’BRIEN, *Introductory Thanksgiving*, p. 242 who sees no necessity to understand ὁ πατήρ τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν as either a genitive of quality or an objective genitive.

¹⁰⁹⁶ Cf. BARRETT, *A commentary*, p. 60; WOLFF, *Der zweite Brief*, p. 22.

¹⁰⁹⁷ In 2 Cor παράκλησις (11x), παρακαλέω (18x), in 2 Cor 1:3-7 παράκλησις (7x), παρακαλέω (4x).

¹⁰⁹⁸ BARRETT, *A commentary*, p. 60. For a brief argumentation see O’BRIEN, *Introductory Thanksgiving*, p. 243f.

¹⁰⁹⁹ As Allo cites Bachmann “en qui tout n’est que consolation”, ALLO, *Saint Paul*, p. 7; also pointed out by WOLFF, *Der zweite Brief*, p. 22.

¹¹⁰⁰ Furnish (pace Bultmann) thinks that ‘all’ was added just for liturgical solemnity and refers to several texts (1 Pet 5:10 and Rom 15:13) in which ‘all’ is also employed; cf. FURNISH, *II Corinthians*, p. 109. However, there is no counterpart for ‘all’ in those texts as it is in our (all affliction).

¹¹⁰¹ Cf. Pss (LXX) 71: 18; 134:21; 143:1; 1 Pet 5:10; Heb 13:20-21; 2 Cor 1:9; 4:6; 5:5. The list is taken from FURNISH, *II Corinthians*, p. 110.

¹¹⁰² Scholars disagree how much inclusive is pronoun ἡμᾶς in v. 4f.: Paul alone, Paul and his collaborators, senders and recipients of the letter. In fact, it is not important for our investigation because what God did for one person in trouble (if it is Paul alone), he does the same to many others: note the plural ὁ παρακαλῶν τοὺς ταπεινοὺς (2 Cor 7:6).

primarily understood as a gift of patience (cf. v. 6b) and deliverance from fear (cf. v. 9).¹¹⁰³ The affliction¹¹⁰⁴ Paul speaks about here is not very clear, yet, vv. 8-10 reveal that it was deadly peril actually¹¹⁰⁵ experienced in Asia. Obviously, Paul's intention is not to groan about personal affairs as his/their experience introduces him to a deeper perception about the power and purpose¹¹⁰⁶ of God's comfort. The comfort granted upon him/them urges to be shared with others whatever affliction they may encounter.¹¹⁰⁷ Noteworthy, that Paul here underlines God's comfort instead of his own human abilities, thus, concluding the blessing with the final note on God's activity.

In summary, this short blessing discloses that God of the OT, who is now known as the Father of Jesus Christ, is worthy of praise and gratitude for what who He is and for what He is doing for the sake of those who are in trouble.

From the theological point of view, God the Father is the source and fullness of any imaginable mercy/compassion and comfort, which is both messianic and liberating. As a merciful/compassionate Father, He is active on behalf of Christians with such a power that enables them to communicate adequately the gift of comfort to others who need it so much.

From the relational point of view, God is above all the Father of Jesus Christ, who is our Lord and through whom God comforts his people. To the already known tripartite structure, here is adjoined a fourth member- Paul or larger group, and it becomes 'God the Father-Christ-Paul-believers'. This quadruple structure reveals very well the shared nature of God's comfort.

4.2.5.4. 2 Sam 7:14 in 2 Cor 6:18

The passage 2 Cor 6:14-7:1, in which our text appears, has been discussed for a long time on the grounds of vocabulary, content, and citation, and many solutions have been proposed as regards its authenticity and original place in the letter's context. The most known proposals are the following: 1) passage neither appears in original context nor is Pauline; 2) passage does not appear in original context but belongs to Paul; 3) passage appears in original context but is not Pauline; 4) passage appears in original context and belongs to Paul.¹¹⁰⁸ Though authenticity and its place in the context remain unclear, we take this passage into consideration, because the fatherhood of God in it is presented by re-reading of Sam 7:14. The

¹¹⁰³ Cf. WOLFF, *Der zweite Brief*, p. 23.

¹¹⁰⁴ θλίψις is another Pauline term vastly used in 2 Cor (especially chapters 1-9).

¹¹⁰⁵ BDF §275 (3): ἐπὶ πάσῃ τῇ θλίψει means "all tribulation actually encountered".

¹¹⁰⁶ BDF §402 (2): εἰς τὸ plus infinitive indicate either purpose or result.

¹¹⁰⁷ BDF §275 (3): ἐν πάσῃ θλίψει means "in any tribulation which may be encountered".

¹¹⁰⁸ For a brief survey see C. HEIL, "Die Sprache der Absonderung in 2 Kor 6,17 und bei Paulus," in R. BIERINGER, (ed.), *The Corinthian Correspondence* (BETHL 125), Leuven: Leuven University Press-Peeters, 1996, pp. 718-721. For a more detailed synthesis on the matter see FURNISH, *II Corinthians*, pp. 375-383.

structure of the passage is quite discernible. Lambrecht distinguishes four unequal parts: A – 6:14a, B – 6:14b-16a, C – 6:16b-18c, D – 7:1.¹¹⁰⁹ According to Furnish there are five parts: A – 6:14a, B – 6:14b-16a, C – 6:16b, D – 6:16c-18, E – 7:1. However, in order to proceed with commentary easier, he shortens the division to three sections: 6:14-16a as the initial admonition, 6:16b-18 as an admonition, promises, and further admonitions, and 7:1 as the concluding appeal.¹¹¹⁰ Noteworthy, that in such division, the part in which the reference to God as Father appears, is the same as proposed by Lambrecht vv. 16b-18 and it starts with the words ἡμεῖς γὰρ ναὸς θεοῦ ἐσμεν ζῶντος (v. 16b). Actually this is the very core of the whole passage. This statement introduces to the OT texts and allusions to it¹¹¹¹ and a special attention merit two parallel expressions καὶ ἔσομαι αὐτῶν θεὸς καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔσονται μου λαός (v.16d) and καὶ ἔσομαι ὑμῖν εἰς πατέρα καὶ ὑμεῖς ἔσεσθέ μοι εἰς υἱοὺς καὶ θυγατέρας (v. 18). The first expression highly depends on Lev 26:12 (with possible influence of Ezek 37:27)¹¹¹² and is closely related to ‘I will live in them and walk among them’ (v. 16c) and through it to above-mentioned v. 16b. It is evident that preceding verses with rhetorical questions, admonitions (vv. 14-16a) and subsequent concluding exhortation (7:1) enclose the central theme about Christians as the temple of God. This way the parallel expressions serve as promise-proof texts to it. The second parallel expression (v. 18) and 2 Sam 7:14:

2 Cor 6:18 καὶ ἔσομαι ὑμῖν εἰς πατέρα καὶ ὑμεῖς ἔσεσθέ μοι εἰς υἱοὺς καὶ θυγατέρας

2 Sam 7:14 ἐγὼ ἔσομαι αὐτῷ εἰς πατέρα καὶ αὐτὸς ἔσται μοι εἰς υἱόν

Paul changes pronouns and verbs from singular to plural and to ‘sons’ adjoins ‘daughters’. The change in the promise to the Davidic king is clearly legitimate, as in the present context the accent is on ‘you’, what is a logical consequence of ‘we are the temple’ (v. 16). The addition ‘and daughters’¹¹¹³ to the ‘sons’¹¹¹⁴ is less clear and there are different opinions on this matter: as an attempt to raise women to a place of equality with men;¹¹¹⁵ it has been added from

¹¹⁰⁹ Cf. LAMBRECHT, *Second Corinthians*, pp. 123f.

¹¹¹⁰ Cf. FURNISH, *II Corinthians*, pp. 371-375.

¹¹¹¹ Cf. Lev 26:12; Ezek 37:27; Isa 43:6; 52:11; 2 Sam 7:8,14.

¹¹¹² Lev 26:12: καὶ ἔσομαι ὑμῶν θεός καὶ ὑμεῖς ἔσεσθέ μοι λαός; Ezek 37:27: καὶ ἔσομαι αὐτοῖς θεός καὶ αὐτοὶ μου ἔσονται λαός.

¹¹¹³ There is no other parallel in Pauline letters.

¹¹¹⁴ The conception of Christians as God’s sons is undoubtedly Pauline (Gal 3:26; 4:6-7; Rom 8:14-17).

¹¹¹⁵ Cf. BARRETT, *A commentary*, p. 201; adopted by BYRNE, ‘*Sons of God*’ - ‘*Seed of Abraham*’, p. 194; MARTIN, *2 Corinthians*, p. 207.

Isa 43:6;¹¹¹⁶ it depends mostly on previous quotations in the passage and extends the idea of new exodus (including Isa 43:6);¹¹¹⁷ it depends on Deut 32:19 (false worship context).¹¹¹⁸

The supposition that the core of the passage should be seen in 'we are the temple of God' may shed some light to the interpretation of 'daughters'. The idea of 'human temple' is not foreign to Paul. In 1 Cor 3:16-17 he speaks about temple in a collective sense (plural ἑστέ) thus explaining that community is the place where God dwells. There is an expression in our passage which also points to the collective character of 'human temple', that is *I will live in them and walk among them* (v. 16c). Though the first phrase *I will live in them* appears nowhere in the OT, its combination with the second phrase (Lev 26:12) provides an additional quality to the latter, i.e. walking among the people means God's actual dwelling in them as in a temple.¹¹¹⁹ Probably, this is patterned on the OT's idea of restoration of Israel. If this is the case, the prophets who speak about that in terms of 'return', gain more credits. In several texts (Isa 43:6; 49:22; 60:4) 'bringing home' includes not only 'sons' but 'daughters' as well. Keeping in mind that Ezek 37:27 possibly influenced 2 Cor 6:16d and that Ezek 37 speaks about restoration of Israel, it seems to be not arbitrary to assume that Paul, by adding 'daughters' may have thought about other restoration, that is, of the people of God¹¹²⁰ and more precisely, of God the Father. The combination in our v. 18 motives of the Davidic covenant,¹¹²¹ new exodus,¹¹²² and restoration theology may imply that Paul intended to remind Corinthians about their present status. They are no longer in exile; they are received as children of God the Father,¹¹²³ therefore they are the temple of the living God (v. 16b). This means that in the context of the whole passage, the reference to God as Father serves as a strong argument for their ethical behavior. Paul concludes his argumentation with unusual phrase to him λέγει κύριος παντοκράτωρ. Surely, it is not his invention;¹¹²⁴ probably he took it from the same chapter and in 2 Sam he has just quoted (7:8) it. Anyway, this phrase is so vastly attested in the OT (especially used by later prophets Malachi and Zechariah) that it is unimportant what the primary source is. The conclusion seems to be logical due to employed various texts of the OT to underline seriousness

¹¹¹⁶ Cf. FURNISH, *II Corinthians*, p. 374f.; THRALL, *Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, vol. 1, p. 479; LAMBRECHT, *Second Corinthians*, p. 124.

¹¹¹⁷ See W. J. WEBB, *Returning Home. New Covenant and Second Exodus as the Context for 2 Corinthians 6.14-7.1*, JSNTSupS 85, Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993, pp. 57-58.

¹¹¹⁸ See J. W. OLLEY, "A Precursor of the NRSV? 'Sons and Daughters' in 2 Cor 6.18," *NTS* 44 (1988), pp. 209-211.

¹¹¹⁹ Cf. FURNISH, *II Corinthians*, p. 374.

¹¹²⁰ Similarly THRALL, *Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, vol. 1, p. 479.

¹¹²¹ See WEBB, *Returning Home*, pp. 54 and 58.

¹¹²² It is interesting on structural grounds that two parallel expressions 'they shall be my people' (v. 16d) and 'you shall be my sons and daughters' (v. 18) are interrupted by 'come out from them, and be separate from them' (v. 17), that apparently is influenced by Isa 52:11, who speaks about exodus from Babylonian exile.

¹¹²³ Cf. BARNETT, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, p. 354.

¹¹²⁴ In Pauline letters there are several cases in which we encounter λέγει κύριος (Rom 12:19; 14:11; 1 Cor 14:21; 2 Cor 6:17) but 'Almighty' is never adjoined.

of what has been said and to guarantee (in a prophetic way) its realization, especially as regards relationships of God the Father and His people.¹¹²⁵

In summary, God is the Father to Christians and they always have to keep it in mind because their status as children of God requires a continuous revision of their lives. The quotation of 2 Sam 7:14 and other texts even more underline that they are received as children of the Father in a special way, i.e. they become the temple of the living God who is their Father. Hence their faith and ethical behavior cannot be separated.

4.2.5.5. An Oath Formula in 2 Cor 11:31

The last reference to God as Father in 2 Cor appears in Paul's apologetic speech in the context of his boasting 2 Cor 11:30-33 that may be regarded as a transitional bridge between declaratory (11:22-29) and narrative (12:1ff.) parts.¹¹²⁶ According to Lambrecht vv. 30-31 is a 'reflection',¹¹²⁷ but v. 31 is better described as an 'oath formula', related primarily to v. 30 and only then to vv. 32-33.¹¹²⁸ These verses are closely tied because what Paul vows to do in v. 30, he repeats in v. 31 by invoking God the Father¹¹²⁹ as a witness to make his vow more solid.

The first part of the verse ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ (v. 31a) is almost identical to that in 1:3. ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, with omission of ἡμῶν and Χριστοῦ.. These omissions may have some christological nuance¹¹³⁰ but they do not affect the image of God the Father. The clause ὁ ὢν εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας is thoroughly Pauline, yet employed here in an unusual way. Firstly, God the Father is¹¹³¹ not simply but continuously blessed forever (present participle ὁ ὢν instead of ἔστιν as in Rom 1:25 or without verb as in Rom 9:5).¹¹³² Secondly, in all NT letters, including Pauline's, phrase εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας (or with addition of τῶν αἰώνων) is always concluded by ἀμήν¹¹³³ because the context of blessing or doxology postulates it. It seems that in our case the situation is different. Therefore

¹¹²⁵ In fact, λέγει κύριος παντοκράτωρ may be observed as concluding the whole passage but as there is a similar phrase in v. 17 λέγει κύριος, this phrase, in my opinion, more underlines the last verse.

¹¹²⁶ Cf. FURNISH, *II Corinthians*, p. 539.

¹¹²⁷ Cf. J. LAMBRECHT, *Collected Studies on Pauline Literature and on the Book of Revelation* (AnBib 147), Roma: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2001, p. 151.

¹¹²⁸ Cf. FURNISH, *II Corinthians*, p. 540; MARTIN, *2 Corinthians*, p. 383.

¹¹²⁹ As to the function of καὶ, see analysis of 2 Cor 1:3-4.

¹¹³⁰ According to Wolff, for Paul self-boasting is nothing else than boasting in the Lord (cf. 10:17), because when he is strong in weaknesses he becomes a representative of the Lord died and resurrected. Therefore, it is important for him to boast of the things that show his weakness (v. 30). Hence, the omissions (especially 'Christ') are not accidental, because Paul uses name 'Jesus', when he points to crucifixion and resurrection event; cf. WOLFF, *Der zweite Brief*, pp. 236-237.

¹¹³¹ BDF §413 (1): "he who is".

¹¹³² Apart these two references there is no other exact formulation in both Testaments.

¹¹³³ Cf. Rom 1:25; 9:5; 11:36; 16:27; Gal 1:5; Phil 4:20; 1 Tim 1:17; 2 Tim 4:18; 1 Pet 4:11; 5:11. The only exception is Heb 13:8.

in this phrase we prefer to see the assertion of practice that has been known to Paul and live out in Christian communities rather than actual blessing.¹¹³⁴ Paul's asseveration ὁ θεὸς...οἶδεν seems to be his stylistic device in this letter¹¹³⁵, because he does not use this expression in his other letters. Paul's appeal to God's knowledge (cf. 11:11) that he is not lying solemnly confirms his previous statement (v. 30). This is the only case Paul refers to God the Father such context and with reference to His knowledge.

In summary, God the Father of the Lord Jesus is and should be continuously blessed as he is the final instance to which Christians (in our case Paul) may appeal: as the Father, he knows who we are.

Since brief summaries have already been done at the end of every analyzed text, here seems to be appropriate to indicate the main characteristics of God's fatherhood.

Thematically, all references to God's fatherhood in 1-2 Cor occur in contexts, where Paul deals with a concrete issue. In two cases Paul himself is presented in relationship to God as Father (2 Cor 1:3-4; 2 Cor 11:31), twice God' fatherhood is referred to Corinthians' ethical behavior as far as concerns 'idols' (1 Cor 8:4-6 in a broader context; 2 Cor 6:14-7:1), and once in the apocalyptic-eschatological passage that deals not only with the end time, but with real resurrection of the dead that has apparently been questioned by some Corinthians (1 Cor 15:20-28).

From the theological point of view, there is only *one* God and his name is 'Father'. As 'the Father' he is the *source, goal, and end* of everything and everybody. His activity pervades all human history from creation to its consummation including even human daily problems. He is the Father of loving *mercy/compassion* and *comfort* in any affliction and enables people to share his comfort with others *promoting love and unity* within Christian community, which becomes his temple in which he dwells. Hence, Christians' ethical behavior and inner life (he knows who we are) must conform to their status as children of God, and their response to him is to be that of gratitude and praise: God the Father *is and should be blessed* continuously and forever.

From the relational point of view, God as Father is *operative* through Jesus Christ our Lord (who is his Son in the unique and absolute sense) from the very beginning (creation) to the final end (the defeat of death). The activity of the Father and Son are so closely *interrelated* that it is inconceivable to speak about one without other and this is strongly underlined in 1 Cor. As regards relationships between God and believers, thanks to 2 Cor we can discern a little modified structure 'God the Father-Christ-Paul-believers'.

¹¹³⁴ Contra BARNETT, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, p. 552.

¹¹³⁵ 2 Cor 11:11; 12:2.3: ὁ θεὸς οἶδεν.

4.2.6. God as Father in the Letter to the Romans

In this letter, apart from initial salutation, there are four¹¹³⁶ other references to God as Father. Three occur in Paul's argumentation on new status of Christians (6:1-4; 8:14-17) and the last one is a wish-prayer¹¹³⁷ with a doxological note (15:5-6).

4.2.6.1. The Glory of the Father in Rom 6:4

The reference to God as Father occurs in the context of Paul's long and ongoing argumentation started from 5:12 on sin, death, and life. A closer context is 6:1-4¹¹³⁸: faithful cannot remain in sin because being baptized into Christ, we are buried with him into death and so that as Christ was raised from the dead, so we might live a new life (vv. 3-4).¹¹³⁹ That Christ was resurrected by God (divine passive) is well established pattern in Pauline letters,¹¹⁴⁰ yet this is the only case Paul indicates that Christ was raised from the dead through/by the glory of the Father¹¹⁴¹ (διὰ τῆς δόξης τοῦ πατρὸς). In other instances where Paul speaks about 'glory' or 'glorify' with reference to 'Father' (Phil 2:11 4:20; Rom 15:6; cf. Eph 1:17) he refers to something that is particularly God's or should be ascribed to him. In our case δόξα is operative and many commentators think it should be understood as God's 'power' as it is closely associated with 'glory' in the Bible.¹¹⁴² Another reason is that in several other texts which refer to Christ's resurrection Paul speaks of God's πνεῦμα or his δύναμις (Rom 1:4; 8:11; 1 Cor 6:14; 2 Cor 13:4; see also Eph 1:19-20). But as Dunn rightly observes the relational aspect of this phrase should not be overlooked: the glory of the Father is not only perceived but also experienced by the human.¹¹⁴³ The term πατήρ is not qualified by any word¹¹⁴⁴ and this means

¹¹³⁶ Twice in Rom 8:15: ἀββὰ ὁ πατήρ.

¹¹³⁷ So called by WILES, *Paul's Intercessory Prayers*, p. 29; or a prayer-wish according to C. E. B. CRANFIELD, *Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (vol. 2, IX-XVI), ICC, Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1979, 1989⁵, p. 736.

¹¹³⁸ Cf. FITZMYER, *Romans*, p. 432.

¹¹³⁹ οὖν in v. 4 is better translated as 'therefore' thus indicating that Paul continues his argumentation.

¹¹⁴⁰ Cf. Rom 6:9; 7:4; 8:34; 1 Cor 15:12.20 etc. The active form is found in Rom 4:24; 8:11; 10:9; 1 Thess 1:10; Gal 1:1; 1 Cor 6:14; 15:15; 2 Cor 4:14 etc.

¹¹⁴¹ The only other text presenting explicitly God as Father at work in Christ's resurrection is Gal 1:1. According to Thompson, 'fatherhood' in Romans is tightly associated with the creation of life, therefore Paul's option for 'father' is not surprising; cf. M. M. THOMPSON, "'Mercy upon All': God as Father in the Epistle to the Romans," in S. K. SÖDERLUND, N. T. Wright (eds.), *Romans and the People of God. Essays in Honor of Gordon D. Fee on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, Grand Rapids / Cambridge: W. B. Eerdmans, 1999, p. 211 note 22.

¹¹⁴² Cf. SCHLIER, *La lettera ai Romani*, p. 327; LEENHARDT, *L'épître de saint Paul aux Romains*, p. 92 note 1; KÄSEMANN, *Commentary on Romans*, p. 166; CRANFIELD, *Romans*, vol. 1, p. 304; WILCKENS, *Der Brief an die Römer*, Teil. 2, p.12; F. F. BRUCE, *The Letter of Paul to the Romans* (rev. ed.), TNTC, Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press / Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1989, p. 130; S. AGERSNAP, *Baptism and the New Life. A Study of Romans 6.1-14*, Aarhus: University Press, 1999, p. 272.

¹¹⁴³ Cf. DUNN, *Romans 1-8*, p. 315.

¹¹⁴⁴ Cf. Gal 4:6; Rom 8:15; 2 Cor 6:18.

that the resurrection of Christ has been effected exclusively by the Father.¹¹⁴⁵ Here the resurrection of Christ is presented not as a simple fact but as having purpose: the second part of v. 4 starts with ἵνα (in order that). By means of parallelism¹¹⁴⁶ ὥσπερ (just as)... οὕτως (so) Paul connects Christ's resurrection with the new life of Christians as its consequence. Surely, the second part of this parallel structure does not correspond exactly to the content of the first part as ἵνα...ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς περιπατήσωμεν does not mean 'resurrection' in a proper sense.¹¹⁴⁷ The vocabulary Paul uses to refer to 'newness'¹¹⁴⁸ of life' in which we are enabled¹¹⁴⁹ and summoned 'to walk'¹¹⁵⁰ thus indicating a completely new lifestyle¹¹⁵¹ which contrasts with the old (cf. 13:13)¹¹⁵² is not usual for him. Noteworthy, the same genitival construction of ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς appears in 7:6 with reference to the Spirit ἐν καινότητι πνεύματος. As the 'newness' nowhere else is attested in the NT these phrases possibly interpret each other, moreover that the Spirit is 'of life' (8:2) and we 'walk according to the Spirit' (8:4). Hence the walking in 'newness of life' points to a life marked by the Spirit.¹¹⁵³

The glory of the Father is not only *operative* and experienced in the resurrection of Christ, also he *enables* and *encourages* us to take seriously 'newness of life' granted by him through Christ by raising him from the dead and live it out according to the law of the Spirit. Here the tripartite structure Father-Christ-we is noticed. The last element 'we' includes also the Spirit because it leads us to a real life in which glory of the Father becomes visible.

4.2.6.2. Divine Fatherhood in Rom 8:14-17

This short passage is a further elaboration of Paul's thought¹¹⁵⁴ presented in Gal 4:4-7. The previous passage (8:1-13) is about Christian life according to the Spirit (πνεῦμα vocabulary), the subsequent text (8:18-23) presents the future destiny of those who are children

¹¹⁴⁵ Cf. L. MORRIS, *The Epistle to the Romans*, Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans / Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1988, 1997², p. 249.

¹¹⁴⁶ This is one of Paul's stylistic features in the wider context of this argumentation; see 5:12.18-19.21.

¹¹⁴⁷ Commenting on Rom 6:1-14 Cranfield distinguishes four senses of 'dying with Christ' and four senses of 'being raised with Christ'. As to the resurrection he postulates that: 1) in some sense it has already occurred (6:11.13); 2) resurrection is implied by baptism; 3) resurrection conceived as moral behavior (6:4); 4) the final resurrection (6:8b). See C. E. B. CRANFIELD, *On Romans and Other New Testament Essays*, Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998, pp. 24-30.

¹¹⁴⁸ In LXX καινότης is used twice in 1 Kgs 8:53; Ezek 47:12. In the NT it appears only here and in 7:6.

¹¹⁴⁹ ὥσπερ (just as)... οὕτως (so) "probably here has a causal flavor". D. J. MOO, *The Epistle to the Romans*, NICNT, Grand Rapids / Cambridge: W. B. Eerdmans, 1996, p. 367.

¹¹⁵⁰ ἵνα... περιπατήσωμεν in the context of Paul's argument here has almost imperative sense; cf. SCHLIER, *La lettera ai Romani*, p. 328; WILCKENS, *Der Brief an die Römer*, Teil. 2, p. 13.

¹¹⁵¹ The metaphorical use of the verb περιπατέω is well attested both in the Old and New Testaments. In the NT it is predominantly used by Paul (more than 30 times).

¹¹⁵² It may well be that Paul emphasizes both 'newness' and 'life'; cf. AGERSNAP, *Baptism and the New Life*, p. 273.

¹¹⁵³ Cf. FEE, *God's Empowering Presence*, p. 502.

¹¹⁵⁴ It is absolutely unnecessary to observe this passage as a piece of pre-Pauline material; see FEE, *God's Empowering Presence*, p. 560 note 260.

of God (υἱός and τέκνον vocabulary). The analyzed text reveals true Christian identity and destiny (πνεῦμα, υἱός, τέκνον vocabulary) thus associating the Spirit of God to the status of children of God.

The flow of thought in 8:14-17 (with vv. 3-4) is basically similar to Gal 4:4-7¹¹⁵⁵:

Gal 4		Rom 8	
v. 4	ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ	v. 3	ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ υἱὸν πέμψας
v. 5	ἵνα	v. 4	ἵνα
v. 5	ἵνα τὴν υἰοθεσίαν ἀπολάβωμεν	v. 15	ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα υἰοθεσίας
v. 6	ἐστε υἱοί	v. 14	υἱοὶ θεοῦ εἰσιν
v. 6	τὸ πνεῦμα...εἰς τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν	v. 15	ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα
v. 6	κράζον· αββα ὁ πατήρ	v. 15	ἐν ᾧ κράζομεν· αββα ὁ πατήρ.
v. 7	οὐκ ἐτι εἶ δοῦλος	v. 15	οὐ γὰρ ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα δουλείας...
v. 7	ἀλλὰ υἱός	v. 15	ἀλλὰ ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα υἰοθεσίας
v. 7	εἰ δὲ υἱός, καὶ κληρονόμος	v. 17	εἰ δὲ τέκνα, καὶ κληρονόμοι·
v. 7	διὰ Θεοῦ	v. 17	κληρονόμοι μὲν Θεοῦ

There are, of course, some differences between these two texts. First of all, it becomes obvious when analyzing the role of the Spirit who dominates 8:14-17, whereas Gal 4:4-7 emphasizes christological, soteriological, and trinitarian aspects in the mission when God send his Son. The ‘adoption as sons’ initialized by the Son of God in Gal 4:5 in our text is closely related to the Spirit (ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα υἰοθεσίας).¹¹⁵⁶ Evidently, Christ is mentioned only once at the end of the passage in 8: 17 (we are ‘co-heirs’ with Christ) but it may be noted that 8:3-4 prepare the idea of the ‘sonship’ by referring to the mission of God’s own Son; hence christological and soteriological environment should not be neglected.¹¹⁵⁷ It is hardly surprising that Paul focuses on the Spirit, because its role is strongly underlined in the previous passage (8:1-13); Paul takes this argument over in 8:26-27. Furthermore, Paul adds some new ideas which do not appear in Gal 4:4-7, namely ‘be led by the Spirit’ (v. 14), ‘spirit of slavery’ as opposed to that ‘of adoption’, ‘Spirit as a witness to our spirit’ (v. 16), and ‘we co-share sufferings and glory with Christ’. Some of these elements supplement the image of God the Father (Gal 4:4-7) with new details and they will be discussed, while for the other material that is common to both passages (υἰοθεσία, κράζω, αββα ὁ πατήρ, κληρονόμος) see the interpretation on Gal 4:4-7. Differently from Gal 4:4-7, the analyzed text presents God as Father exclusively

¹¹⁵⁵ This comparison is borrowed from WILCKENS, *Der Brief an die Römer*, Teil. 2, p. 138.

¹¹⁵⁶ Cf. FEE, *God’s Empowering Presence*, p. 562.

¹¹⁵⁷ Cf. also A. PITTA, *Lettera ai Romani*, LBNT 6, Milano: Paoline, 2001, p. 294.

from the believers' perspective. They are his 'sons' and 'children'.¹¹⁵⁸ It means that Paul here is interested not as much in Jesus' sonship,¹¹⁵⁹ but in ours'. Thematically, these four verses may be divided in two closely related units: *who* and *by means of whom* they are the children of God (vv. 14-16), and further *consequences* (v. 17).

There are five references to God's fatherhood in the first unit:

- 1) *they* are sons of God - οὗτοι υἱοὶ θεοῦ εἰσιν (v. 14)
- 2) *you* received the Spirit of adoption - ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα υἱοθεσίας (v. 15b)
- 3) in which *we* cry Abba! Father! - ἐν ᾧ κρᾶζομεν· ἀββα ὁ πατήρ (v. 15c)
- 4) *we* are children of God - ἐσμεν τέκνα θεοῦ (v. 16)
- 5) *we* are heirs of God - κληρονόμοι μὲν θεοῦ (v. 17)

The change of pronouns they/you/we (vv. 4-5) does not surprise as Paul probably wished to put more emphasis on a communal nature of being the children of God (cf. Gal 4:6-7 but in a different way) here. One of the problematic questions in the first and second references is the relationship between the Spirit and the status of the sons of God. The answer depends on various grammatical and contextual aspects the interpreters appeal to dealing with vv. 14-15b.¹¹⁶⁰ The parallel text in Gal 4:4-5 does not facilitate the solution to the problem because it is also complicated. The verse ὅσοι γὰρ πνεύματι θεοῦ ἄγονται, οὗτοι υἱοὶ θεοῦ εἰσιν (v. 14) is usually interpreted either as a separate statement, or in relation to the preceding text (especially v. 13). Probably it is preferable to interpret it as referring to primacy of the Spirit's activity in being the sons of God. However, who uphold such interpretation, use slightly different terms to express the relationship between role of the Spirit and status of the sons of God: "is determined by",¹¹⁶¹ "constitutes",¹¹⁶² is "the result of this Spirit-dominated existence",¹¹⁶³ "dalla guida compiuta dallo Spirito...derivi il nostro diventare figli di Dio".¹¹⁶⁴

¹¹⁵⁸ υἱοὶ θεοῦ and τέκνα θεοῦ are used in this passage without distinction; cf. CRANFIELD, *Romans*, vol. 1, p. 396 note 1; BYRNE, 'Sons of God' - 'Seed of Abraham', p. 100 note 83; DUNN, *Romans 1-8*, p. 455; SCHREINER, *Romans*, p. 423.

¹¹⁵⁹ Apart from v. 17 in which Christ is described as a God's heir that implies his 'being Son'.

¹¹⁶⁰ For example, there are different interpretations of ὅσοι (v. 14). Since ὅσοι stands in emphatic position some scholars think it has a restrictive sense 'only those who'; cf. O. MICHEL, *Der Brief an die Römer*, KEKNT, IV, 14, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978, p. 259; see also FEE, *God's Empowering Presence*, p. 563f. Others think it has to be understood in an inclusive sense 'all who'; cf. SCHLIER, *La lettera ai Romani*, p. 416; CRANFIELD, *Romans*, vol. 1, p. 395; WILCKENS, *Der Brief an die Römer*, Teil. 2, p. 136; MORRIS, *The Epistle to the Romans*, p. 313; FITZMYER, *Romans*, p. 499; MOO, *The Epistle to the Romans*, p. 498 note 7; PITTA, *Lettera ai Romani*, p. 296. Dunn leaves it ambiguous "as many as"; DUNN, *Romans 1-8*, p. 450. The uncertainty is also with conjunction γὰρ (v. 14) whether it is merely connective or explanatory. For the first sense cf. SCHLIER, *La lettera ai Romani*, p. 416; FITZMYER, *Romans*, p. 499; PITTA, *Lettera ai Romani*, p. 295. The second sense is opted by CRANFIELD, *Romans*, vol. 1, p. 395; MOO, *The Epistle to the Romans*, p. 498; FEE, *God's Empowering Presence*, p. 562; SCHREINER, *Romans*, p. 422.

¹¹⁶¹ DUNN, *Romans 1-8*, p. 451.

¹¹⁶² FITZMYER, *Romans*, p. 498.

¹¹⁶³ MOO, *The Epistle to the Romans*, p. 499.

¹¹⁶⁴ PITTA, *Lettera ai Romani*, p. 295.

Some explanation requires Paul's affirmation that the sons of God are all who are led (passive ἄγονται) by the Spirit. The verb ἄγω is rarely found in the whole Pauline corpus¹¹⁶⁵ and in a passive form only three times. The verse Gal 5:18 (πνεύματι ἄγεσθε) thematically corresponds the line which is parallel to Gal 5:16 (πνεύματι περιπατεῖτε), thus the correspondance sheds more light on our text. This parallelism presents the Spirit in a twofold manner: walking by the Spirit is opposed to fulfilling desires of the flesh (v. 16) being led by the Spirit is opposed to being under the law (v. 18). Apart these verses there are two more pairs of opposite ideas in this chapter: Christ brings freedom and it is opposed to slavery (v. 1); the Spirit justifies and it is opposed to justification by the law (vv. 4-5). So, it is evident that on the one hand freedom (Christ) is the basic principle expressed by means of justification and living not according to the flesh (Spirit) and that the law is slavery (including desires of the flesh) on the other. The reference to the law (v. 18) is a bit confusing as it appears in Paul's ongoing argumentation on the life by the Spirit (vv. 16-26). It is possible, that in such way Paul wants to accentuate the fruit of the Spirit (vv. 22-23) that becomes visible in life, led by the Spirit, therefore Christians are not anymore under dominion of the law. Another suitable interpretation is that Paul sees no contradiction between his polemic against the flesh and freedom from the law; the one' life led by the Spirit is not enslaving and is not a return to legalism but a real Christian freedom.¹¹⁶⁶ The pattern 'Christ-Spirit',¹¹⁶⁷ corresponds to 'freedom-life by the Spirit',¹¹⁶⁸ and is further elaborated in Rom 8 (vv. 2.4-6.9.10-11): life according to the flesh is not only slavery (as in Gal 5) but leads to death (v. 13) whereas life according to the Spirit¹¹⁶⁹ is a true life that leads to resurrection of the mortal bodies (vv. 11.13). Both Gal 5 and Rom 8: 1-13 imply that the phrase in the text πνεύματι θεοῦ ἄγονται (v. 14) should be understood in terms of Christians' behavior that is led¹¹⁷⁰ by the Spirit and it encompasses all aspects of their life. The purpose of this activity is to set people free as the Spirit is not that of slavery (v. 15a). Such slavery-freedom pattern evokes the story of the Exodus¹¹⁷¹ even more that God leads his people

¹¹⁶⁵ Cf. Rom 2:4; 1 Cor 12:2; Gal 5:18; 1 Tess 4:14; 2 Tim 3:6; 4:11.

¹¹⁶⁶ Cf. CORSANI, *Lettera ai Galati*, pp. 356-357.

¹¹⁶⁷ In Rom 8:9 Paul says πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ (the Spirit of Christ) and in Gal 4:6 τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ (the Spirit of his [God's] Son).

¹¹⁶⁸ In Rom 8:2 Paul speaks about νόμος τοῦ πνεύματος τῆς ζωῆς (the law of the Spirit of life).

¹¹⁶⁹ In Rom 8 Paul uses various expressions to present life in the Spirit: περιπατοῦσιν... κατὰ πνεῦμα (walk according to the Spirit, v. 4), φρόνημα τοῦ πνεύματος (setting mind on the Spirit, v. 6), ἐν πνεύματι (you are in the Spirit, v.9), πνεῦμα...οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν (the Spirit dwells in you, vv. 9.11).

¹¹⁷⁰ The supposition of KÄSEMANN, *Commentary on Romans*, p. 226, that ἄγονται means "driven by the Spirit" and his reference to "the vocabulary of the enthusiasts according to 1 Cor 12:2" found little approval, Dunn agreed; cf. DUNN, *Romans 1-8*, p. 450. The observation of SCHLIER, *La lettera ai Romani*, p. 416 note 4, that Gal 5:18 and 5:16 are clearly parallel and point to Christian moral behavior, has been taken over (with or without modifications) by many commentators.

¹¹⁷¹ Also noticed by PITTA, *Lettera ai Romani*, p. 295.

and this act is also expressed by the same verb ἄγω though only in an active form.¹¹⁷² Thus being led by the Spirit means freedom from the law or any kind of flesh slavery and a completely new life under dominion¹¹⁷³ of the Spirit whose purpose is to bring people to the Father as close as it is possible since this is the real freedom (v. 15c), moreover, it makes free from death (v. 13).

The second reference to the divine sonship πνεῦμα υἱοθεσίας (v. 15b) enlightens¹¹⁷⁴ the relationship between the Spirit and the sons of God (v. 14) but, however, it is no less problematic. At least four interpretations have been proposed regarding the Spirit of ‘adoption as sons’. Some scholars think that adoption is a result of the activity of the Spirit; others suggest that the Spirit anticipates adoption that we still await (cf. v. 23); or that the Spirit enables people to express adoption outwardly; still there is an opinion that the Spirit goes reciprocally and is intertwined with adoption.¹¹⁷⁵ First interpretation is more plausible because ‘Spirit’ (v. 15ab) is presented in a twofold way: πνεῦμα δουλείας is opposite to πνεῦμα υἱοθεσίας. ‘Spirit’ is here better understood as the agent either who affects slavery, or processes of ‘adoption as sons’.¹¹⁷⁶ In Rom 8:11 the Spirit is presented as Father’s *agent* through whom he gives life (v. 11), therefore Moo deduces that also through the Spirit as the agent the divine sonship is “bestowed and confirmed”.¹¹⁷⁷ Furthermore, Paul opposes justification by the law (used the same term δικαίω and δικαιοσύνη) to *justification through the Spirit, by faith* (Gal 5:4-5 πνεύματι ἐκ πίστεως) and also asserts that the *divine sonship* of believers is *in Christ Jesus, through faith* (Gal 3:26, see interpretation). Obviously, it is God who effects justification but is valid only for the one who has *faith in Jesus* (Rom 3:26). Namely faith is the common denominator in these texts. Apparently, to be justified through the Spirit means to be ‘sons of God’ and this takes place in Christ, by faith and through the Spirit. Although here is no mention about God’s sending of the Spirit (as it is in Gal 4:6), nevertheless adoption is a natural privilege of a father and in our case of God the Father (cf. Gal 4:4-5); so even here the trinitarian aspect may also be perceived.

¹¹⁷² Cf. Deut 8:2.15; 29:4; 32:12; Josh 24:8; Ezek 19:4; 20:10. Noteworthy, there is only one text in LXX in which this verb occurs in a passive form in relation to God (Amos 7:17). This verse is a prophecy introduced by ‘*thus says the Lord*’ about Israel being led to exile.

¹¹⁷³ SCHREINER, *Romans*, p. 422, strongly emphasizes the aspect of obedience to the Spirit (because of the verb in a passive form). Yet obedience that does not lead to freedom is another kind of slavery.

¹¹⁷⁴ γάρ (v. 15a) is explanatory. So also MOO, *The Epistle to the Romans*, p. 499. Cf. BYRNE, ‘Sons of God’ - ‘Seed of Abraham’, p. 98; WILCKENS, *Der Brief an die Römer*, Teil. 2, p. 136; SCHREINER, *Romans*, p. 423.

¹¹⁷⁵ See T. J. BURKE, “Adoption and the Spirit in Romans 8,” *EvQ* 70 (4, 1998), pp. 316-318.

¹¹⁷⁶ Cf. FEE, *God’s Empowering Presence*, p. 566. He gives a parallel example θεός τῆς ἐλπίδος (Rom 15:13) and explains that instead of thinking of God as full of hope (hardly possible) it is more plausibly to say that God “fills his people with hope”; note 277; cf. also SCHREINER, *Romans*, p. 425 note 16.

¹¹⁷⁷ MOO, *The Epistle to the Romans*, p. 502.

The ‘adoption as sons’ is not something else as being the sons of God¹¹⁷⁸ in the present.¹¹⁷⁹ This status is primarily granted through the Spirit at conversion¹¹⁸⁰ (aorist ἐλάβετε, v. 15b), then further continuously realized through the leading by the Spirit (present ἄγονται, v. 14), and finally manifested fully in eschatological glory (τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ θεοῦ ἀπεκδέχεται, v. 19, υἱοθεσίαν ἀπεκδεχόμενοι, v. 23).¹¹⁸¹

Three last references in our sequence ἐν ᾧ κράζομεν· ἀββα ὁ πατήρ (v. 15c), ἐσμέν τέκνα θεοῦ (v. 16), and κληρονόμοι μὲν θεοῦ (v. 17) add little to the image of God the Father that has been already discussed in Gal 4:4-7 (see interpretation in 4.2.3.2.2.). One of deviations from Gal 4 is here that *we* instead of the Spirit cry in the Spirit ‘Abba! Father!’ but as it has been explained above it makes little difference. Regarding the connection between the phrase ἐν ᾧ κράζομεν· ἀββα ὁ πατήρ (v. 15c) with the following verse (ἐν ᾧ, it is translated ‘when’ as it is done in RSV and NRSV) the traditional rendering is more preferable (ἐν ᾧ means ‘in whom’) and is accepted by many commentators.¹¹⁸² The phrase κληρονόμοι...θεοῦ is more suitable than κληρονόμος διὰ θεοῦ (Gal 4:7) though as it has been noted that the use of the preposition διὰ in relation to God is not completely alien to Paul’s style. However Paul adds some new elements describing the status of being heirs (v. 17). Firstly, he associates the preposition σύν with other terms (three times) to underline ours’ closest relationship with Christ. Thus we are heirs not only of God the Father (as in Gal 4:7) but also co-heirs with Christ and this means our sonship is in Christ. This is possible through¹¹⁸³ co-suffering with Christ in the present daily life. Secondly, this relationship with Christ leads inevitably to ours’ co-glorification with him. The glory of God people because of their sin have been deprived of (Rom 3:23) but still waiting with hope to share it (Rom 5:2) is now accessible in Christ so that¹¹⁸⁴ we may share it arriving at the full manifestation of ours’ being heirs of God the Father.

¹¹⁷⁸ It may be noted that Paul speaks about υἱοθεσία that belongs to Israelites (9:4) though nowhere in the OT this word is mentioned; yet Israel(ites) as son(s) of God are vastly attested (see chapter 1).

¹¹⁷⁹ The present tense εἰσιν, κράζομεν, ἐσμέν (vv. 14-16).

¹¹⁸⁰ Cf. CRANFIELD, *Romans*, vol. 1, p. 396; DUNN, *Romans 1-8*, p. 451. Many scholars think that the reception of the Spirit is associated with baptism though in our text is nothing said about it. The similar text in Gal 3:26-27 does refer to baptism thus it may have been in Paul’s mind in Rom 8:15b; cf. SCHREINER, *Romans*, p. 424.

¹¹⁸¹ This is a modified scheme proposed by SCHLIER, *La lettera ai Romani*, p. 417.

¹¹⁸² For arguments see CRANFIELD, *Romans*, vol. 1, p. 398; cf. MORRIS, *The Epistle to the Romans*, p. 315 note 67; MOO, *The Epistle to the Romans*, p. 502; SCHREINER, *Romans*, p. 425.

¹¹⁸³ The exact sense of ἐνπερ in connection with συμπάσχομεν is not clear. If it introduces a condition (‘if’) the idea is that we are heirs of God and co-heirs with Christ as far as we suffer with him; cf. DUNN, *Romans 1-8*, p. 456. But if it is merely declarative (‘seeing that’, ‘since’) emphasis is put on the fact that we indeed participate in Christ’s sufferings since we are children of God; cf. CRANFIELD, *Romans*, vol. 1, p. 407. First interpretation is closer to vv. 12-13, while the latter better conforms to v. 17 in which εἰ δὲ τέκνα, καὶ κληρονόμοι is clearly unconditional statement.

¹¹⁸⁴ ἵνα here indicates the connection between co-suffering and co-glorification with Christ; *pace* CRANFIELD, *Romans*, vol. 1, p. 408.

The image of God the Father in Rom 8:14-17 should be viewed through the perspective of activity of the Spirit who is vastly referred to in the whole chapter. God is a Father to us because our ‘adoption as sons’ is through the Spirit and our present life as children of God is determined by the Spirit who leads us to a completely new life of freedom from the law or any kind of flesh slavery. Namely, ours self-understanding being free from fear that is the result of slavery enables us to address God in the Spirit *αββα ὁ πατήρ* thus expressing our confidence and obedience as well as affection and respect. As adopted children we have been already granted the status of heirs of God as well as co-heirs with Christ in the present life but its final consummation in the future will be even more amazing as we alongside Christ will share a glory of the Father.

4.2.6.3. A Wish-Prayer in Rom 15:5-6

The last reference to God’s fatherhood appears at the end of the passage (15:1-6) which sums up the second half of discussion about lack of mutual understanding within community on ‘clean’ and ‘unclean’ meals (14:13-23; started in 14:1) and perhaps on other issues.¹¹⁸⁵ Again, Paul points out to the primary responsibility of those who are ‘strong’ in faith, namely they ought to bear with the failings of the ‘weak’ (v. 1), and Christ for them is the example to follow (v. 3). They should hope that harmony in community will be achieved, especially due to the fact that the Scripture also encourages them (v. 4).

The wish-prayer (vv. 5-6) consists of two thematically related parts that both stress the importance of unity of the members of community. Paul knows that a harmonious life is possible only by intervention of God, therefore he appeals to *θεὸς τῆς ὑπομονῆς καὶ τῆς παρακλήσεως*, repeating what he has just said about the Scripture *διὰ τῆς ὑπομονῆς καὶ διὰ τῆς παρακλήσεως τῶν γραφῶν* (v. 4) thereby indicating that behind it stands God who is active in life of believers.¹¹⁸⁶ The patient endurance (*ὑπομονή*) and comfort (*παρακλήσις*) are the most wanted qualities to change the situation¹¹⁸⁷ and they may be granted only by God who is the source.¹¹⁸⁸ Therefore Paul prays that God would grant them ‘to be of the same mind’¹¹⁸⁹

¹¹⁸⁵ Cf. SCHLIER, *La lettera ai Romani*, p. 674.

¹¹⁸⁶ Cf. PITTA, *Lettera ai Romani*, p. 484. So also SCHREINER, *Romans*, p. 749.

¹¹⁸⁷ In LXX God is not qualified as ‘God of patient endurance’ though the term *ὑπομονή* is vastly attested. Paul occasionally employs it in texts when he indicates some tribulation or sufferings (Rom 5:3; 8:18-25; 2 Cor 1:6; 1 Tess 1:3; 2 Tess 1:4). Another phrase ‘God of comfort’ is also exclusively Pauline (cf. 2 Cor 1:3).

¹¹⁸⁸ So does many commentators.

¹¹⁸⁹ That this is the meaning of *τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν* in Pauline letters “may be taken as certain”. CRANFIELD, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, vol. 2, p. 737.

according to the will and example¹¹⁹⁰ (κατὰ Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν) of Christ Jesus. However, Paul's prayer is here not for the unity in the issues which divide community, but for the unity that flows from capacity to accept and love one another despite existing differences.¹¹⁹¹ This unity is not only a matter of living peacefully with each another, i.e. is not to be seen merely from ethical perspective, there is a purpose in it (ὡς... δοξάζητε, v. 6).¹¹⁹² Hence the unity Paul prays for is more than a condition to be achieved within community in order to glorify God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ¹¹⁹³ ('that you may', RSV, NRSV); performing this unanimously (ὁμοθυμαδὸν) and with one voice (ἐν ἑνὶ στόματι) believers experience "a deep and satisfying unity"¹¹⁹⁴ that strengthens them in overcoming disagreements and fosters patience and love.

In summary, since Paul has neither founded the church in Rome, nor has visited Romans before, he wrote this letter, which is not dealing with particular questions with the exception of the problems between 'strong' and 'weak' believers. The main theme that dominates in this letter is righteousness of God/justification that comprises other topics such as sin, law, death, etc. Two references to God as Father occur namely in this context. In this letter God's fatherhood is closely associated with a *new life* which we are granted as his children. The basis for this new life is the resurrection of Christ by the Father and 'adoption as sons' through the Spirit who determines our present life as of children of God and leads from slavery to freedom that results in *completely new relationships* with the Father (αββα ὁ πατήρ) grounded on *confidence and obedience* as well as *affection and respect*. The new life led by the Spirit contains also communitarian dimension, therefore the unity between Christians makes God's glory visible. As his adopted children and heirs, we are guaranteed that our present status will reach its final consummation in the future and will participate in his glory alongside Christ. Glory of the Father is operative and the Christ will be fully revealed in us as the definite victory over death.

* * *

Since brief summaries have been already done at the end of each analyzed letter, it seems opportune to present a thorough outline of the image of God as Father in order to summarize the main characteristics of the divine fatherly activity in all analyzed Pauline letters.

Firstly, it should be noted on the statistic and syntactic grounds that the fatherhood of God is predominantly attested in the 'Father-texts' while the 'son-texts' add little to his fatherly

¹¹⁹⁰ Pace J. D. G. DUNN, *Romans 9-16*, WBC 38B, Dallas: Word Books, 1988, p. 840; followed by SCHREINER, *Romans*, p. 750.

¹¹⁹¹ Cf. CRANFIELD, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, vol. 2, 737; SCHREINER, *Romans*, p. 750.

¹¹⁹² Cf. MORRIS, *The Epistle to the Romans*, p. 501; SCHREINER, *Romans*, p. 750.

¹¹⁹³ For the expression ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ see interpretation of 2 Cor 1:3-4.

¹¹⁹⁴ MORRIS, *The Epistle to the Romans*, p. 502.

image; yet they confirm its exceptional character with respect to Jesus Christ and the Christians. There is no simile regarding the divine fatherhood in any Pauline letters. It is noteworthy that God as Father is never associated with the term 'Lord', that is normally used in other passages either with respect to God or Jesus Christ. The fatherhood of God is strongly associated with the figure of Jesus Christ, yet only two 'addressee' groups are pointed out in the genitive case in connection with God as Father: Lord Jesus Christ and Christians.

Secondly, from the theological point of view, there is only *one* God and his name is 'Father'. Although he is not given any particular epithet such as *creator*, *maker*, or *ruler*, he is the *source*, *goal*, and *end* of everything and everybody; and his activity pervades all human history from creation to its consummation (1 Cor 8:6; 15:28). The salvific activity of Jesus has been grounded on the *will* of God the Father (Gal 1:4). It was neither the coincidence of any circumstances which could have arisen without the divine will nor somebody's autonomous choice or ambition. God the Father is the very *fundament* of Christ's redemptive activity and is *operative* throughout all its stages: he decided when the fullness of time had come to send his Son (Gal 4:4), and he raised him from the dead (Gal 1:1). Moreover, he gave us a possibility to become his children 'in Christ' (Gal 3:26; Rom 8:14) and thereby sent his Son's Spirit to our hearts, donated us completely new relationship with himself (Gal 4:6; cf. Rom 8:15), and made us his free children and heirs from now and onwards (Gal 4:7; Rom 8:17), even shared his glory (Rom 8:17). God of Abraham, who once had given him a promise (Gal 3:18), finally revealed his true name in Christ by the Spirit crying in us *Abba* (Gal 4:6; cf. Rom 8:15). God the Father is the source of *grace and peace* for the Christian communities, continuously empowers them with a true joy, peace, and salvation (initial salutations), and gives loving *mercy/compassion* and *comfort* in any affliction (2 Cor 1:3).

Thirdly, from the relational point of view, first of all God is the Father of Jesus who is his Son in the unique and absolute sense (1 Cor 15:28), and in/through whom *God's glory becomes operative* and reaches its full dimension (Phil 2:9-11). Moreover, God the Father in connection with Jesus Christ shares his authority with him as far as Jesus plays the equal role in granting grace and peace (initial salutations). They are considered to be the compound subject that has the same function equally shared by both of them (1 Thess 3:11). This is also valid in description of God the Father as the *principal protagonist* of the Christian community, whether its' being *in* him were understood in a local-spatial or instrumental/causal sense (1 Thess 1:1). The activity of the Father and Son are so closely *interrelated* that it is inconceivable to speak about one without other, and this is strongly underlined in 1 Cor. It means that the fatherhood of God is very christological and, *vice versa* the Christology is highly theological. Therefore, it is not surprising that the relationship between God as Father and people are portrayed including

necessary participation of Jesus Christ in one or another way: 'Father-Jesus-believers' (initial salutations), 'God-Christ-children of God' (Gal 3:26), 'Father/God-Christ-Paul' (Gal 1:1.16), 'Father-Christ-Spirit-we-Spirit-Father' (Gal 4:6), and 'God the Father-Christ-Paul/companions-believers' (2 Cor 1:3).

Finally, the role of the divine Father in the daily life of Christians is also very important. On the one hand, there is a reference to his *strong* side that is basically portrayed in terms of his *moral-authoritative supremacy* (1 Thess 1:3 and 3:13); on the other hand, his *soft* side is well presented by his *pastoral* activity (1 Thess 3:11) that is in fact based on his *loving/caring* attitude to men in general and the Thessalonians in particular (cf. 2 Thess 2:16-17). He enables people to share his *comfort* with others, *promoting love* and *unity* within Christian community (2 Cor 1:3; cf. Rom 15:5-6), which becomes his temple where he dwells (2 Cor 6:16). Hence, the ethical behavior and inner life of Christians' must conform to their status as children of God, as God the Father *knows* who they are (2 Cor 11:31). God's fatherhood is closely associated with a *new life* which we are granted as his children (Rom 6:4). The basis for this new life is the resurrection of Christ by the Father, and 'adoption as sons' through the Spirit who determines our present life as children of God and leads us from slavery to freedom (Rom 8:15). The *new life* led by the Spirit contains communitarian dimension as well, therefore the unity between Christians manifests God's glory within them (Rom 15:5-6). Actually, the obedience of his children to him is not the primary interest of the divine Father as he *is always open to a dialogue* without any prejudices who his children may appeal to. It results as *completely* new relationships with the Father grounded on *confidence and obedience* as well as *affection and respect* (*Abba* in Gal 4:6 and Rom 8:15). The introductory thanksgiving (1 Thess) and wish-prayers (1-2 Thess) show that the divine Father is the one to whom the prayers may and should be addressed. It is further confirmed by the doxology (Phil 4:20) which actually is the only one text in the NT where the glory is given to God the Father. Evidently, the glory that is ascribed to God the Father (cf. also Phil 2:11) is *a specific characteristic of his fatherhood* what prompts people as his children to praise him forever (cf. also Rom 15:6).

CONCLUSIONS

In this dissertation the references to God as Father in different biblical and non-biblical literature have been examined from various perspectives. The analysis has disclosed the peculiarity as well as similarity of the basic features of God's fatherhood in separately taken segment. Since every chapter and sub-chapters have been summarized thoroughly, it is opportune here to indicate the *basic* characteristics of God as Father which have been disclosed in different writings, also to recapitulate common and divergent ideas, which have been revealed through the analysis of all texts.

1. The statistic and syntactic analysis of the OT regarding the term 'father' in relation to God (is is used only twenty times) has disclosed some important differences: whereas is a tendency in LXX to keep close 'Lord' and 'Father', the HB avoids it; the immediate contexts of theological 'father' employed in LXX are essentially prayers; LXX emphasizes more God's fatherhood in relationship with individuals. The comparison of the 'father-texts' and 'son-texts' forms and contents has revealed their similarities and differences. The largest difference is the usage of the filial images in the deuterocanonical books. The fatherhood of God in those texts is presented from an almost *positive* or *neutral* perspective. Admittedly, the differences between the text-groups need to be understood against the background of their date and addresses. The evident time difference between the traditions that present divine fatherhood to the people and the king and to the individuals reveals the preferences and tendencies conceiving God as Father. It is evident, that his *creative* and *redeeming* activities are the outstanding proofs of his fatherhood to Israel are not emphasized in the other texts-groups. On the other hand, despite the multifaceted relationship between God as Father and Israel as son, the aspect of fatherly *merciful care* is attested; nevertheless a kind of suppression of this facet by his more majestic images is observed. The *merciful care* of the divine Father is revealed as one of his basic characteristics particularly at the individual level. Furthermore, the divine *protection* and *assistance* that are found in all text-groups, achieve the highest materialization at the individual level, i.e. it is valid and effective even in/after death. Despite the fact that the divine *authority* is one of the basic characteristics that stands at the background of the divine fatherhood, the texts in the book of Wisdom suggest that the *mercy* and *care* of God as Father have priority over his more powerful side. There are many similar aspects of the divine fatherhood, which are retraceable in every text-group. The principal convergent idea of texts is that the 'addressees' associate the activity of the divine Father with the *religious-moral behavior*. God as Father is never portrayed in an abstract sense. The *protection* is among the many fatherly aspects which

are presented with various nuances in all text-groups. This quality is even more significant because it has constant character, as the OT presents, i.e., the fatherly protection is not only a temporary element. The *educational* activity is another more credited aspect of the divine fatherhood. This fatherly characteristic is so close to one of the essential qualities of the earthly father, and it is presented in the OT in a manner even to be imitated by men.

2. The analysis of Stoic fragments has revealed that the idea of God as Father is not significant and very innovative. The image of the mythological *prolific fatherhood* of Zeus was complemented by the idea of Platonic *Father-maker, artificer, and ruler*. Thus in the Stoic theological framework the *creative* and *ruling power* of the divine Father was well established. On the other hand, the image of God Zeus as an *all-permeating divine cosmic 'spirit'* that consumes everything at the time of conflagration, reflects a *pantheistic* conception of the divinity by the ancient Stoics. Though in Stoic philosophy god(s) are generally benevolent, there is no real personal relationship between God and man. Cleanthes and especially Seneca exposed more religious character of the conception of Father-God. They pointed out the possibility as well as the necessity to address a philosophical God in order to establish mutual relationships. These two different and even contradictory aspects of the Stoic approach towards the divine fatherhood show that there is hardly any possibility to ascertain their evident and comprehensive position regarding conception of God as Father, the relationships God-man, and their quality as well. The statistic and syntactic analysis of Philonic literature has disclosed that the author employs theological term 'father' quite abundantly. The total amount of references (160x) here is eight times larger than in the OT and four times larger than in the whole Pauline corpus, let alone the Stoic, Qumran, and early Jewish literature. Syntactically, Philo's writings also present the biggest variety of 'Father' associated by means of 'and' with other terms such as *eternal, unbegotten, source, sovereign*, etc. Moreover, the term 'father' is abundantly qualified by various terms, which basically mean 'all, creation'. The analysis of references in different text-groups has also disclosed similarities and differences, especially in the context of the 'addressees' who are in relationship with Father. Four most recurring 'addressee' groups have been detected: the *divine sphere*, the *Logos*, *heaven* and *the world*, and *man/soul*. In all these groups the positive image of God as Father is dominant. The last 'addressee' group *man/soul* is the largest in number and presents the variety of aspects of the divine and the human activity. The *creative-begetting* aspect is one of the most important characteristics in the activity of God as Father. It dominates in the two sub-groups of the 'father-texts' (major and minor phrase-references), also it is significant in the 'son-texts', though it is absent in similes. The continual in its nature divine creative activity is also *beneficent*, because the God as Creator is *good*. The fatherly *goodness* and *beneficence* are also implied in the activities of the 'addressees': they

praise and thanks him. Similarly, this fundamental characteristic should be seen in God's fatherly *providence/provision* and *care*, attested both in the 'father-texts' and the similes, and even more so, since it is closely connected with the activity of God as *Maker*. The terminology of *providence/provision* and *care* both refer to the *responsibility* of God as Creator, and the *natural duty* of the earthly father; their amalgamation is evident in the activity of the divine Father. His *beneficence* and *concern* is expressed by God's *cooperation* with his creation, especially in favor of men, and the *intimacy* or at least *nearness* of the Father is expressed by their wish to imitate the Father's virtues and to belong to him. Even the fatherly *authority* in the 'father', 'son' texts, and the similes expressed in terms of *disciplining* does not alter the overall positive image of God as Father.

3. The survey of the texts referring to God's fatherhood in non-biblical Jewish literature has revealed overly positive presentation of God as Father. Qumran fragments disclose three principal aspects in which the image of God as Father is presented: his *educational and teaching activity, strength, and his non-abandoning position*. The analysis of the 'father-texts' has shown that the *non-abandoning* attitude of God as Father towards the people or individuals is to be considered as his basic characteristics as the accent is put on the individual(s) rather than on the people as in the OT. The appeal of the individual in the analyzed simile *be for me, O of[ur] Lord, like a father* has no parallels in the OT, and shows the tendency to construe the relationships between God and man in a more personal manner. The very personal invocations *my Father, my God* and *my Father my Lord* add a new aspect to their contents. Since both 'addressees' to God as Father are closely connected with his *non-abandoning* attitude, the personal invocation *my Father* highlights the intimate character of the relationships between God and man even more. The overview of the other early Jewish literature has confirmed the positive pattern of Qumran writings: all text-groups present or allude to the divine Father positively. Those texts disclose the variety God as Father and present a rather multifaceted conception of the fatherhood of God. The divine fatherhood embraces the divine (angels) and cosmic (creation and its sustaining/preservation) sphere both. The human 'addressees' of the divine fatherhood are those, who belong to Israel: the people in its integrity, the faithful elect, and the righteous individuals. The characteristics establishing the image God as Father are quite various in different texts; also they vary slightly regarding addressee-group: Israel or Jews enjoy God's fatherly *proximity, mercy* (including the motive of *rescue and protection*), *fidelity, and love* (some texts express it through *chastisement-education* pattern); the faithful elect are promised that they will live with him and will *enjoy his refuge forever*; Job's daughters are assured his *protection and help*; orphans/proselytes may *rely upon the rescue* from danger and his *affectionate love*; single

individuals benefit from his *forgiveness* and even are admitted to *share his glory, reign and peace/salvation*.

4. The statistic and syntactic analysis of the Pauline undisputed letters has revealed that the fatherhood of God is predominantly attested in the 'Father-texts'. There are few 'son-texts', which were taken into consideration; yet they confirm an exceptional character of God's fatherhood with respect to Jesus Christ and the Christians. There is no simile regarding the divine fatherhood in any of Pauline letters. It is noteworthy that, as in the HB and Philo, God as Father is never associated with the term 'Lord', which is normally used in other passages to denote either God or Jesus Christ. The fatherhood of God is strongly associated with the figure of Jesus Christ. There are only two 'addressee' groups which are presented in connection with God as Father: Lord Jesus Christ and Christians. The analysis of the individual texts has shown their mutual relationship and the vital dependence on God as Father. There is only *one* God and his name is 'Father'. Although he is not given any particular epithet such as *creator, maker, or ruler*, as in Philonic literature, he is the *source, goal, and end* of everything and everybody; and his activity pervades all human history from creation to its consummation. The *will* of God the Father has the decisive role in the redemptive work of Jesus. Father is the very *fundament* of every Christ's activity as Father *operates* with/through him in all stages of history of salvation: he sent his Son and raised him from the dead to grant us the 'adoption as sons', he sent his Son's Spirit to determine us as the children of God, in order we might have *completely new* relationship with him when appealing to *Abba*. He is the *principal protagonist* of the very existence of the Christian community which he endows with *grace and peace*, and gives the believers loving *mercy/compassion* and *comfort* in any affliction. Through the detailed analysis of the individual texts, the relational aspect of the relationship between God and Christ who is *the Son* in unique and absolute sense became more evident: God the Father is in connection with Jesus Christ and shares his authority with Son, and in the same way Jesus equally grants *grace and peace*. Son and Father are considered to be the compound subject, where both of them *equally share* the same function. This is also valid in describing God the Father as the *principal protagonist* of the existence of the Christian community, where its' being *in* Father would be understood in a local-spatial or instrumental/causal senses. The activity of Father and Son are so closely *interrelated* that it is impossible to speak about one without another, and this is strongly underlined in 1 Cor. It means that the fatherhood of God is very christological and, *vice versa* the Christology is highly theological. Therefore, the relationships between God as Father and Christians are portrayed including obligatory participation of Jesus Christ in one or another way: 'Father-Jesus-believers' (initial salutations), 'God-Christ-children of God' (Gal 3:26), 'Father/God-Christ-Paul' (Gal 1:1.16), 'Father-Christ-Spirit-we-Spirit-Father' (Gal 4:6), and

‘God the Father-Christ-Paul/companions-believers’ (2 Cor 1:3). Furthermore, the role of the God the Father in the daily life of Christians is also very important. He enables people to share his *comfort* with others, *promotes love* and *unity* within Christian community, which becomes his temple where he dwells. Hence, the ethical behavior and inner life of Christians’ must conform to their status as children of God, because God the Father *knows* who they are; therefore they are enabled and obliged to accept a *new life* which they are granted as his children. The *new life* led by the Spirit contains communitarian dimension as well, therefore the *Father’s glory* is manifested within community through Christian unity, especially when all praise him with one voice.

5. The analyzed texts have disclosed some peculiarities in the description of God as Father in different types of literature; therefore it is worth to summarize and group them:

1) The field of activity of God as Father and the ‘addressees’:

a) the *divine sphere* is one of the fields of God’s fatherly activity in Stoic literature and Philo. He is the creator of other gods and the governor of all that belongs to this sphere (one reference in early Jewish writings);

b) the *all creation* proceeds from him and it is the field of his active *rule* and *preservation*. This is evident in Stoic and Jewish literature, and especially it is emphasized by Philo as he employs a lot of various epithets to express these ideas;

c) according to Stoic literature and Philo, everything that belongs to the *human sphere in general* was created by him, and stays under his *kind* and *sustaining* control;

d) in the OT, God is a Father to the *people of Israel* in the exclusive way as he *created* him (his son, first-born). This conception is amplified and given even more universalistic character in Philo (*Israel* is the first-fruits). The idea about God as Father to *Israel* is also attested in Qumran and in the early Jewish literature, as well as mentioned by Paul (*Israel* has ‘adoption as son’);

e) in the OT, Philo and Qumran, the *elect faithful* or *just individuals* are also portrayed in relationship with God as Father.

f) in the Pauline letters, God is the Father of *Jesus Christ* in the unique sense, and *our* Father.

2) The basic activities of God as Father in the human sphere:

a) *creative* (the OT, Stoic literature, Philo, and the Pauline letters);

b) *redemptive* (the OT and the Pauline letters);

c) *educational-disciplining* (the OT, Philo, and Qumran).

3) The basic characteristics of God as Father in the human sphere:

- a) the OT – *mercy, care* (Israel) *authority* (the Davidic king), *faithfulness* (Davidic king and righteous individuals), *protection* (orphans);
- b) Stoic literature – *benevolence* (humans);
- c) Philo – *preservation, assistance* (man/soul), *merciful goodness* (the first people, patriarchs, and Moses), *bounteousness* (righteous individuals), *providential care* (his sons), one *who should be given thanks to* (people);
- d) Qumran – *non-abandoning attitude* (individuals);
- e) early Jewish literature – *proximity, mercy, fidelity* (Israel or Jews), *protection, help, rescue, affectionate love, forgiveness, one who grants share in his glory* (individuals);
- f) undisputed Pauline letters – *fundament* (activity of Jesus Christ and Spirit), *principal protagonist* (existence of Christian community), *source of grace and peace, mercy, affectionate love, comfort, care, moral-authoritative supremacy, one who promotes love and unity, grants share in his glory, and should be praised and glorified* (Christian community).

RECOMMENDATIONS

Referring to conclusions of this research, the following recommendations can be made:

1. To *The Lithuanian Bishops' Conference, The Archdiocese of Orthodox Church in Lithuania, The Synod of Evangelical Lutheran Church in Lithuania, and other Christian denominations*: it is recommended to expand interconfessional cooperation in their familiarization with biblical traditions.

2. To the *Faculty of Catholic theology* at Vytautas Magnus University, *Religious Studies and Research Centre* at Vilnius University, *Department of Theology* at Klaipėda University, *Department of Religious Education* at Lithuanian University of Educational Sciences, and LCC International University in Klaipėda: it is recommended to promote interdisciplinary studies especially with regard to traditions found in the New Testament and other literature of that time.

3. To *Catholic Evangelization Centres*: in the course of evangelization and while organizing seminars and conferences it is recommended to present the Christian conception of God as Father in a wider context.

4. To *Catechetical Centres* and all those who are engaged in *pastoral activity*: it is recommended to emphasize the role that God as Father plays in formation and activity of Christian community.

ABBREVIATIONS

<i>AB</i>	The Anchor Bible
AnBib	Analecta biblica
ANETS	Ancient Near East Texts and Studies
ApMos	Apocalypse of Moses
ApocEz 2	Apocryphon of Ezekiel 2
ATR	Anglican Theological Review
2 Bar	2 Baruch
BECNT	Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament
BDB	<i>Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament</i>
BDAG	<i>A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature</i>
BDF	<i>A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i>
BETHL	Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium
<i>Bib</i>	<i>Biblica</i>
<i>BibSac</i>	<i>Bibliotheca Sacra</i>
<i>BJRL</i>	<i>Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester</i>
BSB	Biblioteca di Studi Biblici
<i>BZNW</i>	<i>Beihefte zur ZNW</i>
CB	The Century Bible
<i>CBQ</i>	<i>The Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CCWJChW	Cambridge Commentaries on Writings of the Jewish & Christian World 200 BC to AD 200
CSANT	Commentario storico ed esegetico all'Antico e al Nuovo Testamento
CSCO	Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium
CDP	I Classici del pensiero
CT	Colleción Teologica
CTNT	Commentario teologico del Nuovo Testamento
<i>DEB</i>	<i>Dictionnaire Encyclopédique de la Bible</i>
DJD	Discoveries in the Judean Desert (of Jordan)
<i>DSBP</i>	<i>Dizionario di spiritualità biblico-patristica</i>
EB	Études Bibliques
<i>EDB</i>	<i>Encyclopedic Dictionary of the Bible</i>

<i>EDNT</i>	<i>Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament</i>
EKK	Evangelisch-Katolischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
1 En	1 Enoch
<i>EstTrin</i>	<i>Estudios Trinitarios</i>
<i>EvQ</i>	<i>Evangelical Quarterly</i>
<i>ExpTimes</i>	<i>The Expository Times</i>
GNS	Good News Studies
HB	Hebrew Bible
Hermeneia	A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible
HNT	Handbuch zum Neuen Testament
HNTC	Harper's New Testament Commentaries
HTKNT	Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
<i>IDB</i>	<i>The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible</i>
<i>JAOS</i>	<i>Journal of the American Oriental Society</i>
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>JETS</i>	<i>Journal of Evangelical Theological Society</i>
JosAsen	Joseph and Aseneth
<i>JSJ</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of Judaism</i>
JSNTSupS	Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series
JSOTSupS	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
Jub	Jubilees
KEKNT	Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament
LBNT	I Libri Biblici. Nuovo Testamento
LD	Lectio Divina
<i>LAB</i>	<i>Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum</i>
Loeb	Loeb Classical Library
<i>LS</i>	<i>Louvain Studies</i>
<i>LumVie</i>	<i>Lumière et vie</i> (Lyon)
LXX	Septuagint
3 Mac	3 Maccabees
NAB	New American Bible
NAC	The New American Commentary
NCB	The New Century Bible
<i>NDTB</i>	<i>Nuovo Dizionario di Teologia Biblica</i>

NICNT	The New International Commentary on the New Testament
NIGTC	The New International Greek Testament Commentary
NIV	New International Version
<i>NJBC</i>	<i>The New Jerome Biblical Commentary</i>
NovTSup	Supplements to Novum Testamentum
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
NT	New Testament
NTC	Il Nuovo Testamento Comentato
NTD	Das Neue Testament deutsch
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
OBO	Orbis biblicus et orientalis
OPA	Les Œuvres de Philon d’Alexandrie
<i>OrAnt</i>	<i>Oriens Antiquus</i>
OT	Old Testament
<i>OTP</i>	<i>The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha</i>
PNTC	The Pillar New Testament Commentary
PrJac	Prayer of Jacob
<i>RB</i>	<i>Revue Biblique</i>
<i>RevQ</i>	<i>Revue de Qumran</i>
<i>RdT</i>	<i>Rassegna di teologia</i>
RSV	Revised Standard Version
SBD	Studii biblici e giudaistici – “Dabar”
SBT	Studies in Biblical Theology
SibOr	Sibylline Oracles
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
SOC	Scritti delle origini cristiane
<i>SPA</i>	<i>The Studia Philonica Annual</i>
SPIB	Scripta Pontificii Instituti Biblici
SPS	Sacra Pagina Series
STDJ	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
<i>SVF</i>	<i>Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta</i>
TAb	Testament of Abraham
<i>TDNT</i>	<i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i>
<i>TDOT</i>	<i>Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament</i>
THNT	Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament

TJob	Testament of Job
Tlevi	Testament of Levi
<i>TLOT</i>	<i>Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament</i>
<i>TToday</i>	<i>Theology Today</i>
<i>TynBull</i>	<i>Tyndale Bulletin</i>
<i>VT</i>	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
WBC	World Biblical Commentary
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
<i>ZAW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
<i>ZNW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche</i>

SOURCES AND LITERATURE

1. ABBA, R., "Name," in *IDB* 3, 501-508.
2. AGERSNAP, S., *Baptism and the New Life. A Study of Romans 6.1-14*, Aarhus: University Press, 1999.
3. ADLER, M., *Index verborum, notionum, rerum ad Stoicam doctrinam pertinentium*, Lipsiae: B. G. Teubneri, 1924.
4. ALBERTZ, R., *A History of Israelite Religion in the Old Testament Period. Volume 1: From the Beginnings to the End of the Monarchy*, London: SCM Press, 1994.
5. J.-N. ALETTI, "L'argumentation de Paul et la position des Corinthiens: 1 Cor 15,12-34", in L. De Lorenzi, a cura di, *Résurrection du Christ et des chrétiens (1Co 15)*, Rome 1985.
6. ALEXANDRE, M., *De congressu eruditionis gratia*, OPA 16, Paris: Cerf, 1967.
7. ALLEGRO, J. M., *Qumrân Cave 4, I (4Q158-4Q186)*, DJD V, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.
8. ALLEGUE, J. V., "¡Abba Padre! (4Q372 1, 16). Dios como Padre en Qumrán," *EstTrin* 32 (1998) 167-186.
9. ALLEN, L. C., *Ezekiel 1-19*, WBC 28, Dallas: World Books, 1994.
10. ALLMEN, D. von, *La famille de Dieu. La symbolique familiale dans le paulinisme*, (OBO 41), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981.
11. ALLO, E.-B., *Saint Paul première épître aux Corinthiens*, EB, Paris: J. Gabalda et C^{ie}, 1934².
12. ALLO, E.-B., *Saint Paul seconde épître aux Corinthiens*, EB, Paris: J. Gabalda et C^{ie}, 1937.
13. ANDERSON, A. A., *2 Samuel*, WBC 11, Dallas: World Books, 1989.
14. ARANDA G., et al. (eds.), *Biblia Exegesis y Cultura. Estudios: Estudios en Honor del prof. D. José María Casciaro* (CT 83), Pamplona: EUNSA, 1994.
15. ARNALDEZ, R., POUILLOUX, J., MONDÉSERT, C. (eds.), *Les Œuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie*, 36 vols., Paris: Cerf, 1961-1992.
16. ARNALDEZ, R., POUILLOUX, J., SAVINEL, P., MONDÉSERT, C., *De vita Mosis I-II*, OPA 22, Paris: Cerf, 1967.
17. ARNALDEZ, R., *De opificio mundi*, OPA 1, Paris: Cerf, 1961.
18. ARNALDEZ, R., *De mutatione nominum*, OPA 18, Paris: Cerf, 1964.

19. ATTRIDGE, H., et al. (eds.), *Qumran Cave 4, VII. Parabiblical Texts, Part 1*, DJD XIII, Oxford : Clarendon Press, 1994.
20. AUNE, D. E., *The New Testament in Its Literary Environment*, LEC, Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1989.
21. BAILLET, M. *Qumrân grotte 4, III (4Q 482 – 4Q 520)*, DJD VII, Oxford : Clarendon Press, 1982.
22. BALZ, H., αἰώνιος, in *EDNT* 1, 46-48.
23. BALZ, H., SCHNEIDER, G., *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament*, 3 vols., Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1990-1993.
24. BARBAGLIO, G., *La Prima Lettera ai Corinzi*, SOC 16, Bologna: Dehoniane, 1995.
25. BARNETT, P., *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, NICNT, Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1997.
26. BARR, J., “Abba isn’t Daddy,” *JTS* 39 (1988) 28-47.
27. BARRETT, C. K., *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, HNTC, New York/London: Harper & Row, 1957.
28. BARRETT, C. K., *A commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, HNTC, New York: Harper & Row, 1968.
29. BARRETT, C. K., *A commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, HNTC, New York/London: Harper & Row, 1973.
30. BARRETT, C. K., “The significance of the Adam-Christ typology for the Resurrection of the dead: 1Co 15, 20-22. 45. 49”, in de Lorenzi, a cura di, *Résurrection*, 99-122.
31. BARTH, M., *Ephesians* (vol. 1, 1-3), AB 34, New York: Doubleday, 1974.
32. BASSLER, J. M. (ed.), *Pauline Theology. Volume I: Thessalonians, Philipians, Galatians, Philemon*, Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991.
33. BAUCKHAM, R. J., “The Worship of Jesus in Philippians 2:9-11,” in R. P. MARTIN, B. J. DODD (eds.), *Where Christology Began. Essays on Philippians* 2, Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1998, 128-139.
34. BAUMGÄRTEL, F., καρδία, in *TDNT* 3, 605-607.
35. BECKER, J., *Paul. Apostle to the Gentiles*, Westminster: John Knox Press, 1993.
36. BECKER, J., “Der Brief an die Galater,” in J. BECKER, U. LUZ, *Die Briefe an die Galater, Epheser und Kolosser*, NTD 8/1, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998, 9-106.
37. BECKER, J., LUZ, U., *Die Briefe an die Galater, Epheser und Kolosser*, NTD 8/1, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998.
38. BEHM, J., καρδία, in *TDNT* 3, 608-613.

39. BERGER, K., "Apostelbrief und apostolische Rede. Zum Formular frühchristlicher Briefe," *ZNW* 65 (1974) 190-231.
40. BERRY, P., *Correspondence between Paul and Seneca, A.D. 61-65*, ANETS 12, Lewiston: Edwin Mellen, 1999.
41. BEST, E., *A Commentary on the First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians*, HNTC, New York/London: Harper & Row, 1972.
42. BETZ, H. D., *Galatians*, Hermeneia, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979.
43. BIERINGER, R. (ed.), *The Corinthian Correspondence* (BETHL 125), Leuven: Leuven University Press-Peeters, 1996.
44. BIETENHARD, H., ὄνομα, in *TDNT* 5, 252-283.
45. BLACK, M., "Πᾶσαι ἐξουσίαι αὐτῷ ὑποταγῆσονται", in *Paul and Paulinism. Essays in honour of C. K. Barrett / M. D. Hooker and S. G. Wilson, ed./*, London 1982, 74-82.
46. BLASS, F., DEBRUNNER, A., FUNK, R. W., *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press, 1961, 1974⁷.
47. BÖCKLER, A., *Gott als Vater im Alten Testament. Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zur Entstehung und Entwicklung eines Gottesbildes*, Gütersloh: Chr. Kaiser/Gütersloh Verlagshaus, 2000.
48. BOER, M. C., de, *The defeat of death. Apocalyptic eschatology in 1 Corinthians 15 and Romans 5*, JSNTSupS 22, Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988.
49. BOER, P. A. H. de, *Fatherhood and Motherhood in Israelite and Judean Piety*, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1974.
50. BONNARD, P.-E., *L'épître de Saint Paul aux Galates*, CNT IX, Neuchâtel: Delachaux et Niestlé, 1972².
51. BONNARD, P.-E., *Le Second Isaïe. Son disciple e leurs éditeurs*, Paris: J Gabalda, 1972.
52. BORGES, P., FUGLSETH, K., SKARSTEN, R., *The Philo Index. A Complete Greek Word Index to the Writings of Philo of Alexandria. Lemmatised & Computer – Generated*, Trondheim: NTNU, 1997.
53. BORN, A. van den, *Encyclopedic Dictionary of the Bible*, (2nd rev. ed.), New York/Toronto/London: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1963.
54. BORSE, U., *Der Brief an die Galater*, Regensburg: Verlag Fr. Pustet, 1984 = BORSE, U., *La lettera ai Galati*, NTC, Brescia: Morcelliana, 2000.
55. BOTTERWECK, G. J., RINGGREN, H., and FABRY, H. J., *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, vol. 1ff., Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1977ff.
56. BRATSIOTIS, N. P., ψα, in *TDOT* 1, 222-235.

57. BRAULIK, G., *Deuteronomium. 1-16,17*, Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1986.
58. BRAULIK, G., *Deuteronomium II. 16,18-34,12*, Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1992.
59. BRAUN, R., *1 Chronicles*, WBC 14, Waco: World Books, 1986.
60. BREHIER, E., *Les idées philosophiques et religieuses de Philon d'Alexandrie*, Paris: J. Vrin, 1950³.
61. BROOKE, G., et al. (eds.), *Qumran Cave 4, XVII. Parabiblical Texts, Part 3*, DJD XXII, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
62. BROWN, F., DRIVER, S. R., BRIGGS, C. A., *Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977⁹.
63. BROWN, R. E., *An Introduction to the New Testament*, New York: Doubleday, 1997.
64. BROWN, R. E., FITZMYER, J. A., MURPHY, R. E. (eds.), *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1990.
65. BROWNEE, W. H., *Ezekiel 1-19*, WBC 28, Waco: Word Books, 1986.
66. BRUCE, F. F., *1 and 2 Corinthians*, NCB, London: Oliphants, 1971.
67. BUCHARD, C., "Joseph and Aseneth," in *OTP*, vol. 2, 177-248.
68. BULTMANN, R., ἔλεος - ἀνελεῖμων, in *TDNT* 2, 477-487.
69. BURKE, T. J., "Adoption and the Spirit in Romans 8," *EvQ* 70 (4, 1998) 311-324.
70. BURKE, T. J., "Pauline Paternity in 1 Thessalonians," *TynBull* 51 (1, 2000) 59-80.
71. BUSCEMI, M., "Dio Padre in S. Paolo," *Antonianum* 76 (2, 2001) 247-269.
72. BUTTRICK, G. A., *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, 4 vols., New York/Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962.
73. BYRNE, B., 'Sons of God' - 'Seed of Abraham': a Study of the Idea of the Sonship of God of all Christians in Paul against the Jewish Background (AnBib 83), Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1979.
74. CALLAN, T., "Psalm 110.1 and the Origin of the Expectation That Jesus Will Come Again", *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 44 (1982) 622-636.
75. CAPES, D. B., *Old Testament Yahweh Texts in Paul's Christology* (WUNT 2), Tübingen: Mohr, 1992.
76. CARREZ, M., "Résurrection et seigneurie du Christ: 1 Co 15, 23-28", in De Lorenzi, a cura di, *Résurrection*, 127-140.
77. CARROLL, R. P., *Jeremiah: A Commentary*, OTL, London: SCM Press, 1986.
78. CAQUOT, A., - ROBERT, PH. DE, *Les Livres de Samuel*, CAT 6, Genève: Labor et Fides, 1994.
79. CAZEAUX, J., *De migratione Abrahami*, OPA 14, Paris: Cerf, 1965.
80. CHARLESWORTH, J. H., "Prayer of Jacob," in *OTP*, vol. 2, 715-724.

81. CHARLESWORTH, J. H. (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 2 vols., New York: Doubleday, 1983-1985.
82. CHARLESWORTH, J. H., *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the New Testament. Prolegomena for the Study of Christian Origins* (SNTSMS 054), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
83. CHARLESWORTH, J. H., HARDING, M., and KILEY, M. (eds.), *The Lord's prayer and other prayer texts from the Greco-Roman era*, Valley Forge: Trinity Press International, 1994.
84. CHARLESWORTH, J. H., "A Caveat on Textual Transmission and the Meaning of *ABBA*. A Study of the Lord's Prayer," in J. H. CHARLESWORTH, M. HARDING, and M. KILEY (eds.), *The Lord's prayer and other prayer texts from the Greco-Roman era*, Valley Forge: Trinity Press International, 1994, 1-14.
85. CHILDS, B. S., *Exodus. A Commentary*, OTL, London: SCM Press – Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1974.
86. CLEMENTS, R. E., *Isaiah 1-39*, NCB, Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans / London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1980.
87. COHN-SHERBOK, D., "Paul and Rabbinic Exegesis", *Scottish Journal of Theology* 35 (1982) 117-132.
88. COLLANGE, J.-F., *L'épître de saint Paul aux Philippiens*, CNT Xa, Neuchâtel: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1973.
89. COLLINS, J. J., *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature*, New York: Doubleday, 1995.
90. COLLINS, R. F., *First Corinthians*, SPS 7, Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1999.
91. COLLINS, R. F., "God in the First Letter to the Thessalonians: Paul's Earliest Written Appreciation of *ho theos*," *LS* 16 (2, 1991) 137-154.
92. COLLINS, R. F., *Studies on the First Letter to the Thessalonians* (BETHL 66), Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1984.
93. COLLINS, R. F. (ed.), *The Thessalonian Correspondence* (BETHL 87), Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1990.
94. CONZELMANN, H., *1 Corinthians*, Hermeneia, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975.
95. CONZELMANN, H., χαίρω - εὐχάριστος, in *TDNT* 9, 359-415.
96. CORSANI, B., *Lettera ai Galati*, CSANT 9, Genova: Marietti, 1990.
97. CRAIGIE, P. C., *Psalms 1-50*, WBC 19, Waco: Word Books, 1983.
98. CRAIGIE, P. C., KELLEY, P. H., DRINKARD, J. F., *Jeremiah 1-25*, WBC 26, Dallas: Word Books, 1991.

99. CRANFIELD, C. E. B., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (vol. 1, I-VIII), ICC, Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1975, 1990⁷.
100. CRANFIELD, C. E. B., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (vol. 2, IX-XVI), ICC, Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1979, 1989⁵.
101. CRANFIELD, C. E. B., *On Romans and Other New Testament Essays*, Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998.
102. CROSS, F. M., "Notes on the Doctrine of the Two Messiahs at Qumran and the Extracanonical Daniel Apocalypse (4Q246)," in D. W., PARRY, S. D. RICKS (eds.), *Current Research and Technological Developments on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1996, 1-13.
103. DAHL, N. A., ALAN, F. S., "Philo and the Rabbis on the Names of God," *JSJ* 9 (1, 1978) 1-28.
104. D'ANGELO, M. R., "Abba and 'Father': Imperial theology and the Jesus tradition," *JBL* 111 (4, 1992) 611-630.
105. DANIEL, S., *De specialibus legibus I et II*, OPA 24, Paris: Cerf, 1975.
106. DANKER, F. W. (revised and edited by), *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature*, 3 ed., Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press, 2000.
107. DAUMAS, F. (intr., not.), MIQUEL, P. (trad.), *De vita contemplativa*, OPA 29, Paris: Cerf, 1963.
108. DAVIES, G. I., *Hosea*, NCB, Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans – London: Harper Collins, 1992.
109. DELCOR, M., *Les Hymnes de Qumran (Hodayot)*, Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1962.
110. DENAUX, A., "Theology and Christology in 1 Cor 8,4-6," in R. BIERINGER, (ed.), *The Corinthian Correspondence* (BETHL 125), Leuven: Leuven University Press-Peeters, 1996, 593-606.
111. DIBELIUS, M., CONZELMANN, H., *The Pastoral Epistles*, Hermeneia, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972.
112. DONFRIED, K. P., *Paul, Thessalonica, and Early Christianity*, Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 2002.
113. DONNER, H., "Adoption oder Legitimation? Erwägungen zur Adoption im Alten Testament auf dem Hintergrund der altorientalischen Rechte," *OrAnt* 8 (1969) 87-119.
114. DOUGHTY, D. J., "The Presence and Future of Salvation in Corinth", *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 66 (1975) 61-90.

115. DRIVER, S. R., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy*, ICC, Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1902³.
116. DUMORTIER, J.-B., "Un rituel d'intronisation: le Ps. LXXXIX 2-38," *VT* 22 (1972) 176-196.
117. DUNN, J. D. G., *Jesus and the Spirit*, Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1975.
118. DUNN, J. D. G., *Romans 1-8*, WBC 38A, Dallas: Word Books, 1988.
119. DUNN, J. D. G., *Romans 9-16*, WBC 38B, Dallas: Word Books, 1988.
120. DURHAM, J. I., *Exodus*, WBC 3, Waco: Word Books, 1987.
121. EBELING, G., *La verità dell'evangelo. Commento alla lettera ai Galati*, SBD 7, Genova: Marietti, 1989.
122. ECKSTEIN, H.-J., *Verheissung und Gesetz: eine exegetische Untersuchung zu Galater 2,15-4,7* (WUNT 86), Tübingen: Mohr, 1996.
123. ELLIGER, K., RUDOLPH W., *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*, Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1990 (fourth edition).
124. ELORDUY, E., ALONSO, J. P., *El Estoicismo*, 2 vol., Madrid: Editorial Gredos S. A., 1972.
125. ELORDUY, E., *Seneca. I vida y escritos*, Madrid: Consejo, 1965.
126. FABRIS, R., *Lettera ai Filipesi. Lettera ai Filemone*, SOC 11, Bologna: Dehoniane, 2001.
127. FEE, G. D., *God's Empowering Presence. The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul*, Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 1994.
128. FEE, G. D., *Paul's Letter to the Philippians*, NICNT, Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1995.
129. FEE, G. D., *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, NICNT, Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1987.
130. FEE, G. D. "Toward a Theology of 1 Corinthians", in *Pauline Theology*, vol. 2, (David M. Hay, ed.), Minneapolis 1993, 37-58.
131. FITZMYER, J. A., "Abba and Jesus' relation to God," in R. GANTOY (ed.), *A cause de l'évangile: Etudes sur les Synoptiques et les Actes offertes au P. Jacques Dupont, O.S.B. à l'occasion de son 70e anniversaire* (LD 123), Paris: Cerf, 1985, 15-38.
132. FITZMYER, J. A., "Aramaic Epistolography," in J. L. WHITE (ed.), *Studies in Ancient Letter Writing* (Semeia 22), Chico: Scholars Press, 1982, 25-57.
133. FITZMYER, J. A., "4Q246: The 'Son of God' Document from Qumran," *Bib* 74 (1, 1993) 153-174.
134. FITZMYER, J. A., κύριος, in *EDNT* 2, 328-331.
135. FITZMYER, J. A., "Paul," in *NJBC*, 1329-1337.
136. FITZMYER, J. A., *Romans*, AB 33, London: Doubleday, 1993.

137. FITZMYER, J. A., *The Gospel according to Luke (I-LX)*, AB 28, New York: Doubleday, 1979.
138. FOERSTER, W., εἰρήνη, in *TDNT* 2, 411-412.
139. FOERSTER, W., κτίζω, in *TDNT* 3, 1000-1035.
140. FOERSTER, W., κύριος, in *TDNT* 3, 1039-1058, 1081-1095.
141. FOERSTER, W., FOHRER, G., σῶζω, in *TDNT* 7, 965-1024.
142. FOHRER, G., υἱός, in *TDNT* 8, 340-354.
143. FOWLER, J. D., *Theophoric Personal Names in Ancient Hebrew. A Comparative Study* (JSOTSupS 49), Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988.
144. FRIEDMAN, D. N., LUNDBOM, J. R., FABRY, H.-J., יָמָא, in *TDOT* 5, 22-36.
145. FRICK, P., *Divine Providence in Philo of Alexandria*, Tübingen: Mohr, 1999.
146. FUNG, R. Y. K., *The Epistle to the Galatians*, NICNT, Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1988.
147. FURNISH, V. P., *II Corinthians*, AB 32A, New York: Doubleday, 1984.
148. GANTOY, R. (ed.), *A cause de l'évangile: Etudes sur les Synoptiques et les Actes offertes au P. Jacques Dupont, O.S.B. à l'occasion de son 70e anniversaire* (LD 123), Paris: Cerf, 1985.
149. GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ, F., *Qumran and Apocalyptic. Studies on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran* (STDJ 9), Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1992.
150. GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ, F., TIGCHELAAR, E. J. C. (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Study Edition*, 2 vol., Leiden: E. J. Brill – Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1997, 1998.
151. GEORGE, T., *Galatians*, NAC 30, Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1994.
152. GIBLIN, C. H., "Three Monotheistic Texts in Paul," *CBQ* 37 (4, 1975) 527-547.
153. GILBERT, M., *La critique des dieux dans le Livre de la Sagesse (Sg 13-15)*, (AnBib 53), Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1973.
154. GNILKA, J., *Der Philipperbrief*, HTKNT X/3, Freiburg/Basel/Wien: Herder, 1968.
155. GNILKA, J., *Paulus von Tarsus. Apostel und Zeuge*, HTKNT (suppl. VI), Freiburg/Basel/Wien: Herder, 1996.
156. GOOLD, G. P., COLSON, F. H., WHITAKER, G. H., MARCUS, R., *Philo*, 10 vols. & 2 suppl. vols., Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1929-1969.
157. GOULD, J. B., *The Philosophy of Chrysippus*, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970.
158. GREEN, G. L., *The Letters to the Thessalonians*, PNTC, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans / Leicester: Apollos, 2002.

159. GREENFIELD, J., "Two Biblical Passages in the Light of Their Near Eastern Background – Ezekiel 16:30 and Malachi 3:17," *Eretz Israel* 19 (1982) 56-60.
160. GRUBER, M. I., "The Motherhood of God in Second Isaiah," *RB* 90 (3, 1983) 351-359.
161. GRUNDMANN, W., κράζω, in *TDNT* 3, 898-903.
162. GUTHRIE, D., *Galatians*, CB, London: Nelson, 1969.
163. HARL, M., *Quis rerum divinarum heres sit*, OPA 15, Paris: Cerf, 1966.
164. HASLER, V., ἐῖρήνη, in *EDNT* 1, 394-397.
165. HAWTHORNE, G. F., *Philippians*, WBC 43, Waco: Word Books, 1983.
166. HAY, D. M., *Glory at the Right Hand*, Psalm 110 in Early Christianity, SBL Monograph Series 18, Nashville 1973.
167. HAY, D. M. (ed.), *Pauline Theology. Volume II: 1 & 2 Corinthians*, Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.
168. HAYS, R. B., *The Faith of Jesus Christ: The Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1-4:1*, BRS, Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans / Dearborn: Dove Booksellers, 2002.
169. HEIL, C., "Die Sprache der Absonderung in 2 Kor 6,17 und bei Paulus," in R. BIERINGER, (ed.), *The Corinthian Correspondence* (BETHL 125), Leuven: Leuven University Press-Peeters, 1996, 717-729.
170. HEIL, U., "Theologische Interpretation von 1Kor 15, 23-28", *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 84 (1993) 27-35.
171. HELLEMAN, W. E., "Philo of Alexandria on Deification and Assimilation to God," in *SPA* 2 (1990) 51-71.
172. HENGEL, M., SCHWEMER, A. M. (hrs. von), *Königsherrschaft Gottes und himmlischer Kult* (WUNT 5), Tübingen: Mohr, 1991.
173. HENGEL, M., *The Son of God: the Origin of Christology and the History of Jewish-Hellenistic Religion*, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976.
174. HÉRING, J., *La première épître de saint Paul aux Corinthiens*, CNT VII, Neuchâtel: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1949.
175. HEWETT, J. A., "1 Thessalonians 3¹¹," *ExpTimes* 87 (2, 1975) 54-55.
176. HILL, C. E. "Paul's Understanding of Christ's Kingdom in 1 Corinthians 15, 20-28", *Novum Testamentum* 30 (1988) 297-320.
177. HOLLADAY, W. L., *Jeremiah 1: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah. Chapters 1-25*, Hermeneia, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986.
178. HOLLADAY, W. L., *Jeremiah 2: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah. Chapters 26-52*, Hermeneia, Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989.

179. HOLLEMAN, J. *Resurrection and Parousia: A Traditio-Historical Study of Paul's Eschatology in 1Corinthians 15*, Supplements to Novum Testamentum, Leiden/New York/Köln 1996.
180. HOLM-NIELSEN, S., *Hodayot. Psalms from Qumran*, Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget, 1960.
181. HOLTZ, T., *Der erste Brief an die Thessalonicher*, EKK XIII, Zürich: Benziger Verlag / Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1986.
182. HUGHES, P. E., *Paul's Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, NICNT, Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1962.
183. IMSCHOOT, P. van - BUSHINSKI, L. A., "Name," in *EDB*, 1604-1606.
184. IOVINO, P., *La prima lettera ai Tessalonicesi*, SOC 13, Bologna: Dehoniane, 1992.
185. ISNARDI PARENTE, M., *Introduzione a Lo stoicismo ellenistico*, Bari: Laterza, 1993.
186. ISNARDI PARENTE, M., *Stoichi antichi*, 2 vol., Torino: UTET, 1989.
187. JANSEN, J. F., "1Cor 15. 24-28 and the Future of Jesus Christ", *Scottish Journal of Theology* 40 (1987) 543-570.
188. JAPHET, S., *I & II Chronicles*, OTL, London: SCM Press, 1993.
189. JENNI, E., WESTERMANN, C., *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament*, 3 vols., Peabody: Hendricson Publishers, 1997.
190. JENNI, E., זֶרַח, in *TLOT* 1, 1-13.
191. JEREMIAS, J., παῖς θεοῦ, in *TDNT* 5, 654-717.
192. JEREMIAS, J., *The Prayers of Jesus*, SBT II, 6, London: SCM Press, 1967.
193. JEWETT, R., "The Form and Function of the Homiletic Benediction," *ATR* 51 (1969) 18-34.
194. JEWETT, R., *The Thessalonian Correspondence. Pauline Rhetoric and Millenarian Piety*, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986.
195. KAHN, J. G., *De confusione linguarum*, OPA 13, Paris: Cerf, 1963.
196. KAISER, O., *Isaiah 13-39. A Commentary*, OLT, Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1974.
197. KÄSEMANN, E., *Commentary on Romans*, Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1980.
198. KEOWN, G. L., SCALISE, P. J., SMOTHERS, T. G., *Jeremiah 26-52*, WBC 27, Dallas: Word Books, 1995.
199. KEE, H. C., "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," in *OTP*, vol. 1, 775-828.
200. KITTEL, G. (herausgegeben), FRIEDRICH, G., *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, vol. 1-10, Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1964 – 1976.
201. KITTEL, G., δόξα, in *TDNT* 2, 242-255.
202. KLEINKNECHT, H., βασιλεύς, in *TDNT* 1, 564-565.

203. KOEHLER, L., BAUMGARTNER, W., *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros*, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1958.
204. KRAMER, W., *Christ, Lord, Son of God*, SBT 50, London: SCM Press, 1966.
205. KRAUS, H.-J., *Psalms 1-59. A Commentary*, Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1988.
206. KRAUS, H.-J., *Psalms 60-150. A Commentary*, Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1989.
207. KREITZER, L. J., *Jesus and God in Paul's Eschatology*, JSNTSupS 19, Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987.
208. LAGRANGE, M.-P., "La paternité de Dieu dans l'Ancien Testament," *RB* 17 (5, 1908) 481-499.
209. LAMBRECHT, J., *Collected Studies on Pauline Literature and on the Book of Revelation* (AnBib 147), Roma: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2001.
210. LAMBRECHT, J., *Pauline Studies. Collected Essays*, Leuven 1994.
211. LAMBRECHT, J., *Second Corinthians*, SPS 8, Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1999.
212. LAMBRECHT, J., "Structure and Line of Thought in 1Cor 15, 23-28", *Novum Testamentum* 32 (1990) 143-151.
213. LAMBRECHT, J., "Thanksgivings in 1 Thessalonians 1-3," in R. F. COLLINS (ed.), *The Thessalonian Correspondence* (BETHL 87), Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1990, 183-205.
214. LARCHER, C., *Le Livre de la Sagesse ou la Sagesse de Salomon*, I-III (ÉB 1-5), Paris : J. Gabalda, 1983-1985.
215. LARSON, E., "460. 4QNarrative Work and Prayer," in S. J. PFANN, P. ALEXANDER, et al. (eds.), *Qumran Cave 4, XXVI. Cryptic Texts, Miscellanea, Part 1*, DJD XXXVI, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000, 369-386.
216. LEE, J. Y., "Interpreting the Demonic Powers in Pauline Thought", *Novum Testamentum* 12 (1970) 54-69.
217. LEENHARDT, F.-J., *L'épître de saint Paul aux Romains*, CNT 2, VI, Genève: Labor et Fides, 1981² (1957¹).
218. LÉGASSE, S., *Les épîtres de Paul aux Thessaloniciens* (LD Commentaires 7), Paris: Cerf, 1999.
219. LEVINE, L. I., *Judaism and Hellenism in Antiquity; Conflict or Confluence?*, Seattle / London: University of Washington Press, 1998.
220. LIDDELL, H. G., SCOTT, R., *A Greek-English Lexicon* (new rev. ed.), Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961.
221. LIEU, J. M., "'Grace to You and Peace': the Apostolic Greeting," *BJRL* 68 (1985) 161-178.

222. LIMBURG, K., "La paternidad divina en el AT: algunas observaciones lingüístico-formales," in G. ARANDA et al. (eds.), *Biblia Exegesis y Cultura. Estudios: Estudios en Honor del prof. D. José María Casciaro* (CT 83), Pamplona: EUNSA, 1994, 201-220.
223. LINDEMANN, A., *Der erste Korintherbrief*, HNT 9/1, Tübingen: Mohr, 2000.
224. LONGENECKER, R. N., *Galatians*, WBC 41, Dallas: Word Books, 1990.
225. Lorenzi de, L., a cura di, *Résurrection du Christ et des chrétiens (1Co 15)*, Rome 1985.
226. LUCK, U., *φιλανθρωπία*, in *TDNT* 9, 107-112.
227. LÜHRMANN, D., *Das Offenbarungsverständnis bei Paulus und in paulinischen Gemeinden* (WMANT 16), Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1965.
228. LUZ, U., "Der Brief an die Epheser," in J. BECKER, U. LUZ, *Die Briefe an die Galater, Epheser und Kolosser*, NTD 8/1, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998, 107-182.
229. MACGREGOR, G. H. C., "Principalities and Powers: The Cosmic Background of Paul's Thought", *New Testament Studies* 1(1954) 17-28.
230. MACINTOSH, A. A., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Hosea*, ICC, Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997.
231. MACLEOD, D. J., "The Exaltation of Christ: An Exposition of Philippians 2:9-11," *BibSac* 158 (632, 2001) 437-450.
232. MADDALENA, A., *Filone Alessandrino*, Milano: U. Mursia & C., 1970.
233. MALHERBE, A. J., *The Letters to the Thessalonians*, AB 32B, New York: Doubleday, 2000.
234. MARCHEL, W., *Abba, Père! La Prière du Christ et des Chrétiens* (AnBib 19A), Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1971².
235. MARCHESELLI-CASALE, C., *Le lettere pastorali*, SOC 15, Bologna: Dehoniane, 1995.
236. MARSHALL, I. H., *1 and 2 Thessalonians*, NCB, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans / London: Marshall Morgan & Scott Publ. Ltd., 1983.
237. MARTIN, R. P., *A Hymn of Christ: Philippians 2:5-11 in Recent Interpretation & in the Setting of Early Christian Worship*, Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1997.
238. MARTIN, R. P., *Carmen Christi: Philippians ii. 5-11 in Recent Interpretation and in the Setting of Early Christian Worship*, Cambridge: University Press, 1967.
239. MARTIN, R. P., *2 Corinthians*, WBC 40, Waco: Word Books, 1986.
240. MARTIN, R. P., DODD, B. J. (eds.), *Where Christology Began. Essays on Philippians 2*, Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1998.
241. MARTITZ, P. W., VON, υἱός, in *TDNT* 8, 334-340.
242. MARTYN, J. L., *Galatians*, AB 33A, New York: Doubleday, 1998.
243. MATERA, F. J., *Galatians*, SPS 9, Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1992.

244. MAYER, G., *Index Philoneus*, Berlin / New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1974.
245. MAYES, A. D. H., *Deuteronomy*, NCB, London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1979.
246. MAZZANTI, A. M., “Σωτήρ ε σωτηρία nell’esegesi di Filone di Alessandria,” ASE 10 (2, 1993) 355-366.
247. MAZZARELLI, C., RADICE, R., *Le origini del male*, CDP, Milano: Rusconi, 1984.
248. METTINGER, T. N. D., *King and Messiah: The Civil and Sacral Legitimation of the Israelite Kings*, Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1976.
249. MEYNET, R., “Composition et Genre Littéraire de la Première Section de l’Épître aux Galates,” in J. SCHLOSSER, (sous la direction; Congrès de L’ACFEB, Strasbourg 1995), *Paul de Tarse* (LD 165), Paris: Cerf, 1996, 51-64.
250. MCCARTER, P. K., *II Samuel*, AB 9, Garden City: Doubleday, 1984.
251. MCKANE, W., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Jeremiah*, vol. 1 (I-XXV), ICC, Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1986.
252. MCKANE, W., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Jeremiah*, vol. 2 (XXVI-LII), ICC, Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996.
253. MCKANE, W., *Proverbs. A New Approach*, OTL, Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1970.
254. MCKENZIE, J. L., *Dictionary of the Bible*, Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1965.
255. MÉASSON, A., *Du char ailé de Zeus à l’Arche d’Alliance. Images et mythes platoniciens chez Philon d’Alexandrie*, Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1986.
256. MERK, O., *Wissenschaftsgeschichte und Exegese. Gesammelte Aufsätze zum 65. Geburtstag*, BZNW 95, New York/Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1998.
257. MERK, O., “Überlegen zu 2Thess 2:13-17,” in O. MERK, *Wissenschaftsgeschichte und Exegese. Gesammelte Aufsätze zum 65. Geburtstag*, BZNW 95, New York/Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1998, 422-431.
258. METZGER, B. M., *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994².
259. MICHAELIS, W., ὁδός, in TDNT 5, 42-96.
260. MICHEL, O., *Der Brief an die Römer*, KEKNT, IV, 14, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978.
261. MILLER, J. W., *Calling God “Father.” Essays on the Bible, Fatherhood and Culture*, New York / Mahwah N.J.: Paulist Press, 1999.
262. MONLOUBOU, L., “Nom,” in DEB, 903-904.

263. MOO, D. J., *The Epistle to the Romans*, NICNT, Grand Rapids / Cambridge: W. B. Eerdmans, 1996.
264. MOORE, A. L., *1 and 2 Thessalonians*, CB, London: Nelson, 1969.
265. MOORE, C. A., *Tobit. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 40A, New York: Doubleday, 1996.
266. MORRIS, L., *The Epistle to the Romans*, Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans / Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1988, 1997².
267. MORRIS, L., *The First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians* (rev. ed.), NICNT, Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1991.
268. MOSÈS, A., *De specialibus legibus III et IV*, OPA 25, Paris: Cerf, 1970.
269. MOULTON, J. H., - TURNER, N., *A Grammar of New Testament Greek. Vol. III Syntax*, Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1963.
270. MULLINS, T. Y., "Greeting As a New Testament Form," *JBL* 87 (1968) 418-426.
271. MURPHY, R. E., *Proverbs*, WBC 22, Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1998.
272. MURPHY-O'CONNOR, J., *Paul. A Critical Life*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
273. MURPHY-O'CONNOR, J., *Paul the Letter-Writer. His World, His Options, His Skills* (GNS 41), Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1995.
274. MUSSNER, F., *Der Galaterbrief*, HTKNT IX, Freiburg/Basel/Wien: Herder, 1974.
275. NESTLE-ALAND, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1993²⁷.
276. NEUSNER, J., *What is Midrash?*, Philadelphia 1987.
277. NEWSOM, C., "Apocryphon of Joshua," in G. BROOKE, et al. (eds.), *Qumran Cave 4, XVII. Parabiblical Texts, Part 3*, DJD XXII, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996, 237-288.
278. NIKIPROWETZKY, V., "Sur une lecture démonologique de Philon d'Alexandrie, *De Gigantibus*, 6-18," in G. NAHON, CH. TOUATI (eds.), *Hommage à Georges Vajda. Études d'histoire et de pensée juives*, Louvain: Peeters, 1980, pp. 43-71.
279. O'BRIEN, P. T., *Introductory Thanksgiving in the Letters of Paul* (NovTSup 49), Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1977.
280. O'BRIEN, P. T., *The Epistle to the Philippians*, NIGTC, Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans / Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1991.
281. O'BRIEN, P. T., *The Letter to the Ephesians*, PNTC, Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans / Leicester: Apollos, 1999.
282. OEPKE, A., *Der Brief des Paulus an die Galater*, THNT IX, Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1973.

283. OLLEY, J. W., "A Precursor of the NRSV? 'Sons and Daughters' in 2 Cor 6.18," *NTS* 44 (1988) 204-212.
284. ORRIEUX, C., "La paternité de Dieu dans l'Ancien Testament," *LumVie* 104 (1971) 59-74.
285. PANIMOLLE, S. A. (dir.), *Dizionario di spiritualità biblico-patristica. Abbà-Padre*, vol. 1, Roma: Borla, 1992.
286. PANIMOLLE, S. A., "La paternità di Dio nei documenti letterari dell'Antico giudaismo," in *DSBP* 1, 67-81.
287. PARRY, D. W., RICKS, S. D. (eds.), *Current Research and Technological Developments on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1996.
288. PELLETIER, A., *Legatio ad Gaïum*, OPA 32, Paris: Cerf, 1972.
289. PENNA, R., "La paternità di Dio nel Nuovo Testamento," *RdT* 40 (1, 1999) 7-39.
290. PENNA, R., *L'apostolo Paolo. Studi di esegesi e teologia*, Milano: Paoline, 1991.
291. PERKINS, P., "God in the New Testament: Preliminary Soundings," *TToday* 42 (3, 1985) 332-341.
292. PETERSEN, D. L., *Zechariah 9-14 & Malachi*, OTL, London: SCM Press, 1995.
293. PETIT, M., *Quod omnis probus liber sit*, OPA 28, Paris: Cerf, 1974.
294. PFANN, S. J., ALEXANDER, P. et al. (eds.), *Qumran Cave 4, XXVI. Cryptic Texts, Miscellanea, Part I*, DJD XXXVI, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000.
295. PIKAZA, X., "El Padre de Jesús y Padre de los hombres," *EstTrin* 26 (1, 1992) 67-115.
296. PITTA, A., *Disposizione e messaggio della lettera ai Galati. Analisi retorico-letteraria*, Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1992.
297. PITTA, A., *Lettera ai Galati*, SOC, Bologna: Dehoniane, 1996.
298. PITTA, A., *Lettera ai Romani*, LBNT 6, Milano: Paoline, 2001.
299. PLEVNIK, J., *Paul and the Parousia: An Exegetical and Theological Investigation*, Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 1997.
300. POHLENZ, M., *Die Stoa. Geschichte einer geistigen Bewegung*, Band 1, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1948.
301. POHLENZ, M., *La Stoa. Storia di un movimento spirituale*, 2 vol., Firenze: «La Nuova Italia», 1967.
302. POKORNÝ, P., *Der Gottessohn: literarische Übersicht und Fragestellung* (Theologische Studien 109), Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1971.
303. POSEIDONIOS (herausgegeben von W. Theiler), *Die Fragmente, I, Texte*, Berlin / New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1982.

304. POSIDONIOS (eds. L. Edelstein, I. G. Kidd), *The Fragments*, Cambridge: University Press, 1972.
305. POUILLY, J., *Dieu Notre Père. La révélation de Dieu Père et le « Notre Père »* (Cahiers Evangile 68), Paris: Cerf, 1989.
306. PUECH, É., “Fragment d’une Apocalypse en araméen (4Q246=pseudo-Dan^d) et le « Royaume de Dieu »,” *RB* 99 (1, 1992) 98-131.
307. PUECH, É., “Notes sur le Fragment d’Apocalypse 4Q246 – « Le Fils de Dieu »,” *RB* 101 (4, 1994) 533-558.
308. PUECH, É., “246. 4QApocryphe de Daniel ar,” in G. BROOKE, et al. (eds.), *Qumran Cave 4, XVII. Parabiblical Texts, Part 3*, DJD XXII, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996, 165-184.
309. QUELL, G., πατήρ, in *TDNT* 5, 959-974.
310. QUINN, J. D., *The Letter to Titus*, AB 35, New York: Doubleday, 1990.
311. RAD, G., von, βασιλεύς, in *TDNT* 1, 565-571.
312. RADICE, R., *La migrazione verso l’eterno*, CDP, Milano: Rusconi, 1988.
313. RADICE, R., REALE, G., *L’erede delle cose divine*, CDP, Milano: Rusconi, 1981.
314. RADICE, R., REALE, G., ARNIM, H. VON, *Stoici antichi. Tutti i frammenti*, Milano: Rusconi, 1998.
315. RAHLFS, A., ed., *Septuaginta*, 2 volumes, Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1979.
316. RAVASI, G., “Dio Padre d’Israele e di tutti gli uomini nell’Antico Testamento,” in *DSBP* 1, 19-54.
317. RAVASI, G., *Il libro dei Salmi. Commento e attualizzazione*, 3 vol., Bologna: Dehoniane, 1981-1984.
318. REGGIANI, C. K., REALE, G., *L’uomo e Dio*, CDP, Milano: Rusconi, 1986.
319. REGGIANI, C. K., RADICE, R., *La filosofia Mosaica*, CDP, Milano: Rusconi, 1987.
320. RENGSTORF, K. H., δεσπότης, in *TDNT* 2, 44-49.
321. REYDAMS-SCHILS, G., “Stoicized Readings of Plato’s *Timaeus* in Philo of Alexandria,” *SPA* 7 (1995) 85-102.
322. RICHARD, E., “Early Pauline Thought: An Analysis of 1 Thessalonians,” in J. M. BASSLER, (ed.), *Pauline Theology. Volume I: Thessalonians, Philipians, Galatians, Philemon*, Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991, 39-51.
323. RICHARD, E. J., *First and Second Thessalonians*, SPS 11, Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1995.
324. RICHARDSON, N., *Paul’s language about God*, JSNTSup 99, Sheffield: Academic Press, 1994.

325. RIESNER, R., *Paul's Early Period: Chronology, Mission Strategy, Theology*, Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1998.
326. RIGAUX, B., *Saint Paul. Les épîtres aux Thessaloniens*, EB, Paris: J. Gabalda et C^{ie}/Gembloux : J. Duculot, 1956.
327. RINGGREN, H., $\alpha\varsigma$, in *TDOT* 1, 1-19.
328. RINGGREN, H., $\alpha\tau\tau$, in *TDOT* 6, 477-481.
329. RODRIGUEZ NAVARRO, E., *Seneca: religion sin mitos*, Madrid: Syntagma, 1969.
330. ROETZEL, C. J., *Paul. The Man and the Myth*, Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999.
331. ROLOFF, J., *Der erste Brief an Timotheus*, EKK XV, Zürich: Benziger Verlag / Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988.
332. ROMANIUK, K., *L'amour du Père et du Fils dans la sotériologie de saint Paul*, (AnBib 15A), Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1974.
333. ROSSANO, P., RAVASI, G., GIRLANDA, A. (a cura di), *Nuovo Dizionario di Teologia Biblica*, Cinisello Balsamo: Edizioni San Paolo, 1988.
334. RUNIA, D. T., *Philo of Alexandria and the Timaeus of Plato*, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1986.
335. RUNIA, D. T., "God and Man in Philo of Alexandria," *JTS* 39 (1988) 48-75.
336. SABUGAL, S., "La paternidad de Dios en la literatura extraneotestamentaria," *Salmanticensis* 32 (1985) 141-151.
337. SAND, A., $\kappa\alpha\rho\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha$, in *EDNT* 2, 249-251.
338. SANDERS, E. P., *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, Trowbridge 1989³.
339. SANDBACH, F. H., *The Stoics*, Bristol: The Bristol Press, 1989.
340. SCARPAT, G., *Il pensiero religioso di Seneca e l'ambiente ebraico e cristiano*, Brescia: Paideia, 1977.
341. SCARPAT, G., *Libro della Sapienza. Testo, traduzione, introduzione e commento*, I-II, Brescia: Paideia, 1989-1996.
342. SCHEKLE, K. H., *Paolo. Vita, lettere, teologia*, Brescia: Paideia, 1990.
343. SCHLIER, H., *Lettera ai Galati*, BSB 3, Brescia: Paideia, 1965.
344. SCHLIER, H., *La lettera ai Romani*, CTNT, Brescia: Paideia, 1982.
345. SCHLOSSER, J., "La figure de Dieu selon l'Épître aux Philippiens," *NTS* 41 (3, 1995) 378-399.
346. SCHLOSSER, J., *Le Dieu de Jésus* (LD 129), Paris: Cerf, 1987.
347. SCHLOSSER, J. (sous la direction; Congrès de L'ACFEB, Strasbourg 1995), *Paul de Tarse* (LD 165), Paris: Cerf, 1996.

348. SCHMIDT, F., *Le Testament grec d'Abraham. Introduction, edition critique des deux recensions grecques, traduction* (Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum 11), Tübingen: Mohr, 1986.
349. SCHMITHALS, W., "The pre-Pauline Tradition in 1 Corinthians 15. 20-28", *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 20 (4, '93) 357-380.
350. SCHMITZ, O., παρακαλέω and παράκλησις, in *TDNT* 5, 793-799.
351. SCHÖKEL, L. A., *Dio Padre*, Roma: Apostolato della Preghiera, 1994.
352. SCHRAGE, W., *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*, EKK VII, 4 Teilbd., Zürich: Benziger Verlag / Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1991, 1995, 1999, 2001.
353. SCHREINER, T. R., *Romans*, BECNT, Grand Rapids: Bakers Books, 1998.
354. SCHRENK, G., εὐδοκέω, εὐδοκία, in *TDNT* 2, 738-751.
355. SCHRENK, G., θέλημα, in *TDNT* 3, 52-62.
356. SCHRENK, G., πατήρ, in *TDNT* 5, 945-959; 974-1014.
357. SCHULLER, E. M., *Post-Exilic Prophets*, Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1988.
358. SCHULLER, E. M., "4Q372 1: A Text About Joseph," *RevQ* 14 (55, 1990) 349-376.
359. SCHULLER, E. M., The Psalm of 4Q372 1 Within the Context of Second Temple Prayer," *CBQ* 54 (1, 1992) 67-79.
360. SCHUBERT, P., *Form and Function of the Pauline Thanksgivings (BZNW 20)*, Berlin: Töpelmann, 1939.
361. SCOTT, J. M., *Adoption as sons of God. An exegetical investigation into the background of ΥΙΟΘΕΣΙΑ in the Pauline corpus* (WUNT 2/48), Tübingen: Mohr, 1992.
362. SENECAE, L. ANNAEI (ed. O. Hense), *Ad Lucilium epistularum moralium que supersunt*, Lipsiae: B. G. Teubneri, 1914.
363. SENECAE, L. ANNAEI (ed. E. Hermis), *Dialogorum libros XII*, Lipsiae: B. G. Teubneri, 1923.
364. SENECAE, L. ANNAEI (ed. C. Hosius), *De beneficiis libri VII. De clementia libri II*, Lipsiae: B. G. Teubneri, 1914.
365. SENFT, CH., *La première épître de saint-Paul aux Corinthiens*, CNT 2, VII, Neuchâtel: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1979.
366. SEVENSTER, J. N., *Paul and Seneca* (NovTSup 4), Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1961.
367. SKEHAN, P. – DI LELLA, A., *Wisdom of Ben Sirah. A New Translation with Notes by P. W. Skehan. Introduction and Commentary by A. A. di Lella*, AB 39, New York: Doubleday, 1987.

368. SMIT, J. F. M., "1 Cor 8,1-6: A Rhetorical *Partitio*. A Contribution to the Coherence of 1 Cor 8,1-11,1," in R. BIERINGER, (ed.), *The Corinthian Correspondence* (BETHL 125), Leuven: Leuven University Press-Peeters, 1996, 577-591.
369. SPITTLER, R. P., "Testament of Job," in *OTP*, vol. 1, 829-868.
370. SODERLUND, S. K., WRIGHT, N. T. (eds.), *Romans and the People of God. Essays in Honor of Gordon D. Fee on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1999.
371. STAMM, J. J., נא, in *TLOT* 1, 288-296.
372. STAROBINSKI-SAFRAN, E. (DE GENÈVE), *De fuga et inventione*, OPA 17, 1970.
373. STOEBE, H. J., רהם, in *TLOT* 3, 1225-1230.
374. STOICORUM VETERUM FRAGMENTA (ed. H. von Arnim), 3 vol., Lipsiae: B. G. Teubneri, 1903 (vol. 2-3), 1921 (vol. 1).
375. STROTMANN, A., "Mein Vater bist du!" (Sir 51,10). Zur Bedeutung der Vaterschaft Gottes in kanonischen und nichtkanonischen frühjüdischen Schriften (Frankfurter Theologische Studien 39), Frankfurt: Verlag Josef Knecht, 1991.
376. SWEENEY, M. A., *Isaiah 1-39 with an Introduction To Prophetic Literature*, FOTL 16, Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1996.
377. TATE, M. A., *Psalms 51-100*, WBC 20, Waco: Word Books, 1990.
378. TERIAN, A., *Quaestiones et solutiones in Exodum*, OPA 34c, Paris: Cerf, 1992.
379. THISELTON, A. C., "Realised Eschatology at Corinth", *New Testament Studies* 24 (1977/78) 510-526.
380. THISELTON, A. C., *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, NIGTC, Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans / Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 2000.
381. THOMPSON, M. M., "Mercy upon All": God as Father in the Epistle to the Romans," in S. K. SODERLUND, N. T. Wright (eds.), *Romans and the People of God. Essays in Honor of Gordon D. Fee on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, Grand Rapids / Cambridge: W. B. Eerdmans, 1999, pp. 203-216.
382. THRALL, M. E., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians* (vol. 1, I-VII), Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994.
383. THÜSING, W., *Per Christum in Deum. Studien zum Verhältnis von Christozentrik und Theozentrik in den paulinischen Hauptbriefen*, NA 1, Münster: Verlag Aschendorff, 1965.
384. TOORN, K. van der, "Ancestors and Anthroponyms: Kinship Terms as Theophoric Elements in Hebrew Names," *ZAW* 108 (1, 1996) 1-11.

385. TRILLING, W., *Der zweite Brief an die Thessalonicher*, EKK XIV, Zürich: Benziger Verlag / Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1980.
386. UMEMOTO, N., "Die Königsherrschaft Gottes bei Philon," in M. HENGEL, A. M., SCHWEMER (hrs. von), *Königsherrschaft Gottes und himmlischer Kult* (WUNT 5), Tübingen: Mohr, 1991, pp. 207-256.
387. VANDERKAM, J. C., *The Book of Jubilees*, 2 vols. (CSCO 510-511, Scriptores Aetiopici 87-88), Louvain: E. Peeters, 1989.
388. VANDERKAM, J. C., MILIK, J. T., "The First *Jubilees* Manuscript from Qumran Cave 4: A Preliminary Publication," *JBL* 110 (2, 1991) 243-270.
389. VANHOYE, A., "La composition de 1 Thessaloniciens," in R. F. COLLINS (ed.), *The Thessalonian Correspondence* (BETHL 87), Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1990, 73-86.
390. VANHOYE, A., *Lettera ai Galati*, LBNT 8, Milano: Paoline, 2000.
391. VANNI, U., *Lettere ai Galati e ai Romani*, Roma: Paoline, 1967.
392. VANNI, U., "Tessalonesesi (II lettera ai)," in *NDTB*, 1567-1569.
393. VANONI, G., „Du bist doch unser Vater“ (*Jes 63,16*): zur Gottesvorstellung des Ersten Testaments, Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1995.
394. VERMES, G., *Jesus and the World of Judaism*, London: SCM Press, 1983.
395. VÍLCHEZ LÍNDEZ, J., *Sabiduría*, Nueva Biblia Española – Sapienciales V, Estella (Navarra): Verbo Divino, 1990.
396. VORSTER, J. N., "Resurrection Faith in 1 Corinthians 15", *Neotestamentica* 23 (1989) 287- 307.
397. VOUGA, F., *An die Galater*, HNT 10, Tübingen: Mohr, 1998.
398. WACHOLDER, B. Z., ABEGG, M. G., *A Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew and Aramaic Texts from Cave Four*, vol. 3, Biblical Archeological Society, Washington, 1995.
399. WALLIS, W. B., "The Problem of an Intermediate Kingdom in 1Corinthians 15. 20-28", *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 18 (1975) 229-242.
400. WANAMAKER, C. A., *The Epistles to the Thessalonians*, NIGTC, Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans / Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1990.
401. WATTS, J. D. W., *Isaiah 1-33*, WBC 24, Waco: Word Books, 1985.
402. WATTS, J. D. W., *Isaiah 34-66*, WBC 25, Waco: Word Books, 1987.
403. WEBB, W. J., *Returning Home. New Covenant and Second Exodus as the Context for 2 Corinthians 6.14-7.1*, JSNTSupS 85, Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.

404. WEINFELD, M., "The Covenant of Grant in the Old Testament and in the Ancient Near East," *JAOS* 90 (1970) 184-203.
405. WEITZMAN, S., "Allusion, Artifice, and Exile in the Hymn of Tobit," *JBL* 115 (1, 1996) 49-61.
406. WENDLAND, H. D., *Le Lettere ai Corinti*, Brescia 1976.
407. WESTERMANN, C., *Genesis 1-11*, Minneapolis: SPCK, Augsburg / Fortress Press, 1984.
408. WESTERMANN, C., *Isaiah 40-66. A Commentary*, OTL, London: SCM Press, 1969.
409. WHITE, J. L. (ed.), *Studies in Ancient Letter Writing* (Semeia 22), Chico: Scholars Press, 1982.
410. WHYBRAY, R. N., *Isaiah 40-66*, NCB, London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott - Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1981, 1990³.
411. WILCKENS, U., *Der Brief an die Römer*, EKK VI, 3 Teilbd., Zürich: Benziger Verlag / Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1978-1982.
412. WILES, G. P., *Paul's Intercessory Prayers*, SNTSMS 24, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974.
413. WILLIAMSON, H. G. M., *1 and 2 Chronicles*, NCB, London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott - Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1982.
414. WILLIAMSON, R., *Jews in the Hellenistic World. Philo*, CCWJChW, 1ii, Cambridge: University Press, 1989.
415. WINSTON, D., "Judaism and Hellenism: Hidden Tensions in Philo's Thought," *SPA* 2 (1990) 1-19.
416. WINSTON, D., *The Wisdom of Solomon. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 43, Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, 1979.
417. WOLFF, CH., *Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther. Zweiter Teil: Auslegung der Kapitel 8 - 16*, THNT VII/2, Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1982.
418. WOLFF, CH., *Der zweite Brief des Paulus an die Korinther*, THNT VIII, Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1989.
419. WOLFF, H. W., *Hosea*, Hermeneia, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974.
420. WOUDE, A. S. van der, אפ, in *TLOT* 3, 1348-1367.
421. YONGE, C. D., *The Works of Philo: New Updated Edition. Complete and Unabridged in One Volume*, Peabody: Hendrickson, 1993.
422. ZELLER, D., "God as Father in the Proclamation and in the Prayer of Jesus," in A. FINKEL, L. FRIZZELL (eds.), *Standing before God. Studies on Prayer in Scriptures and in Tradition with Essays In Honor of John M. Oesterreicher*, New York: KTAV Publishing House, 1981, 117-129.

423. ZERWICK, M. – GROSVENOR, M., *A Grammatical Analysis of the Greek New Testament* (4th rev. ed.), Roma: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1993.
424. ZERWICK, M., *Biblical Greek Illustrated by Examples*, SPIB 114, Roma: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1963, 1990⁵.
425. ZIMMERLI, W., *Ezekiel I*, Hermeneia, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979.
426. ZORELL, F. (ed.), *Lexicon Hebraicum Veteris Testamenti*, Romae: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1984.
427. ZVONIMIR, I. H., *Liberi in Cristo. Saggi esegetici sulla libertà dalla legge nella lettera ai Galati* (Spicilegium Pontificii Athenaei Antoniani 27), Roma, 1986.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my advisor Rev. Prof. Dr. Ugo Vanni for his continuous support and fatherly patience.

I would also like to thank the Chairman of the doctoral Commision Rev. Prof. Dr. Andrius Narbekovas for his continuous encouragement and priestly brotherhood.

My sincere thanks goes to Most Rev. Prof. Dr. Vytautas Steponas Vaičiūnas for his spiritual support.

I thank all my colleagues and friends who supported and helped me in one or another way: Rev. Kęstutis Rugevičius, Dr. Bronė Gudaitytė, Daiva Šidiškytė, Asta Valaitytė, Vilma Budrytė, Aušra Čebatoriūtė, and Laura Šimkutė.

Lastly, I want to express my gratitude to those who prayed for me through the process of PhD writing.

Arvydas KASČIUKAITIS

**THE IMAGE OF GOD AS FATHER IN THE OLD TESTAMENT,
HELLENISTIC, JEWISH LITERATURE AND UNDISPUTED
PAULINE LETTERS**

Doctoral Dissertation

Išleido ir spausdino – Vytauto Didžiojo universiteto bibliotekos Leidybos skyrius
(S. Daukanto g. 27, LT-44249 Kaunas)

Užsakymo Nr. K15-066. Tiražas 15 egz. 2015 05 22.

Nemokamai.