

LIBERTY UNIVERSITY

**The Canonical Significance of Mindset in Romans 8:5–14 (Φρονέω and its Cognates):  
Implications for Biblical Interpretation, Application, and Evangelism**

A Dissertation Submitted to  
the Faculty of the Rawlings School of Divinity  
in Candidacy for the Degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy

Bible Exposition

by

Denise Anne Pass

Lynchburg, Virginia

April 20, 2024

Copyright © 2024 by Denise A. Pass

All Rights Reserved.

APPROVAL SHEET

**The Canonical Significance of Mindset in Romans 8:5–14 (Φρονέω and its Cognates):  
Implications for Biblical Interpretation, Application, and Evangelism**

Denise A. Pass

READ AND APPROVED BY:

Chairperson:

\_\_\_\_\_

Richard A. Fuhr, Ph.D.

Supervising Reader:

\_\_\_\_\_

Joseph A. Cathey, Ph.D.

Second Reader:

\_\_\_\_\_

Jordan P. Ballard, Ph.D.

*May all who have struggled in their minds find peace through the mind of Christ.*

*solus mens Christi*

## Acknowledgments

An undertaking such as this dissertation would not have happened if it were not for the mighty grace of God and the cloud of witnesses who surrounded me as I endeavored to complete this task and degree.

It has been a privilege to be under Dr. Joseph Cathey's insightful mentorship, inspiring me to write words I did not know I had in me. I am also thankful for each professor who encouraged me in this pursuit, inspiring me to greater depths of study. Thank you to Dr. Richard Fuhr for making time to hear my dissertation idea and encouraging me to write where God had already been calling me to in my ministry. Thank you to Dr. Jordan Ballard for his expertise as the second reader.

My husband has stood by me throughout this pursuit, reading and editing my work and encouraging me to press on even as we both took turns battling cancer and COVID. I could not have done this without his support. To my faithful family and friends, thank you for praying me through while I carved out time for study and research.

The greatest thanks and praise go to my God. Why is it that I came to know Him as my Savior? And how is it that I have been able to attend this university and pursue this degree? Thank you, Jesus, for inspiring me and enabling me for this task. May You receive all the glory.

While many questioned why I would do such a "crazy" thing as pursuing a Ph.D., my only wish is that I had done it sooner. Oh, to know God and his Word more!

## Contents

Abbreviations.....	x
Abstract.....	xvii
<b>Chapter 1: Why Mindset Matters .....</b>	<b>1</b>
Introduction.....	1
Hermeneutics .....	4
Mind Over Matter .....	5
The Shema: The Significance of the Greatest Commandment.....	7
The “Heart” of the Matter: Anthropological Terminology.....	9
Old Testament Terminology.....	10
The Gospels’ Usage of Old Testament Terminology .....	12
Anthropological Considerations and Implications.....	17
What’s the Matter?.....	19
The Origin of Mindsets.....	20
Mindsets are Sin.....	20
Mindsets Begin with Words.....	22
Mindsets are Driven by One’s Senses .....	23
Mindsets are Unbelief.....	24
The Crux of the Matter .....	24
The Biblical Motif: The Promise of Mind Renewal .....	26
The Biblical Metanarrative: The Making of Mindsets .....	27
Conclusion: The Biblical Mandate of the Mind of Christ .....	28
<b>Chapter 2: The Canonical Significance of Mindsets .....</b>	<b>30</b>
Introduction.....	30

The Mindset Metanarrative.....	31
A Canonical Survey of Key Mindset Terms.....	31
The Foundation of Terms.....	32
The Implication of Terms .....	32
The Significance of Terms.....	34
A Canonical Survey of Key Mindset Passages.....	37
A Motif of Hardened Hearts .....	38
A Motif of Circumcised Hearts.....	39
A Motif of Renewed Hearts (Minds).....	40
A Constellation of Terms.....	41
Anthropological Terms .....	43
The Heart לב/לבב ( <i>lēb/lēbāb</i> )/ Καρδία ( <i>kardia</i> ).....	43
The Living Being שׂפָּיִם ( <i>népēš</i> )/ ψυχή ( <i>psyche</i> ).....	51
The Spirit רִּיחַ ( <i>rūah</i> )/ πνεῦμα ( <i>pneûma</i> ).....	56
The Flesh בָּשָׂר ( <i>bāsār</i> )/ σῶμα ( <i>sōma</i> ) .....	61
The Mindset Terminology .....	62
The Mindset Φρονέω ( <i>phroneō</i> ).....	66
The Mind.....	68
Νοῦς ( <i>nous</i> )/ διάνοια ( <i>dianoia</i> )/ ἔννοια ( <i>ennoia</i> ).....	68
Mindset Processes.....	72
The State of the Mind: Mindset Narrative .....	73
Conclusion: The Point of the Matter.....	75
<b>Chapter 3: The Making and Breaking of a Mindset—The Impact of Culture.....</b>	<b>76</b>

Introduction.....	76
The Cultural Condition: The Shaping of a Mindset.....	77
The Counterfeit Environment .....	79
The Carnal Environment.....	81
The Canonical Environment .....	85
The ANE Cognition: The Hebrew Mindset.....	89
The Language Background.....	91
The Historical Background.....	92
The Cultural Background.....	95
The Canonical Call to Contrition: OT .....	96
The Pentateuch.....	97
The Historical Books .....	98
The Prophets .....	102
Old Testament – The Struggle of Israel.....	105
The NT Cognition: The Greco-Roman Mindset.....	107
Language Background .....	109
Historical Background .....	111
Cultural Background.....	113
The Canonical Contrition: NT .....	115
Acts .....	116
1 Peter .....	117
New Testament – The Struggle Is Real .....	120
Jew, Roman, and Greek Mindset Toward Messiah and Misinterpretation.....	124



A Spiritual Heart Condition .....	127
A Hardened Heart .....	128
A Divided Heart.....	131
A Broken Heart.....	134
Don't Follow Your Heart.....	136
The Breaking of a Mindset .....	137
A Heart of Reconciliation .....	141
A Heart of Contrition .....	143
A Call to Repent.....	145
A Call to Relent .....	149
Conclusion: A Heart on Mission.....	151
<b>Chapter Four: The Mind of Christ .....</b>	<b>153</b>
Introduction.....	153
The Motif of the Mind of Christ .....	154
The Mind of the LORD (Yahweh) in the OT .....	157
The Mind of the Lord (Κύριος) in the NT .....	160
The Mind of Christ Through the Ages.....	162
Christ's Mind and Mission .....	167
The Imperative: Repent.....	168
The Indicative: Represent .....	169
The Initiative: Receive and Believe .....	170
What is the Mind of Christ?.....	171
The World of Christ.....	172

Christ Came to Show Us How to Live Counterculture.....	174
The Words of Christ.....	176
Christ Came to Show us the Father.....	178
The Works of Christ.....	179
Christ Came that We Might Know Him .....	180
Christ Came to Break Down Barriers .....	182
Christ Came to Give Us Identity and Indemnity .....	187
The Mind of the LORD Foretold: Isaiah .....	189
The Mind/Spirit of the Lord Fulfilled: 1 Cor 2:10–16.....	190
The Things of God Revealed (1 Cor 2:10) .....	193
The Thoughts of God Appealed (1 Cor 2:11).....	194
The Message Congealed (1 Cor 2:12) .....	195
The Spiritual Things Unsealed (1 Cor 2:13).....	196
The Spirit Concealed (1 Cor 2:14).....	197
Judgment Repealed (1 Cor 2:15) .....	198
A Mind Healed (1 Cor 2:16).....	199
The Mind of Christ: The <i>Teleos</i> of Life.....	204
Conclusion: The Mind of Christ: A New Way of Life .....	206
<b>Chapter Five: The Significance of Φρονέω and Its Cognates .....</b>	<b>208</b>
Introduction.....	208
Φρονέω ( <i>Phroneó</i> ) and its Cognates throughout the Canon.....	209
The Φρήν Family .....	211
Φρήν ( <i>phrēn</i> ).....	212

Φρονέω ( <i>phronēō</i> ) .....	215
Φρόνημα ( <i>phronēma</i> ).....	216
Φρόνησις ( <i>phronesis</i> ).....	218
Φρονεῖν ( <i>phronein</i> ).....	220
Paul’s Use of Other Key Cognitive Terms in NT and LXX.....	220
Καρδία ( <i>kardia</i> ) .....	221
Πνεῦμα, ( <i>pneuma</i> ), Ψυχή, ( <i>psyche</i> ), Σάρξ ( <i>sarx</i> ), Σώμα ( <i>soma</i> ) .....	223
Πνεῦμα ( <i>pneuma</i> ).....	224
Σάρξ ( <i>sarx</i> ).....	228
Ψυχή ( <i>psyche</i> ) .....	231
Σῶμα ( <i>soma</i> ) .....	233
Νοῦς ( <i>nous</i> ).....	236
Διάνοια ( <i>dianoia</i> ), Εννοια ( <i>ennoia</i> ) .....	239
Διάνοια ( <i>dianoia</i> ).....	239
Εννοια ( <i>ennoia</i> ).....	241
The Role of Φρονέω in the NT .....	242
How Now Shall We Live? The Spirit Versus the Flesh: Rom 8:5–14 .....	243
Frame of Mind: You Are What You Think (Romans 8:5) .....	244
State of Mind: Death or Peace (Romans 8:6) .....	245
One Track Mind: In Bondage to the Flesh (Rom 8:7) .....	248
A Narrow-Mind: Trapped in Sin (Rom 8:8).....	249
Keep This in Mind: “In” the Spirit (Rom 8:9).....	250
A Load Off Your Mind: Alive because of Righteousness (Rom 8:10) .....	251

Raise Your Mind: Life through the Spirit (Rom 8:11) .....	252
Make Up Your Mind: Under Obligation (Rom 8:12).....	253
Out of Your Mind: Death Brings Life (Rom 8:13).....	254
Change Your Mind: Led by the Spirit (Rom 8:14).....	255
Conclusion: The Mindset as Part of the Fulfillment of God’s Story .....	255
<b>Chapter 6: Conclusion, A Kingdom Mindset .....</b>	<b>257</b>
Accessing Mind Renewal .....	258
Chapter One Summary: The Significance of Mindsets .....	259
Carnal Mindsets Are Unbelief, Sin, and a Divided Heart.....	260
Chapter Two Summary: The Significance of Human Nature in Mindsets.....	261
Carnal Mindsets Become One’s Identity and Truth .....	262
Chapter Three Summary: The Significance of Culture in Shaping Mindsets .....	263
Mindsets are Shaped by What One Worships.....	264
Chapter Four Summary: The Significance of the Mind of Christ .....	266
The Mind of Christ Enables One to Think Like God .....	267
Chapter Five Summary: The Significance of Φρονέω and Cognitive Terms.....	268
The Significance of Mind Renewal: The Things of God, Not of Man .....	269
The Kingdom Mindset Revealed (Matt 16:23).....	270
Application.....	272
Conclusion .....	273
Contributions of this Research.....	274
Recommendation for Further Study.....	276
<b>APPENDIX A: A Constellation of Terms.....</b>	<b>277</b>

<b>APPENDIX B: The Mind-Body Problem</b> .....	<b>328</b>
<b>APPENDIX C: The Monothelite Controversy</b> .....	<b>331</b>
<b>APPENDIX D: The Language Jesus Spoke</b> .....	<b>335</b>
<b>APPENDIX E: To Οἶδα or to Γινώσκω, that is the Question.</b> .....	<b>340</b>
<b>APPENDIX F: Paul’s View of The Spirit</b> .....	<b>344</b>
<b>APPENDIX G: Mind and Heart—Separate or Together?</b> .....	<b>347</b>
<b>APPENDIX H: Plato’s View of The Soul</b> .....	<b>349</b>
<b>APPENDIX I: LXX Occurrences of Φρονέω</b> .....	<b>351</b>
<b>Bibliography</b> .....	<b>363</b>

## ABBREVIATIONS

### English Versions of the Bible

CSB	Christian Standard Bible
ESV	English Standard Version Bible
KJV	King James Version
ISV	International Standard Version
NASB	New American Standard Version
NIV	New International Version
NKJV	New King James Version
NLT	New Living Translation
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
RSV	Revised Standard Version
TCV	Today's Chinese Version

### General Abbreviations

ANE	Ancient Near East
LXX	The Septuagint
NT	New Testament
OT	Old Testament

### Journals

<i>AnBib</i>	<i>Analecta Biblica</i>
<i>AnBrux</i>	<i>Analecta Bruxellensia</i>
<i>BA</i>	<i>The Biblical Annals</i>
<i>BAGL</i>	<i>Biblical and Ancient Greek Linguistics</i>
<i>BASOR</i>	<i>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research</i>
<i>BHM</i>	<i>Bulletin of the History of Medicine</i>
<i>BSac</i>	<i>Bibliotheca Sacra</i>
<i>BTB</i>	<i>Biblical Theology Bulletin</i>
<i>BZ</i>	<i>Biblische Zeitschrift</i>
<i>CBQ</i>	<i>The Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
<i>CTJ</i>	<i>Calvin Theological Journal</i>
<i>CQ</i>	<i>Covenant Quarterly</i>
<i>Dial. Anth.</i>	<i>Dialectical Anthropology</i>
<i>EFN</i>	<i>Estudios de filología neotestamentaria</i>
<i>EJPR</i>	<i>European Journal for Philosophy of Religion</i>
<i>EvQ</i>	<i>Evangelical Quarterly</i>
<i>GTJ</i>	<i>Grace Theological Journal</i>
<i>EJT</i>	<i>Kairos: Evangelical Journal of Theology</i>
<i>ETS</i>	<i>Evangelical Theological Society</i>
<i>EvT</i>	<i>Evangelische Theologie</i>
<i>HeyJ</i>	<i>Heythrop Journal</i>
<i>IJOT</i>	<i>International Journal of Orthodox Theology</i>

<i>Int</i>	<i>Interpretation</i>
<i>Iraq</i>	<i>Iraq</i>
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>JECH</i>	<i>Journal of Early Christian History</i>
<i>JECS</i>	<i>Journal of Early Christian Studies</i>
<i>JETS</i>	<i>Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society</i>
<i>JGRChJ</i>	<i>Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism</i>
<i>JSBLE</i>	<i>Journal of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis</i>
<i>JSFSC</i>	<i>Journal of Spiritual Formation and Soul Care</i>
<i>JSNT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>
<i>JSOT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
<i>LQ</i>	<i>Linacre Quarterly</i>
<i>MAL</i>	<i>Mind &amp; Language</i>
<i>MSJ</i>	<i>Master's Seminary Journal</i>
<i>Neot</i>	<i>Neotestamentica</i>
<i>NovT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
<i>OTE</i>	<i>Old Testament Essays</i>
<i>PAQ</i>	<i>Palestine Exploration Quarterly</i>
<i>PTJ</i>	<i>Perichoresis Theological Journal</i>
<i>SSCS</i>	<i>Spiritus: A Journal of Christian Spirituality</i>
<i>TBAR</i>	<i>The Biblical Archaeologist Review</i>
<i>TET</i>	<i>The Expository Times</i>
<i>Them</i>	<i>Themelios</i>
<i>TJ</i>	<i>Trinity Journal</i>
<i>TLQ</i>	<i>The Linacre Quarterly</i>
<i>TS</i>	<i>Theological Studies</i>
<i>VeE</i>	<i>Verbum et Ecclesia</i>
<i>VT</i>	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
<i>WTJ</i>	<i>Westminster Theological Journal</i>
<i>ZAW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>

### **Monograph Series and Commentaries**

ACT	Ancient Christian Texts
AGJU	Arbeiten Zur Geschichte Des Antiken Judentums Und Des Urschristentums
BECNT	Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament
CBC	Cornerstone Biblical Commentary
CECNT	Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament
CSS	Cistercian Studies Series
EBC	The Expositor's Bible Commentary
EGGNT	Exegetical Guide to the Greek New Testament
EKKNT	Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
HNTC	Holman New Testament Commentary
ICC	The International Critical Commentary
JCTC	Jewish and Christian Texts in Contexts and Related Studies
NAC	The New American Commentary

NBBC	New Beacon Bible Commentary
NICNT	The New International Commentary of the New Testament
NICOT	New International Commentary on the Old Testament
NIGTC	New International Greek Testament Commentary
NSBT	New Studies in Biblical Theology
NTSup	<i>Novum Testamentum</i> Supplements
ONTC	Osborne New Testament Commentaries
OTL	The Old Testament Library
PNTC	The Pillar New Testament Commentary
PPS	Popular Patristics Series
SNTMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
TFOC	The Fathers of the Church
TNTC	Tyndale New Testament Commentaries
TCWS	The Classics of Western Spirituality
UBS	United Bible Society
ZECNT	Zondervan Exegetical Commentary of the New Testament

### Reference Works

AKA	<i>The Annals of the Kings of Assyria: The Cuneiform Texts with Translations, Transliterations, etc., from the Original Documents in the British Museum.</i> Edited by E. A. Wallis Budge and L. W. King. London: Longmans & Co, 1902.
APOT	<i>The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament.</i> Edited by Robert H. Charles. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1913.
BDAG	Danker, Frederick W., Walter Bauer, William F. Arndt, and F. Wilbur Gingrich. <i>A Greek–English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature.</i> 3rd ed. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
BDB	Brown, F., S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs. <i>The Enhanced Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon.</i> Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977.
BTLNTG	Cremer, Hermann. <i>Biblico-Theological Lexicon of New Testament Greek.</i> Translated by William Urwick. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1895.
BTOT	Zuck, Roy B. <i>A Biblical Theology of the Old Testament.</i> Chicago: Moody Press, 1991.
CAD	<i>The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.</i> Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. 1936–2006.
CEDHLRE	Klein, Ernest. Edited by Baruch Sarel. <i>A Comprehensive Etymological Dictionary of the Hebrew Language for Readers of English.</i> Jerusalem: Carta Jerusalem; The University of Haifa, 1987.
CGEDNT	Newman, Barclay M. <i>A Concise Greek-English Dictionary of the New Testament.</i> Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft; United Bible Societies, 2010.



- CGL* Diggle, James, B. L. Fraser, Patrick James, O. B. Simkin, A. A. Thompson, and S. J. Westripp, eds. *The Cambridge Greek Lexicon*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2021.
- COS* *The Context of Scripture*. Edited by William W. Hallo. 3 vols. Leiden: Brill, NL, 1997–2002.
- DBL (NT)* Swanson, James. *Dictionary of Biblical Languages with Semantic Domains: Greek (New Testament)*. Oak Harbor, WA: Logos Research Systems, Inc., 1997.
- DBL (OT)* Swanson, James. *Dictionary of Biblical Languages with Semantic Domains: Greek (Old Testament)*. Oak Harbor, WA: Logos Research Systems, Inc., 1997.
- EDNT* Edited by Horst Balz and Gerhard Schneider. *Exegetical Dictionary of the New*
- GELNT* Bloomfield, S. T. *A Greek and English Lexicon to the New Testament*. London, UK: Longman, Orme, Brown, Green, & Longmans, 1840.
- HALOT* *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Ludwig Köehler, Walter Baumgartner, and Johann J. Stamm. Translated and edited under the supervision of Mervyn E. J. Richardson. 4 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1994–1999.
- ISBE* *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*. Edited by James Orr, John L. Nuelsen, Edgar Y. Mullins, and Morris O. Evans. Chicago, IL: The Howard-Severance Company, 1915.
- L&N* Louw, Johannes P., and Eugene A. Nida, eds. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Based on Semantic Domains*. 2nd ed. New York: United Bible Societies, 1996.
- LALS* *The Lexham Analytical Lexicon of the Septuagint*. Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2012.
- LBD* *The Lexham Bible Dictionary*, ed. John D. Barry, David Bomar, Derek R. Brown, Rachel Klippenstein, Douglas Mangum, Carrie Sinclair Wolcott, Lazarus Wentz, Elliot Ritzema, and Wendy Widder. Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2016.
- LES* Tan, Randall, and David A. DeSilva. *The Lexham Greek-English Interlinear Septuagint*. Logos Bible Software, 2009.
- LSJ* Liddell, Henry George, Robert Scott, Henry Stuart Jones. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. 9th ed. with revised supplement. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.
- LTW* Mangum, Douglas, Derek R. Brown, Rachel Klippenstein, and Rebekah Hurst, eds. *Lexham Theological Wordbook*. Lexham Bible Reference Series. Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2014.

- LXXHOTLX Brannan, Rick, ed. *Lexham Research Lexicon of the Hebrew Bible*. Lexham Research Lexicons. Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2020.
- MCED Mounce, William D. *Mounce's Complete Expository Dictionary of Old & New Testament Words*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2006.
- MGLNT Abbott-Smith, G. *A Manual Greek Lexicon of the New Testament*. New York, NY: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1922.
- MGS Montanari, Franco. 2015. *The Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek*. Edited by Madeleine Goh and Chad Schroeder. Leiden: Brill.
- NIDNTE *New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology and Exegesis*. Edited by Silva, Moisés. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2014.
- NIDOTTE *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*. Edited by Willem A. VanGemeren. 5 vols. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1997.
- OTT Waltke, Bruce K., and Charles Yu. *An Old Testament Theology: An Exegetical, Canonical, and Thematic Approach*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2007.
- PG *Patrologia Graeca*. Edited by J.-P. Migne. 162 vols. Paris, 1857–1886.
- PGL Lampe, Geoffrey W. H., ed. *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1961.
- TDNT *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Edited by Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–1976
- TDOT *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Edited by G. Johannes Botterweck and Helmer Ringgren. Translated by John T. Willis. Grand Rapids, MI; Cambridge, U.K.: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- TLNT Spicq, Ceslas, and James D. Ernest. *Theological Lexicon of the New Testament*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1994.
- TLOT *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Edited by Ernst Jenni, with assistance from Claus Westermann. Translated by Mark E. Biddle. 3 vols. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1997.
- TOTTA Brueggemann, Walter. *Theology of the Old Testament: Testimony, Dispute, Advocacy*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2005.
- TOTVOT Eichrodt, Walther. *Theology of the Old Testament*. Edited by Peter Ackroyd, James Barr, Bernhard W. Anderson, and James L. Mays. Translated by J. A. Baker. Vol. 1 & 2. The Old Testament Library. Philadelphia, PA: The Westminster Press, 1961–1967.

- TWOT*      *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*. Edited by R. Laird Harris, Gleason L. Archer Jr., and Bruce K. Waltke. 2 vols. Chicago: Moody Press, 1980.
- VAB*      *Vorderasiatische Bibliothek*. Edited by Arthur Ungnad, Moses Schorr, Otto Weber, Maximilian Streck, Rudolf Zehnpfund, Francois Thureau-Dangin, and Franz Heinrich Weissbach. 8 vols. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1907–1916.
- VEDBW*      Vine, William Edwy, Merrill Frederick Unger, and William White. *Vine's Expository Dictionary of Biblical Words*. Nashville, TN: T. Nelson, 1985.

### Primary Sources

- I Apol.*      Justin, *First Apology*
- 1-2 Clem.      1-2 Clement
- 1QapGen ar      Genesis Apocryphon
- 1QS      1QS *Rule of the Community, or Manual of Discipline*, from Qumran Cave 1
- Alex.*      Plutarch, *Alexander*
- ANF*      *Ante-Nicene Fathers*
- Ann.*      Tacitus, *Annales*
- Ant.*      Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities*
- Ant.*      Sophocles, *Antigone*
- ARM      Archives royales de Mari
- Aug.*      Suetonius, *Divus Augustus*
- Bib. hist.*      Diodorus Siculus, *Bibliotheca historica*
- Cap Centum.*      Diadachus, *Capita centum de perfectione spirituali*
- Conf.*      Philo, *De confusione linguarum*
- Ecl.*      Virgil, *Eclogues*
- Giants*      Philo, *On Giants*
- Good Person*      Philo, *Every Good Person is Free*
- Haer.*      Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*
- Herm. Mand.      Shepherd of Hermas, Mandate(s).
- Hist.*      Tacitus, *Historiae*
- Hom.*      Homer, *Odyssey*
- Hymn Apol.      Homer, *Homeric Hymns* 3. To Apollo
- Imag.*      Philostratus, *Imagines*
- Inst.*      Calvin, *Institutes*
- Is. Os.*      Plutarch, *Isis and Osiris*
- J.W.*      Josephus, *Jewish War*
- Jub.      Jubilees
- Leg. 1, 2, 3*      *Legum allegoriae* I, II, III.
- Legat.*      Philo, *Legatio ad Gaium*
- Moses, 1, 2      Philo, *On the Life of Moses*
- Orig.*      Origen
- Prob.*      Philo, *Every Good Man is Free*
- Pss. Sol.      Psalms of Solomon

*Quaest. Conv* Plutarch, *Quaestionum convivialum libri V*  
*Resp.* Plato, *Republic*  
*Retract.* Augustine, *Retractationes*  
*SVF* *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta*. Hans Friedrich August von Arnim. 4 vols.  
Leipzig: Teubne, 1903–1924.

## ABSTRACT

The term mindset is common in today's vernacular, but its significance in the canon has scarcely been explored. Cultures throughout time have viewed mindsets as something that human volition alone can affect. Yet the inability to maintain the mindset God requires of his people has prevented them from faithfully keeping the covenant and rightly interpreting Scripture. Mindsets are habitual or innate mental attitudes that determine how one will interpret life situations and the Word of God, impacting relationships with others and one's ability to love God and walk in obedience to His Word. Paul's extensive use of φρονέω echoes back to its use in the LXX along with a host of other key terms pertaining to one's mindset, revealing that the restoration of mindsets has been an objective of God since the beginning. This dissertation seeks to demonstrate that all of Scripture points to mind renewal through the Holy Spirit and the revelation of the mind of Christ, revealing the significant role that mindsets play in a believer's understanding of the canon, which has implications for biblical interpretation, application, and evangelism. Through utilizing the historical-grammatical method, including exegetical and lexical-syntactical analysis of a constellation of mindset terminology and key passages pertaining to mindset employed canonically, as well as an analysis of the mindsets inherent within the biblical characters and their respective cultural backgrounds, the significance of mindsets φρονέω (*phroneō*) is demonstrated, and the intentions of God are laid bare.

## CHAPTER 1: WHY MINDSET MATTERS

### Introduction

The correct interpretation of Scripture lies in the mind of the one who penned the words through human authors as inspired by the Holy Spirit. Accurate interpretation hinges on knowing authorial intent and removing one's presuppositions that hinder seeing God's intention in his Word. An awareness of presuppositions is tantamount to sound interpretation, yet people are often unaware of how indoctrination and socialization from the culture have shaped mindsets that preclude their understanding of the Word of God.<sup>1</sup> A mindset is a framework of thoughts within one's own mind that shapes one's understanding, belief system, and worldview, impacting how one engages with the Word of God. The significance of mindsets is their ability to alter a right understanding of the Word of God, which hinders one's ability to love God with all one's being and to potentially miss the salvation God offers. The biblical narrative and cognitive terms used throughout the canon reveal the impact mindsets had on God's people, illustrating man's need for mind renewal and the superlative clarion canonical call to think like God.

Running in parallel within Scripture is the emphasis Scripture places on anthropological terms and the biblical narrative of man's struggle to have the heart God requires. From sin's destruction to the human mindset to culture's worldly influence on the mind to the significant

---

<sup>1</sup> Mindsets are habitual or innate mental attitudes that determine how one will interpret life situations and the Word of God, impacting how one will love God and walk in obedience to His Word. For the purposes of this dissertation, the term "mindset(s)" refers to having an outlook that is according to "the things of the flesh," which is the default mindset for man. A mind fixed on the "things of the Spirit" is referred to as the renewed mind, which operates in the mind of Christ (Rom 8:5–6; Matt 16:23; Mark 8:33), available for all believers. The BDAG defines *φρονέω* (*phroneō*) used in these passages as "to give careful consideration to something; set one's mind on, be intent on." In Romans 8:5 and Matthew 16:23, this term is employed as "to take someone's side, espouse someone's cause." BDAG, s.v. "φρονέω," 1065–66. Mindset shifts occur in cultures without an awareness of the mindset inherent within the culture.

role that mindset plays in the reception and application of Scripture, the struggle for a godly mindset that rightly divides the Word of God is a battlefield. Scripture is understood spiritually, as aided by the Holy Spirit through prayer and diligent study of God's Word, not solely through one's reason or senses (1 Cor 2:14). Yet man often relies on his own understanding, believing the thoughts running through his mind as if they were truth, which is ultimately unbelief to believe one's own thoughts over God's. One's thoughts are innate, which compels one to believe one's own reasoning to be true, yet the heart of man is a world of evil (Jer 17:9). As resident thoughts form mindsets shaped by the culture and life experiences that the human mind is often not cognizant of, these mindsets are the impetus behind the misunderstanding, misinterpretation, and misapplication of Scripture. Without the Holy Spirit illuminating the Word of God and providing understanding, people are lost and unable to grasp the intentions of God in his Word or to love God with all their being.

Errant mindsets have caused unfaithfulness to God from the least to the greatest, including priests and kings, who struggled to lead the people well. Eli's failure as a priest led to the establishment of the monarchy, which would also end in failure but ultimately pointed to the need for one who alone could have the mind and heart of God and who would heal the broken mindsets of men. In 1 Samuel 2:35, God makes a promise as part of the plan for mind renewal. "And I will raise up for myself a faithful priest, who shall do according to what is in my heart and in my mind. And I will build him a sure house, and he shall go in and out before my anointed forever".<sup>2</sup> Deenick notes that Christ is the ultimate fulfillment of the "anointed priest,"

---

<sup>2</sup> Unless otherwise noted, all scriptures are from the English Standard Version 2001, Crossway. Used by permission.

not David.<sup>3</sup> The new heart and mind promised would be mediated through this faithful high priest. The mind of Messiah has been a primary goal in the biblical metanarrative from the beginning to help God’s people to know and love God and his Word.

The significance of mindsets canonically and within the fabric of the culture is that they are the driving force preventing one’s ability to understand God’s Word and ultimately receive salvation. Without the renewing of one’s mind, one cannot rightly divide the Word of God, which has implications for biblical interpretation, application, and evangelism. Genesis 6:5 reveals that every intention of the thoughts of the heart (mindset) is continually evil. How could such a heart know God and make him known? One primary goal of Yahweh was for his people to be a witness to the lost people around them. But God’s people could not be an effective witness to the world if they did not rightly understand it. “You are my witnesses,” declares the LORD, “and my servant whom I have chosen, that you may know and believe me and understand that I am he. Before me no god was formed, nor shall there be any after me” (Isa 43:10). The cognitive terms employed in this verse—know דָּעָה (*dā’ā(h)*), believe אָמֵן (*’āmôn*) and understand יָדָע (*bîn*)—show the components in one’s thinking and the progression toward belief, implying that the mind and mindset of God’s people is the driving force behind their faithfulness to God.

Through a lexical, historical, theological, and exegetical analysis of key passages and terms, the metanarrative of mindsets is revealed as the role mindsets play in interpretation is seen through the terms employed and the biblical narrative storyline. This chapter will examine why mindsets matter, exposing inherent problems by studying the nature of man as it relates to

---

<sup>3</sup> Carl Deenick, “Priest and King or Priest-King in 1 Samuel 2:35,” *WTJ* 73 (2011): 337.



worldly mindsets through a lexical overview and analysis of the Shema. Chapter two explores the problem of mindsets becoming one's truth, along with an examination of a constellation of key anthropological and mindset terms that demonstrate the metanarrative of mindsets throughout the canon. In chapter three, the impact that culture and worship have on mindsets is unpacked. The making and breaking of mindsets is examined, first from the perspective of the impact that mindsets inherent in the ANE and Greco-Roman cultures had upon God's people. Second, through examination of the cognitive environment and background that contribute to the making of a worldly mindset (or hardening of the heart.) And lastly, a review of the breaking of mindsets through the process of mind renewal is presented. In chapter four, the metanarrative of mind renewal is encapsulated by examining the characteristics of the mind of Christ in the canon, throughout history, and through the world, words, and works of Christ, followed by an exposition of 1 Cor 2:10–16 which reveals what the mind of Christ is and how the mind of Christ is accessed. Chapter five explores the significance of  $\varphi\rho\nu\nu\epsilon\omega$ , including Paul's use of this term in the NT and the use of this term in the Septuagint and how, ultimately, this term signifies the intention of God from the beginning. In chapter six, the kingdom mindset is unveiled through key passages and a summary analysis of the findings and significance of the nature of mindsets and how they inhibit interpretation.

### **Hermeneutics**

The goal of hermeneutics is to divide the Word of God rightly, but worldly mindsets interfere with the interpretation of Scripture and the ability to apply Scripture to one's life.<sup>4</sup> More

---

<sup>4</sup> The term "mindsets" will refer to an attitude or disposition that is of the flesh or world throughout this dissertation versus the righteous mindset, which is the mind renewed by the Holy Spirit who gives insight into the mind of Christ and enablement to think like Jesus. In this dissertation, mindsets are first explored from the perspective of the biblical canon's vast employment of terms pertaining to man's nature, the mind, and cognitive

than a bias, mindsets are habitual or innate mental attitudes that determine how one will interpret life situations and the Word of God. Within the fabric of the surrounding culture and the culture of one's mind—mindsets can cause one to misinterpret Scripture and miss God because mindsets are ultimately unbelief. One cannot simultaneously believe one's own thoughts and God's if one's thoughts are contrary to the Word of God. Mindsets can prevent unbelievers and believers from rightly dividing the Word of God. "Take care, brothers, lest there be in any of you an evil, unbelieving heart, leading you to fall away from the living God" (Heb 12:3). The heart/mind of man is evil all the time (Gen 6:5), hindering the ability to understand the Word of truth, which is spiritually discerned (1 Cor 2:14).<sup>5</sup> The mind of man requires transformation by the Spirit of God to be able to know the will of God (Rom 12:2). Throughout Scripture, the metanarrative of the need for mind renewal is evident, revealing the significant role that mindsets play in a believer's understanding of the canon, which has implications for biblical interpretation, application, and evangelism.

### Mind Over Matter

One of the world's prescriptions for navigating the human condition and problems in a fallen world is to apply the concept of mind over matter. The world advises people to think differently about life's problems and to set their minds to overcome them. Growth mindsets and positive mindsets are touted as solutions in the surrounding psychological culture, but these strategies require willpower to be able to think rightly about a circumstance to overcome it.

---

aspects of life, then as a motif throughout the biblical narrative, pointing to the mind of Christ as the biblical storyline depicts the struggle the biblical characters had to maintain a godly mindset.

<sup>5</sup> Throughout this dissertation heart/mind will be used interchangeably, reflecting the OT (heart) and NT (mind) usage of these terms, which are synonymous.

Before behavior is evident, mindsets are behind every deed and belief system of man. Mindsets become habitual, a part of one's identity. The Hebrew term דְרֵכַי (*dě'rěk*) illustrates this. It means manner, custom, behavior, depicting the way or custom in which people live. The pull of culture is strong and yields pressure to conform to the surrounding context.<sup>6</sup> Despite Yahweh warning his people to not conform to the customs of the world, the power of mindset to adhere to customs is strong.<sup>7</sup> Ultimately, the whole earth that was corrupted by following corrupt "ways" or mindsets of God's people. "God saw how corrupt the earth had become, for all the people on earth had corrupted their *ways*" (Gen 6:12, NIV). The way of God's people is led by their mindsets and influenced by the customs of the surrounding culture. The answer to this temptation in one's mind is given by Isaiah, who exhorts God's people to forsake their own way. "Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts; let him return to the LORD, that he may have compassion on him, and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon" (Isa 55:7). Ultimately, one's ways or actions emanate from one's inner being. "An action and its consequences cannot be distinguished from a central concept of soul (man does not have a *nephesh*, he is *nephesh*) ... the actions are not sent away from the soul, they are the outer manifestations of the whole of the soul, the traces of its movements; its 'ways.'"<sup>8</sup> Ultimately, it is the task of God's people who were created in the image of God as image bearers to convert their ways and thoughts to God's (Isa 55:8–9), but this task of conversion is performed through renewal the Holy Spirit wields while God's people yield. The matters of the world and the matter within the world are overcome through obedience to God's way over men.

---

<sup>6</sup> HALOT, s.v. "דְרֵכַי," 232.

<sup>7</sup> See Lev 18:3; 20:23; Deut 18:9; 2 Kgs 17:8, 26; Isa 2:6; 8:11–13; Jer 10:3; 15:19.

<sup>8</sup> K. Koch et al., "דְרֵכַי," TDOT, 272.

The human mind and will are void of power apart from the Holy Spirit, and thoughts of the flesh are unable to transform the mind. Fluid mindset changes further complicate the ability of mankind to faithfully choose wisely and consistently. The core belief framework of one's mindset determines the thought processes and decisions one makes, but no human can craft a mindset that can overcome evil apart from the grace of God. The fallible mind of man is unable to think rightly or righteously about any matter, let alone to rightly divide the Word of God, pointing to the need for mind renewal. Mind renewal is only possible with the aid of the Holy Spirit and the living Word of God, which can help God's people to walk in the mind of Christ. In addition to the known presuppositions or biases one has as one approaches the Word of God, mindsets are also vehicles for covert presuppositions, wielding a powerful deception by influencing the minds of masses, often unrecognized. Maintaining a mindset that loves God is no simple matter.

### The Shema: The Significance of the Greatest Commandment

God chose and called his people into a relationship with him through a covenant (Deut 28) that was based on God's faithful love for his people and the faithfulness of man to love God, which is determined by their mindset.<sup>9</sup> God's greatest command, known as the Shema in the OT

---

<sup>9</sup> This covenant that Yahweh made with his people was akin to the covenants within the ANE culture, a suzerain-vassal treaty in which expectations were set in a conditional covenant between a god and man. The first and the last commandments reveal that the heart is at the center of this covenantal relationship in the sovereign vassal treaty between Yahweh and his people. Though the remaining commandments direct the external behavior, all Ten Commandments represent the heart of the covenant relationship. The Shema captures the core principles of God's commandments, and as Jesus said, was the greatest commandment. In a relationship with Yahweh, God's people are held accountable for the internal culture of their mind and heart; the motive which leads to one's external actions. To covet is to accuse God of insufficient provision and goodness. To love anything or anyone more than God is to have an idol, leading to syncretism. Yahweh chose his people and delivered them, then commanded them to maintain an attitude (mindset) of undivided devotion to him. Roy B. Zuck, *A Biblical Theology of the Old Testament* (Chicago, IL: Moody Press, 1991), 37, 40, 68, 78. In the case of this truly unique covenant that Yahweh had with his people, Yahweh fulfilled what man could not.

(Deut 6:4–5) and as the greatest commandment in the synoptic gospel accounts (Matt 22:36–40 // Mark 12:30 // Luke 10:27), is reiterated with varying terminology throughout the canon displaying how love for God is to be made manifest with all one’s heart, mind, and soul (Deut 4:29; 6:5; 10:12; 11:13; 26:16; 30:2, 6, 10; Josh 22:5; 23:14; 1 Kgs 2:4; 8:48; 2 Kgs 23:3; 1 Chr 22:19; 28:9; 2 Chr 6:38). The parallelism employed in the three terms are synonymous, intensifying the involvement of the entire being.<sup>10</sup> God’s people are to love him with all their heart (loyalty), soul (all your life, connoting commitment), strength (all your wealth, all you own or have), and mind (NT, indicating thoughts, intellect, will).<sup>11</sup> The anthropological terms of soul, spirit, heart, and strength in the Shema all refer to the same whole living being and simultaneously components of a mindset—one’s mind or heart, where cognitive processes occur, including one’s emotions, one’s soul or spirit, and one’s will. But man is more than just a sum of anthropological parts. Man’s significance is tied to his maker. As Calvin noted, “Though the principal seat of the divine image was in the mind and heart, or in the soul and its faculties, yet there was no part of man, not even the body, which was not adorned with some rays of his glory” (Calvin, *Institutes*, I.15.3).<sup>12</sup> The significance of the Shema is that loving God depends upon one’s mindset.<sup>13</sup> The overlap in some of the terms employed in the Shema (Deut 6:4–5) makes it

---

<sup>10</sup> Horst Seebass, “שָׁמַרְתָּ,” *TDOT* 9:511.

<sup>11</sup> The Midrash Sifre Deuteronomy interprets *lēbāb*, *ně’pěš*, and *me’ōd* as separate yet collectively taken together to convey what loving God encompasses. S. D. McBride, “The Yoke of the Kingdom: An Exposition of Deuteronomy 6:4–5,” *Int* 27 (1973): 303.

<sup>12</sup> Calvin affirms the Hebraic-Biblical sense of man's unity. In addition, the Augustinian view of God's image in man gives insight into the anthropological significance of man's heart and mind. Reinhold Niebuhr, *The Nature and Destiny of Man: A Christian Interpretation* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2021), 289.

<sup>13</sup> In a polytheistic culture, syncretism impeded devotion to God. God’s people could not love God with all their being if they were worshiping multiple gods. The Shema resounds with the message that there is one God, not many, and his requirements are internal, vastly different from the “gods” of the surrounding culture. Yahweh sought a relationship with his people that was based on love and his righteousness. One’s mindset determines whether they

difficult to differentiate between them, but perhaps the purpose was not differentiation but unity of one's being in the pursuit of God. Before one can consider the mindset of man, one must consider what the mind is and how it differs from the heart, soul, and spirit. Are they one and the same? If the mind and heart are synonymous, why are these terms mentioned separately? And why are the anthropological terminology components of the mind different in the repetition of the Shema in other Scriptures across the canon? If the greatest commandment depends upon a renewed mindset, then understanding the human mind is also of paramount importance.

### **The “Heart” of the Matter: Anthropological Terminology**

The clarion call and greatest command to love God with all one's being is set in man's heart by God and dependent upon the mindset of man. Loving created things could never satisfy the need for one's creator. Nothing in the culture could satisfy the God-shaped hole and need in man's heart, though man's heart is easily led astray. “The real situation is that man who is made in the image of God is unable, precisely because of those qualities in him which are designated as “image of God,” to be satisfied with a god who is made in man's image.”<sup>14</sup> Through anthropological terms, the love of man toward God is conveyed. The significance of these terms is not necessarily in the terms themselves but in what they represent theologically and the implications of these terms as man relates to God. The Hebraic understanding of human nature progressed even as the progressive revelation of Christ crystallized the understanding of man's inner being Christologically, which will be explored in chapter five.

---

will walk faithfully with God in this relationship expressed in the Shema and woven throughout Scripture as the command that expresses the relationship between Yahweh and his people.

<sup>14</sup> Niebuhr, *The Nature and Destiny of Man*, 299.

## Old Testament Terminology

To understand mindsets, one must understand what the mind (or heart) is in both the OT and NT. The OT view of human nature differs from the Greek and modern views of man.<sup>15</sup> The varying anthropological terms employed in both the OT and NT can muddy the water in determining the nature of man, which leads to theological debates atomizing the biblical text and has implications for how mindsets are formed, impacting the interpretation of Scripture.<sup>16</sup>

Niebuhr depicts the gradual understanding of Hebraic thought concerning the nature of man:

At first distinctions are gradually made. At first both *ruach*, and *nephesh* mean little more than “breath”; but they are gradually distinguished and *ruach* becomes roughly synonymous with spirit, or *nous* and *nephesh* with soul or psyche. But unlike Greek thought, this distinction does not lead to dualistic consequences. The monism of the biblical view is something other than the failure to differentiate *physis*, *psyche*, and *nous*, which characterized Greek thought before Anaxagoras; nor is it merely the consequence of an undeveloped psychology. It is ultimately derived from the Biblical view of God, as a creator, and of the Biblical faith in the goodness of creation.<sup>17</sup>

The primary metaphorical anthropological concepts depicted in the OT—“heart” לֵב (*lēb*), “soul or living being” נֶפֶשׁ (*népēš*), “spirit” רוּחַ (*rūah*), and flesh בָּשָׂר (*bāśār*)—are to be understood wholly and theologically, not just compartmentalized physical or spiritual attributes.<sup>18</sup> Further, these terms convey man as he relates to Yahweh in a relationship. They are

---

<sup>15</sup> Walter Brueggemann, *TOTTA*, 453.

<sup>16</sup> See Appendix B for a discussion on the mind-body problem.

<sup>17</sup> Niebuhr, *The Nature and Destiny of Man*, 42. Through Anaxagoras’ quest for a rational principle to understand the material world, he developed his concept of the nous, meaning “mind,” but Anaxagoras did not include God in his concept of nous. Certainly, understanding the cognition of man would need to rely on the one who created man. R. C. Sproul, *The Consequences of Ideas: Understanding the Concepts That Shaped Our World* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2000), 25–26.

<sup>18</sup> Brueggemann, *TOTTA*, 453. When a key term is introduced in this dissertation, it is provided with the original Hebrew or Greek, a transliteration, and a general translation. Afterward, only the Hebrew/Greek will be used in the body.

not merely terms to describe a human in isolation.<sup>19</sup> Attribution of inner qualities through human organs provided a tangible way of expressing the inward soul, a means to communicate the spiritual aspects of the mind of man through his physical body. The anthropological terms in the Shema are ultimately parallelism, placing emphasis on the devotion man is to have by conveying the same concept: love God with all your being. This is not a tripartite view, though the emphasis on different terminology could portray the relationship between God and man for life (spirit), existence as a human being (soul), and existence in a physical world (body).

Throughout the OT, man is conveyed in psychosomatic terms, which are elements of his identity and reveal how his mind functions.<sup>20</sup> Occurring 270 times in the OT, the term בָּשָׂר conveys the substance of man, the flesh, whereas the other three components of the nature of man reveal the inner workings of man that shape his mindset.<sup>21</sup> Though בָּשָׂר only refers to man, never to God, and refers to animals the most in Leviticus as sacrifices.<sup>22</sup> It is man's inner being that directs the outer being. In Deuteronomy 6:5, the three-pronged human nature is heart, soul, and might (מְאֵד [me 'ōd]), though the term “might” is also indicative of the expression of one's will and could be attributed to the mind (heart).<sup>23</sup> In Deuteronomy 13:3, the two terms “heart” (לֵב) and “soul” (נֶפֶשׁ) are the only two terms repeated, but the implications of these two anthropological terms are unfolded in Deuteronomy 13:4, where knowing and loving God

---

<sup>19</sup> Ibid., 453.

<sup>20</sup> Bruce K. Waltke and Charles Yu, *OTT*, 224.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid.

<sup>22</sup> Hans Walter Wolff, *Anthropology of the Old Testament*, trans. Margaret Kohl (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1974), 26, 32.

<sup>23</sup> This word מְאֵד means “completely.” The relationship with Yahweh is a committed covenantal love that is not to have one's attention divided. David J. A. Clines, ed., *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew: English–Hebrew Index*; Word Frequency Table, vol. IX (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2016), 91.



produces behavior that is like God (walk after the LORD your God), הָלַךְ (*hālāk*), is seen by how God's people fear him יָרָא (*yr'*), obey him by keeping his commandments שָׁמַר (*šāmār*) and serving him עָבַד (*‘ābād*). The anthropological terms are not just defining man, but showing how he must love God in his relationship with him.

### The Gospels' Usage of Old Testament Terminology

The repetition of part of the Shema as the greatest commandment in the three synoptic gospel accounts also varies (Matt 22:37 // Mark 12:30 // Luke 10:27). The preposition employed with heart, soul, and mind differs in these gospel accounts as well as the anthropologic terminology utilized.<sup>24</sup> The overlap of some of the terms employed in the gospels and OT repetition of the Shema points to parallel synonymous meanings of the terms such as mind and heart. Communicating the heavenly commitment that loving a Holy God requires in human language necessitates the repetition of similar terms for increased emphasis that aids in understanding what loving God encompasses.

In Mark's recitation of Deuteronomy 6:5 in Mark 12:30, loving God is with all one's heart καρδία (*kardia*), all one's soul ψυχή (*psyche*), and all one's mind διάνοια (*dianoia*), which utilizes these terms in a perfect parallel. Schweizer states that ψυχή in Mark 12:30 is close to the strength of will, and the LXX version focuses on inwardness (ἐξ).<sup>25</sup> Mark's omission of ψυχή in Mark 12:33 conveys the thought that the heart and soul are not distinct from one another (see Acts 4:32 for a similar parallel). Mark also adds the terms συνήμι (*syniēmi*) in Mark 12:33,

---

<sup>24</sup> Matthew employs the same preposition for the heart, soul, and mind (ἐν) in Matt 22:37, while the parallel account in Mark utilizes the preposition (ἐξ), the same as the LXX, and Luke utilizes a different preposition for the heart (ἐν) than soul and mind (ἐξ). While the LXX utilizes heart, soul, and strength, Mark and Luke utilize the heart, soul, mind, and strength, and Matthew utilizes the heart, soul, and mind.

<sup>25</sup> Eduard Schweizer, "Ψυχή," *TDNT* 9:641.

meaning understanding, adding an element of cognition, and strength *ισχύω* (*ischyō*).<sup>26</sup> Heart and soul were viewed in parallel, symbolically, figuratively, and practically (*καρδία καὶ ψυχή μία*) in both Greek and OT usage.<sup>27</sup> Schweizer notes the difference between the Jewish and Hellenistic views of the spirit inside a man.

When the Jew spoke anthropologically of the holy “spirit” to denote the divinely given spiritual existence of man, which is for him so important, the Hellenist naturally found here the idea of a soul which has come down from the divine sphere, is imprisoned in the body and will mount up again to the divine sphere after death.<sup>28</sup>

The Greeks' dualistic emphasis treated the soul as immaterial and separate from the human being, which was not the Hebrew view. This makes it impossible for a human to love God as one, for the divided living being cannot love with a whole heart (being). The *ψυχή* is a term for the whole man, which is limited by death but is not separate from one's being. A soul is a being. Where the Greek world sees the soul as liberated at death, the Christian anthropological view views the totality and unity of man as upheld, not separated, at death.

McConville highlights the conundrum of the differing terminology and how to determine meaning. He offers the example of Psalm 73:21, where the term for the heart, *בֶּלֶב*, is accompanied by another term, *הַכִּלְיָיִם* (literally meaning “my kidneys”). This conveys a complete picture of the

---

<sup>26</sup> This term *ισχύω* is used for Jewish offerings, bringing to light that loving God is evidenced by being a wholly living sacrifice for God. Johannes Behm, “Θύω,” *TDNT* 3:180–191. This love for God is expressed by also loving man and is of greater significance than any other sacrifice. Mark's repetition of the Shema seems to illustrate a progression from the four-membered version: *καρδία* — *ψυχή* — *διάνοια* — *ισχύς*, to a three-membered: *καρδία* — *σύνεσις* — *ισχύς* in Mark 12:30, 33, illustrating the fruit of loving God with all one's being will yield understanding and wholeness. Hans Conzelmann, “Συνήμι,” *TDNT* 7:788–896. The focus is not on the terms themselves but on what such love looks like. The progression is also thought to show Hellenistic influence, which would help the audience to replace their perceptions of these anthropological terms with a Christological one.

<sup>27</sup> Schweizer, “Ψυχή,” *TDNT* 9:641.

<sup>28</sup> Eduard Schweizer, “Πνεῦμα,” *TDNT* 6:392. In Genesis, man is viewed in anthropological terms as an individual, but it is noteworthy to consider that anthropological terms ascribed to individuals were not common in the OT because Israel was viewed as a community in a covenant context. Zuck, *BTOT*, 72.

psalmist's inmost being. The term  $\text{קְלֵי־לֵב}$  is translated in the NIV as "spirit," but the RSV and NRSV translate it as "heart" and render the translation "soul" for  $\text{לֵב}$ .<sup>29</sup> Are these terms all interchangeable? Are they one and the same, yet expressing different qualities within the same mind? The Hebrew view of the heart was that it was the most significant organ, most significantly used to depict intellect and reason, occurring in wisdom literature the most.<sup>30</sup> The seeming confusion of similar lexical terms is compounded by the difficulty of conveying heavenly terms through human language, which is not static and varies depending on the context. The psalms utilize imagery and a semantic range of terms to reveal the human condition as demonstrated by the intellect, ethics, and physical aspects of the psalmist's life, which cannot be perfectly defined by a lexicon.<sup>31</sup> The heart, mind, and soul are felt through the biblical narrative. One typically thinks of the mind as the place where thinking takes place, the heart as the place where emotions and the will are exercised, and the body as the place for acting on one's belief. But these diverse elements are three-in-one, much like God is three persons yet united, and much like the body of Christ, which has many different parts, yet it is still one body. So then, the mind is where one reasons and discerns, but it is also where the soul and spirit reside, as well.<sup>32</sup>

The NT utilizes the term  $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$  for the soul to depict an array of meanings: the natural physical life, life after death, the whole man, the heart, where emotions reside, and as one's true

---

<sup>29</sup> J. Gordon McConville, *Being Human in God's World: An Old Testament Theology of Humanity* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2016), 46.

<sup>30</sup> Wolff, *Anthropology of the Old Testament*, 47.

<sup>31</sup> Ibid.

<sup>32</sup> The different anthropological views are also evident in pseudepigrapha. The dualist stance, also known as *dichotomist* or *dipartite*, views the terms "soul" and "spirit" as synonymous and as immaterial aspects of a human being. The tripartite view (*trichotomist*) sees "soul" and "spirit" as two distinct immaterial parts. Jan A. Sigvartsen, *Afterlife, and Resurrection Beliefs in the Pseudepigrapha*, JCTC 29 (New York, NY: T&T Clark, 2019), 149.

life.<sup>33</sup> Schweizer distinguishes clearly between ψυχή (soul) and πνεῦμα (spirit), citing the soul as the human being, whether pagan or disciple and correlates the term for the soul with the OT term for the heart. Further, the ψυχή is distinct as the place where one chooses to accept or deny Jesus as their Savior. In the Hebrew view, man is one being, often depicted with three or four different terms, in which the πνεῦμα and ψυχή are separated, inferring a threefold division of man into body (σῶμα), soul (ψυχή), and spirit (πνεῦμα), yet man was still considered holistically as one being.

Plato was a proponent of the threefold soul, a theory put forth in *Phaedrus* 246, in the myth of the soul's chariot in which the location of the three different parts of the body is expressed in the later triad of νοῦς-ψυχή-σῶμα. But Schweizer notes that this is not a true trichotomy, for the νοῦς is not differentiated from the soul.<sup>34</sup> Philo of Alexandria applied Platonic thought to his interpretation of the biblical account of Genesis.<sup>35</sup> In contrast to the Platonic ideal, the anthropological terms of man in the OT, נֶפֶשׁ (soul), רוּחַ (spirit), and לֵב/לֵבָב (heart), are one and the same, conveying a living being created in the image of God whose image and purpose is intertextually linked to God's salvation narrative in Scripture and purpose

---

<sup>33</sup> Schweizer, “Ψυχή,” *TDNT* 9:637–643.

<sup>34</sup> Schweizer, “Πνεῦμα,” *TDNT* 6:390–455.

<sup>35</sup> “We must observe, then, that our soul is threefold, and has one part that is the seat of reason, another that is the seat of high spirit, and another that is the seat of desire. And we discover that the head is the place and abode of the reasonable part, the breast of the passionate part, the abdomen of the lustful part; and that to each of the parts a virtue proper to it has been attached; prudence to the reasonable part, for it belongs to reason to have knowledge of the things we ought to do and of the things we ought not; courage to the passionate part; and self-mastery to the lustful part. For it is by self-mastery that we heal and cure our desires.” (Philo, *Creation* 2.70).

for the cosmos.<sup>36</sup> The term  $\text{נַפְשׁ}$  refers to the whole person, more than just a soul in the OT.<sup>37</sup> Man does not “have” a  $\text{נַפְשׁ}$ ; he is a  $\text{נַפְשׁ}$ , a physical being that God breathed life into. Paul spoke about the three aspects of man that God sanctifies: the spirit, soul, and body. “Now may the God of peace himself sanctify you completely and may your whole spirit and soul and body be kept blameless at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ” (1 Thess 5:23–28). Paul was not speaking to different parts of man but emphasizing that all of man was to be sanctified—from thoughts to deeds.

According to Christian anthropology, Christ is the true image of God, fully human yet fully God (Col 1:15; Heb 2:6–9).<sup>38</sup> Paul’s anthropological terms echo the understanding of these terms in the OT. The Holy Spirit cannot be confined to a psychological understanding, and the Holy Spirit affects the whole man.<sup>39</sup> Paul’s anthropological view of  $\text{πνεῦμα}$  parallels  $\text{ψυχή}$ .<sup>40</sup> The term  $\text{πνεῦμα}$  is used primarily to depict the psychical functions of man alongside  $\text{σῶμα}$  and  $\text{σάρξ}$  (see 1 Cor 7:34; 2 Cor 7:1; Col 2:5).<sup>41</sup> Paul adopts the Jewish use of  $\text{πνεῦμα}$  as God-given and as a psychological term, as evidenced by his differentiating between  $\text{πνεῦμα}$  and  $\text{νοῦς}$  (1 Cor

---

<sup>36</sup> Waltke, *OTT*, 228.

<sup>37</sup> William Dyrness connects how the term *nēpēš* is characteristically translated as “throat,” which depicts the rendering of this term as the seat of appetites, as a desire to be fulfilled. William Dyrness, *Themes in Old Testament Theology* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 1977), 85.

<sup>38</sup> Niels Henrik Gregersen, “Introduction: J. Wentzel van Huyssteen and Interdisciplinary Theology,” in *Human Origins and the Image of God: Essays in Honor of J. Wentzel van Huyssteen*, ed. Daniel Pedersen, and Christopher Lilley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2017), 21.

<sup>39</sup> Schweizer, “ $\text{πνεῦμα}$ ,” *TDNT* 6:434.

<sup>40</sup> There is some confusion as to whether  $\text{πνεῦμα}$  refers to the spirit of man or the Holy Spirit. Ultimately, the “spirit” of human beings is the life-giving *breath* from God  $\text{נְשָׁמָה}$  (*neshamah*) in man (Gen 2:7) or  $\text{רוּחַ}$  (*rûah*) in creatures (Gen 6:17) or translated as spirit. Wolff noted that breath was correlated to mindset. “The rise and fall of the breath is namely in the first place to be seen together with the movement of the feelings” and “attitudes of mind.” Wolff, *Anthropology of the Old Testament*, 36–37.

<sup>41</sup> Schweizer, “ $\text{πνεῦμα}$ ,” *TDNT* 6:434–5.

14:14).<sup>42</sup> His avoidance of *πνεῦμα* when depicting the innermost “I” of the pre-Christian man also underscores his anthropological views.<sup>43</sup>

The various anthropological terms emanating from the Shema convey what the substance of a mind is. God’s people are called to love the LORD their God with all their heart לֵבָב, which shows their intellect, will, and affection; with all their soul נַפְשׁוֹ, which is indicative of their whole life; and with all their power כֹּחַ, which implies to one’s full capacity.<sup>44</sup> These terms collectively display the functions of the mind in the whole-hearted devotion man should have toward God, making one’s mindset essential to holy living. Humans are more than a host of terms depicting them or the behaviors they are defined by. The most significant aspect of the nature of man is that he is made in the image of God, and despite his tendency toward sin, he can be transformed by the Holy Spirit and have the mind of Christ.<sup>45</sup>

#### Anthropological Considerations and Implications

OT thought was a far cry from today’s psychological paradigm. The concept of man and mindsets from a Hebrew perspective was focused on determining the differences in various psychic processes, not an analysis of the psychological terms or phenomena themselves.<sup>46</sup> This

---

<sup>42</sup> Schweizer, “*πνεῦμα*,” *TDNT* 6:435.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, 6:436.

<sup>44</sup> The three anthropological terms of Deut 6:5 are concentric, forming a parallelism. According to McBride, the term *me’ōd* is a hapax, occurring only twice in this expression, implying “excess, muchness,” which conveys the superlative nature of devotion to Yahweh that is complete. McBride, “The Yoke of the Kingdom,” 304.

<sup>45</sup> In the study of theological anthropology, the separation of soul and body in the dualistic cartesian view has significant implications. For if the soul is separate from the body, how is the body to be resurrected? Paul proved the resurrection of the whole person in 1 Cor 15:42–45. Just as Christ was bodily resurrected, so will those who believe in Christ be bodily resurrected. Only in having a holistic perspective is the human being best understood as one creation by one God.

<sup>46</sup> Walther Eichrodt, *TOT*, vol. 1, OTL 2, 147.

approach resulted in a host of psychological terms and phrases to attempt to convey the spiritual and cognitive inner workings of the mind/heart without formulating the concept of mindset into one framework.<sup>47</sup> The Hebrew view of human nature was holistic; each part of man was part of the whole, not compartmentalized disconnected terms.<sup>48</sup> This holistic view of man hinges on the *Locus Classicus of Hebrew Bible Anthropology*, namely Genesis 2:7, which has served as a proof text for the holistic view, underscored by the term נִפְשׁ in this verse, which has been interpreted as one being.<sup>49</sup> “And the LORD God formed man of the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living being (נִפְשׁ חַיָּה).” The varying terms, such as נִפְשׁ and רִיָּה represent the whole life of the person from different vantage points.<sup>50</sup> When these anthropological terms are translated as “heart,” “soul,” “flesh,” and “spirit,” in the LXX it can lead to the errant doctrine of dichotomic or trichotomic anthropology, which puts these parts of a being in opposition to one another.<sup>51</sup> Mankind has a physical body and a spiritual component (soul or spirit), which are not considered to be separate and opposing aspects of man.

Mindsets can steer the whole being away from loving one’s creator and understanding the mind of God, making mind renewal essential to God’s plan of salvation. This salvation is for the redemption of the whole being, not just one’s soul. Scripture cannot be understood from a carnal

---

<sup>47</sup> Ibid.

<sup>48</sup> Ibid. See Appendix B for a discussion on the mind-body problem.

<sup>49</sup> Richard Pleijel, “To Be or to Have a Nephesh?” *ZAW* 131 (2019): 194.

<sup>50</sup> Eichrodt, *TOT*, 148. The term “living being” in Gen 2:7 is also rendered as “soul” (KJV, ASV), “creature” (ESV), or “being” (NASB, NIV, NKJV, CSB, NET), in which the context displays that the same term נִפְשׁ is used to depict land animals (Gen 1:24), sea creatures (Gen 1:20–21), and avians (Gen 2:19). This is not to place human beings on the same level as the animals but to show that this term refers to a living being. Man made in the image of God distinguishes mankind from the rest of creation.

<sup>51</sup> Wolff, *Anthropology of the Old Testament*, 7.

mindset. The mind of mankind needs to be renewed. VanGemeren states the significance of misinterpretation of Scripture due to approaching Scripture from a carnal mindset. “When that which is said figuratively is taken as though it were literal, it is understood carnally . . . there is a miserable servitude of the spirit in this habit of taking signs for things so that one is not able to raise the eye of the mind above things that are corporeal and created to drink in eternal light.”<sup>52</sup> The renewal of the mind affects the whole being, and the terms depicting man are to be taken as pronouns defining the core of one’s inner being as it applies to the chief mandate of his existence: to love God with all his being. Managing one’s mindset is necessary to fulfill the Shema and rightly interpret and apply the Word of God. Every person will stand before God alone—the goal is that God’s people would stand firm even if the whole world is opposite. *Si omnes, ego non* (though all, yet not I).<sup>53</sup>

### **What’s the Matter?**

As the anthropological terms employed illustrate the relationship man is to have with God, Scripture also conveys the relationship man has with his own mind. What is it that leads to mindsets? How can man alter the course of his own mind? Examining the origin of mindsets reveals that man does have a choice and is not enslaved by his own mind. Deuteronomy 15:9 provides a good case study and example of biblical principles that help to guard against mindsets. Contained in the section on laws regarding how to treat the poor, God’s people are held accountable for how they think about following God’s laws and subsequently act by fulfilling or not fulfilling God’s desire for social justice and mercy for the poor.

---

<sup>52</sup> Willem VanGemeren, *NIDOTTE*, 16.

<sup>53</sup> Wolff, *Anthropology of the Old Testament*, 222.



## The Origin of Mindsets

The origin of mindsets begins with an errant or deceptive thought, idea, or matter that becomes entrenched and unyielding to God’s Word. Entertaining wicked thoughts turns into an attitude or a mindset, culminating in an action. The NET translation of Deuteronomy 15:9a demonstrates the progression of thoughts to attitude and subsequent action: “Be careful (שָׁמַר) lest you *entertain the wicked thought* (דָּבַר) that the seventh year, the year of cancellation of debts, has almost arrived, and your *attitude* (עֵינֶן) be wrong toward your impoverished fellow Israelite, and you do not lend him anything; he will cry out to the LORD against you, and you will be regarded as having sinned.” There are many significant principles about mindsets found in this one verse.

### Mindsets are Sin

First, it is significant that the thought/mindset depicted in Deuteronomy 15:9a is considered a sin (wicked). Mindsets are not just personal opinions. They are against God’s standards and Word. Moses counsels the people of God to guard themselves against allowing wicked thoughts to become their *attitude* (mindset) and to be aware of their senses and thoughts. The term שָׁמַר (*shamar*) means “to be on one’s guard, beware,” and in Amorite *zmr/dmr* means to protect.<sup>54</sup> One is not a victim of one’s thoughts. If one is not guarding one’s mind and filtering through the thoughts knocking at the door of one’s mind, thoughts can lead to mindsets and sin. David illustrated the significance of examining his thoughts, but more than that, of asking God to help examine his thoughts (Ps 139:1, 2; 23–4). It was prizing God’s thoughts that revealed that David’s thoughts needed redemption (Ps 139:17). In Psalm 139:1 and 139:23, different terms are

---

<sup>54</sup> HALOT, s.v. “שָׁמַר,” 1581.

used for the word rendered “thoughts.” In Psalm 139:2, David uses the word רָעַ (rēʿ), which is rendered as want, purpose, or thoughts that are in one’s mind, and in certain phrases, this word means mind or heart. But in Psalm 139:23, David uses the term שְׁעִיפִים (sé’ippim), also in Psalm 94:19 and Job 20:2, meaning *disquieting thoughts*.<sup>55</sup> “Search me, O God, and know my heart: try me and know my thoughts (שְׁעִיפִים) and see if there be any grievous way דְּרֵעַ (dēreʿ) in me, and lead me in the way (דְּרֵעַ) everlasting” (Ps 139:23–4)! The use of שְׁעִיפִים in Psalm 139:23 is thought to also be related to its use in 1 Kings 18:21, with the meaning “divided opinion” when Elijah asked the people how long they would be waffling between two opinions—follow God or Ba’al. Thoughts in and of themselves are not always sinful, but choosing to meditate on worldly thoughts reinforces those thoughts to become mindsets that oppose God, which is sinful and a divided heart. Disquieting or anxious thoughts are an indication that one’s mind is divided.

Not knowing God’s thoughts leads to destruction (Mic 4:12). Guarding one’s thought life preserves one’s life. The phrase, “What would Jesus Do?” is a significant reminder, but “What would Jesus think?” is a better filter through which to examine one’s thoughts, for thoughts lead to actions. *HALOT* applies this term שְׁמַר to one’s senses anthropologically: “To keep watch on your spirit, or alternatively on your feelings; NRSV: look to yourselves (Mal 2:15f).<sup>56</sup>

---

<sup>55</sup> Clines, “שְׁעִיפִים,” *The Concise Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*, 439. The Greek parallels for שְׁעִיפִים are, according to *L&N* 31.1, φρονέω, κρίνω, λογίζομαι, ἠγέομαι, and ἔχω, meaning “to hold a view or have an opinion with regard to something.” This is what makes mindsets so tenacious. They are an exercising of one’s will to hold onto a way of thinking that is counter to God; they are rebellion within one’s own mind. *L&N*, s.v. “φρονέω,” 1.364

<sup>56</sup> *HALOT*, s.v. “שְׁמַר,” 1584.

## Mindsets Begin with Words

The term used to depict thoughts in Deuteronomy 15:9a is דָּבַר (*dābār*), meaning word, speaking, thing, or matter.<sup>57</sup> The noun and verb of this term are of primary significance, occurring more than 2,500 times in the OT, at least 1,400 times for the noun and 1,100 for the verb.<sup>58</sup> The use of this term is revealing, conveying the significance of words, but more than that, a sense of thought processes, and revealing that every “thing” or “matter” needs to be examined through the Word of God.<sup>59</sup> A close synonym to דָּבַר is אָמַר (*ʾmr*), which reveals that דָּבַר is the result of אָמַר. Thoughts matter because they are ultimately spoken and acted upon. Although אָמַר “to say” is the closest synonym to דָּבַר, it is the opposite of דָּבַר (Piel). The focal point of אָמַר is about *what* is spoken, whereas דָּבַר is primarily focused on the *action* of speaking and the production of words and clauses.<sup>60</sup> It is words or ideas that corrupt or build up the mind. The Word of God can transform and heal minds from the words of man and the things of this world that corrupt one’s will and thoughts. The meaning of circumcision of one’s lips or mouth becomes apparent when the significance of words is revealed. Words from one’s heart/mind are spoken by the tongue, which is a world of evil (Jas 3:6). Built from the root *ʾmr*, *ʾamar* depicts the thoughts before they become actions. One example of a phrase employing this term is the expression *ʾamar ʾel libbo*, meaning “speak to his heart.” The term *ʾamar* is utilized in the sense of “thinking” in the OT, a cognitive function meaning “to consider,” “to discuss,” or “to reflect,”

---

<sup>57</sup> Earl S. Kalland, “דָּבַר,” *TWOT*, 178.

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*, 179.

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid.*

the activity preceding a decision.<sup>61</sup> In ANE literature, the heart was the source of all words and thoughts. “It is the heart that is responsible for all knowledge; it is the tongue that repeats that which is conceived in the heart.”<sup>62</sup> The term דבר most often refers to words that are spoken, but it can also indicate thinking about an event or situation.<sup>63</sup> This is perhaps why meditation is significant for mindset renewal. Ruminating on one’s thoughts rather than meditating on God’s thoughts leads to worldly mindsets fixed on sin rather than dwelling on the Word of God, which leads to the mind of Christ. Herein is a significant finding: mindsets form from thoughts, which form from words, ideas, and matter. Information or data received is converted to understanding through one’s thought process, which gives the data meaning. If matter is considered according to the things of man, it can lead to errant interpretation and misapplication of God’s Word.

### **Mindsets are Driven by One’s Senses**

The third term in Deuteronomy 15:9a of significance that is part of the mindset process is עין (‘*ayin*), which is a general Semitic term and may also mean “source.” In Ugaritic, ‘*yn* means “to behold.”<sup>64</sup> This term is also translated as “eye,” but more than the physical eye or senses is inferred by this word, which can also represent the progression of seeing and, metaphorically, of understanding and obedience (Jer 5:21).<sup>65</sup> In the OT, the ear is predominately used metaphorically to convey understanding, but as Carl Schultz said, “The eye is used to express

---

<sup>61</sup> Siegfried Wagner, “אָר,” *TDOT* 1:333.

<sup>62</sup> Jan Bergman, H. Lutzmann, and W. H. Schmidt, “דָּבַר,” *TDOT* 3:87.

<sup>63</sup> Rick Brannan, s.v. “*dbr*,” *LXXHOTLX*, Lexham Research Lexicons (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2020).

<sup>64</sup> Carl Schultz, “עֵין,” *TWOT* 662.

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*

knowledge, character, attitude, inclination, opinion, passion, and response. The eye is a good barometer of the inner thoughts of man.”<sup>66</sup> The senses are an indicator of one’s mindset. What one sees with one’s eyes (אָי) and hears with one’s ears (אָזן [’ōzen]) can become what one idolizes, prizes, or sets one’s mind upon. The eyes represent one’s spiritual faculties and mirror one’s inner being.<sup>67</sup> The eyes of God are everywhere observing the deeds and thoughts of man (Gen 6:8; 1 Kgs 15:11; 16:25; 2 Chr 16:9; Ps 33:18; 34:15; Prov 15:3; Amos 9:8.) The eyes are the precursor to thoughts and actions (Gen 3:5, 7; Num 22:31; 1 Sam 14:28; 2 Kgs 6:17; Ezra 9:8; Ps 13:3; 19:8; 133:2; Jer 5:21; Isa 6:10; 44:18). The senses and words, matter and information received precede the thoughts in one’s mind.

### **Mindsets are Unbelief**

Mindsets based on carnal thinking are sins, driven by one’s senses, that separate man from God and are ultimately unbelief. Believing one’s own outlook or worldview above Scripture is idolatry. The covenant Yahweh made with his people was a relationship in which God’s people were to trust Yahweh. Unbelief causes one to approach the Word of God with a carnal mindset, unable to rightly divide the Word of God.

### **The Crux of the Matter**

The origin of mindsets is fueled by God’s people being swayed by their own reasoning above God’s, often influenced by the surrounding culture, which is ultimately unbelief. The emphasis on man’s reasoning above God’s became heightened during the Enlightenment and has led to modern biblical criticism. Paramount to a mindset that rightly divides the Word of God is a

---

<sup>66</sup> Schultz, “אָי,” *TWOT* 662.

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*, 663.

high view of Scripture that is above mindsets and the worldviews of the interpreter. The world has its own solutions for broken mindsets, but positive thinking and growth mindsets are not the solution. Psychology or man's reasoning is not the answer. Subjugating the Word of God to man's reasoning is not the answer. As the origin of mindsets is revealed, the mind of Christ is unveiled as a biblical mandate and evidence of mind renewal. The attitude and outlook that God intends for his people becomes evident: the mind of Christ—a mindset that is of the Spirit, not the flesh, is necessary and available through the Holy Spirit who transforms the heart of man.

Entrenched in one's own view, mindsets are difficult to affect and often concealed from recognition. Mindsets are automatic and trusted because they are hidden within the person's own mind. But mindsets can be affected by governing one's thoughts through saturating one's mind in Scripture. The renewal of one's mindset is imperative to faithfulness to God and the interpretation of his Word. Without it, one's actions will follow the condition of one's mind. There are an abundance of terms forming a constellation that points the way to the renewed mindset God intends for his people. These are to be explored in the next chapter. Recurring terms, phrases, and idioms are pervasive throughout the OT and NT, a call to maintain one's mindset by remembering the focal point of one's thoughts: God's law.

A mindset is not invisible. It is revealed by one's actions. Paul's indicative-imperative logic in Philippians 2:5–11 reveals the apprehension of the mind of Christ and what is expected of believers. Paul employs an argument that progresses from Christ's behavior to an appeal of what behavior should be exhibited for those who are in Christ.<sup>68</sup> The verb, *φρονεῖτε* is the present imperative active, occurring four times in the NT in 2 Corinthians 13:11 (be of one

---

<sup>68</sup> Thorvald B. Madsen II, "Indicative and Imperative in Paul and Ancient Judaism: A Comparative Study," PhD Diss. (University of Aberdeen, 1998), 5.

mind), Philippians 2:5 (same mindset as Christ), Philippians 3:15 (perfect, mature mind), and Colossians 3:2 (set your minds). Have the same mindset as Christ Jesus. What Christ has done becomes the basis for new living.<sup>69</sup> Christ's mind has been revealed so God's people can know how to walk in that mindset and relate to one another. Paul employs imperatives that reveal what this mind of Christ looks like practically.<sup>70</sup> The mind of Christ is more than ethics and a belief system. It is shown—demonstrated by the character of Christ—humility, wisdom, righteousness, selflessness, and justice. And aided—by the Holy Spirit and the living Word of God.

### The Biblical Motif: The Promise of Mind Renewal

All of Scripture points to the motif of the promise of a new mind/heart and the necessity of thinking like Christ. Only through a renewed mind can God's people be faithful witnesses of God's love for the surrounding culture. Akin to the motif of the seed throughout Scripture that began in Genesis and saw its fulfillment in Christ, the motif of a promise for renewed minds also begins in Genesis (Gen 6:5) and is interwoven throughout the biblical narrative (Deut 30:6, 1 Sam 2:35, Jer 24:7; 31:33; 32:39; Ezek 11:19; 36:26–28) along with the tension of moral failure as God's people struggled in the repeated cycle of apostasy, unable to have the mind of God.

---

<sup>69</sup> Ibid., 6.

<sup>70</sup> Madsen discusses Rudolf Bultmann's four central examples of Paul's logic employed in his imperatives that exemplify what having the mind of Christ looks like. In Rom 6:1–14, Paul states that believers should not live in sin (imperative) because Christ set them free from sin (indicative). Romans 8:1–14 points to walking in the Spirit, not the flesh (imperative), because the law of the Spirit of Christ trumps sin and death. In 1 Cor 6:1–11, Paul's imperative is that God's people should not participate in immorality because they have been washed and sanctified (indicative). Gal 5:16–25 says to walk in the Spirit (imperative) if we live by the Spirit (indicative). Bultmann notes that these four key indicative-imperatives each form an antinomy, but these serve as a comparison and contrast of the mind of Christ versus living in the flesh. Rudolf Bultmann, "The Problem of Ethics in Paul," in *Understanding Paul's Ethics: Twentieth Century Approaches*, ed. Brian S. Rosner, Trans. Christoph W. Stenschke (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 195. In Paul's Capital Correspondence (Rom, 1–2 Cor, and Eph), Paul employs the imperative to encourage believers to have the mind of Christ in order to live in Christ (Rom 8:6; 11:34; 12:2; 1 Cor 2:16; 2 Cor 5:17; 10:5; Eph 4:23).

### The Biblical Metanarrative: The Making of Mindsets

The making of a mindset is subtle and insidious. It happens easily enough because people tend to believe their own thoughts and what is “true” to them. Given that man’s hearts and thoughts are deceitful (Jer 17:9) and that nothing good is in mankind (Rom 3:10), one’s own heart cannot be trusted apart from a new heart only Christ can give. In the Garden of Eden, we see the first subtle making of a worldly mindset in Eve. Eve reasoned in her own mind above the Scripture. All the evil in this world began with a thought first. A thought that became a mindset. Eve misused God’s Word and twisted the Scripture in Genesis 3:1–6. Eve chose to disregard what God had said. She chose her thoughts over God’s, adding to God’s Word. Eve chose religion over her relationship with Yahweh. The enemy framed it up nicely as a “righteous” thing to do, even saying that God knew that it was better for her to make the choice she was going to make and that she would know good and evil. Eve chose what was good in her eyes, not God’s. God rebuked Adam for choosing Eve’s line of thinking above God’s Word. Adam did not correct her misinterpretation or twisting of God’s Word. “Because you have listened to the voice of your wife and have eaten of the tree of which I commanded you, ‘You shall not eat of it,’ cursed is the ground because of you; in pain you shall eat of it all the days of your life” (Gen 3:17). It was not just listening to Eve that was the cause for God’s rebuke but choosing her thinking and mindset above God’s and acting on it. Deception by the enemy is blamed and, to this day, remains a key excuse for worldly mindsets (Gen 3:13), but one can choose how one thinks. As the motif of the renewing of one’s mindset unfolds throughout Scripture, the apostate cycle of God’s people and subsequent discipline points to God’s solution, finally manifest in Christ.



### **Conclusion: The Biblical Mandate of the Mind of Christ**

Thoughts matter as they determine the course of one's life (Prov 4:23, NLT) and shape one's identity: "For as he thinketh in his heart, so *is* he..." (Prov 23:7). The thoughts of man are naturally carnal. Thoughts shaped by the world are opposed to the Word of God. Worldly mindsets are sin and, ultimately, unbelief, which creates a chasm in the relationship between God and man. Thoughts unchecked begin to form a culture within one's own mind, creating mindsets that lead to actions in conformity to one's mindset, impacting one's ability to be faithful to God. Psalm 95:8–11 is a picture of what unbelief can do. The people went astray in their heart/mind (Ps 95:10) and were not able to enter the promised land because of unbelief (Heb 3:19). If God's people are unfaithful to God, their witness to the world is damaged, and their ability to interpret Scripture is skewed. God's judgment of the Fall of mankind condemned man and separated him from God. There was no prospect for restoration except for a seed of hope. That was the beginning of God's plan set in motion—the redemption of one's mind and salvation of one's soul through the sacrifice of God on behalf of his people. Only a perfect mind could achieve this great salvation by living in accordance with God's righteous demands. Christ fulfilled all the demands of the Law on behalf of man internally, externally, and eternally. The mind of Christ is the goal for the broken mindsets the world's cultures foster, enabled by the Holy Spirit. Indoctrinated from the beginning of life, a fallen world can inhibit man from mind renewal, but the mind of Christ is available to all who believe through the Holy Spirit, shaped through suffering and repentance. Through the Holy Spirit, one can have the mind of Christ, know God, and understand his Word rightly.

The mindset renewal promises in Scripture are secure because God is immutable. If God could be changed, then his promises could be, too. The sovereignty of God reveals that nothing

surprises God that would require a change in his plans, which always come to fruition (Prov 19:21). The omniscience of God attests to his immutability. There is no new knowledge that would cause God to change, for he knows everything. God's perfect righteousness means he has no need to change at all. God's mind is unchanging (Num 23:19; Ps 55:19; 102:27; Mal 3:6; Heb 13:8; James 1:17). God's mindset does not change (Ps 33:11). His mind is not able to be corrupted by deception (Heb 6:18), prejudice or bribes (Deut 10:17), sin (Jas 1:13), or shifting thoughts (Isa 55:8–9).

The mind should govern the senses, not the other way around, but this governance is not achieved by mere human effort or habits. It is not a growth mindset or a positive mindset that the human soul needs to be faithful to God or to live the abundant life Christ promised. It is a righteous mindset—the mind of Christ. In Matt 16:23, Mark 8:33, and Romans 8:5–7, Paul's use of the term φρόνημα brings this idea of a mindset together. God requires the governance of the mind to be not by human intellect, senses, or flesh but by the Holy Spirit. Viewing the functions of the mind as merely being organs of senses or feeling leaves man vulnerable to waywardness from his Creator. The senses are of the flesh but can be “re-trained” with the aid of the Holy Spirit and by seeking wisdom. The significance of the promised mind renewal of the OT is realized through the mind of Christ. The cultures of the world have a significant impact on mindsets and lay a foundation for thinking according to the things of man. In the next chapter, the metanarrative of the mindset will be explored, and its resultant downfall is seen as mindsets become one's truth and identity.

## CHAPTER 2: THE CANONICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF MINDSETS

### Introduction

Like God's hand of providence is interwoven throughout the canon, the motif of mindset is evident canonically. As seen by the emphasis Scripture places on the Shema, one of the most significant implicit influences in Scripture is that of one's mindset and how it determines man's response to God.<sup>1</sup> Though the actual term for mindset is sparse in Scripture, the prevalence of cognitive terms related to mindsets employed in Scripture is evidence of its significance in the biblical narrative. Mindsets become one's truth and identity, shaping a worldview that inhibits man's ability to love God and rightly interpret Scripture. The faulty lens of mindsets is based on man's own subjective truth that he pridefully clings to. The mind of man is fallen, and the image of God within man is broken, but mind renewal through the Holy Spirit is the remedy revealed in an abundance of terms employed in connected passages and demonstrating a canonical progression to the mind of Christ. Carnal mindsets were demonstrated in chapter one to be underpinned by unbelief. Mindsets locked in unbelief keep the heart of man from fulfilling the greatest commandment and the great commission, hindering the interpretation and application of God's Word. Through an investigation of a significant number of anthropological and mindset terms used and a substantive number of passages focused on mindset struggles and mind renewal, the canonical significance of mindsets will be demonstrated in this chapter.

---

<sup>1</sup> There is a wide range of terms depicting one's thoughts or mindset and the array of functions of the mind. In addition to the term φρονέω and its cognates, which Paul used, there are also other significant terms for the mind in the OT, NT, and Septuagint, which further reveal the need for mindset renewal. For the purposes of this dissertation and to show the significance of these terms, a vast array of terms is explored. Many of these terms are in Appendix A, which examines the role these terms play in the metanarrative of mind renewal.

## The Mindset Metanarrative

### A Canonical Survey of Key Mindset Terms

Paul's unique use of the term mindset ( $\varphi\rho\nu\nu\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ ) and its cognates in Romans redefined the way these terms were used in their first Christian anthropological application. The use of  $\varphi\rho\nu\nu\acute{\epsilon}\omega$  in five of his other epistles echoes back to its considerable use in the LXX along with a constellation of other related terms pertaining to mindset, revealing the clarion canonical call to think like God. In the LXX, cognitive and anthropological terms laid a foundation on which Paul built, bringing clarity to the functioning of one's mindset through the use of unique original Pauline terminology. This exposed a new dualism that reveals the chief mindset disjunction, the flesh versus the Spirit—the choice between the things of God or the things of man. Paul clarifies and unites the anthropological terms ascribed to the mind according to the Spirit, not the culture. Man's mind is not an isolated entity, separate from the human being made in God's image. Though mindsets shaped by culture or sin have the potential to influence and control the behavior and thoughts of man, the Word of God and illumination of the Holy Spirit can bring renewal and transformation.<sup>2</sup> Mind renewal must take place in the spirit of one's mind (Eph 4:23), where all cognition takes place; the core of man's inner being that encompasses what is metaphorically called the heart, soul, and spirit, and where man determines to set his mind toward either the Spirit or the flesh. The canonical significance of mindsets is evidenced by the abundance of mindset terminology found, the implications of the terms themselves, and the significance of anthropological terms in the mindset narrative.

---

<sup>2</sup> Mindsets make it difficult to set one's will to seek God, as man's heart/mind is inherently evil and often precludes one's will by its own bent or outlook, which is naturally counter to the purposes of God.

## The Foundation of Terms

The canonical superabundance and repetition of mindset terminology convey the emphasis and significance of mindsets. Collectively, the anthropological and other related mindset terms selected just for the purposes of this dissertation equate to over 3900 uses canonically. These terms connect the mindset motif in various contexts and point to the fulfillment of the renewed mind. Mindset renewal was in God’s mind even before the creation of the world.<sup>3</sup> The consistent use of mindset terminology confirms and communicates mind renewal throughout the canon as part of God’s plan of salvation.

## The Implication of Terms

The anthropological and cognitive terms utilized are not merely synonyms conveying the same truth over and over. Individually, the different terms each convey unique hues and meanings that bring clarity to mindsets depending on the context within the canon. An example of this is in 1 Corinthians 4:3–5, which discusses revealing one’s private “motives” with the Greek term βουλή (*boulē*). Depending on the context, βουλή can refer to “deliberation” or “thoughts” (Isa 55:7), “reasoned wisdom” (Prov 2:11; 8:12; 11:14), “inner deliberation” or “resolve” (2 Macc 14:5), “Divine council” (Job 38:2; 42:3; Prov 19:18; Isa 5:19; 14:26; 25:1; 46:10; Jer. 29:21; 49:20), the hidden intentions of the heart (1 Cor 4:5), and the most inward intentions of the inner life. The most prominent use in the NT refers to the divine council.<sup>4</sup> Scripture interprets Scripture, and the interpretation of God’s Word is not intended to be atomistically understood. The constellation of terms, while not static in their use, paves the way

---

<sup>3</sup> Karen H. Jobes, *Letters to the Church: A Survey of Hebrews and the General Epistles* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2011), 384.

<sup>4</sup> Gottlob Schrenk, “Βούλομαι, Βουλή, Βούλημα,” *TDNT* 1:629–38.

to the heart of God. The understanding of these terms is incomplete without a theological interpretation. For instance, Paul uses *διάνοια* to convey the understanding that Jesus gives to those who have renewed minds. This term *διάνοια* communicates that specific aspect of the mind and disposition to understand the significance of Christ’s coming. This is the same word Jesus used when he summed up the greatest commandment (Matt 22:37 // Mark 12:30 // Luke 10:27). The word *διάνοια* is also used in LXX in Jeremiah 31:33 to indicate where God will write his laws of the new covenant—on their minds and hearts.<sup>5</sup>

Another example of the significance of terminology used is in Paul’s quotation of Isaiah 40:13 in 1 Corinthians 2:16 and in Romans 11:34. The scarce use of *νοῦς* in the LXX is due to the absence of the term “mind” in the Hebrew language. The term heart is the most significant similar term, which was typically rendered as *καρδία* “heart” to represent *לֵב/לִבָּ*; however, *διάνοια* occurs approximately seventy times in the LXX (nine times in Exod and seven in Gen).<sup>6</sup> The term *διάνοια* expresses emotions and acts of the will (Exod 35:22; Isa 35:4), but it also represents the entire inner life (Gen 8:21) and can mean a mindset rendered as “thought or intention” (Num 15:39; Isa 55:9).<sup>7</sup> Paul’s quotation of Isaiah 40:13 in 1 Corinthians 2:16 utilizes the LXX rendering (with *νοῦς*) which expresses the Spirit, rather than the mind, of God, and thus makes a crucial theological statement: “We have the Spirit of Christ and therefore we really know Christ”<sup>8</sup> Behm notes an acute change in meaning that *νοῦν* undergoes in 1 Corinthians

---

<sup>5</sup> Karen H. Jobes, *1, 2, and 3 John*, ZECNT 19 (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2014), 241.

<sup>6</sup> Moisés Silva, *NIDNTTE* “*νοῦς*,” 3:425–435.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 3:428.

<sup>8</sup> Karen H. Jobes, and Moisés Silva. *Invitation to the Septuagint*. Vol. 2. (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015), 219.

2:16 from the mind of man to the mind of Christ: “ἡμεῖς δὲ νοῦν Χριστοῦ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ” (1 Cor 2:11, 14), noting that ἔχομεν constitutes a play on the word, which now renders sense as “mind.” Paul is not equating νοῦς and πνεῦμα as in Hellenistic mysticism, but rather is illustrating the significance of the mind of the Spirit upon the mind of man.<sup>9</sup> Moreover, the mind of the Spirit is the new mindset for those who are in Christ.

Conversely, Silva points out that the use of terms was often not an exact science because some terms were not available in the target language. There was no noun for mind in the OT, for example, so often a verb expression meaning “to think,” “to reason,” or “to understand” would be used depending on context. At times, the closest equivalent of “mind” might be a figurative expression for a term meaning “head,” but typically synonymous with thinking were terms depicting some part of the body, such as “heart” or “liver.”<sup>10</sup> This also explains why the term mindset was not so prevalent and how, through anthropological and other cognitive terms, the significance of mindsets is conveyed.

### **The Significance of Terms**

The anthropological and cognitive terms employed bear a significant role in the mindset metanarrative. OT anthropology did not have a division of the soul into parts. Hence, human understanding was not isolated or elevated, as in the Greek culture. The OT paradigm is that the will and understanding are synced with a focus on right behavior and actions, anchored in a

---

<sup>9</sup> Johannes Behm and Ernst Würthwein, “Διάνοια,” *TDNT* 4:948–980.

<sup>10</sup> Moisés Silva, *Biblical Words and Their Meaning: An Introduction to Lexical Semantics* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994), 116. Waltke notes the significance of organs depicting mindset. “The imagery of organs in Prov 22:17 that are part of the learning process (ear, heart, belly, and lips) was also the case in Egyptian wisdom literature, progressing from the ear to the heart to acquire knowledge to be kept in the heart and espoused on the lips.” Bruce K. Waltke, *The Book of Proverbs: Chapters 15-31*, NICOT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 48.

whole person rather than a dualistic or tripartite individual as in Greek thought.<sup>11</sup> The varied terms in the Shema, as well as the multitude of terms pertaining to the mind and its functions serve to highlight a complete commitment to love God, not to compartmentalize one's devotion. NT quotations and allusions to the Shema employ different mindset terms to make different points. In Hebrews 8:10 and 10:16, Jeremiah 31:33 (LXX 38:33) is cited; the promise that God would put his laws in the *διάνοια* (singular) of the people and write them in their *καρδίας* (plural). So, too, John reiterates that “the Son of God has come and has given us understanding (*διάνοια*,) so that we may know (*γινώσκωμεν*) him who is true” (1 John 5:20).<sup>12</sup> The use of *διάνοια* is significant as this term conveys the psychological aspect of thinking, encompassing understanding, reasoning, and deciding—the mind.<sup>13</sup> The considerable use of a group of mindset words is noteworthy in that it establishes its own interpretation in which understanding itself becomes a disposition, an attitude, and thus a mindset of faith.<sup>14</sup> Paul's remarkable use of *φρονέω* is significant as this term depicts the mind of the resurrected Christ, providing a Christological view of what the mind is supposed to look like and revealing the intimacy God's people have with Christ as he shares his divine thoughts with man. Paul's theological and ethical use of *φρονέω* and other cognitive terms will be discussed in greater detail in chapter five.

Another example encompasses the theological significance conveyed by specific terms used. The term *νόημα* occurs six times, all in 2 Cor (except for Phil 4:7), used in a theological way, pertaining to comprehending God's will concerning salvation and the necessity to keep

---

<sup>11</sup> Eichrodt, *TOTVOT*, OTL 2, 147.

<sup>12</sup> Silva, “*Διάνοια*,” *NIDNTE* 3:425–32.

<sup>13</sup> *L&N*, s.v. “*Διάνοια*,” 1:323–24.

<sup>14</sup> Silva, “*Διάνοια*,” *NIDNTE* 3:434.



one's mind from corruption so one does not fall away (2 Cor 11:3). This apostasy results in hearts becoming hardened (mindsets), rendering them unable to understand God's Word (2 Cor 3:14), becoming spiritually blind which prevents illumination from the Holy Spirit and understanding of the gospel (2 Cor 4:4).<sup>15</sup>

Silva notes that the semantic field of "mind" is an example of the changes the Greek vocabulary has undergone. He cites extrabiblical Greek literature containing a vast number of terms generally meaning "mind," such as νοῦς, διάνοια, φρήν, ψυχή, προνοίας, though ironically καρδία which was used the most significantly in the OT for "mind" is not so used in the Greek Hellenistic literature.<sup>16</sup> Silva states that the use of καρδία had become essentially rare, with nominal use of Polybius one time and Epictetus using καρδία twice, but the LXX reveals that because of the influence of the Hebrew term לֵב, καρδία is considered the standard term for the seat of the mental faculties.<sup>17</sup> The NT use of καρδία is less than the OT but agrees with the OT use as distinct from the Greek. The NT use of καρδία is stronger than in the LXX use as it focuses on the heart as the central organ of spiritual and psychological life, where God "bears witness to himself."<sup>18</sup> Silva also notes that the Greek words used to convey "mind" occur in the immediate context, likely for stylistic variety, playing "an insignificant role in the semantic structure of the language."<sup>19</sup> Silva states that "Other terms, furthermore, are to a large extent confined to Genesis, Exodus, Chronicles, Sirach, Maccabees, and Proverbs. It is clear that the

---

<sup>15</sup> Silva, "Διάνοια," *NIDNTTE* 3:432.

<sup>16</sup> Silva, *Biblical Words and Their Meaning*, 57.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>18</sup> Johannes Behm, "Καρδία," *TDNT* 3:605–14.

<sup>19</sup> Silva, *Biblical Words and Their Meaning*, 57.

wealth of terms found in secular literature with reference to the mind— and the great variety of differentiations possible because of it— is lost in the language of the LXX.”<sup>20</sup> The dominance of καρδία in the OT eclipsed the value of the Greek mindset terms, but the NT sheds light on the OT view of mindset. This is possibly due to the secular mindset of the Greeks, which understand the terms of God’s creation in light of worldly wisdom rather than God’s wisdom. Trying to understand God’s creation from a human point of view misses the connection to the Spirit. God is Spirit and his people are to worship him in spirit and in truth (John 4:24).

#### A Canonical Survey of Key Mindset Passages

As the motif of the promise of mind renewal unfolds throughout Scripture, the cycle of apostasy within God’s people and subsequent discipline point to God’s overarching plan for salvation finally made manifest in Christ. Mind renewal was central to Yahweh’s mission of salvation. Beginning with the grim reality of the condition of one’s heart in Genesis 6:5, to Moses’ promise of God’s circumcision of their hearts when God’s people would turn back to Him (Deut 30:6), to David’s heart cry for a renewed heart (Ps 51:10), to Isaiah’s portrayal of the mind of the Spirit upon Christ (Isa 11:1–5), to Jeremiah’s prophecy of the new covenant (Jer 24:7; 31:33; 32:39), to Ezekiel’s prophetic pronouncement of a new heart and spirit within man (Ezek 11:19; 36:26–28), to Paul’s quest for a mindset that reflected the mind of Christ (1 Cor 2:16; Rom 8:56; Col 3:2; Phil 2:5–8) and Peter’s pointing to how the mind of Christ is lived out (1 Pet 1:13; 4:1) to the author of Hebrews’ quotation of the new covenant in Jeremiah (Heb 8:8, 13; 9:15), the motif of mindset unfolds in the biblical narrative as the theme of a new mind/heart is woven through a constellation of terms employed in key passages throughout the canon. This

---

<sup>20</sup> Ibid.

canonical survey reveals a mindset narrative that points to the need for mindset renewal through passages pertaining to the motifs of hardening of hearts, circumcised hearts, and the mind of Christ.

### **A Motif of Hardened Hearts**

The hardened hearts of God’s people led them into sin and waywardness, away from the covenant they had made with Yahweh. Various key passages conveyed this hard-heartedness. An example from the OT is when רַחַה (*rûah*) only occurs once as an anthropological term referencing a hardened heart by Yahweh (Deut 2:30), which is also a parallel to לֵב in the same verse, indicating the use of רַחַה to convey an inner disposition or ψυχή.<sup>21</sup> Other OT examples include the hardening of Pharaoh’s heart (Exod 7:13, 14, 22, as well as twelve more times in Exod) and the hardened hearts (and necks) of God’s people that were hardened by unbelief (2 Kgs 17:14), rebellion (2 Chr 36:13; Neh 9:16–17, 29) pride (Ps 17:10), and the sin of omission (Jer 7:26; 17:23; 19:15). But God would take their hard hearts and make them soft again (Ezek 11:19). NT examples of hard-heartedness are also prolific throughout the NT canon. One significant term conveying hard-heartedness is the term νόημα (thoughts), utilized only five times in the NT, meaning *sensu malo*, corrupt human thoughts. Paul displays how evil thoughts blind one from being able to understand Scripture apart from Christ. “But the people’s minds were hardened, and to this day, whenever the old covenant is being read, the same veil covers their minds so they cannot understand the truth. And this veil can be removed only by believing in Christ” (2 Cor 3:14 NLT). This blinding by the enemy prevents people from understanding the Word of God. “Satan, who is the god of this world, has blinded the minds of those who don’t believe. They are

---

<sup>21</sup> Zuck, *BTOT*, 72.

unable to see the glorious light of the Good News. They don't understand this message about the glory of Christ, who is the exact likeness of God" (2 Cor 4:4 NLT). Just as Eve's mind was corrupted (2 Cor 11:3 NIV), the minds of God's people are also prey to the devil's deception and their own corruption. Another mindset term pertaining solely to hardening is *παχύνω* (*pachynō*). This term is used to depict the hardening of the disciple's hearts from unbelief (Mark 6:52; 8:17), the hardening the enemy does to prevent people from understanding (John 12:40), the condition of the hearts of God's people (Acts 28:27, Rom 11:7), and the hardening that occurs as a result of the deceitfulness of sin (Heb 3:13), to name a few.<sup>22</sup> The hardening of hearts was also used to bring people to Christ, as the hardening of the Israelites made way for the Gentiles to be grafted in (Rom 11:25). Guarding one's heart from sin and carnal influences prevents the hardening of one's heart.

### **A Motif of Circumcised Hearts**

The term circumcision was a significant ritualistic practice for the Jewish people who would have understood the implications of circumcision for the heart. Figurative and spiritual understanding of circumcision was not foreign to Jews in Palestine during the NT time.<sup>23</sup> The term *περιτέμνω* (*peritemnō*) means to circumcise (the heart), which was in reference to the inward man and his relationship with God.<sup>24</sup> Paul viewed the only true circumcision as that of the heart (*περιτομή καρδιάς*), a work of the Holy Spirit for those who are in Christ.<sup>25</sup> The

---

<sup>22</sup> Karl Ludwig Schmidt and Martin Anton Schmidt, "Παχύνω," *TDNT* 5:1022–31.

<sup>23</sup> Rudolf Meyer, "Περιτέμνω," *TDNT* 6:72–84.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, 6:77.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, 6:83.

Judaizers did not recognize the figurative circumcision as legitimate. They viewed physical circumcision as a work, but Jeremiah spoke of the internal circumcision of the heart to point God's people away from a status based on a physical external procedure towards a spiritual internal procedure of having their hearts right with God. Deuteronomy 30 has a significant passage that prophesies about the renewal of the mind through the use of circumcised heart terminology. "And the LORD your God will circumcise your heart and the heart of your offspring so that you will love the LORD your God with all your heart and with all your soul, that you may live" (Deut 30:6). Once again, this mind renewal hinges upon the Shema; the point of mind renewal was to keep God's people in a right relationship with God so they could also rightly understand and apply his Word. Circumcision is a significant aspect of worship. Without circumcised hearts, one cannot worship, as their hearts are divided. Double-mindedness cannot produce a single-minded devotion.

### **A Motif of Renewed Hearts (Minds)**

The motif of renewed minds is varied, and Scripture is replete with many ways this is communicated. Some of the terms that are defined as "to renew" include *שָׁדַשׁ* (*hādāš*), *תשובה* (*teshuvah*), *ἀνανεώω* (*ananeoó*), and *παλιγγενεσία* (*palingenesia*), meaning renewal, conversion, regeneration, repair; make anew.<sup>26</sup> The νοῦς of Christians should exhibit consistent mind renewal, redirecting their mindset through an "inner direction of their thought and will and the orientation of their moral consciousness (see Rom 12:2)."<sup>27</sup> The mind is repeatedly the focus of Scripture with renewal and spiritual understanding (Gen 6:5; Deut 30:6; Jer 24:7; Ezek 11:19;

---

<sup>26</sup> BDB, s.v. "שָׁדַשׁ," 293–4.

<sup>27</sup> Behm, "Noῦς," *TDNT* 4:948–1022.

36:26–28; Ps 51:10; Rom 12:2; 2 Cor 4:16; Eph 4:23; Col 3:10; Titus 3:5). Mind renewal is completely dependent upon Christ. The risen Jesus “opened” the νοῦς of the disciples to help them understand (Luke 24:45).<sup>28</sup> “In Romans 12:2, the νοῦς is the object of a renewal to be accomplished on the part of the Christian.”<sup>29</sup> The phrase, “μεταμορφοῦσθε τῇ ἀνακαινώσει τοῦ” refers to the necessity of mind renewal in Romans 12:2 for Christians and the Spirit of God produces this inward renewal.<sup>30</sup>

### A Constellation of Terms

Through the bounteous use of anthropological terms to depict the thoughts of man, the mechanics of mindsets are revealed metaphorically in the OT and NT through organs such as the heart לֵב, with close to 900 references in the OT and καρδιά occurring over 900 times in the LXX, as well as around 163 times in the NT. The term καρδιά is synonymous with ψυχή, διάνοια, πνεῦμα, and νοῦς but also contrasts these terms as it depicts the unity and totality of the inner life through a variety of cognitive and spiritual functions.<sup>31</sup> The use of καρδιά is more than just an anthropological synonym. This term has ethical significance denoting the motivations or mindset behind a thought or deed, whether for a single act of sin (Acts 8:22) or a more general depiction of evil (κακία).<sup>32</sup> The soul נֶפֶשׁ (*nēpēš*), also has a significant repetition of 754 times in the OT, with the parallel Greek term ψυχή (*psyche*) occurring 954 times in the LXX and 100 times in the NT. The spirit רִיחַ (*rūah*) occurs 378 times in the OT, and πνεῦμα (*pneuma*) occurs seventy-five

---

<sup>28</sup> Silva, “Νοῦς,” *NIDNTTE* 3:430.

<sup>29</sup> Hermann Cremer, “Ἀνακαινώσις,” *BTLNTG* 324.

<sup>30</sup> Johannes Behm, “Καινός,” *TDNT* 3:447–454.

<sup>31</sup> Friedrich Baumgärtel and Johannes Behm, “Καρδιά,” *TDNT* 3: 609–610.

<sup>32</sup> Walter Grundmann, “Κακός,” *TDNT* 3:469–487.

percent of the times the Hebrew term *rûah* is used in the LXX.<sup>33</sup> The term for kidneys כִּלְיָה (*kilyah*) is used thirty-one times in the OT, often rendered as heart, soul, or mind, as in Ps 73:21.<sup>34</sup> Lesser utilized terms representing the inner being include the organ of the bowels רַחֲמִים (*rahāmîm*), which also refers to the seat of one’s emotions (Gen 43:30; 1 Kgs 3:26).<sup>35</sup> Like all the aforementioned anthropological terms, רַחֲמִים depicts the inner being (see Prov 12:10) or the inner self where human thinking, feeling, and decision-making take place.<sup>36</sup> A singular motif emerges in a constellation of terms throughout the OT and NT, demonstrating man’s desperate need for mind renewal, the canonical significance of mindsets, and God’s plan to give his people a new mind/heart. The superabundance and often parallel use of these anthropological and cognitive terms synonymously representing the mind of man collectively is striking and emphasizes the significance of one’s thoughts and, more importantly, one’s mindset, which governs one’s thoughts and deeds.

The command to love God with all one’s being hinges upon one’s mindset. Displaying human thinking in its vast array of functions through anthropological terms helps to reveal what is behind the mindsets. Significant OT and NT terms and Scripture references have been selected and summarized for this study in Appendix A to display the movement of the mindset motif through these terms canonically. These point to both the need for mindset renewal and eventual

---

<sup>33</sup> Paul S. MacDonald, *History of the Concept of Mind: Speculations about Soul, Mind and Spirit from Homer to Hume*, vol. 1 (London and New York: Routledge, 2017), 2.

<sup>34</sup> John N. Oswalt, “כִּלְיָה,” *TWOT* 1:439–440.

<sup>35</sup> Leonard J. Coppes, “רַחֲמִים,” *TWOT* 1:841–843.

<sup>36</sup> *HALOT*, s.v. “רַחֲמִים,” 4:1218–1219.

fulfillment by Christ.<sup>37</sup> Below is also a synopsis and analysis of key anthropological and mindset terms from Appendix A.

### Anthropological Terms

As chapter one attested to, the significance of the Shema and the anthropological terms employed highlight man's inability to love God with all his heart, soul, and mind and the need for mindset renewal throughout the canon. The mind-body problem has sought to define every aspect of human nature through several anthropological theological concepts in which some terms apply to the physical body and others to the immaterial part of man, that inner man within the mind.<sup>38</sup> But these terms need not be divided, for they together unveil the makeup of man as one whole being and collectively illustrate what composes a mindset.

#### **The Heart לֵב/לֵבָב (lēb/lēbāb)/ Καρδία (*kardia*)**

The anthropological term “heart” is the most important and most common word in the vocabulary of Old Testament anthropology, occurring around 900 times.<sup>39</sup> Its earliest concrete meaning denoted “chest” or “breast,” thought to refer to the walls of the heart or thoracic cage rather than the heart itself.<sup>40</sup> The transition from external to an internal definition, from a “chest” into the “heart” as the seat of human emotions, was also paralleled in the Homeric usage of φρένες (*phrenes*) and καρδία and was evidenced by the imagery employed in the biblical laments

---

<sup>37</sup> Appendix A provides an overview of the cognitive and anthropological terms that pertain to mental functioning. In the following chapters, key terms and passages will be further exegetically analyzed.

<sup>38</sup> MacDonald, *History of the Concept of Mind*, 1.

<sup>39</sup> Susan F. Mathews, “Toward Reclaiming an Authentic Biblical-Christian View of the Body,” *LQ* 68 (2001): 285–6.

<sup>40</sup> MacDonald, *History of the Concept of Mind*, 8.



of vital bodily functions to convey emotions.<sup>41</sup> Appearing in all the OT books except Micah and Habakkuk, the significance of the prolific use of the term heart conveys that how one thinks is a focal point of man's existence and relationship with God.<sup>42</sup> The heart is the center of the person, encompassing the body, spirit, soul, and will—the whole personality and its relationship with God.<sup>43</sup> The activity of the heart is mental and spiritual, not just physical, as the organ is known for.<sup>44</sup> Unique to this anthropological term, לֵב/לִב are used for humans alone, whereas לֵבָב and רִיב can refer to animals or humans.<sup>45</sup> Humans are uniquely made in the image of God, able to differentiate between right and wrong, and held accountable for decisions made. The Jewish Aramaic and Akkadian render similar definitions; “heart, thought, mind,” and “heart, disposition, thought,” respectively.<sup>46</sup>

The term heart is difficult to define when observed through the Western lens. To the Eastern mindset, לֵב depicted the intellectual and mental component of mankind (see Deut 4:39; 6:6; 8:5; 29:3, 18; 30:11; 32:46).<sup>47</sup> In the ANE, the Egyptians viewed the heart as “the seat of intellect, judgment, and memory.”<sup>48</sup> Though just as modern language has similar words to describe the meaning of certain terms, לֵב is often synonymous with לֵבָב as well as other like terms which together convey the meaning of the whole “person” (Deut 4:9, 29; 6:5; 10:12;

---

<sup>41</sup> Ibid., 9.

<sup>42</sup> Heinz-Josef Fabry, “לֵב,” *TDOT* 7:399–437.

<sup>43</sup> Ibid., 7: 401.

<sup>44</sup> Mathews, “Toward Reclaiming an Authentic Biblical-Christian View of the Body,” 286.

<sup>45</sup> MacDonald, *History of the Concept of Mind*, 8.

<sup>46</sup> Fabry, *TDOT* 7:400.

<sup>47</sup> Zuck, *BTOT*, 72.

<sup>48</sup> Fabry, *TDOT* 7:402.

26:16; 28:65; 30:2, 6, 10).<sup>49</sup> The term for the heart is also characteristic of emotions (Deut 15:7, 9–10; 19:6; 20:3, 8) as well as a person (Deut 2:30; 7:17; 8:17; 9:4; 10:16; 18:21).<sup>50</sup> The terms לֵב/לְבָב are rendered as καρδία in the LXX 718 times, but significantly, several other terms pertaining to mindset are also utilized, including διάνοια, occurring 51 times, followed by ψυχή (27 times), νοῦς (12 times), φρήν (*phrēn*) (7 times), στήθος (*stēthos*) (3 times), and φρόνησις (*phrōnēsis*) (2 times).<sup>51</sup> The heart (לֵב) is therefore depicted by an array of terms to convey what is ultimately the mind or intellect, including the role that emotions play regarding mindsets and how thoughts become mindsets. The heart (לֵב) is also often mentioned along with the inner organs (Jer 11:20; 17:10; Ps 26:2), and these similar terms form a parallelism together to emphasize the whole being of the person.<sup>52</sup>

Man is not a sum of three parts intended to be emphasized distinctly from one another but meant to be considered as a whole. The heart/mind/soul is the core of the being, where spiritual and life decisions are made and where one's ability to interpret the Word of God rightly is impacted. In Paul's distinction of the three central parts of a human being in his tripartite blessing of 1 Thessalonians 5:13, Paul is emphasizing that the whole being is affected by Christ's sanctification. Today's culture counsels one to follow their heart, which is devastating when Scripture counsels the opposite due to the insidious nature of the heart of man (Jer 17:9). The inclination of the heart to evil predisposes its decisions and actions.<sup>53</sup> This inclination is part of

---

<sup>49</sup> Zuck, *BTOT*, 72.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>51</sup> Fabry, *TDOT* 7:410.

<sup>52</sup> Schweizer, "Ψυχή," *TDNT* 9:626–66.

<sup>53</sup> Waltke, *OTT*, 225.

the impetus behind understanding mindset renewal. Idioms such as “to set the heart upon” also indicate this mindset and desire.<sup>54</sup> Through the terms denoting “heart” in the OT and NT, the various qualities of the role of the heart are seen, including the heart being the seat of the will, the place where reasoning, resolve, desire, inner thoughts, planning, and mindset change happens.

### Seat of the Will

The heart is the seat of the will.<sup>55</sup> The heart is the repository of an array of emotions.<sup>56</sup> One’s emotions have a profound effect on the will and mindset of an individual. The NT employment of the term heart is essentially the same as the OT use, depicted as the seat of intelligence and where desire and thought emanate from. Though the *לֵב* is the most significant anthropological OT term, there is no exact term for heart in English that incorporates the complex combination and exchange of intellect, affection, and will.<sup>57</sup> The heart was viewed as controlling the body’s and psyche’s functions, while the function of the brain was unknown in the OT.<sup>58</sup> The heart is the locus of a person’s intellect, emotions, spiritual and ethical activity and needs to be protected (Prov 4:23).<sup>59</sup> It is important to note that the heart is not separate from the living being but a facet of the inner workings of the mind.

---

<sup>54</sup> Andrew Bowling, “*לֵב*,” *TWOT* 466–67.

<sup>55</sup> Mathews, “Toward Reclaiming an Authentic Biblical-Christian View of the Body,” 286.

<sup>56</sup> Fabry, *TDOT* 7:410.

<sup>57</sup> Waltke, *An Old Testament Theology*, 225.

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*, 226.

## Reasoning

There are many idiomatic phrases utilizing לֵב that occur in both Akkadian and Hebrew, which convey the reasoning aspect of the heart. Several have to do with choosing one's own reasoning above God's, setting one's mind on one's own view. For instance, one idiomatic phrase לֵב קָלֵךְ is translated as: "To take counsel with oneself; to decide, take counsel in one's heart." An example of this is in Nehemiah. "I (Nehemiah) *decided in my heart*; I censured the nobles and the prefects" (Neh 5:7).<sup>60</sup> The NIV says, "I pondered them in my mind." The emotions and senses play a role in one's reasoning, and ultimately, whether one is under the lordship of God or the flesh. Reason, will, passion, and emotions have their seat in the heart.<sup>61</sup> The heart was considered to be in chorus with other senses of the body. Just as ears hear and eyes see, the heart feels and discerns, thinking everything that it wills.<sup>62</sup>

## Mindset

In 2 Chronicles 11:16, the idiomatic phrase לֵבָם נִתְקַיֵּם is translated as "set their hearts" in the ESV, "And those who had set their hearts to seek the LORD God of Israel came after them from all the tribes of Israel to Jerusalem to sacrifice to the LORD, the God of their fathers" (2 Chr 11:16), but is also interpreted as "who were encouraged/resolved to seek the LORD."<sup>63</sup> While the symbolism of the heart conjures up a fickle inner nature led by emotions, the free will given to man is an opportunity to choose God's will over one's own will with resolve.

---

<sup>60</sup> Hayim Tawil, *An Akkadian Lexical Companion for Biblical Hebrew: Etymological-Semantic and Idiomatic Equivalents with Supplement on Biblical Aramaic* (New York: KTAV Publishing House, 2017), 178.

<sup>61</sup> Silva, "לֵב," *NIDNTTE* 2:622–627.

<sup>62</sup> Waltke, *An Old Testament Theology*, 225.

<sup>63</sup> Tawil, *An Akkadian Lexical Companion*, 179.

The לֵב indicates one’s mindset as an inclination, disposition, or outlook (Gen 6:5; 8:21), as in “his heart impelled him” (Exod 35:21).<sup>64</sup> Matters of the heart can change in a moment. The primary importance of לֵב is to “Keep your לֵב with all vigilance; for from it flow the springs of life” (Prov 4:23).<sup>65</sup> An idiom that indicates how fickle the changing of one’s mindset can be is לֵב הִפָּר, which indicates a change was not due to any other matter on one’s heart.<sup>66</sup> Other key renderings pertaining to mindset include determination, courage, will, reason, and intention.<sup>67</sup> Interpreting לֵב literally is a misinterpretation for לֵב has scarcely been rendered as pertaining to the physical organ of a “heart.”<sup>68</sup>

### Desire

Another idiomatic phrase has to do with desire and appears several times. As in Exodus 35:21, לֵב נָשָׂא לֵב means *to desire* or *wish*.<sup>69</sup> In Job 17:11, an idiomatic hapax occurs in an expression (מִזְרֵשׁ לֵב) that also means *to desire* or *wish*: “My days are past; my plans are broken off, the desires of my heart” (Job 17:11 ESV). The NKJV interprets it as “*even the thoughts of my heart,*” and the NASB interprets it as “*wishes of the heart.*”<sup>70</sup>

---

<sup>64</sup> Koehler, “לֵב,” *HALOT* 2:514–15.

<sup>65</sup> Fabry, “לֵב,” *TDOT* 7:413.

<sup>66</sup> Tawil, *An Akkadian Lexical Companion*, 181.

<sup>67</sup> Koehler, “לֵב,” *HALOT* 2:514

<sup>68</sup> Fabry, “לֵב,” *TDOT*, 7:411.

<sup>69</sup> For the Akkadian cognate, see *CAD* 11:105A. For example, it appears in a line from one of Nebuchadnezzar II’s royal inscriptions: *Ana epēšu Esagil na-ša-an-ni li-ib-bi* (“I *dearly wanted* to rebuild Esagil,” *VAB* 4:126, iii 18–19).

<sup>70</sup> Tawil, *An Akkadian Lexical Companion*, 178.

Another example of desire is the idiomatic phrase לֵב רָגַל, translated as, “To want to do something,” which is seen in Ezekiel 20:16, “My sabbaths they desecrated, their heart followed their fetishes,” in which the NIV, NKJV, ESV, and NASB all depict the heart as following after its idols.<sup>71</sup> This is what mindsets are focused on—what they idolize. Desire gives birth to idolatry when human desire supersedes God’s commands and plan. The parallel Akkadian is *libbu alāku: ulašuma ul libbaša la illakam*, translated as “she should not come if she does not want to” (ARM 10 176:20).<sup>72</sup> Setting one’s will or desire above God’s is having one’s mindset on one’s own glory and way, a position of direct opposition to God.

### Inner Thoughts

The לֵב defines the identity of a person, encompassing all aspects of an individual, including the inner thoughts that make up the person: the vital, affective, noetic, and volunative qualities.<sup>73</sup> The inner thoughts and plans of God, as shown in Psalm 33:11, utilize the idiomatic expression לֵב מִתְשַׁבֵּה, “But the LORD’s plans stand firm forever; his *intentions* can never be shaken” (Ps 33:11 NLT). The word “intentions” connotes thoughts being driven by a mindset. Parallel Akkadian literature conveys this same concept about relying on one’s own faculties and motivations: *ina hissat libbiya ... lu abni*, translated as “I (Assurnasirpal II) built upon my own intuition.” (AKA 210:18).<sup>74</sup> The OT scarcely ever uses לֵב for the “heart” as a physical organ.<sup>75</sup> It

---

<sup>71</sup> Tawil, *An Akkadian Lexical Companion*, 178.

<sup>72</sup> For further usages, see *CAD* 9:171A.

<sup>73</sup> Fabry, “לֵב,” *TDOT* 7:412.

<sup>74</sup> As cited in *CAD* 6:202A.

<sup>75</sup> Fabry, “לֵב,” *TDOT* 7:411.

is, therefore, wrong to interpret לב literally as “heart” or “throat.”<sup>76</sup> The heart depicts the inner thoughts that may develop into unsound mindsets that are destructive when they are opposed to God’s intentions.

## Planning

Another meaning for לב is in the mechanics behind the mindset or determination of one’s view. An example of an idiomatic hapax is הִשָּׁב לֵב, which means to plan out or deliberate (Prov 16:9).<sup>77</sup> Cognition is involved in planning and begins before the senses perceive, for the heart initiates the operation of the senses (Deut 29:3; Eccl 7:21; Ezek 3:10), which leads to mindsets and the hardening of the heart (Ex 7:22; Jer 5:21).<sup>78</sup> Psalm 33 reveals that the human heart is not without hope or redemption because of a loving God who fashioned it: “He who fashioned the heart of them all and observes all their deeds” (Ps 33:15). Planning is coordinated within one’s inner self, the seat of feeling and emotions.<sup>79</sup> In the NT, Paul depicts the heart as where one plans.<sup>80</sup> Yahweh created the לב and ultimately governs the heart (Prov 16:1, 9; 19:21; 20:5; 21:1) and has plans to redeem it. Yahweh’s plans supersede the plans of men.<sup>81</sup>

---

<sup>76</sup> H. L. Ginsberg, “Lexicographical Notes,” in *Hebräische Wortforschung: Festschrift zum 80. Geburtstag von W. Baumgartner*, ed. Benedikt Hartmann, Ernst Jenni, E. Y. Kutscher, Victor Maag, I. L. Seeligmann, and Rudolf Smend, VTSup 16 (Leiden: Brill, 1967), 80.

<sup>77</sup> Tawil, *An Akkadian Lexical Companion*, 180.

<sup>78</sup> Fabry, “לב,” *TDOT* 7:419.

<sup>79</sup> Koehler, “לב,” *HALOT* 2:514.

<sup>80</sup> Mathews, “Toward Reclaiming an Authentic Biblical-Christian View of the Body,” 287.

<sup>81</sup> Fabry, “לב,” *TDOT* 7:425.

## The Living Being נִפְשׁוֹ (*nēpēš*)/ ψυχή (*psyche*)

The term נִפְשׁוֹ began as a concrete term meaning “throat” or “gullet” (see Hab 2:5) and then developed into “desire” or “longing” (Deut 23:24, Jer 34:16), inferring to be satisfied through the throat; then in later OT books, it referred to the whole self.<sup>82</sup> The term נִפְשׁוֹ is used as a pronoun for life.<sup>83</sup> When the OT refers to the Shema and loving God “with one’s whole soul and whole heart,” the נִפְשׁוֹ is the referent, not the לֵב.<sup>84</sup> The term נִפְשׁוֹ communicates life not in a generic sense but the limits of life: life versus death.<sup>85</sup> The Hebrew language did not have a term for “person,” but נִפְשׁוֹ is the nearest term that conveys a person encompassing a “soul” and “neck.”<sup>86</sup> In the 755 occurrences of נִפְשׁוֹ in the OT, 600 occurrences in the Septuagint are rendered as ψυχή (144 occurrences in the book of Psalms alone), with 100 of these rendered as “my soul.”<sup>87</sup> Emanating from Homer, ψυχή was considered to be in the head.<sup>88</sup>

The Akkadian cognate of נִפְשׁוֹ, *napištu*, can have the sense of “life, vigor, vitality, and good health; a living being.”<sup>89</sup> In נִפְשׁוֹ, the drive behind the mindset is seen. Imagery through terms like “throat,” “appetite,” and “life” convey the hunger and passion that are part of the human experience. While this term is translated as being the term “soul” in the Shema, it refers

---

<sup>82</sup> MacDonald, *History of the Concept of Mind*, 2.

<sup>83</sup> Wolff, *Anthropology of the Old Testament*, 23

<sup>84</sup> MacDonald, *History of the Concept of Mind*, 6.

<sup>85</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>86</sup> Danijel Berković, and Dean Slavić, “The Personal and the Private in the Piety of the Biblical Psalmist,” *Kairos: EJT* 14.2 (2020): 57.

<sup>87</sup> Waltke, “נִפְשׁוֹ,” *TWOT* 587–591.

<sup>88</sup> MacDonald, *History of the Concept of Mind*, 6.

<sup>89</sup> Gelb, “*Napištu*,” *CAD* 11:296.



to the entire being, not just a component of a person. Man does not have a נִפְשׁ. He is one. Man's mindset determines his drive for life and, ultimately, his outlook. Just as נִפְשׁ is designated as the vital organ for human needs, it is also a synonym for life.<sup>90</sup> When נִפְשׁ is used with לֵב, it shares a similar meaning and is characterized by mental acts. Otherwise, the heart is thought to refer to intellect, while לֵב is used to depict feelings.<sup>91</sup> In 1 Chronicles 22:19, נִפְשׁ is sometimes translated as “mind.” The term נִפְשׁ depicts man's total nature, giving this term priority in the anthropological vocabulary as the spirit, heart, or flesh represent facets of the nature of man, forming the complete picture.<sup>92</sup> An individual is not a distinct aspect of a human being but is a distinct human being.<sup>93</sup>

### Throat

The term נִפְשׁ is depicted as a throat to convey hunger (greedy man) and breathing.<sup>94</sup> It is most commonly rendered as life, soul, creature, person, appetite, and mind amongst the more than twenty various meanings found in the KJV.<sup>95</sup> One significant Akkadian idiomatic usage, נִפְשׁ נָתַן is rendered as “to grant life.”<sup>96</sup> Another significant Akkadian phrase, *napišti balāti* (“living life”), is similar to the Hebrew idiomatic phrase, נִפְשׁ חַיָּה, which means “living being”; the

---

<sup>90</sup> Wolff, *Anthropology of the Old Testament*, 18.

<sup>91</sup> BDB, s.v. “נִפְשׁ,” 659–661.

<sup>92</sup> Schweizer, “Ψυχή,” *TDNT* 9:620. See Gen 2:7, which calls man in his totality a נִפְשׁ חַיָּה.

<sup>93</sup> MacDonald, *History of the Concept of Mind*, 6.

<sup>94</sup> Wolff, *Anthropology of the Old Testament*, 11.

<sup>95</sup> Waltke, “נִפְשׁ,” *TWOT* 587.

<sup>96</sup> Tawil, *An Akkadian Lexical Companion*, 244.

predominant idea of what a human is in the term נְפֶשׁ.<sup>97</sup> The rendering of “throat,” akin to Ugaritic and Akkadian cognates, which also include the meaning of “throat,” referring to organs in the body, was a common way of expressing emotional or spiritual meanings.<sup>98</sup> Related to Semitic origin, the meaning of the word נְפֶשׁ is determined by usage and context.<sup>99</sup> The term throat here is where breath is drawn in, where life is sustained and nourished, and where the human appetite is appeased. The earliest use of the term נְפֶשׁ is thought to be “to breathe,” as evidenced in Genesis 1:30, referencing the “breath of life.”<sup>100</sup> The term נְפֶשׁ is indicative of the way man first became a living being, as God breathed life into man.

## Soul

The term נְפֶשׁ is also identified as “soul.” The various views of souls in other cultures create some confusion about the meaning of a soul. Ancient Egyptians had a three-layered view of the soul: the *ka*, *ba*, and *akh*, where the *ka* (*k3*) represented a person’s double or “vital energy,” and the *ba* (*b3*) meant “soul,” which was able to embody a being and depart from the body in the form of a bird, then lastly was *akh* (*3h*) which represented the “transfigured individual after death.”<sup>101</sup> A significant amount of OT scholars view the rendering of נְפֶשׁ with ψυχή as troublesome due to the implied introduction of Greek dualism. However, Bratsiotis noted that the primary meaning of ψυχή was “breath,” meaning “life,” emanating from the pre-

---

<sup>97</sup> Ibid., 245.

<sup>98</sup> Waltke, “נְפֶשׁ,” *TWOT* 588. The Arabic term *nas* is rendered as “soul, mind, life, person, inclination, self (as a reflexive pronoun)” not as “throat,” which the Ugaritic and Akkadian cognates do.

<sup>99</sup> Horst Seebass, “נְפֶשׁ,” *TDOT* 9:497–519.

<sup>100</sup> Waltke, “נְפֶשׁ,” *TWOT* 588.

<sup>101</sup> Seebass, “נְפֶשׁ,” *TDOT* 9:499.

Platonic usage, which is interpreted as the seat of desire or emotions, as well as representing a person or pronoun, and concluded that there is an immense amount of correspondence between the Hebrew term נִפְשׁ and the Greek term ψυχή.<sup>102</sup> Daniel Lys investigated the rendering of נִפְשׁ with ψυχή in the LXX and discovered that ψυχή is substituted 680 times out of the 754 occurrences in the OT where נִפְשׁ occurs and that the LXX never renders “soul” to be understood as a “body,” but views people individually.<sup>103</sup> This is more than just vocabulary, Lys points out:

The LXX used *psyche* in the Hebrew meanings of *nephesh*. Of course, this was possible because of some meanings of *psyche* which were independent of dualism. But the Greek translation of the Hebrew word seems to avoid dualism and is an excellent, faithful understanding and interpretation of *nephesh*. This is most important, for it is not only a matter of exact vocabulary it is a matter of theology. Biblical anthropology exists only in the frame of theology and *psyche* in the LXX could not be the Hellenistic butterfly symbolizing an immortal soul out of the chrysalis of body. Such a butterfly would have had its wings burnt at the devouring fire of the living presence of the unique eternal LORD.<sup>104</sup>

The distance from the preceding definition of “throat” to “soul” is not as far as a leap as one would think. As Wolff puts it, “It is only a short step from the [נִפְשׁ] as specific organ [throat] and an act of desire to the extended meaning, whereby the [נִפְשׁ] is the seat and action of other spiritual experiences and emotions as well.”<sup>105</sup> Here belongs also the Deuteronomic and Deuteronomic expression “love with all one’s *nepes̄*.” The term נִפְשׁ rarely refers to the relationship between God and man as in Psalm 63:8: “My *nepes̄* clings to Yahweh; his right hand upholds it.” This is a significant point, for as Horst Seebass noted, “The expression does not require the נִפְשׁ (*nepes̄*) to love God with all its might. Instead, people are required to love God

---

<sup>102</sup> C. Westermann, “נִפְשׁ,” *TLOT* 2:743–759.

<sup>103</sup> Daniel Lys, “The Israelite Soul According to the LXX,” *VT* 16.2 (1966): 186.

<sup>104</sup> *Ibid.*, 228.

<sup>105</sup> Wolff, *Anthropology of the Old Testament*, 17.

with all their *nepeš* and all their might.”<sup>106</sup> As mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, a living being is a soul.

### Appetite

In cognate languages such as Arabic, *נפש* can refer to the appetite, which is also indicative of one’s will or desire.<sup>107</sup> When *נפש* is translated as “life,” this infers the living self with all its drives, not the abstract notion of “life” which is conveyed by *חַיִּים* (*hayyim*) as in Genesis 2:7, “Then the LORD God formed the man of dust from the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of *life* *חַיִּים* (*hayyim*), and the man became a living creature *נֶפֶשׁ* (*népeš*).” The living creature or soul is *נפש* and the drive or mindset within the person.<sup>108</sup> Leviticus 17:11 clearly shows *נפש* as meaning life within the flesh, which expresses the passion and vitality of an individual, and synonymously *נפש* is rendered as “souls” two additional times in this verse.<sup>109</sup>

### Mental Acts

The term *נפש* is used occasionally for mental acts, as seen in Proverbs 23:7, “For as he thinketh in his heart, so is he ...” (NKJV, KJV).<sup>110</sup> It is interesting that the term *נפש* in this verse is rendered as the heart (KJV, NKJV, AMP), as mind/inwardly calculating (ESV), as the soul (LSB), and one’s whole being/person/within himself (NIV, NLT, NASB, ASV) in various translations. One term, *נפש*, conveys the whole being or soul. All the elements that depict a *נפש*

---

<sup>106</sup> Seebass, “*נפש*,” *TDOT* 9:511.

<sup>107</sup> Waltke, “*נפש*,” *TWOT* 588.

<sup>108</sup> *Ibid.*, 589–590. It is noteworthy that *נפש* is scarcely used when referring to God, as God is not driven by appetites or capable of dying.

<sup>109</sup> *Ibid.*, 590.

<sup>110</sup> BDB, s.v. “*נפש*,” 661.

point to the mindset that governs one's life. The goal of a living being is to choose to fulfill the Shema and live for God's will, but exercising one's volition starts in the mind, specifically driven by one's mindset.

### **The Spirit רוח (*rûah*)/ πνεῦμα (*pneûma*)**

Whereas נְפִישׁ can represent breathing to indicate life, רוח represents the power or force behind breath or wind.<sup>111</sup> The נְפִישׁ ends with the being, but the רוח does not perish.<sup>112</sup> Occurring 378 times in the OT, the word רוח varies in its usage in different contexts and time periods, in a semantic range of terms such as breeze, breath, wind, spirit, sense, mind, and intellectual frame of mind.<sup>113</sup> The term πνεῦμα is rendered for רוח in seventy-five percent of occurrences in the LXX.<sup>114</sup> Occurring the most in Ezekiel and Isaiah fifty-two and fifty-one times, respectively, רוח only appears in six of the OT books (Leviticus, Obadiah, Nehemiah, Ruth, Song of Songs, Esther),<sup>115</sup> The corresponding Greek noun πνεῦμα is frequently used in the NT, 380 times, 145 times in the Pauline corpus (thirty-four in Rom, forty in 1 Cor), 106 times in Lukan writings (thirty-six in Luke, seventy in Acts); with Galatians having the most occurrences for the size of the book (eighteen in 6 chapters).<sup>116</sup> The significance of the term רוח is found in its meaning as a spirit, where רוח denotes the dynamic relationship with God.<sup>117</sup> The רוח is often related to the לב

---

<sup>111</sup> MacDonald, *History of the Concept of Mind*, 7.

<sup>112</sup> *Ibid.*, 8.

<sup>113</sup> Fabry, "רוח," *TDOT* 13:366–402.

<sup>114</sup> MacDonald, *History of the Concept of Mind*, 7.

<sup>115</sup> *HALOT*, s.v. "רוח," 4:1196.

<sup>116</sup> Silva, "πνεῦμα," *NIDNTTE* 3:802–823.

<sup>117</sup> Fabry, "רוח," *TDOT* 13:387.

in addition to being connected to שָׁפָּח; together, these three terms reveal the inward work of God's special creation: mankind.<sup>118</sup>

The Syrian-related term, *rāh*, denotes to breathe or be refreshed (of the spirit, heart).<sup>119</sup> Yahweh forms the human רִיחַ within (Zech 12:1; see also Gen 6:3; Ps 104:29–30; Job 34:14–15; Eccl 12:7).<sup>120</sup> The parallel Greek term πνεῦμα occurs 277 times in the LXX.<sup>121</sup> In the OT, it is intriguing that no distinction is made between the spirit or life in an individual from animals and, more significantly, from the רִיחַ of God's inward presence.<sup>122</sup> However, רִיחַ is also translated as “breath,” which supports life.<sup>123</sup> The רִיחַ connects man to God. “Thus human beings and all living creatures belong to a single, all-inclusive domain of life because they all share the same רִיחַ of God.”<sup>124</sup> In approximately forty passages, πνεῦμα denotes the human spirit or personality.<sup>125</sup> But רִיחַ refers to God more than to man.<sup>126</sup> The mystery of the spirit is that it is what marks people and animals as part of God's creation. No human can create a spirit. In the NT, the personal attributes of the Holy Spirit are seen as the central role and function of the Paraclete as a witness, revealer, and interpreter; in short, a helper for God's people.<sup>127</sup> Though

---

<sup>118</sup> MacDonald, *History of the Concept of Mind*, 8.

<sup>119</sup> HALOT, s.v. “רִיחַ,” 4:1196.

<sup>120</sup> Fabry, “רִיחַ,” *TDOT* 13:386.

<sup>121</sup> HALOT, s.v. “רִיחַ,” 4:1197.

<sup>122</sup> Fabry, “רִיחַ,” *TDOT* 13:387.

<sup>123</sup> HALOT, s.v. “רִיחַ,” 4:1199.

<sup>124</sup> Fabry, “רִיחַ,” *TDOT* 13:388.

<sup>125</sup> Silva, “πνεῦμα,” *NIDNTTE* 3:807.

<sup>126</sup> Wolff, *Anthropology of the Old Testament*, 32.

<sup>127</sup> Silva, “πνεῦμα,” *NIDNTTE* 3:821.

there are also instances when ריח refers to the vital force of humans themselves, not the spirit of Yahweh, seen in one's mindset through mental activity, abilities, and emotions, or seen as an influence (which also impacts one's mindset) from the divine or evil spirit.<sup>128</sup> The term πνεῦμα is depicted as an evil or divine spirit more than forty times, primarily in the Synoptic Gospels.<sup>129</sup> In the NT, the Holy Spirit serves as inspiration and as the power of the gospel (1 Pet 1:12) that sets people apart for God (1 Pet 1:2), healing broken mindsets and transforming God's people through suffering into the image of God's glory (1 Pet 4:14).<sup>130</sup>

## Wind

Another way that ריח is interpreted is as "wind" in 144 texts.<sup>131</sup> Though wind is used as a physical element in the OT, it is also used spiritually as a wind from Yahweh (Isa 40:7; 59:19).<sup>132</sup> An interesting employment of ריח together with the term הבל (*hebel*) renders the meaning "breath," or "worthlessness," occurring in Ecclesiastes sixty-six times alone: "The wind (*rûah*) will carry them off, a breath (*hebel*) will take them away."<sup>133</sup> The Greek counterpart verb πνέω refers to wind and occurs only seven times in the NT; and in John 3:8, the wind is compared with the Spirit's activity.<sup>134</sup> The term ריח can also indicate worthlessness in reference to idols as an "empty wind" (Isa 41:29).

---

<sup>128</sup> Fabry, "ריח," *TDOT* 13:388.

<sup>129</sup> Silva, "πνεῦμα," *NIDNTTE* 3:808.

<sup>130</sup> *Ibid.*, 3:822.

<sup>131</sup> Fabry, "ריח," *TDOT* 13:373.

<sup>132</sup> *HALOT*, s.v. "ריח," 4:1199.

<sup>133</sup> Fabry, "ריח," *TDOT* 13:374.

<sup>134</sup> Silva, "πνεῦμα," *NIDNTTE* 3:807.

## Life or Live

Other terms evoking a similar meaning as רוח include חיה (*hāyā*), which means “live,” the noun חַיִּים (*hayyîm*), “life,” and רוח itself can be rendered “physical vitality” (Gen 45:27; Jgs 15:19; 1 Sam 30:12; 1 Kgs 21:5).<sup>135</sup> In the Qumran texts, רוח is used to express the basic orientation of a person’s life.<sup>136</sup> Interestingly, the phrase “breath of life,” the Priestly source calls *rûah hayyîm* in Genesis 6:17, speaking of both humans and animals and of solely animals in Genesis 7:22.<sup>137</sup> The heart is viewed as the source of life (חַיִּים), spirit (רוח), and heart (לב) are treated synonymously in the LXX (Deut 2:30; Josh 2:11; Ps 34:18; 51:10; 143:4; Isa 65:14; Ezek 18:31; Dan 5:20.)<sup>138</sup> The overlap in anthropological terms is evident in which נפש shares the same meaning of רוח as “life” and “breath,” though in most occurrences, רוח is paired with Yahweh, which is very rare with נָפֶשׁ, and רוח is rarely used concretely as נָפֶשׁ is; as a “living being.”<sup>139</sup> When used in parallelism together, both terms collectively mean “soul,” “mind,” or “life” (see Isa 26:9).<sup>140</sup> Schmidt contends that when used in parallelism, the second term is equivalent to a personal pronoun, as in Psalm 31:6, “Into your hand I commend my *spirit*, for you redeem *me*, Yahweh the faithful God.”<sup>141</sup> Though there is overlap in the heart, soul, and mind, נָפֶשׁ denotes the whole being, whereas רוח is “within” the person (Isa 19:3, 14; 26:9; 63:11;

---

<sup>135</sup> Fabry, “רוח,” *TDOT* 13:375.

<sup>136</sup> Silva, “πνεῦμα,” *NIDNTTE* 3:806.

<sup>137</sup> Fabry, “רוח,” *TDOT* 13:375.

<sup>138</sup> Silva, “πνεῦμα,” *NIDNTTE* 3:805.

<sup>139</sup> Fabry, “רוח,” *TDOT* 13:375.

<sup>140</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>141</sup> Werner Schmidt, “Anthropologische Begriffe im Alten Testament,” *EvT* 24.7 (1964): 386.



Ezek 11:19; 36:26–27; Hos 5:4; Hab 2:19; Zec 12:1; Ps 51:12).<sup>142</sup> Both terms can express desire.

The most common overlap in anthropological terms is with רִיחַ and לֵב, where both indicate corporeal vitality.<sup>143</sup>

## Mind

The term רִיחַ can also refer to the mind or disposition, reflecting one’s mindset.<sup>144</sup> It can sometimes specifically pertain to mindset when rendered as “hidden thoughts, intentions, and decisions of a person” (Isa 29:13; Ps 28:3; Job 10:13; Prov 25:3).<sup>145</sup> When referring to the spirit of man, רִיחַ means “the natural spirit of humanity, as sense, mind, intellectual frame of mind.”<sup>146</sup> One of the more common uses for רִיחַ denotes “mind,” as synonymous with “heart” (see Num 14:24; Deut 2:30; Isa 26:9; 29:24; Ezek 13:3; Mal 2:15–16; Ps 32:2; 77:7; 106:33; 142:4; 143:4; Job 21:4; 32:18; Eccl 7:9), referring to either man’s or God’s own “mind,” as in Isa 40:13, when רִיחַ is translated in the LXX with νοῦς, though it is rare for Yahweh’s רִיחַ to denote “mind” or “attitude” (see Mic 2:7; Isa 30:1).<sup>147</sup> The term רִיחַ is also used to depict a mindset through the phrase רִיחַ אֶתְרַת, denoting a frame of mind (Num 14:24; Deut 2:30; Ps 32:2).<sup>148</sup> *Pneuma* is used to depict mindset in the phrase, τίθεμαι ἐν τῷ πνεύματι, meaning to make up one’s mind.<sup>149</sup> The

---

<sup>142</sup> Fabry, “רִיחַ,” *TDOT* 13:375.

<sup>143</sup> *Ibid.*, 13:376.

<sup>144</sup> Ernest Klein, “רִיחַ,” *CEDHLE*, 610.

<sup>145</sup> Fabry, “רִיחַ,” *TDOT* 13:376.

<sup>146</sup> *HALOT*, s.v. “רִיחַ,” 4:1199.

<sup>147</sup> Fabry, “רִיחַ,” *TDOT* 13:377.

<sup>148</sup> *HALOT*, s.v. “רִיחַ,” 4:1199.

<sup>149</sup> *L&N*, s.v. “τίθεμαι ἐν τῷ τίθεμαι ἐν τῷ,” 358.

mind is evident in all three terms: heart, soul, and spirit. The anthropological terms point to one's cognition and the process in which man relates to God and the world. But a living being is also encased in flesh.

### **The Flesh בָּשָׂר (*bāśār*)/ σῶμα (*sōma*)**

The most common equivalent NT term for בָּשָׂר (*bāśār*) is the Greek word σῶμα (*sōma*), referring to the living human body, though there is no perfect equivalent in Hebrew for the body.<sup>150</sup> Another term used as an equivalent is σὰρξ (*sarx*). Viewing σῶμα through a Semitic lens provides a better sense of the term, rather than a Hellenistic lens. Where the Semitic lens refers to σῶμα as the whole self, not just the human body; a σῶμα is not just a facet of humanity that one possesses; man *is* a *sōma* in relationship to God and man.<sup>151</sup> These anthropological terms serve as the seat of psychic and physical aspects and demonstrate how these function in relation to God and others. Wolff aptly states that “The inner parts of the body and its organs are at the same time the bearer of man’s spiritual and ethical impulses.”<sup>152</sup> The biblical man is not separated into a body and a soul, but he is both “flesh and nephesh.”<sup>153</sup> The term for flesh is *bāśār* in Hebrew and *sarx* in Greek and has a range of meanings, with flesh connoting man’s weakness in relation to God (Gen 6:3, 12; Deut 5:23; Ps 65:3). “Flesh is never applied to God as so many of man’s bodily parts are in anthropomorphism: it clearly refers to bodily creatures made by God.”<sup>154</sup>

---

<sup>150</sup> Mathews, “Toward Reclaiming an Authentic Biblical-Christian View of the Body,” 282.

<sup>151</sup> Ibid.

<sup>152</sup> Wolff, *Anthropology of the Old Testament*, 66.

<sup>153</sup> Mathews, “Toward Reclaiming an Authentic Biblical-Christian View of the Body,” 281.

<sup>154</sup> Ibid., 282.

In examination of the above anthropological terms, the spectrum of meaning in the terms depicting the nature of man is both wide and narrow. Wide in that man is fearfully and wonderfully made in the image of God with many varied complexities, yet narrow in that the parts together form one holistic being. The varied terms collectively state man's existence and purpose in relationship to God, and his mind is what helps him to love God with all his being.<sup>155</sup> Having established that the mind of man is where spiritual and cognitive activity takes place, it is to mindsets that this investigation will now turn.

### The Mindset Terminology

The concept of thinking in the OT is commonly communicated with the verb חָשַׁב (*hāšab*, “to think”), or בִּין (*bîn*, “to understand,”) which conveys a broad semantic range of abstract cognitive functions in one's mind. The translation of חָשַׁב in the Septuagint is typically λογίζομαι (*logizomai*), meaning “to reckon,” while the NT employs δοκέω (*dokeō*, “to think”) and φρονέω (*phronéō*, “to think”) is also used the most commonly for חָשַׁב, meaning to have an expressed opinion or formed attitude.<sup>156</sup> *HALOT* underscores the intention and mindset correlation of this term חָשַׁב. “(Pairing) חָ with (an) infinitive (*means*) to intend, to have in mind (1 Sam 18:25; Jer 18:8; 23:27; 26:3; 36:3; Ps 140:5; Job 6:26; Lam 2:8; Est 9:24; Neh 6:2, 6; absolute Isa 10:7).”<sup>157</sup> But the verb φρονέω is not typically used as an equivalent for חָשַׁב in the Septuagint. Context largely determines the meaning of the constellation of cognitive terms pertaining to one's

---

<sup>155</sup> For additional anthropological and mindset terms, see Appendix A. Only a summary of a few primary terms is displayed in this chapter.

<sup>156</sup> David M. Emanuel, “Thinking,” in *Lexham Theological Wordbook*, ed. Douglas Mangum, Derek R. Brown, Rachel Klippenstein, and Rebekah Hurst, Lexham Bible Reference Series. Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2014.

<sup>157</sup> *HALOT*, s.v., “חָשַׁב,” 1:359–360.

mindset. The lack of terms for the mind in the OT once again is why the term mindset is not explicitly mentioned in the OT, but mindsets are evident in certain contexts as well as in idioms employed. The mindset terms collectively work together to show the significance of mindset within the canon that affects the ability of one to love God with all one's being and to be able to discern and apply its contents rightly.

Paul's use of φρονέω is unique in the NT as he utilizes the term twenty-six of the twenty-nine times it appears in the NT.<sup>158</sup> Philippians has the highest number of occurrences (10 times), which Silva notes is not simply redundancy but a point that Paul is making. Other cognitive terms (such as διαλογισμός (*dialogismos*), ἐνθύμησις (*enthymēsis*), ἐννοία (*ennoia*), and δίανοια (*dianoia*) convey the meaning of thoughts or understanding and could have sufficed as synonyms, but they would not convey the message that φρονέω conveys.<sup>159</sup> It is not merely thoughts that Paul is trying to get across, but “mental determination,” which only φρονέω demonstrates, and which leads to the need for a higher supernatural way of thinking to overcome entrenched mindsets and become mature in Christ. With each repetition of φρονέω in Philippians, the pattern of having a mindset like Christ's is emphasized and pressed so Paul's hearers will see the significance of mindsets.

Mindsets determine one's life so one must determine to have the right mindset. This is what makes mindset terms so significant. The term φρονέω is reserved by Paul to illustrate the mind of Christ. Sanders calls the mind of Christ “Jesus-*phronesis*,” stating that it is a clarion call

---

<sup>158</sup> See instances of φρονέω in the NT Matt 16:23; Mark 8:33; Acts 28:22; Rom 8:5; 11:20; 12:3 (2x); 12:16 (2x); 14:6 (4x); 15:5; 1 Cor 4:6; 13:11; 2 Cor 13:11; Gal 5:10; Phil 1:7; 2:2 (2x), 5; 3:15 (2x), 16, 19; 4:2, 10 (2x); Col 3:2 and 7x in the non-apocryphal Septuagint (LXX) Deut 32:29; Esther 8:12; Ps 94:8; Isa 44:18, 28; 56:10; Zech 9:2. The cognate terms in the φρονέω word group are also rare (φρόνησις 2x in Luke 1:17 and Eph 1:8; φρόνημα 4x in Rom 8:6 (2x), 7, 8; φρόνιμος in Luke 16:8; and the adjective φρόνιμος occurs fourteen times.

<sup>159</sup> Moisés Silva, *Philippians*, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1993), 38.

to the Torah. “Paul’s use of the word *phroneō*, bidding his followers to think a certain way, recalls crucial passages in Scripture that express what having God’s Torah, or God’s way of thinking, as the way the prophets thought in their time and wanted the people to think as well.”<sup>160</sup> God’s heart has always been for his people to have his way of thinking, and when God’s people have the mind of Christ collectively, there is beautiful unity. Hellerman emphasizes the volitional aspect of *φρονέω* stating that it is a distinctly Pauline word that is more than just thoughts or emotions, for *φρονεῖν* includes an intentional, volitional component.<sup>161</sup> Posey makes a distinction that when *φρονέω* is joined together with *sophia* or *nous*, “*φρονέω* carries the more practical side of wisdom.”<sup>162</sup> The term “*φρονέω* provides insight into how to live this life by transcending above one’s thoughts through Christ’s thoughts, having the wisdom to see past given situations to gain insight from God’s eternal perspective.

The referent of *φρονέω* is either the flesh or the Spirit; there is no in-between. The term *φρονέω* stands at a crossroads in one’s mind. Choose wisdom or folly; choose the flesh or the Spirit. “Dependence on *σάρξ* or on *πνεῦμα* determines the nature of the whole person, including all of a person’s thoughts and aspirations.”<sup>163</sup> Silva sounds the alarm to not let one’s thoughts dictate how one should live—instead, determine how to think and live:

The Christian’s duty to grow in holiness requires the right attitude, singleness of purpose, and mental concentration. Paul’s concern with this matter is reflected in the striking frequency of the verb *φρονέω* (*phroneō*, lit. “think”) in Philippians. This peculiarity has often been mentioned by commentators but seldom

---

<sup>160</sup> James A. Sanders, “A Disciple in Damascus,” *BTB* 2018 48:1, 38.

<sup>161</sup> Joseph H. Hellerman, *Philippians*, Andreas J. Kostenberger, Robert W. Yarbrough, eds., EGGNT (Nashville: B & H Publishers, 2015), 26.

<sup>162</sup> David A. Posey, “The Unifying Theme of The Mind of Christ in Philippians Demonstrated by Paul’s Use of Rhetorical and Linguistic Devices In Oral/Aural Culture,” (PhD Diss., Liberty University, 2018), 79.

<sup>163</sup> Horst Robert Balz and Gerhard Schneider, s.v. *EDNT* “*φρονέω*,” 3:439

developed. Moreover, the English reader can easily miss it because the verb, which can be used in a variety of contexts, requires more than one rendering.<sup>164</sup>

The use of φρονέω in the LXX is also illuminating, as its use in the OT conveys a sense of understanding, pointing to a higher way of thinking.<sup>165</sup> Other cognitive terms in the LXX are in Appendix I, meaning “thought” or “frame of mind.” In the OT, they convey what shapes the godly mindset—wisdom, understanding, the fear of the LORD, a holy attitude, spiritual discernment, truth, and humility. Below is a brief review of the use of φρονέω as well as similar terms employed throughout the canon, to be expounded on further in chapter five regarding Paul’s use of these terms. These terms provide a lens through which to see God’s intention for the mind of man—mindset renewal is imperative. Man is fearfully and wonderfully made, and one’s thoughts truly matter. Mindsets are not merely pragmatic. Different faculties exist within the mind, including the emotions, the senses, and cognition, but one’s mind can lead one’s senses through the Spirit. The development of mindsets is a spiritual matter driven by human will and cultivated by the culture, flesh, and/or the Holy Spirit. Thoughts emanate from the innermost part of man’s being, which God can influence through the Holy Spirit and the mind of Christ. Jesus helped his disciple’s minds (νοῦς) to understand the Scriptures (Luke 24:45, 1 John 5:20). The Holy Spirit does the same for all believers, and Christ demonstrated how to think, as well. Understanding the background of central cognitive terms helps to shed light on the progression of mindset terminology and how these terms were depicted in the OT and the NT.

---

<sup>164</sup> Silva, *Philippians*, BECNT, 37.

<sup>165</sup> See Deuteronomy 32:29, Psalm 94:8, Isaiah 44:18, 28, 56:10, in the Septuagint and Appendix B, which includes 71 occurrences of φρονέω and φρόνησις.

## The Mindset Φρονέω (*phroneō*)

Derived from the noun stem φρήν, the first instance of the φρονέω word group was in Plato, referring to the trunk of the human body, or mid-section; in essence, “the seat of the passions and the intellect.”<sup>166</sup> The main meaning rendered for this verb in the NT is to have understanding, be wise, and be prudent; the actions of a mindset.<sup>167</sup> Though it is not an exact parallel, the central Hebrew counterpart, the root פָּרַן (*bîn*) exhibits cognitive functioning pertaining to the mindset; “to understand” or “to distinguish,” occurring 250 times, mostly in the Psalms and wisdom texts (Prov 67 times, Job 36 times, Ps 30 times), as well as in Isaiah 28 times, and it is also attested to in almost the entire Northwest and Southern Semitic language domain.<sup>168</sup> The Greek key term for mindset, φρονέω, and its cognates occur extensively in LXX and the NT as well as in extrabiblical literature. Occurring almost 100 times in Homer’s works, the verb φρονέω depicts cognitive functions, with a volitional sense (“to intend, be minded”) being more prominent.<sup>169</sup> Post-Homeric uses of the nouns φρόνημα and φρόνησις emanate from the early classical period, describing a person’s disposition.<sup>170</sup> The root term φρήν is reminiscent

---

<sup>166</sup> Silva, “φρονέω,” *NIDNTE* 4:616–22.

<sup>167</sup> Henry Liddell, et al., “φρονέω,” *LSJ* 1955–1956.

<sup>168</sup> H. H. Schmid, “פָּרַן *bîn* to understand,” *TLOT* 1:230.

<sup>169</sup> Silva, “φρονέω,” *NIDNTE* 4:616. One example of Homer’s works that uses φρονέω is where the term φρονέω is translated as to be “minded.” Apollo approached Telphousa and said, “Here I am minded to make my beautiful temple as an oracle for humankind.” (Τελέφουσ’, ἐνθάδε δὴ φρονέω περικαλλέα νηὶ ἀνθρώπων τεύξαι χρηστήριον.) (Homer, *Hom. Hymns* 3. To Apollo 21:90–91). Utilizing the Chicago Homer tool, the term φρήν (the root of φρονέω) occurs 400 times across the Homer corpus along with other cognitive terms such as θυμός (843) and ἄνθρωπος (336), which are dominant, as well. Ahuvia Kahane and Martin Mueller, “The Chicago Homer,” ed. Craig Berry and Bill Parod, trans. Daryl Hine and Richard Lattimore, (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, El. Pub./Northwestern University Library, 2001), <https://homer.library.northwestern.edu/>. Sullivan states that φρένες (*phrenes*) occurs over 343 times in the Homeric epics, 179 times in the *Il.*, and 164 times in the *Od.*, and is “the second most common hypostatic term in Homer.” Shirley D. Sullivan, *Psychological Activity in Homer: A Study of Phrēn* (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1988), 207, 209–284.

<sup>170</sup> Rachael Tan, “Revisiting the Carmen Christi: Paul’s Perspective on Humiliation and Exaltation in Philippians 3:7–11,” *Matthew, Paul, and Others: Asian Perspectives on New Testament Themes* (2019): 156–7.

of anthropological terms in the OT, where the earliest definition was regarded as a “diaphragm,” as the seat of intellectual and spiritual activity.<sup>171</sup> Canonical occurrences of φρονέω and its cognates reveal the emphasis that Scripture places on willful cognitive functions. The term φρήν occurs twelve times in the LXX, eight of which are in Proverbs, typically congruent with the Hebrew בֶּלֶם, and the verb φρονέω occurs fifteen times with six of those in the OT rendered as four different Hebrew terms (חָכָם, “to be wise,” in Deut 32:29; Zech 9:2), as well as φροντίζω occurring fifteen times without a consistent Hebrew equivalent. The noun φρόνημα occurs only two times in the LXX.<sup>172</sup> Other cognates have a higher frequency, such as the noun φρόνησις, which occurs sixty times, especially in wisdom literature, and the adjective φρόνιμος, which occurs forty times, and ἄφρων, which is the highest occurring member of the word group with 130 times, primarily in the wisdom literature.<sup>173</sup>

One central theme of wisdom literature is the comparison of the fool with the godly person. The significant use of the word group of φρονέω in wisdom literature makes a case for the significance of mindset in determining whether one is a foolish or wise person. This is underscored in the DSS, “Until now, the spirits of truth and injustice feud in the heart of man: they walk in wisdom or in folly.”<sup>174</sup> One’s mindset determines one’s outlook and life. Paul’s extensive use of the φρονέω word family unifies all the anthropological terms, demonstrating that it is not just the cognitive functions that are significant but what one does with those

---

<sup>171</sup> Georg Bertram, “Φρονέω,” *TDNT* 9:220–236.

<sup>172</sup> Silva, “φρονέω,” *NIDNTTE* 4:617.

<sup>173</sup> *Ibid.*, 4:617.

<sup>174</sup> Florentino Garcia Martinez, “1QS IV, 23–24,” *Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, edited by F. Martinez, and E.J.C. Tigchelaar (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 79.



functions. A deeper study of φρονέω will further explore the implications of φρονέω throughout the canon in chapter five.

### The Mind

It is evident that the heart, soul, and spirit all pertain to the mind. There are several terms in the NT that are rendered as mind and simultaneously the functions of the mind. The mind is the place where reasoning transpires, but reasoning can evolve into fixed mindsets that are either set on the things of man or the things of God. There are many significant terms depicting the mind and its functions that convey the role one's mental disposition plays in the formation of mindsets. In the next section is a brief review of the background and general meaning of three main cognitive terms.<sup>175</sup>

#### **Νοῦς (*nous*)/ διάνοια (*dianoia*)/ ἔννοια (*ennoia*)**

The terms νοῦς, διάνοια, and ἔννοια all refer to “mind,” “disposition,” or the total inner or moral attitude,” but also have varying definitions.<sup>176</sup> The term νοῦς is used to depict the result of mental activity, sometimes with the participation of the will; “thought,” “opinion,” “judgment,” “resolve,” “purpose,” “plan.”<sup>177</sup> The term νοῦς functions as a synonym for διάνοια, which is depicted as the first instance in the process or outcome of mental activity, as a “thought,” and representative of the seat of “mental, volitional, and emotional faculties.”<sup>178</sup>

Religion and Greek philosophy developed their own various cognitive terms.

---

<sup>175</sup> See additional terms in Appendix A, where eighty-five terms are examined in relation to mindsets and the promised mind renewal motif throughout the canon.

<sup>176</sup> Behm, “Νοέω,” *TDNT* 4:948–1022.

<sup>177</sup> Behm, “νοῦς,” *TDNT* 4:953.

<sup>178</sup> Silva, “νοῦς,” *NIDNTTE* 3:425–426.

Noûς

The νοῦς became an organ of thought where “reason” or “mind” transpired to comprehend life and the world and defined understanding itself as the ability to perceive, order, and control everything.<sup>179</sup> The term νοῦς is very rare (used six times for לֵב or לִבָּ in the LXX), as there was no Hebrew equivalent that expresses intellect or reason.<sup>180</sup> The scarce use of νοῦς in the LXX is due to the absence of an equivalent Hebraic term for “mind.” The term heart is the most significant similar term, which was typically rendered as καρδία to represent לֵב/לִבָּ. Paul’s quotation of Isa 40:13 in 1 Cor 2:16 utilizes the LXX rendering (with νοῦς), which expresses the Spirit, rather than the mind, of God, and thus makes a crucial theological statement: “We have the Spirit of Christ and therefore we really know Christ.”<sup>181</sup> Paul’s quotation from Isaiah 40:13 in 1 Corinthians 2:16 and Romans 11:34 unveils the saving purpose of God, the mind of Christ, “τίς γὰρ ἔγνω νοῦν κυρίου; νοῦς,” in which Paul reveals the solution to the problem of Israel’s waywardness (Rom 9–11). In 1 Corinthians 2:7, Paul shows the hidden plan of salvation that was manifest in Christ.<sup>182</sup> The noun νοῦς occurs twenty-four times in the NT, slightly higher than the LXX, but still significantly lower than extrabiblical writings (almost 700 in Philo, over 400 in Plato, over 300 in Plutus, with only a dozen times in Epictetus).<sup>183</sup> The significance of the NT use of the group of mindset words is it establishes its own interpretation in which understanding

---

<sup>179</sup> Ibid., 3:427.

<sup>180</sup> Behm, “Noûς,” *TDNT* 4:953.

<sup>181</sup> Jobes, *Invitation to the Septuagint*, 219.

<sup>182</sup> Behm, “Noûς,” *TDNT* 4:959.

<sup>183</sup> Silva, “voûς,” *NIDNTTE* 3:430.

itself becomes a disposition, an attitude, and thus a mindset of faith.<sup>184</sup> Paul's significant use of φρονέω underscores this.

### Διάνοια

The term διάνοια encompasses “the faculty of thinking, comprehending, and reasoning, *understanding, intelligence, mind* as the organ of νοεῖν.”<sup>185</sup> The term διάνοια occurs approximately seventy times in the LXX (nine times in Exod and seven in Gen), expressing emotions and acts of will (Exod 35:22; Isa 35:4), but it also represents the entire inner life (Gen 8:21) and can mean a mindset rendered as “thought or intention” (Num 15:39; Isa 55:9).<sup>186</sup> Whereas the Greeks sought knowledge of the world, Hebrews sought knowledge of the Word, knowing God. Philo was more concerned with the significance of the mind as it related to the ability to gain knowledge of God, using the term διάνοια 500 times in the same way as νοῦς, as the divine aspect in human beings (Deut 29), making them immortal (*Opif.* 135).<sup>187</sup> Parallel to νοῦς, διάνοια can indicate the spiritual aspect of man, one's “spirit” or “soul,” as distinct from

---

<sup>184</sup> Ibid., 3:434.

<sup>185</sup> Arndt, *BDAG*, 234. Hermas conveyed how the faculties of thinking can become corrupt simply by busyness or distraction. “People who believe but fall into these sundry activities ... are led astray from their understanding and perceive nothing at all about righteousness ... their mind is occupied with their other concerns, and they perceive nothing at all” (Herm. Mand. 10.1 (40) [Ehrman]).

<sup>186</sup> Silva, “νοῦς,” *NIDNTTE* 3:428.

<sup>187</sup> Silva, “Διάνοια,” *NIDNTTE* 3:429.

the body.<sup>188</sup> The *διάνοια* is one spiritual faculty among the five faculties of the soul.<sup>189</sup> The term *διάνοια* is reminiscent of a mindset when it is rendered as “way of thought” or “disposition.”<sup>190</sup>

### Εννοια

In the LXX, *ἐννοια* occurs twelve times in Proverbs, meaning “consideration,” “insight,” “perception,” and “cleverness.” But it is rare in other Hellenistic Jewish writings.<sup>191</sup> The term *ἐννοια* conveys one’s disposition or intentions and is understood philosophically as a concept.<sup>192</sup> “Concepts arise out of the understanding by way of experience, or they are formed on the ground of deliberate observation.”<sup>193</sup> The terms for mind and cognitive function that provide the ability of the mind to understand and rightly interpret Scripture hinges upon man loving God with all his being and the Spirit of God renewing man’s mind. This is evident in Barnabas’ apocryphal book as well as in Scripture.

“What, then, meaneth this: “into the good land, a land flowing with milk and honey?” Blessed be our Lord, who has placed in us wisdom and understanding of secret things. For the prophet says, “Who shall understand the parable of the Lord, except him who is wise and prudent, and who loves his Lord” (Barn. 1.6 (*ANF* 1.140))?<sup>194</sup>

---

<sup>188</sup> Behm, “*Διάνοια*,” *TDNT* 4:948–1022. This atomistic ancient philosophical view was espoused in the first century as demonstrated in Plutarch’s *Quaestiones Convivales* by the description of the harm that mindsets can do to both the mind and body. “Remaining with and abiding in those persons ... disturb and *injure them both in mind and body*” (κακοῦν αὐτῶν τό τε σῶμα καὶ τὴν διάνοιαν) (Plutarch, *Quaest. Conv.*, 5.7.6 [Goodwin]).

<sup>189</sup> Behm, “*Διάνοια*,” *TDNT* 4:964. *Διάνοια* is rendered as understanding in the 5-fold faculties of the soul by John of Damascus: “Of these spiritual faculties (mind, understanding, opinion, imagination, sense), understanding has deemed the power of the soul because it can gain knowledge through reasoning and open up a certain path. John of Damascus, *Fragmenta* 575 (PG 95:232b) (Author’s Translation).

<sup>190</sup> Behm, “*Διάνοια*,” *TDNT* 4:964.

<sup>191</sup> Behm “*Εννοια*,” *TDNT* 4:969–70.

<sup>192</sup> *Ibid.*, 4:969.

<sup>193</sup> *Ibid.*, 4:969.

<sup>194</sup> The reference to a prophetic utterance in this passage from Barnabas’ epistle is not from Scripture. Though it is thought to be similar to Isaiah 40:13, it is clearly different. Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and

Jesus conveyed that the “slow of heart” condition of the disciples prevented them from rightly dividing the Word of God. “And he said to them, “O foolish ones, and slow of heart (καρδία) to believe all that the prophets have spoken!” (Luke 24:25) Then it was Christ alone who could open their minds to understand (Luke 24:45).<sup>195</sup> Having the ability to think is not enough for mind renewal. The Holy Spirit illumines the understanding of man so man can walk with God.

### Mindset Processes

The mechanics of mindset formation are evident throughout the canon. In the introduction of chapter one, the progression of a mindset was shown in Isaiah 43:10 through the terms “know דָּעָה (*dā ‘ā(h)*),” “believe יִמְנָן (*’āmôn*),” and “understand יָבִין (*bîn*).” This demonstration of the progression of a mindset reveals the significance of mindsets in shaping one’s belief system and the need to preserve one’s mind from knowledge that leads to corruption. The consequences of unchecked mindsets are evident in Genesis 6:12, where the ways of the entire world became corrupt. One thoughts lead to one’s ways. But Scripture also holds a prescription toward healing broken mindsets by forsaking one’s ways and thoughts (Isa 57:12), which points to the higher thoughts of Yahweh as the remedy (Isa 55:8–9). The examination of

---

A. Cleveland Coxe, eds., “The Epistle of Barnabas,” in *The Apostolic Fathers with Justin Martyr and Irenaeus*, vol. 1, The Ante-Nicene Fathers (Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Company, 1885), 140.

<sup>195</sup> Christian Gnosticism takes the νοῦς and states that access to God is only through the νοῦς, of which God and Christ are by nature νοῦς. T. Flavius Clemens Alexandrinus of Athens was a proponent of this philosophical doctrine of the νοῦς from Anaxagoras to Philo, who made this doctrine necessary in the church: “content a *theologoumenon*” where “God the Father is νοῦς; the Logos is the Son of νοῦς.” Behm, “νοῦς,” *TDNT* 4:960. Clement notes that when the human νοῦς was free from evil, it was able to receive the power of God as God’s image was set up in it. “Mens enim, quæ est munda et ab omni vitio libera, est quodammodo apta ad potestatem Dei snsciendam, cum divina in ea assurgat imago” “For when it is pure and set free from all evil the mind is somehow capable of receiving the power of God and the divine image is set up in it.” Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* 3.5 (*ANF* 2:388) (Author’s translation). The view of the νοῦς in Christianity was set apart from the philosophical and religious mysticism of the culture.

Deuteronomy 15:9a in chapter one also conveyed the formation of mindsets, which begins with a wicked thought and then becomes an attitude (mindset). Idioms were also a way of conveying mindsets. In Isaiah 47:7, the Hebrew idiom “you did not place/lay these things on your heart” is interpreted as “you did not consider these things in your heart.” Consideration depicts the process of mindsets by connecting νοέω with καρδία, suggesting the process of decisions and shaping of mindsets is connected to moral decisions. (See also 1 Sam 4:20; Prov 16:23; Isa 44:18).<sup>196</sup>

### **The State of the Mind: Mindset Narrative**

The roadmap of God’s plan of redemption progressively unfolds through the biblical narrative, which portrays man’s struggle within his own mind to be faithful to God. The prolific use of mindset terminology connects the books of the Bible with common threads that demonstrate their significance as they pertain to man’s state of mind and his inability to seek or love God on his own. Following the trail of breadcrumbs that Scripture has left to be discovered pertaining to mind renewal from the OT to the NT reveals the hope of transformation by the Spirit and the Word of God. But other significant agents of change are necessary to instigate a change of mindset: repentance and suffering. Repentance opens the door for mind renewal by rejecting one’s own thoughts (mindsets) as unbelief while making them subject to God’s thoughts. The significance of repentance *μετάνοια* (*metanoia*) is discussed more in-depth in chapter four.

The state of one’s mind can be turned upside down by life’s circumstances and suffering. Suffering is not something anyone wants to volunteer for in order to have mind renewal.

---

<sup>196</sup> Silva, “Ἐννοια,” *NIDNTTE* 3:428–29.

Suffering can be a harsh tutor, but the fruit of suffering can also render the mind of Christ in those who submit to its instruction. Both Peter and Paul illustrate the potency of suffering with the mind of Christ. Peter appeals to the importance of being armed with the same attitude toward suffering that Christ had (1 Pet 1:13–16; 4:1–2).

Since therefore Christ suffered in the flesh, arm yourselves with the same way of thinking, for whoever has suffered in the flesh has ceased from sin, so as to live for the rest of the time in the flesh no longer for human passions but for the will of God (1 Peter 4:1–2).

Suffering is often a segue for negative mindsets precipitated with complaining and accusations against God, as attested to in the example of the Israelites in the OT. The Jewish people did not expect a suffering Messiah, though they should have (Isa 53). Human nature does not prize suffering, preferring to avoid it. But there is a secret blessing within suffering for those who are willing to see it. Suffering wakes up the sufferer to the reality that there is more to this life than the pursuit of pleasure. And just as it is pleasure that drives one’s mindset to the flesh, it is suffering that can drive one’s mindset to pursue God.

The term Peter uses to depict a mindset is the Greek term *ἔννοια*.<sup>197</sup> In LXX Proverbs *ἔννοια* is rendered as a mindset or disposition that is right and moral (Prov 2:11; 3:21; 16:22; 23:19). Peter uses this term to point his readers toward the same resolve of Christ.<sup>198</sup> Choosing to obey God and have the mind of Christ toward suffering helps one to rise above sinful mindsets that suffering can often produce. Peter is showing the purpose of suffering, which is embodied in the suffering Jesus encountered. Through his suffering and death sprang forth a path to

---

<sup>197</sup> The term *ἔννοια* is a favorite word in the LXX Proverbs, occurring 12 times, rendered as “consideration,” “insight,” “perception,” and “cleverness.” “It is used for *חֵכֶם* (1:4; 3:21; cf. 8:12), *בִּינָה* (4:1; 23:4), *תְּבוּנָה* (2:11), *שִׂכָּל* (16:22), or *דַּעַת* (18:1). The addition of *ἀγαθή* or *όσία* stresses the fact that it has a good sense (5:2; 19:7; 24:7; 2:11) ... in the plural it denotes ethical thoughts, 23:19.” Behm, “*Νοῦς*,” *TDNT* 4:969.

<sup>198</sup> Karen H. Jobes, *1 Peter*, BECNT (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2005), 237.

redemption and a basis for Christian living (1 Pet 1:3, 18–19; 2:21–25; 3:18; 4:1).<sup>199</sup> Changing one's mindset is difficult and, in fact, impossible in the flesh. Suffering is a powerful tool to interrupt man's cyclic thinking and reveal the need for change. Repentance unlocks this change. Mindsets are central to the Fall and central to one's faith. Maintaining one's mindset through the Holy Spirit helps God's people to rise above the agony of life and think like Jesus through it all.

### **Conclusion: The Point of the Matter**

The mechanics of one's mind are complex. Yet the process of thinking and developing a carnal or godly mindset begins with a simple word, concept, or material occurrence that is then received, and either interpreted by the senses, emotions, and thoughts of a person—in accordance with their worldview or identity. These thoughts become “truth” and a part of one's belief system to the individual unless this perceived “truth” is filtered through the Word of truth. Without having one's mind renewed to see God's truth and apply it, God's people are unable to interpret the Word of God rightly. One's own subjective truth is based on a faulty interpretation from a deceptive heart that causes life to be viewed through a warped lens skewed toward self rather than the glory of God. The metanarrative of mindsets in Scripture and in the surrounding culture points to the need to identify with God's thoughts and ways more than one's own and reveals the storyline of God's redemption of man's mind. In the next chapter, the impact that cultures and worship have on mindsets demonstrates many ways that the mind is hardened.

---

<sup>199</sup> Ibid., 240.



## **CHAPTER 3: THE MAKING AND BREAKING OF A MINDSET—THE IMPACT OF CULTURE**

### **Introduction**

The ANE culture of the OT and the Greco-Roman culture of the NT yielded a powerful influence on the mindsets of God's people, turning their hearts away from God. The metanarrative of Scripture shows that the propensity for man to fall into apostasy hinges upon one's mindset, and ironically, it was worship that caused God's people to stumble. Worldly mindsets were shaped by worship practices in the surrounding culture. God's people were created to worship Yahweh, but lesser counterfeit idols took Yahweh's place, ensnaring the mind of man. Yahweh chose Israel as a unique people to be separate from the ANE culture so they would know and worship Him and make Him known to the world's nations. However, the cultural streams surrounding God's people were a threat to their devotion to God, hindering evangelism and the interpretation and application of God's Word. Worshiping the gods of the syncretic culture corrupted the minds of God's people, distracting them from their relationship with God. Their identity in Yahweh became an ethnic identity rather than an ethical one. Being faithful to God is an impossible endeavor without mind renewal but when people repent from worshiping the creation to worshiping God alone, their minds are restored. God had a solution for his people all along, which the Word of God points to—the perfect mind as the solution—the mind of Christ. Through a review of the ANE and Greco-Roman cultures, including archaeological remains, historical records, and then a Scriptural analysis of the biblical narrative, the cognitive environment is evident that shaped the mindsets and worship of God's people and their surrounding cultures.

## The Cultural Condition: The Shaping of a Mindset

The world today tries to define the shaping of a mindset in purely pragmatic terms based on science, social science, psychological principles, and ideologies or traditions in the culture, which impact one's mindset and ultimately shape one's thinking processes.<sup>1</sup> Through cognitive archaeology, the mindsets of people within the biblical cultures of the past begin to take shape, but a high view of Scripture is still needed to correctly interpret the data. In the European school of thought, the archaeological data is primary, correcting Scripture.<sup>2</sup> An example of this is in the work of Lambros Malafouris.<sup>3</sup> Cognitive archaeology has brought a lot of the hidden background to light in the Bible, but it serves to fill in where the biblical witness is silent, not to silence the biblical witness.<sup>4</sup> The shaping of a mindset is a spiritual matter dependent upon man's response

---

<sup>1</sup> Matter refers to elements in the culture, material or immaterial (such as ideologies visible through archaeological data) that one interacts with; signs of the cognitive environment that are detectable through the archaeological material witness. Cognitive archaeology, or "archaeology of the mind," seeks to find the meaning of things from the material culture remains. William G. Dever, *Beyond the Texts: An Archaeological Portrait of Ancient Israel and Judah* (Atlanta, GA: SBL, 2017), 8. The European "materiality approach" is utilized to illuminate the mind from past cultures through the view that the mind is connected to its inherent culture and material surroundings, using what is called material engagement theory (MET) and radical embodied cognitive archaeology (RECA), which view the mind as embodied, extended, and enacted (EEE). Anna Marie Prentiss, ed. *Handbook of Evolutionary Research in Archaeology* (Cham, CH: Springer, 2019), 368.

<sup>2</sup> Dever, *Beyond the Texts*, 35. Grabbe was the first proponent of this notion. Dever critiques the European methodology regarding Israel's history, as well as the excessive skepticism and minimalist approaches regarding the historical reliability of the biblical narrative.

<sup>3</sup> Malafouris sees the mind as a product of biological evolution and "an artifact of our own making." Mindsets are not an evolution but a fixed view influenced by the surrounding culture or one's thoughts. The mind is not an artifact, but it is affected by stimuli. While Malafouris' view certainly demonstrates the impact that culture has on one's mind, defining the mind by the culture and external stimuli is taking the concept of mind too far. Mindsets are strongholds, but they are not impenetrable. Lambros Malafouris, *How Things Shape the Mind: A Theory of Material Engagement* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2013), 231. Malafouris' view is chiefly philosophical and psychological, not taking into account the spiritual impact God has on the mind. Breaching the boundaries of the mind and body debate by extending cognition through material engagement is impossible, for where does the mind end if there are no boundaries between the mind of man and material? Further, man is made in the image of God, and his mind is, therefore, not just a creation of the surrounding culture but interacts with that culture. Matter is not synonymous with the mind and has no cognitive functions. However, how man interacts with matter in his mind determines whether he will have a mindset shaped by the world or the Spirit.

<sup>4</sup> The various positions in cognitive archaeology will not be reviewed in depth here as that is not the focus of this chapter, which reviews the spiritual impact that the surrounding culture had on the people within those cultures. But a few noteworthy comments bear mentioning. Wynn acknowledges that evolutionary cognitive

to life and culture and his reliance on self or God. The ANE and Greco-Roman cultures in biblical times influenced the heart of man away from God and affected their ability to comprehend and apply his Word. People become like what they gaze upon, and minds fixed on the creation rather than the Creator become corrupt (Rom 1:16–32). There is nothing new underneath the sun (Eccl 1:9). Each culture has its fixation on sin and promotes man’s reason over God’s, encouraging people to condone amoral lifestyles that idolize sexual and other sins. The culture’s attempt to define the shaping of the mind (which God created) by science alone (which God also created) is that such a definition ignores the spiritual realities involved in the shaping of the mind.<sup>5</sup> Relying on man’s reason or on science is flawed because man is flawed, and in many cases, scientific study may be affected by the desires of man to have a certain desired outcome. The scientific process can be affected by the same factors that impact one’s

---

archaeologists only have access to a narrow range of cognitive domains, making the findings incomplete on their own. Thomas Grant Wynn, and Frederick L. Coolidge, *An Introduction to Evolutionary Cognitive Archaeology* (New York, NY: Routledge, 2022), 114. This admission, in conjunction with his view of an old earth, demonstrates an emphasis on the archaeological record over Scripture. The material witness is a testimony of Scripture, as will be attested to elsewhere in this chapter, but not a judge of it.

<sup>5</sup> Descartes’ view of the mind extends from his dualistic views. The Cartesian model of an immaterial mind that is separate from the body is hindered by the fact that the mind is attached to the body physically. Further, Cartesian philosophy holds that natural reason has the power to compel belief. Christopher Braider, *The Matter of Mind: Reason and Experience in the Age of Descartes* (Toronto ON: University of Toronto Press, 2012), 68. If faith is something that could be achieved by man, it would cease to be faith. The fatal flaw is trusting the findings or science over Scripture. Nagel points out that the failure of psychophysical reductionism is that the physical sciences could, in principle, provide a theory of everything. Thomas Nagel, *Mind and Cosmos: Why the Materialist Neo-Darwinian Conception of Nature Is Almost Certainly False* (New York, N Y: Oxford University Press, 2012), 4. Laurence J. Kirmayer sees the brain as “the organ of culture” and seeks to define human nature by the created culture rather than the Creator. Laurence J. Kirmayer, et al., “Introduction: Co-Constructing Culture, Mind, and Brain,” in *Culture, Mind, and Brain: Emerging Concepts, Models, and Applications*, ed. Laurence J. Kirmayer, et al., *Current Perspectives in Social and Behavioral Sciences* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020), 1. Kohl notes that many archaeologists have a historical materialist perspective emanating from Marxism. Philip L. Kohl, “Symbolic Cognitive Archaeology: A New Loss of Innocence,” *Dial. Anth.* 9.1 (1985): 105–17. Killin notes that cognitive archaeology is significant to the study of Scripture because the material remains of the archaeological record can provide stable, warranted access to the minds and cultures of the peoples of the deep past. Adrian Currie and Anton Killin, “From Things to Thinking: Cognitive Archaeology,” *Mind & Language* 34 (2019): 265. Currie says that the material remains of past cultures serve as “inferential windows to the development of human thought, past inner lives, and social practices.” *Ibid.*, 263. The value of having such a record is striking and helpful in filling in the pieces that are missing in the biblical record but never usurping it.

mindset—being led by fleshly desires such as pride rather than truth. By contrast, archaeological findings can serve to support the historicity and veracity of Scripture, filling in missing pieces but not usurping Scripture.

The progressive revelation of Christ was for salvation that would begin with the mind—a new heart and a new mind, enabling God’s people to understand his thoughts and to have the mind of Christ. However, accessing the mind of Christ is difficult when hidden mindsets inherent within the culture impede interpretation, leading to false presuppositions and misunderstandings, hindering a biblically sound hermeneutic and the ability to grasp the truth. The cognitive environments within the ANE and ancient Greek cultures shaped the mindsets of people and became inherent within the fabric of the corresponding space and time. Contextual clues from the background inform the interpretation of scripture for modern readers and help to provide insight into the Hebrew or Greek thought of the time.<sup>6</sup> The counterfeit, carnal, and canonical environments within the culture convey the resident influences on one’s mindset.

### The Counterfeit Environment

The mythological, polytheistic, and syncretic environment surrounding God’s people in the OT offered a counterfeit to the relationship Yahweh had with his people. These pagan influences breached their mindsets. There were many similarities in the ANE and Jewish cultures

---

<sup>6</sup> Mindsets within the surrounding culture affect the ability of God’s people to adhere to the canon’s prescription for a righteous mindset. Understanding the surrounding culture is not just a pragmatic exercise or formula that merely examines historical evidence. Studying the mindsets within cultures from biblical times is also a spiritual quest in which the sovereign plan of God is seen to triumph over man’s mindsets and failures. The mindset of the scholar also matters as one seeks to uncover the implications of mindset shifts in biblical cultures. As Waltke so aptly stated, “Biblical scholars must move beyond the historical realm into the moral imperatives of the theological realm.” Waltke, *OTT*, 40. Using human language within a historical context to reveal himself, his Word, and his purposes, a high view of the divine aspect of Scripture must be paramount in the mind of the biblical theologian. Despite the thoughts of man, God’s thoughts are higher. Despite the thoughts of scholars, God’s Word is higher. Any study of the mind of man within the biblical context is a humbling endeavor that is treading on holy ground.

as well as in the Greco-Roman and Christian cultures in the NT, which could subtly lead God's people astray. Similarities in the OT culture between the ANE and Jewish people included similar covenant structures and similar law systems (the Code of Hammurabi in Babylon and the Mosaic Law in the Hebrew Bible), and both had a view of the world being created and run by a god, though the ANE nations were polytheistic, and the Jewish people were monotheistic.<sup>7</sup> But it is the differences that are stark. God's people were to be different than the culture, not to blend in. Israel was chosen to represent Yahweh to the nations, to be an ethical people, not to be defined as an ethnic group. The Torah shaped the beliefs and behavior of God's true people, who were transformed from the inside out rather than from the outside in. However, the biblical narrative conveys that the Hebrews began to worship other deities like Baal and Asherah, who were no deities at all but were actually demons (Deut 32:17; Ps 106:34–39; 1 Cor 10:19–22).<sup>8</sup> It was false worship that diverted their mindset from pure devotion to Yahweh. But the prophetic movement in Scripture guided God's people back to know and understand the mind of God to turn away from these counterfeit idols in the culture. The prophets Elijah and Elisha had the seemingly impossible endeavor of turning the Northern Kingdom of Israel back to pure, single-minded worship of Yahweh, away from the influences of the culture they were embedded in.<sup>9</sup> Zuck depicts Yahweh's battle for the mindsets of his people.

“The intense emphasis on the fertility cult in the north required a response on the part of Yahweh that would prove His superiority over the false deities worshiped

---

<sup>7</sup> Some have viewed these similarities as “evidence” that the Jewish people borrowed from the surrounding culture in forming their beliefs and practices and even in writing the word of God. However, a more plausible argument is that God reached into the surrounding culture and used it polemically to reveal the difference that a relationship with God makes in one's mindset and behavior. Using what they could understand to convey heavenly concepts they could not, Yahweh used the counterfeit to reveal the truth.

<sup>8</sup> Archaeological discoveries such as inscriptions found at Kuntillet 'Ajrud (KA) and Khirbet el-Qom also affirm this syncretic behavior by God's people.

<sup>9</sup> Roy B. Zuck, *BTOT*, 133.

by the Israelites. There were other effects of the miracles, but the struggle for the minds of the people took place in the arena of nature. Elisha was used to show that the LORD has no peer.”<sup>10</sup>

In the NT, similarities between the Greeks and Christians included the fact that both worshiped their God (gods) in a sacred building, a temple for the Greeks, a temple for the Jewish people, and homes or a Jewish temple for the early Christian church. The Romans persecuted the Christians and did not understand their practices. The key difference for both the NT and OT and their corresponding cultures was ethics. The counterfeit religions in the Greco-Roman culture did not contain the message that is unique to the gospel—the redemption and grace of a holy God who would humbly come through virgin birth to lay down his life to save his people.<sup>11</sup> The power of the gospel was presented through the Lamb of God. This was in contrast with the powerful emperors and “gods” who could not save, were sinful, and ultimately ordinary men.

### The Carnal Environment

Wrestling with one’s sinful nature has been depicted from the beginning of the canon. The battle for the heart of man to be enslaved to sin amid broken mindsets is woven in every book of the Bible. The three chief yearnings in the heart of man conveyed in 1 John illustrate man’s wayward propensity. “For the world offers only a craving for physical pleasure, a craving

---

<sup>10</sup> Ibid., 135.

<sup>11</sup> There were similar mythological tales that purportedly entailed a virgin being impregnated by a god, but these tales did not, in fact, have a virgin birth. It is the differences once again that reveal the uniqueness of the gospel. In around 100 BC, Plutarch wrote about the divine conception of the Greek ruler Alexander the Great in his work, *Alexander*. Derek S. Dodson and Katherine E. Smith, eds., *Exploring Biblical Backgrounds: A Reader in Historical and Literary Contexts* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2018), 203. In this account, Arymbas, the wife of Olympias, conceived Alexander by Apollo, who appeared as a serpent-like god (Plutarch, *Alexander* 2.226–227). In another account, Suetonius recounted a story about Caesar Augustus’ mother, Atia, who was honoring Apollo at a service when she fell asleep in the temple and was visited by a serpent who supposedly was Apollo impregnating her (Suetonius, *Aug.* 2.286–289). These stories have been viewed by critical scholarship as parallels but do not parallel the unique story of the birth of Christ, for there was no physical union in Christ’s conception. Moreover, these mythological tales do not have a virgin or immaculate conception, and the virgin birth of Christ was not copied from these mythological tales.

for everything we see, and pride in our achievements and possessions. These are not from the Father but are from this world” (1 John 2:16 NLT). The senses are a gateway to one’s mindset, and the flesh seeks to satisfy its craving. John’s employment of ἐκ in 1 John 2:16 reveals that whether one is *of* the flesh or *of* the world is a statement of spiritual identity and illustrates the origin of one’s mindsets, impulses, and motivations. “Because everything in the world—the desire of the flesh, the desire of the eyes, the pride of life—is not of (ἐκ) the Father but is of (ἐκ) the world” (1 John 2:16).<sup>12</sup> One’s thinking is either directed by the influence of the world or of the Spirit. The three chief carnal influences on believers in these areas of weakness (desire of the flesh, eyes, and pride) are the world, the flesh, and the devil.<sup>13</sup> The definition of these three terms helps to clarify the influence they respectfully wield.

The term for κόσμος (*kosmos*) has a spectrum of possible meanings, including earth, world system, world (creation), world (people), and world (universe); and near the end of the LXX, κόσμος carries a sense of the meaning “world.”<sup>14</sup> The definition of “world” in the chief carnal influence depicted in 1 John 2:16 is aptly characterized by Marshall as “The totality of human beings as sinners and rebels against God (Rom 3:19) *that are characterized by a rebellious attitude or indifference to God which constitutes worldliness.*”<sup>15</sup> Though the original definition, as seen in Homer, was “order.”<sup>16</sup> The world system holds values that are contrary to God, which, given that the world is his creation, reveals how far the world has fallen. The term

---

<sup>12</sup> Karen H. Jobes, *1, 2, and 3 John*, ZECNT 19 (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2014), 111.

<sup>13</sup> I. Howard Marshall, “Living in the ‘Flesh,’” *Bibliotheca Sacra* 159 (2002): 387.

<sup>14</sup> Hermann Sasse, “Κόσμος,” *TDNT* 3:867–898.

<sup>15</sup> I. Howard Marshall, “Living in the ‘Flesh,’” 387 (emphasis original).

<sup>16</sup> Silva, “κόσμος,” *NIDNTE* 2:730–736.

κόσμος in the NT conveys the meaning “world” in some sense, with references unequally distributed through the NT canon, with more than half coming from the Johannine writings.<sup>17</sup> In the NT, κόσμος is not just the universe or speaking of all created things, but it is also estranged from its Creator and Lord.<sup>18</sup> Paul is the first to utilize the term κόσμος in an anthropological and historical manner, correlating the course of the κόσμος as dependent upon the Fall of man and salvation of God (Rom 5:12–14.)<sup>19</sup> When κόσμος no longer denotes the place of creation where man dwells but the place of God’s saving work, it bears new significance, a new concept with no parallels in the Greek or Jewish world.<sup>20</sup> Christians belong to Christ, not the world (1 Cor 3:21–23), and the world is the one in which faith and obedience are played out.<sup>21</sup> “The κόσμος is the sum of the divine creation which has been shattered by the Fall, which stands under the judgment of God, and in which Jesus Christ appears as the Redeemer.”<sup>22</sup> The Johannine and Pauline writings have the concept of κόσμος as the center of theological thinking more than any other NT text, and ultimately, as Sasse stated, “The κόσμος is the setting for the drama of redemption which is recounted in the gospel.”<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> Occurrences of the term κόσμος include John (seventy-eight times); 1 John (twenty-two times); 2 John (one time); Rev (three times); forty-six occurrences in Pauline texts, fifteen in the Synoptics, five each in Hebrew, James, and 2 Peter, two in 1 Peter and 1 in Acts. Sasse, “Κόσμος,” *TDNT* 3:883. The LXX utilizes κόσμος seventy times (Wis (16x); Isa (10x); 2 Macc (8x); and Sir (7x); in the Hebrew canon, it is rendered a variety of terms, including אָדִי (‘*ādī*) “ornament” (7x,) and צָבָא (*tsava*) “army, array.” Silva, s.v. “κόσμος,” *NIDNTTE* 4:732.

<sup>18</sup> Sasse, “Κόσμος,” *TDNT* 3:885.

<sup>19</sup> Silva, “κόσμος,” *NIDNTTE* 2:734.

<sup>20</sup> Sasse, “Κόσμος,” *TDNT* 3:889.

<sup>21</sup> Silva, “κόσμος,” *NIDNTTE* 2:735.

<sup>22</sup> Sasse, “Κόσμος,” *TDNT* 3:893.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, 3:894.



Like a gravitational pull, the forces of evil (Lucifer) and the lure of the world entice the flesh to tempt man away from God through one's thoughts.<sup>24</sup> The term σάρξ likely meant "flesh," referring to the outward body, but through various extensions, additional meanings connected with the primary meaning formed new distinct definitions.<sup>25</sup> Paul considered the flesh as being defined by all the parts of the body which were dominated by sin and in which nothing good resides (Rom 7:18).<sup>26</sup> A "fleshly" person could be described as being worldly, characteristically rebellious, or indifferent in their attitude toward God.<sup>27</sup> The natural tendency of man is to be fleshly as he is of the σάρξ, but seen through the psychological and physical dimensions.<sup>28</sup> John, on the other hand, saw the flesh as referring to the natural desire to satisfy and sustain life.<sup>29</sup> However, the greatest influence on one's outlook and thoughts (mindset) is worldly desires, which are the driving force leading to mindsets fixed on earthly pleasures instead of godly pursuits.

The presence of evil is a reality in a fallen world. Scripture tells us that the devil prowls around seeking to devour (1 Pet 5:8), that God's people should resist him (Jas 4:7), and that the

---

<sup>24</sup> See 1 Chr 21:1; John 8:44; 13:2; Acts 5:3; 2 Cor 11:3; Eph 4:26–7; 6:11–2; 2 Tim 2:25–6; Jas 4:7; Rev 12:9). Loew and Nida note that the semantic range of σάρξ (*sarx*) has many different meanings, including flesh (Rev 19:17–18), body (1 Tim 3:16), people (1 Pet 1:24), human (Heb 12:9), nation (Rom 11:14 – ethnic group), human nature (1 Cor 1:26), physical nature (Gal 4:23), and life (Heb 5:7); these glosses are not definitions, but meanings as interpreted within the context they are contained in. Louw, *L&N*, xv.

<sup>25</sup> I. Howard Marshall, "Living in the 'Flesh,'" 389. Loew and Nida state that regarding σάρξ as meaning 'flesh' with definite semantic aberrations, σάρξ should be viewed as simply a lexical item that has a constellation of related meanings, then context provides relevant different meanings contained within an idiom or keyword. *L&N*, s.v. xv.

<sup>26</sup> BDAG, s.v. "σάρξ," 915

<sup>27</sup> I. Howard Marshall, "Living in the 'Flesh,'" 387.

<sup>28</sup> *L&N*, s.v., xv.

<sup>29</sup> *Jobes, 1, 2, and 3 John*, 112.

enemy can blind the mind of believers (2 Cor 4:4) and even present as an angel of light (2 Cor 11:14). The battle of the flesh versus the spirit is waged in the spiritual realm (Eph 6:12) and in the minds of God's people. The enemy sows enmity and is the archenemy of God and man. The term devil means "adversary," which implies always seeking to separate God and man.<sup>30</sup> The chief end of the enemy is to oppose Yahweh as well as God's people. In the OT, Satan symbolizes a threat to mankind through prosecuting ethical faults or as a demonic and destructive force against the plan of salvation.<sup>31</sup> Though it is common to want to blame Satan for personal failure, full ownership of one's failures belongs to oneself. The flesh, the world, and the presence of evil create a carnal framework in this world that makes living in a fallen world difficult and yields mental warfare. But the Holy Spirit and God's Word can renew one's mind to the mind of Christ and overcome.

#### The Canonical Environment

The canon deals polemically with culture, exploiting the sin within (idolatry, syncretism, sexual immorality, and wickedness, in general) to pave the way for redemption. In the NT, Paul recites the history of Israel, emphasizing the importance of mindset in staying faithful to God. "Now these things occurred as examples to keep us from *setting our hearts* on evil things as they did" (1 Cor 10:6 NIV). Paul utilizes a term from the LXX that is a hapax legomenon, occurring only once in the NT, ἐπιθυμητής (*epithumētēs*), meaning "one who desires" or "to set one's heart upon," with noticeable allusion to Num 10:34, a reminder of God's deliverance, available to his

---

<sup>30</sup> The LXX uses the term "devil" to refer to "the one who separates," "the enemy," "the calumniator," and "the seducer." Werner Foerster, "Διάβολος," *TDNT* 2:71–73.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, 2:75.

people.<sup>32</sup> This term is also thought to mean “one who sets a heart upon.”<sup>33</sup> Israel’s unfaithfulness began in their mind; covetousness that idolized their desire and became a mindset. This covetousness stems from the natural cravings of the flesh that, when not discerned and dealt with rightly, can become a carnal mindset. The noun in this word group, ἐπιθυμία, is viewed by Paul as the source and driving power of the σάρξ (“flesh”), the sinful nature that has rebelled against God.<sup>34</sup> In another example from the OT, the emphasis is on the pursuit of gain because of covetousness, which drives the mindset. “And they come to you as people come, and they sit before you as my people, and they hear what you say, but they will not do it; for with lustful talk in their mouths they act; their *heart is set on their gain*” (Ezek 33:31 ESV). The Hebrew phrase, לִבָּם אֶתְּהַלְּקוּ הַלֵּלָהּ לָקֵץ (“heart is set on their gain”) reveals that בָּצַדְּ (bē’šā’), rendered as “get, gain, be covetous, greedy” (see Isa 57:17), has a powerful tendency to dull the hearing of God’s Word as in Ezekiel 33:31.<sup>35</sup> Covetousness fuels mindsets. As in the previous example, the NT parallel is ἐπιθυμέω/ἐπιθυμία; desire and lust tempt one to overrule God’s desires in preference for one’s own thoughts and desires. The origin of desire, according to the Johannine writings, goes further back than just man’s flesh, but the origin is in the κόσμος, “world” (1 John 2:16), and ultimately from the διάβολος.<sup>36</sup> Thoughts are powerful and need to be directed, or they will direct and govern God’s people. Paul then connects the message of repentance by demonstrating the necessary action one must take to shift one's mindset back to God. “We destroy arguments

---

<sup>32</sup> Friedrich Büchsel, “Ἐπιθυμία,” *TDNT* 3:167–172.

<sup>33</sup> James Swanson, “ἐπιθυμητής (*epithymētēs*),” *DBL (NT)*.

<sup>34</sup> Silva, “σάρξ,” *NIDNTTE* 2:251–262.

<sup>35</sup> John N. Oswalt, “בָּצַדְּ,” *TWOT* 122–23.

<sup>36</sup> Silva, “ἐπιθυμέω,” *NIDNTTE* 2:241–244.

and every lofty opinion raised against the knowledge of God and take every thought captive to obey Christ” (2 Cor 10:5).

The canonical environment urges God’s people to embrace a new paradigm of mind renewal. Walking in the Spirit is the remedy that enables one to rise above the carnal mindset operating in the world and is evident throughout the canon. As has been stated, placing one’s thoughts above God’s is unbelief and idolatry. Silva states that in the phrase, “Take every thought (πᾶν νόημα) captive,” νόημα is rendered as “the product of thinking,” or the common faculty of judgment, which yields decisions, proclaims, and differentiates between right from wrong, as determined and affected by influences in the culture.<sup>37</sup> One does not have to be enslaved by one’s thoughts. The litmus test for thoughts is whether they are thoughts that God would think—in alignment with the Word of God. Examining one’s thoughts through the power of the Spirit enables one to overcome thoughts of the flesh and to have one’s thoughts transformed into a righteous mindset—the mind of Christ.

The canon commanded that God’s people were not to follow the fallen culture, yet they were to reach foreigners and treat them well for the sake of demonstrating their relationship with Yahweh to the world. This is only possible by the guarding of hearts and minds through praying and asking God for help. Paul demonstrated how to do this in the book of Philippians, which says, “Do not be anxious about anything, but in everything by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving let your requests be made known to God. And the peace of God, which surpasses all understanding, will guard your hearts and *your* minds in Christ Jesus” (Phil 4:6–7). It is interesting in this verse that Paul utilizes two different terms for hearts (καρδίας) and minds

---

<sup>37</sup> Silva, s.v. “νοῦς,” *NIDNTTE* 3:342

(νοήματα), where νοήματα is used rather than νοῦς as νοήματα conveys more the idea of a mindset in this context. The term νόημα/νοήματα is the result of the activity of the νοῦς.<sup>38</sup> As specified in chapter two, καρδία is often synonymous with ψυχή, διάνοια, πνεῦμα, and νοῦς, but conveys the whole being of the inner life through a variety of intellectual and spiritual functions.<sup>39</sup> The same term, νοήματα, is utilized in 2 Corinthians to convey how the enemy attacks the mindset of God’s people (2 Cor 2:11; 2 Cor 3:14; 2 Cor 4:4). While it can be tempting to say, “the devil made me do it,” the serpent’s attacks on the minds of men are defeated by the mind of the Spirit that God gives to his people. One has a choice of what one thinks. It will be a challenge, but Paul reveals the solution over and again: walk in the Spirit. “So I say, walk by the Spirit, and you will not gratify the desires of the flesh. For the flesh desires what is contrary to the Spirit, and the Spirit what is contrary to the flesh. They are in conflict with each other so that you are not to do whatever you want” (Gal 5:16–17 NIV).

The canon is replete with the motif of struggling with mindsets. The battle of the mind is insidious within man, keeping him from walking with God. The heart of man is drawn to material thinking, focused on transient things, and enticed by desires of the flesh (ἐπιθυμία) (1 Pet 2:11; 2 Pet 2:10), but those fixed on eternity see past this life and its desires, living for the will of God (1 Pet 4:2).<sup>40</sup> The motif of renewal and restoration is seen as defining the thought of the exilic and post-exilic community, but alongside this is Second Temple literature that presents

---

<sup>38</sup> Behm, “Νοῦς, Νόημα,” *TDNT* 4:948–1022.

<sup>39</sup> Friedrich Baumgärtel, “Καρδία,” *TDNT* 3:605–614.

<sup>40</sup> Silva, “ἐπιθυμέω,” *NIDNTTE* 2:244.

the exile as having no end.<sup>41</sup> This earth is not home for God's people, but they have mind renewal available to them, and one day, they will be home, where their minds will be fixed completely on Christ with no more battles. In addition to the canonical review, which revealed the influence of the flesh and world, a review of the cognitive environment provides insight into the origin of mindset struggles.

### **The ANE Cognition: The Hebrew Mindset**

The OT books convey the mentality of the ANE people.<sup>42</sup> Hebrew thought in the OT developed over centuries, shaped by the ANE culture, events in history, and a remarkable calling of the God of this universe; Yahweh chose the Israelites as his own people (Deut 7:6) as his own treasured possession (Ps 135:4) in a covenantal relationship that would define their identity and set them apart from the other ANE nations. Israelite thinking was predominantly synthetic, where everything was viewed as a unified whole.<sup>43</sup> They believed that God is one and that he is a personal God concerned with the heart of man. The Israelite view of human nature was also as a whole being of "vital power," a psychical whole that had close physical associations.<sup>44</sup> The Israelites understood the uniqueness of the psyche versus the external physical processes, where

---

<sup>41</sup> Volker Glissmann, *Out of Exile, Not Out of Babylon: The Diaspora Theology of the Golah* (Luwina, MW: Mzuni Press, 2019), 9.

<sup>42</sup> Izak Cornelius, "Communicating the Old Testament World of Ideas by Way of Ancient Near Eastern Iconography," *Old Testament Essays* 7 (1994): 327.

<sup>43</sup> Aubrey Johnson, *The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2006), 1.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, 2.

בְּשָׂרַ (bāsār) could be the opposite of רוּחַ (rūah), נְפֶשׁ (népeš), and לֵב (lēb), but dualism was “completely unknown” in the OT view.<sup>45</sup>

Hebrew thought in the OT was centered on the expectation of a future Messiah who would bring salvation, fulfill God's promises, and play a crucial role in God's redemptive plan.<sup>46</sup> The God of the Hebrews was Yahweh—immanent and transcendent, not far off as the other mythical gods were perceived as being in the ANE cognitive environment. Iconography from the surrounding ANE nations provides a peek into the world of ideas and mindsets within those cultures through ANE eyes, conveying the conceptual gap between ANE and today and contextualizing the ANE mindset.<sup>47</sup> Dijkstra noted that “Images represent ideas and ideas involve a worldview, ideology, and religion ... ancient Israelites—who are not identical to Jews—made and used images as an artistic and cultural expression of their worldview.”<sup>48</sup> The unique mentality of the OT is able to be visualized through the aid of ANE iconography.<sup>49</sup> Though the Israelites needed to avoid the image ban, metaphors could also be problematic when

---

<sup>45</sup> Walther Eichrodt, *TOTVOT*, 147. Their spiritual beliefs were connected to everyday life, and ethical behavior was expected in their relationships with others in both sacred and secular cultures. The Israelites were not individualistic but part of a communal environment. The synthetic context of Israelite thinking was a cohesive integration of various elements—religious, ethical, social, and historical—into one unified and interconnected worldview.

<sup>46</sup> Walton asserts that the Israelites thought in terms of a divine council, though this was not thought to be borrowed from their surrounding culture, and it is not certain whether the Israelites understood the plurality of the Godhead. Walton’s assertion that Jewish thought about the divine council and plurality of the godhead is adjusted in the Bible “so that it is in line with revelation about the nature of God” is a massive assumption on his part and also does not take into account that the Word of God is inspired by God and infallible. God did not need to “correct” his Word to make sure it was in line with the revelation about the nature of God. John H. Walton, *Ancient Near Eastern Thought and the Old Testament: Introducing the Conceptual World of the Hebrew Bible*, 2nd. ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2018), 56–7.

<sup>47</sup> Cornelius, “Communicating the Old Testament World of Ideas,” 328.

<sup>48</sup> Meindert Dijkstra, “The Ivory Beds and Houses of Samaria in Amos,” in *Image, Text, Exegesis: Iconographic Interpretation and the Hebrew Bible*, eds. Izaak J. de Hulster, and Joel M. LeMon, LHBOTS 588 (London: Bloomsbury, 2014), 190.

<sup>49</sup> Cornelius, “Communicating the Old Testament World of Ideas,” 331.

figurative expressions were taken literally, likely reducing one's view of God.<sup>50</sup> Through examining the data from the OT, the mindset of the people is revealed inasmuch as it can be done with the puzzle pieces of the past that have been provided. Where there is no material evidence, assumptions should not be made, and silence does not invalidate the biblical record. As has often been said in these kinds of discussions, “the absence of evidence is not evidence of absence.”<sup>51</sup> Through viewing the linguistic, historical, archaeological, and cultural backgrounds, along with the biblical narrative in the OT, the mindset of the Jewish people becomes evident.

### The Language Background

Yahweh revealed himself through human language—heavenly concepts conveyed in human terms—and language reveals the expressions of thinking in a culture.<sup>52</sup> The most common introductory formula, “Thus says Yahweh,” occurs 436 times in the OT and relayed the authority of the message as it came directly from God to his people.<sup>53</sup> The Hebrew language is a concrete language that is based on what the senses experience. Imagery and poetry are commonly used to convey thoughts so they can be experienced, not just heard or read. Dubbed the OT poetic art, the Hebrew language is a sacred language that has a Semitic origin.<sup>54</sup> Where the Greek language is abstract thoughts built on Western view and reason, the Hebrew language

---

<sup>50</sup> Izaak J. de Hulster, “‘A Monument and a Name’: Isaiah 56 and the Aniconic Image,” in *Iconographic Exegesis of the Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: An Introduction to Its Method and Practice*, ed. Izaak J. de Hulster, Brent A. Strawn, and Ryan P. Bonfiglio (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015), 193.

<sup>51</sup> J. Randall Price and H. Wayne House, “Introduction to Archaeology and the Old Testament,” in *Zondervan Handbook of Biblical Archaeology* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2017), 46.

<sup>52</sup> Thorleif Boman, *Hebrew Thought Compared with Greek* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1970), 24.

<sup>53</sup> Edward W. Goodrick, and John R. Kohlenberger, *The NIV Exhaustive Concordance* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994), 568–96.

<sup>54</sup> Boman, *Hebrew Thought Compared with Greek*, 17.



is built on an Eastern perspective and wisdom. Osborne states that grammatical structure was often linked with the basic make-up of the society, in which the Hebrew language was dynamic and action-oriented, highlighting God's acts in linear history, focused on concrete reality with a foundation of unity in a corporate setting.<sup>55</sup> The language, encompassing the words, grammar, and idioms, all reflected the culture. Though there was not a word for "mind" in the Hebrew canon, the pervasive anthropological terms show how God's people processed their thoughts in relation to Yahweh. The "heart" referenced the inner man and conveyed the chief purpose of man to be right with God. Studying other cognate languages helped to reconstruct some of the ancient Hebrew as archaeologists discovered texts from other ancient Semitic languages, including languages such as Akkadian and Ugaritic, though the framework the languages came from was different ethically.<sup>56</sup>

### The Historical Background

Major archaeological discoveries in Israel confirm events in the Book of Kings and tell the tale of the covenant between unfaithful Israel and her faithful God, corroborating the biblical witness of the events themselves, which they portray, and the consequence of mindset shifts that turn people away from their God.<sup>57</sup> One example of God's people's unfaithfulness led them to be

---

<sup>55</sup> Grant R. Osborne, *The Hermeneutical Spiral: A Comprehensive Introduction to Biblical Interpretation*, 2nd ed. (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2006), 78.

<sup>56</sup> Wendy L. Widder, "Introduction to Linguistics and the Bible," in *Linguistics & Biblical Exegesis*, ed. Douglas Mangum and Josh Westbury, Lexham Methods Series, vol. 2 (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2016), 5. Semitic languages encompass a group of languages, including Akkadian, Arabic, Aramaic, Ethiopic, Hebrew, Moabite, Old South Arabian, Philistine Canaanite, Phoenician, Syriac, and Ugaritic. The oldest known Semitic language is Akkadian from ancient Mesopotamia, of which Assyrian and Babylonian are the two primary dialects. A large number of cuneiform tablets were found in Ugaritic, a coastal city in northwestern Syria, that helped interpret Canaanite religious practices during the biblical period.

<sup>57</sup> Discoveries from the Iron Age include the Dan Stele, which mentions the "The City of David" (1 Kings 2), the *millō* in Jerusalem, which confirms Solomon in 1 Kgs 4–11, the divisions of the Kingdom confirm Jeroboam I (1 Kings 12), the Tell el-Far'ah, "Tirzah" (1 Kings 16), and the Mesha stele, which depicts a Moabite perspective

subject to their enemies, paying tribute. The iconography of the Black Obelisk of Shalmaneser III, now housed in the British Museum, depicts Jehu, king of Israel, bringing tribute to Shalmaneser III.<sup>58</sup> Wayward mindsets led to national consequences for the nation of Israel, which are attested to in the archaeological witness.<sup>59</sup> History changed and shaped the culture.

Israel's failure to be faithful to God resulted in them being cursed. The recent archaeological find of the Mt. Ebal Curse Tablet in 2019 is one of the most significant discoveries that codifies the breaking of the covenant between Yahweh and the Israelites and subsequent curses.<sup>60</sup> The site on which the curse tablet was found was where Joshua had built an

---

on the rebellion of Moab against Israel (2 Kgs 3), and provides extrabiblical verification of some events in Kings as well as confirmation of King Omri's existence (1 Kgs 16). William B. Fullilove, "1–2 Kings," in *A Biblical-Theological Introduction to the Old Testament: The Gospel Promised*, ed. Miles V. Van Pelt (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2016), 178. Additionally, the Samaria acropolis proves Ahab's existence (1 Kgs 16–22), and the Tel Dan stele is Moabite evidence which mentions Jehoram (2 Kgs 3–10). William G. Dever, "Archaeology and the Question of Sources in Kings," in *The Books of Kings* (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 520.

<sup>58</sup> Fullilove, "1–2 Kings," 178.

<sup>59</sup> Additional significant archaeological discoveries highlight the covenant with Yahweh and the results of blessings and curses for loyalty or disloyalty. The Babylonian Chronicle was a series of cuneiform tablets that had a chronological list of kings, which also incorporated war stories along with the accession and death of kings. "The Babylonian Chronicle," trans. Alan Millard (*COS* 1.137:467–68). This was similar to the list of kings in the Book of Kings. One particular entry is relevant to Israel for two reasons. (Chronicle 1 iii 34–38) says, "On 20th Tebet Sennacherib king of Assyria – his son killed him in a revolt. For [24] years, Sennacherib ruled over Assyria. From the 20<sup>th</sup> Tebet until the 2<sup>nd</sup> Adar, the revolt continued in Assyria. On [1/2]8<sup>th</sup>, Adar Esarhaddon, his son, ascended the throne of Assyria." "The Babylonian Chronicle," *COS* 1.137:467. The Annals of Sennacherib depict Sennacherib's invasion of Judah and siege of Jerusalem, which is preserved in the Bible as well as the ANE account. See here Aarnoud R van der Deijl, *Protest or Propaganda: War in the Old Testament Book of Kings and in Contemporaneous Ancient Near Eastern Texts Studia Semitica Neerlandica* 51 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 224. The Annals of Hezekiah are a parallel to the Annals of Sennacherib, found in 2 Kings 18:1–20:21. Esarhaddon (2 Kings 19:37) formed vassal-treaties similar to the covenant that Yahweh made with the Israelites. But in the case of Israel, Yahweh fulfilled the demands of the covenant. The Ramataia tablet also contains information solely about royal succession and is the longest treaty discovered, similar to Hittite and OT covenants. These treaties were common in the ANE. D. J. Wiseman, "The Vassal-Treaties of Esarhaddon," *Iraq* 20 (1958): 2–3.

<sup>60</sup> Found on the mountain of curse in Samaria, this 2cm x 2cm tablet is the oldest script emanating from the 14<sup>th</sup>/13<sup>th</sup> century BC. This archaeological find offers one of the most significant pieces of evidence that Yahweh is one God, in contrast to the minimalists who hold that the Bible was a compendium of writings written in later times by different pagan authors who worshiped two different gods, *Yahweh* and *El/Elohim*. But on the tablet are both names ascribed to one God, affirmed by Deuteronomy 11:29 and Joshua 8:30-31. It is notable that both 'El and *Yhwh* are mentioned on the curse tablet. 'El is a general term for creator God, qualifying that the Israelite god *Yhwh* is, in fact, also 'El. He is 'elohim. Scott Stripling, et al., "You Are Cursed by God *Yhwh*: An Early Hebrew Inscription from Mt. Ebal," *Heritage Science* 11.1 (2023): 1.

altar on Mt. Ebal as part of a covenant renewal ceremony.<sup>61</sup> It reads, “Cursed, cursed, cursed—cursed by the God *yhw*; You will die cursed; Cursed you will surely die; Cursed by *yhw*—cursed, cursed, cursed.”<sup>62</sup> It is interesting to note that curse rituals were practiced throughout the Greco-Roman empire, as well, by pagans, Jews, and Christians, but the parallel pagan curses had nothing to do with a relationship with God.<sup>63</sup> It is not the similarity of the existence of curse tablets in both the biblical and pagan cultures that is significant, but the difference in the reason for the curse as well as the content of the curse tablets themselves. The pagan curses were considered to be from the occult, consisting of magic spells, maledictions, and prayers against enemies.<sup>64</sup> But the desire of Yahweh was for the hearts of his people to turn from worshipping worthless created things to turn back to him so his people could avoid the curses for their rebellion. Based upon this curse tablet and many other archaeological findings, including the Tel Dan Stele, Jehu Stele, *bāmôt* installations, which were a number of high places excavated that contained skeletons of children offered in pagan worship, as well as the inscriptions found at Kuntillet ‘Ajrud (KA) and Khirbet el-Qom that illustrate Yahweh and his Asherah being worshiped, it is self-evident that Israel was very syncretic and turned away from Yahweh.<sup>65</sup>

---

<sup>61</sup> Ibid., 1.

<sup>62</sup> Ibid.

<sup>63</sup> Jessica L. Lamont, *In Blood and Ashes: Curse Tablets and Binding Spells in Ancient Greece* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2023), 293.

<sup>64</sup> Ibid., 32.

<sup>65</sup> Dever notes that the possibility of ancient Israel worshipping the goddess Asherah was downplayed, but the evidence confirmed by the material witness at Kuntillet ‘Ajrud (KA) and Khirbet el-Qom also confirms the biblical witness in the book of Kings (1 Kgs 11:5). William G. Dever, “Asherah, Consort of Yahweh? New Evidence from Kuntillet Ajrūd,” *BASOR* 255 (1984): 21. The *bāmôt* installations are mentioned around 100 times in the OT and appear to have been numerous in ancient Israel. John A. Emerton, “The Biblical High Place in the Light of Recent Study,” *PEQ* 129 (1997): 116. Blenkinsopp notes that the sacred tree was called the ‘āšērāh, named after the goddess and associated with sacrifices and incense altars (2 Kgs 16:4), and this tree also was connected with the

These archaeological finds show that the mindsets of the Israelites had shifted from God and led to their demise.

### The Cultural Background

Culture wields a significant influence on its inhabitants. One example of culture changing the mindset of the Israelites happened due to being exiled. Discovered in 1893 in excavations at ancient Nippur, the Murashu documents emanating from the Babylonian Diaspora during the time of Jeremiah unearth the appearance of a mindset shift in God's people.<sup>66</sup> Jeremiah told the Jewish exiles to settle in their land of captivity (Jer 29:4–7), but they were still to maintain their identity within the foreign land. Glissman notes that the way of life for this Babylonian “golah” community influenced their mindset, interpretation, and theology of the biblical texts, as preserved in the texts of Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the synoptic text of Genesis.<sup>67</sup> The Murashu documents seem to demonstrate a shift in mindset by a shift in the onomastic practice. During the exile, they changed the names of their children to non-Yahwistic names.<sup>68</sup> This naming practice was not restricted, but it seems to indicate syncretic behavior as well as the social pressure to conform their beliefs and worldview to the culture they were exiled to, which is

---

high places (Deut 12:2; 1 Kgs 14:23; 2 Kgs 17:10) and where secret ceremonies were held (2 Kgs 17:10; Ezek 8:12). Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Essays on the Book of Isaiah* FAT 128 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019), 223.

<sup>66</sup> Michael D. Coogan, “Life in the Diaspora: Jews at Nippur in the Fifth Century B.C.,” *The Biblical Archaeologist*, 37 (1974): 6.

<sup>67</sup> Glissmann, *Out of Exile*, 1. While the Babylonian exile affected the outlook or mindset of God's people, the inspiration of God's word does not hinge on the mindset of God's people, but the mindset of God's people would be conveyed in the Scriptures.

<sup>68</sup> Coogan notes that these names were often ambiguous as they sounded Jewish but would have been perceived as Babylonian. Coogan, “Life in the Diaspora,” 11. Glissman considered these changes to be a witness of a reorientation of their religion and culture and a re-definition of their identity: “Over and against other displaced diaspora communities inside the Persian-controlled empire.” Glissmann, *Out of Exile*, 4.

evident.<sup>69</sup> While this could be more of an attempt to acclimate to the culture, it seems to indicate that they were not just fulfilling Jeremiah 29:5 but beginning to identify with their new culture.<sup>70</sup> When God's people start to look like the surrounding culture, the change is more than skin deep.<sup>71</sup>

### **The Canonical Call to Contrition: OT**

Worship was central to the covenant Yahweh made with the Israelites. God's people could not love both Yahweh and the world. The covenant with Yahweh required allegiance to him, and his people could not bow to the pagan idols of the surrounding nations. Loving and worshiping anything other than Yahweh corrupted their minds and shifted their mindsets to enslavement to the culture rather than reaching the culture. The OT is replete with examples of mindset shifts, and perhaps another book could be dedicated just to the incidences in the OT alone, but space here does not allow for that endeavor. Nonetheless, here are three significant examples from three different parts of the OT canon (Pentateuch, Writings, and the Prophets) that reinforce the mindset shift due to worshipping idols.

---

<sup>69</sup> Coogan, "Life in the Diaspora," 11. Glissman considers onomastic identification as problematic due to the lack of additional evident ethnic clarification and possibly assimilation or "Babylonization." Glissmann, *Out of Exile*, 7.

<sup>70</sup> For instance, the Murashu documents contain names of Jewish people whose names contained a Babylonian deity, such as Shamesh-Ladin, the son of Yadi'-yaw, Bau-etir, the father of 'Aqab-yaw, and Bel-uballit, the father of Mat tan-yaw. Coogan, "Life in the Diaspora," 12. However, perhaps a more recognizable incidence of non-Jewish names is the names Esther and Mordecai, who were living in Susa and whose names are derived from the Babylonian deities Ishtar and Marduk.

<sup>71</sup> Glissman notes that a recent emphasis on exploring the Persian period has spurred an interest in reinterpreting the book of Genesis through an emphasis of the challenge of the Babylonian golah community in Mesopotamia and Egypt to return to the land of their fathers, highlighting the significance of the land in a diachronic reading of Genesis rather than a synchronic reading of Genesis in its current canonical form. Glissmann, *Out of Exile*, 5.

## The Pentateuch

It did not take long for God's people to stray. The same can be said of all generations.

Even as Yahweh was giving Moses the Decalogue, Aaron and the Israelites crafted a golden calf to be worshiped.

Then the LORD said to Moses, "Go down, because your people, whom you brought up out of Egypt, have become corrupt. They have been quick to turn away from what I commanded them and have made themselves an idol cast in the shape of a calf. They have bowed down to it and sacrificed to it and have said, 'These are your gods, Israel, who brought you up out of Egypt.' "I have seen these people," the LORD said to Moses, "and they are a stiff-necked people." (Exod 32:7–9)

The term used for "turn" is סוּר (*sur*), and in this context, it is interpreted to mean "to backslide from the right course of religion (Exod 32:8; Deut 9:12)."<sup>72</sup> The root is used frequently to depict Israel's apostasy; it is often interpreted as to "turn aside/away" (see Exod 32:8; Deut 9:12; 11:16).<sup>73</sup> This root was also used contrarily to portray a faithful follower of Yahweh, "not to turn aside" (1 Kgs 22:43). The term סוּר was commonly paired with the right hand-left hand motif; "did not turn aside to the right hand, nor to the left" (2 Kgs 22:2; Deut 2:27; 5:32; Josh 1:7).<sup>74</sup> Attested to in the Hebrew, Middle Hebrew, and Phoenician–Punic languages, a primary meaning is to deviate.<sup>75</sup> This term was also used to depict the recurring failure to depart "from the sins of Jeroboam" (2 Kgs 3:3; 10:31; 13:2, 6, 11; 14:24; 15:9, 18, 24, 28; 17:22) and also when Yahweh lamented over the wayward hearts of his people for turning from him (Ezek

---

<sup>72</sup> HALOT, s.v. "סוּר," 747–749.

<sup>73</sup> R. D. Patterson, "סוּר," TWOT 621.

<sup>74</sup> Ibid., 621.

<sup>75</sup> S. Schwertner, "סוּר," TLOT 1:796–797.

6:9).<sup>76</sup> This false worship adopted by the Israelites was not a subtle shift. It was flagrant worship of a god of their own making in direct defiance of their covenant with Yahweh. They cast the “god” with metal they had just removed from their bodies, then bowed down and even sacrificed to it! Notice the condition of their hearts is “stiff-necked,” קָשָׁה (*qāšā*), a term that is frequently used to depict the stubborn (stiff-necked) people of God (e.g., Exod 32:7).<sup>77</sup> Moses would continually remind God’s people of the Shema and their need to adhere to the covenant so they would be blessed, not cursed (Deut 6:4–9; 29:1–15).

### The Historical Books

The book of Judges was a lawless time in which people followed the inclinations of their hearts instead of the King of their souls. This backdrop of lawlessness sets the stage for the book of Kings (1–2 Kgs). When God’s people had their eyes on Yahweh, they were blessed. When they had their eyes fixed on anything else, they were cursed. 1–2 Kings is about so much more than detailing the 38 kings after Solomon, 19 in both the northern and southern kingdoms.<sup>78</sup> Worship defines the Book of Kings.<sup>79</sup> With the word “worship” appearing 35 times in this book, this theme is woven into the fabric of Kings. The implications behind the faithfulness or faithlessness of God’s people in their worship of Yahweh and the consequences they endured for that worship are borne out across the pages of Kings. Despite the critical-interpretive issues and the many varying theological themes in Kings, the primary theological theme that rises to the

---

<sup>76</sup> Patterson, “סֹרֵר,” *TWOT* 1:621.

<sup>77</sup> Leonard J. Coppes, “קָשָׁה,” *TWOT* 1:818.

<sup>78</sup> William H. Barnes, *1-2 Kings*, CBC (Carol Stream, IL: Tyndale House, 2012), 22.

<sup>79</sup> David G. Firth, *Including the Stranger: Foreigners in the Former Prophets*, NSBT 50 ed. D. A. Carson (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press), 172.

surface is the theme of Israel's worship, which fits into the overall theme of Scripture—worship and serve the Creator, not the creation. When Israel worshiped and was loyal to Yahweh, Israel was blessed. And when Israel fell into syncretism by worshiping the gods of the foreigners in tandem with Yahweh, Israel was punished. The theme of the foreigner is prevalent throughout, as well, though not as a force that was problematic because of their ethnicity, but because of their worship, which could lead God's people astray. The foreign women were problematic because they led to defilement, and once again, they distracted and pulled God's people away from worship. The presence of the temple became a stumbling block as God's people defaulted to religion and idolatry instead of worshiping Yahweh, who is not contained by boundaries or in a temple.<sup>80</sup>

Worshiping the creation rather than the Creator and worshiping “worship” or “religion” rather than Yahweh led God's people away from their one true God. The book of Kings parallels the relationship that Christians must have with Jesus. Quoting from Deut 6:18, Jesus said, “It is written, ‘You shall worship the LORD your God, and him only shall you serve’” (Luke 4:8). From beginning to end of the entire canon is the story of God's people struggling with their divided hearts to worship God alone. God's people are now the temple that houses the Holy Spirit within, yet they can miss God (1 Cor 3:16–17). The theme of Kings is the same for believers today: worshiping anything or anyone other than God will lead to one's ruin. God's people were made to worship one and become like the one true God they worship.

Israel's rejection of Samuel led them to want a king just like the other ANE nations surrounding them, a sign of some level of cultural embeddedness and disloyalty to their covenant

---

<sup>80</sup> Ibid., 144.



with Yahweh. The Book of Kings details the division of the kingdom of Israel and the ultimate destruction of Israel because of their idolatry and faithlessness to Yahweh. The kings were largely unfaithful to God, leading God's people further away. Kings were defined by what their hearts/minds were devoted to. "Saul was unfaithful to the LORD and sought a medium for guidance, so he was put to death by God, and his kingdom was given to David" (1 Chr 10:13–14).<sup>81</sup> Other kings followed suit with a "heart that was not fully devoted" to Yahweh, including Solomon (1 Kgs 11:4), Abijam (1 Kgs 15:3), and Ahab (1 Kgs 21:25). Other kings went beyond partial devotion (syncretism) to extreme evil, including Omri (1 Kgs 16:25), Jeroboam (1 Kgs 12:25–33), Manasseh (1 Kgs 22:3–7), and Amon (1 Kgs 22:3–7). The cultural influence on the devotion of the kings and Israelites was clear. "And though they worshiped Yahweh, they *continued to follow their own gods according to the religious customs of the nations* from which they came" (2 Kgs 17:33 NLT). For a king or the people of God to follow the customs of the world was choosing the pagan religion over a relationship with God. But God transforms the hearts of Kings and their mindsets, too. The LORD can change the attitude of kings.<sup>82</sup>

While some consider Kings to be a negative commentary about the condition of the relationship between God's people and Yahweh, in Kings, we see a plan for God's redemption despite his people's unfaithfulness. The central themes of worship and hope looking to Yahweh's promises are attested to in the archaeological discoveries and prevail over critical scholarship that cannot silence the message of Kings: throughout all history and man's failings, salvation is dependent on Yahweh alone. 2 Kings 17 offers a commentary as to why the desolation of Israel

---

<sup>81</sup> Zuck, *BTOT*, 183.

<sup>82</sup> See Ezra 6:22; Prov 21:1. Zuck, *BTOT*, 191.

occurred. “All this took place because the Israelites had sinned against the LORD their God, who had brought them up out of Egypt from under the power of Pharaoh king of Egypt. They worshiped other gods and followed the practices of the nations the LORD had driven out before them, as well as the practices that the kings of Israel had introduced” (2 Kgs 17:7–8 NIV).

God’s people need to know their identity and purpose lest they be drawn away in their minds to faithlessness to God through pagan idolatry or syncretism. Yahweh chose his people to reveal himself to the world. Israel took its status as a privilege, but it was a calling. Walking in a relationship with Yahweh was not about them. It was about being blessed to be a blessing. The theme of syncretism is seen in Ahaz, who had embraced the foreign worship practices that were prohibited by Yahweh.<sup>83</sup> When syncretism was a part of the surrounding culture, it was unique for God’s people to become monotheistic. Israel was to be different than the surrounding ANE nations. They were called to represent Yahweh but often became just like the foreigners they had defeated. Their identity was not an ethnicity; it was in being Yahweh’s people. Their ethical behavior was not their salvation, but it was a by-product of their relationship with Yahweh. True Israelites were sometimes foreigners, and the Israelites sometimes became foreigners to Yahweh. The Book of Kings reveals that the heart of man cannot be tamed by kings, priests, or prophets. The heart of man is desperately wicked, and only a good God could fulfill man’s end of the covenant on his behalf. God created his people for worship. This is their purpose. Yet they tend to worship the created things rather than their Creator. The message of Kings still rings true today and must be kept safe from misguided interpretations that would undermine the core message. The theme of worshiping Yahweh alone is expressed in the first two commandments of

---

<sup>83</sup> Frederick Greenspahn, “Syncretism and Idolatry in the Bible,” *VT* 54 (2004): 492.

the Decalogue and is the heart of the matter today. Idolatry is worship. Those in Christ must guard their hearts to worship only One: Christ alone.

### The Prophets

Jeremiah emphasized the importance of God's people listening (Shema) to what God had said in order to be faithful to God. Goldingay notes that entering into a pledged relationship necessitates that "One makes up one's mind to give up making up one's own mind about some basic things," but as Jeremiah repeatedly reiterates about the spiritual condition of Judah, "they didn't listen or bend their ear but walked each person by the bad determination of their mind" (Jer 3:17; 7:24; 9:14; 11:8; 13:10; 16:12; 18:12; 23:17).<sup>84</sup> As vassals under Yahweh's extraordinary grace and mercy, God's people owe Yahweh their allegiance and fulfillment of their end of the covenant. But mindsets are captivated by what one worships. Mindsets are formed by deception. Mindsets are shaped by putting one's thoughts above God's. Mindsets are sin, breaking the covenant with God, and ultimately unbelief, choosing to believe in false gods, ideologies, or one's thoughts rather than in the one true God. Mindsets are not truth unless they agree with God's Word. The messages of Jeremiah repeatedly emphasized the motif that the people of Judah should not be deceived. Yet Jeremiah, too, was told by Yahweh to change his mindset. Jeremiah's suffering at the hands of God's people caused him to question God. But God told Jeremiah to repent/return, and he would be restored. "Therefore this is what the LORD says: "If you repent (שׁוּבוּ), I will restore (שׁוּבוּ) you that you may serve me; if you utter worthy, not worthless, words, you will be my spokesman. Let this people turn (שׁוּבוּ) to you, but you must not

---

<sup>84</sup> John Goldingay, *The Theology of Jeremiah: The Book, the Man, the Message* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2021), 56.

turn (שׁוּבוּ) to them” (Jer 15:19 NIV). The term שׁוּבוּ is used four times in this verse to reinforce the need to repent. Even harsh circumstances do not make mindsets permissible. Jeremiah was not supposed to be like the people but to be an example to the people even in the face of their persecution and point them back to Yahweh. So, too, do the other major and minor prophets aim to direct the hearts of God’s people back to Yahweh.

Through observing the inner-textuality, intertextuality, and canonicity of Isaiah 6:9–10, a theme of worship throughout Scripture is unearthed, revealing that God’s people today need to hear and apply the same message about idolatry in their own context. Isaiah 6:9–13 is a pronouncement of judgment on Israel’s idolatry, which is the core sin for the nation’s covenantal disobedience and also the same core sin of God’s people today.<sup>85</sup> Language that Isaiah uses inner-textually reveals that Isaiah is discussing idolatry. Isaiah 1–5 establishes idolatry as a chief sin in Israel, whose idolatry also characterized them (also seen in Isa 2:8, 42:17–20, and 43:18). Though God’s people had the physical ability to see and hear, they failed spiritually to see or hear.<sup>86</sup> Intertextually, the theme of idolatry emanates from the idolatry of the golden calf in Exodus, which led to Israel being depicted metaphorically as “rebellious cows running wild and needing to be regathered”, a stiff-necked people.<sup>87</sup> Deuteronomy 4:25–28, 29:4, Exod 15–17, 32 and Num 11–21 also carried forward this idolatry alluded to in Isa 6:10 and developed or alluded to in Ps 81; 106:20; 115:4–8; 135:15–17a; Jer 2:5, 11; and Hos 4:16–17, underscoring the fact

---

<sup>85</sup> G. K. Beale, *We Become What We Worship: A Biblical Theology of Idolatry* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2018), 38.

<sup>86</sup> *Ibid.*, 41–42.

<sup>87</sup> *Ibid.*, 78.

that those who worship idols will become just like them. Psalm 94:7–11 is also an indictment against Israel for further treating God as if he were an idol who did not see their sins.<sup>88</sup>

While the OT is explicit in calling out the problem of idolatry, the NT is relatively silent, but that does not mean it is not there. NT texts can develop and transcend the original authorial intention and historical setting not by usurping the text but by developing it in light of the progressive revelation of Christ.<sup>89</sup> Isaiah 6:9–10 is quoted in John 12:40, the other gospels, and the book of Acts, demonstrating that the meaning of Isa 6 in the OT is carried over into the NT, where the use of the term *καρδία* emphasizes the failure to “understand with the heart,” which kept them from repentance.<sup>90</sup> Israel was spiritually blind and was judged for it.<sup>91</sup> By trading the glory of God for lifeless idols, they demonstrated their spiritual blindness, and their mindsets became like the world’s.<sup>92</sup> Tradition was the idol that caused Israel to stumble. First Corinthians 10:7 and Romans 1:23 reference idolatry in the OT as a reminder that idolatry is still a temptation to the NT church. Deuteronomy 31:29 functioned in the same manner, warning OT believers of generational, systemic idolatry that indicated a pattern that God’s people needed to avoid.<sup>93</sup> Though Israel did not bow down to idols in Jesus’ day, they did put their trust in

---

<sup>88</sup> Ibid., 48.

<sup>89</sup> Richard B. Hays, *The Conversion of the Imagination: Paul as Interpreter of Israel's Scripture* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2005), 173–176.

<sup>90</sup> Silva, “καρδία,” *NIDNTTE* 2:626.

<sup>91</sup> Beale, *We Become What We Worship*, 165.

<sup>92</sup> Psalm 106:20, Hosea 4:7, and Jeremiah 2:11 are the only three instances in the Hebrew OT in which the Hebrew verb מור (mwr), meaning “exchange,” occurs with the word כבוד (*kābhôdh*), meaning “glory,” referring to God’s people exchanging the glory of the true God for the “inglorious reflection of a false god,” alluding to the golden calf incident. Ibid., 102.

<sup>93</sup> Ibid., 77.

something other than God.<sup>94</sup> This is the very definition of idolatry. The good news of the gospel, however, is that the disciples and those who are in Christ will be enabled to see again, as prophesied in Isaiah 29 and Ezekiel 36:24–37:14.<sup>95</sup> Prosperity was a main attraction to followers of Baal.<sup>96</sup> The prosperity gospel of today promises a perfectly blessed life in a fallen world—a promise that Scripture does not make. Stumbling blocks today include biblical illiteracy and a sense that the OT does not apply to today’s context. Further, today’s church needs to recognize that idolatry is spiritual adultery and demonic.<sup>97</sup>

### Old Testament – The Struggle of Israel

Apostasy was the central struggle of Israel as the “gods” of the surrounding nations distracted and turned her heart away from the covenant she had with Yahweh, impacting Israel’s ability to worship Yahweh wholly. The theme of returning to Yahweh is central to the OT canon, with שׁוּב (*shuv*) as a dominant term in the breaking of one’s mindset.<sup>98</sup> Israel’s struggle was a struggle of the heart/mindset. Would God’s people worship Yahweh or perpetually be tempted to worship created things and false idols? In Joel 2:12, the theme of the Shema returns with the

---

<sup>94</sup> Ibid., 162.

<sup>95</sup> Ibid., 279–280.

<sup>96</sup> Gary Yates, “True Knowledge of God and The Transformation of The Heart: Worship in Jeremiah and Ezekiel,” in *Biblical Worship: Theology for God’s Glory*, eds. Benjamin K. Forrest, Walter C. Kaiser, Jr., and Vernon M. Whaley (Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Academic, 2021), 261.

<sup>97</sup> Beale, *We Become What We Worship*, 156.

<sup>98</sup> See the section “The Breaking of a Mindset” for a thorough analysis of this term and its significance in the restoration and renewal of the mind of God’s people. This term, occurring over 2,500 times in all stems, means to repent/return in the Qal stem; meaning “to turn around, repent, to bring back, refresh, refute” is prolific in the OT. *HALOT*, s.v. “שׁוּב,” 1427–1434. (In the Qal stem, see Deut 30:2, 8, 10; 1 Sam 7:3; 1 Kgs 8:35, 47; 13:33; Isa 1:27; 6:10; 9:12; 10:21–22; 19:22; 31:6; 44:22; 55:7; 59:20; Jer 3:1, 7, 10, 12, 14, 22; 4:1; 5:3; 8:5; 15:7, 19; 18:8, 11; 23:14; 24:7; 25:5; 26:3; 35:15; 36:3, 7; 44:5; Ezek 3:19; 13:22; 14:6; 18:21, 23, 27–28, 30; 33:9, 11–12, 14, 19; Hos 3:5; 6:1; 7:10; 11:5; 12:7; 14:2–3; Joel 2:12; Amos 4:6, 8–11; Jonah 3:8, 10; Zech 1:3–4, 6; Ps 7:13; 22:28; 51:15; 78:34; Lam 3:40; Dan 9:13; Neh 9:35; 2 Chr 6:24, 26, 37–38; 7:14; 30:6, 9; 36:13; Joel 2:12–13; see also Jer 15:19; Neh 1:9).

word כֹּל (*kōl*), expressing the crux of the faith of God’s people—that they would love God with *all* their heart, *all* their being. This term כֹּל infers “totality” though it is not often utilized to convey “everything, the whole” (Eccl 1:2; 11:5; Isa 29:11; Jer 10:16; 51:19; Isa 44:24; Job 13:1), instead it typically occurs in the construct כֹּל (*kōl*) and is rendered as “whole,” in particular when it appears before a related noun.<sup>99</sup> BDB depicts this wholeness as being rendered in idioms “to avoid stiffness, all or every ... with *the whole of thy heart* = with *all thy heart*.”<sup>100</sup> Being “all in” with God leaves no room for hardened, wayward hearts. The theme of wholeness in Hebrew thought and within the OT canon is a framework for depicting the relationship God expects of his people. The term כֹּל is used to depict the totality of God’s greatness in ruling over and creating *all* that is in the world and *all* the corruption and devastation that sin has done to all of creation. Nothing is left unaffected by Yahweh, to whom *all* souls belong (Ezek 18:4).<sup>101</sup> These additional definitions fill in the idea of wholeness. When one gives themselves as a living sacrifice wholly to God, he makes them holy, completing his perfect work in his people. Worship is not worship if it does not encompass the whole being, a living whole sacrifice. The Psalmist echoes this theme repeatedly for all of man to worship Yahweh with “all that is within him” כֹּל־קִרְבִּי (*kolqerābay*) as in Psalms 103:1 and 119:2, in which the Psalmist promises that those who seek God with their whole heart will be called blessed.<sup>102</sup>

---

<sup>99</sup> “The LXX uses more than thirty words to render כֹּל. The real equivalent is πᾶς (*pás*) with 4701 occurrences; ἅπας (*hápas*) with fifty-one occurrences, σύμπας (*sýmpas*) with twenty-six occurrences, ὅλος (*hólos*) with 173 occurrences, and ὁσος (fifty-seven occurrences). In the Dead Sea scrolls, כֹּל appears well over 1,000 times.” Helmer Ringgren, “כֹּל,” *TDOT* 7:135–143.

<sup>100</sup> BDB, s.v. “כֹּל,” 481.

<sup>101</sup> In other parallel Semitic languages, the root of כֹּל is *kll*, which forms the qal stem “to finish, make complete.” In Akkadian, *kll* means “to finish,” and in Biblical Aramaic, שָׁפַעַל (*šap‘el*) and אִשְׁתַּפְּעַל (*ištap‘al*) mean to “be finished.” G. Sauer, “כֹּל,” *TLOT* 2: 614–616.

<sup>102</sup> Ringgren, “כֹּל,” *TDOT* 7:139–140.

### The NT Cognition: The Greco-Roman Mindset

Whereas the Jewish tradition held that the heart was the center of cognition, Hellenistic physicians viewed the encephalon (the brain) as the cognitive organ.<sup>103</sup> But aside from anthropological distinctions, the Greek mindset and culture are discoverable by examining the language, literature, historical records, material found in archaeological data left behind, and in the Scriptures. Peeling back the curtains of time, the making of a Grecian mindset hinged on what they worshiped: the idols esteemed in their culture. Through archaeological material, including architecture, iconography, inscriptions, coins, and literature, the Greco-Roman cultural imperial ideologies are evident, including the promotion of emperors who were supposedly appointed by gods or considered gods themselves, providing divine benefits to the Greco-Roman world.<sup>104</sup> The Greco-Roman culture was a polytheistic, syncretic, amoral environment in which sexual practice was connected to religious and political life.<sup>105</sup> Perhaps an unlikely mascot, the chicken served as a symbol or blueprint of the social power structure in the Greek cultural mindset, demonstrating their sexual prowess and political strength through cock fighting, visible

---

<sup>103</sup> Thomas M. Walshe, III, “Ancient Greek Ideas of Cognition,” in *Neurological Concepts in Ancient Greek Medicine* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press), 132. The longstanding dispute about the mind controlling the perceptions with human and cognitive behavior emanates from Homer and was subsequently dealt with philosophically by the pre-Socratic writers. Later, the Hippocratic physicians selected the brain as the organ that ultimately controls the body. However, Aristotle later sided with the Hebrew view that the heart was the seat of one’s mindset and being. Walsh contends that the Hellenistic physicians, through anatomical dissections, proved that the brain was an organ that was the origin of all cognitive processes, which is attested to in ancient Greek thinking. *Ibid.*, 107. Julius Rocca feels that Walshe goes too far with the statement that the Hippocratic physicians “settled the question” to say that the brain is the organ of thought origin. Julius Rocca, Review of *Neurological Concepts in Ancient Greek Medicine*, by Thomas M. Walshe. *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 91 (2017): 126.

<sup>104</sup> Dodson, *Exploring Biblical Backgrounds*, 196.

<sup>105</sup> Bruce W. Longenecker and Todd D. Still, *Thinking through Paul: An Introduction to His Life, Letters, and Theology* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2014), 63–64.



in iconography.<sup>106</sup> The anthropomorphism of the cock as a symbol of the agon (or conflict) within Grecian culture represented the pervasive social struggles.

Before there is a mindset, there is a thought, and before that, a word or idea or matter. Words convey culture, meaning, and beliefs. Greek culture emanating from the Homeric and Epic Greek traditions espoused a collection of words correlating to the beliefs and behavior of human beings, depicted by two separate word groups: ψυχή (*psyche*), θυμός (*thymos*), νοῦς (*nous*), and μένος (*menos*) in one group and κήρ (*ker*), φρένες (*phrenes*) and ἥπαρ (*hēpar*) in the other group which all deal with the heart/mind.<sup>107</sup> Greek culture was defined according to the thoughts of the mind. The term θυμός (*thymos*) was the most significant Homeric term and the origin of all emotions as well as intellectual purposes, similar to the Hebrew term נָפֶשׁ (*nēpēš*) in its depiction of longing and parallel to the Hebrew term לֵב (*lēb*) when speaking of rumination. However, the term that was most identified with cognitive thinking for the Greeks was νοῦς (*nous*).<sup>108</sup> The terms νοῦς and φρήν are used to convey the thoughts and plans of man.<sup>109</sup> All these terms together convey some aspects of a soul, though there was no clear idea of the soul in

---

<sup>106</sup> Eric Csapo, “Cockfights, Contradictions, and the Mythopoeitics of Ancient Greek Culture,” *Arts: The Journal of the Sydney University Arts Association* 28 (2006), 11. Examples of iconography in this aforementioned article include a vase painted shortly after the production of *Aristophanes’ Clouds* around 423 BC, named the “*Attic calyx krater, ca 420 Be, J. Paul Getty Museum, Malibu 82.AE.83, Side A,*” which showcases a conflict and competition between the older value system/argument and the new. The older value system was a proponent of self-control, and the newer system encouraged illicitly reprobated lifestyles. The social struggle between residual and emergent ethics and morals was a pervasive influence in Athens’ political landscape. The display of these figures demonstrated the virility and strength of men in a patriarchal culture. Cockfighting in Athens was another significant means of communicating this struggle in iconography that displayed the competition within the culture, a facet of the Greeks who prized the male appearance and athleticism, as seen in the Olympics and statues. The “calendar frieze” is one such example of a Hellenistic sculpture depicting cockfighting. Though the Greeks were known for philosophical reasoning, their sins revealed their folly.

<sup>107</sup> MacDonald, *History of the Concept of Mind*, 15.

<sup>108</sup> Ibid.

<sup>109</sup> Ibid., 16.

Homeric thought.<sup>110</sup> To Greeks, one's reason was at the center of the culture, and thinking according to the things of man or the gods within the culture was encouraged. The Hellenistic influence provided for a dualistic view that prioritized the spirit over the body rather than seeing the whole person (mind, body, spirit) as being sanctified in Christ (Thess 5:12–22), though the Greek idea of “spirit” was not equivalent to the Christian view.<sup>111</sup> The Greeks were spiritually minded, but not on the things of God. They worshiped idols and the creation rather than their creator.

### Language Background

The NT writings engaged with the Greco-Roman culture by addressing some of the pervasive idolatry, but this was difficult as the gods and ideologies were within the fabric of the culture itself. There was not a clear delineation or separation between religion and state. As an example of this, ruling magistrates in the Hellenistic culture sought to make sure that the people were fulfilling the ancient contract with the gods.<sup>112</sup> Akin to the Suzerain-Vassal treaties of the OT, the people had an expectation of fulfilling their part of the agreement with the “gods” and an expectation of protection from these deities. With similar language, distinguishing between the religious actions of the people in the Greek culture, who were steeped in pagan worship, and the ethical actions of the people of God, who acted in faith and relationship, was difficult.

---

<sup>110</sup> Ibid., 19.

<sup>111</sup> Robert Jewett, “1 and 2 Thessalonians,” in *Eerdmans Commentary on the Bible*, ed. James D. G. Dunn and John W. Rogerson (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003), 1422.

<sup>112</sup> Moyer V. Hubbard, “Greek Religion,” in *The World of the New Testament: Cultural, Social, and Historical Contexts*, ed. Joel B. Green and Lee Martin McDonald (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2013), 114.

Studying the language of Ancient Greece necessitates having the cultural, sociological context, and psychological context of the NT to interpret better the imperative mood, which is significant to this study for it expresses intention and, therefore, impacts the mindset in the Greek culture of the NT.<sup>113</sup> Fantin notes the significance of understanding the imperative mood in the Greek NT context which is first due to the sheer volume of occurrences of the imperative mood—which Fantin states to be around 19,167 finite verb occurrences, of which approximately 8.5% (1633) are imperatives.<sup>114</sup> The imperative mood directs the behavior, thoughts, beliefs, and/or feelings of the recipient in which meaning is contextually activated and constrained.<sup>115</sup> The motif of mind renewal is interwoven into the mechanics of language itself of the NT. As Porter noted, “Understanding the imperative is not an isolated grammatical issue. It involves a much more thorough understanding of society than grammarians have often considered.”<sup>116</sup>

---

<sup>113</sup> The imperative can come across as being harsh. Hermogenes, a rhetorician from the late second century, stated that “... The imperative is most of all a harsh form.” While Aristotle criticized Homer for using an imperative to address the goddess in the Iliad.” But the use of the imperative, taken together with the desire to be persuasive for the gospel, was couched in a polite manner. An example of this is Romans 12:2, which is considered a passive pronouncement imperative directing one to action. Joseph D. Fantin, *The Greek Imperative Mood in the New Testament: A Cognitive and Communicative Approach* (New York, NY: Peter Lang, 2010), 1, 84–5. Boyer notes that “the active indicative means to persuade ... the passive means to be convinced, to be confident.” James L. Boyer, “A Classification of Imperatives: A Statistical Study,” *Grace Theological Journal* 8 (1987): 49–50. Fantin notes politeness strategies are indirect and “serve to deflect the directive impact.” Fantin, *Greek Imperative*, 219. In consideration of human nature, this is a pretty savvy technique akin to reverse psychology. Telling someone to do something can usually illicit rebellion, but a polite command that comes across as a persuasive suggestion can influence the listener to follow through on the command. Imperative mood has an inherent, semantic meaning that is volitional-directive in affecting their mindset. Joseph D. Fantin, “May the Force Be with You: Volition, Direction, and Force: A Communicative Approach to the Imperative Mood,” *BAGL* 7 (2018): 186. Porter states that it is not always the case that both features—volition and direction—occur in every instance. Stanley E. Porter, “Aspect and Imperatives Once More,” *BAGL* 7.5 (2018): 166. Dvorak adds that the imperative mood “Directs someone’s behavior, thoughts, beliefs, and/or feelings.” James D. Dvorak, “Evidence that Commands a Verdict: Determining the Semantics of Imperatives in the New Testament,” *BAGL* 7 (2018): 215.

<sup>114</sup> Fantin, “*The Greek Imperative Mood in the New Testament*,” 6. Fantin notes that a particular branch of linguistics developed by Lamb provides a theoretical basis for isolating the imperative mood from the semantic and pragmatic command(s) to understand the inner workings of the brain. Fantin, “May the Force Be with You,” 178.

<sup>115</sup> Dvorak, “Evidence that Commands a Verdict,” 215.

<sup>116</sup> Fantin, “May the Force Be with You,” 195.

Through the Greek imperative, an invitation is given as the Spirit woos God's people to repentance and mind renewal.

### Historical Background

The historical background enables one better to apprehend the mindset of a people and culture. Cognitive archaeology is one tool that studies elements of ancient culture that Kent Flannery notes, "are the products of the human mind, including the perception, description, and classification of the universe (cosmology), the nature of the supernatural (religion) ... the ideologies ... and iconography and all other forms of human intellectual and symbolic behavior that survive in the archaeological record."<sup>117</sup> In the Greek world, political conquests, persecution, and polytheism formed a framework that made it challenging for the uniqueness of the gospel to break through. Alexander the Great's conquest of the Palestinian region in the first century caused sizeable growth in traditional Greek religion and a synthesis of ideologies that formed a Panhellenic religious structure that honored multiple deities and mythologies in a spectrum of beliefs.<sup>118</sup> Claudius expelled the Jews from Rome around AD 52.<sup>119</sup> The Roman imperial cult dominated the religious scene, and Christians who refused to show devotion to the emperor could be put to death.<sup>120</sup> The persecution of Nero began in Rome in AD 64 and ended with Nero's suicide in AD 68, destabilizing the position of the Roman Empire and increasing the

---

<sup>117</sup> Kent V. Flannery and Joyce Marcus, *Reader in Archaeological Theory: Post-Processual and Cognitive Approaches*, ed. David S. Whitley (London: Routledge, 1998), 36–7.

<sup>118</sup> Hubbard, "Greek Religion," 105.

<sup>119</sup> Thomas Lea, *The New Testament: Its Background and Message* (Nashville, TN: B&H, 2003), 23.

<sup>120</sup> Thomas R. Schreiner, *1, 2 Peter, Jude*, vol. 37, NAC 37 (Nashville: B&H, 2003), 29.

persecution of Christians.<sup>121</sup> Nero started a fire that burned much of Rome, then blamed Christians, many ultimately who were lit on fire as human torches.<sup>122</sup> Despite the intense persecution of the early church, God's people behaved differently than the surrounding culture. In Pliny the Younger's letters, his description of the Christians reveals the uniqueness of the Christian faith to the religions in the first century. The Christians were ethical, seeking to be holy by their behavior, and even obeyed Pliny's orders to disband and not meet.<sup>123</sup> "When this gathering was concluded, it was their custom to depart and meet again to eat a meal, though it was quite harmless. They even ceased this practice after the edict in which, in accordance with your orders, I banned all secret societies" (Pliny the Younger, *Letters* 10.96).<sup>124</sup>

The letters of 1 and 2 Peter emphasize the need for God's people to remain faithful to God in their mindset. Though the message to the NT believers was written to believers within the Hellenistic culture, Peter did not want God's people to become ensnared again by the henotheistic culture. The Greco-Roman culture clung to idolatry, which was so intertwined within their political and religious system (1 Peter 1:18). The uniqueness of the Gospel revealed monotheism in a polytheistic environment. And this God offered Himself as a sacrifice rather than demanding sacrifices from his people. This concept of being ransomed was understood in the NT culture, in which people would sell themselves into slavery to pay off a debt. It was also

---

<sup>121</sup> Nicholas Perrin, "The Imperial Cult," in *The World of the New Testament: Cultural, Social, and Historical Contexts*, ed. Joel B. Green and Lee Martin McDonald (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2013), 132.

<sup>122</sup> Accounts of Nero's burning Rome are found in Suetonius, *The Lives of the Caesars* 6.38.1, and Tacitus, *Annals* 15.38. Suetonius states that Nero purposely set the fire, but Tacitus conceives of this account as a rumor. Lea, *The New Testament: Its Background and Message*, 23. Dio Cassius, the tutor of Nero, wrote about Nero hiring arsonists to start fires throughout the city in his (*Hist. Rom.* 62.16.1–62.17.3). William A. Simmons, *Peoples of the New Testament World: An Illustrated Guide* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2008), 236.

<sup>123</sup> Dodson, *Exploring Biblical Backgrounds*, 227.

<sup>124</sup> J. B. Firth, *The Letters of the Younger Pliny*, 2 vols (London: Walter Scott, 1900), 272.

a central theme in the OT through the great deliverance of God's people who were slaves in Egypt (Exod 30:12).<sup>125</sup>

### Cultural Background

The imperial cult had already permeated every facet of the Roman culture when the NT writings were produced.<sup>126</sup> The melting pot of the first century culture was a prime candidate for polytheism. Temples occupied a central role in the social and economic life of a community; this comes from the fact that religion was more of a communal concern in the ancient world than it is in many modern societies, especially modern societies with a carefully delineated separation between "church" and state.<sup>127</sup> The emphasis on temples was also something the Jewish people could relate to. The cleansing of the temple by Jesus in Matthew 21 is possibly due to the Jewish temple becoming like the Greek temples, which served the dual role of a religious facility as well as the function of a bank.<sup>128</sup> The religious atmosphere made it difficult to reach the culture with yet another religion, but Peter sought to reveal the need for redemption through the uniqueness of the gospel message and Christian otherworldly lifestyle. Religion was infused within both the Greek and Roman cultures. The mythological gods were shared by both Greek and Roman cultures in their literature, though the names were different.<sup>129</sup> The ancient Greco-Roman world had gods everywhere for everything. There were regional gods, universal gods, individualistic

---

<sup>125</sup> Peter H. Davids, *The First Epistle of Peter*, NICNT (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1990), 74.

<sup>126</sup> Perrin, "The Imperial Cult," 132.

<sup>127</sup> Hubbard, "Greek Religion," 114.

<sup>128</sup> *Ibid.*, 113.

<sup>129</sup> Everett Ferguson, *Backgrounds of Early Christianity*, 3rd ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003), 154.

gods, and mystery religions. The religious context was an amalgam of many “gods.”<sup>130</sup> The gods were neither self-existent nor omniscient as Yahweh is but were considered to be eternal and ageless.<sup>131</sup> The Greco-Roman paganism was nonexclusive; people could worship as many gods as they wanted to and even blend the identity of the deities. Christianity’s exclusivity was problematic, as it would require the Greco-Romans to let go of their religion and culture.<sup>132</sup>

Morals were separated from religion, which was ritual purity rather than a moral guide.<sup>133</sup> The religious observance of the people in the Hellenistic culture was to treat the pagan deities as a talisman in a superstitious manner to achieve favor rather than wrath from the gods.<sup>134</sup> The emphasis in Christ is on redemption from sin, but the emphasis in the Greco-Roman culture was serving many gods to get the blessings they wanted.

Whereas the culture sought good fortune and protection, the Gospel presented the favor of God by unmerited grace. The uniqueness of Christianity stood out against a backdrop of endless religious options that all concurred on the denial of bodily resurrection.<sup>135</sup>

Irenaeus depicts Christianity as being marked by a new mindset.

For one and the same God [that blesses others] inflicts blindness upon those who do not believe, but who set Him at naught; just as the sun, which is a creature of His, [acts with regard] to those who, by reason of any weakness of the eyes, cannot behold his light; but to those who believe in Him and follow Him, He

---

<sup>130</sup> Van Kooten, George H. “Christianity in the Graeco-Roman World: Socio-political, philosophical, and religious interactions up to the Edict of Milan (ce 313),” in *The Routledge Companion to Early Christian Thought* (New York, NY: Routledge, 2009), 13.

<sup>131</sup> Hubbard, “Greek Religion,” 108.

<sup>132</sup> Ferguson, *Backgrounds of Early Christianity*, 173.

<sup>133</sup> *Ibid.*, 173.

<sup>134</sup> Hubbard, “Greek Religion,” 117.

<sup>135</sup> *Ibid.*, 121.

grants a fuller and greater illumination of mind” (Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* 4.29.1[ANF 1:502]).

Justin Martyr writes similarly of a renewed mindset in his *First Apology*, which describes repentance and new life in Jesus Christ. “And this washing is called illumination because they who learn these things are illuminated in their understandings” (Justin Martyr, *First Apology* 61 [ANF 1:183]). While civic religion was ingrained in the culture, individual expressions of religion were practiced and equally an influence on the people, who privately sought oracles, divination, and magic in their homes or private lives.<sup>136</sup> The influence was seen in the homes of people who had the Greek gods on their domestic décor and furnishings which conveyed religious motifs of the day.<sup>137</sup> Paul called these “gods” what they truly were—demons (1 Cor 10:20). Idols and false gods are demonic yet differentiating between the religious depictions of these “gods” and Christianity is difficult. The religious backdrop was fused with the cultural and political landscape, making it hard to leave the “gods” interwoven in all of life.

### **The Canonical Contrition: NT**

Paul had a significant focus on mindsets within his corpus. He knew that mindset was the key to faithfulness to God and that straying thoughts were a common human struggle. “But I am afraid that as the serpent deceived Eve by his cunning, your thoughts will be led astray from a sincere and pure devotion to Christ” (2 Cor 11:3). Sin’s impact on the mindset is profound. Beginning with a deeper dive into the definition of a mindset, the contributing factors of deception, rebellion, influence, and reason display why mindsets are difficult to break free from.

---

<sup>136</sup> Ibid., 117.

<sup>137</sup> Ibid.



But components of the surrounding culture stream also reveal why the culture wields such a mighty influence. The secularization of God’s people is subtle and inherent within the context people live in. Various elements of the culture help to shape a mindset, a fixed state of belief. The cognitive environment is not just an external influence. It is internal, as well, and the differences between God’s people and the culture are more significant than the similarities. The impact of foreigners and the phenomenon of groupthink are wielded powerfully as the fear of man is a trap keeping people stuck in mindsets. Paul and Peter demonstrate the truths of mindset change by exploiting the culture to reveal God’s truth.

#### Acts

Paul used reason to try and break the mindsets of the Greeks. “Now while Paul was waiting for them at Athens, his spirit was provoked within him as he saw that the city was full of idols. So he *reasoned* in the synagogue with the Jews and the devout persons, and in the marketplace every day with those who happened to be there” (Acts 17:16–17, emphasis added). The term for reasoned is *διαλέγεσθαι* (*dialegomai*), which was the only means by which Greek philosophy could arrive at the *λόγος* (*logos*) or idea of primary importance.<sup>138</sup> Reason was, in a sense, worshiped, as man elevated his own view above God’s. Paul’s employment of reason was not to talk them into or out of a way of thinking but to reveal the truth of what they had been believing so they could accept God’s words and thoughts over their own. Ideas are built from thoughts, and all thoughts that are not aligned with God’s are evil. A related term, *διαλογισμός* (*dialogismos*), (found in Mark 7:21; Luke 2:35; 9:46; 1 Cor 3:20; Jas 2:4), means “reason” or “thought” and in light of the more adaptable use of this term in the LXX usage, it is remarkable

---

<sup>138</sup> Gottlob Schrenk, “*Διαλογισμός*,” *TDNT* 2:93–98.

that the NT usage of διαλογισμός is solely used in the negative sense, as “evil thoughts” or “anxious reflection,” revealing that the thoughts emanate from one’s sinful nature and extend to one’s mindset and the core of one’s being.<sup>139</sup> Paul’s speech to the Epicurean and Stoic philosophers in Acts displays the mindset of the Greeks. The Greek gods were remote, but Paul said that God was near to his people (Acts 17:27). The Greeks worshiped mythical gods in temples. But God did not live in a temple made by man (Acts 17:24). God was unknown to the Greeks (Acts 17:23). The Greek gods were man-made according to the imagination of man (Acts 17:29), but the God of this universe rules the entire world and rose from the dead (Acts 17:31). The Greeks’ mindset was religious, focused on worshiping idols (Acts 17:16). Reasoning alone cannot transform the mindset of man, for man relies on his own reason, and his reasoning is inherently evil. God’s Word is able to break through man’s reason when one replaces one’s thoughts with God’s.

### 1 Peter

Understanding the Greek worldview and culture provides illumination for the interpretation of Scripture.<sup>140</sup> Where Paul reasoned against the faulty logic of the Greeks, Peter exploited the problems in the culture to reveal God’s solution. The book of 1 Peter serves as an example of the cultural backdrop and space that the disciples were speaking into. Written to a

---

<sup>139</sup> Ibid., 2:97.

<sup>140</sup> The Roman imperial cult dominated the early Christian time period which makes understanding this imperial cult necessary in order to understand the NT Scriptures. Perrin, “The Imperial Cult,” in *The World of the New Testament*, 124. The NT writings engaged with the Greco-Roman culture by addressing some of the pervasive idolatry, but this was difficult in a culture in which the gods and ideologies were within the fabric of the culture itself. There was not a clear delineation or separation between religion and state. As an example of this, ruling magistrates in the Hellenistic culture sought to make sure that the people were fulfilling the ancient contract with the gods. Hubbard, “Greek Religion,” in *The World of the New Testament*, 114. Akin to the Suzerain-Vassal treaties of the OT, the people had an expectation of fulfilling their part of the agreement with the “gods” and an expectation of protection from these deities.

Greek audience, Peter employs metaphors and imagery to communicate soteriology in 1 Peter, painting pictures of elements of salvation that a Greek audience would appreciate, which also pertained to the Jewish people. “And if you call on him as Father who judges impartially according to each one's deeds, conduct yourselves with fear throughout the time of your exile, knowing that you were ransomed from the futile ways inherited from your forefathers, not with perishable things such as silver or gold, but with the precious blood of Christ, like that of a lamb without blemish or spot” (1 Pet 1:17–19). The mention of Christ’s blood as “a blameless and spotless lamb” is an allusion to the sacrificial system in the OT covenant.<sup>141</sup> Perhaps, too, the imagery of pagan sacrifices was still in the minds of the Greeks and the Hebrews when Antiochus had required pagan sacrifices in all Jewish villages. Though a lamb’s redemptive value is nothing in comparison with the blood of Jesus Christ, only one sacrifice could pay for the value of all human life and redeem mankind from their sin: Jesus Christ, fully God, and fully man.

Peter’s terminology evoked an imagery of slavery that was a familiar concept in that culture, but here, he was making an analogy of slavery to sin. Redemption in the Greco-Roman world could include freeing slaves from their masters and releasing prisoners of war, but the introduction in First Peter hearkens back to God setting his people free from bondage in Egypt, a reminder both to the Jewish diaspora as well as the new Greek diaspora, who were grafted in.<sup>142</sup>

---

<sup>141</sup> Jobes, *1 Peter*, BECNT, 41.

<sup>142</sup> Fika J. Janse van Rensburg, “Metaphors in the Soteriology in 1 Peter: Identifying and Interpreting the Salvific Imageries,” in *Salvation in the New Testament: Perspectives on Soteriology*, ed. Jan G. van der Watt (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 423. The political landscape was not clearly distinguished from religion. Political leaders were likened to gods. Philo’s account, “On the Embassy to Gaius,” was a report to Gaius about the violence against Jews in Alexandria. The manner in which Philo depicts Caesar Augustus is truly god-like. “The great regions . . . were waging grievous war all over sea and land . . . so that the whole human race exhausted by mutual slaughter was on the verge of utter destruction, had it not been for one man and leader Augustus whom men fitly call the averter of evil. This is the Caesar who calmed the torrential storms on every side, who healed the pestilences common to

Jobes states that “The verb λυτρόω (*lytroō*), translated as “redeemed” and its cognate noun λύτρον (*lytron*) were used in Greco-Roman culture to refer to the manumission of a slave.”<sup>143</sup> Slaves would purchase their freedom by placing money in the temple of a god or goddess, which would eventually be paid to the owner of the slave, though it was thought that the god or goddess was buying the slave.<sup>144</sup> To Peter’s audience, the message of redemption resonated with their concept of slavery to sin to slaves of God. Further, the silver and gold that the slaves used to pay for their redemption had the impression of an emperor upon them. The imperial cult had many emperors who were considered to be gods to the Greeks, yet they could not save. The Greeks believed that the Greek gods demanded sacrifices, but these sacrifices could not redeem the people. God’s redemption through Christ redeemed not only minds but, subsequently, their whole lives. Christ became a servant to redeem his people from bondage to the flesh. Christ came as the savior to save them from their sins and conferred the mind of Christ to redeem their thoughts. The counterfeit “good news” of the announcement of the birth of a “god” was fertile ground for Peter to reveal the real Messiah.<sup>145</sup> The Greco-Roman culture’s hunt to have an

---

Greeks and barbarians...” (Philo, *Embassy* 21.72–73 [F. H. Colson, LCL]). Likewise, in Virgil’s epic poem *Aeneid*, which was written between 29 and 19 BC, Augustus Caesar is called a son of god, a title also used for Christ. “Here is Caesar ... destined to pass under heaven’s spacious sphere ... Augustus Caesar, son of a god ... he will advance his empire ... to a land which lies beyond our stars, beyond the path of year and sun...” (Virgil, *Aeneid* 6.588–589 [H. Rushton Fairclough, LCL]).

<sup>143</sup> Jobes, *1 Peter*, 117.

<sup>144</sup> Ibid.

<sup>145</sup> The Priene Calendar Inscription circa 9 BC is an example of how the imperial cult was propagated. In this inscription, the emperor Augustus refers to himself as a god and savior, depicting his announcement as “good news,” akin to the term “good news,” which occurs in Romans 1:1 and other places in the NT. Dodson, *Exploring Biblical Backgrounds*, 197. Political power was strengthened by making their rule a religion. Speaking against the rulers was ultimately speaking against the gods. In one such example, Asia’s elders sought to establish a cult in Octavian’s honor in Pergamum at the same time that the cities of Nicea and Ephesus did. Octavian’s shrewd response was a counterproposal to share his honor with other gods—the goddess Roma, which represented the republic, and in the cities of Nicea and Ephesus, Octavian requested that Dea Roma and Divus Iulis (for Julius Caesar) be set alongside their honoring of him. Cassius wrote about this event in his work “Roman History.” Perrin, “The Imperial Cult,” in *The World of the New Testament*, 126. Augustus’ allowance of a cult to be established in his

intermediary between man and God could not be satisfied by making a man a god. For such a time as this, Christ came into this culture to expose and exploit the false ideologies and religions that could not save.

### New Testament – The Struggle Is Real

In the NT, two central motifs display the battle of the mind: the flesh versus the spirit and the spiritual goal of maturity in Christ. Paul’s epistles speak about the battle of the flesh versus the spirit. Romans 8:5 conveys the reality of the struggle in the mind and will be examined in depth in chapter five: “For those who live according to the flesh set their minds on the things of the flesh, but those who live according to the Spirit set their minds on the things of the Spirit” (Rom 8:5). The paradigm one operates from determines the outcome of their thoughts, disposition, and ultimately their lives; how one lives is an overflow of the heart/mind. The struggle is real, even though it takes place in the mind. If the battle is not waged well in the mind, it will continue to corrupt the whole person.

In Romans 12, Paul conveys realities about the struggle in the flesh to think rightly. “I appeal to you therefore, brothers, by the mercies of God, to present your bodies as a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable to God, which is your spiritual worship. Do not be conformed to this world, but be transformed by the renewal of your mind, that by testing you may discern what is the will of God, what is good and acceptable and perfect” (Rom 12:1–2). In light of Christ’s compassion οἰκτιρῶν (*oiktirmos*) for his people in laying down his life on their behalf, they

---

name by the Greeks solidified their loyalties to him and also secured the loyalties of the Roman people. The imperial cult was further promoted through the elements of the culture—architecture, coins, inscriptions, and military or religious rituals. Dodson, *Exploring Biblical Backgrounds*, 196. More than just a power play, Caesar Augustus’ position in the Imperial Cult was considered to be the empire’s new *augur* who served as an intermediary on behalf of mankind to interpret God’s will for man.

should do the same—die to the flesh and walk in the Spirit. Clement describes this wholehearted dedication one should give because of God’s compassion:

“The all-merciful and beneficent Father has bowels [of compassion] towards those that fear Him, and kindly and lovingly bestows His favours upon those who come to Him with a simple mind. Wherefore let us not be double-minded; neither let our soul be lifted up on account of His exceedingly great and glorious gifts” (Clement of Alexandria, *Epistle 23.1* [ANF 1:11]).

A double-minded person cannot live sacrificially for God. Man cannot serve both God and mammon. The act of choosing to lay down one’s life is a sacrifice of praise—worship in deference to following God’s ways rather than one’s own. But the image of presenting a body as a living sacrifice is provocative language. The term *παρίστημι* (*paristēmi*) means “present” and “to place or stand at the disposal.”<sup>146</sup> There is a sense of surrendering oneself to be used by God. True surrender is not intended to be temporary. The meaning is “to bring as an offering,” a figurative statement reminiscent of the sacrifices required in the OT, now fulfilled in Christ, and carried out by Christians as they sacrifice their way of life to live in accordance with Christ’s way of life, as he paid for them to be made righteous.<sup>147</sup> “Sin is no longer to have dominion, yet Christians must not (any longer) place *παριστάνετε* (*paristanete*) their members as weapons of unrighteousness in the service of sin but (now) they should set *παραστήσατε* (*parastēsate*) them in the service of God” (Rom 6:13).<sup>148</sup> The anthropological terminology Paul uses for “bodies” is the term *σῶμα* (*sōma*), and it embraces the whole person, reminiscent of the Shema; to love God with all one’s being, which includes living for Him fully.<sup>149</sup> The divided heart cannot be

---

<sup>146</sup> Bo Reicke, “Παρίστημι, Παριστάνω,” *TDNT* 5:837–838.

<sup>147</sup> *Ibid.*, 5:841.

<sup>148</sup> *Ibid.*, 5:840.

<sup>149</sup> Plutarch was a contemporary of the later NT authors and viewed the human body (*σῶμα*) as a trunk disparate from the head. Eduard Schweizer, “Σῶμα,” *TDNT* 7:1024–1094. In Plutarch’s work *Isis and Osiris*,

surrendered to God’s will. This is the chief struggle in the NT and throughout the canon—the heart/mind of man is divided.

While Paul’s writings emphasized this battle prolifically, there are also other examples of mindset struggles inherent in the biblical text. The writer of Hebrews conveys the significance of training one’s “senses” toward righteousness and spiritual maturity in Christ. “But solid food is for the mature—for those whose *senses* have been trained to distinguish between good and evil” (Heb 5:14 CSB). Other translations render the term “senses” as “minds” (ISV, GWT), “perceptions” (NET), “spiritual faculties” (WNT), the whole person, “themselves” (NIV), and “powers of discernment” (ESV). This term for senses, αἴσθησις, was akin to an “organ of sense” in the OT. The Stoics did not consider νοῦς and αἴσθησις to be equivalent, but both of these terms were understood as different means by which to communicate the same capacity of the soul.<sup>150</sup> This was illustrated in the work of the Stoics compiled in Arnim’s *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta*, where the interplay between the intellect and sense—διάνοια καὶ αἴσθησις—illustrates the different functions that work together to shape the mindset.

ναί φασιν ἄλλὰ ταῦτόν ἐστι διάνοια καὶ αἴσθησις , οὐ κατὰ ταῦτὸ δέ , ἀλλὰ κατ’ ἄλλο μὲν διάνοια, κατ’ ἄλλο δὲ αἴσθησις· καὶ ὄν τρόπον τὸ αὐτὸ ποτήριον κοιλόν τε καὶ περικυρτον λέγεται , οὐ κατὰ ταῦτὸ δέ , ἀλλὰ κατ’ ἄλλο μὲν κοῖλον , 15 οἶον τὸ ἐντὸς μέρος , κατ’ ἄλλο δὲ περικυρτον , καθάπερ τὸ ἐκτός , καὶ ὡς αὐτὴ ὁδὸς ἀνάπτυξης τε καὶ κατάντης νοεῖται , ἀνάπτυξης μὲν τοῖς ἀνιοῦσι δι’ αὐτῆς , κατάντης δὲ τοῖς κατιοῦσιν , οὕτως ἡ αὐτὴ δύναμις κατ’ ἄλλο μὲν ἐστι νοῦς κατ’ ἄλλο δὲ αἴσθησις , καὶ οὐκ εἴργεται ἡ αὐτὴ οὔσα τῆς προειρη μένης τῶν αἰσθήσεων καταλήψεως (Arnim *SVF* 2.5.849.230).

---

Plutarch conveyed a dualistic viewpoint of creation. “And as they term the Nile the efflux of Osiris, so they hold and esteem the earth for the body of Isis; and not all of it either, but that part only which the Nile, as it were, leaps over, and thereby impregnates and mixes with it” [(Plutarch, *Is. Os.* 38 (366a) [Stephanus, LCL]). This dualistic viewpoint was common amongst Greeks, but Rom 12:1 is a proof-text that one cannot present the body without also presenting their soul/spirit/mind. The body is the vessel and organ of a person’s faith expressed through one’s actions, where God is glorified through one’s body as one leads an upright life. BDAG, s.v. “Σῶμα,” 983.

<sup>150</sup> Delling, “Αἴσθησις,” *TDNT* 1:187–188.

Arnim’s analogies of thought and senses to a cup that is both hollow and curved and a road that is both ingoing and outgoing illustrate a symbiotic relationship between the senses and accompanying thought processes. The writer in Hebrews acknowledges the need to train one’s senses in which the thoughts should rein in the senses as led by the Spirit, not man’s intellect alone—to line up with God’s Word and thoughts.

The αἴσθησις (*aisthēsis*) is often in opposition to the νοῦς, which is above all of the inner workings of spiritual influence on the mind.<sup>151</sup> Led solely by either the intellect or the senses, man's mind becomes corrupted.<sup>152</sup> Hermetic literature emanating from the first few centuries viewed αἴσθησις as the source of human passion as an organ of the σῶμα, and γνῶσις (*gnōsis*) as an organ of the νοῦς.<sup>153</sup> To achieve victory in the struggle within one’s own mind, learning how to lead one’s senses/emotions rather than being led by them is significant for mind renewal. The Holy Spirit accomplishes the work, but God’s people cooperate in the process by examining their thoughts and obeying God’s thoughts over their senses. So then, mindsets are unbelief that needs

---

<sup>151</sup> Delling, “Αἰσθάνομαι,” *TDNT* 1:187.

<sup>152</sup> In the intellect, Philo saw the νοῦς as dependent upon having a right αἴσθησις. *Ibid.*, 1:188. In his work *Legatio ad Gaium*, Philo stated that “The human mind in its blindness does not perceive its real interest and all it can do is to take conjecture and guesswork for its guide instead of knowledge” (Philo, *Embassy* 3.12–13 [Colson, G. H. Whitaker, and J. W. Earp, LCL]). This view of Philo’s was not a theological one, and it was commensurate with the Palestinian view at the time, with essentially no difference between spirit and experience. Delling, “Αἰσθάνομαι,” *TDNT*, 1:188. In the LXX, αἴσθησις is used most commonly as נִצְחָה (*da’at*), meaning knowledge, discernment, and understanding. *HALOT*, s.v. “נִצְחָה,” 1:228–229.

<sup>153</sup> One illuminating example of αἰσθητήριον (*aisthētērion*) is in Proverbs 1:7 as an “organ of the soul” as it is compared with wisdom (σοφία) and education παιδεία (*paideia*), mediating between the mind (νοῦς) and the culture (θυμοί) of passion (πάθη) and morals (ἤθη), which make up the psychological point of moral decisions and become actions. This concept in Hebrews 5:14 is underscored in a verse in Maccabees. “But at the same time, he enthroned the mind among the senses as a sacred governor over them all” (4 Macc 2:22 NRSV). In Maccabees, the αἰσθητήρια are organs that are capable of discerning between good and evil, having been trained τέλειος (*teleios*) so that right choices become habits, but in Heb 5:14 πνεῦμα replaces νοῦς in 4 Macc 2:22, and αἰσθητήρια has developed to represent “a plurality of capacities for moral decision,” which through maturity enable one’s mindset to choose righteously. Delling, “Αἰσθάνομαι,” *TDNT*, 1:187–88.



to be oriented toward God’s way of thinking, and this is with one’s whole being—emotions, will, spirit, and body.

### **Jew, Roman, and Greek Mindset Toward Messiah and Misinterpretation**

Where the rubber meets the road is in the significance of mindsets in the interpretation of God’s Word concerning the coming of the Messiah. During the first century, a confluence of varied expectations of Jews and the surrounding culture for a Messiah as a divine hero contributed to a heightened political environment.<sup>154</sup> The Jewish people had widespread expectations of a coming Messiah, though there were various depictions of this Messiah.<sup>155</sup> Josephus was a Jewish writer who was sympathetic to the Romans and held the belief that the prophecy of a Messiah was referring to a Roman emperor named Vespasian, as seen in his writing, *The Jewish War*.

But what more than all else incited them to the war was an ambiguous oracle, likewise found in their sacred scriptures, to the effect that at that time one from their country would become ruler of the world. This they understood to mean someone of their own race, and many of their wise men went astray in their interpretation of it. The oracle, however, in reality signified the sovereignty of Vespasian, who was proclaimed Emperor on Jewish soil (Josephus, *J.W.* 6.268–269 [Ralph Marcus]).

It is intriguing that Josephus, a Jewish writer, should have misinterpreted Messianic prophecy, and yet he was far from the only one. His allegiance to Rome blurred his loyalty to his own people and his ability to interpret the OT prophecies rightly. The Qumran community

---

<sup>154</sup> Martin Goodman, “Messianism and Politics in The Land of Israel, 66–135 C.E.,” in *Redemption and Resistance: The Messianic Hopes of Jews and Christians in Antiquity*, eds. Markus Bockmuehl and James Carleton Paget (London, UK: Bloomsbury, 2007), 151.

<sup>155</sup> Dodson, *Exploring Biblical Background*, 189.

anticipated two different messiahs—one royal and one priestly.<sup>156</sup> Ultimately, Christ fulfilled both positions and then some. He is King of kings (1 Tim. 6:15), the great High Priest (Heb 2:17, 4:14), and a prophet (Deut 18:15, Matt 21:11, Acts 3:22). The hope for Messiah was largely political in the world of the Pharisees, as demonstrated in the Psalms of Solomon, which was written by a group of Pharisees who were against the Hasmoneans as well as the Roman rule.<sup>157</sup>

This passage in Psalms of Solomon illustrates the political power Messiah wielded as a conqueror:

Behold, O Lord, and raise up unto them their king, the son of David, at the time in the which Thou seest, O God, that he may reign over Israel Thy servant. And gird him with strength, that he may shatter unrighteous rulers, and that he may purge Jerusalem from nations that trample (her) down to destruction. Wisely, righteously, he shall thrust out sinners from (the) inheritance; He shall destroy the pride of the sinner as a potter's vessel. With a rod of iron, he shall break in pieces all their substance; he shall destroy the godless nations with the word of his mouth; at his rebuke, nations shall flee before him, and He shall reprove sinners for the thoughts of their hearts (Pss. Sol. *APOT* 2.649 [Gray]).

This image of the Messiah is in sharp contrast with the suffering servant, which would help to explain why so many Jewish people missed the Messiah. Certainly, the imagery of a rod harkens to Isaiah 11:4, and the Messianic expectations of the Jewish people could be mixed because the OT prophecies were not clear as to which of the two Messianic comings they refer to (Isa 7:14; 9:6–7; Zech. 14:4). So, too, the expectations of the characteristics of a Messiah varied among the general public. The Roman perspective was varied as well. Tacitus, a Roman writer, held the same view as Josephus, as seen in his work *Histories*.

Few interpreted these omens as fearful; the majority firmly believed that their ancient priestly writings contained the prophecy that this was the very time when the East should grow strong and that men starting from Judea should possess the

---

<sup>156</sup> Ibid., 191.

<sup>157</sup> Ibid., 189.

world. This mysterious prophecy had in reality pointed to Vespasian and Titus, but the common people, as is the way of human ambition, interpreted these great destinies in their own favour, and could not be turned to the truth even by adversity (Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.198–199 [Clifford H. Moore, John Jackson, LCL]).

The Romans also had poetry that spoke of a child that would bring peace.<sup>158</sup> The surrounding culture and subcultures shaped the mindset of all who were within the culture—Jew, Greek, Roman, Gentile. In the Greco-Roman culture, differing expectations often hinged on political underpinnings. Josephus’s interpretation of what he considered to be faulty Jewish expectations of the Messiah was utilized as a means for divine approval of Vespasian as ruler.<sup>159</sup> Subsequently, Josephus’s interpretation was self-serving as he was rewarded for his alleged prophetic revelation, which supported Vespasian’s rulership by being released from captivity in 69 C.E.<sup>160</sup> Manipulating expectations for political or religious purposes was a way of controlling the culture to affect peace or conquest. The Flavian Dynasty used Josephus’ interpretation to produce honor for the Roman government.<sup>161</sup>

The Gentile mindset emanated from a syncretic environment fixed on a perception of Messiah as a political hero (Vespasian), as depicted by Tacitus in his work *Historiae*, or as personified by Augustus and other emperors who were dubbed “gods.” The Priene Calendar Inscription (*OGIS* 458) was erected around 9 BCE and proclaimed a calendar change to begin on

---

<sup>158</sup> The Roman poet Virgil wrote ten pastoral poems called the *Eclogues*. In *Eclogue* IV, a depiction of a child being born who brings serenity and peace (as seen in Isa 11:6–9, Luke 1:46–55). The child’s identity is contested but becomes a part of the imperial ideology of the emperor Augustus. While this poem is not necessarily influenced by the Jewish tradition, it illustrates the expectation of the Greco-Roman culture of “a divinely established peaceable rule through a divinely appointed agent.” Dodson, *Exploring Biblical Backgrounds*, 193. This child was seen as doing the Father’s will and bringing peace. “And shall himself be seen by them and shall rule the world to which his father’s prowess brought peace” (Virgil, *Eclogue* 5.50–51 [H. Rushton Fairclough, LCL]).

<sup>159</sup> Goodman, “Messianism and Politics in The Land of Israel,” in *Redemption and Resistance*, 152.

<sup>160</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>161</sup> *Ibid.*

the birthday of the emperor Augustus, who was dubbed a “savior” and a “god.”<sup>162</sup> The inscription uses the term “good news” to describe the peace and welfare brought about by Augustus; it is the same term used for the “good news” of God and of Jesus in the New Testament (Rom 1:1, 3; 2 Cor 2:12; Mark 1:14; the verbal form of “good news” can be found in the Septuagint in Isa 52:7; 61:1–3). The inscription resonates particularly with Mark 1:1 and Luke 2:8–14.

The Greeks saw Augustus as a gift from Divine Providence. Augustus was thought to be filled with virtue for the benefit of humanity, a savior sent who ended war and put all things in order.<sup>163</sup> A crucified Messiah did not embody the power they thought God should have. The gospel confounded their idea of wisdom. Yet the parallel poems of a divine child being born reveal the Greco-Roman cultural mindset and expectation that there would be a divine being who would peacefully rule. Through an examination of the Jewish and Gentile perceptions and the impact their surrounding cultures had on their mindsets, the evidence of misinterpretation due to mindsets is uncovered. God’s people must have mindset renewal to be able to have a right relationship with God, rightly understand his Word, and reach the world with the Gospel.

### **A Spiritual Heart Condition**

The human condition causes a heart condition. This human condition is that man is a consumer, desiring to fill what only God can. But the creation and world systems cannot meet the needs of the spirit within. Israel’s failed witness to the nations began in her heart/mind. The failure to love God led to their failure as witnesses to the world, the very purpose to which God

---

<sup>162</sup> Dodson, *Exploring Biblical Background*, 196.

<sup>163</sup> Ibid.

had called them, connected to the second greatest command to love their neighbor. The relationship the Jewish people had with Yahweh hinged upon their ability to keep the greatest commandment, which in turn hinged upon their mindset. Jewish sects relied on the Law for wisdom, while the Greeks relied on rhetoric and man's reason. But they ultimately relied on their own thoughts above God's, and they each, in their own way, misunderstood who the Messiah was, though ultimately, the Jewish rejection of Messiah paved the way to the Gentile reception of Messiah. Their mindset and understanding of what it meant to be Israel became an ethnic identity fixed on the Law rather than an ethical one fixed on God, a religious good work rather than a conduit for their relationship with Yahweh. The culture is a significant force in shaping mindsets, but within man's own heart are other forces to reckon with. A heart exam is in order for those who are in Christ, and there are many heart conditions to be aware of.

#### A Hardened Heart

“The heart is the seat of doubt and hardness as well as of faith and obedience.”<sup>164</sup> If the greatest commandment is that God's people would love him with all their being, then it is the heart/mind that will go through the severest testing in this life.<sup>165</sup> The idiom, “hardening of heart,” is throughout Scripture indicating a heart that is set (mindset) and stubborn rather than pliable and soft toward God.<sup>166</sup> A hardened heart impacts the whole person. When the heart is enslaved to sin, the person's whole being is held captive. Matthew 15:18–19 (Mark 7:21) reveals

---

<sup>164</sup> Silva, “καρδία,” *NIDNTTE* 2:625.

<sup>165</sup> The statement “hardened heart” is a misnomer given the terrain that has been covered to convey that the heart itself cannot think or feel. To clarify the condition, it is the equivalent of an unbelieving mind that has turned away from God. But for the purposes of this section, the term “heart” will be used as it is well-accepted as a metaphor for the place of one's emotions and thoughts in the Shema.

<sup>166</sup> John Rea, “Hardness of Heart,” in *The Wycliffe Bible Encyclopedia*, ed. Charles F. Pfeiffer and Howard F. Vos (Chicago, IL: Moody Press, 1975).

that all evil thoughts are from the heart, as well as sinful desires (cf. Rom 1:24).<sup>167</sup> Man's heart becomes hardened when he rebels against God, but sometimes God hardens man's heart. The challenge of understanding the culpability of the person with a hardened heart when God is the agent of that hardened heart is understood through the salvation history perspective and through the lens of God's sovereignty, who knows the hearts of all men.<sup>168</sup> It is the grace of God to transform hearts and the judgment of God to let human hearts continue on the path of intransigence.

The hardened heart motif means to fail or refuse to understand and is used comprehensively, canonically, directly, and indirectly to address theological and ethical problems (sin) in the camp of God's people.<sup>169</sup> This motif utilizes various terms to address apostasy, employing anthropological terminology alongside hardened heart terms to demonstrate the copious presence of a hard heart in God's people.<sup>170</sup> Occurring twenty times between Exod

---

<sup>167</sup> The heart is described as hard, unbelieving, darkened, impenitent, foolish (Ezek 36:26; Mark 3:5; Rom 1:21; 2:5; Eph 4:18; Heb 3:12). Silva, “καρδία,” *NIDNTTE* 2:626. The term *hāzāq* (הָזַק) typically means to be strong, as in Haggai 2:4, where הָזַק is repeated three times used to encourage Zerubbabel, Joshua the high priest, and the people, respectively. One's heart can be set toward righteousness or bent toward sin. But in an idiom with לֵב, לֵב הָזַק means a hardened heart, and this idiom appears twelve times in Exod 4–14. Carl Philip Weber, “הָזַק,” *TWOT* 1:276–277. *HALOT* notes that this idiom is in reference to an inclination or disposition. *HALOT* s.v. “לֵב,” 513–515. The fundamental meaning of הָזַק is “be or become strong” and is altered to a derived meaning “be or become hard.” F. Hesse, “הָזַק,” *TDOT*, 301–308. The *hazq* qal stem is used to indicate willful intransigence, and the pi'el stem demonstrates a hardening of the heart by God. A. S. van der Woude, “הָזַק,” *TLOT* 1:403–406. The Akkadian use of this idiom implies trusting in oneself rather than the god Aššur leads to a hardened heart. “Because he (Gyges king of Lydia) did not observe the command of the Aššur, my (Aššurbanipal's) begetter, but trusted his own power and hardened his heart.” Tawil, *An Akkadian Lexical Companion*, 181.

<sup>168</sup> Van der Woude, “הָזַק,” *TLOT* 1:405.

<sup>169</sup> Charles B. Puskas, *Hardness of Heart in Biblical Literature: Failure and Refusal* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2022), 4.

<sup>170</sup> Key terms employed in the Hebrew text include כָּבֵד (*kabēd*) (to make hard or heavy, referring to the ears), הָזַק (*hāzāq*) (to become strong or hard), referring to the heart, קָשָׁה (*qashā*) (to be stiff, hard), referring to the heart (Exod 7:3; Isa 63:17), the neck (Jer 17:23, Exod 33:3, 5), and face (Ezek 2:4), אָמֵץ (*'āmetz*) (to be hard or firm, referring to the heart (Deut 2:30; 15:7), מָרָה (*mārā*), meaning to be rebellious (Deut 31:27, Isa 1:20, Ezek 3:9), שָׁרָר (*sārar*), meaning to be stubborn (Ps 78:8, meaning apostasy, Isa 1:23; 65:2; Jer 5:23; 1QHA XIII, 24; CD-A XI, 7, meaning rebellious heart, שְׁרִירֻת (*shərirūt*), meaning stubbornness (Deut 29:19; Jer 16:12, 1 QS III, 3), and עָרַל לֵב (*'erel lēb wə'erel bāsār*), meaning uncircumcised (Ezek 44:7, 9). All three hardening verbs (הָזַק, כָּבֵד, and

4:21 and Exod 14:17 alone, the hardening motif was a literary device connected metaphorically to the heart.<sup>171</sup> Reminiscent of Pharaoh's hard heart, the same literary-theological function of the hardness of heart is displayed through the Jewish religious leaders in the NT, indicating their unbelief and rejection.<sup>172</sup> Hardened hearts lead to misinterpretation of God's Word as one's own mindset and reason are elevated above God's. An example of what a hardened heart can do is evident in the Gospel of Mark regarding the religious Jewish leaders. Klinghoffer cites three central reasons/motifs why the Jews rejected Christ, which come from criteria in the Hebrew canon: the first motif is that there is one God—the religious leaders in the NT did not consider or understand that this one God was triune.<sup>173</sup> The second motif is that the Jewish faith was a religion of commandments, and the third motif is that Christ was to be at the end of history.<sup>174</sup> The Jewish religious leaders (Pharisees, Sadducees) did not understand that Jesus had the authority to do miracles. They were jealous (Mark 15:10), offended (Matt 15:12), and had unbelief (Matt 12:24) because their hearts were hard. They considered Christ's healing deeds to

---

הַשֵּׁק) are used in parallel (Exod 7:3, 13, 14, 22) to emphasize the hardened state of God's people. Puskas, *Hardness of Heart in Biblical Literature*, 6–8.

<sup>171</sup> Puskas, *Hardness of Heart in Biblical Literature*, 11.

<sup>172</sup> Sug-Ho Lee, "An Exegetical-Theological Consideration of the Hardening of the Jewish Religious Leaders' Hearts in Mark 3:1-6." *VeE* 27 (2006): 596.

<sup>173</sup> David Klinghoffer, *The Turning Point in Western History: Why the Jews Rejected Jesus* (New York, NY: Doubleday, 2005), 28.

<sup>174</sup> *Ibid.*, 33. Seeing the Jewish faith as being based solely on the commandments misses the relationship Yahweh intended all along. Interpreting Messiah's coming as only once misinterprets Christ's second coming as his first. Klinghoffer himself a modern-day non-Messianic Jew, misinterprets Scripture due to his presuppositions and established cultural mindset. An example of this misinterpretation is Klinghoffer's quotation of Psalm 146:3 (on page 38), in which he eisegetically picks this scripture to try to prove that scripture speaks against Christ as the Messiah. "Put not your trust in princes, in a son of man, in whom there is no salvation. Don't put your confidence in powerful people" (Ps 146:3). However, the term "son of man" in this context simply means a human being. It is not a title for Messiah. The phrase son of man (υἱοὶ ἀνθρώπων) plainly means "people, human beings" (1 Sam 26:19; Ps 146:3 [145:3]; Prov 8:4; Wis 9:6. Silva, "υἱός," *NIDNTTE* 2:526. The hardened hearts of the Jewish people led them to have a fixed mindset that caused them to miss their Messiah.

be blasphemy (Mark 2:7) and refused to believe that Christ was the Son of God despite the evidence exhibited in his miracles (Mark 2:10; 3:5). This led them to refute and refuse him (Mark 3:6), ultimately plotting to kill him and doing just that (Mark 3:6; 12:12; 14:1-2; 15:1).<sup>175</sup> The hardness of the heart is the basis of *their* rejection of Jesus, not the result of *his* rejection of them.<sup>176</sup> The salvation history of God's people is littered with the motif of the hardening of hearts that need to be renewed. Mark's employment of the hardness of heart motif exposes the resulting mindsets of unbelief that stymie faith.<sup>177</sup> Jesus woos God's people to repentance, beckoning them to distance themselves from their "unbelieving attitude" (mindset).<sup>178</sup> This repentance is an admission of sin not for condemnation but for forgiveness. Mindsets are ultimately unbelief when one believes in one's own thoughts as truth instead of God's Word. Repentance paves the way for mind renewal and the fulfillment of the motif of mindset renewal. "And I will give them one heart, and a new spirit I will put within them. I will remove the heart of stone from their flesh and give them a heart of flesh" (Ezek 11:19).

#### A Divided Heart

Allegiance to God is to be with all one's heart, all one's soul, all one's mind, all one's strength. "All" does not leave room for any other god. The term δίψυχος (*dipsychos*) only occurs in the book of James (Jas 1:8, 4:8,) meaning to be 'double-minded;' to doubt.<sup>179</sup>

---

<sup>175</sup> Lee, "An Exegetical-Theological Consideration of the Hardening," 597.

<sup>176</sup> Lee notes that the Gospel of Mark is unique in employing the hardening of heart motif, whereas the other synoptic gospels omit this reference (Matt) or use other terms like "fury" (Luke 14:11). Ibid.

<sup>177</sup> Ibid., 611.

<sup>178</sup> Ibid.

<sup>179</sup> Eduard Schweizer, "Ψυχή," *TDNT* 9:608–665.



Doublemindedness is also implied in the concept of loving God with a whole heart (all your heart) rather than a divided one (Deut 30:2; Ps 86:11; Jer 24:7; Joel 2:12–13.) Jobes notes the significance of doublemindedness according to the book of James.

James apparently knew professing Christians who couldn't quite make up their minds about what they believed. Twice he refers to those who are not right with God as dipsychos, typically translated as “double-minded.” If the greatest commandment is to love God with one's whole self—heart, soul, mind, and strength (Matt 22:37; Mark 12:30; Luke 10:27)—then to be doubleminded about God is to fail miserably.<sup>180</sup>

Schweizer thinks that δίψυχος must have been in mind where the term double-minded was employed in the Apocrypha (1QH 4:14) and the Apostolic Fathers collection (see Clem. 1:23 [ANF 9.236]; Clem 2:11 [ANF 9:254]; Hermas, *Shepherd* 22.5), where Hermas is keen on the word.<sup>181</sup> Another rare term in Greek that conveys this half-hearted devotion to God is the term νοθρός (*nōthros*) which occurs only once in Heb 5:11, reflecting the inward capacity to receive is dulled, making one sluggish in hearing.<sup>182</sup> This term dulled is reminiscent of the deaf idols and those who worshiped them and became just like them (Ps 135:18). A term related to νοθρός also occurs only once νοθροί (*nōthroi*) in Heb 6:12, meaning dull or slow, slow to understand.<sup>183</sup>

---

<sup>180</sup> Jobes, *Letters to the Church*, 273.

<sup>181</sup> Eduard Schweizer, “Δίψυχος,” *TDNT* 9:665. Hermas employed the Greek adjective δίψυχος (“doublemindedness”) nineteen times, its cognate verb διψυχεῖν (“to be doubleminded”) occurs twenty times, and the substantive διψυχία (“doubleminded”) occurs sixteen times, which is remarkable considering the use of this term is rather infrequent, occurring only ten times total in early Christian writings combined up to this time (Jas 1:8; 4:8; Did 4.4; Bar 19.5; 1 Clem 11.2; 23.2-3; 2 Clem 11.2; 23.5; Carolyn Osiek, *The Shepherd of Hermas: A Commentary*, Hermeneia, ed. Helmut Koester (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1999), 30, 232.

<sup>182</sup> Preisker, “Νοθρός,” *TDNT* 4:1126.

<sup>183</sup> *L&N*, s.v. “νοθρός,” 1:385.

One Hebrew term that is synonymous with *δίψυχος* is *רַעְדָּ* (*sē'ēp*), meaning divided, disunited, futile.<sup>184</sup> This term occurs in Ps 119:113, rendered as divided or half-hearted.<sup>185</sup> The plural of *רַעְדָּ* is the term *רַעְדָּוֹת*, which means division or divided opinion and is also a hapax legomenon in the Bible (1 Kgs 18:21).<sup>186</sup> The term ‘double-mindedness’ is also scarce in the OT, but the concept is not.<sup>187</sup> Double-mindedness was a recurring motif illustrating the problem of mindsets throughout the canon. Partial faithfulness was not faithfulness at all and led to idolatry, divided loyalty, and half-hearted devotion. Loyalty to God prohibited loving the world *and* God. Doing so made one an enemy of God. James 4:4 reveals this reality, referring to dual loyalty as spiritual adultery, using different terms to convey the divided heart. “You adulterous people, don’t you know that friendship with the world means *enmity* against God? Therefore, anyone who *chooses* to be a friend of the world becomes an enemy of God” (Jas 4:4 NIV, emphasis added). The term *ἔχθρα* (*extra*) means “hatred, hostility” as an inner disposition (mindset or outlook).<sup>188</sup> Being duplicitous in one’s faith and relationship with God hinges on one’s mindset, and it is enmity with God. The rebellion of sinners against God is in both their thoughts and actions, making them enemies against God (Rom 5:10; Col 1:21) with a mindset that has its origin in the flesh, depicted as being *ἔχθρα εἰς θεόν* (“[at] enmity against God,” Rom 8:7).<sup>189</sup>

---

<sup>184</sup> HALOT, s.v. “רַעְדָּ,” 3:762.

<sup>185</sup> Patterson, “רַעְדָּ,” TWOT 1:629.

<sup>186</sup> Ernest Klein, s.v. “רַעְדָּ,” CEDHLE, 452.

<sup>187</sup> These verses in the OT convey Yahweh’s command for wholehearted devotion toward him so the people would not bear the curses for breaking the covenant (Deut 4:29; Josh 23:14; 1 Sam 7:3; 1 Kgs 2:4; 8:23, 48; 9:4; 10:24; 11:4; 15:3, 14; 2 Kgs 20:3; 23:25; 1 Chr 12:38; 28:9; 29:9, 19; 2 Chr 6:14, 38; 15:12, 15; 16:9; 19:9, 10; 22:9; 25:2; 29:34; 30:19; Pss 9:1; 16:9; 20:4; 78:37; 86:11, 12; 108:1; 111:1; 119:2, 10, 34, 58, 69, 145; 138:1; Eccl 3:11; 9:1; Isa 1:5; 10:12; 38:3; Jer 3:10; 9:26; 12:11; 13:17; 24:7; 29:13; 32:41; Ezek 36:5; Joel 2:12; Zeph 3:14).

<sup>188</sup> Werner Foerster, “ἔχθρα,” TDNT 4:811–815.

<sup>189</sup> Silva, “ἔχθρός,” NIDNTTE 2:345.

Separation from God begins in the mind. "...You were his enemies, separated from him by your evil thoughts and actions" (Col 1:21 NLT). The operative term in Jas 4:4 that determines the action is βούλεσθαι (*boulomai*), which denotes "A decision of will, based on deliberate resolve...desire or inclination, as the wish of the soul"<sup>190</sup> Both the terms ἔχθρα (an inner disposition of hatred) and βούλεσθαι (an inner intention) together show the significance of one's mindset in this verse. Intention becomes actions. God is after the heart/mind because it determines the direction of one's life. (cf. Prov 4:23). One's desire can give full bloom to sin and a divided heart (James 1:14–16). The term βούλεσθαι is a mindset term that is synonymous with another mindset term ἐθέλω (*ethelō*), as well as ἐπιθυμεῖν (*epithymeō*).<sup>191</sup> So, too, are other terms related to mindset concerning the will that is involved, such as θέλημα (*thelēma*) and the belief that is inherently involved in one's resolve and outlook: πιστεύω (*pisteuō*). A constellation of mindset terms connects throughout the canon to reveal man's heart condition and that he is culpable for his thoughts. Carnal mindsets are ultimately the equivalent of a divided heart—divided between unbelief and belief.

### A Broken Heart

The culture turns the heart of man away from God to worship worthless things, but the mind renewal that Christ brings is the answer that these broken mindsets point to. Living in a broken world renders broken hearts. Trauma makes it difficult for fallen people to function well and to follow Christ. A broken heart caused by being sinned against causes one to doubt the goodness of God. How can one love God, who allowed pain? This is the burning question of

---

<sup>190</sup> Gottlob Schrenk, "Βούλομαι," *TDNT* 2:629–637.

<sup>191</sup> *Ibid.*, 2:630.

people who do not understand the context they are living in (a fallen world), the consequences of free will that has been given, and the goodness and kindness of God, who longs to comfort his people. The people of God do not anticipate suffering, but it is suffering that can lead to a restored mind and heart. Scripture is replete with verses on suffering, whose presence demonstrates God speaks to and cares for those broken from suffering due to the ravages of sin and living in a fallen world. Peter spoke of human suffering due to persecution. Suffering was not just a possibility but a certainty. “And after you have suffered a little while, the God of all grace, who has called you to his eternal glory in Christ, will himself restore, confirm, strengthen, and establish you” (1 Pet 5:10). Suffering has long been associated with punishment from the “gods.” The term for suffering, *πάσχω* (*paschō*), means “to suffer,” “to undergo,” “to experience,” or “to suffer misfortune, blows of fate, or the disfavor of men or gods.”<sup>192</sup> The term *πάσχω* occurs forty-two times in the NT, with most of these occurrences referring to the sufferings of Christ himself, and almost 30% of the occurrences are in the book of 1 Peter (twelve times).<sup>193</sup> Though suffering at first glance seems to have no beneficial purpose, the Greeks saw it as providing better insight and an opportunity to grow wise through suffering.<sup>194</sup> “In the lives of the followers of Christ, his vicarious suffering means deliverance *for*, not *from*, earthly suffering.”<sup>195</sup> Suffering impacts one’s mindset and is difficult, but it can also provide the impetus for healing and growth when one seeks God in the pain and thinks rightly about the suffering. When sufferers elect to worship God through suffering, it is a sacrifice of praise that

---

<sup>192</sup> Wilhelm Michaelis, “Πάσχω,” *TDNT* 5:904–939.

<sup>193</sup> Silva, “πάσχω,” *NIDNTTE* 3:670.

<sup>194</sup> Michaelis, “Πάσχω,” *TDNT* 5:906.

<sup>195</sup> Silva, “πάσχω,” *NIDNTTE* 2:671.

yields beautiful fruit and God's glory. This is where the significance of the Shema is evident. It may seem like it is solely directed to God, but the soul of mankind needs to love and worship God. Worshiping God removes the focus off of pain and redirects one's focus onto the bigger picture. Through all the trauma invoked by sinful hearts, there is a God who is over all hearts, and he is able to heal. He who has given all things to his people is worthy of love that demands all our intellect, all our being, and all our strength.

### Don't Follow Your Heart

Following one's heart or gut is the sage advice of the culture, and it can have some merit until the condition of one's heart is considered. As established in chapter one, carnal mindsets are often covert presuppositions one is unaware of that are sin, driven by one's senses rather than one's spirit, and are ultimately unbelief. Following one's heart is believing one's thoughts above God's. Within the heart (mind) is a world of evil, and following one's heart is a sure path to destruction. All the terminology depicting the nature of man centers around the heart/mind, ultimately conveying that the purpose of one's life depends upon the thoughts and decisions made in one's mind.

The cultural mandate of today to "follow your heart" is not a biblical mandate. The book of Ecclesiastes displays a wrestling in one's heart to understand life in a fallen world. The term "heart" is used more than soul or spirit in Ecclesiastes, depicting the battle in one's mind. One should not follow one's heart but lead it with the plumbline of Scripture and the help of the Spirit. The intellect of the "heart" (where intellect refers to the mind) is the driving force in Ecclesiastes 1:13, 17. The opening phrase in 1:13 is "I applied my mind" in NIV, "I devoted myself" in NLT, "I applied my heart" in ESV, "I set my mind" in NASB, and "I decided" in NET. Eccl 1:17 is similar in terminology. The idea in these verses (Eccl 1:13, 17) is an inner

determination to complete an intellectual pursuit.<sup>196</sup> Other verses in the NIV render “heart” as “mind” in Eccl 7:2, 22, 25; 8:5, 9, 16; 9:1, clearly showing that the heart is to be engaged in intellectual endeavors and not led by emotions.<sup>197</sup> Ecclesiastes also reveals the emotive side of the heart (Eccl 5:2; 7:3, 4; 9:7; 11:9). The battle of intellect versus emotions is won by the fear of God (Eccl 3:14; 5:7; 7:18; 8:12–13; 12:13), wisdom (Eccl 1:13, 16, 17, 18; 2:3, 9, 12, 13; 7:12, 19, 25; 8:1, 16; 9:13, 18; 10:10), and lordship—following God’s precepts over one’s own. The natural disposition of the heart is that it is filled with its own schemes, inclinations, and evil—in short, mindsets (Eccl 7:7, 26; 8:11; 9:3; 10:2). The mind, understood as the heart metaphorically, is where one’s emotions, will, and intellect together reside. But it is the Spirit residing in the mind that guides one to overcome battles within the heart. Humans have an intellect that no other creature on earth has, but the culture woos man to follow the flesh rather than the Spirit. An acknowledgment of one’s need for mind renewal helps to overcome the powerful pull on the heart by the culture and one’s own sinful nature.

### **The Breaking of a Mindset**

The motif of mind renewal throughout the canon is realized in the breaking of mindsets, which happens when man repents and accepts God’s invitation to walk in covenant with him. In the OT, Zechariah 1:2–5 is a reminder that God has kept his covenant, while man has caused his own demise, yet God invites his people to renewal through the term שׁוּב (*šûb*).

The LORD was very angry with your fathers. Therefore say to them, “Thus declares the LORD of hosts: Return to me, says the LORD of hosts, and I will return to you, says the LORD of hosts.” Do not be like your fathers, to whom the former prophets cried out, “Thus says the LORD of hosts, Return from your evil

---

<sup>196</sup> Zuck, *BTOT*, 248–249.

<sup>197</sup> *Ibid.*

ways and from your evil deeds.” But they did not hear or pay attention to me, declares the LORD. Your fathers, where are they? And the prophets, do they live forever? But my words and my statutes, which I commanded my servants, the prophets, did they not overtake your fathers? So they repented and said, “As the LORD of hosts purposed to deal with us for our ways and deeds, so has he dealt with us” (Zech 1:2–5).

The term שׁוּב means “to turn around, repent, or bring back, refresh, refute; to be changed.”<sup>198</sup> Used in the *qal* stem 129 times to convey repentance and 164 in reference to the covenant, שׁוּב appears the most in the book of Jeremiah, forty-eight times.<sup>199</sup> The OT canon is replete with idioms conveying the need for repentance: “Incline your heart unto the LORD your God” (Josh 24:23); “Circumcise yourselves to the LORD” (Jer 4:4); “Wash your heart from wickedness” (Jer 4:14); “Break up your fallow ground” (Hos 10:12). All these idioms are summarized by the verb שׁוּב for this verb is the best representation of what repentance is as it combines turning from evil and turning to the good.<sup>200</sup> The term שׁוּב is used for someone who has shifted direction in a particular way and then shifted back from it in the opposite way, in a theological sense, to return to Yahweh.<sup>201</sup> In Deuteronomy 4:39, שׁוּב is rendered as “consider” (KJV), and *HALOT* renders it as “take to heart, call to mind.”<sup>202</sup> Additional terms in the Septuagint depict this call to repentance. The Septuagint uses a form from στρέφω (*strefō*) to convey repentance, especially ἐπιστρέφω (*epistrefhō*), meaning to turn or return, ἀναστρέφω

---

<sup>198</sup> *HALOT* s.v. “שׁוּב,” 4:1427.

<sup>199</sup> Victor P. Hamilton, “שׁוּב,” *TWOT* 909–910. Other key passages employing this term שׁוּב include Deut 30:2, 8, 10; 1 Sam 7:3; 1 Kgs 8:35, 47; 13:33; 2 Chr 6:24, 26, 37–38; 7:14; 30:6, 9; 36:13; Neh 9:35; Ps 7:13; 22:28; 51:15; 78:34; Lam 3:40; Isa 1:27; 6:10; 9:12; 10:21–22; 19:22; 31:6; 44:22; 55:7; 59:20; Jer 3:1, 7, 10, 12, 14, 22; 4:1; 5:3; 8:5; 15:7, 19; 18:8, 11; 23:14; 24:7; 25:5; 26:3; 35:15; 36:3, 7; 44:5; Ezek 3:19; 13:22; 14:6; 18:21, 23, 27–28, 30; 33:9, 11–12, 14, 19; Hos 3:5; 6:1; 7:10; 11:5; 12:7; 14:2–3; Amos 4:6, 8–11; Jonah 3:8, 10; Zech 1:3–4, 6; Dan 9:13.

<sup>200</sup> *Ibid.*, 909.

<sup>201</sup> *HALOT*, s.v. “שׁוּב,” 1429.

<sup>202</sup> *Ibid.*, 1434.

(*anastrephō*), meaning to turn back, and ἀποστρέφω (*apostrephō*), meaning to turn away or back.<sup>203</sup> Additionally, ὑποστρέφω (*hupostrephō*) is a Greek counterpart meaning “to go back or come back.”<sup>204</sup> In the NT, μετανοέω (*metanoēō*) is used most significantly to illustrate repentance. The mechanics of a mindset precipitate decisions and actions and a change in belief but repentance is a powerful tool in mindset renewal.

Psalm 51 is a beautiful picture of repentance. In it, David acknowledges his guilt and sin before God after the prophet Nathan confronts him with his sins of adultery and murder. In Psalm 51:12, David prays to God for restoration through the term שׁוּב. His use of this term is a picture of what repentance does—restore God’s people to a right relationship with God. David is sorry for his sin and asks God to restore (שׁוּב) to him the joy of God’s salvation. “Restore to me the joy of your salvation, and uphold me with a willing spirit.” This is a fulfillment of God’s promises to his people. If they would return to him, he would restore them (Deut 30:3).

The term שׁוּבָה (*hāšūbā*) is used in Psalm 51:10 to depict the renewal God brings: “Renew (שׁוּבָה) a right spirit within (קִרְבִּי) me.” The renewal God brings makes one anew, restores, and gives a new (firm) spirit.<sup>205</sup> Mind renewal means “To place in a state or condition identical or nearly the same as a prior state (2 Chr 15:8; 24:4, 12; Ps 51:12; 104:30; Isa 61:4; Lam 5:21.)”<sup>206</sup> Repentance leads to restoration—it renews and repairs God’s broken people.<sup>207</sup>

---

<sup>203</sup> Ibid., 1429.

<sup>204</sup> *L&N*, s.v. “ὑποστρέφω,” 1:193.

<sup>205</sup> *HALOT*, s.v. “שׁוּבָה,” 294.

<sup>206</sup> James Swanson, “שׁוּבָה,” *DBL (OT)*.

<sup>207</sup> *BDB*, s.v. “שׁוּבָה,” 293–94.



In the NT, the term μετανοέω takes center stage to convey the breaking of a mindset through repentance and mind renewal that the canon has been leading up to. The verb μετανοέω means to change one's mind, feel remorse, repent, and be converted.<sup>208</sup> Regarding the changing of one's mind (νοῦς) or mindset (φρόνημα), μετανοέω means "to adopt another view" or "to change one's feelings."<sup>209</sup> The first message of Christ and of his forerunner was to repent. "The time has come," he said. 'The kingdom of God has come near. Repent and believe the good news'" (Mark 1:15)! The long-awaited coming of the Messiah and a whole new paradigm and way of thinking had finally arrived. The term μετάνοια depicts repentance as a complete turnaround, turning about or away from dead works to conversion (Heb 6:1) and the beginning of a new relationship with God.<sup>210</sup> Repentance turns one's heart and mind from worshiping the creation to worshiping the Creator.

The concept of repentance was known in surrounding nations in the OT and NT, but the emphasis was on appeasing the gods rather than on heart or mindset change. It was embedded in the culture and a means to win favor from an unknown god. But the repentance God longs for is for his people to understand their wrongdoing so they can be set free from sin's dominion and its impact of deception on their minds, enabling them to love God with all their being. Jobes notes that "All of Jesus' teaching is squarely centered on this statement that summarizes the old covenant: to love the LORD your God with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your mind."<sup>211</sup> Repentance is part of mind renewal, restoring the relationship between God and man.

---

<sup>208</sup> BDAG, s.v. "μετανοέω," 640.

<sup>209</sup> Behm, "μετανοέω," *TDNT* 4:948–1022.

<sup>210</sup> BDAG, s.v. "μετάνοια," 640.

<sup>211</sup> Jobes, *I, 2, and 3 John*, 95.

The sins of idolatry and worship yield hardened mindsets and captivate the hearts of God’s people, but repentance opens the door to restoration. Carnal mindsets are strongholds reinforced by one’s sinful nature, but God is greater than the strongholds of one’s mind. Humanity bears the *imago Dei* that was corrupted by sin, but Christ has restored the *imago Dei* in believers. Christ is τέλειος (*teleios*)—He is the true image of God who fulfilled God’s plan, and his mind, the mind of Christ, is the goal for broken mindsets (Col 1:15; 2 Cor 4:4; Col 3:9-11; 2 Cor 5:17).<sup>212</sup> The implication of Christ as the *imago Dei* is that through the Holy Spirit God conforms his people to the image of Christ (Rom 8:29; 1 Cor 15:49; 2 Cor 3:18; Eph 4:24; Col 3:10). Christ came in the likeness of man to restore mankind to the likeness of God, not just for salvation but to redeem the thoughts of man to be like God’s again (Rom 8:3; 12:2; Eph 4:23). Restoration of one’s identity from the Fall to an identity in Christ is part of having one’s mindset remade. Mind renewal is not possible apart from Christ, and maintenance of mind renewal is through faith and self-discipline to walk in the mind of Christ rather than the mind of the flesh. In the restoration to the mind of Christ, Scripture should shape our mindsets, but misinterpretation of Scripture hinders the renewing of the mind.

#### A Heart of Reconciliation

God’s covenant and the subsequent blessings or curses hinge completely on one’s mindset and the choices made (Deut 30:19). But God fulfilled the demands of his own law. Christ himself came and endured the suffering of man for the penalty of his sins as a sacrifice on behalf of his own creation. The heart of God toward his people is that they would be reconciled.

---

<sup>212</sup> *L&N* s.v. “τέλειοςα,” 1:746.

But pride keeps man from admitting his need.<sup>213</sup> In addition to the boastful pride of life, inflation, or exalting of oneself, one of the three chief sins of man, there is also a nuance in the definition of pride: presumption. The term זָדוֹן (*zādôn*) means presumptuousness and overconfidence.<sup>214</sup> The earliest known use of the *hiphil* occurs in Exod 21:14 in the Covenant Code, underscoring the mindset and intention of wrongdoing in Exod 21:13, “But if he does not do it with premeditation, but it happens by accident, then I will appoint for you a place where he may flee” (Exod 21:13 NET). This was not an arrogance toward God and his moral order but a determination in one’s own mind of presumption.<sup>215</sup> This premeditated apathy towards God’s law was a presumptuous offense against law and morality, and once Israel had become a nation, Scharbert notes that “זָדוֹן (*zīdh*) acquired the meaning of an arrogant transgression of Israel’s basic rights on the part of heathen nations (Exod 18:11; Neh 9:10).”<sup>216</sup> What was once an incredible gift of grace was abused and treated and presumed to be a privilege, regardless of their behavior. Their status became an identity in ethnic Israel rather than an ethical people of God. When one believes one’s own thoughts, there is a presumption that these thoughts are true and, in turn, supplant belief in the thoughts of God. Rationalizing and minimizing one’s failures is a means of an attempt to cover one’s sins that fail to meet the demands of God’s law. Only God can meet the righteous demands of his law for his people. But reconciliation cannot occur if one is not readily able to lay down one’s perceived defense and wholly admit one’s need of God. Presumption is often subtle, like mindsets inherent in the culture. People function in accordance

---

<sup>213</sup> See the section “A Call to Repent” and the coverage of the term for pride, זָבָה.

<sup>214</sup> *HALOT*, s.v. “זָדוֹן,” 263.

<sup>215</sup> J. Scharbert, “זָדוֹן,” *TDOT* 4:46–51.

<sup>216</sup> *Ibid.*, 4:48.

with what they know, but God can open the minds and eyes of his people to understand. The purpose of reconciliation is to restore the prized relationship with God, renew one's mind, and help the world to do the same.

In a similar manner, in the NT, God's people could forget the purpose of their salvation. Paul implored the church at Corinth to represent God to the world by being reconciled so they could then be a vessel to help others to be reconciled as well. "Therefore, we are ambassadors for Christ, God making his appeal through us. We implore you, on behalf of Christ, be reconciled to God" (2 Cor 5:20). Representing God to the world is a humbling endeavor. One cannot represent and live out the message of the gospel well without the grace of God and the empowerment of the Holy Spirit (Acts 1:8).

#### A Heart of Contrition

The response to Christ's sacrifice can only be humble contrition. God invites his people to think higher and to consider what they are thinking and doing. In Haggai, as Yahweh initiated the building of the temple again, three times he asked his people to think and consider the past so they could reorient their mindset toward the present and the future and walk in the will of God and be blessed (Hag 2:15, 18a, 18b). The phrase in these verses, לְבַרְכֶּם, in Hag 2:15, 18a, 18b is translated as "consider" in the ESV, NASB, and NRSV; "give careful thought" in the NIV; "carefully consider" in the NKJV; "think carefully" in the CSB, "reflect carefully" in the NET; and "pay attention" in the ISV, is central to mindset change. A contrite heart is willing to examine one's thoughts and life, to pause and consider erroneous ways, and to implement reform where needed. But the reformation and transformation are yielded through the Holy Spirit. The phrase לְבַרְכֶּם is a combination of שׁוּמָה (*sūmah*), לְבַב (*lēbāb*), and כֶּם (*kem*) and occurs in the small book of Haggai five times as a central thought of the book, provoking man to think about how he

is thinking (Hag 1:5, 7; 2:15, 18 [2x]). The first term שׁוּמָה (*śûmāh*) means “intention, determination, that which has been planned and purposed.”<sup>217</sup> Or to “lay down, set down, arrange, or fix.”<sup>218</sup> This definition illuminates the shift in a mindset that requires an examination of one’s inner determination and then a willingness to lay down one’s own thoughts in consideration of God’s. The Greek counterpart of שׁוּמָה is the term βούλομαι (*boulomai*), which has the implication of planning: to wish, want, or desire.<sup>219</sup> Though desires can drive one’s mindset, laying down these desires and picking up God’s plans is what brings true peace and aligns one with the purposes of God. It is also noteworthy that the phrase יהוה צבאות (YHWH Tseva’oth), “the LORD of Hosts,” appears twelve times in Haggai and is the most frequently used compound title for the God of Israel in the Old Testament, occurring 285 times in the OT.<sup>220</sup> The word LORD, capitalized, refers to Yahweh, the self-existent, redemptive God.<sup>221</sup> God needs no one, yet he cares for his people. He has the authority to know the thoughts of man, command them, and transform them, but man must be willing to examine his thoughts in accordance with the authority and lordship of God. It is disobedience to persist in carnal mindsets when God has mindset renewal for his people. Surrendering to God is ultimately freedom.

Mindsets are shaped by one’s innate desire, but when one is willing to lay down one’s own desires for God’s desires, that is a place of worship and the beginning of mindset renewal. Contriteness has an implication of humility. The proud cannot have mindset renewal, for it

---

<sup>217</sup> Swanson, “שׁוּמָה,” *DBL (OT)*

<sup>218</sup> *HALOT*, s.v. “שׁוּמָה,” 4:1321–1326.

<sup>219</sup> *BDAG*, s.v. “βούλομαι,” 182.

<sup>220</sup> Dempsey Rosales Acosta, “Lord of Hosts,” *LBD*.

<sup>221</sup> Acosta, “Lord of Hosts,” *LBD*.

requires a willingness to survey one's own heart honestly and no longer justify one's own thoughts in the sight of a holy God. The second term in this phrase, לִבְּךָ, reveals that it is once again the heart that impacts the whole being. And the third term puts the ball in man's court. It is up to you (כִּמּוֹ [kem]) if you are willing to be contrite enough to admit your thoughts cannot begin to compare with God's and that you are accountable to him.

Knowing that God's desire is to bless his people, not a prosperity Gospel that translates into a perfect life but a promise that he is with us and for us (Hag 1:13; 2:4), who would *not* want to adopt his thoughts as their own? Left to one's own devices, the heart of man is corrupt and needs mindset renewal. Despite past mistakes, when God's people humble themselves and consider God's goodness and his perfect thoughts, when they choose to walk with God, they will be blessed. Thoughts oriented toward God and away from self will renew our entire being and lead to a lifestyle of worship. What one devotes oneself to (as evident in one's thought life) is what one loves or treasures; in effect, what one worships. The heart/mind is the place where worship happens. Worshiping anything other than God alone condemns the worshiper to destruction, but worshipping the one true God renews the mindset.

### **A Call to Repent**

Repentance is not a one-and-done endeavor; it is a daily acknowledgment of one's need for God to renew one's mind. Christ's work on the cross demands a response of repentance. John Piper explains the significance of mindset in the role of repentance.

“The mind has a ‘spirit.’ In other words, our mind has what we call a ‘mindset.’ It doesn't just have a view; it has a viewpoint. It doesn't just have the power to perceive and detect; it also has a posture, a demeanor, a bearing, an attitude, and a

bent. Our minds are not just finite—they are fallen. ‘Be renewed in the spirit of your mind (Eph 4:23).’<sup>222</sup>

A mindset of the flesh is naturally resistant to the things of God, as has been established in this chapter. But the Spirit in one’s mind is able to reveal wayward thoughts so one can repent and admit one’s need for God’s transformation. Thoughts matter. They will lead toward sin if carnal thoughts are unchecked. Thoughts convey what one worships and what one is devoted to. The natural man left to himself is focused on satisfying the flesh. “Their end is destruction, their bellies are their God, their glory is in their shame, and their minds are devoted to earthly things” (Phil 3:19). In order to think about the things of God rather than the things of man, repentance is necessary. Repentance acknowledges that one’s thoughts are not God’s and that these mindsets of the flesh are ultimately unbelief, couched in sin and pride.

The canon conveys stumbling blocks to mind renewal, and one significant means of inhibiting mind renewal is pride, which can keep people from repentance. In 2 Chronicles 26:16, it was pride that kept Uzziah from repentance and destroyed him. “But when he was strong, he grew proud, to his destruction. For he was unfaithful to the LORD his God and entered the temple of the LORD to burn incense on the altar of incense.” The word for pride in this verse is גָּבַהּ (*gābah*), which means to exalt oneself, be proud, haughty, or arrogant, as a moral failure (2 Chr 26:16; 32:25; Ps 131:1; Prov 18:12; Isa 3:16; Jer 13:15; Eze 16:50; 28:2, 5, 17; Zep 3:11).<sup>223</sup> The root גָּבַהּ and its derivatives are used ninety-four times in the OT.<sup>224</sup> Hentschke notes that the literal meaning of this term גָּבַהּ is “to be high, height,” but its figurative meaning is “to be

---

<sup>222</sup> John Piper, “The Renewed Mind and How to Have it,” *Desiring God Foundation* (August 15, 2004).

<sup>223</sup> Swanson, “גָּבַהּ,” *DBL (OT)*

<sup>224</sup> Hamilton, “גָּבַהּ,” *TWOT* 146.

proud,” as seen in the semantic relationship between this Arabic root and the Hebrew root גבה.<sup>225</sup> The corresponding Greek term is αὐθάδης (*authadēs*), meaning “self-willed.”<sup>226</sup> One’s mindset of the flesh is geared toward self, and one’s own glory, but the mind of Christ yields to the Father’s will and his glory. Mindsets are self-willed, fixed on man’s perception, not God’s, and often steeped in pride.

It is interesting to see that pride is fueled by and linked to the senses, the anthropological organs such as the heart (Ezek 28:2, 5, 17; Ps 131:1; Prov 18:12; 2 Chr 26:16; 32:25–6; Prov 16:5) and also connected with the spirit of man (Prov 16:18 and Eccl 7:8), and pride is seen as being linked with man’s “nose” (countenance; Ps 10:4) and eyes (Isa 2:11; 5:15 and Ps 101:5).<sup>227</sup> Hentschke notes that this connection with anthropological concepts [לב (*lēb*), עֵינַיִם (‘*enayim*), רִיחַ (*rûah*), אֵף (‘*aph*)], organs of the body, denote human proclivities and emotions, which are often depicted as objects of the verb גבה (*gbh*) “pride.”<sup>228</sup>

Whereas pride was the downfall for Uzziah, who had started strong in his faithfulness to God, his son Jotham’s determination כּוֹן (*kûn*) or mindset to do God’s will was what led to his favor. “Jotham grew powerful because he was determined to please Yahweh his God” (2 Chr 27:6). The root for כּוֹן (*kûn*) is כּוּן (*kwn*), and it occurs more than 280 times in the OT.<sup>229</sup> The term has a moral sense, meaning to “be directed aright, of ways (Prov 4:26; Ps 119:5); be fixed aright,

---

<sup>225</sup> Hentschke, “גָּבַהּ,” *TDOT* 2:356–360.

<sup>226</sup> *L&N*, s.v. “αὐθάδης,” 1:763.

<sup>227</sup> Hamilton, “גָּבַהּ,” *TWOT* 146.

<sup>228</sup> Hentschke, “גָּבַהּ,” *TDOT* 2:359.

<sup>229</sup> Klaus Koch, “כּוֹן,” *TDOT* 7:89–101.



steadfast.”<sup>230</sup> It means to “prepare” or “make ready,” and the *polet* stem means to “establish, make permanent,” but the *hiphil*, which is for causative action, is the stem used for 2 Chronicles 27:6, rendered as “determine” or “be determined” (in the psychological sense.)<sup>231</sup> The *hiphil* and *polet* of *kûn* are continually used in the Psalms and Wisdom literature to illustrate the state of a people based on their conduct and the end result of that conduct in which right actions imply preceding right thoughts, where *kûn* is utilized to convey the mindful intention of one’s own intellect (לֵב).<sup>232</sup> The term כּוּן powerfully illustrates that one’s thoughts and mindset “direct one’s step” and “order aright” (2 Chr 27:6, Ps 119:133; Prov 16:9; 21:29; Jer 10:23).<sup>233</sup> “The preparation of the intellect and will (לֵב) necessary for doing what is right consists in attending to the counsel of the wise (Prov 8:5; 20:18; 22:18).”<sup>234</sup> The idiomatic phrase whoever “sets his heart upon Yahweh” as seen in 1 Sam 7:3: אֶל יְהוָה וְנָ לְבוֹ (kûn [hi] libbô ’el yhw) is the right attitude toward Yahweh (1 Chr 29:18; 2 Chr 30:19), which only Yahweh can help his people to keep: “O LORD, the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Israel, our fathers, keep forever such purposes and thoughts in the hearts of your people, and direct their hearts toward you” (1 Chr 29:18).<sup>235</sup> Just as in the anthropological use of pride, so in כּוּן (*kûn*), the anthropological usage of this lexeme conveys the Hebrew conviction that actions are linked imminently with their outcomes

---

<sup>230</sup> BDB, s.v. “כּוּן,” 465.

<sup>231</sup> Koch, “כּוּן,” *TDOT* 7:89.

<sup>232</sup> *Ibid.*, 7:96.

<sup>233</sup> BDB, s.v., “כּוּן,” 466.

<sup>234</sup> Koch, “כּוּן,” *TDOT* 7:96.

<sup>235</sup> Gerstenberger, “כּוּן,” *TLOT* 2:602–606.

and the “panentheistic” belief (in the immanence and transcendence of God) posits that the human condition is under Yahweh’s authority in thought and deed.<sup>236</sup>

Pride begins in the mind and leads to action. In Hannah’s beautiful prayer to God in 1 Samuel, she chose to exalt God when her trials could have led to a discouraged mindset. She chose humility, knowing that God sees and knows all. “Talk no more so very proudly, let not arrogance come from your mouth; for the LORD is a God of knowledge, and by him, actions are weighed” (1 Sam 2:3). The heart/mind is where affection is determined and where man ascribes worth and glory to God, self, or to created things.

### **A Call to Relent**

The God who relents from sending disaster and destruction on a sinful people invites his people to do the same: repent (show remorse for sin) and relent (giving in/changing one’s stance). Repentance is not just an admission of wrongdoing but a complete turn in the other direction and relenting from following the world’s pattern of thinking to craving the things of God. The term נָחַם (*nāḥām*) is another term that demonstrates both repenting and relenting. In Joel 2:13, the word relent is used to depict Yahweh’s merciful behavior toward his people. “Return (שׁוּבוּ) to the LORD your God, for he is gracious and merciful, slow to anger, and abounding in steadfast love; and he relents over disaster” (Joel 2:13b). Occurring in the *niphal* stem forty-eight times, נָחַם is rendered as to regret; become remorseful in some contexts.<sup>237</sup> BDB states that נָחַם means to “be sorry, moved to pity, have compassion, for others.”<sup>238</sup> God’s sorrow

---

<sup>236</sup> Koch, “כַּוֵּן,” *TDOT* 7:97.

<sup>237</sup> *HALOT*, s.v. “נָחַם,” 2:688–689.

<sup>238</sup> BDB, s.v. “נָחַם,” 637.

was not due to his wrongdoing, for he was just to punish them in his righteousness, but the wrongdoing of his people grieved his heart, and their suffering for their willful sinful choices moved him to compassion. The compassion of God, who has mercy on his people even as they are being punished for their own sins, is moved to rescue his people. The term “relent” carries a sense of ceasing behavior, and in the opposite sense, God’s people should relent from sinning in consideration of God’s relenting. The motif of being wholly devoted to God is part of the solution the canon counsels (1 Chr 28:9, 1 Kgs 8:61; Acts 11:23, Rom 8:9). When God’s people fail, God is able to maintain his people’s mindsets, so they are devoted to him. “O LORD God of our ancestors Abraham, Isaac, and Israel, maintain the motives יָצַר (yēšēr) of your people and keep them devoted to you” (1 Chr 29:18). God expected the same devotion that he gave to his people. “The LORD is omniscient, specifically in regard to the thoughts and motives of human hearts (1 Chr 28:9). He who is upright demands the interior integrity of his servants.”<sup>239</sup> And God is the one who accomplishes this devotion. HALOT also conveys an interesting *hithpael* form of relent, which has a rendering “to be grieved by, change one’s mind” when with עָל, as in Num 23:19; Deut 32:36; Ps 135:14.<sup>240</sup> In light of the acts of God’s relenting, deliverance, and the completed work of Christ, God’s people should be moved to repent and relent from engaging in sin.

The term יָצַר illustrates a picture that repentance is followed by behavior that the mindset directs, dependent upon the LORD to sustain. It has this sense of the tendency of man to be inclined to resist God. True repentance is a call to cease striving and resisting God’s shaping of

---

<sup>239</sup> Zuck, *BTOT*, 159.

<sup>240</sup> *HALOT*, s.v. “יָצַר,” 2:689.

his people.<sup>241</sup> Isaiah 26:3 utilizes this same term to show the peace that the man of God has when his mind is steadfastly trusting in God. “You will keep in perfect peace all who trust in you, all whose thoughts are fixed on you” (Isa 26:3 NLT)!

### **Conclusion: A Heart on Mission**

The Word of God conveys the mind of God and the interaction of God with his creation in human history. God chose Israel to mediate his saving purposes to the world he created.<sup>242</sup> The culture influences the heart and mind of man away from God to worship worthless created things rather than the living creator God. The making of mindsets is autonomous and covert—one is born in a culture not of one’s making. Covertly, people's hearts are stolen away from pure devotion to Christ. The canonical plea to receive the renewed mind in Christ is hard to hear when people are deceived, worshiping idols, and becoming like what they worship—hardhearted and dull of hearing. But mindsets can be remade. The breaking of a mindset through repentance and restoration of worshipping God alone softens the heart of man and transforms mindsets.

The greatest commandment must be lived out for the great commission to be fulfilled. One can’t love God with all one’s heart and mind if one’s mindset has been corrupted or indoctrinated by the surrounding culture stream. The Shema is foundational to the faith and relationship of Israel with Yahweh. He alone exists and is to be worshiped (Deut 6:4–5).<sup>243</sup> God’s people need to worship to be set free. Anything that comes before God is an idol . . . and sometimes the idol, and sometimes is prizing one’s thoughts above God’s. Worldliness pulls

---

<sup>241</sup> *HALOT*, s.v. “גחם,” 2:689.

<sup>242</sup> Zuck, *BTOT*, 180.

<sup>243</sup> Zuck, *BTOT*, 190.

God's people away from God. Those who are in Christ can choose to walk in the Spirit rather than the flesh. And this is what true worship hinges upon: only those who know God can truly worship Him.<sup>244</sup> “So that we should be devoted to the extolling of his glorious attributes—we who were the first to fix our hopes on Christ” (Eph 1:12). One day, the focus of worship will shift from place to manner, in which “in spirit and in truth” means “we must worship God by means of Christ.”<sup>245</sup>

---

<sup>244</sup> Yates, “True Knowledge of God,” 257.

<sup>245</sup> Daniel I. Block, *For the Glory of God Recovering a Biblical Theology of Worship* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2014), 4.

## CHAPTER FOUR: THE MIND OF CHRIST

### Introduction

As the curtain opens on the NT, the metanarrative of mind renewal is encapsulated in the first words of the forerunner to Christ: “Repent (μετανοέω, *metanoēō*), for the kingdom of heaven is at hand” (Matt 3:2 ESV) and echoed by Christ as he came into Galilee proclaiming the gospel of God, saying, “The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand; repent (μετανοέω) and believe (πιστεύω) in the gospel” (Mark 1:15). Through repentance, believing in Christ as Savior, and the power of the Holy Spirit, this salvation also brought a new way of thinking—a renewed mind (νοῦς) and the ability to have a new mindset (καρδία and φρόνημα) and the mind of Christ. The mind of Christ is the goal, not the means. Having the mind of Christ is the ability for those who are in Christ to think like Christ and have his attitude through the Spirit. The phrase “mind of Christ” is also a metaphor depicting the ability to think about the things of God and understand them, as well as an exhortation to act on that reality.<sup>1</sup> Carnal mindsets are ultimately sin and unbelief, at odds with the mind of God. But through repentance, God renews minds, and people *can* have the mind of Christ and believe God’s thoughts over their own.<sup>2</sup> By tracing the mind of Christ through the biblical witness (Isa 40:13; Rom 8:6; 11:34; 1 Cor 2:10–16; Phil 2:5), the writings of the Desert Fathers and early church fathers, and studying the world, words, and works of Christ, a clearer picture emerges of the mind of Christ.

---

<sup>1</sup> The mind of Christ is not equivalent to salvation but a fruit of it. One cannot have the mind of Christ apart from the Holy Spirit, who enables God’s people to understand what the Spirit is saying (1 Cor 2:12). Salvation is achieved by belief, and what follows is the sanctification of the Holy Spirit, who illumines the Word of God and gives understanding to those who are in Christ. Only with the Spirit can one understand the mind of Christ.

<sup>2</sup> The cognitive terms throughout the canon convey the significance of one’s thoughts and reveal the need to think like Christ. Mindsets are impacted by one’s volition toward one’s thoughts and by the Spirit through mind renewal. See Appendix A for a sample list of 85 mind and mindset terms throughout the canon.

### The Motif of the Mind of Christ

The metanarrative of the need for a new heart (OT) and renewed mind (NT) is woven throughout the canon, addressing the failure of God's people to love God with all their being (Deut 6:5), wooing them to repentance, salvation, and the ability to have the mind of Christ.<sup>3</sup> Isaiah depicted what the Spirit of Yahweh was like in Isa 40:13, describing man's inability to understand the mind of Yahweh.<sup>4</sup> Paul expounded on this curious mind of the Lord in Phil 2:5 using φρονέω for "mind" and χριστός Ἰησοῦς for "Lord." The riddle is solved. Through the Spirit, the mind of the Lord is found in Christ, the risen Lord, who is the representation of Yahweh (Heb 1:1–3), and God's people *can* also have this mind (1 Cor 2:16; Phil 2:5).

Yet still, "having" the mind of Christ is difficult. The mind of Christ is not something that happens to God's people without their will being exercised. It is not seen or comprehended materially, and yet it was exemplified through the life of Christ as he denied self, embraced God's will instead of his own, and walked in humility and joy in the face of suffering. The mind of Christ is not synonymous with the Holy Spirit but a revelation the Holy Spirit accomplishes within one's inner being, coupled with the volition of God's people to seek to be and think like Christ.<sup>5</sup> Without the mind of Christ, one cannot understand and interpret Scripture rightly nor

---

<sup>3</sup> See Ps 51:10; Jer 31:33; Ezek 11:19; 18:31; 36:26; John 3:3; 2 Cor 5:17; Heb 10:22 for the motif of a new heart and repentance, and Isa 40:13; Ezek 11:19; 36:26; Rom 8:5–6, 14; 11:34; 12:2; 1 Cor 2:16; 2 Cor 5:17; Eph 4:23; Phil 2:5; Col 3:2; 1 Pet 1:13; 4:1 for the motif of renewal and of the mind of Christ.

<sup>4</sup> The Hebrew text uses רִיחַ (Spirit), and LXX uses νοῦς for "mind" or "disposition," or "Spirit," and the Hebrew text uses יְהוָה (Yahweh) while the LXX uses κύριος for "Lord". *HALOT*, s.v. "רִיחַ," 3: 1197–1201. In this context, רִיחַ means "The spirit of Yahweh." (See also Judg 3:10; 6:34; 11:29; 13:25; 14:6, 19; 15:14; 1 Sam 10:6; 16:13; 19:9; 2 Sam 23:2; 1 Kgs 18:12; 22:24; 2 Kgs 2:16; Isa 11:2; 40:7, 13; 59:19; 61:1; 63:14; Ezek 11:5; 37:1; Mic 2:7; 3:8; Zech 6:8). In the OT the term mind was not used, and רִיחַ was used to convey both the Spirit of God as well as the mind. As discussed in Chapter One, other anthropological terms also conveyed cognitive functions.

<sup>5</sup> The mind of Christ is not equivalent or similar to salvation but demonstrative of both salvation and maturity. In 2 Peter 1:4, it is declared that God's people are partakers of the divine nature, but the flesh makes it difficult to walk faithfully with Christ. The mind of Christ is maintained through prayer, the Holy Spirit, and meditating on the Word of God. Through the work of the Holy Spirit, God's people have access to the mind of

apply it and share it effectively with others unless they have mind renewal (Isa 54:13; Jer 31:33–4; Heb 8:10–11). Paul’s declarative statement to have the mind of Christ in 1 Cor 2:16 and imperative statement to have the mind of Christ in Phil 2:5 implies that the mind of Christ is part of the inheritance for all believers, but it is also what the believer must choose to emulate.<sup>6</sup> The mind of Christ is a living template of what it looks like to live wholeheartedly for God.

Forfeiting the wisdom of this world and accepting the wisdom of God cannot happen unless one has a lifestyle of repentance and chooses God’s thoughts over one’s own. One must see one’s need for the mind of Christ.

In Paul’s letter to the church at Ephesus, Paul summarizes the condition of man’s corrupt, hardened heart and the need for mind/mindset renewal in the spirit of one’s mind through Christ:

Now this I say and testify in the Lord, that you must no longer walk as the Gentiles do, in the futility of their minds (νοῦς). They are darkened in their understanding (διάνοια) and alienated from the life of God because of the ignorance that is in them due to their hardness of heart (καρδία). They have become callous and have given themselves up to sensuality, greedy to practice every kind of impurity. But that is not the way you learned Christ!— assuming that you have heard about him and were taught in him, as the truth is in Jesus, to put off your old self, which belongs to your former manner of life and is corrupt through deceitful desires (ἐπιθυμία) and to be *renewed* (ἀνανεοῦσθαι) *in the spirit* (πνεύματι) *of your mind* (νοῦς), and to put on the new self, created after

---

Christ, meaning they are able to understand the things of God, have power from the Holy Spirit to emulate Christ, and can thereby discern spiritual matters.

<sup>6</sup> Paul used both the indicative and the imperative to convey the apprehension of the mind of Christ. To have the mind of Christ was spoken as a command (imperative) and as a reality (indicative). In 1 Cor 2:16, Paul expresses the reality of the mind of Christ with an indicative statement: “We have the mind of Christ.” In Phil 2:5, Paul uses the imperative to exhort God’s people to operate in the mind of Christ: “Have the same mindset as Christ Jesus.” The use of the indicative and imperative reveals the tension that is evident in consistently walking in the mind of Christ rather than in the flesh. Only those who are in Christ can have the mind of Christ. The mind of Christ is not a static position but a goal of those who are in Christ through the empowerment of the Spirit and akin to the sanctification process, whereby one’s thoughts can be carnal and then spiritual. God’s people participate in the mind of Christ through the Holy Spirit’s empowerment and meditating on the thoughts and attitudes of Christ. As Dunn duly noted, “The renewed mind, its starting point ever its dependence on God for illumination and wisdom, seeks to know the will of God, the mind of Christ.” James D. G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (New York, NY: T&T Clark, 2003), 668.



the likeness of God in true righteousness and holiness (Eph 4:17–24, emphasis added).

Paul’s employment of the term ἀνανεοῦσθαι (ἀνανεόω/*ananeoō*), meaning “to be renewed,” reveals that this renewal is passive, not a reflexive, meaning “to renew oneself,” but an infinitive with an imperative sense; Jesus is the one doing the renewing continually in his people (“to be or to let oneself be, renewed”).<sup>7</sup> The term ἀνανεόω indicates a renewing that replaces an earlier condition; “to renew what is old,” “to refresh or reinvigorate a tired being.”<sup>8</sup> Paul makes the distinction that this renewal takes place in the spirit of one’s mind and is a work of the Holy Spirit, who is the Spirit of Christ inhabiting God’s people (Gal 4:6; John 14:26; 16:7). Christ in his people enables them to think and be like Christ. Understanding how the Spirit of the LORD operated throughout Scripture illuminates an understanding of the mind of Christ that Paul speaks of in the NT and how one is renewed in the spirit of one’s mind. It is intriguing that Paul distinguishes between the heart (καρδία) as the depiction of where a mindset is shaped and one’s desires (ἐπιθυμία) as the impetus behind one’s mindset. This distinguishing of anthropological terms is not parallel in this passage from Ephesians 4 but seems to be indicating the process of the formation of mindsets and of mind renewal. The νοῦς (the mind and its inner workings) and the function of being able to comprehend and understand (διάνοια) are impacted by the condition of one’s heart (καρδία). The innate desires within the flesh can be overcome through the Spirit and repentance as one denies the flesh and chooses to operate in the Spirit instead.

---

<sup>7</sup> Johannes Behm, “νέος, ἀνανεόω,” *TDNT* 4:896–901.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, *TDNT* 4:900.

## The Mind of the LORD (Yahweh) in the OT

The Spirit of Yahweh worked similarly in the OT as in the NT to empower God's people for works (Exod 31:3; 35:31), regeneration (Deut 30:6; Ezek 11:19–20; 36:26–29), indwelling (Exod 31:2–5; Num 27:18; 1 Sam 16:12–13) and leading them (Ps 143:10; Ezek 37:1).<sup>9</sup> The renewing of Israel is only through God's Spirit, in which a hardened heart is transformed into a heart of flesh, and the people become a community fixed on God (Isa 44:3; 48:16; Ezek 36:26; Zech 12:10).<sup>10</sup> Curiously, the term “mind” as applies to man or to God is conspicuously absent in the Hebrew Bible, and yet the absence of this term does not mean the mind is not in view.<sup>11</sup> Scriptures that reference the mind of God as unchanging, such as נָחַם (*nāḥam*), are rendered as “repent,” meaning to change one's perspective, sometimes translated as to change one's mind (Num 23:19; 1 Sam 15:29; Ps 110:4). When נָחַם is used in reference to God, the expression is

---

<sup>9</sup> The Spirit of the LORD came upon some of the judges, kings, and prophets, empowering them to lead his people. Examples include Othniel (Judg 3:10); Gideon (Judg 6:34); Jephthah (Judg 11:29); Samson (Judg 13:25; 14:6, 18; 15:4); Saul (1 Sam 10:6); David (1 Sam 16:13, 2 Sam 23:2); Jahaziel the son of Zechariah (2 Chr 20:14); Messiah (Isa 11:2; 40:13; Isa 61:1); God's people (Isa 63:14); Ezekiel (Ezek 11:1, 5; 37:1); Micah (Mic 3:8). IN the NT, the Holy Spirit indwells God's people as the temple of the LORD.

<sup>10</sup> Eduard Schweizer, “Πνεῦμα,” *TDNT* 6:365.

<sup>11</sup> In a progressive revelation of the mind of Christ, the OT conveyed the need for mind renewal to come (Gen 6:5, Deut 30:6; 1 Sam 2:35; Jer 24:7; 31:33; 32:39; Ezek 11:19–21; 36:26–7) in a constellation of terms that move the focus from an external Spirit moving *upon* men to one day moving *within* them at just the right time. For example, looking first at the terms employed in the LXX, there is no single Hebrew original word for φρήν and cognates. The root חכח is used predominantly for φρονέω, φρόνησις, or φρόνιμος, occurring twenty-three times in the HT. Georg Bertram, “Φρήν,” *TDNT* 9:224. The DSS also contains several word groups that are connected to φρόνησις in the HT, including שכל (*skl*), חכמה (*hkm*), חכם (*hkm*), דעת (*d'ṭ*), ידע (*yd'*), בינה (*bynh*), בין (*byn*), משכיל (*skl*). “Φρήν,” *TDNT* 9:226. But more than just the terms themselves is how these terms were conceived by the Hebrew mind, which considered man holistically, with the Spirit of Yahweh moving on the “heart” of man, or man's whole being. Terms considered to be cognitive terms today (listed directly above) were viewed differently in the OT and were frequently rendered as wisdom to the Hebrew mind rather than as a psychosomatic term, as in Greek thought. Interestingly, what these terms meant to early Hebrew and Greek philosophers demonstrates the shift from the depiction of the spirit of a person to the mind or mindset of a person.

anthropopathic.<sup>12</sup> Trying to depict the mind of God is not possible in human terms.<sup>13</sup> By using a term for God that has human qualities, God is relating to his people so they can understand him and his Word, and ultimately, he comes in the flesh to show them his heart and give his mind to them so they can know him. Who can know the mind of the LORD?<sup>14</sup> Only those to whom the Holy Spirit reveals his mind to. Terms alone cannot convey the mind of God. The *ISBE* notes, “We look in vain in the OT and NT for anything like scientific precision in the employment of terms which are meant to indicate mental operations.”<sup>15</sup> The lack of precision in the terminology alone hints that there is knowledge that man cannot fully comprehend. The terms καρδία, πνεύμα, and ψυχή are interchangeable with one another in some contexts, blurring the lines of

---

<sup>12</sup> Marvin R. Wilson, “כַּחֲמַד,” *TWOT*, 570–1.

<sup>13</sup> As the culture grappled with terms to convey and understand the heart of man, there was a shift and progression of cognitive terminology. In Josephus’ rendering of cognitive terms in *Jewish Wars*, for example, the term φρονήματος in the phrase “ἄν τοῦ πατρίου φρονήματος ἤδη σπάσαντες τιμωροὶ τῶν παρεσπονδημένων,” refers to an ancestral mindset, but is rendered as “spirit of our fathers” (Josephus, *J.W.* 1.178–179 [Thackeray]). In Josephus’ work *Antiquities*, the term φρονήματος was translated as “full of Spirit,” depicting the mindset of the Jews. (Josephus, *Ant.* 15. 346–347 [Ralph Marcus]). The Greek Sophist Philostratus of Lemnos circa 190–230 AD rendered φρόνημα is rendered as “high spirits” (Philostratus the Elder, *Imagines* 1.30.120–121 [Fairbanks]). Later Greek philosophers around the time of the NT and afterward tended toward more cognitive descriptions, such as in Greek Epic Fragments which rendered φρόνημα as “attitude” (Aethiopsis, *Greek Epic Fragments* 116–117 [West]). In his work *Antigone*, Sophocles (circa 400 AD) rendered φρόνημα as a “way of thinking” (Sophocles, *Antigone* 22–23 [Lloyd-Jones]). The progressive revelation of mind renewal could not be fully grasped as the understanding of the anthropology of man was also progressing from a primitive understanding of the human being and mind.

<sup>14</sup> Though the term לֵב is used most often to depict the mind/heart in the OT, the terms נֶפֶשׁ (“living being” or “soul”) and רוּחַ (“spirit”) are often used in parallel with other anthropological terms to depict the term “mind.” The term “soul” conveys the mind of man from the choices he makes (Deut 18:6) and from his thoughts (Eccl 7:28), both rendered through the term נֶפֶשׁ. The thought, counsel, or mind of God is also described with the Hebrew term “soul” in 1 Sam 2:35, which points to the mind of Christ. “And I will raise up for myself a faithful priest, who shall do according to what is in my heart (לֵב) and in my mind (נֶפֶשׁ). And I will build him a sure house, and he shall go in and out before my anointed forever” (1 Sam 2:35). This verse uses both לֵב and נֶפֶשׁ for additional emphasis, not to be distinct from one another. A significant combination of anthropological terms occurs with the repetition of the Shema, the most important commandment—and the mindset God requires of his people—one must seek God and love him with all their being: ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς σου (Deut 4:29; 10:12; 11:13; 13:3; 26:16; 30:2, 6, 10, Josh 22:5; 2 Chr 15:12). Edwin Hatch, *Essays in Biblical Greek* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1889), 103–104.

<sup>15</sup> J. I. Marais, “Mind,” *ISBE* 3:2056.

distinction.<sup>16</sup> From the anthropological discussion in chapter one, it is evident that the mind is the “inner being,” a composite of one’s mental, emotional, and spiritual faculties as conveyed through various anthropological terms without compartmentalizing them.

Man is made in God’s image, but trying to understand God from one’s frame of mind is not possible. However, what Scripture reveals that God sets his heart/mind upon reveals what is on his mind and is important to him. “What is man, that you make so much of him, and that you set your heart on him” (Job 7:17)? The mind of God is set on his people whom he dearly loves. God is love personified, only thinking perfectly righteous thoughts. This is difficult for unrighteous people with evil hearts to comprehend (Jer 17:9), and there are no words that could fittingly describe the perfect mind that is God’s. Perhaps the lack of the term “mind” in the OT points to the emphasis God is making on the Spirit over the natural mind. God is Spirit, and his people will worship him in Spirit and in truth (John 4:24). Through the Spirit, one can know God with a redeemed mind. Through the promised mind renewal God’s people would finally be able to understand the mind of God and be able to walk in the mind of Christ.

Another means of trying to comprehend the mind of Yahweh is by examining his character and words, which are perfect (2 Sam 22:31; Ps 18:30; 19:7–10; 30:5; 119:68). God does not change. His mind is completely different from the mind of man. (Num 23:19; see also 1 Sam 15:29; Ps 110:4). The mind of Yahweh in the OT is seen through the righteous laws of God, which are more than just rules, but a means of grace for God’s people to learn a whole new way of righteous thinking and ethics that were counter to the world’s cultures. The mind of Yahweh

---

<sup>16</sup> Hatch, *Essays in Biblical Greek*, 108. For instance, the Hebrew term רוּחַ (*rûah*) in Isa 40:13, “Spirit of the LORD,” is rendered as *voûç* in 1 Cor 2:16 (“mind of the LORD”), in which *voûç* is taken from the LXX, defined as the organ of spiritual perception, which is predominantly rendered as לֵב (Job 7:17; Isa 41:22). Marais, “Mind,” *ISBE* 3:2056.

is seen by his mercy and unfailing love for a people who could not be faithful, yet God sought to bless them still (Deut 23:5). The mind of Yahweh in the Old Covenant pointed to the New Covenant when God's people would have his thoughts written on their minds and hearts (Jer 31:33; Ezek 11:19; 36:26)—the mind of Christ.

The foretelling of mind renewal is woven throughout the OT, pointing to the coming Messiah whose perfect mind could heal broken minds. Isaiah 40 provides a glimpse of the unfathomable mind of God that can accomplish this feat (Isa 40:13–14). In Zech 6:12, the coming of “the Branch” was prophesied (see also Zech 3:8; Isa 11:1; 53:2; Jer 33:15), who would be both priest and king. The immediate context was of Joshua, the high priest, and Zerubbabel, but the ultimate referent is Jesus, the coming Messiah who would bring mind renewal and salvation (John 19:5).<sup>17</sup> Yahweh said their hearts were hard as a diamond (Zech 7:12), that they should speak truth and righteousness (Zech 8:16) and not plan evil in their hearts: “Do not devise חֲשָׁבִים (*hāšāb*) evil in your hearts against one another, and love no false oath, for all these things I hate, declares the LORD” (Zech 8:17). But what man could not do was remedied in the fulfillment of God's promises through Christ.

#### The Mind of the Lord (Κύριος) in the NT

Whereas the Spirit of God worked temporarily in and through his people in the OT, in the NT, the Holy Spirit inhabits his people and works to empower individuals to be transformed in their thinking. From thinking according to the things of man to thinking according to the things of God so the people of God can know and walk with God and reach the world with the gospel.

---

<sup>17</sup> Gen 3:15; 49:10; Num 24:17, 19; Deut 18:15–19; Job 19:25–27; Isa 7:14; 9:6; 35:4; 42:1, 4; 53; 55:3–4; 61:1–3; Jer 31:31–4; Dan 9:25–7; Zech 9:9; Micah 5:2; Mal 3:1.

The righteous thinking God wanted for his people in the OT is available to them in the NT, inscribed on their minds and hearts through the power of the Holy Spirit, but God's people would need to believe and refuse to conform to the world in order to let the Spirit transform them through faith (Rom 12:2).<sup>18</sup> No one knows the thoughts of God except the Spirit of God (1 Cor 2:11), yet Scripture says that those who are in Christ have the mind of Christ (1 Cor 2:16).<sup>19</sup> Paul's indicative and imperative statements about the reality of God's people having the mind of Christ in 1 Cor 2:16 and Phil 2:5 reveal the need for God's people to be reminded of their inheritance in Christ. The mind of Christ is not achieved by man, but it is maintained through belief and replacing one's thoughts with Christ's. It is exemplified in the life of Christ, and the mind of Christ is evidence of the mind of the Spirit upon the mind of man. One's behavior reveals what one is being controlled by (Rom 8:9).<sup>20</sup> Isaiah 40:13 is echoed in 1 Corinthians 2:16 and Romans 11:34–5 as it becomes evident that the unfathomable mind of Christ is the mind of the LORD (Yahweh), available to mankind. The mind of Christ cannot be earned or bought. It is freely given by the Holy Spirit, who is the spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ, enabling man to think and act rightly. "No! Arm yourselves with the spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ, and spend no

---

<sup>18</sup> This mind renewal is not just a moral code one needs to follow. It is a completely different way of thinking enabled by the power of the Holy Spirit. The mind has a "spirit" (Eph 4:23) controlled by man's flesh, but the Holy Spirit enables God's people to be renewed in the spirit of their minds. "We cannot love God without knowing God, and the way we know God is by the Spirit-enabled use of our minds." John Piper, *Think* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2013), 90. The sanctification process is a continual pursuit of the mind of Christ made possible by the indwelling Holy Spirit, who directs the mind of man to the mind of Christ.

<sup>19</sup> While the mind of Christ is available to all who are in Christ, it is not automatic, and Paul reminds the church to recognize they can think like Jesus and have his attitude, but they must choose to do so through the Spirit's enabling.

<sup>20</sup> It is difficult to understand why Christians would not have the mind of Christ when it is available to them. But this is a mark of maturity or lack of maturity in the sanctification process. Paul spoke to the church at Corinth as carnal Christians (1 Cor 3:1–4). This terminology, "carnal," was in reference to their immaturity in Christ but was not a reflection of their salvation.

thought on your earthly nature, to satisfy its cravings” (Rom 13:14 TCV). Examining how the mind of Christ was understood through the ages, in addition to examining the world, works, and words of Christ illuminates how the mind of Christ is perceived and lived out. Having the mind of Christ is significant for the interpretation and application of Scripture.

### The Mind of Christ Through the Ages

Communicating spiritual transformation in human language is a difficult endeavor. Reason alone cannot convey the work of God in the minds of men. The Medieval Church Fathers sought to grapple with understanding and applying the mind of Christ to one’s life, and this paradigm is still a struggle that is contemplated today. In particular, Maximus the Confessor’s (580–662) writings were focused on recognizing the need for mind renewal and how to obtain it. He notes in his work that mindset renewal is achieved through willing surrender, which does not deny free will but is necessary for mindset transformation to a faithful disposition.<sup>21</sup> In Maximus’ work *The Centuries on Charity*, he laid out a three-fold strategy for mankind’s role in mindset renewal. One should first “give serious heed to [one’s] thoughts,” then know the root of one’s thoughts and eliminate the cause of ungodly thoughts.<sup>22</sup> According to Maximus, one’s mindset and will are naturally driven by the pursuit of pleasure ἔκστασις (*ekstasis*) and dominated by the flesh, but under the lordship of Jesus Christ, a change in pursuit and mindset is

---

<sup>21</sup> Maximus the Confessor, *On the Cosmic Mystery of Jesus Christ: Selected Writings from St Maximus the Confessor*, ed. John Behr, trans. Paul M. Blowers and Robert Louis Wilken, PPS 25 (Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 2003), 51.

<sup>22</sup> D. D. Prassas, “Taming the Thoughts in the Writings of Maximus the Confessor,” *JSFSC* 14 (2021): 31–2.

evident as one is governed by the Spirit.<sup>23</sup> Maximus understood passionate thoughts λογίσμοι (*logismoi*) to be the underlying cause of mindsets emanating from the νοῦς, which is central to the relationship between God and man, but two loci (the soul and body) within the person stimulate the formation of thoughts as one composite entity with two parts.<sup>24</sup>

The desert Christian monk Evagrius diagnosed minds according to a list of vices (mindsets) that were driven by a scarcity mindset.<sup>25</sup> These “eight deadly thoughts,” which were not listed together in Scripture, are biblical principles, nonetheless: gluttony (Phil 3:19), lust (Matt 5:28), avarice (1 Tim 6:10), anger (Ps 37:8), sloth (Prov 13:4), sadness (Phil 4:6), vainglory (Prov 14:30), and pride (Prov 16:18). Evagrius diagnosed minds with the “seven deadly sins,” which Evagrius deemed to be eight types of powerful *logismoi*—thoughts that everyone will encounter and must determine to eradicate the thoughts or cause destruction and distortion in a “clouded mind.”<sup>26</sup> The Desert Fathers of the 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> centuries thought of the mind of Christ as cognitive therapy more than hyper spirituality, as practically applying the mind of Christ to everyday life.<sup>27</sup> Maximus also viewed the νοῦς as being the source of spirituality that

---

<sup>23</sup> Maximus, *On the Cosmic Mystery of Jesus Christ*, 52. Maximus lays out a path for having the mind of Christ, illustrating that it is not automatic but a daily choice. One’s orientation toward the spirit or the flesh will be apparent by the lifestyle one lives. Not walking in the mind of Christ is ultimately a sin that grieves the Holy Spirit.

<sup>24</sup> Prassas, “Taming the Thoughts in the Writings of Maximos the Confessor,” 33. Maximus’ view here appears to be dualistic, emphasizing the soul and the body as separate entities, which is problematic. Seeing man as one being instead, whose desire precipitates one’s thoughts, mindset, and subsequent decisions and actions, reveals that, ultimately, it is man’s will/mindset that is steering his behavior.

<sup>25</sup> Mark McIntosh, “Faith, Reason, and the Mind of Christ,” in *Reason and the Reasons of Faith*, ed. Paul J. Griffiths and Reinhard Hütter (New York: T & T Clark, 2005), 128. Reducing one’s choice of mindset to mere lists of vices or biblical principles misses the significance of the help of the Holy Spirit in the endeavor to have the mind of Christ. Discipline is essential to thinking like Christ, but void of the Spirit, it is not possible. Nonetheless, Phil 4:8 advises what to think about, and this practical aspect of the mind of Christ is necessary.

<sup>26</sup> Ponticus Evagrius, and John Eudes Bamberger, *The Praktikos; Chapters on Prayer* (Trappist, KY: Cistercian Publications, 1972), 58; 128.

<sup>27</sup> Stefan Gillow Reynolds, *Living with the Mind of Christ: Mindfulness in Christian Spirituality* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 2016), 62.



could defuse the thoughts that are triggered by material from the surrounding culture.<sup>28</sup> It is the underlying passions that drive the thoughts, which led Maximus to counsel, “Take care of your passions, and you will easily drive them [the thoughts] from your mind.”<sup>29</sup> Paramount to thinking rightly is the understanding that the mind of man cannot do so (Jer 17:9; Rom 3:10–12).

McIntosh notes that one must be suspicious of one’s own thoughts in order to discern what is true and what is false. For man’s criteria for discernment is flawed and man-centered rather than God-centered (1 Cor 1:18–31).<sup>30</sup> The wisdom of this world invokes a prideful response in the heart of man, trusting in his own thoughts. Diadochus posed a diagnostic question to recalibrate one’s thoughts: “Is your life truly attentive to what God is doing, or is it unconsciously driven by concern with your own status and how others perceive you?”<sup>31</sup> A mind focused on what others think about oneself is a mind centered on the things of man rather than the things of God.

Maximus offers a replacement strategy to replace evil thoughts with thoughts of God.<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup> Maximus also notes that spiritual warfare in mindsets is also caused by demonic activity, stirring up passionate thoughts. There are several examples of this from Scripture. In the OT, Satan influenced David to sin. “Then Satan stood against Israel and incited David to number Israel” (1 Chr 21:1). In John 13:2, it was the devil who “had already put it into the heart of Judas Iscariot, Simon’s son, to betray him.” This temptation of the devil does not mean the devil made Judas sin, but it was a temptation to Judas’ desires and sinfulness that were already resident within his mind. Other examples occur in Acts 5:3, “...Ananias, why has Satan filled your heart to lie to the Holy Spirit and to keep back for yourself part of the proceeds of the land?” Paul told the church at Corinth to be on guard from Satan’s lies. “But I am afraid that as the serpent deceived Eve by his cunning, your thoughts will be led astray from a sincere and pure devotion to Christ” (2 Cor 11:3). Maximus also thought that meteorological changes impact the body and one’s thoughts, as well as the care of one’s body (nourishment), which can also impact one’s thoughts. In summary, these four external factors imply that the mind (and one’s thoughts) can be impacted by external forces as well as the actions of the body and soul. Maximus also states that false knowledge gained through deception or ignorance is fertile ground for one’s mind to become impure. Prassas, “Taming the Thoughts in the Writings of Maximus the Confessor,” 35–42.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, 43.

<sup>30</sup> McIntosh, “Faith, Reason, and the Mind of Christ,” 121–22.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, 123.

<sup>32</sup> Prassas, “Taming the Thoughts in the Writings of Maximus the Confessor,” 44. “Through the Spirit, the objectification of thoughts is possible, and the mind is able to separate itself from a thought and adopt a position of considering, accepting, or rejecting it. The longer one indulges a passionate thought through the recollection of

Watching over one's thoughts is necessary. Though the practical measures Maximus, Evagrius, Diadochus, and the Desert Fathers prescribe are not what achieve the mind of Christ, they can be factors that inhibit or help one to have the mind of Christ. While Maximus poses some helpful tips for resetting one's mindset, having the mind of Christ is not merely pragmatic and is only possible as empowered by the Holy Spirit. Christ finished the work, but those who profess and believe in Christ cooperate with that work by denying the flesh.

In the process of attempting to understand the mind of Christ, theologians through the ages have wrestled with the nature of Christ and the nature of man. Maximus the Confessor stated that the mind of Christ in 1 Cor 2:16 is a "mystical participation in Christ to be the basis for discerning reality."<sup>33</sup> Though the mind of Christ is not mystical, it is spiritual. To have the mind of Christ is to think like Christ; achieved not by human effort but by human cooperation and continual transformation of the human mind by the Holy Spirit. Maximus stated that having the mind of Christ meant thinking like him.<sup>34</sup> Yet, understanding the nature of Christ's mind and will was a significant theological controversy during the Byzantine era, and Maximus played a significant role in the theological debates concerning the nature of Christ's will.<sup>35</sup> McIntosh also

---

passionate memories and the continued attention to an object by focusing on the representation of that object, the more difficult it will be to "reign in" the passionate thought." Ibid.

<sup>33</sup> McIntosh, "Faith, Reason, and the Mind of Christ," 120.

<sup>34</sup> Maximus the Confessor, "Chapters on Knowledge," Second Century, chapter 83 in *Maximus Confessor: Selected Writings*, ed. John Farina, trans. George C. Berthold, TCWS (New York, NY: Paulist Press, 1985), 165.

<sup>35</sup> Known as the Monothelite controversy, the debates centered around the question of how many wills Jesus Christ possessed. Maximus defended the position that Christ's two wills were in perfect harmony, as his human will was always in agreement with the divine will. The First Council of Nicaea established that Christ had two natures, but the debate between Monothelitism and Dyothelitism was decided at the Sixth Ecumenical Council, the Third Council of Constantinople in 680–681 AD when Monothelitism was condemned. "[W]e declare that there are two wills and principles of action, in accordance with what is proper to each of the natures of Christ." Norman P. Tanner, *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils* (London: Sheed & Ward, 1990), 135. See Appendix C: The Monothelite Controversy.

notes that thinking like Christ is only possible through the transformation of one's disposition or mindset. This transformation is not a replacement of the *voûç* but an "illuminating and energizing" of the human mind to think a new way as one shares in the mind of Christ by faith.<sup>36</sup> Maximus conveys the transformation that occurs through the mind of Christ in his work, *Ambigua*.<sup>37</sup> This description in *Ambigua* of opening up another mode for humans to think and behave and know God is an insightful means of conveying the ability to think according to the Spirit through Christ, a depiction of the anthropology of psychosomatic sanctification and participation in God, which was typical of Eastern theology, from Macarius to Maximus to Gregory Palamas.<sup>38</sup> The mind of Christ is a gateway to understanding and the ability to discern truth, an intelligence emanating from the inheritance of those who are in Christ.<sup>39</sup> With the mind of Christ available to all believers, how can those who seek to be spiritual miss it? Alexander Brown expounds on how the mind of Christ can be missed.

The ψυχικός (*psychikos*), whose intent is to rise above the world, actually remain enslaved to it. Having received γνῶσις (*gnōsis*) without πνεῦμα (*pneuma*), the psychics remain ignorant in the clutches of the world and its wisdom. Because they fail to receive the spirit, they do not perceive what is revealed by the spirit,

---

<sup>36</sup> McIntosh, "Faith, Reason, and the Mind of Christ," 121.

<sup>37</sup> "For the Word, Who is beyond being, truly assumed our being for our sake and joined together the transcendent negation with the affirmation of nature and what is natural to it, and became man, having linked together the way of being that is beyond nature, that he might confirm the [human] nature in its new modes of being without there being any change in its logos, and make known the power that transcends infinity, recognized as such in the coming to be of opposites." Loudovikos, Nicholas. "Hell and Heaven, Nature and Person: Christos Yannaras, Dumitru Stăniloae, and Maximus the Confessor," *IJOT* 5.1(2014): 23.

<sup>38</sup> Ibid. The church fathers sought to defend the identity and nature of Christ from heresies regarding the nature of Christ (e.g., monergism and Monothelitism). Origen's doctrine of the spiritual senses of the *nous* created a dualism in which the spiritual senses were at odds with the physical senses, which created a "distorted transcendence," according to Gjermundsen, which is more a psychological attitude than a theological position. Gunnar Gjermundsen, "The Spiritual Senses and the Problem of Transcendence," *SSCS* 23 (2023): 297, 302. Gjermundsen contends that the body and senses are not separated from a person when one is saved, but the flesh and the senses have been seen through the Spirit, and a transfiguration of the physical senses occurs, as well as a simultaneous altering of one's worldview or mindset. Ibid., 305.

<sup>39</sup> McIntosh, "Faith, Reason, and the Mind of Christ," 121.

namely the crucified Christ. They therefore misperceive the critical interpretive power of the cross for eschatological life in the present.<sup>40</sup>

The cross dismantles mentalities that attempt to condone or cover up one's sins. Christ embraced the status the unspiritual man wants to escape—death, shame, and slavery—and, in so doing, destroyed the power of death (Heb 2:14).<sup>41</sup> Minds held captive to their mental struggles can now lay claim to the mind of Christ. The culture and its blinding of the senses through natural worldly concepts and habits that are man-centered rather than God-centered can be penetrated through the transformation of one's mindset through renewal by the Holy Spirit that enables the people of God to be able to think like Christ.<sup>42</sup>

### **Christ's Mind and Mission**

Christ's mission reveals what was on his mind. Christ came to renew minds so God's people could be saved, know God, and walk in a right relationship with him.<sup>43</sup> This mind renewal enabled his people to think the thoughts of God and rightly interpret God's Word.<sup>44</sup> God's people become the very temple of the living God.<sup>45</sup> This mission of Christ is only accomplished in the minds of those who see their need for salvation and repent of their own thoughts and sins, believing that God inhabited mankind through Christ and paid for their sins, redeeming them and their mindsets. Through an imperative and an indicative, Christ laid the

---

<sup>40</sup> Alexander R. Brown, *The Cross and the Human Transformation: Paul's Apocalyptic Word in I Corinthians* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1995), 138.

<sup>41</sup> McIntosh, "Faith, Reason, and the Mind of Christ," 129.

<sup>42</sup> Gjermundsen, "The Spiritual Senses and the Problem of Transcendence," 309.

<sup>43</sup> See John 3:3–6, 16; Acts 2:38; Rom 10:9; 2 Cor 5:17; 1 Pet 1:3; 2 Thess 2:13.

<sup>44</sup> See Jer 31:33; Ezek 11:19; 36:26; Matt 10:19–20; John 14:26; Rom 8:14, 26; 12:2; 1 Cor 2:11–12; 2 Cor 3:3; Heb 8:10; 10:16.

<sup>45</sup> See 1 Cor 3:16; 6:19; Eph 2:22.

groundwork for his people to gain his mind, having God’s words written on their minds so they could be faithful to God.

### The Imperative: Repent

Jesus’ opening words in Mark 1:15 were a statement and a command, an indicative and an imperative.<sup>46</sup> “The time has come,” he said. “The kingdom of God has come near. Repent (μετανοέω) and believe (πιστεύω) the good news (εὐαγγελίῳ)” (Mark 1:15 NIV). The imperative to repent and have a change of mind is woven throughout the NT.<sup>47</sup> Salvation and mind renewal were his mission. This word for repent μετανοέω means “change of heart” and a related term, *metamélomai* means the “experiencing of remorse.”<sup>48</sup> These terms for repentance are connected with νοῦς (*nous*), in which the prefix *meta* is rendered “after,” and *noia* means “a thought,” meaning “afterthought,” where an afterthought can be a changed thought, contrasted with forethought (*pronoia*).<sup>49</sup> The term μετάνοια means “to change one’s mind (νοῦς),” which, as regards the varied senses of νοῦς, likely means “to adopt another view” or “to change one’s

---

<sup>46</sup> William Barclay, *The Mind of Jesus* (New York: Harper, 1961), 41–2.

<sup>47</sup> See Matt 3:2, 8, 11; 4:17; 11:20–21; 12:41; Mark 1:4, 15; 6:12; Luke 3:3, 8; 5:32; 10:13; 11:32; 13:3, 5; 15:7, 10; 16:30; 17:3, 4; 24:47; Acts 2:38; 3:19; 5:31; 8:22; 11:18; 13:24; 17:30; 19:4; 20:21; 26:20; Rom 2:4; 2 Cor 7:9–10; 12:21; 2 Tim 2:25; Heb 6:1, 6; 12:17; 2 Pet 3:9; Rev 2:5, 16, 21–22; 3:3, 19; 9:20–21; 16:9, 11.

<sup>48</sup> Gerhard Kittel, Gerhard Friedrich, and Geoffrey William Bromiley, “*metamélomai*,” *TDNT (Abridged)* 589. The classical use of these two terms, μετανοέω and μεταμέλομαι, is illuminating. Thompson examined every occurrence of μετανοέω in the classical period and states that the verb μετανοέω was conceived of as purely intellectual, meaning to *think over again* or to *think differently*. The noun μετανοια, however, implies a *change of feeling*. The term μεταμέλει means to *think or feel differently*. Thompson states that “The feeling rather than the intellect is the potent force of μεταμέλει, and the verb is thus sharply distinguished from μετανοέω.” E. F. Thompson, *METANOESΩ and METAMEAEI in Greek Literature until 100 AD, including Discussion of their Cognates and of their Hebrew Equivalent*s (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1908), 9–11. The intellectual decision to repent leads to an emotional impact. Faith leads one’s feelings, not the other way around. The verb μεταμέλει is a different nuance, meaning *to cause one to regret*. Paul uses these two terms in an interplay in 2 Cor 7:8, stating that he does not repent (μεταμέλομαι) from sharing a difficult message with the Corinthians that caused them to regret, but he regrets (μεταμέλομαι) the grief they experienced. Nonetheless, their grief led to true repentance (μετανοέω).

<sup>49</sup> Barclay, *The Mind of Jesus*, 42.

feelings.”<sup>50</sup> Certainly, repentance is emphasized in both mind and deed as Christ is compelling those around him to then act on the new belief. The employment of an imperative implies that action is necessary, yet Christ completes the work. “The imperative is . . . the mood of volition. It is the genius of the imperative to express the appeal of will to will.”<sup>51</sup> Christ was willing his people to use their will to admit their need and confess their heartfelt repentance. Without this, his people could not have their minds renewed. The imperative was calling for a mindset that resolved to turn away from sin and turn toward Jesus. In the context of the Greco-Roman world, Jesus’ invitation to “repent and believe the good news” was exploiting the Greco-Roman view that emperors were thought to be divine, as evidenced in the calendar inscription of Priene that celebrated as “good news” the birth of Augustus Caesar, declaring him a “Son of God” and beginning their calendar year with his birth. In the Jewish world, Jesus’ ultimate death on the cross was not good news but was viewed as a curse. Christ became a curse for his people (Gal 3:13) to redeem their minds. Surely such an action of coming to earth as a human and then laying down his life for all mankind deserves an action, a compulsory response.

#### The Indicative: Represent

Christ came representing the kingdom of God with both a proclamation of the gospel and an invitation to join the kingdom of God in representing Christ to the world through repentance.

---

<sup>50</sup> Behm, “Noῦς,” *TDNT* 4:976.

<sup>51</sup> Boyer, “A Classification of Imperatives,” 35. Jesus’ statement in Mark 1:15 is a present active imperative, which expresses a command that calls for action that is continuing or repeated and habitual, an action that defines the doer. The largest number of commands were imperative, with the imperative form used 1357 or 83%, while prayers or requests that are imperative make up 11%, and a mere 2% of imperatives express permission/consent. *Ibid.*, 36–41.

The indicative statements that begin Mark 1:15 also end Mark 1:17 and form a bracket, reversing the public announcement:

Mark 1:15

“The time has come,” he said.  
(Indicative)  
The kingdom of God has come near.”  
“Repent and believe the good news!”  
(Imperative)

Mark 1:17

“Come, follow me,” Jesus said,  
(Imperative)  
“And I will send you out to fish for  
people.” (Indicative)<sup>52</sup>

NT scholar Henderson notes that “It is only within this framework—a framework that grounds human life in the context of divine sovereignty— that the imperatives standing at the center of this chiasmic structure can be considered.”<sup>53</sup> The original meaning of the term εὐαγγελίῳ (*euangelio*) meant “good news of victory from the battlefield.”<sup>54</sup> Victory is connoted from the power struggle in the wilderness as Christ had just defeated Satan when he did not yield to temptation in vv. 12–13 of Mark 1–15. Through recitation from the Word of God, Jesus chose to think according to the things of God, not the things of man, setting his will resolutely to do the will of God. This victory is available for those who are in Christ, but just as Christ chose God’s Word over the enemy’s, the mind of Christ must also be chosen over one’s own will.

#### The Initiative: Receive and Believe

Christ’s proclamation included the need to receive and believe the message of the gospel. Henderson pointed out the tension arising from the good news. “There cannot be, either in Mark’s or in the OT prophetic understanding, any divine good news apart from human response.

---

<sup>52</sup> Suzanne Watts Henderson, *Christology and Discipleship in the Gospel of Mark*, Vol. 135 (Cambridge University Press, 2006), 52.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, 53.

<sup>54</sup> M. Eugene Boring, “Mark 1:1-15 and the Beginning of the Gospel,” *Semeia* 52 (1991):56.

Thus, the call of the first disciples reflects and reiterates the dramatic tension between the good news of God's assured victory and its drastic implications for human life."<sup>55</sup> True repentance leads to the ability to receive the Holy Spirit, but one must also believe (Mark 1:15). The unbelief of worldly mindsets must be repented of in order to don the mind of Christ. Belief in God must trump belief in one's own thoughts.

### **What is the Mind of Christ?**

The mind of Christ is not attained but maintained. All who are in Christ have the Holy Spirit, which enables them to have the mind of Christ, but operating in the mind of Christ is a choice of walking in the Spirit or the flesh. Mindsets are a temptation to rely on one's natural senses rather than the Spirit. Just as Jesus was in the wilderness and endured temptation, so will all of God's people. The question is, how will one endure temptation? Renouncing and repenting of earthly mindsets founded in earthly wisdom, one must choose to believe that God has complete sovereign control and dominion over one's life. The mind of Christ is, first and foremost, the mind of God (John 14:9–11). Christ thought, spoke, and acted as God even as he was in the flesh. The mind of Christ is the attitude and the thoughts of Christ matching his actions.<sup>56</sup> Based on Philippians 2:2–5, the mind of Christ is depicted as encompassing unity (unity of affection, spirit, and purpose), humility (no selfish ambition or pride), and selflessness.<sup>57</sup> The spiritual reality of the mind of Christ is that it cannot be achieved by mere

---

<sup>55</sup> Henderson, *Christology and Discipleship in the Gospel of Mark*, 53.

<sup>56</sup> Ben Gutierrez, *Living Out the Mind of Christ: Practical Keys to Discovering and Applying the Mind of Christ in Everyday Life* (Virginia Beach, VA: Innovate Church, 2011), 19–21.

<sup>57</sup> This mind of Christ is known and shown as one knows the thoughts of Christ and lives in accordance with Christ's example. Christ was one with the Father (Phil 2:6), humble (Phil 2:7), a servant (2:7), and selfless (2:8). In Phil 2:1–11, the mind of Christ is prescribed (2–5) and described (6–8) so God's people can know and



human effort or obtained by following a formula in one's own strength of what the mind of Christ is. When one considers the mind of Christ, one must first consider the life of Christ. Jesus suffered just as his creation does, willingly. How Christ navigated the events of his life serves as an example to those who contain his Spirit.<sup>58</sup> Through the world, words, and works of Christ, his mind is shown.

### The World of Christ

Just as the surrounding culture and environment of the ANE helped to reveal the minds of those in the culture, Christ was in a culture, as well. Did the Greco-Roman or Jewish cultures shape the mind of Christ? Hundreds of years before Christ was born, events defined and shaped the Palestinian culture—foreign domination and repeated episodes of genocide against Israel led to a survival mindset that was at the forefront of the minds of many Jews in the first century.<sup>59</sup> Still, Christ came with a mission that was opposite of the survival mindset: to lay down his life. Oppression and conquest fragmented Israel, leading to various Jewish sects forming as a means

---

show this mindset. Gutierrez contends that the mind of Christ was meant to be specific, not general, and Paul clearly showed what the mind of Christ encompasses. *Ibid.*, 58, 114.

<sup>58</sup> The life of Christ is more than just a review of the historical Jesus. The narrative of Christ's life details his works of God and his thoughts as evidenced by what he said. The temptation of Jesus and the miracles he performed have been thought to be unhistorical. While the purpose of this dissertation is not to prove the veracity of Scripture, for it needs no such commendation, it is understood that one cannot understand the mind of the Lord if one negates the events of his life as recorded in the inspired word of God. The pursuit of the historical Jesus is the pursuit of a façade, in fact, a non-historical individual. For the Jesus of the Scriptures is God incarnate, and without that acknowledgment, one cannot know the mind of Christ. Barclay begins his work, *The Mind of Jesus*, stating that his goal was to understand the mind, work, and meaning of Jesus and with no intention of minimizing the faith and relationship one has with Christ as resurrected Lord, yet unfortunately, on the very last page of his book Barclay contends that the virgin birth is merely metaphorical; not "a literal and historical fact." Barclay, *The Mind of Jesus*, 332. Examining the mind of Jesus from a human perspective alone removes the spiritual component of mind renewal and undermines the work of Christ. To consider one part of Scripture as merely metaphorical, which is attested to in multiple places in Scripture, is misinterpretation and approaching Scripture as an adjudicator of it rather than one who is privileged to exegete and seek to understand and interpret what God has spoken and revealed to man.

<sup>59</sup> Simmons, *Peoples of the New Testament World*, 17.

to secure Israel's existence in the face of brutal oppression.<sup>60</sup> Josephus and Hippolytus both stated that there were three primary sects: the Essenes, Sadducees, and Pharisees.<sup>61</sup> Yet Jesus was a teacher not listed in any of these sects. He was in the culture, a teacher, but unlike any other.<sup>62</sup>

The DSS came from the same historical and cultural context as Jesus and the early church.<sup>63</sup> John's affiliation with the Qumran hints at some relation of Jesus to Qumran, given both John the Baptist and Jesus believed that adhering to rituals of purification in water did not cleanse one who did not also live a life of ethical repentance (Mark 1:4; Luke 3:7–14; Josephus, *Ant.* 18.117; 1QS 3.8–9), and both were also part of the fulfillment of Isa 40:1–3 (Mark 1:1–4; 1QS 8.13–16), and also believed in the “Holy Spirit's” eschatological cleansing of humans.<sup>64</sup> Literacy was not prevalent during the time of Christ, with about 10% of the population being considered literate, yet it seems likely that Jesus was expected to and did read (Luke 4:16–17),

---

<sup>60</sup> Ibid.

<sup>61</sup> Clyde Pharr, “The Testimony of Josephus to Christianity,” *The American Journal of Philology* 48.2 (1927): 137.

<sup>62</sup> A famous testimony of Josephus about Jesus reveals he was like no other. “About this time there lived Jesus, a wise man, if indeed one ought to call him a man. For he was one who wrought surprising feats and was a teacher of such people as accept the truth gladly. He won over many Jews and many of the Greeks. He was the Messiah” (Josephus. *Jewish Antiquities* 8:48–51 [Feldman]). A footnote from this entry in the Loeb Classical Library reveals that the Testimonium Flavianum has been under scrutiny since Scaliger first suspected its authenticity in the sixteenth century. However, the authenticity is verified by its presence in all the manuscripts, and it has been cited by Eusebius. (Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* 3.104–105). The rationale behind scrutiny over authenticity is due to Josephus' acknowledgment of Christ as Messiah despite him being a loyal Pharisaic Jew and the documented fact that Josephus did not believe in Jesus as the Christ. There is also the thought that the passage breaks the continuity of the narrative as well as several stylistic peculiarities.

<sup>63</sup> James H. Charlesworth, “John the Baptizer and the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, vol. 3. (Waco, TX: Baylor University, 2006), 16.

<sup>64</sup> There are also differences that set John the Baptist and Jesus apart from the Qumran, such as public declaration of their teaching versus private meetings. Further, the messianic teaching of Qumran appears to have expected dual messiahs, one royal and one priestly, as attested to in the *Rule of the Community*: “They ... shall be ruled by the primitive precepts in which the men of the Community were first instructed until there shall come the Prophet and the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel” (1QS 9.10–11). Ibid, 237–38.

with oral communication preferred at that time.<sup>65</sup> It was common for there to be a subsistence existence and poverty for most of the people who lived during the time Jesus lived.<sup>66</sup> The school of Shammai, which adhered to a stricter interpretation of the law, prevailed during Jesus' ministry in a religious climate.<sup>67</sup> Jesus *was* the law of God in the flesh yet he sought to remove burdens where the Pharisees increased them. He embodied and fulfilled the commandments of God and demonstrated the grace of God in a legalistic, religious environment. Jesus impacted his culture more than the culture impacted him. He lived with the things of God in mind, not the things of man.

### **Christ Came to Show Us How to Live Counterculture**

Jesus grew up learning and reciting the Torah, laying a foundation for revering the righteousness of God and his perfect law.<sup>68</sup> Yet Jesus did not elevate human traditions above the Word of God or add to the requirements of the law as some Pharisees did (Mark 7:1–13). The Shema was a daily prayer in ancient Israel as well as in the time of Christ. Jesus demonstrated what it looked like to love God with all one's being through his impeccable obedience. The mind of Christ was fixed on the Father's will (John 5:19). He thought and did what God the Father thought and did. Jesus was called “an interpreter of the mind of God.”<sup>69</sup> He is the expression of

---

<sup>65</sup> Brian J. Wright, “Ancient Literacy in New Testament Research: Incorporating a Few More Lines of Enquiry,” *TJ* 36, no. 2 (2015): 161.

<sup>66</sup> Steven J. Friesen, “Poverty in Pauline studies: Beyond the So-called New Consensus.” *JSNT* 26, no. 3 (2004): 359.

<sup>67</sup> Ferguson, *Backgrounds of Early Christianity*, 3rd ed., 491.

<sup>68</sup> Stanley Brown-Serman, and Harold Adye Prichard, *What Did Jesus Think? Studies in the Mind of Christ* (New York: Macmillan, 1935), 12–13.

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid.*, 181.

the Father in human form. Jesus' knowledge of the commands was not merely ritualistic or religious, and Jesus was not just a moralist or a legalist. He embodied the righteousness of God. The mindset of Christ reveals his mind. Suffering did not deter Christ from pursuing God and righteousness and living for the will of God more than earthly gain (1 Peter 4:1). He did nothing out of selfish ambition and did not pursue his own glory but chose the path of humility (Phil 2:5–11).<sup>70</sup>

The backdrop into which Christ lived was a confluence of heightened religiosity and idolatry encompassing Jewish monotheism, a panhellenic religious framework, and Roman Imperial Cult, fueling a politically charged environment of the Hellenistic and Roman Empire cultural streams.<sup>71</sup> Yet Christ was counter-cultural in his worldview, which was fixed on things of Heaven rather than earth, and elevated those who were otherwise minimized in the culture, demonstrating grace and the spirit of the law. Christ was true Israel. He loved foreigners yet did not acquiesce to their ungodly idolatry. He lived faithfully for the glory of God. Through the lens of Israel's Scriptures, one is given the foundation, language, and key theological concepts for understanding Jesus' mind and mission and the meaning and significance of Jesus' person and ministry.<sup>72</sup>

---

<sup>70</sup> In chapter five, a review of the mindset of Christ is explored in depth through an exploration of these two preceding passages.

<sup>71</sup> David G. Rice and Stambaugh, John E. *Sources for the Study of Greek Religion, Corrected Edition* (Atlanta: SBL, 2009), xiii.

<sup>72</sup> Lidija Novakovic, "The Scriptures and Scriptural Interpretation," in Green and McDonald, *The World of the New Testament*, 97.

## The Words of Christ

We know the thoughts of Christ by what Jesus said. Christ *is* the Word of God (λόγος), and his words convey his mind and heart. However, the words of Christ have been considered difficult to understand for many reasons. Christ often spoke in parables, and the messages his words contained were also difficult to accept and not able to be understood without spiritual discernment, and the original language of Christ's words is hotly debated still today, having an impact on interpretation. For example, the title "Son of God" was also understood as "Messiah" to Jewish people, but steeped in a Greek culture where this title was also applied to their deities, the significance could easily be lost.<sup>73</sup> Without understanding the words of Christ in their original form, heresies such as replacement theology can also usurp the message of Christ.<sup>74</sup> Despite the common understanding that the primary language in early Christianity was Aramaic, then later Greek and Latin, Porter contends that this is not the reality and that Greek seems to have been the primary language of Jews and Christians. Casey contends that Aramaic was the language Jesus spoke but that the Gospel of Mark was written in Greek and that to be able to uncover Jesus' original words, his sayings must be reconstructed in their original Aramaic, which will convey his cultural background.<sup>75</sup> The combined effects of the exile, the Diaspora,

---

<sup>73</sup> Fields makes a significant statement about the importance of understanding Jesus' words from their original Hebrew context. "The NT is full of Semitic syntax, vocabulary, idioms, and thought patterns. Perhaps in the case of the Synoptics, however, this should not be traced so much to the influence of a Hebrew-to-Greek translation of the OT as a Hebrew-to-Greek translation of documents that lie behind these gospels. In any case, the point is that the Hebrew influence is there, and this fact, coupled with other factors already mentioned in this article, once again points to Hebrew as the linguistic background for the gospels. As for the actual listing of the Hebrew expressions and idioms in the gospels, the 72-page-long list in Moulton-Howard, vol. 2 (where the whole scope of the NT is covered) is only a beginning; there are many more that are most apparent to someone who wears the glasses of Hebrew fluency to see them." Weston W. Fields, "Understanding the Difficult Words of Jesus," *GTJ* 5 (1941): 281.

<sup>74</sup> For a discussion on the language Jesus spoke, see Appendix D.

<sup>75</sup> Casey notes that following the Enlightenment, emerging scholars detected Semitic features in the Greek of the gospel accounts and subsequently sought to understand the Semitic terms behind the Greek, though they resorted to Hebrew rather than Aramaic due to the OT being their primary resource. Though Casey admits that this

and Alexander the Great's conquest yielded substantive changes in the language of the Jewish people. The primary language changed from Hebrew to Aramaic for those exiled. This was evident in Ezra's address in Nehemiah 8:8, which had to be interpreted for the people, likely due to the language of the people being in Aramaic while Ezra read to them in Hebrew.<sup>76</sup> The Diaspora also contributed to a mix of languages for those who were dispersed to the nations, and the conquest of Alexander the Great Hellenized the culture and language. The Jewish people were accustomed to assimilating into their surrounding culture, so adaptation to another language made it reasonable that Greek would be the common tongue. Porter notes that evidence in the Egyptian papyri (e.g., Zenon papyri from the 3<sup>rd</sup> century BC, which records business transactions between Egypt and Judea) indicates the language shift and dominance of the Greek language in Egypt, Syria, as well as Judea. The Hebrew language was considered to be a secondary language for religious communities, while Greek was primary for Jewish people in the Mediterranean area and Galilee, and in Judea, it was likely a second language. Paul is thought to have spoken Greek as his primary language, with Hebrew/Aramaic as his second language, and it is thought that Aramaic shifted to Greek as the primary language among Christians.<sup>77</sup> Of course, the Greek Old

---

did not always make a significant difference as in the idiomatic use of *πρόσωπον* (*prosopon*), for example, in Matt 16:3 was rendered as the Hebrew term פניי' by Theodore Beza in 1557, but this is not always the case as Aramaic and Hebrew are very different. The discovery of Syriac versions of most of the canonical gospels, as well as other scholars' considering Jewish Aramaic as the original language, contributed to the vast array of possibilities, but the absence of original manuscripts in Aramaic from the right time period is the underlying problem. Casey contends that "The view that Jesus spoke and taught in Aramaic was accordingly the prevailing view in 1896, the first watershed in the study of our subject. This year saw the publication of the first major monograph that attempted to see behind the Greek Gospels and the Aramaic sayings of Jesus." Maurice Casey, *Aramaic Sources of Mark's Gospel* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 1–7. 12.

<sup>76</sup> Stanley E. Porter, "The Greek of The Jews and Early Christians: The Language of The People from A Historical Sociolinguistic Perspective," in *Far from Minimal: Celebrating the Work and Influence of Philip R. Davies*, ed. Duncan Burns and John W. Rogerson, LHBOTS 484 (London: T & T Clark, 2014), 355.

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid.*, 356–62.

Testament is a further attestation to this reality. Nonetheless, there is not a cut-and-dry answer due to the fact that most of the NT Greek writings emanate from extra-Palestinian or extra-Judean proveniences. Many of these demonstrate their connection with the Palestinian Jewish matrix, in particular the Gospels and Acts, which convey the ministry and life of Jesus, a first-century Palestinian Jew, as well as the beginning of the first Jewish Christian church in Jerusalem and Judea.<sup>78</sup> Though it seems that Greek was the original language, it is also apparent that the Jewish influence is behind the Greek words. Faithful interpretation of Scripture is exegeting Scripture with Scripture, informed with an understanding of the background and the language in a grammar-historical approach. Tresham's synopsis of the original NT language debate is a noteworthy one:

“Even if Jesus spoke only Aramaic (or Hebrew), the inspired text of Scripture is in Greek; hence, it is questionable whether it is ever appropriate to seek the Aramaic “behind” the inspired text to elucidate its meaning. The authors intended the Greek text to be understood by the original readers, who presumably spoke Greek and not Aramaic. Thus, knowledge of Aramaic should not be necessary to understand the meaning the human author intended. Does the divine Author expect modern readers to use Aramaic to get the “real” meaning 2,000 years later? The facts of history and principles of grammar are sufficient to understand the Word of God without speculating about the Aramaic that might have been originally spoken by Jesus.”<sup>79</sup>

### **Christ Came to Show us the Father**

Understanding the mind of Christ through his words is understanding the mind of Yahweh. They are one and the same. As seen in this dissertation, the Hebrew thought with which the Hebrew canon was written is different than that of the Greek mindset. Ultimately, the message Christ spoke could reach both Hebrew and Greek because Jesus spoke to all who were

---

<sup>78</sup> Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins*, Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature (Grand Rapids, MI; Eerdmans, 2000), 4–5.

<sup>79</sup> Aaron Tresham, “The Languages Spoken by Jesus,” *MSJ* 20 (2009): 94.

in his audience, but understanding the Hebraic mindset and background gives additional insight into the words of Jesus. Hellenism represented the reasoning of the world, and Christ brought the reasoning of God. But the most significant point in comprehending Jesus' words is that not doing so leads to misinterpretation. One's mindset from the culture and biased approach with presuppositions of one's view of Scripture can usurp the message of God.<sup>80</sup>

### The Works of Christ

The works of Christ revealed his mindset. Following his first miracle, two significant interactions at the beginning of his ministry reveal his mission and mind: to reach the world with the gospel through their minds, not their religion or good works. This was the same mindset of Yahweh—that his people would believe and know God and reach the world around them. The first interaction was the revelation of what it meant to be born of the Spirit to Nicodemus (John 3:3), which broke down religion or good works as a means of salvation and replaced it simply with a decision in the mind to believe in Jesus. The second was giving knowledge to the woman at the well of what it really meant to know and worship God, breaking down cultural, religious, and political barriers (John 4). Salvation was accomplished in the mind as one believed and received the Holy Spirit, who transformed their thinking. All are invited to know him, but worldly and cultural knowledge blind one's mindset from the ability to know God.

---

<sup>80</sup> David Bivin and Roy Blizzard *Understanding The Difficult Words of Jesus: New Insights from A Hebraic Perspective* (Shippensburg, PA: Destiny Image Publishers, 1994), 514. Biven mentions several examples of misinterpretation, including the saying, "Kingdom of God," which is thought to be only futuristic versus a present reality. Other examples are theological misunderstandings such as Christ taught pacifism from Matt 5:21, 39.



## Christ Came that We Might Know Him

Nicodemus was a teacher of the Law, and yet he was lost. Christ, the perfect Shepherd, came to rescue the lost of Israel (Luke 19:10) and graft in the lost Gentiles so that they might know him. Yet, as Jesus shared how one must be born again, Nicodemus could not understand. The words of Jesus depicting being “born of water and spirit” should not have been so foreign to Nicodemus, a teacher of Israel, as the terminology of OT and pseudepigraphic eschatology such as Ezek 36:25–6, Isa 44:3, and Jub. 1:23–25 supported Jesus’ words.<sup>81</sup> Yet his mindset and interpretation of the prophecies yielded unbelief (John 3:11) and lack of understanding γινώσκω (*ginōskō*) earthly things (the analogy of wind to being born of the Spirit), which precluded his ability to understand and know οἶδα (*oida*) heavenly things (John 3:11–12).<sup>82</sup> In particular, Jubilees illustrates the prophesied mind renewal, written in Hebrew by a Pharisee between 135 and 105 BC.<sup>83</sup> The author of Jubilees held great hope that the grace of God would triumph over all the perversity of his people, revealing the role of the Holy Spirit in renewal.<sup>84</sup>

And the LORD said unto Moses: ‘I know their contrariness and their thoughts and their stiffneckedness, and they will not be obedient till they confess their own sin and the sin of their fathers.<sup>23</sup> And after this they will turn to Me in all uprightness and with all (their) heart and with all (their) soul, and I will circumcise the foreskin of their heart and the foreskin of the heart of their seed, and I will create in them a holy spirit, and I will cleanse them so that they shall not turn away from Me from that day unto eternity.<sup>24</sup> And their souls will cleave to Me and to all My

---

<sup>81</sup> F. P. Cotterell, “The Nicodemus Conversation: A Fresh Appraisal,” *TET* 96 (1985): 241.

<sup>82</sup> M. M. Pazdan, “Nicodemus and The Samaritan Woman: Contrasting Models of Discipleship,” *BTB* 17(4) (1987): 147. The way in which Jesus addresses Nicodemus in John 3:10 bestows honor yet indicates that it is not being religious that gives one spiritual knowledge: one who was a leader of Israel did not comprehend the work of God due to his mindset. Walter Gutbrod, “Ἰσραήλ,” *TDNT* 3:369–391.

<sup>83</sup> Robert Henry Charles, ed., *Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, vol. 2 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913), 1.

<sup>84</sup> Henry J. Wicks, *The Doctrine of God in the Jewish Apocryphal and Apocalyptic Literature* (London: Hunter & Longhurst, 1915), 167.

commandments, and they will fulfill My commandments, and I will be their Father, and they shall be My children.<sup>85</sup>

Nicodemus knew the prophecies, but he did not know God. John uses two different verbs to communicate the term “know” in John 3:10–11, which are often used synonymously in other NT texts, but in the Johannine corpus, these two verbs seem to be used by John to exploit Gnosticism and to communicate a difference in knowledge as in knowing about something or someone γινώσκω (*ginōskō*) and knowledge that comprehends or understands οἶδα (*oída*). The spiritual things of God cannot be known γινώσκω (*ginōskō*) through human capabilities but can be known οἶδα (*oída*) through spiritual capabilities. In John 8, John conveys this reality: “But you have not known (γινώσκειν) him. I know (οἶδα) him. If I were to say that I do not know (οἶδα) him, I would be a liar like you, but I do know (οἶδα) him, and I keep his word” (John 8:55).

While these two verbs can be used synonymously, when they are paired together, there is a distinction being made, potentially a polemic from John against the prolific Gnosticism of his day.<sup>86</sup> Paul uses this interplay in 2 Cor 5:16: “From now on, then, we do not know (οἶδα) anyone in a purely human way. Even if we have known (γινώσκω) Christ in a purely human way, yet now we no longer know (γινώσκω) Him in this way” (2 Cor 5:16 HCSB). In the encounter between Jesus and the Samaritan woman at the well, a similar interplay on these two terms “to know” connotes that mind renewal is not something that can be achieved by simply knowing

---

<sup>85</sup> Charles, *Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, 12.

<sup>86</sup> Scholars debate whether these two verbs in particular, meaning “to know,” οἶδα versus γινώσκω, are being used to convey different nuances or if John’s employment, for instance, is merely coincidental or synonymous. See Appendix E: To οἶδα or to γινώσκω, that is the Question.

*about* God. The knowledge that saves is revelatory, demonstrated through mind renewal that the Holy Spirit achieves, which is acquired through repenting and believing in God's knowledge over one's own. Without mind renewal, no one could know the mind of Christ, which is vastly different from seeking to learn about the historical Jesus.

### **Christ Came to Break Down Barriers**

In the revelation of himself as the Messiah to the woman at the well, her mindset engrained from her surrounding culture led to a misinterpretation of the Scriptures and a misunderstanding of the mission of the Messiah.<sup>87</sup> So, too, the mindset of the Jewish people also caused them to misinterpret God's purpose in their relationship with foreigners. The Jewish people thought they understood the mind of Yahweh when they sought to separate themselves from foreign people based on their adherence to the law. These laws specified separation so the Jews would not be defiled (Lev 18:3–4; 19:2; Num 23:9; Deut 7:3–4; Ezra 6:21; 9:1; Neh 13:3; 2 Cor 6:17). But the purpose of separation that Yahweh intended was that his people would not adopt pagan practices or intermarry with foreigners who worshiped false gods. The intention was not to shun foreigners but to show the pagan nations around them what it meant to know God. In separating from the Samaritans, the Israelites went beyond what the law required and twisted the

---

<sup>87</sup> The Samaritans date back to around 722 BC, the time of the defeat of the Northern Kingdom, as a direct result of the resettlement policies of the Assyrians. The conquered Jews were taken to sites that were repopulated with other conquered peoples (see 2 Kgs. 17:5–6, 24 and *Ant.* 9.277–91). The mixing of the races caused a loss of national identities and the development of new syncretistic identities (2 Kgs 17:25–41). The Jewish people sought to keep a pure race and segregated themselves from the Samaritans and other mixed people groups following the Babylonian exile. This led to antagonism between the two groups and the formation of a separate canon of Scripture for the Samaritans that only included the Pentateuch, along with a separate temple cult on Mount Gerizim. Subsequent conflicts occurred as a result of the underlying tensions, including the destruction of the Samaritan temple in 128 BC and another significant conflict in AD 52. Gerald L. Borchert, *John 1–11*, NAC 25 (Nashville: B&H, 1996), 199–200.

purpose of God's law.<sup>88</sup> When one considers that Samaria was the capital of the Northern Kingdom, the ancestry of the Samaritans should not have made them outcasts, though they were treated as such. Christ came to take down these mindsets and barriers within the culture.<sup>89</sup>

### Jesus Breaks Down Cultural Barriers

The heart and mind of Christ are the same as the heart and mind of Yahweh—to reach foreign people with the good news of God's salvation. In a time of upheaval and a culture laced with syncretic worship and prejudices against other ethnic groups and against women, Jesus comes with a completely different paradigm to remove the mindsets and limits that people had set, which ultimately kept them from the greatest gift: knowing God. It is to a common Samaritan woman that Jesus reveals Himself—it is not those who are considered great who know God, but it is those who have been marginalized and who had previously been kept from God by barriers in the culture.<sup>90</sup>

---

<sup>88</sup> Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentary on John: ACT*, vol. 1, ed. Joel C. Elowsky, Thomas C. Oden, and Gerald L. Bray, trans. David R. Maxwell (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2013–2015) 119.

<sup>89</sup> Randall Price and H. Wayne House, *Zondervan Handbook of Biblical Archaeology* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2017), 31–41. The history of the Jewish and Samaritan people groups brings out the significance of Jesus speaking with a Samaritan woman. The mindset against foreigners missed the point of God's command that they were not to intermarry with foreigners. God's people were to reach the culture, not be socially unjust toward foreigners. Further, the encounter between Jesus and the Samaritan woman reveals that there was an undercurrent of expectation for the fulfillment of God's promises at that time. Josephus described the hostility and danger of traveling through Samaria on the way to Galilee. "Hatred also arose between the Samaritans and the Jews for the following reason. It was the custom of the Galileans at the time of a festival to pass through the Samaritan territory on their way to the Holy City. On one occasion, while they were passing through, certain of the inhabitants of a village called Ginaë, which was situated on the border between Samaria and the Great Plain, joined battle with the Galileans and slew a great number of them" (Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* 9.62–63 [Feldman]).

<sup>90</sup> Meyer thought modern Nablus to be about half an hour from the well mentioned in John 4:6, which makes Sychar, where the Samaritan woman came from, possibly a separate town. Heinrich August Wilhelm Meyer, *Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Gospel of John*, vol. 1 (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1874), 204. However, recent scholarship positions Jacob's well as being located in the modern city of Nablus and the ancient Bank of Palestine. Abu Alsaud, et al., "New Chronological Information from Radiocarbon Dating of Human Remains at Jacob's Well, Nablus, Palestine," *Radiocarbon* 63, no. 3 (2021): 759. Walking through Samaria, a town that was well-known for being ungodly, the geography lays a foundation for the barriers Christ was breaking in every realm—geographically, historically, politically, and religiously.

The dividing lines in cultures are more than geographical lines. These dividing lines delineate different religions and politics that serve as barriers in human relationships and ultimately serve as a barrier to knowing God and understanding the Scriptures. Jesus *had* to pass through Samaria (John 4:4). The term ἔδει (had) means “Of an inner necessity growing out of a given situation.”<sup>91</sup> This term often indicates a religious or ethical obligation.<sup>92</sup> To the religious, the ethical obligation was predominantly external, but to Jesus, it always centered on God’s heart. Jews viewed Samaritans in the same manner as they did the Gentiles.<sup>93</sup> Considered a half-breed, the animosity between these two groups was significant, but Jesus’s illuminating conversation with the Samaritan woman ultimately reached her village and broke down cultural barriers.

#### Jesus Breaks Down Religious Barriers

The significance of worship in John 4 is evident by the number of times John employs the Greek word for worship προσκυνέω (*proskyneō*) in this chapter—ten times in John 4:20–25.<sup>94</sup> What one worships orients one’s mindset. False worship had historically turned the hearts and minds of God’s people away from loving God with all their being. In the time in which the book of John was written, Gnosticism was prevalent. By the second century, misinterpretations of the Book of John wrought the view that John supported Gnosticism. In this view, Jesus was thought

---

<sup>91</sup> *BDAG*, s.v. “δει,” 214. The reasoning behind this passage through Samaria was practical, given that Samaria was between Judea and Galilee, where Jesus and his disciples were traveling. The background to this term, ἔδει, indicates that it was not preferable to traverse through Samaria, as relations between the Jews and Samaritans were tenuous. The clashing of two cultures was steeped in the background of both people groups’ ancestries, heightened by the fact that the Samaritans traced their descent back to Joseph. Meyer, *John*, 207.

<sup>92</sup> Walter Grundmann, “δει, Δέον Ἔστι,” *TDNT* 2:21–5.

<sup>93</sup> Joachim Jeremias, “Σαμάρεια,” *TDNT* 7:88–94.

<sup>94</sup> Kenneth O. Gangel, *John*, HNTC, vol. 4 (Nashville, TN: B&H, 2000), 77.

of as the gnostic-redeemer.<sup>95</sup> However, the primary religious background in John 4 is between the Jews and Samaritans. To the Samaritan woman at the well, the most important distinction between the Samaritans and the Jews was worship. More important than their perceived notions about the practice of religion, however, Jesus unveiled that the Samaritan woman did not *know* God—she just *knew* a religion. (John 4:22).<sup>96</sup> An interplay between οἶδα and γινώσκω again highlights the need for revelation from God for mind renewal. Knowledge *about* God is not enough. Jesus informs her of where true knowledge is found. “You worship what you do not know (οἶδα); we worship what we know (οἶδα), for salvation is from the Jews” (John 4:22). It is significant that this verb οἶδα is employed with reference to a genitive (the Jews), for this incidence connotes “limitations to one’s thinking.”<sup>97</sup> Not knowing God makes one prone to mindsets fixed on the belief systems of this world, incapacitating one’s ability to understand God’s Word and or interpret Scripture rightly. Yet believers, too, can get blindsided by carnal mindsets of the world that are ultimately unbelief and sin, hindering their interpretation and

---

<sup>95</sup> D. A. Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, PNTC (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1991), 25. In John 4:20, she referenced the history of worship for her people, which was on a mountain (Deut. 11:29). The Samaritan woman brought up the central issue between both groups: the location of worship. The Jewish people said it would be in Jerusalem, and the legitimization of the Samaritans depended upon this view. Josephus wrote about how contentious this matter was. “Now there arose a quarrel between the Jews in Alexandria and the Samaritans who worshipped at the temple on Mount Gerizim, which had been built in the time of Alexander, and they disputed about their respective temples in the presence of Ptolemy himself, the Jews asserting that it was the temple at Jerusalem which had been built in accordance with the laws of Moses, and the Samaritans that it was the temple on Gerizim” (Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* 13.262–263 [Ralph Marcus]). For both the Jewish and the Samaritan peoples, the temple was significant. The ancestors of the Samaritans built the temple on Mount Gerizim during the time of Nehemiah. This temple was between Ebal and Sychem (Sychar) and was destroyed by John Hyrcanus, but the site was still held sacred. Moses had set Mount Gerizim as the place of blessing when God’s people would enter the promised land (Deut. 11:29, 27:12, 13). Meyer, *John*, 211–12.

<sup>96</sup> It is significant to note that the Samaritans only received the Pentateuch; they did not have the full revelation of God in the OT, including the prophets and the hope for Messiah, which the Jews had. This impacted their ability to understand the Word of God. When they lost their temple, they lost the abiding presence of the Deity (Rom. 3:2, 9:4, 5). Meyer, *John*, 213.

<sup>97</sup> James Diggle, ed., *CGL* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021), 988.

application of the Word of God. The pursuit of the mind of Christ clears the fog of unbelief away as man's thoughts are renewed by the Word of God and the power of the Holy Spirit. The natural mind cannot understand the supernatural. In response to Jesus sharing his perfect higher thoughts (Isa 26:3) on worship, the Samaritan woman musters her faith and uses the verb οἶδα instead of γινώσκω in reference to knowing God. "... I know (οἶδα) that Messiah is coming (he who is called Christ). When he comes, he will tell us all things" (John 4:25). Another significant point of using οἶδα in this context is it means "To have seen or perceived," or "to know, to have knowledge of; divine knowledge."<sup>98</sup> The Samaritan woman was seen by Jesus. He knew her life story. And now she knew him.

Jesus broke down the barriers to worship. He placed the emphasis on worshipping in spirit and in truth, of much more significance than a place (mountain or Jerusalem) or a building (temple) (John 4:23–24). Jesus *was* the temple, and his people were going to become the temple of the Holy Spirit. Jesus broke down the barriers for the worshiper. The Samaritan woman was no longer in the dark about whom or where she was supposed to worship. She was no longer a half-breed. She was no longer prevented from worshipping a Holy God, for He made her holy.

#### Jesus Breaks Down Political Barriers

Even though the Samaritans did not have the complete picture, neither did the Jewish people have an accurate picture of Messiah. The Judeans saw the coming Messiah as a political figure, whereas the Samaritans did not. The Samaritans thought Messiah would come and re-establish both the kingdom of Israel and the Gerizim-worship.<sup>99</sup> But in John 4:26, Jesus reveals

---

<sup>98</sup> W. E. Vine et al., "Know," *VEDBW* (Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 2000), 347.

<sup>99</sup> Meyer, *John*, 217.

his identity to the Samaritan woman through the use of an “I am” statement: ἐγώ εἰμί (*ego eimi*) (I am), revealing his true identity as Yahweh in human form.<sup>100</sup> Though the Samaritan woman relied on Moses, one greater than a prophet had come (Deut 18:15; Matt 17:1-8; John 1:17, Acts 13:38–39; Heb 3:1-6).<sup>101</sup> The fourth Gospel was also written on the heels of the Jewish Revolt, creating heightened Roman sensitivities due to the fallout after the Jewish Revolt.

The story of the Samaritan woman in the Gospel of John weaves a heightened Christology into a complicated culture. Breaking down the barriers of culture one by one, Jesus moves the Samaritan woman from focusing on the location of worship to the object of worship. What is worshiped is not what pertains to God but is, in fact, God. The taboos, barriers, and limits that man sets become mindsets that keep man away from God. Gratefully, these can also be broken down through the promised mind renewal as one lets go of religion and false idols and embraces a relationship with God.

### **Christ Came to Give Us Identity and Indemnity**

The works of Christ came from who he is. At the foundation of his ministry and calling, Christ established his work by walking firmly in his identity. In the temptations of Christ, Christ denied his flesh, and the mind of Christ overcame the mind of the flesh. In a series of conditional statements, the devil attempted to tempt Christ. “If you are the Son of God, command ...” (Luke

---

<sup>100</sup> Gangel, *John*, 79.

<sup>101</sup> Grant R. Osborne, *John: Verse by Verse*, ed. Jeffrey Reimer et al. ONTC (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2018), 108. The identity of Jesus as Messiah made the Palestine area a target for political persecution at the hands of Rome. The rise of the Hasmonean and Herodian dynasties as significant political powers became a factor in the political life of Jewish Palestine. The fourth Gospel was also written on the heels of the Jewish Revolt, creating heightened Roman sensitivities due to the fallout after the Jewish Revolt. Travis Trost, *Who Should Be King in Israel?: A Study on Roman Imperial Politics, the Dead Sea Scrolls, and the Fourth Gospel* (New York, NY: Peter Lang, 2010), 107.



4:3); “If you, then, will worship me ...” (Luke 4:7); “If you are the Son of God, throw yourself ...” (Luke 4:9). In the first temptation, the enemy sought to appeal to Christ’s identity and tempt Jesus to act of his own accord, to appease the lust of the eyes, to satisfy his craving for food; but Christ’s identity informed his mindset and was bent toward God’s will, not his own. In the second temptation, the focus was on the boastful pride of life. Christ did not seek his own glory but worshiped God alone. In the third temptation, the enemy appealed to Christ’s identity again and sought to tempt Christ to have confidence in the flesh rather than in God. Jesus demonstrated that his mindset was not fixed on unbelief or the senses but on the Spirit. His heart was not divided or hardened but set on the Father’s will, mind, and heart. Jesus’ mind in baptism was obedience. He laid down his own life as a sin offering, walking in the identity of the likeness of man to redeem and save his people, giving them an identity in him and renewing their minds. Christ is also the indemnity or assurance for mankind. God’s people could not meet a Holy God’s standard or pay the wages for their sins (Rom 6:23). Mankind cannot even think rightly, let alone interpret the Word of God without mind renewal.

It is a humbling thing to come behind someone who does a perfect job. Christ’s work ethic was perfect. His motives were perfect. And he completed the work he was assigned. We know the mind of Christ by how Christ began and completed his work. In the baptism of Jesus, he identifies with mankind and dedicates himself to God’s purposes.<sup>102</sup> In culture, it is common to define a person by their vocation, the title(s), or the role(s) they fill in this life. This would have been an interesting conversation with the one whose mind is perfect. His identity was not in what he did, but his works revealed his identity. As man bears the identity of Christ, Christ also

---

<sup>102</sup> Barclay, *Mind of Jesus*, 30.

becomes their indemnity and redemption. Having seen the world, words, and works of Christ, an examination of key passages grants us access to the mind of Christ in its depiction through the eyes of Isaiah and the Apostle Paul.

### **The Mind of the LORD Foretold: Isaiah**

Isaiah points God’s people to the perfect mind (Isa 26:3; 40:13; 55:8–9). If God’s people would fix their minds on him, trusting in him, they would have peace (Isa 26:3–4). The Law could not transform the minds of God’s people, but the Spirit could. Setting one’s mind is in itself a good work (“will power”) that man is not capable of unless empowered by the Holy Spirit. Translated as “mind,” מַצָּר (yēšer) in Isa 26:3 is rendered as “what is framed,” or “one’s purpose,” or “what is framed in the mind.”<sup>103</sup> This term is further depicted as an inclination or striving which shapes one’s mindset or worldview (Gen 6:5; 8:21; Deut 31:21; Isa 26:3; 1 Chr 28:9; 29:18).<sup>104</sup> According to Keener, the term elsewhere “could apply to something one sets one’s thought on, something like Paul’s “mind-frame” in Rom 8:5– 7.”<sup>105</sup> In Isaiah 40, Isaiah points to the solution for man’s wayward heart—the coming Messiah. Apart from the Spirit, God’s people cannot see, have wisdom, or understand. They are blind and desperate without the Messiah’s intervention (Isa 44:18). Isaiah comes back to the central truth that it is the Messiah who knows all things and is able to reveal wisdom and truth to his people through the Holy Spirit so they can walk in relationship with him (Isa 40:28). Isaiah announced that God is coming to save and be with his people and will place his own Spirit upon them so they can think as he does

---

<sup>103</sup> BDB, s.v. “מַצָּר,” 428.

<sup>104</sup> HALOT, s.v. “מַצָּר,” 3:429.

<sup>105</sup> Craig S. Keener, *The Mind of the Spirit: Paul’s Approach to Transformed Thinking* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2016) 204.

and be saved. This has been God’s plan all along. It is not just man’s actions that God is after—He is after their minds and hearts. Isaiah provides a glimpse of the mind of God in Isaiah 40:13–14. Isa 40:13 employs a unique word that the LXX translates as mind (νοῦς). It is the word נָחַן (*tāḱān*), which occurs twice in Isaiah 40:12–13, meaning “direct,” “measured out,” or “gauge.” But given that there was no term for “mind,” this term was nonetheless depicted as conveying the mystery of the nature of God and his understanding. The LXX rightly interprets this term as referencing the mind of God: “Who has known/comprehended the mind of the LORD.”<sup>106</sup> God’s thoughts are higher than man’s thoughts, but he is able to help mankind to think like him so his people can understand and know him (Isa 55:8–9). Man’s senses are not enough to discern. Man’s deeds and thoughts fall far short of Yahweh’s standard. Isaiah creates a sense of awe and curiosity about the mind of God pointing to the hope in the future when the mind of the LORD will be able to be known.

### **The Mind/Spirit of the Lord Fulfilled: 1 Cor 2:10–16**

Paul picked up the motif of the mind of the Spirit from Isaiah 40:13 by revealing what this mind is in 1 Corinthians 2:10–16. Paul reveals God’s character and wisdom seen in Christ and shown in Isaiah 40:13 as a prophetic reality for God’s people.<sup>107</sup> Christ’s righteousness is his people’s too. They have the mind of Christ available to them when they are saved and receive the Holy Spirit.<sup>108</sup> God’s people are called to reach the world with the gospel but will need to think

---

<sup>106</sup> Bruce K. Waltke, “נָחַן,” *TWOT* 970.

<sup>107</sup> *Ibid.*, 140.

<sup>108</sup> Keener notes that Paul’s quotation of Isaiah 40:13 in 1 Corinthians 2:16 is Paul’s interpretation of the Isaian verse, intimating that Paul did, in fact, believe that the divine mind was at work in renewing the minds of God’s people. *Ibid.*, 243.

like Jesus to accomplish this task. The purpose of the motif of mind renewal throughout Scripture is encapsulated in 1 Corinthians 2—without renewed minds, God’s people cannot understand what the Spirit is saying or interpret his word. One cannot use worldly wisdom to understand the Word of God, as worldly wisdom is oriented toward the things of man, not God. The things of God are spiritually understood and revealed. 1 Corinthians 2:10–16 is sandwiched between chapters 1 and 3, which provide background and context for Paul’s message in 1 Corinthians 2. Paul was addressing the factionalism stemming from the Corinthian’s appreciation for rhetorical eloquence in the sophistic tradition, which prized teachers according to their abilities in Greco-Roman rhetoric in 1 Corinthians 1:12 and 3:1-4.<sup>109</sup> This ultimately led to prizing man’s intellect above God’s thoughts. Paul understood these factions as symptomatic of a grave theological error in Corinth, for the goal of excelling according to worldly standards forfeited their need for the gospel.<sup>110</sup>

In 1 Corinthians 2, Paul utilizes rhetoric to demonstrate a dichotomous spirituality to his readers to persuade them of the need to have wisdom from God rather than from the world.<sup>111</sup> By

---

<sup>109</sup> Corin Mihaila, “The Greco-Roman Rhetoric Background of Sophia in 1 Corinthians 1-4,” *PTJ* 17 (2019): 15–26.

<sup>110</sup> Sigurd Grindheim, “Wisdom for the Perfect: Paul’s Challenge to the Corinthian Church (1 Corinthians 2:6-16),” *JBL* 121 (2002): 689–690.

<sup>111</sup> Paul had an uphill battle in revealing what it meant to be truly spiritual (πνευματικός). The *pursuit of wisdom* (σοφία) and *knowledge* (γνώσις, γινώσκω) produced a mindset of believing they had special wisdom or superior knowledge, which was counter to the gospel. Paul needed to convince them of their need for wisdom from God. To achieve this goal, Paul employed the following rhetorical devices: repetition, comparison and contrast, dialectic language, curiosity, and an attractive result. Dirk G. van der Merwe, “Pauline Rhetoric and the Discernment of the Wisdom of God According to 1 Corinthians 2,” *JECH*, 3.2 (2013), 110–12. Paul’s employment of what are considered to be gnostic terms (*gnosis*, *sophia*, and the anthropological terms *psychic*, *pneumatic*, and *sarkic*) exploits Gnosticism in the culture by utilizing the same language but revealing the wisdom of God instead of the assumed to be superior spirituality and wisdom of the world. Pearson demonstrates that Paul has developed his own *pneumatikos-psychikos* terminology that stems from a Hellenistic-Jewish exegesis of Genesis 2:7. Elaine H. Pagels, “Pneumatikos-Psychikos Terminology in I Corinthians,” *JBL* 95 (1976): 307. Pearson states that “speculations on Gen 2:7 are the primary building blocks for the fabrication of gnostic myths and systems.” Birger A. Pearson, *The Pneumatikos-Psychikos Terminology In 1 Corinthians: A Study in The Theology of The Corinthian Opponents of Paul and Its Relation to Gnosticism*, SBL Dissertation Series 12 (Missoula, MT: SBL, 1973), 55. Paul

juxtaposing two value systems, Paul reveals how the cross turned the world's values upside down.<sup>112</sup> Paul describes an otherworldly knowledge (wisdom) found only in the mind of Christ that is a fulfillment of the promises of having a new mind/heart as prophesied in the OT (Deut 30:6; Jer 24:7; 31:33; 32:40; Ezek 11:19–20; 36:25–27; 37:27; Rom 8:2–8; 1 Cor 2:7; Heb 8:10; 10:6). Paul uses the term “know” seven times in 1 Cor 2, alternating at times between the term γινώσκω (*ginōskō*) and οἶδα (*oīda*) and the word wisdom (σοφία) which also occurs seven times in this chapter. This repetition served to persuade the people to see their need for wisdom. The mind of man is under examination in this passage to point to the perfect mind and solution for all God's people. Wisdom of the world and Gnosticism were at the forefront of the culture and distracted God's people from pursuing knowledge of God. In this passage, distinct from the parallel verse in Isa 40:13, Paul says God's people *have* the mind of Christ. It is not something one earns by good works, but it is a reality for those who are *in* Christ. In the verse leading into the passage explored in this section, 1 Corinthians 2:9, Paul paraphrases OT citations by *peshet* and a combination of elements from Isa 52:15, 64:4, and 65:16 LXX. Ellis notes that the clause “ἀνέβη ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν is a Semitism: עלה לב-על,” revealing the significance of the heart as the seat of intelligence; where “arise upon the heart” is rendered as “enter the mind.”<sup>113</sup>

---

uses the term ψυχικός, which was rare in the first century, as an antithesis to God and God's Spirit. Grindheim, “Wisdom for the Perfect: Paul's Challenge to the Corinthian Church,” 704. Walker says that Biblical psychology does not have an equivalent English term for ψυχικός. The term σαρκικός (*sarkikós*), meaning “fleshly,” is ascribed to the lower appetites of man, and the term πνευματικός (*pneumatikós*), meaning “spiritual” applies to a believer who is led by the Spirit. The term ψυχή (*psuchē*), meaning “soul,” is between the two former terms, considered to be the center of the human being. “This *ego* in each man is bound to the spirit, the higher nature; and to the body or lower nature ... the *natural* [*pseuchikos*] man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God” (1 Cor 2:14).” Dwight M. Pratt, “Senses,” *ISBE* 4:2721.

<sup>112</sup> Grindheim, “Wisdom for the Perfect: Paul's Challenge to the Corinthian Church,” 693.

<sup>113</sup> E. Earle Ellis, *1 Corinthians: A Commentary* (London: Bloomsbury, 2022), 120.

God's mind would enter man's mind. The use of καρδία points back to the significant Hebraic use of the term to depict the heart/mind as the center of one's life.

### The Things of God Revealed (1 Cor 2:10)

The term γάρ at the beginning of 1 Corinthians 2:10 connects and continues the thought of 2:9.<sup>114</sup> 1 Cor 2:10a is the primary clause and fulfillment of 2:9, which is an allusion to Isaiah 64:4. God has revealed ἀποκαλύψω (*apokalypso*), meaning “to cause something to be fully known, reveal, disclose, bring to light, make fully known” to his people his own thoughts and plans, which are higher than man's (Isa 55:89).<sup>115</sup> The unveiling of the mind of Christ and revelation to man has finally arrived. It is a manifestation of deity.<sup>116</sup> This revelation is directly from God to man, made known by the Holy Spirit (Matt 11:25; Luke 10:21; 1 Cor 2:10; Eph 3:5; Phil 3:15).<sup>117</sup> Balz brings another connotation here of what this revelation does. “The opening up of a reality which is by its very nature veiled.”<sup>118</sup> The veil had been torn. A central theme throughout Scripture is man's inability to be faithful to God due to his mindset being fixed on the things of this world rather than the things of God, veiling his mind and understanding as he became like the idols he worshiped—blind and deaf—until the Holy Spirit gave understanding and revealed the mind of Christ. The things of God are ultimately God's thoughts, which are not available to his people unless God reveals them through his Word, his Spirit, and his Son. Paul masterfully compares and contrasts the things of God versus the things of man. Only the Spirit of

---

<sup>114</sup> Ibid., 122.

<sup>115</sup> *BDAG*, s.v. “ἀποκαλύψω,” 112.

<sup>116</sup> Albrecht Oepke, “Καλύπτω,” *TDNT* 3:556–593.

<sup>117</sup> S. T. Bloomfield, *GELNT* (London: Longmans, Green, 1840), 37.

<sup>118</sup> Balz, “ἀποκαλύπτω,” *EDNT* 1:130.

God knows God's thoughts and is able to reveal "the deep things of God."<sup>119</sup> This Spirit of God is the same Spirit of Christ (Rom 8:9), the Spirit of the Lord and the Holy Spirit—there is no discernable difference.<sup>120</sup> "Only the Spirit of God is able to comprehend and explicate the things of God."<sup>121</sup>

### The Thoughts of God Appealed (1 Cor 2:11)

Paul elaborates on v 10 in 1 Corinthians 2:11 by using logic to help persuade the church at Corinth. Just as no one else can know the inner thoughts of someone else, no one can know the thoughts of God except the Spirit of God.<sup>122</sup> The analogy Paul uses here is a principle in Greek philosophy and in Alexandrian Judaism of "like knows like," common in the first-century Graeco-Roman world. Paul's explanation attributes complete deity to the Spirit.<sup>123</sup> Since God is Spirit, Paul's thinking on utilizing the term Spirit is not a separate part of God, but fully God.<sup>124</sup> Whereas the "spirit of man" refers to his mind or understanding of the things of man.<sup>125</sup> Once again, an interplay of the term "knowledge" seems possible as Paul differentiates between what man knows (οἶδεν) about the things of man versus what man knows (ἔγνωκεν) of the things of

---

<sup>119</sup> Thomas R. Schreiner, *1 Corinthians: An Introduction and Commentary*, TNTC (Westmont, IL: InterVarsity Press, 201), 1698f.

<sup>120</sup> Ellis, *1 Corinthians*, 121.

<sup>121</sup> Schreiner, *1 Corinthians*, 1698e.

<sup>122</sup> Mark Taylor, *1 Corinthians*, NAC 28 (Nashville, TN: B&H, 2014), 92.

<sup>123</sup> Leon Morris, *The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians: An Introduction and Commentary*, TNTC 7 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985), 57.

<sup>124</sup> Ellis, *1 Corinthians*, 123.

<sup>125</sup> Ibid.

God. Lightfoot distinguishes between οἶδεν, as “direct knowledge” and ἔγνωκεν, meaning inferential knowledge.<sup>126</sup>

### The Message Congealed (1 Cor 2:12)

The message from the Spirit cannot be understood through human means. One must be perfect to understand the perfect Word of God, which is not possible with man but is possible with the Spirit of God, who can renew the mind of man. Paul instructs the church at Corinth on the goal of being perfect but not by their definition of perfect, which is steeped in the human ego, for those who are perfect are those who are truly spiritual, who have received (λαμβάνω (*lambanō*) the spirit of God and who can understand εἰδῶμεν (*eidōmen*) the things of God. Being perfect is depicted in the term πνευματικός (*pneumatikós*), the opposite of being a ψυχικός (*psychikos*), which means to be resistant to thoughts and revelation from the Spirit of God.<sup>127</sup> Paul’s reference to the “spirit of the world” is thought to represent the spirit of human wisdom, which is alienated from God, in contrast to the “Spirit that is from God.”<sup>128</sup> Believers are identified by a renewed mind that is evidence of having received the Spirit and the presence of the Spirit being evident (Rom 8:15; Gal 3:2, 14). The purpose of this mind renewal through the

---

<sup>126</sup> Ibid., 123–24. For more on the discussion of alternation between the two verbs γινώσκω and οἶδα, see the section “Christ Came that We Might Know Him” and its footnotes.

<sup>127</sup> “An identification of the perfect with all those who have come to faith in Christ would correspond to a Jewish background for the term τέλειος (*teleos*). In the OT (Gen 6:9; 2 Sam 22:24; Job 1:1; Ps 15:2; 18:24; Prov 11:5), as well as in Qumran (IQS 2:2; 4:22; IQH 9:36) and in Jewish wisdom literature (Sir 39:24; 44:17) תָּמִים (*tāmîm*) is used for someone who is righteous.” Grindheim, “Wisdom for the Perfect,” 705. This term “perfect” pertains to not lacking any moral quality. *L&N* s.v. “τέλειος,” 1:746.

<sup>128</sup> Ellis, *1 Corinthians*, 124.



gift of the Spirit is the ability of believers to understand the inheritance that is theirs in Christ and to rightly interpret God's Word.<sup>129</sup>

### The Spiritual Things Unsealed (1 Cor 2:13)

Using comparison again between the wisdom of man and the wisdom of God, Paul reveals that the interpretation of the Scriptures is dependent upon having this new mind.<sup>130</sup> Paul's use of the adjective πνευματικὰ (*pneumatika*), which represents undefined spiritual things, asserts that understanding spiritual things is not possible for unbelievers.<sup>131</sup> Misinterpretation is the outcome of mindsets fixed on the world and not fixed on the Spirit. Regeneration is required to be able to divide the Word of God rightly. Although unbelievers can have some understanding, only through the influence of the Spirit of God can they recognize the influence of the world that has fooled them and receive spiritual things (πνευματικὰ).<sup>132</sup> Schreiner notes that Paul's emphasis on the Spirit is notable in the Greek with Paul's overt emphasis on employing the word "spirit" three times in a remarkable manner: *pneumatōs*, *pneumatikōis*, *pneumatika*, driving home the point that the wisdom of God does not originate from human wisdom, but only by the Spirit.<sup>133</sup> The detached words πνευματικοῖς, πνευματικὰ, and συγκρίνοντες in 1 Corinthians 2:13 are difficult to construe, but have the sense of being united

---

<sup>129</sup> Schreiner, *I Corinthians*, 1698f.

<sup>130</sup> Louw and Nida state that the term συγκρίνω rendered as interpret (ESV), "means to explain, primarily by means of comparison—'to explain, to make clear.' πνευματικοῖς πνευματικὰ συγκρίνοντες 'we explain spiritual truths by means of spiritual matters' 1 Cor 2:13. The expression πνευματικοῖς πνευματικὰ συγκρίνοντες in 1 Cor 2:13 is highly ambiguous and may mean, in addition to the rendering given here, 'we explain spiritual truths to those who have the Spirit' or 'we explain spiritual truths with words given by the Spirit.'" *L&N*, s.v. "συγκρίνω," 1:405.

<sup>131</sup> Van der Merwe, "Pauline Rhetoric and the Discernment of the Wisdom of God," 117.

<sup>132</sup> Richard L. Pratt, *I & II Corinthians*, HNTC 7 (Nashville, TN: B&H, 2000), 37.

<sup>133</sup> Schreiner, *I Corinthians*, 1698g.

with the Spirit and expounding revelations of the Spirit.<sup>134</sup> The spiritual person is united with Christ and, therefore, thinks like Christ.<sup>135</sup> Paul’s contrasting between the wisdom of the world and the wisdom of God demonstrates that godly wisdom is revealed and taught by the Spirit, who interprets spiritual things (wisdom) to spiritual people.<sup>136</sup> Once again, the point is driven home that man, left to his own devices, cannot interpret and live out the Word of God without mind renewal. The mindsets of the world will distract one from faithfully understanding the Word of God and cause one to miss the gospel and the blessing of walking in a relationship with God.

#### The Spirit Concealed (1 Cor 2:14)

The truths of God are concealed from ψυχικός, the natural man who relies on the wisdom of the world. This term ψυχικός is used in Jude 19 to describe those who are “devoid of the Spirit” and in James to depict earthly and demonic wisdom (Jas 3:15).<sup>137</sup> If those who are in Christ should choose to excel through sophistic rhetoric, they are choosing the rulers of this world over the Holy Spirit and unable to receive the gospel.<sup>138</sup> Paul uses two semantically related terms to employ his comparison: ἀνακρίνω (*anakrinō*) and συγκρίνω (*synkriō*). The Holy Spirit illumines the minds of believers so they are able to discern ἀνακρίνω (*anakrinō*). This term used

---

<sup>134</sup> Friedrich Büchsel, and Volkmar Hertrich, “Κρίνω,” *TDNT* 3:921–954.

<sup>135</sup> Büchsel, “Κρίνω,” *TDNT* 3:944.

<sup>136</sup> Van der Merwe points out that this comparing and contrasting illustrates that the human spirit is the same as the spirit of the world and is unspiritual. He further notes that Paul repeatedly makes these comparisons to reveal the counterfeit wisdom they have been leaning on, specifically contrasting the Spirit of God and the Spirit of the world in 1 Cor 2:4, 11, 12, 14, and 15. Van der Merwe, “Pauline Rhetoric and the Discernment of the Wisdom of God,” 120–121.

<sup>137</sup> Paul D. Gardner, *1 Corinthians*, ZECNT (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2018), 148.

<sup>138</sup> Grindheim, “Wisdom for the Perfect: Paul’s Challenge to the Corinthian Church,” 709.

in this verse means “of the power of discrimination, and the superiority, of the πνευματικός.”<sup>139</sup> The term συγκρίνω (*synkrinō*) only occurs in this verse and in 2 Corinthians 10:12, where it occurs twice and means to compare, and in 1 Corinthians 2:13, this term means to interpret.<sup>140</sup> The wisdom of God (mind of Christ) is concealed from those who are not in Christ. The Pauline hapax πνευματικῶς in 1 Corinthians 2:14 (also appears in Rev 11:8) and is significant in its emphasis on “prophetic discernment of the pneumatic.”<sup>141</sup> Discernment of God comes from the Holy Spirit, not from human wisdom.

#### Judgment Repealed (1 Cor 2:15)

Though having the mind of Christ enables one to understand the things of God, mindsets can trump that understanding when God’s people revert to worldly understanding. One’s judgment can easily become clouded when it is fixed on the wrong thing. The people Paul wrote to believed in the gospel and had the Holy Spirit, but Paul recognized their duplicity and the temptation to walk in the flesh rather than in the Spirit due to depending on the wisdom from their own minds or the surrounding culture rather than the Holy Spirit’s revelation.<sup>142</sup> Carnal mindsets prioritize one’s thoughts over God’s. This is ultimately unbelief because one is choosing to believe their perspective instead of God’s, and it is idolatry. Having the mind of Christ is the solution, but maintaining the mind of Christ is a discipline and a choice to rely on the Spirit rather than one’s own strength or flesh. God’s people have the ability to judge and

---

<sup>139</sup> Büchsel, “Ἀνακρίνω,” *TDNT* 3:944.

<sup>140</sup> Van der Merwe, “Pauline Rhetoric and the Discernment of the Wisdom of God,” 125.

<sup>141</sup> Ellis, *1 Corinthians*, 130.

<sup>142</sup> Pratt, *I & II Corinthians*, 47.

discern God’s Word rightly, but their spiritual senses need to be developed. Just as carnal mindsets operate according to one’s senses, one reaches maturity as they are able to subjugate the carnal senses and operate more in the spiritual senses as Christ did.<sup>143</sup>

#### A Mind Healed (1 Cor 2:16)

The mind of the Spirit is the mind of Christ. 1 Corinthians 2:16 confirms this mind of Christ Paul alluded to from Isa 40:13.<sup>144</sup> Viewing Isa 40:13 MT in parallel with Isa 40:13 LXX and 1 Cor 2:16, the key differences in terminology reveal the progression of the revelation of who has this mind of the Lord.

#### The Mind of the LORD

**Isa 40:13**  
MT  
תִּכְרֶה (*tāḵān*)

**Isa 40:13**  
LXX  
νοῦς

**1 Cor 2:16**  
NT  
νοῦς

**Rom 11:3**  
NT  
νοῦς<sup>145</sup>

Who has measured the Spirit of the LORD, or what man shows him his counsel?	For who has known the mind of the LORD so as to instruct him?	For who has known the mind of the Lord so as to instruct him? But we have the mind of Christ.	For who has known the mind of the Lord, or who has been his counselor?
---	---	---	--

<sup>143</sup> Van der Merwe, “Pauline Rhetoric and the Discernment of the Wisdom of God,” 126. Van der Merwe contends that Paul is leading his readers through the process of how one attains the mind of Christ and becomes a spiritual person. He notes that five events take place in a person to lead them to the mind of Christ. (1) The Holy Spirit reveals (ἀποκαλύπτω) (1 Cor 2:10); (2) The Holy Spirit teaches (διδάκτος) (2:13); (3) The Holy Spirit interprets (συγκρίνω) spiritual things (2:13–4); (4) The Holy Spirit enables the spiritual person to understand (εἰδῶμεν) (2:12); (5) The Holy Spirit enables the spiritual person to discern (ἀνακρίνω) (2:14), and then the spiritual person has the mind of Christ (νοῦς Χριστοῦ) (2:16).

<sup>144</sup> Keener notes that “Paul cites “The mind of the Lord” from Isa. 40:13 LXX, but the context of Paul’s own argument (1 Cor. 2:11–12) suggests that he is aware of the Hebrew reading in Isaiah, namely, “The Spirit of the Lord.” Keener, *The Mind of the Spirit*, 213.

<sup>145</sup> Florian Wilk, “Isaiah in 1 and 2 Corinthians,” in *Isaiah in the New Testament: The New Testament and the Scriptures of Israel*, ed. Steve Moyise and Maarten J.J. Menken (London: T & T Clark, 2005), 139–40.

1 Corinthians 2:16 is a quotation taken from Isa 40:13 LXX, which Paul cited again in Rom 11:34, which in the MT is rendered as “the Spirit of Yahweh.” Gardner notes that when Paul quotes from Isaiah 40:13 (LXX), he omits the middle clause of the verse, leaving “who” (ὅς) without an antecedent.<sup>146</sup> Originally applied to Yahweh, Paul applies it to Christ, and the “who” is now those who possess his Spirit.<sup>147</sup> Only the Spirit of God knows the mind of Christ (1 Cor 2:10-13), and the mind of Christ *is* the mind of Yahweh.<sup>148</sup> Paul’s parallel use of νοῦς for the term “mind” in this Scripture is different from his use of φρονέω for “mind” in Phil 2:5, which includes the functions of νοῦς, the thoughts, and mindset of Christ.<sup>149</sup> In 1 Corinthians 2:16, νοῦς provides a picture of the Spirit-filled mind of Christ and issues an invitation to share in the mind of Christ in the pursuit of unity.<sup>150</sup> Robert Jewett provides a perspective on the employment of *nous*:

*Nous* is a complex of thoughts and assumptions which can make up the consciousness of a person; it is quite different from a purely rational capacity from the power of judgment and decision, which the Greek idea presupposes it is a constellation of thoughts which is given in the gospel and as such it provides the basis for unity in the church.<sup>151</sup>

---

<sup>146</sup> Gardner, *1 Corinthians*, 149.

<sup>147</sup> Ibid.

<sup>148</sup> Ellis, *1 Corinthians*, 131.

<sup>149</sup> Paul uses two primary Greek words for the word “mind”: νοῦς (Rom 7:23; 12:2; 1 Cor 2:16; 14:14; Eph 4:23; Phil 4:7; Titus 1:15) which depicts a person’s intellect, reason, or semantic memory, and φρονέω (Phil 2:2, 5; 1 Cor 3:15, 19; 4:2) which includes the functions of νοῦς, such as the experiences and realities underlying and shaping the dispositions, worldviews, attitudes and character of an individual. Peter A. Guinther, “Μέλος, A Significant Anthropological Term in Understanding Rom 7:14–8:8” (PhD Diss., Regent University, 2019), 10. Additionally, other cognates convey varying aspects of cognition such as ἀνοήτως (Rom 8:6, 7, 27), meaning to set one’s mind.

<sup>150</sup> McIntosh, “Faith, Reason, and the Mind of Christ,” 135.

<sup>151</sup> Robert Jewett, *Paul’s Anthropological Terms: A Study of Their Use in Conflict Settings*, AGJU 10 (Leiden: Brill, 1971), 378. Paul’s variation on the use of anthropological terms creates some interpretive problems, similar to the OT variation of these terms, and he also fluctuates in the Hebraic versus Greek use of these terms,

The constellation of thoughts communicated through the life of Christ and the gospel is also communicated by a constellation of terms used canonically to illustrate the mechanics of righteous thinking.<sup>152</sup> The mind of Christ has been the goal of Yahweh from the beginning, that his children would be able to think on his level and know Him, able to rise above worldly mindsets and walk in a righteous mindset.

As Christ and the Father are one, God's people can be unified with God. If all who belong to Christ have the mind of Christ, what a picture of unity this is! Brown beautifully illustrates this unity, stating that to Paul, the mind of Christ is the ability to view reality through a spiritual matrix of reconciliation, service, unity, and humility.<sup>153</sup> Through Paul's use of the terms "wisdom," "spirit," and "mind," Paul seems to have been exploiting the gnostic use of these terms and revealing true wisdom, of which Jewett states that the progression from "Lord" (κύριος) to "Christ" (χριστός) in 1 Cor 2:16 connects true divine wisdom solely to the crucified Christ, rejecting the gnostic gospel of having transcendent wisdom.<sup>154</sup> False spirituality was exposed as the cross communicated God's plan, which is the key to the mind of God. Schrage notes that references to Christ in 1 Corinthians have been to Christ crucified; as Christ humbled

---

where the OT terms were heart, spirit, soul, and body, which Paul employs the Judaic dichotomous anthropology of body and spirit/soul in 1 Cor 7:34; 5:4; 2 Cor 7:1; and the Hellenistic trichotomy of body, soul, and spirit in 1 Thess 5:23 as well as differing anthropological terms in the NT of mind, conscience, inner/outer man. Ibid., 3. The semantic range of these anthropological terms also requires an understanding of the context. For instance, Paul uses terms like νοήματα (*noemata*) from νόημα, which is the result of the activity of the νοῦς, in the same manner as νοῦς for the word "minds" in 2 Cor 3:14, 4:4; 11:3, and Phil 4:7, but elsewhere used to denote the term "thoughts" or "devices" as in 2 Cor 10:5 and 2 Cor 2:11, respectively. Behm, "Νοῦς," *TDNT* 4:960. Jewett states that Paul has an implied synonymy in the anthropological terms of "spirit," "wisdom," and "mind" in 1 Cor 2:10–16. Jewett, *Paul's Anthropological Terms*, 377.

<sup>152</sup> See Appendix A for a review of some of the most significant terms involved in mindsets.

<sup>153</sup> Brown, *The Cross and the Human Transformation*, 138.

<sup>154</sup> Jewett, *Paul's Anthropological Terms*, 378.

himself, so his believers must, too.<sup>155</sup> Grindheim conveys this truth: “To be spiritual...is to have apprehended the word of the cross in such a way that it has transformed the entire existence of the believer into its image – to a cruciform life, a life characterized by self-sacrificing love, and where power is manifest through weakness.”<sup>156</sup>

This cruciform life is no longer characterized by the world but through the power of the cross, which is foolishness to the world. The mind of Christ is not simply an acquisition of truths but a completely new lens or cognitive framework in which to view reality where the spiritual reality trumps the physical; it is participation in the thoughts of Christ as imparted to the body of Christ. Hanse notes, “It is astonishing how seldom we find the phrase *πνεῦμα ἔχειν*. This is linked with the fact that the individual does not receive his own *πνεῦμα* as he has his own *νοῦς* but has a share in the one divine Spirit.”<sup>157</sup> The body of Christ participates in the mind of Christ individually and corporately. The mind of Christ is not just representative of God as an object of our minds, but God as “the actual life by which our minds are what they will have become.”<sup>158</sup> The long-awaited mind renewal is a transformation of one’s understanding of the mind, an expansion of the mind beyond the bounds of the reason known from the experience of individual existence. Paul does not think of “mind” as the natural capacity with which one is born nor as the product of education, but rather as a gift of the new eon . . . for this reason, it can be used in

---

<sup>155</sup> Wolfgang Schrage, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther (1 Kor 1: 1–6, 11)*, EKKNT 7/1 (Zurich: Benziger Verlag, 1991), 267. See 1 Cor 1:17, 23–24, 30; 2:2.

<sup>156</sup> Grindheim, “Wisdom for the Perfect,” 708–9.

<sup>157</sup> Hermann Hanse, “*Ἐχω*,” *TDNT* 2:816–832.

<sup>158</sup> Herbert McCabe, “Knowledge,” in *Thomas Aquinas: Summa Theologiae, Knowing and Naming God*, appendix 1, vol. 3, trans. Herbert McCabe (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1964), 100.

parallel with “spirit.”<sup>159</sup> Hanse notes that the statement, “But we have the νοῦς of Christ,” concludes a section that has primarily referred to the πνεῦμα, leading one to expect the mind of the Spirit, but Paul is influenced by Isa 40:13 and equating κύριος with Christ, he writes νοῦς which means “mind” or “disposition.”<sup>160</sup> The *nous Christou* is a synthesis and conflation of several traditions: the LXX, Greek philosophy, and Paul’s unique rhetoric in which Paul’s idea of νοῦς is a spirit-inspired mindset.<sup>161</sup>

The arrival of the mind of Christ is not temporary. The term ἔχω (*echo*) has a wide semantic range, but in this particular verse and context, ἔχειν is most often utilized with abstract terms such as spiritual gifts and powers and refers to the Christian concept of “having,” or possession of salvation.<sup>162</sup> The one indwelt by the Spirit begins to think the thoughts of God.<sup>163</sup> Whereas the Greek world speaks of having possession of one’s soul, the possession of spirit differentiates mankind from all other creatures where ψυχὴν ἔχειν means “to have life within oneself,” “to be alive,” and [τὸν] νοῦν or λόγον ἔχειν means “to have understanding,” “to possess the power of thought,” “to be rational.”<sup>164</sup> Therefore, to have the mind of Christ is an eternal position that implies that those who have received the mind of Christ can now manifest Christ to the world and bear his likeness and thoughts. Though the mind of Christ is permanently given, it is also a mindset that God’s people can drift from and must return to in order to rightly

---

<sup>159</sup> Hanse, “Ἐχω,” *TDNT* 2:820.

<sup>160</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>161</sup> Kenneth Mmuoebonam, “*Nous Christou* and Communal Transformation: A Rhetorical and Literary Reading of 1 Cor 2: 16” (PhD diss., Boston College, School of Theology and Ministry, 2017), 2.

<sup>162</sup> Hanse, “Ἐχω,” *TDNT* 2:818.

<sup>163</sup> Pratt, *I & II Corinthians*, 47.

<sup>164</sup> Hanse, “Ἐχω,” *TDNT* 2:818.



divide the Word of God and walk faithfully with God. Schweizer stated that “As a substance of the soul (πνεῦμα) can be the seat and agent of the higher intellectual and spiritual functions. But unlike ψυχή, φρόνησις, λόγος or νοῦς, (πνεῦμα) cannot be the true subject of these.”<sup>165</sup> The Spirit indwells man, yet the free will of man can still quench the Spirit (1 Cor 14:32; 1 Thess 5:19–21). Hanse depicts how this life in the mind of Christ is having a part in the body of Christ. “A single word, “Spirit,” pervades the whole, and the understanding of the individual is simply a part or emanation or manifestation of this one Spirit. Instead of being said to have νοῦς or λόγος, man is now said to have a part (μετέχειν) in them.”<sup>166</sup>

### **The Mind of Christ: The *Teleos* of Life**

Biases, presuppositions, and preunderstandings can inhibit faithful interpretation of Scripture, but the presupposition of mindsets formed from the cognitive fabric of the surrounding culture is covert and prevents accurate interpretation of the Scriptures, often without an awareness of the person ascribing to worldly mindsets. No one is capable of faithfully interpreting the Scriptures without God’s Spirit enabling them to understand. Scripture interprets Scripture hinging on illumination from the Holy Spirit and theological presuppositions that Jesus and the apostles demonstrated in their interpretations of the OT.<sup>167</sup> Ellis describes those who

---

<sup>165</sup> Schweizer, “Πνεῦμα, Πνευματικός,” *TDNT* 6:358.

<sup>166</sup> Hanse, “Ἐχω,” *TDNT* 2:818.

<sup>167</sup> Beale mentions five presuppositions that were a part of the NT writer’s approach to interpretation (1) assumption of *corporate solidarity* or *representation* (Israel’s ethnic identity is an example of this, which was a blind spot in their interpretation, (2) Christ is viewed as true Israel and as the church in the NT. (3) History is sovereignly planned by God. (4) The age of eschatological fulfillment is met in Christ. (5) Scripture interprets Scripture. G. K. Beale, *Handbook on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament: Exegesis and Interpretation* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2012), 96.

have received the Holy Spirit and consequently have the mind of Christ as “pneumatics.”<sup>168</sup> The hidden wisdom of God is available to those who share in the mind of Christ through the Holy Spirit. Christ is the *teleos* of life, and the Holy Spirit is the agent of mind renewal—the Spirit of the mind. In 1 Corinthians 2:6 is a picture of the goal for every Christian to be mature in the faith. Both the terms τέλειος (*teleos*), which means “perfect,” and ἅγιος (*hagios*), which means “holy,” point to the divine ethical character that is the goal of those who are in Christ. The term ἅγιος refers to the corporate body of Christ, whereas τέλειος represents individual Christians; though Paul notes that perfection is a continual goal not achievable on this earth (Phil 3:12, 15).<sup>169</sup> Perfection in Christ is not like perfection in the world. Evidence of maturity (τέλειος) in Christ is connected to the humble admission that one lacks perfection.<sup>170</sup> Repentance unlocks the mindsets that shackle the mind of man. The Spirit is the agent doing the renewing and the perfecting. The mind of Christ is the goal, not the means, synonymous with the wisdom of God, illustrating metaphorically what it means to follow after Christ and think like Christ through the inner workings of the Holy Spirit.<sup>171</sup> The mind of Christ is symbolic of the mindset of Christ,

---

<sup>168</sup> Ellis notes that “In I Cor 2:6–16, a proem-type midrash ... (Paul) argues that certain believers are given a gift of divine wisdom (12:8), a prophetic endowment that enables them to speak ‘the wisdom that has been hidden in a mystery’ (2:7) and, indeed, ‘to know (εἰδῶμεν) all mysteries’ (13:2; cf. 2:12) because ‘God has revealed (ἀπεκάλυψε) them to us through the Spirit’ (2:10). They are called pneumatics (2:13, 15; 12:1 ff.), a term that is probably equivalent to ‘man of the Spirit’ in Hos 9:7, that is, a prophet (14:37). As recipients and transmitters of divine mysteries and of wisdom, they are the ‘mature’ (τελείους) believers who ‘have the mind of Christ’ (2:16) and who rightly interpret (οὐκ ἔχουσιν) the things of the Spirit to others (2:6, 13), expounding the Scripture and affirming or testing (διακρίνειν) the exposition of other prophets (14:29, 37). Such a pneumatic interpreter of the word of God is best exemplified by Paul himself.” E. Earle Ellis, *The Old Testament in Early Christianity: Canon and Interpretation in the Light of Modern Research* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019), 119.

<sup>169</sup> Ellis, “True and False Wisdom (1:10–4:21),” 113.

<sup>170</sup> Grindheim, “Wisdom for the Perfect: Paul’s Challenge to the Corinthian Church,” 706.

<sup>171</sup> Van der Merwe, “Pauline Rhetoric and the Discernment of the Wisdom of God,” 118.

which was marked by obedience, humility, and no longer living for oneself (2 Cor 5:15).<sup>172</sup> The spiritual person, which Paul dubs with the term πνευματικός (1 Cor 2:15; 14:37; Gal 6: 1), is the expectation for those who are in Christ.

### **Conclusion: The Mind of Christ: A New Way of Life**

When one tries to comprehend the mind of Christ pragmatically, it is an elusive pursuit. The mind of Christ is not obtained by a historical hunt or by efforts of the flesh. The mind of Christ is only obtained through the Spirit, and it is a continual pursuit. Paul's indicative and imperative statements about the possession of the mind of Christ keep us intently looking to be more like Jesus, for the will of the flesh is to drift into thinking on the things of man rather than the things of God. Those who have inherited the Spirit of God within themselves must seek to exhibit the Holy Spirit—the Spirit of Christ—to the world (Rom 8:9; 1 Cor 3:16; Gal 4:6; 1 Pet 1:11). The Spirit within reveals the word and thoughts of God so God's people can represent Christ to the world.

The mind of Christ is apparent in God's people by the manner in which one speaks and acts; what flows from one's mind/heart. Christ did not seek his own glory and chose to humbly serve the people he created, though he is king of heaven. Christ pursued and loved the Father wholeheartedly. So it is with those who are "Christ"-ians. Those who are in Christ are to look like Christ. Looking to the words and works of Christ reveals his way of thinking to his people. Through the Holy Spirit, one can think, look, and behave like Christ! What a true miracle this is—for the unholy to be clothed in Christ's righteousness and then to be given understanding from God. Those who have the mind of Christ speak and exemplify other-worldly heavenly

---

<sup>172</sup> Ibid.

wisdom that the world cannot understand. They rely on the words of God rather than the words of men. This mind of Christ is a new way of life—a new paradigm and portal to thinking higher than one’s own thoughts—wrought by the Spirit and gained by the will of man, who chooses to accept this gift and simultaneously pursue the mind of Christ. In the next chapter, the significance of the mindset (φρονέω) of Christ and the pervasive use of φρονέω and its cognates will further demonstrate how the mind of Christ is lived out.

## CHAPTER FIVE: THE SIGNIFICANCE OF ΦΡΟΝΕΩ AND ITS COGNATES

### Introduction

As the disciples spread the good news of salvation far and wide, the message of a new heart for God's people was masterfully communicated through familiar terms to the Judaic and Hellenistic cultures. These terms were transformed into a mighty tool in the hands of the Apostle Paul, revealing the new mindset God's people could have through the Holy Spirit. Through Paul's use of φρονέω, its cognates, and a constellation of other connected cognitive and anthropological terms, Paul shapes a new theological anthropology and understanding that conveys the struggle in man's inner being and provides the means to walk in the Spirit. Paul laid a theology using terms from the cultural framework but with a new function to reveal the need for mind renewal to evoke a return to Yahweh. Paul's use of φρονέω and cognates differs from its historical use and was a polemic to its prolific use in the Greco-Roman culture. Paul pointed to a whole new way of thinking that did not rely on the philosophies of the world but on the Spirit. Using an array of cognitive terms more than any other NT writer to communicate a message about mindsets that was both theological and ethical, Paul revealed the significance of anthropological terms in conveying the role that cognition and the πνεῦμα-σάρξ Pauline concept plays in man's inner and outer being. Through an examination of the use of φρονέω, its cognates, and other cognitive terminology throughout the biblical corpus, extrabiblical primary literature, and an exposition of Romans 8:5–14, the significance, purpose, and impact of these terms is evident.

### Φρονέω (*Phroneó*) and its Cognates throughout the Canon

Martin Luther wrote, “It is impossible for a human heart, without crosses and tribulations, to think upon God.”<sup>1</sup> Paul’s use of the φρήν word group shows the inner wrestling of man to think righteously and reveals that transformation of the heart is not just achieved through man’s attempt at a cognitive change. Exploiting the wisdom of the age to communicate the wisdom of God, Paul masterfully connects each term in the φρήν family to lead God’s people to revelation. It is through the Holy Spirit that the heart of man is affected. The Pauline concept of mind renewal is linked to the cognitive functioning of believers. The new way of thinking is dependent upon the Holy Spirit, but one’s cognitive abilities do play a role in mind renewal. The heart of Paul’s message was that this renewal was both theologically and ethically centered.<sup>2</sup> The divine initiative of mind renewal is married to the ethical responsibility of those in Christ, as shown in the indicative and imperative benchmark statements by Paul that are central to the basic structure of Pauline ethics throughout the Pauline corpus.<sup>3</sup> This renewal is grounded in a work of God (indicative) effectuated by the response of man as guided by the Holy Spirit (imperative).<sup>4</sup> In

---

<sup>1</sup> As translated in Martin Luther, *The Table Talk of Martin Luther*, ed. Thomas S. Kepler (New York: World Publishing, 1952), 283. As we have explored the anthropological variance of terms in prior chapters, the term heart will be used metaphorically to refer to the whole being as the spiritual organ that encompasses the metaphorical depiction of the heart, mind, and soul as one.

<sup>2</sup> John Lewis depicts Paul’s discussion of the renewed mind as “theo-ethical reasoning,” a new way of thinking that encompasses theological and moral reasoning to illustrate the divine and human elements of the divine-human partnership revealed in Jesus Christ. John G. Lewis, *Looking for Life: The Role of “Theo-Ethical Reasoning” In Paul’s Religion*, JSNTSup 291 (London: T & T Clark, 2005), 1. Bond contends that mind renewal is not a passive experience, and the work of mind renewal is not completed when one accepts Christ, but it is accomplished through the Holy Spirit and the believer’s conscious, theological, and ethical reflection. James Nicholas Bond, “Renewing the Mind: Paul’s Theological and Ethical Use of *Phronēma* and Cognates in Romans and Philippians” (PhD diss., University of Aberdeen, 2005), 29.

<sup>3</sup> Dennison notes that “The Pauline construction of the indicative and the imperative plays a fundamental role in the structure of his eschatological ethics.” William D. Dennison, “Indicative and Imperative: The Basic Structure of Pauline Ethics,” *CTJ* 14 (1979): 56–57.

<sup>4</sup> Paul V. Furnish, *Theology and Ethics in Paul*, NTL (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2009), 250.

essence, Christians are renewed through an “ethical process” whereby they “actually become what they are in principle.”<sup>5</sup> Paul’s employment of the term φρονέω is couched in indicative and imperative statements that convey mind renewal is much more significant than an individual mindset. It pertains to the whole being and impacts one’s whole life and eternity. However, unique to the passage of Romans 8:5–14, Paul uses seventeen indicatives and no imperatives. The lack of imperatives is striking and elucidates the fact that Paul intentionally demonstrates that the act of mind renewal is performed by the Holy Spirit and not the Christian. The profound influence of terms emanating from the φρήν family is in its extrabiblical and biblical use and in its broad connection to a host of other cognitive terms that reveal man’s need and God’s plan for renewal.<sup>6</sup> Exploring the theological and paraenetic settings of each cognitive term Paul employed

---

<sup>5</sup>D. Hermann Jacoby, *Neutestamentliche Ethik* (Königsberg: Thomas & Oppermann, 1899), 316–17. The English translation is as it appears in Furnish, *Theology and Ethics*, 248. The indicative and imperative framework of Paul is not a contradictory concept but a tension that is evident as the Holy Spirit moves in man’s carnal mindset to think like God. The promised renewal has eschatological overtones of the renewal yet to come in an “already but not yet” paradigm. Dennison notes that “the union of the indicative and the imperative cannot be dialectical and distinctively existential as Bultmann understood, because the Holy Spirit brings to bear upon believers a new covenant consciousness which is eschatologically conceived in the actual redemptive-historical work of God the Father through His Son—Jesus Christ.” Dennison, “Indicative and Imperative,” 75. For discussion beyond Dennison, consider Michael Parsons, “Being Precedes Act: Indicative and Imperative in Paul’s Writing,” *EvQ* 60 (1988): 99–127. Deidun further elaborates on the conjoining of the indicative and imperative in the renewal process: “Here indicative and imperative are conjoined: the Christian’s “new will,” constantly flowing from the activity of the Spirit, is the divinely wrought indicative which carries within itself the Christian imperative. There can be nothing more “indicative,” and, at the same time, nothing more “imperative,” than the activity of the Spirit creating and sustaining my own personal instinct.” See J. T. Deidun, “New Covenant Morality in Paul,” *Analecta Biblica* 89 (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1981), 79–83.

<sup>6</sup> Instances of the φρήν word group occur across the canon, predominantly in 1–2 Kgs and the wisdom books in the Septuagint and in Pauline texts in the NT. The Lexham Analytical Lexicon of the Septuagint cites sixty-five occurrences of φρόνησις. *LALLXX* s.v. “φρόνησις.” There are also fifteen occurrences of φρονέω (*LALLXX* s.v. “φρονέω,” twelve occurrences of φρήν (*LALLXX* s.v. “φρήν”), and two occurrences of φρόνημα in the Septuagint alone. *LALLXX* s.v. “φρόνημα.” In the NT, Paul utilizes the φρήν word group 26 of the 29 occurrences; the other three occur in the gospels and Acts. Extra-biblically, the φρήν word group is used prolifically. Where καρδία is the most significant cognitive term in the canon, φρήν and θυμός were the most widely used in secular Greek literature, with θυμός occurring over 700 times in Homeric works and φρένες alone from the φρήν word group occurring 343 times in the Homeric epics. Boban Dedović, “‘Minds’ in ‘Homer’: A Quantitative Psycholinguistic Comparison of the Iliad and Odyssey; or Lexical Frequency Analyses of Homeric noos (νόος), thymos (θυμός), psyche (ψυχή), phrenes (φρένες), prapides (πρᾶπίδες), kardia (κᾶρδίᾱ), kradie (κρᾶδίη), ker (κῆρ), and etor (ἤτορ), in Contrast to Alleged English-Equivalents Amongst Seventeen Dual-Work Translators” (PhD diss., University of Maryland, 2021), 14–17.

from the φρήν family to a constellation of other cognitive terms, coupled with the background information of each context, one is able to see the significance of these terms in mindset renewal.

### The Φρήν Family

Terms from the root φρήν (*phrēn*) and its derivatives are significant throughout ancient Greek literature, the Septuagint, and the New Testament.<sup>7</sup> The connected terms have nuanced meanings depending on the varied contexts, though the common rendering depicting one's cognitive functions as pertaining to one's mindset is evident. There is not one single Hebrew term for φρήν and its cognates, which leads to another host of connected terms in other Hebrew terms and their Greek parallels. The term נָחַם correlates solely to Origen's psychosomatic range of φρήν, encompassing the mental, emotional, and spiritual aspects of a person and their influence on one's physical well-being.<sup>8</sup> The term φρήν has the following cognates together: φρήν, ἄφρων, ἀφροσύνη, φρονέω, φρόνημα, φρόνησις, and φρόνιμος.<sup>9</sup> There are thirty unique words included

---

<sup>7</sup> Though καρδιά is the most frequent anthropological cognitive term in Scripture, instances of καρδιά occur under 60 times in the Homeric epics, while the φρήν family and cognates occur over 340 times, second only to θυμός (*thymos*) with over 750 occurrences. However, it bears mentioning that both φρήν and θυμός were rendered as the heart in many instances, with instances in English being heart (436+), soul (224+), mind (117+), and stomach (18+). *Ibid.*, 41–42.

<sup>8</sup> Georg Bertram, “Φρήν, Φρονέω, Φρόνημα, Φρόνησις, Φρόνιμος,” *TDNT* 9:220–36. In Origen's theological framework, a holistic view of the heart (φρήν) was theologically significant and shaped his interpretation of biblical passages. An example of this is in Origen's understanding of the heart and how it influenced his interpretation of Song of Songs. In his allegorical interpretation of this biblical book, Origen saw the love relationship between the bride and the bridegroom as symbolizing the mystical union between Christ and the soul. Origen emphasized the role of the heart in experiencing this spiritual union, portraying the longing of the soul for intimacy with God as a deep yearning of the heart. This interpretation reflects Origen's belief in the heart as the seat of spiritual longing and union with the divine. Speaking in his commentary, Song of Songs 1:2, Origen discusses the term heart and how it applies to the passage. “The ground of the heart is, then, as we had begun to say, denoted in the Holy Scripture by a variety of terms... let us understand the ground of the heart as being denoted by the breasts in the passage before us...for just as it seems fitting to speak of their ‘heart’ with regard to those of whom the Lord says that they shall see God...again in respect of the priests the words ‘little breast’ and ‘shoulder’ are used with mystical meaning: so in this present passage, where the behavior and conversation of lovers is described, I think that this same seat of the heart is very happily called ‘breasts.’” Origen, *The Song of Songs Commentary and Homilies*, trans. R. P. Lawson (New York, NY: Newman Press, 1956), 64–65.

<sup>9</sup> Bertram, “Φρήν,” *TDNT* 9:220.



in this semantic range alone, as well as hundreds of related terms, of which eighty-five anthropological and cognitive terms have been selected and included in Appendix A, all pertaining to one's mindset, which is within one's metaphorical heart. This constellation of terms points the way to yet further vast arrays of cognates pointing man to his need to think rightly. Paul employs the φρήν word group and cognates in a unique way with theological and ethical significance, but the use of these cognates in Greek literature and the LXX have an established classical meaning that informs Paul's use. While the φρήν family alone may not be as prolific in Scripture as some other Greek words, its connected terms and its usage are significant in conveying the deeper aspects of human nature, spirituality, and the relationship between the mind, heart, and soul.<sup>10</sup> Paul's use of φρήν and cognates is unique in Scripture and seems to be used perhaps polemically to make a theological statement to the Greeks who used this family of terms to depict one's mindset according to worldly thinking. It is not one's intellect that provides man's needed rescue, but the Spirit that brings transformation upon the mind of man.

### **Φρήν (*phrēn*)**

The term φρήν represents the center of an individual. Rendered as "heart," φρήν encompasses the cognitive process and is defined as "the process of careful consideration, thinking, or understanding."<sup>11</sup> The term φρήν also represents the anthropological metaphorical organs of the heart, mind, or soul as the seat of feelings and passions, depending on context.<sup>12</sup> Of

---

<sup>10</sup> See Appendix G: Anthropological Considerations for discussion.

<sup>11</sup> BDAG, s.v. "φρήν," 1065.

<sup>12</sup> *MGS*, s.v. "Φρήν." This term was also understood as a common term by Augustine physiologically and used metaphorically to convey one's mindset woes. The term phrenitis was derived from the Greek word φρόνησις and meant "disturbance of the intellect or mind." According to Wright, "Augustine's diagnosis of phrenitis, in particular, is an iterative rhetorical strategy that uses technical, medical knowledge to strengthen and expand the

particular significance, the Cambridge definition of the term φρήν is illuminating. “Area of the body which surrounds the heart...physical center of the body, heart, core ... emotional center of the body, breast, heart (as the seat of courage, anger, emotions, and impulses.”<sup>13</sup> The *CGL* also lists an array of cognitive functions pertaining to mindset, including disposition, outlook, intention, and direction of one’s thoughts, inclination, and will.<sup>14</sup> The term φρήν is not just rendered as a cognitive term applying to the mind, but it can also be rendered as the heart itself, for they are one and the same, referring to the center of the living being.<sup>15</sup> In φρήν, all the inner workings and concepts of the heart are tied together.

In the plural (φρένες) is perhaps a missing piece in the anthropological debate. In *LXX*, the plural appears primarily in wisdom literature, offering a distinction from other anthropological terms.<sup>16</sup> One can view it as “the parts about the heart” or a container that holds all the aspects of one’s cognition together, clearing up the confusion and separation between the mind and the heart as they are connected together.<sup>17</sup> The concept was seen as having both

---

conceptual system implied by the conventional metaphor sin is sickness (of the soul).” Jessica Wright, “Preaching Phrenitis: Augustine’s Medicalization of Religious Difference,” *J ECS* 28 (2020): 526.

<sup>13</sup> *CGL* 2, s.v. “φρήν,” 1478.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, 1478–79.

<sup>15</sup> The primary reference to the heart is to its figurative use connoting the emotional, spiritual, and cognitive makeup of a person, which shapes and is part of one’s mindset if not also representing the mindset itself.

<sup>16</sup> See Daniel 4:34; 36, 3 Macc 4:16; 5:47. There are also seven instances in Proverbs (6:32; 7:7; 9:4; 11:12; 12:11; 15:21; 18:2; 24:30). The plural use of φρένες by the translators of the Septuagint is instructive and revelatory, emphasizing the multifaceted nature of the inner being. Though the singular and plural forms of φρήν represent the mind or heart, the plural use illustrates the complex and yet holistic view of one’s inner being.

<sup>17</sup> *LSJ*, s.v. “φρένες,” 871. The term φρήν is distinct in that it is depicted as a container housing man’s inner being. An example of this is seen in Greek literature, in which the cognitive processes in Aethon’s speech are primarily framed using cognitive metaphors. Siobhán Marie Privitera, “Brain, Body, and World: Cognitive Approaches to the Iliad and the Odyssey” (PhD diss., The University of Edinburgh, 2016), 118. In line 236, Aethon tells Penelope to “cast” information in her φρήν, rendered also as “lay it to heart”: “ἄλλο δέ τοι ἐρέω, σὺ δ’ ἐνὶ φρεσὶ βάλλεο σῆσιν” (Homer, *Od.* 2:250–251 [Murray]).

intangible and physical terms.<sup>18</sup> The θυμός (*thymos*), pictured in Homeric literature as the vital force (soul, spirit, as the principle of life) as well as the heart or mind itself, is contained in the φρένες.<sup>19</sup> Different terms, all being referred to as the heart, are not problematic, for they are all part of one's inner being, and the heart is the chief referent for all aspects of man's cognition. The phrase "the sum of the parts is greater than the whole meaning" seems to fit here. Each anthropological term conveys an aspect of the heart that is more informative than simply saying "heart." The term φρένες has a psychological force that is evident in the Homeric literature as well as in the LXX text of Daniel 4:34. There the term φρένες is rendered as "understanding" in reference to the restoration of sanity of Nebuchadnezzar. The plural form of φρένες only occurs once in the NT, rendered as "matters of the mind" in 1 Corinthians 14:20; but in Plutarch and

---

<sup>18</sup> "The φρένες that contain the θυμός ... were probably conceived at once as the lungs and the locus of thought." Brian Jorge Bigio, "Saving the Mind": An Etymological Inquiry into the Cognitive-Behavioral Function of the Ancient Greek Value ΣΩΦΡΟΣΥΝΗ (*Sōphrosynē*)" (PhD diss., Stanford University, 2021), 77. Bigio notes the significance of making explicit the relationship between φρένες and ἔργα in Greek epics, which illustrates the significance of mindsets that ultimately lead to actions. *Ibid.*, 94. The term φρένες was applied to the midriff or diaphragm in the latter half of the fifth century by the Hippocratic school, and Plato in the *Timaeus* also did so. See also Richard Broxton Onians, *The Origins of European Thought about the Body, the Mind, the Soul, the World, Time, and Fate: New Interpretations of Greek, Roman and Kindred Evidence Also of Some Basic Jewish and Christian Beliefs* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 23–25. Onian notes that "the quality and condition of a man's φρένες determine or are the quality and condition of his mind," and ultimately one's actions." Onians, *The Origins of European Thought about the Body*, 23–25.

<sup>19</sup> Here see *LSJ*, s.v. "θυμός," 810 and Dedović, "Minds' in 'Homer,' 18. Various terms (νοῦς, θυμός, ψυχή, φρένες, πρᾶπίδες, καρδία) have overlapping semantic ranges in *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. They share the singular purpose of displaying the significance of the mind, which was viewed in accordance with Greek dualistic thinking, but these cognitive terms were also seen as impacting the entire being. The philosophical and psychological secular thought that cognition takes place in a container begins to unfold the mystery of the mind/heart connection. Marcinkowska-Rosół and Sellmer have observed that there is a sense of an inner space (heart) with cognitive items and their functions throughout the epics. Maria Marcinkowska-Rosół and Sven Sellmer, "The Mind as Container: A Study of a Metaphor in Homer and Hesiod with a Parallel Analysis of the Sanskrit Epics," *Mnemosyne* 75 (2021): 5. See, for example, this line from *Odyssey*: "Ah, dear child, how has this thought come (τοῦτο νόημα ἔπλετο) into your mind (φρεσὶ; φρένες)?" (Homer, *Od.* 2:72–73 [Murray]).

Philo, it is rendered in the realm of “thinking, judgment, or understanding,” where the cognates of mind (φρόνησις, φρονέω) also come into view.<sup>20</sup>

### **Φρονέω (*phronēō*)**

Where φρήν/φρένες depicts the cognitive center, the word φρονέω connotes setting one’s mind, and thoughts formed into a willful purpose.<sup>21</sup> The sense in this verb is to think the thoughts of and have one’s mind controlled by something.<sup>22</sup> This depiction of one’s will orienting and guiding one’s decisions, whether for carnal or spiritual intent, reveals that the mindset is crucial to walking with God. The term φρονέω occurs seven times in the LXX and twenty-nine times in the NT, where the term is used to communicate an array of aspects embedded in one’s mindset, exhibited by one’s outlook, frame of mind, disposition, character, and desire.<sup>23</sup> With only four of the occurrences in the LXX having a Hebrew counterpart, φρονέω is used in the LXX often to depict wisdom and understanding.<sup>24</sup> The Hebrew term for wisdom חָכְמָה (*chākhmah*) conveys this essential aspect of one’s mindset that it is to be grounded in biblical wisdom, not the wisdom of this world (Deut 32:29). Without godly wisdom, one’s mindset is fixed on the things of this

---

<sup>20</sup> Anthony C. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000), 1119–20.

<sup>21</sup> *LSJ*, s.v. “φρονέω,” 872.

<sup>22</sup> *CGEDNT*, s.v. “φρονέω,” 197.

<sup>23</sup> *CGL* 2, s.v. “φρονέω,” 1478–9. Φρονέω occurs 7x in the LXX (Deut 32:29; Est 8:12; Ps 94:8; Isa 44:18, 28; 56:10; Zech 9:2) and 26x in 20 v. in the NT (Matt 16:23; Mark 8:33; Acts 28:22; Rom 8:5; 11:20; 12:3; 14:6; 15:5; 1 Cor 13:11; 2 Cor 13:11; Gal 5:10; Phil 1:7; 2:2; 3:15; 4:2, 10; Col 3:2).

<sup>24</sup> In Deuteronomy 32:29, ἐφρόνησαν (*ephronēsan*) (from Φρονέω) is interpreted as “To be wise; have understanding.” Randall Tan and David A. deSilva, *LES* (Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2009), “Dt 32:29.” The definition to be wise from φρονέω is also found in Ps 93:8, and to think/set (φρονήσατε) one’s mind on God’s goodness in Wis 1:1. In Zech 9:2, the term ἐφρόνησαν (*ephronēsan*) means to think, have understanding, and in Isa 44:18 to think, be wise.

world and unable to interpret the Word of God or walk faithfully with God.<sup>25</sup> “The noun *chākhām*, whether used adjectivally or as a substantive, refers to a living being in the state of *chokhmāh*.”<sup>26</sup> In this sense, the mindset defines the person by how one relates to God.

### Φρόνημα (*phronēma*)

The noun φρόνημα (*phronēma*) connotes a mental approach toward life. Simply meaning “mindset,” φρόνημα was not a new term to Paul given its long history in Greek literature, but it occurs only four times in the NT, all of which are in Romans 8 (Rom 8:6 (2x), 7, 27), and two times in the OT (2 Macc 7:21; 13:9).<sup>27</sup> The noun φρόνημα is a depiction of what the mindset looks like; “a frame of thought, will, aspirations.”<sup>28</sup> But perhaps of more significance, the term also depicts the mind or spirit of a person and what one’s orientation is toward life.<sup>29</sup> In Greek literature, φρόνημα signifies a basic sense of an outlook that shapes one’s attitude, which can

---

<sup>25</sup> HALOT, s.v. “חכם,” 313–4. The roots בִּין (*bîn*) and יָדָה (*yādha*) are significantly similar in interpretation and meaning to חכם. In Deut 32:29 and Job 32:9, חכם and בִּין are parallel in referring to spiritual discernment. H.-P. Müller and M. Krause, “חכם,” in *TDOT*, 371. As a verb, חכם means to be or become wise. As an adjective, this term is rendered as “The pious and wise man who knows and observes the law.” (Ps 107:43; Prov 1:5; Job 15:2; Eccl 7:19; 2 Chr 2:11).

<sup>26</sup> Müller, “חכם,” *TDOT* 4:364–85.

<sup>27</sup> In 2 Maccabees 7:21, the term φρόνημα was utilized to describe a mindset that provided courage. After seeing seven sons killed by Antiochus, an unnamed mother describes them as “being filled (πεπληρωμένη) with noble (γενναίω) spirit/disposition or mindset (*phronēmati*).” Henry Barclay Swete, “2 Macc 7:21” in *The Old Testament in Greek: According to the Septuagint* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909), 3:681. Then, in 2 Maccabees 13:9, this mindset is contrasted with the mindset, mind, or spirit (φρονήμασι) of the king whose mindset has become barbarous (βεβαρβαρωμένος). This usage is in keeping with Philo’s use of the term to describe the philosopher Diogenes: “Thus, it was with the cynic philosopher Diogenes. So great and lofty was his spirit that when captured by robbers, who grudgingly provided him with the barest minimum of food, still remained unmoved by his present position and had no fear of the cruelty of those who held him in their power.” Philo, *Prob.* 9.78–79 [Colson]; cf. *Prob.* 9.22–23). Both Philo and Josephus use the term to describe Moses’s mindset (Philo, *On Moses* 6.352–353; *Jos. Ant.* 2.262–263). Josephus expands this to include the behavior of the Jewish people who “showed some spirit (*phronēmatos*) and objected to compulsion” (Josephus, *Ant.* 6.434–435 [Thackeray]) and a democrat filled with “liberal principles” (φρονήματός ἐλευθερίου) (Josephus, *J.W.* 4.358 [Thackeray]).

<sup>28</sup> *MCED*, s.v. “φρόνημα,” 1306.

<sup>29</sup> *MGS*, s.v. “φρόνημα.”

exhibit a variety of different manifestations, including faithfulness to God, ambition, pride or humility, and courage. The extensive extrabiblical and LXX Greek framework underscoring Paul's use of φρόνημα in Romans 8:6 reveals that the views and perspectives of non-believers are shaped by the carnal flesh σάρξ (*sarx*) rather than by the Spirit πνεῦμα (*pneuma*), which is reflected in their attitudes and subsequent actions. The BDAG defines φρόνημα as “The faculty of fixing one's mind on something, way of thinking, mindset ... with a focus on strong intention, aim, aspiration, or striving.”<sup>30</sup> Despite the rare use in the NT of φρόνημα, the relative infrequency of a term's employment in Scripture in contrast to extrabiblical texts does not mean its use is insignificant. This is attested to by the spiritual significance of this term and the vast employment of other related cognates and cognitive terms that shed light on the varied aspects and mechanics of thought. The significance of φρόνημα is found in the power one's thoughts have on one's relationship with God and the ability to navigate life through faith. The extrabiblical background of the terms in the φρήν family serves as a framework for their use in Scripture. The difference in how these terms are used in contrast to the surrounding culture is of the greatest significance.

Paul uses the term φρόνημα to convey the mindset of a person, whether they are “spiritually minded” (φρόνημα τοῦ πνεύματος) or “carnally minded” (φρόνημα τῆς σαρκός). John Owen masterfully presents the contrast of the two in his treatise *The Grace and Duty of Being Spiritually Minded*.<sup>31</sup> One is either led by the flesh, natural inclinations, or led by the

---

<sup>30</sup> Arndt, *BDAG*, s.v. “φρόνημα,” 1066. Liddell, Scott, and Jones define it as “thought, purpose, will.” *LSJ*, s.v. “φρόνημα,” 1956. The *Patristic Greek Lexicon* concurs and emphasizes the aspect of volition with its interpretation of φρόνημα: “A matter of will and choice.” *PGL*, s.v. “φρόνημα,” 1490. This word throughout the Old Testament speaks to the ideas of “reason, insight, and cleverness.” Bertram, “Φρόνημα,” *TDNT* 9:224.

<sup>31</sup> John Owen, *The Grace and Duty of Being Spiritually Minded: Declared and Practically Improved* (New York, NY: Robert Carter, 1844), 16.

Spirit. This choice determines one's outlook and mindset toward God and life and has implications for one's spiritual state. Owen notes that there is no middle state; one is either of the flesh or of the Spirit, with eternal consequences, though there are varying degrees within each mindset.<sup>32</sup> The carnal mind is ultimately at odds with God (Rom 8:7–9). The backdrop of φρήν terminology in the Greek literature is not insignificant but a means of illustrating the need for mind renewal. Lives torn apart by worldly thinking serves as a reminder that thinking according to the flesh or the world renders one as “carnally minded” (φρόνημα τῆς σαρκός). While having a mindset fixed on God's way of thinking renders one as “spiritually minded” (φρόνημα τοῦ πνεύματος).

### **Φρόνησις (*phronesis*)**

The term φρόνησις (*phronesis*) is the mentality or state of mind of an individual and is used extensively in the LXX, though the LXX subordinates φρόνησις to σοφία (*sophia*).<sup>33</sup> The cognate noun φρόνησις (*phronesis*) is more widely used in wisdom literature (Job, Proverbs, Wisdom of Solomon, Sirach) and in the accounts of Solomon and Daniel, rendering Hebrew terms depicting understanding or wisdom.<sup>34</sup> According to Owen, the term φρόνησις is “the principal power and act of the mind. It is its light, wisdom, prudence, knowledge, understanding,

---

<sup>32</sup> Owen, *Being Spiritual Minded*, 17.

<sup>33</sup> *CGL* 2, s.v. “φρόνησις,” 1479.

<sup>34</sup> The term φρόνησις occurs 59 times in the in the non-apocryphal Septuagint, often translated as “wisdom.” See Josh 5:1; 1 Sam 2:10; 1 Kgs 2:35; 3:28; 4:29, 30; 10:4, 6, 8, 23, 24; 11:41; Job 5:13; 17:4; Prov 1:2; 3:13, 19; 7:4; 8:1, 14; 9:6, 16; 10:23; 14:29; 16:16; 19:8; 24:5; 30:2; Isa 40:28; 44:19; Jer 10:12; Ezek 28:4; Dan 1:4, 17; 2:21, 23; 5:12. According to 1 Kgs 5:12, Yahweh gave Solomon discernment (φρόνησις) and very great wisdom σοφία (*sophia*) and volume of mind “like the sand that is by the sea.” A similar pattern of usage occurs with the adjective φρόνιμος (*phronimos*). According to Wis 6:24, “A sensible (φρόνιμος) king is the stability of a people.”

and discretion.”<sup>35</sup> It is distinguished from *διάνοια* or *σύνεσις*, which are more speculative, whereas *φρόνησις* has a “habitual frame” or tendency toward a mindset and a proclivity toward emotions.<sup>36</sup> This ability to have affection toward thoughts can lead to coveting things of this world or directing one’s intellect and heart toward the things of God. When used to describe the thoughts of God, this term confirms that mankind cannot know the *φρόνησις* of God, for “God’s *φρόνησις* is unsearchable (Isa 40:14, 28.)”<sup>37</sup> And yet through the Holy Spirit, one can know the mind of Christ.

Bertram notes that the employment of the noun *φρόνησις*, though rare, occurs in liturgically shaped texts of particular significance. “At Luke 1:17 *φρόνησις* comes after the quotation from Mal 3:2–3 as a parallel to the first half of the verse and perhaps in reconstruction of the original...to bring back the disobedient to the way of thought and the conduct of the righteous is the eschatological task of the forerunner.”<sup>38</sup> The employment of the *φρόνη* terminology poignantly highlights the need for mind renewal throughout the canon. The biblical texts featuring cognitive language are woven together to carry the significance of the message of mind renewal: without which, God’s people miss God, misinterpret his Word, and miss the mission God has for them.

---

<sup>35</sup> Owen, *Being Spiritual Minded*, 16.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>37</sup> Bertram, “*Φρόνησις*,” *TDNT* 9:225.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, 9:233.



## Φρονεῖν (*phronein*)

This term represents the action of thinking or setting one’s thoughts and the actual fruit of the cognition, the thoughts themselves. Both words, φρονεῖν (Rom 8:5) and φρόνημα (Rom 8:6) come from the same Greek root pertaining to the direction of the will, which encompasses all the faculties of the inner being.<sup>39</sup> Owen notes that φρονεῖν (*phronein*) is rendered to “think ... conceive and judge,” as well as to “set the affection.” “Nowhere doth φρονεῖν design a notional conception of things only, but principally the engagement of the affections unto the things which the mind apprehends.”<sup>40</sup> This is what drives the mindset—one’s affections or desires, which can become covetous. The term φρονεῖν connotes the act of setting one’s mind to be committed to one’s own thoughts.

### Paul’s Use of Other Key Cognitive Terms in NT and LXX

Paul’s intention of establishing one’s mindset as the key to a righteous walk with God with the ability to rightly understand the Word of God, is communicated through a host of terms that reveal different characteristics of mindsets.<sup>41</sup> Paul utilizes the anthropological terms

---

<sup>39</sup> Douglas J. Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans*, NICNT (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1996), 487.

<sup>40</sup> Owen, *Being Spiritual Minded*, 17. Owen lists three principles that are a part of setting one’s mind on the Spirit to be spiritually minded. “1) Exercise one’s mind by fixing one’s thoughts and meditations upon the things of the Spirit...2) The inclination, disposition, and frame of the mind are shaped by habits of relying on the Spirit rather than the flesh...3) The mind is complacent with satisfaction in the things of the Spirit, not preoccupied with the things of the flesh.” Ibid., 22. The significance of mindset cannot be overstated. Because the carnal mindset renders one under the power of death (Rom 8:6), this demonstrates the vitalness of the frame of mind one has. Owen, *Being Spiritual Minded*, 18–19.

<sup>41</sup> Terms like καρδιά, νοῦς, πνεῦμα, ψυχή, σὰρξ, σοφία, διάνοια, ἔννοια, σύνεσις, ἄνθρωπος and λογίζομαι are used to represent one’s mindset. Other terms like ἐπιθυμητής, αἴσθησις, βουλευώ, θέλω, and τίθημι show the inner workings of one’s will and what drives one’s mindset. Terms that depict the work of the Holy Spirit, such as ἀνανεώω, παλιγγενεσία, and τέλειος demonstrate the transformation of one’s mindset. Each term has its own cognates and labyrinth of terms connected to them. Due to space, below is an examination of a few terms to demonstrate the significance of how Paul used these terms theologically; additional terms are in Appendix A. It is important to note that though there is overlap in many of the terms, their unique interpretation takes place as Scripture interprets Scripture in each unique context. As Duvall noted, words such as καρδιά, ψυχή, σὰρξ, πνεῦμα, νοῦς, and φρήν have related meanings listed in Louw and Nida’s semantic domain 26: Psychological Faculties, to

sometimes in parallel to convey the whole being. He also uses them distinctly from one another to reveal unique aspects of each term in the process of mind renewal.

### Καρδία (*kardia*)

The heart is the primary metaphorical vessel that contains all the cognitive, emotive, and spiritual aspects of a human being. The vast employment of καρδία in the LXX and NT displays that this is the most significant anthropological term in all of Scripture.<sup>42</sup> It is intriguing to consider that though the specific term “mindset” was not employed in the OT, it was communicated through the term καρδία as well as in idioms and contexts that revealed the heart condition was due to one’s mindset.<sup>43</sup> Yet Paul scarcely used this term to convey the mindset.

---

display how NT words compare and contrast with one another on a given concept. J. Scott Duvall, “Pauline Lexical Choice Revisited: A Paradigmatic Analysis of Selected Terms of Exhortation in Galatians 5 and 6,” *EFN* 8.13 (1994): 18.

<sup>42</sup> LXX uses καρδία over 900 in striking contrast to secular Greek writings, illustrating the significance of this term as the most important anthropological term. The Greek parallels used for בָּלֵב and לֵבָב in the LXX were foremost καρδία, but other cognitive terms also occurred on a significant frequency: καρδία (718x); διάνοια (51x) ψυχή (27x), νοῦς (12x), φρήν (7x), στῆθος (*stéthos*) (3x), and φρόνησις (2x). Heinz-Josef Fabry, “בָּלֵב,” *TDOT* 7:410. As the LXX had a remarkable frequency of the use of καρδία, so too does the NT, carrying the same holistic meaning as in the OT, not the dualistic Greek view, though more clearly expressed. The term occurs 155x: Luke (22x), Acts (20x), Matthew (16x), and Romans (15x), as well as in Mark, 2 Cor, and Heb (11x each). Silva, “καρδία,” *NIDNTE* 2:625.

<sup>43</sup> Expressions such as “take it to heart” in Isaiah 42:25 employ a combination of words (in this case הָרָאָה *(śûmā(h))* and לֵב) to communicate a mindset or setting of the heart. So, too, the expression “in your heart” communicates a mindset in 1 Chr 17:2, though in both of these instances, the Greek parallel term ψυχή is used to convey the heart. This is also the case with the phrase “on her mind” in 1 Kgs 10:2. “Set your heart” is also a common phrase (2 Chr 12:14; 19:3) employing the terms קִין (*kûn*) and לֵב (in which the Greek equivalent καρδία is employed). Whichever term is used to convey the heart, when the heart is personalized to depict activity that is taking place “in” the heart, there is a shift from the heart as the center of a being to what is transpiring in the heart: the formation of a mindset. Other instances of this idiom show the heart as the mindset through the phrase “upon” or “on” your heart (see also 1 Sam 4:20; Prov 16:23; Isa 44:18; 47:7). Further examples of prepositional phrases “in your heart” (1 Chr 17:2) and “in his heart” (Gen 17:17) use διάνοια for בָּלֵב and are different from the heart and its capacities alone.

Though Paul employed the term καρδία to depict one's conscience in his earliest letters, Paul infrequently used καρδία, and when he did so, it was in the traditional Judaic tradition as the center of man—the source of will, emotion, thoughts, and affections, which Paul connected to Hellenistic categories like “mind,” “attitude,” “thought,” and “desires.”<sup>44</sup> Dunn notes that Paul creates a new usage of Greek terms that modifies the original Hebraic mindset or Greek philosophy. This new usage communicates the necessity of salvation and mind renewal in a completely new paradigm that is by the Spirit and grace through a radicalization of anthropological terms.<sup>45</sup> Paul's synthesizing of Hebrew and Greek anthropology upholds the holistic Hebrew concept of human embodiment as well as the Grecian negative attitude toward existence in the flesh (σάρξ) to illustrate the desperate heart condition of man.<sup>46</sup> While the surrounding culture was prey to one's own thoughts fixed on the world system and the demands of the flesh, Paul views mindset as the essential cognitive component of the heart that is necessary for transformation by the Spirit.<sup>47</sup>

---

<sup>44</sup> Robert Jewett, *Paul's Anthropological Terms: A Study of Their Use in Conflict Settings*, AGJU 10 (Leiden: Brill, 1971), 446–447. Examples include Philippians 1:7 and Romans 1:21, 24, in which the heart is the center from which everything flows. In the prime example of the Shema, the significance of the suffix in Deut 6:5 in its referent to the heart (“your” heart) and the preposition “in” also illustrate this point that it is not just the heart itself being referred to but what transpires within the heart. Lambert's analysis of the leaky לב or לבב reveals that there within the heart is man's volition, which is the determination of his mind or mindset. David A. Lambert, “James Barr and the State of the Biblical Lexicon,” in *James Barr Assessed: Evaluating His Legacy over the Last Sixty Years*, ed. Stanley E. Porter, Biblical Interpretation Series 192 (Leiden: Brill, 2021), 102. Wolde notes that the heart (לב/לבב) in the Hebrew Bible represents the center of the human being, not simply a bodily organ, representing the inner world of the human being where thoughts, emotions, desires are located and linked. As a metaphor, the term ‘heart’ conveys, then, how one's inner being is responding to stimuli in the environment. Ellen van Wolde, “A Network of Conventional and Deliberate Metaphors in Psalm 22,” *JSOT* 44 (2020): 655. Louw and Nida provide an illuminating definition for the heart: “The causative source of a person's psychological life in its various aspects, but with special emphasis upon thoughts—‘heart, inner self, mind.’” L&N, s.v. “καρδία,” 1:320.

<sup>45</sup> James D. G. Dunn, *The New Perspectives on Paul* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2008), 74.

<sup>46</sup> Sunny Chen, “The Distributive Singular in Paul: The Adequacy of a Grammatical Category,” *JGRChJ* 11 (2015): 128.

<sup>47</sup> Fabry notes that “Cognition in the *lēb* is related to sense perception: it is prior to seeing with the eyes and hearing with the ears because it initiates the operation of the senses (Deut 29:3; Eccl 7:21; Ezek 3:10)...then it comes to mean the preservation and internalization of what the senses perceive (Prov 22:17; Eccl 7:2; Isa 32:4; Ezek

Πνεῦμα, (*pneuma*), Ψυχή, (*psyche*), Σάρξ (*sarx*), Σώμα (*soma*)

The anthropological terms such as flesh (σάρξ), body (σώμα), conscience (συνείδησις), spirit (πνεῦμα), mind (νοῦς), soul (ψυχή), inner man (εσώτερος άνθρωπος) and outer man (εξωτερικός άνθρωπος) have played a significant role in understanding the theology of Paul and a controversial role in the debate over the use of these terms by biblical scholars since the 18th century.<sup>48</sup> Through the significant anthropological terms πνεῦμα, (*pneuma*), ψυχή, (*psyche*), σάρξ (*sarx*), and σώμα (*soma*), Paul conveys the role that one's being plays in the inner workings of the mindset. Though there is overlap in these terms, as discussed in chapter one, there are also unique facets in each that develop an understanding of Paul's theology and how the mindset is affected by these aspects of the inner being. Kooten highlights two anthropologies that Paul utilizes in his depiction of the inner man.

The most remarkable feature of Paul's anthropology is that it consists of two separate anthropologies, which can be distinguished as 'spirit anthropology' and 'image anthropology.' This comes as no surprise, as we have seen that Philo, too, knows of these two anthropologies and derives them respectively from the second and first account of man's creation in Gen 1–2. The spirit anthropology is based on Gen 2:7, whereas the image anthropology follows from Gen 1:26–27.<sup>49</sup>

Man's nature, as created in the image of God, is redeemed and understood through Paul's theological anthropology. Paul's employment of these anthropological terms is once again theological and ethical, but foremost spiritual. The transformation the Holy Spirit achieves is not just pragmatic; the Spirit uses man's cognition to reveal one's need. Through an understanding

---

40:4; 44:5; Mal 2:2; Sir 16:24) for the purpose of making judgments and decisions...thus cognition in the *leḥ* is always understood as a compact whole, in that it denotes the total noetic ability of an individual (cf. Dt. 8:5)." Fabry, "כֹּחַ," *TDOT* 7:419.

<sup>48</sup> Jewett, *Paul's Anthropological Terms*, 1.

<sup>49</sup> G. Van Kooten, *Paul's Anthropology in Context. The Image of God, Assimilation to God, and Tripartite Man in Ancient Judaism, Ancient Philosophy and Early Christianity* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2008), 375.

of how Paul used the terms πνεῦμα (*pneuma*), ψυχή (*psyche*), σὰρξ (*sarx*), and σῶμα (*soma*), the significance of these anthropological terms becomes apparent as a force that shapes his theological argument and reveals the battle of the mind.

### Πνεῦμα (*pneuma*)

The term πνεῦμα is at the foundation of Paul's religious-ethical living; in fact, it is the message.<sup>50</sup> Paul employed πνεῦμα 146 times in his letters, giving the term a leading role in Paul's anthropology.<sup>51</sup> It is a verbal noun representing the vital force which transforms the mind of man.<sup>52</sup> Dubbed the “theologian of the Holy Spirit,” Paul's chief aim was to unveil the empowered life available to all through the Holy Spirit. Pauline pneumatology was influenced by both Hellenism and Judaism.<sup>53</sup> Paul did not avoid the topic of Gnosticism but built on the

---

<sup>50</sup> The goal of exploring πνεῦμα in this space is to understand Paul's thought on πνεῦμα and how he used this term, not to cover the Holy Spirit in depth, as there is insufficient space to do so and that is not the objective of this section. The term רִיחַ occurs 387 times in Hebrew and 11 times in Aramaic. Of these occurrences, the LXX renders רִיחַ as πνεῦμα (277), ἄνεμος (52), θυμός (6), πνοή (4), ψυχή (2), νοῦς (1), φρόνησις (1), meaning breeze, wind, breath, and the Spirit of Yahweh, the Spirit of God. In reference to man, רִיחַ takes on the meaning of “The natural spirit of humanity, as sense, mind, intellectual frame of mind.” *HALOT*, s.v. “רִיחַ,” 1197. The term πνεῦμα also takes on the meaning and function of ψυχή. Schweizer, “Πνεῦμα, *TDNT* 6:332–455. Levison notes that רִיחַ is one of the most dominant terms from the OT. Jack Levison, *A Boundless God: The Spirit According to the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2020), 14–15.

<sup>51</sup> Paul's use of πνεῦμα was varied and complex. According to Stacey, Paul used πνεῦμα to depict the Holy Spirit and its activity in believers, evil spirits and their work in unbelievers, the Christian spirit as a result of the Holy Spirit, and the individual spirit of each human. W. David Stacey, *The Pauline View of Man in Relation to its Judaic and Hellenistic Background* (London: Macmillan, 1956), 121, 128–29.

<sup>52</sup> Schweizer, “Πνεῦμα, *TDNT* 6:334. “Without רִיחַ there is no life, and the source of life is outside man.” Schweizer, “Ψυχή,” *TDNT* 9:608–66. “One might say that רִיחַ is the condition of נְפֶשׁ and that it regulates its force. Without נְפֶשׁ an individual dies, but without רִיחַ a נְפֶשׁ is no longer an authentic נְפֶשׁ.” *Ibid.*, 9:629.

<sup>53</sup> Engberg-Pederson notes that one should not position Paul as being between Judaism or Hellenism and should abandon the dichotomy in preference for viewing Paul as a product of his heterogeneous environment to see Paul in the broader cultural context in which he lived, which will provide keener insight for elucidation of his own ideas and practices. Troels Engberg-Pedersen, “Introduction,” in *Paul Beyond the Judaism/Hellenism Divide*, ed. Troels Engberg-Pedersen, 1st ed. (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2001), 4. Meeks notes, “We should not be surprised to find jostling one another in Paul's communities and even within Paul himself some ways of thinking, talking and acting that our scholarly constructs would have segregated into separate worlds.” Wayne A. Meeks, “Corinthian Christians as Artificial Aliens,” in Engberg-Pedersen, *Paul Beyond the Judaism/Hellenism Divide*, 138. In the same volume, Tronier astutely depicts the environment that shaped Paul's pneumatological message. Tronier asserts that the framework for Paul's theology is Jewish Apocalypticism, “which is itself a particular version and

Hellenistic Gnosis as well as the Judaic traditions to segue into the transformation possible through the Holy Spirit.<sup>54</sup> For instance, In 1 Cor 15:44, Paul utilized Hellenistic terminology, which thought in terms of the power of substance with the phrase “σῶμα πνευματικόν” to depict that one is not merely a vessel for the πνεῦμα, but is controlled by the πνεῦμα. To Paul, this was a Jewish matter with Hellenistic vocabulary.<sup>55</sup> To belabor the point of whether Paul was more influenced by Jewish or Hellenistic anthropological concepts is to miss the point. Paul’s theological anthropology brought elements of both together, but it was not about Jewish or Hellenistic views but a completely new way of viewing life through the Holy Spirit. Paul’s treatment of the activity of the divine πνεῦμα is that transformation by the Spirit, which produces an ethical change in the recipient, is inexorably linked to having a relationship with God. The mind of Christ is wrought because of the πνεῦμα. A central motif of Paul’s teaching is the message of Rom 8:5 that one may think (φρονέω) according to the things of the πνεῦμα or according to the flesh (σάρξ). One’s mind (νοῦς) in Christ is in the divine sphere (1 Cor 2:16) because one has Christ’s πνεῦμα (Rom 8:9).<sup>56</sup> Paul’s views on the Spirit are the fundamental substance of his theology, and Paul’s understanding of the Spirit is built upon *Heilsgeschichte*: the salvation history of God’s people from an eschatological perspective.<sup>57</sup> As Du Plessis stated:

---

variation of certain basic ideas in the Hellenistic world at large, Jewish as well as non-Jewish.” Henrik Tronier, “The Corinthian Correspondence Between Philosophical Idealism and Apocalypticism,” in Engberg-Pedersen, *Paul Beyond the Judaism/Hellenism Divide*, 167. Tronier recognizes the cognitive dualism between the wisdom of this world and the wisdom of God in Paul’s message, and he works to show the influence of both Jewish and Hellenistic cultural elements on Paul’s thinking on the Spirit’s relevance to wisdom in every culture.

<sup>54</sup> See Appendix: Paul’s View of the Spirit.

<sup>55</sup> Schweizer, “Πνεῦμα, Πνευματικός,” *TDNT* 6:421.

<sup>56</sup> Michael Winger, “The Meaning of Πνεῦμα in the Letters of Paul: A Linguistic Analysis of Sense and Reference,” *CBQ* 78 (2016): 721.

<sup>57</sup> P. J. Du Plessis, “The Concept of Pneuma in The Theology of Paul,” *Neot* 3 (1969): 11–14. Rabens notes that in late Pauline theology (Rom 8), the Spirit now appears as a hypostatic entity mediating and attesting to

Christ is the Messiah of the fullness of time, anointed with the Spirit. He is the Bearer and Distributor of the Spirit to his people. It is, therefore, possible that he could write: the Lord is the Spirit (2 Cor. 3: 17), which means that where the Lord is, the Spirit is also. The Spirit is the Bridge between Ascension and Parousia.<sup>58</sup>

The πνεῦμα is also the source of unity, which is also a significant feature of Paul's pneumatology. The same πνεῦμα resides in all who are in Christ and should yield the same mind. Paul's statement that "We were all made to drink of one Spirit" (1 Cor. 12:13), reveals that the Spirit is the substance of the new being, and it is the influence of the Spirit upon the spirit of man that enables one to understand the things of God and have the mind of Christ.<sup>59</sup> The varied mentalities in the Greco-Roman/Jewish melting pot could be unified through the power of the Spirit if God's people would indeed walk in the Spirit rather than the flesh. Those who live by the Spirit have a spiritual outlook rather than a carnal one. Paul paints on the canvas of the Spirit, displaying what man was before the Spirit in Romans 7 and then what a renewed being and mind looks like in Romans 8.<sup>60</sup>

Another consideration in Paul's employment of the term πνεῦμα is its varied use when, depending on the context, it takes on different meanings and significance. Martin points out that each use of πνεῦμα has both literary as well as conceptual significance.<sup>61</sup> The question is how

---

salvation, God's love, and intercession for the believers in Christ, aiding in their weakness and transforming them towards δόξα (doxa). Volker Rabens, "The Development of Pauline Pneumatology," *BZ* 43 (1999): 168.

<sup>58</sup> Du Plessis, "The Concept of Pneuma in The Theology of Paul." *Neot* 3 (1969): 15.

<sup>59</sup> Thomas Hartwell Horne, *An Introduction to The Critical Study and Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures*, (New York, NY: R. Carter & Brothers, 1852), 1:445.

<sup>60</sup> Du Plessis, "The Concept of Pneuma in The Theology of Paul," 18.

<sup>61</sup> Martin states that Paul's pneumatological statements build upon and reflect the context demonstrated in the physiology of pneuma in ancient medical texts. Troy W. Martin, "Paul's Pneumatological Statements and Ancient Medical Texts," in *The New Testament and Early Christian Literature in Greco-Roman Context: Studies in Honor of David E. Aune*, ed. John Fotopoulos NTSup 122 (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 105, 126. Louw and Nida list the primary use of πνεῦμα in reference to the third person of the Trinity, the Spirit, Spirit of God, or Holy Spirit, which seems to be Paul's primary use, as well. *L&N*, s.v. "πνεῦμα," 1:140. See *L&N*, s.v. "Introduction," x, for eight primary meanings for πνεῦμα. Paul uses πνεῦμα to depict material and non-material aspects of the term. He uses

these πνεύματα are related, and what is the significance of calling all of them πνεῦμα? Paul contrasts the Spirit of God with the spirit of man and the spirit of the world to reveal the need for the Πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ. With familiar language, Paul seeks to open the eyes of a culture that knew the term “spirit” and introduce them to the Spirit of God available through the risen Christ. Using the same terminology requires an understanding of the context to interpret which use of πνεῦμα is occurring in Paul’s many varied uses. Paul’s primary use of πνεῦμα seems to be two-fold: in reference to the Spirit of God as understood through Christ and man’s cognitive response to the Spirit or the flesh. Paul relates man’s spirit to Christ’s, in which by means of the Holy Spirit, the believer’s spirit is where “The human and the divine interface in the believer's life.”<sup>62</sup> Wright bears the significance of Paul’s treatment of πνεῦμα: “*Pneuma* in the Pauline Corpus, as in the Old Testament, is the power and presence of God at work among his people. But *pneuma* in the Pauline Corpus is more. *Pneuma* is the power and presence of God in Christ experienced by each believer.”<sup>63</sup> Paul’s development of the concept of πνεῦμα is the pinnacle revelation of the promised mind renewal throughout the canon. The promised “new spirit” and “new heart” (Ezek 11:19 36:26–27; Jer 31:33; Heb 8:10) that God’s people ached for had been fulfilled through the work of Christ and the resident Holy Spirit. Paul revealed how the Spirit of God could renew the mind of God’s people and restore their relationship with God as the πνεῦμα is the power of the presence of the risen Christ, where Christ is a life-giving πνεῦμα (1 Cor 15:45), and the πνεῦμα

---

πνεῦμα to represent the Spirit of God (Rom 8:9, 11; 1 Cor 6:19; 12:4; 2 Cor 3:3, 14–18; Gal 4:6; 1 Tim 4:1), a supernatural being (1 Cor 12:10; 2 Thess 2:2); to depict one’s soul or spirit (Rom 1:9; 8:16; 1 Cor 2:11; 12:10; 14:14; 1 Pet 3:18), to convey one’s mindset, inclination, mind, or behavior (1 Cor 12:12; 2 Cor 2:13; Gal 6:1; Eph 1:17; 4:23; Phil 1:27; 2 Tim 1:7); to depict the breath of a living being (2 Thess 2:8), to name a few.

<sup>62</sup> Gordon D Fee, *God’s Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2011), 25.

<sup>63</sup> Walter C. Wright, “The Source of Paul’s Concept of Pneuma,” *CBQ* 41 (1983): 25.



of God is the channel of communication between God and man (1 Thess 1:5; 2 Thess 2. 2; Eph 3:5).<sup>64</sup> Through the term πνεῦμα, Paul creates a unique term to depict what characterizes a person as a spiritual person: πνευματικός (*pneumatikós*), meaning “belonging to the spirit.”<sup>65</sup> God’s people are defined by the term spirit—the Spirit of God or the spirit of the world. Paul’s use of pneumatic terminology was paired with cognitive terms to convey that those who are πνευματικός will be filled with knowledge or wisdom that is of God, not man.

### Σάρξ (*sarx*)

In Paul’s view, the σάρξ is the opposite of the πνεῦμα, which makes it remarkable that the πνεῦμα could dwell within the σάρξ.<sup>66</sup> Bauer’s definition of the Spirit in a Hegelian sense is that the Spirit is “Transcendent, infinite, as opposed to the bounded “flesh” ... and by the “Spirit” one participates of the infinite.”<sup>67</sup> According to Jewett, the term σάρξ is used primarily in argumentative and parenetic settings, and the book of Romans is the only place where σάρξ plays a crucial role in Paul’s theological argument.<sup>68</sup> Through σάρξ, Paul sought to reveal the weakness of the body and then oppose the finite flesh with the infinite spirit as a direct response

---

<sup>64</sup> Wright notes: “The Old Testament writers recognized ruach Yahweh as God involved in history to the extent that occasionally the ruach represented the very presence of God (Ps 51:10–11; 139:7). At the same time, the prophets of Israel looked forward to a messiah empowered by ruach (Isa 11:1–2).” Wright, “The Source of Paul’s Concept of Pneuma,” 21–25.

<sup>65</sup> Gordon D. Fee, *God’s Empowering Presence*, 28–32.

<sup>66</sup> Jesus also contrasts the Spirit with the flesh, “That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit” (John 3:6). Though Jesus never contrasts the πνεῦμα with the σῶμα. D. R. Goodwin, “On the Use of ψυχή and πνεῦμα and Connected Words in the Sacred Writings,” *JSBLE* 1.2 (1881): 75.

<sup>67</sup> Louw and Nida discuss the danger in ascribing one main meaning to a term, and this is certainly the case with σάρξ, which is often assumed to mean “flesh,” a main meaning that Paul employs. However, the various glosses for flesh listed by Louw—flesh, body, people, human, nation, human nature, physical nature, and life—make it apparent that σάρξ does not always mean “flesh.” *L&N*, s.v. “Introduction,” xiv–xv.

<sup>68</sup> The term σάρξ is used to depict the weakness of human flesh and the weakness of one’s will. Jewett, *Paul’s Anthropological Terms*, 3, 50.

to his inability to keep the law.<sup>69</sup> Paul's development of the σάρξ concept and anthropology as a whole was considered to be a gradual confluence of Hellenistic thought patterns with resident Jewish presuppositions.<sup>70</sup> It is the contrast between σάρξ and πνεῦμα that is at the center of Pauline theology and which Lüdemann dubs as the first uniquely Christian anthropology since the concept was neither Hellenistic dualism nor Jewish monism.<sup>71</sup> Paul reveals the corrupt nature of the flesh through the struggle between the flesh and the Spirit (Rom 7:18). The flesh (σάρξ) is the vessel that responds to temptation wrought by sin, which is the active force (Rom 8:7).<sup>72</sup>

The σάρξ category plays a central role in the theological argument of Romans, with three-quarters of the use of σάρξ occurring in Romans 6–8.<sup>73</sup> Σάρξ and its derivatives are used

---

<sup>69</sup> Ibid., 52.

<sup>70</sup> Ibid., 53–54.

<sup>71</sup> Lüdemann contends that Paul provides a Jewish and Hellenistic view of the flesh to reveal that in both systems of thought, the flesh is able “to determine what the inner man—the mind and heart was like.” Hermann Lüdemann, *Die Anthropologie des Apostels Paulus und ihre Stellung innerhalb seiner Heilslehre: nach den vier Hauptbriefen*, trans. Robert Jewett (Kiel: Universitäts-Buchhandlung, 1872), 29, 74. Jewett notes that “Lüdemann’s observation that both σάρξ and πνεῦμα are inner and extra personal forces which struggle within man at the instigation of an externally experienced spirit and the flesh, is an enduring contribution to our understanding of these terms.” Jewett, *Paul’s Anthropological Terms*, 54. Lüdemann astutely points out that since the dichotomy between flesh and Spirit is neither wholly Jewish nor Greek, it is the first Christian anthropology. Lüdemann, *Die Anthropologie*, 49.

<sup>72</sup> According to Jewett, historical-critical scholarship has done an inadequate job of determining how Paul viewed σάρξ as the *Sitz der Sünde* (seat of sin). Some have conjectured parallels between Paul the Qumran literature (comparing 1 QS 11 to Romans 7) or Philo’s mysticism, but these are less than perfect parallels. The translators of LXX may reflect a pre-Christian belief that the flesh (σάρξ) is the source of corruption on the earth (see Genesis 6:12 in LXX), and the LXX rendering of passages like Jeremiah 17:9 hints that the heart was seen as representing the unredeemed flesh. There is an observable Jewish influence focused on a sense of an “evil urge” from the flesh, and Paul does employ the idea of the flesh in the Hellenistic sense that it represents sensuality and actions that conflict with the natural Law. Still, Paul saw the relationship of σάρξ and πνεῦμα in a unique way, fusing Jewish and Hellenistic thought and terminology to invent a new paradigm, which he seems content to leave a bit abstract and ambiguous, perhaps because he saw the Holy Spirit at work within man as something of a mystery. He seems to use both terms polemically at times, contrasting flesh and spirit in a way that is unique to Christianity. Jewett contends that “neither the Hellenistic nor the Judaistic sources . . . provide an adequate parallel to the Pauline connection of flesh and sin.” Jewett, *Paul’s Anthropological Terms*, 79–81, 165.

<sup>73</sup> Jewett, *Paul’s Anthropological Terms*, 145. Paul’s new way of using σάρξ-πνεῦμα is because the Holy Spirit had, in fact, come, and an awareness of the spiritual battle taking place between one’s nature and the Spirit became more evident. Perhaps the question of the origin of Paul’s way of using σάρξ-πνεῦμα is not as significant as the use of it itself. It is in a new paradigm that Paul wrote, and this warrants a new way of thinking about spiritual

twenty-eight times in Romans, more than any other anthropological term.<sup>74</sup> Jewett notes that it is the sinful desire of the flesh to achieve righteousness by works which is counter to the righteousness of Christ revealed in the new aeon—Christ broke the power of the flesh, and righteousness is gained by obedience to the law through the Spirit. “The bondage to the flesh is superseded by life according to the Spirit.”<sup>75</sup> The attitude of the σάρξ is uniquely expressed for the first time in Romans 8:5–7. Paul uses the phrase φρόνημα τῆς σαρκός in Romans 8:6 and 8:7 to reference the attitude of those who live according to the flesh and are opposed to God and the phrase φρόνημα τοῦ πνεύματος to depict the attitude (mindset) of those who walk in and are defined by the Spirit. In this way, σάρξ and πνεῦμα affect one’s mindset.<sup>76</sup> But what is significant in the phrase φρόνημα τῆς σαρκός is both the use of σάρξ coupled with the use of φρόνημα instead of ἐπιθυμία (*epithymia*) in connection with σάρξ.<sup>77</sup>

---

battles, for the Holy Spirit was now within man, and the Holy Spirit was the primary influence directing Paul’s words, speaking into the surrounding culture a new message to help God’s people see the spiritual dynamic resident within their own flesh. It is worth noting that Paul’s flesh category is considered to be somewhat parallel to Hellenistic dualism; Paul’s depiction of σάρξ is distinct from the Hellenistic expression of σάρξ as Paul’s rests on apocalyptic assumptions which are alien to Hellenism. Moreover, the Hellenistic view of σάρξ was limited to sensuality, whereas Paul’s treatment of σάρξ referenced the law and libertinism; it is both the concrete flesh and a demonic power. Paul’s use of flesh is both polemic and centered on the contrast to the Spirit.

<sup>74</sup> Ibid., 135.

<sup>75</sup> Ibid., 456.

<sup>76</sup> Jewett notes the significance of the genitive employed in Romans 8:5–7, “φρόνημα τῆς σαρκός” is that the genitive is not of quality but of origin: “the attitude of the flesh *is* death.” The implication of this expression is that the flesh has a mental attitude in which the person can be the subject of the mental attitude. Whether one walks according to the flesh or the Spirit is a demonstration of the influence of the flesh or the Spirit in that person. Jewett contends that “things flow not from the mental attitude of the person but from the flesh itself.” Often in contradiction to the person. Jewett notes that “It would seem therefore that Romans 8:6–7 makes sense only if the expression “the attitude of the flesh” has a genitive of origin, only if the flesh is a demonic power whose intent is enmity and death.” Ibid., 155–56.

<sup>77</sup> Jewett notes that the use of mental attitude instead of desire in Romans 8:5 is likely due to a different understanding of σάρξ, which does not refer to evil sensuality but to the power of the flesh to cause man to depend on the flesh rather than the Spirit, linking the two terms flesh and spirit in an intentional parallelism. Ibid., 156.

According to Bultmann, the anthropological terms are seen to constitute the very essence of Pauline theology in his depiction of the inner man.<sup>78</sup> Paul masterfully takes two contrasting anthropological systems and synthesizes them into a new way of viewing man's inner being in the new covenant.<sup>79</sup> But Jewett makes the astute point that "The anthropological terms do not constitute the core of Paul's gospel but rather are used to defend that core (which could probably best be defined as the eschatological righteousness of God revealed in the Christ event)."<sup>80</sup>

### Ψυχή (*psyche*)

The term ψυχή represents the immaterial part of a person (soul), thought to be immortal by the Greeks and seen as the seat of emotions and other psychological faculties.<sup>81</sup> In classical Greek ψυχή came to represent "the mind, the inner man, the immortal part of man; and...a special reference to the departed spirits," where the Hebrew counterpart, נְשָׁמָה, "came to designate the dead body."<sup>82</sup> Occurring around 950 times in the LXX, ψυχή, alongside φρόνημα (mind, thought, will), is used to depict volitional and mental faculties.<sup>83</sup> Used metonymically, ψυχή represents the whole living person.<sup>84</sup> Paul's limited use of ψυχή in his epistles is due to his

---

<sup>78</sup> Rudolph Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, trans. K. Grobel (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2007), 191.

<sup>79</sup> Jewett, *Paul's Anthropological Terms*, 4.

<sup>80</sup> *Ibid.*, 10.

<sup>81</sup> Silva, "ψυχή," *NIDNTTE* 4:725–34.

<sup>82</sup> Goodwin, "On the Use of ψυχή and πνεῦμα," 73. The Hebrew term for ψυχή is נְשָׁמָה, though ψυχή is rendered twice as נֶפֶשׁ. Schweitzer notes that "In the philosophical language of the Hellenistic-Roman period, ψυχή denotes the totality of the functions of mind and soul but that in virtue of its distinction from νοῦς, ψυχή undergoes a certain devaluation since it can no longer denote pure spirituality." Schweizer, "Ψυχή," *TDNT* 9:616–7

<sup>83</sup> Silva, "ψυχή," *NIDNTTE* 4:726.

<sup>84</sup> Horst Robert Balz and Gerhard Schneider, "ψυχή," *EDNT* 3:501. The term ψυχή occurs over 100 times in the NT, 13 of which occur in the Pauline corpus, with the majority occurring in the gospels and Acts (65

Judaic use of the term and the connotations that ψυχή had in both the traditional Jewish and Hellenistic culture.<sup>85</sup>

Paul uniquely uses a “Paulinism” term to depict the spiritual person versus the carnal person in Romans. Where πνευματικός depicts a spiritual person, ψυχικός (*psychikos*) depicts its opposite: a person void of the Spirit of God, who does not know the mind of God (1 Cor 2:14–15); a carnal being. Paul contrasts the πνευματικός with the ψυχικός to reveal that one who does not have the Spirit does not know the mind of God. Silva notes that the distinction between the adjectives ψυχικός and πνευματικός in 1 Cor 2:14 and 15:44 is that the term πνευματικός depicts God’s Spirit, not the human spirit; therefore, ψυχικός is not a different anthropological category, but a different mode of existence.<sup>86</sup> Paul’s use of ψυχή pales in comparison to his use of σάρξ in the book of Romans. Ψυχή is used only three times in Romans, in a very Jewish OT traditional manner, playing no particular role in the argument of Romans.<sup>87</sup>

---

occurrences). There are incidences of overlap, such as in Luke 1:46–47, when ψυχή is used in parallel succession with πνεῦμα, denoting the whole inner person. Silva, “ψυχή,” *NIDNTTE* 4:729–731.

<sup>85</sup> Jewett, *Paul's Anthropological Terms*, 448–449. Paul avoided using ψυχή in the strict sense of “soul.” So, too, the Greeks would have wondered what would have happened to their souls, so Paul referred to the whole person (see 1 Thess 4:13–18). Stacey notes, “The infrequency of the use of ψυχή in Paul is the key to the understanding of it. This fact points us away from Jewish and Greek ideas to the third factor, Paul’s religious experience. Paul’s knowledge of the Holy Spirit set the basis of his anthropology, and πνεῦμα took the leading role.” Stacey, *The Pauline View of Man*, 126–7.

<sup>86</sup> Silva, s.v. “ψυχή,” *NIDNTTE* 4:731.

<sup>87</sup> Jewett states that “It is inadvisable to attempt to find indications of a development within Pauline anthropology...the use of ψυχή follows along traditional biblical lines. Jewett, *Paul's Anthropological Terms*, 356.

## Σῶμα (*soma*)

There can be confusion between the terms σάρξ and σῶμα, but Paul makes a clear distinction between the two. The flesh represents human nature impacted by sin.<sup>88</sup> The term σῶμα refers to the body of a human being or animal, living or dead (corpse).<sup>89</sup> Paul makes a distinction between σάρξ and σῶμα (*soma*) in Romans where both σάρξ and σῶμα are used, but not interchangeably to be synonymous with one another as they were in Corinthians—in Romans the body is the means for the flesh to accomplish evil. Paul’s use of σῶμα in Romans 8:10–11 was to depict the resurrection where σάρξ, which Paul used in Romans 8:2–9, would not have fit.<sup>90</sup> The Corinthians knew of a pneumatic body in the Gnostic sense, as hidden under the psychic body which would survive after death.<sup>91</sup> Paul refutes the Corinthians with their own language. Through understanding the σῶμα πνευματικόν as something to be given by God in the

---

<sup>88</sup> William Barclay, *Flesh and Spirit: An Examination of Galatians 5:19–23* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1962), 9.

<sup>89</sup> BDAG, s.v. “σῶμα,” 983. The Hebrew term for the body, בָּשָׂר, only occurs fourteen times in the OT, though σῶμα is also used in the LXX for the Hebrew term בָּשָׂר (*bāsār*), translated for the physical body alone, and רֶשֶׁת is also rendered as σάρξ in different contexts. Stacey, *The Pauline View of Man*, 181. While Bultmann and others argued that σῶμα represented the whole being, Gundry demonstrated Paul’s use was in line with the Septuagint understanding that σῶμα referred to the physical aspect of man, distinct from the inner man. Robert H. Gundry, *Soma in Biblical Theology: With Emphasis on Pauline Anthropology*, SNTMS 29 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 25. Gundry draws out Paul’s intention in Romans 12:1, in which Paul says to “present your bodies (*sōmata*) as a living sacrifice” to emphasize the sanctification of the physical part of man, which the Hellenistic world disparaged. *Ibid.*, 35. In the NT, Paul uses the term σῶμα ninety-one times in his epistles in comparison with the Synoptic Gospels (51 occurrences). Schweizer, “Σῶμα,” *TDNT* 7:1024–1094. The term σῶμα occurs thirteen times in Romans, distributed similarly to σάρξ infrequently Rom 1–4, three times in Rom 12, and more concentrated in Rom 6–8 with 8 of the thirteen occurrences found there. Jewett, *Paul’s Anthropological Terms*, 288.

<sup>90</sup> Jewett surmises the possibility of an important theological motivation behind the use of σῶμα in a largely σάρξ-dominated emphasis in Romans. He notes that Rom 8:10–11 is written in light of the resurrection, which includes the σῶμα but not the σάρξ. Perhaps inserting σῶμα in the σάρξ context provides a basis for the depiction of the body being sacrificed in daily obedience, Jewett contends. The category of the flesh depicts man’s dilemma but not his new life, whereas the body category bridges the gap between the old and the new man and is capable of expressing “the sphere in which the new obedience was to be performed and the old disobedience left behind.” *Ibid.*, 157–159.

<sup>91</sup> Schweizer, “Πνεῦμα,” *TDNT* 6:420.

resurrection, not something that has already been given to the believer that outlasts death, Paul speaks of the πνεῦμα ζωοποιῶν given by the Risen Lord, not the πνεῦμα ζῶν.<sup>92</sup> In σῶμα, the human spirit has a vessel, but the σῶμα is not a contributor in the anthropological terms that impact the mindset. Gieschen observes that Paul’s use of the three anthropological terms of πνεῦμα, ψυχή, and σῶμα in 1 Thess 5:23 is not an indication of a tripartite division of a human being but a representation of the whole person; moreover, it is an expression of the inner and outer man where Paul understands man as a dichotomy, not in the dualistic Greek sense, but as composed of an inner and outer man.<sup>93</sup> The metaphor of the inner man portrayed by Paul was also utilized by Plato.<sup>94</sup> Gundry provides a fitting depiction of the role of σῶμα in Paul’s anthropological portrayal of man.

Paul fully personalizes σῶμα as a necessary part of the human constitution and of authentic existence. However, he neither dematerializes σῶμα in theological

---

<sup>92</sup> Paul rejects the view that the spiritual body is already attained and contends against the belief that the pneumatic σῶμα is original rather than given in the resurrection. Schweizer, “Πνεῦμα,” *TDNT* 6:420. Cullmann contends that “il n’y a qu’un seul corps qui soi déjà ressuscité et qui existe dès maintenant comme esprit corps celui du Christ.” (Tran. By author: “There is only one body which has already been resurrected and which exists from now on as the spirit body that of Christ.” Oscar Cullmann, “La délivrance anticipée du corps humain d’après le Nouveau Testament,” in *Hommage et reconnaissance, recueil de travaux publiés à l’occasion du 60e anniversaire de Karl Barth*, ed. Jean-Jacques von Allmen and Jean-Louis Leuba, author translation, Cahiers Théologiques de L’actualité Protestante, Hors Serie 2 (Paris: Delachaux & Niestlé SA, 1946), 31.

<sup>93</sup> Gieschen notes that in 1 Thessalonians, the outer man is found in the expression τὸ σῶμα, and the inner man is depicted by the terms ψυχή and πνεῦμα. Anthropologically speaking, one who is in Christ is τὸ πνεῦμα, and the outer man (τὸ σῶμα) will perish but be raised in glory when Christ returns. Charles A. Gieschen, “Body, Self, and Spirit: The Meaning of Paul’s Anthropological Terminology in 1 Thessalonians 5:23,” in *The Press of the Text*, ed. Andrew H. Bartelt, Jeffrey Kloha, and Paul R. Raabe (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2017), 88–89. Gieschen’s contribution is illuminating and concurs with the verse as seen by the use of the conjunction και “and” to join ψυχή and πνεῦμα together and then another conjunction και before σῶμα. If the three terms were to be considered collectively as one, there would only be one και. Yet even though these three terms are in two categories—the inner man and the outer man—, they are considered together to demonstrate the completeness of the human being that the whole person will one day be resurrected. Additionally, Paul’s intent in this verse was not to make an anthropological statement contrary to the anthropological framework he demonstrated in all his epistles. Paul spoke of the whole person, both inner and outer beings. Gieschen elaborates on the significance of including ψυχή in the first-century Greco-Roman context, for his hearers would wonder about their fate in the afterlife.

<sup>94</sup> See Appendix I: Plato’s View of the Soul.

usage nor makes it comprehend the total person. To do either would lay upon the term a burden heavier than it can bear. Rather, without having to do double duty for the spirit, σῶμα gains theological significance as the physical body, man's means of concrete service for God.<sup>95</sup>

Paul's conception of the body was a watershed moment in the NT that is still being discussed today. Trying to put Paul in the Judaic or Hellenistic line of thought when he did not wholly fit in either camp has led to a conundrum and thousands of years of attempting to discern where Paul developed his theology and line of thinking in the mind-body problem. In what is conceivably a both/and proposition as well as a neither/nor paradigm, Paul departed from both the dualism of Greek philosophy and the monism of Jewish tradition to formulate a new theological anthropology that was according to the Spirit but also pulled from threads of both Paul's Jewish background and the Hellenistic understanding.<sup>96</sup> Exploiting the terminology of both cultures and using it for a whole new function, Paul introduces the whole person (a Hebrew holistic view) through a dual lens (though different from Greek thought) of an inner and outer

---

<sup>95</sup> Gundry, *Soma in Biblical Theology*, 244. Paul's view of the body was not the same as the negative Hellenistic view, which was that the body was evil and a prison for the soul. For Paul, the body is good, as depicted in creation, and the "old man" or "flesh" represents the sinful condition that seeks to dominate the outer (body) and inner man. Gieschen, "Body, Self, and Spirit," 90. Ware notes that the varied history of the belief in an actual resurrection of the body was dealt a death blow in 1896 by Teichmann's espousal of a "spiritual" resurrection that was not bodily. However, Schweitzer and Jeremias turned the tide back toward the Patristic interpretation of a "miraculous reconstitution and transformation of the flesh." James Ware, "Paul's Understanding of the Resurrection in 1 Corinthians 15: 36–54," *JBL* 133 (2014): 812. Teichmann's view was an annihilation of the flesh, not a redemption of it. Ben F. Meyer, "Did Paul's View of the Resurrection of the Dead Undergo Development?" *TS* 47 (1986): 374. Martin contributes to the conversation with a reminder that pervasive dualism at Corinth undermined the body, leading to the rejection of the resurrection, but Paul overturned the dualistic assumptions at Corinth with the resurrection of the body. Dale B. Martin, *The Corinthian Body* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1995), 117–120. Engberg-Pedersen stated that Paul's "notion of the pneumatic resurrection body presupposes Stoic Cosmology." Troels Engberg-Pedersen, *Cosmology and Self in the Apostle Paul: The Material Spirit* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2010), 37. But Ware contends that Paul's view of the body "reflects the mainstream Jewish concept of the resurrection of the body of flesh and bones from the tomb, familiar to us from Second Temple Jewish texts." Ware, "Paul's Understanding of the Resurrection," 835.

<sup>96</sup> Vito Limone, "The Christian Conception of the Body and Paul's Use of the Term Sōma in 1 Corinthians," in *A History of Mind and Body in Late Antiquity*, ed. Anna Marmodoro and Sophie Cartwright (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018), 205.



being that included the tripartite makeup of man (πνεῦμα, σῶμα, and ψυχή). Using the πνεῦμα-σάρξ theological concept to clarify the role of the flesh as being distinct from the body and exterior to man, Paul laid bare the σάρξ as the culprit that was the source of man's struggle to walk in the Spirit and was part of the realm of the power of sin, not man's body. Paul clarified the message of salvation through anthropological terminology as defined by the Holy Spirit, which affirmed that God's creation is indeed good. Gundry stated it well when he affirmed the physical aspect of human beings. "The physicalness of σῶμα affirms life in a material world and our responsibility for it ... by assuring the importance of materiality in the future through physical resurrection, σῶμα ensures the importance of materiality in the present. Thus, theology retains its this-worldly relevance along with its other-worldly hope."<sup>97</sup>

#### Νοῦς (*nous*)

The νοῦς is the psychic faculty of thinking that thinks and wills, as well as the result of the activity of the cognitive-volitional faculty.<sup>98</sup> Paul used νοῦς more than any other cognitive term for the mind to depict the intellect, understanding, or reasoning faculties of the mind and theologially emphasize the significance of mind renewal and aligning one's thinking with God's truth. Paul spiritualized the use of νοῦς, with an emphasis on depicting that a mindset was more than just cognitive capability, but a vessel for Spirit-infused understanding and renewal. Through νοῦς, Paul developed an awareness of the psychic faculty and the significance of one's thoughts rather than as a singular thought.<sup>99</sup> "Using the term νοῦς, Paul directly confronts the source of the

---

<sup>97</sup> Gundry, *Soma in Biblical Theology*, 203.

<sup>98</sup> Manuel Nägele, "Paul's Usage of the Anthropological Term Νοῦς," *NovT* 65 (2023): 335–39.

<sup>99</sup> *Ibid.*, 330. Silva notes that OT anthropology informs NT understanding and is connected to the whole person. Silva, "νοῦς," *NIDNTE* 3:425–35.

problem, the cognitive volitional faculty and psychic center that led to misinterpretation of Paul's message and resulting fleshly behavior.<sup>100</sup> It is the mind that interprets God's Word and mindsets that corrupt the ability to rightly interpret Scripture and apply it to one's life, impacting the ability to fulfill God's mission to evangelize the world. Only through the Holy Spirit and applying the mind of Christ can one represent Jesus to the world. As shown in chapter four, Paul's quotation of Isaiah 40:13 in 1 Corinthians 2:16 utilizes the LXX rendering (with νοῦς), which expresses the Spirit, rather than the mind, of God, and thus makes a crucial theological statement: "We have the Spirit of Christ, and therefore we really know Christ."<sup>101</sup> Paul uses νοῦς to illustrate the natural νοῦς is transformed into the νοῦς through the πνεῦμα.<sup>102</sup>

The scarce use of νοῦς in the LXX is due to no equivalent Hebraic term for "mind," and the term heart was the most significant similar term, which was typically rendered as καρδία ("heart") to represent לֵב/לֵבָב.<sup>103</sup> In contrast to the LXX, Paul uses νοῦς widely across his

---

<sup>100</sup> Nägele notes, "The anthropological faculty designated by νοῦς represents the dominant element of the soul which acts thoroughly rationally, is equipped by God, or even bestowed on humans as a divine element (see esp. Leg. 1.31–42; Opif. 134–135)." Nägele, "Paul's Usage of the Anthropological Term Νοῦς," 345. Derived from the term νοῦς, the term νόημα specifically refers to something perceived or understood by the intellect and occurs six times, all in 2 Corinthians (except for Phil 4:7), and is used in a theological way, pertaining to comprehending God's will concerning salvation and the necessity to keep one's mind from corruption so one does not fall away (2 Cor 11:3) or become hardened rendering them unable to understand God's Word (2 Cor 3:14), and spiritual blindness prevents illumination from the Holy Spirit of the gospel (2 Cor 4:4). Silva, "νοῦς," *NIDNTTE* 3.432.

<sup>101</sup> Karen H. Jobes, and Moisés Silva. *Invitation to the Septuagint*. 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2015), 219.

<sup>102</sup> Nägele, "Paul's Usage of the Anthropological Term Νοῦς," 348.

<sup>103</sup> Silva, "νοῦς," *NIDNTTE* 3.428. In the Apocrypha, νοῦς usually means "mind" or "disposition." Johannes Behm and Ernst Würthwein, "Noῦς," *TDNT* 4:948–1022. In the writings of Flavius Josephus, νοῦς has the basic sense of "mind," "power of spiritual perception," "inner habit." Ibid. The term νοῦς is rendered as "reason" or "mind" and the organ of thought in Greek philosophy. In Plato, νοῦς represents the superior aspect of the soul. Silva, "νοῦς," *NIDNTTE* 3.427. The term νόημα is from the same root as "νοῦς," but nuanced definitions where νόημα is the result of the activity of the νοῦς, denoting the meaning of words and the act of perception as part of the shaping of a mindset whereas νοῦς is related to cognition, the intellect, mind or faculty of understanding, not merely sensory perception. Behm, "Noῦς," *TDNT* 4:960.

epistles.<sup>104</sup> The mind is the focus repeatedly in the NT (heart in the OT) of renewal and spiritual understanding (Rom 12:2; Eph 4:23), and the risen Jesus “opened” the νοῦς of the disciples to help them understand (Luke 24:45).<sup>105</sup> Paul lays the foundation for νοῦς in 1 Corinthians 1:10 to lead to the νοῦς Χριστοῦ in 1 Corinthians 2:16 and achieves a similar objective in Romans as Paul builds an argument with the lexeme νοῦς in Romans 1:28; 7:23, 25, culminating in Romans 12:2, in effect illustrating a case study of the corruption and possible redemption and renewal of the human mind.<sup>106</sup> In 1 Corinthians 2:6–16, it seems that Paul does an interplay with both νοῦς and πνεῦμα using them interchangeably as if to say that the mind relies on the Spirit for its renewal. Though, in 1 Corinthians 14, the terms are contrasted with one another to display the difference between thinking according to the mind or the Spirit. The truly mature believer yields to the Spirit, not one’s own mind. Behm notes an acute change in meaning that νοῦν (a direct object form of νοῦς) undergoes in 1 Corinthians 2:16 from the mind of man to the mind of Christ: “ἡμεῖς δὲ νοῦν Χριστοῦ = τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ” (1 Cor 2:11, 14), noting that ἔχομεν constitutes a play on the word, which now renders sense “mind.” Paul is not equating νοῦς and

---

<sup>104</sup> The term νοῦς occurs in the LXX 30x, with over half of these occurrences in the Apocrypha (9x in 4 Macc). The verb νοέω also occurs thirty times in the LXX. Silva, “νοῦς,” *NIDNTTE* 3.428. While there is contention as to which are the undisputed letters of Paul, this evaluation of Pauline texts which incorporate the use of νοῦς encompasses all 13 of what has been classified as the Pauline Epistles: Rom, 1–2 Cor, Gal, Eph, Phil, Col, 1–2 Thess, 1–2 Tim, Titus, and Philemon. The seven purportedly disputed epistles of Paul are not excluded in this evaluation. As Dunn so aptly stated, the disputed Pauline texts “should not be wholly disregarded when the attempt is made to describe the theology of the apostle whose name they bear.” Dunn, *The Theology of Paul*, 13. Appearing twenty-four times in the NT, all but 3 (Luke 24:45; Rev 13:18; 17:9) of these occurrences were by Paul (Rom 1:28; 7:23, 25; 11:34; 12:2; 14:5; 1 Cor 1:10; 2:16; 14:14, 15, 19; Eph 4:17, 23; Phil 4:7; Col 2:18; 2 Thess 2:2; 1 Tim 6:5; 2 Tim 3:8; Titus 1:15).

<sup>105</sup> Silva, “νοῦς,” *NIDNTTE* 3.430.

<sup>106</sup> Nägele, “Paul’s Usage of the Anthropological Term Νοῦς,” 331–2.

πνεῦμα as in Hellenistic mysticism, but rather illustrating the significance of the mind of the Spirit upon the mind of man.<sup>107</sup>

### Διάνοια (*dianoia*), Ἐννοια (*ennoia*)

The three terms νοῦς, διάνοια, and ἔννοια refer to the psychological faculty as well as a distinct way of thinking or mindset.<sup>108</sup> These somewhat interchangeable terms represent one's mindset, but they are also distinct from one another. Paul's use of these terms pales in comparison to his use of φρονέω and cognates and Paul's use of νοῦς. Nonetheless, the use and nonuse of these terms is significant.

### Διάνοια (*dianoia*)

Where the φρήν family displays the mechanics of the mindset, and the anthropological terms define one's inner being, διάνοια is most often used to depict the thinking process itself, meaning to think over, meditate, and reflect, similar to the original νοῦς, the activity of thinking or faculty of thought.<sup>109</sup> Though διάνοια is also used anthropologically and in the LXX διάνοια is used the most often for לָב or לִבָּךְ.<sup>110</sup> Like νοῦς, it denotes the faculty of knowing or

---

<sup>107</sup> Behm, “Νοῦς,” *TDNT* 4:959.

<sup>108</sup> *L&N*, s.v. “νοῦςb, διάνοια, ἔννοια,” 1:349.

<sup>109</sup> Behm, “Διάνοια,” *TDNT* 4: 963. The term διάνοια is reminiscent of a mindset when it is rendered as “Way of thought” or “disposition. The term διάνοια expresses emotions and acts of will (Exod 35:22; Isa 35:4), but it also represents the entire inner life (Gen 8:21) and can mean a mindset rendered as “thought or intention” (Num 15:39; Isa 55:9). Silva, “Διάνοια,” *NIDNTTE* 3:428. Another term that depicts and drives the mindset is ἐπίνοια, meaning one's intention of the heart and “the result of a thought process, *thought, conception*.” *BDAG*, s.v. “ἐπίνοια,” 377.

<sup>110</sup> Behm, “Διάνοια,” *TDNT* 4:965. It is noteworthy that in the Shema, διάνοια occurs in the LXX rather than καρδιά, rendered as “Love God with all the mind and all the soul and all the strength” (Deut 6:5). The presence of both καρδιά and διάνοια occurring in the restatement of the Deuteronomic text underscores the parallelism of these terms and the resonating truth that one's heart/mind/spirit is the equivalent of one's inner being which shapes one's mindset and is what determines one's ability to love God with one's being. The term διάνοια occurs approximately seventy times in the LXX (9 times in Exod and 7 in Gen). (See Gen 8:21; 17:17; 24:45; Exod 35:25; 36:1; Num 15:39; Deut 6:5; 1 Chr 29:18; Job 9:4; Jer 38:33; Dan 9:22.) Silva notes that διάνοια can be rendered as

understanding. The alternation of *διάνοια* and *καρδία* shows that both are synonymously related to the center of man's inner life.<sup>111</sup> Philo considers the *διάνοια* to be the organ of the knowledge of God."<sup>112</sup>

In the NT, the term *διάνοια* is rendered primarily as “understanding” or “mind” in the Synoptic Gospels and in Hebrews, but Paul's primary use is depicting the condition of the inner being as correlates to one's inner thoughts.<sup>113</sup> Interestingly, Paul does not use *διάνοια* in Romans, preferring *νοῦς* to unpack his theological concept, though he does use *διάνοια* in Ephesians and Colossians.<sup>114</sup> In Eph 4:18, Paul illustrates how the faculty of perception is the central organ of the inner life by revealing the defect of disposition or mindset (*νοῦς*) in the Gentiles is related to a defect of consciousness in the *διάνοια* (the faculty of spiritual and moral understanding),

---

emotions and acts of will (Exod 35:22; Isa 35:4), but it can also denote the whole of the inner life (Gen 8:21) or as “thought” or “intention” (Num 15:39; Isa 55:9). Silva, “*Διάνοια*,” *NIDNTTE* 3:428.

<sup>111</sup> Behm, “*Διάνοια*,” *TDNT* 4:966.

<sup>112</sup> *Ibid.*, 4:964. In speaking of Moses' reliance on the mind of God, Philo demonstrates the significance of not putting one's confidence in the mind of the flesh and relying on the mind of the Spirit. “And therefore, slow to trust in himself, he besought and entreated God, who surveys the invisible soul and to whom alone it is given to discern the secrets of the mind, to choose on his merits the man most fitted to command, who would care for his subjects as a father. Philo, *On the Virtues* 8.199–200 [F. H. Colson]).

<sup>113</sup> Whereas Hellenistic mysticism understood *διάνοια* as a “faculty of perception” or “gift of apprehension,” in the NT, *διάνοια* or *νοῦς* were not understood in this way. The NT held that the Son of God awakened the mind to receive revelation from Jesus, as in 1 John 5:20 (John's only use of the term), in which *διάνοια* conveys a spiritual knowledge—not Gnosticism, and not natural knowledge, but the knowledge that Christ has awakened the minds of His people and enabled our thinking to be oriented to know God, understand his revelation, and share fellowship with Him, which altered one's orientation to know God and led to a relationship with Him. Paul traced *διάνοια* to the operation of God through the Spirit, 1 Cor 2:12; 2 Cor 4:6; Eph 1:17; 4:17. The NT view of *διάνοια* is not a natural disposition to know God and the *διάνοια* is not the Holy Spirit, but it is activated by the Holy Spirit. Behm, “*Διάνοια*,” *TDNT* 4:967. In Hebrews 8:10, Thistleton differentiates between *διάνοια* and *καρδία*. “The Greek for “mind” (here *dianoia*) denotes not merely rational capacity but also a stance or disposition which includes the mind, while the word for “heart” (*kardia*) denotes a stance or acts of will that stem from hidden depths, today associated with unconscious or preconscious. Thus, the new covenant will actualize God's irrevocable promise to human persons “through and through.” Anthony C. Thiselton, “Hebrews,” in *Eerdmans Commentary on the Bible*, ed. James D. G. Dunn and John W. Rogerson (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003), 1467.

<sup>114</sup> See Eph 2:3; 4:18; Col 1:21; 2:18.

leading to a “blindness of heart” (πώρωσις τῆς καρδίας).<sup>115</sup> In Colossians 1:21, Paul depicts what should be the Christian disposition or mindset. The impulse of one’s will and way of thinking underscores plural διάνοιαι in Ephesians 2:3, in which the context renders “evil thoughts or inclinations” (see for comparison Num 15:39), which demonstrates that the sinful nature of man (σάρξ) is activated by the will (θελήματα) and intellect in his διάνοιαι.<sup>116</sup>

### **Έννοια (ennoia)**

The term έννοια depicts what takes place in the νοῦς, “deliberation,” or “consideration.”<sup>117</sup> The term έννοια can also convey the content of one’s mind or mindset, as “what arises in the νοῦς,” “thought,” “insight,” or “perception.”<sup>118</sup> Overlapping with διάνοια,

---

<sup>115</sup> Behm, “Διάνοια,” *TDNT* 4:966.

<sup>116</sup> *Ibid.*, 4:966–7. Clement expounds on an example of how sin darkens one’s understanding. “For there are some wicked deeds which we commit, and know it not, because of the double-mindedness and unbelief present in our breasts, and our understanding is darkened by vain desires.” Clement of Alexandria, 1–2 Clem. 2:19 (*ANF* 9.256). The “unbelief” in one’s breasts is sometimes as subtle as a mindset fixed on one’s will rather than on God’s. The metaphorical use of διάνοια is also significant in conveying one’s mindset. Peter’s use of διάνοια as a metaphor in 1 Pet 1:13 ἀναζωσάμενοι τὰς ὀσφύας τῆς διανοίας ὑμῶν, is a summons to readiness of mind and soul. In their inner attitude, Christians should be prepared for right conduct without hampering ἐπιθυμίαι (1:14; 2:11). In 2 Pet 3:1, the εἰλικρινῆς διάνοια which the author seeks to maintain in his readers through the epistle is a “pure disposition. Behm, “Διάνοια,” *TDNT* 4:967.

<sup>117</sup> Behm “Έννοια,” *TDNT* 4:968. In the second epistle of Clement (also called “An Ancient Homily,” is dubbed a “Pseudo-Clement of Rome” as the authorship is disputed), the author of this homily illustrates a picture of how spiritual blindness prevents mind renewal, but God can give understanding and revive his people. “We were deficient in understanding, worshipping stones and wood, and gold, and silver, and brass, the works of men’s hand; and our whole life was nothing else than death. Involved in blindness, and with such darkness before our eyes, we have received sight, and through His will have laid aside that cloud by which we were enveloped” *An Ancient Homily 1.1* (*ANF* 7:517).

<sup>118</sup> Behm “Έννοια,” *TDNT* 4:969. The term έννοια also conveys one’s mindset, one’s disposition, or intentions. An example of the need to pay attention to one’s intentions was in Diodorus Siculus’ depiction of how astrologers interpret the future by the intentions of nature in observing the things of man and of Heaven in *Diodori Bibliotheca Historica*, “For some by the east, and some by the west, and some by the color, they mark them both to those who pay attention to their intentions,” (“τὰ μὲν γὰρ διὰ τῆς ἀνατολῆς, τὰ δὲ διὰ τῆς δύσεως, τινὰ δὲ διὰ τῆς χροῆς προσημαίνειν φασὶν αὐτοὺς τοῖς προσέχειν ἀκριβῶς βουλευθεῖσιν”). (Diodorus Siculus, *Bib. hist.* 2.30.450–451 [Author’s translation]).

ἔννοια has a narrower semantic range, rendered most often as a notion or idea.<sup>119</sup> Paul interestingly does not use this term at all, using νοῦς predominantly to convey the spirit-filled mind. Notably, where Paul uses νοῦς for the mind of Christ in 1 Corinthians 2:16, Peter uses the term ἔννοια to convey the mindset of Christ in 1 Peter 4:1, “Since therefore Christ suffered in the flesh, arm yourselves with the same way of thinking, for whoever has suffered in the flesh has ceased from sin.”<sup>120</sup> These terms are interchangeable to depict mindset, yet Paul’s use of νοῦς in 1 Corinthians 2:16 was being able to think like Jesus in all of life because of the Holy Spirit, and Peter’s use was an encouragement in the face of suffering to remember what Christ’s mindset was when he suffered.<sup>121</sup> The mind of Christ is a choice only those with the Holy Spirit can make. Mindsets do not have to be subject to life circumstances.

### The Role of Φρονέω in the NT

The significance of the NT use of the group of mindset words is that these terms yield their own interpretation in which understanding itself becomes a disposition, an attitude, and thus a mindset of faith.<sup>122</sup> Paul’s significant use of φρονέω underscores the point that renewal begins

---

<sup>119</sup> Silva, “ἔννοια,” *NIDNTTE* 3:426. Delitzsch says, “ἐνθυμήσεις (*enthymēsis*) are the emotions, the notions or imaginations, arising in the heart (see Acts 17:29; Matt. 9:4, 12:25); ἔννοιαι are the trains of thought spinning themselves out in the self-conscious life.” Cremer, “Ἐννοια,” *BTLNTG* 440.

<sup>120</sup> The term ἔννοια is only used two times in the NT (Heb 4:12; 1 Pet 4:1). In all NT contexts, other cognitive terms surround its usage. For instance, in Heb 4:12, the terms ἐνθύμησις, ἔννοια, and καρδιά are employed to show the inner workings of the mind, where the term ἐνθύμησις is a rare term, occurring from the time of Euripides and in the papyrus though not LXX, Philo, or Josephus. Friedrich Büchsel, “Ἐνθύμησις,” *TDNT* 3:167–72. Where ἐνθύμησις means thoughts or reflections of a person, ἔννοια refers to the intention of the person (mindset), and heart refers to the location where these thought processes emanate from. Balz, “ἐνθύμησις,” *EDNT* 1:454. Paul commonly uses anthropological terms together to display man’s cognition.

<sup>121</sup> Jobes notes that “The Christian is to be armed with the same resolve (ἔννοια, *ennoia*) that Jesus Christ himself had (cf. Phil. 2:5). In the LXX Proverbs, the noun ἔννοια often refers to that mindset or disposition that issues in right moral action (e.g., Prov. 2:11; 3:21; 16:22; 23:19). Therefore, Peter exhorts his readers to have the same resolve that characterized Christ.” Jobes, *1 Peter*, BECNT, 237.

<sup>122</sup> Silva, “νοῦς,” *NIDNTTE*, 3:434.

with cognition, but it is not solely cognitive. The Spirit renews one's mind continually. Paul communicates through cognitive language that the ethical requirements of God are not merely deeds done out of obedience but deeds performed from a new mindset that is according to the things of God rather than the things of man. The φρονέω cognate group functions as a lexical bridge, spanning the apostle's theological and ethical arguments in Paul's letter to the Romans, and this word group in Romans 8 is syntactically and contextually connected to Romans 12:2, pointing to the promised transformation through the renewing of one's mind by the Holy Spirit.<sup>123</sup> Through the use of the φρονέω cognate group, Paul is urging God's people to think theologically and ethically to point them to the mind of Christ.<sup>124</sup> Paul's connecting of the verb and noun forms in the φρονέω cognate group with the concepts of flesh and Spirit conveys more than mere human cognition but the intent and natural inclination of the saved and unsaved.<sup>125</sup> The new renewed mind opens a portal to thinking higher.

### **How Now Shall We Live? The Spirit Versus the Flesh: Rom 8:5–14**

Paul lays out an argument in Romans 8 that is unparalleled in its use of terms to convey what life is supposed to look like for those who are in Christ. As Dunn noted, "To live 'according to the flesh' is the antithesis to Christian living (Rom 8:4–13); the flesh is a soil which produces corruption."<sup>126</sup> Whether one submits to the flesh or to the Spirit is a matter of

---

<sup>123</sup> Bond, "Renewing the Mind," 5.

<sup>124</sup> Watson notes that the theological sense of the words that Paul uses is found within the context in which they appear, not an atomization of the text to determine meaning. Francis Watson, *Text and Truth: Redefining Biblical Theology* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1997), 21.

<sup>125</sup> Bond, "Renewing the Mind," 284.

<sup>126</sup> Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*, 52.



lordship, obedience, one's belief system, and mindset. The new nature determines the mindset.<sup>127</sup> Through new terminology and anthropological terms, Paul explains the new way of life the Spirit has for those who are in Christ.

#### Frame of Mind: You Are What You Think (Romans 8:5)

In Romans 8:4, Paul introduces two frames of mind, contrasting the φρονέω of the σάρξ with that of the πνεῦμα.<sup>128</sup> Continuing on the thought of Rom 8:4 that because (γάρ) of Christ's fulfillment on behalf of those who are in Christ, one does not live according to the flesh but according to the Spirit. Paul develops this way of life by revealing the mindset of believers. Romans 8:5 sets the stage for this entire passage to expand Paul's argument about walking in the flesh versus the Spirit.<sup>129</sup> How one thinks ultimately becomes how one lives and who they are. From "walking" (περιπατοῦσιν) in Rom 8:4 to "being" (ὄντες) in Rom 8:5, those that "are" after the things of the flesh or the Spirit will eventually "be" σαρκός or πνεύματος.<sup>130</sup> One's mindset becomes one's identity as one is defined by the flesh or the Spirit. This gives the sense that a worldview has developed—setting one's mind is not just pursuing things of the flesh or the Spirit but having a worldview in accordance with the flesh or the Spirit. At the root of this volition behind a mindset is desire—desiring the things of God or desiring the things of the world. Paul uses the term φρονέω as an indicative to express the mind in Rom 8:5 for the first time in the

---

<sup>127</sup> John Stott and Dale Larsen, *Reading Romans with John Stott: 10 Weeks for Individuals or Groups* (Westmont: InterVarsity Press, 2016), 128.

<sup>128</sup> Keener, *The Mind of the Spirit*, 188.

<sup>129</sup> C. E. B. Cranfield, *Romans 1–8: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, ICC (London: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 1975), 385.

<sup>130</sup> Jonathan R. Pratt, "The Relationship between Justification and Spiritual Fruit in Romans 5–8," *Themelios* 34 (2009): 175.

NT, a departure from the use of νοῦς.<sup>131</sup> As stated earlier in this dissertation, the use of φρονέω was a term well-known in the Greco-Roman world, used to depict one’s mindset according to the flesh. Paul’s use here is a transformation, possibly used polemically and to make a theological statement showing a new way of thinking. One’s own intellect or worldly wisdom could not achieve a superior mindset. Only the Holy Spirit could give man the superior mindset: a righteous mindset. Mindsets are operating behind every deed and thought. The mindsets one has are known and shown by how one lives. Thoughts pave mindsets that become fixed ways of thinking. “Those who have the Spirit manifest the mindset of the Spirit.”<sup>132</sup>

#### State of Mind: Death or Peace (Romans 8:6)

The word “for” (γάρ) serves as a preface for an example of what it means to walk in the flesh, which is to be in enmity with God. Like a needle sewing pieces of fabric together, Paul is connecting the dots with multiple uses of the term “for”, building a case and proving that one’s mindset is formed in accordance (κατὰ) with how one is living. Living in accordance with the flesh (σάρκα) puts one at odds with God. Living according to the Spirit (πνεῦμα) puts one at peace with God. Paul contrasts the difference between the φρόνημα τοῦ πνεύματος and φρόνημα τῆς σαρχός with the adversative conjunction δέ (“but”) which continues Paul’s antithetic parallelism to point to the fruit of each mindset and encourage the pursuit of peace (τὸ δὲ φρόνημα τοῦ πνεύματος ζωὴ καὶ εἰρήνη).<sup>133</sup> Though the man of the Spirit is still capable of sin,

---

<sup>131</sup> Bertram notes that Paul uses the indicative for φρονοῦμεν along with the cohortative φρονῶμεν as a verbal at Phil 3:15: “Be thus minded.” “Since the orientation is finally a gift of God’s Spirit, the variant is of no material significance.” Bertram, “Φρονέω,” *TDNT* 9:232–36.

<sup>132</sup> Thomas R. Schreiner, *Romans*, *BECNT* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2018), 397.

<sup>133</sup> John D. Harvey, *Romans*, *EGGNT* (Nashville, TN: B&H, 2017), 192.

the Spirit imparts the power to overcome sin.<sup>134</sup> Romans 6 displays the result of what one thinks about—the formation of mindsets of the flesh or the Spirit. The state of one’s mind is naturally bent toward sin apart from the Holy Spirit and needs to be immersed and renewed in the Word of God regularly. The term φρόνημα is utilized in this verse to depict the mindset. According to Keener, there is no exact equivalent of φρόνημα in English, and the wide semantic range in Greek necessitates context to rightly render the meaning of the term. Given the semantic range of φρόνημα, the phrases often translated as “mind of the Spirit” and “mind of the flesh” can refer to the divergent frames of mind, cognitive dispositions, or cognitive approaches of the Spirit and of the flesh.”<sup>135</sup> The mind of the Spirit is a mind led by righteousness.<sup>136</sup>

The phrase “mind set on the flesh” is the Greek phrase φρόνημα τῆς σαρκός, meaning the mind *of* the flesh. When one’s mind is set on the things of the flesh, one is “of” the flesh. One’s mindset becomes action.<sup>137</sup> The word “of” is indicative of possession.<sup>138</sup> Everyone owns their own behaviors, but does a mindset own a person? It is difficult to be set free from a mindset that dominates the mind. The outlooks, values, and desires of the mind of the flesh are counter to the purposes of God and are part of a culture of death (θάνατος).<sup>139</sup> Allowing the things of this world

---

<sup>134</sup> William M. Greathouse, “Romans,” in *Romans Through 1 and 2 Corinthians*, ed. Albert F. Harper, NBBC 8 (Kansas City, MO: The Foundry Publishing, 2011), 167.

<sup>135</sup> Keener, *The Mind of the Spirit*, 188.

<sup>136</sup> The mind of the Spirit always fulfills the law, whereas the mind of the flesh is in rebellion with God’s law. *Ibid.*, 191.

<sup>137</sup> *Ibid.*, 168.

<sup>138</sup> R. Laird Harris, “γ,” *TWOT* 463.

<sup>139</sup> Cranfield, *Romans 1–8*, 386.

to dominate life is spiritual suicide.<sup>140</sup> The mind of the flesh is in death's grip. Extrabiblical literature also describes this mind of death. The Wisdom of Solomon describes the mind of the flesh as a "covenant with death" (1:16), where one lives according to an interest in this life only, "A result of a failure to grasp God's ultimate purposes for human beings."<sup>141</sup>

Paul's use of φρόνημα and its cognates in Romans and Philippians underscores the significance of human cognition and reasoning as part of the renewed mind.<sup>142</sup> Mindsets are cultures established within one's own mind, where fleshly thoughts form prideful strongholds influencing against repentance, eventually becoming one's belief system. Herein is why one does not have peace. Mindsets trap people in what they are familiar with—their own thoughts. A mind of flesh is a state of mind of being in open rebellion to God, giving one's own thoughts authority over God's. Many are blind to this reality and feel they are a prisoner within their own mind, incapable of choosing the mind of the Spirit. This is the role that deception plays in the culture of death. The fruit of one's actions conveys who rules one's mind. The mind is what must be renewed and can be reset by the Spirit. The mind "of" the Spirit bears the fruit of life (ζωή) and peace (εἰρήνη) and is indicative of one who is operating in the Spirit. Believers who do not walk in the Spirit do not recognize their identity in Christ.<sup>143</sup> Paul's exhortation was applicable to both believers and nonbelievers, an admonishment to believers to live into the grace of God and a

---

<sup>140</sup> Robert Mounce, *Romans: An Exegetical and Theological Exposition of Holy Scripture*, NAC 27 (Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 1995), 137.

<sup>141</sup> David A. deSilva, *Transformation: The Heart of Paul's Gospel* (Ashland, WA: Lexham Press, 2014), 45. See also Isaiah 28:15 for the "covenant with death" language.

<sup>142</sup> By reading the φρήν word group, specifically φρόνημα and its cognates into diverse contexts, Paul distinguishes each use by the corresponding theological or ethical sense of the terms employed. Watson, *Text and Truth*, 21.

<sup>143</sup> Keener, *The Mind of the Spirit*, 196.

warning to unbelievers.<sup>144</sup> A mindset of flesh, then, is much like other sins—it must be dealt with as such. God has commanded everyone to repent (Acts 17:30). Jesus called out thoughts as the source for all sin (Mark 7:20-23). Mindsets can be healed through repentance and the Spirit of life.

#### One Track Mind: In Bondage to the Flesh (Rom 8:7)

In Romans 8:5, the word “set” is used as an infinitive, as a choice of volition, “*to set*,” but in Romans 8:6 and 7, there is a progression that is evidenced by a shift to a mind that “*is set*.” This mindset, Paul says in Romans 8:7, “cannot” submit to God. “For the mind that *is set* on the flesh is hostile to God, for it *does not* submit to God's law; indeed, it *cannot* (δύναται)” (Rom 8:7). This word for “cannot” means here to lack the capability to do something.<sup>145</sup> One who is in the grasp of the mind of flesh cannot submit to God.

What is it about this formation of a progression of a mindset that inhibits one from escaping the death culture of the mind of flesh? Paul states the reason matter-of-factly. The cause (Διότι) of a mindset is hostility toward God. Sin is deceptive and separates man from God. This separation forms a mindset steeped in rebellion, leading to eventual bondage (δουλείας) to the flesh's way of thinking (Rom 8:15). This bondage is birthed from man's pride, which chooses one's own thoughts over God's.<sup>146</sup> This bondage is bondage to self, centered with thoughts that are dominated by the glory of self rather than choosing to be subject (υποτάσσεται) to God. The philosophy of this world, “be true to oneself” is a deceptive link in the chain of bondage to

---

<sup>144</sup> Richard N. Longenecker, *The Epistle to the Romans*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2016), 658.

<sup>145</sup> BDAG, s.v. “δύναμαι,” 261–262.

<sup>146</sup> Cranfield, *Romans 1–8*, 386.

worldly, fleshly mindsets. Therefore, a mind of the flesh must be dealt with. The problem, however, is that many do not take mindsets seriously. Excuses are made. It is the human condition. Victims of fleshly mindsets are held in bondage and likely feel unable to affect their spiritual condition impacted and caused by their own mind. Paul's use of the word "mind" in this context refers to the whole person, who is considered God's enemy.<sup>147</sup>

#### A Narrow-Mind: Trapped in Sin (Rom 8:8)

Paul reiterates one's inability to please God with the repetition of "cannot" in Rom 8:8, seeking to persuade his listeners of their dire situation. Paul continues contrasting (δέ) the σάρξ versus the πνεῦμα but is one-sided in this verse, narrowing in on the reality of the results of life in the σάρξ, building on the truths of verse 7. Paul's progression reveals the final state and end of one trapped in a mindset of flesh. There is no middle ground—one is either in the flesh or in the Spirit.<sup>148</sup> Such a person cannot please (ἀρέσαι) God. This word for "please" connotes the establishment of a beneficial relationship marked by making peace or reconciling.<sup>149</sup> There is no reconciliation with God if one's mind is opposed to God. A mindset is a trap, then, determining one's eternal domain. For it is to God that one is accountable (Rom 3:19). One who is "in the flesh" does what one's human nature dictates and is ruled by the power of flesh and sin rather than by the spirit.<sup>150</sup>

---

<sup>147</sup> Barclay Moon Newman and Eugene Albert Nida, *A Handbook on Paul's Letter to the Romans*, UBS Handbook Series (New York, NY: United Bible Societies, 1973), 149.

<sup>148</sup> William M. Kruidenier and Kenneth Boa, *Romans*, HNTC (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2000), 230.

<sup>149</sup> Werner Foerster, "Ἀρέσκω," *TDNT* 1:455–58.

<sup>150</sup> Newman, *A Handbook on Paul's Letter to the Romans*, 149.

### Keep This in Mind: “In” the Spirit (Rom 8:9)

Paul uses a cluster of indicative statements in Romans 8:9–11 and conditional clauses that progressively lead to 8:12, where “we are debtors” exposes the pretense that supposedly spiritual people are safe. In Rom 8:9 Paul distinguishes between those who belong to God who have the indwelling Holy Spirit and those who do not.<sup>151</sup> This term “belong” (ἀντοῦ) indicates a fulfilled position.<sup>152</sup> The work has already been done. One who is in Christ is secure and in the Spirit. The use of the words “dwells in” (οἰκεῖ ἐν) denotes “a settled, permanent penetrative influence, possession by a power superior to the self.”<sup>153</sup> The exalted Christ is the πνεῦμα, and turning to Him grants one access into the realm of the πνεῦμα, which is defined as “the mode of existence of the κύριος.”<sup>154</sup> In Rom 8:9, the phrase ἔχειν πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ has a strong ethical emphasis where those who have the “Spirit” of Christ can also be said to have the “mind” of Christ.<sup>155</sup> Those who do not belong to Christ are under the influence of the evil one. We see this principle of the powerful influence of the evil one in Ephesians. “...He is the spirit at work in the hearts of those who refuse to obey God” (Eph 2:2, NLT). This refusal to obey God demonstrates a mindset of flesh. But those who are in Christ have a belief system underneath their mindset that is different than those who do not believe. Ἐν ὑμῖν (“in you”) highlights the fellowship between

---

<sup>151</sup> Richard J. Dillon, “The Spirit as Taskmaster and Troublemaker in Romans 8,” *CBQ* 60 (1998): 694.

<sup>152</sup> Cranfield, *Romans 1–8*, 388.

<sup>153</sup> Cranfield, *Romans 1–8*, 388.

<sup>154</sup> In Rom 1:3 πνεῦμα denotes the heavenly sphere or its substance, before Paul did and Paul adopts this understanding, in which πνεῦμα is a sphere of heavenly substance, not just a local sphere. Schweizer notes that “The OT antithesis between the Holy Spirit of God and the weak and sinful flesh (Isa 31:3) is here in the process of adopting Hellenistic features prepared already in the distinction made by Apocalyptic and Rabbinism between the lower and the upper worlds. If the Jew thinks this world is stamped by its rebellion against God or at least by its corruptibility, for the Hellenist, its substance is alien to God.” Schweizer, “Πνεῦμα,” *TDNT* 6:416–19.

<sup>155</sup> Hermann Hanse, “Ἐνέχω,” *TDNT* 2:816–32.

the believer and Christ, describing the combination as a settled permanent penetrative influence.”<sup>156</sup> Both those in the Spirit and those in the flesh can be prone to influences and negative mindsets, but it is unbelief that keeps one bound in fleshly mindsets. Those who are in Christ no longer have to be in bondage to unbelief. Believers are still capable of quenching the Spirit (1 Thess 5:19), grieving the Spirit (Eph 4:30), or of sin, but a person in whom the Holy Spirit dwells should be controlled by the Spirit.<sup>157</sup>

#### A Load Off Your Mind: Alive because of Righteousness (Rom 8:10)

Paul uses a small but important word in Romans 8:9 and then here at the beginning of verse 10: “if” (εἰ). The mindset and eternal standing of man hinges on this conditional word. Those who are in Christ have righteousness (δικαιοσύνην) within them to help them combat the flesh. The consequence of being in Christ is life. The consequence of being in the flesh is death. Paul emphasizes that the body is still dead (νεκρὸν), yet the Spirit brings life. This life is possible because of Christ’s work alone. The body of one who is in Christ is dead because of being *in* Christ, which renders one already dead to sin, but judgment has already been executed on sin through Christ, making one’s spirit alive, for in Christ, one is pronounced righteous.<sup>158</sup> On account of (διὰ) sin (ἁμαρτίαν), there is death. On account of (διὰ) righteousness (δικαιοσύνην), there is life (ζωή). Paul is illustrating a cause and effect, but the cause and effect are trumped by the righteousness of Christ. Those who are in Christ bypass death as the Spirit produces life. The

---

<sup>156</sup> Harvey, *Romans*, 25.

<sup>157</sup> Kruidenier, *Romans*, 230.

<sup>158</sup> Rudolf Bultmann, “Νεκρός,” *TDNT* 4:892–6.



term “διὰ” is rendered consistently for לַעַל and especially לַעַל־בְּיָ, in the LXX, meaning “on the basis of.”<sup>159</sup> On the basis of Christ in an individual, that person is righteous. Hallelujah!

### Raise Your Mind: Life through the Spirit (Rom 8:11)

In Rom 8:11, Paul reveals that the Spirit is an eschatological advance that the bodies of believers will be redeemed, for one’s whole being will be resurrected.<sup>160</sup> The indwelling Spirit of God is the difference in one’s mindset and the difference in the coming resurrection. The use of the phrase πνεῦμα θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν in Rom 8:9, 11, and also in 1 Cor 3:16 was a Paulinism that provided catechetical and didactic elements in Paul’s theology.<sup>161</sup> Dunn notes that in Rom 8:11 and 2 Cor. 3:6, “Paul himself speaks of the life-giving (*zōopoieō*) function of the Spirit, and in Rom 8:2 speaks of the Spirit as “the Spirit of life.”<sup>162</sup> Reaffirming the consequence of life in the Spirit, Paul shifts to stating the Spirit differently, revealing the cause and effect descriptively. The Spirit of Christ in Rom 8:10 is now the Spirit of the one who raised Jesus from the dead. “Πνεῦμα τοῦ ἐγείραντος τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐκ νεκρῶν”. The power of Almighty God dwells (οἰκεῖ) in you (ὑμῖν), in all who profess and believe in Christ. This personalizes the reality of the power of Christ, coupled with the repetition of the phrase, “The Spirit of the One Who raised Jesus from the dead.” The word “ζωοποιήσει” was recognized by Calvin to refer to “the continual operation of the Spirit, by which He gradually mortified the remains of the flesh and renews in us the

---

<sup>159</sup> Albrecht Oepke, “Διὰ,” *TDNT* 2:65–70.

<sup>160</sup> Hanse, “Ἐνέχω,” *TDNT* 2:820.

<sup>161</sup> Of particular importance in this phrase is the term οἰκεῖν, which depicts “inward psychological and spiritual processes,” meaning to “dwell in.” As sin dwells in man, it has dominion over him, but as the Holy Spirit dwells in man, the Holy Spirit is Lord over that person. Otto Michel, “Οἰκέω,” *TDNT* 119–59.

<sup>162</sup> Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*, 261.

heavenly life.”<sup>163</sup> Some think of this term as referencing only the final resurrection. But the mindset of believers should be ever-growing to be more like Christ, not diminishing and reverting to the flesh. Christ’s death and resurrection have a continual efficacy through the resident Holy Spirit.

#### Make Up Your Mind: Under Obligation (Rom 8:12)

One is not obligated to the flesh but to the Spirit. But those in bondage to sin often “feel” as if they cannot help themselves. The flesh compels them to remain under the obligation of the flesh. This is part of the mindset struggle. But the obligation the redeemed man is under is according to the Spirit, not the flesh. According to BDAG, “That which one is obligated to do stands in the genitive ὀφειλέται ἐσμὲν οὐ τ. σαρκὶ τοῦ κατὰ σάρκα ζῆν; we are under obligation but not to the flesh, to live according to its demands.”<sup>164</sup> The mindset that was previously fixed on the flesh is to now be fixed on Christ. In Christ, one is obligated to the Spirit for one’s life. Pressure and condemnation keep one’s mind bound to obligation. “In accordance with the later Jewish use of בּוֹחַ (ὀφειλέτης) is one who is guilty of a fault.”<sup>165</sup> Shame, then, is a culture of its own within the inner workings of the mind, keeping one bound to the lifestyle they have been engaged in. The new paradigm of being indwelt by the Spirit means a new manager has taken residence that overrides allegiance to the flesh and one’s own mind.

---

<sup>163</sup> Cranfield, *Romans 1–8*, 391.

<sup>164</sup> BDAG, s.v. “ὀφειλέτης,” 742.

<sup>165</sup> Friedrich Hauck, “ὀφειλέτης,” *TDNT* 5:560–66.

### Out of Your Mind: Death Brings Life (Rom 8:13)

In Romans 8:13, Paul uses the word “if” (εἰ) to invite the church at Rome to choose between two contrasting conditional clauses that have implications for the possibilities of human existence.”<sup>166</sup> Reminiscent of Moses’ clarion call to choose life over death (Deut 30:19) and Joshua’s challenge to choose whom one would serve—Yahweh or idols (Josh 24:15), Paul connects the dots that this choice begins with one’s mindset. One cannot remain ambivalent about this choice between life and death. Yet it is the Spirit that is the means by which one puts the practices of the body to death.<sup>167</sup> One must make up one’s mind and act on one’s decision. One must put to death (θανατοῦτε) the deeds (πράξεις) of the flesh and sin. This putting to death is a continual action.<sup>168</sup> This is why mindsets are so significant. Repeated actions become habitual and help ingrain mindsets. The phrase in the KJV, “after the flesh” (κατὰ σάρκα) in verses 12–13, is indicative of a state of mind.<sup>169</sup> The death culture of the fleshly mindset ensnares the minds of men to go after the flesh. But choosing to die to those thoughts and deeds brings life. The understanding of the human mind (νοῦς) goes beyond this word for life. “It can be described as something different from vital ζωή which has come into the soul θύραθεν, and which is the divine in man.”<sup>170</sup> The thoughts that precede from one’s mindset need to be shaped by the Word of God for these very thoughts lead to eternity. As was so aptly stated by Bultmann,

---

<sup>166</sup> Cranfield, *Romans 1–8*, 394.

<sup>167</sup> Richard P. Carlson, “Romans 8: 12–17,” *Int* 58 (2004): 281.

<sup>168</sup> *Ibid.*, 395.

<sup>169</sup> *BDAG*, s.v. “κατά,” 511.

<sup>170</sup> Rudolf Bultmann, “Ζωή,” *TDNT* 2:832–75.

“Νόμος rules the βίος of men, and life is truly fulfilled as life in the νοῦς.”<sup>171</sup> Spiritual laws govern one’s mind. Man’s life is fulfilled when one’s mindset yields to the law of the Spirit of life.

#### Change Your Mind: Led by the Spirit (Rom 8:14)

Paul reveals another aspect of why mindsets are so addictive. People are *led* (ἄγονται) by their flesh or led by the Spirit. People cannot lead themselves in their own strength to follow God’s law, for no one is capable of fulfilling God’s Law except for Christ. Christ did so on man’s behalf. Man is easily led by influences, and being resident in the flesh, the flesh has a profound influence. But the Holy Spirit, “Πνεῦμα δουλείας,” is “the activating or essential principle influencing a person.”<sup>172</sup> Those in the flesh have the flesh as the dominant influence. But those with the indwelling Holy Spirit have the Holy Spirit to influence them. Man’s strength and power fail, but there is power that supersedes the will and mindset of man that is available to those who are in Christ (2 Pet 1:3-4). Believers who are led by the Spirit will not be led to the flesh. One’s mind can be changed—transformed by the Spirit—as one yields one’s will to God.

#### **Conclusion: The Mindset as Part of the Fulfillment of God’s Story**

The covenant between Yahweh and his people is the basis and theological center on which the OT is constructed and what binds the OT to the NT; it is an interpretive grid for understanding God’s storyline in the Scriptures, displaying the significance of man’s mindset in

---

<sup>171</sup> Rudolf Bultmann, “Ζωή,” *TDNT* 2: 836.

<sup>172</sup> Harvey, *Romans*, 197.

his inability to love God, interpret or apply God's Word or reach others.<sup>173</sup> Through communicating the means for walking with God by the transformation of one's mind and mindset, man can once again know God and his thoughts and live according to them. The greatest scholar cannot understand the things of God through intellect or scholarship. Without the Holy Spirit's illumination, one cannot even comprehend the Word of God, much less apply it to one's life. Mind renewal is the difference between one faithfully walking with God or not, and the term φρονέω and its cognates, along with a constellation of terms as presented in this chapter, establish this fact. Paul's theological anthropology helped usher in the new paradigm of a whole new way of thinking that relied on God's wisdom, not the world's wisdom. This new kingdom living where one could distinguish in one's inner being between the πνεῦμα and the σὰρξ demonstrates the significance of the Holy Spirit to help one establish a godly mindset for the purposes of God, impacting one's life and eternity. In the next chapter, the culmination of all the exploration of mindset terminology comes to a head as the motif of thinking on the things of God rather than the things of man (Rom 8:5) is pronounced by Matthew and Mark and asserted in Philippians by Paul, displaying the difference one's mindset can make.

---

<sup>173</sup> Paul R. Williamson, *Sealed with an Oath: Covenant in God's Unfolding Purpose*, NSBT 23 (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press; London: Apollos, 2007), 31.

## CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION, A KINGDOM MINDSET

The path to mind renewal is replete with anthropological and cognitive terms that connect and echo throughout the canon to usher the kingdom of God into the heart of man. This in-depth study began with a small word that seemed rare in appearance in the canon but big in impact: the term “mindset.” Trying to prove the significance of mindsets in the OT, which did not use the word “mind,” seemed illogical. But as the progressive revelation of Christ and the revelation of mind renewal unfolded, so did a better understanding of the nature of man. This research has sought to demonstrate the significance of the employment of φρονέω and other cognitive terms throughout the canon and to synopsize their use by Paul through an exposition of Romans 8:5–14.<sup>1</sup> Before one can understand what a mindset is, one needs to understand human nature and the mind/heart. Beginning with a study of anthropological terminology to clarify human nature, the significance of these terms was demonstrated through Paul’s use of them, which helped to redefine the identity and nature of God’s people according to the resurrected Christ. Paul’s revelation of the promised new heart is Christological, redefining man’s broken image through the resurrected Christ and the power of the Holy Spirit in anthropological cognitive terms that were eschatological and transformed to demonstrate mind renewal. Paul’s word choices were more than just words—they were theological and ethical statements about this new kingdom lifestyle and how this lifestyle could be accessed through the Holy Spirit. Ultimately, the term φρονέω harkens back to man’s identity in his maker. The many cognitive and anthropological terms connect throughout the canon to reinforce the message of thinking in accordance with

---

<sup>1</sup> Through a diachronic analysis of φρονέω, it was noted that φρονέω shifted in meaning and significance from the OT to the NT, perhaps in line with the Hellenistic influence, a better understanding of human nature, and an increasing understanding and emphasis of the significance of one’s thoughts. The synchronic analysis of φρονέω in the NT showed how significant this term was in conveying Paul’s message of the Spirit-filled life.

one's true identity. That identity, made in the image of God, is where God's people can begin to think like Christ.

### Accessing Mind Renewal

Mindset is a popular term today. Positive mindsets are touted as the remedy to life's woes, but mankind is incapable of having a righteous, truly healthy mindset without the Holy Spirit. Society's conclusions and solutions for mind renewal emanate from one's own ability to change oneself, but growth mindsets and positive thinking are inadequate solutions that cannot change the heart of man. People today are living less than abundant lives (including Christians). How could the mind renewal God offers be missed? Mindsets. Mindsets fixed on the things of man rather than the things of God hinder one's ability to rightly interpret Scripture or reach the world with the gospel. The hope is that this dissertation has provided an understanding of how mindsets work, as seen in the study of a constellation of terms and exposition of several biblical passages, and that it has become evident everyone needs mind renewal to be able to love God and others. Mind renewal is initiated through repentance, which unlocks the door to mindsets. But it is the Holy Spirit who transforms minds. Then, mindsets are renewed daily by saturating one's mind with the Word of God, which helps to orient one's thinking toward God rather than the things of this world. Mind renewal will mean choosing to believe God's Word when our own thoughts are counter to God's or when life's harsh realities scream the opposite. Paul reveals how the Holy Spirit is able to renew man's whole being through the use of  $\varphi\rho\nu\acute{\epsilon}\omega$  and other cognitive terms. By taking the Hebrew thinking that man is "one being," Paul transforms Greek

dualism to show the significance of man's "inner and outer being" in mind renewal and to reveal how the Holy Spirit is able to renew man's whole being.<sup>2</sup>

### **Chapter One Summary: The Significance of Mindsets**

In chapter one, the case was laid that worldly mindsets, often unbeknownst to people, are wrought through cultural influences and the implicit trust one has in one's own mind, inhibiting one from knowing and loving God, the greatest commandment. The need for mindset renewal was approached from the standpoint of understanding the nature of man and the requirements of a holy God. Examining the anthropological terms atomistically or literally leads to a misunderstanding of man's nature and a misinterpretation of God's Word. To avoid this, a thorough analysis was conducted of terms and their semantic domains within the contexts in which they appeared, and their significance was explored throughout the canon. An examination of the classical Greek view demonstrated that a misunderstanding of the nature of man inhibited understanding God's Word and his purposes in his people. The mind-body argument misses the point. Man is not merely a sum of various anthropological parts, but he is a soul, a whole living being who is an image bearer of God. Understanding one's identity according to God instead of according to culture helps one to think according to the things of God rather than the things of man. The significance of mindsets is realized in the effect a mindset has on one's ability to fulfill the greatest commandment to love God and rightly divide the Word of God. Worldly mindsets

---

<sup>2</sup> Paul reveals that human nature is best understood through the Spirit, not relying on one's cognition or the wisdom of this world but on the mind of Christ. God's people choose to think about the things of God rather than the things of man, walking in the Spirit rather than the flesh. By shifting the dualistic thought of human nature in the culture that emphasized a duality between mind and body to a flesh versus Spirit paradigm, Paul introduces a new concept that is revelatory.



are ultimately unbelief, sin, and a divided heart, which points to the need for a new heart, especially if every inclination or intention of one's thoughts is evil (Gen 6:5).

### Carnal Mindsets Are Unbelief, Sin, and a Divided Heart

Deuteronomy 15:9a highlights the process of mindsets. Mindsets emanate from rumination on matter and words (דבר), which are processed and become thoughts that shape understanding, leading to misinterpretation of circumstances and, more importantly, the Word of God. This leads to worldviews that distort lives and one's relationship with God. Mindsets are ultimately unbelief (when one believes one's own thoughts over God's) and sin (when in opposition to God's thoughts) that lead to a divided heart (one cannot love God with all one's being and also cherish the world and one's own perspective). Repentance is necessary to acknowledge when thoughts are not aligned with God's mind. The senses are a barometer of one's mindset.<sup>3</sup> But one does not have to be led by one's senses, and Scripture advises to keep watch (שמר) over one's spirit (Mal 2:15f). When one's mindset is set against and prized above Scripture, one's thoughts become idolatry. Mindsets lead to misinterpretation and wayward souls. Relying on the wisdom of the world leads one far away from the heart of God. Jewish sects relied on the law for wisdom, while the Greeks relied on rhetoric and man's reason. However, they both relied on their own wisdom above God's, and both missed the Messiah through a misinterpretation of Scripture.

---

<sup>3</sup> Scripture uses the senses to convey the need for man to pay attention to God, and the senses are a driving force behind mindsets. The eyes (עין [ayin]) and ears (אזן [ 'ōzen]) are significant in shaping mindsets, and an indicator of one's mindset. Both עין' and אזן are used metaphorically to convey how man's nature interacts with his surroundings and interprets the world, shaping his worldview and impacting his faithfulness or faithlessness to God. The עין' can lead to coveting and idolatry or can winnow out what is worthless and prize God instead. The אזן are commanded to hear (Shema) what God is saying above the din of the world.

## Chapter Two Summary: The Significance of Human Nature in Mindsets

An abundance of terms forms a constellation that points the way to the renewed mindset God intends for his people, which begins to be unveiled in chapter two. An exploration of human nature and cognitive terms relating to how man thinks unveils the need for man, created in God's image, to be recreated. Understanding human nature is significant to understanding mindsets. Man is more than just the sum of his parts. Man is a whole being exhibiting God to the world. Man was never intended to be defined by components of his being, though those components can provide insight into understanding the mind of man when those anthropological components are theologically understood. Understanding the anthropological terms is not just vocabulary; biblical anthropology has a theological framework and application. These anthropological terms represent the seat and function of psychic and physical aspects in relation to God and others. Wolff noted: "The inner parts of the body and its organs are at the same time the bearer of man's spiritual and ethical impulses."<sup>4</sup> Man is intended to be defined by the one who made him. The implicit significance of mindsets has been seen by the emphasis on the Shema, which is contingent upon the mindset of man. The superabundance of cognitive and anthropological terms in the mindset narrative points to the need for mind renewal. The repetition of similar terms is not simply redundancy, as each term has its own significance and application in mindsets. Silva notes that the term  $\phi\rho\nu\acute{\epsilon}\omega$  could not simply be swapped for other cognitive terms, as  $\phi\rho\nu\acute{\epsilon}\omega$  does not just mean "to think" but means "mental determination" that relies on a higher supernatural mode of thinking.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Wolff, *Anthropology of the Old Testament*, 66.

<sup>5</sup> Silva, *Philippians*, BECNT, 38.

The anthropological and cognitive framework in the canon undergoes a transformation in the progression toward the long-awaited mind renewal. From being made in God's image to becoming like the world's image to an invitation to be remade through Paul's exploitation of human terminology to convey heavenly concepts, the significance of man's identity is at the center of one's mindset. Man's dependence on the σάρξ or the πνεῦμα determines his nature. Paul unified the anthropological terms through his extensive use of the φρονέω word family, showing that the cognitive functions are not as significant as what one *does* with those functions. Relying on the world's wisdom causes one to misinterpret God's Word. The significance of Paul's mindset terms in the NT is that they serve to expose the cause and effect of mindsets and reveal how a carnal disposition or attitude is against God and can only be transformed into a mindset of faith through the Holy Spirit. Carnal mindsets are bondage that prevents one from living an abundant life. Augustine pointed out that when one lives not according to his own reason, he finds true happiness.

“Insofar as the nature of man is concerned, there is nothing in him better than mind and reason—and yet the man who wishes to live happily should not live according to this, for then he lives as man lives although, in order to be able to attain happiness, he should live as God lives” (Augustine, *Retractationes* 1.1.2)

#### Carnal Mindsets Become One's Identity and Truth

The formation of mindsets is susceptible to man's tendency to lean on his own reasoning above God's. The mechanics of a mindset emanate from one's identity, which is either fixed on the things of man or the things of God. The cultures of this world distract man from his true identity. In the culture today, it is common for people to believe “what is true to them.” Mindsets are lies because the human heart is deceptive (Jer 17:9). The deception within one's own heart yields thinking according to the flesh rather than the Spirit. Subjective “truth” leads to faulty reasoning and interpretation. The Enlightenment served to entice people to set their reasoning

above God's. But this was nothing new; the heart of man has always been in rebellion with God since the Fall. The origin of worldly mindsets is a fallen man attempting to rule himself, akin to the book of Judges, where the mindset was depicted as "everyone did what was right in their own eyes." Faithfulness to God hinges upon one's mindset and impacts the interpretation of God's Word. Without mind renewal, one's actions will follow the condition of one's mind. The motif of mind renewal is demonstrated in man's desperate need in the biblical narrative and cognitive terms that illustrate the tension between man's and God's thoughts while pointing to God's solution. Scripture has solutions for the formation of carnal mindsets.<sup>6</sup> These solutions are based on the Spirit and wisdom of God, not the wisdom of this world or the flesh. A high view of Scripture and deference of one's thoughts before God paves the way toward the renewing of one's mind. Mankind was made in the image of God and can think like God again.

### **Chapter Three Summary: The Significance of Culture in Shaping Mindsets**

The ANE and Greco-Roman cultures were fertile environments for cultivating a cognitive environment fixed on what was really demonic worship (Lev 17:7; Deut 32:16–17; 1 Cor 10:20; 1 Tim 4:1) with polytheistic and syncretic practices and flourishing idolatry. Their 'gods' were not gods at all and enticed God's people away into apostasy. Building upon the understanding that carnal mindsets are unbelief shaped by one's fleshly identity and worldview, chapter three revealed that pagan worship led God's people astray. The land was full of idols in the OT and the NT (Isa 2:8; Acts 17:16). Counterfeit religious practices replaced the covenantal relationship with Yahweh in the OT as idolatry and false gods became the impetus behind

---

<sup>6</sup> See Isa 43:10, 47:7; 57:12; Ps 51:10; 119:11; John 8:32; Rom 12:2; 2 Cor 10:4–5; Eph 4:23; Phil 4:6–7, 8, Col 3:2; 1 Peter 1:13.

mindsets. The idolatrous worldview was incorporated into the language and practices of the culture, and the historical backdrop reinforced the cultural values as the norm. For the Greeks, religion was embedded in the culture, making it difficult to separate demonic influences. Human reason was worshiped along with worldly wisdom. Growing in reason and worldly wisdom was touted and cultivated by the culture fixed on its own ideals. By recognizing that the mindsets in the culture are ultimately unbelief and sin, God's people can repent and develop the mind of Christ. Just as a divided kingdom cannot stand so a person with a divided mind (a mindset) cannot stand firmly in Christ.

#### Mindsets are Shaped by What One Worships

While man is being wooed away from God by the culture, the canonical plea to repent and relent from sin is difficult to submit to, for pride and deception block the ability to hear God's voice. Man was made to worship Yahweh but worshiped counterfeit idols and 'gods' instead, corrupting his mindset. Mindsets are formed by what one worships and thus end in idolatry when fixed on the creation rather than the creator. Often unaware of the cultural influence, people are led astray by their own minds. The end result of the influences of a fallen culture and man's innate desires, which are counter to God's commandments, is a spiritual heart condition that needs renewal by God. Mindsets lead to hardened, divided hearts filled with pride. At the root of mindsets are the inner cravings of man, which are a statement of one's spiritual identity. The κόσμος, σάρξ, and Διάβολος have a carnal influence and impact on mindsets. The concept of κόσμος is the center of theological thinking in the Johannine and Pauline writings.<sup>7</sup> Paul's definition of the κόσμος was unique and the first anthropological and historical use of this

---

<sup>7</sup> Hermann Sasse, "Κόσμος," *TDNT* 3:867–898.

term, revealing the values of the world system, which were counter to God’s standards and God’s salvific purposes for the κόσμος.<sup>8</sup> God’s people were to be defined by God, not by the world. The canon serves in part to remind God’s people of their history of faithlessness to Yahweh due to their mindsets. “Now these things occurred as examples to keep us from setting our hearts on evil things as they did” (1 Corinthians 10:6 NIV). Those who do not know history are destined to repeat it. Setting one’s heart emanates from wrongly placed desires (ἐπιθυμητής), ultimately covetousness as illustrated in Ezekiel 33:31 with the term *בְּשָׂא* (*bě’sā*) that fuels mindsets. The origin of desire is not just man’s flesh, but the κόσμος (1 John 2:16) and the διάβολος also fuel man’s desire.<sup>9</sup> An examination of the cognition within the ANE and Greco-Roman environments, along with an examination of the canonical call to contrition, reveals that the shaping of a mindset from the culture can be broken and remade through the Spirit. Jeremiah pronounced the stubborn inclinations of man’s heart (Jer 3:17; 7:24; 9:14; 11:8; 13:10; 16:12; 23:17), which was fertile ground for a remedy and ultimate prophesy of man’s greatest need—a new heart no longer fixed on rebellion against God and a kingdom mindset fixed on God’s glory (Ezek 11:19; 36:26; Jer 31:33, Heb 8:10). This remedy would enable man to be restored to God and to think like God. God searches and examines all hearts to reward or punish (Jer 17:10) but recognizing one’s own mindset as rebellious to God is not readily acknowledged. The heart of God is to reconcile his people back to himself. Repentance breaks the chains of mindsets, and relenting from pursuing one’s own way begins the process of mind renewal. The hope of the gospel is that the renewing of the mind restores God’s people so they can worship God again and

---

<sup>8</sup> Silva, “κόσμος,” *NIDNTTE* 2:734.

<sup>9</sup> Silva, “ἐπιθυμέω,” *NIDNTTE* 2:241–244.

be back on a mission to reach the culture surrounding them rather than being captivated by the culture. The remedy for seemingly untamable desires is to walk in the Spirit (Gal 5:16–17 NIV) with a kingdom mindset fixed on God’s purposes, not man’s.

#### **Chapter Four Summary: The Significance of the Mind of Christ**

The call to repentance is proclaimed in the NT as the mind of Christ is expressed as a metaphor for the people of God to emulate. The concept of “the mind of Christ” has been misunderstood since it was first introduced by Paul. Still today, it is a difficult concept to comprehend because it is spiritual, though it is not mystical (1 Cor 2:14). The mind of Christ is both a practical and perfect example of what is the *τέλειος* (*teleios*) for all believers and, at the same time, a supernatural work the Holy Spirit accomplishes to give God’s people understanding. Through the ages, attempts have been made to seek to understand the mind of Christ by a historical or pragmatic examination, but the mind of Christ is a progressive work and goal for those whom the Holy Spirit inhabits. The gift of the Holy Spirit illumines truth and understanding for God’s people, but the mind of Christ is also a choice to walk in the Spirit rather than the flesh. Through observing the life and attitude of Christ, God’s people have an example to follow in the works and words of Christ, but this they can only do through the Spirit. The mind of Christ is obtained as God’s people subject their will to God over their own and ask God for understanding. This is the significance of the mind of Christ—man *can* think like God when God dwells in man. As Paul led up to his crowning statement in 1 Corinthians 2:16, he laid the foundation that the inner man who is filled with the Spirit can also think in accordance with the Spirit. “For who knows a person’s thoughts except their own spirit within them? In the same way no one knows the thoughts of God except the Spirit of God” (1 Cor 2:11). To be able to

think like God through the Holy Spirit enables man to rise above the things of man and walk faithfully with God, understanding his Word and interpreting it faithfully.

### The Mind of Christ Enables One to Think Like God

In the beginning, God set a boundary that prevented man from knowing God's mind (Gen 2:17). The choice to eat from the tree of knowledge and evil not only broke God's first commandment, but it was the beginning of thinking according to one's own thoughts over God's—the first mindset against God.<sup>10</sup> Man's corrupt heart rendered him helpless to obey the greatest commandment to love God, much less to rightly interpret the Word of God and be a witness to the world.<sup>11</sup> The first Adam thought according to the things of man, but the second Adam thinks like and is God. "This is the significance of the historic doctrine of Christ as the 'second Adam.' The same Christ who is accepted by faith as the revelation of the character of God is also regarded as the revelation of the true character of man."<sup>12</sup> Through Pauline terminology and persuasive rhetoric, the mind of Christ is demystified and seen as both the indicative and imperative Scripture intends. Through Christ, God's people learn what it is to be human the way God intended.<sup>13</sup> Christ is the image of God, who came to restore man's broken image through the Holy Spirit, who brings mind renewal. The imperative and indicative of Paul

---

<sup>10</sup> The battle is waged across the pages of Scripture in the mind of man whether to think according to the things of man or the things of God. The things of God (Matt 6:33; 16:23; 22:21; Mark 8:33; Mark 12:17; Luke 20:25; 1 Cor 2:10, 11, 14; 4:1; Col 3:1,2) and the things of man (Rom 8:1, 4, 5, 13; 12:2; Gal 4:29; Eph 2:2; 1 Pet 4:6).

<sup>11</sup> Failure to love God reveals a lack of the fear of God in one's life. The Desert Father Diadachus revealed the role that the fear of God plays in being faithful to God. "No one can love God with all his heart, if he does not fear God with all his heart, because only the purified soul, tamed by the influence of this fear as it were, is capable of yielding to love's action" (Diadachus, *Capita centum de perfectione spirituali* 16 [Ermatinger]).

<sup>12</sup> Niebuhr, *The Nature and Destiny of Man*, 281.

<sup>13</sup> Watson, *Text and Truth*, 283.



form a tension that invites and pleads with the people of God to live out their inheritance in Christ.

### **Chapter Five Summary: The Significance of Φρονέω and Cognitive Terms**

In chapter five, Paul paints a portrayal of the Spirit-filled life in Christ using unique terms to help people rise above the language and religious views of the culture. The anthropological terms in Genesis undergo a theological and Christological transformation by Paul, shifting the focus from the Spirit moving upon man in the OT to moving inside man in the NT.<sup>14</sup> Without these new terms, people could still think dualistically and not comprehend Christ's mind. Betz states that Paul formulated “a Christian alternative to the predominant religio-philosophical dualistic anthropology of body and soul.”<sup>15</sup> To the Hebrew mind, these anthropological terms were viewed in accordance with wisdom. But to the Greeks, these terms were viewed psychosomatically. The shift from Hebrew to Greek thought, and then new Christian anthropology demonstrates a shift in focus, from outward to inward, with regard to a person's mind or mindset.<sup>16</sup> Paul is thought to have been the first one in Greek literature to use new terms to depict the concept of inner being and outer man: ὁ ἔσω ἄνθρωπος and ὁ ἔξω ἄνθρωπος.<sup>17</sup> Paul's distinction between the inner and outer man is not to condemn the outer man, for Paul speaks of the σῶμα as the outer man, not the σάρξ. In a similar manner, Paul uses two other key

---

<sup>14</sup> Ibid., 282.

<sup>15</sup> Hans Dieter Betz, “The Concept of the ‘Inner Human Being’ (Οἴσω Ἄνθρωπος) in the Anthropology of Paul.” *NTS* 46 (2000): 316.

<sup>16</sup> Lüdemann, *Die Anthropologie*, 49.

<sup>17</sup> Betz, “The Concept of the ‘Inner Human Being,’” 321. Louw and Nida define Paul's inner man as “idioms, literally ‘the inner person’ and ‘the hidden person’; the psychological faculty, including intellectual, emotional, and spiritual aspects, in contrast with the purely physical aspects of human existence—‘the inner being, the inmost being, inwardly.’” *L&N s.v.* “ὁ ἔσω ἄνθρωπος,” 1:319.

terms to convey whether one follows the Spirit or the flesh. The person who is spiritual, *πνευματικός* (*pneumatikós*), “belonging to the spirit,” and the one who is not “σάρκικός (*sarkikos*), “of the flesh.” Through terms like *πνευματικός*, the identity of man shifts back to being identified by the Spirit. One either has the spirit of the world or of Christ. Christ, as the image of God, is the template and *τέλειος* (*teleios*) for the recreation of God’s people.

#### The Significance of Mind Renewal: The Things of God, Not of Man

Through the Holy Spirit, God’s people can think like the King of kings with a kingdom mindset that is fixed on God’s purposes. God’s people *can have* the mind of Christ as they are renewed in their inner being. The motif of mind renewal revealed what minds are fixed upon. In the OT, it was idols that led God’s people away from worshipping and loving God with all their being. In the NT, the theme of the things of God versus the things of man is woven throughout.<sup>18</sup> Paul’s use of *φρονέω* in the NT emphasizes the need to choose to set one’s mind, and the spiritually activated mind is able to discern and choose to set one’s mind on the things of God rather than the things of man. Two significant parallel biblical texts utilize Paul’s signature way of employing *φρονέω*, drawing attention to thinking according to the things of God rather than the things of man in Matthew 16:22–25 // Mark 8:33. Both Matthew and Mark also utilized *φρονέω* to communicate the need to set one’s mind on the things of God—while simultaneously communicating that setting one’s mind on the things of man was demonic.

---

<sup>18</sup> See these vv. for things of God: Matthew 16:23; 22:21; Mark 8:33; 12:17; Luke 20:25; 1 Cor 2:10, 11, 14; 1 Cor 4:1 and these vv. for things of man or the flesh: Rom 8:1, 4, 5, 13; Gal 4:29; Eph 2:2; 1 Pet 4:6.

### The Kingdom Mindset Revealed (Matt 16:23)

Jesus taught an entirely new paradigm and way of thinking and living that was difficult for his disciples to grasp. This kingdom mindset and lifestyle are to be centered around the things of God, not of men. Matthew 16:22–28 explores this kingdom mindset that Jesus described and prescribed in his rebuke to Peter. The verb *φρονέω* found in Matthew 16:23 // Mark 8:33 shows that the new kingdom living is obtained by things of the Spirit rather than the flesh. Leaning on one's own understanding would prevent one from knowing and living in accordance with the purposes of God (1 Cor 2:14). Unnik determined that the expression found in Matthew 16:23, “*phronein ta tinos*,” (meaning “your thoughts are of the things”), is actually a Greek idiom, that has had the same meaning for centuries.<sup>19</sup> This idiom means to “be on the side of” or “be a supporter of,” and the historical view of the use of this idiom, “*φρονεῖν τὰ τινός*” (*phronein ta tinos*) reveals that it is always within a political context.<sup>20</sup> Therefore, the interpretation in consideration of Greek usage as an idiom and in consideration of this context would be, “You are not on the side of God but on (*the side*) of men, or you are not an adherent of God's cause, but of that of men.”<sup>21</sup> This interpretation fits the overall context when one considers Jesus' rebuke to Peter. Carson also supports this interpretation. “Peter was not thinking (the verb *phroneō* [“have in mind,” NIV], common in Paul . . . here, however, he has switched sides, aligning himself not only with men but with Satan.”<sup>22</sup> Jesus' admonition was addressing Peter's reasoning as being

---

<sup>19</sup> W. C. Van Unnik, *Sparsa Collecta: The Collected Essays of W. C. Van Unnik. Part Four: Neotestamentica - Flavius Josephus – Patristica*, ed. Pieter der Horst, W. van Unnik, and Cilliers Breytenbach, NTSup 156 (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 25.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, 25–26.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, emphasis mine.

<sup>22</sup> D. A. Carson, “Matthew,” in *Matthew, Mark, Luke*, vol. 8 of *EBC*, ed. Frank E. Gaebelin (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1984), 377–378.

human rather than spiritual.<sup>23</sup> Getting behind Jesus was more than just a physical command. It was a spiritual one. Jesus' reason for the rebuke was that Peter's reasoning was based on human understanding and goals, not on God's. Ultimately, this kingdom mindset is also about the lordship of Jesus Christ. Those who are in Christ surrender their own thoughts before Jesus and choose the mind of Christ over their own.

Jesus's use of *φρονέω* reveals that a mindset dwelling on worldly thoughts is ultimately demonic. In Christ, one has the capacity to choose whether one will be on the side of God or of man. When Jesus spoke this shocking statement in Matthew 16:23 to Peter, whom He had just stated he would build his church upon, Jesus was bringing clarity to the need to set one's mind on doing God's will, not man's. It was not just about one's outlook but one's allegiance to the things of God rather than thinking from a humanistic, worldly perspective. It is essential that those who profess Christ would not choose their agenda over God's. The passage of Matthew 16:22–28 is a clarion call from Jesus of a new Kingdom of God paradigm. Jesus fulfilled the commandments and brought accountability to a whole new level. How one thinks matters. Discipleship is not about religious practices but about living what one says one believes, in accordance with God's thoughts, not the thoughts of men. The Greek word *φρονέω* is at the center of this passage in Matthew, highlighting the significance of one's mindset.<sup>24</sup> Paul uses the same word for mindset in Philippians 2:5, where he is conveying the pattern Christ's believers are to follow in Christ's mindset, humility and suffering: "It is this humble, self-emptying, and

---

<sup>23</sup> Heinrich August Wilhelm Meyer, *Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Gospel of Matthew*, ed. Frederick Crombie, trans. Peter Christie, CECNT 1 (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1880), 428–429.

<sup>24</sup> See other incidences of *φρονέω* in Matt 16:23; Mark 8:33; Acts 28:22, Rom 8:5; 12:3, 16; 14:6; 15:5; 1 Cor 4:6, 13:11; 2 Cor 13:11; Gal 5:10; Phil 1:7; 2:2, 5; 3:15–16, 19; 4:2, 10, and Col 3:2.

self-sacrificing attitude after which the Philippians are to pattern their mutual relationships.”<sup>25</sup>

The inner attitude fixed on man’s thoughts over God’s thoughts is ultimately a rejection of God and his ways. As Augustine stated, living according to self is not living according to the truth.

“Consequently, when man lives according to truth, he does not live according to his own self but according to God. For it was God who said: “I am the truth.” On the other hand, when he lives according to his own self, that is, according to man and not according to God, assuredly he lives according to falsehood” (Augustine, *Retract.* 14.4.274–275).

### **Application**

Surveying the cultural landscape of the OT and NT serves as a template for God’s people to recognize similar temptations within today’s culture. The diagnostic question, “What would Jesus think?” can serve to help recognize whether one’s line of thinking is of the flesh or of the Spirit. Using the Word of God as a roadmap for right thinking, the church can continue to be a light to a dark world. God’s people are called to stand out and be different, not to blend in. For the church to faithfully represent Christ to this lost world, God’s people need to be equipped to recognize how mindsets operate and to instead walk in the mind of Christ. The culture is littered with propaganda of self-help philosophies that will all ultimately fail. It is when God’s people admit their need and pursue thinking like Christ that victory is in hand. A mindset built on the Kingdom of God will translate into a lifestyle that reflects the mind of Christ. How one thinks will impact one’s life on earth as well as one’s eternity. Jesus laid out the implications of the Kingdom of God mindset, which are just as applicable today as they were in the early church.

---

<sup>25</sup> David Alan Black, “The Discourse Structure of Philippians: A Study in Textlinguistics,” *NovT* 37 (1995): 37.

## Conclusion

From the first day of life, one is surrounded by a culture based on the world system and taught to create a lifestyle that pleases oneself rather than God. Jesus came and turned this worldly philosophy upside down. What was right in the world's eyes was wrong in God's. This new kingdom paradigm is accessed by the grace of God and lived out by the Holy Spirit. It cannot be achieved by human effort and requires repentance and yielding to the will of God over one's own will. Matthew 16:22–28 has implications for today's believers in a society that is saturated and dominated by humanism and self-pleasure. One's mindset will determine the course of one's life. "Guard your heart above all else, for it determines the course of your life" (Proverbs 4:23, NLT). One cannot say that they believe in Jesus and live like the world. A kingdom mindset will lead to a lifestyle and actions that are about the things of God rather than the things of man.

Within the OT corpus, the need for a transformed mind and heart and the promise of a new heart in the future is conveyed (Gen 6:5, Deut 30:6, Isa 11; 40:13; Jer 17:9–10; 32:39, Ezek 36:26–28). In Romans 8:5–14, the use of *φρονέω* is uniquely used to specifically address mindsets, demonstrating the significance of mindset for Christians to live in the Spirit rather than the flesh. The Pauline corpus utilizes this term more than any other author in the Bible to convey its central importance to righteous living. If man does not mind his mind, he will not be able to be faithful to God, rightly interpret God's Word, and live it out as a witness to the world.

Though there have been scores of words employed in showing the significance of terminology communicating mind renewal, in the scope of anthropological terms, there is more to man than just mere terms. There is more to words than their static definition. Words morph to fit the context in which they are intended. With a word, God spoke and created man in his image,

and it was good. Then God gave words to help his people understand what it meant to be in a relationship with God, but man could not understand or faithfully follow God's Word. Then, the living Word came himself to his people, revealing a whole new paradigm of Kingdom living. It is with words that God communicated man's desperate need and the coming transformation of their whole being. Mindsets are not the solution but the problem. Thoughts alone cannot heal the human soul, but the thoughts of God can. The mind of Christ helps God's people to transcend this life while waiting for the blissful reunion with God, where mankind is no longer confined by an earthly broken vessel. The anthropological terms in the canon create a tension that expresses the longing to no longer be defined apart from God. Like breadcrumbs leading to the highest prize and way out, man is intended to shed and transcend the anthropology of the world and don the Spirit instead. Scripture's cognitive and anthropological terms point God's people to something higher and more—an eschatological hope that one day mankind will see God and be like him once again, remade into the image of God with no barriers or labels to hinder intimacy with God, who loves his people eternally. The anthropological labels were made for this earthly kingdom but shed light on the Kingdom to come when God's people will be clothed in his righteousness, always in his presence.

### **Contributions of this Research**

This research explored new territory on an issue that is pervasive in culture: mindsets. It produced an awareness of the canonical presence of mindsets that has scarcely been explored previously, which yielded an understanding behind the apostasy of the OT and holds the answer for today's problems of gender dysphoria and depressive or anxious mindsets that emanate from the culture. The significance of the nature of mindsets being sin, a divided heart, unbelief, and idolatry is original research that reveals once again that human thinking is not superior to God's.

Returning to the grammatical-historical approach, man must examine Scripture to take out from Scripture, not examine Scripture to project one's mindset onto Scripture. On a scholarly level, understanding how mindsets functioned in the biblical narrative is an answer to the critical voice that raises its opinion above Scripture today. If one aspect of mindsets is placing one's own reasons and thoughts above God's, then perhaps this awareness can begin to eclipse the fine-sounding arguments that are ultimately counter Scripture. The Enlightenment began the onset of examining Scripture to question it. Perhaps at the foundation of the Enlightenment was an unawareness of the cultural influences in the industrial age that influenced the proponents of the Enlightenment, affecting their research and findings.

For the church, a greater understanding of mindsets and the mind of Christ can serve to better equip the church toward faithful interpretation and application of Scripture to enable the church to fulfill the Great Commission. On a cultural level, at a conference this author spoke at last year, when an attendee heard that a mindset was placing one's reasoning above God's, she shared that she had believed her own thoughts about her gender orientation, but after understanding the way mindsets operated, she did not believe it anymore—she believed what God's word said, instead. Becoming aware of mindsets can release people from bondage to sin and can also help people to understand God and his word better. Lastly, potential contributions for evangelism were realized in better understanding the nature of mankind and Paul's word choices which showed that effective evangelism did not rely on the wisdom of this world but in conveying heavenly spiritual concepts through cultural norms that have been transformed to showcase the gospel.



### **Recommendation for Further Study**

This dissertation sought to understand how mindsets impact and hinder man's ability to love God and fulfill the greatest commandment and the greatest commission. Further research could be done on mind renewal itself, encompassing the impact of wisdom, discipleship, and the Holy Spirit. Research could also be done to develop how the understanding of the mind-body problem could be exploited to reach the lost, conveying theological terms in a way that can be understood so people understand where their identity truly is.

## APPENDIX A: A CONSTELLATION OF TERMS

<b>OT Terms</b>	<b>279</b>		
<b>Anthropological</b>			
		כּוֹן ( <i>kûn</i> )	293
אָדָם ( <i>'ādām</i> )	280	כּוֹל ( <i>kōl</i> )	293
בָּשָׂר ( <i>bāsār</i> )	280	מִזְמָה ( <i>mezimmāh</i> )	294
כָּבֵד ( <i>kābēd</i> )	281	מַהְשָׁבָה ( <i>maḥšābāh</i> )	294
כִּלְיָה ( <i>kilyā</i> )	281	מַנְדָּע (Aram. <i>manda</i> )	295
לֵב ( <i>lēb</i> )	282	נָחַם ( <i>nāḥam</i> )	295
נֶפֶשׁ ( <i>nepeš</i> )	282	נֹטָה ( <i>nth</i> )	296
רוּחַ ( <i>rūaḥ</i> )	283	הָדַשׁ ( <i>hādaš</i> )	296
קָרֵב ( <i>qereb</i> )	283	נָצַר ( <i>nāšar</i> )	297
		נָתַן ( <i>nātan</i> )	297
<b>Cognitive Terms</b>	<b>284</b>	סוּר ( <i>sūr</i> )	298
אֶהָד ( <i>'ehād</i> )	284	עָוָה ( <i>'āvāh</i> )	298
אָמַר ( <i>'amar</i> )	284	עַיִן ( <i>'ayin</i> )	299
בָּטוּחַ ( <i>bāṭūaḥ</i> )	284	עֲשָׂה ( <i>'ēšaēh</i> )	300
בֵּין ( <i>bîn</i> )	285	עֲקָשׁ ( <i>'iqqēš</i> )	300
גָּבַהּ ( <i>gābah</i> )	286	קָשָׂה ( <i>qāšā</i> )	301
דָּמָה ( <i>dāmāh</i> )	286	רָאָה ( <i>rā'āh</i> )	301
דָּעַת ( <i>da'at</i> )	287	רוּם ( <i>rúm</i> )	302
הֶפֶךְ ( <i>hāpāk</i> )	287	הַשִּׁים ( <i>śúmāh</i> )	303
זָדוֹן ( <i>zādôn</i> )	288	שָׁכַח ( <i>šākaḥ</i> )	303
זָכַר ( <i>zākar</i> )	289	שָׁכַל ( <i>šākal</i> )	304
הֶכְמָה ( <i>hākmā</i> )	289	שָׁלֵם ( <i>šālēm</i> )	304
הֶפְעֵץ ( <i>hāpēš</i> )	290	שָׁמַר ( <i>šamar</i> )	305
הֶשֶׁב ( <i>hāšab</i> )	291	תְּבוּנָה ( <i>tēbūnāh</i> )	305
יָחַד ( <i>yahad</i> )	291	תָּמַךְ ( <i>tāmāk</i> )	306
יָצַר ( <i>yēšer</i> )	292	שׁוּב ( <i>šûb</i> )	306
		סָבַב ( <i>sābab</i> )	307

**NT Terms**

<b>Anthropological</b>	308	σάρξ ( <i>sarx</i> )	322
ἄνθρωπος ( <i>anthrōpos</i> )	308	σοφία ( <i>sophia</i> )	322
καρδία ( <i>kardia</i> )	308	σύνεσις ( <i>synesis</i> )	323
νοῦς ( <i>nous</i> )	309	συνείδησις ( <i>syneidēsis</i> )	324
πνεῦμα ( <i>pneuma</i> )	309	τέλειος ( <i>teleios</i> )	324
ψυχή ( <i>psyche</i> )	310	τίθημι ( <i>tithēmi</i> )	325
<b>Cognitive Terms</b>	311	ὑπολαμβάνω ( <i>hypolambanō</i> )	325
ἀδόκιμος ( <i>adokimos</i> )	311	φθείρω ( <i>phtheirō</i> )	326
δόκιμος, ( <i>dokimos</i> )	311	φρονέω ( <i>phroneō</i> )	326
αἴσθησις ( <i>aisthēsis</i> )	311		
ἀνακαίνωσις ( <i>anakainōsis</i> )	312		
βουλεύω ( <i>bouleuō</i> )	312		
γνώμη ( <i>gnome</i> )	313		
διαλογίζομαι ( <i>dialogizomai</i> )	313		
διάνοια ( <i>dianoia</i> )	313		
ἔννοια ( <i>ennoia</i> )	314		
ἐπιθυμία ( <i>epithymia</i> )	315		
θέλω ( <i>thelō</i> )	316		
θυμὸς ( <i>thymos</i> )	316		
κρίνω ( <i>krinō</i> )	317		
λογίζομαι ( <i>logizoma</i> )	318		
μετανοέω ( <i>metanoēō</i> )	318		
νόημα ( <i>noema</i> )	319		
οἶδα ( <i>oida</i> )	319		
παλιγγενεσία ( <i>palingenesia</i> )	320		
παχύνω ( <i>pachynō</i> )	320		
περιτέμνω ( <i>peritemnō</i> )	320		
πιστεύω ( <i>pisteuō</i> )	321		

As referenced in chapter one, the motif of mindset terms unfolds in Scripture as the theme of a new mind/heart is woven in a constellation of terms employed throughout the canon pertaining to one's mindset in the OT and the NT. Each of these terms plays a role in the metanarrative of mind renewal. For the purposes of this dissertation, terms and Scripture references cited are not every instance in the canon, but examples serve to demonstrate the extensive use. These significant terms and Scriptures are briefly summarized here to display the movement of the mindset motif through these terms canonically pointing man to choose to set his mind on the things of God rather than the things of man and the eventual fulfillment of a new heart through Christ. This summary will not be comprehensive but narrow in scope, homing in on the cognitive aspects of these terms that pertain to mindset and the theological significance of the terms. Each term has its own semantic range, but the definitions of the terms listed only pertain to the process of mindsets and mind renewal.

### **OT Terms**

This investigation of the significance of terms pertaining to mindsets begins in the OT. Some Scripture references for each term are listed alongside each term. The terms are listed according to different categories and significance, such as anthropological and cognitive terms.

## Anthropological

### אָדָם (*'ādām*)

Root: אָדָם

Gen 2:7, 8; 3:8; 4:1.

The term אָדָם occurs 562 times in the OT.<sup>1</sup> Representing an individual human being, male or female, this term also refers theologically and collectively to all men, not just Israelites.<sup>2</sup> This term is theologically significant as mankind was made in the image of God, the pinnacle of all of God's creation.<sup>3</sup> Man's significance comes from the special position that he has in relation to God.<sup>4</sup> Coppes notes that "even after the Fall *'ādām* is used of man! The image of God is still the central distinction...that part of the divine image consisting of true knowledge, righteousness, and holiness was destroyed...only in and by Christ, the new Adam (Rom 5:12–21), can the original divine promise be realized."<sup>5</sup> A phrase that is significant in OT and NT is that of *ben 'adham*, which mean "son of man," and is used 93 times alone in the book of Ezekiel, referring to the prophet. Christ would self-designate with this term, as well, as he came in human identity to redeem mankind.<sup>6</sup> Of particular importance concerning mindsets is that God knows every thought of man, and man will be held accountable for his thoughts and deeds.<sup>7</sup> Understanding the nature of man is significant to understanding mindsets.<sup>8</sup>

### בָּשָׂר (*bāśār*)

Root: בָּשָׂר

Gen 6:3; Ps 78:38; Isa 31:13; Ezek 11:19; 36:26; Joel 3:1.

The term בָּשָׂר can be rendered as flesh and body. Occurring 270 times in the OT, it is used in reference to man and animals. Paul develops the term flesh (σάρξ) in the NT as well as

<sup>1</sup> Fritz Maass, "אָדָם," *TDOT* 1:75–87.

<sup>2</sup> Maass, "אָדָם," *TDOT* 1:81, 84.

<sup>3</sup> Leonard J. Coppes, "אָדָם," *TWOT* 10.

<sup>4</sup> Maass, "אָדָם," *TDOT* 1:85.

<sup>5</sup> Coppes, "אָדָם," *TWOT* 10.

<sup>6</sup> Maass, "אָדָם," *TDOT* 1:81.

<sup>7</sup> Maass, "אָדָם," *TDOT* 1:86.

<sup>8</sup> "Man is a compound that cannot exist without the body." Maass, "אָדָם," *TDOT* 1:79. While man is made in the image of God, after the Fall he is contrasted with God, for his thoughts are not like God's, nor are his ways (Isa 55:8–9). This tension points to the solution when man's thoughts can be like God's again and his image can be restored.

the term body (σῶμα). The theological significance of this term בְּשָׂר is that man is referred to as בְּשָׂר, but God is characterized as רוּחַ (Gen 6:3; Isa 31:13). That the perfect Holy God would permit his Spirit to dwell in human flesh is miraculous. The body in the OT was considered as part of one whole being, and in the NT, Paul emphasizes that the body itself is not evil but part of the entire being, which will be redeemed by the Spirit.

### כֶּבֶד (*kābēd*)

Root: כבד

Gen 49:6, Ps 7:6; 16:9; 30:13; 57:9; 108:2; Lam 2:11.

A כֶּבֶד is a liver that is synonymous with “soul,” an anatomical term parallel to לֵב.<sup>9</sup> This term also means the body (Ps 16:9), mind (Ps 108:2), and inner being (Gen 49:6).<sup>10</sup> This term is another picture of the inmost being metaphorically through an organ. Denoting the interior of the body similar to קֶרֶב, לֵב, as well as other internal organs, this term is significant to Semitic psychology and thought to be the seat of the human will and emotions.<sup>11</sup>

### כִּלְיָה (*kilyâ*)

Root: כלה

Job 19:27; Ps 7:10; 16:7; 26:2; 73:21; 139:13; Prov 23:16; Jer 11:20; 12:2; 17:10; 20:12; Lam 3:13.

The כִּלְיָה is rendered as the literal kidney organ of both animals and people, but it is also used figuratively to refer to the inner person, often translated as “heart” or “inner being.”<sup>12</sup> The kidneys are also used figuratively to depict the entire body (Ps 139:13; Job 19:27).<sup>13</sup> The RSV renders כִּלְיָה as “heart,” “mind,” or “soul,” but KJV and ASV render it figuratively as “reins.”<sup>14</sup> Schweizer notes the significance of “reins”: “The deepest emotions and impulses have their dwelling in the reins כִּלְיֹת. They are so strongly anchored there that the reins can play the part of

---

<sup>9</sup> C. Westermann, “נֶפֶשׁ,” *TLOT* 2:746.

<sup>10</sup> Weinfeld, “כְּבוֹד,” *TDOT* 7:24.

<sup>11</sup> C. Dohmen and P. Stenmans, “כְּבוֹד,” *TDOT* 7:15.

<sup>12</sup> Douglas Mangum, “Conscience,” *LTW*.

<sup>13</sup> John N. Oswalt, “כלה,” *TWOT* 440–41. It is interesting to note that כִּלְיָה was also part of a sacrificial animal (see Ex 29:13, 22; Lev 3:4, 10, 15; 4:9; 7:4; 8:16, 25; 9:10, 19; Is 34:6) and the most secret part of man. *HALOT*, s.v. “כִּלְיָה,” 2:479.

<sup>14</sup> John N. Oswalt, “כלה,” *TWOT* 440.

conscience and instruct man about God.”<sup>15</sup> The reins are synonymous with one’s mindset, determining the direction one will go.<sup>16</sup>

### לֵב (*lēb*)

Root: לב

Gen 6:5; Exod 4:21; Deut 5:29; 6:5–6; Josh 23:14; 1 Sam 2:35; 1 Chr 12:38; 2 Chr 1:11; Ezra 7:27; Neh 2:12; Ps 26:2; Prov 8:5; Eccl 1:13; Isa 32:6; Jer 17:9–10; 31:33; Lam 3:21; Ezek 36:26–28; Dan 7:28.

The לֵב is used metaphorically more than any other anthropological term.<sup>17</sup> A comprehensive term that communicates both the totality and unity of human nature, the heart is the hub of man and bears supreme significance, for it steers the whole person and impacts one’s whole being.<sup>18</sup> The phrase “in your heart” connotes mindset. The inclination of the heart precipitates its decisions and actions.<sup>19</sup> Differentiating between one’s mind and heart is best done by seeing the mind as part of the heart. The condition of one’s heart shapes one’s mindset.<sup>20</sup> Mindsets impact one’s faithfulness to interpret and apply the Word of God rightly.

### נֶפֶשׁ (*nepeš*)

Root: נפש

Gen 2:7; Lev 11:10; Deut 4:29; 6:5; Jos 22:5; 1 Sam 2:35; 1 Chr 22:19; 28:9; 2 Chr 15:12; 1 Kgs 2:4; 2 Kgs 23:3; Ps 10:3; Prov 2:10; Jer 32:41; Ezek 47:9.

The theological significance of נֶפֶשׁ is that it defines the human being as one whole being (soul) who is led by desire, craving, and cognitively assessing needs and how to achieve satisfaction. To be a “nephesh” is to crave/desire/want. Westermann poses that the meaning “craving, desire, want” is not a secondary development of the term but a nearer determination of the basic

<sup>15</sup> Schweizer, “Ψυχή,” *TDNT* 9:626. The figurative use of קִלְיָה (*kilyah*) occurs often in parallel with לֵב (*lēb*) (see Jer 11:20; 17:10), where it is depicted as “reins.” Both of these terms simply depict the inner person that is only fully known by God (see Ps 7:10). קִלְיָה (*kilyah*) is often translated as “heart” or “mind” in 9 of the 31 occurrences of the word (Ps 7:9; 16:7; 26:2; 73:21; Prov 23:16; Jer 11:20; 12:2; 17:10; 20:12). Mangum, “Conscience,” *LTW*.

<sup>16</sup> One Greek parallel compound term, σύννοια, has been correlated to קִלְיָה and means to know thyself; imparting information to oneself, conscience. BDAG, s.v. “σύννοια,” 973. This term occurs twice in the NT (Acts 5:2; 1 Cor 4:4). Silva, “σύννοια,” *NIDNTTE* 4:461. The parallel Greek term in NT is νεφρός (*nefros*), for kidneys, though it does not occur in its literal meaning in the NT; meaning “psychological faculty of desire, intent, feeling.”<sup>16</sup>

<sup>17</sup> Andrew Bowling, “לֵב,” *TWOT* 466. The לֵב has been covered extensively in chapters 1 and 5. Herein only what is specific to mindsets will be covered.

<sup>18</sup> A. Craig Troxel, *With All Your Heart: Orienting Your Mind, Desires, and Will Toward Christ* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2020), 18.

<sup>19</sup> Waltke, *An Old Testament Theology*, 225.

<sup>20</sup> Troxel, *With All Your Heart*, 86–90.

meaning as a core facet of mankind.<sup>21</sup> Of 754 times נִפְשׁ occurs in OT, the most common use refers to the appetite or drive of living creatures.<sup>22</sup> The craving of human nature contributes to the formation of mindsets.

### רוּחַ (*rûah*)

Root: רוּחַ

Gen 7:22; 45:27; Exod 35:21; Num 11:25; 27:16; 1 Sam 16:15–16; 2 Kgs 2:15; Ps 32:2; 51:12; Ezra 1:5; Isa 40:13; Ezek 36:26; Zec 12:1; Mal 2:15.

The theological significance of רוּחַ is that it demonstrates the source of mind renewal. The flesh cannot satisfy a “nephesh.” Only the Spirit can. The promised “new heart” throughout Scripture is through the Spirit. As נִפְשׁ is used to depict the whole being, רוּחַ also functions to represent the entire person.<sup>23</sup> Occurring in the Hebrew OT 378 times, when רוּחַ is pertaining to the psychical aspect of the human constitution, it is best glossed by “spirit” (see Gen 45:27); and רוּחַ also functions to represent the entire person.<sup>24</sup> The רוּחַ depicts one’s inner disposition or mindset and is the seat of mental acts (Isa 29:24 and 40:13).<sup>25</sup> The Spirit of the LORD directs the mind of man, and no man can fathom the mind of the Spirit. The vitality of organs in the human composition (such as the heart, liver, and kidneys) are symbolic of psychological functions affected by רוּחַ in the OT.<sup>26</sup>

### קֶרֶב (*qereb*)

Root: קָרַב

Gen 18:12; Ps 51:10; 64:6; Jer 9:8; 31:33; Isa 26:9; Ezek 11:19; Zech 12:1.

The term קֶרֶב signifies the inward parts as central and the inner processes within man, which are often at odds with external processes.<sup>27</sup> See Ps 51:10, “Create a clean heart (לֵב) within (קֶרֶב)” and Ezek 11:19: “new heart (לֵב), new spirit (רוּחַ) within (קֶרֶב).” קֶרֶב signifies the hidden secret place of man where cognitive and psychological functions transpire. Parallel to לֵב (Jer

<sup>21</sup> Westermann, “נִפְשׁ,” *TLOT* 2:747.

<sup>22</sup> Waltke, *An Old Testament Theology*, 224.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, 227. (Ecc 7:8, 9; Ezek 11:19; 18:31; 36:26), representing the whole inner life (Job 7:11; Ps 78:8), opinions or desires (Ezek 13:3), mind (Ps 77:6–7), will (Prov 16:32), and motives (2 Chr 36:22; Prov 16:2).

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>25</sup> BDB, s.v. “רוּחַ,” 925.

<sup>26</sup> Schweizer, “Ψυχῆ,” *TDNT* 9:628.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, 9:626.



9:8), נֶפֶשׁ (Isa 26:9), and other internal organs, לֵב is theologically significant in representing inner attitudes (Gen 18:12) and thoughts only known to God (Ps 64:6).<sup>28</sup>

### Cognitive Terms

#### אָהַד (*'ehād*)

Root: אָהַד

Gen 2:24; Deut 6:4; Ezek 11:19.

Meaning “one” or “same,” it occurs 960 times and is closely identified with יחד, meaning “to be united.” In the context of Ezek 11:19, it refers to no longer having a divided mind/heart.

#### אָמַר (*'āmar*)

Root: אָמַר

Deut 9:25; Judg 15:2; 2 Sam 12:22; 21:16; 2 Chr 13:8; 28:10, 13; 32:1; Job 31:24; 32:7; Ps 10:6, 11, 13; 14:1; 35:25; 74:8; 106:23; Ezek 11:5; Eze 20:13, 21; Hos 7:2.

This term has a broad semantic range, with saying, speaking, or declaring as the most common, but it also encompasses the mechanics of speaking, which include thinking or believing, supposing, or having in mind to purpose; “to formulate words and sentences in one’s mind.”<sup>29</sup> The term אָמַר is utilized in the sense of “thinking” in the OT, a cognitive function meaning “to consider,” “discuss,” “purpose,” “intend,” or “reflect,” the activity preceding a decision.<sup>30</sup> This term illustrates the power of language in speaking into the formation of mindsets. Vocalizing thoughts influences and shapes mindsets. The internal dialogue is influential. Just as the surrounding culture speaks to those within the culture, the culture of one’s mind is affected by what one’s own thoughts speak. Thoughts are opinions that need to be subject to God’s truth.

#### בָּטְוּחַ (*bātūah*)

Root: בָּטְוּחַ

Ps 112:7; Prov 28:26; Isa 26:3.

<sup>28</sup> Leonard J. Coppes, “קָרַב,” *TWOT* 813.

<sup>29</sup> Hoogendyk, s.v. “אָמַר,” *LALHB*

<sup>30</sup> Siegfried Wagner, “אָמַר,” *TDOT* 328–45.

The term בְּטוּחַ means to have a strong reliance or confidence on someone or something.<sup>31</sup> בְּטוּחַ depicts a secure mindset or secure circumstances.<sup>32</sup> While the basic sense of this term is to trust, the object of trust is where mindsets can go awry. Trusting in one's own heart is the crux of mindset woes—believing one's own thoughts above God's. This term is significant theologically in its conveyance that trust should implicitly be in Yahweh alone; no other entity should be what one ultimately trusts in. In essence, “the righteous will live by faith.”<sup>33</sup> Whether one trusts in God has a direct bearing on one's mindset. The Greek equivalent *παίθω* draws out the confidence one is to have in God. “To believe in something or someone to the extent of placing reliance or trust in or on—‘to rely on, to trust in, to depend on, to have (complete) confidence in, confidence, trust.’”<sup>34</sup>

### בִּין (*bîn*)

Root: בִּין

Deut 4:6; 1 Kgs 3:9, 11; 1 Chr 22:12; 28:9; 2 Chr 26:5; Neh 8:2–3, 8; Job 20:3; 28:12, 20, 23, 28; Psalm 19:13; 33:15; 119:95, 104; Prov 1:2, 6; 3:5; 8:5, 9; 14:8; 17:10, 24; Isa 1:3; 29:16, 24; 11:2; 29:14; 40:21; 56:11; 57:1; Jer 30:24; Mic 4:2; Dan 1:17.

The basic meaning of בִּין is to distinguish or learn, discern, and have understanding.<sup>35</sup> Occurring 250 times, mostly in the Psalms and wisdom literature, בִּין conveys a sense of God's people needing understanding in order to be in a right relationship with Yahweh.<sup>36</sup> The origin of בִּין has a sense of distinguishing and separating, which is interesting in light of the expectation that God's people would be characterized by being a distinct people separate from the ANE culture's ideals. This verb receives an ideological-theological emphasis commonly to illustrate the notion of paying attention to the deeds of Yahweh and also has an apocalyptic emphasis, particularly in Daniel.<sup>37</sup> The emphasis is to live with an understanding of the end in mind. Have your mind fixed on God, not the things of this world.<sup>38</sup> Proverbs 4:7 shows that “understanding”

<sup>31</sup> Hoogendyk, s.v. “בְּטוּחַ,” *LATHB*

<sup>32</sup> E. Gerstenberger, “בְּטוּחַ,” *TLOT* 1:228–30.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, 1:229.

<sup>34</sup> Louw, *L&N*, 375.

<sup>35</sup> *HALOT*, “בִּין,” 1:122–23.

<sup>36</sup> Schmidt, “בִּין,” *TLOT* 230–32.

<sup>37</sup> Helmer Ringgren, “בִּין,” *TDOT* 2:99–107.

<sup>38</sup> The term *bîn* refers to knowledge more than just information. The verb *yāda'* also means “understanding” but generally describes the process in which one gains knowledge, whereas *bîn* is shown by the demonstration of knowledge. Louis Goldberg, “בִּין,” *TWOT*, 103–104. “Both *binah* and *tebhunah* appear as synonyms of חִכְמָה *chokhmāh*, “wisdom,” with all the nuances of meaning of which it is capable.” Ringgren, “בִּין,” *TDOT* 2:107. Those who have wisdom are given understanding and are able to steer their mindsets rather than being ruled by them.

is a synonym for wisdom.<sup>39</sup> Understanding must be sought, and it is a gift God gives. Understanding is more than knowledge; it is applied knowledge demonstrated in one's mindset, character, and behavior.<sup>40</sup>

### **גָּבַהַ (gābah)**

Root: גבה

1 Sam 2:3; 2 Chr 17:6; 26:16; 32:25; Ps 131:1; Prov 18:12; Isa 3:16; Jer 13:15; Eze 16:50; 28:2, 5, 17; Zeph 3:11.

The primary meaning of גָּבַהַ in Hebrew and other Semitic languages is “to be high,” and it occurs around ninety times in the OT.<sup>41</sup> Regarding mindsets, this term refers to the aspect of the effect that pride has on one's mindset. The meaning is to be proud, “to be high,” or negatively, “to be haughty,” an arrogant attitude.<sup>42</sup> The term גָּבַהַ frequently depicts anthropological concepts through connection with human organs to connote the human mindset.<sup>43</sup> Theological significance is apparent in these expressions, which depict human thoughts and behavior and are characteristically regarded as spiritually and ethically evil.<sup>44</sup> Though this term can also be used to depict how high God is, God came in humility to rescue his people, and God detests the proud. A correlated Greek term is αὐθάδης, meaning “self-willed.”<sup>45</sup> One's mindset of the flesh is geared toward self and one's own glory, but the mind of Christ yields to the Father's will and his glory.

### **דָּמָה (dāmāh)**

Root: דמה

Num 33:56; Judg 20:5; 2 Sam 21:5; Isa 14:24; Ps 50:21; Lam 2:13; Esth 4:13.

“The verb דמה occurs thirteen times in the piel. It has, in this case, a “declarative-estimative,” meaning to declare or consider, plan or think.<sup>46</sup> This term carries a sense of

<sup>39</sup> Goldberg, “גָּבַהַ,” *TWOT*, 282–84.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, 282.

<sup>41</sup> R. Hentschke, “גָּבַהַ,” *TDOT* 2:356–60.

<sup>42</sup> The לֵב is used together with גָּבַהַ to convey pride through idiomatic expressions; *gbh lēb* “the heart is proud” (2 Chr 26:16; 32:25; Ps 131:1; Prov 18:12; Ezek 28:2, 5, 17.), *gōbah lēb* “haughtiness” (2 Chr 32:26; Ezek 31:10); and with רִיחַ, *gōbah rūah* “haughtiness” (Prov 16:18). *H.-P. Stähli*, “גבה,” *TLOT* 1:296–99.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, 2:359.

<sup>44</sup> Hentschke, “גָּבַהַ,” *TDOT* 2:360.

<sup>45</sup> *L&N*, s.v. “αὐθάδης,” 763.

<sup>46</sup> Horst Dietrich Preuss, “דָּמָה,” *TDOT* 3:250–60.

imagining and devising in one's thoughts, also through comparison.<sup>47</sup> דמה represents an inclination within man's heart, the impetus behind one's mindset.<sup>48</sup> Of particular significance is the use of *damah* in the qal and piel stems in the OT which compare man to Yahweh, of which there is no comparison (see Isa 40:18, 25).<sup>49</sup>

### דַּעַת (*da'at*)

Root: ידע

Exod 31:3; Job 42:3; Ps 94:10; 119:66; 139:6; Prov 1:4, 7, 29; 2:5–6, 10; 8:9–10, 12; 9:10; 15:7, 14; 22:17; 23:12; Eccl 1:16; Isa 5:13; 11:2; 33:6; 40:14; 44:19; 47:10; 58:2; Jer 10:14; 51:17; Hos 4:1; 6; 6:6; Mal 2:7.

Occurring ninety-three times in the OT, primarily in wisdom literature, the term דַּעַת comes from ידע and conveys a sense of gaining knowledge through one's senses.<sup>50</sup> This term gains knowledge by perception to comprehend or understand and gain insight. (Job 34:4).<sup>51</sup> The term דַּעַת is parallel with wisdom (הַכְּמָה), understanding תְּבוּנָה (*těbúnâ*), instruction מוֹסָר (*mūsār*), and law תּוֹרָה (*Torah*).<sup>52</sup> Of particular theological significance, דַּעַת (*da'at*) is also used for moral cognition and discernment.<sup>53</sup> The heart plays a role as the organ of perception in the usage of ידע and the ability to discern rightly.<sup>54</sup> The senses play an important role in the formation of mindsets, as seen in this definition. But one can learn to rule the senses rather than being ruled by one's senses.

### הַפְּךְ (*hāpāk*)

Root: הפך

Exod 14:5; 1 Sam 10:9; 15; Zeph 3:9.

<sup>47</sup> BDB, s.v. “דַּמָּה,” 198.

<sup>48</sup> HALOT, s.v. “דַּמָּה,” 1:225.

<sup>49</sup> Preuss, “דַּמָּה,” *TDOT* 3:255.

<sup>50</sup> Harris, “דַּעַת,” *TWOT* 366–67.

<sup>51</sup> W. Schottroff, “ידע,” *TLOT* 2:512.

<sup>52</sup> Harris, “דַּעַת,” *TWOT* 366.

<sup>53</sup> Harris, “דַּעַת,” *TWOT* 366. Waltke notes that in Proverbs 22, the root yd' appears in every verse of the chapter except for 18 and 20, which utilize da'at, and 19 and 21, which utilize dā'ā(h), “to cause to know.” Bruce K. Waltke, “The Book of Proverbs 15-31,” *NICOT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005)*, 48.

<sup>54</sup> See Deut 8:5; 29:3; Isa 51:7; Jer 24:7; 31:33f.; Eccl 1:17; 7:22; 8:5; Dan 2:30. Jenni, “ידע,” *TLOT* 2:508–521.

The term **הִפְקֵה** is parallel to **שׁוּב**, and both of these terms are neutral in meaning “to turn,” or “change,” where it could be either negative or positive.<sup>55</sup> Whereas **שׁוּב** has the sense of “surrounding,” **הִפְקֵה** connotes an “overthrow.”<sup>56</sup> In Exodus 14:5, **הִפְקֵה** combined with heart (**לֵב**) means to change one’s mind (*hāpāḳ lēbāb*), to change one’s opinion about truth.<sup>57</sup> This term **הִפְקֵה** is theologically significant in its depiction of the transformation that Yahweh produces in his people.<sup>58</sup> When the verb applies to the heart of man, the change of heart (and mindset) is due to God’s intervention and transformation (Ex 14:51; Sam 10:9; Ps 105:25).<sup>59</sup>

### **זָדוֹן (zādōn)**

Root: **זִד**

Exod 18:11; 1Sam 17:28; Neh 9:10; Prov 11:2 Sir 7:6; Jer 49:16; Ezek 7:10; Obad :3.

This term is rendered as presumption, presumptuousness, and over-confidence.<sup>60</sup> The earliest known use of the *hiphil* occurs in Exod 21:14 in the Covenant Code, underscoring the mindset and intention of wrongdoing in v. 13, “But if he does not do it with premeditation, but it happens by accident, then I will appoint for you a place where he may flee” (Exod 21:13 NET).” This was not an arrogance toward God and his moral order or a determination in one’s own mind of presumption.<sup>61</sup> However, premeditated apathy towards God’s law was a presumptuous offense against law and morality, and once Israel had become a nation, Scharbert notes that “זָדוֹן acquired the meaning of an arrogant transgression of Israel’s basic rights on the part of heathen nations (Exod 18:11; Neh 9:10).”<sup>62</sup> Mindsets are presumptions that lead God’s people astray, in which they choose to believe the assumption of their heart about God and his Word. Psalm 50:21 highlights this presumption: “These things you have done, and I have been silent; you thought that I was one like yourself. But now I rebuke you and lay the charge before you.”

<sup>55</sup> Victor P. Hamilton, “הִפְקֵה,” *TWOT* 221–22.

<sup>56</sup> K. Seybold, “הִפְקֵה,” *TDOT* 3:423.

<sup>57</sup> Swanson, “הִפְקֵה,” *DBLH*.

<sup>58</sup> See Amos 8:10; Jer 31:13; Ps 30:12; Lam 5:15. Seybold, “הִפְקֵה,” *TDOT* 3:425.

<sup>59</sup> Seybold, “הִפְקֵה,” *TDOT* 3:426.

<sup>60</sup> *HALOT*, s.v. “זָדוֹן,” 1:263.

<sup>61</sup> J. Scharbert, “זָדוֹן,” *TDOT* 4:46–51.

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*, 4:48.

**זכר (*zākar*)**

Root: זכר

Gen 9:15–16; 2 Kgs 20:3; Deut 8:2; Ps 22:28; 77:4, 12; 103:18; 105:5; 115:12; 143:5; Neh 9:17; Isa 17:10; Jer 23:36; Jonah 2:8.

The basic meaning of the term זכר is to remember and recall knowledge.<sup>63</sup> Forms of the root זכר occur in the MT a total of 288 times.<sup>64</sup> Referring to inner mental acts, זכר is distinct from other verbs portraying cognition.<sup>65</sup> The term זכר is distinct from other parallel terms in that it connotes an awareness of a mindset, and it “denotes an active cognitive occupation with a person or situation.”<sup>66</sup> זכר is rendered as an internal reflection with oneself six times in the OT (Hab 3:2, Lam 3:20; Job 4:7; 7:7; 21:6; Ps 22:28).<sup>67</sup> The theological significance of זכר is that it depicts the reciprocal relationship between God’s people and Yahweh.<sup>68</sup> The recurring theme of Yahweh remembering his people (78:39; 103:14) and his promises (Ps 105:8) and his people remembering Yahweh (Ps 42:7; 63:7; 77:4; 119:55) points to the cyclic pattern of apostasy and repentance and the role one’s mind has on faithfulness.<sup>69</sup> Remembering is a significant part of determining one’s mindset toward God. God’s people are forgetful, but the recurring phrases “to keep in mind,” “pay attention,” or “call to mind” show the relevance of memory for maintaining one’s mindset.

**הִכָּמָה (*hākmā*)**

Root: חכם

Deut 4:6; 1 Kgs 10:4; 2 Chr 1:10–12; Job 28:12; Ps 37:30; 90:12; Prov 2:10; Eccl 2:12–13, Jer 8:9; Isa 10:13; 11:2; Dan 1:4.

<sup>63</sup> Hoogendyk, s.v. “זכר,” *LATHB*.

<sup>64</sup> W. Schottroff, “זכר,” *TLOT* 1:381–89.

<sup>65</sup> Andrew Bowling, *TWOT* 241–43. Parallel to other verbs and expressions for acts of thought בִּין means “to pay attention to, understand, perceive” in Deut 32:7 and Isa 43:18; חָג means “to consider begrudgingly” in Ps 63:7, 77:7, and 143:5; הִשָּׁב means “to take into account, consider” in 2 Sam 19:20, Ps 77:6; שִׁיתָ means “to meditate” in Ps 77:7 and 143:5; and עָלָה עַל לֵב, “to come to mind.” Schottroff, “זכר,” *TLOT* 1:383.

<sup>66</sup> H. Eising, “זָכַר,” *TDOT* 4:64–82.

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*, 4:66.

<sup>68</sup> Schottroff, “זכר,” *TLOT* 1:385.

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid.*, 1:386–87.

Of special significance is that the heart **לב** is the seat of wisdom.<sup>70</sup> In Isaiah 11:2, the mind of Christ is full of wisdom, endowed by the Spirit of Yahweh.<sup>71</sup> Wisdom is ethical and religious.<sup>72</sup> It is shrewdness and prudence.<sup>73</sup> Wisdom is shown and not just known. It informs mindsets and can be based on the world's wisdom or God's wisdom. Job 28 shows that biblical wisdom is ethical and humble, practically seen as trusting in God, not self.<sup>74</sup> The wisdom of God is distinct from ANE wisdom in the OT. Yahweh's perfect Holy wisdom is to be embodied in his people in their daily lives. OT wisdom centers on a divine imperative: Yahweh revealed himself to Israel, and now man's mind and behavior are to be altered by this wisdom as an example to the surrounding culture.<sup>75</sup> God's wisdom gives insight and sees the intentions and thoughts of man.

### **יָפֵה (hāpēs)**

Root: **יָפֵה**

1 Kgs 13:33; 21:6; 1 Chr 28:9; Mic 7:18 Ps 5:5; 35:27; Ps 34:13; 40:15; 70:3; 111:2; Mal 3:1.

This term **יָפֵה** means “to take pleasure in, delight in.”<sup>76</sup> This term connotes a strong desire for something (1 Chr 28:9).<sup>77</sup> The Psalms render the meanings “desire” or “strive after” “higher nonmaterialistic values which are never secular in nature with **יָפֵה**.”<sup>78</sup> The impetus for this term is to provoke God's people to delight in God, for this is the highest pleasure. To this end, the term **יָפֵה** is used to depict worship of Yahweh.<sup>79</sup> However, worshipping anything other than Yahweh is idolatry and serves to corrupt one's mind. **יָפֵה** connotes a subjective feeling dependent upon a

<sup>70</sup> H.-P. Müller and M. Krause, “חָכָם,” *TDOT* 4:364–86. The root **חָכָם** is the original of φρονέω, φρόνησις, or φρόνιμος 23 times in the HT, 16 of these being in 3 Βασ. 3–11. Bertram, “Φρονέω,” *TDNT* 9:224.

<sup>71</sup> BDB, s.v. “יָפֵה,” 315.

<sup>72</sup> David J. A. Clines, *DCH* 3:222.

<sup>73</sup> Louis Goldberg, “חָכָם,” *TWOT* 282–84.

<sup>74</sup> Goldberg, “חָכָם,” *TWOT* 284.

<sup>75</sup> *Ibid.*, 283. Wilckens notes the eschatological significance of wisdom. “Twice **חָכָם** is called an eschatological blessing. In Isa 33:6 **חָכָם** and **דָּעַת** are Zion's riches of salvation, and the fear of Yahweh is its treasure.” Ulrich Wilckens and Georg Fohrer, “Σοφία,” *TDNT* 7:465–528. Proverbs says that the fear of God leads to wisdom (Prov 1:7; 9:10; 15:33; 111:10). The roots **בִּין** (*bîn*) and **יָדָע** (*yādha*) are similar in meaning to **יָפֵה**; **יָפֵה** and **בִּין** are parallel in Deuteronomy 32:29 and Job 32:9. H.-P. Müller and M. Krause, “חָכָם,” *TDOT* 4:371.

<sup>76</sup> BDB, s.v. “יָפֵה,” 342.

<sup>77</sup> HALOT, s.v. “יָפֵה,” 1:340.

<sup>78</sup> G. Johannes Botterweck, “יָפֵה,” *TDOT* 5:92–97.

<sup>79</sup> Botterweck, “יָפֵה,” *TDOT* 5:98.

psychic attitude for delight.<sup>80</sup> The pursuit of pleasure in the world is rooted in covetousness, which drives mindsets.

### הָשִׁב (hāšab)

Root: חָשַׁב

Gen 50:20 1 Sam 18:25; Neh 6:2, 6; Esther 9:24; Ps 32:2; 140:2; Prov. 16:9; Lam 2:8; Isa 10:7; Jer 18:8; 23:27; 26:3; 36:3; Ezek 38:10.

Characteristic of a mindset, הָשִׁב means to intend, have in mind, devise, invent, make a judgment, or imagine.<sup>81</sup> There is a sense in this word of framing plans.<sup>82</sup> Wood notes that thinking and planning are not synonymous with understanding.<sup>83</sup> This is not thinking that is thought to be emotional but pragmatic planning and calculative inward thinking. When combined with לֵב, the addition of *b<sup>e</sup>lēb*, rendered as “in the heart,” is thought to be an internal thought process.<sup>84</sup> Genesis 50:20 makes a significant theological statement. Despite man’s broken mindsets and evil plans, God’s plans override mankind’s plans. His sovereignty and power are greater. God’s ways are not man’s ways (Isa 55:8–9). The most significant theological statement with הָשִׁב is thought to be in the context of Gen 15:6. Abraham believed, and God reckoned (counted) his belief as righteousness.<sup>85</sup> If mindsets are unbelief, which has been shown in this dissertation, then it is belief in God’s thoughts that reckons one as righteous in his sight. “The reckoning of belief as *ṣ<sup>e</sup>dāqā* (קִדְּוָה, righteousness) documents the conclusion of the transaction.”<sup>86</sup>

### יָחַד (yahad)

Root: יָחַד

Ps 86:11.

<sup>80</sup> G. Gerleman, “הָפִיץ,” *TLOT* 2:467.

<sup>81</sup> *HALOT*, s.v. “הָשִׁב,” 1:359–360.

<sup>82</sup> K. Seybold, “הָשִׁב,” *TDOT* 5:228–45.

<sup>83</sup> Leon J. Wood, “הָשִׁב,” *TWOT* 329–30.

<sup>84</sup> K. Seybold, “הָשִׁב,” *TDOT* 5:233. The term הָשִׁב is used in the OT foundationally from an anthropological perspective. Seybold notes that *hšb* demonstrates “the mark of how human nature expresses itself.” The human will (*lēb ’āḏām*) in Prov 16:9 plans (piel) the course of one’s life with many plans (Prov 19:21), but the plans in man’s heart (mindset) are only evil all the time (Gen 6:5). *Ibid.*, 5:237.

<sup>85</sup> Seybold, “הָשִׁב,” *TDOT* 5:241.

<sup>86</sup> *Ibid.*, 5:243.



The term יְחָד occurs three times in the Qal, once in the Piel.<sup>87</sup> This term is rendered as “unitedness” and conveys unity in community with others; it can also refer to unity within one’s own heart.<sup>88</sup> The original etymology is disputed, but this term carries a sense of “one,” “single,” and “unique.”<sup>89</sup> Though rare in use pertaining to an undivided heart, the piel of יְחָד in Ps. 86:11 means to “direct toward a single goal.”<sup>90</sup> Ezekiel also points to a time when God’s people will no longer have a divided heart (Ezek 11:19), with the term יְחָדָה (’*ēḥād*) to depict “undivided.” Though the term “undivided heart” is not frequently used in Scripture, the concept is evident in the Great Commandment and in the Shema, which commands God’s people to love him with *all* their hearts. Ultimately, worldly mindsets are a divided heart. One cannot choose to obey one’s own thoughts and God’s at the same time when they are not in agreement. Mindsets cause a lack of unity in one’s own mind. Mindsets are a divided mind which makes life difficult to navigate. Man cannot serve God and mammon.

### יָצַר (yāṣar)

Root: יצר

2 Kgs 19:25; Ps 139:16; Isa 37:26; 46:11; Jer 18:11.

The term יָצַר is indicative of inclination or striving.<sup>91</sup> It is a picture of the mindset itself, its purpose, and its frame of mind; it is also characterized by imagination, device, or purpose.<sup>92</sup> There are approximately seventy occurrences of forms derived from the root יָצַר in the OT, with around twenty occurrences of the qal verb rendered as “potter,” as well as verbal forms, and around ten incidences of the noun יָצַר meaning “form” or “purpose.”<sup>93</sup> The noun יָצַר (*yāṣar*) with לב takes on the meaning “imagination of the heart,” the heart’s thoughts and purpose (Gen. 8:21); with the addition of מַחְשְׁבֵתָהּ (*maḥšebet*) it means “imagination of the thoughts of the

<sup>87</sup> Paul R. Gilchrist, “יָחַד,” *TWOT* 372–73.

<sup>88</sup> BDB, s.v. “יָחַד,” 403.

<sup>89</sup> Heinz-Josef Fabry, “יָחַד,” *TDOT* 6:40–8.

<sup>90</sup> Fabry, “יָחַד,” *TDOT* 6:45.

<sup>91</sup> *HALOT*, s.v. “יָצַר,” 1:429.

<sup>92</sup> *BDB*, s.v. “יָצַר,” 428. The Greek equivalent of יָצַר in the LXX is the term *πλάσμα*, which is an inclination (attitude) that demonstrates favor toward a purpose or intention. יָצַר is also employed in Isaiah 26:3 and 1 Chr 28:9, demonstrating God’s sovereignty over men’s mindsets and all their desires or claims as He is the master Potter whose purposes prevail over his creation.

<sup>93</sup> The imagery of God the potter fashioning his people (verb use of יָצַר) is an analogy to the noun use of this term. Just as God fashions and forms his people, man seeks to fashion his circumstances through his mindsets and striving. Otzen notes, “The satire against idols in Isa. 44:9–20 ... provides a good sense of the range of meanings inherent in the root. In v 9, the craftsmen are called idol makers.” Benedikt Otzen, “יָצַר,” *TDOT* 6:257–265. The inclinations of one’s mind can be idolatry when fixed on one’s own will rather than God’s.

heart” (Gen 6:5; 1 Chr 29:18; 28:9). When *yēšer* is utilized by itself, it is rendered as “purpose.”<sup>94</sup> יָצַר also depicts God’s thoughts and devising his preordained purposes.

### כִּין (*kîn*)

Root: כּוּן

1 Chr 29:18; 2 Ch 12:14; 19:3; 20:33; 30:19; Job 11:13; Ps 10:17; 57:8; 78:8; 108:2; 112:7; Prov 23:26; 1 Sam 7:3; Ezra 7:10; Neh 2:12; 7:5; Eccl 1:13, 17; 7:2, 21; 8:9, 16; 9:1.

The root כּוּן appears more than 280 times in the OT.<sup>95</sup> The term כִּיִּן means to be firm, arrange, or direct.<sup>96</sup> כִּיִּן powerfully illustrates that one’s thoughts and mindset “direct one’s step” and “order aright.”<sup>97</sup> Koch notes that כִּיִּן depicts the “conscious intention of one’s own intellect” (where intellect refers to לֵב) as evidenced by the presence of right actions, which are preceded by right thoughts, which are preceded by seeking wisdom.<sup>98</sup> כִּיִּן expresses the inclinations, resolutions, and determinations of the will, especially when connected with לֵב; לֵב הַכִּין לֵב means to set the mind (2 Chr 12:14; 19:3).<sup>99</sup> The *polet* stem means to “establish, make permanent,” but the *hiphil*, which is for causative action, is the stem used for 2 Chronicles 27:6, rendered as “determine” or “be determined” (in the psychological sense).<sup>100</sup> It is also rendered as to be steadfast or fixed. In Psalm 112:7, it is translated as “his heart is fixed” (KJV) or “steadfast” (NIV, NASB) or “firm” (ESV) or “set” (LSB). Mindsets are strongholds that are not easy to recognize or be set free from.

### כָּל (*kāl*)

Root: כָּלַל

2 Kgs 10:31; Ps 119:58; Isa 44:24; Jer 33:8.

<sup>94</sup> Otzen, “יָצַר,” *TDOT* 6:264–265.

<sup>95</sup> Klaus Koch, “כִּין,” *TDOT* 7:89.

<sup>96</sup> Brown, *BDB*, 465. Oswalt states that both BDB and KB have the root meaning of כִּין as “to be firm,” but there is also evidence that suggests the origin of this term was to be formed or fashioned (see Job 31:15; Ps 119:73).<sup>96</sup> Oswalt also notes that כִּין is also rendered as “preparing” their hearts to seek the LORD (see 1 Chr 29:18; 2 Chr 12:14), which has a sense of the RSV rendering “set” (Ps 57:7 “my heart is fixed [RSV “steadfast”], O God”). John N. Oswalt, “כִּין,” *TWOT* 1:433–34.

<sup>97</sup> See 2 Chr 27:6; Ps 119:133; Prov 16:9; 21:29; Jer 10:23. BDB, s.v. “כִּין,” 466.

<sup>98</sup> Koch, “כִּין,” *TDOT* 7:96.

<sup>99</sup> BDB, s.v. “לֵב,” 525.

<sup>100</sup> Klaus Koch, “כִּין,” *TDOT* 7:89.

The theme of the Shema is evident in the word לֵל. This one word, “all,” depicts the root problem in the human heart—one is not capable of loving God with all one’s heart.<sup>101</sup> Occurring over 5400 times in the OT, the significance of this term is in its recurrent theme pointing back to the Shema and the importance of having one’s mind and heart undivided in devotion to Yahweh.<sup>102</sup> The term לֵל infers “totality,” the whole of the heart.<sup>103</sup> God demonstrated what it meant to give one’s all, and his people must do the same.

### מְזִמָּה (*mezimmâh*)

Root: זמם

Job 21:27; 42:2; Ps 10:4; 21:12; Prov 24:8; Jer 23:20; 30:24; Zech 1:6; 8:14.

The term מְזִמָּה has a sense of a structured plot and purpose, used primarily to depict the purposes of God to carry out discipline for those who had schemed against God but also to speak of man’s evil plans and schemes (Gen 11:6).<sup>104</sup> There are thirteen occurrences of the verb in reference to the plans of man, which are typically evil (except for Prov 31:16), and the plans of God. There are also nineteen occurrences of מְזִמָּה, three of which deal with Yahweh’s plans, and the remaining sixteen verses discuss the impact of the thoughts of man.<sup>105</sup> This term is significant in portraying the nature of man’s mindsets, which are bent on evil. One cannot trust in one’s own thoughts (Jer 17:9), and God sees every scheme of man.

### מַחְשָׁבָה (*maḥšābâh*)

Root: חשב

Gen 6:5; 1 Chr 29:18; Ps 56:6; 94:11 Prov 6:18; 19:21; Isa 55:7; 59:7 65:2 66:18; Jer 4:14; 6:19.

The term מַחְשָׁבָה is rendered as thought, intent, plan, or invention.<sup>106</sup> Where חָשַׁב is the verb expressing the contemplation of mankind, מַחְשָׁבָה is the thought itself, formed from חָשַׁב.<sup>107</sup>

<sup>101</sup> See Chapter 3, section “Old Testament – The Struggle of Israel” for a complete treatment of this word.

<sup>102</sup> Hoogendyk, s.v. “לֵל,” *LATHB*.

<sup>103</sup> Helmer Ringgren, “לֵל,” *TDOT* 7:135–143.

<sup>104</sup> Herbert Wolf, “זָמַם,” *TWOT* 244.

<sup>105</sup> “Job 21:27 speaks of thoughts (*mach<sup>a</sup>shābhôth*) and *m<sup>e</sup>zimmôth* that wrong God. Psalm 10:2 says that the wicked will be caught in the schemes that they have devised (*chāshabh*.)” Pride in the mindset of mankind leaves no room for God. S. Steingrimsson, “זָמַם,” *TDOT* 4:87–90. “In his pride the wicked man does not seek him; in all his thoughts (מְזִמָּה) there is no room for God” (Ps 10:4 NIV).

<sup>106</sup> *HALOT*, s.v. “מַחְשָׁבָה,” 2:572.

<sup>107</sup> Klein, “מַחְשָׁבָה,” *CEDHLE* 336.

**מַנְדָּע (Aram. *manda*)**

Root: מַדַּע

Dan 2:21; 4:34.

This term refers to knowledge itself, derived from the verb מַדַּע,<sup>108</sup> This knowledge is obtained by consideration and depicted as “understanding which focuses on proper thought processes.”<sup>109</sup> The concept of thinking yields perception and shapes one’s view. Harris notes that thinking was described as “to see with the heart” or “to look at with the liver” in some languages.<sup>110</sup> This imagery evokes the concept of a mindset, which is the core of a person.<sup>111</sup>

**נָחַם (*nāḥam*)**

Root: נָחַם

Exod 13:17; 32:14; Num 23:19; Judg 21:6; 35; 1 Sam 15:11, 29; 2 Sam 24:16; 1 Chr 21:15; Ps 110:4; 135:14; Jer 8:6; 18:10; Ezek 24:14; Joel 2:13.

The term נָחַם means to become remorseful or regret.<sup>112</sup> BDB adds, “Be sorry, rue, suffer grief, repent, of one’s own doings.”<sup>113</sup> In the thirty-eight occurrences of the rendering “repent,” most of the occurrences refer to God’s repentance, not man’s, where the word used most often to depict man’s repentance is שׁוּב (*šûb*), connoting “to turn” (from sin to God).<sup>114</sup> God’s “repentance” via נָחַם is anthropopathic in which Yahweh is sorrowful and relents from punishment.<sup>115</sup> This conveys the relationship between man’s mindset and subsequent behavioral change that can affect God’s judgment. It is noteworthy to consider that the two primary terms in the semantic range (“repent [of]” for the niphāl, “comfort” for the piel) emanate from the emotional realm.<sup>116</sup> The *Hitpael* stem indicates mindset change.<sup>117</sup> The emotions and senses are a significant part of mindset change, and נָחַם is a key term in mind renewal.

<sup>108</sup> R. Laird Harris, “מַנְדָּע,” *TWOT* 1029.

<sup>109</sup> Swanson, “מַנְדָּע (*māndā*),” *DBLA*.

<sup>110</sup> *L&N*, s.v. “ἐνθυμέομαι,” 1:348–349.

<sup>111</sup> *Ibid.*, 1:349.

<sup>112</sup> *HALOT*, s.v. “נָחַם,” 3:688.

<sup>113</sup> BDB, s.v. “נָחַם,” 683. See (Exod 13:17; Ps 106:45; Jer 20:16; Joel 2:14; Zech 8:14).

<sup>114</sup> Marvin R. Wilson, “נָחַם,” *TWOT* 570–71.

<sup>115</sup> *Ibid.*, 571.

<sup>116</sup> H. Simian-Yofre and Heinz-Josef Fabry, “נָחַם,” *TDOT* 9:340–355.

<sup>117</sup> Louw and Nida show another term that is a parallel Greek term, μεταβάλλομαι, meaning “to change one’s thinking about something—to change one’s mind, to alter an opinion.” In Acts 28:6, the term is used to depict

**הָטָב (*nth*)**

Root: נטה

Jos 24:23; 1 Kgs 8:58; Ps 119:12, 36; Prov 2:2; 21:1; 1 Kgs 11:9.

Occurring 215 times with approximately thirty-five different meanings, one significant definition of this term carries the nuance “to turn” or “incline,” but the dominant amount of usage is figurative.<sup>118</sup> BDB states this term means to turn or influence the heart, to “incline one’s own heart unto (לְ) God and his commands.”<sup>119</sup> The transformation of the heart is the most theologically significant use of this term in the *hiphil* stem in several expressions connoting turning someone’s heart.<sup>120</sup> It is also significant that expressions using this term, such as “incline thine ear,” echo the Shema and play an important role in mindset change (Jer 7:24, 26; 11:8; 17:23).<sup>121</sup>

**שָׁדַח (*hādaš*)**

Root: שחח

2 Chr 15:8; 24:4, 12; Ps 51:10; 103:5; 104:30; Isa 61:4; Lam 5:21; Ezek 36:26–28.

The general sense of this term is to repair or make anew.<sup>122</sup> This term שָׁדַח has theological significance in its depiction of the renewal God brings: to renew the heart of man.<sup>123</sup> The renewal God brings restores and gives a new (firm) spirit to God’s people.<sup>124</sup> This definition of שָׁדַח is illuminating: “To place in a state or condition identical or nearly the same as a prior state (2 Chr 15:8; 24:4, 12; Ps 51:12; 104:30; Isa 61:4; Lam 5:21.)”<sup>125</sup> Of particular theological significance, this term is remarkably used only in limited ways in the OT, only in prophetic texts during the exile to convey the new heart God would give his people. This clarion call to make all things

this change. “They changed their minds and said, He is a god.” The term μεταβάλλομαι is often translated as “to no longer think as they did” or “to think differently now.” *L&N*, s.v. “μεταβάλλομαι,” 1:372.

<sup>118</sup> Wilson, “הָטָב,” *TWOT* 574–75.

<sup>119</sup> BDB, s.v. “הָטָב,” 640.

<sup>120</sup> “Turn my heart to your decrees (Ps 119:36); do not turn my heart to (l<sup>c</sup>) evil (Ps 141:4); [if you] incline your heart to (l<sup>c</sup>) understanding (Prov. 2:2); put away the foreign gods that are among you and incline your hearts to (‘el) Yahweh (Josh. 24:23); [may Yahweh] incline our hearts to (‘el) him (1 Kgs 8:58); they [the foreign women] might incline your heart to follow (‘ah<sup>h</sup>rê) their gods.” Helmer Ringgren, “הָטָב,” *TDOT* 9:381–87.

<sup>121</sup> Wilson, “הָטָב,” *TWOT* 574.

<sup>122</sup> BDB, s.v. “שָׁדַח,” 293.

<sup>123</sup> BDB, s.v. “שָׁדַח,” 293.

<sup>124</sup> *HALOT*, s.v. “שָׁדַח,” 294.

<sup>125</sup> *DBLSDOT*, s.v. “שָׁדַח.”

new was unique as it was spoken only during the exilic period in the entire history of Israel, and it pertains to something new in the relationship between God and his people.”<sup>126</sup>

### נָצַר (*nāṣar*)

Root: נצר

Ps 119:2, 33–34, 69, 100; Prov 4:23.

The root of נָצַר is common to all Semitic languages and has retained its original meaning, to “keep” or “observe through close attention.”<sup>127</sup> This term occurs sixty-two times in the OT, and the BDB translates this term as to watch, guard, or keep.<sup>128</sup> The term for watchmen also comes from this root (found in Jer 31:6; 2 Kgs 17:9; 18:8), and the LORD is depicted as a watchman over Israel and all men (Isa 27:3; Job 7:20).<sup>129</sup> So, too, should God’s people be watchmen over their own minds/hearts so carnal mindsets do not develop. This term is significant in mindsets for guarding keeps in and keeps out. Faith in God is a relationship that must be maintained. The importance of protecting one’s thoughts, beliefs, and attitudes from cultural and worldly influences is essential to preserving a godly mindset so one’s faith is not undermined or distorted.

### נָתַן (*nātan*)

Root: נתן

Num 11:29; 1 Kgs 3:9; 1 Chr 22:19; 2 Chr 11:16; 20:3; Eccl 1:13, 17; Jer 21:8; Dan 10:12.

The term נָתַן has a broad spectrum of use and wide semantic range, used over 2,000 times in the OT, with “to put” occurring 322 times and “to set” occurring 21 times, meaning to fix conclusively or authoritatively.”<sup>130</sup> The verb נָתַן is frequently rendered “set, put, place.”<sup>131</sup> Idiomatic expressions are significant in conveying intentions.<sup>132</sup> The significance of this verb is

<sup>126</sup> Claus Westermann, “שָׁדָן,” *TLOT* 1:394–97. Synonymous with μετανοέω, newness did not progress before the exilic situation. R. North, “שָׁדָן,” *TDOT* 4:225–244. The use of the word “new” in the OT was concentrated in prophetic passages, pointing to the future moment significant act of God in Israel’s history (Isa 42:9f; 43:19; 48:6; 62:2; 65:17; 66:22; Jer 31:22, 31; Ezek 11:19; 18:31; 36:26), to depict the new covenant and new heart and a new heaven and new earth. Westermann, “שָׁדָן,” *TLOT* 1:397. The term שָׁדָן represents the new mind and heart to come. “In the “new song” of Deutero-Isaiah and the related Psalms, “new” itself becomes a synonym for the recognition of God’s redemption within the historical order.” North, “שָׁדָן,” *TDOT* 4:244.

<sup>127</sup> Siegfried Wagner, “נָצַר,” *TDOT* 9:541–49.

<sup>128</sup> BDB, s.v. “נָצַר,” 665–66.

<sup>129</sup> Walter C. Kaiser, “נָצַר,” *TWOT* 594–95.

<sup>130</sup> Hoogendyk, ed., s.v. “נָתַן,” *LALHB*

<sup>131</sup> E. Lipiński and Heinz-Josef Fabry, “נָתַן,” *TDOT* 10:90–108.

<sup>132</sup> Lipiński notes the significance of *nātan libbô l’* with a dative object (Eccl 7:21; 8:9) means “pay attention to; apply one’s mind to,” and is synonymous with *šit libbô l’*, meaning “set or put his heart to” (2 Sam

that the idea of “putting” or “setting” is a deliberate, willful act one is accountable for. The intentional cultivation and establishment of particular attitudes, beliefs, or perspectives is often in line with the biggest influence in one’s life (often the culture) and impacts one’s faith and lifestyle.

### סור (sûr)

Root: סות

Exod 32:8; Deut 9:12; 11:16; 13:7; 2 Sam 24:1; I Kgs 22:43; 1 Chr 21:1; Jer 17:15.

The term סור indicates a change in direction or orientation to leave a set path.<sup>133</sup> It is used most frequently to depict Israel’s apostasy, often interpreted as to “turn aside/away” (see Exod 32:8; Deut 9:12; 11:16), and also to depict spiritual heart issues positively or negatively turning toward or away from God and the right path in wisdom literature.<sup>134</sup> The verb occurs 299 times, primarily depicting unfaithfulness to Yahweh, also rendered as to deviate or abandon.<sup>135</sup> The significance of this term is its employment to depict mindset change (Exod 3:7–9). Silva offers this telling description: “to backslide from the right course of religion (Exod 32:8 Deut 9:12).”<sup>136</sup>

### עָוָה (‘âvâh)

Root: עוה

1 Kgs 8:47; 2 Chr 6:37; Job 33:27; Ps 106:6; Prov 12:8; Isa 24:1; Jer 3:21; Ezek 21:32.

With the exception of Isaiah 42:16, this term depicts twisted and perverted acts of sinful men.<sup>137</sup> It means to “err from the way”.<sup>138</sup> The basic meaning of the verb is to bend, twist, or distort; to pervert, to sin, or to commit iniquity.<sup>139</sup> Proverbs 12:7 depicts this condition: “Whereas the house of the righteous will endure and they will be praised by all for their good sense, the wicked, who has ‘made his mind sinful/oppressed his heart,’ will be despised.”<sup>140</sup> This is a picture of what a mindset is. Mindsets are perverse for they twist God’s truth.

13:20; Ps 48:14; Prov 27:23; Jer. 31:21). Ibid., 10:96. נָתַן is a close parallel with שִׁים (sîm) and שִׁית (sît) when rendered as put, place, set, or appoint. R. Laird Harris, et al., eds., “נָתַן,” *TWOT* 608–609.

<sup>133</sup> Hoogendyk, s.v. “סור,” *LATHB*.

<sup>134</sup> R. D. Patterson, “סור,” *TWOT* 621. See Chapter 3, “The Pentateuch” section, for deeper analysis of סור.

<sup>135</sup> S. Schwertner, “סור,” 2:796–97.

<sup>136</sup> *HALOT*, s.v. “סור,” 3:748.

<sup>137</sup> Ronald B. Allen, “עָוָה,” *TWOT* 693–.

<sup>138</sup> BDB, s.v. “עָוָה,” 730.

<sup>139</sup> Ibid.

<sup>140</sup> Klaus Koch, “עָוָה,” *TDOT* 10:546–62.

## עַיִן (‘*ayin*)

Root: עָיַן

Gen 3:6; Num 15:39; 1 Sam 16:7; 1 Kgs 20:6; Job 31:1; Ps 33:13; Jer 5:3; 22:17; Ezek 20:7f.; 24:16, 21, 25.

The word ‘*ayin* occurs 866 times in the Hebrew OT with the meaning “eye.”<sup>141</sup> The term עָיַן represents the progression of seeing and, metaphorically, of understanding and obedience (see Jer 5:21).<sup>142</sup> When combined with prepositions, expressions are formed in which ‘*ayin* is more toward metonymic abstract concepts indicative of having a mindset, viewpoint, opinion, or assessment.<sup>143</sup> The eyes are a significant part of the development of a mindset, meaning to consider suspiciously.<sup>144</sup> The eyes shape one’s mindset. “The eye is used to express knowledge, character, attitude, inclination, opinion, passion, and response. The eye is a good barometer of the inner thoughts of man.”<sup>145</sup> As is the case, with other anthropological organs, their primary use is metaphorical.

The eye gate is where matter and concepts are taken visually. This can then develop into thoughts, considering what one has seen. The eyes led to the first mindset against God when Eve chose to eat from the forbidden tree. What one feels or perceives is not fact and must be questioned in accordance with God’s thoughts found in his Word.<sup>146</sup> Desire begins the process of rumination and coveting.<sup>147</sup> The eyes never have enough (Eccl 1:8). Despite man’s wayward eyes, God sets his eyes on his people, and they are the apple of his eye (Deut 32:9-10 and Psalm

<sup>141</sup> Stendebach, “עָיַן,” *TDOT* 11:28. In the LXX ὀφθαλμός occurs approximately 700 times. Wilhelm Michaelis, “Ὀφθαλμός,” *TDNT* 5:315–82.

<sup>142</sup> Carl Schultz, “עָיַן,” *TWOT* 662.

<sup>143</sup> Ernst Jenni, “עָיַן,” *TLOT* 2:878. The eyes represent one’s spiritual faculties and mirror one’s inner being. Carl Schultz, “עָיַן,” *TWOT* 663. “The eye is associated with a wide range of “psychical” activities so that at times the use of ‘*ayin* is almost synonymous with *nepesh* and *pānīm* (cf. Job 24:15).” Stendebach, “עָיַן,” *TDOT* 11:36.

<sup>144</sup> *HALOT*, s.v. “עָיַן,” 3:817.

<sup>145</sup> Schultz, “עָיַן,” *TWOT* 662.

<sup>146</sup> “No organ of the human body reflects the totality of life more impressively than does the eye.... All the motions and emotions of the inner life are manifested in the eye.” H.-J. Kraus, “Hören und Sehen in der althebräischen Tradition,” in *Biblisch-theologische Aufsätze*, trans. F. J. Stendebach (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag 1972), 84. “Among the psychic emotions expressed by phrases involving ‘*ayin*, foremost are the various nuances of desire.” Jenni, “עָיַן,” *TLOT* 2:877.

<sup>147</sup> This term is used with idioms to express inner thought processes. Many idioms point to one seeing things according to one’s own perspective; for instance, good, right, or bad “in the eyes of” (see here Deut 12:8).<sup>147</sup> “Intention is conveyed by the idiom “set one’s eyes to ...” (*šū lē*, Ps 17:11).” Stendebach, “עָיַן,” *TDOT* 11:36–37. The idiom “to lift the eyes” occurs around 50 times and is what leads to being able to see spiritually. F. J. Stendebach, “עָיַן,” *TDOT* 11:36. “Prov 15:30 reflects psychosomatic relationships: ‘The light of the eyes rejoices the heart.’” Jenni, “עָיַן,” *TLOT* 2:876. The eyes are used to speak polemically against idols, which cannot see despite having eyes (Ps 115:5; 135:16). Stendebach, “עָיַן,” *TDOT* 11:32.



17:8).<sup>148</sup> God looks at man’s heart, but man looks at the outward appearance. Nothing is hidden from the eyes of the LORD, including the thoughts in the minds of his people.

### הַצָּוָה (‘*ḥṣā’êh*)

Root: חָעַו

Deut 32:28; Judg 19:30; Ps 1:1; 31:13; 73:24; Prov 19:21; Isa 8:10; 47:13.

Over half of the occurrences of חָעַו are rendered as “plan,” with the other half essentially meant to advise.<sup>149</sup> “To plan” seems to be the primary term. Ruppert draws attention to the theological significance of הַצָּוָה in Proverbs 19:21: “Many are the plans (*maḥ<sup>a</sup>šābōt*) in the mind of a man, but it is the plan of Yahweh (*‘ašat YHWH*) that will be established.”<sup>150</sup> Here, this verse relays how God’s divine providence interacts with the plans of man.<sup>151</sup> In the oracles, there is judgment from God on man’s judgment in the various nations (Isa 3:3; 19:11, Jer 49:7–22; Ezek 7:26).<sup>152</sup> This is the crux of mindsets. Mankind relies on his own understanding and not on the counsel of God. This term reveals the significance of counsel in the shaping of one’s mindset.<sup>153</sup>

### שִׁקְצָה (‘*iqqēš*)

Roots: חָשַׁק

Ps 101:4; Prov 10:9; 28:18; Mic 3:9; Isa 59:8.

<sup>148</sup> “When anthropomorphic language speaks of God’s eye, the emphasis is on the eye’s function as the locus of personal attitudes and actions.” Stendebach, “חָעַו,” *TDOT* 11:40. The human “soul” is revealed in the eyes. Stendebach, “חָעַו,” *TDOT* 11:32. The eyes are a lamp to the body. The NT use and function is that the eye is what sheds light to the body (1 Cor 12:16, 21) (see also parables Matt 6:22// Lk. 11:34) where the eye is described as *λύχνος τοῦ σώματος*.<sup>148</sup> Just as the eyes can bring light to one’s thoughts and life, they can also bring darkness and the lust of the eyes is one of three main downfalls in man’s plight to be faithful to God.

<sup>149</sup> There are approximately fifty-seven occurrences in the OT of the verb and eighty-six occurrences in the noun form, thirty-six of which are in Isaiah. In the sense of “plan,” *‘ḥṣā* can take on the specific meaning “decision.” This is true, for instance, when *‘ḥṣā* is the result of deliberation (cf. Ezr. 10:8). In 1 Chronicles 12:20(19), *b<sup>e</sup> ‘ḥṣā* is used almost adverbially in the sense of “purposely.” Ruppert, “חָעַו,” *TDOT* 6:156–85.

<sup>150</sup> Ruppert, “חָעַו,” *TDOT* 6:171.

<sup>151</sup> Ibid..

<sup>152</sup> Ibid., 6:173.

<sup>153</sup> The term *bouleuō* or a compound occurs 70 times in LXX for הַצָּוָה, meaning “to give counsel, deliberate, purpose, determine.” Paul R. Gilchrist, “חָעַו,” *TWOT*, 390–91. The term *boulē*, is theologically significant in its employment in the NT concerning God’s immutable counsel which is far above man’s (see Acts 2:23; 4:28; 5:38–39; 20:27; Eph 1:11; Heb 6:17, and whose purpose never changes). Gilchrist, “חָעַו,” *TWOT* 390. Man falls away because he listens to carnal thinking rather than God’s counsel.

The verb *שָׂקַע* connotes to twist or pervert.<sup>154</sup> This term is paired with “heart/mind” in this verse and paints a picture of the nature of a worldly mindset, which is twisted or perverted, contrary to God’s original design.<sup>155</sup>

### **הִשָּׂקַע (*qāšā*)**

Root: *שָׂקַע*

Exod 7:3; Deut 2:30; 10:16; 2 Kgs 17:14; 2 Chr 30:8; 36:13; Neh 9:16, 17, 29; Job 9:4; Ps 95:8; Prov 28:14; 29:1; Jer 7:26; 17:23; 19:15.

The most common and significant use of the term *הִשָּׂקַע* is its rendering “to be stubborn” or “to stiffen one’s neck.”<sup>156</sup> This term carries a sense of hardening oneself.<sup>157</sup> The theological significance of this term is in the figurative usage referring to the process of people’s rebellion and disobedience to God’s Word, where *הִשָּׂקַע* *hiphil* with the *בָּ* as the object refers to God’s hardening of the heart (Exod 7:3) when God’s people harden their own hearts.<sup>158</sup> This hardening of the heart occurs in one’s mindset when unbelief is unchallenged. This term characterizes one’s mindset and attitude toward others or circumstances.<sup>159</sup> The Greek equivalent *σκληρότης* (*sklērotēs*) is defined as “a stubborn attitude with regard to any change in behavior—‘stubbornness,’” typically due to an unrepentant heart’ (Rom 2:5) refusing to change or think differently.<sup>160</sup> “In some instances, stubbornness may be expressed idiomatically as ‘one’s heart only sees one thing’ or ‘one’s heart is blind’ or ‘one who always says no.’”<sup>161</sup>

### **רָאָה (*rā’āh*)**

Root: *רָאָה*

Gen 1:4, 10, 12, 19, 21, 26, 31; 3:6; 6:2, 5; 16:4; 26:28; Exod 2:2; 33:13; Isa 6:9; Lam 5:1.

Occurring 1,303 times in the OT, the term *רָאָה* carries a sense of mental observation, to examine, inspect, and perceive by sight.<sup>162</sup> The metaphorical and extended use in the *qal* stem is

<sup>154</sup> G. Warmuth, “שָׂקַע,” *TDOT* 11:323–26.

<sup>155</sup> BDB, s.v. “שָׂקַע,” 786.

<sup>156</sup> Hoogendyk, s.v. “הִשָּׂקַע,” *LATHB*.

<sup>157</sup> HALOT, s.v. “הִשָּׂקַע,” 2:1151–52.

<sup>158</sup> A. S. van der Woude, “הִשָּׂקַע,” *TLOT* 3:1175–76.

<sup>159</sup> M. Zipor, “הִשָּׂקַע,” *TDOT* 13:189.

<sup>160</sup> *L&N*, s.v. “σκληρότης,” 1:765.

<sup>161</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>162</sup> BDB, s.v. “רָאָה,” 907. See also H. F. Fuhs, “רָאָה,” *TDOT* 13:209–242.

rendered as “to regard, perceive, feel, understand, learn, enjoy.”<sup>163</sup> This term also alludes to cognitive processes as it is typically rendered as dealing with the ability to see physically but is also often used to depict mental observation (Lam 5:1).<sup>164</sup> Parallel with רָאָה, this term can also mean to understand.<sup>165</sup> “The verb “saw” carries the meaning of reflection in one’s mind (Gen 1:4). The eyes filter and discern or distinguish in the mental processing of information.”<sup>166</sup>

The eyes are a central aspect of the development of a mindset that establishes one’s perception. Part of the forming of one’s mindset or worldview is encompassed in taking in visual information and making a determination based on observations.<sup>167</sup> Fuhs notes the significance of this term:

Unlike other verbs referring to visual perception, *rā`ā* denotes the experience of seeing as a totality, in which sensation and perception merge...the verb *rā`ā* refers particularly to that segment of the process that brings the perpetual flux of the visual experience of living reality to the level of conscious recognition—i.e., conscious perception or the act of comprehension...every conscious apperception, therefore, is initiated by seeing with one’s eyes.<sup>168</sup>

### רוּם (*rûm*)

Root: רוּם

Deut 8:14; 17:20; 2 Sam 22:28; Ps 131:1; Prov 30:13; Isa 2:12; Ezek 31:10; Hos 13:6; Dan 5:20.

The primary use of this term is to lift up or raise, predominantly in reference to Yahweh, as he is great and exalted over the nations and the earth (Ps 99:2; 113:4).<sup>169</sup> Another significant use of this term is to negatively depict an arrogant, haughty mindset or attitude in mankind.<sup>170</sup> Though this term can be used positively to honor, its notable use pertaining to the apostasy of God’s people is negative. As in the preceding examples, the aspect of pride in one’s mindset is characterized by significant anthropological terms to conceptualize pride.<sup>171</sup> Pride impacts one’s

<sup>163</sup> Robert D. Culver, “רָאָה,” *TWOT* 823.

<sup>164</sup> “La 5:1,” *The NET Bible First Edition Notes*, Biblical Studies Press (Biblical Studies Press, 2006).

<sup>165</sup> *HALOT*, s.v. “רָאָה,” 3:1157–61.

<sup>166</sup> *Ibid.*, 3:1157.

<sup>167</sup> D. Vetter, “רָאָה,” *TLOT* 3:1176–83.

<sup>168</sup> Fuhs, “רָאָה,” *TDOT* 13:214–16.

<sup>169</sup> U. Dahmen, et, al., “רוּם,” *TDOT* 13:402–12.

<sup>170</sup> H.-P. Stähli, “רוּם,” *TLOT* 3:1220–25.

<sup>171</sup> “Various passages use *rûm* qal with *lēb* “heart” (Deut 8:14; 17:20; Ezek 31:10; Hos 13:6; Dan. 5:20) or *‘ēnayim* “eyes” (Ps 131:1; Prov 30:13 Ps 18:28; Prov 6:17) to designate a haughty, arrogant, presumptuous attitude.”

heart, hardening it and one's eyes in shaping one's perspective. Pride impacts one's whole being and affects how one sees and thinks. This term is theologically significant as mankind has no impetus to be proud, for everything was given to God's people by Yahweh, yet pride positions man for discipline from Yahweh, for God hates the proud.

### שִׁים (*šûmâh*)

Root: שִׁים

2 Sam 13:32; 1 Kgs 2:15; 2 Kgs 3:3; 10:31; 12:17; 13:2, 6, 11; 14:24; 15:9, 18, 24, 28; 17:22; 18:6; Job 15:30; 28:28; 34:14; Ps 34:14; 54:3, 5; 78:7; Prov 3:7; 13:14; 16:6, 17; 22:6; Isa 41:20; 42:25; 57:1; Jer 9:7; 24:6; 42:17; 44:11–12; Dan 1:8; 6:14; 11:17; Hag 1:5.

Occurring over 580 times, שִׁים is 192 of those occurrences.<sup>172</sup> The significant phrase, to “take to heart” שִׁי עַל-לֵב (see Isa 42:25; 47:7; 57:1, 11; Jer 12:11; Mal 2:2) is an invitation to set one's mind rightly or to set one's heart or intention: “If he set his heart upon man” (Job 34:14, KJV).<sup>173</sup> This term carries a sense of purpose, set aside for special purposes.<sup>174</sup> This term has an impetus on volition through idiomatic expressions with *šîm*, which serve to confirm the basic meaning of cognitive activity.<sup>175</sup> The expression *šîm* + (*’et*) *lēb/lēbab* figuratively conveys centering one's heart “as the organ of attentiveness, inclination, worry, memory, and cognition on a person or thing.”<sup>176</sup>

### שָׁכַח (*šākah*)

Root: שָׁכַח

Deut 4:9, 23, 31; 8:11; 14, 19; 9:7; 32:18; Judg 3:7; Ps 119:16, 93; Prov 3:1; 4:5; Isa 17:10, Jer 3:21; 13:25; 23:27; Hos 13:6.

The term שָׁכַח carries the sense to forget or dismiss from the mind.<sup>177</sup> BDB adds the descriptive “leave,” which shows what forgetting does.<sup>178</sup> Theological significance in this term is

Stähli, “רום,” *TLOT* 3:1222. The high heart is a presumption (Deut 8:14), and pride (Ezek 31:10) and lofty eyes (Ps 131:1), as well as the high arm (Job 38:15), also convey a presumptive spirit. Andrew Bowling, “רום,” *TWOT* 837–39.

<sup>172</sup> Hoogendyk, s.v. “שִׁים,” *LALHB*.

<sup>173</sup> *HALOT*, s.v. “שִׁים,” 4:1322–26.

<sup>174</sup> Gary G. Cohen, “שִׁים,” *TWOT* 872.

<sup>175</sup> “See *yd*': Isa 41:20, 22; *byn*: Neh 8:8; Isa 57:1; *škl*: Isa 41:20; *zkr*: 2 Sam 19:20; Isa 47:7; 57:11; *šm*': Ezek 40:4; Zech. 7:12; Mal 2:2.” G. Vanoni, “שִׁים,” *TDOT* 15:89–113.

<sup>176</sup> Vanoni, “שִׁים,” *TDOT* 15:101.

<sup>177</sup> Hoogendyk, s.v. “שָׁכַח,” *LATHB*.

<sup>178</sup> BDB, s.v. “שָׁכַח,” 1013.

shown as God's people are forgetful of the covenant but Yahweh forgets the sins of his people in his salvific act.<sup>179</sup> Used ten times as an antonym for זכר, the primary use of this term is depicting God and man's reciprocal relationship.<sup>180</sup> As an antonym of יָדַע (to know), שָׁכַח means to forget and not know God.<sup>181</sup> This forgetfulness of God is not a lapse in cognition but a willful choice to neglect the relationship and rebel against God.

### שָׂכַל (*šākal*)

Root: שָׂכַל

Deut 32:29; 2 Chr 30:22; Job 34:35; Ps 64:10; 94:8; 106:7; 119:99; Prov 1:3; 10:19; 21:16; Isa 41:20; 44:18; Jer 3:15; 9:23; Dan 1:4, 17; 9:13, 25; 11:33, 35; 12:3, 10.

Occurring ninety-one times in the OT, the root שָׂכַל is rendered as “insightful,” “reasonable,” or “understanding,” in particular, having theological insight or knowledge of God.<sup>182</sup> The term שָׂכַל is synonymous with בִּין in many instances, though there is a distinction between the two words. Where בִּין has a sense of “distinguishing between,” שָׂכַל pertains to having “intelligent knowledge of the reason.”<sup>183</sup> The focus of this term is not on just one facet of cognition but on the resulting common sense and capacity for understanding, which only God is able to give to man.<sup>184</sup> When one's mindset acknowledges Yahweh, God grants understanding.<sup>185</sup>

### שָׁלֵם (*šālēm*)

Root: שָׁלֵם

1 Kgs 8:61; 11:4 15:3, 14, 2 Kgs 15:4; 20:3; 1 Chr 12:38; 28:9; 29:9 19, 2 Chr 15:17; 16:9; 19:9; 25:2; Isa 38:3.

While שָׁלֵם is thought to have a primary meaning of peace, wholeness is also thought to be considered the primary rendering.<sup>186</sup> This term means “whole” or “complete” and is theologically significant as it conveys the importance of loving God wholeheartedly with an undivided heart, which is the greatest commandment.<sup>187</sup> As established in the dissertation,

<sup>179</sup> W. Schottroff, “שָׁכַח,” *TLOT* 3:1322–26.

<sup>180</sup> Victor P. Hamilton, “שָׁכַח,” *TWOT* 922–23.

<sup>181</sup> *Ibid.*, 922.

<sup>182</sup> K. Koenen, “שָׂכַל,” *TDOT* 14:113–128.

<sup>183</sup> R. Laird Harris, “שָׂכַל,” *TWOT* 877.

<sup>184</sup> Koenen, “שָׂכַל,” *TDOT* 14:117.

<sup>185</sup> *Ibid.*, 14:119.

<sup>186</sup> K.-J. Illman, “שָׁלֵם and שָׁלֵם,” *TDOT* 15:97–105.

<sup>187</sup> *HALOT*, s.v. “שָׁלֵם,” 4:1538–39.

mindsets are divided hearts and unbelief. Having a whole heart devoted to God signifies that cognitive and emotive aspects are united in loving God with all one's being. An undivided heart also brings peace to God's people, which makes the other definition of this term significant.

### שָׁמַר (*šāmar*)

Root: שָׁמַר

Deut 4:9; 26:16; 2 Sam 22:24; 2 Kgs 23:3; 2 Chr 34:31; Prov 19:8.

The term שָׁמַר is similar in definition to נָצַר, meaning to “watch,” “guard,” “keep,” and “observe,” though their context of use differs.<sup>188</sup> The verb שָׁמַר occurs 468 times in the OT, occurring the most often in Deuteronomy (seventy-three times) and the Psalms (seventy-one times), used consistently to convey man's responsibility in the covenant.<sup>189</sup> The theological significance of שָׁמַר is both its extensive use and the subject of its use. “The *šmr* texts of Deuteronomy emphasize the reciprocal relationship between Israel and Yahweh, the relationship between the great commandment and the individual statutes, and the connection between obedience *and* disobedience and blessing/curse.”<sup>190</sup> Whereas נָצַר focuses on keeping (maintaining) one's heart/mindset, שָׁמַר focuses on doing by keeping the covenant. Man is incapable of fulfilling the covenant on his own. The term שָׁמַר can be used to depict a man's attitude of paying attention to and revering God.<sup>191</sup>

### תְּבוּנָה (*těbûnâh*)

Roots: תְּבוּנָה; בִּין

Deut 32:28; 1 Kgs 5:9; 7:14; Job 26:12; Ps 49:4; 78:72; Prov 2:3; 3:13, 5:1; 14:29; 15:21; 18:2; 19:8; 147:5; Isa 40:14; 28; 44:19; Hos 13:2.

Coming from the root בִּין, this term תְּבוּנָה is rendered as understanding or knowledge.<sup>192</sup> Understanding is the object of knowledge; knowledge aids the mind by helping to incline the mind to understanding.<sup>193</sup> Used in a similar way as בִּין, “*těbûnâ* is personified as a woman lifting up her voice in Proverbs 8:1, as a parallel with wisdom. The terms בִּין and תְּבוּנָה appear in synonymous parallelism only in Proverbs 2:3, providing additional emphasis as if to beckon the reader together to cry out for discernment and understanding.<sup>194</sup>

<sup>188</sup> R. Laird Harris, “שָׁמַר,” *TWOT* 939–40.

<sup>189</sup> F. Garcia-López, “שָׁמַר,” *TDNT* 15:279–283.

<sup>190</sup> *Ibid.*, 15:293.

<sup>191</sup> Harris, “שָׁמַר,” *TWOT* 940.

<sup>192</sup> Helmer Ringgren, “בִּין,” *TDOT* 2:100.

<sup>193</sup> BDB, s.v. “בִּין,” 108.

<sup>194</sup> Goldberg, “בִּין,” *TWOT* 104.

**תָּמַךְ (*tāmak*)**

Root: תמך

Ps 119:34; Prov 4:4.

Parallel to שָׁמַר, where שָׁמַר has a sense of watching one's motives of the heart, תָּמַךְ acts on that decision with tenacity.<sup>195</sup> This term has the sense of upholding or maintaining, setting one's mind to support and hold firmly to what one already has.<sup>196</sup> With only one exception, תָּמַךְ is found only in the *qal* stem. With an accusative object, it means “grasp” or “hold.”<sup>197</sup> There is no neutral. One is either going forward or backward. One must set one's mind to maintain and grow. God is calling his people to exercise their minds toward righteousness and to choose who to serve every single day—the flesh or the Spirit. Ten of the twenty-one uses of this term in Scripture are wisdom texts. Wisdom is what orients one mindset to be able to choose wisely, as well as a Spirit-activated mind saturated in the Word of God. One significant verse shows several of these mindset terms correlating to one another: “Let your heart hold fast (*tmk*) my words; keep (*šmr*) my commandments, and live” (Prov 4:4). One's mind determines whether one will live or not.

Mindset is a matter of one's life or death. Ruppert notes in this verse that the heart, the seat of intellect and will, stands for the person's inmost being.<sup>198</sup> In Psalm 119:34, the KJV translates תָּמַךְ as to “retain” God's words in their heart. Wholehearted devotion to God is not passive. It is willful, grasping for his grace to think and act in accordance with his will. One cannot be passive toward cultivating a godly mindset.

**שׁוּב (*šûb*)**

Root: שׁוּב

Deut 4:39; Judg 2:19; 2 Chr 6:37; Jer 50:19; Ezek 39:27; Zech 10:9.

The term שׁוּב means to turn back or return, have a change in belief, a shift in direction, and then a shift back in the opposite way; in a theological sense, to return to Yahweh.<sup>199</sup> The twelfth most frequently used verb in the OT, שׁוּב occurs over 1050 times.<sup>200</sup> The term *sub* serves as an invitation to God's people to come back. The idioms and expressions utilizing anthropological terms to convey the need for man's repentance to experience renewal are

<sup>195</sup> BDB, s.v. “תָּמַךְ,” 1069.

<sup>196</sup> Hoogendyk, s.v. “תָּמַךְ,” *LALHB*.

<sup>197</sup> L. Ruppert, “תָּמַךְ,” *TDOT* 15:694–99.

<sup>198</sup> *Ibid.*, 15:697.

<sup>199</sup> *HALOT*, s.v. “שׁוּב,” 1427–34. See Chapter 3, “The Breaking of a Mindset” for significant analysis of the term שׁוּב.

<sup>200</sup> Victor P. Hamilton, “שׁוּב,” *TWOT* 1:909–10.

summed up in the term שׁוּב; this verb combines the full aspect of repentance: turning away from evil and turning toward good.<sup>201</sup> The purpose of repentance and returning is relationship, reestablishing a right relationship with Yahweh in the covenant.<sup>202</sup> Before one acts, one thinks. In Deuteronomy 4:39, שׁוּב is rendered as “consider” (KJV), and HALOT is rendered as “take to heart, call to mind.”<sup>203</sup> The mechanics of a mindset precipitate decisions and actions. The return to Yahweh hinged upon one’s mindset and decision to accept God’s invitation.

### סָבַב (*sābab*)

Root: סבב

1 Kgs 18:37; 21:4; 2 Kgs 20:2; Eccl 7:25.

This term means to turn or change direction.<sup>204</sup> The theological significance of this term is that it depicts a mindset change, conveying a sense of an investigation within one’s mind that leads to the turning of one’s mind Eccl 7:25.<sup>205</sup> “It (סָבַב) describes a changed mind or attitude, occasionally in great sorrow (1 Kgs 21:4; 2 Kgs 20:2). This changed mind can involve a changed condition before God, whether for evil (2 Chr 29:6) or good (Ezra 6:22). From this, it becomes associated with repentance and restoration to favor after apostasy (1 Kgs 18:37).”<sup>206</sup> This term captures the essence of mindset transformation and renewal.

---

<sup>201</sup> Hamilton, “שׁוּב,” *TWOT* 1:909.

<sup>202</sup> J. A. Soggin, “שׁוּב,” *TLOT* 1312–17.

<sup>203</sup> *HALOT*, s.v. “שׁוּב,” 1434.

<sup>204</sup> R. D. Patterson, “סָבַב,” *TWOT* 615.

<sup>205</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>206</sup> *Ibid.*



## NT Terms

### Anthropological

#### ἄνθρωπος (*anthrōpos*)

Root: ἄνθρωπος

Acts 3:23; Rom 2:29; 7:22; 1 Cor 2:12–15; 15:45, 47–49; 2 Cor 4:16; Phil 2:7; Heb 2:6–9.

An ἄνθρωπος is defined as a human being, male or female.<sup>207</sup> But this term sets man apart from the animals as distinct, made in the image of God.<sup>208</sup> This term also conveys, like the other anthropological terms, man's inner being (Rom 2:29; 7:22; 2 Cor 4:16). In the NT, this term is used to portray the mind of man in comparison to the mind of God.<sup>209</sup> Paul utilizes anthropological terminology in expressions to reveal whether man's inner being is being driven by the flesh or the Spirit, i.e., the outer or inner man, through antithetical adjectival or adverbial attributes. One must choose to put off παλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος and to put on καινὸς ἄνθρωπος.<sup>210</sup> Of most significance in this term is that Jesus Christ chose to identify as an ἄνθρωπος to redeem the mind of man and save his soul, restoring the broken image of man back to God.<sup>211</sup>

#### καρδία (*kardia*)

Root: καρδία

Matt 9:4; 13:15; 22:37; Mark 7:21; 12:30, 33; Luke 1:17; 2:35; 10:27; 16:15; 24:25, 38; John 12:40; Acts 28:27; Rom 1:21; 2:15; 6:17; 7:37; 8:27; 10:1; 16:18; 1 Cor 2:9; 14:25; 2 Cor 9:7; Eph 4:18; Phil 4:7; Heb 3:8; 4:12; 8:10; 10:16, 22; 1 Pet 3:4; 1 Tim 1:5; 2 Tim 2:22; 1 Thess 2:4; Rev 2:23; 17:17.

The term καρδία was covered extensively in chapters one and five. This comprehensive term conveys the whole person, encompassing the thoughts, emotions, and will in connection to

---

<sup>207</sup> *BDAG*, s.v. “ἄνθρωπος,” 81–2.

<sup>208</sup> Joachim Jeremias, “Ἀνθρωπος,” *TDNT* 1:364–67.

<sup>209</sup> *Ibid.*, 1:364.

<sup>210</sup> *Ibid.*, 1:365. Louw and Nida note that “In a number of languages it is quite impossible to speak of the psychological faculty of a person as being merely ‘that which is within.’ It is frequently necessary to refer to a particular organ of the body, for example, ‘the heart’ or ‘the liver’ or ‘the spleen.’ In some languages, however, one may refer to this faculty as being ‘the person who stands inside’ or ‘the real person’ or even ‘the other person.’” *L&N*, s.v. “ἄνθρωπος,” 1:319–20.

<sup>211</sup> *BDAG*, s.v. “ἄνθρωπος,” 82.

the individual's responsibility to God.<sup>212</sup> People must each choose to set their resolve on the things of God or of man, and there are many opportunities to be deterred from loving God with all one's being. The heart contains the soul, mind, and spirit. Together, the heart and other metaphorical anthropological organs convey the inner being, the inner workings of the mindset. The heart is where spiritual conversion occurs (Ps 51:10, 17; Joel 2:12; Mal 4:6). The equivalence of καρδία with לֵב/לִבָּ provides a close connection between καρδία and νοῦς ("mind."), in which νοῦς can imply the whole personality (Rom 12:2; Eph 4:23).<sup>213</sup>

### **νοῦς (*nous*)**

Root: νοῦς

John 12:40; Rom 1:20, 28; 7:23, 25; 11:34; 12:2; 14:5; 1 Cor 1:10; 2:16 (2); 14:14, 15, 19; Eph 4:17, 23; Col 2:18; 1 Tim 6:5; 2 Tim 3:8; Titus 1:15; 2 Thess 2:2; Rev 17:9.

The term νοῦς represents the mind, its disposition, and the inner or moral attitude,<sup>214</sup> In the term νοῦς, Paul had a vehicle to convey the mind of the risen Christ. The νοῦς is thought to be the source where all cognitive activities take place. Paul spiritualized the use of νοῦς, with an emphasis on depicting that a mindset was more than just cognitive capability, but a vessel for Spirit-infused understanding and renewal. The theological significance of this, as well as other anthropological terms (καρδία, ψυχή, πνεῦμα, etc.), is that all these terms depict the whole man, created in the image of God.<sup>215</sup> They each in their own way convey the mechanics of the formation of one's mindset and how man relates to God.

### **πνεῦμα (*pneuma*)**

Root: πνεῦμα

Mark 2:8; Luke 1:47; John 14:26; Acts 19:21; Rom 8:27; Gal 5:17; Eph 4:23; 1 Pet 3:4.

The role of the πνεῦμα is the most significant aspect of mind renewal.<sup>216</sup> This term can depict the human spirit, personality, and the Holy Spirit.<sup>217</sup> The Holy Spirit activates the Spirit of man to be able to understand the things of God. The mind of Christ is accessed through the illumination of the Holy Spirit. "The οὐσία of the soul or its νοῦς or λογισμὸς is the divine

<sup>212</sup> Silva, s.v. "καρδία," *NIDNTTE* 2:622–27.

<sup>213</sup> *Ibid.*, 2:624.

<sup>214</sup> Behm, "Νοέω," *TDNT* 4:952. For further information on this term, review chapters one, four, and five, where the term νοῦς was extensively covered.

<sup>215</sup> Helmut Köster, "Σπλάγγνον," *TDNT* 7:548–59.

<sup>216</sup> See chapters one and five for extensive treatment for πνεῦμα.

<sup>217</sup> BDAG, s.v. "πνεῦμα," 833.

πνεῦμα.”<sup>218</sup> As the other anthropological organs are known as the source and seat of insight, feeling, and will, so is the πνεῦμα.<sup>219</sup> The inner being is comprehensive and not easily definable with one term. Paul’s depiction of the inner being through different anthropological organs conveys the different aspects of the inner workings of the mind/spirit. In Acts 19:21, Paul uses πνεῦμα to describe his mindset, depicted as one’s disposition, “to make up one’s mind.” In addition to σῶμα and σάρξ, πνεῦμα is primarily utilized to depict the psychical functions of man<sup>220</sup>

### ψυχή (*psyche*)

Root: ψυχω

Matt 6:25; 16:25; Luke 12:19; John 12:25; Jas 1:8; 4:8.

In the NT ψυχή occurs over 100 times, sixty-five of which occur in the gospels, and it denotes the soul, life itself, or a person. (Matt 16:25; John 12:25).<sup>221</sup> Ψυχή depicts the inner life (2 Cor 1:23; 1 Thess 2:8).<sup>222</sup> The soul is “the essence of life—thinking, willing, and feeling—inner self, mind, thoughts, feelings, heart, being.”<sup>223</sup> The term ψυχω can also indicate one’s mindset through purpose or desire (Phil 1:27) with a focus on the complete psychological being, also glossed as “heart” or “desire.”<sup>224</sup> The ψυχή was considered to be the epitome of a person and the “omnibus” term depicting human thought, will, and emotion as well as the core of man that could be separated from his body and does not share in the body’s dissolution.<sup>225</sup> Alongside φρόνημα (mind, thought, will), ψυχή is nearly connected with volitional and mental faculties (see Sophocles *Antigones* 176).<sup>226</sup>

---

<sup>218</sup> Schweizer, “Ψυχή,” *TDNT* 9:635.

<sup>219</sup> BDAG, s.v. “πνεῦμα,” 833.

<sup>220</sup> Eduard Schweizer, “Πνεῦμα,” *TDNT* 4:435.

<sup>221</sup> Silva, s.v. “ψυχή,” *NIDNTE* 4:725–34. Ψυχή was dealt with extensively in chapter five. Herein is a focus on the cognitive aspect of this term.

<sup>222</sup> *Ibid.*, 4:725.

<sup>223</sup> *L&N*, “ψυχή,” 1:320–21.

<sup>224</sup> *L&N*, “ψυχή,” 1:320.

<sup>225</sup> Dihle, “Ψυχή,” *TDNT* 9:611.

<sup>226</sup> Silva, s.v. “ψυχή,” *NIDNTE* 4:726. Paul’s unique term ψυχικός expands on the definition of ψυχή, ascribing it to a person who is spiritual according to the world’s philosophies. Silva notes that ψυχικός does not refer to a different anthropological category but to a different mode of existence, and in 1 Corinthians 2:14, the phrase ψυχικός ἄνθρωπος (“soulish man”) is properly rendered “the natural man” (KJV) or “those who are unspiritual” (NRSV) or, better yet, “the person without the Spirit.” Silva, s.v. “ψυχή,” *NIDNTE* 4:731–732. The term for double-minded (δίψυχος) comes from ψυχή and only occurs in two places in the NT (Jas 1:8; 4:8). This term is depicted as a duality of oneself (desires and thoughts) that are opposed to one another, rendering indecisiveness, similar to the concept of having a divided heart in the OT, לב ולב. Schweizer, “Ψυχή,” *TDNT* 9:637–665.

## Cognitive Terms

**ἀδόκιμος (*adokimos*), δόκιμος, (*dokimos*)**

Root: δοκή

Rom 1:28; 12:2; 1 Cor 3:13; 9:27; 11:19; 2 Cor 13:5–7; 2 Tim 3:8; Titus 1:16; Heb 6:8; 1 Thess 2:4.

The term δόκιμος means “approved,” speaking of divine approval.<sup>227</sup> And the opposite term, ἀδόκιμος, is rendered as “worthless, rejected.”<sup>228</sup> The term ἀδόκιμος is a picture of a base, corrupt mind, the polar opposite of the renewed mind, as illustrated in Romans 1:28: the reprobate mind. One’s mind is the litmus test as to whether one is faithful and worthy or not.

**αἴσθησις (*aisthēsis*)**

Root: αἰσθάνομαι

Luke 9:45; Phil 1:9, Heb 5:14.

With minimal appearance in the NT (three occurrences), the meaning of αἴσθησις is used more frequently in the OT (fifty times) but nonetheless big on impact.<sup>229</sup> The significance of the influences that one’s senses can have on one’s mindset is a matter of whether or not one walks faithfully with God. This term is rendered as the capability of being affected by external stimuli, perception, and sensation.<sup>230</sup> Hebrew 5:14 is a significant passage that conveys the process in which one must either train one’s senses and press on toward maturity—τέλειος (*teleios*)—or have one’s mindset breached and live unworthy lives.<sup>231</sup> The αἴσθησις is often in opposition to the νοῦς, which is to direct the spiritual influence on the mind.<sup>232</sup> Led solely by either the intellect or the senses, man’s mind becomes corrupted.<sup>233</sup> Being led by the Spirit and letting the Spirit renew one’s mind (Eph 4:23) enables one to walk in the mind of Christ.

<sup>227</sup> Silva, s.v. “ἀδόκιμος, δόκιμος,” *NIDNTTE* 1:757.

<sup>228</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>229</sup> *Ibid.*, 1:178–79.

<sup>230</sup> *BDAG*, s.v. “αἴσθησις,” 29.

<sup>231</sup> See Chapter 3, the section, “New Testament – The Struggle Is Real”, for further analysis.

<sup>232</sup> Delling, “Αἰσθάνομαι,” *TDNT* 1:187.

<sup>233</sup> In the intellect, Philo saw the νοῦς as dependent upon having a right αἴσθησις. Delling, “Αἰσθάνομαι,” *TDNT* 1:188.” In the LXX, αἴσθησις is used most commonly as נִצְחָה (*da’at*), meaning knowledge, discernment, and understanding. *HALOT*, s.v. “נִצְחָה,” 228–229. The term αἴσθησις is the capacity to understand and have and utilize discernment. *BDAG*, s.v. “αἴσθησις,” 29. Philo considers this word group to be very significant, utilizing αἰσθητήριον 10 times, always plural, meaning “organs of external senses.” Silva, s.v. “αἴσθησις,” *NIDNTTE* 1:179. Philo demonstrated the role external stimuli play in mindset. “In the pursuit of evil, several faculties are needed,

**ἀνακαίνωσις (*anakainōsis*)**

Root: καινῶω

Rom 12:2; 1 Cor 4:16; Eph 4:22–24; Col 3:9–10, 12; Titus 3:5.

The basic word καινῶω is rendered as “to make new,” “to produce something new,” or “to renew,”<sup>234</sup> “To cause something to become new and different, with the implication of becoming superior—to make new, renewal.”<sup>235</sup> Particularly significant about this renewal is that it is continual and is a fulfillment of prophecies (Ezekiel, Jeremiah), a constant renewal of thought performed by the Spirit.<sup>236</sup> This term was only used by Paul.<sup>237</sup> This renewal takes place in one’s mind—the νοῦς is the object of renewal in Romans 12:2.<sup>238</sup>

**βουλεύω (*bouleuō*)**

Root: βασιλεύς

LXX Isa 11:2; Luke 14:31; John 11:53; 12:10; Acts 27:39; 2 Cor 1:17; 2 Pet 3:9.

The term βουλεύω depicts the thought process as careful contemplation and deliberation that accompanies decision-making.<sup>239</sup> Rendered as an inner intention, desire, inclination, and mindset, βουλεύω is synonymous with another mindset term ἐπιθυμεῖν.<sup>240</sup> In the NT, the sense is to desire or intend.<sup>241</sup> The theological significance of this term is its emphasis on the will of God, expressing the eternal divine purpose of salvation and denoting “the resolute will of God as the motive force which gives new life by the Word of truth.”<sup>242</sup>

---

soul, speech, senses, body, for wickedness employs all these in displaying itself.”<sup>233</sup> Philo, *Creation*, 1.216–217 [Colson]).

<sup>234</sup> Johannes Behm, “Ἀνακαίνωσις,” *TDNT* 3:452.

<sup>235</sup> *L&N*, s.v. “Ἀνακαίνωσις,” 1:593.

<sup>236</sup> Behm, “Ἀνακαίνωσις,” *TDNT* 3:453.

<sup>237</sup> *BTLNT*, s.v. “ἀνακαίνωσις,” 324.

<sup>238</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>239</sup> *L&N*, s.v. “βουλεύομαι,” 1: 350.

<sup>240</sup> Schrenk, “Βούλομαι,” *TDNT* 1:630.

<sup>241</sup> *Ibid.*, 1:632.

<sup>242</sup> *Ibid.*, 1:632–633.

**γνώμη (gnome)**

Root: γινώσκω

Acts 20:3; 1 Cor 1:10; Phlm 1:14; Rev 17:13, 17.

This term can refer to one's disposition or will.<sup>243</sup> Brill adds that this is a disposition of *the spirit*, an inclination or intention of the mind.<sup>244</sup> What one purposes to do is one's mindset.<sup>245</sup> This word carries the sense of purpose and resolve; planning.<sup>246</sup> The term γνώμη can be synonymous with νόμος.<sup>247</sup>

**διαλογίζομαι (dialogizomai)**

Root: λέγω

Matt 16:7, 8; 21:25; Mark 2:6, 8; Luke 1:29; 3:15; 5:22; 12:17; John 11:50.

Similar to and a compound form of λογίζομαι, this term pertains to the thought processes and is rendered as “to ponder,” “to consider,” or to reflect or meditate. Most often occurring in gospel accounts and often accompanied by καρδια to illustrate reasoning in one's own heart, this term depicts the inner debate as one determines whether to reason according to the flesh or the Spirit.<sup>248</sup> While the LXX uses this term in both a positive and a negative sense, the dominant use in the NT is to convey evil thoughts. “It is striking that the NT uses διαλογισμός only in the negative sense for evil thoughts or anxious reflection. This shows how strong is the conviction that the sinful nature of man extends to his thinking and indeed to his very heart.”<sup>249</sup>

**διάνοια (dianoia)**

Root: νοῦς

Matt 22:37; Mark 12:30; Luke 1:51; 24:45; Eph 2:3; 4:18; Col 1:21; Heb 8:10; 10:16; 1 Pet 1:13; 4:1; 2 Pet 3:1; 1 John 5:20.

---

<sup>243</sup> Rudolf Bultmann, “Γνώμη,” *TDNT* 1:689–719.

<sup>244</sup> Franco Montanari, ed. Madeleine Goh and Chad Schroeder, *The Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek* (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2015).

<sup>245</sup> BDAG, s.v. “γνώμη,” 202.

<sup>246</sup> *L&N*, s.v. “γνώμη,” 1:357.

<sup>247</sup> Rudolf Bultmann, “Γνώμη,” *TDNT* 1:689–719.

<sup>248</sup> Schrenk, “Διαλέγομαι,” *TDNT* 2:93–98.

<sup>249</sup> *Ibid.*, 2:97.

The term *διάνοια* is rendered as the function of thinking or reflection.<sup>250</sup> Comprehension and reasoning, understanding, disposition, and intelligence are encompassed with this primary cognitive term that depicts the activity of the mind as the organ of νοεῖν.<sup>251</sup> The term *διάνοια* also conveys the result of thinking, which is developed thought, an action, or a mindset that results from cognitive functions, such as thoughts, ideas, or judgment.<sup>252</sup> Used metaphorically in the realm of the will, *διάνοια* reveals the mindset through one's purpose, resolve, or intention.<sup>253</sup> The term *διάνοια* is reminiscent of a mindset when it is rendered as "Way of thought" or "disposition."<sup>254</sup> Of particular theological significance, Paul utilizes *διάνοια* in Ephesians 4:18 to depict the significance of one's thoughts, for one's complete existence emanates from one's thoughts.<sup>255</sup> In 1 John 5:20 *διάνοια* conveys a spiritual knowledge – not Gnosticism, and not natural knowledge, but the knowledge that Christ has awakened the minds of his people and enabled man's thinking to be oriented to know God, understand his revelation, and share fellowship with Him. The reference is not to a natural disposition but knowledge of God and fellowship with Him.<sup>256</sup> The term *διάνοια* is used to depict the renewed mindset.

### **ἔννοια (*ennoia*)**

Root: νοῦς

Heb 4:12, 1 Peter 4:1.

---

<sup>250</sup> Behm, "Διάνοια," *TDNT* 4:948–963.

<sup>251</sup> BDAG, s.v. "διάνοια," 234. Hermas conveyed how the faculties of thinking can become corrupt simply by busyness or distraction. "As good vineyards, when they are treated with neglect, are made barren by the thorns and weeds of various kinds, so men who after they have believed fall into these many occupations which were mentioned before, lose their understanding and comprehend nothing at all concerning righteousness; for if they hear concerning the deity and truth, their mind is absorbed in their occupations, and they perceive nothing at all" (Hermas, *Shepherd* 40.5).

<sup>252</sup> Behm, "Διάνοια," *TDNT* 4:964.

<sup>253</sup> Ibid. Parallel to νοῦς, *διάνοια* can indicate the spiritual aspect of man, one's "spirit" or "soul," as distinct from the body and can also infer and interpret the meaning of something. Ibid., 4:963–65. All three cognitive terms νοῦς, *διάνοια*, and *έννοια* refer to the psychological faculty as well as a distinct way of thinking or mindset. *L&N*, s.v. "διάνοια," 1:349.

<sup>254</sup> Behm, "Διάνοια," *TDNT* 4:964. Another term that depicts and drives the mindset is *ἐπιποθία*, meaning a longing or desire. BDAG, s.v. "ἐπιποθία," 377.

<sup>255</sup> M. Lattke, "διάνοια," *EDNT* 1:309–10. The alternation of *διάνοια* and *καρδία* shows that both are synonymously related to the center of man's inner life. Behm, "Διάνοια," *TDNT* 4:966. The LXX predominately uses *διάνοια* for בָּל or בָּלָה. Ibid., 4:965.

<sup>256</sup> Ibid., 4:967.

The term ἔννοια is rendered as thought, insight, conviction, and the intentions of the heart (Heb 4:12).<sup>257</sup> Νοῦς is the place where ἔννοια deliberates or considers.<sup>258</sup> The term ἔννοια shows the result of cognitive activity: “that which is intended or purposed as the result of thinking—‘intention, purpose.’”<sup>259</sup> The term can also convey the content of one’s mind or mindset, as “what arises in the νοῦς,” “thought,” “insight,” or “perception.”<sup>260</sup> In 1 Peter 4:1, ἔννοια is significant theologically when it is used to depict the mind of Christ, the goal of thinking like Christ in suffering.

### ἐπιθυμία (*epithymia*)

Root: ἐπιθυμέω

Num 11:4, 34; 33:16, 17 LXX; Deut 9:22 LXX; 105:14 LXX; Matt 13:17; Rom 7:7; 13:9; 1 Cor 10:6; Gal 5:17; Eph 2:3; Jas 4:2; 1 Tim 3:1; Heb 6:11; 1 Pet 1:12.

The noun ἐπιθυμία has forty occurrences in the NT, with over half from the Pauline corpus, used mostly in a negative sense.<sup>261</sup> This term is characterized by “desire” and depicts the natural impulse and craving in human nature toward food, sexual satisfaction, and desire in general.<sup>262</sup> The theological significance of this term is in its ability to dominate humanity through one’s innate desires. Paul sees ἐπιθυμία as the driving force of the σάρξ, one’s sinful nature that is opposed to God.<sup>263</sup> Desire fuels one’s mindset, and even one’s thoughts are judged by God. “In Hebrew and Jewish religion there is condemnation not merely of the evil act but also of the evil will.”<sup>264</sup> Jesus knows the ἐνθύμησις of everyone (Acts 17:29), and God’s Word judges the thoughts (Heb 4:12, ἐνθύμησις) and intentions (ἐννοιῶν) of the heart. The ἐπιθυμία σαρκός seeks gratification (Gal 5:16), urging thoughts to become deeds, which is what makes desires, and subsequently thoughts, so powerful.<sup>265</sup> The term ἐπιθυμία is a motion of one’s will or mindset. One’s thoughts need to be transformed in order for one to both think and do in accordance with the will of God. Paul’s treatment of ἐνθύμησις is theologically significant and unique from James’s teaching about desire, sin, and death, as Paul integrates ἐνθύμησις into a soteriological

---

<sup>257</sup> Balz, “ἔννοια,” *EDNT* 1:455–56.

<sup>258</sup> Behm “Ἐννοια,” *TDNT* 4:968.

<sup>259</sup> *L&N*, s.v. “ἔννοια,” 1:357.

<sup>260</sup> Behm “Ἐννοια,” *TDNT* 4:969.

<sup>261</sup> Silva, s.v. “ἐπιθυμία,” 2:242–44.

<sup>262</sup> Friedrich Büchsel, “Ἐπιθυμία,” *TDNT* 3:167–72.

<sup>263</sup> Silva, s.v. “ἐπιθυμία,” 2:243.

<sup>264</sup> Büchsel, “Ἐπιθυμία,” *TDNT* 3:169.

<sup>265</sup> Silva, s.v. “ἐπιθυμία,” 2:243.



theology.<sup>266</sup> Without transformation and mind renewal, there is no salvation. People are left vulnerable to their own corrupt thoughts shaped by the surrounding fallen culture, affecting their ability to rightly interpret and apply the Word of God and reach the culture with the gospel.

### **θέλω (*thelō*)**

Root: **θέλω**

Matt 1:19; Rom 7:15; 9:16; 12:2; 1 Cor 1:1; 7:36; 2 Cor 2:1; Gal 1:4; Eph 1:1; 5:17; Phil 2:13; 2 Tim 1:1.

Meaning to be resolved, make a decision or choice, *θέλω* is synonymous with *βούλομαι* in both the LXX and the NT.<sup>267</sup> An example of this used as a mindset is in the Synoptic gospel accounts, indicating a change and new direction of will (Mark 8:34 // Matt 16:24 // Luke 9:23).<sup>268</sup> It is significant to consider how many terms convey mindset through the mechanics of the mindset or the mindset itself. Troxel notes the distinction between desire and will. “In the Bible, there is a thin margin between the words it uses for desire and will. For example, the important Greek verb *θέλω* (*thelō*) sometimes refers to what one desires, wants, or delights in, but it may also indicate a wish that has grown in its resolve, as the following instances demonstrate.”<sup>269</sup> Similar to *βουλεύω* being used to refer to the will of God, *θέλημα* occurs sixty times in the NT, most often referring to the will of God.<sup>270</sup> A significant consideration about one’s mindset is that it is not necessarily the exercising of conscious volition but the influence wielded by the power of the *σάρξ* (Rom 8; Gal 5:17) affecting the mindset.<sup>271</sup> Having God’s will at the center of one’s mind is a plumb line and a significant part of mind renewal. What one’s mindset is oriented around determines one’s worldview and identity.

### **θυμός (*thymos*)**

Root: **θυμός**

Luke 4:28; Acts 19:28; Rom 2:8; 2 Cor 12:20; Gal 5:20; Eph. 4:31; Col. 3:8; Heb 11:27.

The term *θυμός* was significantly employed in Homer as the most dominant anthropological term and can be rendered as life itself or soul, heart, mind, and the seat of human

---

<sup>266</sup> H. Hübner, “ἐνθύμησις,” *EDNT* 2:27–8.

<sup>267</sup> Gottlob Schrenk, “Θέλω,” *TDNT* 3:44–62.

<sup>268</sup> *Ibid.*, 3:49.

<sup>269</sup> Troxel, *With All Your Heart*, 93. See also Matt 1:19; 7:12; 11:14; 12:7; Mark 9:35; John 7:17; Acts 7:39; 2 Cor 5:4; 2 Thess 3:10; 2 Tim 3:12; Heb 10:5; 1 Pet 3:10; Rev 2:21. The word *θέλω* (*thelō*) appears 208 times in the New Testament.

<sup>270</sup> Silva, s.v. “θέλω.” *NIDNTTE* 2:427.

<sup>271</sup> In Romans 7, *θέλειν* demonstrates being subject to the *σάρξ*. Schrenk, “Θέλω,” *TDNT* 3:51

emotions and faculties.<sup>272</sup> In the LXX, θυμός was parallel to πνεῦμα, as “that which is moved and which moves,” or “vital force.”<sup>273</sup> Whereas this term occurs over 320 times in the LXX, the verb θυμῶ only occurs once in the NT (Matt 2:16), and the noun θυμός is found eighteen times, predominantly in the book of Revelation and the Pauline corpus.<sup>274</sup> The primary rendering is “anger” or as a list of vices in the NT, though, in Homer, it had a sense of desire, impulse, inclination, disposition or mind, thought, and consideration.<sup>275</sup>

### **κρίνω (*krinō*)**

Root: κρίνω

Matt 7:1, 2; Luke 6:37; John 18:31; Acts 3:13; 15:19; 20:16; 23:3; Rom 2:1, 3, 16; 3:6; 14:3, 4, 5, 10, 13; 1 Cor 2:2; 10:15; James 4:11, 12; Titus 3:12.

Derivatives of the verb κρίνω are rendered as “to resolve or determine” or “form an opinion or judgment” and are most commonly rendered as “to decide.”<sup>276</sup> Occurring 114 times in the NT, derivatives of this term carry a sense of the characteristics that accompany judgment: to judge, distinguish, or determine.<sup>277</sup> Büchsel and Hertrich note the impact that the Enlightenment had on destroying belief in divine judgment, though not the belief in judgment after death.<sup>278</sup> This is the irony of mindsets, which, in essence, have a low view of Scripture to elevate one’s own perspective above the Word of God. This concept of judgement is not just depicting God’s judgment but also the personal judgments of man that come from mindsets.<sup>279</sup> In light of the command for man to not judge another, this puts mindsets under the judgment of God when mindsets are against the Word of God or against others (Rom 2:1–3; 14:4, 10, 13; 1 Cor 4:5).<sup>280</sup> The thought that one is free to discern or judge one’s own truth is ultimately going to be judged by God.

---

<sup>272</sup> Silva, s.v. “θυμός,” *NIDNTTE* 2:474. See “Φρήν (*phrēn*)” in chapter 5 for more background information on the significance of θυμός.

<sup>273</sup> Friedrich Büchsel, “Θυμός,” *TDNT* 3:167.

<sup>274</sup> Silva, s.v. “θυμός,” *NIDNTTE* 2:475

<sup>275</sup> Büchsel, “Θυμός,” *TDNT* 3:167.

<sup>276</sup> Friedrich Büchsel and Volkmar Hertrich, “Κρίνω,” *TDNT* 3:921–54.

<sup>277</sup> M. Rissi, “κρίνω,” *EDNT* 2:318–21.

<sup>278</sup> Büchsel, “Κρίνω,” *TDNT* 3:934.

<sup>279</sup> *Ibid.*, 3:923.

<sup>280</sup> M. Rissi, “κρίνω,” *EDNT* 2:320.

**λογίζομαι (*logizoma*)**

Root: λέγω

Gen 15:6 LXX; Ps 31:2 LXX; John 11:50; Rom 2:3; 4:8; 1 Cor 13:11; 2 Cor 3:5; 10:7, 11; Phil 4:8.

This term carries a sense of speculation and rumination, “to reckon,” “appraise,” or “consider.”<sup>281</sup> Λογίζομαι depicts the thought process itself as a precursor to or as part of a mindset. It means to “give careful thought to a matter, think (about), consider, ponder, let one’s mind dwell on.”<sup>282</sup> It can also represent what a mindset is: “to hold a view about something think, believe, be of the opinion.”<sup>283</sup> The term λογίζομαι can represent human reasoning that is elevated above God’s. λογίζεσθαι grounded in reason opposes God’s wisdom.<sup>284</sup> The Apostle Paul sought to have λογίζομαι renewed and oriented toward truth as demonstrated by the reality of God (1 Cor 4:1; 2 Cor 10:7, 11; 12:6).<sup>285</sup> This is the essence of mindsets—placing human reasoning above God’s.

**μετανοέω (*metanoēō*)**

Root: νοῦς

Matt 3:2; 4:16, 17; 11:20; 21:29; Mark 1:4, 15; 6:12; Luke 13:3, 5; 15:10; Acts 3:19; 17:30; 26:20; Rom 2:4; 12:2; Heb 7:21; 2 Tim 2:25; Rev 2:21; 3:19.

This verb means to know “after”, change one’s mind, repent.<sup>286</sup> The agent of change in one’s mindset is repentance which opens the door for transformation by the Holy Spirit. This term is theologically significant as it is the precursor to mind renewal, conversion, and salvation.<sup>287</sup> There are fifty-six occurrences of μετανοέω and μετάνοια in the NT, which consistently carry the same meaning: “change opinions, regret, be grieved about something”; used almost exclusively to convey the attitude or mindset of unbelievers and sinners turning back to God in what is depicted as more than just a change of thoughts, but a change of the whole person.<sup>288</sup>

---

<sup>281</sup> EDNT, s.v., “λογίζομαι,” 2:354.

<sup>282</sup> BDAG, s.v. “λογίζομαι,” 598.

<sup>283</sup> Ibid.

<sup>284</sup> Hans Wolfgang Heidland, “Λογίζομαι,” TDNT 4:287.

<sup>285</sup> Ibid., 4:288.

<sup>286</sup> Spicq, “μετανοέω,” TLNT 2:471. See chapter four for additional information on this term and its significance to mind renewal.

<sup>287</sup> BDAG, s.v. “μετανοέω,” 640.

<sup>288</sup> Spicq, “μετανοέω,” TLNT 2:475.

**νόημα (noema)**

Root: νοῦς

2 Cor 2:11; 3:14; 4:4; 10:5; 11:3; Phil 4:7.

The term νόημα is solely used by Paul and depicts the result of thinking (νοέω), one's thoughts, mind, or intention.<sup>289</sup> Used primarily in 2 Corinthians, this term is theologically significant as it pertains to thinking as it pertains to soteriology and the ramifications of one's thoughts becoming corrupt, pulling them away from God (2 Cor 11:3), creating hardened mindsets in which people can no longer understand Scripture (2 Cor 3:14). Blinded by their own thoughts, they cannot perceive the illumination of the Holy Spirit and the gospel (2 Cor 4:4).<sup>290</sup> The fact that every use of this term is to depict corrupt human thoughts is not just a negative perception but a biblical portrayal of the nature of human thinking (Jer 17:9; Rom 3:10). Mind renewal is necessary in order for man to be able to think thoughts that please God.

**οἶδα (oída)**

Root: εἶδον

John 3:10–12; 4:22–25; 8:55; 1 Cor 2:2; 2 Cor 5:16; Gal 4:8; Titus 1:16; 1 Thess 4:5.

The derivative root οἶδα (*oída*), which the compound σύννοια comes from, means to know or understand.<sup>291</sup> It means to be intimately acquainted with, as in to know God.<sup>292</sup> While the two terms γινώσκω and οἶδα can be synonymous with one another and both refer to knowledge, there is a distinction between the two terms in some instances due to context. Paul seems to differentiate between the two terms when he wrestles with Gnostic influences in his letters to the church at Corinth (1 Cor 2:2; 2 Cor 5:16), and John also seems to make a distinction in the fourth gospel.<sup>293</sup> Knowledge of the world's wisdom leads one's mindset astray but knowledge of God and his Word enables the people of God to rightly interpret and apply God's Word to their lives.<sup>294</sup>

---

<sup>289</sup> W. Schenk, “νόημα,” *EDNT* 2:470.

<sup>290</sup> Silva, s.v. “νόημα,” *NIDNTTE* 3:432.

<sup>291</sup> Silva, s.v. “οἶδα,” *NIDNTTE* 3:460.

<sup>292</sup> BDAG, s.v. “οἶδα,” 693.

<sup>293</sup> Heinrich Seesemann, “Οἶδα,” *TDNT* 5:116–9.

<sup>294</sup> See Appendix E: “To οἶδα or to γινώσκω, that is the Question,” for more on the interplay between these terms.

**παλιγγενεσία (*palingenesia*)**

Root: γίνομαι + πάλιν

Matt 19:28; Titus 3:5.

A compound of γίνομαι and πάλιν, παλιγγενεσία means regeneration or renewal.<sup>295</sup> This is an eschatological term pointing to a future restoration (Acts 3:21) as well as a present application of continual renewal with an emphasis on moral renewal.<sup>296</sup> Connoting a sense of rebirth (being born again), this renewal is wrought by the Holy Spirit.<sup>297</sup> “In Titus παλιγγενεσία denotes a saving act of God, performed on human beings, but not by them.”<sup>298</sup> This salvation is what makes renewal so significant. Man can once again think like God and walk with God, and this renewal secures one’s eternity.

**παχύνω (*pachynō*)**

Root: παχύνω

Deut 2:30 LXX; 2 Chr 36:13 LXX; Isa 6:10 LXX; Matt 13:15; Luke 21:34; John 12:40; Acts 28:27; Rom 11:25; Eph 4:18; Heb 3:13.

This term conveys the results of the metaphor of hardening—hardened hearts or mindsets. The term παχύνω, as well as πορώω, conveys a significant theological idea that hardened hearts are the cause of the reluctance of sinners to respond to God.<sup>299</sup> A hardened heart is synonymous with the effect of an entrenched mindset.

**περιτέμνω (*peritemnō*)**

Root: τομός

Deut 30:6; Jer 4:4; 6:10; Rom 2:28, 29; 3:30; Acts 7:51; Gal 6:15; Col 2:11; Phil 3:3.

This word depicts metaphorically the circumcision of the heart, referring to the inward person and one’s relationship with God.<sup>300</sup> Figurative and spiritual understanding of circumcision was not foreign to Jews in Palestine during the NT time.<sup>301</sup> Using an OT religious aspect of belonging to Yahweh that was physical to depict spiritual change, Paul illustrated the

---

<sup>295</sup> *LALGNT*, s.v. “παλιγγενεσία.”

<sup>296</sup> Friedrich Büchsel, “Παλιγγενεσία,” *TDNT* 1:688.

<sup>297</sup> Silva, s.v. “παλιγγενεσία,” 1:573–4.

<sup>298</sup> *Ibid.*, 1:569.

<sup>299</sup> Silva, s.v. “παχύνω,” *NIDNTTE* 4:312–315.

<sup>300</sup> Rudolf Meyer, “Περιτέμνω,” *TDNT* 6:72–77.

<sup>301</sup> Meyer, “Περιτέμνω,” *TDNT* 6:79.

significance of renewal not being merely a religious or ethical act but inward transformation. This is a theologically significant term due to its use in the OT. The Jewish elements of the culture focused on the external religious application, yet in the OT the circumcision of the heart was alluded to as part of repentance (Lev 26:41; Deut 10:16; Jer 4:4; 9:25; Ezek 44:6–9). Paul viewed the only true circumcision as that of the heart (περιτομή καρδίας), a work of the Holy Spirit for those who are in Christ and a picture of the promised renewal.<sup>302</sup> The Judaizers did not recognize the figurative circumcision as legitimate. They viewed circumcision physically as a work, but Jeremiah spoke of the circumcision of the heart to point God’s people away from a status based on a physical external procedure to show that their hearts need an internal procedure in order to be right with God.

### **πιστεύω (pisteuō)**

Root: πίστις

Matt 21:25; Mark 1:15; 16:14; John 2:22; 5:46, 47; 11:26, 27; Rom 9:33; 14:2; 1 Cor 13:7; Acts 14:23; 18:27; 1 John 4:16; Heb 3:12, 19.

Occurring 243 times each in the NT, the noun and verb represent a central theological concept in a right relationship with God.<sup>303</sup> This word means “give credence to, believe.”<sup>304</sup> Louw and Nida also offer this definition: “to believe something to be true and, hence, worthy of being trusted.”<sup>305</sup> To believe is to trust and commit oneself to that belief.<sup>306</sup> Genuine belief is not just a mental exercise. It is belief to the point of action. Those who believe in Christ are called οἱ πιστεύοντες, “those who believe, believers” by Paul (Rom 1:16; 3:22; 4:11; 1 Cor 1:21), for they are defined by what they believe.<sup>307</sup>

The canonical mantra, “the righteous shall live by faith” (Hab 2:3–4), is impeded by the mindsets the surrounding cultures produce. If the mindsets of man are ultimately unbelief, this also prevents belief in God and a right understanding of God’s Word, inhibited by one’s own belief system, which is centered on self. Here, too, if a mindset is characterized as a divided mindset, in which one is divided by believing in one’s own thoughts above God’s, then one cannot have biblical faith in God, which is with all one’s mind, heart, and being. This exclusiveness in the word belief is seen in the concept of belief in the OT Hebrew word, יָדַע. The *hiphil* demonstrates that belief is declared, not just a causative significance. It means “to declare

---

<sup>302</sup> Ibid., 6:83.

<sup>303</sup> *EDNT*, s.v. “πιστεύω,” 3:92.

<sup>304</sup> *BDAG*, s.v. “πιστεύω,” 816.

<sup>305</sup> *L&N*, s.v. “πιστεύω,” 1:369.

<sup>306</sup> Rudolf Bultmann, “Πιστεύω,” *TDNT* 6:204

<sup>307</sup> Silva, s.v. “πιστεύω,” *NIDNTE* 3:767.

God אָמֵן,” “to say Amen to God.”<sup>308</sup> One’s disposition cannot be divided as in Hosea 10:2: קִלְקַל לֵב (“to be of divided heart”) to have this kind of belief.<sup>309</sup> Belief is not a half-hearted notion. Therefore, divided belief is not belief at all but apostasy (ἀπιστέω).

### **σάρξ (*sarx*)**

Root: σάρξ

2 Chr 32:8 LXX; Ezek 11:19 LXX; Ezek 36:26 LXX; Rom 7:14; 8:3; 5–7; 9–13; 1 Cor 3:1; 2; 15:39; Cor 3:3; Gal 5:16, 17; Col 2:11; 13; 18; 1 Pet 4:1.

The term σάρξ is the third most frequently used anthropological term behind ἄνθρωπος and καρδία.<sup>310</sup> Physically, σάρξ is thought of as the outer shell, the flesh that contains the imperishable; one’s καρδία or φρένες or θυμός (“soul, mind, and passion) and ψυχή.<sup>311</sup> To Paul, σάρξ represents more than just flesh and bones—it depicts the totality of man’s physical existence.<sup>312</sup> Spiritually, the σάρξ, as developed by Paul, refers to the carnal side of human nature that is worldly, of the devil, and contrary to God’s Word—carnal thinking. Adjectively, σάρκινος (*sarkinos*) which depicts a nuance of corruptibility.<sup>313</sup> The term σάρξ is a tool in Paul’s hands to point toward mind renewal and life in the Spirit rather than the flesh.

### **σοφία (*sophia*)**

Root: σοφός

Rom 11:33; 1 Cor 1:19, 20, 21 (2), 22, 24, 30; 2:1, 4, 5, 7, 13; 3:19; 12:8; 2 Cor 1:12; Eph 1:8, 17; 3:10; Col 1:9, 28; 2:3, 23; 3:16; 4:5; Jas 1:5; 3:13, 15, 17; 2 Pet 3:15; Rev 5:12; 7:12; 13:18; 1 Cor 1:17; Jas 1:5; 3:13; Rev 17:9.

Σοφία occurs approximately 250 times in the LXX, seventy percent in wisdom literature, where it is typically rendered as the equivalent Hebrew term חָכְמָה.<sup>314</sup> More than knowledge, the term σοφία signifies the capacity to understand. Wisdom is knowledge applied.<sup>315</sup> Wisdom is shown by the deeds exhibited and behavior one exemplifies. When one’s mindset is guided by wisdom, one is better able to walk faithfully with God. Wisdom is having discretion, sound

<sup>308</sup> Bultmann, “Πιστεύω,” *TDNT* 6:187.

<sup>309</sup> *Ibid.*, 6:188.

<sup>310</sup> A. Sand, “σάρξ,” *EDNT* 3:230.

<sup>311</sup> Silva, s.v. “σάρξ,” *NIDNTTE* 4:251–262.

<sup>312</sup> Schweizer, “Σάρξ,” *TDNT* 7:125.

<sup>313</sup> *Ibid.*, 7:102.

<sup>314</sup> Silva, s.v. “σοφία,” *NIDNTTE* 4:330–332.

<sup>315</sup> *L&N*, “σοφία,” 1:383.

judgment, and practical wisdom.<sup>316</sup> Wisdom is revelation and understanding that is from God and able to impact the mindset of man. Wisdom comes from fearing God (Prov 9:10) and begins with the knowledge of God, not the world.<sup>317</sup> God's wisdom is foolish to the world, and the speculative man-centered wisdom of the Greeks lies in their own intellect (Plato) where knowledge is virtue, but godly wisdom recognizes the need for God's insight over man's.

### **σύνεσις (*synesis*)**

Root: σύνεσις

1 Chr 22:12; Deut 4:6; Dan 2:20; Mark 12:30, 33; Luke 2:47; 1 Cor 1:19; Eph 3:4; Col 1:9; 2 Tim 2:7.

The term σύνεσις means understanding, to have insight, the faculty of comprehension.<sup>318</sup> This word has a sense of understanding that emanates from first perceiving and hearing, and thus is able to discern and judge; it is a gift from God and an insight of the heart.<sup>319</sup> The failure to understand is what leads the hearts and minds of man astray (Isa 6:9).<sup>320</sup> The σύνεσις is also depicted as the conscience itself.<sup>321</sup> Used seven times in the NT, this noun occurs frequently in the LXX, particularly in wisdom literature (Ps 110:10, Prov 2:1; Sir 5:10; 34:11), commonly referring to insight or revelation from God regarding God's activity and will.<sup>322</sup> The noun σύνεσις occurs around 125 times in the OT, thirty-five times alongside σοφία.<sup>323</sup> The term σύνεσις is closely associated with σοφία, though σύνεσις connotes reflective thinking and σοφία productive thinking.<sup>324</sup> It is noteworthy that in the repetition of the Shema (Deut 6:5 LXX) in the Gospel of Mark (Mark 12:33) that καρδιά, ψυχή and δύναμις are replaced with καρδιά, σύνεσις, and ισχύς, and in Mark 12:30, σύνεσις replaces ψυχή and διάνοια. The term σύνεσις together with καρδιά and ισχύς refers to the whole human being, will, judgment, and behavior."<sup>325</sup> The

<sup>316</sup> Henry George Liddell et al., *A Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 1621.

<sup>317</sup> Silva, s.v. "σοφία," *NIDNTTE* 4:332.

<sup>318</sup> Balz, "σύνεσις," *EDNT* 3:305.

<sup>319</sup> Hans Conzelmann, "σύνεσις," *TDNT* 7:888–896.

<sup>320</sup> *Ibid.*, 7:894

<sup>321</sup> *BTLNT*, s.v. "Σύνεσις," 300.

<sup>322</sup> Balz, "σύνεσις," *EDNT* 3:305.

<sup>323</sup> Silva, s.v. "σύνεσις," *NIDNTTE* 4:407.

<sup>324</sup> *BTLNT*, s.v. "Σύνεσις," 300.

<sup>325</sup> Balz, s.v. "σύνεσις," *EDNT* 3:305. The three terms σοφία, φρόνησις, and σύνεσις are considered to be the three chief intellectual character traits in which σοφία refers to the apprehension of knowledge, φρόνησις refers to the practical knowledge from σύνεσις, which is where ethical decisions are made. Thomas Kingsmill Abbott, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Colossians*, ICC, 202.



term σύνεσις connotes having the capacity to make up one's mind, and the organ of σύνεσις is the heart (Col. 2:2); God's will is the object of σύνεσις (Eph 5:17), and understanding is the gift of God (2 Tim 2:7; 1 Chr 22:12).<sup>326</sup>

### **συνείδησις (*syneidēsis*)**

Root: εἰδός

Rom 9:1; 1 Cor 8:7; 10:25; 2 Cor 4:2; Acts 23:1; 24:16; 1 Tim 1:5, 19; 3:9; 2 Tim 1:3; Titus 1:15; Heb 9:9, 14; 10:2; 1 Pet 2:19; 3:21.

The term συνείδησις is rendered as moral consciousness or awareness.<sup>327</sup> The renewal of mindsets purifies one's thoughts. This mindset renewal is more than just ethical. It is transformational. Dubbed as the conscience, the term συνείδησις is metaphorical for the role of the Holy Spirit to reveal truth and conviction to mankind so awareness leads to repentance and mind renewal.<sup>328</sup> Insight and revelation from the Holy Spirit must be sought. Lack of understanding is negligence; for anyone who would desire wisdom, it will be given to them if they ask (Jas 1:5).<sup>329</sup>

### **τέλειος (*teleios*)**

Root: τελός

Matt 5:48; Rom 12:1–2; 1 Cor 2:6; 14:20, Eph 4:13; Phil 3:15; Col 4:12.

The term τέλειος means to be mature, complete, or perfect.<sup>330</sup> The condition of one's heart or mindset is depicted through the term τέλειος in the LXX when it occurs with καρδία (often rendered for ἁπλῶς, conveying a sense of being “undivided.”<sup>331</sup> Symbolizing the undivided wholeness of the behavior of an individual, τέλειος is also eschatological in the hope of salvation.<sup>332</sup> Paul always uses this term theologically in his corpus toward the goal of maturity in Christ (1 Cor 2:6; 14:20, Eph 4:13).<sup>333</sup> Christ is the end (*telos*) of the law (Rom 10:4) and the *teleos*, the perfect template for mankind to emulate. The goal every Christian should aim for is Christ's perfect mind and actions, as aided by the Holy Spirit.

<sup>326</sup> Conzelmann, “σύνεσις,” *TDNT* 7:896.

<sup>327</sup> BDAG, s.v., “συνείδησις,” 967.

<sup>328</sup> Douglas Mangum, “Conscience,” *LTW*.

<sup>329</sup> Conzelmann, “σύνεσις,” *TDNT* 7:890.

<sup>330</sup> Silva, s.v. “τέλειος,” *NIDNTTE* 4:470–80.

<sup>331</sup> Gerhard Delling, “τέλειος,” *TDNT* 8:49–87.

<sup>332</sup> Silva, s.v. “τέλειος,” *NIDNTTE* 4:479.

<sup>333</sup> *Ibid.*, 4:476.

**τίθημι (*tithēmi*)**

Root: τιθέναι

Luke 1:66; 21:14; Acts 5:4; 19:21; 27:12.

This term conveys the motivation that leads to a mindset—the intent or purpose.<sup>334</sup> It means to have (in mind) and can be used in an idiom to convey “to make up (your) minds” (θέτε ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις).<sup>335</sup> An example from the OT, which is rendered as “to set in the heart,” occurs in Ezra 14:3, 4, 7. In the NT, this term carries a sense of “the resolve to do something” (Acts 19:21).<sup>336</sup> The majority of occurrences appear in the Lukan corpus; one primary example that pertains to mindset is Luke’s use of the phrase τίθημι ἐν καρδίᾳ, rendered as “take to heart / pay attention to” (Luke 1:66; 21:14; Acts 5:4).<sup>337</sup> With 101 occurrences in NT writings, this term has a strong theological thrust in the Pauline corpus, in which it denotes God’s past, present, and future actions.<sup>338</sup> Reminders of God’s faithfulness can serve to help God’s people to be resolved in their mindset to seek and love God.

**ὑπολαμβάνω (*hypolambanō*)**

Root: λαμβάνω

Luke 7:43; Acts 2:15.

The definition for this term is illuminating—to assume or believe. This is the very essence of presuppositions. Belief built on one’s assumption is the formation of a mindset that inhibits right interpretation.<sup>339</sup> This term can also mean to think of hold an opinion.<sup>340</sup> In both Luke 7:43 and Acts 2:15, it carries the meaning “to suppose,” which does not have the sense of conviction but an opinion.<sup>341</sup>

---

<sup>334</sup> Maurer, “Τίθημι,” *TDNT* 8:152–68.

<sup>335</sup> BDAG, s.v. “τίθημι,” 1003.

<sup>336</sup> Maurer, “Τίθημι,” *TDNT* 8:155.

<sup>337</sup> T. Schramm, “τίθημι,” *TDNT* 3:356.

<sup>338</sup> Maurer, “Τίθημι,” *TDNT* 8:156.

<sup>339</sup> *EDNT*, s.v. “ὑπολαμβάνω,” 3:404.

<sup>340</sup> Silva, s.v. “ὑπολαμβάνω,” *NIDNTTE* 3:80

<sup>341</sup> Gerhard Delling, “Υπολαμβάνω,” *TDNT* 4:5–15.

**φθείρω (*phtheirō*)**

Root: φθείρω

1 Cor 3:17; 15:33; 2 Cor 11:3; Eph 4:22; 1 Tim 6:5; 2 Tim 3:8; 2 Peter 2:12; Jude 10; Rev 11:18; 19:2.

The natural bent of humanity is toward corruption, and it begins in the mind. The term φθείρω has a sense of “to ruin” or “to destroy,” with the most significant rendering for mind renewal being to be of a corrupt mind led by fleshly desires.<sup>342</sup> The corrupt mind is what leads to the destruction of mankind (Rev 19:2). Occurring forty-five times in the NT, only one instance is in the Gospels (Luke 12:33), but this term is used significantly by Paul, who illustrates corruption with perishable and imperishable analogies (Rom 2:7; 1 Cor 9:24–27) to convey that one’s way of thinking is a matter of life and death.<sup>343</sup> The term φθείρω metaphorically represents the old nature and is in almost every occurrence alongside its antithesis, ἀφθαρσία.<sup>344</sup> By contrast, ἀφθαρσία depicts the renewed mind and new way of being that one needs to have imparted to them (1 Cor 15:53).<sup>345</sup> The ἀφθορία state of mind impacts how one perceives and interprets God’s Word—faithfully (Titus 2:7).<sup>346</sup> This term ἀφθορία is eschatological, as well (1 Cor 15:52), looking to the *parousia*, when “the dead will rise again as ἄφθαρτοι, changed and belonging to a new world.”<sup>347</sup>

**φρονέω (*phroneō*)**

Root: φρην

Matt 16:23; Mark 8:33; Mark 8:33; Luke 1:17; 8:35; Acts 28:22; Rom 8:5–7, 27; 12:3, 16; 14:6; 15:5–6; 1 Cor 14:20; 2 Cor 13:11; Gal 5:10; Eph 1:18; Phil 2:2, 5; 3:15, 19; 4:2; Col 3:2; 1 Pet 3:8; 4:7; 2 Tim 1:7.

The term φρονέω has undergone extensive treatment in this dissertation as to its significance canonically, and in particular, in Pauline texts.<sup>348</sup> This term means to set one’s mind, be intent; to give careful consideration to something (φρονέω); fix one’s mind on something (φρόνημα); having a way of thinking, mindset.<sup>349</sup> Of special significance with this term is Paul’s

<sup>342</sup> Günther Harder, “Φθείρω,” *TDNT* 9:93–106.

<sup>343</sup> Silva, s.v. “φθείρω,” 4:597–602.

<sup>344</sup> T. Holtz, “φθείρω,” *EDNT* 3:422–23.

<sup>345</sup> Harder, “Φθείρω,” *TDNT* 9:104.

<sup>346</sup> *Ibid.*, 9:103.

<sup>347</sup> *Ibid.*, 9:104.

<sup>348</sup> See Chapter five for an in-depth analysis of the theological significance of φρονέω.

<sup>349</sup> BDAG, “φρονέω,” 1065–66.

using this term to define the mind of Christ (Phil 2:5) and to reveal a whole new way of thinking. One's mindset is not just affected by knowledge or one's cognition. The Spirit's impact on the mind is able to transform one's mindset. Understanding, whether a right understanding or a wrong one, impacts the mindsets of individuals. This is the crux of mindsets, which are set on one's own beliefs. Ultimately, unbelief needs to be repented of when one's thoughts are placed above God's.

In Greek φρήν / φρένες usually refers to a person's insight or inner reflection as opposed to indistinct emotions<sup>350</sup> One's φρονέω is the agent of spiritual and intellectual experiences.<sup>351</sup> The etymology of the terms φρήν and plural φρένες were considered to be "diaphragm," which was thought to be the seat of intellectual and spiritual activity. "The diaphragm determines the nature and strength of the breath and hence also the human spirit and its emotions."<sup>352</sup>

---

<sup>350</sup> Balz, *EDNT*, "φρονέω," 438.

<sup>351</sup> Bertram, "Φρονέω," *TDNT* 9:220.

<sup>352</sup> *Ibid.*

## APPENDIX B: THE MIND-BODY PROBLEM

The Greeks held to a dualistic view, which considered the soul to be separate from the body and opposed to it. This view considers the soul immaterial and the part of human beings that goes to Heaven, leaving the flesh behind. The implications of this view are significant. God redeems his creation and one's whole being, not just the soul, which is also not separate from the whole being. Physical bodily resurrection is evidence of this. If a soul were to be separate, then a living being would have no mindset for which to be accountable. If one holds to the dualistic view in which the soul is separate from the body, asceticism is another outcome of such a view in an attempt to perfect the body. The Greek viewpoint progressed from Stoicism, which held a monist philosophy that was dependent upon divine pneuma that pervaded everything.<sup>1</sup> Dualism is thought by some theologians to be an anthropological phenomenon that is a psychological urge rather than a historical phenomenon, concept, or ideology; it is part of the human condition.<sup>2</sup>

The dualistic view is in contrast to the evangelical view that emphasizes the unity of the person created in the image of God. The great debate on human nature is likely far from over, as some Scriptures seem to suggest a dualistic nature in which the terms for soul and spirit are interchangeable immaterial parts of human nature (see Matt 10:28; Luke 1:46-47; 1 Cor 5:3; 7:34), but the tripartite view seems to also be evident in other passages which suggest distinctions yet unity (see Rom 8:16; 1 Thess 5:23; Heb 4:12). The trichotomous view has three distinct parts: one physical (body) and one spiritual (soul, spirit, mind). Once again, the soul is

---

<sup>1</sup> Dylan M. Burns, *Did God Care?: Providence, Dualism, and Will in Later Greek and Early Christian Philosophy*, Studies in Platonism, Neoplatonism, and the Platonic Tradition 25 (Leiden: Brill, 2020).

<sup>2</sup> Petrus Franciscus Maria Fontaine, *Dualism in Ancient Iran, India, and China*, vol. 5 of *The Light and The Dark: A Cultural History of Dualism* (Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben, 1990), xix–xxii.

separate from the body. Scripture teaches that the human body is one whole being. Critics will quote Hebrews 4:12–13 as indicating that soul and spirit are two separate entities, but the metaphoric imagery of the terms employed is in the context of God knowing the hidden intentions of his people and dividing the intentions from unfaithful outward motivations, not parsing out a human into parts.

The holistic view is a tripartite perspective in one being. A more recent perspective of Christian physicalism is defined by McCall as the claim “That human persons do not possess immaterial souls, but are either strictly identical to, emergent from, or constituted by, material objects—namely, living human beings.”<sup>3</sup> In this view, the “soul” is not separate and distinct but refers to a whole living being or as a “spirit” or one’s “mind.” The fatal flaw in this view is that though God is acknowledged as existing, special revelation and knowing God/relationship with God are not credibly conveyed in the physicality approach. This dualistic approach and reductionist physicalism, which view the soul as a non-physical aspect of the mind, are to be rejected.<sup>4</sup> Physicalism denies dualism and is a form of monism.<sup>5</sup> In the biblical view, the term “soul” נַפְשׁ in the OT is the NT Greek counterpart, ψυχή, which is rendered as “soul” but initially was rendered as “life.”<sup>6</sup> NT authors use ψυχή in the same way as OT authors use נַפְשׁ, primarily as one’s heart, mind, or a living person (see Eph 6:6; Phil 1:27; Acts 2:4; 1 Cor 15:45; 1 Pet

---

<sup>3</sup> Angus Menuge, “Christian Physicalism and Our Knowledge of God,” in *Christian Physicalism? Philosophical Theological Criticisms*, ed. R. Keith Loftin and Joshua R. Farris (Lanham, UK: Lexington Books, 2017), 75.

<sup>4</sup> John L. Taylor, review of *Whatever Happened to the Soul? Scientific and Theological Portraits of the Human Soul*, ed. Warren S. Brown, Nancy Murphy, H. Newton Maloney. *Themelios* 25.2 (2000): 114.

<sup>5</sup> John W. Cooper, *Body, Soul, and Life Everlasting: Biblical Anthropology and the Monism-Dualism Debate* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000), 20.

<sup>6</sup> See Albert Dihle, “Ψυχή in the Greek World,” *TDNT* 9:609–11.

3:20). Despite these specific renderings to the heart or mind, Louw and Nida also state that the force of these terms also is rendered as the whole being.<sup>7</sup> Further, no NT text indicates that ψυχή is a non-physical immaterial part of a person. There cannot be a person without a body. All three parts are one, just as God is three in one. Later OT writings and the writings of the Apostle Paul indicate the tripartite view that is ultimately one—unity in diversity, mirroring the triune God, who is one divine essence in three persons.

---

<sup>7</sup> See L&N, s.v. “ψυχή,” 1:321.

### APPENDIX C: THE MONOTHELITE CONTROVERSY

The Monothelite controversy was a debate concerning the number of wills Jesus Christ possessed. Maximus the Confessor defended the position that Christ's two wills were in perfect harmony, as his human will was always in agreement with the divine will. The First Council of Nicaea established that Christ had two natures, but the debate between Monothelism and Dyothelitism was decided at the Sixth Ecumenical Council, the Third Council of Constantinople in AD 680–681 when Monothelism was condemned. “[W]e declare that there are two wills and principles of action, in accordance with what is proper to each of the natures of Christ.”<sup>1</sup>

However, the issue of the will(s) of Christ is still hotly debated primarily, according to Loke, because proponents of Dyothelitism have yet to show how Christ could have two wills yet remain one person.<sup>2</sup> For Christ to be fully human, it necessitates that he has a distinct human will in as much as Christ being fully divine also requires that he must have a distinct divine will. This is the view of Dyothelitism, which is two wills in Christ and which has been affirmed by Protestant, Orthodox, and Roman Catholic churches alike.<sup>3</sup> Pawl notes that in the Second Council of Nicaea, the fathers uphold Dyothelitism, which is a tenant of Conciliar Christology—the claim that Christ had two wills, one proper to his created human nature, the other proper to his divine nature.<sup>4</sup> Gorman notes that though he disputes some of Pawl's claims, he contends

---

<sup>1</sup> Norman P. Tanner, *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils* (London: Sheed & Ward, 1990), 135.

<sup>2</sup> Andrew Ter Ern Loke, “On Dyothelitism Versus Monothelism: The Divine Preconscious Model,” *HeyJ* 57, no. 1 (January 2016): 135.

<sup>3</sup> Randall Johnson, “The Doctrine of Analogy and Christ's Human Nature,” *JETS* 64, no. 1 (2021), 151.

<sup>4</sup> Timothy Pawl, “The Content of Conciliar Christology,” in *In Defense of Conciliar Christology: A Philosophical Essay*, First edition (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 20.



that “Some of the points he (Pawl) makes are hard to dispute, for example, that Conciliar Christology requires one to hold that Christ is one person, as well as to hold that that one person is both divine and human. Likewise, he makes the point that for Conciliar Christology, Christ has to have two wills.”<sup>5</sup> Christ contrasts God’s will with his human will in Scripture.

In John, Jesus said, “For I have come down from heaven, not to do my own will but the will of him who sent me” (John 6:38). In Matthew, Jesus prayed, saying, “My Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me; nevertheless, not as I will, but as you will” (Matt 26:39). In another place in the book of John, Jesus conveys once again that he has a choice to lay down his life. “For this reason the Father loves me, because I lay down my life that I may take it up again. No one takes it from me, but I lay it down of my own accord. I have authority to lay it down, and I have authority to take it up again. This charge I have received from my Father” (John 10:17–18).

According to Stamps, “The position one takes on this issue has implications for the entire structure of one’s theology. If wills belong to persons and Christ has only one will, then what implications does this position have for how one defines the traditional Trinitarian and Christological terms “person” and “nature”?”<sup>6</sup> Could it be that Christ’s demonstration of subjecting his will to the Father’s will is an example of how the mind of Christ operates so the Christian can do the same through the will of the resident Holy Spirit? Christians, too, have another divine will available to them, as well, through the indwelling Holy Spirit.

---

<sup>5</sup> Mark Gorman, “Timothy Pawl, In Defense of Conciliar Christology: A Philosophical Essay,” *EJPR*. 10, no. 4 (2018): 214.

<sup>6</sup> Robert Lucas Stamps, “‘Thy Will Be Done’: A Dogmatic Defense of Dyothelitism in Light of Recent Monothelite Proposals,” (PhD diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2014), 12.

The implications of Christ not having a fully human will are significant. If Christ did not have a fully human will, then he was not human. This is also the case with a fully Divine will, for Christ could not die for his people if he were not also fully God. Randall further notes that those who hold to an ontological kenoticism perspective claim that Christ emptied himself of all or certain of his divine attributes, which is assumed to include his divine will.<sup>7</sup> However, the term κενόω (*kenoō*), meaning “to make empty” or “to deprive of content or possession,” found in Philippians 2:7 was not indicative of the removal of the will or divine identity, but the choosing of a lesser status to redeem his people.<sup>8</sup> Schrenk notes that θέλειν is a “trans-subjective tendency” of humans, similar to φρονεῖν in Rom 8 and ἐπιθυμεῖν of Galatians 5:17. Both of these passages in Romans 8 and Galatians 5:17 show the impact of the flesh on one’s will, affecting one’s mindset.<sup>9</sup> Silva notes that there is special theological significance when Θέλημα is attached to the divine will as reflected in salvation and in the human will in reference to matters of faith.<sup>10</sup>

Steve Wellum stated that the church's affirmation of Dyothelitism is significant as it clarifies the nature of the incarnation, maintains Christ’s humanity, is decisive for soteriology, and Dyothelitism is required for Trinitarian theology.<sup>11</sup> Being fully God and fully man, Jesus had two wills. Maximus argued that “since in the Trinity there are three persons and one nature, and

---

<sup>7</sup> Ibid., 152.

<sup>8</sup> Albrecht Oepke, “Κενόω, *TDNT* 3:659–62.

<sup>9</sup> Schrenk, “Θέλω,” *TDNT* 3:44–62.

<sup>10</sup> Silva, “θέλω,” *NIDNTTE* 2:426–30.

<sup>11</sup> Stephen J. Wellum, *The Person of Christ: An Introduction* (Wheaton: Crossway, 2021) 89.

also one will, the will must be a function of the nature, not the person.”<sup>12</sup> This is an important distinction. “If the Logos did not assume a human will at the incarnation, then the will was not saved.”<sup>13</sup> Wellum contends that “By carefully thinking through the person-nature distinction, Maximus protected the unity of Christ’s person in willing/acting and the distinction of natures and their attributes.”<sup>14</sup>

The significance of this discussion as pertains to mindset is that Christ demonstrated how to overcome mindsets as he walked in the Spirit rather than the flesh. He demonstrated that one’s will can be chosen.

---

<sup>12</sup> Donald Fairbairn and Ryan M. Reeves, *The Story of Creeds and Confessions: Tracing the Development of the Christian Faith* (Ada, MI: Baker Academic, 2019), 138.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid.

<sup>14</sup> Wellum, *The Person of Christ*, 90.

## APPENDIX D: THE LANGUAGE JESUS SPOKE

The debate over which language Jesus spoke and which language the original NT was written in is likely far from over. Stanley Porter states that there are many factors to consider when determining the language the historical Jesus spoke. There is the diachronic consideration of what was the primary language and the secondary language within a culture (diachronic), which varied widely in the Greco-Roman multi-lingual world depending on the household one was born in. Additionally, multilingualism and level of competency (synchronic) in different languages impact the ability to communicate and receive different languages. Further, Porter asserts that it is a proven fact that Greek was the lingua franca of the Greco-Roman world, and koine Greek was considered to be the Prestige language, likely the secondary language in Palestine. Porter noted that Hebrew was likely “The prestige language in relation to Aramaic, but Greek was the prestige language of Palestine in relation to the Semitic languages, Aramaic included.”<sup>1</sup> There is a substantial library of Jewish writings encompassing the DSS, Philo, and other wisdom and apocalyptic literature that was for a Jewish audience; so, too, did Josephus write historical narratives for non-Jews, which is significant in the study of the NT, as a history manual for the NT.<sup>2</sup>

There were four languages Jesus would have been likely to have been exposed to and possibly spoken—Aramaic, Hebrew, Greek, and Latin.<sup>3</sup> Direct evidence concludes that Jews

---

<sup>1</sup> Stanley E. Porter, “The Language(s) Jesus Spoke,” in *Handbook for the Study of the Historical Jesus* (4 vols), ed. Tom Holmén and Stanley E. Porter (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 2457.

<sup>2</sup> Steve Mason, “The Writings of Josephus: Their Significance for New Testament Study,” in *Handbook for the Study of the Historical Jesus* (4 vols), ed. Tom Holmén and Stanley E. Porter (Boston, MA: Brill, 2011), 1639.

<sup>3</sup> Porter, “The Language(s) Jesus Spoke,” 2459.

outside Palestine chiefly spoke, thought, and wrote in Greek.<sup>4</sup> Philo also refers to Greek as his own language in his work *Confusion*: “That name is in the Hebrew tongue, Penuel, but in our own (language) “turning from God.” (Philo, *Confusion* 4:80–81 [F.H. Colson]). The significance of understanding the Aramaic background to the NT cannot be overstated, but it can be misused if proper criteria for distinguishing the authenticity of Aramaic versions of Gospel sayings are not in place.<sup>5</sup> The motivation to find the historical Jesus can misconstrue the Word of God in pursuit of seeking to find hidden meaning that may or may not be there. Exegeting the Word of God with an understanding of the background can yield more consistent results. Casey stated, “Firstly, some scholars whose prime purpose was to illuminate the Gospels and their accounts of the historical Jesus used their knowledge of Aramaic to do so.”<sup>6</sup> While Wellhausen produced some insights in his approach, the atomization approach of studying one word at a time led to conjecture and did not amount to any significant scholarly contribution due to a low standard of verification.

The quest for a historical Jesus can trump the quest to rightly divide the Word of God. “Too much reconstruction of a Jewish man is liable to create problems for the doctrine of the Trinity.”<sup>7</sup> Still, other voices see the primary language of the NT as being in Hebrew. Fields contends that because the original language of some of Jesus’ teachings was in Hebrew, the

---

<sup>4</sup> V. Tcherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews*, trans. S. Applebaum (New York, NY: Atheneum, 1975), 347.

<sup>5</sup> Maurice Casey, *Aramaic Sources of Mark's Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 26–28.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, 26.

<sup>7</sup> Casey, *Aramaic Sources of Mark's Gospel*, 253.

message behind Jesus' words was more difficult to comprehend. "The key to understanding many of the difficult or even apparently unintelligible passages in the gospels is to be found not primarily in a better understanding of Greek but in retroversion to and translation of the Hebrew behind the Greek (made possible by the often transparently literalistic translation methods of the Greek translators)."<sup>8</sup> Given that many of the sayings of Jesus are Hebrew idioms, interpretation of the words of Jesus is increasingly difficult.<sup>9</sup> Additional problems arise from misinterpreting the terms Ἑβραϊστὶ or Ἑβραϊζ as Aramaic in the NIV (see John 5:2; 19:13, 17, 20; 20:16; Acts 21:40; 22:2; 26:14), rather than as in Hebrew.<sup>10</sup> Bivin concurs that the key to understanding the NT is the Hebrew language.<sup>11</sup> Arndt and Danker illustrate the significance of the Hebrew originals in their introduction to the *Greek-English Lexicon*. "Those who heard and read their messages (Greek NT) were no longer conscious of Semitic originals upon which, in one form or another, some of those writings were based ... we shall do well to have recourse to Semitic originals only in cases where the Greek of our literature either cannot be understood from the background of the contemporary language at all or at least not sufficiently well."<sup>12</sup> The dominant language of Palestine was Hebrew, spoken and written. Even in Qumran, the commentaries they wrote were in Hebrew.<sup>13</sup> Examples of the significance of the original Hebrew language are often

---

<sup>8</sup> Fields, "Understanding the Difficult Words of Jesus," 273.

<sup>9</sup> David Bivin, and Roy Blizzard, *Understanding the Difficult Words of Jesus: New Insights from A Hebraic Perspective* (Shippensburg, PA: Destiny Image, 1994), 63.

<sup>10</sup> Fields, "Understanding the Difficult Words of Jesus," 274.

<sup>11</sup> Bivin, *Understanding the Difficult Words of Jesus*, 89.

<sup>12</sup> *BDAG*, xi.

<sup>13</sup> Bivin, *Understanding the Difficult Words of Jesus*, 190.

found in the meaning behind Hebrew idioms employed. The Messianic title “Son of God,” for instance, comes from Dan 3:2, and “Son of Man” emanates from Dan 7:13,14; additionally, the statement “seated at the right hand” is a Messianic reference to Ps 110, and Jesus’ expression of “the power,” as in Matt 6:13, is another rabbinic adaptation of substituting a customary name for a deity with an evasive synonym.<sup>14</sup> Bivin and Blizzard share another example that illustrates the significance of misconstruing Hebraic idioms literally as Greek terms. The Greek word *ochloi* (multitudes) was translated from the Hebrew term *ochlosim*, which means people standing by. In the instance of Jesus delivering the demonized man, for instance, it was not multitudes but people standing by who witnessed it (see Matt 12:15; Mark 10:1; Luke 9:18.)<sup>15</sup>

Fitzmeyer contends that there is no doubt that Jesus spoke Aramaic and that like other Palestinian Jews, Middle Aramaic, dubbed Palestinian Aramaic, was the primary tongue.<sup>16</sup> Blomberg notes the significance of Syriac readings for the gospels due to the similarity of Syriac vocabulary with Aramaic, which is the language spoken before the words of Jesus were translated by the gospel writers into Greek.<sup>17</sup> A second-century bishop of Hierapolis in Asia Minor by the name of Papias held that Matthew had “put together the logia, “sayings,” of Jesus “in the Hebrew dialect” (= Aramaic), though these have never been seen by anyone. Fitzmeyer concludes that Jesus spoke Greek on some occasions but there is no record of this. The Gospels were recorded in Greek but Fitzmeyer notes that “Greek was not the form in which that tradition

---

<sup>14</sup> Fields, “Understanding the Difficult Words of Jesus,” 280.

<sup>15</sup> Bivin, *Understanding the Difficult Words of Jesus*, 44.

<sup>16</sup> Joseph A. Fitzmeyer, “Did Jesus speak Greek?” *TBAR* 18, no. 5 (1992):

<sup>17</sup> Craig L. Blomberg and Jennifer Foutz Markley, *A Handbook of New Testament Exegesis* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010), 4.

was originally conceived or formulated.”<sup>18</sup> In a discussion with Barr, Tomson states that “Paying attention to the Semitic substratum of New Testament language means elaborating an aspect of its Jewish background and this has self-evident if yet unidentified theological implications.”<sup>19</sup>

Perhaps the language framework in which to understand Scripture is a both/and proposition. The presence of the Greek Septuagint is evidence of a shift in language for the Hebrew people, but one cannot take the Hebraic influence out of the OT any more than its influence is in the NT, whether it be Hebrew or Aramaic. As the progressive revelation of salvation from the religion of the Jews reached the Gentiles, the language also shifted to reach them, but the Hebraic influence was unmistakable. The Hebraic and Grecian influence is evident and understanding background is essential for interpretation. But the confluence of languages in the area necessitated utilizing a language that would reach the most people. God used language as a tool to reach all people.

---

<sup>18</sup> Fitzmeyer, “Did Jesus Speak Greek?”

<sup>19</sup> Tomson, P. “‘Theological Implications’ of the ‘Semitic Background’: Conversing with James Barr.” *AnaBrux*, 22 (2022): 134-154.



### APPENDIX E: TO ΟἶΔΑ OR TO ΓΙΝΩΣΚΩ, THAT IS THE QUESTION.

Scholars debate whether these two verbs in particular, meaning “to know” (οἶδα versus γινώσκω), are being used to convey different nuances or if John’s employment, for instance, is merely coincidental or synonymous. Louw and Nida differentiate between these two terms, using only the term οἶδα “to comprehend the meaning of something, with a focus upon the resulting knowledge—‘to understand, to comprehend.’”<sup>1</sup> Louw and Nida use both γινώσκω and οἶδα “to possess information about—‘to know, to know about, to have knowledge of, to be acquainted with, acquaintance.’”<sup>2</sup> Horstman sees the contrast between the two terms as significant in the Johannine corpus. “In John, οἶδα, in contrast to γινώσκω always designates an intuitive or certain knowledge... where the subject is Jesus or the disciples. Burdick concludes that of the 103 occurrences of οἶδα in the Pauline corpus ninety have the classical meaning, only five are synonymous with γινώσκω.”<sup>3</sup> Jeffrey Tripp makes a solid case that John is not haphazard in his alternation of these two verbs; although the two verbs overlap in meaning, John uses these verbs in certain Greco-Roman forensic contexts in the Gospel of John, such as John 9.<sup>4</sup> It also seems probable that John uses it to differentiate between knowledge of God and knowing information as well as to possibly exploit Gnosticism in John 4.

Paul, on the other hand, does not significantly employ οἶδα to depict knowing Jesus, but in the Corinthian letters, Paul utilizes οἶδα when he is wrestling with the influence of Gnostic

---

<sup>1</sup> *L&N*, s.v. “οἶδα,” 1.379.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 1.333.

<sup>3</sup> A. Horstmann, “οἶδα,” *EDNT*, 2:493–494.

<sup>4</sup> Jeffrey M. Tripp, “Claiming Ignorance and Intimidating Witnesses: Reading John 9 in Greco-Roman Forensic Context,” *CBQ* 80 (2018): 474.

ideas in Christianity (1 Cor 2:2; 2 Cor 5:16).<sup>5</sup> But in the Johannine corpus, the significant consistent use of οἶδα, mostly in contrast with γινώσκω, seems to imply a different nuance according to its usage. David B. Sloan makes a convincing case that the tense of both of these verbs also has a role to play in the usage. The Greek perfect participle for οἶδα, for instance, is striking in that though it is regularly used, it seldom communicates any clear implication of how the knowledge was attained.<sup>6</sup> This seems more indicative of a work of the Spirit (revelation) than man's attempt to acquire knowledge. Yet Silva notes that “οἶδα developed the meaning “I know” from its original sense “I have seen,” i.e., observation.”<sup>7</sup> However, Sloan notes that “When Luke uses οἶδα, his desire is to communicate the state of knowledge and when he uses γινώσκω, his desire is to communicate the acquisition of knowledge . . . Luke's tendency is to use a perfect form of οἶδα when communicating the state of having knowledge and to use a non-stative form of γινώσκω when considering the acquisition of knowledge.”<sup>8</sup> Eyo states that γινώσκω signifies new information, beginning or progress in knowledge, “to be taken in knowledge, to come to know, recognize, understand” (Mark 13:28, 29; John 13:12; 15:18; 21:17)” whereas οἶδα references “what is known from past knowledge” “fullness of knowledge.”<sup>9</sup> Abbott-Smith distinguishes γινώσκω from οἶδα as γινώσκω means “to know by observation and experience,”

---

<sup>5</sup> Heinrich Seesemann, “Οἶδα,” *TDNT* 5:116–119.

<sup>6</sup> David B. Sloan, “Verbal Uses of The Perfect Participle in Luke-Acts,” (PhD diss., The Ohio State University, 2009), 3.

<sup>7</sup> Silva, “γινώσκω,” *NIDNTTE* 1:575–88.

<sup>8</sup> Sloan, “Verbal Uses of The Perfect Participle in Luke, 5–7.

<sup>9</sup> Ubong E. Eyo, “Jesus' Principles of Breaking Barriers: A Reflection of John 4:3-42,” *Engendering Peace or Violence in Nigeria: SA Trajectory of Biblical Hermeneutics* 1 (2018): 103.

and οἶδα is “to know by reflection (a mental process, based intuition or information).”<sup>10</sup> Sloan states that “οἶδα speaks more of what is known from past knowledge while γινώσκω is more from new information. Γινώσκω frequently suggests beginning or progress in knowledge, while οἶδα suggests fullness of knowledge.”<sup>11</sup> John 8:55 is an example of the effect that tense bears on the difference between the two terms. “You do not know ἐγνώκατε him,” that is “beginning to know” him, “but I know (οἶδα) him,” that is “but I know him perfectly.” This distinction between these two verbs is witnessed in the New Testament, particularly in the Johannine corpus, in which the verb οἶδα is primarily utilized in contrast to γινώσκω, to mean an intuitive or certain knowledge.<sup>12</sup> Οἶδα, unlike γινώσκω, speaks of knowing with a deep sense of understanding, not surface knowledge. Peter also utilized οἶδα to communicate the knowledge David prophetically had of a future Messiah who would be his descendant in Acts 2:30, which is a quotation from Psalm 16:8–11. Gregory Trull noted that Peter introduced the content of David's knowledge with ὅτι and that the word οἶδα, though considered to be synonymous with γινώσκω, with the addition of ὅτι there is a distinction in which οἶδα functions essentially as the perfect tense of γινώσκω and refers to “knowledge which may serve as a basis for further thought and action.”<sup>13</sup> Of particular theological significance is Paul's use of οἶδα and distinguishing between knowing Christ and knowing things of the world. Paul also used οἶδα over γινώσκω in Corinth when Paul attested that true knowledge is only the crucified Christ (1

---

<sup>10</sup> G. Abbott-Smith, “γινώσκω,” *MGLNT* 92.

<sup>11</sup> Sloan, “Verbal Uses of The Perfect Participle in Luke-Acts,” 7.

<sup>12</sup> Horstmann, “οἶδα,” *EDNT* 2:494.

<sup>13</sup> Gregory V. Trull, “Peter's Interpretation of Psalm 16:8–11 in Acts 2:25-32,” *BSac* 161 (2004): 433.

Cor 2:2; see also Gal 4:8; Titus 1:16; 1 Thess 4:5) and knowledge *of* Jesus on earth (2 Cor 5:16). Kittel, “οἶδα,” *TDNT* (Abridged) 673–4. Chad Thornhill notes that these two verbs at times carry special nuances, while in other places, they may be “roughly synonymous.”<sup>14</sup> Though there is no concrete distinction to be applied across the board for these two verbs, it seems probable that in some contexts, there is some interplay between the terms. Melick noted that οἶδα is used uniquely in the Pauline corpus in some instances. “Paul spoke of his salvation with a note of certainty. The verb “know” (οἶδα) used here contains an air of confidence. The term may be used for a complete knowledge identified with the mind rather than the process of knowledge which comes from the experience.”<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> A. Chadwick Thornhill, *Greek for Everyone: Introductory Greek for Bible Study and Application* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 2016), 182.

<sup>15</sup> Richard R. Melick, *Philippians, Colossians, Philemon*, NAC 32 (Nashville: B&H, 1991), 80.

## APPENDIX F: PAUL'S VIEW OF THE SPIRIT

Paul's view of the Spirit was shaped by the backdrop of a fusion of Hellenism and Judaism. The Greek view of πνεῦμα was not unilateral but a variety of strands of thought. "For *pneuma* is seen in Hellenistic thought as the finest heavenly matter (Stofflichkeit) which has the capacity to penetrate man's being and, in doing so, to endow him with a new nature."<sup>1</sup> Horn holds that the Spirit of God in Palestinian Judaism was primarily conceived of as a power of the end times, whereas Hellenistic Judaism saw the Spirit primarily as the substance of the new being, though Spirit as function and Spirit as substance were both present in Palestinian and Hellenistic Judaism.<sup>2</sup> Rabens makes the case that Stoics understood the human soul to be physical (materialistic monism), which is in contrast with Plato, Aristotle, and other ancient philosophers. It seems apparent that Stoics would support infusion-transformation and the fashioning force of πνεῦμα impacting not just cosmology but also anthropology.

Yet Stoicism misses the ethical component of the transformation by the Spirit.

Rabens notes that there are very few Stoic texts which bear the ethical effect of πνεῦμα.<sup>3</sup> But there is one extant primary example of the Stoics explicitly connecting πνεῦμα and ethics displays differences to infusion-transformation. For example, Seneca connects ethics to the Spirit: "A Holy Spirit indwells within us, one who marks our good and bad deeds, and is our guardian. As we treat this Spirit, so are we treated by it. Indeed, no man can be good without the

---

<sup>1</sup> Volker Rabens, *The Holy Spirit and Ethics in Paul: Transformation and Empowering for Religious-Ethical Life* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 7.

<sup>2</sup> Friedrich Wilhelm Horn, *Das Angeld des Geistes: Studien zur paulinischen Pneumatologie* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992), 25.

<sup>3</sup> Rabens, *The Holy Spirit and Ethics in Paul*, 32.

help of God” (*Ad Lucilium Epistulae Morales*, 41.1 [Rabens]). A clear distinction in Seneca’s view, however, is that the Holy Spirit is part of human nature from birth, not conversion.<sup>4</sup> Nonetheless, Stoicism laid a fertile foundation on which Pauline pneumatology could flourish. The Stoics believed that πνεῦμα was powerful and able to fashion matter because it is a corporeal entity capable of “causing differences in things by differentiation of itself,” but ultimately, cognitive transformation was through philosophy and human reasoning in Stoic ethics rather than by the Spirit.<sup>5</sup>

Judaism also informed Pauline pneumatology, though there were also different sects and strands of Jewish thought. Looking at the Hebraic concept of the Spirit must begin with the writings in the OT, but determining the view of the Spirit is not straightforward. The writers of the Hebrew Bible utilized sensory language and metaphorical language, and the Hebrew concept of the Spirit was not in such highly developed notions as “substance,” “supersensuous substance,” or even “immaterial substance.”<sup>6</sup> Gese states that it has only been since the Enlightenment that the consciousness of a worldview is evident and that there was a lack of ‘highly developed abstraction’ in the OT writers that kept them from engaging in philosophical/scientific discourse concerning the ontology of the Spirit (which was evident in Hellenism).<sup>7</sup> Rabens notes that the Jewish writings demonstrate the Spirit’s work but not its

---

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., 33.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid., 31–33.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid., 40.

<sup>7</sup> H. Gese, *Essays on Biblical Theology* (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg, 1981), 224–228.

im/material nature, and neither Hellenism nor Judaism provide evidence of the concept of infusion-transformation in Biblical times.<sup>8</sup>

One exception to this is Philo's work, *On the Giants*, where Philo writes of the Holy Spirit being with Moses: "Thus may the divine spirit of wisdom not lightly shift his dwelling and be gone, but long, long abide with us, since He did thus abide with Moses the wise" (Philo, *On the Giants*, 2.468–469 [Colson]). However, though Philo ascribes physical effects to the divine Spirit, it was not infusion-transformation, nor did the Spirit transform the interior and exhibit an ethical life due to the Spirit's inhabitation.<sup>9</sup> Rabens' exegesis and discussion of the metaphors for the pouring out of the Spirit reveal that Paul did not write or speak to people who had a presupposition that the Spirit was physical.

---

<sup>8</sup> Rabens, *The Holy Spirit and Ethics in Paul*, 79.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, 75, 119.

## APPENDIX G: MIND AND HEART—SEPARATE OR TOGETHER?

The vast number of different anthropological or cognitive terms depicting the mind or heart shows the significance of one’s mindset across Scripture, yet the various terms can also be viewed as separating emotions from reason, heart from mind, compartmentalizing the human being, a view that was heightened post-Enlightenment, creating a chasm between mind and heart, which are intended to be viewed holistically together as part of one being. Coman illustrates that this was not the case in the Hebrew line of thinking.

In Jewish literature, the distance between mind and heart was not an issue, as the authors of the Old Testament made use of the Hebrew terms (*leb*) and (*lebab*) to denote the center of the human life, which included and controlled the intellect, the emotions, and the will. That being so, the Hebrew term ‘leb’—which was translated by the LXX as either (mind) in Exodus, (soul) in 1–2 Chr and Isa, (mind) or (mind, heart) in Proverbs—related to both the emotional and intellectual human faculties, without projecting any disharmony or tension between heart and mind.”<sup>1</sup>

Silva states that לֵב and לֵבָב both represent “the seat of the mental faculties” and “the inner life and attitude,” respectively, varying depending on context. The לֵב can represent the heart as well as one’s mindset.<sup>2</sup> It is the heart that represents the whole person as expressed in the Greek term καρδία which refers to the whole person, and the seat of emotions, and the senses (Jn 16:22; Lk 24:32), perceptions (Jn 12:40; Eph 4:18), thoughts (Mt 9:4; Heb 4:12), understanding (Mt 13:15; Rm 1:21), reasoning power (Mk 2:6; Lk 24:38), imagination (Lk 1:51), conscience (Acts 2:37), will (Rm 6:17), and faith (Mk 11:23). Coman affirms this position.

The heart should not be simply treated as the seat of emotions only, just as the mind should not be exclusively conceived as the host of reasoning or thinking

---

<sup>1</sup> Viorel Coman, “The Union of Heart and Mind: A Christian Anthropological Theme and Its Current Relevance,” *CV* 63 (2021): 108–9.

<sup>2</sup> Silva, “καρδία,” *NIDNTTE* 2:622–627.



process...the Hesychast union between mind and heart reveals the perichoretic relationship between reason and emotions, as well as the intimate and participative presence of one into the other, to the extent that heart and mind form together a coherent and relational whole.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Coman, "The Union of Heart and Mind," 115.

## APPENDIX H: PLATO'S VIEW OF THE SOUL

Plato introduced the concept of the “image of the soul” in *Politeia* 588a-b and the “man within a man” in *Republic*, “And on the other hand does this mean that he who claims that justice is profitable would say that one must do and say those things from which the man within the man will be the strongest and will look after the many-headed beast, like a farmer, by feeding and domesticating the tame animals and preventing the wild ones from breeding, and, making an ally of the lion’s nature, and, caring for them all in common, will bring them up in such a way as to make them friendly to each other and himself” (Plato, *Resp.* 9.378–379 [Emlyn-Jones]). Plato also refers to “the many-headed beast” which is summarized by Emlyn-Jones, “Such a person would have to take care of a many-headed beast inside the apparent unity of his human shell, and permit himself to be dragged along wherever conflicting passions (lionlike and snakelike, representing the two nonrational elements) lead him” (Plato, *Resp.* 1.xx–xxi [Emlyn-Jones]) and the actual quote from Plato is “And on the other hand does this mean that he who claims that justice is profitable would say that one must do and say those things from which the man within the man will be the strongest and will look after the many-headed beast, like a farmer, by feeding and domesticating the tame animals and preventing the wild ones from breeding, and, making an ally of the lion’s nature, and, caring for them all in common, will bring them up in such a way as to make them friendly to each other and himself” (Plato, *Resp.* 9.378–379 [Emlyn-Jones]).

Hecht contends that these are the three aspects of the inner man. Scholars have largely agreed on the Greek influence in Paul’s inner man metaphor, but the Hebrew framework is also unmistakable. Hecht notes that Jesus’ reference to the temple as his own body in Mark 14:58 and Paul’s correspondence about the human being as a temple (see 1 Cor 3:16; 6:19; 2 Cor 2:17; 5:1) harkens back to the Temple in Jerusalem. Hecht states that “The temple in Jerusalem not only

serves as the cognitive framework and as a pictorial level of the “inner man” but also integrates both anthropologies (spirit anthropology and image anthropology) in this metaphor.”<sup>1</sup> Hecht also notes the parallels to Philo of Alexandria, who used the creation accounts and two anthropologies to depict the inner man. Though the possibility of influence from the culture Paul came from is tenable, the overriding influence is the Holy Spirit, and the new covenant and paradigm Paul was writing about. Hecht’s assessment that the metaphor of the “inner man” of 2 Cor 4:16 is the fundamental concept of Pauline Anthropology is well taken but secondary to the vital force within man.

---

<sup>1</sup> Stephan Hecht, “The “inner man”—Fundamental Concept of Pauline Anthropology?” *BA* 12, no. 69/2 (2022): 289.

## APPENDIX I: LXX OCCURRENCES OF ΦΡΟΝΕΩ

#	Greek Term	Verse	Greek Verse	Translation
<b>Phroneo in LXX</b>				
1	ἐφρόνησαν	Deut 32:29	οὐκ ἐφρόνησαν συνιέναι· ταῦτα καταδεξάσθωσαν εἰς τὸν ἐπιόντα χρόνον.	“They had not sense to understand: let them reserve these things against the time to come.” <sup>1</sup>
2	φρονήσατε	Ps 93:8	σύνετε δὴ, ἄφρονες ἐν τῷ λαῷ· καὶ μωροί, ποτὲ <b>φρονήσατε.</b>	“Understand now, ye simple among the people; and ye fools, at length be wise. “
3	φρονήσατε	Wisd of Sol 1:1	ΑΓΑΠΗΣΑΤΕ δικαιοσύνην, οἱ κρίνοντες τὴν γῆν· <b>φρονήσατε</b> περὶ τοῦ κυρίου ἐν ἀγαθότητι, καὶ ἐν ἀπλότῃ καρδίας ζητήσατε αὐτόν.	“LOVE righteousness, ye that be judges of the earth: think of the Lord with a good (heart,) and in simplicity of heart seek him.”
4	ἐφρόνησαν	Wisd of Sol 14:30	ἄμφοτερα δὲ αὐτοὺς μετελεύσεται τὰ δίκαια, ὅτι κακῶς <b>ἐφρόνησαν</b> περὶ θεοῦ προσχόντες εἰδώλοις, καὶ ἀδίκως ᾤμοσαν ἐν δόλῳ καταφρονήσαντες ὀσιότητος.	“Howbeit for both causes shall they be justly punished: both because they thought not well of God, giving heed unto idols, and also unjustly swore in deceit, despising holiness.”
5	φρονοῦσι	Esther E (16):1	Ἦν ἐστὶν ἀντίγραφον τῆς ἐπιστολῆς τὰ ὑπογεγραμμένα Βασιλεὺς μέγας Ἀρταξέρξης τοῖς ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰνδικῆς ἕως τῆς Αἰθιοπίας ἑκατὸν εἴκοσι ἑπτὰ σατραπείαις χωρῶν ἄρχουσι καὶ τοῖς τὰ ἡμέτερα <b>φρονοῦσι</b>	“And the following is the copy of the letter of the orders. ‘The great king Artaxerxes sends greeting to the rulers of provinces <i>in</i> a hundred and twenty-seven satrapies, from India to Ethiopia, even to those who are faithful to our interests.’”

<sup>1</sup> All LXX translations provided by Lancelot Charles Lee Brenton, *The Septuagint Version of the Old Testament: English Translation* (London: Samuel Bagster and Sons, 1870).

#	Greek Term	Verse	Greek Verse	Translation
			χαίρειν.	
6	ἐφρόνησαν	Esther 16:2?	πολλοὶ τῇ πλείστη τῶν εὐεργετούντων χρηστότητι πυκνότερον τιμώμενοι μεῖζον ἐφρόνησαν,	<sup>2</sup> Many who have been frequently honoured by the most abundant kindness of their benefactors have conceived ambitious designs.”
7	ἐφρόνησαν	Zech 9:2	καὶ ἐν Ἐμαθ ἐν τοῖς ὀρίοις αὐτῆς· Τύρος καὶ Σειδῶν, διότι ἐφρόνησαν σφόδρα·	“And in Emath, <i>even</i> in her coasts, <i>are</i> Tyre and Sidon, because they were very wise.”
8	φρονῆσαι	Isa 44:18	οὐκ ἔγνωσαν φρονῆσαι, ὅτι ἀπημαυρώθησαν τοῦ βλέπειν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς αὐτῶν καὶ τοῦ νοῆσαι τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῶν.	“They have no understanding to perceive; for they have been blinded so that they should not see with their eyes, nor perceive with their heart.”
9	φρονεῖν	Isa 44:28	ὁ λέγων Κύρω φρονεῖν, καὶ Πάντα τὰ θελήματά μου ποιήσει· ὁ λέγων Ἱερουσαλήμ Οἰκοδομηθήσῃ, καὶ τὸν οἶκον τὸν ἅγιόν μου θεμελιώσω .	“Who bids Cyrus be wise, and he shall perform all my will: who says to Jerusalem, Thou shalt be built, and I will lay the foundation of my holy house.”
10	φρονεῖν	1 Macc 10:20	καὶ νῦν καθεστάκαμέν σε σήμερον ἀρχιερέα τοῦ ἔθνους σου, καὶ φίλον βασιλέως καλεῖσθαι—καὶ ἀπέστειλαν αὐτῷ πορφύραν καὶ στέφανον χρυσοῦν—καὶ φρονεῖν τὰ ἡμῶν καὶ συντηρεῖν φιλίαν πρὸς ἡμᾶς.	“Wherefore now this day we ordain thee to be the high priest of thy nation, and to be called the king’s friend; (and therewithal he sent him a purple robe and a crown of gold;) and <i>require thee</i> to take our part, and keep friendship with us.”

#	Greek Term	Verse	Greek Verse	Translation
11	φρονεῖν	2 Macc 9:12	καὶ μηδὲ τῆς ὀσμῆς αὐτοῦ ἀνέχεσθαι δυνάμενος, ταῦτ' ἔφη Δίκαιον ὑποτάσσεσθαι τῷ θεῷ, καὶ μὴ θνητὸν ὄντα ὑπερήφανα <b>φρονεῖν.</b>	“And when he himself could not abide his own smell, he said these words, it is meet to be subject unto God, and that a man that is mortal should not proudly think of himself, as if he were God.”
12	φρονῶν	2 Macc 14:8	πρῶτον μὲν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀνηκόντων τῷ βασιλεῖ γενήσιως <b>φρονῶν,</b> δεύτερον δὲ καὶ τῶν ιδίῶν πολιτῶν στοχασάμενος· τῇ μὲν γὰρ τῶν προειρημένων ἀλογιστία τὸ σύμπαν ἡμῶν γένος οὐ μικρῶς ἀκληρεῖ.	“First, verily for the unfeigned care I have of things pertaining to the king; and secondly, even for that I intend the good of mine own citizens: for all our nation is in no small misery through the unadvised dealing of them aforesaid.”
13	φρονεῖν	2 Macc 14:26	Ὁ δὲ Ἄλκιμος συνιδὼν τὴν πρὸς ἀλλήλους εὐνοίαν καὶ τὰς γενομένας συνθήκας λαβὼν ἤκεν πρὸς τὸν Δημήτριον, καὶ ἔλεγεν τὸν Νικάνορα ἀλλότρια <b>φρονεῖν</b> τῶν πραγμάτων· τὸν γὰρ ἐπίβουλον τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ Ἰούδαν διάδοχον ἀπέδειξεν.	“But Alcimus, perceiving the love that was betwixt them, and considering the covenants that were made, came to Demetrius, and told him that Nicanor was not well affected toward the state: for that he had ordained Judas, a traitor to his realm, to be the king’s successor.”
14	φρονήσαιμεν	4 Macc 6:17	Μὴ οὕτως κακῶς <b>φρονήσαιμεν,</b> οἱ Ἀβραὰμ παῖδες, ὥστε μαλακοψυχήσαντας ἀπρεπὲς ἡμῖν δρᾶμα ὑποκρίνασθαι.	“Let not us who are children of Abraham be so evil advised as by giving way to make use of an unbecoming pretence.”
15	ἐφρόνησαν	Odes 2:29	οὐκ ἐφρόνησαν συνιέναι ταῦτα· καταδεξάσθωσαν εἰς τὸν ἐπιόντα χρόνον.	“They had not sense to understand: let them reserve these things against the time to come.”
<b>Φρόνησις / Phronesis in the LXX</b>				

#	Greek Term	Verse	Greek Verse	Translation
16	φρόνησις	Josh 5:1	Καὶ ἐγένετο ὡς ἤκουσαν οἱ βασιλεῖς τῶν Ἀμορραίων, οἳ ἦσαν πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, καὶ οἱ βασιλεῖς τῆς Φοινίκης οἱ παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν ὅτι ἀπεξήρανε κύριος ὁ θεὸς τὸν Ἰορδάνην ποταμὸν ἐκ τῶν ἔμπροσθεν τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ ἐν τῷ διαβαίνειν αὐτούς, καὶ ἐτάκησαν αὐτῶν αἱ διάνοιαι καὶ κατεπλάγησαν, καὶ οὐκ ἦν ἐν αὐτοῖς <b>φρόνησις</b> οὐδεμία ἀπὸ προσώπου τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ.	“And it came to pass when the kings of the Amorites who were beyond Jordan heard, and the kings of Phœnicia by the sea, that the Lord God had dried up the river Jordan from before the children of Israel when they passed over, that their hearts failed, and they were terror-stricken, and there was no sense in them because of the children of Israel.”
17	φρονήσει	1 Kgdms 2:10	κύριος ἀσθενῆ ποιήσει ἀντίδικον αὐτοῦ, κύριος ἅγιος. μὴ καυχάσθω ὁ φρόνιμος ἐν τῇ <b>φρονήσει</b> αὐτοῦ, καὶ μὴ καυχάσθω ὁ δυνατὸς ἐν τῇ δυνάμει αὐτοῦ, καὶ μὴ καυχάσθω ὁ πλούσιος ἐν τῷ πλούτῳ αὐτοῦ, ἀλλ’ ἢ ἐν τούτῳ καυχάσθω ὁ καυχώμενος, συνίειν καὶ γινώσκειν τὸν κύριον καὶ ποιεῖν κρίμα καὶ δικαιοσύνην ἐν μέσῳ τῆς γῆς. κύριος ἀνέβη εἰς οὐρανοὺς καὶ ἐβρόντησεν, αὐτὸς κρινεῖ ἄκρα γῆς καὶ δίδωσιν ἰσχὺν τοῖς βασιλεῦσιν ἡμῶν καὶ ὑψώσει κέρασ χριστοῦ	“The Lord will weaken his adversary; the Lord is holy. Let not the wise man boast in his wisdom, nor let the mighty man boast in his strength, and let not the rich man boast in his wealth; but let him that boasts boast in this, to understand and know the Lord, and to execute judgment and justice in the midst of the earth. The Lord has gone up to the heavens, and has thundered: he will judge the extremities of the earth, and he gives strength to our kings, and will exalt the horn of his Christ. And she left him there before the Lord.”

#	Greek Term	Verse	Greek Verse	Translation
			αὐτοῦ.	
18	φρόνησιν	3 Kgdms 2:35a	Καὶ ἔδωκεν κύριος <b>φρόνησιν</b> τῷ Σαλωμων καὶ σοφίαν πολλήν σφόδρα καὶ πλάτος καρδίας ὡς ἡ ἄμμος ἢ παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν,	“And the king appointed Banæas son of Jodae in his place over the hosts; and the kingdom was established in Jerusalem and <i>as for</i> Sadoc the priest, the king appointed him to be high priest in the room of Abiathar.”
19	φρόνησιςφρό	3 Kgdms 2:35b	καὶ ἐπληθύνθη ἡ <b>φρόνησις</b> Σαλωμων σφόδρα ὑπὲρ τὴν <b>φρόνησιν</b> πάντων ἀρχαίων υἱῶν καὶ ὑπὲρ πάντας φρονίμους Αἰγύπτου.	“And the king appointed Banæas son of Jodae in his place over the hosts; and the kingdom was established in Jerusalem and <i>as for</i> Sadoc the priest, the king appointed him to be high priest in the room of Abiathar.”
20	φρόνησις	3 Kgdms 3:28	καὶ ἤκουσαν πᾶς Ἰσραηλ τὸ κρίμα τοῦτο, ὃ ἔκρινεν ὁ βασιλεύς, καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ βασιλέως, ὅτι εἶδον ὅτι <b>φρόνησις</b> θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ τοῦ ποιεῖν δικαίωμα.	“And all Israel heard this judgment which the king judged, and they feared before the king; because they saw that the wisdom of God <i>was</i> in him, to execute judgment.”
21	φρόνησιν	3 Kgdms 5:9	Καὶ ἔδωκεν κύριος <b>φρόνησιν</b> τῷ Σαλωμων καὶ σοφίαν πολλήν σφόδρα καὶ χύμα καρδίας ὡς ἡ ἄμμος ἢ παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν,	“My servants shall bring them down from Libanus to the sea: I will form them <i>into</i> rafts, <i>and bring them</i> to the place which thou shalt send to me <i>about</i> ; and I will land them there, and thou shalt take <i>them</i> up: and thou shalt do my will, in giving bread to my household.”
22	φρόνησιν	3 Kgdms 5:10	καὶ ἐπληθύνθη Σαλωμων σφόδρα ὑπὲρ τὴν <b>φρόνησιν</b> πάντων ἀρχαίων ἀνθρώπων καὶ ὑπὲρ πάντας φρονίμους Αἰγύπτου	“So Chiram gave to Solomon cedars, and fir trees, and all his desire.”
23	φρόνησιν	3 Kgdms 10:4	καὶ εἶδεν βασίλισσα Σαβα πᾶσαν <b>φρόνησιν</b> Σαλωμων καὶ τὸν οἶκον, ὃν ᾠκοδόμησεν,	“And the queen of Saba saw all the wisdom of Solomon, and the house which he built.”



#	Greek Term	Verse	Greek Verse	Translation
24	φρονήσεώς	3 Kgdms 10:6	καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα Σαλωμων Ἀληθινὸς ὁ λόγος, ὃν ἤκουσα ἐν τῇ γῆ μου περὶ τοῦ λόγου σου καὶ περὶ τῆς <b>φρονήσεώς</b> σου,	“And she said to king Solomon, <i>it was</i> a true report which I heard in my land of thy words and thy wisdom.”
25	φρόνησίν	3 Kgdms 10:8	μακάριαι αἱ γυναῖκές σου, μακάριοι οἱ παῖδες σου οὗτοι οἱ παρεστηκότες ἐνώπιόν σου [Ἰ δι’ ὅλου Ἰ] οἱ ἀκούοντες πᾶσαν τὴν <b>φρόνησίν</b> σου,	“Blessed <i>are</i> thy wives, blessed <i>are</i> these thy servants who stand before thee continually, who hear all thy wisdom.”
26	φρονήσει	3 Kgdms 10:23	Καὶ ἐμεγαλύνθη Σαλωμων ὑπὲρ πάντας τοὺς βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς πλούτῳ καὶ <b>φρονήσει</b> .	“And Solomon increased beyond all the kings of the earth in wealth and wisdom.”
27	φρονήσεως	3 Kgdms 10:24	καὶ πάντες βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς ἐζήτησαν τὸ πρόσωπον Σαλωμων τοῦ ἀκοῦσαι τῆς <b>φρονήσεως</b> αὐτοῦ, ἧς ἔδωκεν κύριος ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ.	“And all the kings of the earth sought the presence of Solomon, to hear his wisdom which the Lord <i>had</i> put into his heart.”
28	φρόνησιν	3 Kgdms 11:41	Καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν ῥημάτων Σαλωμων καὶ πάντα, ὅσα ἐποίησεν, καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν <b>φρόνησιν</b> αὐτοῦ, οὐκ ἰδοὺ ταῦτα γέγραπται ἐν βιβλίῳ ῥημάτων Σαλωμων;	“And the rest of the history of Solomon, and all that he did, and all his wisdom, behold are not these things written in the book of the life of Solomon?”
29	φρονήσεως	4 Macc 1:2	καὶ γὰρ ἀναγκαῖος εἰς ἐπιστήμην παντὶ ὁ λόγος καὶ ἄλλως τῆς μεγίστης ἀρετῆς, λέγω δὴ <b>φρονήσεως</b> , περιέχει ἔπαινον.	“For reason is necessary to every one as a step to science: and more especially does it embrace the praise of prudence, the highest virtue.”
30	φρόνησις	4 Macc 1:18	τῆς δὲ σοφίας ἰδέαι καθεστήκασιν <b>φρόνησις</b> καὶ δικαιοσύνη καὶ	“And the forms of wisdom are prudence, and justice, and manliness, and temperance.”

#	Greek Term	Verse	Greek Verse	Translation
			ἀνδρεία καὶ σωφροσύνη,	
31	φρόνησις	4 Macc 1:19	κυριωτάτη δὲ πάντων ἡ <b>φρόνησις</b> , ἐξ ἧς δὴ τῶν παθῶν ὁ λογισμὸς ἐπικρατεῖ.	“The leading one of these is prudence; by whose means, indeed, it is that reasoning bears rule over the passions.”
32	φρονήσεως	Prov 1:2	γνῶναι σοφίαν καὶ παιδείαν νοῆσαι τε λόγους <b>φρονήσεως</b>	“To know wisdom and instruction; and to perceive words of understanding.”
33	φρόνησιν	Prov 3:13	μακάριος ἄνθρωπος ὃς εὔρεν σοφίαν καὶ θνητὸς ὃς εἶδεν <b>φρόνησιν</b> ,	“Blessed is the man who has found wisdom, and the mortal who knows prudence.”
34	φρονήσει	Prov 3:19	ὁ θεὸς τῇ σοφίᾳ ἐθεμελίωσεν τὴν γῆν, ἠτοίμασεν δὲ οὐρανοὺς ἐν <b>φρονήσει</b> ,	“God by wisdom founded the earth, and by prudence he prepared the heavens.”
35	φρόνησιν	Prov 7:4	εἶπον τὴν σοφίαν σὴν ἀδελφὴν εἶναι, τὴν δὲ <b>φρόνησιν</b> γνώριμον περιποίησαι σεαυτῷ,	“Say that wisdom is thy sister, and gain prudence as an acquaintance for thyself.”
36	φρόνησις	Prov 8:1	Σὺ τὴν σοφίαν κηρύξεις, ἵνα <b>φρόνησις</b> σοι ὑπακούσῃ,	“Thou shalt proclaim wisdom, that understanding may be obedient to thee.”
37	φρόνησις	Prov 8:14	ἐμὴ βουλή καὶ ἀσφάλεια, ἐμὴ <b>φρόνησις</b> , ἐμὴ δὲ ἰσχὺς,	“Counsel and safety are mine: prudence is mine, and strength is mine.”
38	φρόνησιν	Prov 9:6	ἀπολείπετε ἀφροσύνην, καὶ ζήσεσθε, καὶ ζητήσατε <b>φρόνησιν</b> , ἵνα βιώσητε, καὶ κατορθώσατε ἐν γνώσει σύνεσιν.	“Leave folly, that ye may reign forever; and seek wisdom, and improve understanding by knowledge.”
39	φρονήσεως	Prov 9:16	Ὅς ἐστὶν ὑμῶν ἀφρονέστατος, ἐκκλινάτω πρὸς με, ἐνδεέσι δὲ <b>φρονήσεως</b> παρακελεύομαι λέγουσα	“Saying, Whoso is most senseless of you, let him turn aside to me; and I exhort those that want prudence, saying,”

#	Greek Term	Verse	Greek Verse	Translation
40	φρόνησιν	Prov 10:23	ἐν γέλωτι ἄφρων πράσσει κακά, ἢ δὲ σοφία ἀνδρὶ τίκτει <b>φρόνησιν.</b>	“A fool does mischief in sport; but wisdom brings forth prudence for a man.”
41	φρονήσει	Prov 14:29	μακρόθυμος ἀνὴρ πολὺς ἐν <b>φρονήσει</b> , ὁ δὲ ὀλιγόψυχος [I ἰσχυρῶς I] ἄφρων.	“A man slow to wrath abounds in wisdom: but a man of impatient spirit is very foolish.”
42	φρονήσεως	Prov 16:16	νοσσιαὶ σοφίας αἰρετώτεραι χρυσίου, νοσσιαὶ δὲ <b>φρονήσεως</b> αἰρετώτεραι ὑπὲρ ἄργύριον.	“The brood of wisdom is more to be chosen than gold, and the brood of prudence more to be chosen than silver.”
43	φρόνησιν φρό	Prov 19:8	ὁ κτώμενος <b>φρόνησιν</b> ἀγαπᾷ ἑαυτὸν, ὃς δὲ φυλάσσει <b>φρόνησιν</b> , εὕρήσει ἀγαθά.	“He that procures wisdom loves himself; and he that keeps wisdom shall find good.”
44	φρόνησιν	Prov 24:5	κρείσσων σοφὸς ἰσχυροῦ καὶ ἀνὴρ <b>φρόνησιν</b> ἔχων γεωργίου μεγάλου,	“A wise man is better than a strong man; and a man who has prudence than a large estate.”
45	φρόνησις	Prov 30:2	ἄφρονέστατος γάρ εἰμι πάντων ἀνθρώπων, καὶ <b>φρόνησις</b> ἀνθρώπων οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν ἐμοί,	“For I am the most simple of all men, and there is not in me the wisdom of men.”
46	φρονήσει	Job 5:13	ὁ καταλαμβάνων σοφοὺς ἐν τῇ <b>φρονήσει</b> , βουλήν δὲ πολυπλόκων ἐξέστησεν,	“Who takes the wise in their wisdom, and subverts the counsel of the crafty.”
47	φρονήσεως	Job 17:4	ὅτι καρδίαν αὐτῶν ἔκρυψας ἀπὸ <b>φρονήσεως</b> , ※※ διὰ τοῦτο οὐ μὴ ὑψώσης αὐτούς.	“For thou hast hid their heart from wisdom; therefore thou shalt not exalt them.”
48	φρονήσεως	Wisd of Sol 3:15	ἀγαθῶν γὰρ πόνων καρπὸς εὐκλεής, καὶ ἀδιάπτωτος ἡ ρίζα τῆς <b>φρονήσεως.</b>	“For glorious is the fruit of good labours: and the root of wisdom shall never fall away.”
49	φρόνησις	Wisd of Sol 4:9	πολιὰ δὲ ἔστιν <b>φρόνησις</b> ἀνθρώποις καὶ ἡλικία γῆρως βίος ἀκηλίδωτος.	“But wisdom is the grey hair unto men, and an unspotted life is old age.”

#	Greek Term	Verse	Greek Verse	Translation
50	φρονήσεως	Wisd of Sol 6:15	τὸ γὰρ ἐνθυμηθῆναι περὶ αὐτῆς <b>φρονήσεως</b> τελειότης, καὶ ὁ ἀγρυπνήσας δι' αὐτὴν ταχέως ἀμέριμος ἔσται,	“To think therefore upon her is the perfection of wisdom: and whoso watcheth for her shall quickly be without care.”
51	φρόνησις	Wisd of Sol 7:7	διὰ τοῦτο εὐξάμην, καὶ <b>φρόνησις</b> ἐδόθη μοι, ἔπεκαλεσάμην, καὶ ἦλθεν μοι πνεῦμα σοφίας.	“Wherefore I prayed, and understanding was given me: I called <i>upon God</i> , and the spirit of wisdom came to me.”
52	φρόνησις	Wisd of Sol 7:16	ἐν γὰρ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡμεῖς καὶ οἱ λόγοι ἡμῶν πᾶσά τε <b>φρόνησις</b> καὶ ἐργατειῶν ἐπιστήμη.	“For in his hand are both we and our words; all wisdom also, and knowledge of workmanship.”
53	φρόνησις	Wisd of Sol 8:6	εἰ δὲ <b>φρόνησις</b> ἐργάζεται, τίς αὐτῆς τῶν ὄντων μᾶλλον ἔστιν τεχνίτις;	“And if prudence work; who of all that are is a more cunning workman than she?”
54	φρόνησιν	Wisd of Sol 8:7	καὶ [I εἰ I] δικαιοσύνην [I ἀγαπᾷ I] τις, [I οἱ πόνοι ταύτης I] εἰσὶν ἀρεταί, σωφροσύνην γὰρ καὶ <b>φρόνησιν</b> ἐκδιδάσκει, δικαιοσύνην καὶ ἀνδρείαν, [I ὧν I] χρησιμώτερον οὐδὲν ἔστιν ἐν βίῳ [I ἀνθρώποις I].	“And if a man love righteousness, her labours are virtues: for she teacheth temperance and prudence, justice and fortitude: which are such things, as men can have nothing more profitable in their life.”
55	φρόνησις	Wisd of Sol 8:18	καὶ ἐν φιλίᾳ αὐτῆς τέρψις [I ἀγαθὴ I] καὶ ἐν πόνοις χειρῶν αὐτῆς πλοῦτος ἀνεκλιπῆς καὶ ἐν συγγυμνασίᾳ ὁμιλίας αὐτῆς <b>φρόνησις</b> καὶ εὐκλεία ἐν κοινωνίᾳ λόγων αὐτῆς, περιήειν ζητῶν ὅπως λάβω αὐτὴν εἰς ἑμαυτόν.	“And great pleasure it is to have her friendship; and in the works of her hands are infinite riches; and in the exercise of conference with her, prudence; and in talking with her, a good report; I went about seeking how to take her to me.”
56	φρονήσεως	Wisd of Sol 8:21	γνοὺς δὲ ὅτι οὐκ ἄλλως ἔσομαι ἐγκρατής, ἐὰν μὴ ὁ θεὸς δῶ—[I καὶ τοῦτο	“Nevertheless, when I perceived that I could not otherwise obtain her, except God gave her me; and that was a point of

#	Greek Term	Verse	Greek Verse	Translation
			δ' ἦν <b>φρονήσεως</b> τὸ εἰδέναι τίνος ἢ χάρις [I]—, ἐνέτυχον τῷ κυρίῳ καὶ ἐδέηθην αὐτοῦ καὶ εἶπον [I ἐξ I] ὅλης τῆς καρδίας μου	wisdom also to know whose gift she was; I prayed unto the Lord, and besought him, and with my whole heart I said,”
57	φρονήσει	Wisdom of Sol 17:7	μαγικῆς δὲ ἐμπαίγματα κατέκειτο τέχνης, καὶ τῆς ἐπὶ <b>φρονήσει</b> ἀλαζονείας ἔλεγχος ἐφύβριστος,	“As for the illusions of art magic, they were put down, and their vaunting in wisdom was reproved with disgrace.”
58	φρονήσεως	Sirach 1:4	προτέρα πάντων ἔκτισται σοφία καὶ σύνεσις <b>φρονήσεως</b> ἐξ αἰῶνος.	“Wisdom hath been created before all things, and the understanding of prudence from everlasting.”
59	φρόνησις	Sirach 19:22	καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν σοφία πονηρίας ἐπιστήμη, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ὅπου βουλή ἀμαρτωλῶν <b>φρόνησις</b> .	“The knowledge of wickedness is not wisdom, neither at any time the counsel of sinners prudence.”
60	φρονήσει	Sirach 19:24	κρείττων ἡττώμενος ἐν συνέσει ἔμφοβος ἢ περισσεύων ἐν <b>φρονήσει</b> καὶ παραβαίνων νόμον.	“He that hath small understanding, and feareth God, is better than one that hath much wisdom, and transgresseth the law of the most High.”
61	φρόνησιν	Sirach 25:9	μακάριος ὃς εὔρεν <b>φρόνησιν</b> , καὶ ὁ διηγούμενος εἰς ὅτα ἀκουόντων,	“Well is he that hath found prudence, and he that speaketh in the ears of them that will hear:”
62	φρόνησιν	Sirach 29:28	βαρέα ταῦτα ἀνθρώπῳ ἔχοντι <b>φρόνησιν</b> , ἐπιτίμησις οἰκίας καὶ ὀνειδισμὸς δανειστοῦ.	“These things are grievous to a man of understanding; the upbraiding of houseroom, and reproaching of the lender.”
63	φρονήσεως	Isa 40:28	καὶ νῦν οὐκ ἔγνωσας εἰ μὴ ἤκουσας; θεὸς αἰώνιος ὁ θεὸς ὁ κατασκευάσας τὰ ἄκρα τῆς γῆς, οὐ πεινάσει οὐδὲ κοπιήσει, οὐδὲ [I ἔστιν ἐξεύρεσις τῆς <b>φρονήσεως</b> αὐτοῦ I],	“And now, hast thou not known? hast thou not heard? the eternal God, the God that formed the ends of the earth, shall not hunger, nor be weary, and there is no searching of his understanding.”
64	φρονήσει	Isa	καὶ οὐκ ἐλογίσατο τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ οὐδὲ ἀνελογίσατο ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ αὐτοῦ οὐδὲ ἔγνω τῇ	“And one has not considered in his mind, nor known in his understanding, that he has burnt up half of it in the fire, and baked

#	Greek Term	Verse	Greek Verse	Translation
		44:19	φρονήσει ὅτι τὸ ἥμισυ αὐτοῦ κατέκαυσεν ἐν πυρὶ καὶ ἔπειπεν ἐπὶ τῶν ἀνθράκων αὐτοῦ ἄρτους καὶ ὀπτήσας κρέας ἔφαγεν καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν αὐτοῦ εἰς βδέλυγμα ἐποίησεν καὶ προσκυνοῦσιν αὐτῷ.	loaves on the coals thereof and has roasted and eaten flesh, and of the rest of it he has made an abomination, and they worship it.”
65	φρονήσει	Jer 10:12	κύριος ὁ ποιήσας τὴν γῆν ἐν τῇ ἰσχύι αὐτοῦ, ὁ ἀνορθώσας τὴν οἰκουμένην ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ αὐτοῦ καὶ τῇ φρονήσει αὐτοῦ ἐξέτεινεν τὸν οὐρανὸν	“It is the Lord that made the earth by his strength, who set up the world by his wisdom, and by his understanding stretched out the sky,”
66	φρόνησιν	Baruch 3:9	Ἄκουε, Ἰσραηλ, ἐντολὰς ζωῆς, ἐνωτίσασθε γνῶναι φρόνησιν.	“Hear, Israel, the commandments of life: give ear to understand wisdom.”
67	φρόνησις	Baruch 3:14	μάθε ποῦ ἐστὶν φρόνησις, ποῦ ἐστὶν ἰσχύς, ποῦ ἐστὶν σύνεσις τοῦ γνῶναι ἅμα, ποῦ ἐστὶν μακροβίωσις καὶ ζωή, ποῦ ἐστὶν φῶς ὀφθαλμῶν καὶ εἰρήνη.	“Learn where is wisdom, where is strength, where is understanding; that thou mayest know also where is length of days, and life, where is the light of the eyes, and peace.”
68	φρόνησιν	Baruch 3:28	καὶ ἀπόλοντο παρὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν φρόνησιν, ἀπόλοντο διὰ τὴν ἀβουλίαν αὐτῶν.	“But they were destroyed, because they had no wisdom, and perished through their own foolishness.”
69	φρονήσει	Ezek 28:4	μὴ ἐν τῇ ἐπιστήμῃ σου ἢ ἐν τῇ φρονήσει σου ἐποίησας σεαυτῷ δύναμιν καὶ χρυσίον καὶ ἀργύριον ἐν τοῖς θησαυροῖς σου;	“Hast thou gained power for thyself by thine <i>own</i> knowledge or thine <i>own</i> prudence, and <i>gotten</i> gold and silver in thy treasures?”
70	φρόνησιν	Dan 1:17	καὶ τοῖς νεανίσκοις ἔδωκεν ὁ κύριος ἐπιστήμην καὶ σύνεσιν καὶ φρόνησιν ἐν πάσῃ	“And <i>as for</i> these four children, God gave them understanding and prudence in all learning and wisdom: and Daniel had understanding in all visions and dreams.”

#	Greek Term	Verse	Greek Verse	Translation
			γραμματικῇ τέχνῃ, καὶ τῷ Δανιηλ ἔδωκε σύνεσιν ἐν παντὶ ῥήματι καὶ ὄραματι καὶ ἐνυπνίοις καὶ ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ.	
71	φρόνησιν	Dan 2:23	σοί, κύριε τῶν πατέρων μου, ἐξομολογοῦμαι καὶ αἰνῶ, ὅτι σοφίαν καὶ <b>φρόνησιν</b> ἔδωκάς μοι καὶ νῦν ἐσήμανάς μοι ὅσα ἠξίωσα τοῦ δηλῶσαι τῷ βασιλεῖ πρὸς ταῦτα.	“I give thanks to thee, and praise <i>thee</i> , O God of my fathers, for thou hast given me wisdom and power, and hast made known to me the things which we asked of thee; and thou hast made known to me the king’s vision.”

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Arndt, William, Frederick W. Danker, Walter Bauer, and F. Wilbur Gingrich. *BDAG*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
- Abbott-Smith, G. *MGLNT*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1922.
- Abu Alsaud, Loay, Amer Al-Qobbaj, Mohammad Al-Khateeb, and Alfonso Fanjul Peraza. "New Chronological Information from Radiocarbon Dating of Human Remains at Jacob's Well, Nablus, Palestine." *Radiocarbon* 63 (2021): 759–69.
- Arnim, Hans Von. *Stoicorum veterum fragmenta Volumen II, Chrysippi fragmenta logica et physica*. Editio stereotypa editionis primae (MCMIII). München: K.G. Saur, 2004.
- Balz, Horst Robert, and Gerhard Schneider. *EDNT*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1990–.
- Barclay, William. *The Mind of Jesus*. New York, NY: Harper, 1961.
- Barclay, William. *Flesh and Spirit: An Examination of Galatians 5:19–23*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1962.
- Barnes, William H., and Philip Wesley Comfort. *1-2 Kings*. CBC. Carol Stream, IL: Tyndale House Publishers, Inc., 2012.
- Barry, John D., David Bomar, Derek R. Brown, Rachel Klippenstein, Douglas Mangum, Carrie Sinclair Wolcott, Lazarus Wentz, Elliot Ritzema, and Wendy Widder, eds. *The Lexham Bible Dictionary*. Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2016.
- Beale, G. K. *Handbook on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament: Exegesis and Interpretation*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2012.
- Beale, G. K. *We Become What We Worship: A Biblical Theology of Idolatry*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2008.
- Berković, Danijel, and Dean Slavić. "The Personal and the Private in the Piety of the Biblical Psalmist." *EJT* 14, no. 2 (2020): 55–66.
- Betz, Hans Dieter. "The Concept of the 'Inner Human Being' (Οἴσω Ἄνθρωπος) in the Anthropology of Paul." *NTS* 46 (2000): 315–41.
- Bigio, Brian Jorge, "'Saving the Mind': An Etymological Inquiry into the Cognitive-Behavioral Function of the Ancient Greek Value ΣΩΦΡΟΣΥΝΗ (*Sōphrosynē*). PhD diss., Stanford University, 2021.
- Bivin, David, and Roy Blizzard. *Understanding The Difficult Words of Jesus: New Insights from A Hebraic Perspective*. Digital version. Destiny Image Publishers, 1994.



- Black, David Alan. "The Discourse Structure of Philippians: A Study in Textlinguistics," *NovT* 37 (1995): 37.
- Blenkinsopp, Joseph. "The One in the Middle." In *Essays on the Book of Isaiah*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019.
- Block, Daniel Isaac. *For the Glory of God Recovering a Biblical Theology of Worship*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2014.
- Bloomfield, S. T. *GELNT*. London: Longman, Orme, Brown, Green, & Longmans, 1840.
- Bogan, Mary Inez. *The Retraction*, vol. 60 of *The Fathers of the Church*. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1968.
- Boman, Thorleif. *Hebrew Thought Compared with Greek*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton, 1960.
- Bond, James Nicholas. "Renewing the Mind: Paul's Theological and Ethical Use of *Phronēma* and Cognates in Romans and Philippians." PhD diss., University of Aberdeen, 2005.
- Borchert, Gerald L. *John 1–11*. NAC 25A. Nashville: B&H, 1996.
- Boring, M Eugene. "Mark 1:1-15 and the Beginning of the Gospel." *Semeia* 52 (1991):43–81.
- Botterweck, G. Johannes, and Helmer Ringgren, eds. *TDNT*. Translated by John T. Willis and Geoffrey W. Bromiley. 8 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974–2006.
- Boyer, James L. "A Classification of Imperatives: A Statistical Study." *GTJ* 8 (1987): 35-54.
- Braider, Christopher. *The Matter of Mind: Reason and Experience in the Age of Descartes*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press, 2012.
- Brannan, Rick, ed. *LRLHB*. Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2020.
- Brown, Alexander R. *The Cross and the Human Transformation: Paul's Apocalyptic Word in 1 Corinthians*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1995.
- Brown, Francis, Samuel Rolles Driver, and Charles Augustus Briggs. *BDB*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977.
- Brown-Serman, Stanley, and Harold Adye Prichard. *What Did Jesus Think? Studies in the Mind of Christ*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1935.
- Brueggemann, Walter. *Theology of the Old Testament: Testimony, Dispute, Advocacy*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2005.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. *Theology of the New Testament*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2007.

- Burns, Dylan M. *Did God Care?: Providence, Dualism, and Will in Later Greek and Early Christian Philosophy*. Studies in Platonism, Neoplatonism, and the Platonic Tradition 25. Leiden, NL: Brill, 2020.
- Carlson, Richard P. "Romans 8:12–17." *Int* 58 (2004): 280–282.
- Carson, D. A. *The Gospel According to John*. PNTC. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1991.
- Carson, D. A., Walter W. Wessel, and Walter L. Liefeld. *Matthew, Mark, Luke*. Vol. 8 of *EBC*. Edited by Frank E. Gaebelin. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan 1984.
- Casey, Maurice. *Aramaic Sources of Mark's Gospel*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Cassius, Dio. "Dio's Roman History: Book Li." LCL. Harvard University Press.
- Charles, Robert Henry, ed. *Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, vol. 2. Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press, 1913.
- . "The Book of Jubilees." In *Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, vol. 2, 11–82. Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press, 1913.
- Charlesworth, James H. "John the Baptizer and the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 1–36. In *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Vol. 3. Edited by James H. Charlesworth, Waco, TX: Baylor University, 2006.
- Chen, Sunny. "The Distributive Singular in Paul: The Adequacy of a Grammatical Category." *Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism* 11 (2015): 104–130.
- Clement of Rome. "The First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians." In *The Apostolic Fathers with Justin Martyr and Irenaeus*. Edited by Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Coxe, vol. 1. The Ante-Nicene Fathers. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Company, 1885.
- Clines, David J. A., ed. *The Concise Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2009.
- . *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew: English–Hebrew Index; Word Frequency Table*. Vol. IX. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2016.
- Colson, F. H., G. H. Whitaker, and J. W. Earp, trans. *Philo*. Vol. 1. LCL 22. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1929.
- Coman, Viorel. "The Union of Heart and Mind: A Christian Anthropological Theme and Its Current Relevance." *Communio Viatorum: A Theological Journal* 63 (2021): 107–123.

- Coogan, Michael D. "Life in the Diaspora: Jews at Nippur in the Fifth Century B.C." *The Biblical Archaeologist*, 37 (1974): 6–12.
- Cooper, John W. *Body, Soul, and Life Everlasting: Biblical Anthropology and the Monism-Dualism Debate*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Cornelius, Izak. "Communicating the Old Testament World of Ideas by Way of Ancient Near Eastern Iconography." *Old Testament Essays* 7 (1994): 327–332.
- Cotterell, F. P. "The Nicodemus Conversation: A Fresh Appraisal." *TET*, 96(8) (1985): 237-242.
- Cranfield, C. E. B. *Romans 1–8: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. ICC. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1975.
- Csapo, Eric. "Cockfights, Contradictions, and the Mythopoetics of Ancient Greek Culture." *Arts: The Journal of the Sydney University Arts Association* 28 (2006).
- Cullmann, Oscar. "La délivrance anticipée du corps humain d'après le Nouveau Testament." Pages 31–40 in *Hommage et reconnaissance, recueil de travaux publiés à l'occasion du 60e anniversaire de Karl Barth*. Edited by Jean-Jacques von Allmen and Jean-Louis Leuba. Cahiers Théologiques de L'actualité Protestante. Hors Serie 2. Paris: Delachaux & Niestle, 1946.
- Currie A, Killin A. "From Things to Thinking: Cognitive Archaeology." *Mind & Language* 34 (2019): 263–279.
- Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentary on John: Ancient Christian Texts*, vol. 1. Edited by Joel C. Elowsky, Thomas C. Oden, and Gerald L. Bray. Translated by David R. Maxwell. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2013–2015.
- Davids, Peter H. *The First Epistle of Peter*. NICNT. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1990.
- De Hulster, Izaak J. "'A Monument and a Name': Isaiah 56 and the Aniconic Image." Pages 181–196 in *Iconographic Exegesis of the Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: An Introduction to Its Method and Practice*. Edited by Izaak J. de Hulster, Brent A. Strawn, and Ryan P. Bonfiglio. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015.
- Dedović, Boban. "'Minds' in 'Homer': A Quantitative Psycholinguistic Comparison of the Iliad and Odyssey; or Lexical Frequency Analyses of Homeric noos (νόος), thymos (θυμός), psyche (ψυχή), phrenes (φρένες), prapides (πῤῥάπιδες), kardia (κᾶρδίᾱ), kradie (κῤῥᾷῃ), ker (κῆρ), and etor (ἤτορ), in Contrast to Alleged English-Equivalents Amongst Seventeen Dual-Work Translators." PhD diss., University of Maryland, 2021.
- Deenick, Carl. "Priest and King or Priest-King in 1 Samuel 2:35." *WTJ* 73 (2011): 325–39.
- Deidun, J. T. "New Covenant Morality in Paul." *Analecta Biblica* 89. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1981.

- Dennison, William D. "Indicative and Imperative: The Basic Structure of Pauline Ethics." *CTJ* 14 (1979): 55–78.
- DeSilva, David A. *Transformation: The Heart of Paul's Gospel*. Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2014.
- Dever, William G. "Archaeology and The Question of Sources in Kings." Pages 517–528 in *The Books of Kings: Sources, Composition, Historiography, and Reception*. Edited by Baruch Halpern and André Lemaire. VTSupp 129. Leiden, NL: Brill, 2010.
- . "Asherah, Consort of Yahweh? New Evidence from Kuntillet Ajrûd." *BASOR* 255 (1984): 21–37.
- . *Beyond the Texts: An Archaeological Portrait of Ancient Israel and Judah*. Atlanta, GA: SBL, 2017.
- Diggle, James, *CGL*. Edited by B. L. Fraser, Patrick James, O. B. Simkin, A. A. Thompson, and S. J. Westripp. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2021.
- Dijkstra, Meindert. "The Ivory Beds and Houses of Samaria in Amos." Pages 178–195 in *Image, Text, Exegesis: Iconographic Interpretation and the Hebrew Bible*. Edited by Izaak J. de Hulster and Joel M. LeMon. LHBOTS 588. London: Bloomsbury, 2014.
- Dillon, Richard J. "The Spirit as Taskmaster and Troublemaker in Romans 8." *CBQ* 60 (1998): 682–702.
- Diodorus Siculus. *Library of History, Volume I: Books 1–2*. Translated by C. H. Oldfather. LCL 279. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1933.
- Dodson, Derek S., and Katherine E. Smith, eds. *Exploring Biblical Backgrounds: A Reader in Historical and Literary Contexts*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2018.
- Du Plessis, P. J. "The Concept of Pneuma in The Theology of Paul." *Neot* 3 (1969): 9–20.
- Dunn, James D. G. *The New Perspectives on Paul*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2008.
- . *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*. New York, NY: T & T Clark, 2003.
- Duvall, J. Scott. "Pauline Lexical Choice Revisited: A Paradigmatic Analysis of Selected Terms of Exhortation in Galatians 5 and 6." *EFN* 8.13 (1994): 17–32.
- Dvorak, James D. "Evidence that Commands a Verdict": Determining the Semantics of Imperatives in the New Testament." *BGAL* 7 (2018): 201–233.
- Dyrness, William. *Themes in Old Testament Theology*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 1977.

- Eichrodt, Walther. *Theology of the Old Testament*. Vol. 1. Edited by Peter Ackroyd. Translated by J. A. Baker. OTL 2. Philadelphia, PA: The Westminster Press, 1961.
- Ellis, E. Earle. *The Old Testament in Early Christianity: Canon and Interpretation in the light of Modern Research*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019.
- . “True and False Wisdom (1:10–4:21).” In *1 Corinthians: A Commentary*, 45–188. London: Bloomsbury, 2022.
- Emerton, John A. “The Biblical High Place in the Light of Recent Study.” *PEQ* 129 (1997): 116–132.
- Engberg-Pedersen, Troels. *Cosmology and Self in the Apostle Paul: The Material Spirit*. Oxford, UK: University Press, 2010.
- . “Introduction.” Pages 1–16 in Engberg-Pedersen, *Paul Beyond the Judaism/Hellenism Divide*.
- , ed. *Paul Beyond the Judaism/Hellenism Divide*. 1st ed. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2001.
- Ermatinger, Cliff. *Following the Footsteps of the Invisible: The Complete Works of Diadochus of Photike*. Introduction, Translation, and Notes by Cliff Ermatinger. CSS Book 239. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2010.
- Eusebius. *Ecclesiastical History, Volume I: Books 1-5*. Translated by Kirsopp Lake. Loeb Classical Library 153. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926.
- Evagrius, Ponticus and John Eudes Bamberger. *The Praktikos: Chapters on Prayer*. Trappist, KY: Cistercian Publications, 1972.
- Eyo, Ubong E. “Jesus’ Principles of Breaking Barriers: A Reflection of John 4:3-42.” *Engendering Peace or Violence in Nigeria: SA Trajectory of Biblical Hermeneutics* 1 (2018): 97-112.
- Fantin, Joseph D. “May the Force Be with You: Volition, Direction, and Force: A Communicative Approach to the Imperative Mood.” *BAGL* 7 (2018): 173–199.
- Fantin, Joseph D. *The Greek Imperative Mood in the New Testament: A Cognitive and Communicative Approach*. New York: NY: Peter Lang, 2010.
- Fee, Gordon D. *God’s Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2011.
- Ferguson, Everett. *Backgrounds of Early Christianity*, 3rd ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003.

- Fields, Weston W. "Understanding the Difficult Words of Jesus." *GTJ* 5 (1941): 271-288.
- Firth, David G. *Including the Stranger: Foreigners in the Former Prophets*. NSBT 50. London, UK: Apollos; Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2019.
- Firth, J. B. *The Letters of the Younger Pliny*. 2 vols. London, UK: Walter Scott, 1900.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins, Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Flannery, Kent V., and Joyce Marcus. *Reader in Archaeological Theory: Post-Processual and Cognitive Approaches*. Edited by David S. Whitley. London: Routledge, 1998.
- Fontaine, Petrus Franciscus Maria. *Dualism in Ancient Iran, India, and China*. Vol. 5 of *The Light and The Dark: A Cultural History of Dualism*. Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben, 1990.
- Friesen, Steven J. "Poverty in Pauline Studies: Beyond the So-called New Consensus." *JSNT* 26, no. 3 (2004): 323-361.
- Fullilove, William B. "1–2 Kings." Pages 174–192. In *A Biblical-Theological Introduction to the Old Testament: The Gospel Promised*. Edited by Miles V. Van Pelt. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2016.
- Furnish, Paul V. *Theology and Ethics in Paul*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2009.
- Gangel, Kenneth O. *John*. HNTC, vol. 4. Nashville, TN: B &H, 2000.
- Gardner, Paul D. *1 Corinthians*. ZECNT. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2018.
- Gese, H. *Essays on Biblical Theology*. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg, 1981.
- Gieschen, Charles A. "Body, Self, and Spirit: The Meaning of Paul's Anthropological Terminology in 1 Thessalonians 5:23." Pages 85–100 in *The Press of the Text*. Edited by Andrew H. Bartelt, Jeffrey Kloha, and Paul R. Raabe. Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2017.
- Ginsberg, H. L. "Lexicographical Notes." Pages 71–82 in *Hebräische Wortforschung: Festschrift zum 80. Geburtstag von W. Baumgartner*. Edited by Benedikt Hartmann, Ernst Jenni, E. Y. Kutscher, Victor Maag, I. L. Seeligmann, and Rudolf Smend. VTSup 16. Leiden: Brill, 1967.
- Gjermundsen, Gunnar. "The Spiritual Senses and the Problem of *Transcendence*." *SSCS* 23, no. 2 (2023): 295-315.
- Glissmann, Volker. *Out of Exile, Not Out of Babylon: The Diaspora Theology of the Golah*. Luwina, MW: Mzuni Press, 2019.

- Goldingay, John. *The Theology of Jeremiah: The Book, the Man, the Message*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2021.
- Goodman, Martin. "Messianism and Politics in The Land of Israel, 66– 135 C.E." Pages 149–157 in *Redemption and Resistance: The Messianic Hopes of Jews and Christians in Antiquity*. Edited by Markus Bockmuehl, and Paget, James Carleton. London, UK: Bloomsbury, 2007.
- Goodwin, D. R. "On the Use of ψυχή and πνεῦμα and Connected Words in the Sacred Writings." *JSBLE* 1.2 (1881): 73–86.
- Gorman, Mark. "Timothy Pawl, In Defense of Conciliar Christology: A Philosophical Essay." *EJPR*. 10.4 (2018): 214
- Greek Epic Fragments: From the Seventh to the Fifth Centuries BC*. Edited and translated by Martin L. West. LCL 497. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003.
- Green, Joel B., and Lee Martin McDonald. "Setting the Context: Roman Hellenism." In *The World of the New Testament: Cultural, Social, and Historical Contexts*. Edited by Joel B. Green and Lee Martin McDonald, 101–103. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2013.
- Gregersen, Niels Henrik. "Introduction: J. Wentzel van Huyssteen and Interdisciplinary Theology." Pages 10–25 in *Human Origins and the Image of God: Essays in Honor of J. Wentzel van Huyssteen*. Edited by Daniel Pedersen and Christopher Lilley. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2017.
- Grindheim, Sigurd. "Wisdom for the Perfect: Paul's Challenge to the Corinthian Church (1 Corinthians 2:6-16)." *JBL* 121 (2002): 689–709.
- Guinther, Peter A. "Μέλος, A Significant Anthropological Term in Understanding Romans 7:14–8:8." PhD Diss., Regent University, 2019.
- Gutierrez, Ben. *Living Out the Mind of Christ: Practical Keys to Discovering and Applying the Mind of Christ in Everyday Life*. Virginia Beach, VA: Innovate Church, 2011.
- Gundry, Robert H. *Soma in Biblical Theology: With Emphasis on Pauline Anthropology*. SNTMS 29. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Harper, Albert F, ed. *Romans Through 1 and 2 Corinthians*. NBBC 8. Kansas City, MO: The Foundry Publishing, 2011.
- Harris, R. Laird, Gleason L. Archer Jr., and Bruce K. Waltke, eds. *TWOT*. Chicago, IL: Moody Press, 1999.
- Harvey, John D. *Romans*. EGGNT. Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman: 2017.

- Hatch, Edwin. "On Psychological Terms in Biblical Greek." *Essays in Biblical Greek*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1889.
- Hecht, Stephan. "The "Inner Man"—Fundamental Concept of Pauline Anthropology?" *BA* 12 (2022): 279–294.
- Hellerman, Joseph H. *Philippians*. Andreas J. Köstenberger, Robert W. Yarbrough, eds. *EGGNT*. Nashville: B & H Publishers, 2015.
- Henderson, Suzanne Watts. *Christology and Discipleship in the Gospel of Mark*. Vol. 135. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Homer. *Homeric Hymns. Homeric Apocrypha. Lives of Homer*. Edited and translated by Martin L. West. LCL 496. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003.
- Homer. *Odyssey, Volume I: Books 1–12*. Translated by A. T. Murray. Revised by George E. Dimock. LCL 104. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1919.
- . *Odyssey, Volume II: Books 13–24*. Translated by A. T. Murray. Revised by George E. Dimock. LCL 105. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1919.
- Horn, Friedrich Wilhelm. *Das Angeld des Geistes: Studien zur paulinischen Pneumatologie*. Göttingen, Germany: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992.
- Horne, Thomas Hartwell. *An Introduction to The Critical Study and Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures*. Vol. 1. New York, NY: R. Carter & Brothers, 1852.
- Kahane, Ahuvia, and Martin Mueller. "The Chicago Homer." Edited by Craig Berry and Bill Parod. Translated by Daryl Hine and Richard Lattimore. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, Electronic Publications/Northwestern University Library, 2001. <https://homer.library.northwestern.edu/>.
- Keener, Craig S. *The Mind of the Spirit Paul's Approach to Transformed Thinking*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2016.
- Kirmayer, Laurence J., Carol M. Worthman, and Shinobu Kitayama. "Introduction: Co-Constructing Culture, Mind, and Brain." Pages 1–50 in *Culture, Mind, and Brain: Emerging Concepts, Models, and Applications*. Edited by Laurence J. Kirmayer, Carol M. Worthman, Shinobu Kitayama, Robert Lemelson, and Constance A. Cummings. Current Perspectives in Social and Behavioral Sciences. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2020.
- Kittel, Gerhard, and Gerhard Friedrich. *TDNT*. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids, IL: Eerdmans, 1964–1976.
- . *TDNT Abridged in One Volume*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1995.



- Köhler, Ludwig, Walter Baumgartner, M. E. J. Richardson, and Johann Jakob Stamm. *HALOT*. 4 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1994–2000.
- Jacoby, Hermann. *Neutestamentliche Ethik*. Königsberg: Thomas & Oppermann, 1899.
- Jenni, Ernst, and Claus Westermann. *TLOT*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1997.
- Jewett, Robert. *Paul's Anthropological Terms: A Study of Their Use in Conflict Settings*. AGJU 10. Leiden: Brill Archive, 1971.
- Jobes, Karen H. *1, 2, and 3 John*. ZECNT 19. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2014.
- . *1 Peter*. BECNT. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2005.
- . *Letters to the Church: A Survey of Hebrews and the General Epistles*, HarperCollins Christian Publishing, 2011.
- Jobes, Karen H., and Moisés Silva. *Invitation to the Septuagint*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic. 2015.
- Johnson, Aubrey. *The Vitality of The Individual in The Thought of Ancient Israel*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2006.
- Johnson, Randall. “The Doctrine of Analogy and Christ's Human Nature.” *JETS* 64 (2021): 147–62.
- Jones, Peter. “Paul Confronts Paganism in the Church: A Case Study of First Corinthians 15:45.” *JETS* 49, no. 4 (2006): 713–37.
- Josephus. *Jewish Antiquities, Volume I: Books 1-3*. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray. LCL 242. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1930.
- . *Jewish Antiquities, Volume VI: Books 14-15*. Translated by Ralph Marcus, Allen Wikgren. LCL 489. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1943.
- . *Jewish Antiquities, Volume V: Books 12-13*. Translated by Ralph Marcus. LCL 365. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1943.
- . *Jewish Antiquities, Volume VI: Books 14-15*. Translated by Ralph Marcus, Allen Wikgren. LCL 489. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1943.
- . *Jewish Antiquities, Volume VIII: Book 18*. Translated by Louis H. Feldman. LCL 433. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1965.
- . *Jewish Antiquities, Volume IX: Book 20*. Translated by Louis H. Feldman. LCL 456. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1965.

- . *The Jewish War, Volume I: Books 1-2*. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray. LCL 203. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1927.
- . *The Jewish War, Volume II: Books 3-4*. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray. LCL 487. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1927.
- . *The Jewish War, Volume III: Books 5-7*. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray. LCL 487. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1927.
- Keener, Craig S. *The Mind of the Spirit Paul's Approach to Transformed Thinking*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2016.
- Klein, Ernest. Edited by Baruch Sarel. *A Comprehensive Etymological Dictionary of the Hebrew Language for Readers of English*. Jerusalem: The University of Haifa, 1987.
- Klinghoffer, David. *Why the Jews Rejected Jesus: The Turning Point in Western History*. 1st ed. New York: Doubleday, 2005.
- Kohl, Philip L. "Symbolic Cognitive Archaeology: A New Loss of Innocence." *Dialectical Anthropology* 9 (1985): 105–17.
- Kruidenier, William M. and Kenneth Boa. *Romans*. HNTC. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2000.
- Laird, Benjamin. "Religion in the Greco-Roman World." Video lecture in NBST 800 at Liberty University, Lynchburg, VA, February 17, 2023.
- Lambert, David A. "James Barr and the State of the Biblical Lexicon." Pages 90–114. *James Barr Assessed: Evaluating His Legacy over the Last Sixty Years*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter. Biblical Interpretation Series 192. Leiden: Brill, 2021.
- Lamont, Jessica L. *In Blood and Ashes: Curse Tablets and Binding Spells in Ancient Greece*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2023.
- Lampe, Geoffrey W. H., ed. *PGL*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961.
- Lea, Thomas D., and David Alan Black. *The New Testament: Its Background and Message*. 2nd ed. Nashville, TN: B&H, 2003.
- Lee, Sug-Ho. "An Exegetical-Theological Consideration of the Hardening of the Jewish Religious Leaders' Hearts in Mark 3:1-6." *Verbum et Ecclesia* 27 (2006): 596–613.
- Levison, Jack. *A Boundless God: The Spirit According to the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2020.
- Lewis, John G. *Looking for Life: The Role of "Theo-Ethical Reasoning" In Paul's Religion*. JSNTSup 291. London: T & T Clark, 2005.

- Liddell, Henry George, Robert Scott, Henry Stuart Jones, and Roderick McKenzie. *LSJ*, 9th ed. Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press, 1996.
- Limone, Vito. "The Christian Conception of the Body and Paul's Use of the Term *Sōma* in 1 Corinthians." Pages 191–206 in *A History of Mind and Body in Late Antiquity*. Edited by Anna Marmodoro and Sophie Cartwright. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018.
- Loftin, R. Keith, and Joshua R. Farris, eds. *Christian Physicalism? Philosophical Theological Criticisms*. Lanham, UK: Lexington Books, 2017.
- Longenecker, Bruce W., and Todd D. Still. *Thinking through Paul: An Introduction to His Life, Letters, and Theology*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2014.
- Longenecker, Richard N. *The Epistle to the Romans*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016.
- Loudovikos, Nicholas. "Hell and Heaven, Nature and Person: Christos Yannaras, Dumitru Stăniloae, and Maximus the Confessor." *IJOT* 5 (2014): 9-32.
- Louw, Johannes P., and Eugene Albert Nida. *L&N*. New York: United Bible Societies, 1996.
- Lucius Annaeus Seneca. *Ad Lucilium Epistulae Morales*. Translated by Richard M. Gummere. London: Heinemann, 1917.
- Lüdemann, Hermann. *Die Anthropologie des Apostels Paulus und ihre Stellung innerhalb seiner Heilslehre: nach den vier Hauptbriefen*. Kiel: Universitäts-Buchhandlung, 1872.
- Luther, Martin. *The Table Talk of Martin Luther*. Edited by Thomas S. Kepler. New York: World Publishing, 1952.
- Lys, Daniel. "The Israelite Soul According to the LXX." *VT* 16, no. 2 (1966): 181–228.
- MacDonald, Paul S. *History of the Concept of Mind: Speculations about Soul, Mind and Spirit from Homer to Hume, vol. 1*. London: Routledge, 2017.
- Madsen, Thorvald B., II, "Indicative and Imperative in Paul and Ancient Judaism: A Comparative Study." PhD Diss., University of Aberdeen, 1998.
- Malafouris, Lambros. *How Things Shape the Mind: A Theory of Material Engagement*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2013.
- Mangum, Douglas, Derek R. Brown, Rachel Klippenstein, and Rebekah Hurst, eds. *LTW*. Lexham Bible Reference Series. Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2014.
- Marcinkowska-Rosół, Maria, and Sven Sellmer. "The Mind as Container. A Study of a Metaphor in Homer and Hesiod with a Parallel Analysis of the Sanskrit Epics." *Mnemosyne* 75 (2021): 1–25.

- Marshall, I. Howard. "Living in the 'Flesh.'" *Bibliotheca Sacra* 159 (2002): 387–403.
- Martin, Dale B. *The Corinthian Body*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1995.
- Martin, Troy W. "Paul's Pneumatological Statements and Ancient Medical Texts." Pages 105–106 in *The New Testament and Early Christian Literature in Greco-Roman Context: Studies in Honor of David E. Aune*. Edited by John Fotopoulos. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Martinez, Florentino Garcia. *Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*. Edited by Martinez, F. Garcia, and E. J. C. Tigchelaar. Leiden, NL: Brill, 1999.
- Mathews, Susan F. "Toward Reclaiming an Authentic Biblical-Christian View of the Body." *TLQ* 68 (2001): 277–295.
- Meeks, Wayne A. "Corinthian Christians as Artificial Aliens." Pages 129–138 in Engberg-Pederson, *Paul Beyond the Judaism/Hellenism Divide*.
- Meyer, Ben F. "Did Paul's View of the Resurrection of the Dead Undergo Development?" *TS* 47 (1986): 363–387.
- Montanari, Franco. *MGS*. Edited by Madeleine Goh and Chad Schroeder. Leiden: Brill, 2015.
- Moo, D. *The Epistle to the Romans*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.
- Mounce, Robert. *Romans: An Exegetical and Theological Exposition of Holy Scripture*. Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 1995.
- Mounce, William D. *MCED*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2006.
- Maximus the Confessor. *On the Cosmic Mystery of Jesus Christ: Selected Writings from St Maximus the Confessor*. Edited by John Behr. Translated by Paul M. Blowers and Robert Louis Wilken. Volume 25. PPS. Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2003.
- . "Chapters on Knowledge." Second Century, chapter 83. In *Maximus Confessor: Selected Writings*. Edited by John Farina, 165. Translated by George C. Berthold. TCWS. New York; Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1985.
- McBride, S. D. "The Yoke of the Kingdom: An Exposition of Deuteronomy 6:4–5." *Int* 27.3 (1973): 273–306.
- McCabe, Herbert. "Knowledge." In Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*. Appendix 1, vol. 3. *Knowing and Naming God*. Translated by Herbert McCabe. London, Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1964.
- McConville, J. Gordon. *Being Human in God's World: An Old Testament Theology of Humanity*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2016.

- McIntosh, Mark. "Faith, Reason, and the Mind of Christ." Pages 119–142 in *Reason and the Reasons of Faith*. Edited by Paul J. Griffiths and Reinhard Hütter, New York, NY: T & T Clark International, 2005.
- Melick, Richard R. *Philippians, Colossians, Philemon*. Vol. 32. NAC. Nashville, TN: B&H, 1991.
- Menuge, Angus. "Christian Physicalism and Our Knowledge of God." Pages 75–98 in Loftin and Farris.
- Meyer, Heinrich August Wilhelm. *Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Gospel of John*. Edited by Frederick Crombie. Translated by William Urwick. CECNT 1. Edinburgh, UK: T&T Clark, 1874.
- . *Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Gospel of Matthew*. Edited by Frederick Crombie. Translated by Peter Christie. CECNT 1. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1880.
- Mihaila, Corin. "The Greco-Roman Rhetoric Background of Sophia in 1 Corinthians 1-4." *PTJ* 17 (2019): 15-26.
- Mmuoebonam, Kenneth. "Nous Christou and Communal Transformation: A Rhetorical and Literary Reading of 1 Cor 2: 16." PhD diss., Boston College. School of Theology and Ministry, 2017.
- Morris, Leon. *The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians: An Introduction and Commentary*, vol. 7. TNTC. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1985.
- Moyise, Steve, and Maarten J.J. Menken. *Isaiah in the New Testament: The New Testament and the Scriptures of Israel*. London, UK: Bloomsbury, 2005.
- Nagel, Thomas. *Mind and Cosmos: Why the Materialist Neo-Darwinian Conception of Nature Is Almost Certainly False*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Nägele, Manuel. "Paul's Usage of the Anthropological Term Νοῦς." *NovT* 65 (2023): 330–349.
- Newman, Barclay M. *CGEDNT*. Stuttgart, DE: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2010.
- Newman, Barclay M., and Eugene Albert Nida. *A Handbook on Paul's Letter to the Romans*. UBS. New York, NY: United Bible Societies, 1973.
- Niebuhr, Reinhold. *The Nature and Destiny of Man: A Christian Interpretation*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2021.
- Novakovic, Lidija. "The Scriptures and Scriptural Interpretation." In *The World of the New Testament: Cultural, Social, and Historical Contexts*. Edited by Joel B. Green and Lee Martin McDonald, 84–100. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2013.

- Onians, Richard Broxton. *The Origins of European Thought about the Body, the Mind, the Soul, the World, Time, and Fate: New Interpretations of Greek, Roman and Kindred Evidence Also of Some Basic Jewish and Christian Beliefs*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Origen, *The Song of Songs Commentary and Homilies*. Transcribed by R. P. Lawson. New York: NY, Newman Press, 1956.
- Orr, James, John L. Nuelsen, Edgar Y. Mullins, and Morris O. Evans, eds. *ISBE*. Chicago, IL: The Howard-Severance Company, 1915.
- Osborne, Grant R. *John: Verse by Verse*. Edited by Jeffrey Reimer et al. ONTC. Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2018.
- . *The Hermeneutical Spiral: A Comprehensive Introduction to Biblical Interpretation*, 2nd ed. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2006.
- Osiek, Carolyn. *The Shepherd of Hermas: A Commentary*. Hermeneia. Edited by Helmut Koester. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1999.
- Owen, John. *The Grace and Duty of Being Spiritually Minded: Declared and Practically Improved*. New York: Robert Carter, 1844.
- Pagels, Elaine H. "Pneumatikos-Psychikos Terminology in I Corinthians," *JBL* (1976) 95 (2): 307.
- Parsons, Michael. "Being Precedes Act: Indicative and Imperative in Paul's Writing," *EvQ* 60 (1988): 99–127.
- Patrologia Graeca. Edited by J.-P. Migne. 162 vols. Paris, 1857–1886.
- Pawl, Timothy. "The Content of Conciliar Christology." In *In Defense of Conciliar Christology: A Philosophical Essay*, First edition, 11–28. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2016.
- Pazdan, M. M. "Nicodemus and The Samaritan Woman: Contrasting Models of Discipleship." *BTB* 17 (1987): 145-148.
- Pearson, Birger A. *The Pneumatikos-Psychikos Terminology In 1 Corinthians: A Study in The Theology of The Corinthian Opponents of Paul and Its Relation to Gnosticism*. Missoula, MT, SBL, 1973.
- Perrin, Nicholas. "The Imperial Cult." Pages 124–134 in *The World of the New Testament: Cultural, Social, and Historical Contexts*. Edited by Joel B. Green and Lee Martin McDonald. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2013.
- Pharr, Clyde. "The Testimony of Josephus to Christianity." *The American Journal of Philology* 48.2 (1927): 137–47.

- Philo. *Allegorical Interpretation* 70. Translated by F. H. Colson, G. H. Whitaker, and J. W. Earp, vol. 1, Chapter XXII. LCL 22. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1929–1962.
- . *Every Good Man is Free*. Translated by F. H. Colson. LCL 363. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1941.
- . *Legat*. Translated by F. H. Colson, et al. LCL 379. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1962.
- . *Leg*. 1, 2, 3. Translated by F. H. Colson, et al. LCL 226. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1929.
- . *On Moses*. Translated by F. H. Colson. LCL 289. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1935.
- . *On the Cherubim. The Sacrifices of Abel and Cain. The Worse Attacks the Better. On the Posterity and Exile of Cain. On the Giants*. Vol. 2. Translated by F. H. Colson, G. H. Whitaker. LCL 227. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1929.
- . *On the Confusion of Tongues. On the Migration of Abraham. Who Is the Heir of Divine Things? On Mating with the Preliminary Studies*. Translated by F. H. Colson, G. H. Whitaker. LCL 261. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1932.
- . *On the Special Laws, Book 4. On the Virtues. On Rewards and Punishments*. Translated by F. H. Colson. LCL 341. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1939.
- Philostratus the Elder, Philostratus the Younger, Callistratus. *Philostratus the Elder, Imagines. Philostratus the Younger, Imagines. Callistratus, Descriptions*. Translated by Arthur Fairbanks. LCL 256. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1931.
- Piper, John. “The Renewed Mind and How to Have it.” *Desiring God Foundation*. August 15, 2004.
- . *Think*. Westmont, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2013.
- Plato. *Republic*. Volume II: Books 6-10. Edited and translated by Christopher Emlyn-Jones and William Preddy. LCL 276. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2013.
- Pleijel, Richard. “To Be or to Have a Nephesh?” *ZAW* 131 (2019): 194–206.
- Plutarch. *Lives, Volume VII: Alexander and Caesar*. Translated by Bernadotte Perrin. LCL 99. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1919.
- . *Moralia, Volume V: Isis and Osiris*. Translated by Frank Cole Babbitt. LCL 306. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1936.

- . *Quaestiones Convivales*, 5.7.6. Translated by William W. Goodwin, PhD. Boston, MA: Little, Brown, and Company, Cambridge, UK: Press of John Wilson and Son, 1874.
- Porter, Stanley E. “Aspect and Imperatives Once More.” *BAGL* 7 (2018): 141–172.
- . “The Greek of The Jews and Early Christians: The Language of The People from A Historical Sociolinguistic Perspective.” Pages 350–364 in *Far from Minimal: Celebrating the Work and Influence of Philip R. Davies*. Edited by Duncan Burns and John W. Rogerson. New York: Bloomsbury, 2014.
- Porter, Stanley E., and Matthew Brook O'Donnell, eds. *BAGL*. 7 vols. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2018.
- Porter, Stanley E. and Francis G. H., Pang, eds. *The Letter to the Romans: Exegesis and Application*. Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2018.
- Posey, David A. “The Unifying Theme of The Mind of Christ in Philippians Demonstrated by Paul’s Use of Rhetorical and Linguistic Devices in Oral/Aural Culture.” PhD Diss., Liberty University, 2018.
- Prassas, D. D. “Taming the Thoughts in the Writings of Maximos the Confessor.” *JSCFC* 14 (2021): 31-47.
- Pratt, Richard L. *I & II Corinthians*. Vol. 7. HNTC. Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 2000.
- Pratt, Jonathan R. “The Relationship between Justification and Spiritual Fruit in Romans 5–8.” *Themelios* 34 (2009): 175–178.
- Prentiss, Anna Marie, ed. *Handbook of Evolutionary Research in Archaeology*. Cham, CH: Springer, 2019.
- Price, J. Randall, and H. Wayne House. “Introduction to Archaeology and the Old Testament.” Pages 17–41 in *Zondervan Handbook of Biblical Archaeology*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2017.
- . *Zondervan Handbook of Biblical Archaeology*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2017.
- Privitera, Siobhán Marie. “Brain, Body, and World: Cognitive Approaches to the Iliad and the Odyssey.” PhD diss., The University of Edinburgh, 2016.
- Puskas, Charles B. *Hardness of Heart in Biblical Literature: Failure and Refusal*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2022.
- Rabens, Volker. “The Development of Pauline Pneumatology.” *BZ* 43 (1999): 161–179.
- . *The Holy Spirit and Ethics in Paul: Transformation and Empowering for Religious-Ethical Life*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.



- Rea, John. "Hardness of Heart." In *The Wycliffe Bible Encyclopedia*. Edited by Charles F. Pfeiffer and Howard F. Vos., electronic edition. Chicago, IL: Moody Press, 1975.
- Reynolds, Stefan Gillow. *Living with the Mind of Christ: Mindfulness in Christian Spirituality*. London: Darton, Longman, and Todd, 2016.
- Rice, David G., and John E. Stambaugh. *Sources for the Study of Greek Religion, Corrected Edition*. Atlanta, GA: SBL, 2009.
- Rocca, Julius. Review of *Neurological Concepts in Ancient Greek Medicine*, by Thomas M. Walshe. *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 91 (2017): 125-126.
- Roth, Martha T. *CAD*. Edited by Robert D. Biggs, John A. Brinkman, Miguel Civil, Walter Farber, and Erica Reiner. The Oriental Institute, Chicago IL, and J.J. Augustin Verlagsbuchhandlung, Glockstadt, Germany, 1956.
- Sanders, James A. "A Disciple in Damascus." *BTB* 2018 48:1, 34-39.
- Schrage, Wolfgang. *Der erste Brief an die Korinther (1 Kor 1, 1–6, 11)*. EKKNT 7/1. Zurich, CH: Benziger Verlag, 1991.
- Schmidt, Werner. "Anthropologische Begriffe im Alten Testament." *EvT* 24 (1964): 374-388.
- Schreiner, Thomas R. *1 Corinthians: An Introduction and Commentary*. TNTC. Westmont, IL: IVP, 2014.
- . *1, 2 Peter, Jude*. NAC 37. Nashville, TN: B&H, 2003.
- . *Romans*. BECNT. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2018.
- Siculus, Diodorus. "Diodori Bibliotheca Historica, Vol 1-2." Edited by Immanuel Bekker, Bibliotheca Historica. Medford, MA: in aedibus B. G. Teubneri, 1888–1890.
- Sigvartsen, Jan A. *Afterlife and Resurrection Beliefs in the Pseudepigrapha*. JCTC 29. New York: T&T Clark, 2019.
- Silva, Moisés. *Biblical Words and Their Meaning: An Introduction to Lexical Semantics*. Zondervan, 1994.
- . *NIDNTTE*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2014.
- . *Philippians*. BECNT. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1993.
- Simmons, William A. *Peoples of the New Testament World: An Illustrated Guide*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2008.

- Sloan, David B. "Verbal Uses of The Perfect Participle in Luke-Acts." PhD diss., The Ohio State University, 2009.
- Sophocles. *Antigone. The Women of Trachis. Philoctetes. Oedipus at Colonus*. Edited and translated by Hugh Lloyd-Jones. LCL 21. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994.
- Spicq, Ceslas, and James D. Ernest. *Theological Lexicon of the New Testament*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1994.
- Sproul, R. C. *The Consequences of Ideas: Understanding the Concepts That Shaped Our World*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2000.
- Stacey, W. David. *The Pauline View of Man in Relation to its Judaic and Hellenistic Background*. London, UK: Macmillan, 1956.
- Stamps, Robert Lucas. "'Thy Will Be Done': A Dogmatic Defense of Dyothelitism in Light of Recent Monothelite Proposals." PhD diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2014.
- Stripling, Scott, Gershon Galil, Ivana Kumpova, Jaroslav Valach, Pieter Gertvander Veen, and Daniel Vavrik. "You Are Cursed by God Yhw: An Early Hebrew Inscription from Mt. Ebal." *Heritage Science* 11 (2023): 1–24.
- Stott, John, and Dale Larsen. *Reading Romans with John Stott: 10 Weeks for Individuals or Groups*. Westmont: InterVarsity Press, 2016.
- Swete, Henry Barclay. *The Old Testament in Greek: According to the Septuagint*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909.
- Suetonius. *Lives of the Caesars: Augustus*. Translated by J. C. Rolfe. Introduction by K. R. Bradley. LCL 31. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1914.
- Sullivan, Shirley D. *Psychological Activity in Homer: A Study of Phrēn*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1988.
- Swanson, James. *Dictionary of Biblical Languages with Semantic Domains: Greek (New Testament)*. Oak Harbor, WA: Logos Research Systems, 1997.
- . *Dictionary of Biblical Languages with Semantic Domains: Hebrew (Old Testament)*. Oak Harbor, WA: Logos Research Systems, 1997.
- Tacitus. *Historiae*. Translated by Clifford H. Moore. LCL 111. 3 vols. Edited by Jeffrey Henderson. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1925.
- . *Annals*. Translated by J. Jackson. LCL 322. 4 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1937.

- Tanner, Norman P. *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*. London: Sheed & Ward, 1990.
- Tawil, Hayim. *An Akkadian Lexical Companion for Biblical Hebrew: Etymological-Semantic and Idiomatic Equivalents with Supplement on Biblical Aramaic*. New York, NY: KTAV, 2017.
- Taylor, John L. Review of *Whatever Happened to the Soul? Scientific and Theological Portraits of the Human Soul*, edited by Warren S. Brown, Nancy Murphy, H. Newton Maloney. *Themelios* 25.2 (2000): 114.
- Taylor, Mark. *I Corinthians*. Edited by E. Ray Clendenen, vol. 28. NAC. Nashville, TN: B&H Publishing Group, 2014.
- Tan, Randall, and David A. DeSilva. *LES*. Logos Bible Software, 2009.
- Tcherikover, V. *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews*. Translated by S. Applebaum. New York, NY: Atheneum, 1975.
- Ter Ern Loke, Andrew. "On Dyothelitism Versus Monothelitism: The Divine Preconscious Model." *HeyJ* 57 (2016): 135–41.
- The Ante-Nicene Fathers*. Edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. 1885–1887. 10 vols. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994.
- The Apostolic Fathers, Volume II: Epistle of Barnabas. Papias and Quadratus. Epistle to Diognetus. The Shepherd of Hermas*. Edited and translated by Bart D. Ehrman. LCL 25. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003.
- Thiselton, Anthony C. "Hebrews." Pages 1451–1482 in *Eerdmans Commentary on the Bible*. Edited by James D. G. Dunn and John W. Rogerson. Grand Rapids, MI; Eerdmans, 2003.
- . *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Thompson, E. F. *METANOEOQ and METAMEAEI in Greek Literature until 100 AD, including Discussion of their Cognates and of their Hebrew Equivalents*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1908.
- Thornhill, A. Chadwick. *Greek for Everyone: Introductory Greek for Bible Study and Application*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 2016.
- Tresham, Aaron. "The Languages Spoken by Jesus." *MSJ* 20 (2009): 71–94.
- Tripp, Jeffrey M. "Claiming Ignorance and Intimidating Witnesses: Reading John 9 in Greco-Roman Forensic Context." *CBQ* 80 (2018): 470-490.

- Tronier, Henrik. "The Corinthian Correspondence Between Philosophical Idealism and Apocalypticism." Pages 165–1965 in Engberg-Pederson, *Paul Beyond the Judaism/Hellenism Divide*.
- Trost, Travis Darren. *Who Should Be King in Israel?: A Study on Roman Imperial Politics, the Dead Sea Scrolls, and the Fourth Gospel*. New York, NY: Peter Lang, 2010.
- Trull, Gregory V. "Peter's Interpretation of Psalm 16:8–11 in Acts 2:25-32." *BSac* 161 (2004): 432-48.
- Van der Deijl, Aarnoud R. *Protest or Propaganda: War in the Old Testament Book of Kings and in Contemporaneous Ancient Near Eastern Texts*. Leiden, NL: Brill, 2008.
- Van der Merwe, Dirk G. "Pauline Rhetoric and the Discernment of the Wisdom of God According to 1 Corinthians 2," *JECH* 3.2 (2013), 108-132.
- Van Kooten, George H. "Christianity in the Graeco-Roman World: Socio-political, Philosophical, and Religious Interactions Up to the Edict of Milan (ce 313)." Pages 3–37 in *The Routledge Companion to Early Christian Thought*. New York, NY: Routledge, 2009.
- . *Paul's Anthropology in Context. The Image of God, Assimilation to God, and Tripartite Man in Ancient Judaism, Ancient Philosophy and Early Christianity*. Tübingen, DE: Mohr Siebeck 2008.
- Van Rensburg, Fika J. Janse. "Metaphors In the Soteriology in 1 Peter: Identifying and Interpreting the Salvific Imageries." Pages 409–435 in *Salvation in the New Testament: Perspectives on Soteriology*. Edited by Jan G. van der Watt. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Van Unnik, W. C. *Sparsa Collecta: The Collected Essays of W. C. Van Unnik. Part Four: Neotestamentica - Flavius Josephus – Patristica*. Edited by Pieter der Horst, W. van Unnik, and Cilliers Breytenbach. NovTSup 156. Leiden: Brill, 2014.
- Van Wolde, Ellen. "A Network of Conventional and Deliberate Metaphors in Psalm 22." *JSOT* 44 (2020): 642–666.
- VanGemeren, Willem. *NIDOTTE*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1997.
- Vine, W. E., Merrill F. Unger, and William White. "Know." *VEDBW*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 2000.
- Virgil. *Aeneid*. Translated by H. Rushton Fairclough. Revised by G. P. Goold. LCL 63. 6 vols. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1916.
- . *Eclogues*. Translated by H. Rushton Faircloth. Edited by Jeffrey Henderson. LCL 63, 10 vols. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1916.

- Walshe, Thomas M., III. "Ancient Greek Ideas of Cognition." In *Neurological Concepts in Ancient Greek Medicine*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2016.
- Waltke, Bruce K. *The Book of Proverbs 15-31*. NICOT. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2005.
- Waltke, Bruce K., and Charles Yu. *An Old Testament Theology: An Exegetical, Canonical, and Thematic Approach*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2007.
- Walton, John H. *Ancient Near Eastern Thought and the Old Testament: Introducing the Conceptual World of the Hebrew Bible*, 2nd Edition. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2018.
- Ware, James. "Paul's Understanding of the Resurrection in 1 Corinthians 15: 36–54." *JBL* 133 (2014): 809–835.
- Watson, Francis. *Text and Truth: Redefining Biblical Theology*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1997.
- Wicks, Henry J. *The Doctrine of God in the Jewish Apocryphal and Apocalyptic Literature*. London, UK: Hunter & Longhurst, 1915.
- Widder, Wendy L. "Introduction to Linguistics and the Bible." In *Linguistics & Biblical Exegesis*, ed. Douglas Mangum and Josh Westbury. Vol. 2. Lexham Methods Series. Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2016.
- Williams, Theodore C. *The Aeneid of Vergil*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1910.
- Williamson, Paul R. *Sealed with an Oath: Covenant in God's Unfolding Purpose*. NSBT 23. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press; London: Apollos, 2007.
- Winger, Michael. "The Meaning of Πνεῦμα in the Letters of Paul: A Linguistic Analysis of Sense and Reference." *CBQ* (2016): 706–725.
- Wiseman, D. J. "The Vassal-Treaties of Esarhaddon." *Iraq* 20 (1958): i–99.
- Wolff, Hans Walter. *Anthropology of the Old Testament*. Translated by Margaret Kohl. Fortress Press, Philadelphia, PA, 1974.
- Wright, Brian J. "Ancient Literacy in New Testament Research: Incorporating a Few More Lines of Enquiry." *TJ* 36, no. 2 (2015): 161–89.
- Wright, Jessica. "Preaching Phrenitis: Augustine's Medicalization of Religious Difference." *J ECS* 28 (2020): 525–553.
- Wright, Walter C. "The Source of Paul's Concept of Pneuma." *CBQ* 41 (1983): 17–26.

Wynn, Thomas Grant, and Frederick L. Coolidge. *An Introduction to Evolutionary Cognitive Archaeology*. New York, NY: Routledge, 2022.

Yates, Gary. "True Knowledge of God and The Transformation of The Heart: Worship in Jeremiah and Ezekiel." Pages 256–70 in *Biblical Worship: Theology for God's Glory*. Edited by Benjamin K. Forrest, Walter C. Kaiser, Jr., and Vernon M. Whaley. Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Academic, 2021.

Zodhiates, Spiros, and Warren Patrick Baker, ed. *The Hebrew-Greek Key Word Study Bible: NASB-77 Edition*. Chattanooga, TN: AMG Publishers, 2008.

Zuck, Roy B. *A Biblical Theology of the Old Testament*. Chicago, IL: Moody Press, 1991.