



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

This thesis has been submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for a postgraduate degree (e.g. PhD, MPhil, DClinPsychol) at the University of Edinburgh. Please note the following terms and conditions of use:

- This work is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, which are retained by the thesis author, unless otherwise stated.
- A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge.
- This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the author.
- The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the author.
- When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given.

The God of This Age:
Satan in the Churches and Letters of the Apostle Paul

Derek R. Brown

Doctor of Philosophy
University of Edinburgh

2011

I hereby declare that I am the sole author of this thesis; that the following thesis is entirely my own work; and that no part of this thesis has been submitted for another degree or qualification.

Derek R. Brown

ABSTRACT

This thesis aims to elucidate the nature of the references to Satan in the undisputed Pauline corpus. Although scholarship has frequently devoted attention to the various “powers of evil” in Paul’s letters—including principalities, rulers, demons, etc.—insufficient consideration has been given to the figure of Satan as an isolated subject matter. Moreover, scholarship on the individual references to Satan has often neglected Paul’s depiction of Satan’s activity vis-à-vis his apostolic calling. This raises the question, how and why does the Apostle Paul refer to the figure of Satan in his letters?

In order to address this question, the thesis commences by examining two key areas of background material. First, Chapter Two investigates the various “images” of Satan in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Jewish texts. Instead of delineating a historical sketch of the development of Satan in Jewish thought, emphasis is placed on the various roles in which Satan functions within these writings. Second, Chapters Two and Three investigate two aspects of Paul’s theology which relate to his references to Satan. First, Satan’s place within Paul’s apocalyptic theology is explicated (Chapter Three). Second, the thesis considers Paul’s self-understanding as the Apostle to the Gentiles and, critically, the importance of Paul’s churches for his apostleship (Chapter Four).

Chapters Five and Six then utilize the findings of the previous chapters in their examination of the ten clear references to Satan in the undisputed Pauline letters. Chapter Five focuses on the sole reference to Satan in Romans (16:20) and the two references in 1 Thessalonians (2:18; 3:5). Chapter Six then analyzes the several references to Satan in the Corinthian correspondence (1 Cor 5:5; 7:5; 2 Cor 2:11; 4:4; 6:15; 11:14; 12:7), including their collective significance.

On the basis of the examination of the Pauline references to Satan, it is argued that Paul—while sharing the Jewish and early Christian understanding of Satan as an enemy and tempter of the people of God—fundamentally characterizes Satan in his letters as the apocalyptic adversary who opposes his apostolic labor (*kopos*). Paul

does so, it is argued, because he believed that his apostleship was pivotal in spreading the gospel at a crucial point in salvation history. The final chapter then anticipates the implications of the study for further research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	III
TABLE OF CONTENTS	V
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	X
LIST OF FIGURES	XII
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	XIII
CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 REASONS FOR THE PRESENT STUDY	1
1.1.1 <i>Examples of Satan’s Significance in Paul’s Letters</i>	1
1.1.2 <i>Relevant Scholarship on Satan and Paul</i>	4
General Studies on Satan	4
Satan in the Hebrew Bible.....	6
Satan in the New Testament.....	7
Principalities and Powers.....	9
Satan in the Pauline Letters.....	11
1.2 METHOD AND SCOPE	15
1.2.1 <i>Direction of the Study</i>	15
1.2.2 <i>Scope of the Study</i>	19
1.2.3 <i>Shape of the Study</i>	21
CHAPTER TWO IMAGES OF SATAN IN BIBLICAL AND SECOND TEMPLE JEWISH TRADITIONS.....	23
2.1 INTRODUCTION	23
2.2 SATAN AS ACCUSER.....	24
2.2.1 <i>Zechariah 3:1–10</i>	25
2.2.2 <i>Job 1–2</i>	27
2.2.3 <i>The Book of Jubilees</i>	29
2.2.4 <i>Revelation 12:1–12</i>	29
2.2.5 <i>Summary</i>	30
2.3 SATAN AND THE ORIGIN OF EVIL	30
2.3.1 <i>Variations within the Enochic Literature</i>	31
2.3.2 <i>Sirach</i>	32
2.3.3 <i>Wisdom of Solomon</i>	33
2.3.4 <i>Summary</i>	34

2.4 SATAN AS RULER.....	34
2.4.1 Jubilees.....	34
2.4.1.1 Mastema’s Authority over One-tenth of the Evil Spirits.....	35
2.4.1.2 Mastema’s Rule within Israel’s History	36
2.4.1.3 Other References to Satan’s Rule in Jubilees.....	37
2.4.2 Qumran and the ממשלת בל יעל.....	38
2.4.2.1 The Angel of Darkness’ Dominion in Rule of the Community (1QS).....	39
2.4.2.2 The Dominion of Belial in the Damascus Document (CD)	40
2.4.2.3 The Dominion of Belial in the War Scroll (1QM)	41
2.4.3 Other References to Satan as Ruler in Second Temple Judaism.....	42
2.5 SATAN AS TEMPTER.....	42
2.5.1 Satan as Tempter at Qumran.....	43
2.5.2 Satan as Tempter in the Testament of Job	44
2.5.3 The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs	47
2.5.4 Satan as Tempter in the Life of Adam and Eve.....	48
2.5.5 Excursus on the Relationship between the Devil and the Serpent	50
2.6 SATAN WITHIN THE HISTORY OF ISRAEL: RECASTING ISRAEL’S SCRIPTURES.....	55
2.6.1 Chronicles 21: David’s Census, Yahweh’s Anger, and “Satan”	57
2.6.2 The Book of Job and the Testament of Job.....	59
2.6.3 Jubilees: Satan and the Early Israelites.....	62
2.6.4 Evidence from Qumran	65
2.6.5 Lives of the Prophets	67
2.7 CONCLUSIONS.....	67
CHAPTER THREE APOCALYPTIC AND SATAN IN PAULINE THEOLOGY	70
3.1 INTRODUCTION	70
3.2 APOCALYPTIC	70
3.2.1 Approach and Focus.....	70
3.2.2 Definitions.....	71
3.3 PAUL AND APOCALYPTIC.....	73
3.3.1 Paul’s Modification of Jewish Apocalyptic Theology.....	73
3.3.2 Paul’s Apocalyptic Interpretation of the Death of Christ.....	75
3.3.3 Satan in Paul’s Apocalyptic Theology.....	77
3.4 CONCLUSION.....	81
CHAPTER FOUR PAUL’S APOSTLESHIP AND HIS CHURCHES	83

4.1 INTRODUCTION	83
4.2 THE SIGNIFICANCE OF PAUL’S CHURCHES FOR HIS APOSTLESHIP	84
4.2.1 <i>The Role of Paul’s Churches: A Critique</i>	84
4.2.2 <i>The Role of Paul’s Churches: Pauline Evidence</i>	87
1 Corinthians 3:10–15.....	87
2 Corinthians 10:13–15.....	88
1 Corinthians 9:1–2.....	89
The Letter to the Romans	91
4.2.3 <i>Conclusion</i>	93
4.3 PAUL’S APOSTOLIC RESPONSIBILITY FOR HIS CHURCHES	94
4.3.1 <i>Paul’s Care for the Faith of his Churches</i>	95
4.3.1.1 Pauline Metaphors for the Apostle-Church Relationship	96
4.3.1.2 Examples of Paul’s Care for his Churches.....	97
1 Thessalonians	97
The Corinthian Correspondence	98
Galatians	99
Philippians.....	100
Romans.....	101
4.3.1.4 Summary	102
4.3.2 <i>Paul’s Fear of his Apostolic Labor being “in vain”</i>	103
4.3.2.1 Pauline Language for Apostolic Labor	103
4.3.2.2 Paul’s Fear of Laboring “in vain”	105
4.4 OPPOSITION TO PAUL’S APOSTOLIC LABOR	110
4.5 CONCLUSION.....	113

CHAPTER FIVE PAUL’S REFERENCES TO SATAN: ROMANS AND 1 THESSALONIANS

.....	115
5.1 INTRODUCTION	115
5.2 ROMANS 16:20	116
5.2.1 <i>Introduction</i>	116
5.2.2 <i>The Epistolary Context of Romans 16:20</i>	117
5.2.3 <i>Background to Romans 16:20</i>	119
5.2.3.1 Genesis 3:15 and the “Proto-Evangelium”	119
5.2.3.2 Psalm 8:7 and 110:1 in Romans 16:20	121
5.2.4 <i>Paul’s Pastoral Adaptation</i>	122
5.2.5 <i>Romans 16:20 and Paul’s Understanding of Satan</i>	125

5.3 1 THESSALONIANS 2:18 AND 3:5	126
5.3.1 <i>Introduction</i>	126
5.3.2 <i>Background to 1 Thessalonians 2:17–3:10</i>	127
5.3.3 <i>1 Thessalonians 2:18</i>	129
5.3.3.1 <i>The Means of Satan’s Hindrance</i>	130
5.3.3.2 <i>The Language of 1 Thessalonians 2:18</i>	132
5.3.3.3 <i>Paul and Satan’s Activity</i>	134
5.3.4 <i>1 Thessalonians 3:5</i>	137
5.3.4.1 <i>1 Thessalonians 3:1–10</i>	138
5.3.4.2 <i>Satan as Tempter</i>	139
5.3.4.3 <i>Paul’s Apostolic Labor and the Faith of the Thessalonians</i>	141
5.3.5 <i>Conclusions</i>	144
5.4 CONCLUSION.....	145
CHAPTER SIX PAUL’S REFERENCES TO SATAN: 1 AND 2 CORINTHIANS	147
6.1 INTRODUCTION	147
6.2 2 CORINTHIANS 4:4.....	149
6.2.1 <i>Introduction</i>	149
6.2.2 <i>Satan as “the god of this age”</i>	149
6.2.3 <i>The Function of “the god of this age” in 2 Corinthians</i>	153
6.2.3.1 <i>Satan as the “god” of this Age</i>	154
6.2.3.2 <i>“The god of this age” in 2 Corinthians 3–4</i>	156
6.2.4 <i>“The god of this age” and the Ministry of Paul</i>	158
6.2.5 <i>Conclusions</i>	159
6.3 1 CORINTHIANS 5:5.....	159
6.3.1 <i>Introduction</i>	159
6.3.2 <i>Exegetical Issues in 1 Corinthians 5:5</i>	160
6.3.3 <i>Satan and the Incestuous Man</i>	166
6.3.4 <i>The Realm of Satan, the Corinthian Community, and Paul’s Labor</i>	170
6.3.5 <i>Conclusions</i>	172
6.4 1 CORINTHIANS 7:5.....	172
6.4.1 <i>Introduction</i>	172
6.4.2 <i>Paul’s Response to the Corinthians’ Inquiry</i>	173
6.4.3 <i>Satan in 1 Corinthians 7:5</i>	176
6.4.4 <i>Conclusions</i>	178
6.5 2 CORINTHIANS 2:11	179

6.5.1 Introduction	179
6.5.2 The Relationship between 2 Corinthians 2:5-11 and 1 Corinthians 5:1-5.....	180
6.5.3 Paul, the Corinthian Church, and the Offender.....	181
6.5.4 Satan's "Schemes"	184
6.5.5 Conclusions.....	186
6.6 2 CORINTHIANS 6:15	187
6.6.1 The Disputed Authenticity of 2 Corinthians 6:14-7:1	187
6.6.2 The Epistolary Context of 2 Corinthians 6:15	191
6.6.3 Beliar, Satan, and 2 Corinthians 6:15.....	192
6.6.4 2 Corinthians 6:15 and Paul's Understanding of Satan.....	196
6.7 2 CORINTHIANS 11:3, 14-15.....	196
6.7.1 Introduction	196
6.7.2 The Serpent of 2 Corinthians 11:3.....	197
6.7.3 The Apostle Paul and the Betrothal of the Corinthians to Christ	200
6.7.4 The Servants of Satan at Corinth (2 Cor 11:13-15).....	202
6.7.5 Conclusions.....	206
6.8 2 CORINTHIANS 12:7	207
6.8.1 Introduction	207
6.8.2 The Identity of the "thorn in the flesh"	209
6.8.3 The Relationship between σκόλοψ τῆ σαρκί and ἄγγελος σατανᾶ.....	211
6.8.4 Divine Agency and 2 Corinthians 12:7	214
6.8.5 Conclusions.....	220
6.9 PAUL, SATAN, AND THE CORINTHIAN CORRESPONDENCE	221
6.10 CONCLUSION	223
CHAPTER SEVEN CONCLUSION.....	225
7.1 SUMMARY.....	225
7.2 IMPLICATIONS	229
7.3 FURTHER RESEARCH	231
BIBLIOGRAPHY	234

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is my privilege to acknowledge and honor those who in various ways supported and contributed to this project. I am first indebted to those who helped me along the journey to Edinburgh. I wish to thank Dr. Daniel Falk at the University of Oregon in whose undergraduate courses I first learned about the Dead Sea Scrolls, the importance of the Jewish background to the New Testament, and the “historical Jesus.” Since that initial exposure to the academic world of biblical studies my interest and curiosity in Christian beginnings has only grown.

I cannot stress enough how instrumental my time at Regent College in Vancouver, BC was in shaping me as a person and a scholar; it truly is a greenhouse for the mind and the spirit (in the Pauline sense). Among the faculty there I wish to thank the following people: Dr. Iain Provan, who not only offered first-rate scholarly insights on the Hebrew Bible and hermeneutics in his classes, but equally valuable lessons on how to be an equitable yet gracious scholar during my time as his TA; Dr. Rikk Watts, who makes it impossible for students to escape Regent College without studying the use of the OT in the NT, ancient rhetoric, and sentence flowing. His passion for biblical studies and history, enjoyment of life, and industrious scholarly habits are contagious; and Dr. Sven Soderlund, whose gracious character is matched only by the wisdom which he lovingly imparts to his life’s work, his students. In addition to supervising my master’s thesis, he gave me sagacious advice during my pursuit of doctoral programs. I can only hope to have gleaned the smallest of grains from these fine scholars.

From my time in Edinburgh, gratitude must first be given to my primary supervisor Professor Larry Hurtado, who took interest in my initial research project (even as it ran aground) and offered reassuring encouragement as I frantically searched for a new one. An excellent supervisor, he provided just the right amount of freedom to explore my own interests and guidance to prevent my curiosity from leading me astray. Despite his busy schedule, he was readily available to talk over my research or to read a draft of my dissertation. His expertise in virtually every field related to NT studies, insightful criticisms, and insatiable interest in anything related

to Christian origins have undoubtedly improved this project. I would also like to thank the other Biblical Studies faculty members at New College, especially my secondary supervisor Dr. Helen Bond as well as Dr. Paul Foster, for creating a stimulating and thoroughly enjoyable academic environment.

My time in Edinburgh was greatly enriched by the camaraderie of several of my New College colleagues, including Sean Adams, Matthew Arbo, Mark Batluck, Dr. Chris Keith, Jeremy Kidwell, Jonathan Lo, Scotty Manor, Mike Naylor, Greg Paulson, Dr. Dieter Roth, Dr. Karl Shuve, Todd Stockdale, and Dr. Blair Wilgus. I cannot think of a better group of scholars with whom to have shared my research experiences, including our daily lunches in Rainy Hall, an unforgettable day trip to Dublin to visit the Chester Beatty Library (every Pauline scholar should see P^{46} with their own eyes!), and a certain Biblical Studies Seminar which involved a bucket, a well, and a few raised eyebrows. I am also grateful for time spent with two fellow Regent College alumni studying in the UK: Dr. Aaron Sherwood (Durham) and Ben Edsall (Oxford).

Outside the academic world, this project would not have been feasible without the support, financial and otherwise, of family and friends, including my parents Kathleen Caldwell and Jerry and Marcie Brown, my in-laws Ken and Jacque Mays, Helen Fast, and Larry and Elaine Johnson. Special thanks are due to Anthony and Annie Laughlin for showing interest in my desire to do doctoral work at an early stage and then generously and lovingly supporting me throughout my studies. I greatly hope that my endeavors have honored each of them.

Most of all I am thankful for my wonderful wife, Katie. She has been a rock to me through the ups and downs of my research. She has willingly moved abroad (twice!) and worked to pay the bills in order for me to pursue my academic interests. For that I am forever indebted to her. Most importantly, Katie's companionship and constant encouragement sustained and bettered me as a person. Lastly, I am grateful for the birth of our first child, Evelyn May, during our time in Edinburgh. Although she will not understand for many years, Evelyn breathed new life into me in the final year of this project.

LIST OF FIGURES

<i>Figure 1</i>	203
-----------------------	-----

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AB	Anchor Bible
ABD	Anchor Bible Dictionary. Edited by D. N. Freedman. 6 vols. New York, 1992
<i>ABR</i>	<i>Australian Biblical Review</i>
ADSS	Ars Disputandi Supplement Series
AGJU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums
ANRW	Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt
ANTC	Abingdon New Testament Commentaries
AOTC	Abingdon Old Testament Commentaries
ASTI	Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute
ATJ	Ashland Theological Journal
AYB	Anchor Yale Bible
AYBRL	Anchor Yale Bible Reference Library
BBR	Bulletin for Biblical Research
BECNT	Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament
BETL	Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium
BFT	Biblical Foundations in Theology
BHT	Beiträge zur historischen Theologie
<i>Bib</i>	<i>Biblica</i>
<i>BibInt</i>	<i>Biblical Interpretation</i>
BJS	Brown Judaica Studies
<i>BN</i>	<i>Biblische Notizen</i>
BNTC	Black's New Testament Commentaries
<i>BSac</i>	<i>Bibliotheca Sacra</i>
<i>BTB</i>	<i>Biblical Theology Bulletin</i>
BZ	Biblische Zeitschrift
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
BZNW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
CBC	Cambridge Bible Commentary

CBET	Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology
<i>CBQ</i>	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CBQMS	Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series
<i>CBR</i>	<i>Currents in Biblical Research</i>
CNT	Commentaire du Nouveau Testament
ConBNT	Coniectanea biblica: New Testament Series
CQS	Companion to the Qumran Scrolls
EKKNT	Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
<i>EvQ</i>	<i>Evangelical Quarterly</i>
<i>EvT</i>	<i>Evangelische Theologie</i>
<i>ExAud</i>	<i>Ex Auditu</i>
<i>ExpTim</i>	<i>Expository Times</i>
FOTL	Forms of the Old Testament Literature
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
<i>Hen</i>	<i>Henoch</i>
HSM	Harvard Semitic Monographs
HSS	Harvard Semitic Studies
<i>HTR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
HUCA	Hebrew Union College Annual
ICC	International Critical Commentary
<i>Int</i>	<i>Interpretation</i>
IVPNTC	InterVarsity Press New Testament Commentary Series
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>JETS</i>	<i>Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society</i>
<i>JJS</i>	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>
<i>JNES</i>	<i>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</i>
JSHRZ	Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit
<i>JSJ</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods</i>
JSNT	Journal for the Study of the New Testament
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series

JSOT	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series
JSP	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha
JSPSup	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series
<i>JTC</i>	<i>Journal for Theology and the Church</i>
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
LEC	Library of Early Christianity
LHB	Library of Hebrew Bible
LNTS	Library of New Testament Studies
LSTS	Library of Second Temple Studies
<i>LumVie</i>	<i>Lumière et vie</i>
MNTC	Moffatt New Testament Commentary
<i>MSJ</i>	<i>The Master's Seminary Journal</i>
NAC	New American Commentary
NIB	New Interpreter's Bible
NIBCOT	New International Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament
NICNT	New International Biblical Commentary on the New Testament
NIGTC	New International Greek Testament Commentary
<i>NovT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
NovTSup	Novum Testamentum Supplements
NSBT	New Studies in Biblical Theology
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
NTT	New Testament Theology
OTG	Old Testament Guides
OTL	Old Testament Library
OTS	Old Testament Studies
OtSt	Oudtestamentische Studiën
PVTG	Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece
QD	Quaestiones disputatae
<i>RB</i>	<i>Revue biblique</i>
<i>ResQ</i>	<i>Restoration Quarterly</i>
<i>RevExp</i>	<i>Review and Expositor</i>

<i>RevQ</i>	<i>Revue de Qumran</i>
<i>RHPR</i>	<i>Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses</i>
<i>RSB</i>	<i>Religious Studies Bulletin</i>
SBL	Society of Biblical Literature
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLEJL	Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and Its Literature
SBLMS	Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series
SBLSCS	Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies
SBLSP	Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers
SBLSymS	Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series
SBT	Studies in Biblical Theology
SD	Studies and Documents
<i>SJT</i>	<i>Scottish Journal of Theology</i>
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
SP	Sacra Pagina
SSEJC	Studies in Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity
StBP	Studia post-biblica
SUNT	Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments
SVTP	Studia in Veteris Testamenti pseudepigrapha
TBN	Themes in Biblical Narrative
<i>TDNT</i>	<i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i>
TNTC	Tyndale New Testament Commentary
TOTC	Tyndale Old Testament Commentary
<i>TS</i>	<i>Theological Studies</i>
TSAJ	Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum
<i>TynBul</i>	<i>Tyndale Bulletin</i>
<i>TZ</i>	<i>Theologische Zeitschrift</i>
<i>VT</i>	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
WBC	Word 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>

ZNW

*Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der
älteren Kirche*

Chapter One

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Reasons for the Present Study

The letters of Paul are rife with references to evil powers and figures, including “principalities” (ἀρχαί), “powers” (δυνάμεις), “authorities” (ἐξουσίαι), angels (ἄγγελοι), “rulers” (οἱ ἄρχοντες), “elemental spirits” (τὰ στοιχεῖα), demons (τὰ δαιμόνια), and Satan (ὁ σατανᾶς). In these references the Apostle Paul variously attributes considerable influence to malevolent forces at work in the cosmos. Of these many powers and figures, Paul’s references to the figure of Satan are especially interesting since they are directly related to the Pauline churches and Paul’s missionary efforts. That is, in contrast to powers such as “principalities” and “authorities” which figure only in a generic sense and without concrete referents in the Pauline letters, whenever Paul mentions Satan he does so with respect to Satan’s actions against either himself or his churches.

Despite Paul’s distinct depiction of Satan in comparison to other evil powers and figures, no study to date has offered a comprehensive examination of the Pauline references to Satan which seeks to elucidate his characterization of Satan as an adversary of his apostolic work and of his churches. A brief glance at two examples from Paul’s letters will demonstrate how Paul portrayed Satan as an opponent of his apostolic work, including his missionary travels and his labors for the churches which he founded.

1.1.1 Examples of Satan’s Significance in Paul’s Letters

In 1 Thess 2:17–3:5 Paul recounts his unsuccessful attempts to return to Thessalonica subsequent to his untimely departure: “for we wanted to come to you—certainly I, Paul, wanted to again and again—but Satan hindered (ἐνέκοψεν) us” (2:18). As Paul continues his narrative, he again mentions Satan’s activity in relation to his sending of Timothy to the Thessalonian church: “for this reason, when I could bear it no longer, I sent to find out about your faith; I was afraid that somehow the

tempter had tempted you (ἐπειράσεν ὑμᾶς ὁ πειράζων) and that our labor had been in vain” (1 Thess 3:5). In this passage Paul seems to take for granted Satan’s opposition to the people of God in a general sense. That is, Paul assumes that Satan—the adversary *par excellence*—puts “obstacles in the path of the people of God, to prevent the will of God from being accomplished in and through them.”¹ What is often overlooked by scholars, however, is the contextual nature of Paul’s references to Satan in 1 Thess 2:18 and 3:5. In both verses Paul depicts Satan’s activity as opposition to his apostolic relationship with the Thessalonian church. In doing so, Paul betrays his fear that his apostolic labor for the gospel would be rendered in vain by the work of Satan. In other words, Paul’s concern for Satan’s activity in these two verses is born out of his role as founding apostle of the Thessalonian community.

Another example can be seen in 2 Cor 4 where Paul, in his description of the ministry (διακονία, v. 1) given to him by God, refers to Satan as ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου (“the god of this age,” v. 4) who blinds the minds of “the unbelievers” (τῶν ἀπίστων) from comprehending the gospel. Scholarship on the verse tends to focus, not without reason, on the theological implications of Satan’s ability to inhibit belief and the translation and identity of τῶν ἀπίστων. What frequently goes unnoticed because of these emphases is that Paul portrays his entire apostolic ministry, which is fundamentally concerned with bringing the gospel to people, as antithetical to Satan’s desire to prevent people from understanding the very gospel which Paul proclaimed (τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἡμῶν, vv. 3–4). In other words, Satan appears in 2 Cor 4:4 not simply as the generic opponent of all God’s people (or even of “the unbelievers”) but *also* as the adversary of Paul and his apostolic ministry.

Far from being reticent to speak about Satan,² this quick glimpse at two of the Pauline references to Satan illustrates Paul’s willingness to attribute serious activity

¹ F. F. Bruce, *First and Second Thessalonians* (WBC 45; Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 1982), 55.

² Against Richard H. Bell (*Deliver us from Evil: Interpreting the Redemption from the Power of Satan in New Testament Theology* [WUNT 216; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007], 232), who, in support of this assertion, cites Wilhelm Bousset (“Die religionsgeschichtliche Herkunft der jüdischen Apokalyptik,” in *Apokalyptik* [eds. Klaus Koch and Johann Michael Schmidt; Darmstadt:

and authority to Satan. For in just these two passages Paul refers to Satan by the apocalyptic epithet “the god of this age” while charging him with “blinding” the minds of people, and, crucially, identifies Satan as the acting agent behind two concrete historical events: Paul’s thwarted efforts to return to his fledgling church and the tempting of the faith of the Thessalonian congregation. Thus Witherington is right to suggest that “Paul has a clearly formed notion of the Satan.”³ In view of 1 Thess 2:18–3:5 and 2 Cor 4:4, Paul’s notion of Satan apparently included his belief that Satan specifically opposed his work as a pioneer missionary and an apostle called to preach the gospel and establish communities of faith.

The following questions are worth raising at this point: why did Paul believe that Satan was targeting him, whether directly as in 1 Thess 2:18 or indirectly through his church as in 1 Thess 3:5? How is Satan understood and portrayed in the writings and theology of Jewish and Christian traditions contemporaneous with Paul, and to what degree did Paul share, reflect, or differ from these traditions? Why did Paul consider Satan to have significant power in the present age? Why did Paul believe that Satan was at work against his churches throughout the Mediterranean basin? What caused Paul to believe that the capitulation of one of his churches would result in the failure of his apostolic labor? In what ways did Paul’s self-understanding as the Apostle to the Gentiles shape his characterization of Satan’s activity?

These questions help illustrate that Paul’s references to Satan, although often made in passing and without any theological explanation, are nevertheless interconnected with Paul’s apocalyptic theology as well as his self-understanding as an apostle. A survey of scholarship on the figure of Satan and powers of evil in Paul will show that such questions have not been directly or satisfactorily addressed.

Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1982], 143): “Im allgemeinen tritt freilich in der paulinischen Theologie die Gestalt des Teufels stark zurück.”

³ Ben Witherington III, *Paul’s Narrative Thought World: The Tapestry of Tragedy and Triumph* (Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press, 1994), 19.

1.1.2 Relevant Scholarship on Satan and Paul

To various degrees Paul's understanding of Satan has been discussed by several scholars. A work exclusively devoted to the topic is yet to be published, with most discussions on Satan being found in studies on "principalities and powers" or "powers of evil" in either Paul or the NT as a whole. Our aim will be two-fold in the section below: 1) to locate the present investigation within the context of previous research on Satan in Second Temple Judaism and early Christianity, Paul's self-understanding, and the references to Satan in Paul; and b) to establish the need for a study focused solely on Paul's references to Satan by virtue of the absence of scholarship which adequately engages the aforementioned questions on Paul and Satan.

General Studies on Satan

The first category of relevant research contains works devoted solely to the figure of the devil.⁴ Although the scope of most of these studies goes well beyond the Pauline corpus—and for some even beyond early Christianity—most provide at least a section on Satan in the letters of Paul, though typically with insubstantial findings. For example, Paul Carus' 1900 study on the history of the devil devotes a single chapter to the devil in early Christianity but fails to examine a single Pauline text or discuss Paul's overall presentation of Satan.⁵ More helpfully, in his work on the "combat myth" Neil Forsyth argues that "every time Paul uses the word Satan he is

⁴ Among the many studies in this category are Neil Forsyth, *The Old Enemy: Satan and the Combat Myth* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1987); Henry Ansgar Kelly, *Satan: A Biography* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006); Edward Langton, *Satan, a Portrait: A Study of the Character of Satan through all the Ages* (London: Skeffington, 1945); Ragnar Leivestad, *Christ the Conqueror: Ideas of Conflict and Victory in the New Testament* (London: SPCK, 1954); Trevor Oswald Ling, *Significance of Satan: New Testament Demonology and Its Contemporary Relevance* (London: SPCK, 1961); Bent Noack, *Satanás und Sotería: Untersuchungen zur neutestamentlichen Dämonologie* (Copenhagen: Gads, 1948); Elaine H. Pagels, *The Origin of Satan: The New Testament Origins of Christianity's Demonization of Jews, Pagans and Heretics* (New York: Random House, 1995); Jeffrey Burton Russell, *The Devil: Perceptions of Evil from Antiquity to Primitive Christianity* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1977); *Satan: The Early Christian Tradition* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1981); *Mephistopheles: The Devil in the Modern World* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1986).

⁵ Paul Carus, *The History of the Devil and the Idea of Evil* (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trüber & Co., 1900).

referring to the opponent of human salvation, not to the figure who does battle with Michael in the book of Revelation. Satanic opposition takes the form of opposition to Paul, so completely does Paul identify himself with the Christian message.”⁶ Still, Forsyth’s assertions concerning Paul’s view of Satan are unsubstantiated and, ultimately, overstated in that they cannot be applied to each of Paul’s references to Satan. Henry Kelly’s analysis of the Pauline Satan texts in his “biography” of Satan elucidates the various roles of Satan but fails to provide a concluding synthesis of Paul’s portrayal of Satan.⁷ Bent Noack’s study, *Satanás und Sotería*, is similar in this respect.⁸ Trevor Ling too lacks a cogent account of Paul’s depiction of Satan, defaulting to a generic description of Satan in Paul as a powerful and malevolent spirit who tempts Christians.⁹

Elaine Pagels, whose primary interest is the way in which the early Christians invoked Satan to explain their conflicts and to characterize their enemies, suggests that Paul reflects “traditionally Jewish” view of Satan as God’s agent of testing, not of corruption.¹⁰ Through her sociological approach Pagels also interprets Paul’s characterization of his rivals as “servants of Satan” in 2 Cor 11:13–15 as an attempt to demonize his opponents. Jeffrey Burton Russell’s four volumes on Satan in the history of the Christian tradition are impressive. In *The Devil* Russell discusses the roles of Satan within the NT,¹¹ but unfortunately his focus is too broad to help the proposed focus of the present study.

Several of these generic studies on Satan provide worthwhile insights to the references to Satan in the Pauline letters. A few of them even argue for a specific understanding of Paul’s view of Satan. However, their shortcomings consist in discussing Paul’s references to Satan apart from their connection to other areas of Pauline theology and thought. For this reason, these widely-focused studies on Satan are unable to offer serious contributions to our main research question.

⁶ Forsyth, *The Old Enemy*, 260.

⁷ Kelly, *Satan*, 53–79.

⁸ Noack, *Satanás und Sotería*, 92–113.

⁹ Ling, *The Significance of Satan*, 36–53.

¹⁰ Pagels, *The Origin of Satan*, 183.

¹¹ Russell, *The Devil*, 221–49.

Satan in the Hebrew Bible

As a second category of relevant scholarship, there are a number of studies on the emergence and evolution of (the) Satan in the Hebrew Bible.¹² The most notable of these studies is Peggy Day's *An Adversary in Heaven*, an examination of four Hebrew Bible passages (Num 22:22–35; Zech 3:1–7; Job 1–2; 1 Chr 21:1–22:1) which the Hebrew שָׂטָן allegedly refers to the figure of Satan. In her study Day concludes that there “is not one celestial šāṭān in the Hebrew Bible, but rather the potential for many.”¹³ Marvin Tate arrives at a similar position: “No passage in the Old Testament has to do directly with Satan (or the Devil) in the sense of later literature and Christian theology ... In this sense there is no Satan in the Old Testament.”¹⁴ Although these contributions are helpful in determining how the figure of Satan developed in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Jewish texts, they are not helpful for the present study. For our interest in the Hebrew Bible references to Satan is not in the development of the figure, but in how Jews and early Christians would have perceived Satan in the first century C.E.

A more valuable study on the development of Satan in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Jewish traditions is Paulo Sacchi's *Jewish Apocalyptic and its History*.¹⁵ In his work Sacchi devotes an entire chapter to the devil in the Jewish traditions of the Second Temple period. His aim in the chapter is to trace two distinct

¹² See, e.g., Gustav Roskoff, *Geschichte des Teufels* (Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus, 1869); Rivkah Schärf Kluger, *Die Gestalt des Satans im Alten Testament* (Zürich: Rascher Verlag, 1948); Herbert Haag, *Teufelsgaube* [S.l.]: Katzmann, 1974); Peggy L. Day, *An Adversary in Heaven: Satan in the Hebrew Bible* (HSM 43; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988); Florian Kreuzer, “Der Antagonist: der Satan in der Hebräischen Bibel – eine bekannte Größe?” *Bib* 86, no. 4 (2005): 536–44.

Also important for the study of Satan in the Hebrew Bible are articles on the origin and development of the Hebrew term שָׂטָן: Charles Fontinoy, “Les noms du Diable et leur étymologie” in *Orientalia* (Leiden: Brill, 1984), 157–70; C. Breytenbach and P. L. Day, “Satan,” in *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible* (ed. Karel van der Toorn, Bob Becking, and Pieter Willem van der Horst; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 726–32; Daniel E. Gershenson, “The Name Satan,” *ZAW* 114, no. 3 (2002): 443–45.

¹³ Day, *An Adversary in Heaven*, 15.

¹⁴ Marvin E. Tate, “Satan in the Old Testament,” *RevExp* 89, no. 4 (1992): 461–74 (471).

¹⁵ Paulo Sacchi, *Jewish Apocalyptic and its History* (trans. William J. Short; JSPSup 20; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996); idem, *The History of the Second Temple Period* (trans. Thomas Kirk; JSOTSup 285; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 329–54.

traditions of the devil in the relative literature: (1) the devil as the principle of evil and (2) the devil as a rebellious will “continuously active in history.” In particular, Sacchi is interested in how these two “radical understandings” of the devil can be integrated in various texts and even nuanced to establish a relationship between the devil and God (e.g., in *T. Job*). Sacchi’s study will figure highly in our analysis of Satan in the biblical and Second Temple Jewish traditions.

Satan in the New Testament

Three recent contributions have been made to the study of Satan in the NT.¹⁶ First, a popular-level publication on the “biblical roots” of the devil by Wray and Mobley devotes a section in its chapter on the devil in the NT to “Satan in the Pauline Epistles.”¹⁷ They describe Satan’s primary role in the Pauline letters as an “obstructor” of Paul’s missionary efforts and churches. In this respect their analysis is useful. Unfortunately, Wray and Mobley are less convincing on two points. First, they speak of Paul’s “use” of the word “Satan” in his letters to refer to his human opponents. Second, they claim that *every* mention of Satan in the Pauline letters involves Satan working through human agents against Paul and his churches.¹⁸ This is simply not the case. To note just one example, when Paul claims that Satan hindered his return to Thessalonica in 1 Thess 2:18 he does so without any explanation as to the means of hindrance. In the end, Wray and Mobley fail to offer a nuanced description of Paul’s references to Satan.¹⁹ Second, Sydney Page analyzes

¹⁶ One also finds studies on the roles and significance of Satan in the rest of the NT outside of the Pauline corpus. For instance, Susan Garrett has published a work on the “demise of the devil” in Luke and Acts entitled, *The Demise of the Devil: Magic and the Demonic in Luke’s Writings* (Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress Press, 1989); cf. Jennifer Ann Glancy, “Satan in the Synoptic Gospels” (Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 1990). Several articles have also been published on the devil in the Gospel of John (e.g., Ronald A. Piper, “Satan, Demons and the Absence of Exorcisms in the Fourth Gospel” in *Christology, Controversy, and Community: New Testament Essays in Honour of David R. Catchpole* [eds. David Horrell and Christopher M. Tuckett; NovTSup 99; Leiden: Brill, 2000]: 253–78; Wendy E. Sproston, “Satan in the Fourth Gospel,” in *StudBib 1978*, 2 [JSNTSup 2; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980]: 307–11).

¹⁷ T. J. Wray and Gregory Mobley, *The Birth of Satan: Tracing the Devil’s Biblical Roots* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2005), 129–36.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 136.

¹⁹ Moreover, Wray and Mobley curiously omit the reference to “the god of this age” in 2 Cor 4:4 (*ibid.*, 132–33), a title which virtually all scholars identify as a reference to Satan.

the Pauline references to Satan in greater depth in his study on Satan and demons in the biblical tradition.²⁰ Page's exegesis of the Pauline texts is often helpful, but in the end the study only deals with the verses individually without relating them to other aspects of Pauline theology.

More recently, Richard Bell has published a volume entitled *Deliver Us from Evil* on the NT motif of redemption as deliverance from Satan. To address this issue, Bell attempts to establish a complicated philosophical framework in which to analyze the relevant NT texts. Bell's framework draws on the distinction between the phenomenal and noumenal worlds (derived from Kant and Schopenhauer)—including how myth relates to the noumenal—in order to interpret redemption in the NT in terms of deliverance from “the grip of Satan.”²¹ In other words, in Bell's view Satan is fundamentally a theological (=noumenal) figure (concept?) within Pauline theology. In particular, Bell argues that Paul understood the death and resurrection of Christ as the defeat of Satan, though, Bell claims, this is usually implied rather than made explicit in Paul's references to Satan. Unfortunately, Bell's thesis, that redemption in the NT should be interpreted as deliverance from Satan, cannot readily be applied to each of Paul's references to Satan. Bell attempts to establish his position by connecting Satan with sin so that being under the dominion of sin is tantamount to being under “the tyranny of the devil,”²² but this connection is absent in Paul. And Bell's claim that “Rom. 5.12–21 implies the work of the devil who through Adam brings disobedience and death in to the world” is equally unfounded.²³ For these reasons I consider Bell's analysis to be highly limited when it comes to questions concerning the historical Paul's depiction of Satan within his letters.

²⁰ Sydney H. T. Page, *Powers of Evil: A Biblical Study of Satan and Demons* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans; Leicester: Apollos, 1995), 183–221

²¹ Bell, *Deliver Us from Evil*, 241.

²² *Ibid.*

²³ *Ibid.*, 233.

Principalities and Powers

The subject of “principalities and powers”²⁴ in Paul has received considerable scholarly attention. In general, “principalities and powers” is shorthand for a number of terms used in the Pauline letters and NT to refer to a variety of cosmological forces.²⁵ Defining the meaning of the category “principalities and powers” with any precision has proved a difficult and widely disputed task. Despite numerous publications on the topic throughout the twentieth century, no scholarly consensus exists regarding the interpretation of principalities and powers in the Pauline letters.²⁶ Here we consider the main contributions on the matter relevant to the present study.

One of the most notable interpretations of principalities and powers was that of Rudolf Bultmann, whose existential hermeneutic led him to interpret principalities

²⁴ Note also the related category of the so-called “powers of evil” in the NT. See, e.g., Samson Eitrem, *Some Notes on the Demonology in the New Testament* (Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells, 1966); Everett Ferguson, *Demonology of the Early Christian World* (Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen Press, 1984); René Girard, *I See Satan Fall Like Lightning* (Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 2001); Edward Langton, *Essentials of Demonology: A Study of Jewish and Christian Doctrine, its Origin and Development* (London: Epworth Press, 1949); Roy Yates, “The Powers of Evil in the New Testament,” *EvQ* 52 (1980): 97–111. In addition to the terms used to refer to principalities and powers, these studies typically include angels and demons as part of their discussion. Unfortunately, works focused on the powers of evil fail to give due attention to Paul’s view of Satan since their focus is typically too broad.

²⁵ Included are the following terms: ἀρχαί (Rom 8:38; 1 Cor 15:24; cf. Eph 1:21; 3:10; 6:12; Col 1:16; 2:10, 15); ἄρχοντες (1 Cor 2:6, 8; cf. Rom 13:3; Mark 3:22 par.; also see LXX Dan 10:20 and 12:1); ἐξουσία (1 Cor 15:24; cf. Eph 1:21; 2:2; 3:10; 6:12; Col 1:16; 2:10, 15); δυνάμεις (Rom 8:38; cf. Eph 1:21); κυριότητες (Col 1:16; Eph 1:21); θρόνοι (Col 1:16); κοσμοκράτορες τοῦ σκότους τούτου (Eph 6:12); στοιχεῖα (Gal 4:3, 9; Col 2:8, 20); ἄγγελοι (Rom 8:38; cf. 1 Cor 6:3; Col 2:18).

²⁶ E.g., see the following interpretations: Clinton E. Arnold, *Powers of Darkness: Principalities and Powers in Paul’s Letters* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1992); idem, “Returning to the Domain of the Powers: *Stoicheia* as Evil Spirits in Galatians 4:3,9,” *NovT* 38, no. 1 (1996): 55–76; Hendrikus Berkhof, *Christ and the Powers* (2d ed.; Scottdale, Pa.: Herald Press, 1977); Matthew Black, “Πᾶσαι ἐξουσίαι αὐτῷ ὑποταγήσονται,” in *Paul and Paulinism: Essays in Honour of Charles K. Barrett* (ed. Morna D. Hooker and S. G. Wilson; London: SPCK, 1982), 74–82; G. B. Caird, *Principalities and Powers: A Study in Pauline Theology* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956); Oscar Cullmann, *The State in the New Testament* (New York: Scribners, 1956); Ronn A. Johnson, “The Old Testament Background for Paul’s Use of ‘Principalities and Powers’” (Ph.D. diss., Dallas Theological Seminary, 2004); Jung Young Lee, “Interpreting the Demonic Powers in Pauline Thought,” *NovT* 12, no. 1 (1970): 54–69; G. H. C. Macgregor, “Principalities and Powers: The Cosmic Background of Paul’s Thought,” *NTS* 1, no. 1 (1954): 17–28; Clinton Morrison, *The Powers That Be: Earthly Rulers and Demonic Powers in Romans 13, 1–7* (SBT 29; London: SCM Press, 1960); Peter T. O’Brien, “Principalities and Powers: Opponents of the Church,” in *Biblical Interpretation and the Church* (ed. D. A. Carson; Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1984), 110–50; Heinrich Schlier, *Principalities and Powers in the New Testament* (*QD* 1/3; Freiburg: Herder; Edinburgh: Nelson, 1961); John Howard Yoder, *The Politics of Jesus: Vicit Agnus Noster* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1972).

and powers as mythic projections of human forces.²⁷ Oscar Cullmann, writing in the wake of World War II, interpreted principalities and powers in passages such as Rom 13:1–7; 1 Cor 2:6–8; and 1 Cor 6:1–6 as both spiritual forces and civil authorities.²⁸ Hendrikus Berkhof's *Christ and the Powers* represented another shift in the interpretation of principalities and powers. Berkhof downplayed the theological aspect of principalities and powers in Paul, arguing instead that in early Christianity they represented several types of earthly structures—whether economic, judicial, or technological—which had been “Christianized” (or “neutralized”).²⁹

Perhaps the boldest interpretation of the principalities and powers that has been proposed is that of Wesley Carr.³⁰ Contra Berkhof, who had argued that Paul's references to principalities and powers are to be distinguished from his references to angels,³¹ Carr's main contention is that Paul's references to principalities and powers are allusions, not to demonic forces or socio-political structures, but to either positive human forces or benevolent angels. Carr's thesis has been received with varying degrees of criticism.³²

Walter Wink's three-volume study of principalities and powers, of which volume one is devoted to principalities and powers in the NT, is the most extensive on the subject.³³ In *Naming the Powers*, Wink concludes that in the NT “the ‘principalities

²⁷ E.g., Rudolf Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament* (trans. Kendrick Grobel; vol. 1; New York: Scribners, 1952), 257–59.

²⁸ Thus, in reference to Rom 13:1f. Cullmann commented that “The word ‘powers’, then, exactly like the word ‘rulers’ in I Cor. 2:8 has a double meaning. It means here at once ‘angelic powers’ and ‘State’” (*The State in the New Testament*, 65).

²⁹ Berkhof, *Christ and the Powers*, 45–54.

³⁰ Wesley Carr, *Angels and Principalities: The Background, Meaning and Development of the Pauline Phrase hai archai kai hai exousiai*, (ed. R. McL. Wilson and M. E. Thrall; SNTSMS 42; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981); idem, “Rulers of this Age: 1 Corinthians 2:6–8,” *NTS* 23, no. 1 (1976): 20–35.

³¹ Berkhof, *Christ and the Powers*, 18–20.

³² E.g., see O'Brien, “Principalities and Powers,” 125–8, and (more positively) Wink, *Naming the Powers: The Language of Power in the New Testament* (vol. 1 of *The Powers*; Philadelphia, Pa.: Fortress Press, 1984), 6–8, 21–35, 47–60.

³³ *Ibid.*; idem, *Naming the Powers; Unmasking the Powers: The Invisible Forces that Determine Human Existence* (vol. 2 of *The Powers*; Philadelphia, Pa.: Fortress Press, 1986); idem, *Engaging the Powers: Discernment and Resistance in a World of Domination* (vol. 3 of *The Powers*; Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress Press, 1992).

and powers' are the inner and outer aspects of any given manifestation of power."³⁴ According to Wink, Paul's "unique manner" of dealing with such principalities and powers was to replace "quasi-hypostatized" words such as "flesh," "sin," and "death" with terms drawn from the Jewish apocalyptic tradition such as "Satan," "evil spirits," and "demons."³⁵ To be sure, an ontological understanding of principalities and powers in Paul is not altogether denied, but for Wink there is a strong degree of demythologization of principalities and powers in Paul.

Several other publications on principalities and powers in Paul can be found.³⁶ Related to the present study, however, the fundamental problem with these scholarly contributions is that if they discuss Paul's references to Satan at all, they do so only as a subsidiary subject to "powers and principalities" in Paul.³⁷ The net result of framing the discussion in this manner is that Satan is either interpreted in the same fashion as principalities and powers (e.g., Wink) or virtually disregarded (e.g., Berkhof). That is, Satan is either confused with, or separated from, the broader category of "principalities and powers." Therefore, though such examinations of principalities and powers have made valuable contributions to the topic, they have not given satisfactory attention to Paul's understanding of Satan as a topic in and of itself.

Satan in the Pauline Letters

Despite a strong interest in principalities and powers and evil forces in the biblical tradition in the scholarship of the twentieth century, there is no study solely devoted to the Pauline references to Satan. There are, of course, many studies on the individual references to Satan in Paul, but these typically focus on a single verse

³⁴ Wink, *Naming the Powers*, 5.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 100.

³⁶ E.g., see Chris Forbes, "Paul's Principalities and Powers: Demythologizing Apocalyptic?" *JSNT* 82 (2001): 61–88; *idem*, "Pauline Demonology and/or Cosmology? Principalities, Powers and the Elements of the World in their Hellenistic Context," *JSNT* 85 (2002): 51–73.

³⁷ To be sure, I am not suggesting that Paul's view of Satan should be interpreted apart from the powers of evil in Paul; rather, my point is that by discussing Satan in Paul's letters only as a part of the broader category "principalities and powers" these studies have not given full consideration of a distinct Pauline view of Satan.

without connecting them to other Satan references or aspects of Paul's theology.³⁸ That said, significant contributions have been made toward understanding Paul's theology of the devil, angelic beings, and other evil forces, or what might be typically called demonology.³⁹

One of the earliest and most important contributions to the study of Satan in Paul in modern biblical scholarship is Otto Everling's 1888 volume, *Die paulinische Angelologie und Dämonologie*.⁴⁰ Everling took as his starting point the dismissal of the importance of angelology and demonology in Paul by scholars such as F. C. Baur, remarking that "es scheint die vollständig untergeordnete Bedeutung dieses Teiles der Gedankenwelt des Paulus zu sehr allgemeines Axiom geworden zu sein, als dass man sich darauf einlassen konnte."⁴¹ Responding to this scholarly lacuna, Everling set out to investigate the angelology and demonology of Second Temple Judaism. Everling concluded that Paul's thought is heavily indebted to his Jewish ancestors and, moreover, that angels, demons, and Satan are essential features of Paul's cosmology and soteriology.⁴²

³⁸ See, e.g., K. H. Ostmeyer, "Satan und Passa in 1. Korinther 5," *ZNW* 5, no. 9 (2002): 38–45; Per Bilde, "2 Cor 4:4: The View of Satan and the Created World in Paul," in *Apocryphon Severini* (ed. Per Bilde, Helge Kjær Nielsen, and Jørgen Podemann Sørensen; Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 1993): 29–41 (Bilde's gnostic interpretation of Paul's soteriology as anti-cosmic and anti-somatic is unconvincing); David M. Scholer, "'The God of Peace Will Shortly Crush Satan under your Feet' (Romans 16:20a): The Function of Apocalyptic Eschatology in Paul," *ExAud* 6 (1990): 53–61; Peter W. Macky, "Crushing Satan underfoot (Romans 16:20): Paul's Last Battle Story as True Myth," in *Proceedings, Eastern Great Lakes and Midwest Biblical Societies* (Cincinnati, Ohio: Eastern Great Lakes and Midwest Biblical Societies, 1993), 121–33.

³⁹ A good starting point is Pierre Benoit, "Pauline Angelology and Demonology: Reflexions on Designations of Heavenly Powers and on the Origin of Angelic Evil according to Paul," *RSB* 3, no. 1 (1983): 1–18.

⁴⁰ Otto Everling, *Die paulinische Angelologie und Dämonologie* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1888). That Everling's work marks the first serious contribution to the subject, see Johannes Woyke, *Götter, 'Götzen', Götterbilder: Aspekte einer paulinischen 'Theologie der Religionen'* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2005), 7; Clinton E. Arnold, *Ephesians: Power and Magic: The Concept of Power in Ephesians in Light of its Historical Setting* (SNTSMS 63; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 42. Similarly, Albert Schweitzer (*Paul and his Interpreters: A Critical History* [London: A. and C. Black, 1912], 55) notes that Everling was unable to cite a previous study on angels and demons in Paul.

⁴¹ Everling, *Die paulinische Angelologie und Dämonologie*, 4.

⁴² So Schweitzer, *Paul and his Interpreters*, 57.

In 1909 Martin Dibelius published his well-known work *Die Geisterwelt im Glauben des Paulus*, which remains the single largest volume on the subject.⁴³ Building on Everling’s study, Dibelius made two primary contributions beyond Everling. First, in addition to the Jewish background texts considered by Everling, Dibelius investigated the “spirit world” (Geisterwelt) in Rabbinic sources and those commonly examined by the religionsgeschichtliche Schule. Second, and more importantly for the present study, Dibelius sought to demonstrate that the “spirit world” was central to both Pauline theology—especially eschatology and Christology⁴⁴—and the life and faith of the Christian community. Dibelius claimed the latter point was the main goal of his study: “Die Bedeutung der Geisteranschauungen im Glauben des Paulus nachzuweisen — das gilt als letztes Ziel dieser Untersuchung. Es war die Verbindung herzustellen zwischen dem Geisterglauben und anderen religiösen und theologischen Gedanken des Paulus.”⁴⁵

Although Dibelius correctly stresses the importance of the “spirit world” for Paul’s “theological thought” (theologischen Gedanken) and also rightly emphasizes the significance of the spirit world for the life and faith of the early Christian community, his study is limited in that it only discusses Paul’s “spirit world” in relation to the theological categories of eschatology and christology. Nonetheless, several of Dibelius’ observations regarding the Pauline references to Satan—especially those regarding the nature of the concentration of Satan references in the Corinthian correspondence—will be instructive for the present study.

Critically, the works of Everling and Dibelius brought to the fore the uniqueness of Paul’s view of demonology, while simultaneously demonstrating that such ideas do not belong to the periphery of Pauline theology but are part and parcel of Paul’s theology and worldview. In this sense the present study is an extension of their work,

⁴³ Martin Dibelius, *Die Geisterwelt im Glauben des Paulus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1909). For more on early contributions to the subject, see Derek R. Brown, “The Devil in the Details: A Survey of Research on Satan in Biblical Studies,” *CBR* 9, no. 2 (2011), 200–27.

⁴⁴ Dibelius, *Die Geisterwelt*, 5.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 4. Dibelius goes on to cite Everling’s failure to do the same as the primary weakness of Everling’s work.

though it seeks to move beyond the scope of their inquiries by examining the relation of Paul's understanding of Satan to his apocalyptic theology and self-understanding.

More recently, in a 1990 essay Susan Garrett examined Paul's understanding of his sufferings vis-à-vis his Corinthian opponents.⁴⁶ Garrett's essay included a sustained, albeit brief, consideration of "Paul's view of Satan" which analyzed the references to Satan in the two Corinthian letters with special attention to the Jewish background to Satan and the Hellenistic background to Paul's rhetorical ploys to link his opponents with the work of Satan.⁴⁷ Garrett's central claim is that Paul was "willing to characterize his hardships as Satan's assaults on him."⁴⁸ Garrett persuasively makes the point that Paul charged his opponents at Corinth with being under the authority of Satan and was then able to "discern the spirit" by "identifying the authority behind his human opponents."⁴⁹ In arguing that Paul employed the literary motif of the portrait of the afflicted sage "to persuade his readers that they ought to be proud of him" in light of his sufferings,⁵⁰ Garrett seeks to explain Paul's accusations that his rivals were in fact Satan's servants (2 Cor 11:13–15). To a certain extent this implies—wrongly in my opinion—that Paul's references to Satan are little more than rhetoric ("satanic lore"⁵¹).

In a 1999 article, Lee Johnson also investigated the concentration of references to Satan in the Corinthian letters.⁵² Johnson's main contention is that Paul's references to Satan in the Corinthian correspondence are not allusions to an actual figure of his worldview or theology, but rhetorical language which the apostle employs in order to "cajole, threaten and inspire the Corinthians" to re-submit to his authority.⁵³ Drawing on anthropological studies of the use of witchcraft language among various tribes

⁴⁶ Susan R. Garrett, "The God of this World and the Affliction of Paul: 2 Cor 4:1–12," in *Greeks, Romans, and Christians: Essays in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe* (ed. David L. Balch; Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress Press, 1990), 99–117.

⁴⁷ E.g., *ibid.*, 106–09.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 115.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 117.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 109.

⁵² Lee A. Johnson, "Satan Talk in Corinth: The Rhetoric of Conflict," *BTB* 29 (1999): 145–55.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 154.

and peoples, Johnson concludes that Paul's allusions to the figure of Satan have little, if anything, to do with his theological understanding of Satan or his cosmology.⁵⁴

There is much to be commended in Johnson's article. For example, the question which she addresses—why does Paul refer to Satan so often in 1–2 Corinthians?—is far too often overlooked in Pauline studies. She also rightly stresses the contextual and literary nature of Paul's references to Satan in the Corinthian correspondence. That said, neither Johnson's methodology nor her argument is without problems. First, Johnson's portrayal of Satan as an unimportant figure in Paul is only tenable by ignoring 2 Cor 4:4 (ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου=Satan⁵⁵) and by isolating these texts from Rom 16:20; 1 Thess 2:18; and 3:5. Second, although comparisons between the witchcraft case studies and the Pauline references to Satan may yield a helpful and illustrative analogy, it is far from certain whether they are useful for determining an *historical* explanation of the references to Satan in the Corinthian correspondence. Finally, Johnson applies her sociological-rhetorical analysis of the references to Satan in the Corinthian letters at the expense of a theological interpretation of Satan. In sum, although Johnson addresses a similar question to the one we are concerned with in the present study, her argument and conclusions remain unpersuasive.

1.2 Method and Scope

1.2.1 Direction of the Study

Taken together, the above glance at two Pauline Satan references and the foregoing overview of previous research demonstrate two key points: 1) Paul's references to Satan are more interconnected to his self-understanding and apocalyptic theology than typically thought, and 2) previous scholarship has failed to account fully for the nature of Paul's depiction of Satan in his letters. This all could be, of course, for various reasons. It might be suggested, for instance, that Paul does not in fact have a particular understanding of Satan. He may make the odd reference to

⁵⁴ Ibid.

⁵⁵ See below, §6.2.2.

Satan in his letters, but the paucity of these occurrences indicates that Satan is not important for Pauline theology.⁵⁶ Similarly, it could be the case that where Paul does periodically use the terms σατανᾶς and διάβολος, such language is nothing more than “Satan talk.”⁵⁷

Such objections, however, fail to take seriously the implications of Paul’s references to Satan for the apostle’s wider theology. That Paul does not mention Satan in the context of theologische Erörterungen (“theological discussions”), as Dibelius put it, does not indicate that Paul lacked a clear conception of Satan. On the contrary, that Paul can instruct the Corinthian congregation to “hand over this man to Satan” (1 Cor 5:5) without any explanation whatsoever as to its theological background demonstrates that he envisioned Satan as having a defined role within his apocalyptic framework. Likewise, one of Paul’s boldest appellations for Satan, ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου (2 Cor 4:4), reveals a strong dualistic framework similar to that of the Jewish apocalyptic tradition.⁵⁸ Clearly, Paul’s references to Satan are best understood firmly within his overall theological worldview.⁵⁹

In light of the foregoing discussion, I suggest that what is needed is a full-blown study which isolates and examines Paul’s characterization of Satan in his letters. In response to previous scholarship, many questions can be raised at this point. What are the historical-religious antecedents to Paul’s view of the figure of Satan? What role, if any, does Satan play in Paul’s apocalyptic theology? How does Paul, as a rigorous monotheistic Jew, accommodate a Satan-figure within his theological framework? In what ways, if any, does Paul’s self-understanding as the Apostle to

⁵⁶ So Dibelius, *Die Geisterwelt*, 191: “Die Behauptung daß der Teufel in der Theologie des Paulus stark zurücktrete, ist wohl dahin zu berichtigen, daß die Satansvorstellung mit den religiösen Zentralgedanken des Paulus wenig zu tun hat, desto lebendiger aber mit seinen Lebenserfahrungen als Missionar verbunden ist. Theologische Erörterungen knüpfen sich fast nie an die Erwähnung des Teufels, um so öfter aber apostolische Ratschläge und Weisungen.”

⁵⁷ Johnson, “Satan Talk in Corinth,” 146.

⁵⁸ So Victor Paul Furnish, *2 Corinthians* (AB 32A; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1984), 220.

⁵⁹ Similarly, to insist on a certain consistency within Paul’s references to Satan is also to misunderstand the nature of their occurrences (against Richard A. Horsley, *1 Corinthians* [ANTC; Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon Press, 1998], 79–80). One must not always choose between Satan as a personification of evil or as *provocateur* in Paul. It could also be that the several roles assigned to Satan in Paul’s letters are not indicative of inconsistency on the apostle’s part, but rather reflect a perception of Satan as a protean figure who is capable of carrying out a number of activities in various functions.

the Gentiles shape his perception of satanic activity against his ministry?⁶⁰ While Satan clearly occupies a place within Pauline theology, why does Paul mention Satan in letters which he wrote to his churches in the first place? Lastly, how does Paul's relationship with his churches influence his depiction of Satan within his letters?

These questions can be recapitulated into a single thesis question for the present study: *how and why does Paul refer to the figure of Satan in his letters?*

Unfortunately, the cursory and anecdotal nature of Paul's references to Satan complicates the interpretation of the relevant Pauline passages. More specifically, since none of Paul's references to Satan are accompanied by a theological explanation, it will be necessary, methodologically speaking, to consider relevant background matter in order to provide the necessary context in which to interpret the texts. As I see it, there are two heuristically germane areas of background matter which are requisite for this study, one related to Satan and the other to Paul. First, we will consider the how Satan (or the devil) was understood in the Hebrew Scriptures and Second Temple Judaism. Our approach will differ from both Day's study of the noun שָׂטָן in the Hebrew Scriptures and Sacchi's diachronic analysis of the devil's evolution in Second Temple Jewish texts. Our approach will instead be *synchronic* in perspective, aiming to take a snapshot, as it were, of how Satan might have been understood during the first century C.E. by an educated Jewish Christian such as Paul. In order to achieve this goal, we will examine the relevant texts which mention a Satan-like figure (especially the Hebrew Bible, Pseudepigrapha, and the Qumran literature). To avoid the implication that such texts existed in isolation, we will collate our findings according to the various "images" (or roles) of Satan in the

⁶⁰ Helpful here are Johannes Munck, *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind* (trans. Frank Clarke; London: SCM Press, 1959), trans. of *Paulus und die Heilsgeschichte* (Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget, 1954); J. Christiaan Beker, *Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in Life and Thought* (Philadelphia, Pa.: Fortress Press, 1980); and, more recently, Mark S. Gignilliat, *Paul and Isaiah's Servants: Paul's Theological Reading of Isaiah 40–66 in 2 Corinthians 5:14–6:10* (LNTS 330; London: T&T Clark, 2007).

On this matter Dibelius is more helpful as he connects, at least to a certain extent, Paul's view of Satan's activity with Paul's missionary work at Corinth: "Es ist kein Zufall, daß die Mehrzahl der Satans stellen bei Paulus seinen bedeutsamsten Missionszeugnissen, den Korintherbriefen, angehört. Immer sieht Paulus den Widersacher am Werk, als Versucher oder Friedensstörer den Wohlstand der Gemeinde zu schädigen 1. Kor. 7₅, Rom. 16₂₀, 1. Thess. 3₅; in seinen eigenen Gegnern erblickt er eine Truppe des Satans 2. Kor 11.15" (*Die Geisterwelt*, 191).

examined writings. In doing so, we will elucidate the various names, roles, and traditions of Satan of the thought and theology of Second Temple Judaism. This approach will allow us, as we turn to the Paul material in the latter part of the study, to understand Paul's depiction of Satan within the context of his religious and cultural milieu.

Second, based on a preliminary reading of the Pauline references to Satan, it will be necessary to consider relevant background matter related to Paul's portrayal of Satan. We will do so under two headings. First, in recognition of Satan's place within Jewish apocalyptic theology (especially eschatology) in the Second Temple period, we will consider how Satan figures within *Paul's* apocalyptic theology. Although many of Paul's references to Satan are seemingly unrelated to his eschatology or "demonology," a more coherent analysis of Paul's apocalyptic framework will permit us to reassess this *prima facie* suggestion. Accordingly, our strategy will be to draw attention to the place Satan occupies in Paul's apocalyptic two-age framework and eschatology. Again, because Paul rarely makes explicit statements concerning these matters (e.g., Rom 16:20), we can only *infer* from his overall theological outlook how Satan fits within his apocalyptic thought.

Second, we will examine Paul's self-understanding as an apostle, including his relationship with, and responsibility to, his churches. The rationale behind this direction of investigation is two-fold. First, all of Paul's references to Satan, to make a somewhat obvious point, occur in letters written by Paul and addressed to churches which he either founded (Thessalonica and Corinth) or which figured prominently in his missionary plans (Romans). The second reason for considering the importance of Paul's churches for his apostleship is that in the Pauline letters Satan's activity is often directed at his *churches*. Paul's relation to the communities opposed by Satan is therefore critical to how he understood and depicted the work of Satan. Together, it is hoped that these two background areas of Pauline theology will create an interpretive context in which to read Paul's references to Satan afresh and, consequently, to reconsider how Paul characterized Satan in his letters.

As a final methodological note, I should reiterate that I am not attempting to delineate a Pauline "theology of Satan." To be sure, we will touch upon this subject

in our analysis of Paul’s apocalyptic theology, but the primary goal of this study is to elucidate how Paul portrays the figure of Satan *within his letters*. Accordingly, it may well be the case that Paul thought and believed far more about Satan than we will cover in this study. Unfortunately (or perhaps fortunately!), we do not have access, in an ultimate sense, to what Paul “really believed” about Satan; all we can do is analyze the limited number of Satan references in Paul’s extant letters and assess their meaning and function within their epistolary context. Any macro assessment of Paul’s “understanding” of Satan can only be established subsequent to such examination.

1.2.2 Scope of the Study

It should be pointed out that the present study will only consider the so-called “undisputed” Pauline letters for two main reasons. First, because I am interested in analyzing the Pauline references to Satan in relation to the historical figure of Paul of Tarsus (i.e., Paul’s portrayal of Satan’s activity in his own life), I have chosen to focus only on the letters which are (almost) unanimously considered to be authentically Pauline by the scholarly community. Restricting the body of data to the seven “undisputed” Pauline letters will not only help to limit the size of the present study but to establish the most reliable grounds for investigation. Second, although the present study deliberately excludes six of the letters which are included in the NT’s Pauline corpus, it makes no claims regarding the authorship of these letters. On the contrary, the plurality of references to powers of evil (including the devil) in the “disputed” Pauline letters indicates a common apocalyptic perspective with the other seven letters.⁶¹ To this end, in the conclusion of the study I explicate the implications of the present for future research on the powers of evil in the remaining Pauline letters.

⁶¹ E.g., ἀρχαί (Eph 1:21; 3:10; 6:12; Col 1:16; 2:10, 15); ἄρχοντες (Eph 2:2); ἐξουσία (Eph 1:21; 2:2; 3:10; 6:12; Col 1:16; 2:10, 15; 2 Thess 3:9; Titus 3:1); διάβολος (Eph 4:27; 6:11; 1 Tim 3:6–7; 2 Tim 2:26); δυνάμεις (Eph 1:19, 21; 3:7, 16, 20; Col 1:11, 29; 2 Thess 1:7, 11; 2:9; 2 Tim 1:7–8; 3:5); κυριότητες (Col 1:16; Eph 1:21); θρόνοι (Col 1:16); κοσμοκράτορες τοῦ σκότους τούτου (Eph 6:12); σατανᾶς (2 Thess 2:9; 1 Tim 1:20; 5:15); στοιχεῖα (Col 2:8, 20); ἄγγελοι (Col 2:18; 2 Thess 1:7; 1 Tim 3:16; 5:21).

Furthermore, within the seven “undisputed” letters I exclude Paul’s reference in 2 Cor 11:3 to the serpent (ὁ ὄφις) of the Genesis narrative, which is commonly regarded as an allusion to Satan. As I will argue in §6.7.2, Paul’s intent in 2 Cor 11:3 is to draw a comparison between the naïveté of Eve and the Corinthians, not between the deceptive ways of the Genesis serpent and Satan.

I also exclude references to powers of evil in the Pauline letters. Conceptually, powers of evil such as “principalities” and the figure of Satan both constitute Paul’s apocalyptic cosmology. It might be expected, therefore, that a study of the present nature would include such phenomena. As we noted earlier, however, one of the shortcomings of earlier research in this area has been the failure to distinguish Satan from other powers of evil. For this reason we will deliberately omit allusions to evil powers and forces except where it is necessary to consider them.⁶²

In light of the foregoing discussion, the present study will include the following ten verses which refer to Satan: Rom 16:20; 1 Cor 5:5; 7:5; 2 Cor 2:11; 4:4; 6:15; 11:14; 12:7; 1 Thess 2:18; 3:5. All but three of these verses use the Greek term σατανᾶς to refer to Satan. In 2 Cor 4:4; 6:15; and 1 Thess 3:5, however, Paul uses other names and titles to refer to Satan. In 2 Cor 4:4 Satan is ascribed the title “the god of this age” (ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου); in 2 Cor 6:15 the name “Beliar” (Βελιάρ), which was frequently used in certain Second Temple Jewish circles, appears as a reference to Satan; and in 1 Thess 3:5 Satan is called “the tempter” (ὁ πειράζων). In each case I argue the uncontroversial position that Satan is the referent behind the respective name or title. In sum, in the present study I elucidate how and why the Apostle Paul, in the aforementioned ten verses, refers to the figure of Satan in letters which he composed to nascent Christian communities planted around the Mediterranean basin.

⁶² For example, Paul’s reference to “the god of this age” in 2 Cor 4:4 will require us to also consider the references to “the rulers of this age” in 1 Cor 2:6, 8.

1.2.3 Shape of the Study

Subsequent to laying out my method and research question in the present chapter, in the next three chapters I examine what I consider to be the most salient background material for understanding Paul's references to Satan. In Chapter Two I examine the diverse Satan traditions of the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Jewish writings *from a hypothetical, first-century C.E. perspective* which presupposes that each passage refers to a Satan-like figure. In addition to the occurrences of the noun שָׂטָן in the Hebrew Bible (Job 1–2, Zech 3:1–5 and 1 Chr 21:1; cf. 2 Sam 24:1), I consider several examples from the Qumran literature⁶³ and the OT Pseudepigrapha which I collate according to the following “images” of Satan: accuser, origin of evil, ruler (or supreme power), tempter of the people of God, and a figure within Israel's history. This final category includes texts which testify to the frequent literary phenomenon in Second Temple Judaism of including a Satan figure within a portion of rewritten Scripture (e.g., 1 Chr 21:1; CD 5:17–19; *Jub.* 17:15–18; 48:5–19; *T. Job* 16:2–3; 17:1–6; 23:1–11).

In Chapter Three I consider how Satan functions within Paul's apocalyptic theology. Foundational to the chapter is the work of J. Christiaan Beker who rightly insists on the apocalyptic character of Paul's theology: “apocalyptic is not a peripheral curiosity for Paul but the central climate and focus of his thought.”⁶⁴ In the chapter I aim to establish two points in relation to apocalyptic and Satan. First, Paul's view of Satan is strongly shaped by the constraints of his apocalyptic two-age framework (e.g., Rom 8:18; 1 Cor 2:6, 8; 2 Cor 4:4; Gal 1:4).⁶⁵ Second, building on

⁶³ E.g., 1QS 1:16–18; 3:13–4:26; CD 2:19; 4:12–19; 5:18; 12:2–3; 1QM 1:1–5; 13:4, 10–12; 18:1–3. Studies to be drawn on here include Peter von der Osten-Sacken, *Gott und Belial: Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum Dualismus in den Texten aus Qumran* (SUNT 6; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969); Corrado Martone, “Evil or Devil? Belial between the Bible and Qumran,” *Hen* 26, no. 2 (2004): 115–27; Annette Steudel, “God and Belial,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997* (ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman, Emanuel Tov, James C. VanderKam, and Galen Marquis; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society in cooperation with The Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 2000), 332–40; Philip R. Davies, “Dualism and Eschatology in the Qumran War Scroll,” *VT* 28, no. 1 (1978): 28–36.

⁶⁴ Beker, *Paul the Apostle*, 144.

⁶⁵ Important here are the works of Andrew T. Lincoln, *Paradise Now and Not Yet: Studies in the Role of the Heavenly Dimension in Paul's Thought with Special Reference to his Eschatology* (SNTSMS 43; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981); Jürgen Becker, “Erwägungen zur

Beker's contention that Paul interpreted the death and resurrection of Christ as a proleptic defeat of the apocalyptic powers (sin, death, etc.), I suggest that Paul regarded Satan as an enemy (ἐχθρός) of the cross who was conquered through Christ's death but nonetheless rules over the present age as a powerful figure.

Next, I consider Paul's understanding of his apostleship vis-à-vis his churches in Chapter Four. Here I draw attention to the significance of Paul's churches for his apostleship by examining a selection of representative passages which mention or allude to Paul's relationship with his churches. The point of the chapter is to demonstrate that Paul deemed the success of his churches as an integral part of the fulfillment of his apostolic calling. Accordingly, I argue that Paul's relationship with his churches is the fundamental context in which he interprets Satanic activity as a serious hindrance to his apostolic labor (κόπος⁶⁶) and to God's plan of salvation.

Utilizing the findings of the previous chapters, I then examine the Pauline references to Satan over the span of two chapters. Based on admittedly artificial divisions, in Chapter Five I consider Rom 16:20, the only explicit reference to Satan in Paul's theologically robust letter to Rome, and 1 Thess 2:18 and 3:5. Then, in Chapter Six I investigate the several references to Satan in the Corinthian correspondence (1 Cor 5:5; 7:5; 2 Cor 2:11; 4:4; 6:15; 11:14; 12:7). With each verse in these two chapters, I conduct a historical-literary examination of the texts in order to determine the meaning of the passage in its original context *and* to understand the function of Satan within it. Additionally, I draw attention to Paul's characterization of Satan as an adversary of his apostolic labor and opponent to his churches.

Finally, in Chapter Seven I conclude by recapitulating the findings of the study and explicating their implications for further research.

apokalyptischen Tradition in der paulinischen Theologie," *EvT* 30, no. 11 (1970): 593-609; Klaus Koch, *The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic: A Polemical Work on a Neglected Area of Biblical Studies and its Damaging Effects on Theology and Philosophy* (SBT 2/22; London: SCM Press, 1972); Jörg Baumgarten, *Paulus und die Apokalyptik: die Auslegung apokalyptischer Überlieferungen in den echten Paulusbriefen* (WMANT 44; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1975); Christopher Rowland, *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity* (London: SPCK, 1982); Vincent P. Branick, "Apocalyptic Paul," *CBQ* 47, no. 4 (1985): 664-75.

⁶⁶ The term κόπος is employed by Paul "to describe evangelical activity" (Abraham J. Malherbe, *The Letters to the Thessalonians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* [AB 32B; New York: Doubleday, 2000], 195).

Chapter Two

IMAGES OF SATAN IN BIBLICAL AND SECOND TEMPLE JEWISH TRADITIONS

2.1 Introduction

In the writings of the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Judaism the figure of Satan is referred to by a multiplicity of names and titles.¹ Indeed, it would be misleading to speak of a single Satan in these traditions.² Rather, it is more accurate to speak of several “Satan” figures since various personifications of a chief malevolent character appear in the relevant literature. Moreover, not only are such “Satan” figures referred to by different names and titles (e.g., Mastema, Belial, and the Angel of Darkness), but they are also described as carrying out various functions (e.g., accuser within the divine council or the origin of evil). As we noted in the previous chapter, many studies have been written on the origin and development of the names and roles of Satan.³

¹ Despite the many titles and roles of “Satan” figures in the literature discussed in this chapter, the term “Satan” will be used as a “catchall” for referring to the figure. This simplification is not intended to gloss over the variegated presentations of Satan-like figures in Second Temple Judaism, but rather to employ one of the most common names for the chief malevolent figure in recognition that we are, in most cases—at least from the vantage point of the first century C.E.—dealing with a single character. At times we will also use the expression “the devil” to refer to the same figure since it is a Greek translation of the original Hebrew noun. Where appropriate and significant, we will also use the definite article alongside the noun “Satan” (so “the Satan”) to reflect its presence in various original texts.

² So Peggy L. Day, *An Adversary in Heaven: Satan in the Hebrew Bible* (HSM 43; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988); cf. Marvin E. Tate, “Satan in the Old Testament,” *RevExp* 89, no. 4 (1992): 461–74; Florian Kreuzer, “Der Antagonist: der Satan in der Hebräischen Bibel – eine bekannte Größe?” *Bib* 86, no. 4 (2005): 536–44. See also C. Breytenbach and P. L. Day, “Satan,” in *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible* (ed. Karel van der Toorn, Bob Becking, and Pieter Willem van der Horst; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 726–32.

³ On development of the figure of Satan, see Neil Forsyth, *The Old Enemy: Satan and the Combat Myth* (Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1987), 107–23, 160–211; Jennifer Ann Glancy, “Satan in the Synoptic Gospels,” (Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 1990), 10–39; Trevor Oswald Ling, *The Significance of Satan: New Testament Demonology and Its Contemporary Relevance* (London: SPCK, 1961), 1–11; Sydney H. T. Page, *Powers of Evil: A Biblical Study of Satan and Demons* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans; Leicester: Apollos, 1995), 11–42; Elaine H. Pagels, “The Social History of Satan, the ‘Intimate Enemy’: A Preliminary Sketch,” *HTR* 84, no. 2 (1991): 105–28; Jeffrey Burton Russell, *The Prince of Darkness: Radical Evil and the Power of Good in History* (Ithaca, N.Y.; London: Cornell University Press, 1988), 28–42; Paolo Sacchi, *Jewish Apocalyptic and its History* (trans. William J. Short; JSPSup 20; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 211–32;

The aim of the present chapter differs from such studies in that it considers the relevant Satan traditions, not in terms of their development during the Second Temple Jewish period, but from the perspective of the first century C.E. when the figure of Satan had become a more prominent and inimical figure. By analyzing the data from a synchronic perspective, we will be able to consider how Paul and his (Jewish and Christian) contemporaries might have understood the figure of Satan's theological significance, place within Israel's narrative, and activity within their own lives. To achieve this goal, the present chapter seeks to address the following heuristic question: in what "images" (or roles) is the figure of Satan presented in the texts of the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Judaism?⁴ Our analysis of the relevant texts will be collated according to the following five "images" of Satan figures: Satan as accuser; Satan and the origin of evil; Satan as ruler; Satan as tempter of God's people; and Satan in Israel's Scriptures and history.

2.2 Satan as Accuser

One of the most common functions of a Satan figure within the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Jewish traditions is that of accuser. This role is not surprising, of course, since the noun אֲשֶׁר is derived from the cognate verb אָשַׁם, meaning to "be at enmity with" or "be hostile toward."⁵ The role of accuser has its origin as a function within the divine council, as is seen in various traditions in the ancient Near East, including the Canaanite, Egyptian and Mesopotamian cultures.⁶ The Jewish

idem, *The History of the Second Temple Period* (trans. Thomas Kirk; JSOTSup 285; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 329–54.

⁴ Our analysis of the main conceptions of Satan in Jewish and early Christian thought is not intended to be exhaustive, but instead representative in content, illustrating examples of the proposed categories ("images") while citing additional passages only when necessary.

⁵ Most lexicons also permit a juridical translation, "to accuse" or "to indict." The verb אָשַׁם occurs six times in the Hebrew Bible: Zech 3:1; Ps 38:21; 71:13; 109:4, 20, 29.

⁶ For more on the origin and the significance of the divine council in the ancient Near East, see Frank Moore Cross, "The Council of Yahweh in Second Isaiah," *JNES* 12, no. 4 (1953): 274–77; John Day, *Yahweh and the Gods and Goddesses of Canaan* (JSOTSup 265; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000); Michael S. Heiser, "The Divine Council in Second Temple Literature" (Ph.D. diss., University of Wisconsin, 2004); E. Theodore Mullen, *The Divine Council in Canaanite and Early Hebrew Literature* (HSM 24; Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1980), esp. 274–84; H. W. Robinson, "The Council of Yahweh," *JTS* 45, (1944): 151–57; Mark S. Smith, *The Early History of God: Yahweh and the Other Deities in Ancient Israel* (2d ed.; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2002);

conception of the divine court (or heavenly council) setting envisioned Yahweh as king presiding over the royal court which included his emissaries and counselors. Accordingly, “the accuser” (הַשָּׂטָן) appears in the heavenly court setting as one of the “sons of god” (בְּנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים) whose job it is “to patrol the earth” as a prosecutor or adversary.⁷

In the texts examined below—at least in their original meaning—the Satan-accuser figure is not regarded as inherently evil or even as a fallen angel. Rather, this figure participates within the divine council under the aegis of its king, Yahweh. In later texts of the Second Temple period and early Christianity, however, the “accuser” figure seems to have become something of a renegade accuser who serves his own purposes either *apart from* or *in opposition to* the heavenly council. Taken together, these texts illustrate how Satan was perceived as an accusing figure, at first fully within the boundaries of the heavenly council and thus under God’s authority, but later as one who acts autonomously for his own purposes and against the will of God.

2.2.1 Zechariah 3:1–10

The earliest appearance of Satan as “accuser” figure in the biblical tradition occurs within the book of Zechariah.⁸ Although “the accuser” (הַשָּׂטָן⁹) of Zech 3:1–2 probably did not refer to a personal figure in its original context,¹⁰ it is hard to

George Ernest Wright, *The Old Testament against its Environment* (SBT 2; London: SCM Press, 1951), 9–41.

⁷ Mullen, *The Divine Council*, 275.

⁸ It is widely agreed upon that the first eight chapters of Zechariah are a product of the late sixth century B.C.E. (e.g., see Ralph L. Smith, *Micah–Malachi* [WBC 32; Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 1984], 169, and Michael H. Floyd, *Minor Prophets: Part 2* [FOTL 22; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2000], 303–16).

⁹ Elsewhere in the Hebrew Scriptures the noun שָׂטָן appears in Num 22:22, 32; 1 Sam 29:4; 2 Sam 19:23; 1 Kgs 5:18; 11:14, 23, 25; Ps 38:21; 71:13; 109:4, 6, 20, 29; Job 1:6–9, 12; 2:1–4, 6–7; 1 Chr 21:1.

¹⁰ So Carol L. Meyers and Eric M. Meyers, *Haggai, Zechariah 1–8: A New Translation* (AB 25B; New York: Doubleday, 1987), 187–88.

imagine this to be the case in the first century C.E. given the increasing significance of Satan as well as the function of (the) “Satan” in the prophecies of Zechariah.

The Satan of Zechariah first appears in 3:1–10, the fourth of the eight night visions in the prophetic book.¹¹ In the vision Satan appears standing at the right of the Angel of the Lord in order to “accuse” (לְשַׁמֵּן) Joshua the high priest.¹² The narrative of Zechariah does not specify the nature of Satan’s accusations or, for that matter, whether Satan actually accused Joshua. Presumably, however, such accusations were made since Yahweh rebukes Satan by defending Joshua’s role as high priest.¹³ Given the nature of Yahweh’s response in v. 2, it stands to reason that Satan’s accusations were directed at Joshua’s position as high priest.¹⁴ Yahweh’s defence of Joshua and the subsequent narrative which details Joshua’s purification and investiture as high priest further emphasize Satan’s failure to undermine Joshua’s position as high priest.¹⁵

In relation to the present study, there are two salient features of the references to Satan in Zech 3:1–10. First, although a member of the divine council, Satan is rebuked for opposing Yahweh’s selection of Joshua as “a brand plucked from the fire” (v. 2). That is, Satan at once operates under the auspices of Yahweh *and* sets himself against the people of God. Second, it is significant that Satan targets the most important figure during the time of Israel’s return from the Babylonian exile. As high

¹¹ First vision: a man on a red horse and an accompanying oracle (1:7–17); second vision: four horns and four smiths (2:1–4 [Eng. 1:18–21]); third vision: the man with a measuring line and an accompanying vision (2:5–17 [Eng. 2:1–13]); fourth vision: the accusation of the high priest and accompanying oracles (3:1–10); fifth vision: a golden lampstand, two olive trees and accompanying oracles (4:1–14); sixth vision: the flying scroll (5:1–4); seventh vision: a woman in an ephah (5:5–11); eighth vision: the chariots and the four winds (6:1–8).

¹² The high priest (הַכֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל) is also referred to in Zech 3:8 and 6:11.

¹³ Cf. Meyers and Meyers: “The fact that Joshua survived in exile to return to Jerusalem in the capacity of high priest is hardly accidental, according to the prophet” (*Zechariah 1–8*, 187). The notion of a brand (אֵשׁ) plucked (נִצַּל) from fire, used here of God’s deliverance of Joshua, is also reflected in Amos 4:11: “I [the LORD] overthrew some of you, as when God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah, and you were like a brand (אֵשׁ) plucked (נִצַּל) from the fire; yet you did not return to me, says the LORD.”

¹⁴ In light of the following episode in Zechariah, in which Joshua is ordered by the Angel of the LORD to take off his unclean clothes and replace them with clean ones (Zech 3:3–5), it seems likely that the main issue was Joshua’s cultic impurity.

¹⁵ For more on Joshua’s ceremonial installation, see Meyers and Meyers, *Zechariah 1–8*, 187–94, and Day, *An Adversary in Heaven*, 118–19.

priest Joshua was effectively the leader of the new community alongside Zerubbabel, the governor. It may well be, then, that Joshua is targeted by Satan, the accuser of the divine court, precisely because of the significance of his role.

Although in its original context the Satan of Zech 3 clearly is not a personal name, we can reasonably assume that Jews and Christians alike in the first century C.E. would have understood the text to be referring to *the* Satan, the chief adversary of God and his people. This presumption seems to be confirmed in Rev 12:9–10, which refers to Satan as “the accuser (ὁ κατήγωρ) of our brothers and sisters ... who accuses (ὁ κατηγοροῦν) them day and night before our God.”¹⁶ In sum, Zech 3:1–10 not only demonstrates that Satan’s role as accuser extends far back in the Jewish tradition, but also depicts Satan as an adversary who opposes *key figures* within God’s plan, a motif within Second Temple literature which we will return to later in the chapter.

2.2.2 Job 1–2

Whereas the Satan figure in Zech 3:1–10 remains silent within the divine council, the Satan of Job 1–2 takes on a more active role within the story of Job. For in the narrative of Job Satan both speaks directly to Yahweh and inflicts physical harm on Job, the upright and persevering servant of God. Moreover, in the context of the book of Job, Satan plays a key role in the theodicy issue which, in many ways, shapes the narrative and dialogue of Job. Thus, the Satan figure of Job is both significant as a character within the Joban story and within the theology and worldview of the writer of Job.

There are two passages in Job which present Satan as the accuser of the divine court. First, the opening scene of Job 1–2, like Zech 3:1–10, is set in the context of the divine council, whose members are referred to as the בְּנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים (Job 1:6; LXX: οἱ ἄγγελοι τοῦ θεοῦ). In Job 1:6 Satan reports to the divine council along

¹⁶ On the Jewish background to “the accuser” (ὁ κατήγωρ) in Rev 12:10, see Gregory K. Beale, *The Book of Revelation: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NICNT; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans; Carlisle, Cumbria: Paternoster Press, 1999), 661–63.

with the other **בְּנֵי הַאֱלֹהִים**, though he is the only member of the council directly spoken to by Yahweh. Questioned concerning his whereabouts, Satan responds that he has returned “from going to and fro on the earth, and from walking up and down on it” (1:7). Yahweh then asks, “Have you considered my servant Job?”,¹⁷ whom he refers to as a “blameless and upright man” (**אִישׁ תָּם וְיָשָׁר**, v.8). In response, Satan asks whether Job fears Yahweh “for nothing (**הֲחִנָּם**)?”¹⁸ He then suggests that Job only fears Yahweh because he has been protected and blessed by Yahweh (v. 10). Satan therefore challenges Yahweh to deprive Job of his possessions so that he would curse Yahweh to his face (v. 11). Satan is then granted permission from Yahweh to deprive Job of all his possessions (but not to harm Job himself). Job loses his livestock and his children (1:13–19) but does not blame Yahweh (v. 22).

The second scene in Job featuring Satan occurs in 2:1–10. The passage opens up in the same fashion as the first, following the Hebrew wording almost verbatim. In the council setting Yahweh and Satan the accuser again debate Job’s integrity. This time, however, Yahweh now hands over Job’s “bone and flesh” (v. 5) into Satan’s power (**בְּיָדְךָ**, “in your hand”). Satan then inflicts harm upon Job, leaving him with sores on his body from foot to head. From there the narrative introduces the characters of Job’s wife and his three companions as it shifts to its lengthy speech cycles. Satan, however, disappears entirely from the text; he is neither featured as part of the remaining narrative nor is mentioned in the dialogue of the characters in the rest of the story.

The book of Job’s presentation of Satan as the accuser of the divine council is therefore largely similar to that of Zechariah. He appears as a member of the divine court, makes accusations against a righteous person of God, and then disappears from the narrative. Additionally, however, in the narrative of Job Satan not only

¹⁷ The question posed to Satan assumes that it was the accuser’s responsibility to roam the earth as the “eyes” and “ears” of the council (David J. A. Clines, *Job 1–20* [WBC 17; Dallas, Tex.: Word, 1989], 23). Clines suggests that such activity is analogous to that of the “secret police” of the ancient Persian government who would spy for the king (ibid.).

¹⁸ Cf. Job 2:3 where Yahweh rebukes Satan for aiming to destroy Job “for no reason” (**לָמָּה**). See also Job 9:17.

accuses Job (of fearing God only because of his blessings) but also *tests* Job's integrity by inflicting physical harm on Job.

2.2.3 *The Book of Jubilees*

The depiction of Satan as accuser can also be found outside the Hebrew Scriptures, including in the pseudepigraphic writing *Jubilees*. Likely written in the middle of the second century B.C.E., *Jubilees* refers to a Satan figure by various names at several points throughout its narrative. In its description of the Israelites' Exodus from Egypt, Prince Mastema, the most frequently used name for the Satan figure in *Jubilees*, is bound and imprisoned so that he is unable *to accuse* the fleeing children of Israel (*Jub.* 48:15–16).¹⁹ Although Prince Mastema's rationale for wanting to accuse the Israelites at this point in the Exodus narrative is unclear, that *Jubilees* refers to his activity of accusing suggests that his role as accuser was probably taken for granted during this period. Moreover, in its retelling of Abraham's binding of Isaac (the Akedah), *Jubilees* commences the story in the setting of a heavenly court scene reminiscent of Job 1–2—both in terms of its content and its portrayal of Satan as an accuser of the righteous (*Jub.* 17:15–16).²⁰

2.2.4 *Revelation 12:1–12*

It is worth noting here an example of Satan's function as accuser from an early Christian source. The book of Revelation demonstrates that this image of Satan was still strong at the end of the first century C.E., even if now in a distinctly Christian and eschatological context. Revelation 12:1–12 describes the final cosmic battle between Michael and his angels and the dragon (=Satan) and his angels. In the midst

¹⁹ For more on the origin of Mastema and the demons in *Jubilees*, see Loren T. Stuckenbruck, "Evil in Jewish Apocalyptic Tradition," in *The Fall of the Angels* (ed. Christoph Auffarth and L. T. Stuckenbruck; TBN 6; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 87–118.

²⁰ Further attestation to this role can be found throughout the OT Pseudepigrapha. E.g., in *1 En.* 40:7 many satans come before the Lord to accuse those who dwell on earth and are then expelled. In *Apoc. Zeph.* 3:8–9 the "angels of the accuser" are said to write down the sins of men and report them to the accuser; and in *Apoc. Zeph.* 6:17 "the great angel" is described to the seer as "the one who accuses men in the presence of the Lord."

of the battle a voice from heaven proclaims “the accuser (ὁ κατήγωρ) of our comrades has been thrown down, [the one] who accuses them day and night before our God (ὁ κατηγορῶν αὐτοὺς ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτός, v. 10). In this passage we see that 1) the role of accuser still seems to be thought of in terms of divine council imagery and 2) Satan’s task of accusing has been enhanced, perhaps because of Revelation’s apocalyptic perspective, to a perpetual one.

2.2.5 Summary

Our brief survey of the above texts helps to illustrate Satan’s role as the accuser (שָׂטָן) of the divine court. In this capacity, Satan functions as a member of God’s divine court, whose responsibility is to accuse upright persons in order to test them. In the cases of Satan’s accusing of Joshua the high priest (Zech 3:1–10) and Job (Job 1:6–12; 2:1–8), God silences Satan’s arguments and so vindicates the accused person within the high court of heaven. Importantly, in this forensic role Satan is always presented as serving as part of God’s council and under his divine authority. Although this role is necessarily adversarial in function, as the accuser of the heavenly council Satan is not understood to operate apart from or in opposition to God’s purposes. Revelation’s transposition of Satan’s accusing role into an eschatological context, which envisions the role as a perpetual, evil function, is therefore distinct.

2.3 Satan and the Origin of Evil

Another Satan tradition which emerged and evolved in the Second Temple Jewish period was the association of a Satan figure with the origin of evil.²¹ Although later Christian tradition would draw on the Eden narrative in Genesis 3 and the story of Adam and Eve’s “fall” for its understanding of evil’s entrance into the world, many Second Temple Jewish texts employed Genesis 6—the story of the sons

²¹ In this section I am indebted to Paolo Sacchi’s excellent chapter, “The Devil in Jewish Traditions of the Second Temple Period,” in his *Jewish Apocalyptic and its History*, 211–32. See also Sacchi, *The History of the Second Temple Period*, 328–54.

of God (בני־האלהים) and the Nephilim (הנפלים)—to account for the origin of evil. As we will see below, such stories often included a chief malevolent figure as the head of these rebellious angels. This figure, frequently called Asael or Mastema, is yet another image of Satan within ancient Judaism.

2.3.1 Variations within the Enochic Literature

The earliest appearance of this tradition within the Enochic literature is found in the *Book of Watchers* (*1 En.* 1–36).²² Chapters 6–16 of *1 Enoch* retell the Genesis 6 account of the sons of God (בני־האלהים) descending to earth and marrying the daughters of men. The figure of the devil appears in this story as a leader of the angels and their offspring, “the Nephilim” (הנפלים). As with the angels of the narrative, the chief angel Asael (Ἀσείαλ), or Semeyaza (Σεμιαζᾶς), fades out of the plot subsequent to this episode. In the *Book of the Watchers*, the devil therefore only appears in the narrative insofar as he functions as the chief of the angelic group responsible for introducing evil into the world.²³ Thus, the Satan figure in the *Book of the Watchers* is something like the ἀρχή of evil, a figure of the “distant past” no longer active in the present world.²⁴

In a later section of *1 Enoch*, the *Book of Dreams* (*1 En.* 83–90), dated to somewhere around 160 B.C.E.,²⁵ Enoch narrates two of his visions to Methuselah. Within these visions which also retell sections of the Genesis narratives, the Satan

²² Sacchi, *Jewish Apocalyptic and Its History*, 212.

²³ Curiously, the author of *Jubilees* seems uninterested in Satan’s function as the leader of the rebellious angels. For a comparison of the angel stories in *Jubilees* and *1 Enoch*, including a helpful discussion of how *Jubilees* uses the Enochic framework and text, see James C. VanderKam, “The Demons in the *Book of Jubilees*,” in *Dämonen/Demons* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 339–64.

²⁴ To be sure, within *1 En.* 6–16 the Semeyaza and Asael traditions are distinct traditions which have been intertwined into the narrative as it appears in *1 Enoch* (John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature* [2d ed.; The Biblical Resource Series; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1998], 47–55; see also Paul D. Hanson, “Rebellion in Heaven, Azazel, and Euhemeristic Heroes in *1 Enoch* 6–11,” *JBL* 96, no. 2 [1977]: 195–233; Corrie Molenberg, “A Study of the Roles of Shemihazah and Asael in *1 Enoch* 6–11,” *JJS* 35, no. 2 (1984): 136–46; George W. E. Nickelsburg, “Apocalyptic and Myth in *1 Enoch* 6–11,” *JBL* 96, no. 3 [1977]: 383–405). However, it remains the case that the figure of the devil, understood to be a single figure within the narrative, is a figure of the past who is largely impotent with respect to the generation of the text’s author.

²⁵ Sacchi, *Jewish Apocalyptic and Its History*, 220.

figure intermingles with Adam's children and is locked up in a cosmic prison along with the fallen angels. Although cast in fantastic and occasionally puzzling imagery, the visions in the *Book of Dreams* present the devil more or less in the fashion as the earlier *Book of the Watchers*. However, the *Book of Dreams* also introduces the concept of seventy angels ("shepherd angels") who are assigned by God both to protect and to judge post-exilic Israel (*1 En. [BD] 89:59–65*). This additional element may demonstrate a development in Israelite thought as angelic figures were not only thought of as figures of the primordial past but as acting agents within Israel's history.²⁶

2.3.2 *Sirach*

The book of Sirach (Ecclesiasticus) moves away from the idea that the Satan, as the head of the fallen angels, was in some way responsible for introducing evil into the world. Instead, the author of Sirach traces sin and its unavoidable consequence, death, back to the earliest humans. As is the case with Pauline theology, according to Sirach sin and death entered the world through a human being. Unlike Paul, however, Sirach suggests that sin and death did not enter through Adam but through Eve: "from a woman sin had its beginning, and because of her we all die" (ἀπὸ γυναικὸς ἀρχὴ ἁμαρτίας, καὶ δι' αὐτὴν ἀποθνήσκομεν πάντες, Sir 25:24). While this view of the origin of sin is notable in and of itself, related to the present topic it demonstrates that the myth of Satan and the fallen angels was not the only explanation of evil's origin in Second Temple Jewish traditions. Moreover, as Sacchi contends, this development may suggest that in the mind of the author of Sirach, the notion of human sin as the origin of evil might indicate that the role of the devil as tempter would be reduced since it would be somewhat unnecessary within a worldview that stressed humanity's "evil instinct."²⁷ Thus, rather than seeing Satan

²⁶ Thus Sacchi suggests that presence of the idea of seventy "shepherd" angels over Israel represents a "ripe" period for the development of the "great enemy," a chief angelic figure who acts against Israel (*Second Temple Period*, 347).

²⁷ Sacchi, *Jewish Apocalyptic and its History*, 223.

as the origin of evil, Wisdom seems to envision Satan as “only a metaphor to indicate our worst instincts.”²⁸

2.3.3 *Wisdom of Solomon*

Although most likely written later than Sirach,²⁹ the Wisdom of Solomon offers a similar understanding of the devil to that of the Enochic traditions in that it also implies that the devil was responsible for the introduction of evil into the world. While stressing the devil’s culpability, Wisdom also exonerates God’s responsibility in the creation of death: “for God did not make death; neither does he take pleasure in the destruction of the living” (ὁ θεὸς θάνατον οὐκ ἐποίησεν οὐδὲ τέρπεται ἐπ’ ἀπωλείᾳ ζώντων, Wis 1:13). Thus, while God made humans in the image of his own eternity (εἰκόνα τῆς ἰδίας αἰδιότητος ἐποίησεν αὐτόν, 2:23), “through the envy of the devil death entered into the world” (φθόνῳ δὲ διαβόλου θάνατος εἰσηλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον, 2:24).³⁰ Concerning these verses, Sacchi argues that the reference to the devil can only be explained vis-à-vis the Eden narrative in Genesis 3. If so, the author of Wisdom, while still pointing to the devil as the origin of evil, does so by employing a different passage of Genesis than the one used in *Jubilees* and the Enochic literature. Nonetheless, in Sirach the devil is directly associated with the origin of death (evil) in world.

²⁸ Ibid. See Sirach 21:27: “when the ungodly curses the satan, he curses his own soul,” where σατανᾶς clearly refers to one’s own evil inclinations and not to a personal figure (so Patrick W. Skehan and Alexander A. Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: A New Translation with Notes* [AB 39; New York: Doubleday, 1987], 311–12).

²⁹ On the dating of the Wisdom of Solomon, see David Winston, *The Wisdom of Solomon: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 43; New York: Doubleday, 1979), 20–25. Winston notes that scholars have argued for dates anywhere between 220 B.C.E. and 50 C.E. (ibid., 20), but prefers the reign of Gaius “Caligula” (37–41 C.E.) as the most plausible time frame for the composition of the Wisdom of Solomon (ibid., 23).

³⁰ Heinz-Josef Fabry (“Satan’ - Begriff und Wirklichkeit: Untersuchungen zur Dämonologie der alttestamentlichen Weisheitsliteratur,” in *Dämonen/Demons: die Dämonologie der israelitisch-jüdischen und frühchristlichen Literatur in Kontext ihrer Umwelt* [eds. Armin Lange, Hermann Lichtenberger, and K. F. Diethard Römheld; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003], 269–291), argues that the passage is not related to Genesis 3 but to the divine court scenes of Job 1–2: “Gott hat den Menschen als Ebenbild erschaffen, doch durch den Neid des Teufels kam der Tod in die Welt. Die exkulpernde Tendenz dieser Aussage entspricht ganz den Belegen der Himmelszenen-Redaktion im Hiobbuch” (275).

2.3.4 Summary

Although the above texts reflect variations within the tradition of associating Satan with the origin of evil, a common theological substructure can be deduced from our analysis of these passages: each text postulates that a chief malevolent figure (Satan or the devil), and *not* a human being as in some later Jewish and Christian theological traditions, was responsible for introducing evil (or death) into the world.

2.4 Satan as Ruler

In various traditions within biblical and Second Temple Jewish texts a Satan-like figure is depicted as ruling over humans—both collectively and individually (e.g., the sexually immoral person in several texts from the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*)—and over the entire present age (e.g., the frequent references in the *Rule of the Community* to the ממשלת בליעל). One of the significant aspects of this image of Satan is how it illustrates that within certain Jewish traditions the figure of the devil was regarded not only as a figure of the mythic past—whether as a principle of evil or as angel of the divine court—but also as an active malevolent figure within Israel’s history. That is, Satan was not simply a figure associated with rebellious angels, but a hostile force who could exert his authority over humanity in the present age.

2.4.1 Jubilees

Throughout its text, *Jubilees* portrays the figure of Satan, typically called (the prince of) Mastema or Belial, as ruling over both evil spirits and various human beings. Some of these references are mere allusions to an implied authority given to Satan to rule over individuals, while others are implicit within the narrative of *Jubilees*’ retelling of the biblical narrative. Together, they reveal a theology which envisioned Satan as a powerful figure able to exert control over both demons and humans.

2.4.1.1 Mastema's Authority over One-tenth of the Evil Spirits

According to *Jubilees*, in the post-diluvian period the presence of demons continued to “pollute” the world. In the text, Noah, recalling the destruction wrought by the spirits of earlier days, prays to God asking him to remove the demons’ presence from the renewed earth:

And you know that which your Watchers, the fathers of these spirits, did in my days and also these spirits who are alive. Shut them up and take them to the place of judgment. And do not let them cause corruption among the sons of your servant, O my God, because they are cruel and were created to destroy. And let them not rule over the spirits of the living because you alone know their judgment, and do not let them have power over the children of the righteous henceforth and forever. (*Jub* 10:5–6)

In the subsequent narrative God heeds Noah’s request. However, before he orders his angels to bind the evil spirits, Mastema (Μαστιφάμ), the chief of the spirits, somewhat strikingly appeals to God to allow a portion of the demons to remain under his charge.³¹ Mastema claims that “... if some of them are not left for me, I will not be able to exercise the authority of my will among the children of men because they are (intended) to corrupt and lead astray before my judgment because the evil of the sons of men is great” (10:8). God subsequently decrees that one-tenth of the evil spirits should remain under the charge of Mastema, whom we learn a few verses later is also called “Satan” (10:9).

Satan’s rule over one-tenth of the evil spirits is of key importance for the rest of the references to the figure of Satan in *Jubilees*. For as we will see, passages which refer to Satan (Mastema) within the remaining narrative of *Jubilees* assume, and occasionally refer back to, the portion of demons entrusted to Satan. Thus although the Satan figure of *Jubilees* and his demons appear infrequently after *Jub.* 11, the principle of Satan’s rule over one-tenth of the evil spirits is presupposed in the remainder of the work and, presumably, within the theological worldview of the author of *Jubilees*.

³¹ Mastema’s query is rather unexpected in comparison to the story’s Enochic parallel (so VanderKam, “The Demons in the *Book of Jubilees*,” 344). Indeed, as VanderKam points out, the story in *Jubilees* 10:1–14 is not to be found in any other ancient source (*ibid.*, 354).

2.4.1.2 Mastema's Rule within Israel's History

One of the most striking ways in which the activity of Mastema (Satan) and his demons is evident is the way in which the author of *Jubilees* retells the biblical narratives of Genesis and Exodus by including Mastema as an active character within the story. In a later section we will consider these references in greater detail,³² but here we will briefly focus on how they illustrate Satan's rule over demons and humans in *Jubilees*.

Subsequent to God charging Mastema with a portion of the demons in *Jub.* 10, in the following chapter the demons assist the sons of Noah to commit sin against one another and to lead them astray. According to the author, the demons acted at the orders of prince Mastema, who also "sent forth other spirits, those which were put under his hand, to do all manner of wrong and sin, and all manner of transgression, to corrupt and destroy, and to shed blood upon the earth" (*Jub.* 11:5–6). Later in the chapter Mastema also exercises his authority by sending crows to eat up the crops in Ur of the Chaldees in order to "rob mankind of their labors" (*Jub.* 11:10–11).

In *Jubilees*' retelling of Gen 1–Exod 20, there are three other main inclusions of Mastema within the narrative. First, in the account of the Akedah (*Jub.* 17:15–18:19; cf. Gen 22:1–14), Abraham's "binding" of his son Isaac is precipitated by a debate between the LORD and Mastema concerning whether Abraham was faithful enough to give up his beloved son. The passage clearly echoes the Joban divine council scenes (Job 1–2). Mastema is also present on the mountain for the "sacrifice" of Issac, but is ultimately "shamed" by Abraham's faithfulness to the LORD (*Jub.* 17:9, 12). Although Satan does not necessarily rule over his demons or humans in this episode, he nonetheless *attempts* to gain control of upright characters within Israel's narrative. Second, in *Jubilees*' telling of the Moses narrative Mastema, and not the LORD as in the Genesis narrative (Gen 4:24), attempts to kill Moses as he returns to Egypt from Midian (*Jub.* 48:2–4). Third, Mastema acts against Moses and Israel at several points during Exodus from Egypt: he urges Moses to return to Pharaoh; he aids the magicians of Egypt; and he called the Egyptians to pursue after the Israelites

³² See below, §2.6.3.

with their chariots and horses (*Jub.* 48:9–12). Although Mastema in *Jubilees* remains subordinate to God and is eventually bound by God and his angels (*Jub.* 48:15–16), he nonetheless rules over various episodes within Israel’s history by controlling his demons, various individuals, and animals within the narrative.

2.4.1.3 Other References to Satan’s Rule in Jubilees

Additional references to the rule of Satan can be found elsewhere in *Jubilees*. For instance, the opening chapter of the book, which functions as an introduction to the retelling of the biblical narrative in *Jubilees*,³³ includes a prayer by Moses for God to not abandon his people (v. 19) and to not “let the spirit of Beliar rule over them to accuse them before you and ensnare them from every path of righteousness so that they might be destroyed from before your face” (v. 20).³⁴ A similar prayer is uttered by Abraham as he blesses Jacob in chapter 19: “And may the spirit of Mastema not rule over you or over your seed in order to remove you from following the LORD who is your God henceforth and forever” (v. 18).³⁵

In addition to allusions to Satan’s rule in prayers in *Jubilees*, references can also be found in texts which speak of the ideal time in the future. *Jubilees* 23:22–32, for example, describes the days subsequent to the evil generation³⁶ as an ideal time when people will “live in peace and rejoicing and there will be no Satan and no evil (one) who will destroy, because all of their days will be days of blessing and healing” (v.

³³ For more on the purpose and function of the first chapter of *Jubilees*, see James C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 23–28.

³⁴ The general meaning of the noun בל יעל is something like “worthlessness” or, more pejoratively, “wickedness” (e.g., Nahum 1:11). In 1 Samuel 1:16, for example, the term is used to refer to a “worthless” female servant. However, out of its abstract definition it eventually came to be used to refer to a demonic figure, namely Satan, as it does here (so O. S. Wintermute, “*Jubilees*,” in *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* [vol. 2; ed. James H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1983], 53).

³⁵ Cf. Noah’s prayer in *Jub.* 10:3–6 which asks for protection from the rule of the “evil spirits” (v. 3), hearkening back to the days of the Watchers, “the fathers of these spirits,” and the destruction they caused on earth.

³⁶ Cf. *T.Mos.* 10:1: “Then his kingdom will appear throughout his whole creation. Then the devil will have an end. Yea, sorrow will be led away with him.”

29).³⁷ Equivalent phrases can be found in *Jub.* 40:9 and 46:2 referring to the period in Egypt under Joseph’s reign. In a similar fashion, the final chapter of *Jubilees* looks forward to a time when the land “will not have any Satan or any evil (one)” (*Jub.* 50:5).

2.4.2 Qumran and the ממשלת בל יעל

Generally speaking, within the thought-world of the Qumran writings, Belial (בל יעל³⁸) is “the metaphysical negative entity par excellence.”³⁹ According to the Instruction of the Two Spirits (1QS 3:13–4:26), the Angel of Darkness (חושך מלאך), who is probably to be identified with the frequently mentioned Belial figure, was created by God as a counterpart to the Prince of Light (שר אורים).⁴⁰ It was also commonly believed that Belial would be destroyed in the last days by God’s judgment (e.g., 1QM 1:5, 13). Until Belial’s destruction, however, humans—especially those outside the righteous community—live during a time in which Belial

³⁷ Gene L. Davenport (*The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees* [StPB; Leiden: Brill, 1971], 39, no. 1) contends that of the four occurrences of the Ethiopic *shah-yet-tay-nah* within the text of *Jubilees*—here and *Jub.* 10:11; 46:2; 50:5—only the first one (10:11) should be translated as the name “Satan.” The other three references, Davenport suggests, should be translated as a common noun since in 10:7–8 “a distinction is implied between Satan and Mastema, the chief of the evil spirits” (ibid.). However, in *Jubilees* 10:7–8 the two figures—Satan and Mastema—are actually likely meant to be viewed as one and the same, even though the relationship between Satan and the prince of the spirits in *Jubilees* is at times confusing. Both O. S. Wintermute (“*Jubilees*,” 35–51) and VanderKam (*The Book of Jubilees*, 128) seem to support the argument that the two names refer to the same figure. VanderKam, noting that the context of the story also implies the identification of Mastema with Satan, suggests that this figure is presented in *Jubilees* as the counterpart to the angel of presence (ibid.).

³⁸ According to Annette Steudel, “Belial” is the most frequently used name for the chief malevolent figure within the Qumran literature (“God and Belial,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997* [ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman, Emanuel Tov, James C. VanderKam and Galen Marquis; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society in cooperation with The Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 2000], 332–40). Steudel claims that the term is to be found in twenty-four of the Qumran compositions, and within a variety of genres including historical paraphrases, hymns, sapiential texts, eschatological writings, curses, and *serakhim* (ibid., 333). For an overview of the references to Belial in the Qumran documents, see Hans Walter Huppenbauer, “Belial in den Qumrantexten,” *TZ* 15, no. 2 (1959): 81–89. See also S. D. Sperling, “Belial,” in *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible* (ed. Karel van der Toorn, Bob Becking, and Pieter Willem van der Horst; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 169–71.

³⁹ Steudel, “God and Belial,” 334, italics original.

⁴⁰ The Instruction of the Two Spirits also says that God created both good and evil in order to teach the people the difference between right and wrong (1QS 4:25–26). This teaching on the origin of evil is, therefore, clearly different from both Genesis and fallen angels myth in texts such as *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees*.

and his forces rule over humans and seek to make the children of righteousness stumble (e.g., 1QS 1:16–18).

In contrast to Mastema's role in *Jubilees*, a majority of the references to Belial's rule in the Qumran literature are not associated with specific individuals. Rather, within the Qumran writings Belial is often depicted as ruling over the entire evil age in which the community existed. Moreover, this motif is found in several of the major Qumran documents, indicating a widespread belief at Qumran that in the present era Belial and his forces ruled with significant power and authority. We will now consider the references to Belial's rule in three of the major writings from Qumran: the *Rule of the Community*, the *Damascus Document*, and the *War Scroll*.

2.4.2.1 *The Angel of Darkness' Dominion in Rule of the Community (1QS)*

In the Instruction on the Two Spirits (1QS 3:13–4:26), the Angel of Darkness and his counterpart, the Prince of Light (שר אוריים), are described as each having a “dominion” (ממשלה). The Prince of Light's dominion extends to the “children of righteousness” (1QS 3:20). The domain of the Angel of Darkness (מל אך חושך) includes the “children of iniquity” but also extends to the corruption of the children of the righteous (1QS 3:21–22) whose “sins, iniquities, shameful and rebellious deeds” are works of the Angel's dominion (מעשיהם בממשלהו). Indeed, the Angel of Darkness' dominion is the cause of every affliction (נגע) and distress (צרה) of the righteous (1QS 3:23), and all of the spirits of his lot (גורל) attempt to cause the sons of light to stumble” (1QS 3:24).⁴¹

There is some scholarly debate as to whether the Angel of Darkness in this passage is to be identified with the Belial we find referred to elsewhere throughout the Qumran writings. Against this identification, one can highlight the fact that Belial is not referred to in the Instruction on the Two Spirits. However, it is probable that (at least) at a later stage of development within Qumranic theology “Belial and the

⁴¹ Cf. the phrase גורל בל יעל in 1QS 2:4–5; 1QM 1:5, 13; 4Q257 II, 1; 4Q496 fr. III, 5 (=1QS 2:4–5).

Angel of Darkness were intended as one and the same entity, namely a personification of Evil ruling the world outside the sect.”⁴²

The probability of this identification is further corroborated within the *Rule of the Community* by the yahad’s belief that they were living during the time of “Belial’s dominion” (ממשלת בליעל).⁴³ In 1QS 1:16–18 all those who enter the yahad are commanded not to backslide during the time of ממשלת בליעל. This passage makes it clear that Belial’s dominion and the time of the yahad—and thus of the dominion of the Angel of Darkness—are coterminous epochs within the theology of the *Rule of the Community*.⁴⁴ Similarly, in 1QS 2:19 the priestly rules are mandated to be carried out “all the days of Belial’s dominion” (כול יומי ממשלת בליעל). It is evident based on these passages in 1QS that the yahad understood themselves to be living during the time of Belial’s dominion, when “Belial and his lot had a limited right to rule.”⁴⁵

2.4.2.2 *The Dominion of Belial in the Damascus Document (CD)*

Fundamental to the references to Belial’s rule in the *Damascus Document* (CD) is the community’s belief that they were living in “the last days” (אחרית הימים), the crucial epoch of history (CD 4:4; 6:11).⁴⁶ This period, often referred to as the

⁴² Corrado Martone, “Evil or Devil? Belial between the Bible and Qumran,” *Hen* 26, no. 2 (2004): 115–127. As Martone points out, this is evident based on comparing 4QMidrEschat (XII, 12) to a text such as 1QS 3:24, which, when read synoptically, suggest that בליעל and מלך אדן חושך were being used in a similar, if not interchangeable, fashion at Qumran. For more on this passage, see Annette Steudel, *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QmidrEschat^{a,b}): materielle Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Gattung und traditionsgeschichtliche Einordnung des durch 4Q174 (“Florilegium”) und 4Q177 (“Catena A”) repräsentierten Werkes aus den Qumranfunden* (STDJ 13; Leiden; New York: E.J. Brill, 1994). See also Martone’s comments on CD 4:12–19 and CD 5:17–19 as further evidence of this identification (“Evil or Devil,” 123–24). Likewise, note Sacchi’s comment: “This prince of Darkness is yet another interpretation of the devil” (*The History of the Second Temple Period*, 351).

⁴³ As further evidence for this argument one can also point to the War Scroll’s description of “the final war in which Belial and his lot will be defeated by God and God’s lot, aided by a heavenly army (1QM 1:5; 15:3; 18:1–3)” (Martone, “Belial in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 122).

⁴⁴ Cf. 1QS 1:23–24.

⁴⁵ Steudel, “God and Belial,” 336.

⁴⁶ For more on the phrase אחרית הימים at Qumran, see Annette Steudel, “אחרית הימים in the Texts from Qumran,” *RevQ* 16: (1993): 225–46.

“era of wickedness” (קִץ הַרְשָׁעָה, CD 6:10, 14; 15:7), is characterized by the pervasiveness of evil outside the community and temptation for those within it (e.g., the three “nets” of Belial in CD 4:15–19). Those *within* the community who are deemed to be controlled by the רִיחוֹת בֵּל יַעַל (“the spirits of Belial,” CD 12:2; cf. Lev 20:27) are therefore confined to the same judgment as the necromancer and the “medium” (יִדְעָנִי): they shall be put to death. This is presumably because they have fallen under control of Belial, the ruler of the wicked realm, thus revealing themselves to be actual sons of wickedness and not true members of the yaḥad.

2.4.2.3 *The Dominion of Belial in the War Scroll (1QM)*

As with the references to Belial’s dominion in the *Rule of the Community* and *Damascus Document*, the *War Scroll* (1QM) reflects the belief that Belial functions as a powerful ruler in the present age. According to the *War Scroll*, during this time the Prince of Light and the spirits of truth assist members of the community against Belial, an “angel of malevolence” (מַלְאָךְ מִשְׁטֵמָה), whose dominion is in darkness and whose counsel is to condemn and convict (1QM 13:10–12). In the face of such opposition, the *War Scroll* declares that God’s mercies have not ceased during Belial’s reign, and even the mysteries (רָזִי) of Belial’s malevolence (מִשְׁטֵמָה) have not been able to lead the faithful away from God’s covenant (1QM 14:9–10).

The additional theme regarding Belial in the *War Scroll* is the writing’s frequent allusions to the eschatological fate of Belial’s dominion. For example, the *War Scroll* opens by mentioning the בְּחַיִל בֵּל יַעַל (“army of Belial”), the forces of the sons of Darkness (1QM 1:1), whose time of eternal annihilation (כֹּלֵת עוֹלָמִים) is fast approaching (1QM 1:5). And in 1QM 18 we again find several references to the impending destruction of Belial and his lot (1QM 18:1, 3, 11, 16 [?]).⁴⁷ In some of these references, the *War Scroll* seems to envisage the rule of Belial as being ended, indeed even displaced, by the imminent dominion of God. According to the *War*

⁴⁷ Cf. 4Q215a fr. 1 II, 6, which speaks of the coming קִץ הַשְּׁלוֹמִים (“era of peace”), and 4Q215a fr. 1 II, 10 of the מְמִשְׁלַת הַטוֹב (“dominion of good”).

Scroll, then, “Belial’s rule” was the primary way of referring to the evil nature of the present age. Nonetheless, the *War Scroll* looks forward to the day when Belial’s rule will come to an end and Belial and his lot will be utterly annihilated by God (1QM 1:6–7).⁴⁸

2.4.3 Other References to Satan as Ruler in Second Temple Judaism

At various places elsewhere in the literature of Second Temple Judaism, references to the notion of Satan as ruler can be found. *I Enoch* 9:7, for instance, declares that Σεμιαζῶς was given the authority (τὴν ἐξουσίαν) “to rule over those together with him” (ἄρχειν τῶν σὺν αὐτῷ ἅμα ὄντων).⁴⁹ The *Similitudes of Enoch* refers to Azaz’el and “all his company” as well as “his army” (*I En.* 55:4), implying the figure’s authority over them. And in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (e.g., *T. Iss.* 7:7; *T. Dan* 4:7; *T. Ash.* 1:8), it is said that the evil soul, the soul which fails to obey and remain morally pure, will be ruled (κυριεύω) by Beliar.⁵⁰

2.5 Satan as Tempter

One of the most dominant depictions of Satan within the writings of the Second Temple Jewish period is that of Satan as a tempter (or tester) of the righteous people of God. In addition to the texts which we will discuss below, Satan’s role as tempter

⁴⁸ In addition to the major writings of the Qumran texts, certain other texts which speak of Belial’s rule are worth mentioning. For instance, 4Q Berakhot^b (4Q286–7) contains a number of curses against Belial, including a particular curse of “the wicked one in all of the ages of his dominions” (4Q287 fr. VI, 5). Other texts which mention the rule of Belial include 4Q177 fr. 1 IV, 8, 4Q290 fr. I, 2, and 4Q390 fr. 2 I, 4. Even though the rule of Belial may not be the central focus of these passages, the allusion to Belial’s rule nonetheless demonstrates that it was a pervasive concept within Qumranic theology.

⁴⁹ As George W. E. Nickelsburg points out (*I Enoch: A Commentary on the Book of I Enoch* [Hermeneia; Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress Press, 2001], 213), however, Σεμιαζῶς remains subordinate to God who has “all authority” (πᾶσαν τὴν ἐξουσίαν, *I En.* 9:5).

⁵⁰ See also *Apoc. Zeph.* 3:7, which, though possibly of a later date (75 B.C.E.–150 C.E.), may refer to “the accuser” who “sits on earth,” or, perhaps, “is over the earth” (in the sense of ruling over it). On this text, see O. S. Wintermute, “The Apocalypse of Zephaniah,” in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. James H. Charlesworth; vol. 1; New York: Doubleday, 1983), 497–515 (511, esp. note “h”).

is also attested to in several New Testament writings, including the Synoptic Gospels' accounts of Satan's temptation of Jesus (Matt 4:1–11; Mark 1:12–13; Luke 4:1–13) and the letters of Paul (e.g., 1 Cor 7:5; 2 Cor 2:11). At present we will consider examples of this image of Satan from the following writings: the Dead Sea Scrolls, the *Testament of Job*, and the *Life of Adam and Eve*.

2.5.1 Satan as Tempter at Qumran

In the Instruction on the Two Spirits we learn that the Angel of Darkness, who was probably identified with the figure of Belial at some stage in the history of the Qumran community, was responsible for the sins, iniquities, and shameful and rebellious deeds of the righteous (1QS 3:22). He therefore not only rules over the wicked but also tempts the righteous to succumb to immoral behaviour and break the law. Indeed, the single goal of the Angel of Darkness' spirits is to tempt the Sons of Light “to stumble” (לְהַכְשִׁיל, 1QS 3:24).

In the *Damascus Document* Belial's function as tempter is rooted in the writing's eschatological outlook. According to the *Damascus Document*, Belial was believed to have been “unleashed” (מְשׁוּלַח⁵¹) in Israel during the present age (CD 4:13). Within this era Belial attempts to catch Israel in what are called the “three nets of Belial” (שְׁלֹשֵׁת מְצוּדוֹת בֵּל יַעַל)—fortification (זְנוּת), wealth (הוֹן), and defilement of the sanctuary (טִמְאָה הַמִּקְדָּשׁ).⁵² In this way he rules over the people of the final period of history, tempting them to transgress the rules of the community.

⁵¹ Translation taken from Geza Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (rev. ed.; London: Penguin Books, 2004), 132.

⁵² Cf. also the phrase מוֹקְשֵׁי שַׁחַת (“snares of the pit/destruction”) in CD 14:2. For more on the three nets of Belial, see Hans Kosmala, “The Three Nets of Belial: A Study in the Terminology of Qumran and the New Testament,” *ASTI* 4, (1965): 91–113. Kosmala suggests that the three nets represent for the Essenes something like three cardinal sins (*ibid.*, 98–99). Martone suggests that CD 4:12–19 could be a *peshet* to Isa 24:17 (“Belial in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 124–25).

2.5.2 *Satan as Tempter in the Testament of Job*

One of the most remarkable presentations of Satan in the writings of the Second Temple Jewish and early Christian periods is found in the *Testament of Job*,⁵³ a retelling of the biblical story of Job cast in the genre of “testament” and aimed at promoting the virtue of ὑπομονή.⁵⁴ Imaginative in character, *T. Job* both alters how the biblical book of Job presents Satan and adds new elements to the devil’s character. Most notably for this section, *T. Job* consistently presents Satan as a tempter of the characters of its narrative. Indeed, as tempter and the one tempted, respectively, Satan and Job can be understood as the chief antagonist and protagonists within the narrative of *T. Job*.

Before we can consider the image of Satan as tempter in *T. Job*, we first must discuss the date and relevance of the writing for our study. Scholars have often posited a Jewish provenance for *T. Job*⁵⁵ and, accordingly, a relatively earlier date of its composition, typically somewhere between 100 B.C.E. and 200 C.E.⁵⁶ More recently, James Davila has argued that although Jewish authorship cannot be ruled out in the case of *T. Job*, the writing is most likely a product of a (perhaps Egyptian) Christian circle in the fifth century C.E.⁵⁷ Despite this apparently problematic range for the dating of *T. Job*, the Pseudepigraphal writing remains a relevant and valuable source for understanding the various ways in which Satan was understood within Jewish (and possible early Christian) thought in the centuries roughly contemporary to Paul. Furthermore, that the portrayal of Satan in *T. Job* sheds light on Paul’s

⁵³ Henceforth we will employ the abbreviation *T. Job* to refer to the *Testament of Job*.

⁵⁴ Like the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* and the *Testament of Abraham*, the *Testament (of Job)* opens with a deathbed scene which serves as the occasion for the protagonist Job to recount various stories to his sons and daughters.

⁵⁵ E.g., see Howard Clark Kee, “Satan, Magic, and Salvation in the Testament of Job” in *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* (ed. G. MacRae; Cambridge, Mass.: Society of Biblical Literature, 1974), 53–76; Berndt Schaller, *Das Testament Hiobs (JSHRZ 3)*; Gütersloh: Mohn, 1979).

⁵⁶ E.g., see R. P. Spittler, “Testament of Job,” in *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. James H. Charlesworth; vol. 1; New York: Doubleday, 1983), 829–68 (833–34).

⁵⁷ James R. Davila, *The Provenance of the Pseudepigrapha: Jewish, Christian, or Other?* (JSJSup 105; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 195–99. For an excellent discussion of recent advances in methods for determining the provenance of OT pseudepigraphic writings, see Richard Bauckham, “The Continuing Quest for the Provenance of the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha,” in *The Pseudepigrapha and Christian Origins: Essays from the Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas* (eds. James H. Charlesworth and Gerbern S. Oegema; Edinburgh: T&T Clark International, 2008), 9–29.

understanding of Satan is made clear by considering one of the most often cited verbs used within the writing. During several episodes in *T. Job* (6:4; 17:2; and 23:1), Satan “transforms” (μετασχηματίζω) himself into various forms in order to deceive another character. In 2 Cor 11:13–15 Paul formulates an analogy between the false prophets at Corinth who “disguise” (μετασχηματίζω) themselves as apostles of Christ and Satan who “disguises” (μετασχηματίζω) himself as an angel of light. These two texts clearly share a common religious matrix from which they have drawn on the notion of Satan as a protean figure who is able to change his appearance in order to deceive. In short, *T. Job* fulfills the criteria as a relevant text for this chapter since it contains a portrayal of Satan in a Jewish or Christian writing contemporary to Paul.

As with many features of *T. Job*, Satan’s portrayal is fairly embellished in comparison to his role in the biblical book of Job.⁵⁸ For instance, Satan appears more frequently throughout *T. Job*;⁵⁹ he is more directly involved in the sufferings of Job; and his overall character is more developed than the impersonal accuser figure of Job 1–2. Most importantly for our purpose, Satan’s primary role seems to have been enlarged, or at least shifted, from judicial accuser in Job to something of a tempter or *agent provocateur* in *T. Job*.

The more active and deceptive Satan⁶⁰ of *T. Job* often appears as a tempter in the narrative, as can be seen by considering the following passages which illustrate the

⁵⁸ For other ways in which the *Testament* elaborates the story of Job, see Christopher T. Begg, “Comparing Characters: The Book of Job and the Testament of Job,” in *Book of Job* (Louvain, Peeters: Leuven University Press; Ithaca, N.Y.: Snow Lion Publications, 1994), 435–45.

⁵⁹ Satan appears—referred to by σατανᾶς, διάβολος, ὁ ἐχθρὸς (47:10; cf. 7:11), and “the evil one” (*T. Job* 7:1; 20:2 V)—throughout chapters 3–47 of the *Testament*, whereas he exits the narrative of the biblical book of Job after 2:7. To be sure, a majority of Satan’s activity in the *Testament* occurs within the first of the three sections (chs. 1–27) of the work (Bradford A. Kirkegaard, “Satan in the Testament of Job: A Literary Analysis,” in *Of Scribes and Sages: Early Jewish Interpretation and Transmission of Scripture, Volume 2: Later Versions and Traditions* [ed. Craig A. Evans; SSEJC 10; LSTS 51; London: T&T Clark, 2004], 4–19). Kirkegaard also notes that “both Satan and God have shifted significantly in their roles, powers and descriptions in the second section” (*ibid.*, 15) and even suggests that the Satan of the first section does not bear “significant resemblance to Elihu or any mention of Satan in the second section” (18).

⁶⁰ In the story Satan is not understood to be an angel as in the Enochic tradition; nor is he a human (*T. Job* 23:2; 42:2). Rather, he describes himself as a spirit temporarily “in human flesh” (ἀνθρώπου σαρκίνου ὄντι, *T. Job* 27:2).

aims of Satan in *T. Job*.⁶¹ First, Satan often deceives other characters within the story and is even charged by Job for deceiving (ἀπατάω) all humanity (3:3, 6). At one point in the story Satan tries to deceive Job’s wife, Sitidos, by convincing her to give up her hair for a few loaves of bread. Disguised as a bread-seller and pretending to aid Job’s hungry family, Satan attempts to lead the heart of Sitidos astray (πλανάω, 23:11). When Eliphaz delivers an arrogant tirade against Job later in the narrative, he is described as being “filled with Satan” (ἐμπλησθεὶς ἐν τῷ Σατανᾷ, 41:6). In these cases Satan is described as misleading or inducing characters within the story to act contrary to their perceived desires and against Job.

Second, there are a number of instances in which Satan “transforms” (μετασχηματίζω) himself to appear either as another person or in another form. In each case Satan’s transformation is designed to achieve his evil schemes in the story. Indeed, in his first appearance in *T. Job* Satan transforms himself into a semblance of a beggar who accosts the house of Job (6:4–5). When his initial request is refused, Satan returns to Job’s household bearing a heavy yoke and begging for bread from the doorkeeper (7:1–2). In a later episode, Satan is able to incite the evil-doers of the city to plunder Job’s possessions by posing as the king of the Persians (17:1–2). Lastly, in a passage already mentioned, Satan brings shame upon Job’s wife by posing as a bread-seller and offering her bread in exchange for her hair (23:1).

Accumulatively, these examples illustrate *T. Job*’s characterization of Satan as a tempter (or provoker) of several characters, a central feature of the retelling of the Joban story. As Cees Haas notes, “Job’s perseverance in the sufferings Satan inflicts upon him is the main theme in chapters 1–27 of the *Testament of Job*.”⁶² The endurance (ὑπομονή) of Job is the main focus of the plot: will he succumb to the temptations of Satan and give into his sufferings? From this first section in *T. Job*, then, we see Satan as a tempter of the upright and exemplary figure Job who, because

⁶¹ It should be noted, however, that in the *Testament* Satan still must request permission from God to attack Job (e.g., *T. Job* 20:2–3). So Begg, “Comparing Characters,” 439–40.

⁶² Cees Haas, “Job’s Perseverance in the Testament of Job,” in *Studies on the Testament of Job* (eds. Michael A. Knibb and Pieter Willem van der Horst; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; Ithaca, N.Y.: Snow Lion Publications, 1989), 117–54.

of his ὑπομονή, is able to resist Satan's temptations to react contemptuously to his sufferings.

2.5.3 *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*

The *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, a collection of writings purporting to be the last will and testaments of major figures in ancient Israel, contains a considerable number of references to Beliar as tempter. As with *T. Job*, the *T. 12 Patr.* is difficult to date with any certainty.⁶³ Furthermore, in its present form *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* is undoubtedly the product of Christian circles. Despite the uncertain date and provenance of the composite text as well as the presence of possible Christian interpolations (e.g., *T. Sim.* 7:1–2; *T. Levi* 2:11; 14:2), *T. 12 Patr.* nevertheless provides further references to the function of Satan as tempter within Jewish and Christian circles more or less contemporary to Paul. For even if *T. 12 Patr.* comprises Jewish and Christian sources, it most likely still reflects Satan traditions from the late Second Temple Jewish and early Christian periods.

Generally speaking, the Satan-figure Beliar of *T. 12 Patr.* is portrayed within the context of a strong ethical dualism. According to *T. 12 Patr.*, Beliar was entrusted with seven spirits of deceit at creation to oppose humanity (*T. Reu.* 2:1–9; cf. *T. Naph.* 3:5). Employing these spirits in his service, Beliar provokes humans to sin, especially in matters related to sexuality (e.g., *T. Reu.* 4:6–8, 11; *T. Sim.* 5:3–4; *T. Levi* 9:9; *T. Ash.* 3:2). Furthermore, *T. 12 Patr.* consistently speaks of the distance between humans and God and Beliar. For instance, in *T. Sim.* 5:3 we read that fornication (πορνεία), “the mother of all sins,” separates one from God and brings

⁶³ Dates for the *Testaments (of the Twelve Patriarchs)* vary widely, with the completion of the Septuagint, probably the main source of biblical texts in the *Testaments*, around 250 B.C.E. marking the earliest possible date and Origen's allusion to the *Testaments* as their terminus ad quem (so Harm W. Hollander and Marinus de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary* [PVTG 8; Leiden: Brill, 1985], 82–83, and H. C. Kee, “Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,” in *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* [ed. James H. Charlesworth; vol. 1; New York: Doubleday, 1983], 777–78). At least at a later stage, certain portions of the *Testaments* show clear Christian influence and/or provenance. On this, see Marinus de Jonge, “Once More: Christian Influence in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,” *NovT* 5, no. 4 (1962): 311–19; Davila, *The Provenance of the Pseudepigrapha*, 10–73.

them close to Beliar.⁶⁴ Accordingly, humans are perpetually faced with the fundamental choice between life with God or Beliar (e.g., *T. Levi* 19:1; *T. Naph.* 2:6).

Out of this worldview emerges an image of Satan (here Beliar) as a tempter of human wickedness, and especially of fornication. This image is different from other presentations of Satan as tempter, however, in that for *T. 12 Patr.* Beliar is understood primarily as a personification of sin who, with the assistance of his evil spirits, tempts humans into sin. Effectively, then, Beliar functions as the internal ethical temptation with which all humans are confronted. In this sense Beliar in *T. 12 Patr.* comes close to the understanding of Satan in Sirach where Satan appears as a metaphor for a person's worst instincts.⁶⁵ Nevertheless, the function of Satan (Beliar) as tempter is alive and well in the thought world of *T. 12 Patr.*, further attesting to the widespread Jewish and Christian belief in a malevolent figure who incited the people of God to transgress the law and to do evil.

2.5.4 Satan as Tempter in the Life of Adam and Eve

Another writing in which Satan appears as a tempter is the *Life of Adam and Eve*,⁶⁶ a text which, like *Jubilees* and the *Testament of Job*, offers a “parabiblical” account of a story from the Hebrew Bible. As with the *Testament*, *L.A.E.* is a difficult text to use given its complicated textual history, dating, and provenance.⁶⁷ However, despite clear Christian redactions and resemblances within the text (e.g., ὁ εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ in *Apoc. Mos.* 10–12; *Vita* 10–17), its contemporaneous dating with early Christianity and its similarities to the Enochic and Pauline writings make the

⁶⁴ See also *T. Iss.* 6:1; 7:7; *T. Dan* 4:7; 5:1; *T. Ash.* 1:8; 3:2.

⁶⁵ Sir 25:24.

⁶⁶ The writing commonly known as the *Life of Adam and Eve* exists in various languages and under several different titles. When von Tischendorf published the Greek text in 1866 on the basis of four main manuscripts, he mistakenly entitled it after an allusion to “a revelation of Moses” in one of the prologues, thus creating the misnomer, the *Apocalypse of Moses*. For more on the textual history of *L.A.E.*, see Johannes Tromp, *The Life of Adam and Eve in Greek: A Critical Edition* (PVTG 6; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 3–16, and 67–111 for the Greek text.

⁶⁷ The abbreviation “*Ap. Mos.*” refers to the Greek text and “*Vita*” to the Latin. The initials “*L.A.E.*” will be employed to refer to the composite document comprised of the Greek and Latin as well as the Armenian, Georgian, and Slavonic traditions.

fragmented work of illustrative importance for understanding Adamic and Satan traditions in Second Temple Judaism and nascent Christianity.⁶⁸

The narrative of *L.A.E.* uses several names to allude to the devil. At times the figure is referred to as “the devil” (e.g., *Apoc. Mos.* 15:3; 16:1–2, 5); he is alluded to as “the enemy” (e.g., *Apoc. Mos.* 2:4; 28:3); and once in the Greek text he is called “Satan” (*Apoc. Mos.* 17:1).⁶⁹ As with much of the literature of the Second Temple Jewish period such as the Pseudepigrapha and the Dead Sea Scrolls, the *L.A.E.* contains a fairly developed angelology.⁷⁰ As part of *L.A.E.*’s angelology, Satan appears within the story as a counterpart to the more exemplary angels in God’s service.⁷¹ Satan, who apparently was once part of the fellowship of the angels, has now been banished from heaven to the earth because he disobeyed the angel Michael’s instructions to worship Adam (*Vita* 12–16).⁷² According to *L.A.E.*, Satan’s disobedience was motivated by his jealousy of humans having been made in the “image of God” (e.g., *Vita* 13:3; 14:1–3; *Ap. Mos.* 10:3; 12:1–2; 33:5; 35:2), which in turn engendered his envy of human beings.⁷³

⁶⁸ M. D. Johnson (“Life of Adam and Eve,” in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* [ed. James H. Charlesworth; vol. 2; New York: Doubleday, 1983], 249–95 [254–55]), notes the following common ideas in both *L.A.E.* and Paul: Eve as the source of evil’s entrance into the world (*Ap. Mos.* 9:2; 11; *Vita* 18:1; 19:1–3; cf. 2 Cor 11:3; see also Rom 5:12–21 and 1 Tim 2:4); paradise as the third heaven (*Ap. Mos.* 37:5; cf. 2 Cor 12:2); ἐπιθυμία as the root of all sin (*Ap. Mos.* 19:3; cf. Rom 7:7); and most profoundly, Satan appearing in the brightness of an angel (*Ap. Mos.* 17:1–2; *Vita* 9:1; cf. 2 Cor 11:14). In *Ap. Mos.* 17:1–2 Satan’s appearance is not described in terms of brightness but is only said to be εἶδει ἄγγελου; in *Vita* 9:1, however, Satan is described as “transforming himself into the brightness of angels.” Johnson suggests that given the archangel Michael’s description as the Prince of Lights (מִשְׁרַף אֱלֹהִים) at Qumran (e.g., 1QS 3:20; 1QM 13:9–10), “the *Vita* and Paul in 2Cor 11:14 may imply that Satan disguised himself as Michael” (*ibid.*, 260, n. 9). This suggestion seems all the more plausible given the frequent mentioning of Michael in *L.A.E.*

⁶⁹ According to Antonio Piñero (“Angels and Demons in the Greek Life of Adam and Eve,” *JSJ* 24, no. 2 [1993]: 191–214), “the author uses this designation when he intends to emphasize that the devil has the power of metamorphosis in order to enact his plans (*ibid.*, 203).”

⁷⁰ On this topic, see Johnson, “Life of Adam and Eve,” 253; Piñero, “Angels and Demons,” 193–202.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 203.

⁷² This version of Satan’s “fall” is, of course, a *locus classicus* for the myth of Satan’s fall from heaven (cf. Isa 14:12–15; Ezek 28:2; 2 *En.* 29:4–5).

⁷³ As Piñero helpfully points out, the motif of angelic and/or diabolic envy of humans is not unique to the *L.A.E.* (Piñero, “Angels and Demons,” 205). The most known example of this idea is found in Wisd 2:24: φθόνῳ δὲ διαβόλου θάνατος εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον. Josephus too seems to refer to this tradition: “But while all the living creatures had one language, at that time the serpent (ὄφις), which then lived together with Adam and his wife, showed an envious disposition

Consequently, Satan's envy drives his singular goal in the story: to destroy the soul of humans (*Vita* 17:1). Satan carries out this aim by appearing in the form of an angel (εἶδει ἀγγέλου) and convincing Eve to believe that if she eats of the tree in the garden she will “be like god,” knowing good and evil. In this sense the narrative reads similar to the Eden narrative in Genesis 3. However, in the *L.A.E.*, Satan enters through the gate into paradise disguised as an angel, and using this disguise persuades Eve to promise to share the fruit with Adam. After Eve agrees to share the fruit with Adam, Satan then climbs the tree and “poured upon the fruit the poison of his wickedness, which is lust (ἐπιθυμία), the root and head of every sin” (19:3).⁷⁴

Even from this cursory discussion, Satan's function as a tempter in *L.A.E.* can be seen in three ways. First, like the serpent of Genesis 3, Satan distorts the words of God while speaking to Adam and Eve in order to seduce Eve to eat of the tree. Second, Satan appears in the outward form of an angel. Although in the story Satan is clearly regarded as an angel, his semblance as an *angel of brightness* (*Vita* 9:1)⁷⁵ helps him earn Eve's trust and eventually deceive her.⁷⁶ Third, Satan uses the serpent as a “vessel” (σκεῦος) in order to deceive (ἐξαπατάω⁷⁷) Eve and cast out Adam and Eve from paradise (*Ap. Mos.* 16:5).

2.5.5 Excursus on the Relationship between the Devil and the Serpent

Although the connection between the devil and the serpent of the Genesis narrative would become virtually assumed in later Jewish and Christian traditions, their identification is not self-evident based on a reading of the (MT or LXX) text of Genesis itself. In Genesis, it is the serpent (ὄφις) who tempts Eve to eat the fruit

(φθονερῶς), at his supposal of their living happily, and in obedience to the commands of God” (*Ant.* 1:41).

⁷⁴ Cf. *Jas* 1:15; *Rom* 7:7.

⁷⁵ In the Greek tradition, Satan appears “in the form of an angel” (ἐν εἶδει ἀγγέλου) and sings hymns to God (*Ap. Mos.* 17:1).

⁷⁶ Piñero notes the infrequency of the devil's metamorphosis in the Second Temple Jewish period (“Angels and Demons,” 208). Nevertheless, this tradition is attested in five major recensions of the *L.A.E.*: Slav. 38:1; Arm. 9; Georg. 9; *Ap. Mos.* 17:1; *Vita* 9:1 (*ibid.*).

⁷⁷ Cf. ἀπατάω in *Ap. Mos.* 15:1; 23:4; 30:1; 39:2.

of the tree, not (the) Satan. In other words, according to the MT text of Genesis Satan was not in the garden of Eden.⁷⁸ While the use of term אֱרֵרֵךְ (“crafty”⁷⁹) in Gen 3:1 reveals that the serpent, like the Satan of later traditions, was regarded as a wicked figure, in the original story the serpent is present only as an animal (albeit in anthropomorphic terms), and not as an angel, spirit, or leader of rebellious demonic figures.⁸⁰

Later texts often imply some sort of connection between the serpent and the devil.⁸¹ In the Greek tradition of *L.A.E.*, for instance, the two figures are clearly distinguished. However, upon further inspection of the text Satan’s use of the serpent as an instrument in his efforts to tempt Eve raises questions concerning the relationship between the devil and the serpent. For though it is Satan disguised as an angel who initially accosts Eve in the garden (instead of the serpent as in Genesis 3), Satan is described as speaking “through the mouth of the serpent” (διὰ στόματος τοῦ ὄφειως, *Ap. Mos.* 17:4). Satan and the serpent here are clearly distinguished—indeed, in the Greek tradition Satan first tempts the serpent into his service—but the “crafty” serpent, who was in no way associated with a Satan figure in the original narrative, now serves the purposes of Satan.⁸² In the Latin tradition of *L.A.E.* the relationship is somewhat obscure. There the serpent, who is also called the “beast”

⁷⁸ The LXX follows the MT in this reading by rendering אֱרֵרֵךְ as ὄφεις each of the five times occurs in the Eden narrative (LXX Gen 3:1, 2, 4, 13, 14). אֱרֵרֵךְ is also used in the biblical manuscripts of Genesis at Qumran (e.g., 4Q10 f5:1; f5:2; f5:3; 1Q1 f2:2; f2:3).

⁷⁹ The use of אֱרֵרֵךְ in Gen 3:1 is clearly a play on the word אֱרֵרֵךְ in Gen 2:25: “And the man and his wife were both naked (אֱרֵרֵךְ), and were not ashamed.”

⁸⁰ For more on ophidian iconography and symbology in the ancient world, see the excellent study, James H. Charlesworth, *The Good and Evil Serpent: How a Universal Symbol became Christianized* (AYBRL; New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2010).

⁸¹ Given its developed demonology and parabiblical account of several episodes in Genesis, one might expect *Jubilees* to insinuate some sort of connection between the serpent and the devil. However, there is still no clear relationship between the figures in the writing (*Jub.* 3:17–25).

⁸² As Piñero points out (“Angels and Demons,” 212), the Armenian text of *L.A.E.* makes the relationship even clearer: “‘Arise, come to me’, said the devil to the serpent, ‘so that I may enter into you and speak through your mouth as much as I will need to say’. At that time the serpent became a lyre for him and he came again to the wall of the Garden.”

Piñero, drawing on the notion of prophetic inspiration such as in the writings such as Philo and Pseudo-Philo in which the source of the message is the one ultimately responsible for it, understands the agency of the serpent in a similar fashion. He cites several texts from the Jewish tradition (Isa 1:20; 24:3; 25:8; 49:2; 4 Mos 22:38) in which God stands behind “the word of the LORD” to further establish his suggested analogy.

(*Vita* 37:1; 39:1), is rebuked by Seth and referred to as the “cursed enemy of truth, [the] chaotic destroyer” who will be judged by the LORD God. Despite the absence of a reference to Satan or the devil in this passage, the allusion to the serpent as the “enemy of truth” and “chaotic destroyer” nonetheless suggests a close association between the figures.⁸³

According to Piñero, the first “clear” identification of the serpent of Genesis 3 and the figure of the devil is to be found in *Pss. Sol.* 4:9: “and their eyes (are fixed) upon any man’s house that is (still) secure, that they may, like (the) serpent (ὄφις), destroy the wisdom of others with words of transgressors.”⁸⁴ This verse, which seems to draw on the imagery of the Edenic narrative, may imply a vague association between the devil and the serpent, but the identification of the two figures is far from certain. Thus, the serpent of *Pss. Sol.* 4:9 is probably to be regarded as a mere serpent.

Similar references to a serpent can be found in other texts from approximately the same period. In *4 Macc.*, for example, the righteous mother states that she was not deceived or corrupted by the “destructive, deceitful serpent” (λυμεῶν ἀπάτης ὄφις, *4 Macc.* 18:8). Here the serpent, who by the author’s description is presumably the serpent of Gen 3, is more than a figure of the mythic past of Israel; the serpent is active and present in the world of *4 Macc.*, seeking to corrupt the purity of the virgin woman. Likewise, Sirach twice refers to a serpent, but again nothing intrinsic to these verses suggests that Satan is in view.⁸⁵ The Jewish writing *Lives of the*

⁸³ So Johnson, “Life of Adam and Eve,” 274, n. 39a; Piñero (“Angels and Demons,” 210), contends that in *Vita* 39 “the popular confusion Serpent-Devil is clear because the ordeal referred to by Seth is, of course, the eschatological battle between God and the Dragon, when the latter is decisively defeated (Is 24,21 [?]; 1 Hen 10,4–6; 2 Pe 2,4; Jud 5–6; Rev 12,7. 9–10; 20:7ff).”

⁸⁴ Piñero, “Angels and Demons,” 210, n. 96.

⁸⁵ Sir 21:2; 25:15. Cf. Sir 21:27: “When the ungodly curses Satan, he curses his own soul.” On the basis of the adopted imagery in 21:2 and the reference to Satan at the end of the chapter, one might be tempted to understand the two in relationship to one another. However, as Sacchi has convincingly proposed, for Sirach “the devil does not exist: Satan is only a metaphor to indicate our worst instincts” (*Jewish Apocalyptic and Its History*, 223). This argument is further supported by Sirach’s idea that sin was introduced into the world by a woman, Eve (Sir 25:24). Sacchi claims that the woman’s culpability in bringing sin into the world downplays the importance of the devil’s role as tempter (*ibid.*). For Sirach, then, the devil is an unnecessary figure who can be reduced to a mere metaphor of the “devil” within each person.

Prophets, written probably sometime in the early part of the first century C.E.,⁸⁶ appears to link the serpent to the figure of the devil (*Liv. Pro.* 12:13). However, it is not entirely clear whether the text envisages a full-blown identification of the figures since it does not mention Satan (or the devil) either here or at any other place in its text.⁸⁷

In all likelihood the first clear identification of the serpent with the devil is to be found in the *Wisdom of Solomon*. According to the author of this sapiential text, God created all things in the world but death was not of his design (1:13–14). Moreover, man was made by God in his own eternal image (εἰκόνα τῆς ἰδίας ἀϊδιότητος αὐτόν), that is, to be immortal (2:23). Within this worldview God cannot be responsible for death, “which is evil *par excellence*,”⁸⁸ so the *Wisdom of Solomon* offers an alternative idea: death entered the world, not through the rebellious angels or by God’s design, but through “the envy of the devil” (φθόνῳ διαβόλου, *Wis* 2:24).⁸⁹ Sacchi is right to suggest that this can only refer to Gen 3 and the story of Adam and Eve.⁹⁰ Therefore, for the author of *Wisdom of Solomon* the serpent in the garden of Eden was none other than the devil.⁹¹

This all leads to the crucial question related to the present study, and especially the possible allusion to Satan in 2 Cor 11:3: would the connection between the serpent of Gen 3 and the devil have been widely assumed in Paul’s day?

⁸⁶ E.g., D. R. A. Hare, “The Lives of the Prophets,” in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. James H. Charlesworth; vol. 2; New York: Doubleday, 1983), 379–99 (380–81).

⁸⁷ To be sure, *Liv. Pro.* does refer to Beliar more than once (4:7, 21; 17:2), but is not clear if this Beliar, in the thought of the writer of *Liv. Pro.*, is the same figure as the devil who is presumably described in terms of the Edenic serpent in *Liv. Pro.* 12:13.

⁸⁸ Sacchi, *Jewish Apocalyptic and Its History*, 227.

⁸⁹ In this sense *Wisdom* echoes the *L.A.E.* in understanding Satan’s tempting of Eve to be motivated by his envy. Cf. *1 En.* 69:6; *2 En.* (J) 29:4; *3 Bar.*; b. Yeham 103b; ’Abod. Zar. 22b; b. Sabb. 146a. For more on this tradition, including the notion of Satan’s envy of Eve as Adam’s partner, see James L. Kugel, *Traditions of the Bible: A Guide to the Bible as it was at the Start of the Common Era* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1998), 121–24.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 226–27.

⁹¹ It must be added, however, that for *Wisdom* the traditions of the devil as the origin of evil (as in the Enochic literature) and as the heavenly accuser (as in *Zech* 3) probably had not been fused.

The clearest NT example of Satan’s identification with the serpent of Gen 3 is found in the book of Revelation.⁹² In the Apocalypse’s vision of Satan’s eschatological downfall, Satan is called several different titles: ὁ δράκων ὁ μέγας, ὁ καλούμενος Διάβολος καὶ ὁ Σατανᾶς, πλανῶν τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην, and, importantly, ὁ ὄφις ὁ ἀρχαῖος (Rev 12:9; cf. 12:14, 15; 20:2). That Satan is here referred to as “the ancient serpent” picks up on the well-established Jewish apocalyptic motif of the downfall of God’s chief adversary. More importantly, the chain of epithets used for Satan clearly indicates that several traditions have been conflated in the thought of the writer. In short, in Revelation the devil (Satan) is none other than the ancient serpent of Hebrew lore.

Another key NT text is located in the Pauline letters. We will consider this text in greater detail below, so presently we will only highlight how it might assume some sort of identification of the serpent and the devil.⁹³ In Rom 16:20a Paul seems to allude to the eschatological defeat of Satan by echoing Gen 3:15: “the God of peace will shortly crush Satan under your feet.”⁹⁴ Paul’s reference to the “crushing” of Satan, it is often claimed, echoes God’s cursing of the serpent and promise that Eve’s offspring will “bruise” (MT: שָׁשׁ; LXX: τηρέω) the serpent. If the Genesis passage is influencing Paul’s thought in this text, what is interesting is that Paul does not repeat God’s cursing of the serpent as one would expect if he were directly appealing to the (Hebrew or Greek) Genesis text. Can it therefore be assumed that Paul either assumed or implied Satan’s identification with the Gen 3 serpent in Rom 16:20a? As

⁹² Elsewhere in the NT, commentators often suggest that the references to serpents in Jesus’ sending out of the disciples (Matt 10:16–23; cf. Luke 10: 1–12, 17–20) goes back to Gen 3:1 where the serpent is called the “craftiest” of all the animals on earth. The LXX translation of עָרֵוּם as φρόνιμος further supports this claim given that Jesus uses the same term in Matt 10:16. However, as James H. Charlesworth points out (“Prolegomenous Reflections on Ophidian Iconography, Symbolism, and New Testament Theology,” in *The New Testament and Early Christian Literature in Greco-Roman Context: Studies in Honor of David E. Aune* [ed. John Fotopoulos; NovTSup 122; Leiden: Brill, 2006], 315–29), it is more likely that Jesus simply “represents ancient Palestinian culture, in which many imagined serpents and doves together in a grand symbology in which the serpent is wise, alert, and shrewd” (325).

⁹³ See below, §5.2.

⁹⁴ There is also probably an echo of the early Christian use of Ps 110:1 in conjunction with Ps 8:7 and the notion of placing things “under his [i.e., the messiah’s] feet” to express their belief in the subjection of evil powers at the cross.

we will argue in detail below,⁹⁵ there is sufficient evidence to suggest that this is not the case. Rather, it seems as though Paul is here indebted to the broader apocalyptic tradition which looked forward to the ultimate defeat of the chief adversary of God.⁹⁶

In light of the above discussion, I suggest that even though Satan was, at times, identified with the Edenic serpent, the connection between the two figures was not ubiquitous in the late Second Temple Jewish and early Christian periods.⁹⁷ That is, Jews and Christians would have been familiar with the association between the devil and the Genesis serpent, but also able to distinguish between the two figures. Indeed, as we will argue in case of 2 Cor 11:3, Paul's deliberate use of the term ὄφις instead of σατανᾶς confirms that the apostle could differentiate the serpent of Gen 3 from the Satan of his theology.⁹⁸

2.6 Satan within the History of Israel: Recasting Israel's Scriptures

Most of the roles and functions of Satan which we have considered thus far have been identified or isolated by previous studies. One literary phenomenon within this literature which has not been recognized often enough is when a particular writing includes the figure of the devil within a retelling of Israel's Scriptures.⁹⁹ Strictly speaking, we might not consider this to be Satan tradition in the sense as the roles of tempter or the origin of evil. Nevertheless, the attribution of (mostly) negative activity to a chief evil figure within Israel's rewriting of Scripture demonstrates a

⁹⁵ See §5.2.3.

⁹⁶ James D. G. Dunn (*Romans 9–16* [WBC 38B; Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 1988], 905), cites the following passages in support: *Jub* 5:6; 10:7, 11; 23:29; *1 En.* 10:4, 11–12; 13:1–2; *2 En.* 7:1; *T.Mos.* 10:1; *1QS* 3:18; 4:18–23; *1QM* 17:5–6; 18:1; *Rev* 20:10.

⁹⁷ Among Paul's other contemporaries, neither Josephus nor of Philo seem to insinuate this association in their writings. Josephus uses ὄφις frequently, and even with reference to Genesis 3 (*Ant.* 1:41–50), but nothing within these texts suggests that he equated the serpent with the devil. Philo interprets the serpent in a much different, allegorical fashion—he equates it with ἡδονή, or “pleasure” (e.g., *Creation* 157; *Alleg. Interp.* 2:74, 79; *Agr.* 97). As in the case of Josephus, we can therefore conclude that for Philo no special relationship between the serpent and the devil is to be assumed.

⁹⁸ See §6.7.2.

⁹⁹ To be sure, Steudel does mention this phenomenon with respect to the book of *Jubilees* and 1 Chronicles 21 (“God and Belial,” 334–37). Her references, however, are limited to texts which refer to the figure of Belial, and she does not develop the category any further or connect it to later references to Satan in either the Jewish or Christian traditions.

significant development within the Jewish theology of Satan, and as such yields a distinguishable group of texts which uniquely include Satan within their retelling of the Jewish Scriptures. From this literary phenomenon we learn how Satan was regarded as a significant figure of Israel's history, and remarkably so in terms of past events, present happenings, and the eschatological future.

The inclusion of Satan within these retellings of Israel's stories was no small alteration of the biblical traditions; nor did it arise without prior developments. As Sacchi has effectively shown, during the late Second Temple period Judaism seems to have struggled with a number of issues related to the problem of theodicy, including the legitimacy of God's omnipotence, the origin of sin in the world, the ongoing evil realities which oppressed Israel as a nation and as individuals (even after the punishment of the exile), the presence of fallen and rebellious angels in the cosmos, and, importantly for our purposes, a chief malevolent angel figure who acted contrary to God and against Israel.¹⁰⁰ In the *Book of Dreams*,¹⁰¹ for example, we find the story of seventy angels commissioned by God to protect Israel after the exile, but who instead misuse their power against the nation (*1 En.* 89:59–65). It is in this post-exilic period that a number of new ideas emerged concerning angelic figures since, as Sacchi puts it, the time was “ripe for developing and organizing thought concerning the great enemy.”¹⁰²

During this period certain Jews (or Jewish groups) also began to rewrite their sacred texts and the stories within them. Given the burgeoning interest in malevolent figures at this time, it is not surprising that we find angelic and Satan-like figures introduced into these rewritten, or “parabiblical,”¹⁰³ versions of Israel's stories. What

¹⁰⁰ Sacchi, “Predeterminism and the Problem of Evil,” esp. 343–54.

¹⁰¹ Sacchi dates the *Book of Dreams* to the first half of the second century B.C.E. (ibid., 346–47).

¹⁰² Ibid., 347.

¹⁰³ The term “parabiblical” was first coined by H. L. Ginsberg (in a review of Joseph Fitzmyer's *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave I: A Commentary*, *TS* 28, no. 3 [1967]: 574–77) to describe works such as *Genesis Apocryphon* and *Jubilees* “which paraphrase and/or supplement the canonical Scriptures” (ibid., 574). Since its introduction into the field, scholars have, to varying degrees, both welcomed and criticized the usefulness and suitability of the term. For a recent discussion on the use of “parabiblical” and its various sub-genres, see Daniel K. Falk, *The Parabiblical Texts: Strategies for Extending the Scriptures among the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Philip R. Davies; CQS 8; London: T&T Clark, 2007), 1–25. Falk, in addition to “parabiblical,” also employs the terms “parascriptural” and “rewritten Scripture” (ibid., 17).

is surprising, and altogether remarkable in terms of the developing theology of Satan, is that the authors of these rewritten texts were willing to retroject a Satan figure into their Scriptures and, ipso facto, into their interpretation of Israel's history. Two basic motivations for this literary phenomenon seem likely. First, apparently some Jews considered it expedient to insert a Satan figure into their retelling of Israel's stories in order to avoid any embarrassment over dubious behavior attributed to God. Second, the writers of these texts probably re-allocated certain actions to a Satan-like figure precisely because they understood "Satan" to act in a like manner *in their own time and lives*. That is, as Judaism became more acquainted with a Satan figure who was not only part of Israel's mythic past (e.g., as the origin of evil) but also active in the present, it probably seemed fitting to incorporate the same Satan figure in the stories of her past. In this way Satan became a figure not merely of Jewish lore but of Israel's very history.

These two points will become evident as we consider several texts in which a Satan figure has been included within various retellings of Israel's stories. In our analysis of these texts we will pay special attention to two aspects: the rationale for inserting a Satan figure within the text, especially by comparing the writing to its *Vorlage*, and the actions ascribed to the Satan figure, particularly when they are directed against a key figure of the story.

2.6.1 *Chronicles 21: David's Census, Yahweh's Anger, and "Satan"*

Perhaps the earliest text to retell a biblical story and incorporate a Satan figure into its text is 1 Chr 21.¹⁰⁴ Within the passage the Chronicler revises the history of the kings in a way that protects the integrity of Yahweh by shifting the blame to שָׂטָן.¹⁰⁵ In the 2 Sam 24 version of the census story we read that the LORD was angry

¹⁰⁴ Steudel also highlights this passage as the root of this phenomenon: "The writer of Chronicles 21 is the first who lets Satan intervene in history" ("God and Belial," 337). That the first instance of this practice should occur within one of the biblical writings is surprising given the paucity of references to the שָׂטָן in the Hebrew Bible. See also her "אֲחֵרֵי יְהוָה הַיָּמִים" in the Texts from Qumran," *RevQ* 16 (1993): 225–46.

¹⁰⁵ As Roddy Braun rightly notes (*1 Chronicles* [WBC 14; Waco, Texas: Word Books, 1986], 216–17), the absence of the article with שָׂטָן may actually represent "the final stage in the OT's development of a figure of Yahweh's council who not only brings charges against his people but

with Israel and incited (סור) David to count the people of Israel and Judah. The Chronicler, however, departs from his *Vorlage* of 2 Sam 24 by offering a different explanation of David's rationale for the census.¹⁰⁶ For the Chronicler, David was not roused by God's anger but rather by שטן "who stood up against Israel and incited (סור) David to count the people Israel" (1 Chr 21:1).

The importance of this passage for our purposes is that a Satan figure has been introduced into the history of the Israelite kings, in place of Yahweh, and with the ability to exert serious influence within the narrative. It is clear that for the author of Chronicles God could not be directly responsible for this sort of capricious behavior.¹⁰⁷ He therefore altered his *Vorlage* realizing that it would have otherwise left his audience with "an untenable scenario" of Yahweh instructing David to do something and then punishing him for it.¹⁰⁸ But rather than erase the scene altogether or cast blame on David, the author chose to lay the responsibility of the census onto a character to whom neither he nor his *Vorlage* otherwise refers: שטן. In this figure the Chronicler apparently found a suitable means (scapegoat) to deflect the theological difficulties posed by the anger of Yahweh of 2 Sam 24:1.¹⁰⁹

actually incites them to evil." Additionally, it seems likely that 1 Chr 21 would have been read with *the Satan* in mind by the time of the first century C.E.

¹⁰⁶ Gary N. Knoppers, *I Chronicles 10–29: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 12A; New York: Doubleday, 2003), 752–53, 61–62.

¹⁰⁷ Braun, *I Chronicles*, 217; Knoppers, *I Chronicles 10–29*, 751.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁹ In a recent article, Ryan E. Stokes has proposed a new interpretation of the Chronicler's redaction of 2 Sam 24 ("The Devil Made David Do It ... Or Did He? The Nature, Identity, and Literary Origins of the Satan in 1 Chronicles 21:1," *JBL* 128, no. 1 [2009]: 91–106). Stokes begins by dismissing a number of previous interpretations of the 1 Chr 21 passage, including the traditional view which identifies the שטן of 1 Chronicles 21 as *the Satan*, "the archenemy of God, who appears so prominently in later literature," the argument that 1 Chronicles 21 presents some sort of superhuman "Satan," as well as the view that שטן is here to be understood as "an unnamed human adversary, whether a military opponent of Israel or an adviser in David's royal court who gives the king adverse counsel" (*ibid.*, 92–93). In addition to these inadequate explanations, Stokes suggests supposed textual connections between 1 Chr 21 and Job (see the use of סור in 1 Chron 21:1 and Job 2:3) and 1 Chronicles and Zechariah (the phrase עמד על is found in both 1 Chron 21:1 and Zech 3:1) have proved to be red herrings in trying to identify the שטן of 1 Chr 21:1 (*ibid.*, 95, 100, 104).

The common denominator between all previous interpretations, according to Stokes, is that they fail to consider in full the connections between the Chronicler's *Vorlage* (2 Sam 24) and the story of the prophet Balaam and his adversary (שטן) in Num 22:22–35. Stokes draws attention to five points of similarity (*ibid.*, 101–02): (1) both begin with a declaration of the deity's anger (Num 22:22a; 2 Sam 24:1a); (2) both accounts contain the angel of the LORD who carries out God's judgment (Num

Furthermore, readers of 1–2 Chronicles in the first century C.E. would have understood this figure as none other than *the* Satan, the archenemy of God. From this perspective, 1 Chr 21:1 not only marks what is in all likelihood the first inclusion of a Satan figure within a retelling of Scripture, but also the first incorporation of Satan into the very *history of Israel*. In doing so the Chronicler revealed a view of Satan which understood the figure to be *active* within history and *hostile* to both the purposes of Yahweh and the people of God.

2.6.2 *The Book of Job and the Testament of Job*

Although we have already discussed *T. Job* in terms of its presentation of Satan as tempter, we will now consider how the work illustrates the phenomenon of including Satan within a rewritten scriptural story. To begin, it is worth pointing out

22:22b; 2 Sam 24:16); (3) Balaam and David each confess their sin (Num 22:34; 2 Sam 24:17); (4) both accounts are resolved by the deity's instructions on how to avoid further problems (Num 22:35; 2 Sam 24:18–25); and (5) the contradictory nature of the instructions and actions of the deity towards the main characters of the stories. In light of these commonalities, Stokes suggests that the Chronicler produced his version of David's census as something of a synthesis of the two pericopae which glosses the 2 Sam 24 reference to Yahweh with the Num 22 reference to Balaam's adversary. According to Stokes the similarities between the two passages are so strong that "it would have made sense to an interpreter to understand" one passage in light of the other (*ibid.*, 104). Furthermore, Stokes convincingly points out that besides in 1 Chr 21:1 "*the only other place in all of the OT where אֱלֹהִים without the article refers to a heavenly being is the Balaam pericope of Numbers 22*" (*ibid.*, italics original).

Stokes makes a helpful and cogent case for the source of the redactor's reference to אֱלֹהִים in 1 Chr 21. Indeed, some of the evidence makes his interpretation seem incontrovertible. However, one point in his article which remains insufficiently explained is the *motivation* for the Chronicler to alter the reference to Yahweh in chapter 21 in the first place. For while Stokes demonstrates the plausibility that the Chronicler may have interpreted 2 Sam 24 in light of Num 22:22–35, he does not explain *why* the story of David's census would have been changed at all. Stokes even dismisses possible theological motivations for such changes (*ibid.*, 99–100), arguing that if the Chronicler has merely replaced Yahweh's role in 2 Sam 24 with אֱלֹהִים then we are still left a figure operating under the auspices of the deity. In this case the alleged theological difficulty would still have existed since Yahweh was the "ultimate mover" behind the אֱלֹהִים. According to this "substitution" theory, the mitigation of the problem would have been "very slight" (*ibid.*, 100).

Our interpretation of this text, especially in light of the remaining passages under consideration in this section which include a Satan figure within retellings of scriptural stories, suggests that even a "very slight" distance between Yahweh and his emissary, here called אֱלֹהִים, would have nevertheless been *very significant* for a Jewish audience. The Chronicler's issue with 2 Sam 24, I suggest, was that Yahweh was charged with both inciting David to take a census *and* punishing David for carrying out his orders. If so, then casting the responsibility to any figure besides Yahweh would relieve this theological difficulty. Thus, while I find Stokes' main argument—that the Chronicler probably drew on Numbers 22:22–35 in order to (re-)interpret 2 Sam 24—to be cogent, I think the Chronicler did so because he was troubled by Yahweh's culpability in his *Vorlage*. If the Chronicler was not concerned with the original text, I see no reason for the alteration of this particular pericope in the first place.

that *T. Job* differs from the 1 Chr 21 use of 2 Sam 24 in that it expands upon the role given to Satan in its *Vorlage* rather than reassigning specific actions of a character to a Satan-like figure. Thus, the author of *T. Job* seems to have envisioned a more prominent and consequential role for Satan in comparison to the biblical Joban account.

In his study on the differences between characters in the biblical book of Job and *T. Job*, Christopher Begg has helpfully elucidated several differences in Satan's characterization in the two texts.¹¹⁰ First, the opening heavenly council scene of Job 1–2—the only chapters of the biblical book in which Satan appears—is intriguingly absent in *T. Job*. The omission of the divine court scene is even more curious given that it clearly assumed, and even explicitly mentioned, in the remainder of the narrative of *T. Job*.¹¹¹ In *T. Job* Satan is instead first introduced by an angel speaking to Job as the one to whom false worshippers were to bring libations and as “the power of the devil by which humanity is utterly deceived” (*T. Job* 3:3). As we noted above in our discussion of Satan as tempter, “the power of devil” is most clearly illustrated in Satan's attacks against Job and his possessions.¹¹²

Second, and more significantly, the author of *T. Job* amplifies the extent of Satan's power by portraying him as the “direct cause” of all of Job's sufferings.¹¹³ The author accomplishes this by revising two of the accounts of Job's calamities in the biblical text and by adding several unparalleled episodes to *T. Job*. First, in *T. Job* the destruction of Job's livestock, which in the book of Job is caused by “the fire of God from heaven” (אֵשׁ אֱלֹהִים נִפְלְאָה מִן־הַשָּׁמַיִם, Job 1:16), is carried out by Satan (*T. Job* 16:2–3; cf. 17:6).¹¹⁴ Likewise, whereas the desert wind topples Job's house in the book of Job, in *T. Job* it is destroyed—along with Job's children and servants—by Satan (18:1). By shifting the blame from God to Satan in one instance and

¹¹⁰ Begg, “Comparing Characters,” 439–40.

¹¹¹ E.g., *T. Job* 7:1–2; 20:1–3.

¹¹² See above, §2.5.2.

¹¹³ Begg, “Comparing Characters,” 439.

¹¹⁴ Interestingly, the LXX, which the *Testament* heavily relied upon (Spittler, “Testament of Job,” 833), had already simplified, and ipso facto, to a certain extent, theologically corrected, the Hebrew text by omitting the reference to God: πῦρ ἔπεσεν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ (LXX Job 1:16).

clarifying it where it might not have been suspected in another, the writer of *T. Job* has amended the original Joban account by introducing an embellished version of Satan which presumably would have reflected his worldview and been acceptable to his audience.

At a number of places *T. Job* also adds unique episodes which further demonstrate this motif: Satan deceptively persuades the evil-doers of the city to help plunder Job's possessions (17:1–6); while Job is sitting on his throne, mourning the loss of his children, Satan comes and overturns the throne (20:4–5); and while appearing as a bread-seller Satan convinces Job's wife, Sitidos, to exchange her hair for three loaves of bread for Job's famished family (23:1–11). Although these additions to the Joban account are interesting in their own right, for our purposes it is important to highlight how they serve the purposes of the author's attempt to bring Satan to the fore of the narrative. By altering and adding to the biblical presentation of Satan, the author is, in effect, offering an alternative solution to the problem of theodicy to the one found in his *Vorlage*.¹¹⁵ As Maarten Wisse argues, *T. Job* "offers a popularised but coherent alternative to the intellectual and ambiguous approach to evil in *BJ* [the Book of Job]." ¹¹⁶ That is, in *T. Job* it is Satan, not Yahweh, who causes the protagonist Job's sufferings, though Job ultimately overcomes his adversary by resisting Satan's attempts to incite him to show contempt to Yahweh.¹¹⁷

Given these examples it is clear that the writer of *T. Job* considered it necessary to recast the character of Satan in his telling of the story of Job in a manner that made him more responsible for Job's sufferings. Presumably this depiction of the devil would have been shared, or at least deemed acceptable, by the writer's audience. Thus the embellished image of Satan found in *T. Job* demonstrates the practice

¹¹⁵ *Contra* Berndt Schaller who contends that in the *Testament* "Das Theodizeeproblem wird gar nicht berührt" (*Das Testament Hiobs*, 315). Cf. Maarten Wisse, who argues that the author of *T. Job* does not ignore the issue of theodicy but rather deals with it in a different way by offering "a popularised but coherent alternative to the intellectual and ambiguous approach to evil in *BJ* [book of Job]" (*Scripture between Identity and Creativity: A Hermeneutical Theory Building upon Four Interpretations of Job* [ADSS 1; Utrecht: Ars Disputandi, 2003], 44).

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*

¹¹⁷ *T. Job* 27:1–7.

within Judaism of adding, or in this case, enhancing, the role of Satan in the retelling of Israel's Scripture and history.

2.6.3 Jubilees: *Satan and the Early Israelites*

Probably the most extensive retellings of biblical narratives that include a Satan figure are those found in *Jubilees*. Throughout its paralleling narrative to Gen 1–Exod 20, *Jubilees* retrojects its demonology into the stories of Israel's patriarchs and the Exodus, many of which are crucial moments in Israel's history. The ostensible purpose of these revisions seems to be the mitigation of theological difficulties in the original Pentateuchal versions of the stories.¹¹⁸ To this end the author of *Jubilees* “recasts” the biblical narrative with a new key role, one which he assigns to the chief malevolent figure of his demonology.¹¹⁹

A first set of examples in which a Satan figure is introduced into the narrative of *Jub.* is found within the section which parallels Gen 1–11. As we have already noted, like the book of *1 Enoch*, *Jubilees* retells the story of the *nephilim* in Gen 6 by introducing angelic figures (the Watchers), including their leader (often called Asael or Semeyaza), in order to explain the evil's entrance into the world. This incident is then followed by the binding of nine-tenths of the demons, the other ten percent whom are entrusted to Mastema, the chief of the spirits (*Jub.* 10:7–14). Mastema and his evil angels also appear in the following chapter of *Jub.*, where they are described as “cruel spirits” who assist and lead astray the sons of Noah into idolatry, sin, and “pollution” (*Jub.* 11:4). Behind these spirits stands the prince, Mastema, who “acted forcefully to do all this” and who also sent other spirits to cause further sin, transgression, and bloodshed (11:5).

¹¹⁸ E.g., Wintermute who notes that the author of *Jubilees* wants to teach us three things about evil: 1) it is superhuman; 2) it is not caused by God; and given the first two points, 3) evil therefore comes from angelic beings who have breached the ordering of God's created world (“*Jubilees*,” 47).

¹¹⁹ Wintermute aptly uses the word “recast” to describe the reassigning of roles within the narrative (*ibid.*). Although undeveloped by Wintermute, it seems to me that this term accurately describes what the author of *Jubilees* is doing in his narrative: removing parts of a given role, in this case God's in the Genesis text, and allocating it to a different character within the story, here Mastema, who is in fact an altogether new character within the plot.

Later in *Jub.* 11 Mastema is again introduced into the narrative, only this time in a non-biblical episode in the land of Ur of the Chaldees. In this passage prince Mastema sends crows and birds to devour the people’s crops and to ruin their labor. This account sets the backdrop to *Jubilees*’ account of Abram’s birth and its depiction of him as a young, pious character.¹²⁰ At the age of just fourteen years old, *Jubilees*’ Abram is able to solve the problem of the crows and in doing so thwarts the efforts of Mastema (*Jub.* 11:18–24).¹²¹

A second set of examples of the inclusion of a Satan figure in *Jubilees* concerns two of the most significant stories within Pentateuch’s narrative: the account of Abraham’s binding of Isaac (the Akedah) and the story of the Israelites’ Exodus from Egypt. In the Genesis version of the Akedah, the narrative begins in rapid fashion with God summoning Abraham and asking him to do the unthinkable—sacrifice his only, promised son (Gen 22:1–2).¹²² Conversely, in *Jubilees* the narrative opens in the setting of the divine council with Mastema precipitating God’s testing of Abraham by questioning the extent of his faithfulness (*Jub.* 17:15–18; cf. Job 1:6–12; 2:1–6). Mastema points out that Abraham loves his son Isaac and that he is “more pleased with him than everything” (*Jub.* 17:16). Mastema then suggests that God should request for Abraham to offer Isaac as a burnt offering in order to test Abraham’s faithfulness to God.

¹²⁰ VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, 46–47.

¹²¹ While the motivation for including such a story is not altogether clear, S. P. Brock has suggested an intriguing theory, one which on the whole fits with our assessment of the main purposes for introducing a Satan figure to texts, to account for the origin of this story (“Abraham and the Ravens: A Syriac Counterpart to Jubilees 11–12 and its Implications,” *JSJ* 9, no. 2 [1978]: 135–52). According to Brock, a comparison between *Jubilees* 11–12 and a writing called “Jewish stories” by a seventh century Syriac scholar, Jacob of Edessa, suggests that the common framework must have been shared by these two works (*ibid.*, 151–52). What is striking, if Brock’s hypothesis is in fact correct, is that according to the Syriac accounts it is actually God who sends the ravens to eat the seed of the crops as a punishment for idolatry (*ibid.*, 140). If this is the case, then it is most likely that *Jubilees* has once more introduced Mastema into the narrative in place of God to avoid the theological difficulty of having God committing dishonorable acts.

¹²² The theological difficulty which the author of *Jubilees*’ seems to have found in the text may be somewhat intrinsic to the original text itself. As Wenham notes (*Genesis 16–50*, 103), Delitzsch suggests that the use of the generic term אֱלֹהִים in Gen 22:1, rather than the personal name יהוה, may indicate that the author of Genesis may have distinguished between the generic term “god”—here responsible for asking Abraham to sacrifice his son—and the covenantal name “Yahweh”—the name associated with the angel (מַלְאָךְ יְהוָה) who later in the story prevents Abraham from carrying out the sacrifice.

Furthermore, the *Jubilees* account of the Akedah has Mastema present on the mountain for the intended sacrifice. Subsequent to the angel of the Lord's intervention which vindicates Abraham's faithfulness to God (18:9–11), *Jubilees* concludes Mastema's role in the episode by declaring that "the prince Mastema was put to shame" by Abraham's fidelity. Thus, not only does the Akedah story in *Jubilees* echo the divine council scene of Job 1–2, it is also similar, though not directly related, to Job's defeat of Satan in *T. Job*.

Jubilees also recounts several parts of the Exodus account from the Pentateuch, often condensing lengthier stories of the Hebrew text (*Jub.* 48:2; cf. Exod 3:1–22) and omitting superfluous details. However, as with the story of Abraham's binding of Isaac, *Jubilees*' narration of the Exodus is expanded in order to accommodate the addition of Mastema as a key character within the story.¹²³ In keeping with his overall theological outlook, the author of *Jubilees* once again reassigns certain aspects of Yahweh's role in the biblical Exodus story to Mastema. Additionally, in *Jubilees* Mastema also takes over part of Pharaoh's role in pursuing the Israelites out of Egypt.

The first instance of Mastema's involvement in the Exodus story concerns Moses' return to Egypt. For the author of *Jubilees*, Yahweh's attempt to kill Moses (Exod 4:24–26; cf. *Jub.* 48:1–4) must have seemed as disturbing as the Akedah story. To this end the author recasts the story so that Mastema is the one who desires to kill Moses "with all of his might" (*Jub.* 48:3). The second appearance of Mastema involving the Exodus comes in *Jubilees*' account of the ten plagues and the Israelites' departure from Egypt (*Jub.* 48:5–19). First, we are told that Prince Mastema tried to deliver Moses into the hands of Pharaoh (*Jub.* 48:9), then the Egyptian magicians are alleged to have been aided by Mastema (*Jub.* 48:10),¹²⁴

¹²³ To be sure, neither in the case of this passage nor the others discussed in the section, are we suggesting that adding a Satan character was the *only* reason the author of *Jubilees* expanded or added to the stories which are retold. Rather, the inclusion of a Satan figure was part of the author's overall agenda of retelling scriptural stories in light of his worldview (including his demonology).

¹²⁴ At this point the angel narrating the story says that "we let them (i.e., the magicians aided by Mastema) do evil, but we did not empower them with healing so that it might be done by their hands" (*Jub.* 48:10). This verse more or less sums up the theological standpoint of the author of *Jubilees*: God and his angels are not responsible for evil or disturbing acts—like Abraham binding Isaac or the time when Moses was almost killed—even though they allow such events to occur. Rather, such evil is the

though ultimately Yahweh smites them with evil wounds and prevents them from performing a single sign (*Jub.* 48:11).

The book of Exodus' motif of the hardening of Pharaoh's heart is virtually omitted in *Jubilees*. Instead, it is Mastema who incites the Egyptians to pursue the Israelites as they flee from captivity (*Jub.* 48:12; cf. Exod 14:8–9). Once more, however, angelic intervention thwarts Mastema's actions as Yahweh delivers the Israelites from the Egyptians' pursuit into the wilderness. Lastly, according to *Jubilees* Prince Mastema is bound and shut up in order to prevent him from following and accusing the Israelites (*Jub.* 48:15). In *Jubilees*' narrative of the Exodus, this ultimate judgment against Mastema is what finally enables the Israelites to escape from their captivity in Egypt.

In these alterations of the Exodus account, what seems to be the case is that the author of *Jubilees* has recast portions of Yahweh and Pharaoh's roles and reassigned them to the evil angelic figure of Mastema. Apparently, the author found it theologically necessary to modify the Pentateuch's periodically unpalatable portrayal of Yahweh's actions, and did so by rewriting portions of the biblical narrative to include Prince Mastema, the Satan figure of *Jubilees*. In doing so, the author of *Jubilees* presented to its readers a version of biblical history which presupposes a Satan-like figure capable of causing great distress among God's people.

2.6.4 Evidence from Qumran

Unlike the references in *T. Job* and *Jubilees*, the Qumran texts which refer to Belial's actions within Israel's history are not found in expansions or creative retellings of biblical stories. Rather, such references reflect the wider worldview and theology of Belial at Qumran. Nevertheless, these references offer additional examples of the inclusion of a Satan figure within Jewish traditions or stories.

First, in the Damascus Document one finds a somewhat vague reference to Belial's diabolic actions against Israel. Here the "pit and snare" of Isa 24:17 is given

result of Mastema and his instruments, such as Pharaoh's magicians, who are ultimately subject to God and his angels (e.g., *Jub.* 18:9–12; 48:11).

a midrashic interpretation in the three traps of Belial (fornication, wealth, and defilement of the temple) by which Belial attempts to ensnare Israel (CD 4:14–16).¹²⁵ Although this text only speaks of Belial’s actions in a generic manner, it is preceded by a declaration that Belial has been “unrestrained” (שָׁלַח) in Israel (CD 4:13). By implication, then, one is to understand Belial as actively seeking to trap the sons of Israel in order to cause them to stumble. In CD 4:13–14, then, we find an interpretation of Isa 24:17 which implies Belial’s active presence in history, especially during “the era of wickedness” (קִיץ הַרְשָׁעָה, CD 6:10, 14; 15:7).

Perhaps the most pronounced occurrence of this literary phenomenon in the Qumran literature is the reference to Moses and Aaron’s battle against the Egyptian magicians in CD 5:18–19. As in *Jubilees*, the Damascus Document claims that the magicians were in some way empowered by a Satan figure. But whereas in *Jubilees* the magicians are said to be “aided” by Mastema, in the Damascus Document Belial “raises up” (קָוַם) Yannes and his brother (the magicians) specifically to oppose Moses and Aaron who “stood in the power of the Prince of Lights.” In doing so, the Damascus Document attributes a providential capability to Belial. In short, this passage demonstrates the Essenes’ belief that Belial appeared at “crucial points of history”¹²⁶ which, for the Essenes, included events of Israel’s past, their present existence as a community, and the eschatological future.¹²⁷

Although references to a Satan figure within Israel’s history (and scriptural stories) are less frequent at Qumran than in other contemporary texts,¹²⁸ the references mentioned above illustrate that Belial’s function as an active figure of Israel’s story—including its past, present, and future—was alive and well with the Essenes’ thought. Thus despite the fact that Belial was probably understood by the

¹²⁵ E.g., Philip R. Davies, *The Damascus Covenant: An Interpretation of the “Damascus Document”* (JSOTSup; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983), 108–13.

¹²⁶ Steudel, “God and Belial,” 334. See also Martone, “Belial in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 124.

¹²⁷ For Belial’s appearances in the present age of the yahad, see the discussion of the מְשַׁלְחַת בַּלְיַעַל above. For references to Belial in the future, see, e.g., 1QM 1:15; 18:1–3.

¹²⁸ As Steudel points out (“God and Belial,” 335), further references can be found in psMoses (4Q390) 2, 4 and psEzekiel (4Q388B) 12–13.

Essenes to be a metaphysical entity and not strictly an angelic being, they nevertheless viewed Belial as a powerful force who opposed God's chosen people.

2.6.5 *Lives of the Prophets*

The Lives of the Prophets, a biographic writing concerning the prophets, offers another example of how biblical stories could be retold to include a Satan figure within its narrative.¹²⁹ In a section in *The Lives of the Prophets* concerning the prophet Nathan, the brief text (just four verses!) focuses on the episode in which David lusts after Bathsheba and subsequently has her husband, Uriah, killed (cf. 2 Sam 11:2–27). In this version of the David and Bathsheba story, Nathan anticipates David's transgression with Bathsheba and therefore attempts to prevent him from carrying it out. However, as Nathan is on his way to stop David he is "hindered" (ἐμποδίζω) by Beliar when "by the road he had found a dead man who had been murdered lying naked" (*Liv. Pro.* 17:2). The details of Nathan's failed attempt to prevent David's transgression are clearly meant to better the prophet's name. What is important for our study, however, is that in order to account for Nathan's failure, the author of *Liv. Pro.* introduces a Satan figure to relieve Nathan of any culpability in the story. That the author has done so shows that Beliar could function as a hinderer not only in his time but also in biblical stories of the past.¹³⁰

2.7 Conclusions

By way of conclusion, here we present the most salient findings from our synchronic analysis of the images of Satan in the Second Temple Jewish period.

- (1) In the late Second Temple Jewish period as well as in the time contemporary with Paul and the early Christians, Satan had become a prominent figure within Jewish writings and theology. Satan was no longer regarded as a mere member of

¹²⁹ Like many of the OT Pseudepigraphic texts, the date and provenance of *Liv. Pro.* is questionable. According to Hare, *Liv. Pro.* was probably written in the first century C.E. and from a Palestinian origin ("*The Lives of the Prophets*," 380–82).

¹³⁰ See also *Liv. Pro.* 4:6, 21 where Beliar is also referred to as a figure in the story of Daniel.

the divine council as in some of the earliest references to “Satan” (e.g., Zech 3:1–3), but rather as an independent celestial being whose overarching goal is to oppose the will of God.

(2) Although there were a variety of Satan figures with various functions during this period, they can be summed up under the following five categories: Satan as accuser; Satan as the origin of evil; Satan as ruler; Satan as tempter; and Satan within rewritten biblical texts. Some of these roles reflect distinguishable Satan traditions in Judaism. Nonetheless, I contend that from the perspective of a first-century C.E. Jewish Christian like Paul, there would have only been one Satan. Furthermore, I suggest that Paul would not have identified the Satan of his theology with any single Satan tradition discussed in this chapter. Rather, Paul’s understanding of Satan reflects several of these traditions, emphasizing certain roles of Satan (e.g., Satan as ruler and figure of Israel’s history) while disregarding others (e.g., Satan as the origin of evil; cf. Rom 5:12–21).

(3) What is important in investigating how Satan was understood in the Second Temple period, therefore, is not merely how the figure developed from a less defined role among the divine council to some sort of apocalyptic arch-enemy of God. Instead, for the purpose of investigating the Pauline references to Satan, what we have aimed to do is explicate the Satan traditions of the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Jewish writings *as they would have been understood in Paul’s time*. In doing so, we have sketched out the variegated Satan traditions which would have been present and operative in first-century Jewish thought. This is critical for the present study since Paul does not explicitly appeal to any single Satan text or tradition. The study of Paul’s references to Satan therefore requires a synchronic summary of antecedent and contemporary Satan traditions from Paul’s religious matrix.

(4) Based on our synopsis of Jewish Satan traditions, we can conclude that Satan functions almost exclusively as an opponent of the people of God. That is to say, in the texts analyzed above, Satan is not the enemy of all humanity. Rather, he specifically opposes God’s chosen people, Israel. Furthermore, it seems that in Second Temple Judaism Satan was regarded as an active figure who plotted

against and opposed key Jewish figures (e.g., Job, David, Moses) at “crucial points” within Israel’s history (e.g., the binding of Isaac and the Exodus). To point out an obvious parallel, the NT gospels’ characterization of Satan’s opposition to the mission of Jesus suggests early Christians shared the belief that Satan targeted key servants of God who played pivotal roles in God’s plan, and did so at decisive moments within salvation history (e.g., Matt 4:1–11 par. Mark 1:12–13 Luke 4:1–13; John 13:2). This motif will be critical to bear in mind as we consider Paul’s portrayal of Satan in his letters, especially vis-à-vis his self-understanding of his apostleship.

Chapter Three

APOCALYPTIC AND SATAN IN PAULINE THEOLOGY

“The crystallization and spread of the myth of Satan clearly owes much to apocalypticism in both Jewish and Christian traditions. The tendency of the apocalyptic imagination to conceive of reality in terms of eschatological opposition between good and evil gave Satan a stature he had not yet enjoyed hitherto and one that has continued for almost two millennia.”¹

3.1 Introduction

As we outlined in Chapter One, in order to understand Paul’s references to Satan in their epistolary context we must first examine two relevant background matters related to Paul. In the present chapter we will consider the first of these two subjects: Paul’s apocalyptic thought and theology. This issue is essential for analyzing Paul’s references to Satan since, as we will argue, each of the references presupposes an apocalyptic framework in which Satan operates as a powerful figure. Moreover, not only is Paul’s view of Satan born out of his apocalyptic worldview, but his references to the figure within his letters can only be understood in light of his wider apocalyptic theology. Our discussion of Paul and apocalyptic will therefore not simply aim to show that Paul’s theology was apocalyptic in character, but to explicate Satan’s role within Paul’s apocalyptic theology.

3.2 Apocalyptic

3.2.1 Approach and Focus

The amount of scholarship on Paul’s theology in relation to Jewish Apocalyptic theology is immense.² To rehearse previous research, including such matters as to

¹ Bernard McGinn, *Antichrist: Two Thousand Years of the Human Fascination with Evil* (New York: HarperCollins, 1994), 22.

² Notable contributions from the relevant literature include Jörg Baumgarten, *Paulus und die Apokalypik: die Auslegung apokalyptischer Überlieferungen in den echten Paulusbriefen* (WMANT 44; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1975); Jürgen Becker, “Erwägungen zur apokalyptischen Tradition in der paulinischen Theologie,” *EvT* 30, no. 11 (1970): 593–609; Martinus C. de Boer, “Paul and Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology,” in *Apocalyptic and the New Testament*

what degree Paul's theology is apocalyptic and how Paul's theology relates to earlier Jewish apocalyptic writings, would therefore be impossible here. Moreover, such a discussion would be tangential to the goal of the present chapter, which is to consider Satan's place within Paul's apocalyptic theology. For this reason we will restrict our discussion to two main aspects of Paul's apocalyptic thought: 1) Paul's apocalyptic interpretation of the death of Christ, especially as it pertains to the defeat of apocalyptic powers, and 2) the place of Satan within Paul's apocalyptic framework.

Before we turn to these aspects of Paul's apocalyptic theology, however, we will address two important issues. First, we will put forward a working definition of "apocalyptic" as it relates to Paul's theology in order to make it clear how we are using the term. Second, building on the work of J. Christiaan Beker,³ we will highlight three ways in which Paul has christologically reshaped Jewish apocalyptic categories and concepts: the use of apocalyptic terminology in Paul; Paul's intensified view of powers of evil in the present age; and the de-emphasis of the "kingdom of God" within Pauline theology.

3.2.2 Definitions

Any attempt to define "apocalyptic" is extremely difficult, not least because of the necessity of distinguishing between "apocalypse" as a genre, "apocalypticism" as

(Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989), 169–90; Vincent P. Branick, "Apocalyptic Paul," *CBQ* 47, no. 4 (1985): 664–75; Oscar Cullmann, "Le caractère eschatologique du devoir missionnaire et de la conscience apostolique de saint Paul," *RHPR* 16 (1936): 210–45; David Hellholm, *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East: Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism, Uppsala, August 12–17, 1979* (2d ed.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1989); Klaus Koch, *The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic: A Polemical Work on a Neglected Area of Biblical Studies and its Damaging Effects on Theology and Philosophy* (SBT 2/22; London: SCM Press, 1972); Andrew T. Lincoln, *Paradise Now and Not Yet: Studies in the Role of the Heavenly Dimension in Paul's Thought with Special Reference to his Eschatology* (SNTSMS 43; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981); Douglas Alan Low, "Apocalyptic Motivation in Pauline Paraenesis," Ph.D., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1988; J. Louis Martyn, *Galatians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 33A; New York: Doubleday, 1998); "The Apocalyptic Gospel in Galatians," *Interpretation* 54, no. 3 (2000): 246–66; R. Barry Matlock, *Unveiling the Apocalyptic Paul: Paul's Interpreters and the Rhetoric of Criticism* (JSNTSup 127; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996); Wayne A. Meeks, "Social Functions of Apocalyptic Language in Pauline Christianity," in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East* (ed. D. Hellholm; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1983), 687–705.

³ Although there are many beneficial studies on the relationship between Paul's theology and apocalyptic, Beker's work is particularly useful for the present study because of its focus on the death and resurrection of Jesus as well as Paul's calling in the context of Paul's apocalyptic theology.

a social ideology, and “apocalyptic eschatology” as a theological outlook.⁴ Despite the confusion of terminology, a number of key tenets of Jewish apocalyptic thought can be deduced from our knowledge of its various expressions. These include the following:

1. An urgent expectation of an overthrow of the present earthly conditions.
2. The end in the form of a catastrophe.
3. The division of time into clearly delineated segments.
4. The belief in angels and demons and other cosmological figures in relation to historical events (especially in the end time).
5. The anticipation of a new “paradisaal” place after the catastrophe for the faithful.
6. The transition into the redemption occurs by God’s visible and physical realization of his universal reign.
7. The introduction of a mediator with royal functions.
8. “The catchword *glory* is used wherever the final state of affairs is set apart from the present and whenever a final amalgamation of the earthly and heavenly spheres is prophesied.”⁵

As Beker points out, these basic tenets can be boiled down to three main points around which apocalyptic theology typically revolves: (1) historical dualism, (2) universal cosmic expectation, and (3) the imminent end of the world.⁶ In recognition of the fluidity and plurality of apocalyptic in both Second Temple Judaism and early Christianity, it is virtually impossible to press the above points into a systematized definition. That said, the above three points do form an “axis” from which most apocalyptic thought derives, and thus provide a serviceable description of apocalyptic (theology) with which to proceed.

⁴ Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 2. Collins provides a helpful discussion of the relationship between these three closely related terms with special attention to the genre of apocalypse, on pp. 2–42.

⁵ Quote taken from Koch, *The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic*, 28–32, cited in J. Christiaan Beker, *Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in Life and Thought* (Philadelphia, Pa.: Fortress Press, 1980), 136.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 144–45.

3.3 Paul and Apocalyptic

3.3.1 Paul's Modification of Jewish Apocalyptic Theology

Of the seemingly innumerable studies on the apocalyptic character of Paul's theology, perhaps the most developed and influential has been Beker's model of "coherence within contingency." For Beker, in Paul "the coherence of the gospel is constituted by the apocalyptic interpretation of the death and resurrection of Christ."⁷ Apocalyptic is therefore not only "the mother" of Paul's theology, as Käsemann famously opined, but, in Beker's view, it constitutes "the indispensable framework for his interpretation of the Christ-event."⁸ Although Beker's work has been the subject of criticism, including Martyn's incisive critique of the incompatibility of Beker's thesis with the theology of Galatians,⁹ it remains the most cogent explanation of Paul's apocalyptic theology.

One of the central assertions in Beker's work is that Paul's theology constitutes more than a reiteration of Jewish apocalyptic theology. Instead, Paul's theology is best understood as a modification, or "transposition," of apocalyptic in light of the Christ event.¹⁰ For Beker, Paul's "profound modification" of apocalyptic is primarily evident in three aspects of Pauline theology.¹¹ First, Paul does not use traditional apocalyptic terminology to the extent which his Jewish predecessors do. Whereas 4 Ezra and several writings from the Qumran literature frequently refer to "this age" and "the age to come" by employing typical apocalyptic terminology, such language in Paul occurs infrequently and only in limited contexts (e.g., Rom 8:38–39; 1 Cor 2:6, 8; 15:24–28). While Paul's allusion to "things present" (ἐνεστώτα) and "things to come" (μέλλοντα) in Rom 8:38 betrays a similar chronological framework, the language of apocalyptic speculation (e.g., timetables) is largely absent from Paul's

⁷ J. Christiaan Beker, "Paul's Theology: Consistent or Inconsistent?" *NTS* 34, no. 3 (1988): 364–77.

⁸ Beker, *Paul the Apostle*, 19.

⁹ J. Louis Martyn, review of J. Christiaan Beker, *Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in Life and Thought*, *Word & World* 2, no. 2 (1982): 194–98; idem, "Apocalyptic Antinomies in Paul's Letter to the Galatians," *NTS* 31, no. 3 (1985): 410–24. Cf. Beker's concession to Martyn's criticisms in the preface of the second edition to *Paul the Apostle* (xiii–xxi).

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹ Beker, *Paul the Apostle*, 145.

letters.¹² Beker therefore rightly contends that Paul’s view of the so-called “two ages” has been reinterpreted in light of the Christ event so that, for Paul, the “new creation” (2 Cor 5:17) has already been inaugurated in the present though its consummation will only be realized in the eschatological future, when God will finally defeat his enemies and become “all in all” (1 Cor 15:28).

For Paul, then, the two-age Jewish apocalyptic framework, including its sequential and temporal dualism, was an inadequate way of describing reality in light of Christ’s death and resurrection since its chronological strictures did not permit an interim overlapping of the two ages. Paul believed he was living near the end of the present age *and* that the new age had dawned through the death, resurrection, and exaltation of Jesus. In the Pauline writings we therefore see that Paul has christologically appropriated the apocalyptic two-age schema to reflect his view that the present period is the “juncture of the new creation and the evil age.”¹³ So Andrew Lincoln aptly remarks that, for Paul, “the structure of the ages simply provided the appropriate vehicle for expressing the significance of what God has accomplished in Christ.”¹⁴

Second, and perhaps most important for the present study, Paul seems to have an intensified understanding of “evil powers.” Moreover, not only are powers of evil intensified in Paul, but they are viewed from a different (eschatological) perspective since Paul considers the Christ event to have rendered a proleptic judgment on all evil powers. Thus, in one sense all evil powers and malevolent figures have been defeated through the cross; in another sense, however, they remain at work in the world until the end of the present age. Colossians 2:15 therefore aptly encapsulates Paul’s interpretation of the significance of the victory of the cross over such powers: “he [i.e., Christ] disarmed (ἀπεκδυσάμενος) the rulers (τὰς ἀρχάς) and authorities (τὰς ἐξουσίας) and made a public example of them, triumphing over them in it.”¹⁵

¹² Cf. the language employed in Eph 1:21; 2:2, 7; 3:9; 6:12

¹³ Martyn, *Galatians*, 24.

¹⁴ Lincoln, *Paradise Now and Not Yet*, 173.

¹⁵ To reiterate what was noted in Chapter One (§1.2.2), this study is focused on the undisputed Pauline letters. The present reference to Colossians does not depart from this approach, but rather appeals to the Colossian passage, apart from any claim of authorship, since its understanding of the cross as an apocalyptic victory over enemies is similar to Paul’s.

That is to say, the powers of evil have not yet been fully defeated (final judgment), but they have been stripped of their full power and authority over humanity and the cosmos. Nonetheless, for Paul in the current age the powers of evil—including principalities and powers, Satan, and death—remain powerful forces capable of inflicting serious harm.

Third, it is rare for Paul to speak of the kingdom of God (ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ) in reference to future salvation.¹⁶ According to Beker, when Paul does refer to the kingdom of God “it is in clearly traditional contexts, borrowed from the Jewish-Hellenistic church.”¹⁷ The importance of this is that Paul has taken the two ages schema from Jewish apocalyptic thought and modified it in light of his belief that the new age had dawned in the resurrection of Jesus. For Paul, the old age has begun to fade away and “the ends of the ages have come” upon us (1 Cor 10:11). Paul therefore finds little reason to appeal to a future kingdom of God since its inception (the death and resurrection of Jesus) has already occurred in the past.

In sum, Paul’s theology presents a distinctly new manifestation of Jewish apocalyptic theology. With the death and resurrection of Jesus as the fulcrum of his apocalyptic theology, Paul finds himself at the juncture of the two ages, a unique moment in history in which the powers of evil have, in one sense, already been defeated through the Christ event and thereby “disarmed” of their full power, but in another sense endure in the present age with residual, but deleterious power against the people of God.

3.3.2 Paul’s Apocalyptic Interpretation of the Death of Christ

At the core of Paul’s modification of apocalyptic theology is his interpretation of the Christ event. Indeed, in Pauline theology the death and resurrection of Jesus function as the catalyst for Paul’s entire revision of Jewish apocalyptic. Beker highlights four aspects of Paul’s apocalyptic interpretation of Jesus’ death¹⁸: Paul

¹⁶ The “kingdom of God” is alluded to seven times in the undisputed Pauline letters: Rom 14:17; 1 Cor 4:20; 6:9–10; 15:24, 50; Gal 5:21; 1 Thess 2:12; cf. Col 4:11; 2 Thess 1:5.

¹⁷ Beker, *Paul the Apostle*, 146.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 189–98.

regards the death of Christ as an apocalyptic event with significant cosmic implications, not least of which is its triumph over the evil anti-god powers at work in the world; second, Paul both intensifies and transforms Jewish apocalyptic,¹⁹ especially in terms of apocalyptic exclusivism;²⁰ third, the death and the resurrection of Christ, though two historically distinct events, are inseparably bound in Paul's theology as apocalyptic-cosmic events; and fourth, although Christ's death and resurrection are consecutive events for Paul, he interprets them dialectically, so that "life is not just life after death but also life in the midst of death."²¹

In relation to the present study, Beker's first point—that the death of Christ rendered the proleptic defeat of the evil powers—is of particular importance. But what are these (apocalyptic) powers of evil, and is there any basis for including the figure of Satan within this group? According to Beker "the apocalyptic power alliance" is comprised of death (Rom 5:17; 6:9, 23; 1 Cor 15:26), sin (Rom 3:19; Gal 3:22), the law (Rom 6:14, 15; Gal 3:23), and the flesh (see τὸ φρόνημα τῆς σαρκός in Rom 8:5–7; cf. Gal 5:17).²² Moreover, in Paul's thought this "apocalyptic power alliance" operates as a whole, as can be seen in Rom 7 where Paul describes how each of the members of this "alliance" plays a role in his description of human sinfulness. Collectively, the apocalyptic power alliance exercises its power "under the sovereign reign of death."²³

In relation to the Christ event, Paul understands the apocalyptic power alliance to have been directly affected by the death of Christ. In particular, Paul regards Christ's death as God's *judgment* of the powers of death, sin, the law, and the flesh (e.g., 1

¹⁹ "The intensity of Paul's apocalyptic religion is characterized by hope (*elpis*)" (ibid., 146). See, e.g., Rom 5:1–2; 8:22–25; 1 Thess 1:10.

²⁰ Beker, *Paul the Apostle*, 192–94.

²¹ Ibid., 197. Cf. Beker, *Paul's Apocalyptic Gospel: The Coming Triumph of God* (Philadelphia, Penn.: Fortress Press, 1982), 72–77.

²² Beker, *Paul the Apostle*, 190.

²³ Ibid., 189. While there seems to be no clear hierarchy or systemization of evil powers for Paul, death seems in some sense to characterize this age (Beker refers to it as "the signature of this world" [ibid., 190]). Thus Paul can speak of the present time as the "reign of death" (Rom 5:15–21) and also refer to death as the last enemy (ἔσχατος ἐχθρός) to be defeated in this age (1 Cor 15:26) (so Beker, *Paul the Apostle*, 190).

Cor 2:6–8; 15:24–25; Rom 6:7–10; 7:4–6; 8:35–39).²⁴ That is, according to Paul, the powers which are characteristic of “this age” (cf. Gal 1:4) have been judged by God so that they no longer have dominion or authority as they did prior to Christ’s victory on the cross. This verdict is proleptic in Paul’s theology because it is an eschatological judgment which will only be consummated in the day of judgment when God destroys all his enemies, last of which will be death itself (1 Cor 15:26). As Beker puts it, “God’s apocalyptic judgment in the death of Christ will be confirmed in the last judgment, because those who do not believe the message of the cross ‘perish’ (1 Cor. 1:18; 2 Cor. 2:15). Their ‘end is perdition’ (Phil. 3:19; cf. 1:28) and ‘sudden destruction’ (1 Thess. 5:3).”²⁵

3.3.3 Satan in Paul’s Apocalyptic Theology

In the foregoing discussion we have made two basic, but essential points regarding Paul’s apocalyptic theology. First, in relation to Jewish apocalyptic, Paul’s theology is best understood as a *modification* of earlier apocalyptic categories and concepts. Second, Paul interpreted the death and resurrection of Jesus as a *proleptic defeat* of all powers of evil, and especially of the “apocalyptic power alliance.” Taking these two basic points of Pauline theology as our starting point, we will now attempt to address what Paul’s apocalyptic theology tells us about his understanding of Satan.

Although the figure of Satan is often discussed within the context of eschatology, what place does Satan occupy within Paul’s overall theology? Given that Paul does not spell out a “theology of Satan” at any place in his letters, any answer to this question must therefore be deduced from passages which do not mention Satan. One possible interpretation, suggested by Bell, is that Paul associated Satan with the reign of sin in death in the present age. Accordingly, human redemption is understood

²⁴ According to Beker, Paul’s “focus” on the apocalyptic aspect of the death of Christ is somewhat unique. He suggests that although Paul is clearly indebted to the Antiochian tradition of interpreting the death of Christ with respect to the future resurrection, Paul’s reinterpretation of the death of Christ in light of his radical modification of the two-age schema is distinctively Pauline (ibid., 191).

²⁵ Ibid., 190.

primarily as a defeat of (the tyranny of) Satan.²⁶ However, there is insufficient evidence to associate the human predicament with the figure of Satan in Pauline theology. Instead, Paul sees humanity in need of redemption from the dominion of *death* (e.g., Rom 5–6), which he never directly associates with Satan.

Given the strong connection between the devil, angelic figures, and demons in Second Temple Jewish texts and, more pertinently, early Christian writings such as the Synoptics,²⁷ it might be expected that Satan functions as the head of a developed demonology within Pauline theology. When we look at the passages where Paul mentions Satan, however, it is striking that Paul does not also refer to evil forces such as death and sin or malevolent figures such as demons or evil angels.²⁸ Moreover, nowhere in Paul's letters do we read about Satan using sin as an agent to corrupt believers, of his command over death, or even any direct relationship between demons and Satan. And though, for Paul, all such powers and figures share the same eschatological fate (e.g., 1 Cor 15:24–28),²⁹ he never explicitly mentions Satan's connection to other powers of evil.

If, as it seems, Paul did not perceive Satan primarily in relation to the reign of sin and death or as the chief figure of a hierarchy of demonic forces, how then does Satan function within Paul's theology? I propose that in order to determine Satan's place and function within Pauline theology, we must understand Satan vis-à-vis Paul's apocalyptic interpretation of the death and resurrection of Jesus. In particular, I suggest that Paul regarded Satan as an apocalyptic figure who, along with all evil

²⁶ Bell, *Deliver us from Evil*, 232–41.

²⁷ See, e.g., Matt 9:34; 12:24; Mark 3:22; Luke 10:14–15; 11:18–20.

²⁸ On the relationship between death and Satan, Paul thus differs from the author of Hebrews. According to Hebrews, Christ shared in humanity's "flesh and blood" (αἵματος καὶ σαρκός) in order to defeat (καταργήσῃ) the one who has "the power of death" (τὸ κράτος ἔχοντα τοῦ θανάτου), that is, "the devil" (τὸν διάβολον), and to free those who were held in slavery by the fear of "death" (θανάτου, Heb 2:14–15). So here the devil (Satan) is in control of death, the great apocalyptic enemy. For more on this verse, see the recent work, Richard H. Bell, *Deliver Us from Evil: Interpreting the Redemption from the Power of Satan in New Testament Theology* (WUNT 216; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), esp. 292–318. In a section comparing the theology of redemption of Hebrews and Paul, Bell claims that Hebrews has a more "mythical" view of redemption" (ibid., 311).

²⁹ Thus, *contra* Ernst Lohmeyer, Satan is not absent from 1 Cor 15: "die Tatsache an sich ist geschichtlich für Paulus bezeichnend und stimmt zu der anderen, daß auch in dem apokalyptischen Drama I Cor 15 Teufel keine Stelle hat" (*Probleme paulinischer Theologie* [Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1955], 87–88). Rather, as we have suggested, Satan is tacitly included as an enemy (ἐχθρός) of the cross in Paul's eschatological discourse in 1 Cor 15.

forces, was judged by the Christ event but who nonetheless remains considerably influential in human affairs; he is destined to eschatological defeat, but until the final judgment possesses serious and menacing power. In this sense Satan, like all other powers of evil, functions as an enemy (ἐχθρός) of God who one day will be overcome by God's universal reign (1 Cor 15:25–26). Paul's understanding of Satan's fate is therefore contingent upon his apocalyptic understanding of Jesus' death and resurrection as a victory over evil powers and forces.

Since we have already examined the Pauline texts dealing with the judgment and destruction of the apocalyptic power alliance, are there any passages in Paul which allude to the defeat of Satan? In the Pauline letters, there is, in fact, only one passage which clearly refers to the destruction of Satan. Near the end of his letter to the Romans (16:17–20) Paul offers a warning against those causing internal division within the congregation which he concludes by promising that “the God of peace will shortly crush Satan under your feet” (Rom 16:20). The basic point of the verse is to remind the Romans that on the day of judgment God will defeat both Satan and those who cause strife within the Roman church since because they belong to Satan (cf. 2 Cor 11:13–15). That Paul can anticipate Satan's demise without any explanation whatsoever demonstrates that such a notion was common to both his and the early church's eschatology. Indeed, it seems that Paul's confident anticipation of God's crushing of Satan is predicated on his belief that Satan has already been eschatologically judged by the cross of Christ.³⁰

Although, for Paul, Satan and evil powers have been judged in Jesus' death and resurrection and will be ultimately defeated in the eschaton, such forces remain at work in the present age. As we noted above, Paul believed that the present era—the juncture of the old and new ages—was characterized by intensified activity of evil powers in the world, so much so that he could refer to Satan as “the god” (ὁ θεός) of this age who possesses the ability to “blind” the minds of unbelievers (2 Cor 4:4). Satan's capacity to prevent unbelievers from comprehending the gospel demonstrates

³⁰ Paul's eschatological promise in Rom 16:20a is also dependent on his use of the early Christian appropriation of Ps 110:1 as referring to Christ's victory over God's enemies. See Derek R. Brown, “‘The God of Peace Will Shortly Crush Satan under Your Feet’: Paul's Eschatological Reminder in Romans 16:20a,” *Neot* 44.1 (2010): 1–14.

the genuine threat posed by Satan to the plan of God. Furthermore, the uniqueness of both Satan's title and activity in 2 Cor 4:4 reveal that Paul regarded Satan as an exceptionally powerful figure within his apocalyptic worldview.³¹ For though Satan, like all other powers of evil at work in the world, is condemned to destruction, he nonetheless seems to have unequaled authority among the powers of the world to influence human affairs in the present age (2 Cor 4:4; cf. 1 Cor 5:5).

Although Rom 16:20 is the only place within his letters where Paul *explicitly* refers to the defeat of Satan, the promise of God's future defeat of his enemies is a salient feature of Pauline theology. God's eschatological victory can therefore be presumed as an underlying theological concept within the Pauline corpus. Additionally, in light of our analysis of Paul's apocalyptic theology, I contend that we can also presuppose Paul's theological hope of Satan's ultimate demise in his other references to Satan. That is to say, Paul's belief in Satan's defeat by God, proleptically ensured by Christ's victory over all evil powers, stands behind each reference to Satan in the Pauline letters. In this sense Paul's understanding of Satan is christologically-shaped in that he interprets Satan's role in the present age in light of his belief that Jesus' death and resurrection guaranteed a future defeat of Satan in the age to come.

This perspective on Satan's fate is evidenced by the underlying logic of 2 Cor 11:13–15. There Paul accuses those whom he refers to as “false apostles” of working for Satan (οἱ διάκονοι αὐτοῦ) by appearing as servants of righteousness. Their reward, Paul claims, will be in accordance with their deeds. In other words, Paul suggests that just as the “false apostles” share in their master Satan's deceitful practices, so to will they participate in his ultimate demise.³² Paul's confidence in the destiny of his opponents in this passage is grounded in his interpretation of the death and resurrection of Jesus as a defeat over every enemy of God, including both the apocalyptic figure of Satan and those who carry out his corrosive schemes.

³¹ On the uniqueness of the title “the god of this age,” see §6.2.2 below.

³² See also Ralph P. Martin's comment: “They have done Satan's work; to Satan's fate they will go” (2 *Corinthians* [WBC 40; Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 1986], 353).

Accordingly, Paul's *portrayal* of Satan, as I will maintain in the subsequent chapters, is contingent upon the place of Satan within his apocalyptic theology as outlined in this chapter. By this I mean that Paul's portrayal of Satan as an adversary of his apostolic labor is rooted in his understanding of Satan as inimical figure of his apocalyptic "imagination" who, as the chief ruler of the present age, opposes God's work through chosen servants such as Paul. It is therefore precisely as an apocalyptic figure with significant and real power that Satan appears in Paul's letters, opposing the people of God and, as we will see, the apostle himself in his apostolic endeavors. Or, rephrased in language from Paul's references to Satan, it is the same "god of this age" (2 Cor 4:4), doomed to suffer eschatological defeat (Rom 16:20), who hinders Paul's missionary travels (1 Thess 2:18) and who schemes against the Pauline churches (e.g., 2 Cor 2:11).

3.4 Conclusion

- 1) For Paul, Satan is fundamentally a figure of his apocalyptic imagination. This is not to say that Satan, for Paul, is some sort of hypothetical or "mythical" figure in the sense of the modern usage of "imagination," but rather that Satan is an intrinsic part of Paul's theological worldview which cannot be excised from the fabric of his apocalyptic thought.
- 2) In Paul's theology, Satan and other powers of evil such as "rulers" and "principalities" are not explicitly connected in his cosmology, but rather in his eschatology. Paul's letters simply do not betray a hierarchy of evil powers, though, to be sure, neither do they explicitly deny a developed demonology. Rather, in Pauline theology Satan and powers of evil are primarily linked in their shared judgment by God in the cross and their future eschatological defeat.
- 3) Perhaps most importantly for the present study, the overlap between the two ages—the evil age in which Satan possesses considerable power and the future age in which he will be defeated—means that Paul finds himself carrying out his apostolic task in a world where Satan opposes the very gospel Paul has been commissioned by God to preach. In other words, Paul, according to his apocalyptic theology, perceives his apostolic labor as having apocalyptic

significance since it is opposed by the great apocalyptic adversary Satan *and* because the gospel which he announced was, at its core, a proclamation of the defeat of all apocalyptic powers.

Chapter Four

PAUL'S APOSTLESHIP AND HIS CHURCHES

“Paul is not simply a successor to the Old Testament prophets but the prophet-apostle who bridges the time between the resurrection of Christ and the general resurrection of the dead, when God’s promises to Israel and the Gentiles will find their cosmic fulfillment.”¹

“... because of [Paul’s] fundamental role in [his churches’] foundation (1 Cor 4:15) and eschatological presentation to Christ, apostle and community are indissolubly tied together from beginning to end ...”²

4.1 Introduction

Following our discussion of Paul’s apocalyptic theology in the previous chapter, in the present chapter we will discuss a second area of background matter related to Paul’s references to Satan: the significance of Paul’s churches for his apostleship, including Paul’s mutual hope and fear for the success of his churches. To a certain degree, the content of this chapter anticipates our later analysis of some of the Pauline references to Satan, which, it will be argued, illustrate how Paul regarded the figure as an opponent of his apostolic labor. Understanding how Paul viewed his apostolic task, including the importance of the communities which he founded, will therefore be essential for our interpretation of the Pauline references to Satan in the following chapters. Accordingly, in the present chapter we will consider Paul’s relationship to his churches under two headings: the role of Paul’s churches within his theology of his apostleship and Paul’s apostolic responsibility to his churches. The goal of the chapter is to continue to develop an interpretive framework within which to understand Paul’s characterization of Satan as adversary of his apostolic work as well as of his churches.

¹ J. Christiaan Beker, *Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in Life and Thought* (Philadelphia, Penn.: Fortress Press, 1980), 113.

² Robert J. Banks, *Paul’s Idea of Community: The Early House Churches in their Cultural Setting* (rev. ed.; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1994), 175.

4.2 The Significance of Paul's Churches for his Apostleship

Throughout his career as an itinerant apostle-missionary, Paul founded churches around the Mediterranean basin. This we can hardly dispute in the face of the evidence from the book of Acts and the existence of Paul's letters to his churches. If we ask *why* Paul founded these communities of faith, however, the issue is less clear. For in all of the descriptions of Paul's "call" in the NT—in both his letters as well as in Acts (9:15–16; 22:14–15, 21; 26:17–18)—the commission given to Paul is to take the gospel to the Gentiles. Typically, this commission has been taken to mean that Paul was called by God to *preach* the gospel as he traveled from city to city and encountered new peoples with whom to share his gospel. That is, Paul's role in the gospel has often been characterized as something of a preacher. Yet throughout the NT we learn that Paul, as he traveled and presented his message in new places, often founded communities comprised of those who responded to the gospel with faith. A number of questions concerning these early Pauline churches can be raised at this point. Why, if Paul was primarily focused on preaching the gospel, did he take the time to establish such communities? What role did Paul envision for himself in the growth and nurturing of the communities which he founded? What importance did Paul ascribe to his churches within the wider context of his apostleship? In the section below we will attempt to address these questions and, ultimately, relate them to our wider concern of Paul's perception of opposition to his work for the gospel.

4.2.1 *The Role of Paul's Churches: A Critique*

One of the most remarkable, and yet one of the most overlooked, aspects of Paul's life is that he founded churches in various cities throughout the ancient world. That Paul regarded the preaching of the gospel as integral to his apostleship is clear enough. Indeed, many might identify the preaching of the gospel as the sole responsibility of Paul's role as the apostle to the Gentiles. For as he writes to the Corinthians, Paul believed that he had been sent by Christ not to baptize but to "preach the good news" (εὐαγγελίζεσθαι, 1 Cor 1:17). Moreover, Paul believed that as an apostle he was required to preach the gospel in order to reap the rewards of his

commissioned apostleship: “if I proclaim the gospel (εὐαγγελίζωμαι), this gives me no ground for boasting, for an obligation is laid on me, and woe to me if I do not proclaim the gospel (εὐαγγελίσωμαι, 1 Cor 9:16–17)!” From these texts, as well as several others which could be deduced in order to make the point, it would seem that the primary task of Paul’s apostleship was to preach the good news, the εὐαγγέλιον, to Jew and Gentile alike as he traveled from city to city.

Johannes Munck’s interpretation of Paul’s preaching to the nations and its significance for the Parousia of Christ falls along these lines.³ On the basis of his reading of Rom 15:19–20, Munck contended that the purpose of Paul’s apostleship was to *preach* the gospel to a representative number of nations, which, upon completion, would fulfill his apostolic task—τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἔθνῶν (Rom 11:25; cf. 11:12)—and thereby trigger the salvation of Israel and, ultimately, the return of Jesus.⁴ Unfortunately, Munck’s interpretation reduces Paul’s apostolic task to a single dimension, namely, that Paul traveled to cities such as Antioch, Berea, and Philippi only to preach the gospel and then moved on with little regard for the long-term growth or spiritual health of the communities formed as a result of his preaching.

In addition to failing to make sense of Paul’s prolonged stays in cities where he founded churches (e.g., those in Ephesus and Corinth), Munck’s argument downplays the importance of Paul’s churches for the successful completion of his apostleship. For if the chief objective of Paul’s apostleship was to incite salvific jealousy from Israel by preaching the gospel to the nations, as Munck contends, then the Pauline churches can only have an ancillary role in the fulfillment of his apostleship. Thus Munck writes:

The struggle for the Galatians, and especially the struggle for the church at Corinth, claimed the apostle’s time and thought while he was staying at Ephesus, and cut across his great plan of ending that journey with a splendid gift from the Gentile churches to the poor in the church at Jerusalem. The struggle to keep those churches in the faith of Christ prevented him from going further on his way westward to complete the preaching of the Gospel to all the Gentiles ... He

³ Johannes Munck, *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind* (trans. Frank Clarke; London: SCM Press, 1959), trans. of *Paulus und die Heilsgeschichte* (Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget, 1954).

⁴ *Ibid.*, 49–55.

[Paul] has not reached the stage of being able to leave the east till he has won back the church at Corinth . . . and only then does he go to Jerusalem before the journey that he planned to Spain.⁵

Although Munck's comments attribute a certain level of significance of Paul's churches for his apostolic task, he does so without clarifying what their role within Paul's apostleship might actually be.⁶ So we are left with a picture of Paul in which the apostle treats his churches as nuisances to his effort to carry on with his "real" work, namely, the preaching of the gospel. This sentiment has also been echoed by Knox: "It is clear that [Paul's] pastoral and administrative work irked him and that he wanted to be free of it. One can readily sense his relief when he writes Rom 15: at last he can take up again the work he was really called to do!"⁷ But it must be asked, why does Paul labor for these churches at all if he considers his apostleship to be primarily concerned with the activity of "preaching?"

Against views such as those of Munck and Knox, I contend that Paul's churches are at the heart of his apostleship and his calling: Paul's churches represent the fruit of his preaching and travels, and their faith is the measurement of his apostolic success. We shall return to this point in depth below, but here we note that Paul's level of dedication and amount of time spent with his churches—not to mention his efforts to pastor such communities through epistolary correspondence—demonstrate that Paul's churches were far more important for his apostleship than Munck or Knox claim. Thus while Paul undoubtedly had very intentional travel plans, and even perhaps envisioned a single destination as the climax of his apostleship (i.e., Spain), Paul's churches cannot be characterized as unfortunate hindrances to an alleged single-track mission to go west in his missionary travels. Such a view not only misunderstands Paul's churches but also the nature of Paul's apostleship itself. Moreover, this view can only be maintained by overlooking a number of texts which demonstrate that Paul regarded the founding of, and caring for, Christian communities as essential responsibilities of his apostolic calling.

⁵ Ibid., 54.

⁶ Munck is only able to make sense of Paul's attentiveness to his churches by drawing a vague comparison between Paul's pastoral care to the character of Jesus in the gospels (ibid., 54).

⁷ John Knox, "Romans 15:14–33 and Paul's Conception of his Apostolic Mission," *JBL* 83, no. 1 (1964): 1–11 (7). See also Günther Bornkamm, *Paul* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1971), 54–55.

4.2.2 *The Role of Paul's Churches: Pauline Evidence*

We now turn to places within Paul's letters in which he mentions his relationship to his churches and their significance for his apostleship. Here our hope is to sketch a more rounded picture of the connection between Paul's apostolic labor and the churches which he founded. To achieve this goal we will focus our analysis on four passages which best illustrate the inextricable link between the apostleship and churches of Paul: 1 Cor 3:10–15; 2 Cor 10:13–15; 1 Cor 9:1–2; and Rom 1 and 15.

1 Corinthians 3:10–15

In 1 Cor 3:10–15, as Paul explicates the importance of leadership within the Corinthian church, he turns from an agricultural metaphor in vv. 5–9 to an architectural one concerned with a building and its builder.⁸ Within this metaphor, Paul discloses his understanding of the relationship of his churches—at least the one in Corinth—to his vocation as an apostle. The issue at stake, as he makes known in v. 10, is that although Paul founded the church at Corinth other leaders have now begun to “build” (ἐποικοδομῆι) on his foundation. There has been confusion over the leadership of the Corinthian community which, in Paul's view, has compromised his rightful apostolic authority over the church. In 1 Cor 3:10–15, Paul therefore draws upon architectural imagery and language in order to clarify his role as their founding apostle.

For our own purposes, the critical point which Paul makes regarding his role in establishing the Corinthian church is found in the opening line of vv. 10–15: κατὰ τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι ὡς σοφὸς ἀρχιτέκτων θεμέλιον ἔθηκα (“according to the grace of God given to me, as a skilled master builder I laid a foundation”). Elsewhere Paul uses the term χάρις as a way of referring to his apostolic calling. For instance, Paul appeals to the χάρις given to him by God in order to instruct the Roman church: “for by the grace (χάρις) given to me I say to

⁸ In vv. 16–17 Paul once more turns to another metaphor, namely, one related to temple imagery.

everyone ...” (Rom 12:3; cf. 1:5; 15:15; Phil 1:7).⁹ In Gal 2:9, Paul makes it clear that the Jerusalem pillars—James, Peter, and John—gave the right hand of fellowship to Paul and Barnabas precisely because they recognized the χάρις that had been given to him by God.¹⁰ Paul’s description of his founding role in 1 Cor 3:10 employs the term χάρις in a similar fashion. That is, as the one called by God to go to the Gentiles and preach the gospel (κατὰ τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι), Paul formed the community in Corinth (ὡς σοφὸς ἀρχιτέκτων θεμέλιον ἔθηκα) as a partial fulfillment of his apostolic task.¹¹

2 Corinthians 10:13–15

In 2 Cor 10:13–15 Paul again speaks of his apostolic authority over the Corinthian church as a product of God’s commission to him. Over against the leaders at Corinth who were apparently “commending themselves,” Paul and his co-workers insist that they “will not boast beyond limits, but will keep within the field (κατὰ τὸ μέτρον τοῦ κανόνος) that God has assigned (ἐμέρισεν) to us, to reach out even as far as you” (2 Cor 10:13).¹² According to this passage, the source of both Paul’s boasting and apostolic authority was God’s assignment to Paul of a specific “field,” that is, a geographic area of evangelistic opportunity.¹³ In other words, the Corinthian

⁹ Cf. the use of χάρις in Eph 3:2, 7, 8.

¹⁰ *Contra* Richard N. Longenecker who interprets Paul’s reference to χάρις as referring to “divine grace” in a general sense as opposed to “the grace of apostolic office” (*Galatians* [WBC 41; Dallas, Tex.: Word Books, 1990], 56). In agreement with F. F. Bruce, the χάρις given to Paul in Gal 2:9 is “his apostleship to the Gentiles” (*The Epistle to the Galatians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* [NIGTC; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1982], 121). See also Rom 1:5; 12:3; 15:15; Gal 1:15–16; Phil 1:7; cf. Eph 3:8.

¹¹ See also Rom 1:1–5 where Paul links grace and apostleship (χάριν καὶ ἀποστολήν) with the gentile mission.

¹² On the activity and roles of Paul’s missionary co-workers (Mitarbeitern) and their importance for the Pauline mission, see Wolf-Henning Ollrog, *Paulus und seine Mitarbeiter: Untersuchungen zu Theorie und Praxis der paulinischen Mission* (WMANT 50; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1979), 111–61; John P. Dickson, *Mission-Commitment in Ancient Judaism and in the Pauline Communities: The Shape, Extent, and Background of early Christian Mission* (WUNT 2/159; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003).

¹³ To be sure, there is some debate as to whether κανὼν in vv. 13–16 can be accurately interpreted in geographic terms. On this issue, see *A Review of the Greek Inscriptions and Papyri Published in 1976* (eds. G. H. R. Horsley and S. Llewelyn; *NewDocs* 1; North Ryde, N.S.W.: Ancient History Documentary Research Centre, Macquarie University, 1981), 44–45. In support of interpreting κανὼν in a geographical and administrative sense, see Harris, *Corinthians*, 711–13.

church was, in Paul’s view, given to him by God. And because it is God who assigned the Corinthians to Paul, and he to them, they are therefore bound together.¹⁴ Paul’s founding of the Corinthian church thus forged a unique relationship. For although the Corinthians had “a myriad of guardians in Christ” (μυρίους παιδαγωγούς ἐν Χριστῷ, 1 Cor 4:15), it was Paul who, along with his fellow workers, first arrived to Corinth and preached the gospel to them and thereby became their only father through the gospel (διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἐγὼ ὑμᾶς ἐγέννησα; cf. πατήρ in v. 14).¹⁵

1 Corinthians 9:1–2

The importance of the Corinthian church for Paul is most evident in 1 Cor 9:1–2 where Paul once again describes his relationship with the Corinthians in reciprocal terms: the apostle exists for the church and they for him. As Paul prepares to launch a bold defense (ἀπολογία, 1 Cor 9:3) of his apostleship in 1 Cor 9:3–27, in vv. 1–2 he first makes two remarkable claims about the relationship between his apostleship and the Corinthian church. First, having insisted on his right to be an apostle in the first part of verse 1—“Am I not an apostle? Have I not seen Jesus our Lord?”—Paul rhetorically asks whether they are his work (ἔργον) in the Lord? The reference to ἔργον in v. 1 both anticipates Paul’s argument later in chapter 9 and looks back to his architectural metaphor in 1 Cor 3:10–15. Paul’s use of ἔργον anticipates his later argument in that he links his right to work to support himself financially with his claim that they too are his apostolic “work” (ἔργον). Apparently some in Corinth

¹⁴ It is not therefore surprising when Paul takes issue with others who impose on *his* territory since it was not, by apostolic right, their territory. Thus he writes to the Corinthians: “we will not boast beyond limits (τὰ ἄμετρα), but according to the limited sphere (τὸ μέτρον τοῦ κανόνος) which God assigned (ἐμέρισεν) to us, which reaches even as far as you” (2 Cor 10:13). According to this passage the “field” assigned to Paul and his co-workers included the Corinthian church: “for we were not overextending ourselves (ὑπερεκτείνομεν ἑαυτούς) when we reached you; we were the first to come all the way to you with the good news of Christ” (10:14). So Paul Barnett: “Paul is engaging in wordplay. His newly arrived opponents are boasting ‘beyond measure’ (*ta ametra*), whereas Paul will boast according to the measure (*to metron*) of the field (*to kanōn*) that was measured out (*emerisen*) for him” (*Paul: Missionary of Jesus* [vol. 2 of *After Jesus*; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2008], 65).

¹⁵ As Jerry Sumney notes, one of the issues in 1 Corinthians seems to be that some of the Corinthians were denying Paul’s claim to exclusive authority (“*Servants of Satan*,” “*False Brothers*” and *Other Opponents of Paul* [JSNTSup 188; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999], 76).

objected to Paul’s refusal to accept support and, perhaps, patronage from their members,¹⁶ choosing instead to support himself “in the demeaning fashion of working at a trade.”¹⁷ Against such objections, Paul insisted that he had a right to work (ἐργάζομαι, v. 6) in order to provide for himself. Paul therefore implies that if the Corinthians reject his right to work (for pay), they would be effectively rejecting their status as his apostolic work in the Lord.

The reference to ἔργον also recalls Paul’s description of his apostolic labor in 1 Cor 3:5–15. In this passage Paul asserts that an apostle’s ἔργον (or κόπος, v. 8) serves as the measure by which they will be judged (vv. 13–15). Accordingly, if Paul fails to maintain his apostolic authority in Corinth and to bring its believers to maturity, his ἔργον will be burned up and he will not receive a reward in the day of the Lord (μισθός, 1 Cor 3:10–15). Paul’s reference to the Corinthians as his ἔργον in 9:1 therefore makes two points: (1) Paul has an apostolic right to work both for his own financial support and for the Corinthians themselves (since they too are his ἔργον), and (2) as Paul’s ἔργον, the Corinthians will serve as the basis for Paul’s eschatological boasting. In short, Paul regards the Corinthian church as having lasting significance for both his apostleship and eschatological reward.

The second claim Paul makes regarding his relationship to the Corinthians comes in 1 Cor 9:2. Having laid claim to the Corinthian church as his ἔργον in v. 1, Paul now expounds what this status means for his apostleship: “If I am not an apostle to others,¹⁸ I am at least you; for you the seal (ἡ σφραγίς¹⁹) of my apostleship in the Lord.” The first part of the verse—εἰ ἄλλοις οὐκ εἰμὶ ἀπόστολος—is clearly

¹⁶ Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1987), 404.

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ As Fee points out (ibid., 396), ἄλλοις (cf. v. 27) may refer to either other Christian communities, thus highlighting the special relationship between Paul and the Corinthian church, or those in Corinth whom Paul confronts in 2 Cor 10–12, thus stressing the importance of the submission of Paul’s readers to his apostleship.

¹⁹ The term σφραγίς appears only here and in Rom 4:11 in the undisputed Paulines. According to Fee, Paul’s use of “seal” language has more to do with “ownership” than “legally valid attestation” (*Corinthians*, 392 n. 24).

hypothetical for Paul.²⁰ The Corinthians know very well that Paul is the apostle of other churches. The emphasis thus falls on the remainder of the sentence: ἀλλά γε ὑμῖν εἰμι· ἡ γὰρ σφραγίς μου τῆς ἀποστολῆς ὑμεῖς ἐστε ἐν κυρίῳ (“at least I am to you; for you are the seal of my apostleship in the Lord”). Since the Corinthian church was founded by Paul, they were in fact his apostolic labor (ἔργον), and thus their existence as an ecclesial community functions as a seal of Paul’s apostleship.²¹ Therefore, just as the Corinthians serve as a letter of recommendation for Paul and his co-workers (2 Cor 3:1–3), so the Corinthians themselves are the attestation of genuineness of Paul’s apostleship.²²

Paul’s theology of territorial apostleship therefore has two sides to it. On the one hand, it implies that certain apostles belong to specific churches, as in the case of Paul and the Corinthians. On the other hand, it means that no one can establish themselves as an apostle of a church which already has leaders. For this reason Paul takes exception to those who build on his church and, by the same token, refuses to preach the gospel where Christ had already been named (Rom 15:20) since, for Paul, such preaching often resulted in the founding of a community of believers. 1 Corinthians 9:1–2 therefore makes it clear that Paul regarded his churches as essential ἔργον to his apostleship which would serve as his basis for eschatological reward and, in the case of the Corinthians, as the seal of his apostleship.

The Letter to the Romans

Paul’s theology of territorial apostleship is evident in a different, but equally plain, way in his letter to the Roman believers. At both the beginning and the end of the letter Paul makes it overtly clear that, though an apostle called God by to preach the gospel (Rom 1:1), he is not *their* apostle. In the opening chapter of Romans, Paul

²⁰ So Abraham J. Malherbe, “Determinism and Free Will in Paul: The Argument of 1 Corinthians 8 and 9,” in *Paul in his Hellenistic Context* (ed. Troels Engberg-Pedersen; Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress Press, 1995), 239.

²¹ This point is made by David E. Garland, *1 Corinthians* (BECNT; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic, 2003), 405.

²² On the translation of σφραγίς as “certification” or “attestation,” see Anthony C. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans; Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 2000), 674.

makes known that one of his purposes in stopping in Rome en route to Spain is to share with them spiritual gifts and mutually strengthen their faith (vv. 11–12). Admittedly, Paul writes of his desire to have some “fruit” (καρπός, v. 13) among them and to preach the gospel to those in Rome (v. 15), but he also clarifies that he does not intend to go to Rome in order to exercise his apostolic rights.²³ Paul’s plan is to come to them as a fellow believer brother (ἀδελφός, v. 13) and to share in mutual encouragement.

Near the end of the letter Paul reiterates his intentions for visiting Rome and his relationship to the church: “thus I make it my ambition to proclaim the good news, not where Christ has already been named, so that I do not build on someone else’s foundation (θεμέλιος)” (Rom 15:20).²⁴ In this verse, which Paul prefaces by highlighting the geographic successes of his mission up to this point (v. 19) and which he reinforces by quoting an Isaianic passage (Isa 52:15) that speaks of the Servant’s commission to the Gentiles (v. 21), Paul once more discloses his apostolic plans to stop in Rome only on his way to preach the gospel where it has *not* been heard. Paul does not regard the Roman church as his responsibility in the way he does, say, the Corinthian or Philippian churches, and so he can only pass through the great city on his way to new territory which will allow him to “magnify” (δοξάζω, Rom 11:13) his ministry.

In this sense Rome and Corinth are antithetical in their relationship to Paul: in the case of the former, Paul can only relate to them inasmuch as he is the apostle to *all* gentiles, whereas in the case of the latter he can claim to be their father through the gospel (1 Cor 4:14–15) and them to be the seal of his apostleship (1 Cor 9:2) since he was the first to bring the gospel to them (2 Cor 10:14). The point of looking at the evidence from Romans is that Paul’s efforts to clarify his relationship with the

²³ In agreement, James D. G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids, Mich.; Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1998), 579; cf. Dunn, *Beginning from Jerusalem* (vol. 2 of *Christianity in the Making*; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2009), 544–47: “Paul evidently hesitated to imply that ‘the direction of ministry’ was one way, as though he was Rome’s apostle; rather, ministry would be mutual as between fellow believers” (546).

²⁴ Cf. the comments of N. T. Wright regarding Rom 15:20: “it is his task to name the Messiah where he has not so far been named, rather than building on anyone else’s foundation . . . Paul clearly sees himself above all as a *pioneer*” (*Paul: In Fresh Perspective* [Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress Press, 2005], 162, italics original).

Roman believers shows that he undoubtedly considered the churches which he founded to have considerable significance for *his apostleship*, while those founded by others did not. This is not to imply that Paul disregarded the welfare of such communities since we know that Paul was regularly concerned for the early Christian churches (e.g., 2 Cor 11:28). Rather, what the above passages from Romans help us to understand is how Paul distinguished between those communities which he founded and those he did not as well as their respective importance for his apostleship.

4.2.3 Conclusion

If we are right to assert that Paul regarded the founding of churches as an integral component of his apostleship, then it follows that they cannot occupy an ancillary or secondary role for the success of his calling. In other words, Paul's churches are not mere afterthoughts or, as Munck would have it, "hindrances," to his preaching of the gospel or to his aims as an apostle to the Gentiles. Rather, Paul's churches are at the heart of his apostolic labor as he aimed to make known the gospel of Jesus Christ to the Gentile world. Paul was not only concerned about preaching the gospel, but also about its practical outworking within the communities which he founded in the cities he visited. Paul has received what Carl Bjerkelund refers to as a "doppelte Auftrag" ("double mandate") as an apostle: to spread the gospel *and* to ensure that his communities will not waver in their faith but instead hold fast to the word of faith (1 Thess 3:3).²⁵ Moreover, the two "mandates" are inextricably related: as the apostle who first preaches the gospel to a people who have not yet heard the gospel (Rom 15:20–21; 2 Cor 10:12–18), Paul is thereby entrusted with the responsibility of bringing that newly formed Christian community to maturity in the faith.

Having considered several passages from the Pauline letters which make it clear that Paul's churches were integral to his apostolic calling, we will now consider Paul's remarks concerning his responsibility for his churches in anticipation of our

²⁵ Carl J. Bjerkelund, "Vergeblich als Missionsergebnis bei Paulus," in *God's Christ and his People* (Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1977), 175–91: "hat er einen doppelten Auftrag erhalten. a) Er soll das Evangelium verbreiten. b) Er ist dafür verantwortlich, dass die Gemeinden 'nicht wankend werden', sondern festhalten an dem Wort, das sie empfangen haben" (182).

later argument (in Chapters Five and Six) that Paul regarded Satan as an opponent of his apostolic labor among churches.

4.3 Paul's Apostolic Responsibility for his Churches

One of the results of Paul's *doppelte Auftrag* ("double mandate") and his theology of territorial apostleship was the need for his fledgling faith communities to grow and mature. As we suggested above, Paul viewed this task, at least for his own part,²⁶ as the responsibility of the founding apostle(s) of each respective community. As Beker comments on Paul's apostolic task: "He is sent out not only to found churches but also to sustain them amidst all their burdens and conflicts."²⁷ Paul was therefore both founder and nurturer, both father (1 Cor 4:14–15) and nurse (1 Thess 2:7), to his churches.²⁸

Having illustrated above the integral relationship between Paul and his churches, in this section we will discuss Paul's responsibility of ensuring the maturity of his churches. More specifically, we will be concerned with the following questions: What language and metaphors did Paul employ to describe his relationship with his churches? What role did Paul assign to his churches in the fulfillment of his apostleship? If one of Paul's churches were to fail in their faith or succumb to the leadership of rival apostles, what consequences did Paul think it would have for his apostleship? What did Paul envision as the ultimate goal of the nurturing of his churches? To address these questions, we will consider evidence from the Pauline letters under two headings: 1) Paul's hopes for the faith of his churches, and, conversely, 2) Paul's fear that his apostolic labor might prove to be in vain.

²⁶ It is worth pointing out that Paul is more or less silent on how this works regarding churches which did not belong to him. For as much as Paul is adamant in his letter to the Romans that he is not *their* apostle, he also abstains from making any claims regarding the identity of their founding apostle(s) (Rom 15:20).

²⁷ Beker, *Paul the Apostle*, 305.

²⁸ Along these lines Paul Bowers ("Fulfilling the Gospel: The Scope of the Pauline Mission," *JETS* 30/2 [1987]: 185–98) may be right to interpret Rom 15:19–21 as referring to the completion of *both* Paul's preaching and the nurturing of his churches: "When therefore Paul states that from Jerusalem to Illyricum he has 'fulfilled the gospel of Christ', it is a formulary equivalent of an affirmation that, within the range of territories specified, churches have been brought into being and firmly set on their way 'in the gospel'" (198).

4.3.1 Paul's Care for the Faith of his Churches

In this section we will briefly examine select passages from Paul's letters in order to consider what the apostle says concerning the growth and maturation of his churches. Our discussion will focus on the two main objectives of Paul's ongoing work amongst his congregations: 1) to nurture his churches in their faith and 2) to bring these faith-communities to eschatological maturity.

Before we turn to this matter, it is worth first noting that the practice of letter-writing itself demonstrates Paul's sense of responsibility to his churches. For Paul did not abandon his communities after preaching the gospel to them and leave them to their own fate. Instead, Paul both re-visited his churches, often at great risk to himself, *and* wrote letters to his churches which would have required considerable planning, drafting, time, and money.²⁹ Dunn appropriately comments on Paul's letters as a product of his missionary work: "Paul, then, writes his letters to his churches precisely as their apostle. His letters, in other words, are themselves the exercise of his apostleship. In seeing how he deals with his churches and his converts we come to know what apostleship and apostolic authority meant in practice for Paul."³⁰ Thus it is out of his sense of apostolic responsibility that Paul writes letters to his churches, encouraging them in their faith, urging them to strive for unity, admonishing them of their errors, and, as we will argue below, warning them of the divisive and corrosive work of God's adversaries—both human and "suprahuman."³¹

²⁹ M. Luther Stirewalt, *Paul, the Letter Writer* (Grand Rapids, Mich.; Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2003), 9. On the estimated time and financial costs of Paul's letters, see E. Randolph Richards, *Paul and First-Century Letter Writing: Secretaries, Composition and Collection* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 2004), 165–70.

³⁰ Dunn, *Theology of Paul*, 572.

³¹ The term "suprahuman," taken from Beverly Roberts Gaventa (*Our Mother Saint Paul* [Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press, 2007], 121), is preferred to "supernatural" in order to avoid the connotation of beings who are "beyond" nature since, in Paul's worldview, figures such as angels and Satan are very much part of, and active within, the "natural world." The term "suprahuman" also rightly stresses that figures such as Satan and his "messengers" are something *other* than human.

4.3.1.1 Pauline Metaphors for the Apostle-Church Relationship

Paul not only hoped for the spiritual growth of his churches, but also afforded himself a key role within that process, a role which he often illustrates in his letters with the aid of metaphors. Although at times Paul can refer to his audience as his siblings in Christ, thus implying a reciprocal relationship, he also employs the more authoritative, and arguably more intimate, metaphor of a father's care for his children.³² For instance, in 1 Cor 4:14–15 Paul claims that he writes to the Corinthians as his “beloved children” (τέκνα μου ἀγαπητά) whose (only) father he became in the gospel (διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἐγὼ ὑμᾶς ἐγέννησα). In 1 Thess 2:11–12 Paul describes how he and his co-workers treated each believer in Thessalonica “like a father with his children” (ὡς πατήρ τέκνα ἑαυτοῦ). Lastly, in almost all of his letters to his own churches, Paul refers to his readers not only as “brothers” (ἀδελφοί), which he also does to his fellow believers in Rome (e.g., Rom 1:13), but also as *his* children (τέκνα).³³

What is significant here is how Paul's parental metaphors carry a sense of permanence. So Banks, noting a lack of clarity regarding this metaphor within Pauline studies, rightly describes the relationship between Paul and his communities as “the parent's relationship to an *adult* child rather than to an *infant* child.”³⁴ Paul, as the father of these communities through the gospel, remains their apostle until their maturity in the faith, that is, until Christ is formed in them (Gal 4:19). To this end Paul writes to and revisits his churches, not allowing them to return to their old ways or to the elements of this world (Gal 4:3, 9), or for them to be led astray by false teachers (e.g., 2 Cor 11:12–15). The telos of Paul's apostolic care of his churches is aptly summed up in Col 1:28–29: “it is [Christ] whom we proclaim, warning everyone and teaching everyone in all wisdom, so that we may present everyone mature (τέλειον) in Christ. For this I toil and struggle with all the energy that he powerfully inspires within me.” The apostolic task of founding and nurturing

³² Stephen C. Barton, “Paul as Missionary and Pastor,” in *The Cambridge Companion to St. Paul* (ed. James D. G. Dunn; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 38.

³³ See 1 Cor 4:14; 2 Cor 6:13; 12:14; Gal 4:19; 1 Thess 2:7, 11.

³⁴ Banks, *Paul's Idea of Community*, 175.

a church remains unfinished until they reach a point of maturity at which Paul can be confident of their future faith. As the one who “birthed” them into Christ (γεννώω, 1 Cor 4:15), Paul remains their “father” through the gospel as long as he “remains” (cf. Phil 1:25).

4.3.1.2 Examples of Paul’s Care for his Churches

Paul’s desire and concern for the growth of his churches can be seen in his letters to each of his respective churches. Here a brief example from each letter will help illustrate Paul’s personal involvement in the nurturing of his churches. In each example we will attempt to show that Paul regarded the growth of his churches as his apostolic responsibility. Collectively, our analysis of these Pauline texts will show that “Paul understood his mission not simply as a broadcasting of seed but also as a cultivating of seedlings into sturdy plants.”³⁵

1 Thessalonians

In what is likely the earliest extant Pauline letter, Paul writes to the Thessalonians to disclose his concern for them in his absence (1 Thess 2:17).³⁶ Due to his inability to return to them in person, Paul claims that he sent Timothy from Athens to comfort the Thessalonians and find out about their faith (1 Thess 3:1–5).³⁷ When Timothy returned with good news of their faith (3:6), Paul wrote back to them encouraged through their faith: “for we now live (ζῶμεν) if you continue to stand firm (στήκετε) in the Lord” (3:7; cf. 1 Cor 16:13; Gal 5:1; Phil 1:27; 4:1). In this passage Paul’s ability to live, that is, to continue in ministry, is made entirely contingent upon the survival of the faith of the Thessalonians. Paul’s own status, in other words, could

³⁵ Bowers, “Fulfilling the Gospel,” 197.

³⁶ As Dunn points out, Paul does not open 1 Thessalonians (or 2 Thessalonians) with the expression “Paul, an apostle ...” (*Theology of Paul*, 571), which might imply that he does not write to them as such, that is, as *their* apostle. However, in 1 Thess 2:7 Paul reminds his readers that he and his co-workers did not make demands as apostles of Christ (Χριστοῦ ἀπόστολοι), thus implying that they could have since they were in fact apostles themselves (cf. 1 Cor 9:14).

³⁷ In 1 Thess 2:17, Paul likens his abrupt departure from the Thessalonians to a parent who has been bereft of a child: ἀπορφανισθέντες ἀφ’ ὑμῶν.

not be separated from that of the community which he had so recently founded. In this sense the entire purpose of 1 Thessalonians can be understood in terms of Paul's desire to ensure that the faith of the Thessalonians had prevailed and that he had not therefore failed in his task of caring for them.

The Corinthian Correspondence

Since we have already discussed some of Paul's comments regarding his relationship with the Corinthian church (e.g., 1 Cor 3:5–15, 9:1–2; 2 Cor 10:13–15),³⁸ here we will focus on a different passage to highlight Paul's role in the church's growth. In 1 Cor 3:1–3, Paul admonishes the Corinthians for their immaturity, claiming that they should have already outgrown their need for γάλα (“milk”) and progressed to βρώμα (“solid food”). What is significant for our purposes is that Paul accomplishes this by speaking in the first-person and describing his own role in their development in the faith.³⁹ Thus Paul's concern in 1 Cor 3:1–3 is not merely the content of the Corinthians' spiritual “food,” but also his own role in giving it to them.⁴⁰ Paul, the one who “planted” and laid the foundation of the church (1 Cor 3:5, 10) is also involved in bringing them to maturity in Christ. So Gaventa rightly states that these verses contribute to what, in Paul's view, “constitutes authentic apostolic ministry.”⁴¹ In other words, Paul's apostleship is authenticated both in laying the foundation of the Corinthian church *and* in nursing the Corinthian believers in Christ.

If we read this passage in conjunction with Paul's reference to the Corinthian church as the seal of his apostleship (1 Cor 9:1), his later statements of fear for the

³⁸ See above, §4.2.2.

³⁹ Gaventa draws attention to the peculiar yet often overlooked use of first-person verbs (ἠδυνήθην and ἐπότισα, vv. 1–2) in the text in order to claim that Paul is fundamentally concerned with his own apostolic teachings and role as a “wet nurse” (*Our Mother Saint Paul*, 41–50).

⁴⁰ Both γάλα and βρώμα are subject to a variety of interpretations since Paul does not explain the terms to the Corinthians. Whatever their precise meanings are, Morna Hooker shrewdly sums up Paul's central point: “The fundamental contrast in Paul's mind is ... between the true food of the Gospel with which he has fed them (whether milk or meat) and the synthetic substitutes which the Corinthians have preferred” (“Hard Sayings: I Corinthians 3:2,” *Theology* 69, no. 547 [1966]: 19–22, quoted in Gaventa, *Our Mother Saint Paul*, 42).

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 50.

Corinthians (2 Cor 12:20), and in light of Paul’s overall efforts in writings some four or five letters and making three or more visits to the Corinthians, it is clear that Paul regarded the maturation of the community as not only essential for their own spiritual development but for his apostolic labor. As they advance from being “infants in Christ” (νηπίοις ἐν Χριστῷ, 1 Cor 3:1) to “spiritual” people (πνευματικοίς), the foundation laid in Corinth will grow up as God’s temple, and Paul, the builder, will receive his reward (vv. 14–17).

Galatians

Paul’s care for the churches of Galatia (ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Γαλατίας, Gal 1:2) is made clear in his use of an evocative maternal metaphor in Gal 4:19. The context of the metaphor is Paul’s concern for the direction of the Galatian church. Paul writes to the Galatians that he has grown “perplexed” (ἀπορέω, Gal 4:20) concerning their progress; having started with the Spirit they are now trying to finish with the flesh (Gal 3:3). Indeed, Paul fears that they are even returning to the στοιχεῖα to which they were enslaved before their salvation (Gal 4:3, 9). Paul knows the Galatians are on shaky ground in their faith, and so he urges them to be faithful to the gospel which he first presented to them (Gal 1:6–9) and to use their freedom in Christ to love one another (Gal 5:13–15) and bear the fruit of the Spirit (Gal 5:22–26). And to remind the churches in the region that he himself is a participant in their growth, Paul vividly characterizes his care for the Galatians as a woman in the pain of childbirth (ὡδίνω).⁴²

Two points concerning Paul’s relationship with the Galatian church are worth noting here. First, the maternal metaphor, which paradoxically imagines a pregnant mother again (πάλιν) in birth pains, implies an indissoluble, familial bond between Paul and the Galatians. Paul relates to them as their “mother,” and they are his children (τέκνα μου, v. 19; cf. v. 12: ἀδελφοί). But Gal 4:19 contains more than an

⁴² On this passage and other maternal metaphors in Paul (e.g., 1 Thess 2:6–8), see Gaventa, *Our Mother Saint Paul*, 29–50.

intimate analogy by which Paul appeals to the Galatian believers. Note Gaventa's comment:

... [Gal 4:19] is not simply an appeal based on the friendship Paul and the Galatians have established, however. It is, instead, a theological claim that Paul's work as an apostle occurs within an apocalyptic framework that is created by God's revelation of Jesus Christ and that looks forward to the full incorporation of all believers—indeed, of the cosmos itself—into Christ. This theological claim provides the grounding for the personal appeal of earlier lines, not merely in the person of Paul but also in the action of God. (*Our Mother Saint Paul*, 37)

Second, Paul envisions his role with a long-term goal in mind: “until Christ is formed in you” (μέχρις οὗ μορφωθῆ Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν). Although it is uncertain whether μέχρις οὗ refers to the near or distant future, Gaventa correctly stresses that the two options can remain in tension: the Galatians may continue to mature in their faith, but will not reach full maturity until the Christ event reaches its fulfillment. For this reason Paul finds himself “in labor” until they turn away from the στοιχεῖα once and for all and press toward Christian maturity.⁴³

Philippians

The reciprocal nature of the relationship Paul maintained with the believers in Philippi can be seen in the opening chapter of Philippians. There the imprisoned Paul is torn between the possibility of his death, which would mean being with Christ (Phil 1:23), and remaining in the flesh, which would allow more time with his churches. Knowing that “to remain in the flesh” (τὸ ἐπιμένειν ἐν τῇ σαρκί, v. 24) is more necessary for the Philippians, Paul writes, “I know that I will remain and continue with all of you for your progress and joy in faith, so that I may share abundantly in your boasting in Christ Jesus when I come to you again.” In other words, Paul's apostolic task is to remain alive for the sake of the Philippians' progress (προκοπή), which would mean “fruitful labor” (καρπὸς ἔργου) for him (v. 22).

⁴³ Both Gaventa (*Our Mother Saint Paul*, 34–39) and J. Louis. Martyn (*Galatians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* [AB 33A; New York: Doubleday, 1998], 418–31) highlight the possible apocalyptic context of Paul's language. Gaventa claims that Gal 4:19 employs a “conventional metaphor ... to identify Paul's apostolic work with the apocalyptic expectation of the whole created order” (ibid., 31).

The opposite is also the case in the Philippians' relationship with Paul: their maturity helps fulfill his apostolic mission. Shortly following the above passage, as Paul urges the Philippians to continue to "live in a manner worthy of the gospel of Christ" (v. 27), Paul exhorts his church to "make my joy complete" (πληρώσατέ μου τὴν χαράν, Phil 2:2; cf. 4:1) by being of the same mind, having the same love, being in full accord and of one mind. Even though Paul is "filled up" (πεπλήρωμαι, 4:18) from a financial gift from the Philippian church, it is ultimately the unity of their church that will make *his* joy complete.⁴⁴ This is the case precisely because Paul regarded the growth and maturity of his churches as an essential task of his apostleship, and thus the Philippians, as Paul's church, have the potential to fill up Paul's cup through their unity.

Romans

Having considered examples from Paul's letters to his own churches, we now turn to Romans, a letter written to a group of believers that shared a different type of relationship to Paul, but which nonetheless helps to elucidate Paul's apostolic care for his churches.

In light of the section above in which we discussed how Paul afforded himself a (nurturing) role in the maturation of his churches, it is of telling significance that Paul does not use similar language in Romans. Accordingly, nowhere in this great letter do we find the intimate and relational language Paul uses in his other letters: he does not urge the Romans to make his joy complete; he does not claim to be "in labor" with them now or at any point in the past; and Paul never refers to them as his children (τέκνα; cf. 1 Cor 4:14; 2 Cor 6:13; 12:14; Gal 4:19; 1 Thess 2:7, 11). While Paul frequently addresses the Romans as ἀδελφοί (Rom 1:13; 7:1, 4; 8:12; 10:1; 11:25; 12:1; 15:14, 30; 16:17), as he does with his own churches, it is not by accident that Paul's language in Romans avoids the implication that he is their father through

⁴⁴ Gerald Hawthorne's suggestion that "Paul is concerned with his own feelings only as a byproduct" (of the Philippians' unity) understates the case (Hawthorne and Ralph P. Martin, *Philippians* [rev. and exp. ed.; WBC 43; Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 2004], 85).

the gospel, that is, their apostle.⁴⁵ The Roman believers are not, therefore, Paul's apostolic responsibility in the way the communities in Corinth and Philippi were, even though he greatly desired to be mutually encouraged in the faith by them during his visit to Rome (Rom 1:11–12; 15:32). Moreover, because Paul does not regard the Romans as his immediate apostolic responsibility, he makes virtually no admonishing statements in the letter.⁴⁶ The point to be made here is that Paul clearly distinguished between two main categories of churches vis-à-vis his apostleship: those which he founded and those which he did not.⁴⁷ The former group Paul considers himself responsible for as their founding apostle, whereas the latter group plays only an ancillary role in Paul's apostolic calling.

4.3.1.4 Summary

In light of our analysis of Paul's sense of responsibility for the churches which he established, it seems that Paul presumed the existence of reciprocity between an apostle and the faith of the churches which he planted: as the faith of a community grows and matures, Paul's joy is completed and his apostleship is partially fulfilled; as Paul labors among his churches, their faith is strengthened and they mature as believers. As we have seen in the examples considered from Paul's letters to these communities, it is clear that "Paul's missionary vocation finds its sense of fulfillment in the presence of firmly established churches."⁴⁸ Consequently, Paul's theology of

⁴⁵ Dunn, *Theology of Paul*, 576–80; idem, *Beginning from Jerusalem*, 544–47.

⁴⁶ Rom 16:17–20 may be an exception here. However, it can also be suggested that Paul's vague and unclear instructions are not intended to be authoritative teaching but rather pastoral advice intended to warn the Romans of the potential danger of divisive individuals within their ranks.

⁴⁷ Paul's principle of apostolic care may apply to individuals too. Here the case of Paul's correspondence with Philemon is intriguing. In his letter to Onesimus' owner, Philemon, Paul writes with the same apostolic care and concern for the slave Onesimus that he does for his churches: "I am appealing to you for my child (τοῦ ἐμοῦ τέκνου), Onesimus, whose father I have become (ἐγέννησα) during my imprisonment" (Phlm 10). Notable here is that Paul appeals for Onesimus *as* his "father." That is, Paul's status as Onesimus' "father" is the basis on which he makes his request to Philemon. Apparently for Paul, all those whom he "birthed" in Christ, whether collective groups such as his churches or individuals like Onesimus or even Philemon himself (Phlm 19), he regarded as his apostolic responsibility. Paul's relationship with Timothy may also be relevant here (Phil 2:2; 1 Cor 4:17).

⁴⁸ Bowers, "Fulfilling the Gospel," 198. See also David Peterson, "Maturity: The Goal of Mission," in *Gospel to the Nations: Perspectives on Paul's Mission* (eds. by Peter Bolt and Mark Thompson; Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 2000), 185–204, and James P. Ware, *The Mission*

his apostolic care for his churches strongly shapes his fear of their possible failure and, as we hope to demonstrate in our analysis of Paul's references to Satan in the following chapters, has profound implications for how he perceived and characterized inimical opposition to his apostolic labor. But first we will conclude our discussion of Paul's relationship to his churches by considering his fear of laboring for them in vain.

4.3.2 Paul's Fear of his Apostolic Labor being "in vain"

Paul not only deeply cared for his churches and afforded himself a key role in their maturation, but, knowing the difficulties which these fledgling communities faced, worried about their spiritual health. Paul was fully aware that the founding of Christian communities did not guarantee their successful outcome. In this section we will look at places in his letters where Paul speaks of his concern for the welfare of the churches which he founded. Following this section we will address how Paul's care for his churches, including his fear of their downfall, shaped how he perceived, and ultimately depicted in his letters, opposition to his apostolic labor—including that of Satan.

4.3.2.1 Pauline Language for Apostolic Labor

Paul's efforts to achieve his goals as a preacher of the gospel, pioneer missionary, and pastor of his churches are often denoted in his letters by his use of the term κόπος and its cognate κοπιῶ which carry connotations of arduous or burdensome labor. As we suggested above, the aim of Paul's κόπος, his apostolic labor, was to preach the gospel, establish faith-communities in key cities in the Mediterranean world, and then to nurture these congregations as they grew in their faith. All of this activity is summed up in Paul's language of apostolic "labor," which is most commonly represented by κόπ–language, but also by the noun ἔργον (as well as its

of the Church in Paul's Letter to the Philippians in the Context of Ancient Judaism (NovTSup 210; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 210–15.

cognate ἐργάζομαι).⁴⁹ These terms, then, come to refer to Paul’s “evangelical activity”⁵⁰ (as well as that of others⁵¹) to fulfill his “doppelte Auftrag,” including, but not limited to, his extensive missionary travels, the preaching of the gospel to Jews and Gentiles, the practice of writing letters, and the collection for the poor.⁵²

Although Paul undoubtedly believed that his “doppelte Auftrag” as an apostle was God-given (e.g., Gal 1:1, 11–12) and, moreover, that it was God who worked through him in order to win the obedience of the Gentiles (Rom 15:18; cf. 1 Cor 15:10), he nevertheless believed that the achievement of his two-fold apostolic task was not assured of a positive outcome.⁵³ In his aim to preach the gospel, Paul continually pressed onward to new territory and new people with whom to share his gospel (e.g., Rom 1:15; 15:20, 23–29; 2 Cor 10:15–16). In particular, he seems to have set his eyes on Spain as a pivotal location for the spreading of the gospel. As for the fledgling churches scattered throughout the regions of Asia Minor, Achaia, and Macedonia, Paul’s genuine concern for their welfare remained constant throughout his missionary career. Indeed, as Paul himself writes at the climax of one of his hardship lists, “besides other things, I am under daily pressure (ἐπίστασις⁵⁴)

⁴⁹ Abraham J. Malherbe claims that ἔργον only rhetorically differs from κόπος in the Pauline letters (*The Letters to the Thessalonians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* [AB 32B; New York, 2000], 311).

⁵⁰ Malherbe, *The Letters to the Thessalonians*, 311; cf. 195. Malherbe notes that Paul also uses the term to refer to both “his hard, physical labor” (e.g., 1 Cor 4:12) and his evangelical activity (e.g., 1 Cor 15:10). See also Adolf von Harnack, “Κόπος (Κοπιᾶν, Οἱ Κοπιῶντες) im frühchristlichen Sprachgebrauch,” *ZNW* 27 (1928): 1–10.

⁵¹ Paul also uses the term to refer to the Christian labor of others: Rom 16:6, 12; 1 Cor 15:58 (?); 16:16; 1 Thess 5:12; cf. Acts 20:35; Col 1:29; 2 Thess 3:8; 1 Tim 4:10; 5:17; Rev 2:2, 3. See also 2 *Clem.* 7:1; *Barn.* 19:10;

⁵² So Efrain Agosto (“Paul and Commendation,” in *Paul in the Greco-Roman World: A Handbook* [ed. J. Paul Sampley; Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 2003], 101–33): “While we cannot determine from the term itself what specific aspect of gospel work Paul refers to, the emphasis in the most frequent translation of *kopos*—‘hard work’—lies on the *effort* of those who labor for the gospel” (112, italics original).

⁵³ Judith M. Gundry-Volf rightly emphasizes that for Paul, the effectiveness of the gospel and its saving power is never in question, though the fruitfulness of his missionary activity is (*Paul and Perseverance: Staying in and Falling Away* [Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press, 1991]), 267–68.

⁵⁴ In the NT the noun ἐπίστασις occurs only here and in Acts 24:12 where it is used in a different sense.

because of my anxiety (μέριμνα⁵⁵) for all the churches” (2 Cor 11:28).⁵⁶ Paul’s hope for the success of his churches is therefore mirrored by his equally intense concern for his churches and their possible failure. In the words of Gundry-Volf: “Paul’s confidence in the successful outcome of God’s saving work through the gospel thus stands side by side with his fear of laboring in vain and losing the attestation to his faithful service which his converts will provide on the day of Christ. His confidence and fear mutually interpret each another.”⁵⁷

4.3.2.2 Paul’s Fear of Laboring “in vain”

This concern is often expressed by Paul with reference to his fear that his apostolic labor might be ruined by the failure of his churches. In particular, Paul often writes of his hope that his κόπος would not be “in vain.”⁵⁸ For example, Paul expresses to the Galatians his concern that because they turned back to the “weak and poor spirits” (στοιχεῖα) by observing “special days, and months, and seasons, and years,” that he has therefore labored (κεκοπίακα) for them “in vain” (εἰκῆ, Gal 4:11).⁵⁹ In Phil 2:16 Paul writes of his desire to boast on the day of Christ that he has

⁵⁵ The term μέριμνα is found only here in the Pauline corpus (cf. Matt 13:22; Mark 4:19; Luke 8:14; 21:34; 1 Pet 5:7). In the Septuagint, uses of μέριμνα include the psalmist urging his reader to “cast your burden/anxiety (μέριμναν) on the Lord and he will sustain you” (LXX Ps 54:23) as well as several references in Sirach to the stresses of ordinary life (Sir 30:24; 31:1–2; 38:29; 42:9).

⁵⁶ The translation of Murray J. Harris (*The Second Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* [eds. I. Howard Marshall and Donald A. Hagner; NIGTC; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2005]) captures Paul’s sense well: “Not to mention other things, there is what presses on me every day — my anxiety for all the churches” (810). Harris also rightly points out that the Greek text (πασῶν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν) can be understood in a possessive sense to refer only to those churches which Paul founded: “all our congregations” (ibid., 812). But he also stresses that Paul, despite his preoccupation with “pioneer evangelism,” was concerned with other churches given that he wrote to the Roman churches (as well as to those in Colossae and Laodicea if Colossians is regarded as genuinely Pauline [Col 4:16]). Harris aptly sums up the most likely scope of πασῶν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν: “We conclude that although the primary reference in πασῶν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν is to churches in which Paul exercised pastoral care, a wider reference to other Christian congregations should not be excluded” (ibid., 813).

⁵⁷ Similarly, Gundry-Volf, *Paul and Perseverance*, 268.

⁵⁸ For more on the terminology related to Paul’s fear of futile apostolic work, see Gundry-Volf, *Paul and Perseverance*, 262–71. See also Carl J. Bjerkelund, “Vergeblich,” 175–91; Seyoon Kim, *The Origin of Paul’s Gospel* (WUNT 2/4; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1981), 288–96; I. Howard Marshall, *Kept by the Power of God: A Study of Perseverance and Falling Away* (London: Epworth, 1969), 90–119.

⁵⁹ εἰκῆ is used similarly in Gal 3:4 and 1 Cor 15:2.

neither run in vain (εἰς κενὸν ἔδραμον) nor labored in vain (εἰς κενὸν ἔκοπίασα).⁶⁰ And in 1 Thess 3:5, a passage to which we will return to in greater detail in the next chapter, we find this “anxiety” directly related to a reference to Satan as Paul informs the Thessalonians that his purpose in sending Timothy to visit them was because he was “afraid that somehow the tempter (ὁ πειράζων) had tempted you and that our labor (κόπος) had been in vain” (εἰς κενόν).⁶¹

Even where the terms κόπος or ἔργον (or their cognates) do not feature, there are several passages in which Paul expresses his fear that his missionary labor might be futile. In Gal 2:2, for example, Paul claims that his trip to Jerusalem—in which he presented his gospel to the Gentiles to the Jerusalem leaders—was to ensure that he was “not running, or had not run, in vain” (εἰς κενόν).⁶² Later in the letter Paul questions whether the “foolish” Galatians experienced the Spirit for nothing (εἰκῆ, Gal 3:4). In 1 Cor 15:2, Paul warns the Corinthians of the possibility of their faith becoming “in vain,” a concern which runs throughout much of the chapter (cf. vv. 14, 17, 58).⁶³ Similarly, Paul urges the Corinthians not to receive (δέξασθαι) the grace of God “in vain” (εἰς κενόν, 2 Cor 6:1). Even from a brief overview of these texts, it is clear that although Paul hoped his apostolic work would succeed, he genuinely feared that his churches might fail and, ipso facto, that his labor for them might become “in vain.”

How are we to make sense of Paul’s “in vain” statements? In a 1977 essay Carl J. Bjerkelund investigated the “in vain” (Vergeblich) terminology within the Pauline corpus. In the essay Bjerkelund draws a distinction between the mundane and formal usage of the terminology in Hellenistic sources⁶⁴ and examines similar language in

⁶⁰ See also the use of τρέχω in 1 Cor 9:24, 26; Gal 2:2; 5:7; cf. Heb 12:1. For more on the use of this term in Paul, see Victor C. Pfitzner, *Paul and the Agon Motif: Traditional Athletic Imagery in the Pauline Literature* (NovTSup 16; Leiden: Brill, 1967).

⁶¹ For equivalent uses of the expression εἰς κενός, see LXX Lev 26:20; Job 39:16; Isa 29:8; 45:18; 65:23; Jer 6:29; 28:58; cf. Deut 32:47.

⁶² Gundry-Volf suggests that Paul here is concerned that the authority of his gospel will be undermined by Judaizers (*Paul and Perseverance*, 265–66).

⁶³ In 1 Cor 15:2, 10, 14, and 58 κενός is used; in v. 17 μάταιος is employed (cf. 1 Cor 3:20). At end of the chapter Paul refers to the Corinthians’ labor with similar hope: “Therefore, my beloved, be steadfast, immovable, always excelling in the work of the Lord (τῷ ἔργῳ τοῦ κυρίου), because you know that in the Lord your labor is not in vain (ὁ κόπος ὑμῶν οὐκ ἔστιν κενός, v. 58).”

⁶⁴ Bjerkelund, “Vergeblich,” 178.

the Septuagintal and midrashic literature, the latter of which he suggests is closest to Paul's usage.⁶⁵ More specifically, Bjerkelund asserts that LXX Isa 49:4 and 49:8 are the key Hebrew Bible texts for interpreting Paul's "in vain" references.⁶⁶ For like the Isaianic servant who was called (ἐκάλεισεν) by God from the womb (ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου, LXX Isa 49:1) to be a light to the nations (φῶς ἐθνῶν, v. 6), Paul likewise believed God had set him apart (ἀφορίσας) from his mother's womb (ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου) and called him (καλέσας) in order to preach to the Gentiles (Gal 1:15–16). Furthermore, Paul regarded his ministry as being carried out in the eschatological "day of salvation" (ἐν ἡμέρᾳ σωτηρίας/שְׁוֹעַת הַיּוֹם) of Isaiah 49:8 (2 Cor 6:2). With these Isaianic resonances in mind, it is impossible to overlook the similarities of Paul's "in vain" terminology in comparison to the Servant who, although called to be an instrument of God's plan, fears he has "labored in vain" (κενῶς ἐκοπίασα, LXX Isa 49:4).⁶⁷

How does this then relate to Paul's use of "in vain" terminology? Gundry-Volf, building on Bjerkelund's interpretation of the relevant LXX verses, contends that the aforementioned LXX texts "parallel Paul's viewing his labor for the gospel from the perspective of the eschaton."⁶⁸ For Paul, then, to labor "in vain" is to produce "nothing of eternal value, of eschatological significance,"⁶⁹ as can be seen in 1 Cor 15:2; 2 Cor 6:2; Phil 2:16; Gal 2:2; 4:4; 1 Thess 3:5. Of these verses, Phil 2:16 is particularly instructive. Gundry-Volf comments:

In Phil 2:16 the eschatological dimension of Paul's statements about laboring in vain becomes explicit. As he hopes for a successful ministry in Philippi—that "I have not run in vain or labored in vain"—he anticipates the result of being able to

⁶⁵ According to Gundry-Volf's summary of Bjerkelund, "The midrashic commentaries on some of these occurrences of κενός and cognates in the LXX bring out the eschatological overtones even more by relegating what is 'in vain' to this age and by associating the coming age with all that is not 'in vain'" (*Paul and Perseverance*, 263; cf. Bjerkelund, "Vergeblich," 179–82).

⁶⁶ So Gundry-Volf, *Paul and Perseverance*, 263; also important in Bjerkelund's study are LXX Isa 65:23 and Deut 32:47.

⁶⁷ Bjerkelund argues that Isa 49:4, 8, as well as other places in the LXX where εἰς κενόν appears, suggests "in vain" language, had eschatological overtones. Additionally, he claims that the midrashic literature shares a similar understanding of "in vain" language: "Aus dem Midrasch geht ebenfalls deutlich hervor, dass »vergeblich«, »leer«, als eschatologischer Begriff verstanden wird" ("Vergeblich," 181).

⁶⁸ Gundry-Volf, *Paul and Perseverance*, 263.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 263–64.

“boast at the day of Christ.” ... If the exemplary converts described in Phil 2:14–16a do indeed come into being through Paul’s ministry, he will have something to boast about when the day of reckoning for God’s servants comes. The opposite will be the case, however, if his efforts have no lasting effects in God’s kingdom. He would miss God’s ultimate approval, having lost his *καύχημα*, by laboring in vain. (Gundry-Volf, 264)

Paul’s use of “in vain” language thus signifies that he not only feared the corrosion of his churches might result in personal failure, but that it might deprive him of his ability to boast in the eschaton. Or, in the language and imagery of 1 Cor 3, that Paul’s work for his churches would be burned up and, as a result, without (eschatological) reward (*μισθός*, 1 Cor 3:14).

In all this Gundry-Volf and Bjerkelund have cogently demonstrated that Paul’s “in vain” terminology has an eschatological telos. That is, Paul desires for his labor to be fruitful in the present age so that he might reap its harvest in the age to come. I would add, however, that the reason Paul’s language has eschatological connotations is precisely because his eschatological hopes were rooted in his calling as an apostle. More specifically, I suggest that what Paul feared above all else was the failure of the two aspects of his *doppelte Auftrag*.

This can be demonstrated by looking at two passages from Paul’s letters which we have previously noted, though now for a different purpose. First, in 1 Cor 9:15–18 Paul asserts *the necessity of preaching* for his apostleship by referring to the preaching of the gospel (*εὐαγγελίζομαι*) as an “obligation” (*ἀνάγκη*) which has been laid upon him. Paul’s point in the passage is that his labor is not voluntary or else he would have right to “pay” or a “reward” (*μισθός*) since it would then be of his own will (v. 17).⁷⁰ Instead Paul wholeheartedly regards his apostolic task as a commission (*οἰκονομία*) that has been entrusted (*πιστεύω*) to him (v. 17) by God. To fail in preaching the gospel would therefore result in God’s judgment: “woe to me if I do not preach the gospel” (*οὐαὶ γάρ μοί ἐστιν ἐὰν μὴ εὐαγγελίσωμαι*, v. 16). By preaching the gospel without taking pay, however, Paul fulfills his apostolic commission and gains ground for boasting (vv. 15–16). In relation to the present study, the point to be made here is that Paul regarded the task of preaching the gospel

⁷⁰ As Fee notes, *ἀνάγκη* is “intended to be understood metaphorically as ‘pay’” (*Corinthians*, 420).

as a compulsory requirement of his apostleship. By failing to preach the gospel—or doing so of his own accord—Paul knows that his labor would be in vain since it could not result in eschatological boasting.

Second, Paul likewise considered *the founding and nurturing of churches* to be an integral responsibility to his apostolic calling with eschatological significance. Consequently, one of Paul’s greatest fears was that his churches would fail and thus make his labor for them futile. This can be most clearly observed in Phil 2:16, which we considered above in terms of the eschatological connotations of Paul’s “in vain” language.⁷¹ Here we return to the verse in order to show that Paul’s hope of eschatological boasting is rooted in his apostolic task to ensure the faithfulness of his churches. In the passage Paul claims that the only way for him to not run (τρέχω) or labor (κοπιᾶω) in vain is if the Philippians hold fast to the word of life (λόγον ζωῆς), namely, the gospel which Paul preached to them.⁷²

Paul’s eschatological hopes and his apostolic calling therefore go hand in hand. Indeed, as Phil 2:16 makes clear, Paul considered his two main apostolic tasks—preaching the gospel and caring for his churches—to be inextricably linked in both his calling and eschatological hopes: as the Philippians hold fast to the gospel which Paul first preached to them, Paul will be able to boast on the day of Christ. Paul’s hope of boasting before God was thus nothing less than his hope of successful laboring to fulfill his two-fold calling from God. Conversely, Paul feared being deprived of his eschatological boast since it would mean failing, at least in part, to fulfill his apostolic calling.

⁷¹ Cf. 2 Cor 10:12–18 where Paul connects the notion of territorial apostleship and eschatological boasting.

⁷² So Hawthorne and Martin (*Philippians*, 146): “The expression λόγον ζωῆς, ‘word of life,’ coming first in the sentence, has the emphatic position and refers not to Christ as the Word, the Logos (John 1:1, 4, 14), but to the gospel that Paul preached, which the Philippians heard and believed and by which they had received the life of God (cf. Acts 16:32).” Cf. Peter T. O’Brien, *The Epistle to the Philippians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans; Exeter: Paternoster, 1991), 297–98.

4.4 Opposition to Paul's Apostolic Labor

Out of the two primary tasks of his apostleship, Paul seems to have been especially concerned for his churches. Laurie Woods thus rightly comments that Paul's greatest fear was the erosion of faith in his church communities, "which alone would render his work useless."⁷³ In light of our analysis of the significance of Paul's churches for his apostleship (§4.2) as well as Paul's fear of the failure of his churches (§4.3), I propose that Paul perceived all opposition to his evangelical activity—both that related to the preaching of the gospel and working among churches during his missionary travels—within the context of his apostolic labor for the gospel and his churches, and thus as a threat to his apostleship. Paul's apostolic care for his churches therefore functions as the interpretive background necessary for understanding how Paul construed and portrayed opposition to his labor, and especially that of Satan.

Paul's understanding of Satan as an opponent of his apostolic labor is therefore born out of his sense of apostolic responsibility for his churches. As we will aim to demonstrate in the subsequent chapters, Paul's characterization of Satan in his writings reflects this view of Satan. This is because throughout the letters which Paul wrote to his churches, he consistently portrays Satan's activity as opposition to his churches and, by the same token, as opposition to his apostolic labor. Therefore it seems that the reason Paul believed that Satan opposed him was not because he cast himself as "the afflicted righteous one, who is mocked by the devil's allies,"⁷⁴ but because he had been commissioned with the significant task of preaching the gospel and establishing communities of faith among the nations.

⁷³ Laurie Woods, "Opposition to a Man and His Message: Paul's 'Thorn in the Flesh' (2 Cor 12:7)," *ABR* 39 (1991): 44–53 (50). Similarly, Malherbe speaks of Paul's anxiety for his churches (2 Cor 11:28) as Paul's "chief apostolic hardship" (*Paul and the Thessalonians: The Philosophic Tradition of Pastoral Care* [Philadelphia, Penn.: Fortress Press, 1987], 61).

⁷⁴ Susan R. Garrett, "The God of this World and the Affliction of Paul: 2 Cor 4:1–12," in *Greeks, Romans, and Christians: Essays in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe* (ed. David L. Balch; Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress Press, 1990), 99–117 (101). According to Garrett's essay, in which she examines Paul's depiction of his opposition in the context of Hellenistic philosophy, Paul casts himself as the righteous one opposed by, not the devil himself, but the devil's allies (*ibid.*, 116–17). Garrett's analysis is, on the one hand, helpful in that she illustrates how Paul understood Satan to work through human servants (e.g., 2 Cor 11:12–15), but, on the other hand, limited in that she presents Paul's view of Satan vis-à-vis his apocalyptic eschatology but not in relation to his apostleship.

Paul's view of Satan as an adversary of his apostleship gains additional gravitas when we recall Satan's place within Paul's apocalyptic theology, which we discussed in the previous chapter. There we noted how Satan, between the apocalyptic events of the cross and judgment day, functions as the preeminent evil figure at work in the world. According to Pauline theology, therefore, there was no greater hostile power, force, or figure which could have opposed Paul and his ministry. It is thus Satan, the apocalyptic adversary of this age—indeed, its “god” (2 Cor 4:4)—whom Paul fears will corrupt his basis for eschatological boasting in the next age. And just as Paul reminded the Roman believers that God would soon vanquish Satan once and for all (Rom 16:20), he too must have clung tightly to the hope of a day when Satan no longer troubled his work in the Lord, when he could finally finish his race and lay claim to his prize (1 Cor 9:24–27; Phil 3:12–16).

But what might have led to Paul's belief that he, the “least” of all the apostles (1 Cor 15:9), would be opposed by such a significant and powerful opponent? For as Paul makes clear by claiming to be fully aware of Satan's designs or schemes (τὰ νοήματα, 2 Cor 2:11),⁷⁵ Satan's activity was not carried out haphazardly but methodically and against intentional targets. So, to rephrase the question, what reason, if any, can we give for Paul's depiction of Satan in his letters as an adversary of his apostolic labor? The answer, it seems, is that Paul believed that he had been entrusted with a unique role in spreading the gospel throughout the then known-world. Although Paul describes himself as one “abnormally born” (ἐκτρώμα) and unfit (ἰκανός) to be called an apostle, he also claims to have labored harder than all the other apostles (περισσότερον αὐτῶν πάντων ἐκοπίασα, 1 Cor 15:10) and to have “greater labors” (ἐν κόποις περισσοτέρως, 2 Cor 11:23) than his Corinthian rivals.

But how does Paul's role within God's plan help account for his view of Satan as his adversary? Here it is important to recall our earlier analysis of the increasingly popular theological and literary phenomenon in Second Temple Jewish writings of incorporating a Satan-like figure into sections of rewritten Scripture. In those

⁷⁵ Cf. the use of νόημα (“designs”) in 2 Cor 3:14; 4:4; 10:5; 11:3. For more on 2 Cor 2:11, see below, §6.5.

passages there are two salient aspects which frequently, though not uniformly, occur: Satan opposes (1) *key figures or servants* of God (e.g., Abraham, Job, Moses and Aaron) and (2) at *pivotal moments* in Israel's history (e.g., the binding of Isaac, the Exodus, David's census of Israel).

Paul too considered himself to be living at a—if not *the*—crucial moment in the history of God's people. The present era is, as Paul calls it, the time when “the end of the ages” (τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰώνων) has arrived (1 Cor 10:11). During this period, the juncture of the two ages, Paul therefore carries out his work for the gospel with “a sense of eschatological urgency.”⁷⁶ And Paul considers his task as the apostle to the Gentiles to have considerable significance for God's plan. By way of example, in Romans 11 we find what is perhaps the most theologically articulated example of Paul's self-understanding. In this passage Paul, as the apostle to the gentiles (ἔθνῶν ἀπόστολος, Rom 11:13), assigns himself a primary role in bringing about the “fullness of the Gentiles” (τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν, Rom 11:25) which will ultimately lead to the salvation of “all Israel” (πᾶς Ἰσραήλ, Rom 11:26; cf. 11:11=τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτῶν).⁷⁷ This role, which Paul carried out by preaching the gospel and founding churches in various cities around the Mediterranean basin, demonstrates that Paul regarded his apostolic *task*—though not necessarily himself—as unique and highly significant for God's plan of salvation.

If we are right in positing a theological outlook within Second Temple Judaism and early Christianity which regarded Satan as an active figure within history, then it is not at all surprising that Paul would have considered the possibility of, or even expected, Satan's opposition to his labor, his κόπος. On the basis of 2 Cor 2:11 alone we know that Paul at least anticipated Satan's malevolent activity among his churches. Furthermore, as we see in 1 Thess 2:18, Paul was prepared to ascribe

⁷⁶ Terence L. Donaldson, *Paul and the Gentiles: Remapping the Apostle's Convictional World* (Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress Press, 1997), 259.

⁷⁷ Commenting on this same passage, Seyoon Kim describes Paul's apostleship as “the decisive instrument for the salvation of ‘all Israel’ as well, indeed for the whole saving plan of God that he calls ‘the mystery’ (τὸ μυστήριον, Rom. 11.25–26)” (“Paul as an Eschatological Herald,” in *Paul as Missionary: Identity, Activity, Theology, and Practice* [eds. Trevor J. Burke and Brian S. Rosner; LNTS 420; London; New York: T&T Clark International, 2011], 9–24) (23).

concrete actions in space and time to the hand of Satan.⁷⁸ Paul does so, I propose, because he believed that his apostleship was pivotal in spreading the gospel at a crucial point in salvation history, and that Satan therefore opposed his apostolic labor in order to frustrate the work of God in the present age.

4.5 Conclusion

Before we turn to the references to Satan in the Pauline letters in the following chapters, we will conclude the present chapter by recapitulating its findings.

- 1) Paul's did not regard his churches as hindrances or nuisances to his missionary work and apostolic calling. Rather, he considered them to be one of the two main focal points of his career as a pioneer missionary and, as such, essential to his calling from God. Thus, far from preventing Paul from completing his apostolic task, Paul's churches represent the success of his efforts to spread the gospel and establish communities of faith.
- 2) As the founding apostle of communities of faith, Paul regarded the faith and spirituality of his churches as his apostolic responsibility. As such, Paul's churches carried the potential both to attest to the validity of his apostolic labor and to prove its failures. In this sense we can speak of a reciprocal relationship between Paul and his churches: he toils to ensure their unity and maturation, and they serve as evidence that Paul has faithfully labored to complete his God-given duties as an apostle to the Gentiles.
- 3) Because Paul considered his churches to be absolutely essential to his calling as an apostle, one of his greatest fears was their failure. Accordingly, Paul's anxiety for churches such as those in Galatia and Corinth (e.g., 2 Cor 11:28) not only arose out of his relationship to them as a fellow-believer or friend, but as their founding apostle who exercised apostolic authority over them and for whose faith he was accountable to God.

⁷⁸ Similarly, see Garrett's remark concerning 2 Cor 4:4 ("The God of this World," 107): "Paul implies that he is able to detect the diabolical spirit behind human opponents."

4) Paul's apostolic responsibility for his churches provides the interpretative context in which to comprehend Paul's references to Satan. As we will demonstrate in the subsequent chapters, again and again in his letters Paul depicts the apocalyptic figure of Satan as an adversary to his apostolic labor for his churches. This is why Paul is primarily concerned with the *present* activity of Satan and rarely speaks of the eschatological fate of Satan. For Paul, Satan is not a figure of mythic past as in *1 Enoch*; instead, Paul sees Satan as an active force who, although doomed to destruction in the future, is able to inflict serious harm to his churches and missionary efforts in the here and now.

Chapter Five

PAUL'S REFERENCES TO SATAN: ROMANS AND 1 THESSALONIANS

5.1 Introduction

In both Paul's earliest and one of his latest letters—1 Thessalonians and Romans, respectively—we find at least one reference to the figure of Satan. The nature and the function of these references, however, are markedly different in the two letters. Whereas earlier, in his letter to the church in Thessalonica, Paul described Satan's *present* activity against his travel plans and against the Thessalonians themselves, the only place Paul where Paul mentions Satan in Romans is within a *future*, eschatological context. In this chapter we will turn to our primary research question (how and why does Paul refer to Satan in his letters to his churches?) by examining Paul's three references to Satan in these two letters: Rom 16:20, 1 Thess 2:18, and 3:5. Under the presumption that these verses are intelligible in light of the findings of the previous chapters, I will argue that Paul's reference to Satan in Romans is best understood in light of Paul's apocalyptic theology—in particular his apocalyptic interpretation of the death and resurrection of Christ—which we analyzed in Chapter 3, and that the references to Satan in 1 Thessalonians are borne out of Paul's understanding of his apostolic responsibility for his churches, which was the focus of Chapter 4.

We will begin our examination of the Pauline texts with Rom 16:20, the first Pauline reference to Satan in canonical order, though it may be the last one in chronological order.¹ From there we will turn to the two references to Satan in Paul's early letter to the Thessalonians. In both sections we will aim to determine the exegetical meaning of the passages as well as their significance for Paul's wider understanding of Satan, especially as they relate to Paul's apocalyptic theology and his apostolic mission. The remainder of the Pauline references to Satan, all of which

¹ Romans, written in the latter stages of Paul's missionary career, is typically dated to within a year or two of 57 C.E. (so Douglas J. Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans* [NICNT; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1996], 3). Gerd Lüdemann diverges from the majority position by proposing a notably earlier date (*Paul: Apostle to the Gentiles: Studies in Chronology* [Philadelphia, Penn.: Fortress Press, 1984], 263).

occur within the Corinthian correspondence, will be considered in the following chapter.²

5.2 Romans 16:20³

5.2.1 Introduction

In Paul's letter to the Romans there are a number of passages in which, given their theological content, one might expect the apostle to refer to Satan. For instance, it has been suggested that Paul "logically could have invoked the name of Satan"⁴ in Romans 8:38–39 as one of the forces unable "to separate us from the love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord." Likewise, Rom 5:12–21 is claimed to implicitly assume "the work of the devil."⁵ Yet in neither of these texts does Paul employ the common terms for the figure of Satan, such as σατανᾶς, διάβολος, or ὁ πειράζων. Thus, although arguments for implicit allusions to Satan within such passages can be marshalled, the fact remains that Paul's letter to Rome contains just one explicit reference to Satan, Rom 16:20a: "the God of peace will shortly crush Satan under your feet."⁶

Furthermore, two observations distinguish the reference to Satan in Rom 16:20 from Paul's other allusions to the figure. First, unlike the other undisputed Pauline letters addressed to churches, Paul wrote Romans to a Christian community which he did not found and to believers with whom he was not familiar. Accordingly, Paul's relationship to the letter's recipients and his purpose in writing to them are comparatively different from his other letters to churches. Second, Rom 16:20 is the only place in his letters where Paul explicitly mentions the eschatological fate of

² The division of our analysis of the references to Satan within the undisputed Pauline letters into two separate chapters is admittedly artificial. It is necessary, however, in order to discuss the Corinthian references to Satan within a single chapter and to prevent any one chapter from becoming too lengthy.

³ In this section I will be drawing on my article, "The God of Peace Will Shortly Crush Satan under Your Feet': Paul's Eschatological Reminder in Romans 16:20a," *Neot* 44.1 (2010): 1–14.

⁴ Lee A. Johnson, "Satan Talk in Corinth: The Rhetoric of Conflict," *BTB* 29 (1999): 145–55 (146).

⁵ Richard H. Bell, *Deliver Us from Evil: Interpreting the Redemption from the Power of Satan in New Testament Theology* (WUNT 216; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 232–35.

⁶ Although the part of the verse with which we are concerned only constitutes the first half (20a), throughout the remainder of the chapter we will nonetheless refer to the entire verse.

Satan, though, as we suggested in chapter 3, other passages occasionally assume or allude to it. As we hope to demonstrate in this chapter, these two points show how Rom 16:20 differs from Paul's other references to Satan in both purpose and content.

5.2.2 *The Epistolary Context of Romans 16:20*

Although there is a level of uncertainty regarding the authenticity of Romans 16,⁷ perhaps the most difficult interpretive matter concerning the section of Rom 16:17–20 is its unexpected content and tone. As most commentators highlight, these verses come as something of a surprise within the flow of the letter due to their abrupt shift from the previous text and the critical nature of their content.⁸ Whereas Paul's tone has been largely irenic in the first fifteen chapters of Romans as well as in the previous verses of chapter 16, in 16:17–20 he offers unanticipated words of warning and admonition, the only such passage within the letter. Moreover, throughout the letter Paul's aim has been to clarify and explain his gospel to the Roman believers, whereas in Rom 16:17–20 the focus shifts from a theological explication of the gospel to a warning of outside influences, a subject typically more characteristic of the letters Paul wrote to his own churches over whom he exercised a certain level of apostolic authority.

⁷ For an overview of the various reasons the authenticity of Romans 16 has been called into question, see Peter Stuhlmacher, *Paul's Letter to the Romans: A Commentary* (trans. Scott J. Hafemann; Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press, 1994), 244–46. Most problematic is the textual evidence from \mathfrak{P}^{46} , which places the final doxology—located at Rom 16:25–27 in the NA²⁷—between chapters 15 and 16 of the letter (on the location of the doxology in various manuscripts, see Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* [2d ed.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994], 470–73.). This ordering of the text raises the possibility of both a fifteen-chapter version of Romans (minus chapter 16) and that chapter 16 may have circulated as an independent letter—with Ephesus as its most probable destination—before being joined together with chapters 1–15 (on the suggestion that chapter 16 was originally a separate letter, see Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Romans* [AB 33; New York: Doubleday, 1993], 59–61). Despite the evidence from \mathfrak{P}^{46} , however, Harry Gamble is right to assert that the manuscript “remains a single witness and cannot carry the case for the originality of the fifteen-chapter text form by itself” (Harry Y. Gamble, *The Textual History of the Letter to the Romans: A Study in Textual and Literary Criticism* [SD 42; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1977], 53). In the absence of further external evidence to support either a hypothetical fifteen-chapter Romans letter or chapter 16 as a separate letter, our analysis of Rom 16:20 will proceed by positing Romans 16 as an original part of the letter and as a product of the Apostle Paul.

⁸ Furthermore, it has been argued that Rom 16:17–20 is not only a non-Pauline addition to the letter but actually an *anti-Pauline* interpolation (Robert Jewett, *Romans: A Commentary* [Hermeneia; Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress Press, 2007], 986–88).

As unexpected as this section might seem, however, there are two main points which help clarify the ostensibly incongruent character of vv. 17–20. First, even if one accepts a certain level of discontinuity between Rom 1–15 and 16:17–20, there are explanations which help account for their differences, including the possibility that Paul had received fresh information regarding the Romans to which he was responding and the suggestions that Paul himself wrote this section instead of his amanuensis, Tertius.⁹ Second, as Gamble rightly suggests, vv. 17–20 do not necessarily reflect “a developed state of conflict,”¹⁰ as some have suggested; rather, given the reference to the obedience of the Roman believers in v. 19, the verses may be intended to prevent such a situation from developing.¹¹ If so, this would fit well with Paul’s hope of using Rome as a base for his missionary journey to Spain. For if the Roman believers were divided due to different teaching it would pose a challenge to Paul’s hope for the unified reception of his gospel in Rome. Conversely, if they remain “wise in what is good and guileless in what is evil” (v. 19) and avoid the dissenters mentioned in verse 17, then Paul will be able to fulfill his longstanding desire to have fellowship with the Roman Christians on his way to Spain (Rom 1:10–15; 15:22–24).

In light of the foregoing discussion, and in particular the lack of evidence against the traditional position, our analysis of Rom 16:20 will proceed by positing chapter 16 of Romans as an original part of the letter and as a product of the Apostle Paul while also regarding vv. 17–20 as a pre-emptive, even if generic, warning of a latent situation among the Roman believers.

⁹ On the former point, see C. K. Barrett, *The Epistle to the Romans* (2d ed.; BNTC; London: A. & C. Black, 1991), 284–85; on the latter, see James D. G. Dunn, *Romans 9–16* (WBC 38B; Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 1988), 906.

¹⁰ Gamble, *The Textual History of the Letter to the Romans*, 52.

¹¹ Cf. Ernst Käsemann’s remark: “The enemy has not yet entered the community but is at the doors. Preparing for his attack, the apostle offers the solution” (*Commentary on Romans* [London: SCM Press, 1980], 418).

5.2.3 Background to Romans 16:20

It seems likely that Paul's promise in Rom 16:20 contains a scriptural allusion associated with the Jewish hope of Satan's ultimate demise. Determining which text Paul is drawing upon, however, is a matter disputed by scholars. A number of scholars have identified the language of God "crushing" Satan as an allusion to the "Proto-Evangelium," the idea that in Gen 3:15 God first announced the gospel and the future defeat of Satan (the serpent). Others have suggested that Paul is here alluding to Ps 110:1, a text often interpreted christologically within early Christianity. In this section we will consider these two possibilities since they strongly shape the meaning of Paul's references to God's victory over Satan in Rom 16:20 and, consequently, how we understand Paul's implicit theology behind the reference to Satan's demise.

5.2.3.1 Genesis 3:15 and the "Proto-Evangelium"

The majority of scholars identify Paul's reference to the "crushing" of Satan as an allusion to Genesis 3:15.¹² In the Genesis narrative God curses the serpent for deceiving Eve and Adam and promises that "he [Eve's offspring] will strike your [the serpent's] head" (הוּא יִשׁוּפֵךְ רֹאשׁוֹ). In later Jewish tradition, especially as Satan and the serpent of Genesis 3 were increasingly identified as one and the same,¹³ this text became the basis for the hope of Satan's eschatological defeat. For instance, *T. Sim.* 6:6 reads: "then all the spirits of error shall be given over to being trampled underfoot" (εἰς καταπάτησιν). Similarly, *T. Zeb.* 9:8 declares that "he [the

¹² So C. E. B. Cranfield, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (vol. 2; ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1979), 803; Frédéric Louis Godet, *Commentary on St Paul's Epistle to the Romans* (trans. A. Cusin; vol 2; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1881), 406; Franz J. Leenhardt, *L'Épître de Saint Paul aux Romains* (CNT VI; Neuchâtel: Delachaux, 1957), 217; Peter W. Macky, "Crushing Satan underfoot (Romans 16:20): Paul's Last Battle Story as True Myth," in *Proceedings, Eastern Great Lakes and Midwest Biblical Societies* (Cincinnati, Ohio: Eastern Great Lakes and Midwest Biblical Societies, 1993), 122; Thomas R. Schreiner, *Romans* (BECNT 6; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Books, 1998), 804; Wilckens, *Der Brief an die Römer*, 143; N. T. Wright, "The Letter to the Romans: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections," in *The New Interpreter's Bible: A Commentary in Twelve Volumes* (ed. Leander E. Keck; Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon, 2002), 393–770 (764–65); Gordon J. Wenham, *Genesis 1–15* (WBC 1; Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 1987), 81; cf. Leon Morris, *The Epistle to the Romans* (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1988), 541.

¹³ See above, §2.5.5.

Lord] will liberate every captive of the sons of men from Belial, and every spirit of error will be trampled down” (πατηθήσεται). Among early Christian texts, the Gospel of Luke reflects this tradition in Jesus’ words to the seventy-two upon their return: “I watched Satan fall from heaven like a flash of lightning. See, I have given you authority to tread (πατεῖν) on snakes and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy and nothing will hurt you” (Luke 10:19). In these Jewish and early Christian texts the imagery and language of Genesis 3:15 was considered appropriate for expressing the hope of an ultimate defeat of Satan.¹⁴ If Paul’s reference to the “crushing” of Satan in Rom 16:20 alludes to Genesis 3:15, it would therefore be in continuity with Jewish and early Christian eschatological hopes.¹⁵

There are several reasons, however, to doubt such an allusion to Gen 3:15 in Rom 16:20 as well as its *direct* influence on Paul’s thought. First, Paul’s wording does not follow either the Hebrew or Greek versions of Gen 3:15, which suggests Rom 16:20 does not contain either a citation or echo of the *text* of Genesis in mind.¹⁶ Second, Paul’s verb choice does not seem to fit the possible allusion to Genesis 3. Whereas the MT has the Hebrew verb כָּרַע (“to bruise”) and the LXX confusingly uses τηρέω (“to guard” or “to keep”), Paul employs the more violent συντρίβω (“to crush” or “to break”). Third, if Gen 3:15 is in Paul’s mind here, one would probably expect to find the Greek term for serpent (ὁ ὄφις) instead of ὁ σατανᾶς. Although by the first century C.E. the serpent of the Genesis narrative was commonly identified with the figure of Satan, Paul’s only other allusion to the serpent of Genesis 3 uses the term ὁ ὄφις (2 Cor 11:3), not ὁ σατανᾶς. Finally, although Luke 10:19, Heb 2:14, and Rev 12:7 are cited as additional NT allusions to the “Proto-Evangelium”—none of which are certain allusions—this theological motif is not common in the rest

¹⁴ See also *Jub.* 5:6; 10:7, 11; 23:29; *1 En.* 10:4, 11–12; 13:1–2; *2 En.* 7:1; *T. Mos.* 10:1; 1QS 3:18; 4:18–23; 1QM 1:5; 17:5–6; 18:1–3, 11; *T. Levi* 18:12; *T. Jud.* 25:3; cf. 1QM 13:10–11; *1 En.* 54:6 where God uses a divine agent to defeat a Satan-like figure. Cf. Rev 20:7–10 where the devil is cast into the lake of fire for eternity.

¹⁵ For a recent article on Gen 3:15 and the historical development of the Proto-Evangelium, see Theresia Mende, “Sieger über Satan: Zum glaubensgeschichtlichen Entstehung der Deutung von Gen 3,15 als Protoevangelium,” in *Schöpfungsplan* (Trier: Paulinus Verlag, 2002), 87–121.

¹⁶ To be sure, other possible allusions to Gen 3:15 in Jewish writings also fail to follow its wording closely (Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans*, 932, n. 40). See, e.g., *Jub.* 23:29; *T. Mos.* 10:1; *T. Levi* 18:37; *T. Sim.* 6:6; cf. also the twelfth benediction in the *Shemoneh Esreh*).

of the New Testament writings and conspicuously absent in Paul.¹⁷ If Gen 3:15 has influenced Paul's thought here, it has done so *indirectly* through the broader apocalyptic hope of an ultimate defeat of the evil powers and of Satan being "crushed under foot."¹⁸

5.2.3.2 Psalm 8:7 and 110:1 in Romans 16:20

Rather than reading Rom 16:20 as an allusion to the Genesis narrative and the ancient promise of the crushing of the serpent, what seems to be the case is that Paul is evoking the early Christian appropriation of Ps 110:1 as a means of emphasizing the believer's share in God's defeat over all evil, including Satan and those who oppose the community of faith.¹⁹ This textual allusion is more probable for several reasons. First, Ps 110—at times interpreted in conjunction with Ps 8:7—was the most cited Hebrew Bible text within early Christianity writings.²⁰ Second, Paul alludes to or echoes the text of Ps 110:1 elsewhere within his letters.²¹ This suggests there is a greater likelihood that Paul would have drawn from the language of Ps 110 than the Genesis text. Third, unlike the alleged Gen 3:15 allusion which lacks a clear verbal

¹⁷ Even Godet, who identifies a connection between Gen 3:15 and Rom 16:20, is forced to admit that it is "strange" that no other allusions to "the ancient promise, Gen 3:15," are to be found in the New Testament (*Romans*, 406).

¹⁸ Dunn, *Romans 9–16*, 905. Dunn identifies the following possible allusions: Ps 91:13; *T. Sim.* 6:6. *T. Levi* 18:12; Luke 10:18–19. Käsemann suggests that Gen 3:15 may have been "the starting point" of this tradition but also maintains that to identify an allusion to Gen 3:15 in Rom 16:20 is "much too harmless" (*Romans*, 418).

¹⁹ Those who recognize an allusion to Ps 110:1 include Macky, "Crushing Satan underfoot," 122; David M. Scholer, "'The God of Peace Will Shortly Crush Satan under your Feet' (Romans 16:20a): The Function of Apocalyptic Eschatology in Paul," *ExAud* 6 (1990): 53–61. Both Jewett (*Romans*, 994) and Neil Forsyth (*The Old Enemy: Satan and the Combat Myth* [Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1987], 265–66) mention a possible allusion here.

²⁰ According to Martin Hengel ("Sit at My Right Hand! The Enthronement of Christ at the Right Hand of God and Psalm 110:1," in *Studies in Early Christology* [Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1995], 133), the following twenty-one passages contain at least an allusion to Ps 110:1: Matt 22:44; 26:64; Mark 12:36; 14:62; 16:19; Luke 20:42f.; 22:69; Acts 2:33, 34f.; 5:31; 7:55f.; Rom 8:34f.; 1 Cor 15:25; Eph 1:20; Col 3:1; Heb 1:3, 13; 8:1; 10:12f.; 12:2; 1 Pet 3:22. See also Jacques Dupont, "'Assis à la droite de Dieu': l'interprétation du Ps 110, 1 dans le Nouveau Testament, in *Resurrexit. Actes du Symposium international sur la résurrection de Jésus* (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1974), 340–422; Michel Gourgues, *A la Droite de Dieu: Résurrection de Jésus et Actualisation du Psaume 110:1 Dans le Nouveau Testament* (Paris: J Gabalda, 1978); William R. G. Loader, "Christ at the Right Hand: Ps 110:1 in the New Testament," *NTS* 24, no. 2 (1978): 199–217; Herbert W. I. V. Bateman, "Psalm 110:1 and the New Testament," *BSac* 149, no. 596 (1992): 438–53.

²¹ Rom 8:34; 1 Cor 15:25; cf. Eph 1:20; Col 3:1.

link, the phrase ὑπὸ τοῦς πόδας in Rom 16:20 corresponds directly to the LXX text of Ps 8:7 (LXX 8:6) and 110:1 (LXX 109:1) (ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν/ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν) as well as conceptually to the Hebrew expressions in the respective Psalms (הָרַם לְרַגְלֵי יְהוָה/תַּחַת-רַגְלֵי יְהוָה). In view of these points, the most plausible explanation of the scriptural allusion in Rom 16:20 is that Paul has incorporated both the words and metaphorical imagery of Pss 8 and 110 in order to underscore his reminder of Satan’s assured eschatological demise.

5.2.4 Paul’s Pastoral Adaptation

According to David Hay, early Christians interpreted Ps 110 in a consistent and limited manner “as an oracle about the subjection of Christ’s foes.”²² Keeping in line with this early Christian interpretation of Ps 8:7 and 110:1 we might therefore expect Rom 16:20 to read as follows: “God will soon crush Satan under the *Messiah’s* feet.” However, Paul’s remarkable appropriation of Scripture in Rom 16:20 redirects the focus of the eschatological victory to the Roman believers themselves: “the God of peace will soon crush Satan under *your* feet” (ὑπὸ τοῦς πόδας ὑμῶν).²³ Paul’s use of Ps 8:7 and 110:1 in Rom 16:20 therefore departs from the typical early Christian appropriation of the Psalms to refer to the eschatological subjugation of God’s enemies under the Messiah’s feet. Instead, here Paul claims that God will soon defeat Satan, not under the feet of the risen and exalted Christ, but under the feet of his readers in Rome. What do we make of this difference, and how does it influence our interpretation of Rom 16:17–20?

Paul’s appropriation of Ps 110:1 in Rom 16:20 is unique in that he applies the text to the community of believers. In virtually every other citation of the psalm in early Christian texts enemies are described as being defeated under the feet of the Messiah.²⁴ This is also the case in the two other places within Paul’s letters which

²² David M. Hay, *Glory at the Right Hand: Psalm 110 in Early Christianity* (SBLMS 18; Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon, 1973), 122.

²³ ὁ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης also occurs in Rom 15:33; cf. Rom 15:13. See also 1 Cor 14:33; 2 Cor 13:11; Phil 4:9; 1 Thess 5:23; cf. 2 Thess 3:16; Heb 13:20; LXX Judg 6:23–24.

²⁴ E.g., Matt 22:44; 26:64 par.; Heb 1:3; 10:12–14; 1 Pet 3:22.

allude to Ps 110:1. In Rom 8:34 Paul draws on the early Christian belief that Jesus had been vindicated and exalted to God’s right hand, a conviction often expressed in terms of a christological reading of Ps 110:1.²⁵ In 1 Cor 15:20–28, Paul employs Ps 110:1 in conjunction with Ps 8:7 in order to emphasize the subjection of “all things,” including enemies such as death and Satan, to the Son, and, ultimately, to God the Father so that he “may be all in all” (πάντα ἐν πασιν, v. 28).²⁶ Thus, in both Rom 8:34 and 1 Cor 15:24–28 Paul draws on the words and concepts of Ps 8:7 and 110:1 with reference to the final destruction of God’s enemies. In both passages Paul’s use of the psalm passages is consistent with other uses of these scriptural passages in early Christianity.

So why in Rom 16:20 does Paul envision God’s enemies being crushed under the feet of believers and not the Messiah? The best explanation for the change in pronoun in Paul’s use of Ps 110:1 in Rom 16:20, which shifts the focus of the eschatological scene from Christ to believers, is that Paul has intentionally appropriated the Psalms for his own pastoral purposes in writing to the Roman Christians. One could argue the change in pronoun indicates that Paul might be alluding only to Ps 8 which speaks of humanity’s (שׁוֹמֵר אֶת הָאָדָמָה/ἄνθρωπος) dominion by declaring that God has “put all things under his feet” (כָּל שְׂתֵתָה תַּחֲתֵי רַגְלֵי יְיָ/LXX: πάντα ὑπέταξας ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ, v. 7). But as Ps 8:7–8 (Eng. vv. 6–7) make clear, there the psalmist is concerned with humanity’s dominion over creation. Romans 16:20, on the other hand, looks not backward to creation and humanity’s appointed role as its steward, but rather to the future and to believers’ share in God’s eschatological triumph over his enemies.²⁷

²⁵ According to Hay, both 1 Cor 15:24–28 and Rom 8:31–39 are “broad landscapes of eschatological things” since they address the final defeat of death by appealing to Ps 110:1, and thus Rom 8:34 likely “implies the defeat of enemies” (*Glory at the Right Hand*, 127).

²⁶ Hengel speaks of Ps 8:7 and 110:1 as being “woven together” in 1 Cor 15 (“Sit at my Right Hand,” 163–72). For other examples of this tradition, see Eph 1:20–22; 1 Pet 3:22; cf. Pol. *Phil* 1:1.

²⁷ Excluded, therefore, are interpretations which argue that the crushing of “Satan”—whether taken to mean the devil himself or those mentioned in vv. 17–19—is to take place immediately (Gordon P. Wiles, *Paul’s Intercessory Prayers: The Significance of the Intercessory Prayer Passages in the Letters of St. Paul* [SNTSMS 24; London: Cambridge University Press, 1974], 95; Morris, *Romans*, 541). Furthermore, Moo is right to say that ἐν τάχει does not present a problem for the eschatological interpretation in light of passages such as Rom 13:11–14 (*Romans*, 933, n. 41).

What we find in Rom 16:20, therefore, is an adaptation of the early Christian interpretation of Pss 8 and 110 by Paul in order to meet his own purposes in writing to the Roman churches. Whereas in 1 Cor 15:20–28 Paul drew upon these texts to remind the Corinthians of the timing of God’s reign, here Paul adapts the Psalms in order to remind the Romans of the promise that God’s defeat of Satan will also mean the defeat of those who cause dissensions and offenses within the church.

So how then does Paul’s use of the Psalms function within the letter to the Romans? The primary subject of the immediate section (Rom 16:17–20) is an unidentified group of outsiders who were apparently causing dissension amongst the Roman believers through their teaching, and thereby posing a threat to the unity of the congregations. Having warned the Romans of this threat and cautioned them to avoid such people, in v. 20 Paul adds an eschatological reminder which evokes the Jewish and early Christian hope that all evil powers and enemies, including Satan himself, would one day be defeated by God for once and all. The relevance of that hope for the Romans is that God will “crush” Satan under *their* feet. That is, the Roman believers will share in God’s eschatological victory over his enemies.²⁸ Paul’s extension of Ps 110:1 to believers thus plays a crucial role in this part of Romans as he reminds his readers in this pithy but potent promise of the final outcome of evil, a reminder from which they could take courage knowing that their perseverance against these “teachers” and potential internal division would not be in vain.²⁹ The work of Satan and his servants would not prevail in their midst (cf. 2 Cor 11:13–15).

²⁸ So Käsemann: “God is the victor who destroys Satan ... in such a way that the community shares in the triumph” (*Romans*, 1980, 418; cf. Brendan Byrne, *Romans* [SP 6; Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1996], 278; Moo, *Romans*, 1996, 933).

²⁹ Scholer, “The God of Peace,” 53. See also Eduard Lohse, “Apostolische Ermahnung in Röm 16,17–20,” in *Bleibende Gegenwart des Evangeliums* (eds. Roland Gebauer and Martin Meiser; Marburg: N. G. Elwert Verlag, 2003), 101–08.

5.2.5 Romans 16:20 and Paul's Understanding of Satan

There are two main conclusions we can draw from our above analysis of Rom 16:20 vis-à-vis our discussion of Paul's apocalyptic worldview and his apostleship earlier in Chapters 3–4.

- (1) Paul's expectation of Satan's ultimate defeat by God in the eschaton is fully consonant with his apocalyptic interpretation of the death of Christ. As we noted in Chapter Three,³⁰ God, through Christ's death on the cross and exaltation to the right hand of God, has proleptically judged the powers of this age—fundamentally the apocalyptic power-alliance of sin, death, and the flesh, but also Satan and all “enemies of the cross of Christ” (Phil 3:18)—who now no longer reign as they once did. The promise of this judgment functions as a sign of hope that the powers of “this age,” including its god (2 Cor 4:4), will perish at the end of the present age when Christ destroys every ruler, every authority, and power and puts all his enemies under his feet” (1 Cor 15:24–25).³¹ Paul's confidence in this final judgment yields a hope that God will soon complete his judgment of his enemies and their opposition to the people of God. It is this eschatological confidence, underscored by the scriptural citation in Rom 16:20, to which Paul appeals in order to remind the Romans that God will soon destroy his enemies and realize his universal reign.
- (2) The second conclusion from this section, one which is admittedly more speculative, may provide an explanation as to why Paul does not refer to the work of Satan more frequently in his lengthy letter to the Romans. As we highlighted above, Paul's letters are written predominately to his own churches, with the exception of Romans and Philemon. They are, therefore, letters written by Paul to the churches for whom he not only had great affection but also a sense of apostolic responsibility, which, in turn, resulted in his fear of Satan's destructive activity directed against his churches. The Roman churches, on the

³⁰ See §3.3.2.

³¹ In Paul's eschatology there is little difference between the reigns of God and Christ, and one can even speak of a “functional and conceptual overlap” between God and Jesus in Paul's eschatology (Larry J. Kreitzer, *Jesus and God in Paul's Eschatology* [JSNTSup 19; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987], 165–70).

other hand, were not founded by Paul and therefore were not his apostolic responsibility in the same manner as the churches which he did found.

If our assessment is correct—that in his letters Paul characteristically refers to or warns of Satan’s activity when he fears Satan’s corrosive work against his apostolic labor—then it is at least possible that Paul does not refer to Satan’s *present* activity in his letter to the Romans since they were not his church (i.e., his children through the gospel). Or, to put it more acutely, Paul is not concerned about Satan’s work at Rome vis-à-vis his own apostolic calling/work (κόπος)—though he doubtlessly cared for them as part of the universal body of Christ (e.g., Rom 1:11–13)—precisely because Satan could not threaten his apostolic labor there. Nonetheless, Paul could still draw upon the eschatological hope of Satan’s ultimate defeat when it suited his desire to comfort and encourage the Roman believers.

5.3 1 Thessalonians 2:18 and 3:5

5.3.1 Introduction

In 2 Cor 11:28 Paul writes that he carried out his apostolic labor under the “daily pressure because of my anxiety for all the churches.”³² Paul’s account of his relationship with the Thessalonians church in 1 Thess 2:17–3:10 stands as a vivid example of how Paul was often anxious for the welfare and faith of his congregations. Indeed, despite being written after Timothy’s return with good news regarding the Thessalonian community, Paul’s sense of angst and concern in 1 Thess 2:17–3:10 is impossible to overlook.³³ Furthermore, within this same section of the

³² Regarding the syntax of 2 Cor 11:28, Charles Wanamaker persuasively argues that ἡ μέριμνα stands in exegetical apposition to ἡ ἐπίστασις, yielding the following translation: “What presses on me every day — my anxiety for all the churches” (*The Epistles to the Thessalonians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* [NIGTC; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1990], 811–12).

Although πασῶν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν in 2 Cor 11:28 should probably not be taken to exclude congregations other than his own, given Paul’s concern with pioneer evangelism (Rom 15:20) and his sense of responsibility for the communities which he founded, the *primary* reference in the expression πασῶν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν is probably best understood as Paul’s own churches.

³³ Gordon D. Fee, *The First and Second Letters to the Thessalonians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2009), 104.

letter Paul twice mentions the activity of Satan (1 Thess 2:18 and 3:5), the only such occurrences within the letter.

1 Thessalonians 2:18 and 3:5 are important for the present study in that they are the first passages which fit our contention that Paul's desire to fulfill his apostolic calling—which included nurturing the churches which he founded—is the fundamental context in which to understand his references to Satan. Indeed, as we will see below, Paul's allusion to Satan as “the tempter” (ὁ πειράζων) in 1 Thess 3:5 encapsulates our argument that Paul's references to Satan are shaped by his apostolic relationship to his churches.

In this section we will look at the two references to Satan in 1 Thessalonians, a letter written by Paul to a fledgling community from whom he had been suddenly separated just a short period after he had founded it. Our approach will be first to consider the historical background to 1 Thess 2:17–3:10 since it provides the context in which Paul twice mentions Satan, and then to turn to the meaning and implications of the references to Satan in 1 Thess 2:18 and 3:5.

5.3.2 Background to 1 Thessalonians 2:17–3:10

Although the church at Thessalonica was certainly not the first that Paul founded, it was the recipient of what is likely the earliest extant letter written by the apostle. According to Acts 17:1–9, Paul founded the community in the Macedonian capital during his second missionary journey as he traveled westward from Philippi along the Via Egnatia. Based on the evidence of Paul's letter to the church, he seems to have developed a warm and strong relationship with the community in a relatively short period of time.³⁴ However, Paul was soon forced to leave Thessalonica—possibly due to conflict with a group of Jewish opponents within the city (see Acts

³⁴ Acts claims that Paul preached in the synagogue at Thessalonica for three weeks (17:2), which some have interpreted as suggesting a stay of three weeks within the city. As commentators often point out, however, the reference to “three sabbaths” may only refer to the period in which Paul engaged the Jewish synagogue in Thessalonica, after which he may have continued his ministry in other capacities. This seems more likely the case, especially in light of the multiple gifts sent by the Philippian church to Paul during this time (Phil 4:16), with Paul's stay lasting possibly up to six months (Leon Morris, *The First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians* [rev. ed.; NICNT; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1991], 3).

17:5–11)—from where he then traveled to Berea (Acts 17:10–15) and Athens (1 Thess 2:2–3:1) before finally arriving at Corinth where he wrote the letter now known as 1 Thessalonians.

In the text of 1 Thessalonians Paul describes his initial visit to the city and how he quickly formed an intimate relationship with the believers at Thessalonica.³⁵ In 1 Thess 2:1–12, recalling his and his co-workers' time of ministry at Thessalonica, Paul reminds his readers how they worked day and night (νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας ἐργαζόμενοι, v. 9) and treated each one of the Thessalonians similar to a nurse with her own children (ὡς ἔαν τροφὸς θάλπη τὰ ἑαυτῆς τέκνα, v. 7) and as a father with his children (ὡς ἕνα ἕκαστον ὑμῶν ὡς πατὴρ τέκνα ἑαυτοῦ, v. 11).³⁶ In 2:17 he likens their subsequent separation from the church as to being made orphans (ἀπορφανισθέντες³⁷ ἀφ' ὑμῶν πρὸς καιρὸν ὥρας). Although the separation was only “in person, not in heart” (προσώπῳ οὐ καρδίᾳ)³⁸ and for a temporary period (πρὸς καιρὸν ὥρας), it nevertheless caused the apostle great angst and worry.

So strong was the concern for the community who had become dear to Paul and his co-workers (ἀγαπητοὶ ἡμῖν ἐγενήθητε, 2:8) that Paul made repeated attempts (καὶ ἄπαξ καὶ δίς³⁹) to return to Thessalonica in order to assuage the community's fears and to inquire about their faith. When Paul was unable to return to the city himself, he resolved to send Timothy⁴⁰ instead on behalf of his co-workers to restore

³⁵ Margaret Mitchell highlights the language of fictive kinship used in the letter to describe the relationship between Paul and the Thessalonians (“1 and 2 Thessalonians,” in *The Cambridge Companion to St. Paul* [ed. James D. G. Dunn; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003], 53).

³⁶ Paul also addresses the community as ἀδελφοί some fourteen times in the letter: 1 Thess 1:4; 2:1, 9, 14, 17; 3:7; 4:1, 13; 5:1, 4, 12, 14, 25, 26.

³⁷ As Wanamaker notes, ἀπορφανίζω “was frequently used either of children who had been orphaned or of parents bereaved of their children” (*Thessalonians*, 120).

³⁸ Cf. 2 Cor 5:3; 10:1–2; Col 2:5. Stanley Stowers suggests that this theme was frequent in friendship letters in the ancient Greek and Roman worlds (*Letter Writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity* [LEC 5; Philadelphia, Penn.: Westminster John Knox Press, 1986], 60).

³⁹ On the phrase καὶ ἄπαξ καὶ δίς, see especially Leon Morris, “ΚΑΙ ΑΠΑΞ ΚΑΙ ΔΙΣ,” *NovT* 1, no. 3 (1956): 205–08.

⁴⁰ The debate concerning the seemingly discrepant information in 1 Thessalonians and Acts regarding the locations and travels of Paul's co-workers (especially Timothy) is highly convoluted. For a cogent argument claiming that Timothy was never in Athens with Paul, and thus sent to Thessalonica from elsewhere, see Karl P. Donfried, *Paul, Thessalonica, and Early Christianity* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2002), 209–19.

the relationship which had been “jeopardized by their separation.”⁴¹ Upon Timothy’s return, Paul learned of their longing for him and was comforted by news of their love and faith (3:6). Nevertheless, with a sense of angst and an eagerness to encourage the Thessalonian believers,⁴² Paul deemed it still necessary to write to his church to further instruct them and to explain his failure to return to them.⁴³

Paul’s unanticipated separation from and subsequent inability to return to his newly founded church thus served as the catalyst for the writing of 1 Thessalonians.⁴⁴ It is therefore essential to regard Paul’s relationship with the church as the background to the letter’s content, not least to the exceptionally personal section of 2:17–3:13 in which Paul describes his concern for the Thessalonians. Moreover, it is important to keep in mind Paul’s notion of territorial apostleship when reading 1 Thessalonians, since in many ways it is a letter written by an apostle who sincerely fears that his missionary labor (κόπος; cf. 2:9; 3:5) at Thessalonica might be ruined in his absence. Furthermore, Paul’s references to Satan in this section are borne out of the events described in 1 Thess 2:17–3:10 and his apostolic concern for the young community in Thessalonica which he had founded shortly prior to his departure from the city and the writing of 1 Thessalonians.

5.3.3 1 Thessalonians 2:18

Despite Timothy’s visit, the Thessalonian community seems to have continued to question the circumstances of Paul’s disappearance as well as his absence, a concern which prompted Paul’s response in 1 Thess 2:17–3:10. In 1 Thess 2:18, Paul offers a brief explanation for his continued absence by charging Satan with obstructing his

⁴¹ Mitchell, “1 and 2 Thessalonians,” 54.

⁴² James D. G. Dunn identifies encouragement in the face of “suffering and distress” as the letter’s “pastoral theme” (*The Theology of Paul the Apostle* [Grand Rapids, Mich.; Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1998], 705).

⁴³ According to Mitchell, Paul writes 1 Thessalonians as a “substitute” for his absence which would “represent his living presence among the Thessalonians and carry the power to effect fully his pastoral leadership among them” (“1 and 2 Thessalonians,” 55).

⁴⁴ To be sure, it seems as though Paul also needed to address theological issues concerning his apocalyptic message and its related social issues. On this matter, see the perceptive articles by John M. G. Barclay: “Thessalonica and Corinth: Social Contrasts in Pauline Christianity,” *JSNT* 47 (1992): 49–74; idem, “Conflict in Thessalonica,” *CBQ* 55, no. 3 (1993): 512–30.

plans to return to Thessalonica. For modern scholars, Paul’s “answer” to the Thessalonians’ inquiry has prompted more questions than answers. Moreover, scholars tend to focus on the historical referent behind Satan’s hindrance, offering speculative explanations of what might have prevented Paul’s return to Thessalonica. Our study of 1 Thess 2:18 will not focus on *how* Satan impeded Paul’s return, but instead on a) *what* language Paul uses to characterize Satan’s activity, and, more importantly for our wider study, b) *why* Paul would have believed that Satan was behind his inability to return to Thessalonica.

5.3.3.1 *The Means of Satan’s Hindrance*

Before we turn to address our questions, it is necessary that we briefly consider the commonly suggested causes of Paul’s failure to return to Thessalonica since the issue features so strongly in scholarship on the verse. The suggestions are numerous. For example, William Ramsay maintained that the politarchs’ (πολιτάρχης, Acts 17:6, 8) stance toward the Thessalonians Christians stood behind “Satan’s” actions.⁴⁵ Another frequent suggestion is that some sort of malady or disease prevented Paul from traveling.⁴⁶ Interpreting the verse in light of Paul’s allusion to a “thorn in the flesh, a messenger of Satan” (σκόλοψ τῆ σαρκί, ἄγγελος σατανᾶ) in 2 Cor 12:7, Marshall suggests that Paul may here be referring to a physical illness.⁴⁷ Riesner simply notes that the situation had become too risky for Paul in Thessalonica.⁴⁸

⁴⁵ William M. Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1895), 231. Curiously, Ramsay goes on to note that, “This interpretation of the term ‘Satan,’ as denoting action taken by the governing power against the message from God, is in keeping with the figurative use of the word throughout the New Testament” (ibid.). One wonders which NT (and especially Pauline) texts Ramsay had in mind here.

⁴⁶ So Trevor Oswald Ling, *The Significance of Satan: New Testament Demonology and Its Contemporary Relevance* (London: SPCK, 1961), 39; Bent Noack, *Satanás und Sotería: Untersuchungen zur neutestamentlichen Dämonologie* (Copenhagen: Gads, 1948), 94. Although Noack’s argument is unsubstantiated and therefore unconvincing, he rightly rules out a human opponent behind Paul’s statement, noting that “Das ist jedoch weniger wahrscheinlich, da Paulus sich sonst nicht scheut, seine Gegner zu nennen” (ibid.).

⁴⁷ I. Howard Marshall, *1 and 2 Thessalonians* (NCBC; London: Marshall, Morgan, and Scott, 1983), 86.

⁴⁸ Rainer Riesner, *Paul’s Early Period: Chronology, Mission Strategy, Theology* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1998), 359.

Despite the various proposals put forward, the fact remains that Paul does not explain *how* Satan hindered his return visit to Thessalonica. Nevertheless, two clues within the text of 1 Thessalonians help to establish parameters for plausible hypotheses. First, in light of Paul’s usage of the verb ἐγκόπτω, which can refer to a military operation to render a road impassable,⁴⁹ it seems as though something *between* Paul in Corinth and the believers in Thessalonica had thwarted his desire to see them again.⁵⁰ Second, apparently Satan’s hindrance prevented *only Paul* from returning, whereas Timothy was able to reach Thessalonica. All suggestions which fail to address these criteria remain unpersuasive and speculative. In the end, Marshall rightly concludes that “we are completely in the dark in this matter, and all attempts are simply guess work.”⁵¹

A more important question is whether the Thessalonians themselves knew to what Paul was referring in 1 Thess 2:18, that is, if the church was aware of what, historically speaking, had prevented Paul from returning to them. If not, then it is curious that Paul does not fully account for his continued absence given that the Thessalonians clearly longed to understand why he had been unable to return (cf. 3:6).⁵² If, however, the Thessalonians *did* know what had stopped Paul’s efforts, then here Paul intriguingly adds theological significance to the historical event of which they were already aware.⁵³ Either way, the most significant aspect of the verse is that Paul attributed his failure to return to Thessalonica to Satan, and, importantly, that he considered it prudent to describe his absence in these terms in a letter written to the very people whom he had been prevented from visiting. Effectively, then, in 1 Thess

⁴⁹ Morris, *Thessalonians*, 95.

⁵⁰ J. B. Lightfoot (*St. Paul’s Epistle to the Galatians: A Revised Text with Introduction, Notes, and Dissertations* (4th ed.; London: Macmillan and Co., 1874], 205) notes that the opposite notion to the military term ἐγκόπτω is the verb προκόπτω (“to clear a way”; e.g., Rom 13:12; Gal 1:14; 2 Tim 2:16; cf. the cognate term προκοπή in Phil 1:12, 25). Perhaps this is precisely what Paul had in mind in his prayer in 1 Thess 3:11: “Now may our God and Father himself and our Lord Jesus direct (κατευθύναι) our way to you.” Elsewhere in the NT the verb ἐγκόπτω occurs in Acts 24:4; Rom 15:22; Gal 5:7; 1 Pet 3:7.

⁵¹ Marshall, *Thessalonians*, 95.

⁵² Fee believes that the Thessalonians probably did not know (*Thessalonians*, 107).

⁵³ According to Wanamaker, Timothy (or whoever was responsible for delivering the letter to the Thessalonians) “undoubtedly ... explained the meaning of Paul’s remark about Satan’s hindering his return” (*Thessalonians*, 122).

2:18 Paul charges Satan not only with “cutting up” his path to Thessalonica, but also with attempting to “cut up” his relationship with the community of believers there.

5.3.3.2 *The Language of 1 Thessalonians 2:18*

In many ways the meaning of 1 Thess 2:18 is straightforward: having been forced to depart from Thessalonica earlier than they had intended, Paul desired to return to his church there but his attempts to do so were thwarted by Satan. That said, two aspects of the verse help bring to light the subtlety of Paul’s description of his failed return to Thessalonica: 1) the person and number of ἠθελήσαμεν and ἡμᾶς, and 2) Paul’s use of the first personal singular (ἐγὼ μὲν Παῦλος). We will briefly address these issues in order to assess more closely Paul’s language and intent in the verse before then proceeding to discuss the verse within the wider context of Paul’s thought.

The central question concerning the terms ἠθελήσαμεν and ἡμᾶς in 2:18 (as well as the verbs in 3:1, 2, 5) is whether they are to be regarded as epistolary plurals. In other words, is Paul here speaking for himself and on behalf of his co-workers by using “real” plurals, or is he employing epistolary plurals by which he is only referring to himself? Malherbe, along with other commentators, notes that ἐπέμψαμεν and ἔπεμψα in 3:2 and 3:5, which together form an *inclusio* within the passage, are interchangeable, and therefore suggest that the former is likely an epistolary plural.⁵⁴ This suggestion seems even more likely if we understand Paul to have been alone (see μόνον in 3:1) during his time in Athens.⁵⁵ Paul’s use of epistolary plurals also helps explain his growing anxiety for the believers in Thessalonica and his desire to inquire about the status of their faith. Separated from

⁵⁴ Abraham J. Malherbe, *The Letters to the Thessalonians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* [AB 32B; New York: Doubleday, 2000], 87. Similarly, see the argument by Karl P. Donfried (*Paul, Thessalonica, and Early Christianity*, 209–19), who also highlights the corresponding change in person in στέγοντες (3:1) and στέγων (3:5) (213).

⁵⁵ This is the central claim of Donfried’s essay, “Was Timothy in Athens? Some Exegetical Reflections on 1 Thess. 3.1–3,” in *Paul, Thessalonica, and Early Christianity*, 209–19. Donfried argues that Timothy was never in Athens with Paul and that the apostle remained there alone until his departure to Corinth.

his co-workers and estranged from the community in Thessalonica, Paul was eager for fresh news concerning their progress in the faith.

Why then, if Paul is referring to himself by employing rhetorical plurals, does he switch to the first person singular—ἐγὼ μὲν Παῦλος—in 2:18 as well as 3:5?⁵⁶ If the verbs in 2:18 and 3:5 are understood as inclusive of Paul and his co-workers, then it would seem the change (to the first person plural) would serve to distinguish Paul's desires in comparison to those of his co-workers.⁵⁷ If, however, the verbs are to be taken as rhetorical or epistolary plurals—as we maintained above—then another explanation is needed to account for the change in person.

The context of the letter offers us clues as to why Paul oscillates between the first person plural and first person singular within this section of the letter. It is most likely the case that Paul wrote 1 Thessalonians during his early days in Corinth in collaboration with his co-workers Silas and Timothy.⁵⁸ Although Paul writes the letter using the epistolary plural, at times he apparently considered it necessary to alter his prose when he wished “to refer to a past event that relates primarily to himself.”⁵⁹ Such is the event behind 1 Thess 2:18 and 3:5: Paul had been “orphaned” from his church in Thessalonica and isolated from his co-workers while in Athens. So to address the Thessalonians' concerns regarding his absence and care for them, Paul uses the first person singular in order to account for *his personal* failure to return to the church (2:18) and to recall his response to the situation (3:5).⁶⁰ Thus, it is Paul alone in Athens, so to speak, who is the subject of the singular actions in 2:18 and 3:5.

⁵⁶ The only other occurrence of the first person singular in the letter is 5:27: “I solemnly command (ἐνορκίζω) you by the Lord that this letter be read to all of them.” Cf. 2 Thess 2:5; 3:17.

⁵⁷ So F.F. Bruce on 1 Thess 2:18: “all three spoke for themselves in confirming their desire to revisit Thessalonica (Timothy, in fact, was able to do so), but Paul has in mind special efforts that he himself had made” (*First and Second Thessalonians* [WBC 45; Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 1982], 55).

⁵⁸ On the debate whether Σιλουανός and Σιλῶς refer to the same person, see Bruce, *1 and 2 Thessalonians*, 6.

⁵⁹ Donfried, “Was Timothy in Athens?,” 213.

⁶⁰ Similarly, Malherbe proposes that Paul departs from the epistolary plurals “because of the intense emotions he expresses” (*Thessalonians*, 184).

This is further confirmed in v. 18 by Paul's use of his name which ups the ante, as it were, in terms of the personal nature of the section. Malherbe notes that the use of an author's personal name within a letter was a common feature of friendship letters in the ancient world which also often assume "a strong sense of separation."⁶¹ This epistolary convention, though rare within the Pauline corpus, thus draws our attention to the personal and relational nature of Paul's correspondence with the Thessalonian church.⁶² Significantly, 1 Thess 2:18 and 3:5, the only two verses in the letter which refer to Satan, are therefore fundamentally concerned with Paul's relationship with, and concern for, the Thessalonian believers.

5.3.3.3 *Paul and Satan's Activity*

Whatever might have stood in Paul's way in his attempts to return to Thessalonica, what is important for our purposes is that Paul interpreted these historical events not psychologically or sociologically, but theologically.⁶³ This leads to our *second* question concerning 1 Thess 2:18: *why* did Paul believe that Satan was behind his inability to return to the Macedonian capital? This question is particularly important in light of our wider investigation of how Paul understood and characterized Satan's activity vis-à-vis his apostolic ministry. In order to understand why Paul believed Satan was opposing him by hindering his efforts to return to Thessalonica, we need to keep in mind the wider epistolary context of the two references to Satan within the letter and ask whether it can help to answer our question.

There are more or less two main proposals by scholars as to why Paul charges Satan with hindering his return to Thessalonica. Both explanations, however, ultimately fail to explain adequately Paul's reference within the context of his wider thought and theology. The first suggestion, made by Wanamaker, is that Paul

⁶¹ Ibid.

⁶² Elsewhere in his letters, Paul uses his name in a similar fashion in 2 Cor 10:1; Phlm 9, 19; cf. Eph 3:1.

⁶³ Beverly Roberts Gaventa, *First and Second Thessalonians* (Interpretation; Louisville, Ky.: John Knox Press, 1998), 42.

attributes “his failure to the malevolent activity of Satan’s supernatural powers” to avoid “personal responsibility for his failure to revisit his readers.”⁶⁴ In response to the Thessalonians’ concerns about his care for the church, which Paul seems to have learned about upon Timothy’s return (e.g., 3:3–4), Paul undoubtedly would have wanted to allay their fears and reiterate his commitment to them. Although this theory helps account for Paul’s continued absence, it still fails to explain why Paul attributes his “failure” to Satan and not to another source as he does, for example, in 1 Cor 16:7–9 where he describes his delayed visit to Corinth as the result of a door being opened to him—presumably by God—for further work in Ephesus.⁶⁵ Or, why does Paul here not use a passive verb as he does both in Rom 1:13 (ἐκωλύθη) and in Rom 15:22 where he even employs the same verb which he uses in 1 Thess 2:18 (ἐνεκοπήθη)? Again, the question must be raised: why does Paul accuse *Satan* of hindering his attempts to return to Thessalonica?

The second explanation, one made more frequently, attempts to relate Paul’s reference to Satan in 1 Thess 2:18 to general apocalyptic thought concerning Satan. Duane Watson, for instance, asserts that “Paul’s personal struggle to see his beloved congregation is part of the greater apocalyptic struggle between God and the faithful versus Satan and the unfaithful.”⁶⁶ Given Satan’s place within Paul’s apocalyptic worldview, it would be wrong to reject Watson’s claim outright.⁶⁷ Nonetheless, Watson probably emphasizes the eschatological nature of 1 Thess 2:18 too strongly. Does Paul really understand his own struggles and the Thessalonians’ persecution “in the context of the cosmic, end-time battle between God and Satan?”⁶⁸ Paul’s angst for his congregation certainly had eschatological implications, as the several

⁶⁴ Wanamaker, *Thessalonians*, 122.

⁶⁵ cf. 1 Cor 4:19.

⁶⁶ Duane Watson, “Paul’s Appropriation of Apocalyptic Discourse: The Rhetorical Strategy of 1 Thessalonians,” in *Vision and Persuasion: Rhetorical Dimensions of Apocalyptic Discourse* (eds. L. Gregory Bloomquist and Greg Carey; St. Louis, Miss.: Chalice Press, 1999), 61–80 (69).

⁶⁷ Gaventa maintains a similar position: “For Paul, this is an apocalyptic battle involving implacable enemies, and they will fight over every inch of terrain” (*First and Second Thessalonians*, 42).

⁶⁸ Watson, “Paul’s Appropriation of Apocalyptic Discourse,” 79.

eschatological terms he uses for them in vv. 19–20 make clear.⁶⁹ However, Paul’s statement here is not concerned with a future conflict against Satan, but rather with Satan’s activity in the here and now against his apostolic labor for his churches, as 1 Thess 3:5 will make lucidly clear.

Against these views, I contend that the reference to Satan in 2:18 is rooted in Paul’s apostolic relationship to the Thessalonian church. For it is not only as a concerned ἀδελφός (1 Thess 2:17) or as a worried friend that Paul writes to the Thessalonians, but, as an apostle—indeed, the apostle who founded their community—that Paul writes to the Thessalonian believers, whom he cared for as a nurse with her own children (2:7),⁷⁰ and to whom he was a father while in their presence (2:11). Accordingly, Donfried rightly argues that Paul switches to the first person singular in 2:18 to refer to a past event specifically concerning himself in order to “reject emphatically” concerns of his prolonged absence (“I myself tried to return but could not”).⁷¹

It is therefore within the context of Paul’s apostolic angst and growing concern for his church at Thessalonica that we must understand the reference to Satan in 1 Thess 2:18. What Paul reveals in the verse, then, is that he believed Satan somehow thwarted his attempts to visit the Thessalonians, not because Satan acts against all humans at all times, or because Paul believed himself to be engaged in an apocalyptic battle, but because he regarded Satan as an adversary against his apostolic labor for the church in Thessalonica. Otherwise there is little reason here for Paul to attribute his “failure” to return to the Thessalonica to Satan, when other

⁶⁹ See the discussion in Malherbe, *Thessalonians*, 185. Cf. Phil 4:1; 1 Cor 9:24–27. For Jewish parallels, see especially the occurrences of שמחה (“joy”), כתר (“crown”), and כבוד (“glory”) in an eschatological context in 1QS 4:7.

⁷⁰ The textual variant in 1 Thess 2:7 is notoriously problematic. If, on the one hand, one accepts νήπιοι (“infants”) as the original reading (so NA²⁷), then the reader is left with “incongruous” metaphors in the passage (Malherbe, *Thessalonians*, 145). But if, on the other hand, one prefers ἡπιόι (“gentle”) as a more natural reading (e.g., NRSV), one must do so against the textual evidence which is “decisively in favor” of νήπιοι (Fee, *Thessalonians*, 70; cf. Beverly Roberts Gaventa [*Our Mother Saint Paul* (Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press, 2007), 18–20]). Accordingly, Paul’s contrasting but nonetheless complementary metaphors serve to emphasize both the innocence with which Paul and his co-workers labored among the Thessalonians and the care with which they watched over the believers in Thessalonica.

⁷¹ Donfried, “Was Timothy in Athens?,” 213.

explanations might have sufficed (e.g., “I wished to remain in Athens until Timothy’s arrival”).

When we look at the “big picture” of Paul’s thought and theology, and in particular the importance of his churches for his apostleship, how might we account for Paul’s statement that Satan “hindered” his travel efforts? Within the framework proposed in Chapter Four, I propose that Paul believed Satan would oppose his apostolic missionary endeavors, and thus does so 1 Thess 2:18—and 3:5 as we shall see—because he already believed that Satan was targeting his missionary labor around the Mediterranean basin precisely because he occupied such a significant role in the spreading of the gospel. Only within this conceptual framework is it possible to offer a cogent explanation for Paul’s remarkable insistence that Satan stood behind his thwarted attempts to return to the fledgling Christian community in Thessalonica.

5.3.4 1 Thessalonians 3:5

The second of the two references to Satan in 1 Thessalonians occurs within the same literary section of 1 Thess 2:17–3:10, which has often been referred to as Paul’s “apostolic parousia.”⁷² Having already informed the Thessalonians of Satan’s hindrances of his attempts to return to them, Paul now writes of his fears of Satan’s work in their midst: “For this reason, when I could bear it no longer, I sent to find out about your faith; I was afraid that somehow the tempter had tempted you and that our labor had been in vain” (1 Thess 3:5). Our discussion of this second reference to Satan within 1 Thessalonians will be organized under three headings: 1) the context of 1 Thess 3:1–10; 2) Satan as “the tempter”; and 3) the relationship between Paul’s labor (κόπος) and the faith (πίστις) of the Thessalonians.

⁷² E.g., Robert W. Funk, “Apostolic Parousia: Form and Significance,” in *Christian History and Interpretation: Studies Presented to John Knox* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967), 249–68.

5.3.4.1 1 Thessalonians 3:1–10

A brief overview of 1 Thess 3:1–10 will be beneficial before considering 1 Thess 3:5 in particular. In 1 Thess 2:17–20 we saw how Paul offered an explanation for his sudden departure from Thessalonica which had caused uncertainty among the congregation. Beginning in 3:1, and continuing through the remainder of the literary section (v. 10), Paul now writes about his response to the situation. While still in Athens and unable to return to Thessalonica, Paul sent Timothy to the Macedonian city in his place. In v. 2 Paul reveals his reasoning for sending Timothy: to strengthen (στηρίξει) and encourage (παρκαλέσαι) the faith of the Thessalonian congregation. Verses 3–4 then discuss the nature of the issues which caused Paul’s anxiety. The believers in Thessalonica had been experiencing some sort of persecutions (θλίψεσιν, v. 3; cf. 1:6; 2:14) subsequent to Paul’s abrupt exit from the city.⁷³

In v. 5 Paul then returns to the first person singular—because, as was the case in 2:18, he is addressing a past event specifically regarding himself—as he reiterates his concern for the Thessalonians’ faith: “for this reason (διὰ τοῦτο),⁷⁴ when I could no longer bear it, I sent to find out about your faith” (τὸ γινῶναι τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν). The latter part of the verse returns to Paul’s motivation for sending Timothy, and, presumably, for his own thwarted attempts to return: Paul wanted their faith to be encouraged because he feared that “the tempter” had tempted them and ruined their faith through their persecutions.⁷⁵ Paul’s fears were relieved however, upon Timothy’s report of good news (v. 6). The Thessalonians had withstood the persecutions and the temptations, and so Paul writes that he and his co-workers “now live” since the Thessalonian believers “stand firm in the Lord” (v. 8). Indeed, Paul

⁷³ Barclay rightly critiques Wanamaker’s (*Thessalonians*, 42) contention that the persecution had ceased at some point subsequent to Paul’s departure (“Conflict in Thessalonica,” 514, no. 5). On the nature of the social persecution experienced by the Thessalonians as a result of their (mis)understanding of Paul’s apocalyptic gospel, see Barclay (*ibid.*, 513–16).

⁷⁴ Fee is correct to note that διὰ τοῦτο ties v. 5 back to the “parenthetical moment” in vv. 3b–4 and to the narrative which began in v. 1 (*Thessalonians*, 119).

⁷⁵ Or, as Fee puts it: “In verse 2 [Paul] mentions the sending of Timothy from the Thessalonians’ perspective (why he was coming to *them*); now he mentions it from his own perspective” (*ibid.*).

and company now thank God for the joy of the Thessalonians which they shortly hope to share face to face (vv. 9–10).

5.3.4.2 *Satan as Tempter*

Even though there is uncertainty regarding the nature of the persecutions which the Thessalonians suffered, what is clear is that Paul believed Satan to be standing behind the persecutions just as he believed Satan to be the orchestrator of the hindrances to his attempts to return to Thessalonica. On account of the persecutions and social pressure experienced by the Thessalonians, Paul feared that “the tempter” (ὁ πειράζων) would cause them to capitulate in their faith and, in doing so, ruin his work in the city.

This much seems clear. But it must be asked, why does Paul refer to Satan using the epithet ὁ πειράζων and not the term σατανᾶς as he did in 2:18? The term ὁ πειράζων seldom occurs within Paul’s letters and the NT in general. The only other NT occurrence of the title is found in Matthew’s temptation narrative: “the tempter (ὁ πειράζων) came and said to him, ‘If you are the Son of God, command these stones to become loaves of bread’” (Matt 4:3). Moreover, the term is absent from the Septuagint and other contemporary texts such as Josephus, Philo, and the *Psalms of Solomon*. On the basis of the extant texts and traditions, ὁ πειράζων is clearly an uncommon title for the figure of Satan within the biblical tradition.

The activity of tempting (as well as the related activity of testing), however, is one frequently attributed to the figure of Satan.⁷⁶ As we discussed in Chapter Two, a Satan-like figure is often depicted as tempting the people of God in a number of writings from the Second Temple period, including, but not limited to, the *Testament of Job*, the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, the *Psalms of Solomon*, the *Life of Adam and Eve*, and several writings from Qumran (e.g., the *Rule of the Community* and the *Damascus Document*).⁷⁷ Outside the Pauline corpus in the NT, Satan is

⁷⁶ Satan is clearly to be understood by the expression. So Noack: “Mit ὁ πειράζων kann nur der Satan gemeint sein. Schon der Name beweist, dass Paulus den Teufel als Versucher kennt” (*Satanás und Sotería*, 100).

⁷⁷ See above, §2.5.

portrayed as the tempter in the narrative of Jesus' wilderness experience in each of the Synoptic Gospels, though, as we previously noted, only Matthew employs the term ὁ πειράζων. The letter to the Hebrews twice refers to the temptations suffered by Jesus, though it is unclear whether the wilderness testing or Jesus' entire ministry is in view (Heb 2:18; 4:15). Finally, in the message to the angel of the church in Smyrna, Revelation warns its readers that "the devil (ὁ διάβολος) is about to throw some of you into prison so that you may be tested (πειρασθῆτε)" (Rev 2:10).

The only other explicit reference to Satan's temptations within the undisputed Pauline letters is 1 Cor 7:5, a verse which we will consider at length in the next chapter.⁷⁸ However, here we briefly note that in both 1 Thess 3:5 and 1 Cor 7:5 Paul understands Satan to tempt believers by making use of presently existing circumstances. In the former passage, Paul seems to envision Satan as taking advantage of the social pressures and persecutions experienced by the Thessalonians in attempt to break down their faith. In the latter text, Paul warns the Corinthians that their self-imposed sexual abstinence provides Satan with a chance to tempt them within their marriages.

Despite the infrequency of references to Satan as a tempter within Second Temple Jewish or early Christian writings, the role of Satan as a tempter of the righteous people of God seems to be commonplace within both Jewish and early Christian thought. Moreover, Paul's understanding of Satan's role as tempter seems to be consistent with that of Second Temple Jewish texts in that he understands Satan as a tempter of the people of God rather than humanity in general. In this sense, Satan remains the enemy of God, as he is often depicted in Second Temple Jewish and early Christian traditions, by tempting the people of God in hopes they will be led astray and turn against God.

⁷⁸ Cf. Eph 4:27 and 6:11, both of which possibly allude to the temptations of the devil. See also 2 Tim 2:26.

5.3.4.3 Paul's Apostolic Labor and the Faith of the Thessalonians

Perhaps nowhere else within the Pauline corpus is Paul's fear of Satan the tempter's work expressed more acutely than in 1 Thess 3:5. For in this passage it becomes lucidly clear that Paul regarded Satan's corrosive work against his churches as a direct assault on his apostolic calling and his labor for the gospel. For Paul, then, there exists a corresponding link between the growth of his churches and the success of his apostleship. This relationship, spoken of in terms of their πίστις and his κόπος, comes under threat in 1 Thess 3:5, just as it had in 1 Thess 2:18, from the work of Satan, the opponent of the apostle Paul.

At the core of Paul's reference to Satan in 1 Thess 3:5 is his use of two key terms: κόπος and πίστις. We will briefly discuss the use of these two words before analyzing their meaning in 1 Thess 2:17–3:10. First, as we showed in Chapter 4, the term κόπος is the primary term Paul employs in referring to his apostolic labor.⁷⁹ In 1 Thess 2:9, for example, Paul had reminded his readers of his and his co-workers' "labor and toil" (τὸν κόπον ἡμῶν καὶ τὸν μόχθον) among the Thessalonians during their stay in the city, including the proclamation of the gospel, their manual labor both night and day, and their pastoral care for the Thessalonian believers.⁸⁰ Paul's aborted visit to the city, however, left his κόπος at Thessalonica unfinished and in jeopardy. That is, Paul feared that his apostolic fruit might be spoiled if the Thessalonians wilted in their faith under the pressure of their persecutions. In 1 Thess 3:5, the term κόπος thus encapsulates everything that Paul and his co-workers had accomplished in Thessalonica for the sake of the gospel and, by the same logic, everything that Paul feared might become "in vain" if Satan prevailed in his tempting of the Thessalonians.

This brings us to our second point: Paul's fear for the corruption of the Thessalonian believers' faith. Paul's concern for their faith is discernible in light of

⁷⁹ See above, §4.3.

⁸⁰ Likewise, in 1 Thess 1:3 Paul writes that he remembers their "work of faith and labor of love (τοῦ ἔργου τῆς πίστεως καὶ τοῦ κόπου τῆς ἀγάπης) and steadfastness of hope in our Lord Jesus Christ."

the five occurrences of πίστις within 2:17–3:10.⁸¹ In 3:2 Paul specifies that the purpose of Timothy’s visit was “to strengthen you and encourage you in your faith” (ὑπὲρ τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν). In verse 6, Paul writes that his fears were assuaged by Timothy’s report of their faith and love (τὴν πίστιν καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην). In light of this news Paul has even been encouraged through their faith (διὰ τῆς ὑμῶν πίστεως, v. 7). Lastly, Paul’s prayer is that he will finally be able to return to them and complete whatever is lacking in their faith (τὰ ὑστερήματα τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν, v. 10).

The reason for the term’s frequency within this section of the letter becomes clear in v. 5: the maturity of the Thessalonians’ faith is the intended outcome and eschatological telos of Paul’s apostolic labor. This is why Paul fears specifically for the *faith* of the Thessalonians and not, for example, their unity, hope, or safety, though he surely would have remained concerned for these matters too. Critically, then, the inextricable and reciprocal link which Paul envisions between his κόπος and the πίστις of the Thessalonian church becomes the attacking point for Satan “the tempter.” Thus, unlike Job who was deprived of his possessions and family by Satan, or Abraham whose faithfulness to God was tested by Mastema in *Jubilees*, in 1 Thessalonians neither Paul’s righteousness nor faithfulness is tested by Satan. Rather, the focal point of Satan’s activity is Paul’s apostolic κόπος for the πίστις of the Thessalonian church.

In 1 Thess 3:5, therefore, Satan appears as the opponent of Paul’s apostolic labor for his churches and their faith. As Ernst von Dobschütz astutely comments on the verse: “Die Feindschaft Satans richtet sich als in letzter Richtung nicht gegen die Thess., sondern gegen den Apostel, dessen mit aller Anstrengung betriebenes Missionwerk (vgl. 2.9) er zu nichte machen will.”⁸² In Paul’s view, for Satan to oppose or attack any of the churches which he founded was to oppose Paul’s calling as an apostle to the gentiles and his labor for his churches.

⁸¹ See also uses of πίστις in 1:3, 8; 5:8.

⁸² Ernst von Dobschütz, *Die Thessalonicher-Briefe* (MeyerK 10; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1909), 138.

Paul undoubtedly cared for his churches in and of themselves. In 1 Thess 3:5, however, Paul's concern extends beyond the Thessalonian congregation to also encompass his fear that his apostolic κόπος might prove to be "in vain" and, consequently, that he might be robbed of his eschatological boast. Paul's repeated but failed attempts to return to Thessalonica were motivated by his fear that Satan had tempted his church through persecution, thereby damaging their πίστις and, as a result, rendering his κόπος "in vain" (εἰς κενόν). Out of this sense of concern and apostolic responsibility for his church, in 1 Thess 3:5 Paul returns to the first person singular to stress his personal interest in sending Timothy to inquire about their faith. He longs to know whether their faith has withstood the pressures of Satan's persecutions and whether his κόπος among them has become "in vain," or, as he hopes, if they have stood firm in the Lord (3:8).⁸³

The threat of Satan's temptations was genuine for Paul. He believed that if the Thessalonians were to succumb to these temptations then he would be unable to boast of their faith in the day of Christ. In this sense we can see how Paul's words in 1 Thess 3:5 are predicated on 2:18–19 where he refers to the community as his ἐλπίς, χαρά, στέφανος καυχήσεως, and δόξα, which, collectively and individually, evoke the eschatological scene in which Paul hopes to boast of his faithfulness to his apostolic calling. Noack expresses a similar view: "durch Versuchung will Satan die Gemeinde in Thessalonich zwingen, den Glauben aufzugeben sodass die ganze Arbeit des Apostels ohne Erfolg bleibt. Das sind keine leeren Worte, denn es würde den Verlust des Ruhmesglanzes bedeuten."⁸⁴ Nonetheless, Paul rests on his hope that God himself will bring the Thessalonians to maturity in "the coming of our Lord Jesus" (ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, 1 Thess 5:23–24). Until then, however, Paul sees Satan as a real threat to the relationship between apostle and church, between his apostolic κόπος and the community's πίστις.

⁸³ Ultimately, Paul hopes for the eschatological maturity of the Thessalonians' faith (1 Thess 5:23–24; cf. 1 Cor 1:8–9; Phil 1:6).

⁸⁴ Noack, *Satanás und Sotería*, 100.

5.3.5 Conclusions

1 Thessalonians 3:5 is an important verse for the present study, as it brings together all three main elements of our argument: 1) Paul's apostolic labor, encapsulated in the term κόπος, is 2) opposed by Satan, who is here referred to as ὁ πειράζων, and thereby 3) his labor is in jeopardy of becoming εἰς κενόν. Drawing on our findings in the above analysis of 1 Thess 2:18 and 3:5, here we observe two conclusions for our wider study.

(1) It was of vital importance for the Apostle Paul that his apostolic labor, through the preaching of the gospel and pastoral care of believers, produced enduring faith among the communities which he founded. The faith of his churches was for Paul the evidence of successful apostolic labor as well as the eschatological hope for his congregations. It is not surprising, then, that Paul primarily frets over the *faith* of the Thessalonians in the wake of his sudden departure from them. Paul therefore not only fears that their corrupted faith might result in his work becoming "in vain," but, conversely, he hopes that it will be strengthened until the day of Christ (1 Thess 5:23–24).

The connection between Paul's κόπος and the community's πίστις is evident in 1 Thess 3:5, but it is also assumed in 2:18–20. Indeed, the community's faith is the focus of the entire section of 2:17–3:10. Paul wanted to check up on the church at Thessalonica, his joy and crown of boasting in the day of Christ, in order to ensure that his labor for their faith continued to grow (cf. 1:8) into maturity so that he would have eschatological fruit from his work in Thessalonica (3:10).

(2) At the nexus of his labor for his churches and their faith, Paul sees Satan the ancient adversary of Israel, who opposes Paul by hindering his efforts to preach the gospel and nurture his congregations. Clearly Paul was aware of several ways in which his evangelical activity was impeded, attacked, or even set back. Paul's hardship lists, for example, reveal a multitude of physical obstacles and deterrents which the apostle faced along his missionary journeys. Furthermore, in both Galatia and Corinth Paul's authority and gospel were challenged by *human*

adversaries. Yet the threat of Satan’s activity remained, for Paul, a dangerous and identifiable threat to his apostolic labor.

If we can link διὰ τοῦτο in 1 Thess 3:5 back to 2:17 and its ensuing verses, then we could paraphrase 3:5 as follows: “when I could no longer stand Satan preventing me from returning to you, I sent Timothy in my stead because I feared that Satan might have also opposed you through temptation, and thereby corrupted your faith and ruined my apostolic labor among you.” Paul thus believed Satan to be at work on both sides of his relationship with the Thessalonians: he prevented Paul from traveling back to the city *and* he tempted the believers there in order to corrupt their faith. Even though the means and targets of “the tempter’s” opposition are different in 1 Thess 2:18 and 3:5, in both verses Paul portrays Satan as an adversary against his labor for the sake of the church at Thessalonica.

5.4 Conclusion

In many ways it is rather striking that Paul does not refer to Satan more frequently in his long and theologically robust letter to the Romans. When considered in light of ideas of earlier Jewish and contemporary Christian writings, the general absence of Satan from Paul’s theological expositions in Romans on the origin of sin, the role of the law, and Israel’s unbelief is remarkable. It is equally striking that the single reference to Satan in Romans is so terse and somewhat obscure. Nonetheless, Paul’s ability to refer to Satan in a pithy manner apart from any theological explanation indicates that Paul and his readers shared greater knowledge about the figure than we find in the letter.⁸⁵ Contrary to the claims of some scholars, however, Paul does not envision Satan’s role as the origin of evil or as a disciplinary agent; rather, he sees Satan primarily as one of many enemies (ἐχθροί) within his apocalyptic worldview which have been proleptically defeated by the death and resurrection of Christ.

⁸⁵ In this sense Dibelius was wrong to downplay Satan’s place within Paul’s theology since the reference to Satan in Rom 16:20 is predicated upon Paul’s apocalyptic interpretation of the death and resurrection of Jesus as a victory over Satan (see §3.3).

In our above analysis of Rom 16:20, we contended that this theological premise underpins Paul's reference to Satan's eschatological defeat. Furthermore, we maintained that Paul appropriates the language of the christologically re-interpreted imagery of Ps 110:1 by theologically expanding it from a statement of Christ's eschatological victory to one in which believers *also* share in God's triumph.

Concerning 1 Thessalonians, we argued that the references to Satan in the letter are rooted in Paul's concern for the success of his churches and, concomitantly, his fear of their failure. Similarly, we contended that Paul presented Satan as the one responsible for thwarting his efforts to return to his church in Thessalonica (1 Thess 2:18) *and* for testing the faith of the Thessalonians (3:5). What Paul fears in both of these instances is that his apostolic labor for the gospel would be ruined by the work of Satan.

By way of conclusion, it is worth pointing out that although the functions of the references to Satan in these two Pauline letters are hardly the same, they are nevertheless both at home in the apocalyptic theology of Paul. In the case of Rom 16:20, Satan is depicted as the ancient foe of God's people who will be destroyed in the day of Christ Jesus. In the case of 1 Thess 2:18 and 3:5, Satan functions as the adversary of God's envoy Paul at a crucial moment in salvation history.

Chapter Six

PAUL'S REFERENCES TO SATAN: 1 AND 2 CORINTHIANS

“Es ist kein Zufall, daß die Mehrzahl der Satans stellen bei Paulus seinen bedeutsamsten Missionszeugnissen, den Korintherbriefen, angehört. Immer sieht Paulus den Widersacher am Werk, als Versucher oder Friedensstörer den Wohlstand der Gemeinde zu schädigen 1. Kor. 7,5, Rom. 16₂₀, 1. Thess. 3₅; in seinen eigenen Gegnern erblickt er eine Truppe des Satans 2. Kor 11₁₅.”¹

6.1 Introduction

Paul's relationship with the Corinthian church was unique among his relationships with the churches he founded. It was, at times, a trying and strained relationship. His work in Corinth necessitated an eighteen-month stay, multiple visits, and perhaps up to five letters, a remarkable demand of time and effort for an itinerant apostle concerned with founding new congregations and committed to gathering a collection for the poor in Jerusalem. Paul's authority at Corinth was seemingly in constant jeopardy. At the same time, Paul clearly considered the Corinthians to have special status among his churches and particular significance for his apostleship. Indeed, he goes so far as to refer to them as the “seal” of his apostleship (1 Cor 9:1), a striking claim in light of Paul's view of the importance of his churches for his calling which we discussed in Chapter Four.

Significantly and remarkably, the two extant Pauline letters written to the Corinthian community contain seven out of the ten references to Satan in the undisputed letters of Paul.² This “curious concentration”³ of references to Satan raises an intriguing question: why does Paul refer to Satan so many times in his correspondence with the Corinthian church when he rarely does so in his other letters?⁴ How can we account for this cluster of Satan references in 1–2 Corinthians?

¹ Martin Dibelius, *Die Geisterwelt im Glauben des Paulus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1909), 191.

² Rom 16:20; 1 Cor 5:5; 7:5; 2 Cor 2:11; 4:4; 6:15; 11:14; 12:7; 1 Thess 2:18; 3:5. See below, §6.7.2, on the issue of whether 2 Cor 11:3 should be interpreted as an allusion to Satan (=serpent).

³ Lee A. Johnson, “Satan Talk in Corinth: The Rhetoric of Conflict,” *BTB* 29 (1999), 145–55 (146).

⁴ Along these lines, see Abraham J. Malherbe's astute observation: “It is striking that Paul's references to Satan under one name or another appear in letters either written to Corinth ... or from

Is it a coincidental, albeit surprising, occurrence which Paul himself might have overlooked? Or is there evidence from the Pauline corpus which might help explain this phenomenon?

In order to address these questions our aim in the present chapter will be two-fold: 1) to understand the meaning and significance of the seven references to Satan in 1 and 2 Corinthians in their epistolary context, and 2) to account for the concentration of references to Satan within Paul's Corinthian correspondence.

Although we could commence in a strictly canonical order of the Corinthians passages, we will instead begin with 2 Cor 4:4 since, as we will argue below, it overlaps conceptually and theologically with 1 Cor 5:5. By first considering a later Pauline passage we will, hopefully, demonstrate that the notion of "handing someone over to Satan" in 1 Cor 5:5 is consonant with Paul's apocalyptic title "the god of this age" in 2 Cor 4:4, and, consequently, that much of the exegetical confusion surrounding the former verse is unwarranted.⁵ Such an approach is also permissible given that none of the Pauline references to Satan necessitate interpretation to be conducted in either canonical or chronological order.

From there we will examine the only other reference to Satan in Paul's first letter to the Corinthians: 1 Cor 7:5. We will then return to 2 Corinthians and examine Paul's statement regarding the "designs of Satan" in 2 Cor 2:11. Next, we will analyze the three other places in the letter where Paul mentions Satan: 2 Cor 6:15; 11:14; and 12:7. Finally, we will return to the issue of the cluster of Satan references in the Corinthian correspondence.

Corinth" (*The Letters to the Thessalonians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* [AB 32B; New York: Doubleday, 2000], 184).

⁵ To be sure, I do not mean to imply that 1 Cor 5:5 can only be interpreted in relation to 2 Cor 4:4. Rather, in light of the theological commonalities between the two verses, the order of investigation in the present chapter is designed to offer a different approach of interpreting what has been an historically controversial and disputed text (1 Cor 5:5) by first looking at a relatively less controversial passage (2 Cor 4:4).

6.2 2 Corinthians 4:4

6.2.1 Introduction

In the writings of the Second Temple Jewish and early Christian periods there was hardly a shortage of names and epithets for the chief malevolent figure. The figure now commonly referred to as Satan or the devil was known in various Jewish and Christian circles by several personal names, such as Mastema, Satan and Belial, as well as various titles, including “the tempter” and “the Prince of Darkness.”⁶ Despite the plurality of these names and titles, perhaps none are as striking as Paul’s reference to Satan as ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου (“the god of this age”) in 2 Cor 4:4. Paul’s application of θεός to Satan in 2 Cor 4:4 is even more extraordinary given his scrupulous use of the divine term which he reserves almost exclusively for God the Father throughout his letters. For Paul to predicate the term θεός to Satan would have been a lexical and theological surprise to his readers.

In attempting to make sense of Paul’s bold title for Satan in 2 Cor 4:4, our analysis of the designation “the god of this age” will proceed as follows. First, we will argue that there is sufficient evidence for identifying ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου in 2 Cor 4:4 as a reference to Satan. Second, we will consider the literary context of 2 Cor 4:4 in order to demonstrate how Paul depicts the activity of “the god of this age” vis-à-vis his own ministry. This motif, the antithetical missions of Paul and “the god of this age,” will be our focus in the third section. Finally, in our conclusion we will explicate the implications of 2 Cor 4:4 for both Paul’s theology as well as for the remainder of the Corinthian references to Satan.

6.2.2 Satan as “the god of this age”

Despite the near consensus among scholars that Paul is alluding to Satan and his activity against the gospel in 2 Cor 4:4, there remain some who object to the

⁶ On the various names of Satan, see Douglas L. Penney, “Finding the Devil in the Details: Onomastic Exegesis and the Naming of Evil in the World of the New Testament,” in *New Testament Greek and Exegesis: Essays in Honor of Gerald F. Hawthorne* (eds. Gerald F. Hawthorne, Amy M. Donaldson, and Timothy B. Sailors; Grand Rapids, Mich.; Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2003), 37–52; Charles Fontinoy, “Les noms du Diable et leur étymologie,” in *Orientalia: J. Duschesne-Guillemain Emerito Oblata* (Acta Iranica 9; Leiden: Brill, 1984), 157–70.

suggestion that Paul would have employed θεός, a term which he typically reserves for God and God alone, in referring to the evil figure of Satan.⁷ For example, Young and Ford believe it to be inconsistent with Pauline thought to regard ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου as a reference to Satan, instead submitting that “It is both anachronistic, and inappropriate both to the text and to Paul’s views expressed elsewhere to read *theos* as meaning anything other than God.”⁸ They claim for Paul

⁷ The lone possible exception to this usage is found in Rom 9:5(b): ὧν οἱ πατέρες καὶ ἐξ ὧν ὁ Χριστὸς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα ὁ ὧν ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸς εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας ἀμήν. However, as any commentary or article on the verse will point out, the syntax and the punctuation of the verse are widely debated and thus its rendering is far from certain. As such, Rom 9:5 cannot be claimed to be evidence of Pauline application of θεός to any figure besides God the Father.

⁸ Frances M. Young and David Ford, *Meaning and Truth in 2 Corinthians* (BFT; London: SPCK, 1987), 117. Their argument for identifying God the Father as “the god of this age” is not without historical precedent. As they point out, early Christian writers such as Chrysostom shared a similar interpretation of the expression (ibid., 115). Similarly, Jerome Murphy-O’Connor (*The Theology of the Second Letter to the Corinthians* [ed. James D. G. Dunn; NTT; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991], 42), suggests that the expression ought to be translated as “the god who is this age” (cf. Phil 3:19); idem, “Philo and 2 Cor 6:14–7:1,” *RB* 95, no. 1 (1988): 55–69.

Perhaps the most intriguing argument for identifying “the god of this age” as God (the father) is that of Donald E. Hartley, “2 Corinthians 4:4: A Case for Yahweh as the ‘God of this Age’” (paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society, Valley Forge, Pa., 16–18 November, 2005), 1–22. Hartley situates Paul’s language of “hardening” (πρωρόω, 2 Cor 3:14) and “blinding” (τυφλόω, 2 Cor 4:4) in the context of Isa 6:9–10. Citing the ambiguous evidence and translations of the Patristic period and the shortcomings of modern arguments for identifying “the god of this age” as Satan (or the devil), Hartley argues that the “near consensus” scholarly view which regards 2 Cor 4:4 as a reference to Satan has “scant support for it” and is therefore less plausible than typically assumed. Instead, drawing on his doctoral dissertation on the aforementioned sapiential Isaianic passage, Hartley contends that “Contextually 2 Cor 4:4 seems to stress Yahweh’s powers of *preterition* in leaving those who are congenitally (not judicially) hard, deaf, and blind to their unhappy state thereby *perpetuating* the evil in the evil age” (ibid., 20, italics original). In addition to positing Yahweh’s role as “the god of this age,” Hartley outright rejects any possibility of Satan’s function as the “god who blinds” since “In order to deprive someone of something, one must be able to bestow its opposite” (ibid.). In Hartley’s estimation, because Satan is incapable of regenerating (the opposite of hardening/blinding/deafening, according to Hartley), he therefore cannot be the one who blinds in 2 Cor 4:4.

Hartley’s essay draws attention to many important motifs from the Deuteronomic and Isaianic traditions of spiritual obduracy and hardening of the heart which are clearly relevant for interpreting Paul’s language in 2 Cor 4:4 and elsewhere. He also rightly stresses the importance of reading 2 Cor 4:4 in relation to 2 Cor 3:14 and Paul’s contrasting of the “veiledness” of his gospel and that of Moses’ message. Nonetheless, Hartley’s analysis of the subject of 2 Cor 4:4 remains unpersuasive. Three points can be raised here in response to his argument. First, although the biblical notions of hardening, blinding, and deafening share a certain degree of conceptual overlap, they need not be conflated so that the hardening of the minds (ἐπρωρώθη τὰ νοήματα) in 2 Cor 3:14 and the blinding of the minds (ἐτύφλωσεν τὰ νοήματα) in 2 Cor 4:4 are effectively indistinguishable acts (ibid., 18). Second, a major lacuna in Hartley’s analysis is any assessment of the references to Satan at other places in the Pauline letters, not least the four passages in 2 Corinthians which mention Satan (2 Cor 2:11; 11:14; 12:7; cf. 2 Cor 6:15). Third, Hartley too easily downplays the contrasting roles of “the god of this age” in v. 4 and “the God who said, ‘let light shine out of darkness’” in v. 6. In Hartley’s view, it is Yahweh who both blinds and illumines. Against this view, I contend that at the heart of 2 Cor 4:4–6 is Paul’s comparison of Satan’s and God’s antithetical roles (reflecting his apocalyptic framework) which also serves as the theological context in which Paul is able to account for the

to refer to Satan would be to use θεός in a way “unparalleled” in his other letters and would present a “theologically uncomfortable” translation.⁹

Despite such objections, there are several reasons for regarding ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου as a reference to the same Satan whom Paul mentions in letters to the Romans and Thessalonians. First, other early Christian texts deploy similar expressions and titles to express the theological notion of Satan’s role as a powerful ruler in the present age. For example, in John’s gospel Satan is referred to as ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου three times (John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11).¹⁰ In these passages “the ruler of this world” is spoken of by the Johannine Jesus as having been judged and condemned (12:31; 16:11; cf. 16:33) and therefore powerless against Jesus (14:30). Likewise, the letter to the Ephesians speaks of “the ruler of the power of the air (τὸν ἄρχοντα τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ ἀέρος), the spirit that is now at work among those who are disobedient” (Eph 2:2; cf. 6:11–12). As with 2 Cor 4:4, the majority of interpreters understand the author of Ephesians to be referring to Satan in the passage.¹¹ Furthermore, the notion of various angels and spiritual powers ruling in the air, or “this age,” is well attested in the Jewish tradition.¹²

In later Christian texts we find similar references to the “ruler” of this world in Ignatius’ letters (τοῦ ἄρχοντος τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, Ign. *Eph.* 17:1; 19:1; Ign. *Mag.* 1:3; Ign. *Tral.* 4:2; Ign. *Rom.* 7:1; Ign. *Phila.* 6:2) and the Epistle of Barnabas (ὁ ἄρχων καιροῦ τοῦ νῦν τῆς ἀνομίας, *Barn.* 18:1–2). In all likelihood these

supposed “veiledness” of his gospel and in which Paul situates his apostolic ministry (διακονία, 2 Cor 4:1).

⁹ Young and Ford, *Meaning and Truth*, 115, 117.

¹⁰ So George Raymond Beasley-Murray, *John* (2d ed.; WBC 36; Nashville, Tenn.: Thomas Nelson, 1999), 213–14; Leon Morris, *The Gospel according to John* (NICNT; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1995), 531; also see Craig R. Koester, *Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel: Meaning, Mystery, Community* (2d ed.; Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress Press, 2003), 144, who suggests that the figure of Satan is less than “fully personified” in John.

To be sure, John 14:30 lacks a reference to “this age”—ὁ τοῦ κόσμου ἄρχων (“the ruler of the world”)—though no difference in meaning should be understood.

¹¹ So F. F. Bruce, *The Epistles to the Colossians, to Philemon, and to the Ephesians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1984), 280–83; Ernest Best, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Ephesians* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 203–04; Andrew T. Lincoln, *Ephesians* (WBC 42; Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 1990), 95–96, 442–44.

¹² Lincoln, *Ephesians*, 95–97, citing Job 1:6; Dan 10:13, 21; 2 Macc 5:2; 1 Enoch 61:10; 90:21, 24; Philo *De Spec. Leg.* 1.66; *De Plant.* 14; *De Gig.* 6, 7; cf. *T. Benj.* 3.4; *Targum of Job* 5.7; *Asc. Isa* 7.9; 10.29, 11.23). Best lists several more texts (*Ephesians*, 204).

writers were echoing the language of the Johannine and Pauline writings. Similar references can also be found in the later writing the *Martyrdom and Ascension of Isaiah* (1:3; 2:4; 10:29) as well as the Rabbinic literature.¹³ In each of these examples, it is clear that the ruler (ἄρχων) of the present world is understood to be Satan. The conceptual overlap between the above texts and 2 Cor 4:4 make it highly plausible that Paul employed the expression “the god of this age” as a way of alluding to Satan within his apocalyptic worldview.

Second, how might we account for Paul’s use of θεός given its apparent theological difficulties? First, the lexical range of θεός permits the application of the term to figures other than “God” alone. In LXX Ps 81:6, for example, the Septuagint applies the term θεοί to humans (cf. אֱלֹהִים in Ps 81:6). In 1 Cor 8:5 Paul himself uses the term in reference to other “gods” (θεοί), despite in the very next verse declaring that “for us there is one God, the Father” (εἷς θεὸς ὁ πατήρ, 1 Cor 8:6).¹⁴

As bold as it might have been for a rigorous monotheistic Jew such as Paul to predicate the term θεός of any figure besides God the Father, Paul’s monotheism was clearly not compromised by the language of 2 Cor 4:4. For Paul’s language in the verse is borne out of, and should be read in light of, his apocalyptic worldview. Accordingly, just as Paul’s apocalyptic framework allows him to envision an overlap of the present age and the age to come, so too it permits Paul to depict Satan as a temporary and so-called “god” (cf. 1 Cor 8:5–6).¹⁵ Satan’s function as θεός is, however, intrinsically tied to the fate of the present age which will one day come to

¹³ On the allusions to “the ruler of this world” in the Rabbinic literature, see Alan F. Segal, “The Ruler of This World,” in *The Other Judaisms of Late Antiquity* (BJS 127; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1987) 41–77.

¹⁴ As Margaret E. Thrall notes, the translations of this verse by some early Christian writers (e.g., Chrysostom and Tertullian) implies that they too wrestled with the use of θεός in 2 Cor 4:4 (*II Corinthians 1–7* [vol. 1; ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994], 306–07).

¹⁵ Nor must one interpret “the god of this age” in terms of Gnostic ideas as did Rudolf K. Bultmann, *The Second Letter to the Corinthians* (trans. Roy A. Harrisville; Minneapolis, Minn.: Augsburg, 1985), 103–05. See also Per Bilde, “2 Cor 4:4: The View of Satan and the Created World in Paul,” in *Apocryphon Severini* (eds. Per Bilde, Helge Kjær Nielsen, and Jørgen Podemann Sørensen; Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 1993), 29–41. Bilde unpersuasively contends that Paul’s “anti-cosmic” and “anti-somatic” theology in 2 Cor 4:4 represents a “decisive step” towards Gnosticism (*ibid.*, 39).

end when the one true θεός defeats his enemies and becomes “all in all” (Rom 16:20; 1 Cor 15:28).

Finally, it is clear that Satan is envisioned in 2 Cor 4:4 since in the following verses Paul contrasts the “blinding” activity of ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου with God the Father who said, “let light shine out of darkness” and who “has shone in our hearts the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ” (2 Cor 4:6). For Paul, the roles of “the god of this age” and God the Father, much like the two ages within apocalyptic thought, are antithetical. It would therefore make little sense if the two “gods” of vv. 4 and 6 referred to the same figure. Collectively, these points demonstrate the plausibility that Paul’s expression ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου was not a reference to God the Father but to the same Satan whom Paul charged with hindering his missionary efforts in 1 Thess 2:18.

6.2.3 The Function of “the god of this age” in 2 Corinthians

In one sense the reference to “the god of this age” is incidental to Paul’s exposition of his ministry in 2 Cor 4:1–7:4, occurring only as part of Paul’s reaction to apparent accusations of the “veiledness” of his gospel. Moreover, Paul only briefly explains the role of “the god of this age” before resuming his description of his ministry in v. 7. In another sense, however, that Paul refers to Satan’s activity of “blinding” unbelievers in the midst of discussing his own ministry reveals a greater dimension to the verse, one often overlooked by scholars who tend to focus on the theological complexities of the passage. Our analysis of the function of Paul’s reference to “the god of this age” in this section will primarily focus on how Paul characterizes Satan’s role as “the god of this age” in relation to his own ministry. Accordingly, we will first consider why Paul uses the term θεός to refer to Satan in 2 Cor 4:4, and, second, we will examine the role of “the god of this age” within the context of 2 Cor 4:1–6.

6.2.3.1 Satan as the “god” of this Age

Although Paul’s use of θεός in 2 Cor 4:4 is occasioned by its epistolary context, it remains highly significant that Paul is willing to apply the term to a figure other than God the Father, let alone the chief malevolent figure in Judaism. In the undisputed Pauline letters, Paul almost exclusively uses the term σατανᾶς to speak of Satan.¹⁶ Aside from 2 Cor 11:3 where Paul’s allusion to the Genesis serpent may refer to Satan,¹⁷ 2 Cor 4:4; 6:15; and 1 Thess 3:5 represent the only places where Paul does not use σατανᾶς to refer to Satan. The appellation ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, although unique within the Pauline corpus, may very well be the boldest reference to Satan by the apostle.¹⁸

This raises the question, why does Paul use the title ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου here rather than ὁ σατανᾶς? Is it because Paul believed Satan to be capable of deceiving people to regard him as their “god?”¹⁹ Or does Paul’s word choice reflect his belief that Satan desired to set up himself as a second, rival god to the one true God?²⁰ Or perhaps Paul’s “bold expression” for Satan is “based on the commonplace apocalyptic presupposition that in the present age the devil has usurped God’s authority.”²¹

Two clues from within the Corinthian letters may help explain Paul’s use of θεός in 2 Cor 4:4. First, in 1 Cor 2:6 and 2:8 Paul mentions τῶν ἀρχόντων τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου (“the rulers of this age”) who in their ignorance “crucified the Lord of glory.” The interpretation of τῶν ἀρχόντων τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου in 1 Cor 2:6, 8 is

¹⁶ Rom 16:20; 1 Cor 5:5; 7:5; 2 Cor 2:11; 11:14; 1 Thess 2:18; and 2 Cor 12:7 where the article is absent.

¹⁷ See below, §6.7.2.

¹⁸ Cf. Westerholm’s quotation of Claude G. Montefiore: “Paul even goes so far as to call Satan the god of this world, an expression which, to the average rabbinic Jew, would verge upon blasphemy” (Stephen Westerholm, *Perspectives Old and New on Paul: The “Lutheran” Paul and his Critics* [Grand Rapids, Mich.; Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2004], 121).

¹⁹ Trevor Oswald Ling, *The Significance of Satan: New Testament Demonology and Its Contemporary Relevance* (London: SPCK, 1961), 47.

²⁰ Philip E. Hughes, *Paul’s Second Epistle to the Corinthians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1962), 126–27.

²¹ Barrett, *Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, 130.

notoriously difficult.²² Among the several competing alternative hypotheses, including regarding the rulers as demonic powers or angelic custodians of the nations, in our estimation the argument for interpreting τῶν ἄρχόντων τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου as earthly political rulers has the most merit.²³ In this case, if in 2 Cor 4:4 Paul were to refer to Satan as ὁ ἄρχων of this age then he would be implying some sort of relationship between Satan and human (political) rulers, a notion not found elsewhere in Paul. In addition to distinguishing between earthly rulers and Satan, Paul may have employed the term θεός (rather than ἄρχων) in order to highlight Satan’s unique and powerful role.

Second, Paul’s use of the term θεός seems to be motivated by his comparison of the antithetical roles of Satan and God in the passage. According to 2 Cor 4:3–6, “the god of this age blinds” unbelievers (τῶν ἀπίστων) in order to prevent them from understanding the gospel (2 Cor 4:4), whereas God the Father, described here in terms of the Genesis creation narrative, shines in the hearts of individuals in order to “give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ” (2 Cor 4:6). The roles of the two “gods” are thus antithetical. Satan, who “deals in darkness,”²⁴ desires to blind people’s minds (=hearts); by contrast, the God of creation shines light in people’s hearts so they can comprehend (“see”) the gospel. We will discuss this role of Satan in greater detail below, but the point to be made here is that the opposing roles and antithetical missions of Satan and God the Father may have contributed to Paul’s understanding of Satan as this age’s “god.” Paul’s language in 2 Cor 4:4 is therefore apocalyptic in that it affirms a type of dualism,

²² The literature on these two verses is vast. For a comprehensive discussion of the different interpretations, see Anthony C. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans; Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 2000), 233–39. Thiselton divides the views into four categories: 1) rulers as demonic powers; 2) rulers as earthly political powers; 3) rulers as angelic custodians of nations; and 4) rulers as “sociopolitical powers in a structural collectivity that transcends given human individuals” (ibid.).

²³ Gordon Fee argues that linguistic evidence, epistolary context, and Pauline theology collectively rule out interpreting the “rulers” as demonic powers (*The First Epistle to the Corinthians* [NICNT; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1987], 103–04).

²⁴ Gordon D. Fee, *Pauline Christology: An Exegetical-Theological Study* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2007), 183.

even though only a “superficial” dualism since Satan’s reign as “god” is confined to this age.²⁵

6.2.3.2 “The god of this age” in 2 Corinthians 3–4

In the section of the letter prior to 2 Cor 4:4, Paul has been defending the openness of both the gospel and his ministry (v. 2).²⁶ In particular, Paul seems to be addressing accusations that his gospel, “and not the covenant of Moses, has been veiled.”²⁷ Verses 3–4 then add a caveat to Paul’s defense which situates his apostolic ministry (δικαονία, v. 1) within a broader, apocalyptic context. He argues that though the gospel may be “veiled” (κεκαλυμμένον) to some, it is not due to an inherent flaw in the gospel or because of Paul and his fellow-workers; they have worked openly before everyone proclaiming Jesus Christ (vv. 2, 5). Rather, Paul argues that in the case of unbelievers (οἱ ἄπιστοι)²⁸ who are already perishing (οἱ ἀπολλύμενοι),²⁹ it is “the god of this age” who further blinds (τυφλόω) them “to keep them from seeing the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God.”³⁰ Satan—not Paul or the gospel—is the reason for the “veiledness” of the gospel (cf. 2 Cor 3:12–18). To be sure, human culpability is not excluded here; those

²⁵ Barrett, *Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, 131. Murray J. Harris rightly points out that Paul’s dualism is not material or metaphysical but temporal and ethical (*The Second Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* [ed. I. Howard Marshall and Donald A. Hagner; NIGTC; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2005], 328).

²⁶ Paul’s defense, like his exposition of the two covenants in 2 Cor 3:1–18, was probably aimed at those who came with letters of recommendation (3:1f.). For further contrasts between 3:1–18 and 4:1–6, see Jan Lambrecht, *Second Corinthians* (ed. Daniel J. Harrington; SP 8; Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1999), 65–66.

²⁷ Victor Paul Furnish, *II Corinthians* (AB 32A; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1984), 247.

²⁸ ἄπιστοι here, as elsewhere in Paul, refers to unbelievers in general and not to Paul’s opponents. See also 1 Cor 6:6; 7:12–15; 10:27; 14:22, 24; 2 Cor 6:14–15; cf. 1 Tim 5:8; Tit 1:15. In agreement, Harris, *Corinthians*, 329; cf. Ralph P. Martin, *2 Corinthians* (WBC 40; Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 1986), 78–79; Susan R. Garrett, “The God of this World and the Affliction of Paul: 2 Cor 4:1–12,” in *Greeks, Romans, and Christians: Essays in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe* (ed. David L. Balch; Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress Press, 1990), 99–117 (101–02, no. 12 and no. 13).

²⁹ On the relationship between οἱ ἄπιστοι and οἱ ἀπολλύμενοι, see Harris, *Corinthians*, 329, who argues that the two are “coextensive” as categories but not synonymous since some ἄπιστοι could be saved by embracing the gospel.

³⁰ The infinitival phrase εἰς τὸ μὴ ἀυγάσαι ..., is either final or consecutive. Both are grammatically possible (C. F. D. Moule, *An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek* [2d ed.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959], 143, no. 2). Barrett takes it as final, arguing that it suits the context better as “a description of Satan’s purpose” (*Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, 131).

who are blinded by Satan are already “perishing” (τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις) and thus called unbelievers (οἱ ἄπιστοι).³¹ Nonetheless, in Paul’s view Satan plays a key role in preventing people from comprehending the gospel.³²

Looking closer at the text of 2 Cor 4, Satan’s activity in v. 4 is to be contrasted with God’s in v. 6. As Lambrecht points out, there are several similarities in vocabulary and syntactical structure between the two verses³³:

2 Cor 4:4—εἰς τὸ μὴ αὐγάσαι τὸν φωτισμὸν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τῆς δόξης τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅς ἐστιν εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ.

“... to keep them from seeing the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God.”

2 Cor 4:6—πρὸς φωτισμὸν τῆς γνώσεως τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν προσώπῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

“... to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.”

In light of these similar yet contrasting verses, Paul’s point in vv. 4–6 is quite clear: “the god of this age” blinds the minds of unbelievers, whereas it is the God who said, “let light shine out of darkness” (cf. Gen 1:3) who gives illumination for the comprehension of the gospel. These verses therefore function as a reminder to the Corinthians that though God and Paul are at work in the world, so too are malevolent forces.

³¹ For a discussion of Paul’s attribution of Jewish unbelief not only to God and Israel but also to Satan, see the insightful article by Mohan Uddin (“Paul, the Devil and ‘Unbelief’ in Israel [with Particular Reference to 2 Corinthians 3–4 and Romans 9–11],” *TynBul* 50, no. 2 [1999]: 265–80).

³² The sequence of unbelief is significant here. As Harris comments, “that ἀπιστία *precedes* the τύφλωσις seems indicated by Paul’s statement that Satan ‘blinded the minds of the(se) unbelievers’, that is, those who already were unbelievers, not, ‘so that they became unbelievers’ or ‘who are now unbelievers’” (*Corinthians*, 329).

³³ Lambrecht, *Second Corinthians*, 66. Although not specified by Lambrecht, other similarities include the common force of the infinitival phrase εἰς τὸ μὴ in v. 4 and the preposition πρὸς in v. 6, the occurrence of φωτισμός in both verses (found nowhere else in the NT), the string of genitives, and the mentioning of Χριστός in both verses. Gordon D. Fee (*Pauline Christology*, 183–84) also draws attention to the contrastive nature of vv. 4 and 6. Likewise, Lambrecht highlights the parallels between 2 Cor 3:18 and 4:4 (*Second Corinthians*, 65–66).

6.2.4 “The god of this age” and the Ministry of Paul

In relation to the present study, 2 Cor 4:4 is especially important in that Paul contextualizes his apostolic labor within his apocalyptic worldview. That is, the opposition between the two “gods” in 2 Cor 4:4–6 becomes the grounds for Paul to defend his ministry in v. 5: “for we do not preach ourselves, but Jesus Christ as Lord and ourselves as your slaves for Jesus.” Here Paul maintains a typical apocalyptic perspective on the antithetical roles of God and Satan, but he *also* locates his ministry within that antithesis as he explicates his labor for the gospel to the Corinthians.

Within his apocalyptic worldview, Paul sees himself carrying out his appointed ministry—his *doppelte Auftrag*—in the face of Satan who rules as the “god” of this age. Importantly, Paul envisions his task as co-operation with God to “lift the veil” and enable people to see “the light of the good news of the glory of Christ.”³⁴ Simultaneously, Paul envisions Satan as working against his missionary goals by “blinding” those who do not believe. As Garrett writes, “Paul puts himself in direct opposition to the god of this age.”³⁵ That is, Paul sees his own ministry as an assault, by virtue of the light of the gospel of Christ, on Satan’s rule over the present age of darkness and evil (2 Cor 4:4–6; Gal 1:4). Conversely, the mission of Satan—“the god of this age”—is diametrically opposed to that of Paul.

Paul therefore regards Satan as both an enemy of God and an adversary to his apostolic ministry. This general theological view of Satan thus allows Paul to detect and point out Satan’s particular actions during the course of his apostolic labor, whether it be against his own travel plans, as we saw was the case in 1 Thess 2:18, or against the faith and unity of his congregations, as we observed in 1 Thess 3:5. This yields an important point for the Pauline understanding of Satan: it is the same “the god of this age” who stands in opposition to the light of the gospel of Christ and who blinds the minds of unbelievers who also opposes Paul’s apostolic labor by tempting and corrupting his churches.

³⁴ Garrett, “The God of this World,” 114.

³⁵ *Ibid.* In my assessment, Garrett’s analysis of Paul’s view of Satan does not go far enough by suggesting that “Paul casts himself in the role of one opposed by the devil’s allies” (*ibid.*, 117). It is Satan himself—not just the “devil’s allies”—whom Paul fears (e.g., 1 Thess 2:18).

6.2.5 Conclusions

In our analysis of 2 Cor 4:4, we argued three main points: (1) the designation ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου should be understood as a reference to Satan since this view is lexically permissible, theologically unproblematic for Paul's monotheism, and because it fits within the logic of Paul's argument in 2 Cor 3–4; (2) Paul, defending the apparent “veiledness” of his gospel, refers to Satan as the “god” of this age because the term θεός allowed him to emphasize Satan's powerful role within his apocalyptic framework and to highlight the antithetical roles of Satan and God the father; and (3) Paul's description of the work of “the god of this age” within his defense of his gospel and apostleship demonstrates that he understood his apostolic ministry and Satan's work to be fundamentally antithetical.

2 Corinthians 4:4 fits curiously within our overall argument. On the one hand, the verse is different from Paul's other allusions to Satan in that it does not mention an historically specific example of Satan's work against Paul's churches (cf. 1 Thess 2:18) but instead makes a theological claim concerning “the god of this age” and his efforts against the ἄπιστοι. On the other hand, Paul contextualizes his apostolic ministry within his wider apocalyptic framework and against the work of “the god of this age.” Thus, whereas in 1 Thess 2:18 and 3:5 Paul described specific events in which Satan opposed Paul's labor, in 2 Cor 4:4 he characterizes his *entire* apostolic ministry as opposed by Satan's work.

6.3 1 Corinthians 5:5

6.3.1 Introduction

1 Corinthians 5:1–13 is well-known to many as an example of ecclesial discipline in early Christianity. In the passage Paul confronts the Corinthians' pride over their liberal toleration of a member of their congregation who was living with his father's wife. In response, Paul commands them “to hand over this one to Satan for the destruction of his flesh so that the spirit might be saved in the day of the Lord.” The passage presents a remarkable instance of Paul's epistolary efforts to discipline one

of his fledgling churches. Our own interest in 1 Cor 5:5 is, of course, Paul's reference to Satan within his instructions to the Corinthian congregation. In particular, we are interested in the following question: why, in an instance of ecclesial discipline, does Paul command the Corinthians to hand over the man to *Satan*? In other words, what does Satan have to do with the situation described in 1 Cor 5:1–13?

In order to consider these questions, we must face the necessary task of addressing several exegetical issues in 1 Cor 5:5, each of which significantly bear on the translation and meaning of the verse. Subsequent to our exegetical analysis of 1 Cor 5:5, we will argue that the notion of “handing over” someone to Satan means to cast someone back into the *realm* of Satan. Finally, we will examine the significance of 1 Cor 5:5 for our wider investigation, especially as it relates to Paul's relationship to the Corinthian church.

6.3.2 Exegetical Issues in 1 Corinthians 5:5

Paul's command to the Corinthians in 1 Cor 5:5 is in many ways an exegete's worst nightmare due to its highly disputed meaning and diverse history of interpretation. As Thiselton comments, “such is the length of this single convoluted sentence in vv. 3–5 that it is difficult to argue for one view over another.”³⁶ It would therefore be neither feasible nor within the scope of this study to rehearse the reception history of the passage or to examine the minutiae of its exegetical complexities. However, it also would be impossible to discuss the meaning of 1 Cor 5:5 and Satan's role within it without addressing these issues to some extent. It will be necessary, therefore, to first offer an explanation of what we consider to be the most historically plausible meaning of 1 Cor 5:5 prior to discussing the verse's implications for our wider study.

Before we turn to the individual exegetical issues, we note the recent study on 1 Cor 5:5 by David Smith, whose assessment of the critical reception of the verse is

³⁶ Thiselton, *Corinthians*, 394.

particularly valuable.³⁷ Smith divides previous theories into four basic categories: 1) curse and magical interpretations of παραδῶναι τὸν τοιοῦτον τῷ σατανᾷ (e.g., Collins 1980: 251–63);³⁸ 2) non-curse and/or non-magical interpretations that envision physical suffering and exclusion (e.g., Barrett 1968); 3) non-curse and/or non-magical interpretations that envision psychological suffering and exclusion (e.g., Murphy-O’Connor 1979: 239–45); and 4) exclusion-only interpretations (e.g., Fee 1987; South 1993: 539–61; Thiselton 2000).³⁹

Smith’s own view represents a fifth alternative interpretation. He argues that Paul’s command in 1 Cor 5:3–5 entails both a curse and exclusion and envisages “Satan exercising his malevolent power to physically destroy the sexually immoral man.”⁴⁰ Despite Smith’s attempt to revitalize the curse interpretation of 1 Cor 5:5, we conclude that this argument remains unconvincing, not least because it presents a view of Satan (as an unwitting agent of God⁴¹) inconsistent with our interpretation of Satan in Paul.⁴² Instead, we follow those who interpret Paul’s command

³⁷ David Raymond Smith, *Hand this Man over to Satan: Curse, Exclusion and Salvation in 1 Corinthians 5* (LNTS 386; London: T&T Clark International, 2009).

³⁸ Sydney H. T. Page goes so far as to claim that the so-called “curse” interpretation is favored by “the majority of modern scholars” (*Powers of Evil: A Biblical Study of Satan and Demons* [Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans; Leicester: Apollos: 1995], 201). Advocates of this position include, among others, Hans Conzelmann and George W. MacRae, *1 Corinthians: A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975); Göran Forkman, *The Limits of the Religious Community: Expulsion from within the Qumran Sect, within Rabbinic Judaism, and within Primitive Christianity* (ConBNT 5; Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1972). BDAG also lends support to the “curse/death” interpretation, citing both primary and secondary sources attesting to this usage of παραδίδωμι in relation to handing over individuals to “the gods of the netherworld.”

Bent Noack, *Satanás und Sotería: Untersuchungen zur neutestamentlichen Dämonologie* (Copenhagen: Gads, 1948), 98: “Er verflucht den Betreffenden, d.h. er begnügt sich nicht mit einer Exkommunikation, sondern fordert einen schädlichen Einfluss Satans. Der Teufel ist also auch in diesem Falle der Urheber der Krankheiten und des Todes, der imstande ist, den Körper (die σάρξ) eines Menschen vollständig zugrunde zu richten.” Thus, for Noack the curse is to be associated not with Deuteronomy, as is often suggested, but with Satan who is able to inflict harm upon the σάρξ.

³⁹ Another (although uncommon) interpretation is that Paul intended for the Corinthians to hand over the man to civil authorities. E.g., see J. Duncan M. Derrett, “‘Handing over to Satan’: An Explanation of 1 Cor 5:1–7,” *Revue internationale des droits de l’antiquité* 3 (1979): 11–30; William F. Orr and James Arthur Walther, *1 Corinthians: A New Translation; Introduction with a Study of the Life of Paul, Notes, and Commentary* (New York: Doubleday, 1976); cf. Henry Ansgar Kelly, *Satan: A Biography* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 58.

⁴⁰ Smith, *Hand this Man over to Satan*, 180.

⁴¹ “Through Satanic agency, the curse is the vehicle by which physical suffering and death is produced” (ibid.).

⁴² Although Smith (ibid., 45–50) strongly disagrees with the influential critique of the curse view by James T. South (“A Critique of the ‘Curse/Death’ Interpretation of 1 Corinthians 5.1–8,” *NTS* 39,

fundamentally as an exclusion from the Christian community (Smith’s fourth category). In addition to the typical exegetical arguments marshaled in favor of this view, this argument also accords with Paul’s apostolic care for his churches if we read Paul’s command to “hand over” the incestuous man as a command to preserve Paul’s apostolic labor at Corinth, a suggestion we will consider below.

Turning now to the disputed exegetical issues of 1 Cor 5:5 and its immediate context, we begin with the prepositional phrase ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου [ἡμῶν] Ἰησοῦ (1 Cor 5:4).⁴³ The primary issue here is to determine to which verb the phrase is subordinate. In Thiselton’s commentary, six main permutations are presented, two of which seem to have the greatest contextual support: 1) construing ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου [ἡμῶν] Ἰησοῦ with both συναχθέντων and σὺν τῇ δυνάμει and 2) construing the phrase with “the entire remainder of the two clauses.”⁴⁴ We conclude with Fitzmyer that the former has the most to commend it, and thus understand Paul to be urging the Corinthians to carry out this disciplinary action when they are

no. 4 [1993]: 539–61), South’s sustained criticisms remain astute and cogent. South offers ten points of criticism against this view: (1) the alleged parallels of the Greek and Jewish curse formulae are not legitimate parallels; (2) neither Acts 5:1–11 nor 1 Cor 11:30 are comparable to the situation in 1 Cor 5; (3) a “curse/death” interpretation of ὀλεθρος is not demanded by Paul’s use of the term; (4) parallel Hebrew Bible examples of “curse/death” situations cannot account for 1 Cor 5:5; (5) the Greek and Jewish curse formulae are not the most likely background to the expression παραδοῦναι τὸν τοιοῦτον τῷ σατανᾷ; (6) the only other NT verbal parallel to παραδοῦναι τὸν τοιοῦτον τῷ σατανᾷ (1 Tim 1:20) clearly excludes the idea of death; (7) the “curse/death” interpretation is contrary to Paul’s typical understanding of σάρξ and πνεῦμα; (8) 1 Cor 5:2, 7, and 13 provide a more cogent and immediate context of interpretation than the curse formulae; (9) 1 Cor 5:9–13 help explain the “intention” of παραδοῦναι τῷ σατανᾷ; and (10) the “curse/death” interpretation renders unintelligible the subordinate clause ἵνα τὸ πνεῦμα σωθῇ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ κυρίου (ibid., 544–59).

This last, and “most serious flaw” (ibid., 556) of the “curse/death” argument is illustrated by scholars’ various attempts to explain the final clause of v. 5: Conzelmann considers the phrase to be “an enigmatic statement” but is unable to prefer any particular interpretation of it (*1 Corinthians*, 97–98); Adela Yarbo Collins suggests that the πνεῦμα in view is not that of the individual but rather the Holy Spirit that dwelt in the community (“The Function of ‘Excommunication’ in Paul,” *HTR* 73 [1980]: 251–63; cf. Simon Kistemaker, “‘Deliver this man to Satan’ (1 Cor 5:5): A Case Study in Church Discipline,” *MSJ* 3 [1992], 43–44); Hans von Campenhausen also understands πνεῦμα to refer to the Holy Spirit, but differs from Collins in that he views it as the Spirit once imparted to the incestuous man that is now to be taken away from him (*Ecclesiastical Authority and Spiritual Power in the Church of the First Three Centuries* [London: A. & C. Black, 1969], 134). As is often noted by commentators, the interpretation that πνεῦμα here refers to the church goes back to Tertullian (*De pudicitia*, 13).

⁴³ On the textual variants in the verse, see Thiselton, *Corinthians*, 392.

⁴⁴ Ibid., 393–94.

gathered “in the name of the Lord Jesus.”⁴⁵ That the use of the name Jesus (often with κύριος) was common in early Christian liturgical settings further supports this view.⁴⁶

The second issue concerning 1 Cor 5:5 is the interpretation of the verb παραδίδωμι. Typically the verb means to “hand over” or “deliver” someone or something in a transitive sense. For instance, in the Synoptic Gospels it is used with reference to Judas delivering Jesus to the authorities (e.g., Mark 14:10; Matt 26:15; Luke 23:25). The Septuagint of Job uses παραδίδωμι to describe God’s deliverance of Job into the hands of “the Satan” (LXX Job 2:6; cf. 16:12).⁴⁷ That LXX Job 2:6 and 1 Cor 5:5 deploy similar verbs and refer to Satan has led some to see a conceptual similarity between the two passages.⁴⁸ However, the subjects of the verbs in the two texts are different: in the book of Job it is the Lord who “delivers” (παραδίδωμι) Job into (the) Satan’s hands, whereas in 1 Cor 5:5 Paul instructs *the Corinthians* to “hand over” the man to Satan. Although the two texts share similarities, the Joban story remains a vague parallel at best.

Third, Paul’s use of the terms σάρξ and πνεῦμα in 1 Cor 5:5 has caused interpreters difficulty, not least because they are such typical Pauline terms. At stake in the interpretation of the noun σάρξ is what kind of “destruction” (ὄλεθρος) Paul anticipated for the incestuous man. Did Paul believe the man would suffer a literal,

⁴⁵ Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AYB 32; New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2008), 237. Since the intended disciplinary action is to take place when they gather “in the name of the Lord Jesus,” it would be wrong to press the syntactical evidence to exclude the application of “in the name of the Lord Jesus” to also the “handing over” of the man to Satan.

⁴⁶ According to Larry W. Hurtado (*Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity* [Grand Rapids, Mich.; Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2003], 117), the expression “in the name of the Lord Jesus” in 1 Cor 5:3–5 alludes to the Christian “liturgical practice of invoking Jesus as *Kyrios*.” For example, see Acts 22:16; 1 Cor 1:2; Rom 10:13. For more on the early Christian use of the name of Jesus (as Lord), see Hurtado, *One God, One Lord: Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism* (Philadelphia, Pa.: Fortress Press, 1988), 108–11.

⁴⁷ Cf. the MT of Job 2:6—וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל־הַשָּׂטָן הֲנוּ בִידֶךָ אֵךְ אֶת־נַפְשׁוֹ שָׁמַר—which lacks a corresponding verb.

⁴⁸ The suggestion that the use of παραδίδωμι in 1 Cor 5:5 is analogous to the use of παραδίδωμι in LXX Job 2:6 is highly questionable (against Forkman, *The Limits of the Religious Community*, 143; Kelly, *Satan: A Biography*, 58; Michael Douglas Goulder, “Libertines? [1 Cor 5–6],” *NovT* 41, no. 4 [1999]: 334–48). That Paul’s view of Satan is in some way connected to the portrayal of Satan in Job, see David E. Garland, *1 Corinthians* (BECNT; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic, 2003), 154; Sydney H. T. Page, “Satan: God’s Servant,” *JETS* 50.3 (2007): 449–65.

bodily death? Or did Paul believe that the man would experience some sort of psychological oppression? Representative of a position commonly espoused by scholars, Conzelmann claimed that “[t]he destruction of the flesh can hardly mean anything else but death.”⁴⁹ Despite this *prima facie* interpretation of σάρξ in 1 Cor 5:5, there is sufficient evidence to reject this notion.⁵⁰ In the end, the most cogent interpretation of σάρξ is to take it as a metaphorical reference to the man’s “flesh” as opposed to his “spirit.” Accordingly, we conclude with Thiselton: “what it is to be destroyed is arguably not primarily the physical body of the offender (although this may or may not be secondarily entailed) but the ‘fleshly’ *stance of self-sufficiency* of which Paul accuses *primarily the community* but surely *also the man*.”⁵¹ Importantly, this interpretation of σάρξ coheres with Paul’s express purpose of the action in v. 5—ἵνα τὸ πνεῦμα σωθῆ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ κυρίου.

Thiselton’s cautious remarks on πνεῦμα and the purpose of Paul’s command are also convincing. He rejects his earlier view that only the individual’s salvation is in view, and now, following Rosner, Campbell, and South, argues that “the salvific purposes embrace both the community and the man.”⁵² Although this view makes any proposed translation of τὸ πνεῦμα problematic, Thiselton is right to leave open whether Paul means “the *stance of the man, the man under the mode of his openness to God, the stance of the church, the animating principle of the church* . . . or simply, *that mode of being of the community and of the man which is purged of its fleshly, self-sufficient complacency*.”⁵³

But if Paul did not envision that “handing over” the man to Satan would result in his death, then how can we make sense of the force of εἰς ὄλεθρον τῆς σαρκός? Given our interpretation of 1 Cor 5:5 thus far, perhaps the question we should ask is how does Paul anticipate the “fleshly self-sufficiency” of the incestuous man (as well

⁴⁹ Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 97. Similarly, F. F. Bruce claims that ὄλεθρος demands “more than” expulsion (*1 and 2 Corinthians* [NCB; London: Oliphants, 1971], 55).

⁵⁰ Especially note the five problems with the “death” interpretation raised by Fee, *Corinthians*, 209–12.

⁵¹ Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 395–400 (396), italics original.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 397. Cf. *idem*, “Meaning of Sarx in 1 Corinthians 5:5: A Fresh Approach in the Light of Logical and Semantic Factors,” *SJT* 26, no. 2 (1973): 204–28.

⁵³ Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 397, italics original.

as that of the Corinthian community) will be “destroyed” (ὄλεθρος) by casting him out of the (Corinthian) church and into the realm of Satan. And furthermore, how will this act of destruction result in his and/or the church’s salvation? As to the first question, by being cast out of the community of faith, the incestuous man will be cut off from the Corinthian believers, and they from him. Paul’s hope is that this act will actualize the judgment which he has already made (v. 3) by shaming the man for his perverse behavior *and* by denying the Corinthians any further opportunity to boast (v. 6).⁵⁴ In this way the man’s “fleshly” pride and lust will be destroyed. Regarding the second question, Paul’s hope is that the destruction of the man’s “flesh” will result in repentance of his conduct and, in an ultimate sense, his eschatological salvation.⁵⁵ In this way both the sinful man and the Corinthian community, Paul hopes, will be “saved.” Despite whatever uncertainties remain regarding *how* this action is to take place—for it is impossible to say with real certainty—it seems most likely that Paul’s hope for the man’s expulsion, and thus the purpose of the ecclesial act commanded in vv. 3–5, is that his “present punishment [will open] up the possibility of future salvation.”⁵⁶

In short, the above discussion brings us to the following preliminary interpretation of 1 Cor 5:3–5: The Corinthians are to gather in the name of the Lord Jesus and cast out the wicked man from their community, the realm of Christ’s rule, into the realm of Satan because of the nature of his sin and the church’s boastful tolerance of it. Because both the individual and the community are culpable, Paul hopes that their “fleshly” ways will be destroyed so that their eschatological reward will not be lost.⁵⁷ For Paul, then, to “hand over” someone to Satan means to expel

⁵⁴ Indeed, Paul wishes the Corinthians would have expelled the man in the first place (v. 2).

⁵⁵ As Fee puts it: “What Paul was desiring by having this man put outside the believing community was the destruction of what was ‘carnal’ in him, so that he might be ‘saved’ eschatologically” (*Corinthians*, 212).

⁵⁶ Gundry-Volf, *Paul and Perseverance*, 120.

⁵⁷ A similar reference is found in 1 Tim 1:20 where the author refers to Hymenaeus and Alexander whom “I have handed over to Satan so that they may learn not to blaspheme” (παρέδωκα τῷ σατανᾷ, ἵνα παιδευθῶσιν μὴ βλασφημεῖν). Taken together, 1 Cor 5:5 and 1 Tim 1:20 may demonstrate that the notion of “handing over” someone to Satan functioned as “quasitechnical language for some kind of expulsion from the Christian community” (Fee, *Corinthians*, 208–09; cf. Wayne A. Meeks, *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul* [New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1983], 128: “Paul takes it for granted that such a plenary meeting is the way such a solemn action is to be taken.” Meeks furthermore suggests that the Matthean procedure of

them from the church. Thus it is probably accurate to interpret the notion of handing over a person to “Satan” as a metonymic expression for handing over someone to the “realm of Satan,” that is, to an existence outside the Christian community.⁵⁸

6.3.3 *Satan and the Incestuous Man*

Having briefly considered some of the more problematic exegetical issues of 1 Cor 5:3–5, we are now in position to address a more salient question concerning our study: what did Paul mean when he commanded the Corinthians to “hand over this man to Satan?” If, as we maintained above, Paul primarily intended for the incestuous man to be excluded from the community, *why* then does he also expect that the man will be handed over to *Satan*?

Many interpreters have argued that the individual would suffer physical suffering and/or death in the hands of Satan. It does not seem likely, however, that we are to envision the Corinthians literally delivering the man to Satan. What then does it mean to be “handed over” to Satan? The best answer to this question is that when Paul refers to Satan in 1 Cor 5:5 he is actually referring to *the realm of Satan*—not to the malevolent figure in a literal way.⁵⁹ As Witherington rightly remarks, delivering the man into Satan’s realm is not the same as delivering him to Satan (himself).⁶⁰

communal discipline in Matt 18:15–18 offers a parallel account to 1 Cor 5. According to Meeks, both passages place the authority of discipline in the hands of the community and have their roots in “the Jewish community’s self-governance” [ibid.].

⁵⁸ In agreement, Fee, *Corinthians*, 209; Clinton E. Arnold, *Powers of Darkness: Principalities and Powers in Paul’s Letters* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1992), 134–35; Leon Morris, *The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians: An Introduction and Commentary* (2d ed.; TNTC; Leicester: Inter-Varsity, 1985), 88; Herman N. Ridderbos, *Paul: An Outline of his Theology* (London: SPCK, 1977), 471. However, Paul’s language of internal and external boundaries, as Gaventa rightly points out (concerning Romans), does not correspond “to the disparaging remarks of 2 Peter about the false teachers or to 1 John’s castigation of the ‘children of the devil,’ to say nothing of Qumran’s instruction to ‘hate all the Children of Darkness, each commensurate with his guilt and the vengeance due him from God” (Beverly Roberts Gaventa, *Our Mother Saint Paul* [Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press, 2007], 145).

⁵⁹ So Fee: “the language means to turn him back out into Satan’s sphere. This does not mean that Satan would not directly attack him in some way, but that is incidental to the language, not its primary intent” (*Corinthians*, 209).

⁶⁰ Ben Witherington III, *Conflict and Community in Corinth: A Socio-rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans; Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1995), 158; Fee, *Corinthians*, 209.

The distinction is subtle, but it is crucial for interpreting both the meaning of Paul's command in 1 Cor 5:5 as well as Paul's view of Satan in the text.

At this point it becomes clear why 2 Cor 4:4 and 1 Cor 5:5 should be interpreted together, and thus our rationale for examining 2 Cor 4:4 prior to the present verse: both assume Paul's underlying theological notion that Satan rules over the temporal-physical sphere outside the Christian community, the *Zugriffsbereich des Satans* ("access-area of Satan").⁶¹ In our discussion of 2 Cor 4:4, we observed that Paul regarded Satan's authority over the present age as so influential that he is willing to ascribe him the title ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου. In 1 Cor 5:5, the same principle underlies the logic of Paul's command: the Corinthians are to hand over the incestuous man to the realm of existence where Satan rules as "god."⁶² To hand over someone to Satan is therefore tantamount to delivering them to the *Zugriffsbereich des Satans* precisely because within Paul's apocalyptic worldview there are only two "spheres"—the Christian community over which the risen Christ rules and the *Zugriffsbereich des Satans*.

The notion that outside the Christian community lies the *Zugriffsbereich des Satans* is also reflected elsewhere in the NT and in Paul. In Acts 26:18, the risen Jesus tells Paul that he is being sent to the Gentiles "to open their eyes so that they may turn from darkness to light and from the power of Satan (τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ σατανᾶ) to God, so that they may receive forgiveness of sins and a place among those who are sanctified by faith in me." In Col 1:13 the author declares that God has "rescued us from the power of darkness (τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ σκότους) and transferred us into the kingdom of his beloved Son." While the name "Satan" is not employed here, the inside/outside imagery is parallel to that in 1 Cor 5 and 2 Cor

⁶¹ The phrase *Zugriffsbereich des Satans* is taken from Karl-Heinrich Ostmeyer, "Satan und Passa in 1. Korinther 5, ZNW 5, no. 9 (2002): 38–45. Ostmeyer posits a number of similarities between 1 Cor 5 (esp. vv. 6–8) and the Passover narrative in Exodus. In particular, he suggests that in both instances the communities are protected by the Passover lamb, whereas outside the protection of the lamb lies the *ägyptische Nacht*, the *Zugriffsbereich des Satans* (ibid., 44). Ostmeyer furthermore understands the goal of the individual's excommunication in terms of the Passover motif that he perceives in the passage: "Reumütige Umkehr, um wieder in die Passagemeinde drinnen aufgenommen zu werden und dem Satansbereich draußen zu entkommen, ist das der Passamotivik entsprechende Ziel der Exkommunikation" (ibid., 44).

⁶² It is telling that Johnson, who resists a "dualistic" interpretation of 1 Cor 5:5 ("Satan Talk in Corinth," 149), entirely omits 2 Cor 4:4 from her study.

4:4.⁶³ In Paul we find the concept expressed most clearly in Gal 1:4 where he refers to Lord Jesus Christ who “gave himself for our sins to set us free from the present evil age” (ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦ ἐνεστώτος πονηροῦ).⁶⁴

As we saw in Chapter Two, this notion is paralleled in the Qumran literature by the expression ממשלת בל יעל (“dominion of Belial”).⁶⁵ In the Rule of the Community, for instance, the Instruction on Two Spirits (1QS 3:13–4:26) dualistically divides the universe into the dominion (ממשלת) of the Prince of Light and the dominion (ממשלת) of the Angel of Darkness. Similarly, in the *Damascus Document* the community is presented as living in the last days—the “era of wickedness” (קין הרשע)—in which Belial attempts to ensnare people with his “three nets” (CD 4:15–17).⁶⁶ Lastly, in the *War Scroll* the community are assisted by the Angel of Light against the dominion of Belial (1QM 13:10–12). Similar to Paul, in the Qumran writings the sphere outside the community of the righteous was regarded as the realm of Satan (or Belial).⁶⁷

Out of a similar sectarian matrix,⁶⁸ Paul conceived of the early Christian church as the community under the rule of the Lord Jesus Christ which stood over against the *Zugriffsbereich des Satans*. Indeed, Paul even conceives of salvation in terms of deliverance from “the present evil age” (Gal 1:4) which has Satan as its “god” (2 Cor 4:4).⁶⁹ Returning to the language and imagery in 1 Cor 5:5, the logic behind Paul’s command seems to be that a person either exists as part of the faith-community or as

⁶³ The term σκότος has clear connotations of evil (cf. Luke 22:52; Eph 6:12).

⁶⁴ See also Eph 2:12 and 1 John 5:19.

⁶⁵ See above, §2.4.2.

⁶⁶ To be sure, CD 12:2–3 (cf. Lev 20:27) presents a halakhic regulation which implies members of the community who fall sway to the dominion of Belial will be put to death. The example is not illustrative for 1 Cor 5:5, not least because in the *Damascus Document* the punishment is punitive whereas in 1 Cor 5 it is redemptive in purpose.

⁶⁷ For a related study, see Michael Newton, *The Concept of Purity at Qumran and in the Letters of Paul* (SNTSMS 53; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985).

⁶⁸ Timothy H. Lim, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 111–12.

⁶⁹ For a study on the theme of redemption from Satan in the NT, see Richard H. Bell, *Deliver Us from Evil: Interpreting the Redemption from the Power of Satan in New Testament Theology* (WUNT 216; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007).

part of Satan's realm. Therefore, to be expelled from the Christian community can only mean to be cast back into the realm of Satan.⁷⁰

Although many scholars claim that the language of 1 Cor 5:5 implies some level of agency on the part of Satan, such a view is not explicit within the passage. For if to "hand over" the errant man to Satan means to deliver him to the *realm* of Satan (*Zugriffsbereich des Satans*) and not Satan himself, then there is little reason to posit any agency of Satan in 1 Cor 5:5.⁷¹ From Paul's perspective, the crucial agent in the act of "handing over" of the man to the *Zugriffsbereich des Satans* is the Corinthian community. It is the believers of Corinth themselves, while invoking the name of the risen Jesus, who partake in the disciplinary action. This is not to diminish the serious nature of the act or to exclude the possibility of the individual suffering harm by Satan. For as Fee rightly comments, delivering the man into the *realm of Satan* "does not mean that Satan would not directly attack him in some way, but that is incidental to the language, not its primary intent."⁷²

⁷⁰ In the passage the emphasis falls more on the individual's expulsion *out of* the Corinthian community than his entrance *into* the realm of Satan. Especially important here is the repeated Deuteronomic refrain, "drive out the wicked person" (1 Cor 5:13; cf. Deut 13:6; 17:7, 12; 19:13, 19; 21:9, 21; 22:21, 22, 24; 24:7). On the importance of Paul's use of these Hebrew Bible texts in 1 Cor 5 and the tradition they represent, see Brian S. Rosner, *Paul, Scripture and Ethics: A Study of 1 Corinthians 5–7* (AGJU 22; Leiden: Brill, 1994); idem, "The Function of Scripture in 1 Cor 5,13b and 6,16," in *Corinthian Correspondence* (ed. Reimund Bieringer; BETL 125; Louvain; Peeters, 1996), 513–18; idem, "'Drive out the Wicked Person': A Biblical Theology of Exclusion," *EvQ* 71 (1999): 25–36; and Richard B. Hays, *The Conversion of the Imagination: Paul as Interpreter of Israel's Scripture* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2005), 1–24; cf. John Paul Heil, *The Rhetorical Role of Scripture in 1 Corinthians* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005), 91–92, who argues that both Rosner and Hays "overinterpret" the significance of the context of Deuteronomy for Paul's use of scripture in 1 Cor 5:13b.

⁷¹ Against Dibelius, *Die Geisterwelt*, 191; Judith M. Gundry-Volf, *Paul and Perseverance: Staying in and Falling Away* (Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press, 1991), 118, n. 88; Richard A. Horsley, *1 Corinthians* (ANTC; Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon Press, 1998), 80; Ling, *The Significance of Satan*, 40; Orr and Walther, *1 Corinthians*, 188; Page, *Powers of Evil*, 202; Page, "Satan: God's Servant," 463; Elaine H. Pagels, *The Origin of Satan: The New Testament Origins of Christianity's Demonization of Jews, Pagans and Heretics* (New York: Random House, 1995), 183. Timothy C. G. Thornton ("Satan: God's Agent for Punishing," *ExpTim* 83, no. 5 [1972]: 151–52) goes even further by claiming that in 1 Cor 5:5, 2 Cor 12:7, and 1 Tim 1:20 Satan is to be regarded as "God's agent" in contrast to his typical depiction as God's enemy.

⁷² Fee, *Corinthians*, 209. See also Gundry-Volf, *Paul and Perseverance*, 118.

6.3.4 *The Realm of Satan, the Corinthian Community, and Paul's Labor*

If we are correct to agree with Thiselton and others in asserting that *both* the individual's and the community's salvation are in view in 1 Cor 5:5, then, on the basis of our analysis of Paul's apostolic care for his churches, it can also be asserted that Paul's concern in 1 Cor 5 is not only for the individual's salvation and the unity of the Corinthian congregation, but also that his apostolic labor for the Corinthian church, the seal of his apostleship (1 Cor 9:2), would not be compromised. Or, to use the language of 1 Thess 3:5, Paul's motivation for commanding the Corinthians to preserve their congregation by casting out one of its members was to ensure that his labor (κόπος) would not become "in vain" (εἰς κενόν).

Paul's concern for his apostolic labor is evident in 1 Cor 5 by his involvement in the solemn act of "handing over" the man to Satan. Three points from the text help bring this to light. First, immediately prior to the section in which he deals with the incestuous man (1 Cor 5:1–13), Paul reminds the Corinthians that he writes to them in order to admonish them as his beloved children (τέκνα μου ἀγαπητὰ νουθετῶν, 1 Cor 4:13). As their father through the gospel (v. 15), Paul considered it his responsibility to watch over and even discipline the Corinthian community, his children in the gospel, when necessary. He therefore responds to the report which he has heard (1 Cor 5:1) as their founding apostle under whose authority the Corinthian church exists.⁷³

Second, despite Paul's absence from Corinth which prevented him from dealing with the Corinthians in person, Paul nonetheless emphasizes his involvement in the process. In v. 3 Paul stresses that although "absent in body" (ἀπὼν τῷ σώματι) he is "present in spirit" (παρὼν τῷ πνεύματι), and that his judgment—made emphatic by the early placement of ἐγὼ within the sentence—was made "as though present" (ὡς παρὼν). In v. 4 Paul insists that the disciplinary act is to be carried out both "in the name of our Lord Jesus" as well as in the presence of "my spirit" (τοῦ ἐμοῦ πνεύματος).⁷⁴ Thus in addition to the Corinthians' involvement in the act of

⁷³ Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 165.

⁷⁴ The notion that Paul was absent "in body" though present "in spirit" is difficult for modern readers. Fee comments on this problem (*1 Corinthians*, 205): "If all of that is not easy for us to grasp,

handing over the man to Satan, it must not be overlooked that Paul repeatedly emphasizes his apostolic participation within the disciplinary process.⁷⁵

Finally, the perfect tense of the verb κέκρικα in v. 3 along with the term ἤδη may indicate a certain level of impatience on Paul's part,⁷⁶ possibly due to the Corinthians' failure to heed his warnings against associating with πόρνοις in a previous, now lost letter (1 Cor 5:9). Having heard that the Corinthians are not merely associating with such people but that there is actually πορνεία in their very midst (v. 1), Paul acts decisively and pastorally with the authority of a founding apostle by judging the incestuous man. It is thus Paul's authority as founding apostle of the Corinthian church which permits him to intervene and pronounce judgment on those within the congregation (1 Cor 5:12–13).⁷⁷

There is, therefore, a note of irony in Paul's command to hand over the errant man to the realm of Satan: in order to save the Corinthians, his apostolic labor—and hopefully the incestuous man himself—Paul orders the man to be cast out of the congregation into the realm of the very figure whom Paul fears might rob him of his apostolic labor and eschatological reward.⁷⁸ For Paul, however, the severity of the situation in Corinth, and the threat it posed to the community's existence, warranted the unique and harsh command to cast out one of its members.

we must nonetheless not try to make Paul think or talk like us. This letter, of course, communicates his prophetic word to them on this matter; he probably therefore thinks of the reading of the letter in the gathered assembly as the tangible way in which the Spirit communicates his prophetic-apostolic ministry in their midst (cf. 2 Cor. 10:10–11)."

⁷⁵ Fee rightly criticizes Conzelmann's translation which rendered Paul as the sole acting person (*Corinthians*, 205, n.44; cf. Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 94–98).

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷⁷ So Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 165, who notes that Paul takes "full responsibility" for the behavior of the Corinthians.

⁷⁸ This is not to suggest that Satan has any active role in the redemptive process of the individual or in preserving Paul's labor. Satan, here and elsewhere in Paul, remains the "god" of the present evil age who opposes God's people and his plan, not to mention Paul's evangelistic efforts to preach the gospel among the nations and nurture communities of faith.

6.3.5 Conclusions

In relation to our investigation of the Pauline references to Satan, we note the following conclusions from the above discussion:

- (1) Underlying both 1 Cor 5:5 and 2 Cor 4:4 is the theological premise that Satan rules over the present age—he is its “god”—in a significant and powerful way. 2 Cor 4:4 thus provides a conceptually parallel verse to 1 Cor 5:5. Accordingly, 1 Cor 5:5 should be understood as a command to “hand over” the errant man to the *realm* of Satan, the *Zugriffsbereich des Satans*, which in Pauline theology is the realm of existence outside of the Christian faith community.
- (2) Therefore, it cannot be claimed that Satan functions as an (unwitting) agent of God in 1 Cor 5:5. The verse does not refer to Satan himself, but primarily to the realm of existence outside the Christian community over which Satan rules.
- (3) The motivation behind Paul’s command in 1 Cor 5:5 is three-fold: 1) he is concerned for the Corinthian congregation’s pride; 2) he hopes to safeguard the sinful man’s eschatological fate; and, critically, 3) he intends to preserve his apostolic work among the Corinthians (cf. 2 Cor 12:20–21).
- (4) Paul’s instructions to the Corinthian church are ostensibly paradoxical in that they require the Corinthians to deliver one of their own members—who as such represents part of Paul’s *κόπος*—to the realm of Satan, whose malevolent activity Paul fears will render his apostolic *κόπος* in vain. Nonetheless, because the presence of this one incestuous man and the resultant pride (*φυσιόω*, 1 Cor 5:2) among the Corinthians, Paul deemed it necessary to expel the man from the community by handing him over to the domain outside the church—the *Zugriffsbereich des Satans*.

6.4 1 Corinthians 7:5

6.4.1 Introduction

In comparison to the complexities of Paul’s reference to Satan in 1 Cor 5:5, 1 Cor 7:5 is far less complicated both in terms of its exegetical concerns and its

presentation of Satan. In 1 Cor 7:5 Paul refers to Satan as a tempter of God's people, a more traditional role within Second Temple Jewish and early Christian traditions. In this sense Paul's reference to Satan in the verse is straightforward. Paul recognizes that the behavior of the Corinthians is creating opportunities for Satan to tempt their self-control, and so he warns them of this threat in order to preserve their sexual morality and marital harmony.

It will be our contention that within the case of 1 Cor 7:1–7 Paul's concern extends beyond the marriages of the Corinthian believers to Paul himself and his labor among them. That is, he desires that the married Corinthians will cease their practice of self-imposed sexual abstention so as not to be tempted by Satan for their own sake *and* so that his work for their congregation would not be spoiled by Satan's temptations. In order to demonstrate this point we will first examine the details of the passage, including the issues of sexual ethics and asceticism, and then turn to the function of the Satan reference in 1 Cor 7:5 within its epistolary context.

6.4.2 Paul's Response to the Corinthians' Inquiry

The second of the two references to Satan in 1 Corinthians, much like the first, occurs in the context of Paul's responses to various issues within the Corinthian community.⁷⁹ Having addressed the case of the incestuous man in 1 Cor 5 and lawsuits between fellow Christians and the permissiveness of the elite in 1 Cor 6, in 1 Cor 7 Paul takes up several issues concerning marriage.⁸⁰ The first of Paul's responses, in which the reference to Satan is found, addresses whether it is permissible for married believers to abstain from marital relations under any circumstances. Paul begins by acknowledging what they had written in their own letter to him, namely, that "it is good for a man not to touch a woman" (καλὸν

⁷⁹ 1 Cor 7:1 represents the first of seven occasions in the letter where Paul responds to their concerns; each time Paul begins his response with *περὶ δέ* (1 Cor 7:1, 25; 8:1, 4; 12:1; 16:1, 12; cf. 11:17–34; see also 1 Thess 4:9; 5:1).

⁸⁰ Scholarly discussion on the meaning of these issues within their cultural milieu is vast and diverse. For an overview of the literature on 1 Cor 7 and contemporary views of Paul's time, see Thiselton, *Corinthians*, 483–97.

ἀνθρώπῳ γυναικὸς μὴ ἄπτεσθαι).⁸¹ The euphemism “to touch someone,” quoted by Paul in 1 Cor 7:1, indicates that some form of marital abstinence was almost certainly being practiced by the Corinthian Christians and had likely resulted in a debate over the issue within the community.⁸²

In response to their Cynic-like attitude toward marital relations,⁸³ as well as in light of instances of *porneia* at Corinth (v. 2), Paul counsels the married Corinthians that “each man should have his own wife and each woman her own husband” (ἕκαστος τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα ἐχέτω καὶ ἕκαστη τὸν ἴδιον ἄνδρα ἐχέτω, v. 2).⁸⁴ Moreover, Paul advocates that neither a wife nor a husband within a marriage should withhold from each other, but rather they ought to give one another their “conjugal rights” (τὴν ὀφειλήν). The rationale behind Paul’s injunction is that within a marriage the authority over one’s body resides with the spouse (v. 4) and not merely with oneself. To deprive one’s spouse of sexual relations, therefore, would be to withhold something which is not their own in the first place.

Although Paul clearly does not sanction the ongoing practice of abstinence at Corinth, he also does not reject it altogether.⁸⁵ In 1 Cor 7:5 he therefore offers a concession to his advice accompanied by the following two conditions: any separation from sexual relations must be mutual (ἐκ συμφώνου) and only for a set

⁸¹ This idiomatic use of ἄπτω to refer to sexual intercourse occurs within various writings in antiquity (e.g., see Josephus, *Ant.* 1.8.1 [1.163]; LXX Gen 20:6; LXX Prov 6:29; *T. Reub.* 3:5).

⁸¹ In a recent study Roy E. Ciampa has argued that ἄπτω has a more narrowed meaning in 1 Cor 7:1 (“Revisiting the Euphemism in 1 Corinthians 7.1,” *JSNT* 31, no. 3 [2009]: 325–38). He claims that the scope of the term is limited to particular kinds of sexual relations rather than to sexual practices on the whole. In conclusion, Ciampa paraphrases Paul’s argument in 1 Cor 7:1–2 as follows: “Regarding the things about which you wrote to me (in complaining about those men who continue to visit prostitutes or sleep with the household slaves, etc.), ‘it is good for a man not to use a woman for sexual self-gratification’, but since πορνεία is so ubiquitous, and to keep from falling into it yourselves, each man should enjoy regular sexual relations with his own wife and each woman should do so with her own husband” (*ibid.*, 337).

⁸² Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 278.

⁸³ On the relationship between Paul’s views of marriage in 1 Cor 7 and Cynic and Stoic ideas, see Will Deming, *Paul on Marriage and Celibacy: The Hellenistic Background of 1 Corinthians 7* (2d ed.; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2004), 107–27.

⁸⁴ This usage of ἐχέτω is fairly common. See, e.g., LXX Exod 2:1; Deut 28:30; 2 Chr 11:21; 1 Esd 9:12, 18; Tob 3:8; Isa 13:16; 54:1; Matt 20:23; 22:28; Mark 6:18; 12:33; Luke 20:28; John 4:18 [2x]; 1 Cor 5:10.

⁸⁵ The allotted duration of sexual abstinence was debated in various Jewish circles (e.g., Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 260–63).

time (πρὸς καιρόν) agreed upon by both husband and wife.⁸⁶ While Paul's suggestion comes "by way of concession, not of command" (v. 6), it was, undoubtedly, to be permitted only in the last instance as an accommodation of the Corinthians' scruples toward sexuality.

Paul also qualifies his concession by stipulating that any abstention from marital relations should be for the expressed purpose of prayer.⁸⁷ Similar practices found in *T. Naph.* 8:8⁸⁸ and *Tob* 8:4–8⁸⁹ demonstrate that times of sexual abstention for prayer were not unparalleled in Jewish circles. Although Paul does not elaborate on how this might be beneficial for prayer,⁹⁰ it is probably to be understood that temporarily abstaining from sexual relations, much like fasting from food for a period of time, would allow for a stronger and more focused devotion to prayer.⁹¹

Paul furthermore buttresses his concession with a second purpose clause to warn of the dangerous outcome of avoiding his advice: Satan will tempt them due to their lack of control (τὴν ἀκρασίαν).⁹² Husbands and wives must stop depriving one another within marriage—unless for a determined period of prayer—"precisely so that it will not put one's spouse at the ready disposal of the Tempter."⁹³ If the

⁸⁶ This differs from other stems of Jewish tradition which asserted that the husband could, of his own accord, absent himself from sexual relations provided that he informed his wife (e.g., *Jub.* 1:8; *m. Yoma* 8:1). The length of abstention was later debated by the rabbis (e.g., *m. Ketub.* 5:6; *t. Ketub.* 5:6).

⁸⁷ Concerning the relationship between the two purpose clauses in 1 Cor 7:5, Fee (*Corinthians*, 281) maintains that the clause (ἵνα σχολάσητε τῇ προσευχῇ καὶ πάλιν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἦτε) goes with the concessional participle combination εἰ μήτι ἄν. Consequently, the second purpose clause (ἵνα μὴ πειράζη ὑμᾶς ὁ σατανᾶς διὰ τὴν ἀκρασίαν ὑμῶν) goes back to the original imperative at the beginning of the verse, thereby qualifying the purpose of the entire warning in v. 5: that they would not be tempted by Satan. Thiselton disagrees, instead translating the second ἵνα clause as a noun: "the goal would be nullified if Satan went on putting you through trials" (*Corinthians*, 508).

⁸⁸ *T. Naph.* 8:8: καιρὸς γὰρ συνουσίας γυναικὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ καιρὸς ἐγχερατείας εἰς προσευχὴν αὐτοῦ ("for there is a time for a man to embrace his wife, and a time to abstain for his prayer").

⁸⁹ Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 281.

⁹⁰ Frederik Willem Grosheide's suggestion that the presence of the article with προσευχῇ indicates that Paul had a specific prayer in mind is unconvincing (*Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians: The English Text* [NICNT; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1953], 157). A more cogent account for the reference to prayer is the possibility that "the early church placed value on concerted times of prayer, uninterrupted by other normal pursuits" (Fee, *Corinthians*, 282).

⁹¹ Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 262.

⁹² ἀκρασία is antithetical to ἐγκρατεύομαι in 1 Cor 7:9 (cf. 9:25; see also ἐγκράτεια in Gal 5:23 and 1 Pet 1:6).

⁹³ Fee, *Corinthians*, 282.

Corinthians continue to practice self-imposed abstinence, Paul fears that their effort to draw closer to God might actually achieve its opposite goal by making them more vulnerable to Satan.⁹⁴

In the end, the meaning of 1 Cor 7:5 is clearer than the syntactical and lexical difficulties of the verse might suggest.⁹⁵ Fee helpfully sums up the point of Paul's pastoral advice: "The net result of all this is (a) that Paul seems almost certainly to be forbidding something that is already going on, and (b) that he altogether eliminates abstention as a normal practice, acceding to it only hypothetically and under certain conditions."⁹⁶ Yet the question remains, what does Satan have to do with the marital practices of the Corinthians?

6.4.3 Satan in 1 Corinthians 7:5

As we saw in the case of 1 Thess 3:5, Paul's understanding of the activity of Satan included tempting the people of God. In our discussion of 1 Thess 3:5 we also argued that Paul regarded Satan's temptations of Thessalonians as a genuine threat to his apostolic task. With 1 Thess 3:5 in mind, how can we assess the reference to Satan's temptations of the Corinthians in 1 Cor 7:5? Can the case be made that the scope of Paul's concern in 1 Cor 7 includes not only the Corinthians themselves but also Paul's labor among them? In this section we will explore this question as we address Satan's role within 1 Cor 7:1–7.

In both 1 Corinthians 5:5 and 7:5 Paul mentions Satan while addressing issues pertaining to sexual immorality. This raises the question: did Paul regard issues related to sexual activity as an area of life in which believers were specifically vulnerable to Satan's temptations?⁹⁷ Although the *Testaments of the Patriarchs* are

⁹⁴ Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 262; Thiselton, *Corinthians*, 509.

⁹⁵ Orr and Walther, *1 Corinthians*, 206.

⁹⁶ Fee, *Corinthians*, 282.

⁹⁷ It has been suggested that the means of Satan's temptations were "sexual fantasies that prevent concentration in prayer" (Gerd Theissen, *Psychological Aspects of Pauline Theology* [trans. John P. Galvin; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987], 172). Surely, however, this is a speculative suggestion at best. If any guess is to be wagered, Thiselton's seems to be most accurate to the Jewish tradition of Satan's role as tempter: "Probably Satan is cast into the role of a hostile agent (as in Jewish and early Christian apocalyptic) who causes distress in an objective sense (including accusation) rather than

of disputed date and provenance, they may reflect a similar attitude toward sexuality.⁹⁸ To cite one example, in *T. Sim.* 5:3 we read that πορνεία, “the mother of all sins,” separates one from God and brings them close to Beliar. Whatever connection between Satan and sexual immorality there might be in other texts, there is insufficient evidence to posit any *special* relationship between the two for Paul. Rather, what seems to be the case is that Paul understands issues of sexual behavior as an opportunity for satanic temptation like any other area of morality. Thus it is not sexual activity per se that creates the latent possibility of immoral behavior and thus an opportunity for Satan to entice. To be sure, sexuality measures are extremely powerful and, at times, require extreme measures to be curtailed (e.g., 1 Cor 5),⁹⁹ but for Paul they function as yet another area in which the believer must remain *en garde* in the face of Satan’s temptations.¹⁰⁰

Why then does Paul, in his apostolic advice to the married Corinthians practicing some form of self-imposed abstinence, refer to the malevolent figure of Satan in this passage? To get at this issue, perhaps we need to ask a second, derivative question: why did Paul believe that if the Corinthians continued in their behavior that Satan would tempt the community which he founded? By raising this question, we bring into focus a more pressing issue in 1 Cor 7:5, namely, Paul’s concern for the Corinthian church.

When we consider Paul’s reference to Satan in 1 Cor 7:5 in the context of chapters 5–8 of the letter, we notice that Paul’s fundamental concern is the welfare of the Corinthian congregation. Importantly, this section of the letter is prefaced by 1 Cor 4:14–21 where Paul addresses them as his “beloved children” in the gospel.¹⁰¹ As Paul proceeds in chapters 5–8, moving from issues of sexual immorality to

primarily provoking experiences of inner tension” (Thiselton, *Corinthians*, 509; cf. Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 263, n. 29).

⁹⁸ E.g., see *T. Reu.* 4:6–8, 11; *T. Sim.* 5:3–4; *T. Levi* 9:9; *T. Ash.* 1:8; 3:2; *T. Iss.* 6:1; 7:7; *T. Dan* 4:7; 5:1.

⁹⁹ As Garland comments, “the sexual drive is a powerful force, and Satan is a powerful adversary” (*1 Corinthians*, 262).

¹⁰⁰ Paul’s warning regarding prostitutes in 1 Cor 6:15–20 shows that he considered sexual immorality as especially dangerous since it is a “sin against the body” (v. 18).

¹⁰¹ To be sure, 1 Cor 4:14–21 is technically the conclusion to Paul’s appeal to the Corinthians which begins in 1:10.

lawsuits to issues pertaining to marriage, he writes to the Corinthians as *their* founding apostle and father in the gospel. At the beginning of the next section of the letter, when Paul returns to the defense of his apostleship in chapter 9, he will once more remind the Corinthians of their importance to his calling by declaring them to be “the seal of his apostleship” (v. 2). Thus the unique and intimate relationship between Paul and the Corinthians is the context in which Paul writes in 1 Cor 5–8.

Paul’s apostolic relationship with the Corinthians therefore tacitly functions as the focal point of Satan’s temptations of the Corinthians. Paul’s fear in 1 Cor 7:1–7 is that the married Corinthians might succumb to Satan’s temptations due to their lack of self-control, thereby damaging their marital relationships *and* the Corinthian church whom Paul regards as his apostolic labor. In short, here Paul fears that “the tempter” will prey on the weak and misguided sexual practices of the Corinthians—perhaps because of the latent corruptive potency of sexual immorality—in order to corrupt his work among them. In this sense we can read both 1 Cor 7:5 and 1 Thess 3:5 as examples of Paul’s fear of Satan’s activity against his fledgling churches, his apostolic κόπος. Although in the former verse Paul does make his fear explicit, when read in the context of his apostle-church relationship with the Corinthians (i.e., 1 Cor 4:14–21; 9:1–2), there is every reason to regard 1 Cor 7:5 as a similar warning of Satan’s work against Paul.

6.4.4 Conclusions

In the context of the present study, perhaps the most salient feature of Paul’s reference to Satan in 1 Cor 7:5 is that he refers to Satan at all. For if the Corinthians were surprised at Paul’s rebuttal of their misinterpretation of his teachings regarding sexuality and marriage, then they may have been altogether astonished that their ascetic practices, which they believed would honor God, were actually leading them into the temptations of Satan. Nonetheless, Paul’s warning of Satan’s activity specifically against the married Christians in Corinth shows that he could detect Satan’s opposition to his churches in a real and concrete manner. Our discussion can be summed up by the following points:

- (1) As was commonplace in Second Temple Jewish and early Christian writings, in 1 Cor 7:5 Paul refers to Satan as the tempter of the people of God. Satan is depicted by Paul as the opportunistic enemy of God who seeks to take advantage of the misguided asceticism of the Corinthian marriages.
- (2) In both 1 Thess 3:5 and 1 Cor 7:5 Paul is concerned that Satan's temptations will hinder his work for the gospel by corrupting the faith-communities which he founded and for whom, as their apostle, he was responsible.
- (3) The fundamental context of Paul's references to Satan in 1 Cor 7:5 is that of his relationship to the church as its founding apostle. As their only father through the gospel (1 Cor 4:14–15), Paul warns his "children" in 1 Cor 7:5 so that they might not succumb to Satan's temptations and thereby ruin his labor for the Corinthian church.

6.5 2 Corinthians 2:11

6.5.1 Introduction

If the concentration of references to Satan in Paul's Corinthian letters can be regarded as "curious,"¹⁰² then the even greater frequency with which Satan appears in 2 Corinthians is nothing short of extraordinary. In contrast to the lone reference to Satan in the lengthy letter to the Romans or the complete absence of Satan from Paul's letter to the Philippians and even the polemical one to the Galatians, the recurrent references to Satan in 2 Corinthians suggest that something concerning the relationship between the Corinthian congregation and the Apostle Paul precipitated the references to Satan in the letter.

Building on our contention that Paul's sense of apostolic responsibility for the churches which he founded was the theological context in which he regarded Satan as an opponent of his ministry, in this section we will examine 2 Cor 2:11 as an expression of Paul's concern for Satan's activity against the Corinthian church. Paying close attention to the epistolary context of 2 Cor 2:11 and the rationale behind

¹⁰² Johnson, "Satan Talk in Corinth," 146.

Paul's reference to Satan, we will argue that the verse is not a generic reminder of Satan's opposition to all people but rather a warning—specifically from Paul to his church at Corinth—of Satan's intentional “schemes” against the Corinthian congregation. Ultimately, we will aim to show that Paul's knowledge of Satan's activity in 2 Cor 2:11, like the remainder of the Satan references in the letter, is borne out of his apostolic relationship with the Corinthian church.

6.5.2 *The Relationship between 2 Corinthians 2:5-11 and 1 Corinthians 5:1-5*

One of the greatest difficulties in making sense of Paul's reference to Satan in 2 Cor 2:11 is identifying the individual who is the subject of 2 Cor 2:5–11. The lengthy scholarly debate over his identity would be far too long to review at this point.¹⁰³ Additionally, in our view it would be wrong to base our exegesis of the passage on any particular identification of the individual since there is insufficient historical evidence to establish an argument with certainty. However, we will briefly summarize the two main positions since each interpretation has potential bearing on how one interprets the reference to Satan in 2 Cor 2:11.

The first view, one held widely by many scholars and theologians until the early part of the twentieth-century, suggested that the man whom Paul commanded to be “handed over to Satan” in 1 Cor 5:5 was, in fact, the same person he instructed the Corinthians to forgive in 2 Cor 2:5–11.¹⁰⁴ Defenders of this traditional view claim that Paul's assertion in 2 Cor 2:5 that the man had primarily caused them pain, and not Paul himself, fits with the identification of the “offender” in 2 Cor 2:11 as the same person in 1 Cor 5:1–5.¹⁰⁵ If this is correct, then Paul either had a change of heart regarding the incestuous man or, more likely, he saw the remedial punishment of excommunication as having achieved its rehabilitative goal. The man was to be

¹⁰³ For a helpful overview, see Barnett, *Corinthians*, 123–25. For an argument in favor of identifying the individual of 1 Cor 5:5 with the “offender” of 2 Cor 2:5–11, see Colin G. Kruse, “The Offender and the Offence in 2 Corinthians 2:5 and 7:12,” *EvQ* 60 (1988): 129–39.

¹⁰⁴ Earlier proponents of this position include C. Hodge, R. H. Lightfoot, B. Weiss. See also Hughes, *Corinthians*, 126–27. Although this interpretation is largely obsolete now, Page is skeptical of the ease with which scholars dismiss this position (*Powers of Evil*, 190, no. 25).

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 64–65.

welcomed back into his former Christian community, now fully sure of his salvation “in the day of the Lord” (1 Cor 5:5).

Second, in recent decades a growing consensus of scholars have suggested that the traditional view is untenable. Objections to the first view are raised due to 1) the apparent contrast between Paul’s conciliatory tone in 2 Cor 2:5–11 and his rather austere tone in 1 Cor 5:1–5, and 2) the allegedly more personal nature of the situation behind 2 Cor 2:5–11. Alternatively, many scholars now suggest that 2 Cor 2:5–11 is related to an incident stemming from Paul’s “intermediate” and painful visit (2 Cor 2:1), and consequently that the disciplinary case of 1 Cor 5:1–5 should be interpreted on its own. This second view therefore resists the traditional link between 1 Cor 5:1–5 and 2 Cor 2:5–11 and at the same time prefers a generic identification of the individual in 2 Cor 2:5–11.

Although the similarities between the two scenes in 1 Cor 5:1–5 and 2 Cor 2:5–11, not least the reference to Satan, are highly suggestive, there is insufficient evidence to construct an argument on a reading which conflates the two episodes. The present study will therefore proceed without assuming any specific identification of the individual in 2 Cor 2:5–11.

6.5.3 Paul, the Corinthian Church, and the Offender

The general context of Paul’s reference to Satan in 2 Cor 2:11 is his advice to the Corinthian congregation to desist from their prolonged “punishment” of one of their members by finally offering him forgiveness. Prior to the section of 2 Cor 2:5–11, Paul reminded his readers of his own dealings with the church: he claims that he and his associates do not rule (οὐχ κυριεύομεν, 2 Cor 1:24) over the *faith* of the Corinthians, but rather, knowing that the Corinthians already “stand firm” in their faith (τῇ πίστει ἐστήκατε),¹⁰⁶ labor with the Corinthians as co-workers (συνεργοί)

¹⁰⁶ Furnish (*II Corinthians*, 139) rightly dismisses the possibility of taking τῇ πίστει in 1 Cor 1:24 as an instrumental dative (“by faith”). Instead, the dative should be understood in a locative sense: the Corinthians stand firm *in* their faith.

for their joy (χαρά).¹⁰⁷ Paul's reminder in v. 24 therefore stresses how he and his co-workers labor to bring the Corinthians to their full maturation in their faith in hopes of attaining joy in the day of Christ. Nonetheless, the strain on Paul's relationship with the Corinthians had become so severe that he resolved not to visit them again after his "painful visit" (2:1). So he instead sent a letter with great anguish and many tears in preparation for another visit and in hopes of reconciliation with the church.

At the heart of the troubled relationship between Paul and the Corinthian church is the matter addressed in 2 Cor 2:5–11. The problem surrounds the "punishment" (ἐπιτιμία) by a majority of the Corinthians of one of their members. In Paul's view, the punishment has been overextended and so he urges them to forgive the individual so that he is not "swallowed up by excessive sorrow" (τῇ περισσοτέρᾳ λύπῃ καταποθῆναι, v. 7). If they forgive the person, Paul too will forgive him. If, however, the Corinthians maintain their rigorist position by withholding forgiveness from the individual, Paul claims that they will open a door for Satan's corrosive activity. In v. 11 Paul makes his concern clear by insisting that the reason the Corinthians are to forgive the man and restore him to the congregation is to avoid the threat of being outwitted by Satan (ἵνα μὴ πλεονεκτηθῶμεν ὑπὸ τοῦ σατανᾶ).¹⁰⁸

Before we turn to Satan's role in this passage, two main exegetical questions are worth raising at this point. What is the meaning of the verb πλεονεκτηθῶμεν, and what are the number and identity of the verb? First, within the NT πλεονεκτέω is an exclusively Pauline term, occurring once in 1 Thess 4:6 and four times in 2 Corinthians (2:11; 7:2; 12:17, 18). In general, πλεονεκτέω means "to exploit" or "to outwit" someone, as is the case in 2 Cor 7:2 and in 12:17–18 where Paul speaks of his and his co-workers' refusal to take advantage of the Corinthians.¹⁰⁹ In 2 Cor 2:11, Paul's use of πλεονεκτέω in the passive most likely carries the meaning of "being

¹⁰⁷ As elsewhere in Paul (e.g., Rom 15:13; Phil 1:25), πίστις is linked closely with the eschatological term χαρά.

¹⁰⁸ In agreement with Harris (*Corinthians*, 233), the ἵνα μή in 2 Cor 2:11 looks back to the three occurrences of χαρίζομαι in v. 10. It therefore links the ἵνα clause to both Paul's and the Corinthian congregation's forgiveness of the individual.

¹⁰⁹ Literally, πλεονεκτέω (πλέον="more" + ἔχειν="to have") carries the sense of having or possessing more than someone else at their expense. Hence its cognate πλεονεξία often is translated as "covetousness." For similar usage of πλεονεκτέω with negative connotations, see Josephus, *Ant.* 1:66; 2:260; LXX Hab 2:9; Ezek 22:27; *T. Iss.* 4:2; *T. Ash.* 2:5–6.

outwitted.”¹¹⁰ Accordingly, Paul’s concern is that by continuing to withhold forgiveness from “the offender,” the Corinthians “would be playing into the hands of Satan, who already had gained one advantage when the man sinned.”¹¹¹

Second, much like the debate regarding the plurals in 1 Thess 2:17–3:10, the issue is whether or not *πλεονεκτηθῶμεν* and *ἀγνοοῦμεν* are to be read as epistolary plurals. Two observations suggest that the two verbs in 2 Cor 2:11 should be understood as “real” plurals with both Paul and the Corinthians as their collective subject.¹¹² First, although Paul predominantly uses the first person plural throughout the first nine chapters of 2 Corinthians, in the unit 2 Cor 1:15–2:13 he uses the first person singular almost exclusively with the exceptions of *κυριεύομεν* and *ἔσμεν* in 1:24—which undoubtedly refer to Paul and his co-workers (*συνεργοί*)—and the two verbs in 2:11. Paul’s departure from the frequently used singular to the plural in 2:11 therefore should be regarded as an intentional change. Against those who argue for an epistolary use of the first person plural in 2:11, there would be little reason for Paul to change person here if he meant to refer only to himself since he was already using singular verbs throughout the section.

The second reason to regard the two verbs of 2:11 as “real” plurals is the syntactical relationship of vv. 10 and 11. The critical point to bear in mind here is that the *ἵνα μή* clause, which along with v. 11, is subordinate to the three uses of *χαρίζομαι* in v. 10, each of which have both Paul and the Corinthians as their subjects. It follows then that Paul and his readers are the implicit subjects of the verbs in 2:11.¹¹³ Indeed, it may well be the case that Paul deliberately changed to the first person plural in 2:11 in order to stress collective forgiveness necessary to prevent further discord among the Corinthian congregation. Only if both Paul and the

¹¹⁰ Bent Noack’s (*Satanás und Sotería*, 98–99) suggestion that *πλεονεκτέω* here means “to rob” (*rauben*) is conceptually difficult. While the semantic range of the word does not preclude this meaning, it seems to run counter to the Pauline conception of ecclesiological exclusion in 1 Cor 5:1–5 (cf. 1 Tim 1:20). There the individual is handed over (*παρὰδίδωμι*) to Satan by the collective authority of the apostle and the Corinthian congregation, but Satan does not “rob” them of the man. See also Martin, *2 Corinthians*, 39; Thrall, *2 Corinthians 1–7*, 181.

¹¹¹ Harris, *Corinthians*, 234.

¹¹² *Contra* Hughes, *Corinthians*, 71; Barnett, *Corinthians*, 132, n. 52.

¹¹³ Although it is possible that Paul included his co-workers as additional subjects of the verbs in 2 Cor 2:11, there is nothing in the next which supports the position.

Corinthian church forgive (χαρίζομαι) the individual will they be able to avoid being “outwitted” by Satan’s divisive work.

Having warned the Corinthians of the possibility of Satan “outwitting” them in the first part of 2 Cor 2:11, in the second part of the verse he adds a further remark about Satan: οὐ γὰρ αὐτοῦ τὰ νοήματα ἄγνοοῦμεν. The plural verb ἄγνοοῦμεν, as with πλεονεκτηθῶμεν, includes both Paul and the Corinthians as its subject. The reason the Corinthians and Paul must forgive the offender is because they “know fully well”¹¹⁴—literally, “we are not ignorant”—of Satan’s “designs” or “schemes” (τὰ νοήματα).¹¹⁵ Although Paul here does not offer an exposition on what he understands by τὰ νοήματα or how they might aid Satan to outwit Paul and the Corinthians, Barnett rightly notes that whatever the nature of Satan’s “schemes” is, Paul understood them to be “designs” which “would separate him from the Corinthians.”¹¹⁶ That is, Paul fears that not only might the offender remain ostracized and the Corinthians at odds with one another, but also that he *and* the Corinthians would be outwitted by the adversary Satan who seeks to ruin the apostle’s labor by preying on the divided congregation.

6.5.4 Satan’s “Schemes”

If the above analysis of Paul’s language helps us to understand *how* Paul speaks of Satan in 2 Cor 2:10–11, it remains to be explained *why* he mentions Satan in the first place. In other words, what does Satan have to do with a faction within the Christian community of Corinth and their reluctance to pardon one of their

¹¹⁴ As Harris points out, the expression οὐκ ἄγνοοῦμεν means, by litotes, something like “we know well” or “we are fully aware” (*Corinthians*, 234). Harris, however, translates the verb in the first person singular: “I know well.” Cf. 1 Cor 1:7, 26; Acts 21:39.

¹¹⁵ The noun νόημα is found only in the undisputed Pauline corpus within the NT (2 Cor 2:11; 3:14; 4:4; 10:5; Phil 4:7). As Furnish (*II Corinthians*, 158) observes, τὰ νοήματα are probably not equivalent to τὰ βάθη τοῦ σατανᾶ (“the deep things of Satan”) in Rev 2:24. Elsewhere in 2 Corinthians νόημα is used in its typical sense of “mind” or “thoughts,” but here Paul’s use has the sense of “schemes” or “designs” (cf. the similar meaning in Bar 2:8: καὶ οὐκ ἐδεήθημεν τοῦ προσώπου κυρίου τοῦ ἀποστρέψαι ἕκαστον ἀπὸ τῶν νοημάτων τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν τῆς πονηρᾶς). While the conceptually similar term μεθοδεία might have been employed instead (cf. Eph 4:14 and 6:11: τὰς μεθοδείας τοῦ διαβόλου), the use of νόημα here is likely due to Paul’s play on the Greek words νοήματα and ἄγνοοῦμεν. So the paraphrase of Witherington, *Conflict and Community*, 365: “Paul, using a wordplay, says he is *mindful* of what is in the Devil’s *mind*.”

¹¹⁶ Barnett, *Corinthians*, 132.

members? As we have seen in other passages, the most cogent explanation is that Paul believed Satan to be at work against his apostolic labor, including his churches such as the one at Corinth.¹¹⁷ Thus, when a situation arose in his dealings with the Corinthian church which had the potential to fragment his relationship with them, Paul “knew” that Satan’s designs would be to sow seeds of discord not only between factions within the church but also between the church and its founder. Paul’s switch to the first person plural in 2 Cor 2:11 is his appeal to the Corinthians to join in his “awareness” of Satan’s schemes against them.

Returning to the first part of the single sentence of 2 Cor 2:10–11, Paul’s concern for his church in Corinth is also evidenced by the two prepositional phrases in v. 10: “for what I have forgiven, if I have forgiven anything, [I have done] for you in the presence of Christ” (δι’ ὑμᾶς ἐν προσώπῳ Χριστοῦ). Concerning the first prepositional phrase, Harris remarks that δι’ ὑμᾶς “clearly implies that, in Paul’s eyes, the primary motivation for his ready forgiveness of the offender — and, we may assume, his earlier demand for the offender’s punishment contained in his ‘severe letter’ — was the well-being of the Corinthian community.”¹¹⁸ The second prepositional phrase, ἐν προσώπῳ Χριστοῦ, suggests that Paul considered his forgiveness to have eschatological significance. This interpretation is plausible in light of Paul’s overall sense of apostolic responsibility for his churches as well as his reference to the Corinthians’ eschatological χαρά in 2 Cor 1:24.¹¹⁹ Together, the two qualifying prepositional phrases show that Paul’s concern was not only directed at

¹¹⁷ *Contra* Johnson, who argues that the “Satan rhetoric” found in 2 Cor 2:11 “does not likely describe in general theological terms how Paul understands the workings and dominion of Satan over the people of God” (“Satan Talk in Corinth,” 153). Instead, Johnson claims that Paul is referring to his opponents by “labelling the source of their authority as Satan” (ibid.) There are two major difficulties with this position. First, when Paul means to speak of his opponents in his letters he does so explicitly—even when he accuses them of colluding with Satan (e.g., 2 Cor 11:14–15). Second, Johnson’s thesis on the rhetoric in 2 Cor 2:11 presents Paul as trying to “outwit” the Corinthians by presenting them with an ultimatum: either they follow Paul’s instructions and reaffirm their love for him or they follow the leadership of Paul’s rivals. But this deceptiveness is the very sort of thing Paul is urging them to be aware of and to resist, as can be seen elsewhere in the letter where Paul speaks of his and his co-workers’ refusal to “take advantage” of the Corinthians (πλεονεκτέω, 2 Cor 7:2; 12:17–18). It is unlikely, therefore, that Paul would have deceptively tricked the Corinthians into an “ultimatum” in order to protect them from “the evil influence of the false apostles” and to reassert his role as *pater* over the Corinthians church (Johnson, “Satan Talk,” 153).

¹¹⁸ Harris, *Corinthians*, 232.

¹¹⁹ So Barrett, *Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, 131, n. 48; Furnish, *II Corinthians*, 157–58; Thrall, *2 Corinthians 1–7*, 180–81; cf. Harris, *Corinthians*, 233, n. 53.

the offender who had suffered great punishment (v. 7) or his own “pain” (v. 5), but also the Corinthians’ unity, their eschatological fate, and their importance as one of his churches.

6.5.5 Conclusions

By way of summary, we note the following three observations:

- (1) Efforts to identify the “offender” who had been punished by the Corinthians or the nature of his offense are ultimately pointless since we lack sufficient evidence to establish his identity. Even though a connection between 2 Cor 2:5–11 and 1 Cor 5:1–5 cannot be ruled out, it does not seem likely that Paul had the same individual in mind.
- (2) Paul’s concern in 2 Cor 2:5–11 is the welfare of the entire Corinthian church, including its status as his labor for the gospel. Accordingly, the reason Paul mentions Satan’s threatening activity in 2 Cor 2:11 is because he perceived it as a threat to apostolic labor amongst the Corinthians whom he regarded as his responsibility. Paul therefore urges the Corinthian church to put an end to their behavior by forgiving the offending individual. If they do, Paul too will forgive the man for their sake (δι’ ὑμῶς) and in the presence of Christ (ἐν προσώπῳ Χριστοῦ).
- (3) 2 Corinthians 2:11 therefore should not be read as a generic statement of Satan’s activity against all believers. On the contrary, it is specific not only to the issue at hand in 2 Cor 2:5–11 but also to Paul’s relationship with the Corinthian church. Consequently, Paul’s “knowledge” of Satan’s schemes in 2 Cor 2:11 does not pertain to all of Satan’s activity, but is limited to the Corinthians’ dealing with “the offender” and its implications for his relationship to them.

6.6 2 Corinthians 6:15

6.6.1 *The Disputed Authenticity of 2 Corinthians 6:14–7:1*

Any attempt to investigate a verse, theme, or even a single term within 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 is immediately faced with a myriad of interpretive problems. From the section's prima facie foreign terminology (including some six *hapax legomena*) to its conspicuous location within the letter (cf. the logical flow from 6:11–13 to 7:2), 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 raises red flags on almost every point which call into question its authenticity, authorship, and provenance. Furthermore, the remarkable similarities of the imagery and language of 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 to the Qumran writings have raised questions with respect to the origin of the passage. Thus, it was not without reason that Pierre Benoit described 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 as “a meteor fallen from the heaven of Qumran and into Paul’s epistle.”¹²⁰ Nonetheless, no extant manuscript lacks the section and thus its inclusion within 2 Corinthians is difficult to dispute.¹²¹

In the present study our primary interest is, of course, the reference to Beliar in v. 15: “what agreement (συμφώνησις) does Christ have with Beliar (Βελιάρ)?” As with the section as a whole, any interpretation of the reference to Beliar in v. 15 is plagued with endless questions which seem to prevent any agreement among scholars. Perhaps the most pressing issue is the use of the term Βελιάρ to refer to the figure of Satan instead of the more common Pauline term σατανᾶς. For if 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 can be called a meteor from Qumran, then, in comparison to the other Pauline references to Satan, the presence of the term Βελιάρ in 2 Cor 6:15 is like discovering a rock from the Qumran caves on the Acrocorinth.

¹²⁰ Pierre Benoit, “Qumran and the New Testament,” in *Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. J. Murphy-O’Connor and J. H. Charlesworth. New York: Crossroad, 1990), 1–30 (5).

¹²¹ That is to say, there is no textual evidence which suggests that this section was added to the text of 2 Corinthians at a later time. As William O. Walker Jr. suggests, however, there are some textual variants within 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 which may indicate copyists were uncertain regarding its content and therefore attempted to make the passage harmonize with other Pauline material (*Interpolations in the Pauline Letters* (JSNTSup 213; Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 200). Moreover, Harris rightly comments that “The absence of any textual evidence for the omission of 6:14–7:1 is no argument against it being an interpolation, for the putative editorial work by a redactor would predate the earliest textual witness” (Harris, *Corinthians*, 23, n. 48).

In addition to the exegetical complications of 2 Cor 6:15, a number of questions can be raised in relation to the present study. For instance, what is the significance, if any, of the use of Βελιάρ rather than σατανᾶς? How does the dualistic language of 2 Cor 6:14–15 map onto Paul’s apocalyptic theology? And, importantly, how does the portrayal of Beliar in 2 Cor 6:15 compare to the other references to Satan in Paul’s letters? These questions will be the focus of our investigation of 2 Cor 6:15. As noted above, however, there are several difficult issues which influence this section of the letter. In our study of the figure of Satan in Paul’s letters, this is hardly the place to reconsider or rehearse previous theories on the authenticity and location of 2 Cor 6:14–7:1. This should not prevent us, however, from examining the astonishing appearance of the term Βελιάρ in 2 Cor 6:15 if it can be demonstrated that there is reasonable evidence to consider the passage to be authentically Pauline in origin and thus relevant for our broader investigation.

The most difficult aspect in interpreting 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 is making sense of its heavily disputed authorship. Among the many reasons which have caused scholars to doubt the section’s authenticity, Harris¹²² has helpfully put forward seven broad categories under which most objections to Pauline-authorship can be placed: (1) the passage seems to be “self-contained” and fails to mention any issues related to the Corinthian congregation; (2) the section interrupts the flow of the letter from 2 Cor 6:13 to 7:2; (3) the passage contains several *hapax legomena*, including four terms which occur nowhere else in the Greek Bible (ἑτεροζυγέω, συμφώνησις, συγκατάθεσις, Βελιάρ) and two which are not found elsewhere in the NT (μετοχή, μολυσμός); (4) many “Pauline” terms (e.g., δικαιοσύνη and πιστός) are used in a “non-Pauline” sense; (5) the scriptural citation formulas in 2 Cor 6:16, 17, and 18 are distinct from the more typical Pauline introductory formula, καθὼς γέγραπται;¹²³ (6) the strong similarities between the terminology and theology of 2 Cor 6:14–7:1

¹²² Harris, *Corinthians*, 14–25; see also the several points in the extended discussion in Thrall, *2 Corinthians 1–7*, 25–36.

¹²³ On the use of Scripture in this passage, see James M. Scott, “The Use of Scripture in 2 Corinthians 6:16c–18 and Paul’s Restoration Theology,” *JSNT* 56 (1994): 73–99.

and the Qumran writings;¹²⁴ and (7) the stringent exclusivism of the passage is ostensibly incompatible with the freedom promoted elsewhere in the Pauline corpus.

For the reasons just adduced, scholars have proposed seemingly endless theories on the location and content of 2 Cor 6:14–7:1. Here we highlight the most notable of these arguments. Among those who identify the passage as non-Pauline there are three main categories of arguments. First, some recognize 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 as having originated from Qumran. For example, Fitzmyer, after noting the strong resemblances of the passage to the Qumran literature, concluded that “the evidence seems to total up to the admission of a Christian reworking of an Essene paragraph which has been introduced into the Pauline letter.”¹²⁵ Likewise, Gnilka referred to 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 as “a Christian exhortation in the Essene tradition, whose author is not Paul, but some unknown Christian.”¹²⁶ Second, it has been argued that 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 is not only a non-Pauline fragment but an anti-Pauline interpolation. For instance, Hans Dieter Betz proposed that the interpolation represents the theology of Paul’s opponents at Antioch and Galatia.¹²⁷ Third, some scholars have left the question more open by suggesting that the section is derived from an unspecified Christian source. So, for example, Belleville concluded that Paul used a homily familiar to the Corinthian congregation.¹²⁸ Similarly, Martin argues that it is at least possible that,

¹²⁴ Along these lines, John R. Levison (“The Spirit and Temple in Paul’s Letters to the Corinthians,” in *Paul and his Theology* [ed. Stanley E. Porter; Pauline Studies 3; Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2006], 189–215) quipped that the “exclusive terminology” of 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 seems “more at home in the Community Rule than in a Pauline letter” (211).

¹²⁵ Joseph A. Fitzmyer, “Qumrân and the Interpolated Paragraph in 2 Cor 6:14–7:1,” *CBQ* 23, no. 3 (1961): 271–80 (279–80).

¹²⁶ Joachim Gnilka, “2 Kor 6,14–7,1 im Lichte der Qumranschriften und der Zwölf-Patriarchen-Testamente,” in *Neutestamentliche Aufsätze* (Festschrift für Josef Schmid; eds. J. Blinzer et al.; Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1963), 86–99; ET: “2 Cor. 6:14–7:1 in Light of the Qumran Texts and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,” in *Paul and Qumran* (ed. J. Murphy-O’Connor; London: Chapman, 1968), 48–68. Cf. Nils Alstrup Dahl, “A Fragment and Its Context: 2 Corinthians 6:14–7:1,” in *Studies in Paul: Theology for the Early Christian Mission* (Minneapolis, Minn.: Augsburg, 1977), 62–69; Peter von der Osten-Sacken, *Gott und Belial: Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum Dualismus in den Texten aus Qumran* (SUNT 6; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969), 73–78.

¹²⁷ Hans Dieter Betz, “2 Cor 6:14-7:1: An Anti-Pauline Fragment?,” *JBL* 92, no. 1 (1973): 88–108.

¹²⁸ Linda L. Belleville, *2 Corinthians* (IVPNTC; Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1996), 26–28. Also included in this category is the view of Stephen J. Hultgren (“2 Cor 6.14–7.1 and Rev 21.3–8: Evidence for the Ephesian Redaction of 2 Corinthians,” *NTS* 49, no. 1 [2003]: 39–56), who claims that 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 and Rev 21:1–8 share a common origin (i.e., Ephesian Christianity in the mid-90s).

during a pause in dictation, Paul encountered something like a tract with strong similarities to the Qumran literature which he then reworked “into his epistle as something which might profit the Corinthians too.”¹²⁹

Despite the confidence of some scholars concerning the authenticity of 2 Cor 6:14–7:1, there seems to be a growing consensus that Paul might have been responsible for the passage in one way or another. As Garland recently suggested, “The tide may be turning regarding the authorship of 6:14–7:1 as a growing list of scholars now argue from a variety of perspectives that Paul wrote this passage and that it fits into the logical flow of Paul’s argument.”¹³⁰ For instance, Gordon Fee, who interprets the passage vis-à-vis Paul’s temple language in 1 Cor 10:14–22 and 3:16–17, considers the evidence for the non-Pauline interpolation argument to be unpersuasive, instead claiming that Paul is “responsible for the passage in its present setting.”¹³¹ Goulder too considers the passage to be Pauline and correctly placed; he argues that 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 fits its context because “it supplies the appeal for holiness and the requirement of discipline which form the culmination of similar passages in 1 Cor. 4–6 and 2 Cor. 10–13.”¹³² Lambrecht, in an aptly entitled essay, pleads for “a conservative attitude” toward Pauline authorship of 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 in light of the “complete manuscript support” for the passage as well as its “Pauline style.”¹³³ Accordingly, Lambrecht proposes that the passage represents “a ‘common’ paraenesis meant for Christians who live in the midst of manifold dangers in a Gentile world.”¹³⁴

¹²⁹ Martin, *2 Corinthians*, xlv. See also the interesting proposal by J.-F. Collange, *Enigmes de la deuxième Epître de Paul aux Corinthiens: Etudes Exégétique de 2 Cor. 2,14–7,4* (SNTSMS 18; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972).

¹³⁰ David E. Garland, *2 Corinthians* (NAC 29; Nashville, Tenn.: Broadman & Holman, 1999), 319.

¹³¹ Gordon D. Fee, “II Corinthians 6:14–7:1 and Food Offered to Idols,” *NTS* 23, no. 2 (1977): 140–61 (143)

¹³² Michael D. Goulder, “2 Cor 6:14–7:1 as an Integral Part of 2 Corinthians,” *NovT* 36, no. 1 (1994): 47–57 (52–53).

¹³³ Jan Lambrecht, “The Fragment 2 Cor 6:14–7:1: A Plea for its Authenticity,” in *Studies on 2 Corinthians* (eds. R. Bieringer and J. Lambrecht; BETL 112; Leiden: David Brown, 1994), 531–49.

¹³⁴ *Ibid.*, 548. Others who posit Pauline authorship include Gregory K. Beale, “The Old Testament Background of Reconciliation in 2 Corinthians 5–7 and its Bearing on the Literary Problem of 2 Corinthians 6:14–7:1,” *NTS* 35, no. 4 (1989): 550–81; Reimund Bieringer, “2 Korinther 6,14–7,1 im Kontext des 2. Korintherbriefes. Forschungsüberblick und Versuch eines eigenen Zugangs,” in

In light of the increasing agreement among scholars that 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 may actually be Pauline (whether Paul himself wrote it or incorporated an earlier composition) in origin, including several theories on why Paul might have digressed at this point in the letter (e.g., Lambrecht), there seems to be sufficient reason to proceed in the present study under the presumption that Paul was responsible for either the section’s composition or inclusion as well as its location within 2 Corinthians. We will therefore proceed to examine the reference to Beliar in 2 Cor 6:15 under the *hypothesis* that Paul was responsible for the passage’s inclusion within 2 Corinthians *and* that it therefore tells us something about the Apostle Paul’s understanding of the figure of Satan.

6.6.2 The Epistolary Context of 2 Corinthians 6:15

In order to address the contrast between Christ and Beliar in 2 Cor 6:15 we must first address the verse’s immediate context. In particular, what needs to be explicated is the main message of the section 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 and, even more specifically, the function of the rhetorical questions in vv. 14–16a. Regarding the message of the passage as a whole, it seems best to understand the purpose of 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 *in its present context* as an intentional digression¹³⁵ which, rhetorically speaking, functions as an appeal to the Corinthians “to sever all their ties with paganism and thereby become fully reconciled to their father in the faith, whose gospel of reconciliation they had embraced (cf. 5:18–20).”¹³⁶ Accordingly, the necessity of the

Studies on 2 Corinthians (eds. R. Bieringer and Jan Lambrecht; Leuven, Belgium: Leuven University Press, 1994), 551–70; J. Duncan M. Derrett, “2 Cor 6:14: A Midrash on Dt 22:10,” *Bib* 59, no. 2 (1978): 231–50; David A. DeSilva, “Measuring Penultimate against Ultimate Reality: An Investigation of the Integrity and Argumentation of 2 Corinthians,” *JSNT* 52 (1993): 41–70; Jerome Murphy-O’Connor, “Relating 2 Corinthians 6:14–7:1 to its Context,” *NTS* 33, no. 2 (1987): 272–75; Gerhard Sass, “Noch einmal, 2 Kor 6,14–7,1: Literarkritische Waffen gegen einen ‘unpaulinischen’ Paulus?,” *ZNW* 84, no. 1–2 (1993): 36–64; Scott, “The Use of Scripture,” 73–99; Margaret E. Thrall, “The Problem of II Cor 6:14–7:1 in Some Recent Discussion,” *NTS* 24, no. 1 (1977): 132–48; William J. Webb, *Returning Home: New Covenant and Second Exodus as the Context for 2 Corinthians 6:14–7:1* (JSNTSup 85; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993); Franz Zeilinger, “Die Echtheit von 2 Cor 6:14–7:1,” *JBL* 112, no. 1 (1993): 71–80.

¹³⁵ Typically 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 has been understood as a digression which interrupts the “logical flow” of the letter from 6:11–13 to 7:2. Thrall, however, has compellingly demonstrated that the real digression may be 2 Cor 6:3–13 and that 6:14–7:1 is therefore integral to the original letter (“Recent Discussion,” 144–48).

¹³⁶ Harris, *Corinthians*, 25.

congregation's holiness is the fundamental concern of the passage. This is confirmed by the centrality of the temple motif in 2 Cor 6:14–7:1, including Paul's declaration in v. 16a—"for we are the temple of the living God" (ἡμεῖς γὰρ ναὸς θεοῦ ἐσμεν ζῶντος)—and the catena of scriptural allusions in vv. 16b–18 which further develop the temple motif.

Witherington has helpfully explained the purpose of the series of rhetorical questions in vv. 14–16a. He argues that it is not uncommon for Paul to open a new section with a series of rhetorical questions (e.g. 1 Cor 6:1–11) and that "such a clustering of questions is part of dialogical or diatribal style."¹³⁷ Drawing on the work of Wuellner, Witherington also suggests the rhetorical questions in vv. 14–16a are meant to "evoke a conventional ... value that [Paul] expects his converts to uphold,"¹³⁸ which in this passage is clearly the need for the Corinthian church to remain holy as the temple of God amidst the pressures of the outside, pagan world. The five rhetorical questions in vv. 14–16a, all of which anticipate an emphatic negative answer, are thus employed to reinforce the "radical incompatibility of Christian and pagan values."¹³⁹

6.6.3 *Beliar, Satan, and 2 Corinthians 6:15*

In 2 Cor 6:15 Paul asks one of his many rhetorical questions within the immediate section: "what agreement does Christ have with Beliar" (τίς δὲ συμφώνησις Χριστοῦ πρὸς Βελιάρ)? In the discussion of this verse below, we will examine three issues: (1) Βελιάρ as a term for the figure of Satan; (2) the use of Βελιάρ rather than σατανᾶς; and (3) the Χριστός/Βελιάρ contrast in relation to the other contrasting pairs in vv. 14–16a.

¹³⁷ Witherington, *Conflict and Community*, 404.

¹³⁸ *Ibid.*, 404–05.

¹³⁹ Harris, *Corinthians*, 501.

First, the term Βελιόρ(-λ)¹⁴⁰ is used in 2 Cor 6:15 as an alternative name for Satan. The Greek version of the term is derived from the Hebrew noun בל יעל, which in the Hebrew Bible carries the idea of “worthlessness” or “wickedness.”¹⁴¹ As we mentioned in Chapter Two,¹⁴² in the Qumran literature¹⁴³ and the pseudepigraphic writings¹⁴⁴ “Belial” (or “Beliar) was employed as the most common name for the figure of Satan.¹⁴⁵ The reference to Beliar in 2 Cor 6:15 clearly reflects this usage of the name and, in particular, the dualistic opposition between Beliar and the forces of darkness against God and the forces of light which is pervasive in the Qumran writings. However, Barrett rightly cautions against drawing the conclusion that 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 must therefore be of Qumran provenance; instead, the frequent use of the name merely demonstrates that “Beliar(-l) was a vogue word in the first century.”¹⁴⁶

Second, what is the significance of the use of Βελιόρ instead of Paul’s preferred term σατανᾶς? As Barrett has pointed out, the surprising element in v. 15a is not the contrast itself, but the use of Βελιόρ to refer to Satan.¹⁴⁷ If in 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 Paul has incorporated previous material, then it is intriguing that he has not reworked the text to read σατανᾶς when it appears that the reference to Χριστός is a

¹⁴⁰ As several commentators point out (e.g., Martin and Harris), the ending of Βελιόρ is a result of dissimilation whereby the two liquid consonants λ and ρ were spelled or spoken interchangeably. For a discussion of the variants of Βελιόρ, including Βελιόν (D K Ψ 6 pc [b] vg^{ms}), Βελιόβ (F G d), and Βελιόλ (pc lat Tert), see Hughes, *Corinthians*, 248–49.

¹⁴¹ E.g., see Deut 13:13; 1 Sam 1:16; 2:12; Ps 18:4; Nah 1:11; Prov 19:28.

¹⁴² §2.4.2.

¹⁴³ E.g., see 1QH^a 2:16–17; 3:27–32; 1QS 1:23–24; 10:18; 1QM 13:2–6; 18:1; CD 4:13–15; 5:18–19; 8:2; 11Q13 2:12–25.

¹⁴⁴ E.g., see *Jub.* 1:20; *T. Levi* 18:12; 19:1; *T. Iss.* 6:1; 7:7; *T. Dan* 1:7; 4:7; *T. Ash.* 1:8; *T. Jos.* 7:4; *T. Ben.* 3:4; 6:1; 7:1; *Sib. Or.* 3.63.

¹⁴⁵ At times “Beliar” can also refer to an “antichrist” figure (e.g., *T. Dan* 5:1, 10; *Asc. Isa* 4:2–13; *Syb. Or.* 2:167–70; 3:63–74). On this subject see G. W. Lorein, *The Antichrist Theme in the Intertestamental Period* (JSPSup 44; London: T&T Clark, 2003); William Horbury, “Antichrist among Jews and Gentiles,” in *Jews in a Graeco-Roman World* (ed. Martin Goodman; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 113–33.

¹⁴⁶ Barrett, *Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, 198.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid. Thrall, who otherwise argues for Pauline authorship, is so struck by the presence of Βελιόρ in 2 Corinthians that she regards the term as the only *hapax* which “counts against Pauline authorship” (“Recent Discussion,” 138).

Paulinism.¹⁴⁸ If, however, Paul himself has composed the passage, it is equally intriguing that σατανᾶς is not used since it is Paul's preferred term for the figure of the devil. Either way, what seems to be the case is that Paul has deliberately used the term Βελιόρ (whether by retention or stylistic preference) in order to refer to Satan. How can we account for the term in 2 Cor 6:15?

Barrett has proposed that Paul's choice of Βελιόρ may be due to his Rabbinic training.¹⁴⁹ He draws attention to *Sifre Deut.* 117 (on 15:7–9), Sanh. 111b where בל יעל (b^elîa'al) is interpreted as בל י עול (b^elî 'ol), that is, "having no yoke" or "one who has thrown off (God's) yoke."¹⁵⁰ Martin explains the possible significance of this for 2 Cor 6:15: "The point is that the believers in Corinth were not to be 'unequally' yoked with those who were 'unbelievers,' those in the dark, those of iniquity, namely, those who were not ruled by God."¹⁵¹ In another theory, Murphy-O'Connor argues that if Paul wanted to use a proper name to oppose Christ he would not have used σατανᾶς since elsewhere he associates it with believers, whereas in 2 Cor 6:14–15 Beliar is associated with "unbelievers." He concludes that the name Βελιόρ is actually evidence in favor of Pauline authorship.¹⁵² Although both of these hypotheses are possible, they are unsatisfactory in the end.¹⁵³

I suggest Paul's use of Βελιόρ can be explained by a simpler solution. In the passage of 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 Paul apparently has either incorporated an earlier text or utilized several (preexisting?) antithetical pairings which share strong similarities to the dualistic language of the Qumran writings. If, as it seems reasonable, the original contrast was between *God* and Beliar (cf. 1QM 13:1–4), it is not surprising that Paul has changed the reference to Χριστός since, in Paul's theology, the risen Messiah reigns at the right hand of God until the eschaton (e.g., 1 Cor 15:24–28). Yet it is also unsurprising that Paul was willing to employ the term Βελιόρ since the name was

¹⁴⁸ So Martin, *2 Corinthians*, 200.

¹⁴⁹ Barrett, *Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, 198.

¹⁵⁰ Ibid.

¹⁵¹ Martin, *2 Corinthians*, 200.

¹⁵² Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, "Philo and 2 Cor 6:14–7:1," *RB* 95, no. 1 (1988): 55–69.

¹⁵³ See also Fee, "Idols," 140–61.

frequently used in contemporaneous Jewish and Christian writings and since, if one may conjecture, it would not have been difficult to decipher as a name for Satan in light of the contrast with Christ as well as the other reference to Satan in the Corinthian correspondence. Therefore, the significance of the term Βελιάρ in 2 Cor 6:15 is not its affinity with the theology of Qumran, any inherent meaning from its Hebrew etymology, or Paul’s alleged reticence to associate “unbelievers” with Satan. Rather, 2 Cor 6:15, like 2 Cor 4:4 and 1 Thess 3:5, illustrates the diversity of Paul’s terminology for Satan which enabled him to refer to Satan by several names and titles in order to fit a variety of contextual needs and rhetorical purposes.

Third, how does the antithetical pair in 2 Cor 6:15a relate to the other rhetorical questions in vv. 14–16a? Paul’s basic point in v. 15a is that no “agreement” between Christ and Beliar is possible within his apocalyptic theology. Their purposes are intrinsically antithetical to one another and their reigns in constant conflict. Thus, for Paul, the discord between Christ and Satan is rooted in the very soil of his apocalyptic theology. Yet it is also evident in earthly affairs and in Paul’s contrasts between righteousness and lawless, light and darkness, believers and unbelievers, and the temple of God and idols. By delineating these binary pairs in a succession of rhetorical questions, Paul shrewdly demonstrates to the Corinthians that darkness, immoderate fellowship with unbelievers, associating with idols, and Beliar’s rule are all bound together. Such a rhetorical ploy demands a decision on the part of Paul’s readers. Either they must heed Paul’s call to holiness and separate themselves from “unbelievers” and idols, or they will be found to be in “agreement” (συμφώνησις) with Satan.¹⁵⁴ Levison aptly comments: “Paul draws a line in the sand with respect to universality: believers share nothing with unbelievers. Holiness demands separation, cleansing of body and spirit . . . and necessitates a clear border between light and darkness, between Christ and Beliar.”¹⁵⁵

¹⁵⁴ Cf. *T. Levi* 19:1: “choose for yourselves either the darkness (τὸ σκότος) or the light (τὸ φῶς), either the law of the Lord (νόμον κυρίου) or the works of Beliar” (ἔργα Βελιάρ).

¹⁵⁵ Levison, “Spirit and Temple,” 214.

6.6.4 2 Corinthians 6:15 and Paul's Understanding of Satan

In relation to the other Pauline references to Satan, there are two points to be made. First, Paul's use of a name or title other than σατανᾶς to refer to Satan should not be surprising. As we noted above, Paul also employs variant terminology for Satan in 1 Thess 3:5 and 2 Cor 4:4.¹⁵⁶ Collectively, these three verses illustrate that Paul was willing to make use of various names and titles for the figure of Satan when he wished to alter his language. This usage is also reflected in the so-called "disputed" Pauline letters, where Satan is referred to as σατανᾶς (2 Thess 2:9; 1 Tim 1:20; 5:15), διάβολος (Eph 4:27; 6:11; 1 Tim 3:6–7; 2 Tim 2:26), ὁ πονηρός (Eph 6:16; 2 Thess 3:3), ὁ ἄρχων τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ αἵρος (Eph 2:2; cf. τὸ πνεῦμα, ad loc.), and possibly ὁ ἀντικείμενος (1 Tim 5:14; cf. *1 Clem.* 51:1; *Mart. Pol.* 17:1).

Second, the theology underlying the basic thrust of 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 coheres with Paul's apocalyptic theology and, in particular, his understanding of the Christian community and the domain of Satan (*Zugriffsbereich des Satans*) as the two fundamental spheres of existence (cf. 1 Cor 5:5; 2 Cor 4:4). Paul's issue with the Corinthians is that their behavior (i.e., association with "unbelievers" and idols) is characteristic of those who belong to the sphere of Satan (Beliar) of which they should have no part. The logic of Paul's appeal in 6:14–7:1 is that if Christ has no "agreement" (συμφώνησις) with Beliar, then the Corinthians should have no "fellowship" (κοινωνία) with the things of Beliar's domain. So Paul exhorts them to uphold their calling as "the temple of the living God" (ναὸς θεοῦ ἑσμεν ζῶντος, v. 16; cf. 1 Cor 3:16–17; 6:19) by perfecting holiness (ἀγιωσύνη, 7:1).

6.7 2 Corinthians 11:3, 14–15

6.7.1 Introduction

In two of the texts which we previously examined, 1 Cor 7:5 and 2 Cor 2:11, Paul's motivation was primarily to warn the Corinthians of Satan's *potential* activity

¹⁵⁶ On whether 2 Cor 11:3 should be regarded as an allusion to Satan, see §6.7.2.

against them. In 2 Corinthians 11, when Paul charges those he labels “false apostles” with being Satan’s servants, he is describing Satan’s *present* activity within the Corinthian church. The focus on Satan’s present activity rather than his potential temptations is a considerable change within Paul’s writings. By claiming that Satan was working through his opponents it becomes clear that Paul believed Satan to be already at work amongst his church and against his missionary labor in Corinth.

Before we look at Paul’s reference to the “servants of Satan” in greater depth, we will address two issues pertaining to the reference to the serpent of Genesis 3 in 2 Cor 11:3, a verse which is taken by many as an allusion to Satan. We will first consider the validity of this purported identification and its implications for the present study. Second, we will explore Paul’s betrothal metaphor in 2 Cor 11:2–3 as the operative context in which to interpret his reference to the “servants of Satan” in 2 Cor 11:14–15.

6.7.2 *The Serpent of 2 Corinthians 11:3*

In 2 Corinthians 11:3 Paul expresses his fear of the Corinthians’ infidelity to Christ by employing a scriptural parallel: just as the serpent of the Genesis 3 narrative deceived Eve into disobeying God’s command, so Paul believes the Corinthians will be led astray from their “sincere and pure devotion” (τῆς ἀπλότητος καὶ τῆς ἀγνότητος)¹⁵⁷ to Christ. Many have taken it for granted that Paul presupposes an identification of the serpent of Genesis 3 and Satan in this verse. It must be asked, however, whether there is sufficient evidence to recognize Paul’s reference to the serpent (ὁ ὄφις) in 2 Cor 11:3 as an allusion to Satan. Against this view I contend that Paul, although probably familiar with the tradition of associating

¹⁵⁷ The two main readings—ἀπὸ τῆς ἀπλότητος καὶ τῆς ἀγνότητος (82 H Ψ 0121. 0243. 1739. 1881 ̱ [b] f* vg syp; Julius Cassianus^{C1}) and ἀπὸ τῆς ἀπλότητος (P46 8* B D(2) F G 33. 81. 104. [326] ar r syh** cop Pelagius)—each lack sufficient external evidence to be regarded as original readings (Harris, *Corinthians*, 731). Moreover, equally valid explanations can be offered to account for the modification of each reading (Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* [2d ed.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994], 514–15). In the end, however, there is probably sufficient reason to maintain the longer reading (ibid.; Harris, *Corinthians*, 731; Margaret E. Thrall, *2 Corinthians 8–13* [vol. 2; ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000], 663).

the serpent and the devil in Jewish thought, did not assume or imply any specific relationship between Satan and the serpent in 2 Cor 11:3.

In Chapter Two we discussed the increasing conceptual overlap between the Genesis 3 serpent and the figure of Satan in Second Temple Judaism.¹⁵⁸ In particular, we noted that although a close connection between Satan and the serpent is intimated in writings such as *L.A.E.*, *Pss. Sol.*, *4 Macc*, *Liv. Pro*, and *Sirach*, the two figures were not always so closely associated. We also suggested that the first clear identification between the Genesis serpent and the figure of the devil is found in Wis 2:24. Among early Christian texts, in Revelation the connection is made unequivocal in the author's description of "the great dragon, the ancient serpent who is called the Devil and Satan" (ὁ δράκων ὁ μέγας, ὁ ὄφις ὁ ἀρχαῖος, ὁ καλούμενος Διάβολος καὶ ὁ Σατανᾶς, Rev 12:9; cf. 20:2). In Paul, however, no explicit connection is made within his letters. In our analysis of Rom 16:20, the other Pauline text most commonly discussed as a reference to the Edenic serpent, we argued that the "crushing" of Satan is most likely an allusion to Ps 110:1, not to (the text of) Genesis.¹⁵⁹

In the case of 2 Cor 11:3 it is often assumed, partially on the basis of the verse's proximity to Paul's reference to Satan in vv. 14–15, that ὁ ὄφις should be taken as an allusion to Satan.¹⁶⁰ In the text itself, however, Paul stops short of making such an identification, which is significant in light of his explicit reference to Satan later in the chapter. Therefore, although it can be argued that "the parallelism in the verse and the explicit reference to ὁ σατανᾶς in v. 4 (*sic*) indicate that we should take Satan to be the one who corrupts the thinking of the Corinthians,"¹⁶¹ the opposite case can be made: because Paul explicitly names Satan in v. 14 (as well as several

¹⁵⁸ See above, §2.5.5.

¹⁵⁹ See above, §5.2.3.

¹⁶⁰ E.g., Lambrecht, *Second Corinthians*, 173; Furnish, *II Corinthians*, 486; Arnold, *Powers of Darkness*, 61; Page, *Powers of Evil*, 192–93; Bell, *Deliver Us from Evil*, 233, 240.

¹⁶¹ Harris, *Corinthians*, 741. The reference to Satan is actually located in 2 Cor 11:14.

other times in 2 Corinthians) but does not do so in 2 Cor 11:3, we can be confident that Paul was thinking of only a serpent and not of Satan.¹⁶²

Moreover, Paul's emphasis in 2 Cor 11:3 is on the analogical similarities between the manner in which Eve and the Corinthians were deceived, not between the Genesis serpent and Satan.¹⁶³ Like the Galatians whom Paul accused of being "bewitched" (Gal 3:1), Paul feared that the Corinthians were being led astray by false teaching. In this sense the Corinthians were in danger of being led astray just as Eve was in the garden of Eden. Therefore, while the connection between the serpent and Satan seems implicit in 2 Cor 11:3, Paul, in his allusion to the Genesis narrative, preserves the reference to the cunning serpent rather than conflating the two figures probably because he did not mean to mention Satan at this point.¹⁶⁴ If there is any link between v. 3 and vv. 14–15 it is not the relationship between the serpent and Satan, but the deception of the Corinthians and the duplicitous practices of the false apostles.¹⁶⁵

¹⁶² For more on ancient ophidian imagery, see James H. Charlesworth, *The Good and Evil Serpent: How a Universal Symbol became Christianized* (AYBRL; New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2010).

¹⁶³ Similarly, see the remark by Abraham J. Malherbe ("Through the Eye of the Needle: Simplicity or Singleness?" *ResQ* 5, no. 3 [1961]: 119–29): "The point of contact with the story of Eve is not the discussion of purity, but the cunningness of the serpent, through which she was led astray" (128).

¹⁶⁴ As Furnish (*II Corinthians*, 487), *inter alios*, points out, some rabbinic texts "interpret the serpent's deception of Eve as her seduction and the infusion of lust ('*Abod. Zar.* 22b; *b. Šabb.* 145b–146a; *Yebam* 103b; cf. *Sotah* 9b), and there are indications such an interpretation was current in Paul's day (1 Enoch 69:6; 2 Enoch 31:6; Apoc Abr 23; perhaps also 1 Mac 19:7–8). See also *L.A.E.* 44:2–5; *Jub.* 3:17–35.

¹⁶⁵ It is debated whether the ὑπερλίαν ἀποστόλων of 2 Cor 11:5; 12:11 and the ψευδαπόστολοι of 2 Cor 11:13–15 are one group or two. Martin (*2 Corinthians*, 342), Barrett ("Paul's Opponents in II Corinthians," *NTS* 17, no. 3 [1971]: 233–54), and Harris (*Corinthians*, 73–77) claim they are two separate groups; Witherington (*Conflict and Community*, 446), Furnish (*II Corinthians*, 502–05), and Margaret E. Thrall ("Super-Apostles, Servants of Christ, and Servants of Satan," *JSNT* 6 [1980]: 42–57) see them as a single group. The present study will proceed under assumption that the two expressions designate a single group of Paul's opponents.

6.7.3 *The Apostle Paul and the Betrothal of the Corinthians to Christ*

Paul begins a new section of 2 Corinthians in chapter 10 by responding to fresh reports brought to him concerning the church at Corinth.¹⁶⁶ In particular, it seems that Paul has become acutely concerned with the influence of rival apostles within the Corinthian congregation (2 Cor 10:1–5, 7, 12–18; 11:7–15, 22–30; 12:6, 12; 13:3–4).¹⁶⁷ Undoubtedly Paul was threatened by the presence of these other apostles in his absence from his church. Yet Paul’s ultimate concern in this section looks beyond any sense of personal insecurity due to the moderate success of his rival apostles. Instead, what drives Paul’s boasting of his apostolic credentials and, conversely, his vehement repudiation of the deceptive practices of his opponents is his relationship with the Corinthian church which had come under threat by the presence of the so-called “super apostles.”

Having defended his and his co-workers’ ministry at Corinth, including their exclusive right to boast among the Corinthians in ch. 10, Paul launches his so-called “boast of a fool,” a zealous attack on his opponents, in ch. 11. Beginning in vv. 1–2, which frame the entire section of 11:1–15, Paul makes his concern for the Corinthians clear by introducing an intimate metaphor by which the church is to understand their relationship to both Christ and their founding apostle: “I feel a divine jealousy for you, for I promised (ἡρμοσάμην) you in marriage to one husband, to present you as a chaste virgin (παρθένον ἀγνήν) to Christ.” This verse is critical for understanding both the Corinthian church’s relationship to Christ as well as the role which Paul believed he played within that relationship. Harris helpfully summarizes Paul’s nuptial metaphor:

¹⁶⁶ As any commentator on 2 Corinthians will point out—whether they regard 2 Cor 10–13 as original to the letter, a separate letter such as the “tearful letter” of 2:3–4, or something altogether different—Paul’s writing has shifted from the more conciliatory tone of the first nine chapters to an unexpectedly harsh and polemical one in the final three chapters. Additionally, in 2 Cor 10–13 the new focal point of Paul’s letter becomes the presence of other apostles and their threat to Paul’s apostleship in Corinth. Thus in many ways 2 Cor 10–13 seems like a separate letter. At the same time, at the heart of the final chapters of the letter which we now regard as “2 Corinthians” is Paul’s tumultuous relationship with his church in Corinth. In this sense 2 Cor 10–13 bears marked similarity to not only the first seven chapters of 2 Corinthians, but also a majority of 1 Corinthians.

¹⁶⁷ Harris (*Corinthians*, 79–80) lists some nineteen different possible opponents of Paul in 2 Corinthians. For an overview of scholarly literature on the identity and teaching of Paul’s opponents, see *ibid.*, 67–87.

With the preaching of the good news at Corinth, Paul's evangelistic role was fulfilled and the church that had been created there was betrothed to Christ. But his pastoral role always remained incomplete, for he aimed to preserve the virginity of the infant church right up to her wedding day (v. 2), to maintain her exclusive devotion to Christ (cf. v. 3), and to counter the efforts of foreign lovers (such as his rivals at Corinth) to entice her away from her one and only husband (v. 4). This jealousy for the church's purity was prompted by Paul's paternal affection and expressed the very jealousy of God. (Harris, *2 Corinthians*, 738)

Thus, in many ways, Paul's metaphor in 2 Cor 11:2 reflects our characterization of Paul's view of his apostleship (his *doppelte Auftrag*) in Chapter Four: first, Paul arrived at Corinth and preached the gospel to the Corinthians; second, he then founded a community of those who responded positively to his preaching. In doing so Paul "betrothed" the Corinthian believers to Christ.

The end goal of the betrothal (ἀρμόζω) is the eschatological presentation (παρίστημι) of the bride, the Corinthians, to the groom, Christ. During the period between these two events—betrothal and presentation—Paul fears that the Corinthians might be deceived and thereby jeopardize their purity and devotion to their "one husband" (ἐνὶ ἀνδρί, v. 2). Moreover, because Paul plays a significant role in this betrothal,¹⁶⁸ he therefore considers it his responsibility to ensure that the Corinthians remain faithful to their pledge to Christ. If the Corinthians continue to succumb to the teaching of those he refers to as "super-apostles" (τῶν ὑπερλίαν ἀποστόλων, v. 5), then Paul will be responsible for their unfaithfulness to Christ. He therefore warns his congregation against the danger of his rival apostles by pledging his "divine jealousy" (v. 2) and love (vv. 7–11) for the Corinthians. As we turn to the reference to Satan and his servants in 2 Cor 11:14, it will be crucial to keep in mind that just as Paul perceived his own role within the nuptial metaphor introduced in v. 3, he also thought of Satan's opposition in terms of the same metaphor.

¹⁶⁸ Harris (*Corinthians*, 736–37) outlines four main interpretive models for understanding Paul's role within the betrothal: (1) the friend of the groom or the groomsman; (2) the friend of the bride; (3) the father's agent; and (4) the father of the bride. Harris prefers the fourth option because of Paul's role as parent to the Corinthians (1 Cor 4:15; 2 Cor 6:13; 12:14), the father's responsibility to protect his daughter's virginity between betrothal and marriage, and the Corinthian church's collective relation to Paul as his "daughter."

6.7.4 *The Servants of Satan at Corinth (2 Cor 11:13–15)*

After defending his financial practices in 2 Cor 11:7–11,¹⁶⁹ in vv. 13–15 Paul launches an ardent attack on his opponents: “for such ones are false apostles (ψευδαπόστολοι), workers of deceit, disguising themselves (μετασχηματιζόμενοι) as apostles of Christ. And it is no wonder, for Satan disguises himself (μετασχηματίζεται) as an angel of light (ἄγγελον φωτός). It is no great thing therefore if his servants also disguise themselves (μετασχηματίζονται) as servants of righteousness; their end will correspond with their works.” Whereas at the beginning of 2 Cor 11 Paul was primarily concerned with the influence of his rivals on the “thoughts” (τὰ νοήματα, v. 3) of the Corinthians, Paul now addresses their threat to his own status as the rightful apostle of the Corinthian church. The threat of Paul’s opponents to his apostleship can be seen in his pejorative use of terms in vv. 13–15 which he applies to himself elsewhere in the Corinthian correspondence:

¹⁶⁹ In v. 12 Paul writes that he will continue his financial practices “in order to deny (ἐκκόψω) an opportunity to those who want an opportunity to be recognized as our equals in what they boast about.” Although no certain connection can be established, the verb ἐκκόπτω brings to mind Paul’s use of the verb ἐγκόπτω (Rom 15:22; 1 Thess 2:18; cf. κωλύω in Rom 1:13) to describe Satan’s efforts to deny his apostolic labor.

Paul	His opponents
ἀπόστολος (2 Cor 1:1; cf. 12:12)	ψευδαπόστολοι (2 Cor 11:13); cf. τῶν ὑπερλίαν ἀποστόλων (11:5; 12:11)
συνεργοί θεοῦ (1 Cor 3:9); cf. κοπιᾶω (1 Cor 15:10); κόπος (2 Cor 10:15; 11:23)	ἐργάται δόλιοι (2 Cor 11:13)
Παῦλος ἀπόστολος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ (2 Cor 1:1)	μετασχηματιζόμενοι εἰς ἀποστόλους Χριστοῦ (2 Cor 11:13)
θεοῦ διάκονοι (2 Cor 6:4; cf. 11:23)	οἱ διάκονοι αὐτοῦ (“servants of Satan,” 2 Cor 11:15)
Paul and his co-workers are ministers of the new covenant (διακόνους καινῆς διαθήκης; 2 Cor 3:6); cf. ἡ διακονία τῆς δικαιοσύνης, 2 Cor 3:9	Satan’s servants merely masquerade (μετασχηματίζονται) as διάκονοι δικαιοσύνης (2 Cor 11:15)
Paul’s role in the Corinthians’ betrothal is to preserve their exclusive devotion to Christ	Paul’s rivals aim to supplant him as apostle and to claim the Corinthians as their own

Figure 1

With the contrasting use of the above terms in view, it is evident that Paul regarded his opponents as a threat to his apostleship in Corinth.

As we argued above, Paul’s betrothal metaphor in 2 Cor 11:2, which depicts the Corinthians as the pledged bride to Christ as well as Paul’s role as protector of the betrothal, is the operative context in which Paul confronts the influence of these “apostles” among the Corinthians. What is ultimately at stake for Paul, therefore, is not merely his reputation but the Corinthian church’s future marriage to Christ. Furthermore, if Paul’s role in the betrothal is to safeguard their future marriage until he presents them to Christ in the eschatological future—which, as we have seen, is Paul’s goal with all of his churches—then it follows that Paul considered his opponents not only as interfering with his work at Corinth but as threatening his entire apostolic task of bringing the Corinthian church to eschatological maturity.

While scholarly efforts to determine the historical identification of Paul’s opponents continue unabated, what is important for the present study is their theological identification as “servants of Satan.” It would be easy to regard such an

epithet as akin to a witchcraft accusation or a generic threat,¹⁷⁰ but this would be inconsistent with the other references to Satan in Paul's letters. For as we have seen throughout our analysis of his references to the figure, the primary role in which Paul casts Satan in his letters is the adversary of Paul's apostolic relationship to his churches.

It is not surprising, therefore, that Paul associates his rivals in Corinth with the great enemy to his missionary work. Paul considered himself to be the rightful apostle to the Corinthian church, whom he regarded as the "seal" of his apostleship (1 Cor 9:2) and as the sphere of ministry which God had assigned to him and his co-workers (2 Cor 10:13). And while Paul refused to boast beyond his limits, that is, where he had been the first to preach the gospel (2 Cor 10:12–18), his opponents at Corinth were not above doing so. Paul therefore considers them to be "bogus apostles"¹⁷¹ (ψευδαπόστολοι) precisely because they did not found the Corinthian church. Their presence in Corinth therefore endangered both Paul's apostolic relationship to the Corinthians and the church's betrothal to Christ. For Paul, then, his opponents are "servants of Satan" not only because they, like their master, disguise themselves as something they are not, but because they too seek to ruin Paul's apostolic relationship to the Corinthian church.

In order to demonstrate his opponents' connection to Satan, Paul likens their duplicitous practices to those of Satan who disguises himself as an angel of light (μετασχηματίζεται εἰς ἄγγελον φωτός). The story of Satan's transformation into an angel of light has several possible literary antecedents. First, as Keener points out, "Stories of supernatural beings transforming themselves were familiar in ancient lore."¹⁷² Second, the closest parallel within the biblical texts is probably Job 1:6–

¹⁷⁰ Cf. the remarks of Johnson: "Paul's use of Satan talk in 2 Corinthians 11 is akin to the sorcery accusations made by the pre-medieval Romans. When Paul perceived negative reactions to his authority, the false apostles were characterized as deceivers, determined to delude Paul's followers" ("Satan Talk in Corinth," 151). Johnson's analysis of Paul's words is mistaken, however, due to her misguided expectation that Paul's references to Satan should only occur within passages concerning "Satan's cosmic conflict with God" or "the fate of the world" (ibid.). Johnson rightly emphasizes that in the passage "the issue is the fate of Paul's reputation as an apostle" (ibid.), but fails to recognize Paul's apostolic relationship with his churches as the background to his Satan references.

¹⁷¹ Martin, *2 Corinthians*, 349.

¹⁷² Craig S. Keener, *1–2 Corinthians* (NCBC; Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 230. As an example, Keener cites Achilles Tatius 2.15.4 (ibid.).

12.¹⁷³ Third, in the Pseudepigrapha we find several analogous accounts: in the *Testament of Job* Satan disguises himself (μετασχηματίζω) as a beggar (6:4), as the king of the Persians (17:2), and as a bread seller (23:1);¹⁷⁴ in the *Life of Adam and Eve*, Satan transforms himself into “the brightness of angels” (*Vita* 9:1); and in the Greek *Apoc. Moses* 17:1 appears “in the form of an angel” (ἐν εἴδει ἀγγέλου). Fourth, at various places in the DSS the archangel Michael is referred to as the “prince of lights” (שר מאור, 1QM 3:10; 1QS 3:20). Fifth, Harris claims that pre-Pauline Jewish traditions are irrelevant here since Paul’s use of binary light/dark imagery in 2 Cor 6:14–7:1 can explain the expression ἄγγελον φωτός.¹⁷⁵ In the absence of clear evidence which might indicate a direct citation of any of the aforementioned texts, there is little reason to interpret 2 Cor 11:14 in light of any single background story.¹⁷⁶ In all likelihood, Paul here is drawing on the wider Jewish tradition which knew of Satan’s ability to disguise himself in order to achieve his aims.

Returning to the section of 2 Cor 11:12–15, Paul’s point is that the false apostles’ identity as Satan’s servants is evidenced by their duplicitous behavior since it mirrors that of their master. The allusion to Satan’s transformation into an ἄγγελον φωτός therefore illustrates how an evil and deceptive figure can, by protean transformation, appear to be good-natured. In Paul’s view, such duplicity is the modus operandi of both Satan and those who serve his aims.¹⁷⁷ Accordingly, Paul insists that just as the “false apostles” mimic the deceptive ways of their master, they will likewise participate in his fate: “their end will match their deeds” (ὧν τὸ τέλος ἔσται κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν, v. 15).¹⁷⁸

¹⁷³ Martin, *2 Corinthians*, 351. See also the use of the verb μετασχηματίζω with reference to Satan in *T. Job* 6:4; 17:2; 23:1.

¹⁷⁴ See above, §2.5.2.

¹⁷⁵ Harris, *Corinthians*, 774–75.

¹⁷⁶ In addition, Keener (*1–2 Corinthians*, 230) notes a rabbinic account of a demon who disguised himself as King Solomon (*Pesiq. Rab Kah.* 26:2).

¹⁷⁷ Additionally, both the expression καὶ οὐ θαῦμα (“and no wonder!”) in v. 14 and οὐ μέγα οὖν (“it is therefore not surprising ...”) in v. 15, in an ironic manner, serve to further establish the link between Satan and “his servants” (οἱ διάκονοι αὐτοῦ).

¹⁷⁸ Cf. Rom 16:20; Phil 3:19. See also Martin’s comment: “They have done Satan’s work; to Satan’s fate they will go” (*2 Corinthians*, 353).

The intention of Paul’s harsh critique of his opponents at Corinth is clear: he hopes to demonstrate that these “super apostles” (ὑπερλίαν ἀποστόλων) are nothing short of false apostles” (ψευδαπόστολοι) who, like Satan their master,¹⁷⁹ have presented themselves in disguise in order to deceive the Corinthians and to supplant Paul’s apostolic authority among them. If our analysis of Paul’s view of Satan as an adversary of his apostolic care for his churches is accurate, then it stands to reason that Paul likely perceived his opponents at Corinth as Satan’s servants not only because they conducted themselves in a like manner, masquerading themselves as authentic apostles among the Corinthian believers, but because they also shared Satan’s aim of destroying Paul’s apostolic labor for his church, of leading the Corinthians astray from their pure devotion to Christ. Although Paul’s rivals presented themselves as workers sent by Christ (ἀπόστολοι, v. 13=“sent ones”), Paul exposes them to be ἀπόστολοι of Satan, sent to carry out his “schemes” against the Corinthian church.

6.7.5 Conclusions

Ultimately, Paul’s entire “boast of a fool” speech in 2 Cor 11:1–12:10 turns on his introduction of the betrothal metaphor (2 Cor 11:2–3) in which he affords both Satan and himself key roles. Paul, metaphorically speaking, is the father of the bride seeking to preserve the Corinthian church’s status as παρθένον ἀγνήν until her marriage to Christ. Satan functions as an agent provocateur who aims to tempt the bride’s faithfulness, elsewhere by hardening their hearts against forgiveness (2 Cor 2:5–11), but here by working through his emissaries—his ἀπόστολοι (“sent ones”)—in order to corrupt Paul’s apostolic relationship with the Corinthian church and thereby render Paul’s κόπος in vain.

The crucial point for our wider study which becomes clear in light of 2 Cor 11:14–15 is that Paul did not only regard Satan as the generic enemy of all people or, like the Belial of the Qumran writings, as “*the* metaphysical negative entity par

¹⁷⁹ Cf. John 8:44: “You are from your father the devil, and you choose to do your father’s desires.”

excellence,”¹⁸⁰ but *also* as an inimical figure who specifically targeted his work. Paul’s depiction of Satan in his letters—which is to be distinguished from any notion of an abstract Pauline “theology of Satan”—is almost entirely contingent upon his experiences of Satan’s hostility to his apostolic labor. Paul therefore portrays Satan *in his letters* as the apostle-church adversary who acts in concrete places and at particular times in order to hinder both the faith of Paul’s churches and his missionary efforts. In the case of 2 Cor 11, Paul identifies Satan as the authority behind his Corinthian rivals who sought to usurp his apostolic authority and deny him of the congregation whom he regarded as the “seal” of his apostleship.

6.8 2 Corinthians 12:7

6.8.1 Introduction

The final reference to Satan in 2 Corinthians is perhaps the most well-known within the Pauline corpus. It occurs within Paul’s vivid autobiographical account of being “caught up” (ἄρπάζω) in the third heaven and hearing things “that no mortal is permitted to repeat” (2 Cor 12:2–4).¹⁸¹ Subsequent to these visions, Paul claims that he was “given” (ἐδόθη) “a thorn in the flesh, a messenger of Satan to torment me, to keep me from being too elated” (σκόλοψ τῆ σαρκί ἄγγελος σατανᾶ ἵνα με κολαφίζῃ ἵνα μὴ ὑπεραίρωμαι, 12:7). From virtually the time Paul penned these words up to the present, the meaning and identity of Paul’s “thorn” has been widely debated. Scholarly interest in the nature of Paul’s mysterious “thorn” is not without reason, either, for it raises a number of grammatical, theological, and lexical questions, each with a myriad of answers and objections.¹⁸²

¹⁸⁰ Annette Steudel, “God and Belial,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997* (eds. Lawrence H. Schiffman, Emanuel Tov, James C. VanderKam and Galen Marquis; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society in cooperation with The Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 2000), 332–40, italics original (334).

¹⁸¹ On the function of the third person in 2 Cor 12:2–4, see Martin: “Paul’s use of the third person is a means of reflecting his embarrassment (or reluctance) at boasting of what he has done or been a part of” (2 *Corinthians*, 398).

¹⁸² In the 19th cen. Danish philosopher Søren Kierkegaard famously quipped, “this passage ... seems to have afforded an uncommonly favorable opportunity for everyone to become an interpreter of the Bible” (in *Edifying Discourses*, cited in Furnish, *II Corinthians*, 547–48).

In our own study, however, we are particularly interested in why Paul mentions Satan—or to be more specific, an “angel/messenger of Satan” (ἄγγελος σατανᾶ)—at all in the passage. With this focus in mind, we will limit our discussion of 2 Cor 12:7 to only matters relevant to this question, though doubtlessly we will be occasionally required to address related issues of interpretation. In particular, we will be interested in the following questions: 1) can we, with any certainty, identify Paul’s “thorn in the flesh?” 2) What is the relationship, grammatically and conceptually, between σκόλοψ τῆ σαρκί and ἄγγελος σατανᾶ? 3) Who “gave” Paul the thorn and for what purpose?

Before we turn to answer such questions, it is important to recall the context in which Paul recounts his ecstatic vision. One of the questions which arises from reading the passage is why did Paul choose to disclose the episode to the Corinthians when the vision occurred some fourteen years ago (πρὸ ἐτῶν δεκατεσσάρων, 12:2)? Harris, clueing into the epistolary context of the account, rightly comments that “... it was only the present contest with his rivals, brought on by the Corinthians’ disloyalty to him, that had forced him (cf. 12:1, 11) to break that silence and reluctantly mention his privileged ascent to heaven.”¹⁸³ The purpose of Paul’s boasting is not to divulge details of his extraordinary journey to paradise—that is the content of his response to the Corinthians; rather, the *intention* of Paul’s narrative is to address the value of “visions and revelations of the Lord” (ὄπτασίαις καὶ ἀποκαλύψεις κυρίου, 12:1) by recounting his own revelation in order to rebut the Corinthians’ inflated value of such experiences.¹⁸⁴ Within the context of 2 Cor 12:1–10, Paul’s reference to his σκόλοψ τῆ σαρκί, ἄγγελος σατανᾶ is therefore incidental to his wider point. Nonetheless, it will be important to bear in mind as we consider this reference to Satan that his “thorn” episode took place fourteen years prior to the writing of 2 Corinthians, and that it occurs within Paul’s narration of a sequence of events subsequent to his revelation.

¹⁸³ Harris, *2 Corinthians*, 837.

¹⁸⁴ Paul’s rivals probably claimed that such visions and revelations had special spiritual value (so Witherington, *Conflict and Community*, 461).

6.8.2 The Identity of the “thorn in the flesh”

As we noted above, there is no shortage of opinions on the nature and identity of Paul’s “thorn.” To rehearse the various interpretive options would be both fruitless and tangential to our main concern. That said, it will be worthwhile to offer a brief overview of the dominant interpretations in order to come to a fuller understanding of the apposite terms σκόλοψ τῆ σαρκί and ἄγγελος σατανᾶ.

The majority of interpretations can be divided into one of two categories: physical and relational.¹⁸⁵ In the case of the first category, typical interpretations of Paul’s “thorn” are associated with illnesses, disabilities, or some sort of bodily defect. For instance, William Ramsay contended that Paul suffered from “chronic malaria fever.”¹⁸⁶ Thrall argued that Paul’s “thorn” was a physical illness, preferring to identify it as recurring migraines.¹⁸⁷ Dibelius considered Paul’s “thorn” to be a case of epilepsy.¹⁸⁸ Connecting this passage to Gal 4:13–15, some scholars have claimed that Paul was plagued by ophthalmia.¹⁸⁹ Others, however, have maintained that Paul suffered from some type of physical malady without naming its specific nature.¹⁹⁰

The second category of interpretation, relational, can be more or less divided into three subcategories. First, some claim that Paul’s “thorn” is to be identified with the opposition he experienced at Corinth.¹⁹¹ Second, Mullins narrows the scope of the

¹⁸⁵ The two categories are borrowed from Barnett, *Corinthians*, 569. In addition to these categories, it has been suggested that Paul suffered from a psychological condition or moral temptation. For more on the interpretive options, see Martin, *2 Corinthians*, 413–17 and Thrall, *2 Corinthians 8–13*, 809–18.

¹⁸⁶ William M. Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1895), 94–97. See also E. B. Allo, *Saint Paul: seconde épître aux Corinthiens* (2d. ed.; Paris: Ébib, 1956), 320–21.

¹⁸⁷ Thrall, *2 Corinthians 8–13*, 808, 818.

¹⁸⁸ Dibelius, *Die Geisterwelt*, 45–47.

¹⁸⁹ See the discussion in Thrall, *2 Corinthians 8–13*, 814–15.

¹⁹⁰ E.g., Arnold, *Powers of Darkness*, 133–34; John C. Thomas, “‘An Angel from Satan’: Paul’s Thorn in the Flesh (2 Corinthians 12.7–10),” *JPT* 9 (1996): 39–52.

¹⁹¹ J. J. Thierry, for instance, argues that Paul himself was accused of being an ἄγγελος σατανᾶ: “Μὰν schimpft Paulus einen ἄγγελος σατανᾶ, der sich für einen ἄγγελον φωτός, einen ἀπόστολος Χριστοῦ ausbe — das ist der Dorn, der in seinem Fleische steckt” (“Der Dorn im Fleische (2 Kor 12:7–9),” *NovT* 5, no. 4 (1962): 301–10 [309]). See also Jerry W. McCant, “Paul’s Thorn of Rejected Apostleship,” *NTS* 34, no. 4 (1988): 550–72.

“thorn” to refer to a personal enemy of Paul, possibly “to a specifically obnoxious member of the clan, a particular ἄγγελος σατανᾶ.”¹⁹² Third, others take Paul’s “thorn” to be an allusion to his opponents in general.¹⁹³

On the whole, those who highlight the physical nature of Paul’s “thorn/messenger” tend to emphasize the word σκόλοψ in 2 Cor 12:7. Conversely, those who highlight the relational nature of Paul’s “thorn/messenger” often emphasize the term ἄγγελος. Taken together, these points illustrate the virtual impasse among scholars in attempting to identify Paul’s thorn.¹⁹⁴ Despite the merits of each of the two main interpretations, neither view is able to overcome its own exegetical or historical difficulties. For this reason it is hard to not concur with Barnett: “on the grounds of historical analysis, however, the truth is that we do not have enough unambiguous information to do more than speculate on the nature of Paul’s *skolops*.”¹⁹⁵

Despite the difficulty in identifying a clear referent for Paul’s “thorn/messenger,” the verse remains important for the present study. Its value, however, is not in determining the identity of Paul’s “thorn/messenger.” Rather, the significance of 2 Cor 12:7 for the present study is Paul’s association of a painful hindrance to his ministry with (a messenger/angel of) Satan. Our interpretation of the verse will therefore not be contingent upon a specific interpretation of the identity of the “thorn/messenger.” Instead, our focus will be on the connection between σκόλοψ and

¹⁹² Terence Y. Mullins, “Paul’s Thorn in the Flesh,” *JBL* 76, no. 4 (1957): 299–303 (302).

¹⁹³ E.g., Murphy-O’Connor, *The Theology of the Second Letter to the Corinthians*, 118–19; Laurie Woods, “Opposition to a Man and His Message: Paul’s ‘Thorn in the Flesh’ (2 Cor 12:7),” *ABR* 39 (1991): 44–53. Michael L. Barré also identifies the “thorn/messenger” with Paul’s opponents, but does so in light of the alleged parallel in 1QH 2.22 (“Qumran and the ‘Weakness’ of Paul,” *CBQ* 42, no. 2 [1980]: 216–27). For a critique of Barré’s argument, see Thrall, *2 Corinthians 8–13*, 813.

¹⁹⁴ In addition to the aforementioned proposals, see David Abernathy, “Paul’s Thorn in the Flesh: A Messenger of Satan?,” *Neot* 35, no. 1 (2001): 69–79; Verena Jegher-Bucher, “‘The Thorn in the Flesh’/‘Der Pfahl im Fleisch’: Considerations about 2 Corinthians 12:7–10 in Connection with 12:1–13,” in *Rhetorical Analysis of Scripture: Essays from the 1995 London Conference* (ed. S. E. Porter and T. H. Olbricht; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 388–97; David M. Park, “Paul’s ΣΚΟΛΟΨ ΤΗ ΣΑΡΚΙ: Thorn or Stake (2 Cor 12:7),” *NovT* 22, no. 2 (1980): 179–83; Robert M. Price, “Punished in Paradise (An Exegetical Theory on 2 Corinthians 12:1–10),” *JSNT* 7 (1980): 33–40.

¹⁹⁵ Barnett, *Corinthians*, 570.

ἄγγελος and the question of Satan’s agency in the passage, matters to which we now turn.

6.8.3 *The Relationship between σκόλοψ τῆ σαρκί and ἄγγελος σατανᾶ*

So much scholarly attention has been devoted to discovering the meaning of Paul’s “thorn” that it is easy to overlook the fact that he *also* refers to it as an ἄγγελος σατανᾶ (“messenger/angel of Satan”). Determining the aggregate meaning of the two appositional substantives, however, has proved problematic for interpreters. As Woods comments, “the difficulty in the interpretation of 2 Cor 12:7 comes down to a choice between reading “thorn in the flesh” and the “angel of Satan” as a physical disability or as a figure of speech describing the opposition which questioned Paul’s apostolic authority and undermined his mission.”¹⁹⁶ When interpreters highlight one term over the other, it often yields, as we noted above, unpersuasive results which fail to account for both terms.

In order to understand the syntactical and conceptual relationship between σκόλοψ τῆ σαρκί and ἄγγελος σατανᾶ, Paul’s use of metaphor in 2 Cor 12:7 must be considered. More to the point, we must ask which of the two terms—σκόλοψ τῆ σαρκί or ἄγγελος σατανᾶ—should be regarded as metaphorical and which as literal? Is it the case, as many interpreters seem to understand, that Paul is referring to something physically painful like a “thorn” which he compares to a “messenger/angel of Satan?” Or perhaps he is alluding to an actual messenger (or angel) from Satan—or, indeed, to Satan who disguises himself as an ἄγγελον φωτός as in 2 Cor 11:14—which caused him a certain level of irritation. The interpretive possibilities are seemingly endless. But what guidelines might we be able to establish to arrive at a more cogent explanation?¹⁹⁷

¹⁹⁶ Woods, “Opposition to a Man and His Message,” 49.

¹⁹⁷ Harris’ proposed seven characteristics of Paul’s “thorn” are a good starting point: 1) it was given as a consequence to Paul’s revelations; 2) it caused him great pain; 3) Paul considered it both an instrument of Satan and a gift from God; 4) it was apparently a permanent condition; 5) it was humbling; 6) it was humiliating; and 7) it caused Paul to feel weak, which in turn caused him to boast (*Corinthians*, 857).

First, let us consider each of the two apposite terms in 2 Cor 12:7. Concerning the meaning of σκόλοψ τῆ σαρκί, it is generally agreed that among the two most likely translations of σκόλοψ, “thorn” and “stake,” the former is to be preferred on the basis of the occurrences of the term in the Septuagint, where it never means “stake” (LXX Num 33:55; Sir 43:19; Hos 2:8; Ezek 28:24).¹⁹⁸ Grammatically τῆ σαρκί (“to/for the flesh”) qualifies σκόλοψ, but ultimately it relates to the indirect object μοι since it is *Paul’s* flesh in which the “thorn” is located.¹⁹⁹ In short, “a thorn in the flesh” is a valid translation of σκόλοψ τῆ σαρκί, whether interpreted in a literal sense as something harmful which Paul experienced or in metaphorical sense qualifying the reference to ἄγγελος σατανᾶ.

Second, there is reasonable evidence to suggest that Paul’s use of ἄγγελος probably should be interpreted in a relational manner. First, Paul’s use of the singular ἄγγελος is generally personal elsewhere in his letters (e.g., 2 Cor 11:14; Gal 1:8; 4:14). Second, the verb κολαφίζω (“to beat” or “to buffet”), which has the appositional terms σκόλοψ τῆ σαρκί and ἄγγελος σατανᾶ as its subjects, is typically interpersonal in its meaning (Matt 26:67; Mark 14:65; 1 Pet 2:20; but cf. 1 Cor 4:11), thus suggesting a similar use in 2 Cor 12:7. Third, Paul’s plea for the departure of his σκόλοψ/ἄγγελος in v. 8 employs the verb ἀφίστημι, which is often used in the NT to describe the departure of persons, not things such as “thorns” (e.g., Luke 2:37; 4:13; 13:27; Acts 12:10; 19:9; 22:29). In light of these points, there seems to be slightly more evidence in favor of interpreting ἄγγελος, and therefore probably Paul’s σκόλοψ/ἄγγελος as a whole, in a relational sense.

Concerning the reference to Satan in the verse, any interpretation of 2 Cor 12:7 must fully take into consideration Paul’s characterization of Satan elsewhere in his letters.²⁰⁰ For in 2 Cor 12:7 Paul does not place “thorn in the flesh” in apposition to “evil” or even “a messenger of evil,” but rather to an ἄγγελος of *Satan*. Consequently, interpretations which take the reference to Satan in 2 Cor 12:7 to

¹⁹⁸ So Harris, *Corinthians*, 853–54. Additionally, Thrall rightly notes that “‘stake’ ... seems to produce too exaggerated a picture” (2 *Corinthians* 8–13, 807).

¹⁹⁹ In agreement with most commentators, τῆ σαρκί should be taken as locative and not as a reference to Paul’s sinful nature (e.g., Harris, *Corinthians*, 854; Thrall, 2 *Corinthians* 8–13, 807).

²⁰⁰ In agreement, Woods, “Opposition to a Man and His Message,” 48.

mean evil in a generic sense insufficiently account for Paul’s understanding of Satan. In Paul’s letters, as we have argued thus far, Satan appears primarily as the adversary of Paul’s apostolic labor to preach the gospel and nurture his churches.²⁰¹ Assuming Paul’s view of Satan was somewhat consistent over the span of his career, including the period in which he experienced his σκόλοψ/ἄγγελος, then it would seem that Paul attributed the “thorn in the flesh” to Satan because he believed it to be a hindrance to his apostolic calling.

Building on this contention, Paul’s three-fold²⁰² petition to the Lord to remove his “thorn” (v. 8) should therefore be understood in terms of his desire to continue his ministry without Satan’s hindrance in the form of his σκόλοψ/ἄγγελος. Accordingly, the Lord’s reply to Paul’s request to remove Satan’s painful hindrance to his apostolic labor is thus a reminder that God’s grace²⁰³ is in itself satisfactory even with the presence of his “thorn.” As Paul makes clear in vv. 9–10, it is actually the abiding presence of his “thorn” which enables “the power of Christ” (ἡ δύναμις τοῦ Χριστοῦ, v. 9) to dwell in him and be perfected.²⁰⁴ Not even Satan’s ἄγγελος is able to prevent the power of Christ working through Paul.

So how can the above discussion help us to narrow the range of likely interpretations of 2 Cor 12:7? Returning to Paul’s use of metaphor in 2 Cor 12:7, it is difficult to see how Paul’s “thorn in flesh,” if taken in a literal sense to refer to a physical malady or condition, could also be regarded as personal “messenger” of

²⁰¹ So Woods: “As far as Paul is concerned, Satan is out to frustrate all efforts that would reinforce the faith and constancy of the Christian churches. Consequently, he regards Satan as the author of obstructive opposition to his apostolic efforts” (ibid., 47).

²⁰² Like Paul’s references to his three beatings (τρὶς ἑρραβδίσθην) and three shipwrecks (τρὶς ἐναυάγησα) in 2 Cor 11:25, it seems most likely that Paul made three separate pleas to the Lord (τρὶς τὸν κύριον παρεκάλεσα) for the removal of his thorn (so Harris, *Corinthians*, 860–61). Therefore, the number three (τρὶς) in v. 8 is not symbolic of a greater number of appeals to the Lord or an allusion to Jesus’ three petitions in the Gethsemane (Matt 26:44; Mark 14:41). For an analysis of the intriguing parallels between Paul’s experience of his thorn and Jesus’ experience in Gethsemane, see Jerry W. McCant, “Paul’s Thorn of Rejected Apostleship,” *NTS* 34, no. 4 (1988): 550–72.

²⁰³ It is possible that χάρις in v. 9 is not only a reference to grace in a general sense, but additionally to Paul’s apostolic calling (cf. Rom 1:5; 12:3; 15:15; Phil 1:7; Gal 2:9; 1 Cor 3:10).

²⁰⁴ Cf. 2 Cor 4:7: “But we have this treasure in clay jars, so that it may be made clear that this extraordinary power belongs to God (ἡ ὑπερβολὴ τῆς δυνάμεως ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ) and does not come from us.”

Satan, which seems to be the more favorable interpretation of ἄγγελος σατανᾶ.²⁰⁵ Conversely, given the appositional relationship between σκόλοψ and ἄγγελος in 2 Cor 12:7, as well as Paul’s view of Satan as an adversary to his ministry, it seems reasonable that Paul would have characterized an opponent—whether human or suprahuman—using the metaphorical imagery of a “thorn” in his flesh which was meant to “torment” him. In the end, although there is insufficient historical and linguistic evidence to identify Paul’s thorn with a high degree of certainty, and although no interpretation of 2 Cor 12:7 should rely too heavily on a particular identification of Paul’s “thorn,” it seems most plausible that Paul’s “thorn” was a personal adversary whom he likened to a painful thorn in his flesh due to the agony which his opponent caused him.

6.8.4 Divine Agency and 2 Corinthians 12:7

One of the clearest exegetical matters in 2 Cor 12:7 is that the verb ἐδόθη is a divine (or theological) passive.²⁰⁶ Typically, a divine passive is employed as a way of obliquely referring to the activity of God. In 2 Cor 12:7 Paul utilizes the passive form of δίδωμι to make it clear that God, despite Satan’s involvement in the sending of Paul’s “thorn,” was the one *ultimately* responsible for the “thorn” in his life. That is, by using the divine passive Paul is “speaking of God as the hidden agent behind events and experiences in human lives.”²⁰⁷ Thus, even though Paul refers to his “thorn in the flesh” as a “messenger of Satan,” he nonetheless insists that it “was given” (ἐδόθη) to him by God.

God’s identity as the giver of Paul’s “thorn” raises questions concerning Satan’s role in 2 Cor 12:1–10. How can we make sense of the involvement of Satan, who

²⁰⁵ Similarly, Woods: “The appositional relationship between σκόλοψ and ἄγγελος in 2 Cor 12:7 rules out the likelihood of any reference to a bodily ailment and indeed the context of the whole section point to personal opposition put up by those who questioned Paul’s apostleship and Gospel” (“Opposition to a Man and His Message,” 50–51).

²⁰⁶ E.g., Barnett, *Corinthians*, 568; Barrett, *Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, 315–16; Keener, *1–2 Corinthians*, 240; Page, *Powers of Evil*, 197; Thomas, ““An Angel from Satan’,” 42. For more on the use of the divine passive in the New Testament, see Joachim Jeremias, *New Testament Theology* (New York: Scribners, 1971), 9–14.

²⁰⁷ Martin, *2 Corinthians*, 412. Similarly, Barnett speaks of God as the “invisible source” of Paul’s suffering in 2 Cor 12:7 (*Corinthians*, 570).

elsewhere in Paul's letters functions as his adversary, in helping to keep Paul's pride in check? Or, as Thornton puts it, "How can Satan, the abettor of pride, here be linked with the inculcation of humility?"²⁰⁸ More specifically, we must ask whether Paul's use of the divine passive in 2 Cor 12:7 implies that he believed God to have sent a "messenger of Satan" in the sense that he envisioned God to have colluded with Satan? Many have suggested that 2 Cor 12:7 assumes a sort of dual agency along these lines. For instance, Thomas contends that Paul implies "some sort of cooperation on the part of God and Satan" through his use of the divine passive.²⁰⁹ Abernathy, who maintains that Paul's thorn was a demonic adversary, states that God worked "through Satan."²¹⁰ Similarly, Page asserts that although the "thorn" is "an attack from Satan," Paul "also sees it as a gift of God with a salutary purpose."²¹¹ In even stronger language, Johnson claims that "God's parental discipline is exercised upon Paul through Satan."²¹² Lastly, Thornton goes further yet by suggesting that Satan functions in 2 Cor 12:7 as "God's agent" but *not* as God's enemy.²¹³ Such arguments for dual agency—in which God and Satan are said to cooperate to some degree—are regularly put forward by scholars. But is such language appropriate in light of our analysis of Paul's apocalyptic theology and his other references to Satan?

The notion of Satan acting with God's permission would have been familiar to Paul. To cite just one example, in the book of Job Satan (שָׂטָן) is granted permission by God to harm Job physically and to destroy his possessions (Job 1:12; 2:6).²¹⁴ Indeed, many scholars cite Satan's role in the Joban story as a scriptural and theological precedent for the supposed dual agency in 2 Cor 12:7, and Page even claims that Paul himself viewed "his experience of the thorn through the lens of

²⁰⁸ Thornton, "Satan: God's Agent for Punishing," 151.

²⁰⁹ Thomas, "'An Angel from Satan,'" 44–45.

²¹⁰ Abernathy, "Paul's Thorn in the Flesh," 76.

²¹¹ Page, "Satan: God's Servant," 464.

²¹² Johnson, "Satan Talk," 152.

²¹³ Thornton, "Satan: God's Agent for Punishing," 151.

²¹⁴ In addition to the book of Job, Thornton claims that a Satan-like figure serves as an agent of punishment in Exod 12:23; *Jub.* 49:2; CD 4:13, 15; 5:18; *1 En.* 56:1; 62:11; 63:1 ("Satan: God's Agent for Punishing," 152).

Job’s experience.”²¹⁵ However, there are reasons to doubt the relevance of the Joban account for understanding Satan’s role in 2 Cor 12:7. First, whereas Satan appears within the narrative of Job as part the divine council, and thus already under the authority and will of God, in the NT (including the Pauline letters) Satan is depicted as something of a renegade angelic figure who operates apart from, and in opposition to, God’s purposes.²¹⁶ Indeed, to a degree the title “the god of this age” in 2 Cor 4:4 assumes Satan’s independence from God. It is therefore difficult to imagine that Paul would have understood God to have permitted Satan to send his “thorn” in the same fashion the Joban Satan was granted divine permission to attack Job. Second, nothing in the text of 2 Cor 12:7 itself suggests that Satan knowingly served as God’s agent *or* that God granted Satan authority to attack Paul. In short, Satan’s role as accuser of the divine council in the book of Job does not seem to help explain Satan’s role in 2 Cor 12:7.

Furthermore, nowhere else in the Pauline letters does Satan function as an agent of divine punishment or discipline.²¹⁷ By contrast, in 2 Cor 12:7 and elsewhere in Paul’s letters God and Satan are antithetical, but by no means equal, forces. As we noted above in our discussion of Paul and apocalyptic, in Pauline theology Satan is categorized as an “enemy” (ἐχθρός) of God destined to be destroyed at the end of the present age (1 Cor 15:20–28; Rom 16:20).²¹⁸ Thus, in the Pauline writings, not least 2 Cor 12:7, Satan cannot be described as a *witting* agent of God. Moreover, if Paul understood God to use Satan as agent of punishment one would probably expect such language to occur more frequently in Paul’s letters. The absence of this function in the Pauline writings, however, points away from interpreting Satan’s role in 2 Cor 12:7 as an agent of God. This does not rule out the possibility that Paul understood God to have worked through Satan to subdue his pride, but it does cast doubt on

²¹⁵ Page, “Satan: God’s Servant,” 464.

²¹⁶ Similarly, J. Christiaan Beker: “Satan is no longer a messenger and servant of God—as in the Old Testament—but has become a fallen angel who is allowed to reign over this world” (*Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in Life and Thought* [Philadelphia, Pa.: Fortress Press, 1980], 188).

²¹⁷ 1 Cor 5:5 is often regarded as evidence in support of Satan’s role as an agent of divine punishment in Paul. See §6.3 for a critique of this view. Page claims that Satan’s role as an agent of God is evident in several scenes in the Synoptic Gospels, including the temptation narratives and Matthew’s version of the Lord’s prayer (Page, “Satan: God’s Servant,” 456–61).

²¹⁸ See above, §3.3.3.

interpretations which assume or imply some sort of *intentional* cooperation between God and Satan.

In the end, if we can speak of Satan as God’s agent at all—though, as we have noted, there is reason to suggest that such language is not applicable to the Pauline writings—it is only as an *unwitting* tool of God’s will and not as an accomplice of God’s purposes. Along these lines Page has claimed that Satan often acts as an “unwitting instrument” of God in the biblical tradition. Furthermore, Page warns against dichotomizing between Satan’s roles as an enemy and a servant of God.²¹⁹ Hypothetically speaking, “enemy” and “agent” (or “servant”) are not mutually exclusive roles; a person or figure can function as an adversary while simultaneously, but *unknowingly*, having a hand in accomplishing the will of their opponent.²²⁰ In this sense Page is right to refer to Satan as an “unwitting instrument” of God. But such language is of limited benefit for explaining Satan’s role in 2 Cor 12:7 since, to a certain degree, all things are “instruments” of God’s will in a worldview such as Paul’s where God’s supremacy and uniqueness are incontestable.²²¹

How then can we account for both God and Satan’s roles in the passage? Against interpretations of 2 Cor 12:7 which imply some level of dual agency, I propose that 2 Cor 12:7 should instead be understood in terms of *antithetical agency*. By this I mean that the two agents of Paul’s “thorn”—God and Satan—are opposed to each in their purposes. On the one hand, Satan, who participates in the sending of Paul’s “thorn” by virtue of the appositional reference to the ἄγγελος σατανᾶ, aims to torment Paul (ἵνα με κολαφίζῃ). On the other hand, God, revealed by Paul as the “giver” of his “thorn” through the divine passive ἐδόθη, determines to prevent Paul from becoming

²¹⁹ Page, “Satan: God’s Servant,” 465.

²²⁰ E.g., consider the story of Joseph and his brothers in the Genesis narrative which concludes with Joseph’s reinterpretation of his siblings’ actions: “even though you intended to do harm to me, God intended it for good” (Gen 50:20). Here Joseph’s siblings, though seeking to harm their brother, ultimately (and unwittingly) function as an instrument of God’s will in Joseph’s life.

²²¹ E.g., see Paul’s christologically-modified version of the Jewish confession of God’s uniqueness, the Shema (Deut 6:4): “... for us there is one God, the Father, from whom are all things and for whom we exist, and one Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom are all things and through whom we exist” (1 Cor 8:6).

too elated concerning his revelation (ἵνα μὴ ὑπεραίρωμαι).²²² In other words, Satan's intentions for Paul's thorn are inimical whereas God's are salutary, and thus the two "sources" of Paul's thorn are fundamentally antithetical. Both God's grace and Satan's ἄγγελος are simultaneously operative, but they are opposed to each other in purpose.

These respective negative and positive roles of Satan and God are, importantly, consonant with Paul's other references to Satan. As we have observed earlier in this chapter as well as in the previous one, Paul frequently depicts Satan as an adversary to his apostolic labor. Satan's role in the present passage is no different. By sending his "messenger" (ἄγγελος; cf. διάκονοι in 2 Cor 11:14–15) Satan attempts to torment Paul in order to hinder his efforts for the gospel. But, as always in Paul's experience, God triumphs over Satan by accomplishing his will. As Garland aptly writes concerning this verse, "What is sent to torment Paul is transformed by God into a means of proclaiming Christ's power and grace. This surprising twist reflects the paradoxical way God defeats Satan."²²³ Therefore, although God's and Satan's purposes are at odds with each other in the passage, it is God who prevails over Satan when Paul embraces the sufficiency of God's grace (χάρις, v. 9)²²⁴ and accepts God's purpose for the "thorn" instead of Satan's (i.e., physical torment) or his own (i.e., its departure).²²⁵ In this way the "thorn" is no longer regarded by Paul as only an attack by Satan but also as a gift (χάρις) "given" to him by God.

²²² Concerning the repeated purpose clause (ἵνα μὴ ὑπεραίρωμαι), Harris states that the "second telic clause is an exact and therefore emphatic repetition of the earlier states a purpose of the bestowal of the σκόλοψ — to curb the spiritual elation" that might arise as a result of Paul's unique privilege (*Corinthians*, 856).

Also important here is the function of the the term καί at the beginning of 2 Cor 12:7. In agreement with Harris, the conjunction καί "suggests a specific link between the experience recorded in vv. 3–4 and Paul's receiving of the 'thorn'" (*Corinthians*, 855). Furthermore, it is preferable to read v. 7a with v. 7b rather than as the conclusion to v. 6 (*ibid.*, 851–53). The conjunction καί therefore indicates that a thorn was given to Paul *because of* the great nature of the revelations.

²²³ David E. Garland, *2 Corinthians* (NAC 29; Nashville, Tenn.: Broadman & Holman, 1999), 522.

²²⁴ Interestingly, in the Pauline letters the passive form of δίδωμι is often used to describe the χάρις "given" to Paul (e.g., Rom 12:3; 15:15; 1 Cor 3:10; Gal 2:9; cf. Eph 3:2, 7–8; 4:7; 6:19; Col 1:25).

²²⁵ Along these lines it is difficult to overlook the similarities between 2 Cor 12:7 and Jesus' prayer, "my father, if it is possible, let this cup pass from me; yet not what I want but what you want"

Consequently, I suggest that 2 Cor 12:7 should not be discussed in terms of dual agency in order to avoid the implication that Satan and God colluded with each other. Again, in 2 Cor 12:7 and throughout the Pauline letters, Satan's modus operandi is to frustrate the work of God by opposing Paul's apostolic labor. The purposes of God and Satan for Paul's thorn are therefore antithetical. The Satan of 2 Cor 12:7 is therefore not an agent (or servant) of God; rather, as Paul makes known earlier in the same letter, he is "the god of this age" who seeks to blind people from "seeing" the gospel (2 Cor 4:4); the one who attempted to take advantage of Paul and the Corinthians in 2:5–11; and the one who sent his servants to infiltrate the Corinthian congregation and challenge Paul's apostolic authority (11:12–15). In short, he is the opponent of God's purposes and the adversary of the Paul's apostolic labor, even if only through his emissary in 2 Cor 12:7. Perhaps for this reason Paul, cognizant of the evil origin of his "thorn," pleaded with God for its departure. If so, Paul's acceptance of God's salutary purpose for the "thorn"—Satan's ἄγγελος—is all the more remarkable.

Before we conclude our discussion of 2 Cor 12:7, it is worth pausing to consider the rhetorical function of the divine passive ἐδόθη. Typically it is suggested that the divine passive was employed in the writings of the NT as a continuation of the Jewish aversion to the name of God.²²⁶ Given the frequent references to God's name and activity in the Pauline letters, however, Paul does not seem reticent to mention the divine name. Why then does Paul use the passive to describe God's role in the sending of his thorn? Why not use the active form of δίδωμι with God as the named subject as he does elsewhere?²²⁷ Although one cannot answer with certainty, Paul's use of the divine passive in 12:7 may have been prompted by his rhetorical purposes in 2 Corinthians: the reader is at once faced with Satan's *and* God's roles in the sending of Paul's thorn. Remarkably, in the midst of his "boast of a fool" (11:1–12:10), Paul digresses from the immediate issue of the value of visions and

(Matt 26:39 par. Mark 14:26; Luke 22:42). Similarly, see McCant, "Paul's Thorn of Rejected Apostleship," 550–72.

²²⁶ E.g., see Max Zerwick, *Biblical Greek: Illustrated by Examples* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1963), 76.

²²⁷ 1 Cor 3:5; 2 Cor 10:8; 13:10; cf. Rom 11:8; 2 Cor 9:9.

revelations in order to make a secondary point to the Corinthians: even though Satan was partially responsible for Paul's "thorn," it is God who triumphs over Satan in using the "thorn" to suppress Paul's pride.

Paul's timely reminder of God's ultimate rule over all things and people would not have been lost on the Corinthian congregation. In the chapter prior to this passage, Paul had warned the Corinthian church of the duplicitous ways of Satan, who masquerades as an ἄγγελος φωτός, and his servants whom Paul declares will suffer judgment at the hand of God (11:12–15). Now Paul describes to the Corinthians how God overcame Satan and his ἄγγελος by using Paul's painful experience for a positive outcome. In both passages—the only two in Paul where σατανᾶς and ἄγγελος occur so closely—God triumphs over the attempts by Satan and his servants (or "messengers") to hinder the work of Paul. And in order to draw attention to God's role in "giving" the "thorn," Paul may have found the passive ἐδόθη to be a suitable rhetorical means of grabbing the Corinthians' attention to remind them that the work of Satan—whether through his emissaries or a painful "thorn"—will always fail against the power of Christ which is paradoxically manifested through weakness (ἀσθένεια).²²⁸

6.8.5 Conclusions

In the end, the reference to Satan in 2 Cor 12:7 stands apart from the others in the Corinthian correspondence since it does not directly connect to the Corinthians themselves. Nevertheless, Paul's identification of his "thorn in the flesh" as a "messenger of Satan" remains valuable for our wider study. Here we note the key points from the above section:

- (1) Despite scholarly effort to identify the nature of Paul's "thorn," its historical antecedent remains uncertain. What is certain, and far more significant for the present study, is that Paul associated the "thorn" with the figure of Satan.

²²⁸ Cf. other references to the term ἀσθένεια in 2 Cor 11:30; 12:5; 13:4.

- (2) Paul's expansion of his metaphor σκόλοψ τῆ σαρκί to also refer to an ἄγγελος σατανᾶ suggests that his plea to the Lord (v. 8) was, effectively, a plea for Satan's departure. This is significant since it suggests that Paul understood Satan's opposition to his apostolic work to date back to the beginning of his apostleship, possibly prior to the writing of 1 Thessalonians which contains the earliest references to Satan within the Pauline corpus.
- (3) The language of "dual agency," which often implies cooperation between Satan and God, is not suitable for describing 2 Cor 12:7. Rather, it is more beneficial to speak of the agency in 12:7 as "antithetical agency" in order to uphold the conflicting tension within the passage as well as in Paul's apocalyptic theology.
- (4) Given the proximity of the expression ἄγγελος σατανᾶ in 2 Cor 12:7 to the use of the same terms in the previous chapter (11:14), Paul's reference to Satan would have had rhetorical significance in relation to his other references to Satan in the Corinthian correspondence. Just as Satan had hindered Paul through a "messenger" some fourteen years ago, so he now attacked the Corinthian congregation through his "servants" (11:15).

6.9 Paul, Satan, and the Corinthian Correspondence

The final matter to consider in this chapter is the collective significance of Paul's references to Satan in the Corinthian correspondence. Having addressed the meaning of these references individually, what now can we say about the cluster of Satan references in 1–2 Cor? More specifically, why does Paul refer to Satan so many times in these two letters when he rarely does so in his other letters? Is this just a random cluster of data, or can we deduce from the Pauline corpus details which might help explain this phenomenon?

Although not many have attempted to address this specific question, perhaps the most substantial theory is that of Lee Johnson, who in a 1999 article proposed that in these passages Paul is employing "Satan talk" in order to "cajole, threaten and inspire" the Corinthians to reject the leadership of the false apostles and to submit to

his apostolic authority over the church.²²⁹ Johnson also maintains that these passages tell us nothing about Paul's cosmology or his understanding of Satan since they are merely rhetorical references. Despite that Johnson's article is one of the only attempts to explain Paul's frequent references to Satan in 1–2 Cor, it is not without its problems.²³⁰ In the end, Johnson's rhetorical model is unable to provide a cogent account of the concentration of Satan references in 1–2 Cor.

How then might we account for the cluster of Satan references in the Corinthian letters? As a starting point, Johnson is right to claim that “the setting for each of the references to Satan involves conflict between Paul and the community, either in their personal response to him or in his instructions.”²³¹ However, it does not follow, as Johnson claims, that Paul employed “Satan talk” as a rhetorical device in order to coerce his readers into obedience.

What I propose instead is that the concentration of references to Satan in 1–2 Cor is rooted in Paul's concern for his churches and his fear for all genuine threats—whether human or demonic—to his apostolic labor (κόπος). With respect to the Corinthian congregation, what seems to be the case is that Paul believed that Satan had made significant progress in hindering the faith of believers and disrupting the unity of the church. Whereas Paul's desire for the success of his churches is evident in most of his letters, Paul's characterization of Satan's work against his labor is limited to 1 Thess and the Corinthian correspondence. Thus the concentration of references to Satan in 1–2 Cor is not as random as it first seems, but arises because of the seriousness of the congregation's plight. Paul feared that Satan might ruin the church through the presence of his servants, the false apostles; by tempting the Corinthian believers; and by taking advantage of their sexual immorality. That Paul

²²⁹ Johnson, “Satan Talk in Corinth,” 154.

²³⁰ For instance, Johnson omits 2 Cor 4:4 entirely from her study without explanation. Given the virtual scholarly consensus that “the god of this age” refers to Satan, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that Johnson avoids the verse because it does not accord with her rhetorical interpretation of Paul's “Satan talk” in 1–2 Cor. Additionally, Johnson presumes that Paul's writings will only refer to Satan in a particular function (i.e., a consistent one) and in particular context (i.e., a cosmological or theological discourse). As we suggested in Chapter Two, however, Satan is often characterized as functioning in several roles in the Jewish and early Christian traditions (e.g., member of the divine council, ruler, the origin of evil, and Satan as tempter). There is therefore no reason to expect Satan to be cast in a homogenous role within a given writing or author.

²³¹ *Ibid.*, 146.

regarded the Corinthian church as the “seal” (σφραγίς, 1 Cor 9:2) of his apostleship probably led him to labor even harder for the Corinthians, and thus may explain why he was keenly cognizant of Satan’s threat to the Corinthian community.

So it is not as a scare tactic that Paul frequently mentions Satan within the Corinthian correspondence. Instead, it is Paul’s love and pastoral concern for the church he founded (1 Cor 4:14–15; 2 Cor 10:13–14) and with whom he spent some eighteen months (Acts 18:1–11) that drives his concern for the church and, ultimately, his references to Satan. He writes to them, as he says in 1 Cor 4:14–15, to admonish them as his children in the Lord. He does so by warning them of Satan’s potential temptations, reminding them to be aware of Satan’s schemes, identifying Satan’s henchmen within their midst, and even by commanding them to preserve their fellowship by expelling one of their members into the domain of the very enemy who seeks to destroy them.

6.10 Conclusion

This chapter has examined the seven references to Satan within the Corinthian correspondence. In my analysis of these texts I attempted to show that Paul’s references to Satan are rooted in his understanding of his apostolic care for his churches. Moreover, I argued that 2 Cor 4:4 and 12:7 serve to illustrate Paul’s belief that Satan not only opposed his churches but Paul himself as a key figure within God’s plan. In this sense Paul seems to share a religious matrix with the Qumran writers who envisioned Satan (Belial) to act at decisive moments in Israel’s history against specifically targeted envoys of God. Likewise, Paul also identified his contemporary opponents (the false apostles) as Satan’s earthly agents.

In our examination of the other references to Satan in 1–2 Corinthians (1 Cor 5:5; 7:5; 2 Cor 2:11; 6:15; 11:14) we noted how Paul again and again refers to Satan in contexts which concern his relationship to the Corinthian church to warn them of Satan’s schemes against their congregation. These findings demonstrate that Paul’s concern for Satan’s activity runs much deeper than the temptation of a few individuals in the Corinthian community. Instead, this chapter has shown that Paul’s

care for the Corinthian church as part of his apostolic labor not only underlies the references to Satan on a literary level, but also his fears of Satan's actions within his own life and in the midst of the Corinthian church.

Having now completed our investigation of the Pauline references to Satan in the present chapter, in the final chapter we will conclude this study by recapitulating our findings and exploring their implications for further research.

Chapter Seven

CONCLUSION

7.1 Summary

This study commenced in Chapter One by illustrating, through examples from the Pauline letters and a survey of previous scholarship on Satan and powers of evil in Paul, the need for a full-length consideration of the Pauline references to Satan. In our brief analysis of 1 Thessalonians 2:17–3:5 and 2 Corinthians 4:4 we observed that Paul exhibits a clearly formed notion of Satan as a powerful and menacing figure in the present age. We also observed that though several studies on the development of Satan in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Jewish writings have been produced, and despite the numerous scholarly contributions on the issue of powers of evil in Paul, insufficient attention has been given to the meaning and purpose of the references to Satan within the letters which Paul wrote to his churches. So we proposed the following research question to guide our study: *how and why does the Apostle Paul refer to the figure of Satan in his letters?* To establish the necessary interpretive context in which to make sense of Paul’s anecdotal and seemingly opaque references to Satan, we then outlined a research strategy that would enable us to read the Pauline references to Satan 1) in relation to other germane areas of Pauline theology and 2) within their epistolary context.

In Chapter Two we then turned to the first relevant background matter, the Satan traditions of the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Judaism. Since our primary focus in the study is *Paul’s* understanding and portrayal of Satan, we departed from the diachronic approach utilized by most studies on the Jewish background of the figure of Satan. Instead, we examined these Satan traditions from a *synchronic* perspective in order to elucidate the various “images” (traditions) of Satan extant during Paul’s time. Although it is impossible to determine with precision which texts concerning Satan that Paul might have known, we argued that it is plausible he was acquainted with, to varying degrees, the following five Satan traditions: (1) Satan as the designated accuser (שָׂטָן) of the heavenly council as reflected in texts such as Job 1–2 and Zech 3:1–6; (2) traditions which associate a Satan-like figure with the origin

of sin (or evil) in the world (e.g., *Book of Watchers* and *Wisdom of Solomon*); (3) Satan as a powerful ruler, whether over people or other evil forces (e.g., Mastema in *Jubilees* or the Angel of Darkness [מלאך חושך] in *Rule of the Community*); (4) Satan as a tempter of the people of God, as exemplified by the Belial figure of the Qumran writings and the Satan of the later *Testament of Job*; and (5) the inclusion in rewritten Scriptures of a Satan-like figure as an active and influential figure in Israel's history. Of these images of Satan with which Paul was likely familiar, we argued that the Second Temple Jewish depiction of Satan as an adversary against key figures of God at crucial moments in history, along with Satan's rule in the present age, offer the clearest parallels to Paul's depiction of Satan.

Chapters Three and Four then concentrated on two additional background matters. First, we considered Satan's place within Paul's apocalyptic theology. In particular, we argued that the fundamental way in which Satan features within Paul's theology is in his apocalyptic eschatology (e.g., 1 Cor 15:20–28), not in his cosmology or soteriology. Paul's apocalyptic interpretation of the death and resurrection of Jesus, as articulated by J. Christiaan Beker, is therefore critical to understanding Paul's view of Satan. In short, we argued that Paul, in accordance with his apocalyptic outlook, considered Satan to be in one sense proleptically defeated by the death, resurrection, and vindication of Jesus, but in another sense engaged in serious opposition to God's people until the end of the present age when he will be destroyed once and for all.

Changing topics, we next addressed Paul's apostleship and his churches which, as we suggested in the first chapter, are critical for understanding how Paul perceived, and in turn portrayed, opposition to his ministry. In this chapter we made three main assertions. First, far from hindering or slowing down his missionary work, Paul regarded the founding and nurturing of churches, along with the preaching of the gospel, as one of the two *essential tasks* of his apostleship (“doppelte Auftrag”). This can be seen at a number of places in Paul's letters where he speaks of the indissoluble relationship¹ forged between apostle and church whenever he founded

¹ Robert J. Banks, *Paul's Idea of Community: The Early House Churches in their Cultural Setting* (rev. ed.; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1994), 175.

(“birthed”; 1 Cor 4:14–16; Gal 4:19) a new community of faith (e.g., 1 Cor 3:10–15; 2 Cor 10:13–15; 1 Cor 9:1–2; cf. Rom 15:20–21). Second, out of Paul’s understanding of his apostolic responsibility to his churches *and* his desire to reap an eschatological reward, Paul feared the failure of his labor (κόπος) for his churches. Third, in light of the first two points, we claimed that Paul’s sense of apostolic responsibility to his churches served as the theological framework in which Paul perceived opposition—including that of Satan—to his missionary efforts and labor for his churches.

Utilizing the findings of Chapters 2–4, we then began to examine the primary data of our investigation by asking how Paul depicts Satan in his letters, and for what rhetorical and theological purposes. First, in Chapter Five we looked at Romans 16:20; 1 Thessalonians 2:18; and 3:5. Concerning the sole reference of Satan in the lengthy letter to the Romans, we showed that Paul drew upon the early Christian interpretation of Psalm 110:1 and Psalm 8:6 for the rhetorical purpose of reminding his readers of the assured eschatological defeat of Satan and his earthly agents. We also maintained that Paul’s promise in Romans 16:20 is strongly consonant with his apocalyptic hopes as outlined in Chapter Three.

Turning to 1 Thessalonians, we suggested that Paul’s willingness to attribute concrete historical events to the agency of Satan in 1 Thessalonians 2:18 and 3:5 reveals his belief that Satan functioned as an adversary to his apostolic labor. Only for this reason is it possible to explain why Paul blames Satan, and not any other source or hindrance, for thwarting his attempts to return to the recently founded Thessalonian community (1 Thess 2:18). This same characterization of Satan is also evident in 1 Thessalonians 3:5 where Paul expresses his fear that “the tempter” (ὁ πειράζων=Satan) might corrupt the faith of his church and thereby render his labor (κόπος) in vain (εἰς κενόν). In conclusion, we argued that Paul’s references to Satan in 1 Thessalonians illustrate that even early in his missionary career Paul regarded Satan primarily as an inimical opponent to his apostolic calling.

Finally, in Chapter Six we examined the seven clear references to Satan in the Corinthian correspondence. To begin, we first analyzed 2 Corinthians 4:4 and 1 Corinthians 5:5 since they conceptually overlap by virtue of their shared presentation

of Satan as a powerful figure within Paul's apocalyptic worldview. In the remaining references to Satan, we showed how Paul consistently depicted Satan as a figure of hostile opposition to either himself (2 Cor 12:7) or his labor among his churches (1 Cor 7:5; 2 Cor 2:11; 6:15; 11:14–15). In addition, we also contended that the concentration of references to Satan within the two extant Corinthian letters is directly related to a number of grave problems in Corinth (e.g., cases of *πορνεία* and the presence of rival apostles) which jeopardized the apostle-church relationship between Paul the Corinthian community.

From the outset of the study we aimed to elucidate the nature of the Pauline references to Satan within their epistolary context. By first examining the Satan traditions of Second Temple Judaism coterminous with Paul's religious milieu, and then explicating Satan's role in Paul's apocalyptic theology and the importance of Paul's churches for his apostleship as the context in which to interpret our primary data, the present study has illustrated that Paul's depiction of Satan is far more subtle and deeply rooted in his apostleship than NT scholarship typically suggests. Over against generic views of Satan in Paul or those which seem to be separated from pertinent aspects of Pauline theology (e.g., his self-understanding as an apostle and church-planter), this study has shown that Paul deliberately and characteristically portrays Satan as an hostile figure who seeks to corrupt *his* churches. And given Paul's depiction of Satan's opposition to his churches *qua* opposition to his apostleship, we are therefore left with a portrayal of Satan in the Pauline letters as an apocalyptic adversary of the Apostle Paul.

Thus, in answer to our original research question—*how and why does the Apostle Paul refer to the figure of Satan in his letters?*—we submit the following answer: Paul fundamentally characterizes Satan in his letters as the apocalyptic adversary who opposes his apostolic labor precisely because Paul believed that his apostleship was pivotal in spreading the gospel at a crucial point in salvation history. Consequently, what Paul explicitly states in 1 Thessalonians 3:5—that he feared Satan's work might render his labor (*κόπος*) in vain—can be presumed in each of the other references to Satan in the Pauline corpus by virtue of our explication of his apocalyptic theology and the importance of his churches for his apostleship. Lastly, in terms of their rhetorical function Paul's references to Satan serve several purposes:

to name Satan's activity where it has gone undetected (e.g., 2 Cor 11:14–15); to inform his readers of Satan's past opposition to his ministry (e.g., 2 Cor 12:7; 1 Thess 2:18); and to warn his churches of Satan's constant schemes to take advantage of them for his own evil purposes (e.g., 2 Cor 2:11).

7.2 Implications

This study yields a number of helpful findings related to the major topics considered. Concerning Second Temple Jewish and Pauline traditions on Satan, Paul seems to both share and differ from the Satan traditions examined in Chapter Two. As in the rest of the New Testament, Satan's role as accuser (of the heavenly council) is virtually absent in Paul, and probably because of the apocalyptic tradition's emphasis on Satan's independent role as a renegade angelic figure. Satan's role (as ἀρχή) in the introduction of evil is also heavily muted in Pauline theology. Paul's emphatic insistence on human (Adam's) culpability in sin therefore departs from many Second Temple Jewish narratives which claimed that evil was first brought into the world by a Satan-figure and/or demons (e.g., *1 En.* 6–11). Paul's view of Satan as a ruler in the present age reflects a similar understanding to antecedent Jewish traditions, though the title "the god of this age" (ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, 2 Cor 4:4) may indicate an intensification of this tradition in light of Paul's pessimism of the present age (Gal 1:4) and his confidence in Satan's ultimate demise (Rom 16:20; cf. 1 Cor 15:20–28). Satan's function as tempter of Israel is also alive and well in Paul's writings, though it has been given a new locus: the Jew-Gentile people of God congregated in churches throughout the Mediterranean basin. Lastly, the Second Temple Jewish literary phenomenon of including a Satan-figure within a retelling of Scripture, where a Satan-like figure often opposes a key envoy of God at a pivotal moment in Israel's history, is reflected by Paul's depiction of Satan as an opponent of his own missionary work during the present, critical period between the resurrection of Jesus and the final judgment.

The present study also has implications for Paul's understanding of his apostleship as well as the significance of his churches for his calling. First, given our assessment of Paul's two-fold apostleship (*doppelte Auftrag*), Paul's apostleship

cannot be reduced to the sole task of preaching the gospel in a literal sense. Instead, Paul's apostleship should be understood in terms of a balanced call to proclaim the gospel of Christ (where it has not yet been proclaimed) *and* to establish and nurture communities of faith based on the gospel. In other words, Paul's apostolic calling necessarily makes him both a preacher and a pastor.

This means that the communities of faith founded by Paul (and his co-workers) are not ancillary functions of Paul's apostleship or subordinate to his desire to preach the gospel; rather, they are fundamental to his responsibilities as an apostle. And though some may be reticent to speak of Paul's ownership or possession of specific churches, on the basis of the Pauline letters it is unavoidable to speak of Paul's sense of apostolic responsibility to the churches which he founded. In this way we see how Paul's churches are far more central to his strategy as an itinerant missionary and far more important to the successful fulfillment of his apostleship than typically conceived. Indeed, Paul's fear of losing any of his churches and his concomitant fear of being deprived of his eschatological boast suggests that Paul's churches, in his estimation, are the *sine qua non* of his apostleship. If so, it is important for future scholarship on the nature of Paul's apostleship and on Paul's relationship with his churches to stress the centrality of the Pauline churches to his apostolic calling and mission.

Finally, this study also has beneficial implications for Paul's understanding and depiction of the figure of Satan. First, it is worthwhile to note the consequences of this study for what Paul does *not* say about Satan. In contrast to a number of writings from the Second Temple Jewish period, Paul does not seem to conceive of Satan in relation to angelic figures within a hierarchy of evil powers. Moreover, Paul does not delve into, or even allude to, Jewish lore concerning the "fall" of Satan (cf. Isa 14; Ezek 28). Neither does Paul speculate on the specifics of Satan's future since, for Paul, the *fact* of Satan's fate had already been guaranteed by God's apocalyptic judgment of *all* evil forces in the death and resurrection of Jesus. Lastly, Paul does not speak of Satan's relation to forces such as principalities and powers or "the rulers of this age." If these distinctions are accurate, then it would be fruitful for further studies to reflect the subtleties of Paul's language and theology.

On the positive side, our analysis of the references to Satan in the Pauline letters reveals a number of interesting insights into Paul's view of Satan. Like his Jewish predecessors as well as both his Jewish and Christian contemporaries, Paul understood Satan to tempt or test all the people of God. At the same time, Paul does not seem to think of Satan as an omnipresent figure or force, and therefore anticipates that Satan will act in particular moments and places, against specific persons, and with a predetermined plan (e.g., 2 Cor 2:11). This is important because it suggests that Paul believed Satan to be acting in a strategic and vigilant manner. And given Paul's understanding of the importance of his apostolic task, including the significance of his churches and his belief that he was living near the end of the ages, it is not surprising that Paul considered Satan to be working against him. Thus, in contrast to Satan's depiction in 1 Peter 5:8 as an opponent of all the people of God, Paul in his letters portrays Satan as an enemy of his apostolic work in particular. So just as the Satan of the Joban narrative can be called "Job's adversary," so the Satan of the Pauline letters is *Paul's* adversary.²

Therefore, although Paul's notion of Satan is derived from his christologically-modified apocalyptic theology, his portrayal of Satan in his letters to his churches is thoroughly contingent upon his self-understanding as an apostle and church-planter as well as his actual experiences of Satan's opposition to his ministry. This may help account for why Paul mentions Satan within the combative Corinthian correspondence with relative frequency but rarely does so in a more cordial letter such as Philippians. In other words, Paul apparently speaks or warns of Satan's activity in his letters when he has already discerned Satan's work among his respective churches.

7.3 Further research

By way of conclusion, here I suggest a few potential avenues of future research opened up by the present study. First, there seems to be room within Pauline studies to revisit Paul's understanding of the nature and aims of his apostleship. Too often

² David J. A. Clines, *Job 1–20* (WBC 17; Dallas, Tex.: Word, 1989), 20.

Paul is painted as something a “lone ranger” figure whose only objectives were to preach the gospel and to travel to Spain by way of Rome. This unbalanced view places too much emphasis on the literal preaching aspect of Paul’s apostleship and, to a certain extent, fails to integrate Paul’s relentless care for his churches as a key responsibility of his calling as an apostle. Future research would therefore do well to take into account both Paul’s labor for his churches and his preaching of the gospel (as well as additional extensions of his apostleship such as the collection for the poor).

Second, it would be worthwhile to explore how various Second Temple Jewish Satan traditions are reflected in respective early Christian writings. For instance, the depiction of Satan in the Synoptic Gospels as an opponent of Jesus and his ministry, much like Paul’s portrayal of Satan, seems to reflect the tradition of Satan operating as an active figure within Israel’s history who deliberately challenges key figures within God’s plan. Also, it would be fruitful to ask why certain Satan traditions (e.g., Satan and the origin of evil and, to a lesser degree, Satan as accuser) seem to have run aground in early Christian theology, and to consider what implications this has for the emergence of early Christian understanding(s) of Satan.

Finally, since the present study focused exclusively on the so-called undisputed Pauline letters—for reasons of limitation and not due to any particular stance on authorship—I have been unable to address if and how our main argument works within the other Pauline writings. In some ways this question mark concerning the rest of the Pauline corpus tempers the major findings of our study unless we either dismiss the disputed Pauline letters as relevant data points or demonstrate their presentation of Satan to be in accordance with the one outlined in the present study. Rather than weaken the present argument, however, I suggest that this study has established *terra firma* on which to proceed with an assessment of the characterization of Satan in the remaining Pauline letters.

To draw attention to a single, but curious difference in the “disputed” Pauline letters, whereas in the “undisputed” letters Paul never uses the title ὁ διάβολος but instead prefers the more personal ὁ σατανᾶς, in the remaining Pauline letters both ὁ σατανᾶς and ὁ διάβολος (“the devil”) are employed in a seemingly

interchangeable manner. This difference in terminology may indicate a slightly divergent, and perhaps more generic, characterization of the figure of Satan. Regardless, the references to Satan (or the devil) and other evil forces in the letters to the Ephesians and Colossians would be especially intriguing to examine in light of our argument for Paul's portrayal of Satan as an adversary to his apostolic labor. For example, would it be possible to interpret the call in Ephesians 6:11 to put on the armor of God and stand against the devil in terms of Paul's desire to protect one of his churches (i.e., his labor) from Satan? The appearance of the "man of lawlessness" in the "power of Satan" (ἐνέργειαν τοῦ σατανᾶ) in 2 Thessalonians 2:9 would also be interesting to investigate along these lines. In short, further macro analysis of Paul's self-understanding as an apostle-church planter and of his relationship to his churches is needed to understand how and why Satan is referred to in the remainder of the Pauline corpus. It is hoped that this study has made the first step in that process.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abernathy, David. "Paul's Thorn in the Flesh: A Messenger of Satan?" *Neotestamentica* 35, no. 1 (2001): 69–79.
- Agosto, Efrain. "Paul and Commendation." Pages 101–33 in *Paul in the Greco-Roman World: A Handbook*. Edited by J. Paul Sampley. Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 2003.
- Allo, E. B. *Saint Paul: seconde épître aux Corinthiens*. 2d. ed. Paris: Ébib, 1956.
- Arnold, Clinton E. *Ephesians: Power and Magic: The Concept of Power in Ephesians in Light of its Historical Setting*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 63. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- _____. *Powers of Darkness: Principalities and Powers in Paul's Letters*. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1992.
- _____. "Returning to the Domain of the Powers: *Stoicheia* as Evil Spirits in Galatians 4:3,9." *Novum Testamentum* 38, no. 1 (1996): 55–76.
- Banks, Robert J. *Paul's Idea of Community: The Early House Churches in their Cultural Setting*. Rev. ed. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1994.
- Barclay, John M. G. "Thessalonica and Corinth: Social Contrasts in Pauline Christianity." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 47 (1992): 49–74.
- _____. "Conflict in Thessalonica." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 55, no. 3 (1993): 512–30.
- Barnett, Paul. *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*. New International Biblical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1997.
- _____. *Paul: Missionary of Jesus. After Jesus 2*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2008.
- Barré, Michael L. "Qumran and the 'Weakness' of Paul." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 42, no. 2 (1980): 216–27.
- Barrett, Charles K. "Pseudapostoloi (2 Cor 11,13)." Pages 377–96 in *Mélanges bibliques en hommage au R P Béda Rigaux*. Gembloux, Belgium: Duculot, 1970.
- Barrett, C. K. "Paul's Opponents in II Corinthians." *New Testament Studies* 17, no. 3 (1971): 233–54.
- _____. *A Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians*. Black's New

- Testament Commentaries. London: A. & C. Black, 1973.
- _____. "The Gentile Mission as an Eschatological Phenomenon." Pages 65–75 in *Eschatology and the New Testament: Essays in Honor of George Raymond Beasley-Murray*. Edited by W. Hulitt Gloer. Peabody, Mass: Hendrickson, 1988.
- _____. *The Epistle to the Romans*. 2d ed. Black's New Testament Commentaries. London: A. & C. Black, 1991.
- _____. *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*. 2d ed. Black's New Testament Commentaries. London: A. & C. Black, 1992.
- Barton, Stephen C. "Paul as Missionary and Pastor." Pages 34–48 in *The Cambridge Companion to St. Paul*. Edited by James D. G. Dunn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Bateman, Herbert W. IV. "Psalm 110:1 and the New Testament." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 149, no. 596 (1992): 438–53.
- Bauckham, Richard. "The Continuing Quest for the Provenance of the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha." Pages 9–29 in *The Pseudepigrapha and Christian Origins: Essays from the Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth and Gerbern S. Oegema. Edinburgh: T&T Clark International, 2008.
- Baumgarten, Jörg. *Paulus und die Apokalyptik: die Auslegung apokalyptischer Überlieferungen in den echten Paulusbriefen*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 44. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1975.
- Beale, Gregory K. "The Old Testament Background of Reconciliation in 2 Corinthians 5–7 and its Bearing on the Literary Problem of 2 Corinthians 6:14–7:1." *New Testament Studies* 35, no. 4 (1989): 550–81.
- _____. *The Book of Revelation: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans; Carlisle, Cumbria: Paternoster Press, 1999.
- Beasley-Murray, George Raymond. *John*. 2d ed. Word Biblical Commentary 36. Nashville, Tenn.: Thomas Nelson, 1999.
- Becker, Jürgen. "Erwägungen zur apokalyptischen Tradition in der paulinischen Theologie." *Evangelische Theologie* 30, no. 11 (1970): 593–609.
- Begg, Christopher T. "Comparing Characters: The Book of Job and the *Testament of Job*." Pages 435–45 in *Book of Job*. Louvain, Peeters: Leuven Univ Press; Ithaca, N.Y.: Snow Lion Publications, 1994.
- Beker, J. Christiaan. *Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in Life and Thought*.

- Philadelphia, Pa.: Fortress Press, 1980.
- _____. *Paul's Apocalyptic Gospel: The Coming Triumph of God*. Philadelphia, Penn.: Fortress Press, 1982.
- _____. "Paul's Theology: Consistent or Inconsistent?" *New Testament Studies* 34, no. 3 (1988): 364–77.
- _____. "Paul the Theologian: Major Motifs in Pauline Theology." *Interpretation* 43, no. 4 (1989): 352–65.
- _____. *The Triumph of God: The Essence of Paul's Thought*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1990.
- Bell, Richard H. *Deliver Us from Evil: Interpreting the Redemption from the Power of Satan in New Testament Theology*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 216. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.
- Belleville, Linda L. *2 Corinthians*. InterVarsity Press New Testament Commentary Series. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1996.
- Benoit, Pierre. "Pauline Angelology and Demonology: Reflexions on Designations of Heavenly Powers and on the Origin of Angelic Evil according to Paul." *Religious Studies Bulletin* 3, no. 1 (1983): 1–18.
- _____. "Qumran and the New Testament." Pages 1–30 in *Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by J. Murphy-O'Connor and J. H. Charlesworth. New York: Crossroad, 1990.
- Berkhof, Hendrikus. *Christ and the Powers*. 2d ed. Scottdale, Pa.: Herald Press, 1977.
- Bertram, G. "συντρίβω, σύντριμμα." *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (1985): 7:919–25.
- Best, Ernest. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Ephesians*. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998.
- Betz, Hans Dieter. *Der Apostel Paulus und die sokratische Tradition: Eine exegetische Untersuchung zu seiner Apologie 2 Korinther, 10–13*. Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 45. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1972.
- _____. "2 Cor 6:14–7:1: An Anti-Pauline Fragment?" *Journal of Biblical Literature* 92, no. 1 (1973): 88–108.
- Bieringer, Reimund. "2 Korinther 6,14–7,1 im Kontext des 2. Korintherbriefes. Forschungsüberblick und Versuch eines eigenen Zugangs." Pages 551–70 in *Studies on 2 Corinthians*. Edited by R. Bieringer and Jan Lambrecht. Leuven, Belgium: Leuven University Press, 1994.

- Bilde, Per. "2 Cor 4:4: The View of Satan and the Created World in Paul." Pages 29–41 in *Apocryphon Severini*. Edited by Per Bilde, Helge Kjær Nielsen, and Jørgen Podemann Sørensen. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 1993.
- Bjerkelund, Carl J. "Vergeblich als Missionsergebnis bei Paulus." Pages 175–91 in *God's Christ and his People*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1977.
- Black, Matthew. "Πᾶσαι ἐξουσίαι αὐτῷ ὑποταγήσονται." Pages 74–82 in *Paul and Paulinism: Essays in Honour of Charles K. Barrett*. Edited by Morna D. Hooker and S. G. Wilson. London: SPCK, 1982.
- Boccaccini, Gabrielle and Giovanni Ibba. *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees*. Grand Rapids, Mich., 2009.
- Boer, Martinus C. de. "Paul and Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology." Pages 169–90 in *Apocalyptic and the New Testament*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989.
- Boismard, Marie Emile. "Satan selon l'Ancien et le Nouveau Testament." *Lumière et Vie* 15, no. 78 (1966): 61–76.
- Bornkamm, Günther. *Paul*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1971.
- Bousset, Wilhelm. *Der Antichrist in der Überlieferung des Judentums, des Neuen Testaments und der alten Kirche: ein Beitrag zur Auslegung der Apokalypse*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1895.
- _____. *Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter*. Berlin: Reuther & Reichard, 1903.
- _____. "Die religionsgeschichtliche Herkunft der jüdischen Apokalyptik." Pages 132–45 in *Apokalyptik*. Edited by Klaus Koch and Johann Michael Schmidt. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1982.
- Bowers, Paul. "Fulfilling the Gospel: The Scope of the Pauline Mission." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 30/2 (1987): 185–98.
- _____. "Church and Mission in Paul." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 44 (1991): 89–111.
- Branden, Robert C. *Satanic Conflict and the Plot of Matthew*, Studies in Biblical Literature 89. New York: Peter Lang, 2006.
- Branick, Vincent P. "Apocalyptic Paul." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 47, no. 4 (1985): 664–75.
- Braun, Roddy. *1 Chronicles*. Word Biblical Commentary 14. Waco, Texas: Word Books, 1986.
- Breytenbach, C. and P. L. Day. "Satan." Pages 726–32 in *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*. Edited by Karel van der Toorn, Bob Becking, and Pieter

- Willem van der Horst. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Brock, Sebastian P. "Abraham and the Ravens: A Syriac Counterpart to *Jubilees* 11–12 and its Implications." *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods* 9, no. 2 (1978): 135–52.
- Brock-Utne, A. "'Der Feind': Die alttestamentliche Satansgestalt im Lichte der sozialen Verhältnisse des nahen Orients." Pages 219–27 in *Beiträge zu-Alten Geschichte*. Klio, 1935.
- Brown, Derek R. "'The God of Peace Will Shortly Crush Satan under Your Feet': Paul's Eschatological Reminder in Romans 16:20a." *Neotestamentica* 44.1 (2010): 1–14.
- _____. "The Devil in the Details: A Survey of Research on Satan in Biblical Studies." *Currents in Biblical Research* 9, no. 2 (2011): 200–27.
- Bruce, F. F. *1 and 2 Corinthians*. New Century Bible. London: Oliphants, 1971.
- _____. *First and Second Thessalonians*. Word Biblical Commentary 45. Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 1982.
- _____. *The Epistle to the Galatians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1982.
- _____. *The Epistles to the Colossians, to Philemon, and to the Ephesians*. New International Biblical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1984.
- Bultmann, Rudolf Karl. *Theology of the New Testament*. Translated by Kendrick Grobel. 2 vols. New York: Scribners, 1952.
- _____. *The Second Letter to the Corinthians*. Translated by Roy A. Harrisville. Minneapolis, Minn.: Augsburg, 1985.
- Byrne, Brendan. *Romans*. Sacra Pagina 6. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1996.
- Caird, G. B. *Principalities and Powers: A Study in Pauline Theology*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956.
- Cambier, J. "La chair et l'esprit en 1 Cor 5:5." *New Testament Studies* 15, no. 2 (1969): 221–32.
- Campanhausen, Hans von. *Ecclesiastical Authority and Spiritual Power in the Church of the First Three Centuries*. London: A. & C. Black, 1969.
- Carr, Wesley. "Rulers of this Age: 1 Corinthians 2:6–8." *New Testament Studies* 23, no. 1 (1976): 20–35.

- _____. *Angels and Principalities: The Background, Meaning and Development of the Pauline Phrase hai archai kai hai exousiai*. Edited by R. McL. Wilson and M. E. Thrall. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 42. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.
- Carus, Paul. *The History of the Devil and the Idea of Evil*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trüber & Co., 1900.
- Charlesworth, James H. "Prolegomenous Reflections on Ophidian Iconography, Symbology, and New Testament Theology." Pages 315–29 in *The New Testament and Early Christian Literature in Greco-Roman Context: Studies in Honor of David E. Aune*. Edited by John Fotopoulos. Novum Testamentum Supplements 122. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- _____. *The Good and Evil Serpent: How a Universal Symbol became Christianized*. Anchor Yale Bible Reference Library. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2010.
- Ciampa, Roy E. "Revisiting the Euphemism in 1 Corinthians 7.1." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 31, no. 3 (2009): 325–38.
- Clines, David J. A. *Job 1–20*, Word Biblical Commentary 17. Dallas, Tex.: Word, 1989.
- Collange, Jean-François. *Enigmes de la deuxième Epître de Paul aux Corinthiens: Etudes Exégétique de 2 Cor 2,14–7,4*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 18. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972.
- Collins, Adela Yarbro. "The Function of "Excommunication" in Paul." *Harvard Theological Review* 73, no. 1–2 (1980): 251–63.
- _____. "Satan's Throne : Revelations from Revelation." *Biblical Archaeology Review* 32, no. 3 (2006): 26–39.
- Collins, John J. *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*. 2d ed. The Biblical Resource Series. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Conzelmann, Hans and George W. MacRae. *1 Corinthians: A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975.
- Cranfield, C. E. B. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. 6th ed. 2 vols. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1979.
- Cross, Frank Moore. "The Council of Yahweh in Second Isaiah." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 12, no. 4 (1953): 274–77.
- Cullmann, Oscar. "Le caractère eschatologique du devoir missionnaire et de la

conscience apostolique de saint Paul.” *Revue d’histoire et de philosophie religieuses* 16 (1936): 210–45.

_____. *The State in the New Testament*. London: SCM Press, 1957.

Dahl, Nils Alstrup. “A Fragment and Its Context: 2 Corinthians 6:14–7:1.” Pages 62–69 in *Studies in Paul: Theology for the Early Christian Mission*. Minneapolis, Minn.: Augsburg, 1977.

Das, A. Andrew. “Paul of Tarshish: Isaiah 66.19 and the Spanish Mission of Romans 15.24, 28.” *New Testament Studies* 54 (2008): 60–73.

Davenport, Gene L. *The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees*. Studia post-Biblica 20. Leiden: Brill, 1971.

Davidson, Maxwell J. *Angels at Qumran: A Comparative Study of 1 Enoch 1–36, 72–108 and Sectarian Writings from Qumran*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series 11. Sheffield: JSOT, 1992.

Davies, Philip R. “Dualism and Eschatology in the Qumran War Scroll.” *Vetus Testamentum* 28, no. 1 (1978): 28–36.

_____. *The Damascus Covenant: An Interpretation of the “Damascus Document.”* Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983.

Davila, James R. *The Provenance of the Pseudepigrapha: Jewish, Christian, or Other?* Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 105. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

Day, John. *Yahweh and the Gods and Goddesses of Canaan*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.

Day, Peggy L. *An Adversary in Heaven: Satan in the Hebrew Bible*. Harvard Semitic Monographs 43. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988.

Deming, Will. *Paul on Marriage and Celibacy: The Hellenistic Background of 1 Corinthians 7*. 2d ed. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2004.

Derrett, J. Duncan M. “2 Cor 6:14: A Midrash on Dt 22:10.” *Biblica* 59, no. 2 (1978): 231–50.

_____. “‘Handing over to Satan’: An Explanation of 1 Cor 5:1–7.” *Revue internationale des droits de l’antiquité* 3 (1979): 11–30.

DeSilva, David A. “Measuring Penultimate against Ultimate Reality: An Investigation of the Integrity and Argumentation of 2 Corinthians.” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 52 (1993): 41–70.

- Dibelius, Martin. *Die Geisterwelt im Glauben des Paulus*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1909.
- Dickson, John P. *Mission-Commitment in Ancient Judaism and in the Pauline Communities: The Shape, Extent, and Background of early Christian Mission*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2/159. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.
- Dobschütz, Ernst von. *Die Thessalonicher-Briefe*. MeyerK 10. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1909.
- Dodd, C. H. *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans*. Moffatt New Testament Commentary. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1932.
- Donaldson, Terence L. "The 'Curse of the Law' and the Inclusion of the Gentiles: Galatians 3:13–14." *New Testament Studies* 32, no. 1 (1986): 94–112.
- _____. *Paul and the Gentiles: Remapping the Apostle's Convictional World*. Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress Press, 1997.
- Donfried, Karl P. "A Short Note on Romans 16." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 89, no. 4 (1970): 441–49.
- _____. *Paul, Thessalonica, and Early Christianity*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2002.
- Dunn, James D. G. *Romans 9–16*. Word Biblical Commentary 38B. Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 1988.
- _____. *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*. Grand Rapids, Mich.; Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1998.
- _____. *Beginning from Jerusalem*. Vol. 2 of *Christianity in the Making*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2009.
- Dupont, Jacques. "Assis à la droite de Dieu': l'interprétation du Ps 110, 1 dans le Nouveau Testament." Pages 340–422 in *Resurrexit. Actes du Symposium international sur la résurrection de Jésus*. Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1974.
- Eitrem, Samson. *Some Notes on the Demonology in the New Testament*. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells, 1966.
- Elliott, Neil and Mark Reasoner. *Documents and Images for the Study of Paul*. Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress Press, 2011.
- Evans, Paul. "Divine Intermediaries in 1 Chronicles 21: An Overlooked Aspect of the Chronicler's Theology." *Biblica* 85, no. 4 (2004): 545–58.
- Everling, Otto. *Die paulinische Angelologie und Dämonologie*. Göttingen:

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1888.

Fabry, Heinz-Josef. “‘Satan’ - Begriff und Wirklichkeit: Untersuchungen zur Dämonologie der alttestamentlichen Weisheitsliteratur.” Pages 269–91 in *Die Dämonen: die Dämonologie der israelitisch-jüdischen und frühchristlichen Literatur in Kontext ihrer Umwelt*. Edited by Armin Lange, Hermann Lichtenberger, and K. F. Diethard Römheld. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.

Falk, Daniel K. *The Parabiblical Texts: Strategies for Extending the Scriptures among the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Philip R. Davies. Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 8. London: T&T Clark, 2007.

Fee, Gordon D. “II Corinthians 6:14–7:1 and Food Offered to Idols.” *New Testament Studies* 23, no. 2 (1977): 140–61.

_____. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1987.

_____. “1 Corinthians 7:1–7 Revisited.” Pages 197–213 in *Paul and the Corinthians: Studies on a Community in Conflict. Essays in Honor of Margaret Thrall*. Edited by Trevor J. Burke and J. K. Elliott. Novum Testamentum Supplements 109. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

_____. *Pauline Christology: An Exegetical-Theological Study*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2007.

_____. *The First and Second Letters to the Thessalonians*. New International Biblical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2009.

Ferguson, Everett. *Demonology of the Early Christian World*. Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen Press, 1984.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. “Qumrân and the Interpolated Paragraph in 2 Cor 6:14–7:1.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 23, no. 3 (1961): 271–80.

_____. *Romans*, Anchor Bible 33. New York: Doubleday, 1993.

_____. “Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls.” Pages 599–621 in *Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years*. Edited by Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

_____. *First Corinthians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Yale Bible 32. New Haven, Conn. and London: Yale University Press, 2008.

Floyd, Michael H. *Minor Prophets: Part 2*. Forms of the Old Testament Literature 22. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2000.

Fontinoy, Charles. “Les noms du Diable et leur étymologie.” Pages 157–70 in

Orientalia: J. Duschesne-Guillemin Emerito Oblata. Acta Iranica 9. Leiden: Brill, 1984.

Forbes, Chris. "Paul's Principalities and Powers: Demythologizing Apocalyptic?" *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 82 (2001): 61–88.

_____. "Pauline Demonology and/or Cosmology? Principalities, Powers and the Elements of the World in their Hellenistic Context." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 85 (2002): 51–73.

Forkman, Göran. *The Limits of the Religious Community: Expulsion from within the Qumran Sect, within Rabbinic Judaism, and within Primitive Christianity.* Coniectanea biblica: New Testament Series 5. Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1972.

Forsyth, Neil. *The Old Enemy: Satan and the Combat Myth.* Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1987.

Funk, Robert W. "Apostolic Parousia: Form and Significance." Pages 249–68 in *Christian History and Interpretation: Studies Presented to John Knox.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967.

Furnish, Victor Paul. *2 Corinthians.* Anchor Bible 32A. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1984.

Gamble, Harry Y. *The Textual History of the Letter to the Romans: A Study in Textual and Literary Criticism.* Studies and Documents 42. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1977.

Garland, David E. *2 Corinthians.* New American Commentary 29. Nashville, Tenn.: Broadman & Holman, 1999.

_____. *1 Corinthians,* Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic, 2003.

Garrett, Susan R. *The Demise of the Devil: Magic and the Demonic in Luke's Writings.* Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress Press, 1989.

_____. "The God of this World and the Affliction of Paul: 2 Cor 4:1–12." Pages 99–117 in *Greeks, Romans, and Christians: Essays in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe.* Edited by David L. Balch. Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress Press, 1990.

_____. "Paul's Thorn and Cultural Models of Affliction." Pages 82–99 in *Social World of the First Christians: Essays in Honor of Wayne A. Meeks.* Edited by L. M. White and O. L. Yarbrough. Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress Press, 1995.

_____. *The Temptations of Jesus in Mark's Gospel.* Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1998.

Gaventa, Beverly Roberts. *First and Second Thessalonians. Interpretation.*

- Louisville, Ky.: John Knox Press, 1998.
- _____. *Our Mother Saint Paul*. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press, 2007.
- Gershenson, Daniel E. "The Name Satan." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 114, no. 3 (2002): 443–45.
- Gignilliat, Mark S. *Paul and Isaiah's Servants: Paul's Theological Reading of Isaiah 40–66 in 2 Corinthians 5:14–6:10*. Library of New Testament Studies 330. London: T&T Clark, 2007.
- Ginsberg, H. L. Review of Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave I: A Commentary*. *Theological Studies* 28, no. 3 (1967): 574–77.
- Girard, René. *I See Satan Fall Like Lightning*. Maryknoll, New York, N. Y.: Orbis Books, 2001.
- Glancy, Jennifer Ann. "Satan in the Synoptic Gospels." Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 1990.
- Gnilka, Joachim. "2 Kor 6,14–7,1 im Lichte der Qumranschriften und der Zwölf-Patriarchen-Testamente." Pages 86–99 in *Neutestamentlich Aufsätze; Festschrift für Josef Schmid*. Edited by J. Blinzer et al. Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1963.
- Godet, Frédéric Louis. *Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans*. Translated by A. Cusin. 2 vols. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1881.
- Goguel, Maurice. *The Primitive Church*. New York: Macmillan, 1964.
- Görg, Manfred. "Der 'Satan' – der 'Vollstrecker' Gottes." *Biblische Notizen*, no. 82 (1996): 9–12.
- Goulder, Michael D. "2 Cor 6:14–7:1 as an Integral Part of 2 Corinthians." *Novum Testamentum* 36, no. 1 (1994): 47–57.
- _____. "Libertines? (1 Cor 5–6)." *Novum Testamentum* 41, no. 4 (1999): 334–48.
- Gourgues, Michel. *A la Droite de Dieu: Résurrection de Jésus et Actualisation du Psaume 110:1 Dans le Nouveau Testament*. [S.l.]: J. Gabalda, 1978.
- Grosheide, Frederik Willem. *Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians: The English Text*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1953.
- Gundry-Volf, Judith M. *Paul and Perseverance: Staying in and Falling Away*. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press, 1991.
- Gunther, John J. *St. Paul's Opponents and their Background: A Study of Apocalyptic*

and Jewish Sectarian Teachings. Novum Testamentum Supplements 35.
Leiden: Brill, 1973.

Haag, Herbert. *Teufelsgaube*. [S.l.]: Katzmann, 1974.

Haas, Cees. "Job's Perseverance in the Testament of Job." Pages 117–54 in *Studies on the Testament of Job*. Edited by Michael A. Knibb and Pieter Willem van der Horst. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; Ithaca, N.Y.: Snow Lion Publications, 1989.

Hanson, Paul D. "Rebellion in Heaven, Azazel, and Euhemeristic Heroes in 1 Enoch 6–11." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 96, no. 2 (1977): 195–233.

Hare, D. R. A. "The Lives of the Prophets." Pages 379–99 in vol. 2 of *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1985.

Harnack, Adolf von. "Κόπος (Κοπιᾶν, Οἱ Κοπιῶντες) im frühchristlichen Sprachgebrauch." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 27 (1928): 1–10.

Harris, Murray J. *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. Edited by I. Howard Marshall and Donald A. Hagner. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2005.

u, Donald E. "2 Corinthians 4:4: A Case for Yahweh as the 'God of this Age'." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society. Valley Forge, Pa., November 16–18, 2005.

Hawthorne, Gerald F. and Ralph P. Martin. *Philippians*. Rev. and exp. ed, Word Biblical Commentary 43. Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 2004.

Hay, David M. *Glory at the Right Hand: Psalm 110 in Early Christianity*. Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series 18. Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon, 1973.

Hays, Richard B. *The Conversion of the Imagination: Paul as Interpreter of Israel's Scripture*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2005.

Heckel, Ulrich. "Der Dorn im Fleisch: Die Krankheit des Paulus in 2Kor 12,7 und Gal 4,13f." *Zeitschrift für Die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und Die Kunde Der älteren Kirche* 84, no. 1–2 (1993): 65–92.

Heil, John Paul and Society of Biblical Literature. *The Rhetorical Role of Scripture in 1 Corinthians*. Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005.

Heiser, Michael S. "The Divine Council in Second Temple Literature." Ph.D. diss., University of Wisconsin, 2004.

Hellholm, David. *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East*:

Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism, Uppsala, August 12–17, 1979. 2d ed. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1989.

Hengel, Martin. “‘Sit at My Right Hand!’ The Enthronement of Christ at the Right Hand of God and Psalm 110:1.” Pages 119–226 in *Studies in Early Christology*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1995.

Hollander, Harm W. and Marinus de Jonge. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary. Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece*. Leiden: Brill, 1985.

Hooker, Morna D. “Hard Sayings: I Corinthians 3:2.” *Theology* 69, no. 547 (1966): 19–22.

Horbury, William. “Extirpation and Excommunication.” *Vetus Testamentum* 35, no. 1 (1985): 13–38.

_____. “Antichrist among Jews and Gentiles.” Pages 113–33 in *Jews in a Graeco-Roman World*. Edited by Martin Goodman. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Horsley, G. H. R. and S. Llewelyn. *A Review of the Greek Inscriptions and Papyri Published in 1976, New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity*. North Ryde, N.S.W.: Ancient History Documentary Research Centre, Macquarie University, 1981.

Horsley, Richard A. *1 Corinthians*. Abingdon New Testament Commentaries. Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon Press, 1998.

Hughes, Philip E. *Paul’s Second Epistle to the Corinthians: The English Text with Introduction, Exposition and Notes*. New International Biblical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1962.

Hultgren, Stephen J. “2 Cor 6.14–7.1 and Rev 21.3–8: Evidence for the Ephesian Redaction of 2 Corinthians.” *New Testament Studies* 49, no. 1 (2003): 39–56.

Huppenbauer, Hanns Walter. “Belial in den Qumrantexten.” *Theologische Zeitschrift* 15, no. 2 (1959): 81–89.

Hurtado, Larry W. *One God, One Lord: Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism*. Philadelphia, Pa.: Fortress Press, 1988.

_____. *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity*. Grand Rapids, Mich.; Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2003.

Jackson, David R. *Enochic Judaism: Three Defining Paradigm Exemplars*. Library of Second Temple Studies 49. London: T&T Clark International, 2004.

Japhet, Sara. *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and Its Place in Biblical Thought*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1989.

- Jegher-Bucher, Verena. “‘The Thorn in the Flesh’/‘Der Pfahl im Fleisch’: Considerations about 2 Corinthians 12:7–10 in Connection with 12:1–13.” Pages 388–97 in *Rhetorical Analysis of Scripture: Essays from the 1995 London Conference*. Edited by S E. Porter and T. H. Olbricht. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- Jeremias, Joachim. *New Testament Theology*. New York: Scribners, 1971.
- Jewett, Robert. *Romans: A Commentary*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress Press, 2007.
- Johnson, Lee A. “Satan Talk in Corinth: The Rhetoric of Conflict.” *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 29 (1999): 145–55.
- Johnson, M. D. “Life of Adam and Eve.” Pages 249–95 in vol. 2 of *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1985.
- Jonge, Marinus de. “Once More: Christian Influence in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.” *Novum Testamentum* 5, no. 4 (1962): 311–19.
- _____. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text*. Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece. Leiden: Brill, 1978.
- Joüon, Paul. “BELIYYA’AL Béliäl.” *Biblica* 5, no. 2 (1924): 178–83.
- Käsemann, Ernst. “Beginnings of Christian Theology.” *Journal for Theology and the Church* 6 (1969): 17–46.
- Kee, Howard Clark. “Satan, Magic, and Salvation in the Testament of Job.” Pages 53–76 in *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers*. Edited by G. MacRae. Cambridge, Mass.: Society of Biblical Literature, 1974.
- Keener, Craig S. *1–2 Corinthians*. Cambridge Bible Commentary. Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Kelly, Henry Ansgar. “Devil in the Desert.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 26, no. 2 (1964): 190–220.
- _____. *Satan: A Biography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Kim, Seyoon. *The Origin of Paul’s Gospel*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2/4. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1981.
- _____. “Paul as an Eschatological Herald.” Pages 9–24 in *Paul as Missionary: Identity, Activity, Theology, and Practice*. Edited by Trevor J. Burke and Brian S. Rosner. Library of New Testament Studies. London; New York: T&T Clark International, 2011.
- Kirkegaard, Bradford A. “Satan in the Testament of Job: A Literary Analysis.” Pages

- 4–19 in *Of Scribes and Sages: Early Jewish Interpretation and Transmission of Scripture, Volume 2: Later Versions and Traditions*. Edited by Craig A. Evans. *Studies in Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity* 10; Library of Second Temple Studies 51. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Kistemaker, Simon. ““Deliver this Man to Satan” (1 Cor 5:5): A Case Study in Church Discipline.” *Master’s Seminary Journal* 3, no. 1 (1992): 33–45.
- Knoppers, Gary N. *I Chronicles 10–29: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 12A. New York: Doubleday, 2003.
- Knox, John. “Romans 15:14–33 and Paul’s Conception of his Apostolic Mission.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 83, no. 1 (1964): 1–11.
- Koch, Klaus. *The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic: A Polemical Work on a Neglected Area of Biblical Studies and its Damaging Effects on Theology and Philosophy*. Studies in Biblical Theology. Second Series 22. London: SCM Press, 1972.
- Koester, Craig R. *Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel: Meaning, Mystery, Community*. 2d ed. Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress Press, 2003.
- Kosmala, Hans. “The Three Nets of Belial: A Study in the Terminology of Qumran and the New Testament.” *Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute* 4 (1965): 91–113.
- Kreitzer, Larry J. *Jesus and God in Paul’s Eschatology*. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 19. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987.
- Kreuzer, Florian. “Der Antagonist: der Satan in der Hebräischen Bibel – eine bekannte Größe?” *Biblica* 86, no. 4 (2005): 536–44.
- Kruse, Colin G. “The Offender and the Offence in 2 Corinthians 2:5 and 7:12.” *Evangelical Quarterly* 60 (1988): 129–39.
- Kruse, Heinz. “Das Reich Satans.” *Biblica* 58, no. 1 (1977): 29–61.
- Kugel, James L. *Traditions of the Bible: A Guide to the Bible as it was at the Start of the Common Era*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1998.
- Lambrecht, Jan. “Paul’s Christological use of Scripture in 1 Cor 15:20–28.” *New Testament Studies* 28, no. 4 (1982): 502–27.
- _____. “The Fragment 2 Cor 6:14–7:1: A Plea for its Authenticity.” Pages 531–49 in *Studies on 2 Corinthians*. Edited by R. Bieringer and J. Lambrecht. *Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium* 112. Leiden: David Brown, 1994.
- _____. *Second Corinthians*. Edited by Daniel J. Harrington. *Sacra Pagina* 8. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1999.

- Langton, Edward. *Satan, a Portrait: A Study of the Character of Satan through all the Ages*. London: Skeffington, 1945.
- _____. *Essentials of Demonology: A Study of Jewish and Christian Doctrine, its Origin and Development*. London: Epworth Press, 1949.
- Lee, Jung Young. "Interpreting the Demonic Powers in Pauline Thought." *Novum Testamentum* 12, no. 1 (1970): 54–69.
- Leenhardt, Franz J. *L'Épître de Saint Paul aux Romains*. Commentaire du Nouveau Testament VI. Neuchâtel: Delachaux, 1957.
- Leivestad, Ragnar. *Christ the Conqueror: Ideas of Conflict and Victory in the New Testament*. London: SPCK, 1954.
- Levison, John R. "The Spirit and Temple in Paul's Letters to the Corinthians." Pages 189–215 in *Paul and his Theology*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter. *Pauline Studies*. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2006.
- Lewis, Theodore J. "Belial." Pages 654–56 in *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David N. Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Liettaert Peerbolte, L. J. *Paul the Missionary*. Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 34. Leuven: Peeters, 2003.
- Lightfoot, J. B. *St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians: A Revised Text with Introduction, Notes, and Dissertations*. 4th ed. London: Macmillan and Co., 1874.
- Lim, Timothy H. *Holy Scripture in the Qumran Commentaries and Pauline Letters*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.
- _____. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Lincoln, Andrew T. *Paradise Now and Not Yet: Studies in the Role of the Heavenly Dimension in Paul's Thought with Special Reference to his Eschatology*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 43. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.
- _____. *Ephesians*. Word Biblical Commentary 42. Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 1990.
- Ling, Trevor Oswald. *The Significance of Satan: New Testament Demonology and Its Contemporary Relevance*. London: SPCK, 1961.
- Lohmeyer, Ernst. *Probleme paulinischer Theologie*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1955.
- Lohse, Eduard. "Apostolische Ermahnung in Röm 16,17–20." Pages 101–08 in *Bleibende Gegenwart des Evangeliums*. Edited by Roland Gebauer and

- Martin Meiser. Marburg: N. G. Elwert Verlag, 2003.
- Longenecker, Richard N. *Galatians*. Word Biblical Commentary 41. Dallas, Tex.: Word Books, 1990.
- Lorein, G. W. *The Antichrist Theme in the Intertestamental Period*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series 44. London: T&T Clark, 2003.
- Low, Douglas Alan. "Apocalyptic Motivation in Pauline Paraenesis." Ph.D. diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1988.
- Lüdemann, Gerd. *Paul: Apostle to the Gentiles: Studies in Chronology*. Philadelphia, Penn.: Fortress Press, 1984.
- Macgregor, G. H. C. "Principalities and Powers: The Cosmic Background of Paul's Thought." *New Testament Studies* 1, no. 1 (1954): 17–28.
- Macky, Peter W. "Crushing Satan underfoot (Romans 16:20): Paul's Last Battle Story as True Myth." Pages 121–33 in *Proceedings, Eastern Great Lakes and Midwest Biblical Societies*. Cincinnati, Ohio: Eastern Great Lakes and Midwest Biblical Societies, 1993.
- Malherbe, Abraham J. "Through the Eye of the Needle: Simplicity or Singleness?" *Restoration Quarterly* 5, no. 3 (1961): 119–29.
- _____. *Paul and the Thessalonians: The Philosophic Tradition of Pastoral Care*. Philadelphia, Penn.: Fortress Press, 1987.
- _____. "Determinism and Free Will in Paul: The Argument of 1 Corinthians 8 and 9." Pages 231–55 in *Paul in his Hellenistic Context*. Edited by Troels Engberg-Pedersen. Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress Press, 1995.
- _____. *The Letters to the Thessalonians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 32B. New York: Doubleday, 2000.
- Marshall, I. Howard. *Kept by the Power of God: A Study of Perseverance and Falling Away*. London: Epworth, 1969.
- _____. *1 and 2 Thessalonians*. Cambridge Bible Commentary. London: Marshall, Morgan, and Scott, 1983.
- Martin, Dale B. *The Corinthian Body*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1995.
- Martin, Ralph P. *2 Corinthians*. Word Biblical Commentary 40. Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 1986.
- Martone, Corrado. "Evil or Devil? Belial between the Bible and Qumran." *Henoch* 26, no. 2 (2004): 115–27.

- Martyn, J. Louis. "Review of J. Christaan Beker, *Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in Life and Thought*." *Word & World* 2, no. 2 (1982): 194–98.
- _____. "Apocalyptic Antinomies in Paul's Letter to the Galatians." *New Testament Studies* 31, no. 3 (1985): 410–24.
- _____. *Galatians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 33A. New York: Doubleday, 1998.
- Matlock, R. Barry. *Unveiling the Apocalyptic Paul: Paul's Interpreters and the Rhetoric of Criticism*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 127. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
- McCant, Jerry W. "Paul's Thorn of Rejected Apostleship." *New Testament Studies* 34, no. 4 (1988): 550–72.
- _____. *2 Corinthians*. Readings: A New Biblical Commentary. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- McGinn, Bernard. *Antichrist: Two Thousand Years of the Human Fascination with Evil*. New York: HarperCollins, 1994.
- Meeks, Wayne A. *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1983.
- _____. "Social Functions of Apocalyptic Language in Pauline Christianity." Pages 687–705 in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East*. Edited by D. Hellholm. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1983.
- Mende, Theresia. "Sieger über Satan: Zum glaubensgeschichtlichen Entstehung der Deutung von Gen 3,15 als Protoevangelium." Pages 87–121 in *Schöpfungsplan*. Trier: Paulinus Verlag, 2002.
- Metzger, Bruce M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. 2d ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994.
- Meyers, Carol L. and Eric M. Meyers. *Haggai, Zechariah 1–8: A New Translation*. Anchor Bible 25B. New York: Doubleday, 1987.
- Mitchell, Margaret M. "1 and 2 Thessalonians." Pages 51–63 in *The Cambridge Companion to St. Paul*. Edited by James D. G. Dunn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Molenberg, Corrie. "A Study of the Roles of Shemihazah and Asael in 1 Enoch 6–11." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 35, no. 2 (1984): 136–46.
- Moo, Douglas J. *The Epistle to the Romans*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1996.
- Morris, Leon. "ΚΑΙ ΑΠΙΑΞ ΚΑΙ ΔΙΣ." *Novum Testamentum* 1, no. 3 (1956): 205–08.

- _____. *The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians: An Introduction and Commentary*. 2d ed. Tyndale New Testament Commentary. Leicester: Inter-Varsity, 1985.
- _____. *The Epistle to the Romans*. Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1988.
- _____. *The First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians*. Rev. ed. New International Biblical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1991.
- _____. *The Gospel according to John*. New International Biblical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1995.
- Morrison, Clinton. *The Powers That Be: Earthly Rulers and Demonic Powers in Romans 13, 1–7*. Studies in Biblical Theology 29. London: SCM Press, 1960.
- Moule, C. F. D. *An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek*. 2d ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959.
- Mullen, E. Theodore. *The Divine Council in Canaanite and Early Hebrew Literature*. Harvard Semitic Monographs. Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1980.
- Mullins, Terence Y. "Paul's Thorn in the Flesh." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 76, no. 4 (1957): 299–303.
- Munck, Johannes. "La vocation de l'Apôtre Paul." *Studia theologica* 1, no. 1–2 (1948): 131–45.
- _____. *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind*. Translated by Frank Clarke. London: SCM Press, 1959. Translation of *Paulus und die Heilsgeschichte*. Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget, 1954.
- Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome. "Relating 2 Corinthians 6:14–7:1 to its Context." *New Testament Studies* 33, no. 2 (1987): 272–75.
- _____. "Philo and 2 Cor 6:14–7:1." *Revue biblique* 95, no. 1 (1988): 55–69.
- _____. *The Theology of the Second Letter to the Corinthians*. Edited by James D. G. Dunn, New Testament Theology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome and Pierre Benoit. *Paul and Qumran: Studies in New Testament Exegesis*. London: Chapman, 1968.
- Newton, Michael. *The Concept of Purity at Qumran and in the Letters of Paul*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 53. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E. "Apocalyptic and Myth in 1 Enoch 6–11." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 96, no. 3 (1977): 383–405.

- _____. "An ektrōma, though Appointed from the Womb: Paul's Apostolic Self-Description in 1 Corinthians 15 and Galatians 1." *Harvard Theological Review* 79, no. 1–3 (1986): 198–205.
- _____. *1 Enoch: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress Press, 2001.
- Noack, Bent. *Satanás und Sotería: Untersuchungen zur neutestamentlichen Dämonologie*. Copenhagen: Gads, 1948.
- O'Brien, Peter T. "Principalities and Powers: Opponents of the Church." Pages 110–50 in *Biblical Interpretation and the Church*. Edited by D. A. Carson. Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1984.
- _____. *The Epistle to the Philippians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans; Exeter: Paternoster, 1991.
- Ollrog, Wolf-Henning. *Paulus und seine Mitarbeiter: Untersuchungen zu Theorie und Praxis der paulinischen Mission*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 50. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1979.
- Orr, William F. and James Arthur Walther. *1 Corinthians: A New Translation; Introduction with a Study of the Life of Paul, Notes, and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 32. New York: Doubleday, 1976.
- Osten-Sacken, Peter von der. *Gott und Belial: Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum Dualismus in den Texten aus Qumran*. Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments 6. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969.
- Ostmeyer, Karl-Heinrich. "Satan und Passa in 1. Korinther 5." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 5, no. 9 (2002): 38–45.
- Page, Sydney H. T. *Powers of Evil: A Biblical Study of Satan and Demons*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans; Leicester: Apollos, 1995.
- _____. "Satan: God's Servant." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 50.3 (2007): 449–65.
- Pagels, Elaine H. "The Social History of Satan, the 'Intimate Enemy': A Preliminary Sketch." *Harvard Theological Review* 84, no. 2 (1991): 105–28.
- _____. *The Origin of Satan: The New Testament Origins of Christianity's Demonization of Jews, Pagans and Heretics*. New York: Random House, 1995.
- Park, David M. "Paul's ΣΚΟΛΟΣ ΤΗ ΣΑΡΚΙ: Thorn or Stake (2 Cor 12:7)." *Novum*

Testamentum 22, no. 2 (1980): 179–83.

Penney, Douglas L. “Finding the Devil in the Details: Onomastic Exegesis and the Naming of Evil in the World of the New Testament.” Pages 37–52 in *New Testament Greek and Exegesis: Essays in Honor of Gerald F. Hawthorne*. Edited by Gerald F. Hawthorne, Amy M. Donaldson, and Timothy B. Sailors. Grand Rapids, Mich.; Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2003.

Peterson, David. “Maturity: The Goal of Mission.” Pages 185–204 in *Gospel to the Nations: Perspectives on Paul’s Mission*. Edited by Peter Bolt and Mark Thompson. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 2000.

Pfifzner, Victor C. *Paul and the Agon Motif: Traditional Athletic Imagery in the Pauline Literature*. Novum Testamentum Supplements 16. Leiden: Brill, 1967.

Piñero, Antonio. “Angels and Demons in the Greek Life of Adam and Eve.” *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period* 24, no. 2 (1993): 191–214.

Piper, Ronald A. “Satan, Demons and the Absence of Exorcisms in the Fourth Gospel.” Pages 253–78 in *Christology, Controversy, and Community: New Testament Essays in Honour of David R. Catchpole*. Edited by David Horrell and Christopher M. Tuckett. Novum Testamentum Supplements 99. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

Price, Robert M. “Punished in Paradise (An Exegetical Theory on 2 Corinthians 12:1–10).” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 7 (1980): 33–40.

Ramsay, William M. *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1895.

Reed, Annette Yoshiko. *Fallen Angels and the History of Judaism and Christianity: The Reception of Enochic Literature*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Richards, E. Randolph. *Paul and First-Century Letter Writing: Secretaries, Composition and Collection*. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 2004.

Ridderbos, Herman N. *Paul: An Outline of his Theology*. London: SPCK, 1977.

Robinson, H. W. “The Council of Yahweh.” *Journal of Theological Studies* 45 (1944): 151–57.

Roskoff, Gustav. *Geschichte des Teufels*. Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus, 1869.

Rosner, Brian S. *Paul, Scripture and Ethics: A Study of 1 Corinthians 5–7*. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 22. Leiden: Brill, 1994.

- Rowland, Christopher. *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity*. London: SPCK, 1982.
- Russell, Jeffrey Burton. *The Devil: Perceptions of Evil from Antiquity to Primitive Christianity*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1977.
- _____. *Satan: The Early Christian Tradition*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1981.
- Sacchi, Paolo. *Jewish Apocalyptic and its History*. Translated by William J. Short. *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series 20*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990.
- _____. *The History of the Second Temple Period*. Translated by Thomas Kirk. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 285*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- Sandnes, Karl Olav. *Paul: One of the Prophets? A Contribution to the Apostle's Self-Understanding*. *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2/43*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1991.
- Sass, Gerhard. "Noch einmal, 2 Kor 6,14–7,1: Literarkritische Waffen gegen einen 'unpaulinischen' Paulus?" *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 84, no. 1–2 (1993): 36–64.
- Sasse, Hermann. "αἰών, αἰῶνος." *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (1985): 1:197–209.
- Schaller, Berndt. *Das Testament Hiobs*. *Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit 3*. Gütersloh: Mohn, 1979.
- Schärf Kluger, Rivkah. *Die Gestalt des Satans im Alten Testament*. Zürich: Rascher Verlag, 1948.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H., Emanuel Tov, James C. VanderKam, and Galen Marquis. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997*. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society in cooperation with The Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 2000.
- Schlier, Heinrich. *Principalities and Powers in the New Testament*. New York: Herder & Herder, 1961.
- Schmeller, Thomas. "Der ursprüngliche Kontext von 2 Kor 6.14–7.1: zur Frage der Einheitlichkeit des 2. Korintherbriefes." *New Testament Studies* 52, no. 2 (2006): 219–38.
- Schnabel, Eckhard J. *Early Christian Mission*. 2 vols. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press; Leicester, England: Apollos, 2004.
- _____. *Paul the Missionary: Realities, Strategies and Methods*. Downers Grove,

Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 2008.

- Scholer, David M. “‘The God of Peace Will Shortly Crush Satan under your Feet’ (Romans 16:20a): The Function of Apocalyptic Eschatology in Paul.” *Ex Auditu* 6 (1990): 53–61.
- Schreiner, Thomas R. *Romans*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament 6. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic, 1998.
- Schweitzer, Albert. *Paul and his Interpreters: A Critical History*. London: A. and C. Black, 1950.
- Scott, James M. “The Use of Scripture in 2 Corinthians 6:16c–18 and Paul’s Restoration Theology.” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 56 (1994): 73–99.
- Segal, Alan F. “The Ruler of This World.” Pages 41–77 in *The Other Judaisms of Late Antiquity*. Brown Judaica Studies 127. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1987.
- Shea, William H. “Azazel in the Pseudepigrapha.” *Journal of the Adventist Theological Society* 13, no. 1 (2002): 1–9.
- Shillington, V. George. “Atonement Texture in 1 Corinthians 5.5.” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, no. 71 (1998): 29–50.
- Skehan, Patrick W. and Alexander A. Di Lella. *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: A New Translation with Notes*. Anchor Bible 39. New York: Doubleday, 1987.
- Smith, David Raymond. *Hand this Man over to Satan: Curse, Exclusion and Salvation in 1 Corinthians 5*. Library of New Testament Studies 386. London: T&T Clark International, 2009.
- Smith, Mark S. *The Early History of God: Yahweh and the Other Deities in Ancient Israel*. 2d ed. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2002.
- Smith, Ralph L. *Micah–Malachi*. Word Biblical Commentary 32. Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 1984.
- South, James T. “A Critique of the ‘Curse/Death’ Interpretation of 1 Corinthians 5.1–8.” *New Testament Studies* 39, no. 4 (1993): 539–61.
- Sperling, S. D. “Belial.” Pages 169–71 in *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*. Edited by Karel van der Toorn, Bob Becking, and Pieter Willem van der Horst. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Spittler, R. P. “Testament of Job.” Pages 829–68 in vol. 1 of *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1985.

- Sproston, Wendy E. "Satan in the Fourth Gospel." Pages 307–11 in *Studia Biblica 1978*. Edited by E. A. Livingstone. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 2*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980.
- Studel, Annette. "אֲחֵרֵי תַּיְמֵי־ם in the Texts from Qumran." *Revue de Qumran* 16 (1993): 225–46.
- _____. *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QmidrEschat^{a,b}): materielle Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Gattung und traditions-geschichtliche Einordnung des durch 4Q174 ("Florilegium") und 4Q177 ("Catena A") repräsentierten Werkes aus den Qumranfunden*. STDJ 13. Leiden; New York: E.J. Brill, 1994.
- _____. "God and Belial." Pages 332–40 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman, Emanuel Tov, James C. VanderKam and Galen Marquis. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society in cooperation with The Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 2000.
- Stirewalt, M. Luther. *Paul, the Letter Writer*. Grand Rapids, Mich.; Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2003.
- Stokes, Ryan E. "The Devil Made David Do It ... Or Did He? The Nature, Identity, and Literary Origins of the Satan in 1 Chronicles 21:1." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 128, no. 1 (2009): 91–106.
- Stone, Michael E. "The Fall of Satan and Adam's Penance: Three Notes on The Books of Adam and Eve." *Journal of Theological Studies* 44, no. 1 (1993): 143–56.
- Stowers, Stanley K. *Letter Writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity*. Library of Early Christianity 5. Philadelphia, Penn.: Westminster John Knox Press, 1986.
- Stuckenbruck, Loren T. "Evil in Jewish Apocalyptic Tradition." Pages 87–118 in *The Fall of the Angels*. Edited by Christoph Auffarth and L. T. Stuckenbruck. Themes in Biblical Narrative 6. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Stuhlmacher, Peter. *Paul's Letter to the Romans: A Commentary*. Translated by Scott J. Hafemann. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press, 1994.
- Sumney, Jerry L. "Servants of Satan," "False Brothers" and Other Opponents of Paul. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 188*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1999.
- Tate, Marvin E. "Satan in the Old Testament." *Review and Expositor* 89, no. 4 (1992): 461–74.
- Theissen, Gerd. *Psychological Aspects of Pauline Theology*. Translated by John P. Galvin. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987.

- Thierry, J. J. "Der Dorn im Fleische (2 Kor 12:7–9)." *Novum Testamentum* 5, no. 4 (1962): 301–10.
- Thiselton, Anthony C. "Meaning of Sarx in 1 Corinthians 5:5: A Fresh Approach in the Light of Logical and Semantic Factors." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 26, no. 2 (1973): 204–28.
- _____. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids, Mich.; Eerdmans; Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 2000.
- Thomas, John C. "'An Angel from Satan': Paul's Thorn in the Flesh (2 Corinthians 12.7–10)." *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 9 (1996): 39–52.
- Thomas, John Christopher. *The Devil, Disease, and Deliverance: Origins of Illness in the New Testament Thought*. Journal of Pentecostal Theology Supplement. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- Thornton, Timothy C. G. "Satan: God's Agent for Punishing." *Expository Times* 83, no. 5 (1972): 151–52.
- Thrall, Margaret E. *1 and 2 Corinthians*. Cambridge Bible Commentary. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964.
- _____. "The Problem of II Cor 6:14–7:1 in Some Recent Discussion." *New Testament Studies* 24, no. 1 (1977): 132–48.
- _____. "Super-Apostles, Servants of Christ, and Servants of Satan." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 6 (1980): 42–57.
- _____. *2 Corinthians 1–7*. Vol. 1, International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994.
- _____. *2 Corinthians 8–13*. Vol. 2, International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000.
- Toorn, Karel van der, Bob Becking, and Pieter Willem van der Horst. *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible (DDD)*. 2d rev. ed. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Tromp, Johannes. *The Life of Adam and Eve in Greek: A Critical Edition*. Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece 6. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Uddin, Mohan. "Paul, the Devil and 'Unbelief' in Israel (with Particular Reference to 2 Corinthians 3–4 and Romans 9–11)." *Tyndale Bulletin* 50, no. 2 (1999): 265–80.
- VanderKam, James C. "The Origins and Purposes of the Book of Jubilees." Pages 3–24 in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees*. Edited by Matthias Albani, Jörg Frey, and Armin Lange. Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum 65. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1997.

- _____. "The Aqedah, Jubilees, and PseudoJubilees." Pages 241–61 in *Quest for Context and Meaning: Studies in Biblical Intertextuality in Honor of James A. Sanders*. Edited by C. Evans and S. Talmon. *Biblical Interpretation Series* 28. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- _____. *The Book of Jubilees*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- _____. "The Demons in the Book of Jubilees." Pages 339–64 in *Die Dämonen: die Dämonologie der israelitisch-jüdischen und frühchristlichen Literatur in Kontext ihrer Umwelt*. Edited by Hermann Lichtenberger Armin Lange, and K. F. Diethard Römheld. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.
- Vermes, Geza. *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. Rev. ed. London: Penguin Books, 2004.
- Walker Jr., William O. *Interpolations in the Pauline Letters*. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series* 213: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- Wanamaker, Charles A. *The Epistles to the Thessalonians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. *New International Greek Testament Commentary*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1990.
- Ware, James P. *The Mission of the Church in Paul's Letter to the Philippians in the Context of Ancient Judaism*. *Novum Testamentum Supplements* 210. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Watson, Duane. "Paul's Appropriation of Apocalyptic Discourse: The Rhetorical Strategy of 1 Thessalonians." Pages 61–80 in *Vision and Persuasion: Rhetorical Dimensions of Apocalyptic Discourse*. Edited by L. Gregory Bloomquist and Greg Carey. St. Louis, Miss.: Chalice Press, 1999.
- Webb, William J. *Returning Home: New Covenant and Second Exodus as the Context for 2 Corinthians 6:14–7:1*. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series* 85. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.
- Wehrle, Josef. "Wesen und Wandel der Satansvorstellung im Alten Testament." *Münchener theologische Zeitschrift* 52 (2001): 194–207.
- Wenham, Gordon J. *Genesis 1–15*. *Word Biblical Commentary* 1. Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 1987.
- Wernle, Paul. *Paulus als Heidenmissionar*. Freiburg: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1899.
- Westerholm, Stephen. *Perspectives Old and New on Paul: The "Lutheran" Paul and his Critics*. Grand Rapids, Mich.; Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2004.
- Wilckens, Ulrich. *Der Brief an die Römer*. 3 vols. [S.l.]: Benziger, 1978.
- Wiles, Gordon P. *Paul's Intercessory Prayers: The Significance of the Intercessory*

- Prayer Passages in the Letters of St. Paul*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 24. London: Cambridge University Press, 1974.
- Wink, Walter. *Naming the Powers: The Language of Power in the New Testament*. Vol. 1 of *The Powers*. Philadelphia, Pa.: Fortress Press, 1984.
- _____. *Unmasking the Powers: The Invisible Forces that Determine Human Existence*. Vol. 2 of *The Powers*. Philadelphia, Pa.: Fortress Press, 1986.
- _____. *Engaging the Powers: Discernment and Resistance in a World of Domination*. Vol. 3 of *The Powers*. Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress Press, 1992.
- Winston, David. *The Wisdom of Solomon: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 43. New York: Doubleday, 1979.
- Wintermute, O. S. "Jubilees: A New Translation and Introduction." Pages 35–142 in vol. 2 of *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1985.
- _____. "Apocalypse of Zephaniah." Pages 497–515 of vol. 1 in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1985.
- Wisse, Maarten. *Scripture between Identity and Creativity: A Hermeneutical Theory Building upon Four Interpretations of Job*. Ars Disputandi Supplement Series 1. Utrecht: Ars Disputandi, 2003.
- Witherington III, Ben. *Paul's Narrative Thought World: The Tapestry of Tragedy and Triumph*. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press, 1994.
- _____. *Conflict and Community in Corinth: A Socio-rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans; Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1995.
- Woods, Laurie. "Opposition to a Man and His Message: Paul's 'Thorn in the Flesh' (2 Cor 12:7)." *Australian Biblical Review* 39 (1991): 44–53.
- Woyke, Johannes. *Götter, "Götzen," Götterbilder: Aspekte einer paulinischen "Theologie der Religionen."* Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2005.
- Wray, T. J. and Mobley Gregory. *The Birth of Satan: Tracing the Devil's Biblical Roots*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2005.
- Wright, George Ernest. *The Old Testament against its Environment*. Studies in Biblical Theology. London: SCM Press, 1951.
- Wright, N. T. "The Letter to the Romans: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections." Pages 393–770 in *The New Interpreter's Bible: A Commentary in Twelve Volumes*. Edited by Leander E. Keck. Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon, 2002.

_____. *Paul: In Fresh Perspective*. Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress Press, 2005.

Yates, Roy. "The Powers of Evil in the New Testament." *Evangelical Quarterly* 52 (1980): 97–111.

Yoder, John Howard. *The Politics of Jesus: Vicit Agnus Noster*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1972.

Young, Frances M. and David Ford. *Meaning and Truth in 2 Corinthians*. Biblical Foundations in Theology. London: SPCK, 1987.

Zeilinger, Franz. "Die Echtheit von 2 Cor 6:14–7:1." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 112, no. 1 (1993): 71–80.

Zerwick, Max. *Biblical Greek: Illustrated by Examples*. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1963.