# PAULINE ESCHATOLOGY AND THE WISDOM OF SOLOMON

# THE PROBLEM OF THE DUAL PAULINE ESCHATOLOGY IN LIGHT OF THE ESCHATOLOGY OF THE WISDOM OF SOLOMON

by

MANFRED THEOPHIL BRAUCH, B.A., B.D., Th.M.

A Thesis

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

McMaster University

November, 1972

c Manfred Theophil Brauch 1973

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (1972)
(Religion)

McMASTER UNIVERSITY
Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: The Problem of the Dual Pauline Eschatology in Light of the Eschatology of the Wisdom of Solomon

AUTHOR: Manfred Theophil Brauch, B.A. (Houghton College)
B.D. (North American Baptist Seminary)
Th.M. (Princeton Theological Seminary)

SUPERVISOR: Professor E. P. Sanders

NUMBER OF PAGES: xii, 357

SCOPE AND CONTENTS:

The present study is primarily an attempt to break new ground in a much debated area of Biblical Studies. The Pauline eschatology, with its complexity and diversity in eschatological conceptions and formulations, has called forth a number of scholarly solutions. The apparently unconnected juxtaposition of individualistic and corporate, end-historical eschatological conceptions in the thought of Paul has been accounted for variously as: 1) the result of development from the early to the late Paul under the influence of Hellenism; 2) the result of personal crises which turned his attention away from the end of human history to the end of his personal history; 3) the result of a mind that is unreflective and therefore does not see the contradictoriness. A further attempt at a solution is the non-recognition of the contradictoriness, and a subordination of the undeniable individualistic elements to the corporate eschatological scheme.

None of these solutions were found to be satisfactory to this writer. A careful analysis of the apocryphal work, the Wisdom of Solomon,

revealed the same kind of duality of individual and corporate eschatological perspectives as in Paul. Our study further showed that this duality arises out of a conception of the presence and work of the divine figure of Wisdom in history and in the lives of men, and that this conception provides a strikingly informative background for the Pauline conception of the Christ who is Lord of history and at the same time the personal, intimate, indwelling divine presence. A detailed analysis and comparison of these configurations of like elements in the two writers suggests that Paul was influenced by the Wisdom of Solomon, particularly by that work's conception of the fate of the individual and by its depiction of union with Wisdom as the guarantee of life, both in the present and in the future.

It has always been recognized that Paul, like any other outstanding figure of history, was dependent on streams of thought that crossed the contemporary atmosphere, and that he made use of conceptions from that general environment to give expression to his own experience and thought. But this dependence is usually conceived of in very general terms, such as Paul's dependence on Hellenism, on Apocalypticism, on Rabbinic Judaism, on Diaspora Judaism, on Essenism, etc. Our study demonstrates the possibility that these larger contexts may have provided but a general background, and that Paul was specifically dependent on individual works, such as the Wisdom of Solomon, for central formulations within his theology.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The affirmation that "no man is an island" is particularly true in the area of research and writing. The acknowledgement of my debt to those without whom the completion of this dissertation would have been impossible is therefore both a duty and a privilege.

I am particularly grateful to Dr. E. P. Sanders, my thesis supervisor, for both his personal interest in my progress all along the way, as well as for his academic guidance. The former expressed itself well in the kinds of duties given me while serving as his research and teaching assistant; they were always related to my progress toward the degree, and I was never simply used. Dr. Sanders' academic guidance was especially valuable in terms of critical, incisive questions which, at various stages of this study, set the proper tone for the ongoing research and saved me from the wasted effort and time of "dead end street" pursuits.

I am also grateful to Dr. B. F. Meyer for his encouragement and the contribution of valuable comments, particularly in reference to the early chapters of this thesis. I only regret that circumstances prevented me from benefitting to an even greater degree from Dr. Meyer's insights.

To both of these men I am especially thankful for giving me considerable freedom in the development and completion of this study.

I shall always be indebted to McMaster University and the Canada Council for the generous financial assistance given me in the form of scholarships and doctoral fellowships. And I am thankful for the

opportunity thus provided to engage in a programme of graduate study with a minimum of economic concerns.

Above all, I thank Marjean for standing by me through it all, and Gregory, for trying to be patient with his Daddy's business!

TABLE OF CONTENTS


Page

CHAPTER I THE PROBLEM OF PAULINE ESCHATOLOGY.....1

A. INTRODUCTION.....1

B. THE PROBLEM OF A DICHOTOMY BETWEEN PALESTINIAN JUDAISM AND HELLENISTIC JUDAISM.....2

C. THE PROBLEM OF A DICHOTOMY WITHIN PALESTINIAN JUDAISM.....11

D. DEVELOPMENT IN PAUL'S ESCHATOLOGICAL THOUGHT?.....19

1. The Pressure of Environment.....22
2. The "Delay of the Parousia".....25
3. Personal Crises as Motivating Forces.....26

E. CRITICAL EVALUATION OF DEVELOPMENT THEORIES.....30

F. ATTEMPTS TO RECONCILE DIVERSITY WITHIN PAUL'S ESCHATOLOGICAL THOUGHT.....37

G. THESIS: A DUAL ESCHATOLOGY IN PAUL.....40

CHAPTER II PAUL AND THE WISDOM OF SOLOMON.....47

A. PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS.....47

B. THE WISDOM OF SOLOMON AND PALESTINIAN JUDAISM.....49

C. POINTS OF CONTACT BETWEEN PAUL AND THE WISDOM OF SOLOMON.....60

1. Previous Studies.....60
2. Comparison of Texts and Ideas.....71
   a. The Concept of Predestination.....71
   b. Evaluation of Idolatry.....77
   c. Other Significant Points of Contact.....82

D. CONCLUSIONS.....91

CHAPTER III THE ESCHATOLOGY OF THE WISDOM OF SOLOMON.....92

A. INTRODUCTION.....92

B. ANTHROPOLOGY.....100

Page

C. INDIVIDUAL ESCHATOLOGY....126

1. The Problem of Death....126
2. The Fate of the Individual....137

D. CORPORATE ESCHATOLOGY....179

1. The Historical Perspective....179
2. The Eschatological Judgment....185

E. CONCLUSIONS....192

CHAPTER IV THE DUALITY OF ESCHATOLOGICAL CONCEPTIONS IN PAUL....197

A. INTRODUCTION....197

B. "TO DEPART AND BE WITH CHRIST" (PHIL 1:21-23)....201

1. Exegetical Considerations....201
2. The Interpretation....207
3. Religio-Historical Considerations....215

C. "AWAY FROM THE BODY -- AT HOME WITH THE LORD" (II COR 5:8)....240

CHAPTER V UNION WITH WISDOM / CHRIST AS GUARANTEE OF BOTH INDIVIDUAL AND CORPORATE ESCHATOLOGICAL REALITIES....253

A. INTRODUCTION....253

B. UNION WITH WISDOM AND ITS RESULTS....257

1. The Need and the Gift....257
2. The Nature of Union with Wisdom and its Effects....267

C. CHRIST AND THE WISDOM OF GOD....275

1. Introduction....276
2. General Considerations: The Scholarly Discussion....277
3. The use of the term Sophia....282
4. Texts with Sophia....287
   a. I Corinthians 1....287
   b. I Corinthians 2....295
5. Texts without Sophia....300
   a. II Corinthians 3:18, 4:4,6....300
   b. Galatians 4:4....306

Page

D. UNION WITH CHRIST AND THE ESCHATOLOGICAL REALITIES....308

1. Introduction....308
2. Union with Christ and the Influence of the Wisdom of Solomon....308
3. Union with Christ as Guarantee of the Future....327

CONCLUSION....335

BIBLIOGRAPHY....338

I. TEXTS AND TOOLS....338

II. BOOKS....339

III. JOURNAL ARTICLES AND ESSAYS IN COLLECTED VOLUMES....351

## ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|---|---|
| AThANT | Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments |
| AltAbh | Alttestamentliche Abhandlungen |
| AJTh | American Journal of Theology |
| ARW | Archiv für Religionswissenschaft |
| BBB | Bonner Biblische Beiträge |
| BEvTh | Beiträge zur Evangelischen Theologie |
| BEvThS | Bulletin of the Evangelical Theological Society |
| BHTh | Beiträge zur Historischen Theologie |
| Bib | Biblica |
| BJRL | Bulletin of the John Rylands Library |
| BNTC | Blacks New Testament Commentaries = HNTC |
| BWANT | Beiträge zur Wissenschaft des Alten und Neuen Testaments |
| BzFCHrTh | Beiträge zur Förderung Christlicher Theologie |
| BZ | Biblische Zeitschrift |
| BZNW | Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft |
| CBQ | Catholic Biblical Quarterly |
| ET | Expository Times |
| EvTh | Evangelische Theologie |
| ExHbzAT | Exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament |
| FRLANT | Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments |
| HbzAT | Handbuch zum Alten Testament |
| HbzNT | Handbuch zum Neuen Testament |
| HNTC | Harper's New Testament Commentaries = BNTC |

| | |
|---|---|
| HTR | Harvard Theological Review |
| IB | The Interpreter's Bible |
| ICC | International Critical Commentary |
| IDB | The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible |
| IJA | International Journal of the Apocrypha |
| Inter | Interpretation |
| JAAR | Journal of the American Academy of Religion |
| JBL | Journal of Biblical Literature |
| JBR | Journal of Bible and Religion |
| JHI | Journal of the History of Ideas |
| JQR | Jewish Quarterly Review |
| JRAS | Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society |
| JThS | Journal of Theological Studies |
| KEK | Kritisch-Exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament (A. W. Meyer) |
| KerDog | Kerygma und Dogma |
| MNTC | The Moffatt New Testament Commentary |
| NF | Neue Folge |
| NIC | The New International Commentary |
| NRTh | Nouvelle revue théologique |
| NT | Novum Testamentum |
| NTAb | Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen |
| NTD | Neues Testament Deutsch |
| NTS | New Testament Studies |
| Ps-Solomon | Pseudo Solomon (the unknown author of the Wisdom of Solomon) |

| | |
|---|---|
| PTR | Princeton Theological Review |
| RB | Revue Biblique |
| RE | Review and Expositor |
| REG | Revue des études grecques |
| RL | Religion in Life |
| RSPhTh | Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques |
| RSR | Recherches de science religieuse |
| RSV | Revised Standard Version |
| SJTh | Scottish Journal of Theology |
| Str.-Bill. | H. Strack and P. Billerbeck |
| SBT | Studies in Biblical Theology |
| ThB | Theologische Blätter |
| TDNT | Theological Dictionary of the New Testament = TWNT |
| ThGl | Theologie und Glaube |
| ThLZ | Theologische Literaturzeitung |
| ThR | Theologische Rundschau |
| ThSK | Theologische Studien und Kritiken |
| ThZ | Theologische Zeitschrift |
| TrThZ | Trierer Theologische Zeitschrift |
| TWNT | Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament = TDNT |
| USR | Union Seminary Review |
| VT | Vetus Testamentum |
| WS | The Wisdom of Solomon |
| ZAW | Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft |
| ZKTh | Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie |

| | |
|---|---|
| ZNW | Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft |
| ZSyTh | Zeitschrift für die Systematische Theologie |
| ZThK | Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche |
| ZWTh | Zeitschrift für Wissenschaftliche Theologie |

# CHAPTER I

## THE PROBLEM OF PAULINE ESCHATOLOGY

### A. INTRODUCTION

So-called "assured results" of the scholarship of the past, especially if they have provided a basic framework and the presuppositions for ongoing research, are often slow in giving way to new and more adequate results. This circumstance has repeatedly led biblical scholarship down dead-end streets. There have always been those voices which have not followed, or been convinced of, prevailing tendencies and trends, who have seriously called them into question and have clearly demonstrated the erroneous nature of the prevailing assumptions and presuppositions. Yet it has often taken decades before these voices were heard, before their criticisms gained momentum and were able to elicit the support of others. Indeed, some "assured results" of the past seemingly refuse to be put to death.

One need only to mention the rigorous application of the Darwinian evolutionary hypothesis to the study of Israelite religion by Wellhausen, which was such an influential pillar in his depiction of the development of Israel's religion and of her religious literature. Though Wellhausen's analysis has been seriously questioned, it continues to cast an influential shadow across much that is written in the area of Old Testament studies. Coming closer to the area of the present investigation, there is the "myth" of the "Gnostic Redeemer Myth" which has taken such an

important place in the writings of Rudolf Bultmann and is still in vogue in much New Testament scholarship. The supposition that this "Gnostic Redeemer Myth" formed the model for the Pauline Christology has increasingly come under attack by reputable scholars,[1] yet this "myth" refuses to be put to death. Again, the "Mandaean Hypothesis" has been greatly influential in Johannine studies, though the improbability of an influence from the (late) Mandaean literature upon the Gospel of John has been repeatedly demonstrated, most recently in the studies by C. H. Dodd and R. Brown.[2]

## B. THE PROBLEM OF A DICHOTOMY BETWEEN PALESTINIAN JUDAISM AND HELLENISTIC JUDAISM

The present study, as an attempt to come to grips with a difficult problem in Pauline eschatology, must be seen against the background of some basic assumptions in New Testament scholarship which simply refuse to be put to death, though they have been the subject of rigorous attack since their currency in the days of Albert Schweitzer. One of these assumptions, made by most scholars and informing most treatments of the background of the New Testament in Schweitzer's day, was that a clear

---

[1] C.-H. Colpe, Die Religionsgeschichtliche Schule. Darstellung und Kritik ihres Bildes vom gnostischen Erlösermythus (FRLANT, N.F., 60; Göttingen, 1961). H.-M. Schenke, Die Herkunft des sogenannten Evangeliums Veritatis (Göttingen, 1959). Cf. R. Brown's discussion of the latest research on the "Gnostic Redeemer Myth" in The Gospel According to John L-XII (Anchor Bible, 29; New York, 1966), p. LV.

[2] C. H. Dodd, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel (Cambridge, 1953), pp. 115-130 (cited according to the 1968 paperback ed.); cf. also, R. E. Brown, John, pp. LIV-LV.

distinction could be drawn between Palestinian Judaism and Hellenistic Judaism, with the result that Hellenistic and Jewish elements could be isolated in the thought of Paul, or that Paul's thought could be seen as dominated by either the Jewish or the Hellenistic elements in his background and environment.[3] Thus, Schweitzer set Paul, whom he saw dominated by Palestinian categories, over against John, whom he saw dominated by Hellenistic ones.[4] Operating with the same basic assumption, Montefiore drew a picture of Paul dominated by Hellenistic categories, both by way of Diaspora Judaism, as also by direct contact with Pagan Hellenism.[5]

The existence of the dichotomy as a presupposition for the analysis of Pauline thought has been increasingly questioned, and it is the considered judgment of Davies that the work which has been done since Schweitzer has made the sharp separation between Hellenistic and Palestinian elements impossible: "In Paul, Athens and Jerusalem are strangely mixed...because the Judaism within which he grew up, even in Jerusalem, was largely Hellenized, and the Hellenism he encountered in

---

[3]For a brief analysis of the undermining of this basic assumption since Schweitzer, see the recent contribution by W. D. Davies, "Paul and Judaism since Schweitzer" in The Bible in Modern Scholarship, ed. by J. P. Hyatt (Nashville, 1965), now reprinted as an Introduction to the 1967 Torchbook edition of W. D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism. For a more extensive survey cf. E. E. Ellis, Paul and His Recent Interpreters (Michigan, 1961).

[4]See A. Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, tr. by W. Montgomery (London, 1931).

[5]C. G. Montefiore, Judaism and St. Paul (London, 1914). The direct influence from the Hellenistic environment upon Paul has been stressed particularly by the Religio-Historical School, e.g., in the writings of Reitzenstein and Bousset.

his travels largely Judaized".[6] We need not trace here the progress which has been made,[7] except to mention some representative contributions. Already early, Emil Schuerer had voiced reservations against the dichotomy[8] and the impact of Schweitzer, though dominant, was not quite able to erase the lingering conviction that the separation into virtually watertight compartments was an artificial one. Paul Krüger,[9] in his brief but significant study of the relations between Hellenism and Judaism, although denying any extensive influence upon the religiosity of the latter by the former,[10] has clearly shown that Palestinian Judaism,

---

[6]"Paul and Judaism since Schweitzer", pp. VIII, X-XI (citation of page numbers is to the reprint of this essay).

[7]This has been done. See, e.g., Davies' "Paul and Judaism since Schweitzer", and the literature cited in the footnotes.

[8]E. Schürer, A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ, tr. by S. Taylor and P. Christie (Edinburgh, 1885), Division II, Vol. I; pp. 29-50. Cf. also, M. Friedländer, Griechische Philosophie im Alten Testament (Berlin, 1904) and Die Religiösen Bewegungen Innerhalb des Judentums im Zeitalter Jesu (Berlin, 1905). In the former work he attempts to show the Greek-Hellenistic influence making itself felt long before the time of the Maccabees. According to Friedländer, many Psalms, dating from the end of the fourth century B.C., already mirror the conflict between the old piety and the new Hellenism. The Maccabees brought to the Hellenization of the Jewish religion, evident in Proverbs, Job, and Ecclesiastes, in increasing intensity, a violent end, and particularistic Pharisaism won the day. The deep gulf which thus arose between Hellenistic Judaism and Palestinian Judaism was bridged by the Essenes and the Apocalypticists. Friedländer, in the second work cited above, sees Essenic and Apocalyptic Judaism as a mixture of Palestinian and Hellenistic Judaism, and traces its influence into the New Testament.

[9]Paul Krüger, Hellenismus und Judentum im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter (Leipzig, 1908).

[10]"Die Juden haben die Selbständigkeit ihres Glaubens und die Unabhängigkeit ihrer Religion von hellenistischen Einflüssen behauptet ....Griechentum und orthodoxes Judentum sind keine Verbindung miteinander eingegangen". Ibid., pp. 13, 28.

in terms of external civilizational aspects, such as culture, customs, and language, was thoroughly Hellenized.[11] Going beyond Krüger, Rudolf Meyer[12] saw that such a thorough Hellenization could not possibly have left the inner-civilizational aspects of the Jews in Palestine, such as religious-anthropological views, unaffected. Indeed, he located Hellenistic influence in the very particularistic Pharisaic Judaism which both Friedländer and Krüger had excluded from the encroachments of Hellenism. On the basis of his very incisive study of Hellenistic elements in Rabbinic anthropological conceptions, he came to the following conclusion:

> ...even Rabbinic Judaism did not shut itself off against the religious-philosophical thought of Hellenism....Though it was not Hellenized to the extent of Diaspora Judaism, Greek concepts and formulations helped in the shaping of its own particular thought-world and contributed to the transformation of its primitive Old Testament anthropological conceptions. It is evident that the Palestinian Judaism of the Hellenistic period "learned in the schools of the Greeks".13

Meyer showed[14] that the Rabbis in general adopted a very friendly attitude toward not only Greek customs and language, but also toward Greek wisdom. A serious opposition did not materialize except under the influence of the Zealot movement. The Hellenization in the area of

---

[11] Hellenismus, pp. 16-18.

[12] R. Meyer, Hellenistisches in der Rabbinischen Anthropologie (BWANT, 4/22; Stuttgart, 1937), pp. I ff.

[13] Ibid., p. IX.

[14] Ibid., pp. 135-146.

Rabbinic anthropology,[15] and to a somewhat lesser degree in Rabbinic eschatology,[16] reveals the great openness of Rabbinic Judaism in reference to Hellenistic thought. The Rabbis used Greek literature; thus, Greek thought came largely by the literary way, but also by means of direct discussion with Greeks and indirectly by way of the Diaspora.[17] In all of this Meyer is careful to point out that the incorporation of Hellenistic thought in Rabbinic anthropology did not proceed in such a way that the adopted conceptions remained in their pure original form; rather, a transformation of the various motifs took place on Palestinian soil: "Von vornherein gingen die Rabbinen mit ihren religiösen Voraussetzungen an den Stoff heran und gestalteten ihn so, dass er für haggadische Vorträge brauchbar wurde. Sie bemühten sich also bei jedem Motive, es so zurechtzubiegen, dass es der rabbinischen Gottesvorstellung und der Geschichtsauffassung der palästinischen Theologen nicht widersprach".[18] But despite this note of caution, it is for Meyer clear that

---

[15]Some examples which Meyer cites for the presence of Hellenistic conceptions are: Mekh. Ex 15:1; Sifre Deut 32,2 306; Lev Rab 34 3; Chag. 16a Bar. (ibid., pp. 27-30, 40).

[16]...ein Blick auf die rabb. Eschatologie zeigt, dass der anthropologische Dualismus sich nicht in der Weise durchsetzte, wie etwa bei den völlig unter griechischem Einfluss stehenden alexandrinischen Juden; denn zu einem konsequenten Dualismus gehört, dass die Seele nach dem Tode endgültig von dem Leibe erlöst ist. Diesen Schritt hat aber das rabb. Judentum nicht vollzogen; es hat vielmehr den Gedanken von der Auferstehung des Leibes, der an die innerweltliche Vorstellung vom Ruhen der Toten im Grabe anknüpft, beibehalten und versucht, beide Vorstellungen miteinander zu verbinden". Ibid., p. 146.

[17]Meyer is uncertain as to Philo's influence on Palestinian Judaism: "Ob Philo selbst die Tannaiten beeinflusst hat ist nicht mit Sicherheit festzustellen, da Talmud und Midrasche sich über ihn ausschweigen". Ibid., p. 31, n. 1.

[18]Ibid., p. 145.

much in Rabbinic thought can only be explained when it is traced to corresponding elements in Greek thought.

Much of Meyer's study is based on the work of those scholars who had traced the extent of the influence of the Greek language in Palestine.[19] Thus, Lieberman[20] is not the first to recognize this influence, although his treatment of the extent of Palestinian Jews' familiarity with the Greek language and usages and with Hellenistic thought breaks new ground and establishes the presence of Greek and Hellenism in Jewish Palestine beyond doubt.[21]

Many of those scholars who attributed much of Pauline thought to the influence of Hellenism, either by way of Diaspora Judaism, or directly by way of Pagan Hellenism, made much of the commonly accepted supposition that Paul spent his youth in the great Hellenistic center

---

[19] E.g., Th. Zahn, Einleitung in das Neue Testament (Erlangen, 1897), I, pp. 27 f.; G. Dalman, Jesus-Jeshua: Studies in the Gospels, tr. by P. Levertoff (London, 1929), pp. 1 ff.; G. Kittel, Die Probleme des Palästinischen Spätjudentums (Stuttgart, 1926), pp. 34 ff.; E. Schürer, Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi (4th ed.; Leipzig, 1907), II, pp. 84 ff.; A. Schlatter, Geschichte Israels (3rd ed.; Stuttgart, 1925), pp. 16 ff.; Str. - Bill., IV, pp. 405 ff.

[20] S. Lieberman, Greek in Jewish Palestine (New York, 1942), and Hellenism in Jewish Palestine (New York, 1950); also, "How much Greek in Jewish Palestine?" in Studies and Texts, Vol. I: Biblical and Other Studies, ed. by A. Altmann (Cambridge, 1963), pp. 123-141.

[21] Cf. Davies' remarks on the significance in this regard of E. R. Goodenough's work, Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman World. Davies goes farther than Goodenough in recognizing that first-century "legalistic" or Pharisaic Judaism was itself Hellenized, so that the gulf between Hellenism and Judaism of a Rabbinic kind is not so sharp as Goodenough supposes. ("Paul and Judaism since Schweitzer", pp. VIII-IX, n. 8.)

of Tarsus (cf. Acts 22:3), being educated there and consequently being influenced greatly by his Greek education, Paul's claim that he was a "Hebrew of the Hebrews" (Phil. 3:5) to the contrary notwithstanding. This supposition has been seriously questioned and, if Van Unnik is correct in his monograph Tarsus or Jerusalem,[22] then Tarsus can have influenced him very little indeed. According to Van Unnik's analysis of Acts 22:3, Paul was born in Tarsus, but lived in Jerusalem during his early youth and schooling. Thus, it is possible that that "Hellenism" commonly attributed to Paul's contact with Diaspora synagogues and his Hellenistic congregations came to him via Palestinian Judaism, being already a product of the impingement of Hellenism upon the religiosity of his native Judaism. Van Unnik's findings find support and amplification -- from the point of view of thought dependence -- in Max Pohlenz's study "Paulus und die Stoa".[23] Pohlenz demonstrates that Paul is familiar with the popularized conceptions of the Stoics (no doubt known in Palestine), though it cannot be assumed from this that he was profoundly influenced by the philosophy as such. Indeed, it turns out in the evaluation of the so-called Hellenistic influence on Paul that great caution must be exercised. W. D. Davies[24] has clearly demonstrated that

---

[22] W. C. Van Unnik, Tarsus or Jerusalem: The City of Paul's Youth, tr. by G. Ogg (London, 1962).

[23] ZNW 42 (1949), pp. 69-104.

[24] Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology (London, 1948; revised edition with additional notes, London, 1955).

many elements in Paul's thought, which are often labelled as Hellenistic, might well be derived from Palestinian Judaism, so that we need not look to Paul's Hellenistic environment as the source for certain key elements in his thought.[25]

The discovery of the Qumran literature has further undermined the thesis of the dichotomy between, on the one hand, Hellenistic and Jewish-Hellenistic thought, and on the other, Palestinian-Jewish thought.[26] We cannot here give an account of the way Qumran has refuted Schweitzer's dichotomy between Hellenistic and Jewish forms of mysticism and the increasing recognition of mystical and proto-gnostic currents within strands of Palestinian Judaism, formerly largely attributed to Hellenism.[27] For our immediate concern, i.e., Pauline thought, Oscar Cullmann's remarks, in his study on "The Significance of the Qumran Texts for Research into the Beginnings of Christianity",[28] are significant. Cullman defends the thesis that on the edge of Judaism existed a

---

[25]Cf. J. Jeremias, "Zur Gedankenführung in den Paulinischen Briefen" in Studia Paulina in honorem Johannis de Zwaan (Haarlem, 1953), pp. 149-151; also "The Key to Pauline Theology", ET 76 (1964/65), pp. 27-30.

[26]F. M. Cross, Jr., "The Contribution of the Qumran Discoveries to the Study of the Biblical Text", Israel Exploration Journal 16/2 (1966), believes that "the normative Judaism" which used to be located in Jesus' lifetime did not conquer the variety in Jewish religion until the third century A.D. This reinforces the probability of diversity within primitive Christianity.

[27]See the literature cited by Davies in "Paul and Judaism since Schweitzer", pp. IX-X, nn. 11, 12, 13.

[28]JBL 74 (1955), pp. 213-226 (now reprinted in K. Stendahl, ed., The Scrolls and the New Testament (New York, 1957; London, 1958). Page references to Cullmann's essay in the following notes are to the reprint.

form of Jewish Gnosticism "which, judged externally, must be considered the cradle of early Christianity. Since this Jewish Gnosticism already shows Hellenistic influence, we must view the entire question of Hellenism vs. Judaism from a different perspective than has become habitual".[29] If Hellenistic influence can be traced in the New Testament, argues Cullmann, it is not automatically late. It is a false idea that Christianity was at first merely Jewish, and then later became Hellenistic. There was a Jewish Hellenism -- by which Cullmann does not mean Diaspora Judaism -- before there was a Christian Hellenism. Thus, "the evolution which is generally supposed from an early narrow Judaistic Christianity to a later universalistic Hellenistic Christianity is an artificial schema which does not correspond to historical reality".[30] Both tendencies existed in the primitive church, and "the history of primitive Christianity is the interplay of these two tendencies, both of them present from the beginning in the Palestinian church....Both forms of Christianity existed from the beginning, because both found their roots in forms of Judaism present in Palestine".[31]

If Cullmann is correct,[32] and if the trend in the studies briefly

---

[29] Ibid., p. 19.

[30] Ibid.

[31] Ibid., p. 30. It is striking that Cullmann's insight into the presence of a "Jewish Hellenism" in Palestine apparently did not inform his Ingersoll Lecture, delivered the same year, on "Immortality of the Soul or Resurrection of the Dead", first published in Harvard Divinity School Bulletin 21 (1955/56), pp. 5-36, then in book form by Epworth Press, London, 1958, now also in K. Stendahl, ed., Immortality and Resurrection (New York, 1965), pp. 9-53. See the discussion of Cullmann's programmatic essay, below, pp. 15-17.

[32] Even if the use which Cullmann makes of the Stephen story in Acts is somewhat questionable [cf. R. H. Fuller, The New Testament in

surveyed above is in the right direction, then the picture of early Christianity moving from a Palestinian-Jewish Christianity to a Pauline-Hellenistic Christianity needs increasingly to be revised. For we are then not only dealing with the presence of Jewish Hellenism in the earliest Palestinian church, but also with its presence in the environment and the thought of Paul the Jew. The assumption of the dichotomy between Hellenism and Judaism has become impossible.[33] The implications of the above analysis for the thesis proposed in this study will become apparent below.[34]

C. THE PROBLEM OF A DICHOTOMY WITHIN PALESTINIAN JUDAISM

Besides the assumption of the dichotomy discussed above, Schweitzer

---

Current Study (New York, 1962), pp. 127-128], his view of the presence of a Jewish Hellenism in Palestine (and from there the possibility of the presence of a primitive "Christian-Jewish-Hellenism") has recently been restated most emphatically in the work of Martin Hengel, Judentum und Hellenismus (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 10; Tübingen, 1969). Generally, he affirms that "Die Differencierung zwischen 'palastinischem' und 'hellenistischem' Judentum, die zu den grundlegenden heuristischen Prinzipien der neutestamentlichen Wissenschaft gehört...erweist sich im Ganzen als nicht mehr ausreichend". More specifically, he says that "...die von Apostelgeschichte 11:19 her bestimmte Differenzierung zwischen der palästinischen (Ur-) Gemeinde und der hellenistisch-jüdischen Gemeinde der Diaspora...bedarf einer schärferen Definierung: Man wird das griechisch-sprechende -- und vermutlich aktivere -- Element in der palästinischen Gemeinde nicht unterschätzen dürfen. Die Kenntnis des Griechischen war ja Ausdruck einer sozial höheren Stufe, besserer Bildung und stärkerer Kontakte mit der Welt ausserhalb des jüdischen Palästinas" (p. 194).

[33] E. Grässer, "Der Hebräerbrief 1938-1963", ThR, N.F. 30 (1964), p. 176, who says that "...die Alternative 'hellenistisch' - 'palästinisch' hat sich endgültig als völlig abwegig erwiesen" (see especially p. 176, n. 4).

[34] Pp. 37-46.

made a second assumption which has deeply influenced most treatments of Paul. Within Judaism itself he drew a sharp distinction between various aspects of Judaism, especially between Apocalyptic and Pharisaic Judaism. And just as Schweitzer's Jesus was the final flowering of Apocalyptic Judaism,[35] untouched by other elements within Judaism, so his Paul was assigned to the purely apocalyptic-eschatological current within first-century Judaism, untouched by other currents within this Judaism.[36] On the basis of studies and discoveries since Schweitzer's work,[37] Davies emphatically rejects the Schweitzerian dichotomy between Apocalyptic-eschatological Judaism and Pharisaic Judaism as well as other currents within Judaism: "Apocalyptic and Pharisaism -- differing as they did in emphases -- were not alien to each other, but often, if not always, enjoyed a congenial coexistence. Such a figure as Akiba should have warned us that this was the case, and now the Dead Sea Scrolls, which reveal a people fiercely dedicated to the Law and yet ardent in their eschatological hopes, have put the matter beyond any possible doubt".[38] In a recent dissertation on the problem of Qumran eschatology, George Nickelsburg shows that the Qumran documents are thoroughly apocalyptically oriented, and yet there is not an unequivocally clear testimony to a

---

[35]A. Schweitzer, The Quest of the Historical Jesus, tr. by W. Montgomery (London, 1910), pp. 365 ff.

[36]See A. Schweitzer, Paul and His Interpreters, tr. by W. Montgomery (London, 1912).

[37]See the literature cited by Davies in "Paul and Judaism since Schweitzer", p. XI, n. 17.

[38]Ibid., p. XI.

belief in a physical resurrection,[39] which is an almost indispensable element in the apocalyptic literature of both Judaism and the emergent church.[40] Thus, we find in Qumran a strange mixture of various strands of Judaism, warning us against any neat and clear-cut categorization of various currents within the Judaism to which Paul was heir. Not only were Jew and Greek Paul's tutors unto Christ,[41] but within Judaism itself there were various tutors, of which Apocalyptists and Rabbis are the most conspicuous. Davies has isolated important Rabbinic elements within Pauline thought, without at the same time denying the various other influences upon him.[42]

In spite of the insight into the complexity and variety within first-century Judaism, "the dominance of Schweitzer in Pauline studies has been such that the old dichotomy...upon which he insisted still invades the field. The approach to Paul along almost exclusively apocalyptic lines and the rigidity of Schweitzer's dogmatic Paul re-emerges

---

[39]George W. E. Nickelsburg, Jr., Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism (Harvard Divinity School Dissertation; Cambridge, 1967).

[40]See, e.g., the treatment by R. H. Charles, Eschatology: The Doctrine of a Future Life in Israel, Judaism, and Christianity, 2nd ed. 1913. Now reprinted, with an Introduction by G. W. Buchanan (New York, 1963). Cf. L. Goppelt, "Apokalyptik und Typologie bei Paulus", ThLZ 89 (1964), pp. 321-344; now reprinted in L. Goppelt, Typos (Gütersloh, 1966), pp. 259-299; "Für die Apokalyptik ist das Eschaton markiert durch die Auferstehung der Toten" (p. 264).

[41]Cf. G. H. C. McGregor and A. C. Purdy, Jew and Greek Tutors unto Christ (London, 1936).

[42]Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, p. 1.

again and again".[43] The slogan, "Paulus war auch als Christ Apokalyptiker!"[44] continues to be the center of much of the discussion in Pauline studies. The slogan means that Paul not only adopted apocalyptic terminology and concepts, either directly from Apocalyptic Judaism, or indirectly from early Christian tradition, but that his theology is thoroughly determined by apocalyptic eschatology. It cannot be denied, of course that apocalyptism influenced the thought of Paul, and particularly his eschatology.[45] In light, however, of the increasing recognition of the great diversity and complexity within first-century Judaism, it must be seriously questioned whether this apocalyptic eschatology was the dominant force in the shaping of the Pauline

---

[43] Davies, "Paul and Judaism since Schweitzer", pp. XI-XII. Davies notes especially the two most recent large-scale treatments of Paul, one by J. Munck, Paulus und die Heilsgeschichte (Aarhus, 1954); the other by H. J. Schoeps, Paulus. Die Theologie des Apostels im Lichte der jüdischen Religionsgeschichte (Tübingen, 1959). The former places Paul in an "eschatological straightjacket, the latter strongly emphasizes the eschatological framework of Paul's thought, though insisting that Rabbinism and other factors have to be exploited for the interpretation of Paul. Cf. Davies' reviews of the work of Munck and Schoeps in NTS 2 (1955), pp. 60-72 and in NTS 10 (1964), pp. 295-305, respectively.

[44] Cf. the discussion of this in L. Goppelt, "Apokalyptik und Typologie bei Paulus", pp. 263 ff.

[45] Cf. H. H. Rowley, The Relevance of Apocalyptic (3rd ed., London, 1963), p. 130: "The study of the eschatological teaching of Paul... reveals how far the ideas of apocalyptic eschatology had permeated the church".

eschatology.[46] The recognition of the presence of Jewish Hellenism within Jewish Palestine, as for example, in Qumran and among the Rabbis, forces us to ask to what extent other eschatological motifs may have influenced, and helped to shape, the Pauline eschatology, or to what extent these other eschatological motifs, present in Paul's Jewish environment, may have forced him either to present a synthesis between the various strands or simply to present them in an unreconciled juxtaposition. Oscar Cullmann was apparently unable to appreciate these considerations when he confronted Christian believers and New Testament scholars with his programmatic either-or: Immortality of the Soul or

---

[46] C. H. Dodd has consistently maintained the presence of "Hellenistic" elements in Jewish apocalyptic eschatology [e.g., in The Coming of Christ (Cambridge, 1952)], so that even Jesus' eschatology may have been influenced by other than strictly apocalyptic conceptions, such as the idea of bodily resurrection, or the concept of an inbreaking of God in the future of human history. In his The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Jesus (Philadelphia, 1963), N. Perrin categorically rejects Dodd's assertion that Jesus conceived of a "transcendent order beyond time and space" as a concept "which is Greek rather than Hebraic and which has no place in first-century Judaism" (pp. 68 ff.). He cites W. D. Davies as "a lone voice" which has been raised in defense of Dodd. Davies points to an element in late Judaism in which the "Age to Come" is conceived of as existing eternally in the heavens, and the souls of the righteous as entering into it after death (Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, pp. 315-320). Perrin rejects the interpretation given to the relevant texts (particularly I Enoch 71:15, 39:4) by Davies. What is striking in Perrin's own interpretation of these passages is that what Davies saw as heavenly dwelling-places existing permanently in a transcendent realm, he sees as a "heavenly prototype of that which will be established on earth when the end comes" (pp. 70-72). It seems to us that Perrin argues with a "Platonic" conception of "heavenly prototypes" (cf. Hebrews), against the "Greek conception" of a "transcendent realm". If, then, his "Platonism" is accepted as having a place in first-century Judaism, why not the "transcendent order beyond time and space"? Though it seems that Dodd has over-Graecized the parables, the possibility is nevertheless given that not only Jesus, but Paul as well, were influenced by "Greek" concepts within the context of Palestinian Judaism.

Resurrection of the Dead.[47] Although he admits that "one must reckon with Greek influence upon the origin of Christianity from the very beginning",[48] and that Qumran reveals a Jewish Hellenism,[49] he does not seem to let these insights influence his analysis of New Testament, specifically of Pauline, eschatology. He appears to assume that there was a single Jewish view on the subject of resurrection and that Paul and the other New Testament writers were heir to that view, though informing it from the viewpoint of the Christ-event. Although we would agree with Cullmann that there is a great gulf between the Greek-Platonic conception of the immortality of the soul and the Jewish idea of the resurrection of the dead, and that it is unlikely that Paul was influenced by the former,[50]

---

[47]See above, n. 31.

[48]In K. Stendahl, ed., Resurrection and Immortality, pp. 11-12.

[49]In K. Stendahl, ed., The Scrolls and the New Testament, pp. 19, 30.

[50]Cf. H. J. Cadbury, "Intimations of Immortality in the Thought of Jesus" in K. Stendahl, ed., Resurrection and Immortality, p. 132: "How alien, not to say mutually exclusive, the two concepts are to each other was brought to our attention by Prof. Cullmann....It is well to remind ourselves of the clear-cut words of Justin Martyr in his Dialogue with Trypho, written after a full century of Christianity:

> If you have met with some so-called Christians who do not accept this (resurrection and millenium) but dare to blaspheme the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob, and affirm that there is no resurrection of the dead but that when they die their souls are taken up to heaven, do not suppose that they are Christians...

It needs to be pointed out here that "a full century of Christianity" is likely to have polarized elements which in earliest Christianity may have enjoyed an uncontested co-existence.

Cullmann's polarization of positions, without the recognition of possible intermediate positions hammered out on the anvil of at least two centuries of Greek-Jewish intercourse, is unwarranted. Nickelsburgh[51] has ably demonstrated that Cullmann's four contrasts between the Greek and the Jewish New Testament view -- in the understanding of death, of anthropology, of immortality or new creation, and of the intermediate state -- are theoretical contrasts between extremes which in the actual thought and belief of Judaism (and of the New Testament writers), have merged and formed a variety of combinations. Thus, in the Wisdom of Solomon and in IV Macc "death is the gate to eternal life or immortality", and not necessarily an event to be feared and dreaded. These writings are, according to Nickelsburg, strongly Hellenized,[52] but, as Test Ash, Jub, IV Ezra, and II Bar indicate, the idea of immediate assumption to an eternal life at the time of death does not even require the Greek language of immortality. None of these texts betrays patent Greek influence. These same texts, particularly Test Ash and Jub 23, show that despite the general difference between Greek and Hebrew anthropology, there are Jewish writings that conceive of a whole life after death without the body. I Enoch 103- 104 speaks of a future resurrection of souls or spirits of the righteous, and there is no hint that these must

---

[51] Immortality, pp. 424-427.

[52] See our discussion on the Wisdom of Solomon, below, chs. II and III. It may not be as strongly Hellenized as often supposed. We shall see that its eschatology is to some extent more "Jewish" than "Hellenistic". It is also significant that the Wisdom of Solomon was most likely well known and read in Palestine; see below, ch. II.

or will assume bodies. And although these chapters may reflect some Hellenistic influence, it is all the more significant that such influence should occur in a Palestinian apocalyptic writing. Cullman presents the option of either "natural immortality" or "new creation". But these are not the only options. Both the Test Ash and Jub show that bodiless life after death as a gift of God (i.e., assumption) is possible without intrinsic immortality. And while the Wisdom of Solomon speaks of immortality, it does not speak of natural immortality: only the righteous attain immortality; the wicked face death. Finally, though much Jewish literature looks forward to a future resurrection, whether of body or of soul, and thus posits an intermediate state of some kind, some texts speak of an immediate assumption to heaven.[53] Thus, "the shadowy existence which the Jews expected and which cannot be described as life"[54] was not expected by all Jews. For some, the rewards of the new life are at least anticipated or partially experienced in the intermediate state, whether in Paradise, heaven, or elsewhere (cf. I Enoch 22).

That there is great diversity within Jewish apocalypticism has of course long been recognized.[55] Yet, the supposition of a relatively unified apocalyptic eschatology, and its influence upon both Jesus and

---

[53] E.g., WS, Test Ash, IV Macc, and Jub 23.

[54] Cullmann, Immortality or Resurrection, p. 24.

[55] Cf. G. F. Moore, Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of the Tannaim (Cambridge, 1927), II, p. 389; Paul Volz, Die Eschatologie der Jüdischen Gemeinde im Neutestamentlichen Zeitalter (Tübingen, 1934), p. 1.

Paul, continues to cast its shadow across relatively recent studies, as Cullmann's alternative illustrates. Even if it could be shown that Paul stood thoroughly within Apocalyptic Judaism, this would not by itself prove that his eschatological thought was determined by that "kind" of apocalyptic eschatology which by both Schweitzer and Cullmann is subsumed under the general designation "apocalyptic eschatology", and refers to a view of the eschaton in which such elements as a great universal judgment, a messianic figure, a resurrection, etc., are present. For it is increasingly becoming clear that even within Palestinian Apocalyptic Judaism there were elements and strains which have not generally been accepted as falling within the perview of what is considered apocalyptic. Some of these elements are present also in Rabbinic Judaism. Thus, "non-apocalyptic" eschatological motifs may have influenced Paul in the context of his native Judaism, and it is impossible to define and confine his eschatological thought by calling him an "Apokalyptiker". To isolate him in such a manner from other currents within Judaism has become impossible.

## D. DEVELOPMENT IN PAUL'S ESCHATOLOGICAL THOUGHT?

The presuppositions discussed -- namely that of a dichotomy between Hellenism and Judaism, and that of a dichotomy between Apocalyptic and other elements within Judaism -- form the background against which, and the context within which, another presupposition must be located which has virtually dominated Pauline studies, and particularly the study of Pauline eschatology. It is the thesis that Paul's thought developed, that environment, events, and personal crises forced him to

undergo significant changes in his thinking, and that these changes and this development can be traced in his correspondence.[56] The reason for placing the concept of Pauline thought-development within the context of the other two presuppositions discussed above must be obvious. If early Christianity, and with it Paul, moved from a narrow Judaic-Christian sect into Hellenistic-universalistic Christianity, Paul's thought must have kept pace with this movement.[57] If Paul, as an apocalyptic Jew, shared with the earliest community an apocalyptic eschatology, then it is likely that as he carried his Gospel into an increasingly Hellenistic environment his eschatology would need to be modified and transformed in keeping with Hellenistic models.

The pressures of a changing environment, however, are not usually considered the only factors in Paul's thought development. Much of the discussion has centered around the concept of the "Parusieverzögerung".[58]

---

[56]Cf. the treatment of "developmental theories" by John Lowe, "An Examination of Attempts to Detect Development in St. Paul's Thought", JThS 42 (1941), pp. 129-142, and by V. P. Furnish, "Development in Paul's Thought", JAAR 38/3 (1970), pp. 287-303.

[57]The assumption of a development in Paul's thought was extensively influenced by the conceptions of O. Pfleiderer, P. W. Schmiedel, and J. H. Holtzmann (see below, nn. 64, 65, 66). Their view of development in Pauline theology as a whole was based to a great extent on the fact that they detected two series of conceptions in the Pauline eschatology, one Jewish and the other Hellenistic. They postulated a coming together of both ideologies in II Cor 5:1-10, where, according to their view, the Jewish conception was overcome by the Hellenistic one. For these scholars, the work of the Apostle became the center of historical-critical research into the beginnings of Christianity, since they thought to detect here the clear process of the Hellenization of early Christianity.

[58]See, e.g., Erich Grässer, Das Problem der Parusieverzögerung (BZNW 22; Berlin, 1960).

It is argued that Paul, together with the early community, expected the imminent return, the parousia, of Christ, at which time the kingdom would be established in all its apocalyptic glory. When this expectation was not immediately fulfilled, the parousia of Christ was brought into association with the apocalyptic conception of the resurrection of the dead, in order to make it possible for those Christians who had died before the parousia to participate in this glorious event (thus I Thess). As the fervent expectation of the parousia faded even more into the background due to its delay, and as Christianity became even more "Hellenized", intimations of immortality came to the fore, replacing a distant parousia with immediate blessedness upon death (II Cor, Phil).[59]

Besides the movement in the early church from Judaism to Hellenism and the problem of the delay of the parousia, as factors in the development of Paul's eschatology, some scholars have accounted for it on the basis of personal crises in the life of Paul. Thus, as Paul became increasingly subject to the threat of persecution and the possibility of his own imminent death, he found the prospect of lying in the grave until the parousia increasingly unappealing and realized that his old views did not really accord with the pattern of Christ's own immediate resurrection.[60] This experience resulted in the adoption of Hellenistic or

---

[59] In the Lukan theology, according to Conzelmann, the problem of the delay of the parousia was alleviated by the idea that the existence of the church constituted an interim, a "Mitte der Zeit", which would be brought to an end in the indefinite future by the parousia.

[60] See Ch. Buck and G. Taylor, Saint Paul: A Study of the Development of his Thought (New York, 1969), pp. 58-60, who identify two crises which required Paul to shift his position: the death of some Christians prior to the expected parousia and -- even more significant for the development of Paul's thought -- his experience of persecution in Asia (II Cor 1:8-10).

Hellenized categories with which to describe the fate of the individual at death and beyond it.

It is impossible to do justice, within the compass of this introduction, to the immensity and complexity of the discussion which has centered around the problem of development in Paul's thought.[61] However, in order to provide the proper frame of reference for our study, some important representative contributions need briefly to be mentioned.[62]

1. The Pressure of Environment

We have referred above[63] to the basis of the developmental theories in the work of O. Pfleiderer,[64], P. W. Schmiedel,[65] and H. J. Holtzmann,[66] who saw a Jewish and a Hellenistic strain in the Pauline eschatology and supposed that the early Pauline conception of a future resurrection was eventually displaced by the hope of immediate entrance into the full blessings

---

[61] In our exegesis of the relevant Pauline passages (below, Chapter IV), we shall have occasion to enter into discussion with some of the extensive literature on the problem.

[62] For a thorough history of the recent interpretation of Pauline eschatology, cf. Paul Hoffmann, Die Toten in Christus: Eine religionsgeschichtliche und exegetische Untersuchung zur Paulinischen Eschatologie (Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen, NF, 2; Münster, 1966).

[63] See above, p. 20, n. 57.

[64] O. Pfleiderer, Das Urchristentum. Seine Schriften und Lehren (Berlin, 1887).

[65] P. W. Schmiedel, Die Briefe an die Thessalonicher und an die Korinther (Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament, 2/1, 2nd ed.; Freiburg, 1892). See especially the excurses to I Cor 15 and II Cor 5.

[66] H. J. Holtzmann, Lehrbuch der Neutestamentlichen Theologie (2nd ed.; Tübingen, 1911), Vol. II.

of redemption upon death.[67] The classical statement of this development in an English work is no doubt that by R. H. Charles,[68] who clearly outlines the movement of the Pauline eschatology in a chapter entitled "The Pauline Eschatology in its Four Stages".[69] He finds in Paul "no single eschatological system", but rather eschatology "in a state of development" from "an expectation of the future that he had inherited largely from Judaism"[70] to a spiritualized conception of resurrection at the

---

[67]These ideas were exponded in an extreme form by E. Teichmann in his Die Paulinischen Vorstellungen von Auferstehung und Gericht (Freiburg-Tübingen, 1896). According to Teichmann's interpretation, in I Thess 4: 13-18 Paul shares the Jewish view of a real, corporeal resurrection, "den reinen Auferstehungsgedanken" (p. 35). I Cor 15 is developed on the basis of his contrast between sarx and pneuma (pp. 51, 53). In the same time between I and II Cor, Paul, driven psychologically by personal experiences and determined by Hellenistic influences (p. 57), draws the final consequence from his conception of the pneuma. "Das Ergebnis ist die Beseitigung des Begriffs der Totenauferstehung....Das gewichtigste Zeugnis für die Wandlung in des Apostels Anschauung findet sich II Kor 4:16-5:10" (p. 59). The believer does not become subject to the "detestable condition" of nakedness -- "von Christus und der himmlischen Welt getrenntem Dasein, etwa als Schatten im Hades", -- but at the moment of death is clothed with the heavenly body. The same conception, in heightened form and with greater conviction, Teichmann locates in Phil 1:21-23 and Rom 8:38 f. The idea of resurrection, of an interim, even of death, is removed (pp. 65 f., 68). It is significant that Teichmann, although recognizing that Paul continues to use the "überlieferten Termini" occasionally, does not let this influence the result of his interpretation: Pauline eschatology must be seen as a development toward Hellenism (p. 67).

[68]The Doctrine of a Future Life in Israel, in Judaism, and in Christianity (2nd ed., 1913. Citations will be to the reprint of the second edition, Eschatology [New York, 1963]).

[69]Ibid., pp. 437-473. Cf. A. M. Hunter, Paul and His Predecessors (2nd ed.; London, 1961), p. 98, who essentially follows Charles' scheme.

[70]Charles, op. cit., p. 437.

time of the believer's departure in death.[71] For Charles, this development -- "in the course of which the heterogenous elements were for the most part silently dropped" -- took place "under the influence of great formative Christian conceptions",[72] particularly the conception of the believer's spiritual fellowship with Christ.[73] Though Charles does not explicitly state it, it is clear in his treatment that he views the transformation of the Pauline eschatology, though motivated internally by the Apostel's deepening faith,[74] as dependent upon increasingly Hellenistic conceptions.[75] A very clear statement of the Hellenization

---

[71] Ibid., pp. 456-463.

[72] Ibid., p. 437.

[73] Ibid., p. 449.

[74] Cf. E. Kühl, Über 2 Korinther 5:1-10. Ein Beitrag zur Frage nach dem Hellenismus bei Paulus (Königsberg, 1904), pp. 43-46, who contrasts the conception of II Cor 5 to that of I Thess 4 thus: "Dass dieser Fortschritt in den Aussagen des Apostels einem Fortschritt seiner inneren Anschauungen und Glaubensgewissheit entspricht, ist zwar nicht absolut gewiss, aber doch höchst wahrscheinlich".

[75] Cf. A. Titius, Der Paulinismus unter dem Gesichtspunkt der Seligkeit (Tübingen-Freiburg, 1900), who, though he emphasizes Paul's personal pneumatic experiences as formative influences in the development of his eschatology (p. 65), and speaks of the overcoming of the Old Testament fear of death through Paul's longing to be completely united with his Lord (p. 58), nevertheless interprets the result of this development as Hellenistic. See also, E. von Dobschütz, Probleme des Apostolischen Zeitalters (Leipzig, 1904), pp. 100-101, who accounts for the development of Paul's eschatology (from I Thess to II Cor 5 and Phil 1:23) as motivated by the "Damaskusvision", by "persönliche Glaubenserfahrung", by Christian "Glauben und Hoffen". At the same time, he does not discount Hellenistic influences. First it was "rabbinische Eschatologie, dan [war] hellenistischer Spiritualismus die Form gewesen, in die Paulus seine Zukunftserwartung fasste".

of Paul's eschatological thought is that by W. L. Knox.[76] He argues that Paul's experience at Athens convinced him that the eschatological presentation of the Gospel would not avail with a Gentile world, and "from this point forward his epistles show a progressive adaptation of the Christian message to the general outlook of the Hellenistic world".[77] This process is already apparent in I Cor 15, with its doctrine of a spiritualized resurrection, though Paul here did not go far enough. "It appears", says Knox, "that Paul's admission of the immaterial nature of the risen body...was not enough to satisfy the Corinthians. The Second Epistle is largely devoted to a complete revision of Pauline eschatology in a Hellenistic sense".[78] According to Knox, then, the Hellenization of Paul's eschatological thought arose out of a crisis of thought; it was the result of a need felt to restate the Gospel in terms understood by the Hellenistic world.

2. The "Delay of the Parousia"

Whereas Charles and Knox do not utilize the concept of the Parusieverzögerung as a raison d'etre, other scholars, though remaining within the context of a movement from Judaism to Hellenism in Paul's eschatology, view the pressure of the delay of the parousia as the basic factor in this development.[79] M. Brückner[80] distinguishes between a

---

[76] St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles (Cambridge, 1939), pp. 128 ff.

[77] Ibid., p. 26. [78] Ibid., p. 128.

[79] Often, the threat of Paul's own death (cf. 1 Cor 1:8), together with the delayed parousia, are viewed as factors which were formative in the development.

[80] M. Brückner, in RGG (1st ed., 1910) II, pp. 619 ff. (Cited by Hoffmann, Die Toten in Christus, p. 9.)

sleep-like interim, connected with the assurance of a parousia experience, and a Hellenistically oriented assurance of immediate union with Christ at death. The movement from the former to the latter, and the formation of the latter, are caused by Paul's sense of his own impending death and the delay of the parousia, the latter motive being the weightier of the two: "Das Ausbleiben der erwarteten Parusie...und die immer ausschliesslichere Übertragung des Christentums auf griechisch-heidnischen Boden haben geschichtlich die Umwandlung vollzogen".[81] Similarly, O. Kuss explains the later conceptions in Paul's eschatology as the result of further development of previous conceptions, motivated by the delay of the parousia, and asserts that the later conceptions betray the influence of Hellenistic thought.[82]

### 3. Personal Crises as Motivating Forces

Other scholars find the central motivating force for what they see as transformation in Paul's eschatology in the personal crisis of the death, and reject the idea of the Hellenization of his thought as the

---

[81] Ibid., p. 620. Cf. F. Tillmann, Die Wiederkunft Christi nach den Paulinischen Briefen (Freiburg, 1909), p. 175, who rejects the idea that Paul's developing eschatology involves an elimination of Jewish conceptions, and yet affirms that the fading of the intense expectation of the imminent parousia resulted in the fact "dass der Gedanke an das Geschick nach dem Tode vor der Parusie mehr in den Vordergrund trat und Gedanken auslöste, die bis dahin mehr im Hintergrund gestanden haben".

[82] O. Kuss, Der Römerbrief (Regensburg, 1959), pp. 322-323. "Viel spricht dafür, dass die Eigenart der einschlägigen Texte...den Einfluss hellenistischen Denkens verraten, das den wirklichen Tatbestand hier offenbar leichter und sachlicher wiedergeben konnte".

cause.[83] This line of interpretation is particularly emphasized by C. H. Dodd in his famous lectures on "The Mind of Paul: Change and Development",[84] and by his pupil, W. D. Davies.[85] Dodd's understanding of Paul's thought is greatly influenced by his conviction that Paul underwent considerable spiritual and psychological development, centering in a kind of "second conversion"[86] around the time of the writing of II Cor.[87] In respect to eschatology, Dodd argues that initially Paul's faith was fitted into an apocalyptic framework,[88] persisting, with but slight change of emphasis, through I Cor. Thereafter, "the thought of the imminence of the Advent retires into the background",[89] while there is a "growing emphasis on eternal life here and now in communion with Christ".[90] "It seems probable that the extreme danger of death in which he had recently stood had helped to alter his outlook in this respect".[91] Thus, in II Cor "he has faced the fact that it is possible or probable that he will 'go to stay with the Lord' through death",[92] for Paul "has

---

[83] There are those, however, who emphasize the factor of Hellenization, while at the same time admitting the significance, for the eschatological transformation, of the threat of death. E.G., O. Kuss, Die Briefe an die Römer, Korinther und Galater (Regensburger Neues Testament, 6, Regensburg, 1940), p. 216; also J. Dupont, SYN CHRISTŌ. L'union avec le Christ suivant Saint Paul (Paris, 1952), pp. 186, 192.

[84] C. H. Dodd, New Testament Studies (Manchester, 1953), pp. 80 ff., 108 ff.

[85] Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, p. 319.

[86] Studies, p. 81.

[87] Ibid., p. 113.

[88] Ibid., p. 109.

[89] Ibid., p. 111.

[90] Ibid., p. 113.

[91] Ibid., p. 111, with reference to II Cor 1:8-9.

[92] Ibid., p. 110.

become reconciled to experience".[93] Davies follows his teacher by contending that II Cor 5 reflects the result of "a crisis in experience, the necessity to reconcile himself to death as a physical event", and that it is not the result of a process of Hellenization.[94]

The most recent full-scale treatment of the idea of development in Paul's thought is the study by Charles Buck and Greer Taylor,[95] who, like Dodd and Davies, identify two crises which forced Paul to shift his position within a very short period of time: the death of some Christians before the parousia, and, even more significant for the new position, his experience of persecution in Asia and the threat of his own imminent death (cf. II Cor 1:8-10).[96] Paul's eschatology is portrayed as developing in unilinear fashion primarily as modification, extension, elaboration, and revision of his own earlier teaching, in dialogue with those who are responding to this teaching. The authors contend that the teaching of I Cor 15 about a spiritual resurrection of Christians who have died before the parousia and a similar spiritual transformation of those who are still alive at the parousia carries

---

[93] Ibid., p. 108. In the conclusion to his study (pp. 126-128), Dodd explicitly correlates the revision in Paul's eschatological thought with the spiritual crisis which he sees reflected in II Cor.

[94] Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, p. 319; cf. also, p. 311, where he cites both Paul's facing of possible death prior to the parousia and the even more prominent fact of Christians' dying before its arrival as factors which constrained Paul to rethink his original position.

[95] Saint Paul: A Study of the Development of his Thought (New York, 1969). For a precise summary and analysis of the authors' thesis, see V. P. Furnish, "Development in Paul's Thought", pp. 292 ff., whom we generally follow below.

[96] Ibid., p. 58.

Paul's teaching "one step further" than it was in I Thess.[97] It seems to be assumed by them that the "mode" of resurrection in I Thess is other than in I Cor 15. The next step in the development is seen to result largely from the second great crisis in Paul's experience and is reflected in II Cor 1-9. Whereas in I Cor 15 the transformation of the believer is seen as instantaneous, in II Cor 1-9 it is seen as lifelong and gradual (e.g., 3:18).[98] Further, in Phil I:23, possibly also in II Cor 5:6,8, Paul seems to conceive of the individual's resurrection as occurring immediately upon death, rather than being delayed until the parousia as in I Thess and I Cor.[99] The presence of the parousia motif in Phil 3:20-21 is accounted for by the authors by placing Phil between I Cor and II Cor as a "transitional" letter where both "systems" (that of an awaited parousia and that of an immediate resurrection upon death) operate.[100] Thus, Paul is pictured as a man constantly in the process of "reexamining" and "revising" his thought so that there are no random elements and no loose ends.[101] Paul's eschatological thought is ultimately seen by Buck and Taylor as in a process of growth, a process running parallel to his "deepening...

---

[97] Saint Paul, p. 42.

[98] Ibid., p. 54.

[99] Ibid., p. 56.

[100] Ibid., pp. 71, 234, 239. It is interesting that in view of the position of Phil before II Cor, the idea of immediate resurrection upon death should be more explicit in the former than in the latter. One would expect to find the reverse in a scheme of development such as Buck and Taylor expound.

[101] Ibid., p. 16.

knowledge of Christ" and nurtured by the crises that accompanied this growth. Dialectic and paradox in Paul's thought are excluded. There can be no doubt that the Buck and Taylor hypothesis represents the final step in the attempt to trace Paul's thought development, particularly in the area of his eschatological thought.

## E. CRITICAL EVALUATION OF DEVELOPMENT THEORIES

In the above paragraphs we have briefly presented the three directions which the developmental hypothesis of Pauline eschatology has taken, and have attempted, in the footnotes, to indicate the various combinations which have been undertaken. Whatever is isolated as the motivating force(s) for development in Pauline eschatology -- whether it be the need to restate the Gospel in terms understood in the Hellenistic world (e.g., Knox), or the delay of the parousia (e.g., Brückner, Kuss), or crises in Paul's own experience (e.g., Dodd, Davies) -- it is understood by all advocates of development to move from an early (Jewish) view, as expressed in I Thess, toward an increasingly "spiritualized", "Christianized", or "Hellenized" view, as expressed in II Cor and Phil. Most advocates of such a development would admit, with H.-D. Wendland,[102] that Paul "bleibt durchaus nicht...bei der jüdischen Anschauung stehen; denn er denkt sie von Christus aus um", though they would not admit this Christocentric motif as the only, or even the most important, cause, as Wendland seems to do. Again, for most advocates of development, a process of Hellenization is either explicitly asserted or

---

[102] H.-D. Wendland, Die Briefe an die Korinther (7th ed., NTD, 7; Göttingen, 1954), p. 175.

implicitly assumed. Where this does not seem to be the case, the Pauline eschatology is seen to become increasingly lofty and spiritual, and his later formulations are most easily to be understood on the basis of Greek analogies, though the development from his earlier to his later position is seen to be internally motivated.

If, as we have argued above, the assumption of a dichotomy between Judaism and Hellenism, and the concomitant assumption of a movement in the early church from the former to the latter, has become increasingly doubtful, then a major portion of the foundation for the hypothesis of development in Pauline thought has been removed, and the hypothesis must be called into question on a priori grounds. For if it can be demonstrated that those elements in Pauline eschatology which are assigned to his later view by proponents of a development from Judaism to Hellenism were already present in the native Judaism to which Paul was heir, then the <u>possibility</u> is at least given for these elements to be present already in the "early" mind of Paul. Again, if, as we have argued above, the assumption of a dichotomy between Apocalyptic Judaism and other strands of Judaism must increasingly be called into question, together with the concomitant assigning of Paul to the one or other strand (such as Schweitzer does), then the early Paul can no longer be assumed to have been immersed only in apocalyptic thought together with the early church, from which both he and she gradually emerged into a lofty Hellenism. For the <u>possibility</u> is now given that Paul was acquainted with other than apocalyptic eschatological motifs, present in his Jewish environment, and that they influenced his early thought. Thus, the assumption of a "development to Hellenism" -- more specifically

a development from "apocalyptic eschatology" to "Hellenistic eschatology" -- based as it is on the dichotomies discussed above, must be seriously questioned. On the other hand, it remains to be demonstrated, primarily exegetically, from internal considerations of Paul's eschatology that the "possibilities" mentioned above are actualized in the Pauline eschatology from the outset.

A similar argumentation can be employed against the assumption that the Parusieverzögerung was the guiding motivation for the alleged development of Paul's eschatology. The parousia is usually apocalyptically conceived in such terms as "the coming of the Son of Man on the clouds of heaven". This, it is asserted, was the early Christian hope, which Paul shared, and which involved the intense expectation of an imminent coming. As this intense expectation became increasingly subdued because of the delay of the parousia, the early church, and Paul, were forced to transform the expectation, which transformation usually took the form of Hellenization. If, however, apocalyptic motifs were not the only formative influences in the early church's eschatology, and if the general assumption of a movement toward Hellenism be removed, the possibility is given for a parousia-expectation to exist, together with other formulations of the Christian hope, from the outset, and continuing even in the late writings of Paul. Can it really be demonstrated that an intense expectation of the parousia was Paul's only eschatological conception, reflected in I Thess, and that it was replaced, because of its delay, by immediate union with Christ at death? What about the expectation of the parousia in such late letters as Philippians (3:20-21, 4:5) and Romans (13:11-14)? Or, conversely, what

about the idea of being "with Christ" at death in such an early letter as I Thess?[103] More generally, it is possible to argue against the assumption of the Parusieverzögerung -- as a basic motivation for development -- on the basis of the time-span in which this development is supposed to have taken place. Traditionally, Paul's conversion is placed around A.D. 32-33, his earliest correspondence (to the Thessalonians) around A.D. 49-51, Romans, with the Corinthian and the Galatian correspondence preceding it, around A.D. 57, and the Prison Epistles around A.D. 61-62.[104] This leaves at least sixteen years in which Paul has been a Christian, sixteen years in which the intense expectation of the parousia continued undiminished. Then, suddenly, in the course of a very few years (from I Thess to II Cor), the delay of the parousia, which apparently had not caused serious difficulty in the course of many years, has suddenly forced a radical shift in Paul's eschatological viewpoint. Such a radical shift in such a short period of time appears inherently improbable.[105] In our exegesis of the

---

[103]Cf. Paul Feine, Theologie des Neuen Testaments (8th ed.; Berlin, 1951), p. 283. Feine interprets I Thess 5:10 in terms of a fellowship with Christ beginning immediately after death. He places the expression on the same level as II Cor 5:6-8 and Phil 1:21-23. J. Müller, Der Lebensbegriff des heiligen Paulus (Wien, 1940), p. 62, holds that the expression oi nekroi en Christō in I Thess 4:16 presupposes the idea that fellowship with Christ continues after death.

[104]See, e.g., C. H. Dodd, Helps to the Study of the Bible (2nd ed.; London, 1932), pp. 87-89. Cf. the discussion of the chronology proposed by Buck and Taylor in the article by V. P. Furnish, "Development", pp. 291-292.

[105]Cf. A. L. Moore, The Parousia in the New Testament (Supplement to NT, 13; Leiden, 1966), p. 61.

relevant Pauline passages we shall have opportunity to demonstrate the validity of the above criticisms.

The view which defines development in Paul's eschatology in terms of crisis experiences in his life, especially that of the threat of death, may be criticized generally on the basis of the time-span available for the kind of profound spiritual and psychological transformation which Dodd, for example, postulates. Twenty pages of Dodd's essay[106] are devoted to refuting Duncan's theory of an Ephesian origin of the Prison Epistles,[107] for he recognizes that if Duncan is right, any case for development in Paul's thought vanishes. For if these epistles, particularly Philippians, were written during Paul's stay (and imprisonment?) in Ephesus, they would fall in the same period with the Corinthian correspondence, and before Romans, leaving virtually no time for development. In fact, Duncan's theory would cause difficulty for any scheme of development, since Romans is generally conceived both chronologically and logically before Philippians.[108] But even if Duncan is wrong, and granting a Roman provenance for the Prison Epistles, every one of Paul's letters would be within a period of about a dozen years, i.e.,

---

[106] Studies, pp. 85-105.

[107] George S. Duncan, Paul's Ephesian Ministry (London, 1929).

[108] See, e.g., W. L. Knox, Church of the Gentiles, p. 96, who even places Romans "logically prior to the development of Paul's thought in the Corinthian Epistles, which are earlier in date". Cf. also, the chronology which Buck and Taylor adopt: they accept an earlier date for Philippians, placing it between I and II Corinthians. But in this scheme, the time available for the development is reduced to a period of less than two months (Saint Paul, p. 175).

A.D. 50-62. Further, since a major development is postulated between I Thess and II Cor, even this traditional chronology allows for but a very few years for this development in Paul's thought. This means that since Paul, in I Thess and I Cor, still gives evidence of his adherence to early Jewish-Christian apocalyptic thought, his thinking did not develop at all during "what would presumably be the formative stages in Paul's career as a Christian, the years following his conversion".[109] It seems intrinsically unlikely that we should find any radical development in Paul's thought in letters dating from a very short period at a stage in his life when he had already been teaching and preaching for years.

Dodd's psychological reconstruction of Paul's personality,[110] though fascinating, is simply too subjective to be convincing, and the related postulation of something like a second conversion experience is extremely doubtful and questionable. Deissmann, for instance, in his picture of Paul, does not offer anything like the same picture. The remarkable tension in the Apostle, which Dodd assigns to the old, not <u>really</u> converted Paul, are seen by Deissmann as Paul's strength and greatness.[111] Moore points out in this connection that Paul refers to

---

[109] John Lowe, "An Examination of Attempts to Detect Development in Saint Paul's Thought", p. 132. Cf. M. Dibelius, <u>Paul</u> (edited and completed by W. G. Kümmel; London, 1953), p. 60: "Except for changes in the emphasis of certain particular doctrines, all the attempts of scholars to distinguish between a doctrinal system that was as yet undeveloped -- in the earliest letters that we have (to Thessalonica) -- and that of the four principal letters...have broken down".

[110] <u>Studies</u>, pp. 67 ff.

[111] A. Deissmann, <u>Paul, A Study in Social and Religious History</u> (London, 1926), pp. 55 ff. Cf. McNeile, <u>St. Paul: His Life, Letters, and Christian Doctrine</u> (Cambridge, 1920), pp. 2 ff.

the Damascus road experience in a passage (Gal 1:15) where important events bearing on his apostleship are being enumerated, yet does not mention (Dodd's postulated) second "really significant" experience save in a passing reference (II Cor 12:9).[112]

But what about the crisis of an impending death for Paul, which Dodd, Buck and Taylor, and many other scholars see as the (or one of several) motivating force(s) for development? Cannot such a crisis have wrought the radical change postulated, even in the course of a very brief period?[113] The problem of the Parusieverzögerung is frequently associated with this idea. Paul faces the possibility of his own death; yet the parousia has not taken place. The conjunction of these two circumstances forces him to rethink his position, and the result of this process is reflected in II Cor 5 and Phil 1:23. The clearest refutation of such a reconstruction of events -- besides the general criticism against the idea of a parousia-delay problem -- is II Cor 1:8-10, the very text in which Paul speaks of the persecution in Asia and the threat of death. The scholars who have used this motif have apparently failed to read on past vs. 9. For in vs. 10 Paul clearly and decisively asserts the conviction that, though he was threatened by death, God miraculously delivered him from this peril, and that God will deliver him again from future threats of death. Now if this means that Paul has had to "reconcile himself to death" as a

---

[112] The Parousia, p. 61, n. 3.

[113] For Buck and Taylor, this argument is significant, since the period allowed for major changes in Paul's thought is but one year.

possibility before the parousia, then a meaning is being pressed out of words that simply do not contain that meaning, for Paul neither implies this nor states it. Taken at face value, Paul expresses the conviction that God will protect him; there is not the slightest hint here of anxiety about the prospect of not living until the parousia. This fact, coupled with the late expressions of a still "intense" expectation of the parousia in Romans (8:23, 13:11) and in Philippians (4:5), forces us decisively to reject the idea that the threat of death caused a major change in Paul's eschatological thought. In support of the contention that, due to the crisis in Asia, Paul decidedly shifted his position, it has been pointed out that whereas in I Cor 15:52 Paul speaks of a sudden transformation of believers by God at the End, in II Cor 3:18 and 4:16 the transformation is gradual.[114] It is difficult to see how such a tour de force can be undertaken. The contexts of the passages make it decisively clear that the former is concerned with an "eschatological" transformation of the physical body, while the latter are concerned with a "spiritual-ethical" transformation of man's inner nature into the likeness of Christ, "so that the life of Jesus may be made manifest in our bodies" (II Cor 4:10). To contrast the two ideas and use them to point out an advance in Paul's thought is simply not warranted.

## F. ATTEMPTS TO RECONCILE DIVERSITY WITHIN PAUL'S ESCHATOLOGICAL THOUGHT

The foregoing considerations have led to the conclusion that the Pauline eschatology is not correctly understood when seen in terms of

---

[114] E.g., Buck and Taylor, Saint Paul, p. 54.

development, whatever the reasons proposed for the development. How, then, can we account for the diversity of expression, of imagery, of "Weltanschauung", of concepts, of terminology, which has led scholars to posit some sort of development? There are those scholars who have attempted a unified interpretation of Paul's eschatology. Some have interpreted the expectation expressed in Phil 1:23 as the special privilege of the martyrs. A. Schweitzer, for whom Paul is an apocalyptic Jew, reasons that Paul, in case of a martyr's death, expects "seine Entrückung zu Christus in alsbaldiger Auferstehung".[115] E. Lohmeyer seems to follow Schweitzer in this interpretation: "Wenn er (der Tod) Gewinn ist, so ist er es allein für den Martyrer, für ihn allein ist er die Krönung des Martyriums, aller Seligkeit des ewigen 'Mit-Christus-seins' voll".[116] Others have sought to support a unified interpretation by demonstrating that the idea of fellowship with Christ at death is present already in the early letters.[117] It is asserted, for example, that the expression oi nekroi en Christō in I Thess 4:16 presupposes the conception that fellowship with Christ continues in death,[118] or that the idea of "sleep" (koimasthai) in I Cor 15 must be interpreted as "blessed rest" and equated with the condition of blessedness described in

---

[115] Die Mystik des Apostels Paulus (Tübingen, 1930), p. 136.

[116] E. Lohmeyer, Der Brief an die Philipper (9th ed., KEK 9/1; Göttingen, 1953), p. 64. Cf. E. Bammel, "Judenverfolgung und Naherwartung: Zur Eschatologie des Ersten Thessalonicherbriefs", ZThK 56 (1959), pp. 294-315, who follows Lohmeyer in his interpretation (p. 311, n. 5).

[117] See n. 103, above.

[118] J. Müller, Lebensbegriff, p. 62.

II Cor 5, where fellowship with Christ is no longer restricted and marred by the life in the flesh.[119]

These attempts to find one single eschatological system in Paul seem to be either attempts to expunge "undesirable" elements from what "should be" a unified system, or to establish Paul as a consistent and systematic thinker. On the other hand, is it enough, with John Lowe, to discount the possibility of finding a unifying factor in Paul's eschatology, and to describe it as a "whole wonderful muddle unarranged and alive..."?[120] This latter view results from the recognition that even in Paul's late letters, where his "developed eschatology" is usually seen to be reflected, the intense expectation of an imminent parousia remains undiminished. W. Lueken[121] concludes that "Beide Zukunftserwartungen stehen fast unvermittelt nebeneinander". H. Windisch[122] gives this "Nebeneinander" a psychological rationale:

> It must be noted that Paul's eschatology is no unified whole, but the sum total of both independent conceptions and interdependent fragments.

---

[119]Cf. B. Weiss, Lehrbuch der Biblischen Theologie (7th ed.; Stuttgart-Berlin, 1903), p. 389 and n. 4.

[120]"Development in St. Paul's Thought", p. 142. Lowe posits four reasons for the "baffling inconsistencies" in Paul's thought: 1) changes in mood, 2) changes of external circumstances, 3) perpetual tension between his Jewish heritage and his Christian experience, and 4) "the most satisfying reason...,the real justification for his apparent inconsistencies, is the inherently paradoxical character of the Gospel he preaches".

[121]W. Lueken, Der Brief an die Philipper (3rd ed.; Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments, II; Göttingen, 1917), p. 308. Cf. P. Althaus, "Retraktationen zur Eschatologie", ThLZ 75 (1950), pp. 253-258, who opposes any attempt at a unified interpretation of Paul's eschatology.

[122]H. Windisch, Der Zweite Korintherbrief (9th ed., KEK, 6; Göttingen, 1924), p. 174.

> Paul is selective, and chooses variously from the Jewish, Hellenistic, and Christian tradition known to him, depending on his mood or need at the time. Thus it is that at one and the same time he is able to reproduce and develop mutually exclusive ideas, that fundamental conceptions are completely eliminated, that completely new thoughts are incorporated. In all this he neither recognizes, nor seeks to eliminate, the contradictory elements, because he is not a dogmatician but rather a man of tradition, of intuition, of impulse. It is thus illegitimate to say that he changed his mind at various points, because we are in the gray area of gradually changing perspectives, of variation in the use made of the tradition.

## G. THESIS: A DUAL ESCHATOLOGY IN PAUL

For this writer, neither the somewhat forced interpretations of a unified Pauline eschatology, nor its interpretation as a "wonderful muddle unarranged and alive", seems to represent adequately the Pauline view. We are in substantial agreement with the latter position in so far as it recognizes the presence, throughout the Pauline writings, of the expectation, both of the parousia, and also of an eschatological union with Christ which commences with death. On the other hand, we do not agree that we have to do here with an unconnected juxtaposition of these two conceptions. M. Dibelius well expresses the position, which will be defended in this study, when he asserts that "ein Nebeneinander von eschatologischer Erwartung der Parusie und der individualistischen Hoffnung auf die Zeit nach dem Tode" corresponds to the "Eigenart paulinischen Glaubens in gewisser Weise....Während die Eschatologie Weltvollendung und persönliche Vollendung zusammenfallen lässt, kann der Glaube des Einzelnen den Zeitpunkt otan elthe to teleion [I Cor 13: 10], auf den Tod verlegen".[123] Now the "particularity of Pauline faith"

---

[123] M. Dibelius, Die Briefe des Apostels Paulus, II: An die Philipper, (3rd ed., HbzNT, 11; Tübingen, 1937), p. 69.

consists in the dialectical, paradoxical juxtaposition of the "already" and the "not yet" aspects of the redemptive event. If it is true, as Dodd and others have asserted, that there is a realized element in the Pauline eschatology, that reconciliation with God has been effected, that the new creation has begun (II Cor 5), then for Paul this realized element cannot be suspended by death, only to be resumed in the "eschaton", for "...death...will (not) be able to separate us from the love of God in Jesus Christ..." (Rom 8:38). Thus, the realized element persists beyond death, or better, persists in the face of death. At the same time, on the historical, the cosmic plane, the "not yet" element of eschatological fulfillment is rather conspicuous: "...the creation waits with eager longing" (Rom 8:19). Thus, for Paul, the idea of continuing "redeemedness" (Gerettetsein) on a personal, experiential level, which even death cannot abrogate or suspend, is not incompatible with the idea of an historical, or better, end-historical cosmic redemptive act involving parousia and resurrection. Both realities are for Paul grounded in the redemptive event of cross and resurrection, neither is possible without this event. Consequently, both the so-called "Jewish" and "Hellenistic" views are transformed! What to us seem to be inconsistencies are for Paul simply two sides of the same coin, two ways of looking at the same reality. From the point of view of the personal-relational experience, syn Christō einai (Phil 1:23) is simply the continuation and culmination of the present existence en Christō.[124] Here, external-historical events are virtually

---

[124]Of course, the formula syn Christō is also used on occasion to refer to the reality of present Christian existence, as well as to the apocalyptically conceived reality of presence with Christ after the parousia. Cf. Chapter V, below.

excluded from the purview, except for the historical event of one's death, though this becomes a rather "personal" event. On the other hand, from the point of view of the cosmic-historical process, there are the objective events of Incarnation (Life, Death, Resurrection), of parousia, of Judgment, of ultimate Reconciliation. Thus, the two views stand side by side, seemingly contradictory and mutually exclusive, but actually, in Paul's view, two aspects of the same reality: life en Christō.

The correctness of this interpretation will have to be demonstrated in our exegesis of the relevant Pauline passages. There is, however, a more specific problem which this study addresses, namely: what, apart from his experience of Christ (which in any view is decisive for Paul), made it possible for the Apostle to hold to both "eschatological" realities -- the personal and the cosmic-historical -- without abandoning either the one or the other? What made it possible for him to hold them in tension, and to relate them both to the reality "in Christ", without becoming aware of the (to us) glaring inconsistency?

In our analysis and critique of some basic presuppositions in Pauline studies, we tentatively indicated that Paul was likely heir to a kind of Judaism which had not been unaffected by Hellenistic intrusions, even in Palestine. So-called Greek conceptions of immortality and blessedness immediately after death were already present, though these conceptions had been somewhat Judaized, and they existed side by side, often in the same literary work, with apocalyptic-eschatological conceptions. It seems hardly possible, however, that these general "intimations

of immortality" in Jewish literature were in any sense formative influences upon Paul's thought, although their presence in Palestine in the first century is significant in terms of the diversity of thought to which Paul must have been exposed. There is, however, one literary work, the Wisdom of Solomon,[125] dating from the middle of the last century B.C., which presents a unique juxtaposition of two diverse eschatological conceptions: the righteous, who die before God's great eschatological intervention at the End, are at rest, in the hand of God, share the joys of the Sons of God -- immediately upon death; but there is also the conviction that there will be a cosmic-historical triumph of God over his rebellious creation. What makes both realities possible, and what unites them, is the reality, the presence, the work of Wisdom/Spirit in the individual and in history. Thus, we have a juxtaposition of two diverse eschatological conceptions, held in tension by means of the presence of Wisdom, which is in many respects similar to what we find in Paul, although of course for Paul Wisdom has been replaced by Christ.[126]

In answer to the question posed above, namely, what made it possible for Paul (apart from his experience of Christ), to hold to both the personal and cosmic-historical eschatological realities, without

---

[125]For the place of the Wisdom of Solomon in the context of other Jewish literature, see the excellent study by J. Fichtner, "Die Stellung der Sapientia Salomonis in der Literatur und Geistesgeschichte ihrer Zeit", ZNW 36 (1937), pp. 113-132. Introductory questions regarding the Wisdom of Solomon will be discussed in Chapter III, below.

[126]Cf. H. Windisch, "Die göttliche Weisheit der Juden und die paulinisch Christologie", in Neutestamentliche Studien für G. Heinrici (Untersuchungen zum N.T., 6; Leipzig, 1914), pp. 220-234. See particularly, Chapter V, below.

abandoning the one for the other -- the thesis proposed and defended in this study is that it is very possible that the Wisdom of Solomon provided Paul with a two-sided eschatological model, and that it was a determining influence in his own formulation of the eschatological realities which he discovered in Christ.

It has long been recognized, of course, that certain of the so-called "transcendental-eschatological" elements in the eschatology of the Wisdom of Solomon were probably used by Paul. But such a relationship was usually seen to be confined to individual passages, and fitted into the theory of Paul's development from Judaism to Hellenism.[127] Thus, W. L. Knox connects II Cor 5:1 ff. with WS 9:15, defining the Wisdom of Solomon as "Hellenistic literature".[128] What has not been

---

[127]The influence of the Wisdom of Solomon on Paul has usually been held to have come via Diaspora Judaism, since the work is clearly of Alexandrian origin. However, the extensive use made of the work by writers of the New Testament, would indicate that the book was known and read in Palestine in the first century A.D. This is particularly evident from the close parallels that exist between this book and the Gospel of John. See C. H. Dodd, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel (Cambridge, 1953), pp. 274-275; also R. E. Brown, The Gospel According to John, I-XII (The Anchor Bible, 29; New York, 1966), pp. LXI, CXXII-CXXV; also his Appendix II, pp. 521-523. Cf. also, G. Ziener, "Weisheitsbuch und Johannesevangelium", Bib 38 (1957), pp. 396-418; 39 (1958), pp. 37-60; and H. R. Moeller, "Wisdom Motifs in John's Gospel", BEvTHS 6 (1963), pp. 92-100. It is also becoming increasingly certain that the Johannine tradition has strong Palestinian roots. (See the review of recent research by S. Smalley, "New Light on the Fourth Gospel", TB 17 (1966), pp. 35-62.) Beside these considerations, the active exchange between the Diaspora Judaism of Alexandria and Palestinian Judaism would make it inherently more probable that a work as "Jewish" as the Wisdom of Solomon would become known to Paul in Palestine before his extensive contact with the Diaspora Judaism of Syria and Asia Minor.

[128]The Church of the Gentiles, p. 136, n. 8. Cf. H. St. J. Thackary, The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought (London, 1900), pp. 131 ff.

appreciated is the "total" impact that the "total" eschatological view of the Wisdom of Solomon may have had on the Pauline formulation. The possibility of such an impact is supported by the theory that Paul most likely knew and used the Wisdom of Solomon as authoritative scripture, a theory which has been ably defended in a number of studies.[129] We shall review the case for Paul's use of, and dependence upon, the Wisdom of Solomon below, as it is crucial for our thesis. However, general dependence upon the work does not in itself establish specific dependence upon particular themes within it. Therefore, a detailed exegesis of the eschatological passages in the Wisdom of Solomon will be necessary in order to provide the data which will make a comparison with the Pauline eschatology possible. The exegesis will have to be amplified by a terminological analysis of significant concepts, in order to determine the meaning they may have had for the author. On the basis of a similar exegetical analysis of the pertinent Pauline passages, the attempt will be made to see the two complex eschatologies in their relation to one another.

It must be noted here that this study will not attempt to prove that Paul used the Wisdom of Solomon as his eschatological model. The following chapter[130] on Paul's use of the Wisdom of Solomon will show

---

[129]E.g., Eduard Grafe, "Das Verhältnis der paulinischen Schriften zur Sapientia Salomonis", in Theologische Abhandlungen für Carl von Weizsäcker (Freiburg, 1892), pp. 251-286. Paul Heinisch, Das Buch der Weisheit (ExHbzAT 24; Münster, 1912). B. J. Roberts, "St Paul and the Book of Wisdom", IJA (July, 1909), pp. 58-60. Kasimir Romaniuk, "Le Livre de la Sagesse dans le Nouveau Testament", NTS 14 (1967-68), pp. 498-514.

[130]See also Chapter V, below.

how few definite literary connections exist. Yet it will also demonstrate extensive acquaintance with specific themes in the work. Thus, Paul, being thoroughly versed in its content, is likely to have been affected by it, though not citing passages verbatim. This is particularly true with reference to the "eschatological" passages in the Wisdom of Solomon, as we shall see. And yet, we believe it can be demonstrated that the impact of content was much more extensive than verbal connections would indicate. It is hoped that the demonstration of this impact upon the Pauline eschatology will contribute to a better understanding of the tension in Paul's eschatological thought.

## CHAPTER II

## PAUL AND THE WISDOM OF SOLOMON

### A. PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS

Did Paul know the WS, and if he knew it, did he make use of it, and was he influenced by its thought? We shall see below that various answers have been given to these questions and that the various possibilities have led other scholars to express a reserved agnosticism in respect to the questions posed above. Thus, O. Eissfeldt, though stating that "there are not infrequent echoes of it [the WS] in his [Paul's] letters", concludes that "We cannot decide with certainty whether Paul knew and used it".[1] Since the relative rarity of close verbal parallels between Paul and the WS precludes the possibility of decisive proof of literary dependence, the skepticism expressed by Eissfeldt and others can be justified. However, as we shall attempt to show, there are such close "ideological" parallels and points of contact that it can be shown with a high degree of probability that Paul knew the WS and was influenced by it.

Before we proceed to review and analyze the case for Pauline dependence and to document the probability that Paul was influenced by the WS, preliminary consideration must be given to the question whether the WS and/or its distinctive ideas were at all known and present in the

---

[1] O. Eissfeldt, The Old Testament. An Introduction. Tr. from 3rd German ed. by P. R. Ackroyd (New York-London, 1965), p. 602.

Palestinian realm. In reference to our contention that the distinctive eschatological ideas of the WS may have influenced Paul in his early thought, this question becomes important. For if it could be demonstrated that the WS, with its eschatological thought, had no place in the complex Judaism to which Paul was heir, then its influence upon his early thought would have to be questioned on a priori grounds,[2] and those connections which many scholars have noted would either have to be attributed to other sources, or to a late influence by the WS upon the apostle, by way of Diaspora Judaism. The former alternative would lead us to seek for individualistic-eschatological ideas in other Jewish literature known to have been present in the Palestine of the first century. We shall see below that there are very few, and mostly imprecise and vague, indications of such ideas in Jewish intertestamental literature, though their presence is in itself an indication of an openness for other than strictly prophetic-apocalyptic conceptions. The second alternative posed above would lead again in the direction of development from Paul's early to his late eschatological thought, a development which we have rejected tentatively on other grounds and will have to establish exegetically. On the basis of the conviction that the Pauline letters betray a dual-eschatology from the very outset, we contend that the kind of impact which the WS could have provided must have taken place when Paul's "early" thought was taking shape, i.e., in those

---

[2]It is of course also clear that its place in that Judaism, if demonstrated, would not necessarily establish its influence on Paul. Nevertheless, the possibility of that influence would be given.

same years when he shared the "apocalyptic" outlook with the primitive Christian community.

## B. THE WISDOM OF SOLOMON AND PALESTINIAN JUDAISM

A brief look at the history of the formation of the canon of the Old Testament, both in Palestine and in Alexandria, reveals that whereas the WS became part of the Alexandrian Bible, it found no home in the canon of Palestine.[3] Why the apocryphal writings were not admitted into the Palestinian canon cannot be determined with certainty. It is likely that no Jewish book composed originally in Greek (as is most probably the case with the WS) would have ever been considered. But what about those apocryphal writings which were composed in Hebrew[4] and only later translated into Greek, most likely because there was a demand for these writings among Greek-speaking Jews?[5] One reason for the ultimate rejection

---

[3]Cf. R. H. Pfeiffer, "Canon of the Old Testament" in IDB, I (New York, 1962), pp. 498-520.

[4]The books most certainly composed originally in Hebrew (or Aramaic) are Tobit, Ecclesiasticus, Judith, I Maccabees and I Baruch. Cf. R. H. Brockington, A Critical Introduction to the Apocrypha (London, 1961), pp. 1-12; R. H. Pfeiffer, History of New Testament Times. With an Introduction to the Apocrypha (New York, 1949).

[5]Cf. M. Hengel, Judentum und Hellenismus, p. 461. "Die Apokalyptik (scheint) auch weit in die Diaspora hineingewirkt zu habe. Die jüdischen Sibyllinen (ab 140 v. Chr.) und das slavische Henochbuch sind ein deutliches Zeugnis dafür". Hengel further asserts that the multitude of Apocalypses and the Testaments of the 12 Patriarchs need not necessarily have been composed in Palestine. "Selbst wenn sie ursprünglich hebräisch-aramäisch geschrieben waren, hätte man sich ohne verbreitetes Interesse in der Diaspora kaum die Mühe gemacht, diese und andere apokalyptische Werke ins Griechische zu übersetzen. Auch die Missionspredigt des Urchristentums wäre ohne entsprechende apokalyptische Neigung in der Diaspora kaum möglich gewesen" (p. 462).

of the apocryphal works at the time of the Council of Jamnia (c. A.D. 90) was surely the use made of these writings by the Christian communities. The same reason played its part in the rejection and condemnation of the LXX under the leadership of Rabbi Akiba in A.D. 130, which Greek Old Testament probably contained the apocryphal writings.[6] Since many of the apocryphal writings are clearly of Palestinian provenance, their non-inclusion in the Palestinian canon in no way indicates that these works were not known, or even widely read and treasured, by many Jews or groups of Jews within Palestine. The Dead Sea Covenanters differed apparently from normative Judaism in recognizing some sacred books unknown or rejected by the rabbis. They not only knew and used the books of the Old Testament, but also some of the books not officially admitted into the canon, since fragments of Tobit and Ecclesiasticus have been found among their literary remains.[7] Further, the books of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha preserved by the Christians illustrate the types of books that some Jews or groups of Jews recognized, if not as canonical, as edifying, sacred, or inspired writings.[8] From the closing of the

---

[6]Cf. H. B. Sweete, An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek (Reprint of 2nd ed. of 1914.) (New York, 1968), Part II. See also, Sidney Jellicoe, The Septuagint and Modern Study (Oxford, 1968), pp. 74 ff., who affirms that "with the dawn of the Apostolic Age the Greek Old Testament had firmly established itself, both throughout the Dispersion and in Palestine itself....in Palestine (it) enjoyed a prestige exceeded only by that which it enjoyed in the dispersion".

[7]M. Burrows, More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls (New York, 1958), p. 117.

[8]Cf. Pfeiffer, "Canon", p. 510. A. Schlatter, Geschichte Israels, p. 67. "Der Kreis der zur Vorlesung im Gottesdienst zugelassenen Bücher konnte sich nach örtlichen Gewohnheiten verschieden gestalten und der verschiedene Umfang des alt-testamentlichen Kanons in den verschiedenen Teilen der Kirche während des zweiten Jahrhunderts lässt vermuten, dass

Palestinian canon near the end of the first century[9] it can be deduced that a controversy concerning apocryphal writings was going on within the Palestinian Judaism of the first century, and that the middle to last decades of this century witnessed the final stages toward the finalization of the canon.[10] The leaders of what emerged as normative Judaism toward the close of the first century A.D. were doubtless acquainted with the books that were read by their dispersed brethren in Alexandria[11] and by sectarian groups within Palestine; for only on the basis of such an acquaintance can their negative attitude be explained. They chose to reject these writings; but they could neither remove them from popular use, nor muffle the influence that these works had on the Jewish people, both in Palestine and in the dispersion.[12]

---

auch in den jüdischen Gemeinden nicht unbedeutende Verschiedenheiten vorhanden gewesen sind".

[9]The date for the close of the Palestinian canon is generally placed c. A.D. 90, although there is evidence that Akiba was still engaged in debates on some books deemed canonical by his time. Cf. E. E. Ellis, Paul's Use of the Old Testament, pp. 33-37, "Paul's Canon". Cf. also, Jellicoe, The Septuagint, p. 75, who holds that the fixing of the canon was a much lengthier process than was once thought, and that this process was still not completed by the time of the Bar Cochba revolt in A.D. 132.

[10]O. Michel, Paulus und seine Bibel, BzFChrTh 2/18 (Gütersloh, 1929), p. 11. Cf. W. Staerk, "Der Schrift und Kanonbegriff der jüdischen Bibel", ZSyTh 6/1 (1928), p. 111.

[11]From the silence of Philo we cannot reach the conclusion that there was no difference between the Alexandrian and Palestinian evaluation of "canonicity", as Ellis does in Paul's Use of the Old Testament, p. 34.

[12]Cf. Peter Katz, "The Old Testament Canon in Palestine and Alexandria", ZNW 47 (1956), pp. 197-217; Albert C. Sundberg, Jr., "The Old Testament of the Early Church", HTR 51 (1958), pp. 205-226, has demonstrated that a Greek text type of the Old Testament was current among Jews in Palestine in the first century A.D., and that both Greek and Hebrew/Aramaic Jewish writings of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha circulated in Palestine at

Thus, the possibility remains that the WS, together with other apocryphal writings, was known in Palestine in the first century A.D.[13] This possibility is strengthened when certain other factors are considered. The influence of the WS on Paul (when it has been asserted) has often been held to have come via Diaspora Judaism, since the work is clearly of Alexandrian origin.[14] However, the active interchange carried on between the Diaspora Judaism of Alexandria and Palestinian Judaism would make it inherently more probable that a work as "Jewish"[15] as the WS would become known to Paul in Palestine[16] before his extensive

---

the time. His study further shows that the third "canonical" group, i.e., the "Writings", was undefined, and included works which were later excluded.

[13]J. N. Sevenster, Do You Know Greek? How Much Greek could the First Christians Have Known? (Suppl. to NT 19; Leiden, 1968), has demonstrated quite conclusively that the Greek language was known and read quite extensively in the Palestine of the first century, not only among the educated and upper strata of Jewish society, but also among the common people. This fact underlines the possibility that Jewish literature, composed in Greek perhaps outside Palestine, could have been read and used more extensively than hitherto supposed.

[14]E.g., W. L. Knox, Church of the Gentiles, p. 163, n. 8.

[15]"Sap [ientia vertritt] keinen rein alexandrinischen Standpunkt, sondern auch Gedanken...die auf palästinensischem Boden denkbar sind, wie denn überhaupt die Grenzlinie zwischen palästinensischem und hellenistischem Judentum in unserer Zeit eine fliessende sein dürfte" (Grafe, Verhältnis, p. 258).

[16]M. Hengel, Judentum und Hellenismus, pp. 459-460, contends that "die Grenze gegenüber der Diaspora war eine fliessende und kann nicht geradlinig gezogen werden; der Gegenseitige Austausch, auf theologisch-geistigem Gebiet, scheint äusserst rege gewesen zu sein, zumal Jerusalem durch die bewusste Politik der Hasmonäer und des Herodes ab dem 2. Jh. v. Chr. in noch stärkerem Masse als zuvor zum religiösen und geistigen Zentrum des Weltjudentums geworden war: Jersualem war in hellenistisch-römischer Zeit eine 'internationale Stadt', in der sich die Vertreter der Diaspora aus aller Welt trafen".

contact with the Diaspora Judaism of Syria and Asia Minor during his missionary activity. The possibility of its impact on Palestinian religious thought is underlined increasingly by the close parallels that are seen to exist between the WS and the Gospel of John.[17] This recognition goes hand in hand with the increasing certainty that the Johannine tradition has strong Palestinian roots.[18] Thus, if the WS influenced the Johannine tradition as it was taking shape within some Jewish-Christian group in the Palestinian realm, the possibility is given that its influence in the Judaism of Palestine was more pervasive than has often been recognized.

Especially during the nineteenth century the view was defended that the WS is thoroughly influenced and penetrated by Greek philosophy,[19] so that any decisive influence upon the religious thinking of Palestine had to be ruled out of court. As late as 1928, Büchsel designates the

---

[17] See literature cited above, Chapter I, n. 127. R. Brown, John I-XII, p. LXI, maintains that "the most decisive influence on the form and style of the discourses of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel comes from the speeches of divine Wisdom in books like Proverbs, Sirach, and Wisdom of Solomon". To us, the most significant parallels are those between John and the WS.

[18] "A large number of scholars are coming to agree that the principal background for Johannine thought was the Palestinian Judaism of Jesus' time" (Brown, ibid., p. LIX).

[19] See the excellent presentation of this research in P. Heinisch, Die griechische Philosophie im Buch der Weisheit (AltAbh, 14; Münster, 1908), pp. 7 ff. The impetus for the trend away from this understanding of the WS was given in a series of studies by W. Weber, "Die Unsterblichkeit der Weisheit Salomos", ZWTh 48 (1904-1905), pp. 409-444; and "Die Seelenlehre der Weisheit Salomos", ZWTh 51 (1909), pp. 314-332. On the basis of these studies, he concludes, in "Heimat und Zeitalter des Eschatologischen Buches der Weisheit", ZWTh 53 (1911), pp. 322-345, on p. 322, that he could not detect the influence of Greek philosophy in the WS.

WS a "rein griechisches Buch".[20] This view has not been able to maintain itself in the more recent investigations.[21] This newer research has demonstrated that the WS, despite many points of contact with Greek thought, is thoroughly dominated by the matter and spirit of the Old Testament.[22] Isaiah seems to have been particularly influential.[23] For example, the parable of the carpenter in Is. 44:13-20 is clearly the basis for part of Ps-Solomon's polemic against idolatry in WS 13:11-19. To be sure, the story is repeated without decisive verbal correspondence, but the similarities between the parables are so great that they can be explained only on the basis of a literary relationship.[24] Further, WS

---

[20] F. Büchsel, Johannes und der hellenistische Synkretismus (Gütersloh, 1928), p. 86.

[21] See especially P. Heinisch, Die griechische Philosophie, pp. 155 ff.; J. Heinemann, Poseidonios' Metaphysische Schriften (Breslau, 1921), I, p. 152; J. Fichtner, "Die Stellung der Sapientia Salomonis in der Literatur-undGeistesgeschichte ihrer Zeit", ZNW 36 (1937), pp. 128 ff.; E. Schürer, Geschichte, III, pp. 505-506, had already asserted that of all the literary products of Hellenistic-Jewish thought, the WS "(steht) der Form nach der alten palästinischen Spruchweisheit am nächsten ....Der eigene theologische Standpunkt des Verfassers schliesst sich an die palästinische Spruchweisheit, wie wir sie aus den Sprüchen Salomonis und aus Jesus Sirach kennen, an".

[22] Cf. Fichtner, "Stellung der Sapientia", p. 115: "Die ersten Kapitel setzen bei Anspielung auf Atliche Stellen nicht selten einen Text voraus, der nicht LXX entspricht, sondern selbständige Wiedergabe von Mt zu sein scheint (Jes 56 ff. in c. 3-5)".

[23] Cf. P. W. Skehan, "Isaiah and the Teaching of the Book of Wisdom", CBQ 2 (1940), pp. 289-299.

[24] M. J. Suggs, "Wisdom of Solomon 2:10-5: A Homily based on the Fourth Servant Song", JBL 76 (1957), pp. 26-33.

11:22, with its picture of the world's insignificance before the power of God, recalls Is 40:15:[25]

> The whole world before thee is like
> a speck that tips the scales,
> and like a drop of morning dew... (WS 11:22)
>
> The nations are like a drop from a bucket,
> and are accounted as dust on the scales;
> (Is 40:15)

Again, the misunderstanding of the lot of the righteous in WS 3:1-3, 4:17 echoes Is 57:1-2: in both, the death of the righteous man is misunderstood; in both, their lot is described as "entering into peace" (ἐν εἰρήνῃ); in both, the wicked are condemned. Finally, the most striking influence on the WS from Is seems to be its description of the suffering servant, which likely provided Ps-Solomon with an example for his description of the suffering righteous. J. Suggs has ably demonstrated that the παῖς-figure of the WS (2:13 ff.) shares the nature of the experience of the παῖς of Is 52:13 ff.[26] Besides the Isaiah influence on Ps-Solomon's conception of the suffering righteous, Ps 88 (LXX) is also echoed; a number of similarities with WS 2:12 ff. indicate that characteristics of the Davidic king were transferred to the righteous:

---

[25] Cf. Fichtner, "Die Stellung der Sapientia", p. 115.

[26] Op. cit., pp. 29 ff. Cf. D. Georgi, "Der Vorpaulinische Hymnus Phil 2:6-11" in Zeit und Geschichte. Festschrift für R. Bultmann (Tübingen, 1964), pp. 266, n. 16; 271, n. 37.

Some of the most striking parallels are: WS 2:14 where the oppressors refer to the "child" as being "grievous unto us even to behold"; cf. Is 53:2. WS 2:19-20 characterizes the righteous man as "patient under wrong" and "gentle"; he is given a shameful death; cf. Is 53:7-9. In both WS 3:2-3 and Is 53:4 the child/servant is "accounted (λογίζεσθαι) hurt (κάκωσις)".

like the king, the righteous one is both servant (Ps 88:21; WS 2:13) and son of God (Ps 88:28; WS 2:18); like the king, he may call God his father (Ps 88:27; WS 2:16); like the king, the righteous one is protected from his enemies, who are crushed by God (Ps 88:22-24; WS 5:16), yet they are also delivered into the hands of their enemies.[27]

Affinity with Jewish Wisdom literature is also present. Thus, the curse of sinful children in WS 3:12-4:1 recalls Sir 16:1-3. The assumption of the righteous man in WS 4:10 may depend on Sir 44:16, though it may also be directly formulated on the basis of Gen 5:24. In Prv 8:15 f. it is said that σοφία empowers kings to reign and speak justice. WS 6:21 seems to build on this conception, but then goes beyond it by asserting that σοφία enables them for an eternal reign. Also, the idea of loving Wisdom, seeking her, and finding her (Prv 8:17) is the basis for the same assertion in WS 6:12-13.[28]

Besides these relationships with the earlier books of the Old Testament and the Wisdom literature, the WS also betrays influence from apocalyptic literature, notably Daniel and I Enoch.[29] The most notable

---

[27]Cf. G. Ziener, "Die Verwendung der Schrift im Buche der Weisheit", TrThZ 66 (1957), pp. 138-152; P. Skehan, "Borrowings from the Psalms in the Book of Wisdom", CBQ 10 (1948), pp. 384-397.

Several other psalms possibly influenced the WS: cf. Ps 104:39 - WS 10:17; Ps 2 - WS 6:1-11. It also seems that Ps-Solomon has transferred characteristics and attributes from the Davidic king to Wisdom: WS 72:8 - WS 8:1; Ps 110:1 - WS 9:4; Ps 2:7; Ps 109:3 (LXX) - WS 7:25 f. (Ziener, p. 145).

[28]Cf. Ziener, op. cit., pp. 144-145.

[29]Fichtner, "Die Stellung der Sapientia", p. 124: "Die Annäherung der Chokma an die apakalyptischen Erwartungen wird im palästinischen Schrifttum des II. Jhs. v. Chr. in zwei Büchern sichtbar, deren enge Verwandtschaft mit Sap. nicht deutlich genug betont werden kann: Daniel und Henoch (Spez. 91-105)".

affinities with I Enoch are: the expectation of a sudden judgment (94: 6 f. - WS 6:5); the erroneous judgment of the wicked concerning the final lot of the righteous (102:6 - WS 4:17); the challenge to "love righteousness" (94:1 - WS 1:1); the hopelessness for the "healing" of the wicked (95:4; 98:10 - WS 2:1); the certainty that none of their sins will remain hidden (98:6 ff. - WS 1:6, 10:8).[30] With Daniel, the WS shares the knowledge that the king's power is given him by God (2:21, 37 - WS 6:3 f., 9:7), that it is sinful to give divine honor to him (3:5, 8 - WS 14:17 f.). Beyond these general similarities, there are some striking verbal correspondences between WS 12:12 and Dan 4:35:

τίς γὰρ ἐρεῖ τί ἐποίησας;
ἢ τίς ἀντιστήσεται τῷ κρίματί σου;
οὐκ ἔστιν ὃς ἀντιποιήσεται τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ
καὶ ἐρεῖ αὐτῷ τί ἐποίησας;

Further, the unique idea of the WS that nature increases or decreases her power and effectiveness vis-à-vis the wicked and the righteous, respectively (5:17, 16:24, 19:19 f., etc.), can already be documented in Daniel: thus, the flames for which the three young men were destined, destroyed the king's servants when they came near, while they were engulfed by them and not harmed (3:22,24); the hungry lions did not harm Daniel (6:23), while they devoured his enemies even before they hit the bottom of the pit (6:25).[31]

---

[30]For parallels between WS and I Enoch 37-71, cf. W. Weber, "Heimat und Zeitalter des Eschatologischen Buches der Weisheit Salomos", ZWTh 53 (1911), pp. 322-345, on pp. 329-332. For his treatment of parallels with I Enoch 91-105, see pp. 332-337.

[31]Fichtner, op. cit., pp. 125-126.

From all this it is apparent that the WS fits easily into a thought-world at home in the Judaism of Palestine, a thought-world fed by the various literary elements discussed above.[32] The recognition of this Jewish thought-milieu of the WS is even present in those recent studies which once again seek to come to grips with the WS's contact with Greek/Hellenistic sources. Larcher[33] devotes considerably more space to tracing the WS's literary relationships with other Jewish writings than he does to Hellenistic influence. In the latter he limits himself to an "over-all view".[34] Reese[35] goes beyond Larcher. Although he also rejects the direct influence of Greek philosophy, he works out considerable relationships with Hellenistic writings.[36] Yet, he too recognizes the theological continuity of the book with the Old Testament as demonstrated by the work of scholars to whom we referred above.[37]

---

[32]Fichtner, "Die Stellung der Sapientia", pp. 113-132, concludes his study with the following observation: "Die Sap Sal ist -- bei aller griechisch-philosophischen Färbung -- in ihrem Kern ein ausgesprochen jüdisches apokalyptisches Weisheitsbuch" (p. 131).

[33]C. Larcher, Études sur le Livre de la Sagesse (Etudes Bibliques; Paris, 1969), pp. 86-178, 179-236.

[34]Ibid., p. 181.

[35]J. M. Reese, Hellenistic Influence on the Book of Wisdom and its Consequences (Analecta Biblica 41; Rome, 1970).

[36]Ibid., pp. 1-89.

[37]Ibid., pp. 88-89. Reese is concerned to show that the WS did more than simply restate earlier biblical teaching in a new form: "His work is a practical example of how his ardent faith was able to contemplate the marvels of revelation and thus use his insights as a means of integrating advances in human learning and culture into an apologia for the divine plan of salvation for mankind".

He points out that the WS's defense of the God of revelation and of his working in history has been called an attempt at a "fusion" of two cultures.[38] "In reality", he continues, "the Sage does not place his faith and Hellenism on the same level. For him, revelation is more fundamental; it is the integrating element of both the personal destiny of the individual and the common destiny of mankind".[39]

We may summarize. The result of the newer investigations into the relationships of the WS with its thought-environment is the recognition of its close ties with the Jewish-Palestinian literature. Thus, it is not surprising that a number of points of contact between the WS and the Qumran community have been found,[40] and that the Manual of Discipline has even been seen as a source of a passage in the WS.[41] Thus (in spite of its origin in the realm of Hellenistic Judaism),[42] the WS becomes an

---

[38]This is the term used by M. Hadas in "Plato in Hellenistic Fusion", JHI, 19 (1958), pp. 3-13.

[39]Reese, Hellenistic Influence, p. 89.

[40]Ibid., p. 63. Cf. M. Delcor, "L'immortalité de l'âme dans le Livre de la Sagesse et dans les documents de Qumrân", NRTh 77 (1955), pp. 614-630. But see the discussion of Delcor's thesis in H. Ringgren, The Faith of Qumran, tr. by E. T. Sander (Philadelphia, 1963), pp. 149-150.

[41]A. M. Dubarle, "Une source du livre de la Sagesse?" RSPhTh 37 (1953), pp. 425-442. He originally argued for an influence of 1QS 3.23-24 upon WS 2:24. After his reasoning was refuted by S. Lyonnet, "Le sens de en Sap. 2.24 et la doctrine du péché originel", Bib 39 (1958), pp. 27-33, he modified his position and maintained that the question is still an open one ["La tentation diabolique dans le Livre de la Sagesse (2.24)", in Mélanges E. Tisserant, I (Vatican City, 1964), pp. 187-195].

[42]There have been several attempts to account for the "Jewishness" of this hellenistic book by postulating a Hebrew source or sources, which the author of the complete book translated into Greek [e.g., Purinton,

important witness, together with the Qumran texts, for Jewish-theological thought at the beginning of the Christian era in Palestine.[43] The possibility is therefore given that the book influenced Paul's thought in the context of the Judaism of Palestine.[44]

## C. POINTS OF CONTACT BETWEEN PAUL AND THE WISDOM OF SOLOMON

### 1. Previous Studies

Both Origen and Jerome had maintained that the apocryphal books

---

"Translation Greek in the Wisdom of Solomon", JBL 47 (1923), pp. 276-304; A. E. Speiser, "The Hebrew Origin of the First Part of the Book of Wisdom", JQR 14 (1923/24), pp. 455-482]. However, more recent scholars generally reject this view, maintaining that the entire book was originally composed in Greek [see e.g., Eissfeldt, Introduction, p. 602; Pfeiffer, History, pp. 319-323; S. Holmes, "The Wisdom of Solomon", in Charles, Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, I (Oxford, 1913), pp. 524 ff.], and that the thoroughly Jewish character of the work can be accounted for on the assumption that the author was steeped in the Old Testament. Perhaps he was even a Palestinian Jew who had been educated at Alexandria.

[43]It is significant in this connection to note that in the attempt to universalize the teaching of Scripture, the author of the WS does not use the method of allegory, as Philo did later, but rather that of typology. And in this he is very close to the method used by Paul to describe the relation between the Old and the New Covenants. For Paul's use of "types" see Rom 5:14; 1 Cor 10:6. Cf. I. Heinemann, "Die Allegoristik der hellenistischen Juden ausser Philo", Mnemosyne, 4/5 (1952), pp. 130-138, who calls the method of the WS "symbolic".

[44]In his "Beiträge zur Erklärung des Buches der Weisheit", ZNW 28 (1929), pp. 334-340, G. Kuhn shows quite convincingly that WS 11-19 not only provides a model for the Johannine Apocalypse, but that in the WS itself the Egyptian plagues are used as paradigms for the stages of an apocalyptic judgment. If Kuhn is correct, then we have here another instance of the close relationship between the WS and a particular segment of Palestinian-Jewish religious thought. Cf. also, J. Fichtner, "Die Stellung der Sapientia", pp. 124 ff., who calls the WS "ein apokalyptisches Weisheitsbuch".

were used by the writers of the New Testament,[45] and this has always been the belief of the Roman church. The Reformation reopened the question. In the eighteenth century, several scholars undertook to catalogue parallels of ideas and words, often without investigating literary relationships.[46] Eichhorn goes further, postulating a "sachlich Verwandtschaft", though rejecting a "formale" or "inhaltliche Abhängigkeit".[47] The nineteenth century witnessed a large outpouring of scholarly opinion in response to the controversy concerning the inclusion or non-inclusion of the Apocrypha in the Bible. In a series of studies, Stier[48] and Bleek[49] attempted to demonstrate conclusively that Paul knew and used the WS. Grimm came to exactly the opposite conclusion in his two commentaries.[50] He believed that the similarities and

---

[45]See the documentation in Schürer, Geschichte III, pp. 508 ff.

[46]See the summary of this research in E. Grafe, "Das Verhältnis der Paulinischen Schriften zur Sapientia Salomonis", pp. 253-254. In the following survey I am indebted to Grafe's historical review, as well as to those of Michel, Paulus und seine Bibel, pp. 11 ff.; A. T. S. Goodrick, The Book of Wisdom (The Oxford Church Bible Commentary; New York, 1913), pp. 398-400; C. Larcher, Études, pp. 14-20.

[47]Jh. Eichhorn, Einleitung in die apokryphischen Schriften des Alten Testaments (Leipzig, 1795), pp. 202 ff.

[48]E. R. Stier, Sogar die Apokryphen im N.T.? (1828), and Die Apokryphen. Vertheidigung ihres althergebrachten Anschlusses an die Bibel (Braunschweig, 1853), pp. 19-25.

[49]J. F. Bleek, Studien und Kritiken (Berlin, 1853), pp. 286 ff., 340-344.

[50]C. L. W. Grimm, Commentar über das Buch der Weisheit (Leipzig, 1837); idem., Das Buch der Weisheit (Kurzgefasstes Exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen des A.T., 6; Leipzig, 1860).

parallels consist either of very general ideas, to be found even outside the Bible, or that they can be traced to a common Jewish-biblical education. Weizsäcker[51] was more restrained than Grimm, maintaining that although many passages in Paul are clearly reminiscent of the WS, one cannot say whether Paul knew the book. On the other hand, Schürer was convinced that the book was used in the church from the very beginning: "Schon in den paulinischen Briefen finden sich so starke Anklänge daran, dass die Bekanntschaft Pauli mit unseren Buche nicht zu bezweifeln ist".[52]

Where Hellenistic thought was seen in Paul, the influence of the WS was often assumed. This was particularly true of O. Pfleiderer.[53] He attempted to prove that Paul actually derived his doctrines directly from the WS, such as his doctrine of the Spirit, and that in one instance he was induced by the study of the book to change his opinions on a vital point, namely, in the area of eschatology.[54] Over against Pfleiderer, Gunkel was skeptical of this kind of direct and overpowering influence upon Paul by the WS, and admitted an influence only in a very restricted sense.[55]

---

[51]C. von Weizsäcker, Das Apostolische Zeitalter der Christlichen Kirche (2nd ed.; Freiburg, 1892), p. 97.

[52]Schürer, Geschichte, III, pp. 508-509.

[53]But see the other scholars listed by Grafe, "Verhältnis", p. 256.

[54]O. Pfleiderer, Das Urchristenthum. Seine Schriften und Lehren (Berlin, 1887), pp. 158 ff.; also Der Paulinismus. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Urchristlichen Theologie (2nd ed.; Leipzig, 1890), pp. 27 ff., 284. See the discussion in Chapter I, above, on the theory of development in Paul's eschatology; cf. also Chapter IV, below.

[55]H. Gunkel, Die Wirkungen des Heiligen Geistes nach den populären

One reason for this diversity of opinion is clearly the circumstance that Paul nowhere mentions the WS explicitly, nor does he cite it verbally.[56] Consequently, the degree to which points of contact are discovered is often determined by a writer's point of view, his willingness or unwillingness to see these relationships. And yet, the fact that Paul never cites explicitly or verbally should not be the cause for adopting a stance of agnosticism with respect to the question of dependence or influence. For even in his use of Old Testament passages, Paul very frequently cites by memory;[57] yet this fact has not deterred scholars from asserting dependence upon, or use of, Old Testament material by the Apostle. One look at the Nestle text shows clearly how

---

Anschauungen der Apostolischen Zeit und der Lehre des Apostels Paulus (2nd ed.; Göttingen, 1899), pp. 79 ff. "Paulus und die Weisheitsschrift sind nicht Artverwandt. Paulus glaubt an den göttlichen Geist weil er ihn erfahren hat, das apokryphe Buch spekuliert über die Weisheit und kombiniert dieselbe mit der ganz abgeblassten, aus der Tradition entnommenen Vorstellung vom Geiste Gottes....die Ähnlichkeit der Gedanken ist rein formal..." Gunkel seems to judge the WS too harshly. It is true that the Pauline doctrine of the Spirit is not derived from the WS. But the WS is not as cold and speculative in its presentation of the Wisdom/Spirit as the above quotation by Gunkel indicates.

[56]This fact has led some scholars, who have maintained Pauline dependence upon the WS, to postulate an "oral" acquaintance. Thus, Nachtigal, who collected an imposing series of passages in which he detected Pauline acquaintance with the WS (27 in WS and 30 in Paul; see Grafe, p. 263, n. 3), professed himself unable to decide whether the Apostle had studied the WS himself or whether he had come to know the ideas of the WS through the lectures of his teacher Gamaliel [Jh. K. Nachtigal, Das Buch der Weisheit (Halle, 1799), pp. 195 ff.]. Whether Gamaliel knew the WS is of course impossible to determine; and yet it cannot be ruled out on a priori grounds. Cf. also, Westcott, in Smith's Dictionary of the Bible: "In the case of St. Paul it may be questioned whether his acquaintance with the book may not have been gained orally rather than by direct study" (cited in Goodrick, The Book of Wisdom, p. 399, n. a).

[57]P. Heinisch, Das Buch der Weisheit (ExHbzAT, 24; Münster, 1912),

at times one single word, even when contexts are completely different, is enough to indicate a Pauline allusion to an Old Testament passage or idea. That great caution must be exercised is clear, "Denn wer möchte auf diesem Gebiete der Berührungen zweier Schriftsteller in Gedanken oder Worten mit zweifelloser Bestimmtheit entscheiden, ob der Eine gerade von dem Anderen beeinflusst ist?"[58] Thus we are moving in the realm, not of provable certainties, but of possibilities and, at best, probabilities. The tentative nature, however, of such an undertaking ought not to deter us from making the attempt.

With a recognition of these cautions, Eduard Grafe made the first full-scale attempt to determine Paul's relation to the WS.[59] Grafe investigated the supposed points of contact under three headings: 1) Parallels which under critical examination turn out to be merely "apparent parallels;[60] 2) The decisive relationships;[61] and 3) Noteworthy parallels, which gain in significance on the basis of the prior investigation.[62] On the basis of a very thorough investigation on these

---

p. XLII. More recently, cf. K. Stendahl, The School of Matthew (Uppsala, 1954); E. E. Ellis, Paul's Use of the Old Testament (Grand Rapids, 1957), pp. 11 ff.

[58]Grafe, "Verhältnis", p. 257.

[59]Although Grafe from the outset postulates the possibility of Paul's dependence, he recognizes that general considerations prove nothing, "wenn nicht durch handgreifliche Berührungen die Bekanntschaft des Apostels mit diesem Buche wahrscheinlich gemacht werden kann" (ibid., p. 259).

[60]Ibid., pp. 260-264.

[61]Ibid., pp. 264-277.

[62]Ibid., pp. 277-285.

three levels, Grafe came to the conclusion that "it is at least highly probable that Paul knew and had read the Wisdom of Solomon".[63]

Grafe's study has provided the basis for all subsequent discussions of the problem. Sanday and Headlam,[64] in their commentary on Romans, follow Grafe's analysis and employ it in their interpretation of two key passages,[65] asserting that indications of Pauline dependence are not lacking elsewhere. In his commentary on the WS, Heinisch follows Grafe point for point, concluding that the "numerous similarities and agreements prove that the Apostle read the book often; and since he uses it in the same way as other Old Testament writings, he must have considered it as sacred as these".[66] In his book Agnostos Theos, E. Norden[67] supports Grafe[68] in so far as he sees Paul dependent

---

[63] Ibid., p. 285.

[64] W. Sanday and A. C. Headlam, The Epistle to the Romans (ICC; New York, 1895), pp. 51, 267 ff. Cf. R. Roberts, "St. Paul and the Book of Wisdom", IJA (July, 1909), pp. 58-60, who mentions the discussion of the Roman passage by Sanday and Headlam, and adds three passages to the discussion, already discussed by Grafe, but apparently without Roberts' knowledge. Thus, he provides an independent contribution. See below, Section 2.

[65] Rom 1:18-32, 9:19-23. In both passages, "there are clear indications of the use by the Apostle of the Book of Wisdom" (Sanday and Headlam, op. cit., p. 51).

[66] R. Heinisch, Das Buch der Weisheit, p. XLIII.

[67] Eduard Norden, Agnostos Theos. Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religiöser Rede (Stuttgart, 1913), pp. 128-131.

[68] Norden indicates (ibid., p. 128, n. 1), that he had already independently come to the conclusion that Paul is dependent on the WS at many points, before Grafe's study appeared.

on the WS, especially in Romans 8:1 ff. But over against Grafe, he does not wish this dependence to be confined to particular thoughts and sentences, but emphasizes larger complexes, comparing the whole to the whole.[69] For to him the clarity of the dependence becomes obvious only when Paul's argument as a whole in this passage is compared to the corresponding one in the WS.

F. Focke[70] introduces a new dimension into the study of our problem. He begins by criticizing Norden's method, convinced that it does not do justice to the peculiarity of Paul and that it overlooks the context in which both Paul and the WS stand. Then he argues strongly against Grafe's position,[71] who he thinks has paid too much attention to the formal aspects of the relation. He investigates the textual parallels of Grafe and discovers everywhere "differences in substance" (sachliche Verschiedenheiten) between Paul and the WS. This leads Focke to assume at the most a "gemeinsamen traditionellen Untergrund" which was used by Paul in his own way: "Das Gefüge der Tradition ist für ihn nur ein Skelett, das erst der kraftvollen Eindringlichkeit, die seine Predigt an dieser Stelle auszeichnet, Fleisch und Blut verdankt".[72] But

---

[69] Ibid., p. 128. "Den Worten des Paulus (Röm 1:18 ff.) stelle ich zur Seite die entsprechenden aus der Σοφία Σαλωμόν 12,27 ff, denn es kann m. E. nicht zweifelhaft sein, dass es diese Stelle ist, die Paulus in seiner Weise...paraphrasiert hat; man darf daher nicht einzelne Worte und Gedanken mit einzelnen, sondern muss das Ganze mit dem Ganzen vergleichen".

[70] Die Entstehung der Weisheit Salomos (FRLANT, NF 5; Göttingen, 1913).

[71] Ibid., pp. 113-126.

[72] Ibid., p. 123.

Focke does not isolate this "Skelett", this "Gefüge der Tradition", and thus leaves us with a hypothetical well from which both Paul and the WS draw. It is at this weak point of Focke's thesis that Michel starts: "Aber dieser traditionelle Untergrund, dies Skelett, das Paulus erst mit Fleisch und Blut bekleidet, liegt doch vor. Vielleicht hätte Focke an dieser Stelle doch noch weiter vordringen müssen".[73] What Focke has conclusively demonstrated, according to Michel, is that the contacts between Paul and the WS are merely of a formal nature. Then Michel goes further and locates the "traditionelle Untergrund" in the "commonly shared Hellenistic soil of Jewish-Christian apologetic". For Michel, the problem shifts: we need no longer inquire as to the relation between Paul and the WS; rather we must ask about their common ground in the Jewish-Christian apologetic tradition. But where, we ask, is this tradition to be found? On the basis of the assertion that the problem of idolatry was a very common theme of Hellenistic Jewish-Christian apologetic, Michel attempts to demonstrate by the contrast between Rom 1:18 ff. and WS 13, that there are such substantial differences that the literary connections -- which even he admits as existing -- fade into insignificance. He concludes that "Paulus und Sapientia sind von einer bestimmten apologetischen Tradition abhängig".[74] But with this assertion, Michel has not gone significantly beyond Focke. Unless such a tradition can be isolated and somewhat defined as to its limits and content, it ought not to be employed as a means to get around the difficulties with

---

[73] O. Michel, Paulus und Seine Bibel, p. 16.

[74] Ibid., p. 18.

which the differences between Paul and the WS confront us. According to most recent interpretations, the WS was written not later than c. 50 B.C. It is certainly possible that the author was dependent on some apologetic tradition. But it is in the WS itself that this tradition is concretized and passed on into the first century A.D. And though there may have been other deposits of this tradition, the similarities in form and expression between this "tradition" in the WS and in Paul would make it at least possible that Paul is here dependent on this concretized form of the tradition, rather than upon some hypothetical form.

More recent interpreters have tended to follow Grafe, rather than Focke and Michel,[75] although no major treatment of the problem has appeared. Kuhn, in his brief but significant study on the "apocalyptic" character of the last part of the WS, provides a lengthy list of parallels between the WS and the New Testament, of which about half are in Paul's letters.[76]

---

[75]There are some exceptions to this general trend. Thus, H. Lietzmann, An die Römer (4th ed.; HbzNT 8, Tübingen, 1933), p. 33, sees Paul in Rom 1 as dependent on a general theme of Judaeo-Hellenistic diatribe, encountered on his missionary journeys. J. Huby, Épître aux Romains, Vol. X (2nd rev. ed. by S. Lyonnet; Paris, 1957), expresses strong reservations about a direct literary dependence (p. 82, n. 3; p. 90, n. 5). O. Michel, Der Brief an die Römer (12th ed.; KEK, 4; Göttingen, 1963), rejects dependence on Hellenistic diatribe, and asserts that the material in Rom 1:18-32 is derived from a basic late-Jewish model (p. 60 and n. 1).

[76]G. Kuhn, "Beiträge", pp. 338-339, n. 1. "Es bestehen deutliche Anzeigen, dass das Buch der Weisheit von den Schriftstellern des NT hochgehalten und fleissig gelesen wurde. Man findet seine Spuren, wie bei Paulus, so in der Apokalypse und den Evangelien....Sie hatten in ihm eine Fundgrube wichtiger Gedanken, die sie sich aneigneten..."

Oesterly,[77] Fichtner,[78] and Torrey[79] are also convinced that Paul knew and used this book. According to C. H. Dodd, in his discussion of Romans 1, Paul follows the WS's line of thought (WS 13-14) so closely "that our...passage might be taken for a brief summary of it".[80] L. Cerfaux[81] insists on a rigorous parallelism between Romans 1-3 and WS 13:1 ff., while S. Lyonnet[82] contends that in Rom 5:12 Paul was inspired by WS 2:24. In a recent article devoted to this topic, K. Romaniuk[83] presents quite an imposing list of New Testament parallels. For Paul, he admits of but one "proper citation", and gives a quite lengthy list of "liberal citations and allusions".[84] One weakness of Romaniuk's study is the fact that parallels are given with little philological analysis. C. Larcher devotes one of his études[85] on the

---

[77]O. E. Oesterly, Wisdom of Solomon (New York, 1918), pp. XIX ff.

[78]J. Fichtner, "Die Stellung der Sapientia", p. 123.

[79]C. C. Torrey, The Apocryphal Literature (New Haven, 1945), p. 21.

[80]C. H. Dodd, The Epistle of Paul to the Romans (MNTC; London-New York, 1932), p. 27.

[81]Cerfaux, Christ in the Theology of St. Paul, tr. by G. Webb and A. Walker (New York, 1959), pp. 261-263.

[82]Lyonnet, "Le péché originel et l'exégèse de Rom. V, 12", RSR 44 (1956), pp. 63-84.

[83]Kasimir Romaniuk, "Le Livre de la Sagesse dans le Nouveau Testament", NTS 14 (1967/68), pp. 498-514.

[84]Ibid., pp. 503 ff.

[85]C. Larcher, Études sur Livre de la Sagesse, pp. 11-30.

WS to a careful exploration of the resemblances in thought and teaching between the WS and various New Testament writings, and concludes that no instance capable of rigorous proof can be found. But he concludes his analysis of the alleged Pauline parallels to the WS[86] with the assertion that one gets the distinct impression that Paul has read the book and has kept in his memory certain ideas and certain terms.[87] Most recently, J. M. Reese[88] limits himself to the observation that the problem has "not been definitely resolved, although the majority of commentators assume it (scil., Paul's dependence on the WS) to be a fact".

Since the foregoing discussion of the various critical positions on the question of Pauline dependence on, or influence by, the WS, has not revealed anything like a prevailing consensus, we will attempt in the following to re-examine the most important alleged points of contact, in order to arrive at a conclusion on the matter for the purpose

---

[86] Ibid., pp. 14-20.

[87] Ibid., pp. 19, 20. "Et pourtant, on a l'impression que Paul a lu notre livre, gardé dans sa mimoir les idées maîtresses des principaux développements, certaines idées ou mème certains termes". Larcher is particularly impressed by the recent study of A. Feuillet, Le Christ Sagesse de Dieu (Paris, 1966), who has made an extremely strong case for the dependence of the Pauline Christology on the WS (cf. pp. 92-94 and 99-101 on the comparison of 1 Cor 10:1-2 with WS 19:7 and 10:17-18; pp. 105-107, 359 on 1 Cor 10:4 with WS 10:1 ff.; p. 151 on II Cor 5:1-4 with WS 9:15: "à peu près certainement"; pp. 335-336 on Rom 5:12 with WS 2: 24a: "la dépendance litteraire de Paul à l'endroit de Pseudo-Salomon est indubitable"; pp. 334 ff.: "l'antithèse Adam le Christ en V,12-21 est développée à partir de réminiscences du Livre de la Sagesse"). Cf. the discussion on Paul's Christology, Chapter V, below.

[88] Reese, Hellenistic Influence, p. 160

of this study.

2. Comparison of Texts and Ideas

We shall begin with a consideration of those points of contact which Grafe considers decisive for our problem:[89]

a. The Concept of Predestination. In rejecting Paul's dependence on WS in this matter, it has been pointed out that there were circles within Judaism which wrestled with the problem of the contrast between God's justice and his mercy, and that both WS and Paul borrowed from commonly accepted solutions. And yet there remains such a remarkable relationship between the WS and Paul in this matter that an immediate dependence is by far the most probable explanation. There are, to begin with, certain basic concepts which are common to both writers: 1) Both writers present the limitless power of God and contrast with this the insignificance of man (WS 11:22; 12:12 ff./Rom 9:19-23). By itself, this proves nothing, for the idea is not unique to the WS, but is found repeatedly in the Old Testament (e.g., Ps 8:3-4), even in similar wording (e.g., Is 45:9-10). 2) However, in both contexts the unusual idea is expressed that God exercises restraint and mercy toward his enemies, although he knows it will bear no fruit (WS 12:8, 10, 11a, 20a/

---

[89]Grafe, "Verhältnis", pp. 264 ff. It is Grafe's merit that he has not followed those writers who have seen a multitude of parallels, virtually leading to the conclusion that Paul had the WS before him and referred to it continually while writing every one of his epistles. To cite single verbal parallels, although the contexts are completely different, is surely going too far (see, e.g., the list of parallels from Nachtigall's work, cited in Grafe, pp. 263-264, n. 3).

Rom 9:22). 3) Both contrast the fate of God's enemies with that of his children (WS 12:20-22/Rom 9:22,23). This contrast, although very common, is formulated very similarly by both (cf. p. 75, below). These, then, are the relationships. Yet there are weighty differences which must be considered. The Pauline idea of the glorification of God is not present in the WS. The latter only says that since God's enemies received such a mild, gradual judgment, how much more gracious was he in the judgment of his people. Again, the recognition of the goodness of God and the expectation of his mercy are not related, as in Paul, to God's patience toward his enemies, but rather to the manifoldness of his judgments upon them (WS 12:20 ff./Rom 9:22). Do these differences, then, exclude the possibility of relationship? Not if we reckon with the possibility that Paul had these WS passages in mind, that he employed their ideas and expressions, but that finally he gave these a different orientation, in order to make them more fitting for his purposes.

The possibility of Paul's use of the WS, indicated by the originality in the presentation and formulation of ideas of points 2) and 3) above, and their combination in similar contexts, is underlined by the surprising, in part verbal, similarity in expression in the two writers (in the common ideas listed under points 1) and 2) above):

WS 12:12

τίς γὰρ ἐρεῖ·
τί ἐποίησας;
ἢ τίς ἀντιστήσεται
τῷ κρίματί σου;

Rom 9:20,19

μὴ ἐρεῖ τὸ πλάσμα
τῷ πλάσαντι· τί με
ἐποίησας οὕτως;
τῷ γὰρ βουλήματι αὐτοῦ
τίς ἀνθέστηκεν;

It seems from this comparison that there is a remarkable parallel here. A look at certain Old Testament passages[90] (especially Is 45:9-10) reveals, however, that both authors may independently depend on Old Testament conceptions; indeed, in some specifics, Paul is closer to the Old Testament than to the WS. Thus, Rom 9:20 is closer to Is 45:9 f. than to WS 12:12a (Rom and Is have μή, WS has τίς ).[91] Further, Paul's picture of the potter and the clay, applied to man's relation with God, is clearly reminiscent of Is 45:9, as well as other Old Testament passages.[92] Despite these considerations, there is a decisive parallel between WS and Paul in the question:

ἢ τίς ἀντιστήσεται τῷ
κρίματί σου; (WS 12:12b)

τῷ βουλήματι αὐτοῦ
τίς ἀνθέστηκεν (Rom 9:19b)

This question, placed by both writers in the same context, using the same verb and sentence-structure, creates the strong impression that Paul had in mind not only the text from Isaiah, but also the passage from the WS.[93]

---

[90]Cf. Is 29:16; Jer 18:6; Is 64:8; Job 9:12; Dan 4:32.

[91]Both Job 9:12 and WS 12:12 read ἐρεῖ τι ἐποίησας . In exact wording, the Pauline τί ἐποίησας is closer to the above, while in meaning he stays with Is 45:9.

[92]Is 26:16, 64:8; Jer 18:6.

[93]This despite the fact that Paul has βούλημα instead of κρίμα, and the perfect tense rather than the future. We have already noted above (p. 46) that strictly verbal citations cannot be expected from Paul. "Wie seine Benützung der LXX. oder auch des hebräischen Textes des A.T.'s zeigt, legt der Apostel auf genaue Wiedergabe in der Regel keinen Werth" (Grafe, op. cit., p. 267). Cf. O. Michel, Paulus und seine Bibel, pp. 74-75, where he shows how often Paul cited the Old Testament loosely, most likely from memory, rather than verbally.

Beyond this decisive parallel, it is significant that in his use of the picture of the potter and clay -- although employing it in the same context as Is 45:9 ff. -- he follows the use made of the same image by the WS (15:7), with close verbal similarities:

WS 15:7 καὶ γὰρ κεραμεὺς .... πλάσσει πρὸς ὑπηρεσίαν ἡμῶν ἕν ἕκαστον, ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ πήλου ἀνέπλασσε τά τε τῶν καθαρῶν ἔργων δούλα σκεύη, τά τε ἐναντία, πάντα ὁμοίως. τούτων δὲ ἑκατέρων τίς ἑκάστου ἐστὶν ἡ χρῆσις κριτὴς ὁ πηλουργός.

Rom 9:21 ἢ οὐκ ἔχει ἐξουσίαν ὁ κεραμεὺς τοῦ πηλοῦ ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ φυράματος ποιῆσαι ὃ μὲν εἰς τιμὴν σκεῦος ὃ δὲ εἰς ἀτιμίαν;

Although the contexts -- within which the image occurs of the potter's sovereign disposal of the vessels he makes -- are different in Paul and the WS,[94] both expand the otherwise common image of potter and clay in the unusual and otherwise unparalleled[95] way that the potter uses one and the same clay to make vessels for uses diametrically opposed.[96] The common point here is clearly the different destination of the vessels made by the potter. It may be objected that such an image lies close

---

[94]The WS shows the senselessness of idolatry: the potter makes both clean and unclean (idols) vessels. Paul compares the various classes of men with vessels designated for different uses.

[95]Grimm, Buch der Weisheit, p. 36, who rejects Pauline dependence on the WS, is forced to admit that no other parallels to this usage of the potter image are known.

[96]The potter in the WS makes vessels both for clean uses, as well as their opposites. The Pauline potter (God) makes vessels (men) both for honorable and dishonorable use.

at hand.[97] And yet, when the unparalleled use of this image is characterized by the choice of common words, and when the idea that the potter freely disposes of his vessels is strongly emphasized in both (WS: τίς ἑκάστου ἐστὶν ἡ χρῆσις κριτὴς ὁ πηλουργός; Rom: ἢ οὐκ ἔχει ἐξουσίαν ὁ κεραμεὺς), literary dependence becomes a stronger historical probability than independent formulation of the same idea. The partially different vocabulary used by Paul (τιμή instead of καθαρός) can best be accounted for by the assumption that Paul depends on his memory, as also by the different use to which he puts the image.

A final factor in favor of Paul's dependence on the WS in the formulation of his predestination theory is the similarity with which both he and the WS express the way in which God treats his enemies (point 3) above):

| WS 12:20 | Rom 9:22 |
|---|---|
| εἰ γὰρ ἐχθροὺς παίδων σου καὶ ὀφειλομένους θανατῷ μετὰ τοσαύτης ἐτεμωρήσω προσοχῆς καὶ δεήσεως. | εἰ δὲ θέλων ὁ θεὸς ἐνδείξασθαι τὴν ὀργὴν .... ἤνεγκεν ἐν πολλῇ μακροθυμίᾳ σκεύη ὀργῆς κατηρτισμένα εἰς ἀπώλειαν. |

The use of the εἰ in both opening phrases is conspicuous, although no case can be built on this by itself. Of greater significance is the similar characterization of the objects of God's dealings: ὀφειλομένους θανάτῳ/κατηρτισμένα εἰς ἀπώλειαν. The attitude of God toward his

---

[97] Larcher, Études, p. 18, "Il est possible que, sur ce point précis, Paul se souvienne de Sag. Mais avait-il besoin de ce précédent pour une distinction aussi sommaire?"

enemies is also described in similar terms: μετὰ τοσαύτης ... διεσεως/ἐν πολλῇ μακροθυμίᾳ. The rare term δίεσις has led to textual difficulties,[98] but the following phrase (δοὺς χρόνους καὶ τόπον δι' ὧν ἀπαλλαγῶσι τῆς κακίας / "giving them time and place to change from their wickedness") makes sense only if διέσεως has the meaning of "patience" or "indulgence".[99]

As in the first two points of comparison, we have encountered here remarkable resemblances, both in the designation of God's enemies, as also in the surprising attitude which God is described as displaying toward them. It may be said in summary that the various points of contact discussed above are underlined in importance when seen in light of the fact that three basic ideas, common to both writers, are in each found joined in the same context, although any one could stand by itself.[100] To attribute this to coincidence is surely going past the more probable explanation of literary dependence.

---

[98] καὶ διέσεως (א); καὶ δεήσεως (B); και διέσωσας (some MSS); omitted (A). The א reading is preferred by most standard text editions (e.g., Rahlfs, Septuaginta II, p. 363). The latter two readings make little sense, and, like the omission by A, are an attempt to interpret the unusual διέσεως (cf. Grafe, "Verhältnis", p. 269, n. 2).

[99] Both RSV and J. Reider, The Book of Wisdom (Jewish Apocryphal Literature; New York, 1957), translate "indulgence". The primary meaning of δίεσις "sending through" or "letting through" (Liddell-Scott) must be understood in a transferred sense, i.e., to let something go by unnoticed, to overlook (cp. πάρεσις, Rom 3:25).

[100] Cf. Grafe, "Verhältnis", p. 270: "Nicht nur also sind von den drei Hauptgedanken zwei sehr origineller Natur, nicht nur werden die gemeinsamen Gedanken in zum Theil wörtlicher Übereinstimmung mindesten mit grosser Ähnlichkeit ausgedrückt, sondern die drei Hauptgedanken, die innerlich keineswegs nothwendig zueinander gehören, sind in einem und demselben Gedankengefüge dort wie hier verbunden".

b. Evaluation of Idolatry. The Pauline formulation of his critique on idolatry (Rom 1:18 ff.) has often been compared with passages from a quite lengthy and elaborate treatment in the WS (chs. 11, 13, 15). Since the author of the latter devotes a great part of his work to the attack upon, and the critique of, idolatry, it is understandable that it treats several topics[101] which Paul does not discuss, since they are unimportant in terms of the purpose for which he introduces the topic. Thus, the many differences are not (as many critics have held) in and by themselves proof against a relationship between WS and Paul. A further, and weightier, objection against Pauline dependence in the passage under discussion is the fact that many elements in Paul's discussion can be seen as derived from the Old Testament, just as well as from the WS.[102] Thus, the idea that the glory of God, recognizable in his works,[103] was debased into the worship of animal images (Rom 1:23), finds its closest parallel in Ps 106:20. And yet, the correspondences between the WS and Paul go beyond their possible independent use of the Old Testament, or Paul's dependence on a Jewish-Hellenistic apologetic tradition[104] in which the WS is but one represen-

---

[101] E.g., the various kinds and activities of idol-manufacturers (13:11 ff., 15:8 ff.), the origin of idolatry (14:15 ff.), the absurdity of the activity of both idol-makers and idol-worshipers (15:15 ff.).

[102] Cf. Rom 1:22,23,25 with Jer 10:14,15 on the absurdity of idolatry and the corresponding foolishness of men who practice it. The warning against making pictures of animals, or worshiping the sun, moon and stars could be derived from Deut 4:16-19 (cp. Rom 1:23; Gal 4:8-10).

[103] Cp. Ps 19:2 ff.; Is 40:26; Ps 8:2-4.

[104] Thus O. Michel, Paulus und seine Bibel, p. 18. Cf. our discussion of Michel and Focke, above.

tative. Although "there can be no question of direct quotation...the resemblance is so strong both as to the main lines of the argument... and in the details of thought and to some extent of expression as to make it clear that at some time in his life St. Paul must have bestowed on the Wisdom of Solomon a considerable amount of study".[105] We shall briefly document this correspondence.[106]

The WS brings a dual point of view to bear on the question of idolatry. It distinguishes between two forms of idolatry: a refined form of pagan idolatry consisting in nature worship, specifically in the adoration of the heavenly bodies as gods (13:1-5); secondly, a coarse and debased form of idolatry, namely the adoration of man-made idols and despicable animals as gods (13:10 ff.; cf. 12:24). With this dual point of view corresponds a dual evaluation or judgment: the former is judged rather mildly (13:6, "For these there is small blame"), the latter rather harshly (13:10, "...miserable, with their hope set on dead things"; 14:8, "But the idol made with hands is accursed, and so is he who made it"). What is now remarkable, in view of the author's otherwise clear-cut distinction and evaluation, is the fact that he wavers in his judgment of the more refined kind of paganism. The same context, in which he is concerned to judge kindly (13:6, ἐπὶ τούτοις ἐστὶ μέμψις ὀλίγη ), climaxes in the assertion: πάλιν δὲ οὐδ' αὐτοὶ συγγνωστοί (13:8). This uncertainty clearly derives from

---

[105] Sanday-Headlam, Romans, p. 52.

[106] In the following, we are indebted in the main to Grafe, "Verhältnis", pp. 271-274.

the circumstance that, on the one hand, the author emphasizes man's ignorance and foolishness (13:1, θεοῦ ἀγνωσία, μάταιοι ; 14:22, ἄγνοια ), and gives it his sympathetic understanding (13:6 ff.); on the other hand, he emphasizes the possibility -- there for all men -- really to know and worship God (13:3 ff., 9; cf. 1:1-2). Men should have, and could have, arrived at a knowledge of the Creator as a result of their observation of the creation (13:5, 9). This they not only neglected to do, but through their ἀδικία and κακία they finally robbed themselves of the possibility of the knowledge of God (11:15; cf. 1:3a, 2:21).

Now it is precisely this original and peculiar view and argumentation which can be documented again in Paul. He too is acquainted with a form of idolatry associated with the astral bodies ("which by nature are no gods", Gal 4:8-10). But since men were captive to these "elemental spirits" (Gal 4:3,9) they did not, indeed they could not, know God ( οὐκ ἐιδότες θεόν ). Paul's sympathetic understanding comes through at this point; in a sense he excuses them (cf. I Cor 12:2 "you were led astray to dumb idols, however you may have been moved"). On the other hand, Paul becomes very harsh and uncompromising in his critique of the baser form of pagan idolatry (Rom 1:18 ff.), and describes those who practice it as ἀναπολογήτους (Rom 1:20). In this context, Paul, like the WS, speaks of the possibility of true knowledge of God, based on the same reasoning (1:19-21). With the WS, Paul takes the final step and assumes that men through their own wickedness -- using the same term, ἀδικία , v. 18 -- have lost the truth which was available to them and subsequently fell into increasing darkness (1:18,

21 f.). It cannot be denied that there is in Paul's evaluation of idolatry a duality, a wavering, indeed a contradictoriness (cp. Gal 4:8, οὐκ εἰδότες θεόν ; with Rom 1:19,20, γνόντες τὸν θεόν ) very similar to the Wisdom passage. The entire thrust of the argumentation, the structure of the thoughts, is reminiscent of the WS. This correspondence is further underlined by a similarity, at times by exact verbal correspondence, in expression. Both writers employ the same expressions by which to designate the knowledge of God: ἐπίγνωσις / ἐπιγινώσκειν (Rom 1:28; WS 13:1, 12:27) and νοεῖν (Rom 1:20; WS 13:4). When describing the impossibility of knowing God, caused by man's sin, Paul uses a similar picture (Rom 1:21, ἐσκοτίσθη ἡ καρδία ) as the WS (2:21b, ἀπετύφλωσε αὐτοὺς ἡ κακία αὐτῶν ). Again, the analogy: from creation to Creator -- is expressed by similar constructions ( ἀναλόγως ... θωρεῖτας, WS 13:5; νοούμενα καθορᾶται, Rom 1:20). Finally, both writers use the expression ἀσύνετος (WS 11:15; Rom 1:21) to describe the condition of those who were led astray into idolatry. The WS speaks here of "senseless reasonings" ( λογισμῶν ἀσυνέτων), while Paul speaks of their "senseless heart" ( ἀσύνετος καρδία ).[107] The difference may be no more than that between a more Greek and a more Hebraic way of expressing the same idea. That Paul may have had this wisdom passage in mind, despite the difference, is underlined by the previous, and parallel, expression in the same verse: ἐματαιώθησαν ἐν τοῖς διαλογισμοῖς αὐτῶν. Thus, the phrase "they became foolish in their thinking", is reminiscent of the WS's "foolish reasonings" (Rom

---

[107] RSV translates καρδία in this context with "minds"; likely in view of the parallelism with the preceding "they became futile in their thinking" ( διαλογισμός ).

1:21, διαλογισμός ; WS 11:15, λογισμός).

The correspondences outlined above, as probable indications of dependence, receive further support from the fact that they are not only present in both writers' description of idolatry but also in their analysis of the consequences. The WS connects, with the ethical degradation flowing from the practice of idolatry, a divine judgment, seen in terms of the principle that like will be punished by like (WS 11:15, 16, 12:27). Paul repeats this same idea in a play on words: καθὼς οὐκ ἐδοκίμασαν τὸν θεὸν ἔχειν ἐν ἐπιγνώσει παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς εἰς ἀδόκιμον νοῦν (Rom 1:28),[108] as well as in the assertion that unnatural practices turn on those who practice them and destroy them (Rom 1:26,27). The correspondence goes even further: just as the WS asserts that idolatry is the source of all unethical behavior (14:12,27) and supplements this with a comprehensive list of resulting vices (14:23-27), so Paul, in the same context, illustrates the depths of immorality to which idolatry leads by a catalogue of vices (1:24-32, especially v. 29-31). The observation that the two catalogues have few contentual correspondences [109] cannot reduce the significance of the fact that,

---

[108] The Pauline formulation is obscured in the RSV translation of καὶ καθὼς ...with "and since..." It is better translated, as Luther did, with "gleichwie" ("just as", "in the same manner as"). To catch the word-play, we might translate as follows: "Just as they decided not to acknowledge God, so God gave them up to an indecisive mind..."

[109] We cannot expect Paul to repeat the WS's catalogue verbally, especially if he cites from memory. Both the WS and Paul list those vices which appeared to them as most significant. Paul has other catalogues of vices (e.g., I Cor 6:9 ff.) with terminological differences from the one in Romans. Such catalogues were no doubt commonplaces. Even so, there are some correspondences between WS and Rom which should

after both writers have described the nature and foolishness of idolatry, following with a description of the unethical results, they climax this description in a catalogue of vices, in which sin is followed by sin, without any seeming inner connection or necessity.

c. Other Significant Points of Contact.[110] We have pointed out above that scholars who have seen the Pauline eschatology as developing from a primitive Jewish-Christian apocalypticism to a Hellenistic spiritualism have often pointed to the resemblance between WS 9:15 and II Cor 5:1 f. as proof that in Paul's later correspondence is revealed this shift toward an Alexandrian spiritualistic hope for immortality.[111] Although we cannot accept the idea of development,[112] for which this parallel has formed a link in the chain, the correspondences cannot be denied. Recently, Schmithals[113] has reminded exegetes that Paul's

---

not be overlooked. Both lists contain the words φόνος / δόλος (WS 14:25 /Rom 1:29). In both descriptions of the vices, the sins of fornication are emphasized (cp. WS 14:12, πορνεία, 14:26, γάμων ἀταξία, μοιχεία, with Rom 1:24), especially those contrary to the natural order (WS 14: 26; Rom 1:26,27). Finally, Paul, like the WS, notes that the degraded practices following from idolatry are actually seen in a favorable light by those who practice them.

[110]Grafe, "Verhältnis", pp. 264-277, includes the correspondence between WS 9:15 and II Cor 5:1,4 in his discussion of the "Entscheidenden Brührungen". Since the two areas of dependence discussed above involved lengthy passages, and the alleged dependence of Paul on WS 9:15 is of limited scope (although very significant in terms of our thesis!) we will treat it together with those parallels which Grafe discusses under the heading "Die übrigen beachtenswerthen Parallelen", which even for him "(weisen) mindestens eine sehr bemerkenswerthe Verwandtschaft (auf)".

[111]E.g., O. Pfleiderer, Urchristenthum, p. 161; cf. Knox, Church of the Gentiles, pp. 127-128, 136 f., 141.

[112]See Chapter I, above, and the exegetical reasons for our rejection, below, Chapter IV.

[113]Walter Schmithals, Die Gnosis in Korinth (2nd ed.; Göttingen, 1965), pp. 246-248.

argumentation in II Cor 5:1 ff. is somewhat determined by the position of his opponents, which necessitated that he adapt himself somewhat, in terminology and conceptualization, to his opponents. Thus, it is illegitimate to base an interpretation of an advanced Pauline anthropology and eschatology on this passage.[114] Even if Schmithals is correct,[115] the use of WS 9:15 by Paul still remains a possibility, since it could have provided him with the tools needed to combat the Corinthian's skpeticism regarding the final destiny of the believer. Nor is his use of otherwise "non-Pauline" terminology and imagery necessarily an indication that Paul is here expressing opinions recently arrived at.[116]

Both WS 9:15 and II Cor 5:1 f. employ the term "tent" ( σκῆνος ) metaphorically for "body" in a more or less negative sense. For the WS, it is something which "weighs down" ( βαρύνει) soul/mind in the quest to fathom the will of God (9:13) and the heavenly realities (9:16). For Paul, this σκῆνος is something in which "we groan, being weighed down" (στενάζομεν βαρούμενοι, 5:2,4), because of its "mortality" (θνητός 5:4). It has often been argued that there is nothing unique in such a

---

[114]Schmithals here clearly polemicizes against the views of such students of Paul as Pfleiderer: "...so liegt nicht der geringste Grund zu der Annahme vor, Pls. trüge an dieser Stelle eine geänderte Zukunftserwartung auf der Grundlage einer hellenistisch-gnotischen Anthropologie vor" (ibid., p. 248).

[115]Cf. the discussion of Schmithals' interpretation of this Pauline passage in Chapter IV, below.

[116]We shall see in Chapter IV, below, that Paul is here operating on the level of a personal-experiential level, in terms of an individualistic eschatological perspective, and that this point of view is not confined to the "late" Corinthian passage.

designation of the body, since it was widespread in the ancient world,[117] and that therefore such a common image in both writers cannot be used to support dependence of one upon the other. If the use of such a common image by both writers were the only ground for postulating dependence at this point, the argument would be valid enough. However, closer inspection of both the use of the image in other ancient writings, as well as in the WS and Paul, reveals that the specific use made of it by the latter writers is, on the one hand, not as common as often supposed, and, on the other hand, shows a number of points of contact between the WS and Paul beyond the general image of the tent for the body. The Greek writer Democritus frequently spoke of the body as a tent, although for him it did not have any negative connotation;[118] there is a positive relationship between body (σκῆνος) and soul.[119] The sepulchral inscription, placed over a recumbent skeleton:

Εἰπεῖν τίς δύναται, σκῆνος λιπόσαρκον ἀθρήσας,
εἴπερ Ὕλας ἢ θρεσίτης ἦν, ὧ παροδεῖτα;

is in fact quite neutral, and does not have the force of a parallel to

---

[117] Cf. H. Lietzmann, An die Korinther I/II (4th ed., HbzNT, 9; Tübingen, 1949), p. 117. Paul Wendland, Die Hellenistisch-Römische Kultur in ihren Beziehungen zu Judenthum u. Christentum (2nd ed., HbzNT 1/2; Tübingen, 1912), p. 182, n. 4, where he refers to the "Seufzen der Kreatur bei Paulus, der...auch den Ausdruck σκῆνος aus der religiösen Begriffswelt seiner Zeit entlehnt hat". Also H.-D. Wendland, Die Briefe an die Korinther (NTD 7, 8th ed.; Göttingen, 1962), p. 169.

[118] See H. Diels, "Wortindex", in Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker, Vol. II/2 (2nd ed.; Berlin, 1910), s.v., "σκῆνος", pp. 550-551.

[119] Cf. frgms. 223, 187. (On the other hand, Democritus can admonish [frgm. 37] that to strive after "spiritual goods" [τὰ ψυχῆς ἀγαθὰ] is better than after "bodily" ones [τὰ σκήνεος]). Diels, ibid.

the Pauline usage, as Moulton-Milligan seem to indicate.[120] It is simply a reflection of the common designation of the body as σκῆνος, without any hint of a negative relation between it and the soul or self. Several references adduced from Greek inscriptions and Greek magical papyri[121] simply present a contrast between the body as σκῆνος, and the ψυχή, while the Pythagorean philosopher Timaeus of Locri, speaks clearly of the body as the σκῆνος in which the soul dwells.[122] A clear instance of the use of σκῆνος for the body in a negative sense comes from the Pseudo-Platonic Axiochus, where the soul, our immortal life, is said to be enclosed within the body ( σκῆνος ) as within a prison.[123] We have a similar picture in the Hermetic tractate on rebirth,[124] where the body, as σκῆνος, composed of elements from the planetary spheres, is seen as that out of which the reborn person has

---

[120]Moulton-Milligan, s.v., " σκῆνος ".

[121]Cf. Bauer, s.v., "σκῆνος ".

[122]Thayer, s.v., "σκῆνος ".

[123]Ps-Plato, Axiochus 365e-366a. Text in J. Souilhé, ed., Platon Oevres Complètes, Vol. 13/3 (Collection des Universités de France; Paris, 1962).

Ἡμεῖς μὲν γὰρ ἐσμεν ψυχὴ ζῷον ἀθάνατον ἐν θνητῷ καθειργμένον φρουρίῳ· τὸ δὲ σκῆνος τουτὶ πρὸς κακοῦ περιήρμοσεν ἡ φύσις,

Cf. the reference given in Bauer from Achilles Tatius 2.36,3. However, the manuscript evidence does not support the conjectural σκήνει by Jacob. See Achilles Tatius, ed. by Ebbe Vilborg (Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia, I; Stockholm, 1955). Even if the emendation be granted, the text does not contrast between body and soul as such, but between two orientations toward beauty.

[124]C. H. 13.12,15, Text in Nock-Festugiere, Corpus Hermeticum, Vol. II (Paris, 1960), pp. 205-206; cf. p. 214, n. 53.

come forth. Here the σκῆνος has an unquestionable negative, burdensome connotation.

Over against these rather limited occurrences of the negative connotation of the σκῆνος image,[125] it appears that the negative relation between the body and soul was much more readily expressed by the σῶμα-σῆμα image, or by the picture of the body as the prison-house (δεσμωτήριον) of the soul. Plato frequently makes use of the σῶμα-σῆμα image, but attributes the conception to certain "secret logi" and/or to the Orphics.[126] There can be no reasonable doubt that the idea of the body as the prison or tomb of the soul, from which it must be freed, was shared by both "Orphics"[127] and Pythagoreans.[128] Clement

---

[125]The passage in II Peter 1:13-14 is not really a parallel to the body-soul contrast. The phrase ἐμὶ ἐν τούτῳ τῷ σκηνώματι in its context simply means "I am alive"; while the contrasting ἡ ἀπόθεσις τοῦ σκηνώματός refers to the event of death, as is reinforced by the following reference to his ἔξοδος. It may be, nevertheless, that the author, acquainted with the Pauline epistles (cf. 3:15), is here in conscious dependence on the Corinthian passage.

[126]See Cratylus 400 E; Gorgias 492 Ef; Phaedo 61 Cf. See also, Epistles VII 335 A.

[127]The term "Orphics" must be employed cautiously, since I. M. Linforth, The Arts of Orpheus (Berkeley, 1941) demonstrated, over against the traditional interpretation -- represented by M. P. Nilsson, "Early Orphism and Kindred Religious Movements", HThR 28 (1935), pp. 18 ff. -- that there was no clearly definable "Orphic" creed or group: "If we must call something Orphism, it must be the entire religion of teletae and mysteries with their magical ritual, the poems of Orpheus...and the ideas concerning God and man which were inherent in poems and ritual" (p. 173). H. J. Rose, in a review of Linforth's work, Classical Review 19 (1943), pp. 33-34, speaks of his findings as a "minimum conclusion". "It does not exclude the possibility that there were here or there groups of persons practicing an 'Orphic life', who might therefore be styled Orphic conventicles or even congregations".

In any case, several Platonic references to the concept as held by certain "wise men" and those who practiced an "Orphic life" make it clear, at least, that there was such a mood, an attitude associated with the term "Orphic".

[128]Cf. W. K. C. Guthrie, The Greeks and Their Gods (London, 1968),

of Alexandria attributes such a conception to the Pythagorean philosopher Philolaus,[129] and his acquaintance with the image testifies to its presence as a "Grundgedanke der alexandrinischen Philosophie",[130] which found its clearest expression in the writings of Philo.[131] He spoke of the body as both the σῆμα[132] and the δεσμωτήριον[133] of the soul or the mind, in obvious dependence on the Platonic-Pythagorean-Orphic conception.[134] Very characteristic is the following passage:

> ...the soul...has been entombed in the body (σῶμα) as in a sepulchre (σῆμα); whereas, should we die, the soul lives forthwith its own proper life, and is released from the body, the corpse to which it

---

pp. 311-312 and n. 3. Cf. W. Burkert, Weisheit u. Wissenschaft. Studien zu Pythagoras, Philolaos und Platon (Erlanger Beiträge zur Sprach-und Kunstwissenschaft, 10; Nürnberg, 1962), pp. 230-231, nn. 53, 54. Also E. Franck, Plato und die Sogenannten Pythagoreer (2nd ed.; Tübingen, 1962), p. 357, n. 168.

[129] Strom. III, 17a. Cf. Diels, Fragmente, "Philolaos", fr. 14. ἁ ψυχὰ τῷ σώματι συνέζευκται καὶ καθάπερ ἐν σάματι τούτῳ τέθαπται

[130] Grafe, "Verhältnis", p. 274.

[131] Citations from Philo are given according to the Loeb Classical Library edition of Philo's works by F. H. Colson — G. H. Whitaker, Vols. 1-5, and by F. H. Colson, Vols. 6-10 (New York, 1929-1962). For the location of passages, the Index by J. Leisegang in the Cohn-Wendland edition of Philonis Alexandrini, Vol. VII (Berlin, 1930) was used.

[132] De Spec. Leg. 188. "...the human mind (νοῦς)...entombed in a mortal body which may be quite properly called a sepulchre (σῆμα) ..."

[133] De Ebr. 101; Leg. All. III, 21.

[134] Although Philo attributes the σῶμα-σῆμα concept to Heraclitus (Leg. All. I, 108).

was tied.[135]

The foregoing study shows that an extreme pessimism with regard to the body was much more forcibly, and more frequently, expressed in the σῶμα - σῆμα image, or in the idea of the soul's imprisonment, than in the rather neutral image of the body as the σκῆνος of the soul or self. This is rather significant; for the fact that both the WS and Paul employ the more neutral image indicates that neither felt at home with a pessimistic, dualistic conception of the body-soul relation.[136]

The possibility of Paul's dependence (in II Cor 5) on the WS passage, rather than on the more popular σῶμα - σῆμα image, is strengthened by the fact of several verbal correspondences. Paul shares with the WS not only the technical term σκῆνος,[137] but also βαρέω (βαρύνω),[138] used by Paul in only one other passage (II Cor 1:8). Paul's use of two rather unusual words in the same sentence, paralleled by their combination in the Wisdom passage, speaks strongly in favor of

---

[135]Leg. All. I, 108. Cf. Gigant. 7, "The chief cause of ignorance is the flesh and association with the flesh. Nothing presents such a hindrance to the growth of the soul as the flesh, for it is a kind of foundation of ignorance and stupidity, on which all the evils are built ...souls that bear the burden of the flesh are weighed down and oppressed..."

[136]Cf. J. Reider, The Book of Wisdom, pp. 130-131, n. 15.

[137]Σκῆνος appears in biblical Greek only at WS 9:15 and at II Cor 5:1,4, while σκηνή is used frequently.

[138]Grafe argues that "Die Anwendung des Wortes βαρέω ist...in dem paulinischen Zusammenhang wohl entbehrlich und erklärt sich im Grunde befriedigend nur aus unmittelbarer literarischer Abhängigkeit des Apostels von Sap" ("Verhältnis", p. 275). The contention that the use of βαρέω is "entbehrlich" is somewhat subjective judgment; although it is true that vs. 4a repeats the idea expressed already in vs. 2a, and is thus not absolutely necessary.

dependence. This circumstance is underscored by the observation that the entire Pauline passage (II Cor 5:1-9) contains some remarkable parallels to WS 9, not only in terms of ideas, but in the use of words. Thus, WS 9:16, in clear connection with the limitations which this earthly frame ( σκῆνος ) imposes upon us (9:15), emphasizes that man could not fathom the heavenly realities or the divine will, would not God send his Holy Spirit (or Wisdom) from on high (τὸ ἅγιόν σου πνεῦμα ἀπὸ ὑψίστων , 9:17, cf. 9:10). Very similarly, Paul expresses the limitation imposed upon us while we live in this earthly tent ( σκῆνος ) by emphasizing that διὰ πίστεως περιπατοῦμεν οὐ διὰ εἴδους (5:7), and speaks in the same context of the ἀραβὼν τοῦ πνεύματος which God gives to Christians (5:5). Although the place of the Spirit in the two contexts is somewhat different,[139] a recollection of WS 9 is very probable at this point, especially when the more unusual word εὐάρεστος[140] is also found in both contexts (WS 9:10; II Cor 5:9).

Further points of contact between the two writers have been noted in the conception of how sin and death came into the world, and the consequences resulting from it. (WS 1:13-16, 2:24; Rom 5:12, 6:23, 7:13, 8:19 ff.) The thought common to both, that it was sin, and not God, that brought death into the world, is of course already present in the Old Testament (cf. e.g., Gen 2:17; Ez 11:31-32, 33:11). More significant is

---

[139] But cf. WS 8:13,17.

[140] In biblical Greek, before Paul, εὐάρεστος appears only in WS 4:10 and 9:10 (Hatch-Redpath), and only a few times in the Pauline and Deutero-Pauline epistles; once in Hebrews (Moulton-Geden).

the fact that Rom 5:12, which speaks of the coming of death into the world, expresses this in part with the same words as WS 2:24 (εἰς τὸν κόσμον εἰσῆλθεν / εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον). The idea that death entered by means of sin (in WS "the devil's envy"; in Paul, the disobedience of Adam)[141] is expressed similarly by both writers. But the contact goes further: in the same verses, both express the idea that the presence of sin in men after the Fall is the result of individual men's personal participation in the original sin (WS 2:24b, "they that belong to his party [i.e., by virtue of their unrighteous conduct] experience it [death]"; Rom 5:12b, "death spread to all men because all men sinned"). Finally, it is very probable that the conception expressed in WS 1:13-14 lies at the root of the difficult Pauline passage in Rom 8:19 f. Both passages express the thought that the "decay" or "destruction" (Rom 8:21, φθορά, WS 1:13,14 ἀπώλεια, ὄλεθρος) of nature is not something originally willed by God. It is possible that both independently reflected upon Gen 1:31, where God pronounces the entire created order as "good". However, nothing is said about the permanence or impermanence of Nature. Thus, these parallel passages contain a somewhat original idea, in that the forcible termination or decay of the natural order is seen as something which is neither willed by God, nor inherent in the make-up of nature itself.[142]

---

[141] Both are clearly allusions to the Genesis account (Gen 2).

[142] Grafe, Verhältnis", p. 280, gives several more pages to a consideration of what he calls "beachtenswerthe Parallelen". Some of these seem rather weak. But in light of the rather important parallels which we have considered above, even these minor contacts further underline the probability of Paul's knowledge of, and dependence upon, the WS.

## D. CONCLUSIONS

The foregoing study leads us to postulate the strong probability that Paul had read the WS, that he was acquainted with elements of its thought, and that in the formulation of some of his own thinking he was influenced by formulations, argumentations, and ideas of the WS. But apart from the points of contact documented above, was Paul influenced in other areas of his thought, particularly in that of eschatology, by the WS? Does Paul share the WS's conceptions on such related themes as the nature of death, the ideal of life, the destiny of the individual, and the end of history?

In the present chapter we have attempted to show that Paul most probably knew the WS. It will be our purpose in the next three chapters to address the questions posed above, and to show that the influence of the WS on Paul extended beyond the immediate points of contact studied above to the overarching eschatological thought of the Apostle.

# CHAPTER III

## THE ESCHATOLOGY OF THE WISDOM OF SOLOMON

### A. INTRODUCTION

It will not be necessary to devote much space to the critical introductory questions. The reason for this brevity is the conviction that the problem which this study addresses is not appreciably influenced by the various solutions to questions of introductory criticism. For if Paul knew the book, he knew it in its final form, and it is in this form that it had its impact on the formulation of aspects of his thought.

However, in view of our previous contention that the WS shares in some respects a common religious outlook with various Palestinian-Jewish writings,[1] it is necessary to discuss briefly those aspects of an introductory-critical nature which have a bearing on the WS's place in the "Literatur und Geistesgeschichte"[2] of the intertestamental period. Thus, we are particularly concerned with the original language and the provenance of the book.

Although Paul must have known the book in its Greek form,[3] the

---

[1] See above, Chapter II, B.

[2] Cf. J. Fichtner, "Die Stellung der Sapientia in der Literatur- und Geistesgeschichte ihrer Zeit", ZNW 36 (1937).

[3] The contacts between Paul and the WS which we have discussed in Chapter II, C, above (cf. also Chapter V, below) presuppose an acquaintance with the book in its entirety and in its final form.

problem of the original language of the book has a bearing on what we have called the thoroughly "Jewish" nature of the book. Numerous studies have shown that the book is full of Hebraisms,[4] and that throughout much of his book the author made use of parallelismus membrorum,[5] the essential quality of Hebrew verse.[6] This fact has led some scholars to postulate a Hebrew original for the book,[7] or for the earlier parts of the book[8] where these features are more pervasive.[9] If the book, or parts of it, were originally composed in Hebrew, then the provenance is

---

[4]Some of these striking Hebraisms are: ἁπλότης καρδίας (1:1)= תם לבב ("straightness of heart"), in Hebrew the seat of the intellect; νεφρός (1:6)= כליה ("kidneys"), in Hebrew the seat of feelings and emotions; μερίς and κλῆρος (2:9)= חלק and חבל ("portion" and "lot"; cf. Is 57:6); τρίβοι (2:15, 5:7, 9:18)= ארחות חיים ("ways"; "manner of life"); ἐν χειρί [τινος ](3:1, 7:16, 11:1)=ב"ד ("in or by the hand of someone"); πληροῦν χρόνον (4:13)=מלא ימים ("fulfilled long years"); ἐξ ὅλης καρδίας (8:21)= בכל לב ("whole heart"); αἰών (13:9, 18:4)= עולם (meaning "world", instead of the Greek "period of time", "age"). Cf. F. Zimmermann, "The Book of Wisdom, Its Language and Character", JQR 57 (1966), pp. 1-27, 101-135; Reider, Wisdom, pp. 24-25.

[5]Some examples of parallelismus membrorum are:

> God is witness of his inmost feelings ( νεφρός )
> and a true observer of his heart ( καρδία ) (1:6)

(Cf. the parallel of "kidney" and "heart" in Ps 7:10.)

> Wisdom will not enter a deceitful soul,
> nor dwell in a body enslaved to sin. (1:4)
>
> Do not invite death by the error of your life
> nor bring on destruction by the works of your hands. (1:12)

[6]J. M. Reese, Hellenistic Influence, p. 25; Fichtner, op. cit.

[7]D. S. Margoliouth, "Was the Book of Wisdom written in Hebrew?" JRAS (1890), pp. 263-297.

[8]Chs. 1-5 and 6-9.

[9]E. A. Speiser, "The Hebrew Origin of the First Part of the Book of Wisdom", JQR (1924), pp. 455 ff.; C. E. Purinton, "Translation Greek in the Wisdom of Solomon", JBL 47 (1928), pp. 276-304.

most likely the Palestinian realm.[10] Both Weber and Focke[11] postulated a Hebrew original for Chapters 1-5 and located it in Palestine, agreeing with all others who defend a partial Hebrew original that the author[12] of the rest of the book translated the Hebrew and incorporated it into his own work. A corollary of the thesis of a partial Hebrew original has been the interpretation of the WS's eschatology in terms of apocalyptic conceptions.[13]

We shall see below that Ps-Solomon does more than simply echo an apocalyptic eschatology, though he shares certain of its conceptions.[14] However, it has been clearly shown,[15] especially more recently, that on

---

[10]Recently, Zimmermann, op. cit., attempted to prove that the entire book was written originally in Aramaic, and postulated the Syrian Diaspora as the provenance of the book.

[11]W. Weber, "Heimat und Zeitalter des eschatologischen Buches der Weisheit Salomos", ZWTh 53 (1911), pp. 322-45; Focke, Entstehung.

[12]That the author of the book in its final Greek form was a Hellenistic, or more specifically an Alexandrian Jew, has been the almost universally held opinion of scholarship. See e.g., B. M. Metzger, An Introduction to the Apocrypha (New York, 1957), pp. 69-70; R. H. Pfeiffer, History of New Testament Times, pp. 319-320; J. Reider, The Book of Wisdom, pp. 1-29; J. Fichtner, Weisheit Salomos HbzAT, 6; Tübingen, 1938), pp. 6-8; O. Eissfeldt, The Old Testament. An Introduction (New York, 1965), pp. 601-602.

[13]Thus Weber, "Die Unsterblichkeit der Weisheit Salomos", ZWTh 48 (1904-05), pp. 409-444; also in "Der Auferstehungsglaube der Weisheit Salomos", ZWTh 54 (1912), pp. 205-239; Focke, Entstehung, pp. 28-41.

[14]See above, Chapter II, B.

[15]F. Freudenthal, "What is the Original Language of the Wisdom of Solomon?" JQR 3 (1891), pp. 722-753, decisively refuted Margoliouth on linguistic grounds.

the basis of linguistic[16] and structural[17] considerations, the thesis of a Hebrew original for any part of the WS is untenable.[18] But if a Hebrew original, and with it a Palestinian provenance of the book, cannot help to explain, at least in part, its "Jewishness", what does account for it? Could a Jew, steeped in the Hellenistic culture of Alexandria, and using this culture to a considerable extent in deliver-

---

[16]E.g., the dependence of WS on the LXX seems undeniable: WS 2:12, ἐνεδρεύσωμεν τὸν δικαιον, ὅτι δύσχρηστος ἡμῖν ἐστιν; Is 3:10, δήσωμεν τὸν δίκαιον ὅτι δύσχρηστος ἡμῖν ἐστι

WS 11:4, καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτοῖς ἐκ πέτρας ἀκροτόμου ὕδωρ; Deut. 8:15, τοῦ ἐξαγαγόντος σοι ἐκ πέτρας ἀκροτόμου πηγὴν ὕδατος. It has been pointed out that ἀκρότομος ("steep") is an incorrect translation of צור חלמיש ("flint"), and that therefore the connection between the passages is unquestionable. Cf. Holmes, "Wisdom of Solomon", p. 524, who gives many more examples.

Another linguistic criterion that speaks against a Hebrew original is the presence of an abundance of compound words, a mark of Alexandrian Greek. Cf. Swete, Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek, p. 311, who gives over fifty examples.

Further, the presence of Hebraisms is no proof for an original Hebrew. Deissmann, Die Hellenisierung des semitischen Monotheismus (Leipzig, 1903), clearly demonstrated that these Hebraisms are part and parcel of Hellenistic Greek. Through contacts with the Semitic peoples, particularly by means of the Greek Old Testament, Hellenistic Greek became Hebraized to a great extent.

[17]J. Fichtner, "Die Stellung der Sapientia", p. 118 f. has demonstrated that the use of "Leitmotivworte" throughout the book, with uniformly specific meanings, speak against the assumption of a partial Hebrew original. Some examples may here be given: ἄξιος (1:16; 15:6; 16:1; 18:4; [3:5]); ὅσιος (4:15; 10:15; 18:5); ῥύεσθαι for the redeeming action of Wisdom / God (2:18; 10; 16:8; 19:9); the connection between δικαιοσύνη and ἀθανασία (1:15; 15:3), and between ποποιθώς and πιστός (3:9; 16:24, 26); the description of the hope of the godless as πάχνη ("hoarfrost" 5:14; 16:29); etc.

[18]Cf. G. Ziener, Die Theologische Begriffssprache im Buche der Weisheit (BBB, 11; Bonn, 1956); P. W. Skehan, "The Text and Structure of the Book of Wisdom", Traditio 3 (1945), pp. 1-12; J. M. Reese, "Plan and Structure in the Book of Wisdom", CBQ 27 (1965), pp. 391-399; also in Hellenistic Influence, pp. 122-145.

ing his message,[19] remain so faithful to the central religious convictions of his fathers? J. Klausner[20] has suggested that the WS was composed by an ex-Palestinian Jew, who wrote the various parts of the book in Alexandria over the period of some time, and in the Greek language. This is of course possible,[21] and it is reasonable to suppose that as a result of the active interchange between Jerusalem and the Jewish centers in the dispersion, some enterprising Palestinian Jews went to Alexandria and were educated there. However, the Jewish religiousness which meets us on every page of this work need not be dependent upon the insights of a Palestinian Jew. It is sufficient to recognize that Ps-Solomon was steeped in the sacred books of the Old Testament and that it was to them that he looked for inspiration.[22] We shall see that he went beyond the

---

[19]Reese, Hellenistic Influence, has shown how Ps-Solomon used his Greek learning to "universalize" the central conceptions of his faith.

[20]J. Klausner, Von Jesus zu Paulus (Jerusalem, 1950), p. 130.

[21]Though G. Ziener, Begriffssprache, p. 13, n. 1 objects that a Palestinian Jew would hardly have used the Old Testament in its Greek translation, which Ps-Solomon certainly did. [The WS's dependence on the Greek Bible has been established in several studies: G. Ziener, "Die Verwendung der Schrift im Buche der Weisheit", TrThZ 66 (1957), pp. 138-152; Fichtner, "Der AT-Text der Sapientia Salomonis", ZAW 57 (1939), pp. 155-192]. There is however no reason to suppose that the LXX, or a recension of it, may not have been known to a Palestinian Jew (see Chapter II, n. 12). The WS, too, does not always follow the LXX-text exactly, but is often closer to a "Vorläufer" of the version of Symmachus (Fichtner, p. 192).

[22]See literature cited in Chapter II, nn. 22-30.

sacred tradition in many respects, and that his Greek learning provided him with the means for the formulation and expression of this advance; but he never lost sight of his basic orientation.

The complexity and diversity within the book, and the differences in tone and emphasis between the various parts of the book,[23] which have often been seen to support the theory of multiple authorship,[24] can be accounted for quite easily when both the various tendencies of the author are recognized, as well as the diverse Old Testament materials upon which he depends. Thus, parts I (1:1-5:23) and III (10:1-19:22) deal primarily with the fate of the righteous and the wicked. Just as God in the past stood by the righteous and punished the wicked (part III), so the righteous man of today, despite his precarious situation and his oppressed condition, can be confident that his God will not forsake him (part I). While part I comforts the righteous by promising them fullness of life in the beyond, part II (6:1-9:18) is concerned to discuss the significance of "Wisdom" for both this life and the life beyond. In part III (10:1 ff.) Wisdom is portrayed as involved in the historical redemption of Israel; in part II (6:1 ff.) Wisdom's relation to a particular individual (i.e., Solomon) is worked out; in part I (1:1 ff.)

---

[23]The book has generally been divided into three major parts: I (1:1-5:23); II (6:1-9:18); III (10:1-19:22). It is at the junctures from 5:23 to 6:1 and from 9:18 to 10:1 that a shift in subject matter and purpose takes place.

[24]E.g., E. Gärtner, Komposition und Wortwahl des Buches der Weisheit (Berlin, 1912); S. Holmes, "The Wisdom of Solomon", in R. H. Charles, ed., The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament, Vol. I (Oxford, 1913), pp. 521-524.

Wisdom's presence is the guarantee of the righteous man's reward.[25] While part I is addressed primarily to Jews, part II addresses readers "who have somehow come into contact with Greek wisdom, and are to be won over to Israel's Wisdom".[26] For this reason, part II betrays a closer connection and points of contact with Greek-Hellenistic thought than the other parts of the book,[27] though such influence is not absent from any part of the book.

The differences among the various parts of the book rest further on the materials which the author incorporated. While part I reveals great dependence on the prophetic writings, especially Isaiah,[28] and the Psalms,[29] part II depends primarily on the historical books, and echoes in many instances Israel's wisdom literature.[30] Part III is concerned

---

[25]This theme will be considered in detail below, Chapter V, section B.

[26]G. Ziener, Theologische Begriffssprache, p. 91.

[27]Cf. Reese, Hellenistic Influence, pp. 36-50, who seeks to show that Ps-Solomon's presentation of Wisdom is in terms of the Hellenistic hymns to Isis, the ancient Egyptian goddess who at the time was being honored as the giver of divine wisdom, and was increasingly being identified with the divine Wisdom. Reese's rejection of any dependence on the Wisdom literature of the Old Testament and Sir, however, is not too convincing (see below).

[28]Skehan, "Isaias and the Teaching of the Book of Wisdom", CBQ 2 (1940), pp. 289-299; M. J. Suggs, "Wisdom of Solomon 2:10-5: A Homily based on the Fourth Servant Song", JBL 76 (1957), pp. 26-33.

[29]Skehan, "Borrowings from the Psalms in the Book of Wisdom", CBQ 10 (1948), pp. 384-397.

[30]D. S. Margoliouth, "The Wisdom of Ben Sira and the Wisdom of Solomon", Expositor 1 (1900), pp. 141-186; Skehan, The Literary Relationship Between the Book of Wisdom and the Protocanonical Wisdom Books of the Old Testament; F. Feldmann, Das Buch der Weisheit (Die Heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments; Bonn, 1926), p. 5.

with the exodus event, and thus depends on the Pentateuch, though not following it exactly.[31] Thus, the complex character of the Wisdom of Solomon is grounded in the purpose for which the various parts are designed and in the incorporation of a diversity of materials, so characteristic of wisdom literature generally. Ps-Solomon's thinking is rooted, on the one hand, in Palestinian-Hebraic wisdom, which he no doubt learned to know as a result of the rich exchange between the homeland and the Greek diaspora. This wisdom tradition, in turn, was nurtured by the Hebrew Old Testament, resembled Proverbs and Sirach in style and word usage, and concerned itself primarily with the problems of the individual. This emphasis is reflected in the main in parts I and II of the WS. On the other hand, Ps-Solomon is acquainted with the Hellenistic wisdom, and does not hesitate to dip into the well of this tradition.[32] Out of this variety of material the sage created his work, which, despite its diversity in subject matter and manner of presentation, is governed by one central orientation: Wisdom, gift of God to mankind, leads to righteousness, and consequently to eternal life. It is the object of this chapter to interpret and understand the author's unfolding of this central orientation of his work.

---

[31]Feldmann, "Die literarische Art von Weisheit Kap. 10-19", ThGl 1 (1909), pp. 178-184.

[32]Fichtner, "Die Stellung der Sapientia", pp. 116-117; Reese, Hellenistic Influence, pp. 1-89; 160-162.

## B. ANTHROPOLOGY

In order properly to understand Ps-Solomon's view of the nature and destiny of man, preliminary consideration must be given to the anthropological-psychological terminology which he employs, and the meaning which this terminology has in the various contexts in which it is employed. A proper understanding of an author's terminology will help to avoid erroneous understanding of his thought as a whole. This is particularly true of the text presently under investigation; its intricate mixture of Hebraic conceptions and Hellenistic ideas, expressed in the Greek language, has fostered the growth of the most diverse theories as to its conception of man, his nature, and his destiny. The use of Hellenistic-philosophical terminology has often led to the conviction that the author also adopted the philosophical thought and ideology associated with that terminology.[33] But such is not necessarily the case. It is at once obvious, to any careful reader of the book, especially of the Greek text, that the author's use of terms and his statements on the nature of man lack scientific explicitness and semantic consistency. Terms which in the context of Greek thought are often explicitly defined and delimited in their application are used almost arbitrarily in the WS, often interchangeably, and applied in contexts which modify or alter their usual meanings. DiLella

---

[33]E.G., K. Siegfried, "Die Weisheit Salomos", in Kautzsch, Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des A.T, Part I (Tübingen, 1900), pp. 476 ff.: W. J. Deans, The Book of Wisdom (Oxford, 1881); F. W. Farrar, "The Wisdom of Solomon", in Wace, Apocrypha, Vol. I (London, 1888).

suggests two reasons why this should not surprise us: 1) In order to underline the enduring relevance of Israel's inspired books, Ps-Solomon couched his message at times in the more primitive anthropological categories found in those books which he knew so well. 2) As a well-educated progressive who felt compelled to rethink and adapt the teachings of the past for a generation of Jews who were thinking in categories different from the ones contained in the older scriptures, he employed some of the terms and thought patterns of Greek-Hellenistic speculation regarding the nature of man.[34] It is this two-fold purpose which forces us to pay particular attention to the contexts in which the various terms occur, and to determine their meaning in reference to these contexts.

We begin our study with the author's use of the word psychē, for his use and understanding of this term will reveal (more than anything else), to what extent he is indebted to either the Greek or the Hebraic conception of the nature of man, or to both.

In the opening lines of the book, where the author calls upon his fellow men for righteousness and warns them that separation from God is the result of wickedness, we find this couplet (1:4):

> Wisdom will not enter a malicious soul,
> nor abide in a body indebted to sin.

Is this a case of synonymous parallelism, so that sōma and psychē could just as well trade places? Or is the author thinking of the Hellenistic distinction between soul and body? Reese suggests that a comparison with

---

[34]A. A. DiLella, "Conservative and Progressive Theology: Sirach and Wisdom", CBQ 28 (1966), p. 149.

statements in Chapter 15, where the author uses similar vocabulary, decides in favor of the latter alternative.[35] The term "malicious" (κακότεχνον) used in 1:4 to describe an evil man's soul, is used again in 15:5, as the attribute of human devising.[36] The text discusses man's intellectual powers and the moral implications of their use, not his physical existence. From this observation, Reese concludes that "the similarity of the two passages favors the opinion that in both cases the sage looks on man's soul as the director of his moral life".[37] But this is reading something into the text which is not there. The latter passage (15:4) certainly speaks of moral attitude, but there is no mention of "soul" as being in charge of this activity.[38] Nor is the

---

[35]Reese, Hellenistic Influence, pp. 83-84.

[36]The term occurs only at these two places in the Bible.

[37]Hellenistic Influence, p. 84.

[38]It is interesting to note in this connection that Ps-Solomon affirms the unity of the human being in his moral and emotional activity by his use of the Greek equivalents for the Hebrew terms lēb "heart", and kilyâ "reins" ("kidneys") in parallel construction (1:6); both terms here designate man's inmost being. Ps-Solomon uses the term kardia in a Greek-philosophical meaning only at 2:2 (cf. Reider, Wisdom, p. 61; Osty, Sagesse, p. 35; DiLella, "Progressive and Conservative Theology", p. 150). In all the remaining five instances (1:1,6; 8:17;21; 15:10) it designates, as the Hebrew lēb, the seat of man's central volition; e.g., 1:1, where the phrase "singleness of heart" is a pure Hebraism: straightness of mind as opposed to crookedness. Cf. vs. 3, "crooked thoughts" (cf. Holmes, "Wisdom", p. 535). Cf. also 9:4, where we would expect "uprightness of heart", (cf. 1:1) Ps-Solomon speaks of "uprightness of soul". The expression ἐν εὐθύτητι ψυχῆς corresponds exactly to the ἐν εὐθύτητι καρδίας in Ps 119:7 and I Kings 3:6. Though the LXX has here faithfully rendered the Hebrew lēb, Ps-Solomon conforms to common LXX usage in using psychē in the place of lēb to denote man's innermost orientation (see D. Lys, "The Israelite Soul according to the LXX", VT 16 (1966), pp. 181-228, on p. 214). The meaning of the phrase, in both its Hebrew and Greek form, clearly denotes "integrity of character".

"soul" in 1:4 any more in charge of man's moral motivation than the "body". Reese further appeals to 15:8, where the figure underlying the term "indebted" recurs "in a text that clearly contrasts body and soul. Man's body is born of earth; he enjoys his soul only temporarily on loan, because God may demand χρέος (payment) at any time."[39] The use of 15:8 ff. to support the dualistic interpretation of 1:4 is not warranted, for an analysis of the passage 15:8-16 reveals that the author is clearly alluding to the account of man's creation in Gen 2:7, and is thus emphasizing man's utter dependence on his Maker for life. 15:8 states that when a man "is required to return the soul (psychē) that was lent him", he "goes to the earth from which he was taken". There is here certainly a contrast between psychē and the person who, having been made of dust, returns to it when psychē is removed. But it is significant that there is no contrast drawn between body as "mere body" and soul as "mere soul". For the author, at least in this passage, "soul" does not seem to denote that entity which is the seat of man's personality and which survives the death of the body. 15:16 uses the term pneuma for that which man, molded of clay, holds as a loan from God; thus, psychē and pneuma are used interchangeably for the same reality. What is this reality? 15:11 gives a clear answer, and it is in this passage that we have an unquestionable allusion to Gen 2:7. The text reads:

> He discerned not him that moulded him,
> that inspired him with an active soul
> and breathed into him a vital spirit.

---

[39]Reese, Hellenistic Influence, p. 84.

As we have seen, psychē and pneuma are used interchangeably in 15:8 and 15:16. So also here. Both the ψυχὴν ἐνεργοῦσαν and the πνεῦμα ζωτικόν are that which constitute man as a living, vital being. The ψυχὴν ἐνεργοῦσαν reflects the "living nephesh", and the πνεῦμα ζωτικόν reflects the "neshamah hajjim" of Gen 2:7.[40] For the author, these two expressions are quite identical in meaning: the verbs are synonymous; the descriptive attributes are not distinctive; and between the nouns themselves the author seems in this connection to have made no distinction.[41] He simply expresses, throughout Chapter 15, the conviction expressed also in Ps 104:29: "When thou takest away their breath, they die and return to dust."[42] Thus, the soul (15:8) or spirit (15:16) of man which must be returned at death is to be interpreted in light of 15:11 as the "breath

---

[40]Reese, ibid., p. 16, points out that WS 15:11, in expressing the truth of Gen 2:7, replaces the LXX rendering πνοὴ ζωῆς "breath of life", a rather literal translation of the Hebrew נִשְׁמַת חַיִּים, with the technical term of Alexandrian physicians, πνεῦμα ζωτικόν. But it is equally possible that the author had a Greek text before him which varied from the LXX text (cf. Fichtner, Weisheit, p. 57).

[41]See the excellent analysis by F. C. Porter, "The Preexistence of the Soul in Book of Wisdom and in the Rabbinical Writings", AJTh 12 (1908), pp. 53-118; this essay has also appeared in Old Testament and Semitic Studies in Memory of W. R. Harper, I (Chicago, 1908), pp. 207 ff. Cf. Goodrick, Wisdom, pp. 314-315; Holmes, "Wisdom", p. 560; Weber, "Die Seelenlehre der Weisheit Salomos", pp. 317-318; Gregg, Wisdom, pp. 146-148; Osty, Sagesse, pp. 92-94; J. Gayer, The Wisdom of Solomon (London, 1963), pp. 117-118; H. Zsohokke, "Die Anthropologie des Buches der Weisheit", Katholik 55 (1875), pp. 225-250, on pp. 237-238.

[42]Cf. Gen 3:19; Job 34:14 f.; Eccl 12:7. Cf. also Martin-Achard, From Death to Life, tr. by J. P. Smith (London, 1960), p. 31 f.

of God". It does not belong to man, nor is it (in this context) the seat of his personality.

On the basis of this analysis of the passages in Chapter 15, it is impossible to use them, as Reese does, for an interpretation of 1:4 in terms of a contrast between body and soul. Both terms must here be seen as but poetic variations for anthrōpos,[43] man as a body-soul unity. For the author, both sōma and psychē, individually and together,[44] can express the human personality in its totality; man is always "leibhafte seele, beseelter Leib".[45] In this connection, we must take note of those passages where psychē seems to reflect the Hebraic conception of nephesh in the sense of the "life" of a person, that which constitutes him as a living being. In 1:11 we read:

> a mouth uttering deceit destroys the soul.

---

[43]Cf. K. Grobel, "Σῶμα as 'Self, Person' in the LXX", in Neotestamentica: Studien für R. Bultmann (BZNW, 21; 1957), pp. 52-60, on p. 56, who refers to Prv 11:17, where the same double expression (here for "self") occurs:

> To himself (ψυχῇ ἑαυτοῦ) a merciful
> man does good,
> but he who is unmerciful destroys
> himself (ἑαυτοῦ σῶμα).

[44]Grobel, ibid., has shown that sōma in the LXX stands quite frequently for "self, person". It is also significant that the LXX usage of psychē faithfully reflects the various nuances and meanings of the Hebrew nephesh: it denotes the individual, the personal reality of the self, the bodily, individual reality, but not a separate, separable substance, the soul of the Hellenistic dualism (see the excellent study by D. Lys, "The Israelite Soul according to the LXX". Cf. also J. Fichtner, "Seele oder Leben in der Bibel", ThZ 17 (1961) pp. 305-318).

[45]K. Barth, Dogmatik III, 2, 394 ff. (cited by Grobel, art. cit., p. 52).

It is at once clear that psychē here can not denote a dualistic, independent entity, for a "soul" thus conceived cannot be "destroyed". Nor does the line refer to what later theology has called "second death".[46] The context does not support such an interpretation. The following two lines (1:12),

> seek not death in the error of your life,
> nor draw destruction upon yourselves
> by the work of your hands,

continue the thought of the previous line, and in a sense interpret it. The sense of the full passage is that a person who is deceitful, whose life is wrongly oriented, whose actions are wicked, brings destruction, i.e., death, upon himself. "Mouth" simply expresses the intent of the whole person,[47] while psychē is the poetic circumlocution for the personal pronoun, the self, the life. Thus we may render this line freely as: "a deceitful person destroys himself". This interpretation is supported by the fact that the LXX frequently employs psychē as a translation for nephesh in passages where the nephesh is said to be destroyed or to die, and where the meaning is clearly not that nephesh/psychē is an independent reality apart from the body, but in the sense that the individual, the person, dies.[48] Thus, the author reflects here once

---

[46]Thus F. R. Tennant, "The Teaching of Wisdom and Ecclesiastes on the Introduction of Sin and Death", JThS 2 (1901), pp. 207-223, on pp. 216-217.

[47]Cf. Job 27:4. In the MT we have a plain parallelism between "lips" and "tongue" which will not lie; in the LXX this becomes a progressive parallelism. Instead of "tongue" we have, "my soul will not meditate unrighteous things". The translators have understood that "lying" originates in man's inner being.

[48]E.g., Jud 16:30; I Kings 19:4; Ez 18:4; Lev 19:28; 22:4; Num 5:2; 6:11.

again the LXX usage of psychē in the sense of person, a living being, a life. To the passages discussed above must be added a number of uses of psychē where it clearly designates a living human being, a person (thus in 10:7; 12:6; 17:1,8; 15:14; at the latter passage and at 16:9, psychē may stand simply for the personal pronoun). The meaning of psychē in these passages lies on the surface, and there is no need to discuss them.[49]

In the passages from Chapter 15, which were discussed above, pneuma and psychē were used interchangeably to denote that reality by which man is constituted a living being. Very similarly, 16:14 uses these terms in a parallel construction.

> A man slays in his wickedness,
> yet the spirit that has gone forth he turns not again,
> nor does he return the soul that is captured.

Does the author here contrast pneuma and psychē as two separate entities

---

[49]The use of psychē in 7:27 seems at first sight to fall outside the usage in the sense of "person". We are told that Wisdom passes into "holy souls", making them friends of God. But then the passage goes on to say that "nothing does God love save him who dwells with Wisdom" (vs. 28). From the context it is clear that Wisdom takes up residence in persons (cf. 1:4, where she is said to abide in both body and soul). Perhaps the author uses psychē here to emphasize man's innermost being, his moral orientation, though no contrast is intended between body and soul. The same internalization may be intended by the use of psychē in 10:16, though the obvious meaning is simply that Wisdom dwelt in God's servant. Again, the parallelism of 14:11c,d would indicate that "souls of men" is simply an alternate expression for "the foolish". Yet, the author may have intended the psychē here to denote man's inner, moral life (cf. 14:26, "pollution of souls", where a similar emphasis is placed on man's moral orientation).

which leave the body at death? DeWette[50] seems to understand the verse in this way, and translates:

> Er (der Mensch) bringt den ausgefahrenen Geist
> nicht wieder zürück,
> noch befreit er die (in die Unterwelt) aufgenommene
> Seele.

Accordingly, pneuma designates either the breath of the person, or the "breath of life" (cf. 15:11) which returns to God who gave it; while psychē denotes the "shade" of the person which has descended into Sheol. The immediate context seems to support such an interpretation. Vs. 13 speaks of the authority of God over life and death; he can lead men to the gates of Hades, and also bring man back from there. Over against this vs. 14 contrasts man's impotence: while God can both kill and make alive,[51] man can only inflict death but never restore to life.[52] The contrast almost demands that the psychē which cannot be released (ἀναλύειν) is seen to be captured (παραλημφθεῖσαν) by Hades.[53]

---

[50]Cited in Weber, "Die Seelenlehre", p. 317. Cf. also the translations by Osty, Sagesse, p. 98 (et ne libère pas l'âme que l'Hadès a reçue), Holmes, "Wisdom", p. 561, and Gregg, Wisdom, p. 156 ("neither giveth release to the soul that Hades hath received"); Fichtner, Weisheit, p. 59. See further Goodrick, Wisdom, p. 328, who cites a passage from Polyb. III 39:2: "Taken prisoner by Hades".

[51]Ps-Solomon is here clearly dependent on Deut 32:39 and I Sam 2:6.

[52]Cf. Reider, Wisdom, p. 190, who points to a similar contrast in Ps 49: Man cannot rescue his brother (vs. 8), but God can redeem from the hand of Hades (vs. 15 LXX).

[53]Cf. 2:1, where the impious assert that no one has ever been released (ἀναλύειν) from Hades.

If this interpretation is correct, then we have a passage which, though closely dependent on Old Testament conceptions, has no real parallel there. Nowhere is it said that nephesh continues an existence after death,[54] and the LXX preserves this state of affairs.[55] There is one possible exception in I Kings 17:17 ff. The life-breath (neshamah) has left the boy: thus he is dead. Elijah asks God that the nephesh (LXX psychē) of the boy may return into him, so that he might live again (17:21 f.); it does, and the boy revives. But can nephesh (psychē) here have the meaning of "soul" in the sense of an independent entity, which exists apart from the body after death, when such a meaning is nowhere

---

[54]Cf. N. H. Snaith, "Life after Death. The Biblical Doctrine of Immortality", Inter 1 (1947), pp. 309-324, who states on p. 312: "...with the Hebrews and in the Septuagint nephesh (psychē) stays this side the grave and never has anything at all to do with the next world. Death is the end of nephesh." But cf. the critical review of Snaith's essay by J. Bear, "Is Man as Man Immortal? A Reply", Inter 1 (1947), pp. 493-498, where he criticizes Snaith's analysis, especially that of the New Testament data.

[55]Cf. Lys, "The Israelite Soul", p. 183: "To ask the question whether the 'animation' (nephesh) of a body is mortal or immortal is to ask the wrong question." Thus, "there is no speculation about the destiny of the soul in sheol." But E. Fascher, Seele oder Leben (Berlin, 1959), p. 18, interprets Is 38:10-20 as teaching that the "soul" (nephesh/psychē) in the sense of an independent entity, continues to exist in the netherworld (vs. 17). However, in analogy to numerous Psalms (e.g., 30:2-3, 11; 88; 86:12-13; 103:1,3-5) Is 38:10-20 does not speak of a "preservation of the nephesh" in the sense of the "salvation of the soul", but in the sense of the preservation of physical life. Cf. Martin-Achard, From Death to Life, 60-65; also C. Barth, Die Errettung vom Tode in den individuellen Klage-und Dank liedern des A.T. (Basel, 1947).

attested in the Old Testament?[56] Fichtner[57] is surely right when he asserts that "the text does not admit to speak of a 'vom Leib gelösten Seele' and its immortality ...nephesh means here 'life'".[58] That is, God grants new life to the child; there is no thought here of the return of the "soul" from Hades.

Is it possible that Ps-Solomon, in 16:14, is simply affirming the impossibility of returning a man's "life" to him? Though the imagery of "capture" and "release" militates against such an interpretation of vs 14c, this is certainly the import of the verse as a whole.[59] It is of course possible that the author uses psychē here to designate that lifeless and powerless shade (rephaim) of a person which was believed to lie dormant in the netherworld. Yet, rephaim is never rendered by psychē in the LXX.[60] It seems therefore much more natural,

---

[56]As Fascher, Seele oder Leben, p. 8, asserts.

[57]Fichtner, "Seele oder Leben in der Bibel", p. 315; cf. Fohrer, "Das Geschick des Menschen nach dem Tode im A.T.", KerDog 14 (1968), pp. 249-262, on pp. 252-253; also Hooke, Life after Death: V. Israel and the Afterlife", ET 76 (1964/65), pp. 236-239.

[58]The parallel construction: "and the soul of the child came into him again and he revived" supports the idea that the return of the soul into the child simply means that life returned to a life-less body.

[59]Cf. Gregg, Wisdom, pp. 155-156.

[60]See Lys, "The Israelite Soul", Cf. the completely untenable position of J. Scheftelowitz, "Der Seelen-und Unsterblichkeitsglauben im A.T.", ARW 19 (1916/17), pp. 210-232, on pp. 228 ff., who interprets all cases of the dead "shades" (rephaim) in sheol as the existence of an imperishable "soul" which has separated from the body. This position is also taken by P. Torge, Seelenglaube und Unsterblichkeitshoffnung im Alten Testament (Leipzig, 1909), pp. 28-98.

in view of both the clear identification of pneuma and psychē in Chapter 15 and the parallel usage of the terms in the present passage (16:14), to see them as synonymous expressions of the same reality:[61] man kills, but he cannot restore "life", or the "principle of life", to the dead.

Thus far we have studied two groups of texts; 1) those in which psychē is used together with other terms, such as sōma and pneuma, and 2) those in which psychē is a substitute for the personal pronoun, or stands for the "life of a person" in terms of his physical existence. We go on to study a series of texts which W. Weber has grouped together, and in which he sees the term psychē "denoting the soul of a departed person".[62] He sees the soul as an entity which man possesses in this life and which departs from the body at death, incorporating within itself man's full conscious life.[63] Let us examine the texts.[64] In 3:1

---

[61]Thus Reider, Wisdom, p. 190; Osty, Sagesse, p. 98, n. a: "Aucune différence entre le 'souffle' et l' 'âme'; l'auteur demeure fidèle à la conception traditionelle du composé humain (Gen 2:7)."; Zschokke, "Anthropologie", pp. 237-238; J. Weber, "Le Libre de la Sagasse", in La Sainte Bible: Livres Sapientiaux (6th ed. by L. Pirot and A. Clamer; Paris, 1946), pp. 508-509.

[62]Weber, "Seelenlehre", p. 314.

[63]There are two passages which Weber includes in this grouping which may be briefly disposed of in a note. In 2:22e we read that the wicked were not aware that there was a "prize for blameless souls". What is asserted is simply that life with God, immortality, is the reward for righteousness. In 3:13, the righteous, barren woman is promised "fruit in the visitation of souls". We shall discuss the use of ἐπισκοπή below. It is sufficient to point out that the use of psychē here reflects the LXX usage where the term stands for the whole person.

[64]Ibid., p. 316.

we read:

> But the souls of the righteous are in the
> hand of God,
> and no torment shall touch them.

Is the meaning of psychē here obvious?[65] It seems to be, when the first line is read by itself. But to what does αὐτῶν in the second line refer? As it is a genitive, it is unclear, and can have as its antecedent either δικαίοι or ψυχαί. If it refers to "souls", then the author gives clear expression to the belief of the continuance of the soul which has left a body subject to torment. But in this case, and in order to provide consistency, the following lines (3:2),

> they seemed to have died,
> and their departure was counted a misfortune,

would likewise have to refer to the psychē of vs. 1a. This, however, is nonsense. It is not the "souls" of the righteous that seemingly died and departed; it is "the righteous". Again, in 3:3, the immediate context shows that the meaning is not "the souls of the righteous are at peace", but rather "they (the righteous) are at peace". Further, in 3:9 we are told that "the faithful", not the "souls" of the faithful, shall abide with God in love.[66] Finally, 4:7 speaks of the righteous man (δίκαιος) who will be at rest, not of his "soul". Is it possible, on the basis of our study of Ps-Solomon's use of psychē thus far, to

---

[65]Cf. J. Reider, Wisdom, p. 71, "The aim here is to teach the immortality of the soul". Gregg, Wisdom, p. 24, "Freed from the body, the soul is delivered from the pains that are inevitable in a material world". Fichtner, Wisdom, pp. 18-19, "Ihre Seelen werden nach dem leiblichen Tode in Gottes Hand sein".

[66]These passages will be discussed in detail below, section C,2.

suggest that psychē in 3:1a, in terms of its connection with the phrase, "the souls of the righteous", means simply "the righteous (persons)"? We must, however, beware of pressing the author into a consistent use of a term or a consistent conception of things. Thus it is surely possible that his acquaintance with Hellenistic-philosophical thought breaks through at this point, and that he can only conceive of an immediate presence with God in terms of psychē as an independent and separable entity. And yet if, as we shall argue below,[67] the author introduces the story of Enoch's translation in 4:10 ff. as an interpretative example and prototype of the ἔξοδος (3:2) of the righteous, then it must be questioned whether he seriously could have entertained the concept of a soul as that part of man which survives death.[68]

In the passage which describes the translation of Enoch,[69] we find the following two passages, the second of which repeats the essence of the first in somewhat different formulation:

(4:10-11) Being well-pleasing to God he was cherished,
And living among sinners was translated.
He was plucked away, lest wickedness should
alter his understanding,
Or guile deceive his soul.

(4:14) For his soul was well-pleasing to God,
Therefore he hastened him away
from the midst of wickedness.

It is at once clear that the author does not here express the idea that

---

[67]Section C,1.

[68]Cf. Weber, "Seelenlehre", p. 316: "Die Seele ist demnach der Bestandteil des Menschen, der den Tod überdauert."

[69]Ps-Solomon avoids the use of all names of persons; but the reference to the translation of Enoch in Chapter 4 is beyond doubt.

God takes to himself the "soul" of the righteous man. Indeed, it is expressly stated that God plucks the righteous person from the midst of wickedness in order that his σύνεσις and his ψυχή might not be led astray and be deceived by evil. Thus these terms, used as they are in parallel construction, denote here the moral character of man, his innermost being, his personhood. If this interpretation be correct, then it is not psychē, dualistically conceived over against the body, which survives death. Rather, it is the whole person, in his conscious, moral oneness,[70] who is somehow mysteriously (cf. μυστήρια θεοῦ, 2:22) snatched from the world of men[71] into the presence of God. It may be that Ps-Solomon used the term psychē to denote this reality in 3:1. For insofar as he used the term for the personality of man as a whole, it could be used as a synonym for the person after death. But this is far removed from the conception of soul as that aspect of man which survives death.

In terms of our analysis of the author's use of the term psychē in the context of his understanding of the nature and destiny of man, two passages remain to be discussed which have provided the battleground for extensive scholarly debate. Chapters 7-8 contain a eulogy on Wisdom (her origin, her exalted status, her nature, her functions), interrupted

---

[70]Cf. J. E. Bear, "Is Man as Man Immortal?" Inter I (1947), pp. 493-498.

[71]That this is by means of physical death is clear; but this physical death has been re-interpreted in terms of Enoch's translation; see below, section C,1.

occasionally by the author's[72] autobiographical references to his own estimation of himself, to his desire for Wisdom, to his relationship with her. The much-debated passage, 8:19-20, immediately precedes his prayer to God for Wisdom, contained in Chapter 9. The text reads:

19. παῖς ἦμην εὐφυὴς
ψυχῆς τε ἔλαχον ἀγαθῆς
20. μᾶλλον δὲ ἀγαθὸς ὢν ἦλθον εἰς σῶμα ἀμίαντον.

On the surface, the meaning of the passage seems quite clear. Vv. 19-20, in their context, serve to refute the supposition that a supremely gifted person can find Wisdom on his own.[73] The speaker declares, on the basis of a reflective look into his childhood, that he "was a child of good natural disposition", and that "a good soul" had come into his possession. But immediately he corrects himself (μᾶλλον δὲ ), apparently not quite satisfied with this statement, and asserts that

---

[72]Who speaks here in the guise of King Solomon. Yet, as Reese has clearly seen, the author avoids the use of proper names because he wants his ideal king, his just and wise "man", to be understood not as the individual King Solomon but rather as the type of everyman, favored and esteemed by the common Father of all men, who cares for all (12:13), and who "spares all as ἄνθρωπον", that is, not as a member of a particular people but as belonging to the one human race that he created (12:8). (Reese, Hellenistic Influence, p. 76). As we have seen above, Enoch, though unnamed, is another typical example. So is ὁ δίκαιος (2:12,16,18) who almost imperceptively becomes οἱ δίκαιοι (3:1 f.). On this latter, see below, section C,2.

[73]In 7:1-7, immediately preceding the first mention of Solomon's prayer for Wisdom, it is clearly stated that station and rank in no wise guarantee the attainment of Wisdom. These are in a sense parallel passages: man, regardless of station in life, or natural endowment, is weak and impotent; the receiving of Wisdom does not come by attainment, rather it is a gift. (Cf. J. Fichtner, Weisheit, p. 35).

"being good, I came into an undefiled body". Clearly, in the first statement, there seems to be an identification of the ego, the "I", with the physical reality of the body, to which "soul" is added, or rather, into which the "soul" enters. The second statement reverses this identification: the "good soul" (ἀγαθῆς ψυχῆς) is identified with the good (ἀγαθὸς) "I", which enters the undefiled body.

Many scholars have seen reflected in these verses the Platonic doctrine of the pre-existence of the soul,[74] though admitting, for the most part, that the author modified the Platonic conception somewhat.[75] However, any direct dependence upon Platonic thought in this sentence has been clearly disproved[76] by two independent studies, one by P. Heinisch,[77] and the other by F. C. Porter.[78] We shall briefly summarize

---

[74]E.g., Grimm, Wisdom, pp. 19, 177 ff.; W. O. E. Oesterly, The Wisdom of Solomon (Translation of Early Documents, Series II, Hellenistic Jewish Texts, I; London, 1918), p. 50; Gregg, Wisdom, p. 86; A. Guillaumont, "La Sagesse de Solomon" in La Bible II, ed. by E. Dhorme (Paris, 1959), 1673; R. H. Charles, Eschatology, p. 308; Pfeiffer, History, pp. 328, 337; Reider, Wisdom, pp. 32-33, 124-125. S. Lange, "The Wisdom of Solomon and Plato", JBL 55 (1936), pp. 293-302, on pp. 299-302.

[75]Cf. Focke, Entstehung, 91, who notes that the μᾶλλον δέ indicates "dass diese Anschauung (i.e., the view of vs. 20 over against vs. 19) dem Verfasser absolut nicht in Fleisch und Blut übergegangen war; die an erster Stelle ausgesprochene ist ihm die geläufigere, angeborene, und es bedarf erst einer besonderen Überlegung, eines willkürlichen Umdenkens für ihn, um die andere Stellung folgen zu lassen".

[76]This assertion by Reese, Hellenistic Influence, p. 81, concurs fully with this writer's own evaluation of the arguments brought forth by Heinisch, Porter, Goodrick, and others.

[77]Heinisch, Die Griechische Philosophie im Buche der Weisheit, pp. 83-89; his arguments were also accepted by Gärtner, Komposition und Wortwahl, p. 30.

[78]Porter, art. cit., on pp. 73-74. His arguments have been

the arguments presented. The Platonic theory with its metaphysical dualism, and the consequent antagonism between spirit and matter, soul and body, is conspicuous by its absence from the entire book.[79] The author does not indicate in the least that the ideal to be striven after is the permanent escape of the soul from the body. There is no trace of an antagonism between flesh and spirit, "in which the warfare is waged by means of a perpetual asceticism and mortification of the vile fleshly envelope".[80] The sage never speaks of the soul in the Platonic sense of being "older" than the body.[81] Further, it is important to keep in mind that the author does not consider body and soul as two independent substances.[82] He shows no influence of the metaphysical conception of the soul elaborated in the earlier Platonic dialogues, which presented the νοῦς, the superior part of the soul, as something belonging to the

---

accepted, to a greater or lesser degree, by M. J. Lagrange, in his review of Focke's study in RB 28 (1919), p. 269; Goodrick, Wisdom, pp. 377-388; Holmes, "Wisdom", p. 531; Fichtner, Weisheit, p. 35; H. Bückers, Die Unsterblichkeitslehre des Weisheitsbuches: Ihr Ursprung und ihre Bedeutung (Münster, 1938), p. 143.

[79]Cf. Zschokke, art. cit., who demonstrates clearly that Ps-Solomon's references to God's creative activity exclude any kind of metaphysical dualism (pp. 230-232).

[80]Goodrick, Wisdom, p. 382. It must be pointed out here that Plato himself did not look upon the body as something utterly despicable and vile, but merely deprecates the limitations it imposes on the spirit. Yet Plato had provided the impetus in that direction, and later Platonism, together with "Orphic", Pythagorean and Gnostic speculations, drew the final consequences implied in his dualism.

[81]See Plato, Laws, 892a, 896c, 967b; cited by Reese, Hellenistic Influence, p. 81.

[82]As we have shown above.

divine sphere.[83] Nor does he subscribe to the development within the Platonic tradition by those philosophers who considered the soul as "a thing essentially divine and essentially immortal and of an immeasurable superiority to the body, needing only purification and freedom from carnal contacts to enjoy God forever".[84]

If it be admitted, then, that a Platonic-Hellenistic conception of the pre-existence of the soul,[85] as an independent embodiment of the personality, must be excluded from consideration in regard to the passage 8:19-20, how is it to be understood? To assert that Ps-Solomon deliberately accentuates the distinct roles of soul and body in 8:19-20,[86] is hardly accurate in view of the context. What the author is concerned with is the acquisition of Wisdom, and in this context he is

---

[83]In fact, he definitely identifies νοῦς and ψυχή in a synonymous parallelism (9:15); cf. a similar parallelism between σύνεσις and ψυχή (4:11).

[84]A. D. Nock, Conversion. The Old and New in Religion from Alexander the Great to Augustine of Hippo (Oxford, 1933), p. 248. Cf. Porter's summary of Philo's agreement with these concepts (art. cit.). Had Ps-Solomon subscribed to these ideas, he could have never spoken of a κακότεχνον ψυχὴν (1:4), of a "destruction of the soul" (ἀναιρεῖ ψυχήν, 1:11), of an σῶμα ἁμαρτιῶν(8:20).

[85]A substantiating reason for excluding the philosophic-mystical conception of the pre-existence of the soul is the connection of that conception with the idea of transmigration (Cf. Rohde, Psyche, I, pp. 568-569). That such a conception cannot be attributed to Ps-Solomon is recognized by all. The contrast with Philo is instructive (Cf. E. Schürer, Geschichte, III, pp. 558, 561).

[86]As well as in 9:15 (Thus, Reese, Hellenistic Influence, p. 83, italics mine).

concerned to express the relation of soul and body, i.e., his inner and outer being, and to what extent this relational oneness equips him for the getting of Wisdom. Yet, though he does not emphasize distinct roles for soul and body, there is in this passage the tendency to connect the personality with the soul and to give to the latter a kind of priority over the body. In an extremely important study, Porter has attempted to prove that the pre-existence indicated here is founded not on Greek speculations, but on Jewish conceptions of pre-existence developed in the post-biblical period. He contrasts the Greek and Jewish views thus:

> To the Greek the soul that preexists was or tended to be the real personality, the man's real thinking self, while to the Jew it was only a part of the coming man, the divine breath or spirit which was to make him alive, the breath (nĕshāmāh) of life which God breathes into the earthly form, making it a living being (nephesh)....When the Jews wished to speak of that which preceded and survived the earthly life of man, the word they naturally used was not 'nephesh' but 'nĕshāmāh' (less often rūah), not the word that expressed the personal self of man, but the word that suggested the divine in contrast to the earthly element that entered into his making. But the pre-existence of the 'nĕshāmāh' is a very different thing from the pre-existence of the psychē.[87]

Porter recognizes of course that in the Old Testament period generally Hebrew thought did not individualize each man's share in God's nĕshāmāh, still less connect with it man's personal consciousness. However, it was to be expected that in the course of time the idea would arise that the

---

[87]Porter, art. cit., pp. 211 ff.

breath of God also was for each man in some sense a distinct entity.[88] Porter documents the belief that God has the "souls" (or better, the nĕshāmôth) in his keeping, and that he provides one for each body that comes into the world, from Rabbinic literature.[89] If such a conception of pre-existence, whether the result of internal development[90] or of external influence,[91] forms the background of thought for the expression of vs. 19, what are we to do with the second clause in vs. 20? Porter's explanation is this: the author is a Jew writing Greek. He holds the Jewish view of the pre-existence of the nĕshāmôth. Having expressed this (in vs. 19), it occurs to him that it would be better to connect the personality with the soul, and to say that the body was happily matched to the soul rather than the soul was happily matched to the body. What we have, therefore, in the second clause is a presentation in a form intelligible to Greeks or Hellenized Jews of the belief expressed in the first clause.

---

[88]The beginnings of such a tendency, Porter sees in Prov 20:27, and especially in the expression "the neshamoth which I have given" in Is 57:16 (Ibid., 213). On the Jewish idea of pre-existing things, cf. L. Kohler in the Jewish Encyclopedia, s.v. "soul".

[89]Cf. Moore, Judaism II, 353, n. 3. Cf. also the acquaintance of Josephus with such a conception (Bell. Jud II, 8,11; III, 8,5; VII, 8,7.) as also of II Enoch 23:4 f. and Ass Mos 1:14.

[90]This is clearly Porter's opinion.

[91]Cf. R. Meyer, Hellenistisches in der Rabbinischen Anthropologie, pp. 49-61 ("Die Seele als göttliches Wesen"), who thinks that the Rabbinic idea of the pre-existence of souls is the result of the impingement of Greek ideas on Jewish thought.

That the author depends here on a Jewish conception of the soul's pre-existence is a distinct possibility, though his close dependence on Gen 2:7 in Chapter 15[92] and his description of man's origin and development in 7:1 ff. would tend to indicate that he was not familiar with, or that he did not subscribe to, such a doctrine. There is, however, a third possibility for the interpretation of this passage, and it is an interpretation which takes the context of the passage more seriously.

It is interesting that Siegfried, who throughout his commentary emphasizes Ps-Solomon's dependence on Greek-philosophic thought, did not detect any indication of pre-existence in vss. 19-20, and by his translation of the passage points the direction for a proper interpretation of the passage:

> I was a well-endowed child,
> and had a good disposition
> Or rather, being of good nature,
> I had come into possession of a good body.[93]

He deliberately avoids the use of the word "soul" in his translation, and thus translates in terms of the emphasis in the context, which is as follows: Since I was aware of the great blessings which Wisdom could

---

[92]See above.

[93]Siegfried, Weisheit, p. 492. Cf. the recent translation by Reese, Hellenistic Influence, p. 81:

> I was a child of good natural disposition
> and obtained an honorable soul;
> or rather, being honorable, I reached a body
> without taint.

bestow, I sought to acquire her. I was, by nature, well-endowed, both in terms of mental faculties and bodily functions. However, realizing that Wisdom cannot be acquired except as given by the grace of God, I prayed to him for this gift.[94] Thus, for the context, vss. 19-20 have no significance, in and of themselves, except as they underline Solomon's natural endowment and the fact that, despite this, he cannot attain Wisdom on his own (cf. 9:6). There is no speculation here about the origin and nature of the soul, nor is the passage a repetition of the account, given in 7:1 ff., of Solomon's coming into the world, i.e., it is not an account of the coming together of body and soul. E. Gärtner has pointed out that the expression used for this union is not the author's manner of describing motion in space. On two occasions he uses the normal Greek idiom εἰσέρχομαι εἰς "come into" to describe the coming of Wisdom into man (1:4; 10:16). Here, on the contrary, he employs the simple ἔρχομαι εἰς , because he is speaking about the attainment of a certain interior perfection, namely, the perfect integration of the human personality of the wise man, the fullest effective union of body and soul.[95] Gärtner has correctly recognized that in this text the author affirms that even when a man reaches the highest degree of human

---

[94]Cf. the similar analysis of the context by Zschokke, art. cit., 234.

[95]Cf. Gärtner, Komposition u. Wortwahl, pp. 30-31. This interpretation of 8:19-20 eliminates the very basis of those who argue for Platonic influence upon it. It also makes unnecessary the alternate explanation of a Jewish idea of pre-existence.

perfection, the condition in which his external life is completely mastered by his internal motivation, he still falls short of what he needs to please God.[96] As such, the sentence forms an appropriate introduction to his prayer for the gift of Wisdom which alone can make him pleasing to God (9:6).

In light of this interpretation of 8:19-20, the author's comment in 9:15 can lastly be considered:

> For a perishable body weighs down the soul
> And the earthly tent burdens a thoughtful mind.

Beside the passage 8:19-20, this verse has often been a proof text for those who have attributed to the WS a Greek-Hellenistic dualism. We have already discussed (Chapter II, above) the use of the σκῆνος image in various Greek-philosophical and Hellenistic writings, and have concluded that Ps-Solomon's use of the image does not agree with that utterly pessimistic view of the body-soul relation so clearly expressed in the σῶμα-σῆμα image.[97] That the vocabulary of the passage is present in a Platonic passage[98] has often been pointed out. But whereas Plato uses the words "soul", "heavy", "weigh down" in a metaphysical sense,[99]

---

[96]Cf. Reese, Hellenistic Influence, pp. 80-86, who emphasizes the practical, moral bent of the author's affirmations. He states that the passage "brings out once again that he saw an intrinsic and necessary link between body and soul as integral parts of man and not as separate substances".

[97]Cf. Reider, Wisdom, pp. 130-131; Gregg, Wisdom, pp. 92-93; Goodrick, Wisdom, pp. 221-223; 382-384; Heinisch, Philosophie, pp. 51-55.

[98]Phaedo, 81 C.

[99]Reese, Hellenistic Influence, p. 86. Cf. Porter, art. cit., p. 227, who points out that in Phaedo, 81 C, Plato is not speaking of the hindrance that the body offers to the mind in its search for truth, but

Ps-Solomon uses them in a moral-religious sense. This becomes clear when the context is considered. The verse appears in the prayer (9:1-18) for Wisdom (vs. 4), in which vss. 5-18 give the reasons for the necessity of the request. Vss. 5-8 explain that Wisdom is necessary for Solomon's task:

> For though one be perfect among the sons of men,
> If Wisdom from thee be lacking, he shall be
> accounted for naught. (vs. 6)

Vss. 9-12 show why Wisdom is able to assist Solomon in his task:

> For she knows and understands all things
> and shall guide me in my actions prudently. (vs. 11)

Vss. 13-18 finally emphasize man's weakness, and assert that without the help of Wisdom, man is incapable of discerning God's will and way.[100] In this context vs. 15 appears, and it is designed to show why

> ...the reasonings of mortals are worthless,
> and our devices are prone to fail. (v. 14)

The reason is that we are mortal (φθαρτὸν σῶμα), that our inner strivings to search out God's will are restricted by this earthly tent (γεώδες σκῆνος), this prone-to-weakness body of flesh. What the author is expressing here is therefore not in keeping with the tendencies of later Hellenistic mysticism, with its opposition between soul and body in man. Rather, it is an expression of the commonplace of experience

---

of the lot after death of souls which have been defiled by the body during the earthly life. Cf. also P. Heinisch, Philosophie, pp. 51-55, for texts in which the vocabulary appears in the way the WS uses it. He compares this use to Plato, where it is not the body itself that weighs down the soul, but the soul's love for bodily pleasures.

[100] Vs. 13 seems to be based on Is 40:13 (cf. Is 55:8); vs. 14 is a reminiscence of Ps 94:11.

that "the spirit is willing, but the flesh is weak". There is here none of that dualism which pronounces matter evil. The writer goes no further than the psalmist when he says "He knows our frame, he remembers that we are dust" (Ps 103:14). The difference is this, that Ps-Solomon uses the common image of the tent to designate the body, which houses the soul, the inner life of man.[101] That he did this was no doubt due to his desire to be understood in a Hellenistic milieu.[102] 9:15 is a "comment upon human weakness",[103] an expression of the universal recognition that flesh imposes limitations on man's higher quest.

In this passage we have before us a crystallization of the author's anthropological position: not a metaphysical dualism, and consequently antagonism, between soul and body, spirit and matter, but rather an ethical-moral-religious dualism. Body, as well as soul, can be undefiled, can be recipients of the Wisdom which God gives, can be given to the paths of righteousness. Likewise soul, as well as body, can be defiled, can be given to the works of unrighteousness, can be subject

---

[101]The synonymous parallelism of the verse, which equates ψυχή with νοῦς, is a final proof that the author is not reflecting Platonic conceptions here (for Plato, the "mind" is the higher, divine part of the "soul"), and that he uses both terms in reference to man's inner quest for discernment of God's ways.

[102]Though the image of the body as a tent was not unknown in the Old Testament, e.g. Is 38:12; (cf. Job 4:19). Also, the adjective γεώδες could be an allusion to the biblical commonplace that man is "dust" (cf. Chapter 15).

[103]Reese, Hellenistic Influence, p. 86.

to destruction. Man, as man, in his body-soul wholeness, is either oriented toward God, or away from him, and thus against him; he is either led by Wisdom to immortality, or he refuses Wisdom and faces death.

We shall see presently how this understanding of the WS's anthropological perspective informs our understanding of his view of the destiny of the individual. Before we proceed to that analysis, it is necessary to discuss, in the context of individual eschatology, what may be called "the problem of death" in the WS. Since "death" belongs both to the area of anthropology and to that of eschatology, the discussion of this problem will form the transition to section C, 2, below.

## C. INDIVIDUAL ESCHATOLOGY

### 1. The Problem of Death

In our discussion of the passages in Chapter 15:8-17, where in his critique of idolatry Ps-Solomon emphasizes the nothingness and impotence of man, we saw that he conceived of man's end in typically Jewish fashion as the return of man to the dust from which he was taken and formed (15:8) and the return into God of the breath of life (15:8, 16). The clear import of the entire passage is that man has life only temporarily, that it is bestowed by God and will be removed by him; in other words, man is mortal, he is a creature destined for death (θνητός, 15:17). This conviction by the author is expressed even more forcefully in the pericope which deals with the birth of the ideal and typical wise man, i.e., Solomon (7:1-6). In the guise of an autobiographical reminiscence, the author asserts that man, even the greatest among them,

is mortal (θνητὸς ἄνθρωπος, 7:1), that

> there is for all one εἴσοδος into life
> and a common ἔξοδος (7:6).

Man, as man, is mortal; his entrance into life is by means of birth (7:1b-7:3) and his exit by means of death. There are no exceptions, all men (πάντων, 7:6) are involved.

It is clear that in these passages "death" is understood as the end of life as man experiences it, death as a physical, real event on the historical plane.[104] But there are two passages in the opening chapters of the WS (1:12-16; 2:23-24) which discuss the introduction of death into the realm of life and the world of man in which death seems to be conceived in different terms. We are told in so many words that death comes only to those who actively court him. On the surface, then, there appears to be an open contradiction between such a conception of death and death as a physical event to which all men are subject. It is therefore our task to understand the nature of the death with which the author is concerned in these passages. We begin our discussion with 1:12-16.[105]

> 12. Do not seek θάνατον by your erring way of life,
> nor draw ὄλεθρον upon yourselves by the
> works of your hands,

---

[104]The word θάνατος does not appear in these passages. It is used at 12:20; 16:13; 18:12; 16:20; 19:5 to designate death and dying in general; that is, θάνατος in these instances designates the same reality as that which is described in Chapter 15 as man's return to the earth from which he was taken, and in 7:6 as man's ἔξοδος.

[105]The assertion in 1:11 that "a lying mouth detroys the soul" has already been discussed above. It affirms essentially the same thing as the vss. that follow, namely, death is the result of unrighteousness.

13. For God did not make θάνατον,
    nor does he rejoice in the ἀπωλείᾳ ζώντων,
14. For he created εἰς τὸ εἶναι τὰ πάντα,
    And the creatures of the world are wholesome
    And there is not in them the poison of ὀλέθρου,
    Nor is the dominion of ᾅδου upon earth;
15. For righteousness is ἀθάνατος
16. But the impious summoned him (αὐτον)
    by their hands and words;
    Deeming him a friend they longed for him,
    And made a covenant with him,
    Because they are worthy to be of his portion.

We observe at once that various terms are used to denote the reality of death. 12a and 12b are a clear case of synonymous parallelism, and thus θάνατος and ὄλεθρος can be equated as denoting the same thing. The same is true of 13a and 13b, so that θάνατος and ἀπώλεια in these two lines must also be equated. There is further a parallel structure to be observed between 12a and 13a, and between 12b and 13b, where 13a is the counterpoint to 12a (both lines use θάνατος) and 13b is the counterpoint to 12b (both lines use alternate terms for θάνατος). Again, the term ὄλεθρος in 14c is the counterpoint to the phrase εἰς τὸ εἶναι in 14a. The latter phrase expresses positively what 13a expressed negatively (i.e., "not death",--"but life"), while the term ὄλεθρος in 14c indicates that 14c answers to 12b: the "destruction" which men bring on themselves is not an inherent element in the created order. This initial analysis suggests that the very structure of these verses betrays a uniform and single conception of the author's understanding of death. A final term is introduced in 14d, namely ᾅδης, and it is asserted that "Hades" has no dominion upon the earth. Now ᾅδης is clearly the antecedent of the αὐτος of vs. 16. The activity which vs. 12 warns against is clearly the activity in which the impious of vs. 16 are involved, i.e.,

the active courting of death. Therefore ἅδης and θάνατος are to be equated.[106] Whereas 14a-c asserts that death is not an inherent principle in the created order, 14d asserts that death as an external power is also excluded.[107]

Several central motifs emerge on the basis of this analysis. It is unequivocally stated in this passage that 1) death (whatever its precise meaning) is not ordained of God; 2) its seeds are not within the created order; 3) its power cannot impinge upon the life of man from the outside; 4) death comes only to those who by their unrighteous living actively court it. Indeed we might sum up the content of 1:12 and 1:16 by formulating a sentence in analogy to 1:15, and expressing its polar opposite: "unrighteousness is θάνατος".

If it be granted that these motifs are clearly expressed, the question arises: what about those who are righteous, those who are not

---

[106]Cf. Is 38:18 and Hos 13:14, where death and Hades are clearly identical. (A. F. Key, "The Concept of Death in Early Israelite Religion", JBR 32 (1964), pp. 239 ff., on p. 245. Even in classical Greek, ἅδης occurs as a synonym for θάνατος in expressions like ἅδης πόντιος (J. P. Weisengoff, "The Impious of Wisdom 2", CBQ 11 (1949), pp. 40-65, on p. 42; n. 7). It is also relevant to point out that the following line (vs. 15) with its assertion that righteousness is immortal, contrasts with the "dominion of Hades" of 14d; which means that ἀ/θάνατος is the opposite of ἅδης , i.e., θάνατος.

[107]There seems in this line to be a rejection of the common Old Testament conception that Sheol/Hades as a sphere of power often impinges upon the world of the living, especially in the form of sickness and other calamities which ultimately lead to death (e.g., Ps 18:5-6; Ps 88: 4-6; Ps 71:20; Is 38:10; cf. Fohrer, "Das Geschick des Menschen nach dem Tode", p. 250). See also the excellent treatment of this topic in Martin-Achard, From Death to Life, pp. 16-47, 60-65.

worthy to be partakers of death? It is a fact that the righteous do suffer and die, that all men are mortal and experience the same ἔξοδος from the plane of history.[108] Since we cannot attribute to the author such outright contradiction, the reality expressed by the terms θάνατος, ἀπώλεια, and ὄλεθρος in 1:11 ff. must be something other than the physical death to which all men are subject, or it must designate a reality which includes physical death in its purview, but goes essentially beyond it. A voluminous discussion has centered around these alternatives,[109] a discussion which has often degenerated into

---

[108]As we saw above (section B), this is the clear assertion by Ps-Solomon.

[109]The former alternative, expressed in terms of "spiritual", "definitive", or "second" death, has been defended by Grimm, Weisheit, pp. 59 ff.; R. Schütz, Les Idées Eschatologigues du Livre de la Sagesse (Strasbourg, 1935), pp. 45-63; P. Gröbler, "Die Ansichten über Unsterblichkeit und Auferstehung in der jüdischen Literatur der beiden letzten Jahrhunderte vor Christus", ThSK 52 (1879), pp. 651-700, on p. 695; J. P. Weisengoff, "Death and Immortality in the Book of Wisdom", CBQ 3 (1941), pp. 113 ff.; F. R. Tennant, "The Teaching of Ecclesiastes and Wisdom on the Introduction of Sin and Death", JTS 2 (1901), pp. 207-223.

The second alternative is proposed by P. Heinisch, Weisheit, pp. 21 ff.; F. Feldmann, Das Buch der Weisheit (Die Heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments, VI/4; Bonn, 1926), pp. 28 ff.; H. Bückers, Die Unsterblichkeitslehre des Weisheitsbuches, pp. 18-24.

Several writers have interpreted the passage in terms of a double conception of death, so that in some verses "death" is seen to refer to "physical death" only, while in others it refers to "spiritual death" only; e.g., C. Gutberlet, Das Buch der Weisheit (Münster, 1874),p. 75; A. Schulz, Der Sinn des Todes im Alten Testament (Braunsberg, 1919), pp. 35-37. This type of interpretation, however, demands too much of the text, and requires ingenious manipulation of the material, which would only be justified if the author wanted to impart some esoteric knowledge to initiates in the art of textual manipulation!

theological-dogmatic hair-splitting and has thus frequently missed the central thrust of the author's intention.[110] Thus it is not our intention to repeat here the detailed exegetical discussion (except insofar as the exegetical insights of commentators are relevant to our purpose), but to attempt to ascertain the author's central thrust, and within this his understanding of death.

In these verses (1:12-16), Ps-Solomon contrasts the creative accomplishment and intention of God, which excludes death, with the sin of men, which includes death. The latter relationship is expressed in terms of a covenant of friendship between the wicked and death (vs. 16).[111] "Sünde und Tod gehören zusammen";[112] but the opposite is also true: righteousness and "not-death" (ἀ/θανασία), i.e., life,

---

[110]The irrelevance of aspects of the discussion is clearly reflected in the history of the interpretation of this problem, given by J. P. Weisengoff, "Death and Immortality in the Book of Wisdom", pp. 104-133. Whereas Ps-Solomon is concerned exclusively with man and his fate, much of the discussion has concerned itself with such questions as, 1) the relation of lower creatures (seen in the ζώντων of 13b and the τὰ πάντα of 14a) to man's destiny; 2) are they created εἰς τὸ εἶναι in terms of individuals, species, or natural life span? 3) how do creatures help man to achieve his destiny (as per 14b)? These speculations are certainly interesting, but were hardly in the purview of the author. What he expresses, especially in vs. 14, is simply the conviction that God is the author of life, not of death. Tennant, art. cit., p.219, suggests that the verse is simply introduced (as an extension of Gen 1:31) as an illustration of the general principle that the creation, as it left the hand of God, did not contain within itself the germ of its own destruction.

[111]This idea seems to be based on Is 28:15-18, where the people are castigated for making a "διαθήκην μετὰ τοῦ ᾅδου" and a "συνθήκας μετὰ τοῦ θανάτου" (cf. 14d).

[112]Bückers, Unsterblichkeitslehre, p. 19.

belong together (vs. 15). This latter relationship is expressed elsewhere as "friendship with God" (7:27d).[113] Thus, a clear contrast is drawn between, on the one hand, personal sin and its result, death, and, on the other hand, righteousness and its result, life. In such a context, physical death as such cannot be in view, for how does personal sin bring about a death to which all men are subject anyway? Nor can the destruction of the soul be in view here,[114] for, as we shall see below, the death which follows from unrighteousness continues to be a reality on the other side of the grave. The death envisioned here is conceived in terms of a "relational reality",[115] it is not a once-for-all ontological event in history. It is the condition of a very specific relationship, a condition which expresses the result of a very definite personal-moral-religious orientation, that is, an orientation opposed to the creative intention of the Creator. This understanding of "death" in 1:11 ff. is further supported by the fact that "death" is contrasted with ἀθανασία (1:15). We shall see below that "immortality" is not an ontological, "essential" designation, but rather designates a condition, a relationship. If this is so, then "death" must be a

---

[113]This idea will be discussed more fully below, Chapter V,B.

[114]As Weber in "Seelenlehre", p. 316, maintains. The result of our discussion on the author's understanding of psychē removes the basis for any interpretation which holds that the WS teaches the annihilation of the "soul".

[115]By "relational reality" we intend to designate a state of affairs the essence of which consists in a relationship. This means that "death" and "life" or "immortality" (see below) are not so much conceived as ontological/metaphysical realities -- such as the "immortal soul" which in its very essence is immortal -- but as dynamic realities.

condition expressing the reality of a relationship standing over against that of "immortality".

This interpretation of the meaning of death, not as a physical event, but as a relational reality, is further supported by the observation that this death is not only the result of unrighteousness, but it is a reality already present in a man's life here and now.[116] This is clearly implied in the covenant of friendship between the unrighteous and death which involves a present participation (1:16). Though death has no dominion on the earth, that is, though it cannot impinge upon man from the outside of its own accord (1:14d), unrighteous men have already summoned him (1:16a, προσεκαλέσαντο). In this sense, they "ceased to be when they were born" (5:13), that is, their "life" stands under the continuing signature of "death".[117] With this state of affairs can be contrasted the fact that "immortality" too, is not only the result of righteous living, but is also a reality in a man's life here and now.[118] Thus "death", over against "immortality", is a permanent condition consequent upon sin, and expresses a relational reality, both present and future.

---

[116]We are indebted for this insight to Nickelsburg, Resurrection, Immortality, Eternal Life, p. 137.

[117]Cf. D. Georgi, "Der Vorpaulinische Hymnus Phil 2, 6-11", in Zeit und Geschichte (Festschrift für Rudolf Bultmann; Tübingen, 1964), pp. 263-293, on p. 270; "Wie sehr es sich bei der Welt der Gottlosen um eine Todeswelt handelt, wird an dem Reden der Gottlosen 2:1 ff. klar. Der Tod ist nicht nur die Grenze des Lebens der Gottlosen, sondern dessen wesentliches Charakteristikum und Motor ihres Handelns".

[118]See below, #2.

The second passage (2:23-24) which deals with the introduction of death into the realm of life and the world of man must now be considered:

> 23. For God created man ἐπ' ἀφθαρσίᾳ
> And made him an εἰκόνα τῆς ἰδίας ἰδιότητος.
> 24. But through the devil's envy
> θάνατος εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον,
> And they who belong to his party experience it.

The first thing to be noted about these verses is that they parallel, in essence, the passage considered above. 2:23 corresponds to 1:14, and 2:24 corresponds to 1:16 (note especially the use of the phrase τῆς ἐκείνου μερίδος in 1:16d and 2:24b). This would indicate, initially, that the ideas expressed would also correspond. The second thing to be observed is that these verses clearly reflect, in summary fashion, the accounts of the creation of man and his fall in Gen 1:26-27 and 3:1 ff.[119] 2:23 alludes to, and at the same time interprets, Gen 1:26-27.[120] Ps-Solomon apparently interprets the εἰκόνι and ὁμοίωσις of God in terms ἀφθαρσία and ἰδιότητος, i.e., man was created in the image of God's

---

[119]Most commentators see a reference in 24a to the temptation of Eve by the serpent, and its consequence. But Gregg, Wisdom, pp. 22-23, makes out a good case for a reference to Cain's murder of Abel. It is true that the first instance of death as a physical event is Abel's murder, yet Eve's disobedience is seen as the ultimate cause of death in Gen 3 (cf. Ben Sir 25:24, II Baruch 54:15), and the immediate connection of serpent (devil)-sin-death is located in the temptation story, not in the Cain-Abel account. Cf. J. Reider, Wisdom, p. 70; Goodrick, Wisdom, pp. 119-121; Fichtner, Weisheit, pp. 17-18.

[120]Ps-Solomon may be reflecting here the LXX text (Gen 1:27, ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον, κατ' εἰκόνα θεοῦ ἐποίησεν αὐτόν), though he does not use the term ὁμοίωσις.

incorruptible nature, in the image of God's eternity.[121] Vs. 24a clearly identifies the serpent of Gen 3 with the devil,[122] and attributes the entry of death to his envy.[123] The death in view here seems clearly to be physical death,[124] in keeping with the Genesis imagery (Gen 3:19). And yet, 24b restricts the experience of this death to those who belong to the party of Satan (cf. 1:16d "the party of death"). As in 1:12,16, this death expresses a very particular kind of relationship, a participation in unrighteousness (1:12), which involves membership in the party of death/devil (1:16, 2:24). Therefore, the experience of this death must be excluded from those who are not participants in this relationship. This means that physical death, which comes

---

[121] ἰδιότητος ("nature", "proper being") is the reading in Swete's text and in the critical edition by J. Zeigler, "Sapientia Salomonis", Septuaginta XII/1 (Göttingen, 1962). This reading has the best support in the manuscripts (BSA Clem). The variant ἀϊδιότητος ("eternity", "everlastingness") is supported by most minuscules, and accepted by Rahlfs, as well as by P. W. Skehan in his review of Zeigler's edition in CBQ, 24 (1962), p.439, and by Reese, Hellenistic Influence, pp. 2, 67. This latter reading fits the text better (and may therefore be suspect!), preserving the parallelism with the previous line ("incorruption" -- "everlastingness"). Whether one or the other is accepted, the sense of the passage is not materially changed. While ἀϊδιότητος corresponds exactly with ἀφθαρσία, with ἰδιότητος the line means that God created man according to his own nature, which implies "incorruption"; Weisengoff, "Death and Immortality", p. 124, n. 31

[122] This may be the first such identification in literature (Porter, art. cit., p. 236). Cf. II Enoch 31:3, I Enoch 69:6; Life of Adam and Eve 10:4.

[123] In context, the devil's envy seems to be directed against man, as being created in the image of God (cf. Goodrick, Wisdom, p. 121.

[124] Thus Reider, Wisdom, p. 70; Gregg, Wisdom, p. 23.

to all, must either be excluded here altogether,[125] or that physical death is in view, though subordinated to death in a deeper, more comprehensive sense.[126]

In light of the explicit reference to the Genesis account in 2:24 one is hard put to deny a place to physical death in the author's view.[127] He may have agreed with Ben Sirach (25:24) that physical death passed upon all mankind as a result of the sin of Eve,[128] but his individualistic-ethical orientation prevented him from acknowledging its punishment character for all members of the human race. Thus he is led to affirm in 24b that only those who, in their own lives, ratify the sin of the first man, experience death in its punishment character, in its depth and fullness.[129] For the impious, therefore, physical

---

[125]Gröbler, art. cit., p. 695; Schütz, Les Idées Eschatologiques, pp. 45-46; Weisengoff, "Death and Immortality", pp. 126-129.

[126]Bückers, Die Unsterblichkeitslehre, p. 18; Heinisch, Weisheit, p. 59 f.

[127]In view of the clear correspondence between 1:12-16 and 2:23-24, the idea of physical death in a subordinate sense cannot be denied to the author's thought in the former passage, either. "God made not death" in 1:13a can be understood in a comprehensive sense, i.e., physical death came by the sin of first man -- God did not make it; ultimate death comes by unrighteousness -- God is not its author. Cf. the discussion by Bückers, Die Unsterblichkeitslehre, pp. 19-24, who concludes that "1:11-16 speaks about physical death in so far as it is the beginning of the other-worldly, eternal death".

[128]Ben Sir 25:24 is evidently the first to utilize the idea implied in Gen 2:17.

[129]Cf. Bückers, Die Unsterblichkeitslehre, p. 18, "For the wicked, physical death is a punishment in its total sense, since it finds its continuation in an other-worldly damnation." Cf. Sir 41:1-13 where Sheol is the permanent lot of all; the difference between the righteous and the ungodly lies in the fact that the name of the former lives on (vs. 11) while that of the wicked is cursed (vs. 9).

death provides the transition from a "life" that already stands under the signature of death into a total and ultimate relatedness with that death.[130]

Such an understanding of the author's position is corroborated by his obvious attempt, in Chapters 3 and 4, to re-interpret (or to interpret away) the physical death of the righteous. Since this re-interpretation is intimately connected with an understanding of the individual's fate (especially of righteous individuals), we shall discuss it in that connection.

2. The Fate of the Individual

We have seen above that death, in its comprehensive sense, comprising physical death in the larger idea of death as a relational

---

[130]We are concerned in this study primarily with the fate of the righteous, since it is their life with Wisdom (see Chapter V, A below) which guarantees their future; and it is this connection between Wisdom, righteousness, and eternal life which affords a comparison with the Pauline eschatology (see Chapters IV and V). A brief consideration may here be given to the author's view of the individual fate of the unrighteous. As we have seen above, it is described as θάνατος, a relational-reality opposed to the relational-reality of the righteous' ἀθανασία. Not much is said about their θάνατος-existence. It is asserted that in their death, in contrast to the hope for immortality of the righteous (3:4), they have no hope (3:18a). After the Enoch paradigm (4:10-15) has served to re-interpret the death of the righteous as assumption, the fate of the wicked, who saw but did not understand (4:17), is now contrasted (4:19) by means of some vivid images from the Old Testament. God "will dash them speechless to the ground" (cf. Ps 137:9; Job 18), and thus "they will become dishonored corpses" (cf. Is 14:19) "and an outrage among the dead forever" (cf. Ez 32:24 f.). What the author asserts, then, is simply that the wicked experience death in its fullness, with its anguish and degradation. In his description of the fate of the wicked, Ps-Solomon is quite restrained, as compared with the vivid and lurid pictures of anguish and torment in much of the apocalyptic literature.

reality opposed to a relationship with God, has for the author of the WS no place in God's created order. He created man not for death, but εἰς τὸ εἶναι (1:14), not for corruption, but ἐπ' ἀφθαρσίᾳ (2:23), not for a covenant of friendship with Hades (1:16, 2:24), but for eternal communion with God (3:9; 6:19).[131] This is man's appointed destiny, the goal for which he was created.[132] But death entered the scene through first man's disobedience (2:24), and experience demonstrates that all men die. This is not only affirmed in the lengthy speech of the godless in 2:1b-20, which the author satirizes (2:21), but by the author himself (7:6). Does this death then frustrate the purpose of God for man, does it end the fellowship with God for which he was created? As we have seen, for those who reject this fellowship by the unrighteous "work of their hands" physical death becomes the beginning

---

[131]Fellowship with God is the essence, the content, of man's immortality, according to the WS. See below.

[132]That ἀφθαρσία was that for which man was created, and not a qualitative endowment, is indicated by the use of ἐπὶ with the dative, denoting purpose, intention, the end for which. (Cf. Blass-Debrunner, Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch (6th ed.; Göttingen, 1931), No. 235,4. Reese, Hellenistic Influence, pp. 66-67, rejects this interpretation of ἐπ' ἀφθαρσίᾳ, contending that the author's use of ἐπί with the dative generally indicates a state, a condition. Yet, he too recognizes that for Ps-Solomon "Man does not possess the capacity for life with God through any disposition of the material order or any endowment of his human nature", but that "he enters his final destiny through the workings of the divine power giving him a new dignity, a sharing in God's own 'eternity'".

The context further confirms seeing ἐπί as that of purpose. The ἀφθαρσία of 2:23 must be seen as the content of the "mysteries of God" (p. 22a), the "reward of holiness" (p. 22b), and the "prize of blameless souls"(p. 22c). Each of these terms points to the future, to something which is not yet (at least not in its fullness).

of the "experience" of death in its ultimate sense, i.e., separation from the fellowship of God. But what about the righteous? Were those Psalmists right who lamented the fact that their relationship with Yahweh would be ended by death?[133] The author's unambiguous answer to that question is a resounding "No", and he utters this "No" in terms of a re-interpretation of this physical death to which even the righteous are subject.

The second part of the speech of the godless (2:10-20) expresses their contempt for the righteous man[134] and their design against his life. It is clear that they plot his death (ἐκβάσις, 2:17, θάνατος, 2:20). In Chapter 3 the death of the righteous,[135] is seen to have been carried out. But something mysterious has happened (cf. 2:22); God has intervened. The godless condemned the righteous to a shameful death (2:20) and performed the execution. Now they were convinced that their view of life and death (expressed in 2:1-10) had been vindicated (3:2). They did not observe a divine intervention on behalf of their adversary.

---

[133]E.g. Ps 30:9; 88:10 ff.; 6:5; 115:17.

[134]Though 2:12-20 is a story about a particular man and his enemies, within the context of the WS the righteous man (singular) is a type for the righteous (plural). This is seen in the fact that even within the speech, not only the δίκαιος, but also the poor, the widow, and the old man are objects of their contempt, as well as from the fact that at 3:1 there is the sudden shift to the plural, and from then on the singular and plural alternate almost indiscriminately. Cf. Dieter Georgi, art. cit., p. 272; cf. also Nickelsburg's analysis of the righteous man's suffering and vindication as dependent upon the "wisdom novels" of the Old Testament (in Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life, pp. 81-137).

[135]Now plural, cf. n. 120.

But they were wrong (2:21a), their wickedness made them blind so that they could not comprehend the mysterious purposes of God (2:22a). They did not consider that there was a reward for holiness[136] and a prize for blameless living (2:22b,c). Thus, though the ἔξοδος (cf. 7:6) of the righteous was considered by the impious to be a misfortune (3:2) and a punishment (3:4), this ἔξοδος was not death in its proper sense at all: the righteous only "seem to die" (3:2a, ἔξοδον τεθνάναι), i.e., the wicked observed, correctly enough, the external aspect of the physical demise of the righteous, but they were blind as to what was actually taking place within this physical death.[137]

---

[136]Zimmermann, "The Book of Wisdom: Its Language and Character", p. 106, suggests that the Greek ἤλπισαν in 2:22b expresses a misunderstanding of the Aramaic רגב, which he postulates for an Aramaic original. If the author was a Jew who knew Aramaic, such a confusion could result without recourse to an Aramaic document. In any case, the idea that the wicked did not "consider" that there was a reward seems to fit the thrust of the passage better than the idea of "hope". Though the author could be saying that, since they were blind to God's purposes, there was for them no reason to hope, as there was for the pious (cf. 3:4).

[137]Dieter Georgi, in "Der Vorpaulinische Hymnus", attempts to elucidate the Jewish-Hellenistic background for the hymn in Phil 2:6-11, and finds points of contact between the hymn and the WS. He emphasizes the docetic orientation of 3:1-4: "Es verhält sich mit dem Gerechten nicht so, wie die Gottlosen in ihrer Verblendung meinen. Was die Gottlosen zu sehen glauben, ist keine Wirklichkeit. Das Leiden des Gerechten geschieht nur dem Augenschein nach. Selbst sein Tod ist nur Schein." (p. 272). Georgi has correctly seen the "apparent" character of the death of the righteous. However, he imposes upon the story of the debasement of the righteous man the contrast between the phenomenal and the noumenal in such a way that both the suffering and death are mere phenomena ("Schein"), since for the righteous, as a "wahres Geschöpf Gottes" the limitations of the phenomenal world do not exist. This is going too far. The suffering of the righteous man is certainly seen as real (cf. 3:5-6). The righteous man is not "der wirkliche Mensch", or "ein göttliches Wesen", who for this reason escapes phenomenal realities. No, he is a man like all others, who, because of his positive response

The nature of the physical death of the righteous is elucidated by means of an illustration from the Old Testament tradition, namely the translation of Enoch (4:10-17).[138] The illustration provides an expanded interpretation of that translation, given in Gen 5:24: 1) Enoch[139] was a man who pleased God and was loved by him (4:10,14); 2) therefore, God took him out of the midst of sinners (4:10), he snatched him from the world of sin (4:11) and took him quickly from the midst of wickedness (4:14), so that the pressures of wickedness would not cause his ultimate ruin (4:11-12). Point 1) above is the clear import of Gen 5:24, but the idea that Enoch was taken out of the midst of wickedness so that he would not succumb[140] is Ps-Solomon's interpretation, resulting from his attempt to apply the incident to the situation of righteous men living in the midst of wickedness. It can be

---

to God, is accepted by him (3:6b), and on whose behalf God transforms death. (On the nature of this transformation, see below).

[138]Cf. Georgi, art. cit., p. 273, "Dafür, wie das Lebensend des Gerechten 'sub specie aeternitatis' aussieht, wird 4, 10-17 das Henochbeispiel bemüht". Most commentators have paid little or no intention to the significance of this illustration for an understanding of Ps-Solomon's conception of the death of the righteous and their immediate destiny. It is, in this writer's estimation, indispensible for a correct understanding.

[139]The name is not given; this is true of all historical figures in the WS. They are all de-historicized, and transformed into typical cases.

[140]The motive for his removal is different both from Gen 2:24-25, as well as from that given in either the Hebrew or Greek renderings of Ben Sir 44:16 (in former: "a sign of instruction to future generations"; in latter: "an example of repentance to all generations"). Cf. however Midr. Ber. rabba 25:1, which offers the same motive for Enoch's translation (cited by Reider, Wisdom, p. 85).

shown that in this kind of application and interpretation of the Enoch story he was not the first, but he is apparently dependent on other Old Testament models.

That WS 4:10 is directly dependent on LXX Gen 5:24 is borne out by the close verbal agreement. Both εὐάρεστος ("well pleasing") and μετατιθέναι ("translate") are present in both texts. It must have been obvious to the author in his reading of the catalogue of the ante-deluvian patriarchs in Gen 5 f. that in Enoch's case the sinister refrain is, as it were, momentarily interrupted. The phrase "and he died" is set aside, and the end of Enoch (in terms of his historical presence) is a disappearance from the sight of men (οὐχ εὑρίσκετο), but an entrance into the life and purpose and world of God (ὅτι μετέθηκεν αὐτὸν ὁ θεός). In the Genesis account, Enoch is primarily the pattern of the devout man, the righteous, in the biblical sense of the word.[141] According to Eichrodt, the Hebrew expression "to walk with God"[142] means nothing other than "to live in total righteousness".[143] Enoch, in Gen 5:21 ff., is revealed as an example of perfect piety; he lived in communion with God; the bonds that bind him to his Creator cannot be broken by death. Thus, the man who always walked

---

[141]Cf. the connection in Gen 6:9 between "righteous" and "walking with God" in Noah's case. It is interesting that the story of Noah too ends with the refrain "and he died". (Gen 9:28).

[142]The Greek "well-pleasing" adequately catches the meaning of the Hebrew phrase, and does not imply the kind of mystical speculations which were woven around the incident in other Jewish writings (see below).

[143]W. Eichrodt, Theologie des Alten Testaments, Vol. III, 2nd ed.; Berlin, 1948), p. 89.

with God is still living with him.[144] It is in this sense that Ps-Solomon understood the account; he does not share the tradition, emphasized especially in the Pseudepigrapha, according to which Enoch had been initiated into the heavenly mysteries.[145]

The author's application of the Enoch story to the situation of righteous men living in the midst of wickedness possibly reflects the use of the translation motif in the story of Elijah's assumption (II Kings 2:1-15) and in two Psalms (49:15 and 73:24).[146] It has been long noted that the verb lāqah[147] "to take" with God as subject and man as object, which is employed in Gen 5:24, occurs again in connection with the translation of Elijah and in Psalms 49 and 73. In these

---

[144]Martin-Achard, From Death to Life, p. 68.

[145]Especially the Similitudes of Enoch (I Enoch 37-71) and Jubilees (4:17-25; 7:38; 10:17, 19, 24-27; 21:10). Jude 4-15 might be an imitation of I Enoch. Sir (44:16; 49:14) does not seem to know this speculative tradition (contra Martin-Achard, Ibid., p. 66), and as the book of Hebrews (11:5), reflects the sense of Gen 5:21-24.

[146]We cannot here enter into a critical discussion of these disputed Psalm passages. But the view seems to be gaining ground that in both passages the writers profess the firm conviction that God will take them to himself; just as he took Enoch and Elijah; in other words, the belief in "assumption" is expressed. See, e.g., Mitchell Dahood, Psalms I (Anchor Bible, 16; New York, 1966), p. 301; Psalms II (Anchor Bible, 17; New York, 1968), p. 195; Cf. Martin-Achard, From Death to Life, pp. 153-165; 65-71. For a full listing of scholarly opinion, see J. van der Ploeg in Studies on Psalms (Oudtestamentische Studien, 13; Leiden, 1963), p. 163.

[147]The LXX translates with μετατιθέναι at Gen 5:24, but with λαμβάνειν/ἀναλαμβάνειν in II Kings 2:3 ff. and with λαμβάνειν in the Psalm passages. The Enoch references in Ben Sir 44:16 and 49:14 are divided. 44:16 follows the LXX of Gen 5:24 with μετατιθέναι, while 49:14 uses λαμβάνειν (the textual variant, μετατέθη is only found in A, and is clearly a correction; Rahlfs).

instances "it seems to be used as a technical expression to denote the assumption of a human being to God,[148] and expresses a hope for life with God beyond death.[149] In Elijah's case, the immediate situation is not threatening, but his entire life as the spokesman of God, defending the Law of the God of Israel, is depicted as a struggle with a wicked environment. In the WS, the righteous, too, are depicted as defenders and upholders of the Law of God.[150] Psalm 73 depicts the frustration of the pious man in face of the overwhelming wickedness of his contemporaries and their apparent success and prosperity. He is acquainted with their wickedness and oppression (73:8) and speaks of his sufferings as a result of his righteous life (73:13-14). Nevertheless, he utters the conviction that, appearances to the contrary, the wicked will come to ruin, while he will be "taken up" by God. The similarity between this Psalm and the WS in terms of the contexts within which the assumption is placed is remarkable. Psalm 49 likewise depicts the righteous man surrounded by wickedness and persecution (49:5-6), and affirms similarly that whereas the end of the wicked is death (49: 13-14), the righteous man will be "taken" by God (49:15). Both Psalms attempt to come to grips with the problem: why do the righteous suffer, and the wicked prosper? Ps-Solomon demonstrates, in a long section

---

[148]Martin-Achard, Ibid., p. 69.

[149]S. H. Hooke, "Life after Death: V. Israel and the Afterlife", ExT 76 (1965)p.238; Bückers, Die Unsterblichkeitslehre, p. 72.

[150]E.g., 2:12; 3:14 ff.; 4:6-7.

preceding the Enoch-illustration (3:10-4:9) that the this-worldly prosperity of the wicked, defined in terms of long life and offspring, ultimately amounts to nothing. Both he and the authors of these Psalms find consolation in the faith that the end of the righteous man is not participation in death; but life with God.

This analysis suggests that Ps-Solomon depended upon Gen 2: 24-25 for the clear connection between righteous living before God and assumption to God, and that he may have depended, for his specific use of the translation motif, on the story of the translation of Elijah and on Psalms 49 and 73.[151] From a consideration of this background we must turn briefly to certain internal connections between WS 4:10 ff. and the depiction of the righteous man's fate in Chapter 2. From a consideration of these connections it will be seen that the story of Enoch is not merely introduced as an interpretation of the immediately preceding account of a righteous man who dies before his time,[152] but as that example par excellence which interprets the demise of all righteous persons.[153]

In the second part of the speech of the godless (Chapter 2) in which the plot against the righteous man is expressed, we read (2: 17b-18):

---

[151]WS 16:14 possibly reflects Ps 49:8.

[152]Thus B. Metzger, ed., The Oxford Annotated Apocrypha, RSV (New York, 1965), p. 106; cf. Gregg, Wisdom, p. 37; Fichtner, Weisheit, p. 23.

[153]Cf. Georgi, art. cit., p. 273.

> Let us try what will happen at his ἔκβασις,
> For if the righteous be God's son, he will uphold him,
> And save him from the hand of his adversaries.

3:1-4 gives an initial response to that "test" proposed by the unrighteous: the departure of the righteous was only apparent. But 4:10 ff. states unequivocally that God did, in fact, intervene, that he did uphold and save the righteous man. It provides therefore the needed answer to the challenge thrown out by the unrighteous. Again, in 2:21, the unrighteous are depicted as completely missing the meaning and nature of the death of the righteous, due to lack of understanding and insight; else they would have known that in the mysterious purpose of God there was a goal for the righteous man beyond physical death (2:22 f.). This same argumentation is repeated after the Enoch-illustration has been given (4:15, 17): the wicked saw the end of the wise man, but did not understand what the Lord purposed for him, and for what end he took him into safety. There is then a direct connection here between the perception of the end of the righteous by the wicked in Chapter 2 and that of the wicked in Chapter 4. The whole thrust of the Enoch-illustration seems to be directed against the challenge of the unrighteous in Chapter 2. It confirms specifically what has already been announced in response to the challenge in 3:1 ff., namely, the righteous man, who has lived a life well-pleasing before God, has been transferred into the presence of God from the midst of wickedness. This means that he has not <u>really</u> died, for that which <u>seemed to be</u> his death has in <u>reality</u> been his translation. Ps-Solomon could easily have quoted the words from Hosea 13:14, which Paul later used to express his conviction that in Christ death has been overcome:

Where are your plagues, O Death?
Where is your sting, O Hades?

Death for the righteous has been transformed; it has become the gateway to a new kind of existence in the presence of God. It is now our task to analyze and understand the nature of that new existence for which the righteous are destined in this life and into which they are ushered by their assumption-in-death.

In the two passages which deal with the introduction of death into the world (1:12 ff. and 2:23-24),[154] there are two statements which provide the key terms for an understanding of the author's conception of the nature of the new existence of the righteous:

1:15 δικαιοσύνη ἀθάνατός ἐστιν
2:23 ὁ θεὸς ἔκτισεν τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐπ' ἀφθαρσίᾳ

Both statements explicitly provide antitheses to the result of unrighteousness, which is death. Then these terms may be taken as definitive of the author's conception of the nature of this "not-death" of the righteous. What does he mean when he uses these terms?

The discussion of the author's conception of the nature of man led to the conclusion that he did not conceive of psychē as an independent and separable entity which continues an existence beyond death.[155] This result is confirmed by the author's use of the abstract Greek nouns ἀθανασία and ἀφθαρσία, and the adjectival forms ἀθάνατος and ἄφθαρτος. Never does he apply the adjectives "immortal" and

---

[154]See the discussion of these passages above, section C,1.

[155]See above, section B.

"incorruptible" to the soul or to man, nor does he attribute "immortality" or "incorruption" to the soul or to man. It has been correctly noted in several studies[156] that Ps-Solomon does not look upon immortality as a metaphysical entity, as the inherent indestructability of the soul as Platonic tradition conceived it, a quality which adheres to soul, but rather as a state, a condition, a designation of a particular relationship. We shall see how the author uses these technical terms from Hellenistic religious speculation and fills them with essentially "new wine".

It is worthwhile to note at the outset that Ps-Solomon never uses ζωή (except at 5:15) as an eschatological term,[157] and one wonders whether he deliberately avoided the term in favor of ἀθανασία and ἀφθαρσία. The use of ζωή would certainly have corresponded more to the Old Testament hajjim[158] and its LXX equivalent,[159] and would have

---

[156]E.g., F. C. Porter, "The Preexistence of the Soul", p. 85; P. Heinisch, "Die Unsterblichkeitslehre" in Die Griechische Philosophie im Buche der Weisheit, pp. 77-80; H. Bückers, Die Unsterblichkeitslehre; Weisengoff, "Death and Immortality", pp. 104-105, 110, 126.

[157]It is interesting to note that IV Macc, which bears a heavier stamp of Hellenism than the WS, and seemingly re-interprets II Macc's doctrine of resurrection in terms of immortality (see Townshend, The Fourth Book of Maccabees, in Charles, II, pp. 653-665), frequently uses the term ζωή in an eschatological sense, and expresses the life with God in the beyond in such phrases as ζῆν τῷ θεῷ (7:19; 16:25; cf. 17:18), and with the familiar New Testament formulation ζωὴ αἰώνιος (15:3).

[158]Cf. P. Kleinert, "Zur Idee des Lebens im Alten Testament", ThSK 68 (1895), pp. 693-732; J. Lindblom, Das Ewige Leben. Eine Studie über die Entstehung der religiösen Lebensidee im N.T. (Uppsala, 1914); W. W. Graf von Baudissin, "Alttestamentliches hajjim 'Leben' in der Bedeutung von 'Glück'" in G. Weil, ed., Festschrift Eduard Sachau (Berlin, 1915), pp. 143-161.

[159]The Greek ζωή is almost always the translation of the Hebrew

paved the way for the New Testament use of the word ζωή. Instead, the author used terminological designations which do not appear in the Hebrew Old Testament,[160] nor in the canonical books of the LXX.[161] Thus, a linguistic dependence of WS on the Old Testament is excluded.

In Greek literature since Plato and Isocrates, ἀθανασία designates the existence of the gods[162] and the possible continued existence, after death, of the human soul. Greek inscriptions sometimes speak of the deceased as ἀθανάτη ψυχή.[163] Contrarily,

---

חיים. In most cases, the LXX translation agrees with the Hebrew original and means "life" in a this-worldly sense. Bückers, Die Unsterblichkeitslehre, pp. 107-108, gives examples where the LXX has given a this-worldly reference in the Hebrew a decided transcendent-eschatological twist (e.g., Job 19:25-27; is 53:8; Prv 9:6, 10:25; Hos 10:12). Thus, the concept of an eternal life appears in the LXX more often than in the Hebrew.

[160]There is no word in the Old Testament meaning "immortal". Prov 12:28 is difficult: the MT vocalization of אַל מָוֶת (אַל מָוֶת, "not death") is probably incorrect; most mss. read אֶל מָוֶת, ([leads] "to death"). This vocalization is also demanded by the LXX εἰς θάνατον, as well as by the context. But cf. M. Dahood, "Immortality in Prov 12:28", Bib 41 (1960), pp. 176-181.

[161]In Sir 17:30, "immortality" is denied to man; yet "immortality" here means continued physical existence. In Ben Sir 51:9, ἀθανάτου is a poorly attested reading (only A; see Ralfs and Charles, I.). The usual ὑπὲρ θανάτου ῥύσεως ("he prayed for redemption from death") fits the context.
Both ἀθανασία/ἀθάνατος and ἀφθαρσία appear a number of times in IV Macc.

[162]Cf. I Tim 6:16, the only place in the Bible where God is thus designated.

[163]R. Bultmann, s.v. "ἀθανασία", TWNT III. pp. 23-25; M. P. Nilsson, "The Immortality of the Soul in Greek Religion", Eranos Jahrbuch 39 (1941), pp. 1-16. For Philo's teaching on immortality see E. R. Goodenpugh, "Philo on Immortality", HTR 39 (1946), pp. 85-108. Remarkably, the term is used in the New Testament only at I Cor 15:53, 54, where it designates, not the soul, but the "resurrection body". (In I Tim 6:16, the term is used of God.).

Ps-Solomon uses both the noun ἀθανασία and the adjective ἀθάνατος in none of the above connections. The term immortality for him "always designates something that happens to man, some aspect of his relationship to God or to divine Wisdom or to moral integrity".[164] The noun is used five times in the book: 1) as the content and hope of the righteous man's hope (3:4); 2) as a result of the remembrance of virtue (4:1); 3) as the gift of Wisdom (8:13); 4) as the result of communion with Wisdom (8:17); and 5) as the ultimate result of a knowledge of God's power (15:3). The adjective is used at 1:15 as a predicate of δικαιοσύνη. Let us examine these usages in the order of their occurrence. The statement that "righteousness is immortal" may mean simply that righteousness, as a virtue, or as an ethical principle, has eternal value, or endures in the memory of posterity.[165] However, the context does not support such an interpretation. The passage (1:12-16) asserts emphatically that God is not the author of death, and clearly shows death to be the result of unrighteous living. On the one side there is unrighteousness and death; on the other is righteousness and immortality. This is certainly the contrast that is drawn.[166] The

---

[164]Reese, Hellenistic Influence, p. 64.

[165]W. Weber, "Die Unsterblichkeit der Weisheit Salomos", ZWTh 48 (1904/05), pp. 409-444, on p. 435, who asserts that the author speaks of God's righteousness. This does not fit the context. Weber interprets all references to "immortality" in the book in terms of pure Hebraic thought, in the sense of a continuing existence in the memory of posterity. Weber's view is completely untenable.

[166]Bückers, Die Unsterblichkeitslehre, p. 15, has correctly seen that 1:12-16 and 2:21-24 are closely related, one forming the introduction, the other the results of the speech of the godless, and that both passages provide a contrast between the result of wickedness

sense of the line is then that "righteousness leads to immortality", and, in analogy to the parallel expression of 2:23, this goal of the righteous man's life is the intention of the Creator.[167]

The use of ἀθανασία in 3:4 underlines the above interpretation. The phrase ἡ ἐλπὶς αὐτῶν ἀθανασίας πλήρης ("their hope [was] full of immortality") provides the antithesis to 2:22b, where it is said of the impious that "they did not hope for the reward of holiness", namely, ἀφθαρσία (2:23). 3:4 does not speak of an "immortal hope", but of a hope whose content is immortality, whose orientation is toward immortality. The context supports this sense. 3:1-3 picture the lot of the righteous already attained in contrast to the lot of the wicked which in the preceding verse (2:24) is said to be death. 3:4 ff. now speak of the righteous' sufferings, in the past tense. What we have here therefore is not a chronological continuation of the account,[168] but a

---

and the result of righteousness. We have noted (above, section C,1) the close relation of these passages in terms of their conception of death.

[167]Cf. Gregg, Wisdom, p. 9, who says, "We should expect a link between vss. 14 and 15", such as "For (God destined His creation for righteousness, and) righteousness is..." Cf. the textual addition in two Latin mss.: "But injustice is the very attainment of death." This is obviously an attempt to complete the parallelism.

[168]Weber, "Die Unsterblichkeit der Weisheit Salomos", pp. 429-433, deduces from vs. 4 that the new life begins only with the resurrection, since the departed righteous still hope for immortality. This is improbable (see below).

flashback into the time before the "translation" of the righteous from the perspective of eternity, from the beyond. We must therefore translate 4b as a past tense,[169] in keeping with 4a, which speaks of this-worldly tribulations through which the righteous have already gone. Thus, the meaning of 4b is that despite tribulation, they did not relinquish their hope in immortality, of which they are now participants.[170]

The sense of ἀθανασία in 4:1 is somewhat problematic. 4:1-2 is a song in praise of virtuous womanhood, picking up a theme already enunciated in 3:13; i.e., that numerous progeny is not necessarily a blessing,[171] but that the undefiled and virtuous woman is blessed. In the earlier passage, she is promised fruit in the ἐπίσκοπῇ ψυχῶν. Whatever else the meaning of this strange phrase,[172] the "visitation"

---

[169]The tense is missing in the line 4b. Most commentators translate "their hope is full of..." (E.G., RSV, J. Reider, Wisdom, p. 73; Goodrick, Wisdom, p. 124; Gregg, Wisdom, p. 26; Fichtner, Weisheit, pp. 18-19), but most do not commit themselves on a time-reference of this hope. Reider's comment is typical: "...whether the reference be to hopes they cherished on earth or to expectations entertained now that they are in the hand of God." It is better, with Weisengoff, "Death and Immortality", pp. 129-150, and Reese, Hellenistic Influence, p. 64, n. 146, to translate, "was full of".

[170]Cf. Bückers, Die Unsterblichkeitslehre, p. 26, "Die Unsterblichkeit [described in vs. 4] ist der Terminus für das vss. 1-3 beschriebene neue Leben."

[171]This is the general conception of the Old Testament (e.g., Ps 127 and 128, etc.). But cf. Is 54:1 and 56:4 where sterility, if pure, is blessed.

[172]It will be discussed fully below.

spoken of is clearly in the future (ἔξει). The text of 4:1 reads:

> Better is childlessness with virtue,
> For there is immortality in its remembrance,
> Since it is recognized both with God and with men.

Weber seems to be correct in asserting that immortality here describes the remembrance of virtue in posterity.[173] Yet the following lines seem to indicate that that is not the only meaning. The virtuous person has a double effect upon men: when he is present, his virtuous life becomes an example (4:2a); when he is absent, there is a longing for him (4:2b), i.e., he lives on in the praise of posterity (cf. 4:1b). In quite another way is this immortality seen in relation to God. He recognizes the virtue (4:1c); therefore it may celebrate its triumphs in eternity (4:2c,d). The expression ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι clearly points to a real continuation of life in the beyond.[174] Ultimately it is God's recognition of the just person's virtue that gives him eternal life.[175] The recurrent connection between righteousness and ultimate destiny in the book supports the connection also in this passage. The contrast with both the preceding (3:16-19) and the following passage (4:3-6), where unrighteous living is linked with ultimate destruction, also lends

---

[173]Weber, "Die Unsterblichkeit", pp. 433-434.

[174]There is great similarity between this march of virtue toward eternity and the triumphal march of the soul, in similar contexts, in other literature (e.g., IV Macc 17:11-16; cf. I Cor 9:24-25). Cf. F. Feldmann, Textkritische Materialien zum Buche der Weisheit (Freiburg, 1902), p. 49; Heinisch, Weisheit, p. 76; Schütz, Les idées eschatologiques, pp. 128-130.

[175]Bückers, Die Unsterblichkeitslehre, p. 16; cf. Reese, Hellenistic Influence, p. 64, n. 147, who notes with approval Bücker's interpretation of God's recognition of virtue "in the dynamic sense".

weight to the interpretation of 4:1 f. suggested above.

The third (8:13) and fourth (8:17) usages of ἀθανασία must be considered together, since vs. 17 clearly refers back to vs. 13:

> 8:13 Through her (Wisdom) I shall have immortality
> And leave to those after me an everlasting
> memory.
>
> 8:17 Considering these things within myself
> And reflecting in my heart
> That there is immortality in the kinship
> with Wisdom,
> . . . . . .
>
> 17e I went about seeking how I may take her to
> myself.

Most exegetes interpret these verses with Weber in terms of a living on in the praise and memory of posterity,[176] while some interpret only vs. 13 in this sense, and see in vs. 17 a transcendent reference.[177] This interpretation, especially of 8:13 seems to be on the surface, and is supported by the parallelism of 13a and b. Again, 8:9-16 speaks exclusively of the this-worldly results of a life lived under the guidance of Wisdom. Should the "immortality" of vs. 13 form an exception within such a practical this-worldly orientation? In such a scheme of things, vs. 17 must also be referring to fame with posterity, representing but a summary of what has gone before. Yet, some objections

---

[176] Bückers, ibid.; Heinisch, Weisheit, p. 166; Feldmann, Textkritische Materialien, p. 64; Weisengoff, "Death and Immortality", pp. 130-131; Grimm, Weisheit, p. 174; Nötscher, Auferstehungsglaube, pp. 255-256; Gregg, Wisdom, p. 84; Reider, Wisdom, p. 123. Cf. Goodrick, Wisdom, pp. 209-211, who interprets similarly, but in response to Gregg says, "To attempt to reduce Wisdom's idea of immortality to this posthumous reputation is absurd".

[177] R. Cornely, Commentarius in Librum Sapientiae, p. 319 (quoted by Bückers); F. W. Farrar, "The Wisdom of Solomon" in H. Wace, ed., Apocrypha I (London, 1888), cited by Goodrick.

may be raised against such a meaning for both passages. If vs. 13 is a case of "consecutive parallelism", rather than synonymous parallelism, then two connected, but yet different ideas are expressed: on the one hand, the possession of Wisdom leads to immortality, in the eschatological sense; on the other, it causes one to be remembered by posterity for a "wise" conduct of one's life.[178] In this case, 17c is not a summary statement at all, rather it is the beginning of a summary: immortality, the highest of Wisdom's gifts, is first; then follows a catalogue of this-worldly goods, which are subordinate. The thrust of 8:9-18 may be profitably compared with the sorites in 6:17-19 and the context within which it is placed. Chapter 6, like 8:9-18, is concerned to point out the positive results of a life lived in kinship with Wisdom, and the emphasis is on the benefits for this life. Within this context, 6:17-19 presents an ascending order of Wisdom's benefits, climaxing in ἀφθαρσία and life with God.[179] Since 6:17-19 and 8:13,17 are closely related in a total context, the clear reference to a transcendent reality in the former passage must at least play a minor role in an understanding of the latter passage.[180]

---

[178]It must be remembered that in the WS the "righteous man" and the "wise man" are identical (see 4:15-17, where both terms are used interchangeably). Thus, the remark by Weisengoff, "Death and Immortality", p. 131, that the speaker "prophesies for himself everlasting fame with succeeding generations because of his extraordinary wisdom, not his justice", does not support his interpretation.

[179]Cf. our discussion below on the author's use of ἀφθαρσία.

[180]Cf. Reese, Hellenistic Influence, p. 64, who seems to support this view, though he is not explicit.

One final use of ἀθανασία must be considered (15:3). The text reads:

> To know you (God) is perfect righteousness
> And to know your power is the root of immortality.

This is clearly a case of synonymous parallelism, in which "knowledge of God" and "knowledge of his power" are equated, as well as "righteousness" and the "root of immortality". The connection with the preceding verses (15:1-2) shows that this "knowledge" is not intellectual comprehension,[181] but a participation in, and experience of, God and his power.[182] Thus, to "know" God is to be wholly righteous;[183] to experience the power of God ultimately issues in immortality.[184] The double phrase recalls the words of 1:15, "righteousness is immortal".[185] If righteousness is immortal, then the first step to immortality is the discovery of him who is righteous, who in his mercy forgives sin (15:2a), in whose fellowship the motivation to sin is

---

[181]Gregg, Wisdom, p. 143.

[182]The concept of "knowing" here reflects the Hebrew יָדַע in the experiential sense (cf. Bultmann, s.v. "γινώσκω", TDNT I, pp. 696-701).

[183]Cf. I John 4:8, "He that loves not, does not know God", i.e., to "know God" is to love.

[184]The context of Chapter 15 for the understanding of this "immortality" is important. It is a polemic against idols, who are characterized as a "corruption of life" (φθορὰ ζωῆς), the very opposite of the "incorruption" (ἀφθαρσία) which God destined for man (2:23).

[185]Cf. H. Eising, "Der Weisheitslehrer und die Götterbilder", Bib 40 (1959), pp. 393-408. By tying 15:3 with 1:15, Eising stresses that an effective knowledge of God leads to justice and thence to immortality. The writer knows that the life God gives is immortal (1:13-16; 3:25 ff.; 5:1 ff.).

excluded (15:2b), and by whose gracious power a life of righteousness leads to immortality.[186] R. Murphy sums up his special study of this verse by observing, correctly, that it is response to God's "death-destroying power that makes our immortality possible".[187] This review of the author's use of the term ἀθανασία makes clear that a Platonic-Hellenistic influence upon his conception of immortality must be excluded from consideration.[188] The overwhelming impression is that immortality, whatever its "content", is not a quality of man's nature, but always either a gift, or a recompense. In either case, its origin is God, who bestows it only upon the righteous.[189] The author's use of the terms is, in a sense, a negative one. It affirms the reality of an existence which is characterized by "not-death", but it does not, by itself, fill this existence with any positive content. The use of the term may signify that the righteous have before them the prospect of a god-like existence, since the gods of the pagan world were considered to be ἀθάνατος. It is more likely, however, that the affirmation of

---

[186]There is no justification for the interpretations by Weber, "Die Unsterblichkeit", pp. 427 ff., and Goodrick, Wisdom, p. 309, who see here another case of "figurative immortality", that acquired by leaving behind an honored name.

[187]R. Murphy, "To Know Your Might is the Root of Immortality (Wis 15:3)", CBQ 25 (1963), pp. 88-93, on p. 93.

[188]Reese, Hellenistic Influence, p. 65, thinks the author shows closer kinship with the Stoic teaching that man's happiness comes from the enjoyment of common citizenship with the gods in the universe. But such a connection is not necessary, since the author clearly reflects throughout his book the Jewish sentiment of a life lived in fellowship with God.

[189]Reese, ibid., p. 64.

ἀθανασία for the righteous is simply the denial of θάνατος, and that the author provides a positive content for this ἀθανασία existence by means of other categories.

Such a view of the author's intention is corroborated by his use of the other strictly Hellenistic-philosophical term, ἀφθαρσία.[190] This noun appears in two passages in the WS (2:23; 6:17-19) to which reference has already been made above on several occasions. In 2:23 he employs the term in answering the attack of the unrighteous against the righteous man who places his trust in God's care (2:12-22). The goal of man's life is "incorruption" (2:22-23); for this he was created,[191] but it is granted only to the righteous; for those who have covenanted with death (2:24) have forfeited their birthright. What this "incorruption" entails is announced in the following verses (3:1 ff.); at the very

---

[190]The noun ἀφθαρσία appears in the Greek Old Testament only in WS and in IV Macc (9:22; 17:12); the adjective appears only in WS 12:1 and 18:4, in former, it designates God's "spirit", in latter, the "light of the law". In the New Testament the adjective appears several times, but never (with possible exception of I Pet 1:4) in an eschatological sense. The noun is used in an eschatological sense in Rom 2:7, several times in I Cor 15, and in II Tim 1:10 (at Eph 6:24 it is non-eschatological).

[191]Reese, Hellenistic Influence, p. 66, says in reference to 2:23 that the author does not conceive of incorruption "as man's goal but as the positive quality granted to his nature enabling him to enter into a special, personal relationship with his Creator". We shall more specifically discuss Reese's location of the author's usage of the term in Epicurean speculation on the nature of man and the gods, below. But it may be pointed out here that for the author, man's destiny depends not on any "positive quality", whether inherent or granted by God, but upon a moral-ethical relatedness of man with his God.

least it is the denial of death. The second use of ἀφθαρσία is in the sorites of 6:17-19 which forms the conclusion of a section (Chapter 6) concerned to point out the positive results of a life lived in kinship with Wisdom. Within this context, 6:17-19 presents an ascending order of Wisdom's benefits, climaxing in ἀφθαρσία and life with God:

> 18b Adherence to (Wisdom's) laws is the assurance of incorruption,
> 19 and incorruption makes one close to God.

The first thing to be noted in the passage is the close connection between righteous living[192] and incorruption, i.e., presence with God, a connection which we have observed especially at 2:22-23 and 15:1-3. In view of the repeated connections between righteous living and its transcendent reward (ἀθανασία, ἀφθαρσία), and the contrast with its opposite -- unrighteousness leads to death, 1:11,12,16; 2:24 -- the sorites climax must also be interpreted in such a sense. The this-worldly interpretation,[193] which sees vs. 20 as a reference to a terrestrial kingdom, and thus understands ἀφθαρσία in the sense of the permanence of virtue, and "nearness to God" as representative divine

---

[192]For the author the "laws of Wisdom" are an expression of the divine will. He is no doubt thinking of the Law of his people, though for him this Law, as mediated by Wisdom, has universal validity. Cf. G. Ziener, Begriffssprache, p. 93, "Die Funktion des Gesetzes wird...von den Geboten der Weisheit (6,18) übernommen."

[193]Cf. S. Schulz, Der Sinn des Todes, p. 40; Focke, Entstehung, pp. 38-40; Weber, "Unsterblichkeit", p. 421; Gärtner, Komposition u Wortwahl, pp. 25-27.

kinship, is not in keeping with Ps-Solomon's central orientation.[194] Indeed, ἀφθαρσία cannot be re-interpreted in the sense of a virtue. The clear statements of the WS never combine the two, while the result of virtuous living is repeatedly described in terms of an existence which is the denial of death. In 6:19 this reality is described as "nearness to God", a phrase which parallels the assertion in 3:1 that "the righteous are in the hand of God".

The statement in 3:1 is closely associated with both the terms "incorruption" (2:23) and "immortality" (3:4). This raises the question concerning the author's use of the two terms discussed above. Does he use them interchangeably, indiscriminately, or does he attach a special significance to one or the other term? Most commentators treat the use of one or the other term simply as a stylistic feature to provide a synonym, both denoting "immortality".[195] Contrarily, J. M. Reese[196] has sought to demonstrate that Ps-Solomon uses the term ἀφθαρσία in its technical sense, as it was developed in Epicurean philosophy. In this technical sense, ἀφθαρσία[197] (i.e., the ability of the gods, despite their corporeality, to receive endless existence), denotes a positive power,

---

[194]See the critique of the above interpretation by Bückers, Unsterblichkeitslehre, pp. 13-15.

[195]Cf. the translation of ἀφθαρσία as "immortality" at 6:18-19 by RSV; Reider, Wisdom, p. 105; Goodrick, Wisdom, pp. 176-177; Weisengoff, "Death and Immortality", p. 125.

[196]Reese, Hellenistic Influence, pp. 62-69.

[197]This term, which is not used by Isocrates or Plato, apparently developed in the context of Epicurean speculations on the nature of man and the gods.

a special capacity that prevented the gods from losing the atoms that make up their being. Thus, they never disintegrate, and are perfectly happy. Reese thinks that the author of the WS "found in this speculation certain features of the nature of blessed immortality, namely, that it is not a quality of man's nature as such, but rather something outside of him, a result of divine power". We have repeatedly found that the author attributes man's immortality not to man's nature, but to God; in this, Reese is correct. But to attribute this to an application of the Epicurean speculation seems to be missing the mark. In the first place, the Epicurean speculation is concerned expressly with a "natural quality" of the gods; in the second, there is no hint that this might be transferred to man. Ps-Solomon may of course have been acquainted with the technical meaning of ἀφθαρσία, but its use in the WS does not coincide with this meaning. As we have seen above, it is intimately connected with righteousness and denotes not a quality of man, or even a quality given to him, but an ethical-moral relational reality. This is the same reality that the author denotes with the term ἀθανασία.[198]

We noted above that in 6:19, the reality denoted by ἀφθαρσία is closely linked with "nearness to God', and the parallel conception in 3:1 ("The righteous are in the hand of God") is closely linked with

---

[198]Goodrick, Wisdom, p. 176, notes that the author's use of ἀφθαρσία and ἀθανασία demonstrates "the utterly loose way in which the words for 'immortality' are used by writers of the time of 'Wisdom'". Cf. the use of these terms in interchangeable and synonymous fashion in IV Macc, and by Paul in I Cor 15:52-54.

both ἀφθαρσία (2:23) and ἀθανασία (3:4). Thus, this reality is qualified, or better, "filled", with the idea of an existence in God's presence. It is our task now to examine this "content" of the author's hope.

We saw earlier in this study that Ps-Solomon re-interpreted the death of the righteous as translation, as assumption to God. This understanding of the author's conception of what happens to the righteous at the time of their death calls into question that interpretation which understands the state of the righteous after their death in a more or less negative sense, as a time of waiting and hoping for final vindication and exaltation, as an interim state in which, to be sure, persecution, oppression, and suffering are absent but in which participation in the joys of God's kingdom is also conspicuous by its absence.[199] This interpretation is largely the result of the observation that the WS contains passages which point to an event in the future, an event beyond death, an event of apocalyptic judgment in which righteous and wicked confront each other and in which God's wrath is poured out upon all wickedness in the world.[200] In order to account for this phenomenon in a work which has so much to say about the individual and his fate immediately after death, an intermediate state

---

[199] Cf. Wm. Weber, "Unsterblichkeit", pp. 429 ff.; also in "Der Auferstchungsglaube der Weisheit Salomos", ZWTh 54 (1912), pp. 205-239; Goodrick, Wisdom, p. 390; Focke, Enststehung, pp. 25-36.

[200] See our discussion of this element in the WS in section D, below.

is posited for both righteous and wicked, in analogy to what we find in much apocalyptic literature,[201] which then brings the fate of individuals into the context of a systematic time-table of eschatological expectations. The attempt to read into the WS a uniform and unified eschatological view has produced a multiplicity of views and reconstructions,[202] all of which labor under the obviously difficult attempt of forcing upon the author an eschatological time-table which he does not espouse and in which he was apparently not interested.[203] On the one hand he speaks of the fate of individuals; on the other he envisages a final eschatological event in the prophetic-apocalyptic sense. But he never connects the two; transitions between passages which deal with the former and latter ideas, respectively, are sudden and abrupt.[204] How can this unconnected juxtaposition be accounted for?

---

[201]See e.g., P. Volz, Die Eschatologie der Jüdischen Gemeinde, pp. 256-272.

[202]See the various commentaries that have been cited. For a convenient summary of discussions on this matter, see Pfeiffer, History, pp. 336 ff.

[203]Cf. Nickelsburg, Resurrection, Immortality, Eternal Life, p. 137. Pfeiffer, ibid., p. 340, attributes the lack of clarity in timetable to the author's conflation of a Greek idea of immediate immortality with Jewish future eschatology. As we have seen, the WS's conception of immediate immortality is not so much Greek, as personal-relational.

[204]This has been correctly observed by G. Ziener in Theologische Begriffssprache, p. 116. "Schauplatz und Zeit der Handlung wechseln unvermittelt."

Must it simply stand as a "whole wonderful muddle, unarranged and alive",[205] or is it not rather possible to see the two strands as manifestations of two particular points of view, combined in the vision of a man who is both mystic and a member of an historical community, a man who combines within himself the personal-relational point of view of the Psalmist with the collective-historical view of prophetic-apocalyptic? It seems to this writer that this is the answer to the dilemma posed above.[206]

In such an understanding, the need to systematize the author's view is eliminated, and we can permit the author to speak to us on his own terms, though the attempt must still be made to decide where the author is referring to the final, historical eschatological event of prophetic-apocalyptic expectation, and where he is describing the righteous man's "immortality", his individual position in God's presence commencing with his death-translation. The latter state will be discussed in the following pages, the former in the next section of this chapter.

In the speech of the wicked (Chapter 2) the author, through them, expresses what is certainly his conviction concerning the special

---

[205]This is the judgment of Lowe upon the "dual eschatology" (as we call it in this study) of Paul ("Some Recent Attempts to Detect Development in Paul's Thought", p. 142). It is a judgment which is also applicable to the WS, i.e., as with Paul, a systematizing attempt is rejected, but no alternative is provided.

[206]Such an interpretation is likewise posited for an understanding of dual strands in the Pauline eschatology; see Chapter IV, below.

relationship that exists between the righteous and God (2:13):

> He professes to have knowledge of God
> And calls himself a child of the Lord

There are two aspects to this relationship, one of obedience, and the other of personal intimacy. The γνῶσις θεοῦ is not, as in the mysteries and gnosticism, a specially revealed mystical gnōsis, but rather a commitment to the will of God (cf. vs. 12), and thus a participation in the ways of God.[207] This aspect of a relationship of obedience is expanded by the second line into a relationship of dependence, of trust, of intimacy. The phrase παῖδα κυρίου is open to various interpretations. It may mean "servant[208] of the Lord", as the LXX often translates עבד יהוה with παῖς θεοῦ .[209] In this case, παῖς would point to a less intimate relationship,[210] and the aspect of obedience and service in the first line would be underscored. However, the meaning seems to be determined by vs. 16d, where God is called the righteous man's "father", and by vs. 18a, where he is called υἱὸς θεοῦ;[211] it is better therefore to read "child" instead of "servant",

---

[207]Cf. Is 11:2,9; Hos 4:1; Fichtner, Weisheit, p. 16; "...nicht nur intellectuell, sondern Einsicht in Gottes' Willen."

[208]In classical Greek, παῖς can mean either "servant" or "child".

[209]See W. Zimmerli and J. Jeremias, s.v. "παῖς θεοῦ", TDNT V, pp. 654-717.

[210]Cf. Gregg, Wisdom, p. 18.

[211]In 9:4,7 and 12:19,20 παῖς and υἱὸς seem to be used interchangeably.

and see here expressed an intimate father-son relationship.[212]

On the basis of this relationship, the ἔσχατα of the righteous is declared to be "happy" (12:16c). The reference is clearly to the end of the righteous man's life, i.e., death,[213] for in the following verses the wicked plot his death (vs. 20), in order to determine "what will happen at his ἔκβασις" (vs. 17). This end, this death is considered to be μακάριος, a term that expresses, in its religious sense, deep joy and blessedness.[214] What gives the righteous man the possibility to speak so positively of his death? The certainty that God will uphold him, that he will deliver him (vs. 18),[215] that

There shall be a visitation of him...(2:20)

Much discussion has centered around the interpretation of the term ἐπισκοπή as used here and elsewhere in the book.[216] Whatever the term

---

[212]Cf. J. Jeremias, "Ἀμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ -- παῖς θεοῦ", ZNW 35 (1935), pp. 115-123, on pp. 118-119, who shows that the WS's use of LXX Is 53 led to an understanding of παῖς θεου as God's child, not God's servant. See also J. M. Lagrange, "La paternite de Die dans l'ancien Testament", RB (1908), pp. 481-499. Whereas in the Old Testament Israel as a nation (or the king as its representative) is called God's son, here it refers to the individual righteous person.

[213]In the Psalms, τὰ ἔσχατα is used of the destiny of men, during this life (e.g., Ps 73:17; cf. Job 42:12). In Sir, the term invariably denotes the death of a man (1:13; 7:36; 51:14).

[214]Cf. C. C. McCown, "The Beatitudes in the Light of Ancient Ideals", JBL 46 (1927), pp. 50-61.

[215]We have seen above that we have in this verse an anticipation of the Enoch paradigm (Chapter 4).

[216]At 3:7; 3:13; 4:15; 14:11; 19:15.

denotes in the other passages,[217] here it is definitely a reference to the miraculous intervention of God,[218] hinted at already in vs. 18, and, in the view of the author, it is an event which takes place in the context of the righteous man's death. The wicked, of course, expect a this-worldly visitation, but the author charges them with ignorance and blindness (vs. 21). For in the μυστήρια of God (vs. 22)[219] the visitation did indeed take place, the righteous man did indeed prove to be God's son (2:18). It was this relationship of obedience (2:13) and trust (3:9) which in fact guaranteed this gracious and saving[220] intervention. This is clearly the import of the Enoch paradigm in Chapter 4. On the basis of a loving and obedient relationship with his

---

[217]See below.

[218]In the LXX, the religious sense of ἐπισκοπή is as the translation of פקדה, "visitation" (TDNT, II, s.v. "ἐπισκέπτομαι, ἐπισκοπή"), and designates either God's coming upon individuals or peoples in judgment and punishment (Lev 19:20; 7:18; Job 24:13, 34:9; Is 10:3, 23:17; Jer 6:15, 11:230), or in redemption and grace (Gen 50:24,25; Ex 3:16; 13:19; 30:12; Job 6:14, 29:4; Is 24:22; 29:6). Cf. also the use of פקדה in IQS IV.6 (positive) and in IQS IV.11-12 (negative).

[219]The μυστήρια θεοῦ are not, as Martin-Achard indicates, mystical illuminations akin to visions in the mystery cults (From Death to Life, p. 161), but rather, as the context indicates, their content is "the wages of holiness" and "the prize of blameless souls", i.e., incorruption. These mysteries are known by those who are related to God in an intimate, childlike, fellowship. Cf. Goodrick, Wisdom, pp. 117-118; and Reider, Wisdom, p. 69, who correctly reject the idea that μυστήρια means the esoteric doctrine of immortality, and characterize them as the mysterious dealing of God with the righteous upon earth. But as Holmes,"Wisdom", p. 538, and Gregg, Wisdom, p. 21,point out, ultimately these mysterious dealings of God issue in immortality for the righteous.

[220]Cf. 5:2b, παραδόξω τῆς σωτηρίας.

God (4:10,14), God took him to himself. Thus, the visitation-assumption guarantees the continuation of that intimate relationship.[221] How the author conceived of the character of that continuing relationship is described in 3:1 ff.

The righteous are said to be, after their death (or rather by means of their death), ἐν χειρὶ θεοῦ (3:1a), where "no torment will ever touch them" (3:1b). Several scholars interpret "in the hand of God" as meaning simply "under God's protection".[222] This sense is supported by appealing to Old Testament passages where the picture of the hand of God (בְּיַד אֱלֹהִים) conveys the idea of power and protection.[223] Yet, none of these passages contain the phrase ἐν χειρὶ θεοῦ, nor the idea expressed by this phrase, namely, a being in God's hand. In fact, the idea of being rejected from God's hand in Sheol (Ps 88:5) does not mean being out of God's protection, but separated from the possibility of fellowship with God, while Dt 33:3 expresses the idea of ownership,

---

[221]This is the meaning of 4:10: "He was caught up, lest evil change his understanding or guile deceive his soul."

[222]Thus Grimm, cited and followed by Weber, "Die Unsterblichkeit", pp. 431-432, who thinks that the righteous are in Sheol, but protected by God. Cf. also Goodrick, Wisdom, p. 122; Gregg, Wisdom, p. 24; Osty, Sagesse, p. 39. Reider, Wisdom, p. 71, compares the idea with b, Shab 152b: "The souls of the righteous are concealed under the throne of glory." Cf. Volz, Eschatologie, p. 270, who comments in reference to b. Shab 152b: "Die fromme Seele kommt mit dem Tod unter den göttlichen Thron, zur Verwahrung (im Lebensbündel), vermutlich bis zum Endakt." This rather negative conception is not shared by the WS; see below.

[223]E.G., Deut 33:3; Ps 88:5, 89:21; Is 51:16. Cf. also Lk 1:66; Acts 11:21.

not of protection.[224] The idea of protection is of course included; it is for this reason that "no torment shall touch them" (3:1b). But the phrase expresses more than this. As Fichtner expresses it, the righteous are "in Gottes schützender Hand",[225] that is, they are safe because they are with God.[226]

Such a relational view of the character of the immortality of the righteous is supported by the concluding words of this section (3:1-9), which as a whole answers to the speech of the unrighteous in Chapter 2. The text (3:9b) reads:

οἱ πιστοὶ ἐν ἀγάπῃ προσμενοῦσιν αὐτῷ.

The fellowship with God, for which the faithful are destined, is here expressed in terms of love: the ἐν ἀγάπῃ goes with προσμενοῦσιν, not with οἱ πιστοὶ .[227] Here, an active communion is expressed, which

---

[224]The closest parallel is probably Jn 10:28, where the idea of being in the hand of the Lord is clearly expressed.

[225]Fichtner, Weisheit, p. 19. Cf. also F. Schwally, Das Leben nach dem Tode nach den Vorstellungen des alten Israel und des Judentums (Giessen, 1892): "(Die Unsterblichkeit) is zu verstehen als...seliges Geborgensein in der Hand Gottes (III, 1), von keiner Qual berührt (III, 1)..." (cited by Weber, "Unsterblichkeit", p. 431.).

[226]Cf. Bückers, Unsterblichkeitslehre, p. 26, who states that the righteous are "an einem Ort der Ruhe in Gottes Nähe." This is not quite correct, and may reflect the idea expressed in b. Shab 152b (see note 202, above). The figure of being in God's hand conveys immediacy, intimacy, not simply proximity. Cf. the climax of the sorites in 6:17 ff., where the immortality which results from a life lived with Wisdom is characterized as "nearness to God". The idea of fellowship with God in the beyond is clearly expressed here.

[227]In the latter case it would read, "They that are faithful through love shall abide with him." (Gregg, Wisdom, p. 28).

fills the previously noted father-child relationship, characterized by obedience, dependence, and trust, with the added and deepened dimension of love.[228] This intimate and loving relationship is characterized generally as a condition of "peace" (3:3b):

οἱ δὲ εἰσιν ἐν εἰρήνῃ

It cannot simply denote a negative kind of peace, implying rest from toil and freedom from oppression.[229] It does contain this negative aspect, for there is certainly a contrast drawn here with the oppression which the righteous experienced. But the word εἰρήνη almost invariably has a positive meaning, whether it be in classical Greek, in the LXX, or in the New Testament.[230] In the LXX it faithfully reflects the various ramifications of the Hebrew שָׁלוֹם. Among others, the term denotes an aspect, sometimes the totality, of the prophetic proclamation of God's eschatological salvation.[231] In terms of his individual perspective, the eschatological εἰρήνη of the prophetic tradition has

---

[228]Cf. Reider, Wisdom, p. 74, and Gregg, ibid., think the phrase means that the righteous shall be loved by God. But this one-way love is certainly too limited. The WS's concept of the filial relationship between the righteous and God demands a filial response. Cf. also the use of ἀγάπη and ἀγαπάω in the relation between man and Wisdom (6:17,18; 7:10), God and man (7:28), God and Wisdom (8:3).

[229]Thus Gregg, Wisdom, p. 25; Weber, "Unsterblichkeit", p. 432; Focke, Entstehung, p. 34.

[230]See Von Rad and Foerster, TWNT, II, s.v., "εἰρήνη", pp. 398-416.

[231]Von Rad, ibid., pp. 402-405.

become for Ps-Solomon the possession of the righteous immediately after death.[232] This is a positive good (cf. 3:5),[233] a positive blessedness under God's protection.[234] Fichtner sums it up well: "...sie sind 'in Frieden', d.h. frei von Pein (vs. 1) und in Gottes Gemeinschaft (vs. 9)".[235]

The description of the glorious fate of the righteous in 3:1-9,[236] is followed (in 3:10;4:9) by a series of contrasts between the ungodly, for whom the traditional[237] Israelite blessings of posterity[238] and old age[239] are valid, and examples of righteous persons who have neither the one nor the other. The offspring of the ungodly are called "evil" and "accursed" (3:12-13), and it is asserted that "the prolific brood of the ungodly will be of no use", (4:3 ff.). Again, the old age of unrighteous men "will be without honor" (3:17), and their "prolonged old age" stands under condemnation (4:16), "for

---

[232]There may be a slight indication of such "peace" in Is 57:2.

[233]For the contrasting "having no peace", said of the fate of the godless, cf. Is 48:22, 57:21; I Enoch 5, 4; 94:6; 98:11, 15; 99:13; 101:3; 102:3, 8, etc.

[234]Goodrick, Wisdom, p. 123. Weisengoff, "Death and Immortality", p. 129.

[235]Fichtner, Weisheit, p. 19.

[236]The difficult passage, 3:7-8, will be discussed below.

[237]This conception was still quite current, despite Job and Ecclesiastes, and is to be found as late as Ben Sirach.

[238]Childlessness was considered a curse (Gen 30:23; I Sam 1:5-8), a punishment (II Sam 6:23; Hos 9:11), or a reproach (Lk 1:25).

[239]That the pious arrive at a high old age is asserted in Gen 15:5, 25:8; Job 5:26, 4:17. The same theme is prominent in the work of the Deuteronomist: Ex 20:12; Dt 5:16, 30, 4:40, 6:2, 32:47, etc.

old age is not honored for length of time, nor measured by number of years" (3:8). In his polemic against the posterity and old age of unrighteous men, Ps-Solomon presents three examples of righteous persons; he who dies in his youth (4:7), the eunuch (3:14), and the childless woman (3:13). The examples of 4:7 and 3:14 are relevant to our discussion.

> 4:7 The righteous man, though he die early,
> will be at rest.

The meaning of ἀνάπαυσις, like that of εἰρήνη, is by some taken to indicate merely a negative kind of state, a rest from toil and earthly care.[240] As in εἰρήνη, this meaning is certainly present.[241] However, as with εἰρήνη, the term ἀναπάυσις (and its cognates) can also have a very positive force.[242] This latter aspect is underlined for vs. 7 by the immediately following Enoch paradigm (4:10 ff.), which, as we have seen, typifies the righteous man's assumption, at death, into the presence of God. The ἀνάπαυσις of the righteous man who has died is therefore qualified as a "rest in God's presence", and is not simply the negative rest that comes with the death-separation from difficulty in life.

The example of the righteous eunuch (3:14) is a further illustration of the fellowship-character of the immortality which commences with death. Here, Ps-Solomon consciously polemicizes against Dt 23:1, where

---

[240]Weber, "Unsterblichkeit", p. 430; Goodrick, Wisdom, pp. 123, 141; Osty, Sagesse, p. 44.

[241]Cf. Job 3:13, 17; Rev 14:13, 6:11.

[242]Cf. Mt 11:28, 29; Lk 12:19; I Cor 16:18; II Cor 7:13; Phm 7:20.

the eunuch is cut off from the assembly of the Lord; in this polemic he is clearly dependent on Is 56:4,5, where the eunuch who is faithful within the covenant-relationship is promised a place in the house of God. In Isaiah's prophetic vision, access to God's sanctuary is of course conceived in terrestrial terms, as an eschatological, yet this-worldly reality. In the WS, the picture is definitely removed to the beyond. As the prophetic-eschatological "peace" (3:3) has become in the WS a transcendent possession, so the eunuch's access to God's sanctuary (promised by Isaiah) has become a transcendent reality. Since fellowship with God was the highest worth of the earthly temple, the promise of the eunuch's access to it points to fellowship with God in the beyond.[243]

From our investigation of the character, the nature, the content of the immortality promised to the righteous, we are led to the conclusion that the emphasis lies on the relational reality of this state. That is to say, the not-death existence of the righteous beyond death is a continuation of an already present reality, though the relational reality already experienced in his life is infinitely deepened and heightened by the immediacy of a presence with God. The

---

[243]Cf. Bückers, Unsterblichkeitslehre, pp. 45-46, 27-28; Grimm, Weisheit, p. 31, interprets the idea of access to the temple in a "spiritual sense"; Goodrick, Wisdom, p. 133, and Reider, Wisdom, p. 78, think it denotes heaven, in analogy to Ps 11:4; Hab 2:20. Cf. also the idea of the new Temple as an apocalyptic-eschatological reality in I Enoch 90:29.

immortality which the WS promises is high and lofty.[244] Yet its description of this is marked by acute restraint in comparison with the fantastic pictures of the apocalyptic literature.[245]

We shall see below (section D) that the WS does use prophetic-apocalyptic imagery when describing the eschatological judgment (4:20-5:23), though in quite subdued form. There is one indication, however, that the apocalyptic imagery which informed his historical-eschatological perspective spilled over into his conception of the fate of the righteous after death. Because the passage (3:7-8) stands at the borderline between the individualistic and collective eschatological perspectives of the author, it will be discussed at this point, and thus form a transition to the consideration of the author's collective eschatology.

3:7-8 is a passage which seemingly is an intrusion into a larger section (3:1-4:19) that is concerned exclusively with the fate of righteous (and godless) immediately after death. The righteous are envisaged as a collective entity, who share, under God's sovereignty, the rulership over the cosmos:

---

[244]Cf. P. Gröbler, "Die Ansichten über Unsterblichkeit und Auferstehung in der Jüdischen Literatur der beiden letzten Jahrhunderten v. Chr." ThSK 52 (1879), pp. 651-700, on pp. 689-696, where he interprets the lot of the righteous similarly, but rejects any collective-eschatological event ("Die Begriffe Tod und 'Tag des Gerichts' werden zur Bezeichnung des gleichen Zeitpunktes alternierend gebraucht.")

[245]For a comprehensive summary of the apocalyptic descriptions of eschatological blessedness, cf. P. Volz, Eschatologie, pp. 256-272, 340-421.

In the time of their ἐπισκοπῆς
they shall shine forth,
And as sparks they shall run through
the stubble (καλάμη).
They shall govern (judge) nations
and rule over peoples,
And their Lord shall reign over them forever.

The first question which must be asked of this passage is: When does all this take place? When is the καιρός of the ἐπισκοπή of the righteous? The difficulty in answering this question arises from the fact that there is a constant shifting back and forth between past, present, and future in 3:1-9. Thus, 3:1-3 speaks of the present condition of the righteous in the hand of God. 3:4-6 is apparently a flashback into the time before the righteous' death, the time of trial and affliction, though 5a provides a look into the future from out of this past. God "accepted them" (3:6b), in the past; now they are in his hand (implied). A καί connects vss. 7-8 with the foregoing, possibly indicating continuity in a series of events, and vss. 7-8 speak exclusively in the future tense. Yet, is it possible that 7-8 provides another flashback, that the exaltation of the righteous is seen as future, not in respect to the author's time, but only in respect to the time when the righteous suffered?[246] The use of the term ἐπισκοπή in the passage lends weight to the latter alternative. In discussing the Enoch paradigm, we noted that the assumption of Enoch

---

[246]Cf. Nickelsburg, Immortality, Resurrection, Eternal Life, p. 137, n. 118, who raises the possibility that the function of ruling in 3:7,8 may provide merely the contrast with their former oppression. Cf. Gregg, Wisdom, p. 27, for a similar view.

was interpreted by the author as a "visitation" (ἐπισκοπή, 4:15). This usage in turn informed the interpretation of ἐπισκοπή in 2:20, where the reference is clearly to the death of the righteous, as the following verses show. This makes it likely that the author's use of the term at 3:7 has the same import, that as vs. 5, vs. 7 is again spoken from the perspective of the past, and that the καιρός of the visitation denotes the death, i.e., the death-assumption, of the righteous. Most commentators, however, reject such an interpretation, and understand the "time of visitation" as an eschatological-apocalyptic reference to the Last Judgment.[247] In favor of this interpretation is the suggestion by Bückers that there is a clear contrast between the condition of the righteous, as pictured in 3:1-3, and the "totally different picture of the beyond" in 3:7 f.[248] Yet this is not a convincing argument, since 3:7-8 could simply reveal an added dimension, a further aspect of the eternal life with God pictured in 3:1 f. Of greater significance is the observation that the imagery

---

[247]Cf. Weber, "Unsterblichkeit", p. 433; Reider, Wisdom, p. 73; Osty, Sagesse, p. 40; Fichtner, Weisheit, p. 19; Focke, Entstehung, pp. 30-36; Goodrick, Wisdom, pp. 126-127; cf. Holmes, "Wisdom", p. 539, who states that "the writer cannot refrain from picturing the visible triumph of the godly over the wicked, though it is quite inconsistent with the idea of reward or retribution coming immediately after death". He goes on to interpret vs. 8 as a reference to the "messianic kingdom".

[248]Bückers, Unsterblichkeitslehre, pp. 25-26, "(Die) Herrschaft der Gerechten und Gottes verwirklicht sich erst beim Endgericht (vgl. 5:15-23), worauf die ganze Schilderung passt..." Cf. Ziener, Theologische Begriffssprache, p. 116, "So spricht 3:1-6 von der individuellen Vergeltung gleich nach dem Tode; 3:7-9 meint dagegen wahrscheinlich die kollektive Enderwartung" (italics mine).

of the "sparks among the stubble" (7b) is a metaphor for judgment quite frequent in the Bible,[249] (though for the exact metaphor there is no parallel).[250] If the metaphor indicates judgment, meted out by the righteous upon the wicked, then we have a scene which is seemingly out of place in a condition of peace and joy in fellowship with God.[251]

---

[249]Holmes, Comm., p. 74, cites these references: Is 1:31; Joel 2:5; Obad 18; Zech 12:6; Mal 4:1.

[250]Only in Is 1:31 do both words (καλάμη and σπινθήρ) appear together; and though the scene is one of punishment, it is both the "strength" (= καλάμη) and the "works" (= σπινθῆρες) of the wicked which shall be burned. Here then, "sparks" denotes insignificance, nothingness, and not "consuming power" as in WS 3:7. Obad 18 is perhaps the best parallel, where Edom, upon whom judgment comes, is compared to stubble, and Israel (Jacob) is the consuming "fire", (not sparks). The other passages speak of judgment by fire, but are doubtful parallels.

[251]Even in the description of that end-historical eschatological event of judgment in 4:20-5:23, the righteous are not depicted as active participants. The passage 4:16 cannot be used to support such an idea. The context of the passage, as well as its internal structure, indicates that the high value placed on a righteous life, though short, is an automatic condemnation of the long life of the unrighteous person. The very existence of the wicked stands under condemnation by the fact that the righteous, whom the wicked thought of as having been brought to naught, are in the hand of God. Cf. Gregg, Comm., p. 41, who proposes a similar interpretation: "Not with final judgment, but by the daily moral contrast between his life which they count as death, and their moral death which they mis-call life." Cf. also Fichtner, Weisheit, p. 23, who is inclined to detect references to the Last Judgment frequently, but sees this passage as indicating a "condemnation by results": "Der Früh Vollendete Gerechte wird den Lebenden Gottlosen zum Gericht (vs. 16) dadurch, dass, sie, die sein untadeliges Leben kannten, nun das darauffolgende Geschick miterleben und seinen Sinn nicht begreifen wollen (vs. 17)."

If 7a, with its idea of "shining forth" (ἀναλάμψουσιν),[252] is parallel to 7b,[253] then the idea expressed is primarily one, not of judgment, of vengeance, but of exaltation and glorification.[254] The question of the godless in the judgment scene (5:5),

> Why has he been numbered among
> the sons of God?
> And why is his lot among the saints?[255]

would support the correctness of the view that in 3:7-8 the righteous

---

[252]In apocalyptic literature, "light" plays a dominant role in descriptions of eschatological glory. (See the comprehensive documentation in P. Volz, Eschatologie, pp. 364-367), especially I Enoch 104:2; Dan 12:3, IV Ezra 7:97,125.

[253]A. Dupont-Sommer, "De l'immortalité astrale dans la 'Sagesse de Solomon'", REG 62 (1949), pp. 80-86, has forcefully argued that with a slight emendation of the text there is perfect parallelism between the lines 7a and 7b. He proposes that καλάμη ("stubble") is corrupt for γαλαξίη, and translates the line: "shall shine forth and follow their course among the stars". (Cf. Dan 12:3, where the wise are said to shine forth in the firmament, and the righteous as the stars). This suggestion certainly removes the difficulty of the passage, though it is purely hypothetical. But cf. the connection in Jewish literature between exaltation and a presence among the stars (Ass Mos 10:9) as well as between the stars and the angels (I Enoch 85:1-4; Sir 43:8 f.). Jewish literature also attributes a ruling function to the angels (Cf. C. D. Morrison, The Powers That Be (SBT 29; London, 1960), pp. 18-20, for a summary of late Jewish literature on this matter). These connections may form the background for the idea of rulership expressed in 3:8 (cf. 5:5).

[254]Georgi, "Der Vorpaulinische Hymnus", p. 274, in using the story of the righteous man in the WS as a background for Phil 2:6-11, suggests that the righteous man's assumption is synonymous with his exaltation "in richterliche und königliche Würde und Funktion....Die Erhöhung geschieht...aus dem Tode heraus."

[255]Though "sons of God" corresponds to the similar expression in 2:13,16,18, both this term and "holy ones" are typical appelations for the angels. (Cf. Heinisch, Weisheit, p. 95; Schütz, Les idées eschatologiques, p. 162 f.). Similar language describing fellowship among the angels occurs at Qumran, IQS XI 7 f.; IQH III, 21; IQH VI, 13. Cf. Nickelsburg's discussion of "Fellowship with the Angels" in the Qumran materials, Immortality, Resurrection, Eternal Life, pp. 310-323. (But cf. n. 280, below).

man's elevation into the heavenly court of the angels involves his exaltation to a position of authority, and that this exaltation has taken place, not as a result of the eschatological judgment, but in the context of the death-assumption.

The passage 3:7-8 is best seen, therefore, as the intrusion, into an essentially individualistically-oriented context, of apocalyptic-eschatological imagery, which is somewhat alien to an understanding of the individual's fate as intimate communion with God. As such it would provide an indication that the individual and collective perspectives in the author's thought were not separated into watertight compartments.

## D. CORPORATE ESCHATOLOGY

### 1. The Historical Perspective

On the basis of the material studied thus far, it is eminently clear that Ps-Solomon is thoroughly individualistically oriented in terms of his concern for the wellbeing and final destiny of the righteous. The hope he gives to his persecuted and oppressed and otherwise deprived brethren is not in terms of "national", but in terms of "individual" vindication.[256] Their hope is full of immortality, not

---

[256]Cf. C. Steuernagel, "Die Strukturlinien der Entwicklung der jüdischen Eschatologie", in Festschrift Alfred Bertholet (Tübingen, 1950), pp. 479-487, who distinguishes between national, individual, and universal eschatological elements, and shows the variety of combinations that developed.

because they belong to a people called the Jews,[257] but because they have lived righteously before their God. Nor is their hope for individual vindication overshadowed by the prospect of delay: the author does not entertain the thought that the departed righteous are, until the time of the Great Judgment, asleep in Sheol,[258] or stored up in compartments of Sheol[259] or in "bundles of life" underneath God's throne,[260] ideas so common in apocalyptic literature.[261] Physical death, for the righteous, is the gate, not to an interim existence, but to life with God.

Because he is concerned with the individual, with his responsibility and standing before the God who is the Lord of the universe, he therefore has, of necessity, also a universalistic outlook. The two go

---

[257]Cf. P. Volz, Eschatologie, p. 59, "Die unterdrückten Gerechten sind wohl die frommen Juden; doch sind sie dem Verfasser nicht als Juden, sondern als Gerechte und Gesetzestreue wichtig."

[258]I Enoch 100:4 f.; II Bar 30:2; Cf. I Enoch 51:1 f.

[259]E.g., I Enoch 22; IV Ezra 7:88 ff., 4:41, 7:32; II Bar 21:23 f.

[260]B. Shabbat 152b; cf. Rev 20:4 ff. Cf. Str.-Bill., Vol. IV, pt. 2.

[261]Cf. P. Volz, Eschatologie, p. 135 ff., for a comprehensive survey of these various conceptions; also K. Schubert, "Die Entwicklung der Auferstehungslehre von der nachexilischen bis zur frührabbinischen Zeit", BZ, N.F. 6 (1962), pp. 177-214; H. H. Rowley, The Relevance of Apocalyptic (2nd ed.; London, 1947); W. J. B. Boyd, "Apocalyptic and Life after Death" in F. L. Cross, ed., Studia Evangelica, V (Berlin, 1968).

hand in hand.[262] Before the universal Lord, national ties are meaningless; each man stands naked, and as an individual he is examined (1:6-10) and weighed on the scales of universal justice (12:15). Within such a perspective, the individual can become a prototype, or simply a concrete example of that which is universally true and valuable (or false and bad). Ps-Solomon clearly reflects such a perspective, as we have seen. One of the striking features of the book is the total absence of proper names; this would not be too significant if it were not precisely those who are such prominent figures within the historical traditions of Israel. But it is by this device that historical personages become prototypical, become individual-universal paradigms: thus Solomon becomes the ideal wise man, in whose autobiography the truth is illustrated that a life lived with Wisdom issues in immortality; thus Enoch becomes the ideal righteous man, in whose fate the truth is illustrated that a life of righteousness leads into the presence of God.

Yet, in spite of these emphases, the author does not lose himself in abstractions, in a universe of ideals in which only the individual counts. He does not have, as D. Georgi suggests, "die

---

[262]Both the individualistic and universalistic emphases are recognized mainly as products of the national collapse and the exilic period. Cf. E. Sellin, "Die alttestamentliche Hoffnung auf Auferstehung und ewiges Leben", Luthertum 30 (1919), pp. 232-289, on pp. 253 ff.). Ps-Solomon incorporates these within himself; he does not share the legalistic exclusivism that emerged in the post-exilic period.

programmatische Absicht, der Geschichte in all ihrer Konkretheit und Differenziertheit den Abschied zu geben."[263] His thoughts not only "stray to the ultimate victory of righteousness in the world",[264] but he indeed affirms this victory in a very concrete way.[265] He does not simply "(vividly and pictorially describe) an ethical and spiritual future";[266] no, he points to this future as a concrete, historical reality. Ps-Solomon had an individual-universal vision; but he was also steeped in the Heilsgeschichte of his people. What he did was to universalize this Heilsgeschichte, convinced that as God had guided the history of Israel, so he was guiding the world towards its appointed goal.

This historical perspective is particularly prominent in part III (Chapters 10-19) of the book, though, as we shall see, it is certainly not absent from the other parts; indeed, it finds its concrete, future-oriented expression in a description of what may be called the eschatological event[267] on the historical plane.[268] Solomon's prayer

---

[263]Georgi, "Der Vorpaulinische Hymnus", p. 272.

[264]Drummond, Philo Judaeus I, p. 212 (cited by Gregg, Wisdom, p. xlviii).

[265]See below.

[266]Gregg, Wisdom, p. xlviii.

[267]Cf. Volz, Eschatologie, p. 1, who contends that it is only the events of a collective character which deserve the designation "eschatological": "Eschatologie des Individuums ist ein Wiederspruch in sich."

[268]4:20-5:23.

(Chapter 9) for Wisdom ends in the assurance that by God's gift of Wisdom[269]

> the paths of those on earth were set right,
> and men were taught what pleases thee (God)
> and were saved by Wisdom. 270

The chapters that follow[271] become an illustration from history of this truth, but also an illustration of the judgment that comes when Wisdom is rejected.[272] The Egyptians and the Canaanites, who did not heed "the warning of light rebukes", experienced the deserved judgment of God (12:26; cf. 17:1) in the past; but the idolatry and godlessness which they represent, and which was not exterminated with their destruction, is also doomed: its speedy end has been planned (14:14) and a terrible visitation[273] will fall upon it (14:9-11). For the execution of this judgment God employs his own creation as a tool (16:24), an

---

[269]The "holy Spirit" in 9:17b is certainly synonymous with "Wisdom" in 9:17a.

[270]After 11:1 "Wisdom" as a concrete figure fades from the picture, though it is likely that God's Spirit (12:1) and his "all-powerful Word" (18:15) are for the author synonymous with Wisdom ("Word" and "Wisdom" are synonymous in 9:1-2; "holy Spirit" and "Wisdom" in 1:4-5 and 9:17). It seems that the author's involvement in the great exodus-event, seen in the tradition as the act of God, prevented him from introducing Wisdom directly as an intermediary agent.

[271]10:1-11:1 rehearses the guidance, instruction and salvation of the patriarchs by Wisdom, from Adam to Moses; Chapters 11 ff. expand, in detail, the various aspects of the exodus event.

[272]Thus, Cain "departed from Wisdom" and "perished" (10:3); the "Five Cities" were judged by fire "because they passed Wisdom by". (10:8).

[273]The word ἐπίσκοπή is here used in a negative sense, similar to one of its uses in the Old Testament: not a visitation for vindication, but for judgment (cf. Lev 19:20, 7:18; Job 24:13, 34:9; Is 10:3, 23:17; Jer 6:15, 10:15).

idea that will come to concrete fulfillment at the end of history (5:17-23). The duality of past and future judgment is interestingly revealed in the account of the plague of darkness upon the Egyptians (Chapter 17): the judgment of darkness, depicted in terms of sinister imagery that included fear and terror, is equated with Hades (17:14), and then said to be but "an image of the darkness...destined to receive them" (17:21).

Contrasted with the punishment and judgment that came and will come upon all representatives of unrighteousness and godlessness, are God's people (15:4, 16:2), his holy ones (18:1,2,5), his children (19:6), his sons (16:10, 18:4), "through whom the imperishable light of the law was to be given to the world" (18:4). Thus, Israel is seen to have an historical mission, and it is a mission with universal scope; for the "light of the law" is surely to be equated with the instruction and guidance that Wisdom gives to all men (9:18). Israel thus becomes the historical prototype, the paradigm of "the righteous" (10:20), the "son of God" (18:13). In the author's over-all perspective, the "national" identity is not, or is no longer, of significance. What <u>is</u> of significance is the fact that as "the righteous", as the "sons of God", as those who "know God",[274] they are destined for life and immortality (15:3). It is this historical, universal perspective which permits the author to depict a final confrontation between wickedness and righteousness, between God and all that is opposed to God. To this

---

[274]Cf. the confession of the unrighteous (5:7): "...the way of the Lord we have not known."

description we shall briefly turn.

## 2. The Eschatological Judgment

There occurs a decided shift in thought between 4:18c-19, which describe the dishonorable death of the godless in contrast to the assumption of the righteous (4:7 ff.), and 4:20 ff., where a post-mortem confrontation is depicted. There is an event coming, says vs. 20, when (in contrast to their "contempt" for the righteous in this life, (vs. 18a) they shall stand as "cowards" ἐν συλλογισμῷ ἁμαρτημάτων αὐτῶν . This reckoning, this counting up of their sins, has already been hinted at in 3:18b and 4:6b, where the expressions ἡμέρᾳ διαγνώσεως ("day of decision") and ἐξετασμῷ αὐτῶν ("their examination") are most probably references to the same event.[275] This event is now pictured very concretely, and there can be no reasonable doubt[276] that we have before us the final eschatological event.[277]

---

[275]Cf. Focke, Entstehung, p. 32 ff.; Goodrick, Wisdom, pp. 152 ff.; Fichtner, Weisheit, p. 21; but Reider, Wisdom, p. 89, does not commit himself.

[276]Even Gregg, who "spiritualizes" and "poeticizes" all descriptions of judgment in the WS is compelled to admit that "although the writer is careful to abstain from any doctrine of a final judgment, it is probable that he was not unfamiliar with such speculations as those of the Book of Enoch" (p. 43); cf. Pfeiffer, History, p. 337 f., who sees 4:20 ff. as a rhetorical, poetic outburst intending to show how the tables will be turned and how in the end it is righteousness which carries away the victory wreath, and not unrighteousness. The author, says Pfeiffer, "is fond of poetic justice". Cf. P. Heinisch, "Das jüngste Gericht im Buche der Weisheit", ThGL II (1910), pp. 89-106, on pp. 89-90, for a summary of the various positions on this passage.

[277]Cf. Focke, Entstehung, p. 33, "Die realistische Ausmalung der einzelnen, konkreten Forgänge lässt...keine andere Deutung zu."

The godless are, collectively, confronted by their transgressions (4:20)[278] and are convicted by them (cf. 1:9). The severity of their situation becomes even clearer when they recognize, with dreadful fear, the unexpected σωτηρία of the righteous (5:2),[279] when they see that the righteous face this final event with great boldness (5:1), that, indeed, they are already among the "sons of God" and the "holy ones" (5:5).[280] This confrontation elicits from them the remorseful confession that they were fools (5:4), that they strayed from the way of truth into the darkness of lawlessness (5:6),[281] a darkness implicating destruction (5:7a),[282] and that they did not know the way of the Lord (5:7c).[283] The great reversal is taking place.[284] The

---

[278]The personification of sins is of course poetic (cf. Gen 4:7; Nu 32:23; Ps 140:11; I Tim 5:24); they are condemned on the basis of their sins.

[279]The singular must here be understood in the generic, representative sense (cf. 5:15). Cf. P. Heinisch, "Das jüngste Gericht", p. 92.

[280]Beside a reference to the angels (see n. 255, above), these appellations also refer to the company of the righteous; for 5:5 in the speech of the godless is a clear reference to their previous speech (2:1 ff.), in which they heaped contempt upon the righteous for their claim of son-ship (2:13,18). Cf. Mt 5:9; Lk 6:35; Acts 26:18.

[281]For the theme of "darkness", cf. 17:2; 18:4.

[282]Cf. 17:21.

[283]Cf. the contrast with the righteous (i.e., Israel) whose "knowledge" of God leads to righteousness and thus to immortality (15:3).

[284]Nickelsburg emphasizes this aspect in his discussion of the confrontation scene, though he thinks it is "the ending and resolution and adjudication of a particular situation", not a description of the final judgment.

wicked now confess (5:9-10) that all they stood for (cf. their speech in Chapter 2) was emptiness and nothingness, and their confession ends in the despairing recognition that their entire life has stood under the signature of death (5:13).[285] The author now confirms the correctness of the confession by describing the "hope of the ungodly man" in a series of metaphors which all speak of emptiness and nothingness (5:14).[286]

That the scene before us is a real judgment scene is confirmed by a comparison of the various elements of the scene with what we find in the contemporary apocalyptic literature of Judaism. The idea was widespread that in the endtime all that was opposed to God would be destroyed in a great universal judgment.[287] The correspondence between the I Enoch and the WS is particularly instructive.[288] The judgment

---

[285]Cf. the remark of Reuss, which is representative of those who will not admit that an Alexandrian Jew could have entertained apocalyptic-eschatological ideas: "One might conclude that this was a representation of the Last Judgment, as the Jewish theologians contemporary with our Lord represented it. But as this idea does not occur elsewhere, we may be satisfied to see here a poetic tableau of the late repentance of the sinner." ["Das Buch der Weisheit" in Das Alte Testament, VI (Braunschweig, 1894), pp. 343-378, cited by Goodrick, Wisdom, p. 153, who rightly objects that "it would be just as easy to explain away the description of the Judgment in Mt 25:31-46 as a 'poetic tableau', a 'dramatic representation', on the ground that nowhere else do we have in the Gospel so full a depiction."]

[286]Cf. 3:18; 15:10.

[287]Cf. Volz, Eschatologie, pp. 83 ff., 173 ff.; Bousset-Gressmann, Die Religion des Judentums, pp. 250 ff.; Schürer, Geschichte II, pp. 622 ff.

[288]Cf. P. Heinisch, "Das jüngste Gericht", pp. 91 ff., for a detailed comparison.

is universal in scope, covering the righteous and the sinners (I En 1: 7,9); God (or the Messiah) sits on the throne of glory (I En 45:3; 47:3, etc.), and the books of the righteous (47:3; 103:2; 108:3) as well as of the wicked (81:4) in which the deeds of men are recorded (89:62 ff.; 90:17, etc.) are opened (47:3). All sinners are gathered together before God (90:21; 100:4); the righteous too step before him (47:4; 62:8) in order to testify against the wicked (99:3) whose transgressions are counted up (89:63). While the righteous now rejoice (47:4), the wicked are struck with fear and terror (100:8; 102:1); they look at one another in anguish (62:5) and beg for mercy (62:9). But it is too late (50:5); they are judged and declared guilty (90:24 ff.). Now most of these elements of a judgment are also present in the WS: the sinners appear as the accused, fearful and terror-stricken (4:20a; 5:2). As the books of unrighteousness are read in I Enoch, so the transgressions step on the scene as accusers (4:20b). As in I Enoch, so here the sins are counted up (4:20a), and the righteous appear as witnesses against the wicked (5:1).[289] The accused admit their guilt (5:3 ff.), and repent in anguish of spirit (5:3); but it is too late (5:13), and sentence (by implication) is pronounced: their hope is like chaff (5:14).

It is of course clear that the WS lacks much of the vividness and fantastic character of the apocalyptic imagery, but the substance is nevertheless there. If the author did not believe in a real judgment,

---

[289]This is not explicitly stated, though it is clearly the import of the entire confrontation.

then his words would belie his convictions. For those for whom the book was intended could not help but interpret his words in terms of the great judgment which was part and parcel of their hope and expectation. But that the author deliberately intended to deceive his readers concerning his convictions cannot be assumed.

The presentation of the judgment scene is followed by a description of its consequences (5:15-23). In contrast to the hopeless situation of the wicked,

> the righteous live forever,[290]
> and their reward is in the Lord;[291]
> and their care is with the Most High.
> Therefore they will receive a glorious crown,[292]
> and a beautiful diadem[293]
> from the Lord's hand.[294]

---

[290]With εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα cf. I Jn 2:17; II Macc 7:9; Sir 41:13.

[291]The ἐν κυρίῳ is capable of a variety of meanings. The context, as well as the similar idea of 3:1, point in the direction of fellowship with God. The line 5:15c supports this meaning in the sense of "God is their portion", as in Pss 73:26 and 119:57 (cf. Is 62:11).

[292]βασίλειον may denote either "crown" or "kingdom". It is used in the sense of "kingdom" in 1:14 and is so taken by Reider, Wisdom, p. 96; Goodrick, Wisdom, p. 163. But in view of the parallelism with the next line (διάδημα τοῦ κάλλους, vs. 16b), the meaning "crown" seems more fitting (Cf. Is 62:3, "a crown of beauty and a royal diadem"). See Lidd.-Scott, s.v. βασίλειον, who translate "diadem of beauty". In either case, the essential meaning is the same.

[293]Is 62:3 (LXX) is certainly alluded to here. The bestowal of royal insignia upon the righteous recalls the conception of royal authority and rule in 3:8, which we interpreted as an apocalyptic-eschatological "intrusion" into an essentially "individualistic-oriented" context.

[294]The following lines (16c,d) reflect, in an expanded form, the thought already expressed in the context of the individualistic hope: "no torment will ever touch them" (3:1). The expressions σκεπάζειν ("to cover") and ὑπερασπίζειν ("to shield"), which occur often in the Old Testament (cf. Hatch-Redpath, 1268, 1408) and generally denote the

We have in this passage a further justification for attributing to the author the conception of a real judgment,[295] for the various elements are again paralleled in apocalyptic writings. According to I Enoch 62:15, the righteous receive garments of glory,[296] and their glory will never end (I En 62:16); for they will receive eternal life (I En 40:9)[297] and be in eternal fellowship with God (I En 45:6). These are integral parts of the apocalyptic hope, and Ps-Solomon was surely aware of this.[298] Nor is the crowning element of the apocalyp-

---

protection of God without which his people cannot exist, are used here in an eschatological context. They express here this same gracious activity of God on behalf of his righteous: they are sons of God (2:13; 18; 5:5), he is their king (3:8), and his protection is his guarantee that their blessedness cannot be abrogated. In the words of a later apocalyptic writer, "death shall be no more, neither shall there be mourning nor crying nor pain anymore." (Rev. 21:4)

[295]For the meeting out of punishment and rewards in the Jewish literature, cf. Volz, Eschatologie, pp. 298 ff., 325 ff.; Bousset-Gressman, Religion des Judentums, pp. 245 ff., 315 ff.; Schürer, Geschichte II, pp. 628 ff., 644 ff.

[296]Cf. the use of similar eschatological imagery in IQS IV 6-8, where the "visitation" of the righteous is said to consist of "abundance of bliss", "blessings without end", "eternal joy", the "garment of honor", and the "glorious crown". (Acc. to translation by A. Dupont-Sommer, The Essene Writings from Qumran, tr. by G. Vermez (Cleveland, 1962), p. 80.

[297]Cf. also II Macc 7:9,36.

[298]Cf. the scene of the judgment in Mtt 25:31-46: gathering of mankind before the judge (vss. 31-32), separation into righteous and unrighteous (vs. 33), pronouncement of sentence over the good (vss. 34-40) and the bad (vss. 41-45): "and they (the wicked) will go away into eternal punishment, but the righteous into eternal life." (vs. 46).

tic hope absent from his thought, namely, the final and total defeat of all the powers of wickedness and godlessness (5:17-23).[299] Indeed, it would have been strange, after the announcement that a severe judgment was impending (4:20), had the author neglected to mention the result of the sentence which is passed on the unrighteous. Thus, Chapter 5 ends with the description of God's cosmic destruction of evil.[300]

A comparison with the apocalyptic literature reveals that in his depiction of the final destruction of the unrighteous and wickedness, Ps-Solomon is quite restrained. He does not picture an eternal suffering in fiery torment,[301] in chains,[302] or in unbearable thirst.[303] He depicts their ultimate demise in the simple metaphor of being "winnowed away". Whether, in the context of this apocalyptic vision, he thought of them as continuing a conscious existence in suffering,

---

[299] In terms of the "armor" of the Lord (17a, 18-20a, cf. Is 59: 17 ff.), the author emphasizes that the punishment of the wicked is the imposition of a real judgment (δικαιοσύνη, κρίσις ἀνυπόκριτος, ὁσιότης). The arming of the creation for the final conflagration (17b, 20b-23) introduces a motif which is later taken up and applied in detail (16: 17 ff.; 19:6 ff.): as God had in the past punished the wicked by means of his creation, so he will do it again in their final destruction. (5:23).

[300] In apocalyptic literature, the universal judgment is often connected with the renewal of the world (cf. Volz, Eschatologie, pp. 292 ff.; Schürer, Geschichte II, pp. 636 ff.) in such a way that the old world is destroyed, usually by means of fire (Cf. II Bar. 31:5; 32:1,6; Syb Oracles 3:670 ff.; 4:172 ff.; IV Ezra 7:31). Ps-Solomon shares the idea of a total destruction on the face of the earth (5:23c), but he is silent about a new earth.

[301] Cf. I Enoch 90:26; 100:9; 108:3 ff.; 102:3; IV Ezra 7:38; II Bar 44:15, etc.

[302] Cf. I Enoch 69:28; 103:8.

[303] Cf. IV Ezra 8:59.

we cannot determine finally, though his refusal to speak of it militates against such a probability. He was not therefore primarily a prophet of doom, overcome with sentiments of revenge, but a bringer of hope for the righteous. Rather than gloating over the misfortune of the wicked,[304] he rejoices in the blessing that awaits those who are righteous, for they will live forever and share in God's royal dominion (5:15-16).[305]

## E. CONCLUSIONS

The foregoing study suggests that Ps-Solomon held within his purview both an individualistic and a collective eschatological strain. These two orientations are not necessarily mutually exclusive, but there is an essential difference between them and both are derived from

---

[304]Cf. I Enoch 62:12.

[305]A brief note must here be given on the question of resurrection. Whether Ps-Solomon subscribed to such a doctrine has been hotly debated (cf. the discussion of the various positions in Bückers, Unsterblichkeitslehre, pp. 32-37). The consensus of opinion, whether pro or con (apart from those who reject the idea on the a priori ground that the WS, as a product of Hellenistic-Jewish thought, could not teach a resurrection) is that there are no explicit references to resurrection of the dead in the book (Cf. Focke, Entstehung, p. 35; Heinisch, "Das jüngste Gericht", pp. 101-106; but cf. Weber, "Der Auferstehungsglaube", pp. 205-239, who seeks to establish that the doctrine was explicitly taught). However, on the basis of the concreteness of the eschatological judgment, a knowledge of, or an adherence to, the idea of a resurrection can be postulated for the author. Our analysis of the author's anthropology (see above, section B) prevents us from assuming that he made a strict distinction between body and soul, and thus we cannot determine how he conceived of a resurrection for the judgment (if in fact he did). We can say with some assurance, however, that the presence of righteous and wicked in the judgment demands some sort of psycho-somatic presence (Cf. K. Schubert, "Die Entwicklung der Auferstehungslehre", pp. 190-191).

divergent complexes of tradition. The collective-eschatological orientation derives from the historically-oriented prophetic-apocalyptic tradition, with which, as we have seen, the author shares the basic conviction that God is at work in history, that he has a purpose for it, and that despite the opposition of wickedness in the lives of unrighteous men and nations, he will bring his purposes to fulfilment at the end of time by reaching down into his cosmos in judgment and in salvation. Over against this perspective (or better, side by side with it) we find the individualistic-eschatological perspective (so clearly represented in the WS), namely the conviction that life with God, fellowship and communion with the divine, are the highest good, and that death is not the end, nor only the beginning of an indeterminate interim period, but that it means liberation, that it is but the gateway to eternal life.

It has often been thought that this perspective, as represented in the WS, is the result of the influx of Greek-Hellenistic thought. In such a view, the chronological-historical perspective of prophetic-apocalyptic thought is seen to be replaced by the spatial categories of the "here" and the "beyond", of the "phenomenal" and the "noumenal". What is significant is not so much history, as the escape from history, not a pressing on into the future of God, but a transcending of the present into the presence of God.[306]

On the basis of the study of Ps-Solomon's individual hope, this

---

[306]Philo is by far the clearest example of this Greek-Hellenistic influence.

writer cannot subscribe to the thesis that the author of the WS is indebted, for his individualistic perspective, to the Greek-Hellenistic tradition. To be sure, the author uses the technical terms ἀθανασία and ἀφθαρσία, but he fills these terms with a content that is, we believe, derived from a tradition in the Old Testament which E. Sellin has designated as a "mystical hope".[307] This hope arose not from the perception of some abstract idea of immortality -- essentially foreign to the Old Testament -- but from the experience of an intimate fellowship with God, which in turn gave rise to the conviction that this fellowship, tied as it was to the eternity of the divine life, was also unending.[308] In the Proverbs and some Psalms there dawns the dim realization that there is a death without physical death, and a life despite physical death,[309] a hope which for some individuals in their wrestling with the paradoxes of life and in their personal experience of God became an unshakeable certainty.[310] Thus, the Psalmist (cf. Ps 16) is certain that life before the face (i.e., in the presence) of God, in his fellowship, is beyond time, imperishable,

---

[307] E. Sellin, "Die alttestamentlich Hoffnung", pp. 266-287. In the following sketch of the development of this hope, we are indebted primarily to Sellin's excellent analysis (Cf. also Martin-Achard, "Nothing can separate us from the Living God", in From Death to Life, pp. 147-185.

[308] Cf. P. Kleinert, "Die Idee des Lebens im A.T.", p. 725

[309] E.g., Prov 8:35; 36; 2:18; 5:5; 7:26 f.; 9:18; 21:16; 4:13; 10:2, 11; 11:4; 13:12; 14; 14:27; 15:24.

[310] Pss 16; 49; 73.

and cannot be destroyed by death. The singer of Psalm 49 is certain that all men face physical death, and yet he affirms with even greater certainty that death and Sheol have no power over him, since the God whom he "knows" so intimately will take him to himself, despite death. The righteous man, affirms Ps 73, lives continually in God's presence; by virtue of this fellowship he has life, and, though he die, he shall live.

This conviction, that nothing shall separate the righteous man from the God in whom he places his trust and from whom he receives life -- this conviction which is unaccompanied by thoughts of retribution, of judgment, of resurrection -- this conviction is shared by the author of the WS: The righteous man, though he die, shall be at rest, in peace, in the hand of God, continuing there in the fellowship of love which was already a reality in this life. But the unrighteous man, who rejects the reality of such a relationship, experiences death in its fullness.

This individualistic hope is complete in itself. It needs no historical perspective, no added apocalyptic event to give it meaning. And so, as this individualistic hope ran its course side by side with the developing prophetic-apocalyptic hope, so we find it side by side, in unconnected juxtaposition with the prophetic-apocalyptic hope, in the WS. The former is the expression of a personal-experiential perspective; the latter is the expression of a historical-cosmic

perspective. What makes both realities possible is the presence and work of Wisdom in the lives of men and of history.[311]

[311]See Chapter V below for a discussion of union with Wisdom as the guarantee of both formulations of the eschatological realities.

# CHAPTER IV

# THE DUALITY OF ESCHATOLOGICAL CONCEPTIONS IN PAUL

## A. INTRODUCTION

The problem of the eschatology of Paul is one of the most difficult problems that confront the interpreter of the Pauline literature.[1] As we saw,[2] the materials that present eschatological conceptions have been the subject of rigorous scholarly discussions and debate, and it may be fairly said that many questions have not been satisfactorily answered. This is particularly true in regard to the two very difficult pericopes in I Cor 5 and Phil 1. The supposed (real or imagined?) "Hellenistic" flavor of these texts frequently led to the assumption that we must postulate a far-reaching development within Paul's eschatological conceptions. In its extreme form, this resulted in a Paul who, toward the end of his life, adopted the Hellenistic conception of the immortality of the soul, having finally rejected the remnants of his Jewish-apocalyptic and primitive-Christian heritage concerning the resurrection of the dead. We saw that this hypothesis -- whatever the reasons proposed for such a radical change in the Apostle's conception -- was unacceptable.[3] Nevertheless, the problem raised by the

---

[1] Cf. J. N. Sevenster, "Einige Bemerkungen über den 'Zwischenzustand' bei Paulus", NTS 1 (1954), p. 291.

[2] Above, Chapter I.

[3] See Chapter I, E. for that discussion. The primarily general

texts which called forth this radical solution remained: namely, how are we to understand the individualistic eschatological conceptions present in the Pauline literature, side by side with collective, end-historical conceptions that include particularly the parousia and the resurrection? Various attempts to reconcile this diversity within the eschatological thought of Paul were noted briefly,[4] and tentatively rejected as inadequate.[5]

In an attempt to break new ground in this much debated area, and to shed new light, it was suggested that the apocryphal book, the Wisdom of Solomon -- with its duality of individual and corporate eschatological elements and the undergirding of these elements by the conception of a union with the divine figure, Wisdom[6] -- may have influenced Paul in his own conception and formulation of diverse conceptions of the eschatological realities, and thus provide a key for a better understanding of Paul's complex eschatology.

In a second chapter, we investigated the question of the possibility of contact between the Wisdom of Solomon and Paul, establishing both the possibility that this book was known and read in Palestine in the first century A.D. and that thus Paul could have been influenced by

---

considerations provided there will need to be supported by the more detailed investigation of the textual material (see below).

[4]See Chapter I, F.

[5]A more thorough discussion of these attempts to reconcile diversity within Paul's eschatological thought will be given below.

[6]See Chapter V, below.

its various conceptions from very early in his life,[7] as well as the strong probability that, for various formulations in his letters, Paul was in fact indebted to this apocryphal work. In light of the fact that this Hellenistic-Jewish work has often been seen to present a thoroughly Hellenistic conception of man and of his destiny -- namely the dichotomy between matter and spirit, between the body and the soul, and the conception of the immortality of the soul -- it was necessary, in a third chapter, to undertake a detailed investigation of the Wisdom of Solomon's anthropological and eschatological conceptions. This analysis showed that the work's conception of man's destiny stood neither within Hellenism nor, as isolated critics of this conception had held, squarely within the Jewish prophetic-apocalyptic tradition. We found, rather, that the author stands within two traditions: he shares, with prophetic-apocalypticism, the historical-future perspective of an inbreaking of God into human history, a defeat of all those powers that are opposed to God's reign of righteousness, and of an eternal life of the redeemed in the presence of God. But he also stands within a tradition which is only slightly and very occasionally attested in the literature, a tradition which came to understand fellowship with God in the present as such an abiding reality that it could not conceive of death as an end to that reality, and consequently interpreted the death of those who in this

---

[7]This was significant in light of the fact that where some influence on Paul by the WS had been acknowledged, such influence was seen to have come via Diaspora Judaism in the context of Paul's extensive contacts with this Judaism during his missionary activity. Thus, the WS's impact was seen as a contributing factor in the development of Paul's "late" Hellenistic eschatology.

life knew themselves related to God as assumption, as translation from this present existence into the presence of God. In the isolated texts where this shadowy tradition, this "mystical hope", emerges, we may perhaps speak of an "explosion of faith". In the Wisdom of Solomon, however, these hopes, expressed prior to its writing, become certainties of faith and objects of theological reflection. Death, reinterpreted as assumption of the individual, is placed in the context of a wisdom-theology in which union with the divine figure of Wisdom becomes the basis, as well as the means, for the "death-event" which ushers one into the very presence of God.

That Paul stands at least to some extent within the prophetic-apocalyptic tradition is generally acknowledged today. One needs only to read I Cor 15 or I Thess 4, as well as numerous other passages throughout his letters, to recognize this. With primitive Christianity, he shared the belief that with the Christ-event the eschaton had already broken in (cf. I Cor 10:11), although recognizing that in its fullness it was yet to come with the parousia of Christ. In that faith, Paul never wavered; even in the "late"[8] letter to the Philippians this orientation toward the future of God remains intact. But side by side with this historical orientation, this conception of a corporate-eschatological event which intends the final redemption of all believers (I Cor 15), indeed, the redemption of the cosmos (Rom 8:19-21) from the enslaving power of death (I Cor 15:26), stands what may be described as

---

[8]If the Ephesian-imprisonment provenance be accepted for this letter, the possibility for development could be excluded on a priori grounds.

a "mystical hope", a hope which sees in death a gateway to immediate life in union with Christ and in the presence of God. This conception of the individualistic eschatological reality has been equated, improperly, we believe, with Hellenistic conceptions of immortality, or interpreted, again improperly, as an interim condition analogous to a variety of conceptions within Judaism. Within the context of this impasse, it is suggested by this study that the conception of death as an event of translation into the presence of God, as worked out in the Wisdom of Solomon, may provide the proper interpretative background[9] for Paul's individualistic hope, as it comes to expression particularly in II Cor 5 and Phil 1.

## B. "TO DEPART AND BE WITH CHRIST" (PHIL 1:21-24)[10]

### 1. Exegetical Considerations

The phrases within this pericope that primarily demand our attention are ἀποθανεῖν κέρδος ("to die is gain", vs. 21), and εἰς τὸ ἀναλῦσαι καὶ σὺν Χριστῷ εἶναι ("to depart and be with Christ", vs. 23). Our exegesis must concern itself with the context of these

---

[9] Cf. Sevenster, "Zwischenzustand", p. 291: "Wer die modernen Kommentare...zu II Kor 5:1-10 oder zu Phil 1:23 aufschlägt, wird nicht nur keine Übereinstimmung in Einzelheiten der Exegese finden, sondern Einstimmigkeit im Ausgangspunkt, in der Bestimmung des Hintergrunds der Gedanken des Paulus, vermissen".

[10] We may begin our analysis with the Phil passage, although it may be chronologically the later of the two, since it is clearer in its assertions than the Cor passage. Our procedure is thereby in accord with the sound hermeneutical principle that the more ambiguous texts ought to be interpreted in light of the less ambiguous. Cf. F. Guntermann, Die Eschatologie des hl. Paulus (NTAb 13 4/5; Münster, 1932), p. 278.

expressions, with the movement of the Apostle's thought within which they function. The precise content of these expressions, however, is not developed within this passage. Either Paul presupposes a comprehension of these conceptions by those whom he addresses,[11] or he is here giving creative expression to a hope within him.[12] In any case, the meaning of these expressions must be determined to some extent by means of religio-historical considerations.

Paul is not concerned here with the "how" of the being-with-Christ; he is concerned with the "that", and it is a concern that emerges out of a concrete situation. This situation is characterized by imprisonment[13] and by a trial whose final outcome -- either being freed or being executed -- is uncertain.[14] In 1:12-20, Paul gives a "situation

---

[11]Thus P. Hoffmann, Die Toten in Christus. Eine religionsgeschichtliche und exegetische Untersuchung zur paulinischen Eschatologie (NTAbh, N.F., 2; Aschendorff, 1966), pp. 286, 290, 325.

[12]Cf. O. Schmitz, "Zum Verständnis von Philipper 1,21", in Neutestamentliche Studien für G. Heinrici (Leipzig, 1914), p. 164.

[13]1:7, 13, 14, 17; cf. 1:19.

[14]Paul's conviction (οἶδα) that he expects to be freed (1:19), and his assurance (οἶδα) that he will remain for continued service among the Philippians, must be understood as expressions of hope, not certainties (1:25). For in the same context he does indeed face the possibility of his death (1:20 ff.; cf. 2:17)! Cf. J. Gnilka, Der Philipperbrief (Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, 3; Freiburg-Basel-Wien, 1968), p. 69; F. W. Beare, The Epistle to the Philippians (HNTC; New York, 1959), p. 62, understands the σωτηρία of 1:19 in terms of "ultimate vindication by God", rather than as a temporal reference to physical deliverance from imprisonment. Cf. also, E. Lohmeyer, Der Brief an die Philipper (9th ed.; KEK, 9/1; Göttingen, 1953), pp. 50-51, who takes a position similar to Beare, supporting it with the affirmation that Paul is unconcerned with the "äussere[n] Fortgang der gerichtlichen Angelegenheit". That for Paul the outcome of his situation is not "gleichgültig" seems to be evident from his desire to be available to the Philippians in continued ministry.

report", in which he emphasizes the success of the gospel despite, or better, because of his imprisonment.[15] His personal status, from the point of view of some detractors, is of little concern to him -- as long as the Gospel is proclaimed.[16] The absolute and ultimate primacy of the proclamation and, through it, of the glorification of Christ (1:19-20) determines the climax of this situation report and leads into a discussion in which the point of view has shifted. The turning point in the text is located in Paul's insistence that μεγαλυνθήσεται Χριστὸς not merely by way of the proclamation, but ἐν τῷ σώματί μου , i.e., in the very real, concrete physicalness of his being,[17] and that εἴτε διὰ ζωῆς εἴτε διὰ θανάτου. Death is here mentioned for the first time and shows, in terms of its antithesis to life, the final possibility of service to Christ which the servant might render in his existence.[18]

Thus far, in a certain sense, the "fate of Christ",[19] i.e., his

---

[15] 1:12-14.

[16] 1:15-18.

[17] Cf. Gnilka, Philipper, p. 68: "σῶμα bezeichnet hier nicht einen Teil des menschlichen Seins, sondern die 'somatische' Verfasstheit der menschlichen Existenz, die im Leib erlebt und erleicdet". Cf. also, E. Schweizer, s.v. "σῶμα" in TWNT VII, pp. 1062 ff. J. H. Michael, The Epistle of Paul to the Philippians (MNTC; New York, 1929), p. 51, translates "in my own person".

[18] The εἴτε διὰ ζωῆς ...is intimately tied to the ἐν τῷ σώματί μου; that is to say, the glorification of Christ is to take place either in an ongoing, bodily life, or in the coming-to-end of this bodily existence. Cf. E. Haupt, Die Gefangenschaftsbriefe (7th ed.; KEK 9; Göttingen, 1902), p. 31.

[19] Gnilka, op. cit., p. 70, speaks of the transition from "Christusschicksal" to "Paulusschicksal".

glorification, was tied to the situation, the fate, of his Apostle. From vs. 21 on, the fate of the Apostle is seen to be intimately tied to Christ. The change in emphasis is also noticeable in the fact that in vs. 20 Paul envisages the possibility: "either death or life", but does not cross the threshold of death because he sees it as a means for the glorification of Christ. In vs. 21, his perspective goes beyond the ἐν τῷ σώματι and crosses the threshold of the possibility of his death to a consideration of the meaning this might have, both for him as well as for the church.[20]

The antithesis ζωή - θάνατος of vs. 20 is caught up in vs. 21 and leads on into a series of parallel formulations and explications ending at vs. 24. Although this series is capable of a number of structural interpretations,[21] the following most adequately reflects the progression of Paul's thought:[22]

---

[20]Cf. Hoffmann, Die Toten, p. 287.

[21]Hoffmann, ibid., p. 293, proposes a chiastic arrangement by including vs. 20c: life-death; vs. 21: death; vs. 22: life; this is problematic, since vs. 21 can hardly be restricted to refer solely to the death of Paul. W. Michaelis, Der Brief des Paulus an die Philipper (Theologischer Handkommentar zum NT, 11; Leipzig, 1935), pp. 24-25, thinks vs. 22 interprets vs. 21a, and vs. 23 takes up the concept of vs. 21b. This is also difficult, for vs. 21a ( τὸ ζῆν Χριστός ) cannot simply be equated with τὸ ζῆν ἐν σαρκί (vs. 22).

[22]Thus Gnilka, op. cit., p. 70; cf. Lohmeyer, Philipper, p. 58, n. 1, who criticized a similar scheme by M. Dibelius, An die Philipper (3rd ed.; HbzNT 11; 1937), p. 66, by asserting that such a scheme breaks the literary parallelism between the antithesis life-death in vss. 20 and 21. Contra Lohmeyer, it must be said that meaning should not be sacrificed to literary and stylistic precision. We can hardly demand stylistic precision in a writing which expresses such deep feeling and intense emotions. Cf. J. B. Lightfoot, St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians (rev. ed., London-New York, 1891), p. 92.

21a: ἐμοὶ γὰρ τὸ ζῆν Χριστός
21b: καὶ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν κέρδος
22: εἰ δὲ τὸ ζῆν ἐν σαρκί...
23: τὸ ἀναλῦσαι καὶ σὺν Χριστῷ εἶναι
24: τὸ δὲ ἐπιμένειν τῇ σαρκί

The introductory ἐμοί clearly sets what follows apart from common or popular opinion;[23] it may even be that Paul is bringing something to expression which is not "Gemeingut christlicher Lebensbeurteilung".[24] Rather, we have here the expression of Paul's personal conviction and faith.[25]

Stylistically, τὸ ζῆν and τὸ ἀποθανεῖν of vs. 21 parallel διὰ ζωῆς and διὰ θανάτου of vs. 20. However, a substantial equation of these elements is prevented by the introduction of the Χριστός. If vs. 21a were purely a reference to earthly existence, then we would simply have a strange echo of vs. 20, and the assertion of vs. 21b that "death is gain" would be completely without foundation; indeed, in a sense, it would be un-Christian, since similar convictions were an intimate part of the Hellenistic mood.[26] Contrarily, the assertion of 21a

---

[23]Cf. Lohmeyer, Philipper, p. 57, n. 5: "...in dem ἐμοί (wird) eine bewusste Distanz von der communis opinio deutlich". Cf. Hoffmann, Die Toten, who, on p. 293, speaks of the ἐμοί γάρ as indicating that what follows is Paul's "persönliche Einstellung", although he affirms at the same time (p. 290) that what follows "wird als bekannt vorausgesetzt" (sic!).

[24]Schmitz, "Zu Phil, 1,21", p. 161.

[25]Cf. M. R. Vincent, Epistles to the Philippians and to Philemon (ICC; Edinburgh, 1897), p. 26.

[26]See below on the religio-historical investigation.

makes the assertion of 21b possible, if the phrase τὸ ζῆν Χριστός is properly understood. It is commonly acknowledged that the articular infinitive τὸ ζῆν has the force of a substantive,[27] and is thus identical with ἡ ζωή .[28] Although τὸ ζῆν is grammatically the subject of the phrase, with Χριστός as predicate, it is very probable that in terms of the essence of the phrase, Χριστός becomes the dominating subject.[29] Paul is explaining in this phrase (note the introductory γάρ ) how it is possible for him to make the really astounding claim εἴτε διὰ ζωῆς εἴτε διὰ θανάτου. While normally the subject is characterized in a certain respect by the predicate (as is the case in the following τὸ ἀποθανεῖν κέρδος), the Χριστός must really be seen to catch the τὸ ζῆν up within itself, so that the latter becomes identical with the former. The result of this transformation can be formulated in the assertion: "Christ is life".[30] Thus, what began as a statement about life becomes an affirmation about Christ.[31] To Paul, then, Christ is life, and because he is life, the antithesis between death and life is overcome,[32] and death can become κέρδος, "gain".

---

[27]Cf. Blass-Debrunner, par. 399.

[28]See the Greek texts cited by Lohmeyer, Philipper, p. 57, n. 4. Cf. also, F. Rienecker, Sprachlicher Schlüssel zum griechischen Neuen Testament (12th ed., Giessen-Basel, 1966), p. 457.

[29]Cf. Schmitz, "Zu Phil. 1,21", p. 157: "Der Inhalt der Aussage ist in das eine Wort gepresst: Χριστός . Subject und Prädikat sind auf die einfachste Weise....gleichgesetzt" (cf. pp. 157-163 for the following).

[30]Hoffmann, Die Toten, p. 294, translates: "Christus ist mein Leben".

[31]Cf. Gnilka, Philipper, p. 71.

The equation τὸ ζῆν = χριστός not only makes the κέρδος-character of death possible, but reaches beyond that into the explication -- in the following vss. 22-24 -- of the two possibilities confronting Paul. Thus, τὸ ζῆν ἐν σαρκί [33] can be characterized by καρπὸς ἔργου ("fruitful work" - vs. 22). And since Christ is the very "ground of being", that life which is identical with him cannot be abrogated by death, but can only be discovered in its deeper dimensions beyond it (vs. 23). Σὺν χριστῷ εἶναι is therefore also overshadowed by the all-embracing τὸ ζῆν χριστός.

2. The Interpretation

From the above structural analysis of the relationships within the passage it becomes clear why Paul could weigh the alternatives death-life and affirm the necessity of continued existence [ἐν] σαρκί (1:24), although recognizing that σὺν χριστῷ εἶναι would be πολλῷ μᾶλλον κρεῖσσον (1:23). The two possibilities are set over against each other: death is gain,[34] but (δὲ) life in the flesh[35] means fruitful work.[36]

---

[33]This phrase is clearly restrictive vis-à-vis τὸ ζῆν χριστός. It denotes an aspect of the total "sphere" of existence ἐν χριστῷ.

[34]As with τὸ ζῆν the τὸ ἀποθανεῖν can be substantivized, and is therefore identical with ὁ θάνατος. This then leads to the equation ὁ θάνατος = κέρδος.

[35]It is certainly wrong, with Lohmeyer, Philipper, p. 64, to interpret τὸ ζῆν ἐν σαρκί, and the parallel τὸ ἐπιμένειν τῇ σαρκί, as designating existence within the power of σάρξ ("...das 'Fleisch' erscheint als die Macht, 'bei der' Paulus zu bleiben hat wie der Legionär bei seinem Befehlshaber"). That Paul could conceive of "flesh" as a "power-sphere" is of course clear from such phrases as, e.g., κατὰ σάρκα ὄντες (Rom 8:5) and ἐν σαρκὶ ὄντες (Rom 8:7). But in the Philippian passage the phrase simply means "physical, earthly existence", as the contrast between ἀναλῦσαι (1:23) and ἐπιμένειν (1:24) makes abundantly clear.

[36]Michaelis' suggestion that καρπός is eschatologically oriented,

Paul is torn[37] between the two possibilities; he does not know which he would choose. So he weighs the possibilities again: the phrase τὸ ἀναλῦσαι (vs. 23) parallels τὸ ἀποθανεῖν (vs. 21), and σὺν Χριστῷ εἶναι (vs. 23) parallels κέρδος (vs. 21) and gives it its content. That is, death is gain because it means life σὺν Χριστῷ. Thus, as far as he personally is concerned, he is moved in that direction.[38] But his own desire moves into the background, for it is not the governing principle of his life,[39] and for the sake of others, he affirms life ἐν σαρκί.[40]

The stark contrasts between the two possibilities seem to admit of but one interpretation. For Paul it is either death or life, either

---

paralleling κέρδος (Philipper, p. 26), seems not to be warranted by the context. The vss. 24-26 explicate the meaning that must be attached to καρπός, namely, fruitful service among the Philippians. Cf. Hauck, in TDNT III, s.v. "καρπός", p. 615, who defines it as fruitful missionary labor.

[37]The basic meaning of συνέχω is clearly to "hold or press together", "to bind"; but in a transferred sense, in keeping with the context in which Paul must choose, we may translate "torn between"; cf. Bauer, p. 797. But see G. Friedrich, Der Brief an die Philipper (9th ed.; NTD 8; Göttingen, 1962), p. 104; and Lohmeyer, Philipper, p. 62, n. 2, who think that Paul is saying that his fate is determined by a higher power.

[38]Michaelis, Philipper, p. 26, interprets ἐπιθυμία as "egotistic desire". However, the word can have either a positive or a negative connotation (cf. Bauer, p. 293), and the present context demands the former. Cf. Gnilka, Philipperbrief, p. 73, n. 24: "of course ἐπιθυμία has here a positive sense".

[39]Beare, Philippians, p. 63.

[40]Michael, Philippians, p. 59, renders the phrase "to remain in the flesh" with "live on here below". Cf. Hoffmann, Die Toten, p. 290, who renders with "das Am-Leben-blieben".

departing or remaining, either being with Christ or being with the Philippians. The event of death ( ἀναλύειν )[41] is intimately related to the "being with Christ". The simple καί ties the two phrases together in such a way that the second phrase ( σὺν Χριστῷ εἶναι ) indicates the meaning of the first ( τὸ ἀναλῦσαι ).[42] Thus it is abundantly clear why Paul could view his own death as a possibility to be desired: he expected an immediate presence with Christ on the other side of death.[43] Only this meaning seems to be warranted by the plain sense of the passage. And yet it is exactly at this point where interpretations have differed so widely. It is therefore necessary to subject the positions which have been taken to a critical analysis, and to do this in light of a closer investigation of the significant terms and ideas in Phil 1:21-24.

According to Michaelis,[44] Phil 1:23 must be understood in terms

---

[41]See below.

[42]Cf. Hoffmann, Die Toten, p. 289: "Das καί ist explikativ zu verstehen..."

[43]A number of scholars understand the passage in this sense [e.g., M. Dibelius, Paul (Toronto, 1953), p. 110; Vincent, Philippians, p. 29; F. Guntermann, Die Eschatologie des hl. Paulus (NTAb XIII, 4/5; Münster, 1932), pp. 270-302; M. Rissi, Studien zum zweiten Korintherbrief (AbThANT 56; Zürich, 1969), pp. 95-96; W. Manson, "Eschatology in the New Testament", in Eschatology (SJTh Occasional Papers, 2; Edinburgh, 1953), pp. 13-14; Beare, Philippians, pp. 64-65; Michael, Philippians, pp. 57-58; Lightfoot, Philippians, p. 93; P. Althaus, "Retraktationen zu Eschatologie" ThLZ 75 (1950), pp. 253-258. W. G. Kümmel, Die Theologie des Neuen Testaments nach seinen Hauptzeugen (Grundrisse zum Neuen Testament 3; Göttingen, 1969), pp. 211-214]. It is of course clear, as we shall see below, that there are great differences in the understanding of the nature of that immediate presence.

[44]Philipper, p. 26.

of Phil 3:11, where Paul expresses the hope that he might "attain the resurrection from the dead". Accordingly, Phil 1:23 includes the resurrection. It is to be located between the ἀναλῦσαι (death) and the σὺν Χριστῷ εἶναι. The latter takes place on the day of the parousia.[45] This interpretation is based on the presupposition that generally in Paul, σὺν Χριστῷ εἶναι lies on the other side of the resurrection. Michaelis nowhere supports this assumption. It is of course clear that the σὺν Χριστῷ formulation[46] is used by Paul of the eschatological fulfillment at the parousia,[47] but it cannot be restricted to that usage.[48] A further weighty objection against the attempt to relate the σὺν Χριστῷ εἶναι to a future-eschatological expectation is the fact that the problem of the antithesis which Paul

---

[45] In Gnilka's opinion (Philipperbrief, p. 75, n. 36), Michaelis' interpretation "...sieht an der Problematik des Textes vollkommen vorbei. Sie stellt einen gewaltsamen Versuch dar, Phil 1,23 mit I Thess 4:17 zu harmonisieren".

[46] Cf. Lohmeyer, "Syn Christō", in Festgabe für A. Deissmann (Tübingen, 1927), pp. 218-257. Since the actual σὺν Χριστῷ appears only twice in Paul (Rom 6:8, Phil 1:23), paralleling the freely interchangeable σὺν κυρίῳ (I Thess 4:17), σὺν αὐτῷ (I Thess 5:10, 4:14; II Cor 13:4) and σὺν Ἰησοῦ (II Cor 4:14), it is not quite correct to speak of a "formula". Cf. Grundmann, in TWNT VII, s.v. "σὺν ", p. 781, n. 79.

[47] I Thess 4:17 (cf. 4:14, 5:10; Rom 8:17). E. Schweizer, "Die 'Mystik' des Sterbens und Auferstehens mit Christus bei Paulus", EvTh 26/5 (1966), pp. 239-257, assigns Rom 8:6 and II Cor 13:4 also to this group. We believe both should be taken in a present sense. On Rom 8:6 see Chapter V, section D, below.

[48] Rom 6:8, 17; II Cor 13:4; possibly I Thess 5:10 (cf. Rom 14:8). Cf. Hoffmann, Die Toten, p. 289: "Bei der Vielfalt der Anwendungen der Formel lässt sie sich nicht einseitig auf diese [eschatologische] Bedeutung beschränken".

is weighing in the balance would be eliminated. Dibelius correctly observes that "wenn das σὺν Χριστῷ εἶναι erst nach der Parusie möglich wäre, dann bestände die Alternative, bei Christus-bei euch, gar nicht zu Recht. Dann würde jeder jetzt gestorbene auch erst in der Endzeit zu Christus kommen, d.h. zur selben Zeit wie die anderen Christen auch".[49] E. Schweizer follows Michaelis, although he offers a different rationale. "Since Phil 3:20 f. speaks of the expected (imminent, 4:5) parousia, the being-with-Christ of 1:23 cannot be different from the eschatological union".[50] Schweizer's reasoning here is clearly based on the unwarranted a priori assumption that one and the same writing cannot contain divergent or contradictory conceptions.[51] He goes on to argue that "Paul probably never reflected on the problem of the time between death and the parousia". This is not very likely.[52] According to Phil 1:25, Paul hopes to continue living, and he continues to wait for the parousia (3:20 f., 4:5). Yet at the same time, he is ready to die now, indeed he would even prefer to die now. He therefore must have known quite well what that would mean for him. To postulate with Schweizer a Pauline

---

[49] Philipper, p. 69.

[50] Schweizer, "Die Mystik", pp. 239-240, n. 1. Cf. also, H. A. A. Kennedy, St. Paul's Conception of the Last Things (The Cunningham Lectures for 1904; New York, 1904), pp. 272-273.

[51] We have seen that the juxtaposition of two divergent formulations of the eschatological realities is certainly true for the Wisdom of Solomon.

[52] For the following, cf. M. Rissi, Studien, pp. 95-96, n. 254.

consciousness of a possible interval between death and resurrection[53] does not do justice to the dynamic involved in the σὺν Χριστῷ formulation. The preposition σὺν has "personal character",[54] and "denotes a unity between persons who share with each other, come together, accompany each other, work together".[55] The conception of such an intense fellowship with Christ can hardly be equated with "some kind of peaceful sleep in the hand of Christ".[56]

A further attempt to eliminate the difficulty posed by the Philippian passage is one in which the immediate presence with Christ after death is held to be the special privilege of martyrs. According to Kabisch, Phil 1:23 must be understood in the sense of a "proleptic resurrection"[57] which leads immediately to union with Christ. But such a resurrection, prior to a general resurrection, is only possible for one whose life and death, like Paul's, is a complete imitatio Christi.[58]

---

[53]"Dying and Rising with Christ", in New Testament Issues, ed. by R. Batey (Harper Forum Books; New York, 1970), pp. 173-190, on p. 174.

[54]Gnilka, Philipperbrief, p. 75.

[55]W. Grundmann, in TWNT VII, s.v. "σὺν", p. 770; cf. our discussion on the σὺν-formulations in the Wisdom of Solomon, Chapter V, section B, below.

[56]Schweizer, "Dying and Rising", p. 174.

[57]R. Kabisch, Die Eschatologie des Paulus in ihren Zusammenhängen mit dem Gesamtbegriff des Paulinismus (Göttingen, 1893), pp. 301-305. He uses the phrase "beschleunigte Auferstehung".

[58]Ibid., p. 305: "Zu dieser beschleunigten Auferstehung ist aber eben nur dies gänzliche Nachbilden des Daseins Christi, das auch seinen Leidenstod nacherlebt, das zureichende Mittel..."

A. Schweitzer likewise restricts the hope expressed in 1:23 to one who faces a martyr's death. Paul "is speaking only of what he expects for himself....On the ground of his own self-consciousness (he expects) that in case of his dying a martyr-death a special kind of resurrection will be vouchsafed to him".[59] Paul, so argues Schweitzer, had already come to the conclusion, as regards the dead in Christ, that they would not rise in the same condition as the rest of the dead since they had already undergone with Christ a dying and rising again, but that on their awaking from the sleep of death would immediately possess an imperishable corporeity, and in this will be rapt away to meet Jesus in the air (I Thess 4:17).[60] Paul, who is conscious of having undergone in a unique fashion the dying with Christ and of having already experienced being rapt away to heaven (II Cor 12:2-4),[61] may well therefore, in face of his probable death, have attained to the expectation of experiencing a still more privileged resurrection than that of the others who have died in Christ. "Thus, there arises in him the hope that in the case of his martyr-death, he will be rapt away, by an immediate

---

[59]A. Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, tr. by. W. Montgomery (London, 1931), p. 136.

[60]Ibid., p. 137.

[61]Schweitzer seems to attach great significance to this reference about a "rapture into the third heaven" in an attempt to account for the origin of Paul's individual hope (pp. 136-137). In view of the very strange and nebulous conception expressed in II Cor 12:2-4, and the difficulty of its interpretation (cf. the commentaries), it seems unwarranted to utilize it in the interpretation of Phil 1:23.

individual resurrection, to where Christ is".[62]

The above interpretation has no basis whatever in the text.[63] The idea of immediate union with Christ is expressed without any reference to the special nature of Paul's death. Nor is it possible to find any hint in the Pauline writings that would indicate that Paul differentiated between his own relationship to Christ and that of other Christians.[64] Such a position of privilege for martyrs has no parallel either in the Jewish background[65] or in primitive Christianity.[66]

---

[62] Ibid.; cf. Lohmeyer, Philipper, who seems to understand the passage in a similar sense: "Wenn er (der Tod) aber Gewinn ist, so ist er es allein für den Märtyrer, für ihn allein ist er die Krönung des Martyriums..." (p. 64). E. Bammel, "Judenverfolgung und Naherwartung. Zur Eschatologie des Ersten Thessalonicherbriefs", ZThK 56 (1959), pp. 294-315, on p. 311, n. 5, assents to Lohmeyer's interpretation.

[63] Lohmeyer's attempt to differentiate between the ἐν χριστῷ condition of all Christians and the identification of the life of the martyr with the life of Christ (1:21), is certainly wrong. (Philipper, p. 59).

[64] Cf. Gnilka, Philipperbrief, p. 75: "Es ist durch nichts angedeutet, dass die Aufnahme in die Gemeinschaft mit Christus nicht allen Christen, sondern nur Priviligierten, den Blutzeugen, zugesprochen würde".

[65] Cf. Hoffmann, Die Toten, p. 290: "in den jüdischen Parallelen lässt sich eine Einschränkung des Paradiesaufenthaltes auf Martyrer nicht nachweisen".

[66] Tertullian seems to have been the first to differentiate clearly between the fate of the martyrs and that of all Christians; here it is polemically oriented. Cf. Dibelius, Philipper, p. 69.

If then the individual hope expressed in 1:23 cannot be assimilated to the parousia hope, nor restricted to privileged individuals, then we must seek to understand it in other terms.

3. Religio-Historical Considerations

One line of investigation attaches great importance to the observation that the passage contains words and phrases which recall a host of conceptions from the Hellenistic environment, expressed in identical or similar terms.[67] These conceptions and terms are: 1) the idea that death ( τὸ ἀποθανεῖν ) is gain ( κέρδος ); 2) the use of the word ἀναλῦσαι for "dying"; 3) the characterization of that death as "much, much better" ( πολλῷ μᾶλλον κρεῖσσον ). Because of the presence of these elements, the question has been asked: Does Paul here give expression to the popularized philosophic conception of the immortality of the soul which, after the disintegration of the body, this vile prison, begins its homeward journey to that higher world to which it essentially belongs? The most recent, thorough attempt to answer this question in the affirmative[68] is that by J. Dupont.[69] It is in reference to his interpretation that the following critical analysis will be made.

From the outset it cannot be denied that Paul was dependent on the language of his time and that he made use of it in order to be

---

[67]Cf. E. Schweizer, "Die Mystik", pp. 239-240, n. 1, who, although he rejects the Hellenistic interpretation, says: "It is only to be admitted that here, as also in II Cor. 5:1-10, the Greek language has had a greater impact".

[68]With modifications, of course.

[69]In Syn Christō. L'union avec le Christ suivant Saint Paul (Paris, 1952), pp. 173 ff.

understood. But the critical question to be asked of Dupont is whether formal linguistic contacts automatically imply or demand the adoption of particular philosophical concepts attached to the use of these terms in some quarters. Hoffmann[70] has pointed out that it is important to be aware of the relation that exists between the linguistic form and content of an expression, since an original relation may no longer be present in the widespread and general use of the expression.[71]

The Pauline τὸ ἀποθανεῖν κέρδος reproduces a quite common conception and even in form corresponds to similar formulations in Greek literature. A survey of the texts cited by Dupont[72] demonstrates the very general nature of these expressions.[73] Death is to be sought,

---

[70] Die Toten, p. 297.

[71] It is, for instance, possible that the technical, philosophical meaning of an expression is secondary, i.e., that the term had, and continues to have, a meaning or meanings quite other than the philosophical. It is also possible that originally technical, philosophical expressions have lost their precision and have taken on quite general meanings in the context of popular usage. It is a methodological weakness of Dupont's work that he does not take these matters into serious consideration.

[72] Cf. the many texts cited by Dupont, op. cit., p. 175.

[73] Cf. Pausanias, Mess. 7,11: πρό τε δὴ τηλικούτων κακῶν κέρδος εἶναι καλῶς τινα ἀποθανεῖν ("better a noble death than such evils"). Sophocles, Antig. 461 f.: "...if death is thereby hastened, I shall count it gain. For death is gain to him whose life, like mine, is full of misery" ( κατθανὼν κέρδος φέρει ). Aeschylus, Prom. 747 ff. "What gain have I then in life? Why did I not hurl myself from this rugged rock...[to be] freed from all my sufferings? Better it were to die once for all than linger out all my days in misery..." (The terms κέρδος , θανεῖν , and κρεῖσσον are here used together.) Euripides, Med. 145, 146: "...for in living wherein any more is my gain? ( τί δέ μοι ζῆν ἔτι κερδος ;)....Would God I might bring to an ending the life that I loathe, and behind me might cast all its burden of pain!" (The above texts and translations are cited according to the Loeb Classical Library editions; see Bibliography.)

death is gain, because it brings deliverance from a life that is full of hardship and toil and pain, it brings an end to a life that has become unbearable. Over against this general conception of death as κέρδος, the Platonic usage represents a more refined conception: death is gain because it means the deliverance of the soul from the body.[74] It should be eminently clear that the similar Pauline formulation has an essentially and radically different orientation. For Paul, death as gain is not dominated by a negative valuation of earthly existence or bodily life.[75] Rather, it is based on a view of earthly life which is dominated by Christ ( τὸ ζῆν Χριστός ) and the certainty that what lies on the other side of death is only an intensification of what is already true of the present. Paul's longing for death is not based on the negative observation that the σῶμα is a σῆμα, but on the positive expectation σὺν Χριστῷ εἶναι. And that is why Paul is even able to affirm existence ἐν σαρκί as an existence that can bring καρπὸς ἔργου.[76]

That death, described as "departure",[77] is said to be "much,

---

[74]Cf. Plato, Apol. 40 DE: θαυμάσιον κέρδος ἂν εἴη ὁ θάνατος ("...death would be a marvellous gain"). The reason given for this assertion is that according to some, death is the transfer of the soul from this place [body] to some other place.

[75]Cf. Gnilka, Philipper, p. 71: "Das 'Mehr' das Paulus vom Sterben erhofft...ist nicht in einer resignierenden Abwendung vom Leben begründet".

[76]In view of Paul's positive attitude toward life and toward the body (Phil 1:20, 22, 24; cf. II Cor 4:10; I Cor 6:12 ff.), it is almost impossible to see how Lohmeyer, in reference to Paul's "remaining in the flesh", could say: "In the very moment in which death seemed to lead him to freedom, the demand is made to bend again under the old and hated yoke. Thus, the phrase is tinged with the bitterness of personal pain" (Philipper, p. 65). Contra Lohmeyer, cf. Beare, Philippians, pp. 62-63.

[77]See below.

much better" in comparison with continued existence, sounds as Greek as the affirmation that "death is gain". The intense comparative πολλῷ μᾶλλον κρεῖσσον echoes similar comparisons of death and life both in Greek-Hellenistic[78] as also in Jewish[79] literature. "Von allen Seiten klingt es: 'Besser sterben als leben'".[80] But when Dupont seeks to postulate literary dependence, implying a dependence of content, he is certainly going too far.[81] That Paul here echoes the language of his environment is clear; but the use of such an almost proverbial expression[82] does not mean the adoption of the mood, the Weltanschauung that lies behind it. One need only read the reasons given for the assertion that dying is better than living in order to recognize the fundamental difference between Paul and these pessimistic assertions.[83] The flight from the difficulties of life, or the flight of the soul from the bodily tomb -- these are strangers to the thought of Paul, and we dare not let

---

[78]Cf. Plato, Gorg, 492 E: "The stones and the dead would be the happiest of all". This is uttered in a context in which it is also said that the body (σῶμα) is the grave (σῆμα) of the soul. Isocrates, Archid. 89: πολὺ γὰρ κρεῖττον ... τελευτῆσαι τὸν βίον μᾶλλον ἢ ζῆν ἐν ταῖς ἀτιμίαις ("it is much better to end life than to live in this disgrace").

[79]Cf. Sir 40:28 - κρεῖσσον ἀποθανεῖν.

[80]Lohmeyer, Philipper, p. 64.

[81]Op. cit., p. 177, 190. The only parallel containing all three comparatives is from Isocr. (cf. n. 78 above). Yet here, as Hoffmann, Die Toten, p. 298, n. 43, points out, the μᾶλλον does not intensify the first comparative, but only repeats it.

[82]Lohmeyer, Philipper, p. 64.

[83]Cf. nn. 78, 79, above.

terminological affinities overshadow essential differences. Finally, the use of the term ἀναλῦσαι to describe dying as a "departing"[84] has also led Dupont to postulate Paul's dependence on Greek ideas. He correctly sees, with many others,[85] that the term ἀναλῦσαι is a common euphemistic circumlocution for "to die".[86] He also recognizes that the Vulgate rendering (dissolvi) is incorrect.[87] But the observation that the term is used only here in the Paulines leads him to ask whether its use does not denote "une influence littéraire précise".[88] He sees "un parallèle interessant" in Tobit 3:6. Two observations are significant for Dupont. First, here as in Phil 1:23 the assertion is made that "it is better...to die than to live".[89] Second, the term used to designate dying is ἀπολύω, which clearly means "to release, set free".[90] Despite the fact that here, as in texts cited above, the

---

[84]The Greek verb goes back to the nautical metaphor of a ship weighing anchor and going out to sea (cf. Bauer, s.v.).

[85]Cf. Lohmeyer, Philipper, p. 63; see the texts cited there, n. 1. Cf. Gnilka, Philipperbrief, p. 73; Hoffmann, Die Toten, pp. 289, 298; Beare, Philippians, p. 63; Michael, Philippians, p. 57.

[86]Op. cit., p. 178: "Au sens de 'depart', il fournit un euphemisme tout indique pour signifier la mort". Cf. Moulton-Milligan, s.v., for an interesting grave inscription where it means "to die" (p. 36).

[87]The Latin rendering understands ἀναλῦσαι in a transitive sense, with the meaning "to dissolve", while the Pauline use of the term in Phil 1:23 requires the intransitive meaning "to depart" (Liddell-Scott, s.v.).

[88]Op. cit., p. 178.

[89]The comparative λυσιτέλεια has a very interesting parallel in Id., Tht. 181b τεθνάναι νομίσασα λυσιτελεῖν ἢ ζῆν - "thinking it better to be dead than alive" (Liddell-Scott, s.v.).

[90]Cf. Liddell-Scott, s.v.

motive for desiring death is hopeless misery,[91] and despite the fact that the word ἀπολύω is used and not the Pauline ἀναλύω ,[92] Dupont uses this text as a bridge from Paul to Plato. The term ἀπολύω ("to release") is used of death in Plato. The soul is tied to the inferior body; we must keep it as pure as possible "till God himself releases us" ( ἕως ἂν ὁ θεὸς αὐτὸς ἀπολύσῃ ἡμᾶς ).[93] On the basis of this reference, Dupont affirms that the ἀπόλυσις is not only "une délivrance, mais aussi un départ vers Dieu".[94] From here, the step is taken to the Platonic use of λύσις :[95] "Pour parler de la mort, la Phédon emploie le mot ἀπόλυσις , mais davantage encore celui de λύσις".[96] With this word we have arrived at the specific philosophic conception of the release of the soul from the body, which is then read back into the

---

[91]Thus establishing a divergence from that basic Pauline orientation. Cf. D. Daube, "Death as Release in the Bible", NT 5 (1962), pp. 82-104, on pp. 98-99.

[92]The basic meanings are quite different!

[93]Phaedo 67A; cf. idem., 65A; Epict., Diss 1, 9, 16 (cited by Gnilka, Philipper, p. 74).

[94]Op. cit., p. 179. The text really says nothing about a "departure toward God!"

[95]In the "Allegory of the Cave" (Rep. 515c, 532b), the "release" of the prisoners from the cave is of course a picture of the release of the soul from the body, climbing from the darkness of the cave toward the light of the sun, i.e., the highest good [cf. Platon/Sämtliche Werke, Vols. I-III, ed. by E. Loewenthal (6th ed.; Köln, 1969), Vol. II, p. 276]. In Phaedo 67 C,D and Axiochus 371a, λύσις is used in the technical sense of the release of the soul from the body (cf. Liddell-Scott, s.v.).

[96]Op. cit., p. 179.

Pauline ἀναλῦσαι . But the only common ground between the technical λύσις and the euphemism ἀναλυσαι is the root λυ! At the same time Dupont has not found a single use of ἀναλύσαι in the technical-philosophic sense. Although he recognizes the difficulties, as well as the divergences between Paul and the philosophic conception, Dupont believes that the Pauline use of the terms κέρδος and μᾶλλον κρεῖσσον guarantee the technical sense for ἀναλῦσαι . In view of the larger literary context examined, in which death is seen as God's deliverance of the soul from the body(!), Dupont concludes that "La pensée de saint Paul dans Phil I , 23-24 est incontestablement apparentée à ce grand contexte".[97]

The most that can safely be claimed for the similarities brought to light by Dupont is that we are here dealing with related themes which are dealt with by the use of common terms. But Dupont's view of a far-reaching essential correspondence cannot be supported. At every critical point we saw Paul diverging sharply from the conceptions expressed elsewhere,[98] although he used similar terms. He does, indeed, express the

---

[97] Ibid., p. 180.

[98] We have already seen that the pessimistic evaluation of physical existence is not restricted to the Greek-Hellenistic thought milieu, but also has a place in Judaism. Such passages as Tobit 3:6 and Sir 40: 28-41:13 agree with the Hellenistic texts in their higher valuation of death, in contrast to the misery of life, and differ, especially from the philosophic texts, in that they do not conceive of a separation of the essential self from the body, but maintain the early Israelite conception of a shadowy existence in Sheol. The Tobit reference to the πνεῦμα that is to be taken up has nothing to do with an immortal soul/self. It simply gives expression to the Old Testament conception of the removal of the animating principle of life.

conviction that death will usher him into an immediate existence σὺν Χριστῷ, but he does not see this in terms of a welcome release from the hopelessness and misery of earthly existence, nor as the flight of the soul from the tomb of the body. Therefore we must look elsewhere for the background of the Pauline conception.

The rejection of attempts to eliminate the problem of an immediate union with Christ at death, as well as the rejection of the Hellenistic interpretation, has led some scholars to look for the Geistesgeschichtliche background of the Pauline view in the Jewish-apocalyptic milieu.[99] The basic thrust of this line of investigation is the attempt to see the Pauline σὺν Χριστῷ εἶναι as a real event and form of existence between the death of the individual and the parousia, in analogy to the apocalyptic conception of a Zwischenzustand, an interim.[100] Let us examine the relationships that have been seen to exist between Paul's individual hope, as expressed in Phil 1:23, and the apocalyptic conceptions of an interim condition.[101]

We begin by bringing into sharper focus the characteristics of the Pauline conception as they have emerged out of the foregoing analysis:

---

[99]E.g., Guntermann, Die Eschatologie des hl. Paulus, pp. 270-302; Hoffmann, Die Toten, pp. 95-133, 310-320; Gnilka, Philipperbrief, pp. 76-93; W. Manson, Eschatology in the New Testament, pp. 13-14. Kümmel, Theologie des Neuen Testaments, pp. 211-216.

[100]So many of the commentaries; cf. n. 99 above, and J. N. Sevenster, "Bemerkungen über den Zwischenzustand bei Paulus", pp. 291-299. Cf. also, the literature below on II Cor 5:1-10.

[101]The attempt by Hoffmann in this area is perhaps the most thorough that has been undertaken. Our discussion will therefore be carried on in the context of his analysis.

1) Being with Christ commences with the death of the individual. The σὺν Χριστῷ formulation is characterized here, as well as in other Pauline texts, by intimacy, sharing, fellowship, support; in short, a union of persons.[102] 2) Although it is not expressed, it may be assumed that the union with Christ thus conceived, as union with the risen and exalted Lord, has its "place" where Christ is, namely, in the heavenly world.[103] 3) The assertion of Phil 1:21-23 must be distinguished from the future-eschatological conceptions expressed in such texts as I Thess 4; I Cor 15; Rom 8:17 ff.; II Cor 4:14. Neither the parousia nor the resurrection can be presupposed for the expression of the individualistic hope. 4) Side by side with this conception stands the hope for an end-historical eschatological event.[104] No attempt is made to reconcile the two conceptions or to harmonize them. 5) The manner in which union with Christ beyond death is expressed seems to indicate that it is the highest of all possible goods, and that it therefore needs nothing more to enrich it or to complete it.

In light of these characteristics the apocalyptic materials brought forward to illustrate the Pauline view may now be discussed.

---

[102]Cf. O. Kuss, Der Römerbrief (Regensburger Neues Testament; Regensburg, 1959), p. 332, who says of the σὺν Χριστῷ formulation that it has the "Charakter der Innigkeit, der Intimität, der Einung des Glaubenden und des Christus in personaler Liebe als Inbegriff der Heilsvollendung". Cf. Chapter V, below.

[103]Lohmeyer, "Syn Christō", pp. 224-226 showed that the σὺν Χριστῷ concept must be associated with the idea of a transcendent heavenly world, in which believers attain to union with Christ.

[104]Phil 2:16, 3:11, 20, 4:5.

One significant aspect of the development of apocalyptic conceptions was the belief, in some quarters, that a separation between righteous and wicked would take place immediately upon death. I Enoch[105] is concerned at several places with the "where" of the departed. Ch. 22:1-13 describes compartments in the underworld where the spirits or souls[106] of the departed are assembled and separated according to merits. Although all the souls of all the dead are assembled here (vs. 4), the chamber reserved for the spirits of the righteous has a "bright spring of water" (vs. 9), while the spirits of the wicked are in "great pain" (vs. 11). In the positive assertion concerning the chamber of the righteous, we clearly have the rudiments of the attempt to assure for the dead righteous, even before the judgment, at least a small aspect of that bliss which awaits them in the future. The phrase "till the great day of judgment" which is repeated several times,[107] characterizes the condition of the dead as an interim condition. The assertion that the spirits of some of the wicked will neither be slain nor raised on

---

[105]Translations given in the following are according to Charles, "Book of Enoch", in Pseudepigrapha, pp. 136-281.

[106]The anthropological conceptions are not clearly worked out; so that we read in 22:3: τὰ πνεύματα τῶν ψυχῶν τῶν νεκρῶν. In any case, it seems clear that the apocalyptic speculations concerning the condition of the dead did not remain unaffected by Greek conceptions of disembodied souls. Cf. Hoffmann, Die Toten, p. 317, "Allmählich wird der altisraelitische Scheolglaube in verschiedenen Ausprägungen umgestalted; die Vorstellung von einem himmlischen Aufenthalt der Seelen gewinnt dabei besondere Bedeutung, weil sie auch den hellenistischen Einflüssen entgegenkam, mit welchen in dieser Zeit zweifellos zu rechnen ist".

[107]22:4, 11, 13.

the day of judgment, would imply that the spirits of the righteous will be raised.[108] How such a "resurrection of spirits" was conceived is difficult to say.

The similitudes of Enoch[109] reflect a conception concerning the condition of the dead that quite overshadows the germinal ideas expressed in ch. 22. In 39:4-13, we hear of the "dwelling-places" or the "resting-places" of the righteous,[110] located "at the end of the heavens" (39:3). In 61:12 it is clearly stated that "the elect" are in the "garden of life".[111] In both passages, they are pictured as dwelling "with the holy ones" or "with the righteous angels".[112] Existence in that heavenly realm, according to Hoffmann, is characterized by "communion with the Elect One (39:6), with the Messiah (39:4-8), and by immediate closeness to the Lord of Spirits (39:7)".[113] This interpretation seeks to read more into the text than is there.[114] The position of the righteous "before" the Elect one and "before" the Lord of Spirits is described as

---

[108]Cf. Hoffmann, op. cit., pp. 110-111.

[109]I En 37-71.

[110]39:4.

[111]Since in the Similitudes the earth is seen as the place of the final eschatological bliss (cf. 38:1,3; 45:2,4-6), the reference to the "garden of life" speaks of a paradisiac place in heaven.

[112]"Holy one" and "righteous angels" are used interchangeably to designate the heavenly beings.

[113]Op. cit., p. 116.

[114]Although in light of Hoffmann's contention that this is the background of Paul's conception of an existence in the interim, it is understandable.

one in which adoration and praise is rendered (39:7). What is here expressed is the relationship between one who is worshipped and his worshippers, which can hardly be expressed with the term "Gemeinschaft". It might be better to speak of a "Gemeinschaft" with the righteous angels and the holy ones (39:4-5). How one can speak of a "Gemeinschaft with the Messiah" and point to vss. 4-8 is difficult to understand. In vs. 8, Enoch expresses his desire also to dwell in that heavenly place, but there is certainly no messianic identification here, much less an indication of a heavenly union between Messiah and believers during the interim.[115] Again, the reference to 70:1 as indicating a heavenly fellowship with Messiah and the Lord of Spirits[116] is not warranted. As 71:11 ff. shows, the relationship is again one in which adoration and praise are rendered. There is no thought here of a relationship between persons, or an intimate communion.

It is difficult to say whether the author contemplated a resurrection of these righteous.[117] It is possible that 61:5 alludes to a resurrection of the departed.[118] And while ch. 51 clearly describes a

---

[115]Cf. Gnilka, Philipperbrief, p. 91, who also speaks of a "Gemeinschaft" with the Lord of Spirits and the Elect One, but does not mention a messianic fellowship.

[116]Hoffmann, op. cit., pp. 116-117; Gnilka, op. cit., p. 91.

[117]In the Similitudes, the blessed are called "the righteous" or "the elect" interchangeably; there is no further anthropological determination. Elsewhere, we hear of the πνεύματα or ψυχαί of the righteous or wicked (22:3, 9, 11, 13, 102:4, 103:3, 4, 7, 108:6, 7).

[118]Cf. P. Volz, Eschatologie der Jüdischen Gemeinde, p. 261.

resurrection of all the dead, it seems to presuppose a condition in Sheol similar to that described in ch. 22, and diverging from that described in chs. 39 and 61. One gets the impression from ch. 39 that the condition of the dead in their heavenly resting-places is an eternal one; but since chs. 45 ff. describe a day of messianic judgment, it seems best to think of the condition of the dead as an interim condition.[119]

Chs. 91-105[120] present some interesting conceptions concerning the lot of the dead. In 91:3-10 and 92:3-5, everything seems oriented toward the eschatological future, the judgment, in which both the salvation of the righteous will take place[121] and the condemnation of sinners.[122] The condition of the righteous dead before the resurrection is described as "sleep". To see in this term more than a euphemism for "dead" does not seem to be warranted.[123] In 100:5 it is said that even

---

[119]The comprehensive work by P. Volz, ibid., illustrates the fantastic complexity of conceptions in the apocalyptic literature. Cf. also the material gathered in Str.-Bill. IV, pp. 1116-1198, and in W. Bousset and H. Gressmann, Die Religion des Judentums, pp. 242-301. Hoffmann, op. cit., maintains that the "author" of the Similitudes was more a collector of various apocalyptic traditions than an author who imposed uniformity on his material (p. 119).

[120]Volz, Eschatologie, pp. 18-21, divides these chapters into several independent sections; more recently, the unity of this part of I Enoch has been defended; e.g., O. Eissfeldt, Einleitung in das Alte Testament (3rd ed.; Tübingen, 1964), pp. 838 f. and H. H. Rowley, The Relevance of Apocalyptic, p. 57.

[121]91:10, 92:3 f.

[122]91:5-9, 11, 92:5.

[123]Cf. O. Michel, "Zur Lehre vom Todesschlaf", ZNW 35 (1936), pp. 285-290; R. E. Bailey, "Is 'Sleep' the Proper Biblical Term for the Intermediate State?", ZNW 55 (1964), pp. 161-167.

if the righteous dead "sleep a long sleep" they have nothing to fear. The situation addressed seems to be one in which the author wants to give assurance to his co-religionists who have become worried about the delay of the eschatological time.[124] Vis-à-vis these descriptions of the state of the righteous dead, 102:4-103 seems to present a different picture:

> Fear not, ye souls of the righteous,
> And be hopeful ye that have died in righteousness.
> And grieve not if your soul into Sheol has descended in grief.
>
> (102:4-5a)

This call to the "souls" of the departed righteous is followed by a denunciation of those who hold that the fate of all men, whether wicked or righteous, is the same after death (102:6-11).[125] The following promises to the spirits/souls of the righteous dead are proclaimed as a mystery:

> That all goodness and joy and glory are prepared for them,
> And written down for the spirits of those who have died in righteousness,
> And that manifold good shall be given to you in recompense for your labours,
> And that your lot is abundantly beyond the lot of the living.
> And the spirits of you who have died in righteousness shall live and rejoice,
> And their spirits shall not perish...
>
> (103:3-4b)

The assurance to the righteous is followed by the assertion that the souls

---

[124] It may be legitimate to speculate whether this situation is analogous to the one Paul confronted in I Thess 4.

[125] It is generally held that this is a criticism of Sadducean views (cf. WS 2:1-5, 3:2-4; Eccl. 2:14-16, 3:19-21, etc.); cf. Charles, "Enoch", p. 274.

of the wicked shall enter into Sheol and experience wretchedness and tribulation, and that their spirits shall enter "into darkness and chains and a burning flame where there is grievous judgment" (103:7-8).

Several observations are pertinent. The paraenetic nature of this passage is unmistakable.[126] The previous chapters were thoroughly eschatologically oriented toward judgment and resurrection. This is also true of ch. 104, where the promise is held out that the righteous "shall shine like the lights of heaven" (4:6). Within this context, the passages cited above are more specifically interested in dispelling concern about the time between that eschatological salvation and the prior death of the righteous. It is hardly correct to speak of a present, intermediate-state experience of "goodness and joy and glory".[127] What is affirmed is that even though the souls of the righteous are now in Sheol (2:5)[128] their situation is characterized by "hope" (2:4). Their lot is better than the lot of the living, not in an absolute sense,[129] but in the sense that they are removed from earthly difficulty

---

[126]"Das Ziel des ganzen Abschnittes ist offenkundig das einer eschatologischen Mahn-und Trostrede" (Hoffmann, op. cit., p. 126).

[127]Cf. J. Lindblom, Das Ewige Leben. Eine Studie über die Lebensidee im Neuen Testament (Uppsala, 1914), pp. 51 f., 52, n. 2.

[128]Volz, Eschatologie, pp. 19-20, argues that since the Sheol-existence of the wicked is characterized by pain and fire and anguish (102:7-8), the righteous can hardly be understood to also exist in Sheol in an interim condition. He explains 102:5 as "probably corrupt". This argument is hardly convincing, for the "Sheol-existence" of the righteous may be conceived in analogy to that described in ch. 22. Cf. Bückers, Die Unsterblichkeitslehre, p. 123.

[129]Contra Hoffmann, op. cit., p. 124.

and that eschatological bliss characterizes their future. Thus, the time of salvation is not yet,[130] but the present time of waiting is wholly determined by that future; therefore: "fear ye not ye souls... that have died in righteousness".

In the Book of Jubilees there is one passage that is of significance for our discussion. The book as a whole is thoroughly nationalistically oriented and concerned with the eschatological fate of the last generation of Israelites at the great judgment.[131] Within this larger context 23:31 seems strange. It is preceded by a description of the tribulations that will fall upon Israel through the Gentiles (23:23-25). The turning point comes in vs. 26: the law shall be read, the commandments sought, and a return to the paths of righteousness shall come about. This ushers in the time of salvation, described with imagery from Isaiah 65: long life in peace and joy (vss. 27-29).[132] Then

---

[130]Charles, op. cit., p. 274, leaves the question open whether the blessings described are to be enjoyed in Sheol or in a "spiritual theocracy set up after the final judgment". He seems, though, to lean in the direction of the latter when he remarks, "There seems to be only a resurrection of the spirit". Hoffmann, op. cit., p. 125, seems to look past the plain sense of the text when he states: "Der Ort der Verdammung ist die Scheol, der Ort der Seligkeit ist nicht näher bestimmt" (2:5?). His interpretation seems guided by the need to locate an intermediate state of heavenly bliss for the departed righteous. Although he has just affirmed that the "place of blessedness" cannot be determined, he goes on to say that it is probable "dass ein himmlischer Aufenthalt der Verstorbenen Gerechten ähnlich wie in den Bilderreden vorausgesetzt wird". (!)

[131]Cf. 1:13-18, 22 f., 23:26-30.

[132]It is probably correct, with Volz, Eschatologie, p. 29, to say that life in the Golden Age is limited in length (cf. vs. 29). However, as Bousset, Religion, p. 276, points out, the accent must fall on the length of the time of salvation, rather than on its limitations.

follow these words:

vs. 30a And at that time the Lord will heal his servants,
And they will rise up and see great peace,
And drive out their adversaries.

vs. 30b And the righteous shall see and be thankful,
And rejoice with joy for ever and ever,
.....
vs. 31a And their bones shall rest in the earth,
And their spirits shall have much joy.

The passage, as well as the context, is characterized by a series of repetitions,[133] and it may be assumed that 30a does not introduce something new, but describes the same time already described in 26 ff. "In that time", i.e., in the time when Israel "shall return to the paths of righteousness" (vs. 26), "the Lord will heal his servants", i.e., Israel. It is they who shall participate in the driving out of their adversaries, i.e., the Gentile sinners who have oppressed them (vs. 24). Over against this event stand "the righteous",[134] who "see" what is taking place and rejoice. 31a shows that "the righteous" are no longer alive at the time of the inauguration of the Golden Age. Who they are, whether the ancient fathers or the martyrs out of the time of tribulation[135] cannot be determined. In any case, their "spirits", in contrast to their bones that rest in the earth, see from their abode the fortune of their brethren, and rejoice with them. Where that abode is is not

---

[133]Hoffmann, op. cit., p. 100.

[134]It seems that "the righteous" are not to be identified with "his servants". Cf. Nickelsburg, Immortality, Resurrection, and Eternal Life, pp. 59 ff.; Volz, Eschatologie, p. 29.

[135]Volz, Eschatologie, p. 29; cf. Hoffmann, op. cit., p. 102, "Es handelt sich wahrscheinlich um jüdische Märtyrer".

indicated. The references to the ancients who have departed to "endless sleep"[136] may indicate a Sheol existence. However, the fact that they rejoice militates against it, and it is likely that some paradisal place is in view. The anthropological problem of the separation between "spirit" and "bones" does not admit of an easy solution. It is possible that the Ethiopic text is based on πνεύματα and/or רוח / נפש, and that the conception in Jubilees is to be traced to an inner-Israelite development in which רוח / נפש is becoming individualized and personalized.[137] But it is also possible, if not likely, that such a development received a helping hand from the Hellenistic conception of the immortality of the soul.

The Testament of Asher may preserve a conception of the survival of man's spirit (in an individualized, personal sense) similar to that expressed in Jubilees 23. In Test Ash 6:4-5 it is said that the nature of a person's death reveals whether his soul becomes the property of the angels of the Lord or of Satan. Thus, if a person dies peacefully, his soul meets the "angel of peace" who leads him into eternal life.[138] The concept of the resurrection is not present in Test Ash; it is clearly attested in Test Sim 6, Test Jud 25, Test Seb 10, and Test Benj 10.

IV Ezra and II Baruch, both written toward the end of the first

---

[136]Cf. 36:1,18, 45:15.

[137]Cf. Hoffmann, op. cit., pp. 102-103.

[138]Ibid., pp. 130-131; cf. Nickelsburg, Immortality, pp. 65 ff.

century, provide no direct evidence for the background to which Paul may have been indebted, though the conceptions expressed therein are in line with, and developed out of, earlier conceptions. In both works, Sheol is the place where righteous and wicked spend the interim before the resurrection of the dead. In IV Ezra 7:88 ff. is described how the souls of the righteous,[139] after they are "separated from this vessel of mortality", are received into special chambers in Sheol[140] where they experience a seven-fold joy (vss. 91-98). In general, their condition is described as one in which they enjoy rest in profound quietness (vs. 95). This condition of rest is wholly determined by an intense expectation of that which is to come:[141] glory, liberty, immortality, incorruption, and finally, the joy of beholding the face of Him[142] whom they served in life and the reception of the reward for

---

[139]Cf. 7:88 and 7:100, 4:35, 41, 7:32, 7:80.

[140]Although the location of the chambers for the souls of the righteous is not clearly given in 7:88-98, the virtually synonymous use of "earth", "dust", and "chambers" in the description of the resurrection (7:32) indicates that they must be located in the underworld (cf. 4:35, 41).

[141]The general resurrection, followed by the great judgment (as described in 7:32 ff.) is that turning point from interim expectation to eschatological fulfillment.

[142]According to 7:91, the souls of the righteous receive a preliminary vision of the glory of God, before they go into their chambers for the interim. Billerbeck (Str.-Bill. IV, 1027) and Volz (Eschatologie, 259 f.) have suggested that this conception, together with the presence in Sheol, may represent an attempt to combine the idea of an interim in heaven with the older idea of the interim in Sheol. This is possible; however, the brief reference to the vision of God's glory may simply be an original attempt to provide for the departing righteous a "foretaste" of that for which they are ultimately destined.

their faithfulness (vss. 96-98). II Baruch[143] does not seem to share IV Ezra's conception of a proleptic enjoyment and anticipation of the eschatological bliss during the interim. Indeed, the condition of the righteous dead seems to be viewed somewhat negatively in 21:23, where we read that the souls of the righteous are "enclosed" in chambers.[144] In general, their condition in these chambers is described in terms of sleep,[145] of preservation or of being guarded.[146] The anthropological conceptions are not precise. "The dead" are generally mentioned in connection with presence in Sheol, in the earth, or in the dust;[147] while in connection with the "chambers", the "souls" of the departed are mentioned.[148] It is possible that II Baruch understood resurrection in terms of a reunion between body and soul.[149] There is no hint of a heavenly dwelling place for the souls of the righteous.

On the basis of a very thorough analysis of the apocalyptic conceptions concerning the fate of the departed righteous -- of which we have attempted to present and analyze the most relevant material in

---

[143]It is generally acknowledged that II Baruch is dependent on IV Ezra, cf. Eissfeldt, Einleitung, p. 853.

[144]Cf. Hoffmann, op. cit., p. 152.

[145]30:2, 21:24, 11:4.

[146]30:2, 23:4, 50:2, 42:7.

[147]11:6, 21:22, 23:4, 50:2.

[148]21:22, 30:1-4.

[149]Cf. 50:2, where it is said that the earth, having received the dead, will surrender them exactly as she received them.

the foregoing discussion -- Hoffmann[150] seeks to draw some very straight lines to Paul's conception of the believer's presence with Christ immediately upon death.[151] The first significant observation is that for both Paul and the apocalyptic tradition behind him, "resurrection hope and [immediate] heavenly blessedness, stand side by side". This is clearly the case for at least some of the literature which has been examined, though it is by no means as common and as widespread as implied in Hoffmann's categorical assertion. In fact, the idea of a heavenly blessedness is quite rare. It would be more correct to say that resurrection hope and some conception of an interim condition stand side by side. But then the line to Paul would already become problematic, unless one assumes a priori, as Hoffmann and others[152] clearly do, that Phil 1:23 is indeed a reference to some such intermediate state. Yet it is precisely this assumption that must be called into question! The first observation is underlined and expanded by a second, namely, that "no attempt is made to reconcile the two conceptions".[153] It is interesting that Gnilka quotes Hoffmann with approval,[154] while on the

---

[150]Followed, with modifications, by Gnilka, Philipperbrief, pp. 88-93.

[151]Hoffmann, op. cit., pp. 317-318: "Folgende Parallelen lassen sich zwischen den paulinischen Anschauungen, wie sie in Phil 1:23 vorliegen, und den jüdischen Vorstellungen einer himmlischen Seligkeit feststellen". For the discussion of these alleged parallels, see the following.

[152]Cf. Guntermann, Eschatologie, p. 282; Gnilka, op. cit., p. 88.

[153]Hoffmann admits of one possible exception, cf. n. 142 above.

[154]Philipperbrief, p. 92.

previous page he affirms: "Zwischenzustand und ewige Vollendung stehen nicht unvermittelt nebeneinander, sondern das eine leitet zum anderen über, und das ist das Bezeichnende".[155] This latter statement, vis-à-vis Hoffmann, seems to reflect correctly the tenor of the majority of the material examined. The interim condition, whether described as a heavenly anticipation of the joys of the eschaton, or a restful waiting in Sheol, is uniformly oriented toward the final act in the eschatological drama. There is something better, something more that awaits the souls of the righteous. The idea of resting, of waiting and of hoping gives clear expression to the tension that exists between the "already" and the "not yet". In Paul's expression of his hope σὺν Χριστῷ εἶναι, such a tension is absolutely excluded. Thirdly, Hoffmann observes that it is characteristic for both Paul and the apocalyptic literature that both forms of blessedness are valued equally, and are therefore described with the same pictures and expressions. There is some substance in this assertion; e.g., in the Similitudes, the departed righteous already in the interim constitute a "community" of the righteous or the elect, and it is this same community that shall appear on earth at the end of days. Or there is the conception of a paradisiac state for the departed righteous, with which the eschatological paradise is in some sense identical. Yet, even Hoffmann acknowledges that the pre-eminence of the future aeon must be maintained as fundamental. This pre-eminence of the future bliss is implied by the very common insistence on the

---

[155] Ibid., p. 91 (italics mine). Cf. Lohmeyer, "Syn Christō", p. 242: "...diese individuelle und jene eschatologische Vorstellung (gehören) untrennbar zusammen".

resurrection as a necessity for participation in the eschatological fulfillment, and it is underscored by the many descriptions of this final state in terms that far surpass anything said of the interim condition.[156] In a certain sense, then, the Jewish-apocalyptic conceptions concerning the progression: interim→eschaton, may be aptly characterized by the idea of "promise and fulfillment". It is impossible to characterize the Pauline σὺν Χριστῷ , as expressed in Phil 1:23, with the word "promise". My desire is, says Paul, to depart and be with Christ. The promise lies in the present experience ἐν Χριστῷ and σὺν Χριστῷ ; the fulfillment lies on the other side of the "death which is gain", on the other side of the ἀναλῦσαι . It is further significant that no intensification of the nature of the "fulfillment", as described in Phil 1:23, is present in the expressions of the corporate-eschatological conceptions. Thus, the most "apocalyptic" passage in all of Paul climaxes in the words: "so we shall always be σὺν κυρίου" (I Thess 4:17) -- nothing more, nothing less. Again, the expression in Rom 8:17 that we will be "glorified with him" means simply that, being "with him", we shall share the glory which is his.[157] Since both the individual hope as well as the eschatological hope conceive of the condition of blessedness as a σὺν Χριστῷ, it is difficult to see how Paul could have

---

[156]The description of what awaits the righteous in IV Ezra 7, in contrast to what they now possess, illustrates the point.

[157]Cf. O. Michel, Der Römerbrief (12th ed.; KEK 4; Göttingen, 1963), p. 199; H. W. Schmidt, Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer (Theologischer Hand-Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 6; Berlin, 1963), p. 143.

understood the "with Christ" at death as but a preliminary condition of blessedness upon which another would follow.

A final characteristic ostensibly paralleled in the Pauline and apocalyptic conceptions is the idea of "Gemeinschaft" with the Messiah in the heavenly interim. We have already taken a critical position vis-à-vis Hoffmann's interpretation of the apocalyptic material adduced in support of this idea,[158] and found that the texts were made to yield fruit that was not native to them. Indeed, no parallel, not even a close approximation to the intense-dynamic σὺν Χριστῷ was found. When Hoffmann says that the Pauline σὺν Χριστῷ, although to some extent unique, is nevertheless merely the singular expression of a common idea, he certainly oversteps the bounds of the available evidence.

Some further critical considerations of a more general nature may here be appended. It seems to us significant that in the two extended passages where Paul is concerned to explicate the resurrection hope, he nowhere gives a hint that the condition of departed Christians is anything but that of death, euphemistically designated by the word "sleep".[159] The analogy with the seed in I Cor 15 suggests that Paul may have understood the condition of departed Christians as simply "in the earth". In the apocalyptic descriptions of the interim, the condition of the departed is generally limited, contingent, in the sense that it is bodiless existence. The descriptions of the "souls" or "spirits" of the righteous who are "near God", "in heaven", "in Sheol", or "in

---

[158] See above.

[159] Cf. the literature cited in n. 123, above.

their chamber", waiting for the final act which is most commonly conceived of as resurrection -- all this at least implies that the interim condition was a "not-yet" condition. It may be that Paul adamantly resisted the idea of bodiless spirits waiting -- even if in bliss -- for the final consummation,[160] and that it was precisely for this reason that he made no use of the apocalyptic descriptions of an interim.[161] Hoffmann[162] is very critical of the attempt by Guntermann[163] to interpret the σὺν Χριστῷ εἶναι from the perspective of a particular interpretation of II Cor 5 and to see it as the soul's "resting in proximity to Christ", since Paul can conceive of a complete life only somatically. Hoffmann's criticism is certainly correct, but it is inconceivable how he can affirm a few lines down the page that it is highly probable that Paul conceived of this intermediate union as a "Zustand der Leiblosigkeit".[164] But he, and with him Gnilka, are almost

---

[160]Cf. the discussion of II Cor 5, below.

[161]Cf. F. C. Porter, "The Place of Apocalyptic Conceptions in the Thought of Paul", JBL 41 (1932), pp. 183-204, who is very critical, and incisively so, of attempts to link Pauline conceptions with apocalyptic ones.

[162]Op. cit., p. 314.

[163]Eschatologie, p. 282.

[164]Op. cit., pp. 314, 337. In light of Paul's insistence on the somatic nature of the eschatological existence in I Cor 15, and in light of his extremely high estimate of man's bodily life, so that he can speak of Christ's life as being "manifested in our bodies" (II Cor 4:10) or of the necessity to "glorify God in your body" (I Cor 6:20), it is difficult to attribute to Paul any conception of a-somatic existence. The nature of the personal union, expressed in the σὺν Χριστῷ, virtually excludes the conception of a bodiless soul. Cf. W. G. Kümmel, Theologie, p. 214: "[Paulus] denkt...schwerlich an eine Leiblose Existenz, die für ihn unvorstellbar ist..."

driven to that conclusion by the conception of the problem in terms of the following formulation: "Paulus erwartet die Christusgemeinschaft schon nach dem Tod und die Erweckung des Leibes am Tag der Parusie".[165] Undergirding the entire attempt to see the Pauline conception of immediate union with Christ in terms of the Jewish-apocalyptic background is the assumption that the individualistic hope and the resurrection hope must in some way be related to one another. In light of the negative results of the foregoing study of attempts to relate Phil 1:23 either to Hellenism or to apocalypticism, the assumption which has undergirded these attempts must be called into question. We must be open to the possibility that the two divergent conceptions of the eschatological realities can exist in unconnected juxtaposition.

### C. "AWAY FROM THE BODY - AT HOME WITH THE LORD" (II COR 5:8)

The passage in II Cor in which the above-named antithesis is located is among the most disputed in Paul's letters. Most substantial commentaries devote extended notes or excurses to it[166] and essays given to its interpretation continue to appear.[167] The variety of results flowing from such an intense preoccupation virtually span the

---

[165] Gnilka, Philipperbrief, p. 88.

[166] E.g., H. Lietzmann, An die Korinther I, II, ed. W. G. Rümmel (4th ed.; HbzNT 9; Tübingen, 1949), pp. 117-120, 202-203; H. Windisch, Der Zweite Korintherbrief (9th ed.; KEK 6; Göttingen, 1924), pp. 172-175; A. Plummer, The Second Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians (ICC: New York, 1915), pp. 160-164; H.-D. Wendland, Die Briefe an die Korinther (10th ed.; NTD 7; Göttingen, 1964), pp. 168-175.

[167] E.g., L. Brun, "Zur Auslegung von II Cor 5:1-10", ZNW 28 (1929), pp. 207-228; J. N. Sevenster, "Some Remarks on the gymnos in II Cor. V. 3",

spectrum of possibilities. Schmithals[168] catalogs the results of the quest for Paul's real meaning in a few short, pithy phrases: Paul is no longer interested in the parousia; he thinks of nothing but the parousia; the death of Christians before the parousia is now a normal occurrence; immediately upon death believers receive their heavenly bodies; a state of "nakedness" awaits those who die before the parousia and only at that time do they receive new bodies; the old body has to be stripped off before the new one is put on; the new body is formed around the old one and absorbs it; etc.[169] In terms of our study it cannot be our task to retrace the steps which the various interpretations have taken, and to decide between them. Our purpose is to attempt to understand the passage from a perspective that thus far has not been utilized and thereby to shed some light on the problem of the Pauline eschatology. Nevertheless, our discussion cannot be carried on in a vacuum. Since it is possible to reduce the multiplicity of interpretations to two main lines of thought,[170] our analysis will be carried on in terms of a critical discussion of two representative positions.

---

in Studia Paulina in Honorem J. De Zwaan (Harlem, 1953), pp. 202-214; idem., "Zwischenzustand bei Paulus"; K. Hanhart, "Paul's Hope in the Face of Death", JBL 88 (1969), pp. 445-457; C. Dehmke, "Zur Auslegung von 2. Korinther 5, 1-10", EvTh 29/11 (1969), pp. 589-602; E. E. Ellis, "The Structure of Pauline Eschatology", in Paul and His Recent Interpreters (Grand Rapids, 1961), pp. 35-48.

[168] W. Schmithals, Die Gnosis in Korinth. Eine Untersuchung zu den Korintherbriefen (2nd ed.; FRLANT NF 48; Göttingen, 1956), pp. 246-247.

[169] "These often contradictory opinions could be easily multiplied" (ibid., p. 247).

[170] Schmithals' contention that the diversity has in common the view that Paul's eschatology changed between I Thess and II Cor is not

H. Lietzmann[171] understands Paul's argumentation in 5:1-10 to be oriented toward the parousia. In the face of death, believers have the certainty that the resurrection body ( οἰκοδομὴ ἐκ θεοῦ ) lies ready in heaven (5:1-2);[172] but the "being clothed" with it takes place at the parousia, "die auch hier dem Paulus als das Normale vorschwebt".[173] For this interpretation, Lietzmann places considerable weight on the similarities between II Cor 5:4 and I Cor 15:53 f. / Rom 8:23, both of which are clear parousia references. He follows the same line of interpretation in vss. 6-8, for "only at the parousia, when we walk by sight and no longer just by faith, are we really with the Lord".[174] But how is the fear (!) and anxiety of Paul, concerning the possibility of a naked condition, to be explained in view of the certainty of the parousia hope, asks Lietzmann. He finds this fear of death as something rather strange, but it must be seen as something "relatively insignificant".[175] Lietzmann's understanding of the movement of Paul's thought in the entire passage is clearly summarized in a paraphrase: "we intensely long for the breaking in of the parousia when we shall receive new bodies, for everyone faces the possibility that, in case of a delay

---

quite accurate (ibid., p. 247).

[171] An die Korinther I. II, pp. 117-122; cf. R. Bultmann, Exegetische Probleme des Zweiten Korintherbriefes (2nd ed.; Darmstadt, 1963); Schmithals, Gnosis, pp. 246-261; Schweizer, "Die Mystik", pp. 239-240, n. 1; Brun, "Zur Auslegung von II Cor. 5:1-10"; Ellis, "Structure of Pauline Eschatology".

[172] Ibid., p. 117.

[173] Ibid.; cf. Bultmann, Probleme, p. 7.

[174] Ibid., p. 121.

[175] Ibid., p. 118.

of the parousia, the physical body disintegrates and one is 'naked' (like the grain, I Cor 15:37) and rests in the grave until that day when the resurrection body is received (I Cor 15:52 ff.): therefore we do not wish death, the ἐκδύσασθαι of the physical body (vs. 4)".[176]

The second line of interpretation is well represented by O. Cullmann.[177] Christians, caught in the tension of the interim between Christ's resurrection and the general resurrection, are, because of the possession of the Spirit (II Cor 5:5), "closer to the final resurrection". But their bliss is not complete, since between death and the final resurrection lies the interim state of "nakedness", i.e., "the condition of the inner man who has no body".[178] Cullmann argues that the adjective γύμνος (5:3) designates the condition during the interim, and that the word ἐπενδύσασθαι (5:2,4) must refer to the glorious transformation described in I Cor 15:51 f. Paul still hopes to be alive on that day so that he may be able to put on the spiritual body -- here called an "eternal, heavenly house" -- over the old body (5:1-2). But in vs. 3 is expressed the fear that he might die before the parousia. Whereas 5:1-5 were concerned with the parousia and the fear of "nakedness" due to its delay, 5:6-9 deal with the condition after death in the interim. That is, the fear of "nakedness" is overcome by the confidence

---

[176] Ibid., p. 117.

[177] Immortality or Resurrection, pp. 51-54; J. A. T. Robinson, The Body (Studies in Biblical Theology 36; London, 1952), pp. 17, 29, 77; Sevenster, "Some Remarks on the Gymnos", pp. 202-214; Schweitzer, Mysticism, p. 131; Rissi, Studien zum Zweiten Korintherbrief, p. 90.

[178] Ibid., pp. 51 ff.

that that condition is nevertheless an existence in proximity to the Lord.[179]

Several serious objections must be raised against the interpretations sketched above, and they are of such a nature as to cast doubt on the validity of each.

To begin with, one receives the distinct impression that every effort is being made in these interpretations to guarantee for Paul a consistent eschatological view: namely, all believers, sooner or later, arrive at the parousia, where the mortality of human existence will be swallowed up by immortality. In such a view, I Cor 15 becomes decisively important.[180] In his support of the parousia orientation of the passage, Bultmann states categorically that "it is for [Paul] self-understood that the receiving of the heavenly robe takes place at the parousia ..."[181] If this belief were not expressed in II Cor 5:1-10, that is, if it were concerned with the death of the individual, then it would not be in line with the dominant view of Paul ("herrschenden Anschauung"). The implication is: therefore, Paul must have the parousia in view, at which event the reception of the heavenly body (οἰκοδομὴν ἐκ θεοῦ, II Cor 5:1; σῶμα πνευματικόν - I Cor 15:44) takes place. But is

---

[179] Ibid., pp. 52 f.; cf. Robinson, The Body, p. 77, who equates "absent from the body" with the "naked" interim state.

[180] Every interpretation which either emphasizes the parousia or the interim condition as central concerns of the II Cor passage is dependent on the alleged equation of II Cor 5:2-4 and I Cor 15:53 f. Cf. studies cited in nn. 171 and 177, above.

[181] Probleme, pp. 7, 9.

it permissible, on the basis of the scanty literature, to even speak of this conception as the predominant one in Paul? Of the texts cited in support,[182] only I Cor 15 and Phil 3:21 can bear the weight of the interpretation placed on them,[183] and even here there is no uniformity. While Phil 3:21 speaks of a "transformation" of our "lowly body" into a likeness of Christ's glorious body,[184] I Cor 15 says that those alive will be changed and the dead will be raised. Both of these together, the transformation of the living and the raising of the dead, are described in these words:

τὸ φθαρτὸν τοῦτο ἐνδύσασθαι
ἀφθαρσίαν
καὶ τὸ θνητὸν τοῦτο ἐνδύσασθαι
ἀθανασίαν.

It is the use of the word ἐνδύσασθαι ("to put on") in this parousia context, and its presence in II Cor 5:3 (cf. 5:2,4 -- ἐπενδύσασθαι), which has led many to locate a parousia reference in II Cor 5. But is that equation legitimate? In II Cor 5:2-4, the antithesis between the "earthly tenthouse" and the "house not made with hands" of vs. 1 merges almost imperceptibly into the imagery of "being unclothed" and "being clothed". The parallel with vs. 1 suggests that the perspective has not

---

[182] I Thess 4:13 ff.; I Cor 15:50 ff.; Rom 8:23; Phil 3:21.

[183] I Thess 4:13 ff. reflects a very common apocalyptic conception of the resurrection; there is no hint here of immortal or spiritual bodies being put on believers. Rom 8:23 is also too general to allow it to be drawn into a determination of Paul's "most prominent" conception.

[184] The context (3:20, 4:5) clearly shows that the parousia is in view, and that this is a transformation of those living.

shifted; what he is yearning for in vs. 4, although he speaks in terms of "being clothed", is that "building from God" which is antithetical to our "tenthouse". In this context, the verb ἐπενδύεσθαι has almost invariably been interpreted as meaning "to be clothed with a body". For this interpretation, appeal has been made to I Cor 15:53 f. But, as Hanhart[185] has forcefully argued, even there the object with which one is clothed is not specifically a body but ἀφθαρσία and ἀθανασία. This immortal life indeed implies bodily existence -- man as σῶμα πνευματικόν (15:44) -- but what is put on is not the new body as such. It is instructive to note that Paul frequently uses the analogy of clothing, but always in a moral-religious sense, as something which has to do with the totality of man's existence. Thus, ἐνδύεσθαι stands for the putting on of the "new man", i.e., Christ, and of the armor of light.[186] Here, then, the clothing process refers to the new life in Christ, a new kind of existence, an existence that is "being renewed every day" (II Cor 4:16)[187] by the presence of the Spirit who at the same time guarantees our attaining to "that very thing" for which God has destined us (5:5). In light of such an understanding of the Pauline ἐνδύεσθαι -- as the "putting on" of a new existence -- it may be possible to suggest that the use of the preposition ἐπί in ἐπενδύεσθαι

---

[185]"Paul's Hope", p. 451.

[186]I Thess 5:8; Gal 3:27; Rom 13:12, 14.

[187]Cf. Rissi, Studien, pp. 66, 67, " ἔσω ἄνθρωπος on the one side, and ἔξω ἄνθρωπος on the other side, do not stand over against each other as two separate parts of the person, but rather as two aspects of the same reality".

does not so much refer to the putting on of a new heavenly body over the old one, but that it refers to receiving a new mode of existence, the nature of which is glorious and beyond imagination (4:17).[188] It cannot be denied, of course, that the references to man's body --"earthly tent-house", 5:1; "in the body", 5:6 -- betray the Pauline concern for the whole man, but this does not necessarily imply a concern for bodily resurrection at the parousia. In fact, there are several considerations that militate against such an assumption.

It is rather difficult to deny that 5:1, with its reference to the "destruction" ( καταλυθῇ ) of the "earthly tent-house" speaks about the moment of death.[189] To be in this tent[190] means to exist as a human being, to be involved in this earthly, transitory, physical life, in contrast to that which is unseen and eternal (4:18). Man's entire earthly existence is described as ἡ ἐπίγειος ἡμῶν οἰκία τοῦ σκήνους.[191] It comprises his entire psycho-somatic reality. This form of existence stands under the signature of θνητός ; it will be dissolved, broken down, come to an end. But on the other side of that end, of that

---

[188]Hanhart, "Paul's Hope", p. 451.

[189]Brun, "II Cor 5, 1-10", pp. 219 f., attempts to relate καταλυθῇ to 4:16, as designating the "process of gradual dissolution". However, the aorist verb hardly admits of such a sense.

[190]See our discussion in Chapter II, pp. 83-89 on the σκῆνος image in the WS and in Hellenistic literature.

[191]τοῦ σκήνους is epexegetical, and describes the "nature" of the "house", i.e., man's existence is like a tent: easily broken down. Cf. the Old Testament background of this image (Job 4:19; Is 38:12, ὁ καταλύων σκηνήν, cf. καταλυθῇ in II Cor 5:1). These passages

dissolution, stands a building ἐκ θεοῦ,[192] ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς,[193] αἰώνιος. These terms describe the nature of the new existence as an eschatological form of existence.[194]

The antithesis: earthly tent-building from God, and the transformation of existence that it implies, is now taken up in terms of a different formulation of the antithesis in 5:6-9, and the announcement in 4:17 of "an eternal weight of glory beyond all comparison" is given content in these verses. The believer's situation on earth and with the Lord is here described with the contrasting ἐνδημεῖν and ἐκδημεῖν. What does being "in the body" mean? It has long been recognized that for Paul σῶμα does not only designate a part of man, his flesh-body, but designates rather his total psycho-somatic existence. Recent studies have demonstrated that the Pauline sōma-concept designates the person in respect to its acting and reacting, its relation to God, to sin and to others. Sōma does not designate man in his spatial dimension, but rather man in terms of his relationships.[195] This "being at home in

---

do not imply an anthropological dualism; man dwells in this tent of clay, but at the same time this tent is identical with his entire existence.

[192]The attempt by Ellis, "Pauline Eschatology", pp. 41-43, to interpret the "building from God" in terms of the messianic temple seems to me to be reading past the plain sense of the text.

[193]This phrase designates the heavenly nature of the new existence, not the presence of bodies lying ready on the heavenly shelves. Cf. Schlatter, Paulus, Der Bote Jesu. Eine Deutung Seiner Briefe an die Korinther (2nd ed.; Stuttgart, 1956), p. 545.

[194]Cf. Rissi, Studien, p. 80.

[195]F. Neugebauer, "Das Paulinische 'In Christo'", NTS 4 (1958), p. 130; cf. E. Schweizer TWNT, VII, s.v., "σῶμα", p. 1063.

the body", in the earthly-historical form of existence, means "being away from the Lord". Paul knows himself to be caught in the tension between the "already" and the "not yet" (cf. Phil 3:12 ff.), between πίστις and εἶδους .[196] It is this limitation in the soteriological situation that arouses the desire to step across the boundary of the "not yet", to leave the earthly form of existence and to be πρὸς τὸν κύριον:[197] life in fellowship with the heavenly Kyrios.

The language of this passage, which so closely resembles that of Phil 1:21-23, surely excludes the idea of a "naked"[198] interim state where the dead exist in an unconscious sleep in proximity to Christ. To postulate, as Cullmann does, that there is a shift from parousia concerns in 5:1-5 to concerns about existence after death in the interim in 5:6-9 cannot find any support in the text. The parallel structure of the several antitheses throughout the passage excludes the attempt to isolate various conceptual units. The entire text, as Rissi has observed, arises out of Paul's "theologizing on the question of the existence after death. And the conception of an enduring, closer relationship with the Lord decidedly excludes an unconscious sleep-condition".[199]

---

[196]Cf. I Cor 13:12.

[197]Cf. John 1:2, πρὸς τὸν θεόν, and I Cor 13:12, πρόσωπον πρὸς πρόσωπον.

[198]I am convinced of the basic soundness of Schmidthals' analysis of 5:3-4 in terms of the context of Paul's debate with his opponents. Thus, it is quite possible that for some in Corinth, γυμνότης meant the deliverance of the soul from the body and the final state of redemption. With an eye to these, Paul may have formulated οὐ θέλομεν ἐκδύασθαι (5:4). In this case, anxiety about a naked interim state cannot be attributed to Paul.

[199]Studien, p. 96.

As with the σὺν Χριστῷ εἶναι of the Philippian passage, so the ἐνδημῆσαι πρὸς τὸν κύριον cannot be understood of as anything less than the fullest and most final attainment of the life which begins ἐν Χριστῷ. As in the Philippian situation, the thought of that union with Christ elicits from Paul a πολλῷ μᾶλλον κρεῖσσον, so the same thought in the Corinthian situation elicits from him an εὐδοκοῦ μᾶλλον. And just as, in the Philippian passage, Paul is concerned to honor Christ εἴτε διὰ ζωῆς εἴτε διὰ θανάτου so also in the Corinthian passage Paul is concerned to please his Lord εἴτε ἐνδημοῦντες εἴτε ἐκδημοῦντες.[200] These parallels between the two texts, and the analysis of the two passages, suggest that we have here a two-fold expression of the Pauline certainty[201] and hope that nothing shall separate him -- not even death -- from the love of God which he has experienced and expects to continue to experience in his relationship with Christ.[202] "To be forever with the Lord is his hope, and he will not tolerate any conceptions which seem to him to put in danger the

---

[200]I do not think that the reference to the "judgment seat of Christ" in 5:10 in any way militates against the interpretation worked out above. It rather seems that the ethical admonition which climaxes the passage in 5:9 elicits the conception of the judgment in Paul's mind. But the correlation of judgment and ethical behavior is so general that it does not require a particular contextual framework, such as the parousia.

[201]The οἴδαμεν of 5:1 does not necessarily mean that Paul is appealing to a "piece of tradition" [so, e.g., Rissi, Studien, pp. 73-74; Windisch, Korinther, p. 158]. The subtle shifting back and forth between the common "we" and the Apostolic "we" [cf. Bultmann, Probleme, pp. 3-4] does not permit us to say with any degree of finality which is prominent in 5:1. In either case, the οἴδαμεν could be rendered "we are certain", and thus express deep convictions (cf. Rom 8:22, 28).

[202]Cf. Rom 8:38-39.

certainty and full reality of this personal life with Christ. Death before his coming must not stand in its way; and the nature of life after death cannot be different from his life after death".[203]

## D. CONCLUSION

Pauline eschatology appears to have two poles. His hope is expressed both in terms of the parousia with the resurrection of the dead and in terms of the entrance into an eternal home upon death, in order to live with Christ. His is an eschatology both of heaven and of the last day, like two sides of the same coin.[204] The hope oriented toward the corporate, end-historical event is inspired by the Christ who is and the Christ who comes. The hope oriented toward the individual event of death is inspired by the Christ who is and the Christ with whom one will be.[205]

In the context of Paul's individualistic hope it was not possible to detect either the concept of the immortality of the soul or the idea of an individualized, proleptic resurrection at the point of death. How then did Paul conceive of this event?

In reference to Phil 1:21-23, Schweitzer suggested that Paul expected the same fate as that allotted to Enoch, Elijah, Ezra, and

---

[203] Porter, "Apocalyptic Conceptions", p. 201.

[204] Hanhart, "Paul's Hope", p. 448.

[205] In light of the results of our investigation, it may be legitimate to understand I Thess 5:10 and Rom 14:8-9 from this same perspective, and to find here the expression of the "mystical strain" in Paul's eschatological thought. Exegetically it is impossible to make that decision. Cf. E. Schweizer, "Die Mystik", pp. 246-247.

Baruch.[206] But that is impossible. Paul clearly could not have adopted the idea of the assumption as a physical transfer, for: "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God" (I Cor 15:50). However, as we saw above,[207] in the Wisdom of Solomon the assumption of Enoch has become prototypical for the fate of all the righteous. It has also been transformed: it takes place in death, and means a movement from mortality to immortality, from corruption to incorruption, from existence characterized by ἄνητος to existence characterized by ζωή. This transformation takes place in the event of death; but it is prepared for in the context of a life in which the Wisdom which dwells in men recreates them and brings them into right relationship with God ("she makes them friends of God").

As we shall see, the intimate relationship between Wisdom and God is the τύπος, the paradigm, of the union between Wisdom and men in whom she dwells. But beyond that, union between man and Wisdom becomes the guarantee, as well as the model, for the other worldly or eschatological union between man and God. In Paul, of course, a transformation takes place. The experience of union with Christ in the present, in analogy to the union as depicted in the Wisdom of Solomon, becomes the first-fruit of an eschatological union with this Christ who is the Wisdom of God. That, of course, lies beyond the vision of the Wisdom of Solomon.

---

[206] Mysticism, p. 136.

[207] Chapter III.

# CHAPTER V

# UNION WITH WISDOM / UNION WITH CHRIST AS GUARANTEE OF BOTH INDIVIDUAL AND CORPORATE ESCHATOLOGICAL REALITIES

## A. INTRODUCTION

Our analysis in chs. III and IV suggests that Paul, like the author of the WS, conceives the eschatological future in a dual way, or, to put it more precisely, in terms of two diverse perspectives. From the historical-universal perspective, that future is seen by both in terms of an inbreaking of God (Christ) into history, a final defeat of all those powers opposed to God's reign, and an eternal dwelling of the saved in the presence of God. From an individual-relational perspective, that future is seen in terms of an immediate presence with God (Christ) upon the physical death of the individual, death being seen as but a gateway to eternal life. Neither Ps-Solomon nor Paul seem to make the attempt to reconcile these two disparate formulations. In both, these formulations stand side by side.

How is this possible? We have already suggested that both writers operate, at one and the same time, in two different spheres: On the one hand there is the historical orientation of the prophetic-apocalyptic tradition which both share, and according to which God works out his purpose both in and over against the world. On the other hand,

there is the more personal-mystical orientation within which man's intimate relationship with God is seen as having an abiding validity, a relationship which transcends man's limitations -- expressed supremely in the fact of death -- and thus guarantees an unbroken, eternal future with God.

Our study has further suggested that this dual orientation is undergirded in both the WS and Paul by a "realized eschatology"; that is, both "life" and "death", as future realities -- whether conceived of in the framework of "individual" or "corporate" eschatology -- are present realities in the here and now. That is, the nature of future existence is intimately dependent upon, and flows out of, the nature of the present existence. The righteous of the WS are those for whom physical death becomes the gateway to life and immortality. At the same time, the righteous are those who, at the future climax of God's history with the world at which the sins of the unrighteous are reckoned up (WS 4:20), shall enter into everlasting life (WS 5:15).[1] For Paul, the "righteous"[2] are

---

[1]See above, ch. III, sections C and D.

[2]Of course, Paul never designates Christians as "righteous ones"; it seems that he deliberately avoids the use of this designation because of his polemic against "works-righteousness" (e.g., Rom 3:20). However, as a result of the life in Christ, Christians are clearly admonished to bring forth "fruits of righteousness" (Phil 1:11, cf. Rom 6:16) and Paul can speak of his conduct among the Thessalonians as "righteous" (I Thess 2:10). Further, in I Cor 6:9, those who "will not inherit the kingdom of God" are called "the unrighteous" (ἄδικοι), the implication being that those who will inherit it are "the righteous". This implication is confirmed by vs. 11, where Paul affirms that these Christians were once classed with these "unrighteous", but that they "were made righteous" (ἐδικαιώθητε). It is in and through Christ that Christians "become the righteousness of God" (II Cor 5:21; cf. Phil 3:9; I Cor 1:30). Paul

those for whom death holds no threat, since the power of death has been broken (Rom 8:2), and death becomes but a transition from "in Christ" existence to "with Christ" existence. At the same time, Christians are those who, at the eschaton (I Cor 15:24), at the "day of Christ" (Phil 2:16), enter resurrection life, and are "forever with the Lord" (I Thess 4:17).

But what is the nature of the present existence which guarantees this future? What is it that transforms "mere existence" into the beginning, the first-fruits, of "eternal existence?" At various points throughout this study, the answer to this question has already been intimated: in the WS, it is union with Wisdom; in Paul, it is union with Christ. The purpose of this final chapter is to explicate these relationships, and to suggest that the Pauline formulation of the believer's relationship with Christ, and the subsequent realization of the eschatological reality of eternal life -- whether individually or corporately conceived -- may have been influenced by the way the WS connects the same dual eschatological realities and union with Wisdom. The origin of the so-called "Pauline mysticism" has been a matter of much uncertainty and controversy.[3] But, to my knowledge, the intimate union be-

---

jealously guards the origin of the "new righteousness" which has become a Christian possibility (Phil 1:11); thus, in contrast to the "unrighteous", Christians are called "saints" (ἅγιοι) rather than δίκαιοι (I Cor 6:1-2).

[3]See e.g., the discussions of the debate in A. Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, tr. by W. Montgomery (New York; Seabury Paperback Edition, 1968), ch. II, and in A. Wikenhauser, Pauline Mysticism. Christ in the Mystical Teaching of St. Paul, tr. by J. Cunningham (Freiburg and Edinburgh-London, 1960), ch. IV.

tween Wisdom and the righteous in the WS has not been considered as a possible source for, or even influence upon, the Pauline conception.[4] Such an influence must be acknowledged as at least possible if, as we have suggested,[5] Paul knew and used the WS. It becomes a greater possibility when it is seen that, as we shall demonstrate below, the results of union with Wisdom in the WS, and of union with Christ in Paul, show such striking resemblances. Finally, such an influence moves from possibility to probability when it can be demonstrated that, in many ways, Paul's conception of Christ is influenced by the figure of Wisdom in the WS, indeed, that for Paul, Christ is θεοῦ σοφία.

Our investigation must begin with a study of the nature of union with Wisdom and its results in the WS. From there we proceed to an investigation of the relationship between the hypostatized figure of Wisdom in the WS and the Pauline Christ. Finally, this study will be concluded by an analysis of the relationship between union with Christ and the dual eschatological realities present throughout the Pauline literature.[6]

---

[4]E.g., D.J. Selby, Toward the Understanding of St. Paul (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1962), p. 40: "...it is not to the Wisdom Literature that we are to look for the source of the basic concepts of Paul's thought".

[5]Ch. II, above.

[6]See ch. IV above.

## B. UNION WITH WISDOM AND ITS RESULTS

### 1. The Need and the Gift

The WS opens with a call for righteousness, and affirms that this righteousness is attained in a relationship with God[7] where God is sought after with sincerity of heart, and found by those who trust him (1:1-2). The opposite of this relationship is separation from God, which is the direct result of unrighteousness (1:3). The immediately following verses introduce the figure of Wisdom, bringing her, both negatively and positively, into these relationships:

> Because Wisdom will not enter a
> deceitful soul,
> nor dwell in a body enslaved to sin.[8]
> For a holy and disciplined Spirit will
> flee from deceit,
> and will rise and depart from foolish
> thoughts,
> and will be ashamed at the approach
> of unrighteousness.
>
> (1:4-5)

The clear implications of the connection between these verses and the foregoing are: 1) Wisdom and unrighteousness are incompatible; Wisdom cannot dwell in a life given to the ways of sin; and though it is not

---

[7]Cf. G. Ziener, Das Buch der Weisheit (Die Welt der Bibel. Kleinkommentare zur Heiligen Schrift; Düsseldorff, 1970), p. 20: "Gerechtigkeit meint heir...umfassend das rechte Verhältnis zu Gott".

[8]See the discussion of the anthropological conceptions of the WS in ch. III, section B, above.

expressly stated, it is unquestionable that the opposite is also true: Wisdom comes into the life that is not enslaved to sin. 2) The finding of God, i.e., the manifestation of God to those who sincerely seek him (1:1-2), is to be understood in terms of the coming of Wisdom (1:4), while separation from God (1:3) is to be understood in terms of the departure of Wisdom (1:5). 3) The parallelism in 1:4-5 indicates that σοφία and πνεῦμα are used interchangeably,[9] and this is borne out by the following lines (1:6), where Wisdom is called a "Spirit that loves man",[10] and is then further identified as "the Spirit of the Lord" (1:7).[11] What this identification signifies is that Wisdom indwells man as spirit, as pneumatic reality, and that, as agent of God, she is operative in the lives of men who seek God in sincerity.

In a real sense, these opening verses provide a prologue for the chapters that follow. The indwelling of Wisdom, or its absence, as the case may be, is intimately related to the fate of the righteous, or

---

[9]Cf. Ziener, Weisheit, p. 20.

[10]RSV translates φιλάνθρωπον πνεῦμα with "kindly spirit" and the parallel expression in 7:23 with "spirit loving the good". This is not quite correct, and it seems better, with Ziener, Weisheit, pp. 20, 54, to translate "menschenfreundlicher Geist". Cf. Georgi, "Hymnus", p. 277, who speaks of the φιλανθρωπία of Wisdom as "die Menschenfreundlichkeit der Weisheit".

[11]Cf. also 9:17, where the identification between σοφία and God's ἅγιον πνεῦμα is clearly expressed; cf. also 12:1, where God's "immortal Spirit" (ἄφθαρτόν πνεῦμα) is said to dwell in all things, an affirmation which is made of Wisdom at 7:24.

the wicked, respectively. The righteous of chs. 2-5 are those in whom Wisdom has found a dwelling place, while the ungodly are those in whom Wisdom could not dwell, from whom she fled; thus they are "fools".[12] Since righteousness leads to immortality (1:15), to peaceful presence in the hand of God (3:1-3) and to the attainment of eternal life (5:15), while unrighteousness summons death (1:12, 16; 2:24), calls forth punishment (3:10) and ends in destruction (4:18 ff.),[13] union or non-union with Wisdom is determinative of man's destiny.

Thus far it is not clear how this relationship with Wisdom is brought about, or what its nature is. From the opening passages considered above it seems that righteousness in the lives of men is a precondition for the coming of Wisdom, and that therefore the attainment of eternal life is not, in the first instance, dependent on the presence of Wisdom, but on man's unaided endeavor. However, the opening appeal to "seek" the Lord (1:1), and the expressed conviction that he manifests himself to those who trust him (1:2), indicate man's dependence on God and the need to be properly related to him, in order that true righteousness -- which leads to life -- might be realized.[14] This latter emphasis is

---

[12] 1:3, 5: 5:4.

[13] See ch. III, above, for the detailed analysis of these passages.

[14] Cf. Reese, Hellenistic Influence, pp. 34-50, who maintains that the purpose of the author is precisely to "distinguish the nature of his quest for Wisdom from the self-sufficient pagan attitude..." (p. 44).

worked out in detail in WS 6:12-10:21, the section that has been called "the book of Wisdom proper".[15] It is in these chapters where "the Way of Salvation",[16] and its prerequisite, union with Wisdom, are set forth. The nature of that salvation was set forth in the first chapters by means of the contrasting fate of the righteous and the wicked.[17] Now the author turns to the task of explicating the means for the attainment of that salvation--a means foreshadowed in the opening verses of the book.

Let us summarize the development of the author's argument in these chapters,[18] and then proceed to a detailed analysis. The author presents a religious program by which men will be saved. He identifies himself with the wise King Solomon as he gives detailed instructions about how to attain eternal happiness. He expands upon the μυστήρια θεοῦ -- defined in 2:22-24 in terms of God's purpose for man's eternal fellowship with himself -- to show how divine grace conducts the just

---

[15]Weber, "Unsterblichkeit", p. 419; Focke, Entstehung, p. 74; Gärtner, Komposition, p. 2.

[16]Cf. W. Berwick, The Way of Salvation in the Book of Wisdom (PhD. Diss., Boston University, 1957).

[17]See ch. III, above.

[18]We follow here essentially the summary statement by Reese, Hellenistic Influence, p. 35. In his analysis of this material, Reese is primarily concerned to work out the relationship between Ps-Solomon's treatment of union with Wisdom and the literature of the Isis cult. In our own analysis we are not so much concerned with the religio-historical background of Ps-Solomon's treatment of Wisdom, as we are with the nature and results of union with Wisdom as the author conceives it.

man during this life and brings him ultimately to heavenly bliss. For this is the work of God, who gives to those who seek him sincerely a special gift, his own divine Wisdom, without which even the "perfect among the sons of men...will be regarded as nothing" (9:6). To reach life with God forever -- the ultimate goal of the search (1:1) -- man must now become "related to Wisdom" (8:17). The necessity of this relationship -- if one would enter life -- is forcefully underlined in ch. 10 where the author concludes the development of his argument by examples from history; showing that Wisdom has always been present to save men, and that those who have "passed Wisdom by" (10:8) ended in destruction.

The necessity for the presence of Wisdom in the lives of men is predicated on the nature of man: he is "mortal" (θνητός-7:1):

> there is for all mankind one
> entrance into life, and a
> common departure.
>
> (7:6)

> ...even if one is perfect among
> the sons of men,
> yet without the Wisdom that comes
> from thee he will be regarded
> as nothing.
>
> (9:6)

> For the reasoning of mortals
> is worthless,
> and our designs are likely to fail,
>
> (9:14)

> Who has learned thy counsel,
> unless thou hast given Wisdom
> and sent thy holy Spirit from
> on high?
>
> (9:17)

The recognition of human frailty, of human weakness, of human limitation vis-à-vis the divine -- expressed in these verses -- goes hand in hand with the parallel recognition that man must seek God if he is to find him (1:1-2).[19] It is this seeking, this openness toward the divine, this recognition of one's creature-hood, which opens the human life for the coming of Wisdom and her indwelling. The assertion that Wisdom "goes about seeking those worthy of her" (6:16)[20] does not mean, as some have held, that the initiative toward salvation lies wholly with man and that divine grace is excluded,[21] or that righteousness is demanded before Wisdom is given.[22] For those "worthy of her" are precisely "those who seek her" (6:12), that is, their "worthiness" does not consist of a self-attained goodness, but of their recognition of their need, of their human

---

[19]In 6:12, 13, 17, Wisdom is the object of this seeking; but what is here said explicitly is already intimated in the opening verses of ch. 1, where the finding of God, and his self-manifestation, is described in terms of the coming of Wisdom. Likewise, in 6:12 ff., the finding of Wisdom is identical with becoming "friends of God" (7:14, 24). More on this below.

[20]Cf. the parallel assertion in 1:4 that Wisdom will not dwell in a person enslaved to sin.

[21]Thus J.W. Montgomery, "Wisdom as Gift. The Wisdom Concept in Relation to Biblical Messianism", Inter. 16 (1962), pp. 43-57, who states that in the WS there is a strong works-righteousness emphasis, and that we have here "great anthropomorphic presumption".

[22]G. Zeiner, Die Theologische Begriffssprache im Buche der Weisheit, p. 89, n. 6; p. 112, "Die Gabe der Weisheit setzt die Rechtschaffenheit des Empfängers bereits voraus....Die Weisheit...setzt schon Gerechtigkeit voraus, die sich der Mensch durch eigenes Bemühen erwerben soll".

predicament. It is their "openness" toward the divine, then, that constitutes them "worthy candidates" for the indwelling Wisdom. This understanding of the beginning of the divine-human relationship -- or rather, of the relationship with Wisdom which leads to the divine-human relationship -- is supported by several textual considerations: It is said of Wisdom that

> She hastens to make herself known
> to those who desire her.
>
> (6:13)

Here, no preconditions are set forth for righteousness; only the human attitude, the desire, is a prerequisite, and on this basis Wisdom takes the initiative.[23] Further, in 7:27 we read:

> in every generation she passes into
> holy souls
> and makes them friends of God.

If the adjective ὁσίος here designated "righteousness of life", we would have here a clear statement of a precondition for the coming of Wisdom. Such a sense is, however, excluded by the context. For if "righteousness of life" leads to immortality,[24] and immortality signifies life in the presence of God,[25] then it could not be said that indwelling Wisdom makes men "friends of God". For friendship with God could not be something

---

[23]Cf. Reese, Hellenistic Influence, p. 38, n. 34, where he states that the divine initiative is clearly expressed in this text, as well as in 7:12-14, 9:17-18, and in the miracles of the Exodus (related in 10: 15 ff.).

[24]1:1; 6:18.

[25]6:19; 3:1 ff.; cf. the treatment of this theme in ch. III, above.

extra, something beside life in his presence. Friendship with God[26] is clearly the ultimate goal of the seeking after him, and must be equated with the other prominent formulation of this goal; i.e., immortality.[27] Thus, "holy souls" are simply those who seek God in sincerity, who are open toward him.

This seeking becomes concrete in the act of prayer[28] which, in itself, expresses a conviction of utter helplessness and dependence. The confession of man's mortality in 7:1-6 is followed by these words:

> Therefore I prayed, and
> understanding was given me;
> I called upon God, and the Spirit
> of Wisdom[29] came to me.
>
> (7:7)

---

[26] 7:14, 27. Cf. the treatment of "Die Gottesfreundschaft" by Zeiner in Theologische Begriffssprache, pp. 88-92.

[27] It should be observed that we understand the term "immortality" (or "incorruption") in terms of our interpretation offered in ch. III, above, namely, as life in the presence of God.

[28] According to P. van Imschoot, Sagesse et esprit dans l'AT, the WS knows only one way to receive Wisdom, namely by prayer (p. 37). Ziener, Theologische Begriffssprache, p. 113, disagrees and points to 6:9 as indicating a second way, i.e., through instruction. However, it seems that in 6:9 we have a use of "wisdom" in its non-hypostatized sense.

[29] We have already pointed out (n.11, above) that in 1:6 (cf. 12: 1/7:24) it is expressly said that Wisdom is a πνεῦμα, and that in 9:17 σοφία is parallel to πνεῦμα ἅγιον. In this context, H. Ringgren, Word and Wisdom. Studies in the Hypostatization of Divine Qualities and Functions in the Ancient Near East (Lund, 1947), p. 115, points out that the statement of 7:23 -- ἔστιν γὰρ ἐν αὐτῇ πνεῦμα ("For in her is a spirit ...") -- does not mean that spirit is one aspect of Wisdom, among many others, but that the nature of Wisdom, as such, is here intended. "It is possible to read ἐν αὐτῇ and to translate it by: She is by herself, i.e., as far as her nature is concerned, a spirit". The intent of the phrase "the spirit of Wisdom" in 7:7 is surely the same.

This brief statement is expanded in the introduction to "Solomon's"[30] prayer (8:21) and in that prayer (ch. 9) itself:

8:21 I perceived that I would not
possess Wisdom unless God gave
her to me--
so I appealed to the Lord and
besought him,
and with my whole heart I said:

9:1 "O God of my Fathers and Lord
of mercy,
who hast made all things by thy
word,
9:2 and by thy Wisdom hast formed
man,

9:4 give me the Wisdom that sits by
thy throne,

9:5 For I am thy slave and the son of
thy maidservant,
a man ho is weak and short-lived.

9:9 With thee is Wisdom, who knows
thy works
and was present when thou didst
make the world,

9:10 Send her forth from the holy
heavens,
and from the throne of thy glory
send her,

9:17 (For) who has learned thy counsel,
unless thou hast given Wisdom
and sent thy holy Spirit from on high?

Two things are clearly stated here: one, that man's mortality and weak-

---

[30]It was earlier pointed out (ch. III, above) that the figure of Solomon, as well as the patriarchs in ch. 10, must be understood as paradigms for all wise and righteous men. Cf. U. Wilckens, Weisheit und Torheit, Eine exegetisch-religionsgeschichtlich Untersuchung zu I Kor 1 und 2 (BHTh 26; Tübingen, 1959), p. 172: "Die Väter sind zu τύποι des von der Weisheit geretteten geworden".

ness necessitates the coming of Wisdom into man's life, and two, that this divine indwelling, this coming down of Wisdom from the throne of God's glory, is purely an act of God's mercy and grace; it is pure Gift. The author of the WS does not subscribe to the widespread pagan-Hellenistic theory that the soul achieves its own salvation by ascending through the spheres of this harmonious cosmos to arrive at its true heavenly dwelling-place.[31] On the contrary, he insists that divine Wisdom and the salvation she brings to men are gifts from the personal God, who is creator, father, and director of all. The religious literature of the Hellenistic world provided ample material for portraying man's search for union with God. But the author of the WS wanted to show that man's search for God was not the beginning of salvation -- though it was clearly a necessary condition. Rather, the beginning of salvation is God's search for man, for the Lord of creation is also the sole author of salvation, i.e., of eternal life with himself. God manifests himself in his gift of Wisdom.[32] In her he seeks those who recognize their creatureliness and open their lives to the divine.[33]

---

[31]The contrast between the way of salvation in the WS and the contemporary Hellenistic religions is pointed out particularly well by Reese, Hellenistic Influence, pp. 32-89. Cf. also the treatment given this theme by Berwick, The Way of Salvation in the Book of Wisdom PhD. Diss.; Boston University, 1957), pp. 304 ff.

[32]1:2, 4; 6:13. Cf. Peter Dalbert, Die Theologie der hellenistisch-jüdischen Missionsliteratur unter Ausschluss von Philo und Josephus (Hamburg, 1954), p. 90: "(Wisdom) is basically God himself in her work in and regarding the world".

[33]6:16; 1:4.

In her he makes himself known to them.[34] In her, God's love for his creation takes on concrete form.[35]

## 2. The Nature of Union with Wisdom and its Effects

Union with Wisdom, as we have already seen, has its beginning in the coming of Wisdom into the life of the man who is a seeker of God. This is expressed negatively in 1:4:

> Wisdom will not enter a
> deceitful soul,
> nor dwell in a body enslaved to sin.

and positively in 7:27:

> in every generation she passes into
> holy souls
> and makes them friends of God..

Since Wisdom is Spirit, this coming into the life of man must be understood in some sense as "mystische Bei- und Einwohnung",[36] as spiritual-personal incorporation.[37] This mystical indwelling is more specifically

---

[34] 6:13; 8:4; 7:25-27.

[35] 11:24, 26; 8:28 (cf. 1:6; 7:23). In ch. 10 the love of God for his chosen people is expressed in terms of the saving activity of Wisdom in their midst. More on this below.

[36] D. Georgi "Der Vorpaulinische Hymnus", p. 277. I would translate: "a mystical relationship and indwelling".

[37] Reese, Hellenistic Influence, p. 39, shows that the relationship between Wisdom and man, as depicted in the WS, is quite different from that relationship as depicted in the Hebrew wisdom tradition. There, the just man is depicted as the pupil of Wisdom. He comes to her to learn the riches of revelation because ultimately she is the personification of the infinite religious treasure of the Mosaic Law (Sir 24:23-29; I Bar 4:1; implied in Prv 1:20-33; 8:1-9:6). By fidelity to her precepts the God-fearing Israelite finds "life" (Prv 9:35; I Bar 9:3), that is, the peace

described as a "living with Wisdom":

> God loves nothing so much
> as the man who lives with Wisdom.
>
> (7:28)

A relationship is here described, a dynamic reality, a "life together". This is brought out even more clearly in those passages where Wisdom's indwelling is seen in terms of entering with her into a συμβίωσις, a "community of life":[38]

> ...I determined to take
> her to live with me (συμβίωσις)
>
> (8:9)

> Life with her (συμβίωσις) has no pain,
> but gladness and joy.
>
> (8:16)

The "community of life"[39] brought about by Wisdom's indwelling is seen to be an intimate, personal religious experience, and the extended use of sexual imagery[40] is the author's literary device for picturing the

---

and prosperity promised in Deuteronomy and many of the Psalms. Wisdom is here essentially the Law, either objectively as taking up an abode in Israel (Sir 24:1-27; I Bar 4:1), or subjectively, motivating the upright man as hia "way" (I Bar 3:23; Prv 8:35) or as his "guide" (I Bar 4:2; Sir 15:1-8; 51:16).

[38]This translation is offered by Reese, Hellenistic Influence, p. 36.

[39]συμβίος is the ordinary, Hellenistic term for "spouse"; See J. and L. Robert. "Bulletin épigraphique", REG 74 (1961), no. 79.

[40]Georgi, "Der Vorpaulinische Hymnus", p. 277, sees it in terms of the ἱερὸς γάμος motif. Cf. W.L. Knox, "The Divine Wisdom", JTS 38 (1937), p. 230-237, who thinks the description of Wisdom and union with her is heavily influenced by the literature of the Isis cult. Cf.

intimacy of this relationship:

> Wisdom is radiant and unfading,
> and she is easily discerned by those
> who love her,
> and is found by those who seek her.
> She hastens to make herself known
> to those who desire her.
> He who rises early to seek her will
> have no difficulty,
> for he will find her sitting
> at his gates.
>
> (6:12-14)

> I loved her and sought her
> from my youth,
> and I desired to take her
> for my bride,
> and I became enamored
> of her beauty.
>
> (8:2)

> Therefore I determined to take
> her to live with me,
>
> (8:9a)

> When I enter my house, I shall
> find rest with her,
> for companionship with her[41]
> has no bitterness.
>
> (8:16a, b)

---

also Reese, Hellenistic Influence, p. 40, who maintains that the WS's presentation of divine Wisdom and the need for union with her to achieve man's true destiny is a conscious effort to offset the appeal of the literature of the revived Isis cult in the Hellenistic period.

[41]It is probably correct, as Reese, Knox and others have maintained, that the sexual imagery, used as a vehicle for describing the union of Wisdom with man, is consciously borrowed from the Isis cult in order to polemicise against it. It should, however, be remembered that the sexual imagery, as a vehicle for describing man's relation with the divine, is not absent from the Old Testament. One needs only

This "community of life" -- pictured in the passages cited above -- this intimate relationship between Wisdom and man, is but a reflection of the prior union between God and Wisdom. The nature of that higher union is the "paradigmatic model" for the possibility of man's union with Wisdom, and man's union with Wisdom becomes the paradigm for man's ultimate union with God. Let us examine this progression more closely.

---

to recall that the word yadah ("to know"), used to designate intercourse between a man and a woman, is also used to designate the relationship between Israel and God; e.g., Amos 3:2, "You only have I known of all the families of the earth"; Is 1:3, "Israel does not know [God--thought it should!]"; Jer 31:34, "... they shall all know me". The intimacy of this divine-human relationship, described in the language of sexual intercourse, is expressed more comprehensively in the depiction of this relationship as a marriage relationship between God and Israel:

> I have loved you with an everlasting love;
> therefore I have continued my
> faithfulness to you. Jer 31:3
>
> Surely, as a faithless wife leaves her husband
> so have you been faithless to me,
> O house of Israel. Jer 3:20
>
> I remember the devotion of your youth
> your love as a bride. Jer.2:2
>
> (Israel) went after her lovers,
> and forgot me, says the Lord. (Hos 2:13)

It should also be pointed out that the ἱερὸς γάμος in the Hellenistic mystery cults is an end in itself: it is in this union that the devotee becomes one with the goddess. Not so in the WS; the indwelling of Wisdom, in her dynamic presence (cf. 7:25), is what enables man to enter into his divine destiny as described in the opening chapters of the book (see below); the sexual imagery is but "dramatic machinery" in order to convey the intimacy of this religious experience.

and this same συμβίωσις, as we have seen, characterizes her relationship with man.[45] The similarity in the description of these relationships is not confined to this parallel use of the same words. Wisdom is said to be "with God" (μετὰ σοῦ ἡ σοφία , 9:9), even as man is "with her" (8:16a), has "companionship with her" (8:16b), "lives with her" (7:28), has κοινωνία[46] with her, and as she is with him (9:10). Further, God "loves" her (8:3), just as she is a "lover of men" (1:6; 7:23) and as men ought to love her (6:12).[47]

It seems clear from this data that a very conscious effort was made to bring about this correspondence of relationships, for in 8:2 f. and in 9:10, the union between man and Wisdom is related specifically to the union existing between God and Wisdom.[48] What is the significance of this correspondence? It lies in the recognition that because Wisdom is so intimately related to God -- "an initiate in the knowledge of God andan associate in his works" (8:4); "a breath of the power of God and a pure emanation of the glory of the almighty" (7:25); a reflection of eternal light, a spotless mirror of the working of God and an image of

---

[45] 8:9, 16 c.

[46] Cf. note 41 above.

[47] Cf. 7:10; 8:2.

[48] Cf. Wilckens, Weisheit und Torheit, p. 184, n. 2.

his goodness (7:26)[49] -- she is able, by incorporating herself in men (1:4; 7:27c), to mediate the nature and essence of that paradigmatic union to man, and so make men "friends of God" (7:27), i.e., lead them to salvation (9:18), to eternal life in the presence of God (3:1-3).[50]

Let us briefly delineate her redemptive activity. At the end of Solomon's prayer for the gift of Wisdom we read:

> Who has learned thy counsel
> unless thou hast given Wisdom
> and sent thy holy Spirit from on high?
> And thus the paths of those on earth
> were set right,
> and men were taught what pleaseth thee,
> and were saved by Wisdom.
> (καὶ τῇ σοφίᾳ ἐσώθησαν)
>
> (9:18)

In these words we have a summary prologue of what follows in ch. 10: an account of Wisdom's saving activity in history. The names of the figures in Israel's history are conspicuous by their absence, but the figures themselves stand out clearly: they were the objects of Wisdom's election (10:5), of her guidance (10:4, 10, 17)[51] of her support (10: 13 14), of

---

[49]See Ringgren, Word and Wisdom, pp. 116-119, for an excellent and concise discussion of the passage 7:25-26. We give here the result of that discussion: Wisdom clearly shares in the divine nature; indeed she is an independent divine being. At the same time, the relationship is so close that "in the activity of Wisdom in the world the activity of God is clearly visible." Cf. Reese, Hellenistic Influence, p. 45: "... in her he accomplishes his divine plan".

[50]Cf. Wilckens, Weisheit und Torheit, p. 181: "All dies kann sie nur, weil sie selbst himmlischen Wesens und ihre Heimat der Himmel und die Gottesnähe ist".

[51]Cf. 10:18, where Israel is the object.

her protection (10:1, 5, 12), and of her redemption (10:4, 6, 9, 13, 15).[52] The fact that the author has eliminated all biblical names, and designated the patriarchs with the stereotype ὁ δίκαιος, indicates that the activity of Wisdom in history is to be understood as typical: the patriarchs are τύποι of those who are saved -- not only in the past, but also in the present and future. This "typical" character of Wisdom's redemptive activity in history is confirmed by the fact that the figure of Enoch is missing from the otherwise complete list in ch. 10, and that his marvellous fate -- translation into the presence of God -- has already been used in ch. 4:10 ff. as a paradigm of the fate of all righteous as such.[53] His example explicates what happens in the redemption in which Wisdom is the divine instrument; that is, we are here told where Wisdom leads those who have opened their lives to her

From the above it is clear that Wisdom is Revealer and Redeemer. She is not a revealer in the sense of the gnostic revealer who imparts divine γνῶσις. She is herself the revelation of God (7:25-26) and of his μυστήριον (2:22), since she is his μύστις (8:4). As an "associate in his works" (8:4) she is ever active, preserving God's cosmos. This creative, preserving activity is combined in a beautiful way in 7:27 with her redemptive activity. We are told that, as the perfect embodiment of the power, the glory, the light, the goodness of God (7:25-26), she "can do all things" (7:27a), that is, "she renews all things" (7:27b). The

---

[52]Cf. Ziener, Theologische Begriffssprache, p. 112.

[53]See our analysis of this passage in ch. III, above.

fact that the next sentence is connected with a simple καί indicates that a parallel statement is being made: i.e., "she passes into holy souls and makes them friends of God". That means that her creating, preserving activity manifests itself precisely in her redemptive activity.[54] And this activity takes place as down through the ages she incorporates herself in the lives of men.[55]

We summarize: Wisdom, as the gift of God (9:10, 17) is sent as πνεῦμα into the lives of men (7:7; 9:17). As a result of her indwelling, heavenly riches (7:11, 14), fullness of life (8:16 ff.), incorruption (6:19), and immortality (8:13, 17; 1:15) come to weak, mortal man (7:1, 5; 9:5-6). She guides and guards the man in whom she dwells (9:11) and leads him ultimately into the very presence of God (6:19; 3:1), i.e., to salvation. Thus, her dynamic presence (7:25) enables man to enter into his divine destiny as described in the opening chapters of the book.[56]

## C. CHRIST THE WISDOM OF GOD[57]

---

[54]Cf. Reese, Hellenistic Influence, p. 41: "...Wisdom...shares in God's creative activity (8:4), which is also the first manifestation of his saving will, because God created man 'unto incorruption' (2:23)".

[55]Georgi, "Der Vorpaulinische Hymnus", p. 277.

[56]See above, ch. III.

[57]The most extensive and thorough study of this theme is the work by A. Feuillet, Le Christ Sagesse De Dieu. D'Apres Les Epitres Pauliniennes (Etudes Bibliques; Paris, 1966). Feuillet's work is very comprehensive in that it draws upon the entire literature of the wisdom tradition. However, as a look at the Scriptural index shows, the list of citations from the WS is as long as those of Prv and Sir combined; this is a clear indication of where the weight of dependence falls. Further, whereas ca. 125 pages are devoted to the study of the theme in the generally acknowledged Paulines (Specifically I and II Cor), ca. 150 pages

1. Introduction

We have seen above that the figure of divine Wisdom in the WS is God's agent in the drama of creation and redemption.[58] In terms of the latter activity, Wisdom, as the gift of God, comes into the lives of men who are open toward God and dwells in them. This union between man and divine Wisdom becomes both the ground and the means for the attainment of fullness of life in the presence of God.

In terms of our study, these observations take on significance when it is seen, as we shall attempt to demonstrate, that Paul saw in the Wisdom figure of the WS a foreshadowing of the exalted Lord whom he knew and experienced and that he pictured this Lord in terms of that divine figure. Not only did he conceive of Christ as the Wisdom of God, he went further and described the Christian's experience of this Christ and union with him in analogy to the union between Wisdom and man, as pictured in the WS. This union with Christ is, for Paul, not an end in itself: it is not a "mysticism" of absorption into, and assimilation with, the divine nature.[59] Rather, union with Christ is oriented toward the future, whether individually of collectively conceived.[60] And here

---

are devoted to the study of the christological hymn in Col 1:15-20, and to Ephesians.

[58]In this association of creation and redemption, the author of the WS is clearly in keeping with the thought of the Old Testament where the redemption of Israel from Egypt is pictured as an act of creation.

[59]Cf. M. Dibelius, "Paulus und die Mystik", in Das Paulusbild in der neueren deutschen Forschung, ed. K.H. Rengstorf (Wege der Forschung, 24; Darmstadt, 1964), pp. 470-471.

[60]See section C below.

again, Paul follows what we have already observed in the WS, where union with Wisdom is also future-oriented and is the guarantee of the attainment of the dual eschatological realities.

## 2. General Considerations: the Scholarly Discussion

The question of the origin or source of the Pauline conception of Christ has been the subject of much scholarly discussion. How was it possible for Paul to depict Jesus as the divine, heavenly being, the exalted Lord? Conservative theology has always rejected this "gulf" between the earthly Jesus and the exalted Lord,[61] holding that in Jesus himself can be traced a self-consciousness of divinity, while radical criticism has bypassed the problem and pictured "Paulinism" as a purely syncretistic construct. Historical-theological Biblical criticism largely forged a mediating path between these extremes and attempted to show that Paul transferred to Jesus the descriptions of the heavenly Messiah, a figure familiar to him out of his Jewish tradition, long before he became a Christian.[62] M. Brückner, in his Die Entstehung der Paulinischen Christologie,[63] attempted to establish this thesis on solid footing. As a result of the Damascus-road experience, Paul came to be-

---

[61] Cf. the treatment of this problem in C.F.D. Moule, The Phenomenon of the New Testament (Studies in Biblical Theology, 2nd series, I, Naperville, 1967), pp. 43 ff.

[62] E.g., W.Wrede, Paulus (Halle, 1905), p. 86 and J. Weiss, Das Urchristentum (Göttingen, 1914), p. 341.

[63] (Strasbourg, 1903).

lieve in Jesus as the Messiah. But his picture of the Messiah was a "synthetic picture", forged out of the primitive Christian proclamation of Jesus' Messiahship and out of the pre-Christian Jewish-apocalyptic conception of the heavenly Messiah. It must be acknowledged, as continuing research has shown, that all of these elements -- Paul's conversion, the Christian proclamation of Jesus' Messiahship and the apocalyptic conception of the heavenly Messiah -- have influenced the Pauline doctrine of Christ, though the various elements have been emphasized in differing degrees.[64] But it is wrong, as H. Windisch has shown,[65] to see the Pauline Christology as simply a combination of, on the one hand, Paul's conversion experience and early Christian proclamation and on the other, the apocalyptic heavenly Messiah. For, contrary to Olschewski's emphasis on the centrality of the Damascus experience,[66] it must be maintained that experience is but a subjective, nebulous abstraction that must be given flesh and bone, that must in some way be conceptualized. On the other hand, the apocalyptic conception of the Messiah, in all its variation and complexity, is not sufficient to account for

---

[64]Thus W. Olschewski, in his Die Wurzeln der Paulinischen Christologie (Königsberg i. Pr., 1909), critized Brückner for what he considered a too mechanical synthesis, and emphasized the Damascus experience--as an experience of the risen Christ as Spirit and divine power--as the "root" of, and central to, Paul's Christology.

Cf. more recently J. Jeremias, "The Key to Pauline Theology", ET 76 (1964), pp. 27-30.

[65]"Die göttliche Weisheit der Juden und die paulinische Christologie" in Neutestamentliche Studien für G. Heinrici (Leipzig, 1914), pp. 220-234.

[66]Cf. n. 7 above.

the Pauline conception of Christ.[67]

Windisch seeks to overcome this discrepancy by pointing to the "clearly defined biblical figure...Wisdom" as the model which supplied the Pauline Christ with some essential characteristics. Windisch broke new ground[68] and opened new interpretative possibilities for the Pauline conception of Christ.[69] Thus, O. Michel, in his essay, "Die Entstehung der paulinischen Christologie",[70] utilizes Windisch's "new directions" in his own analysis. He combines Olschewski's emphasis on the centrality of the Damascus experience[71] with characteristics of Jewish Wisdom, which

---

[67]E.g., that the Christ was involved in God's creation of the world, as Paul clearly believed (I Cor 8:6), is nowhere asserted in apocalyptic descriptions of the Messiah.

[68]This is clearly illustrated by the fact that in the important work by W. Bousset, Kyrios Christos, published one year prior to the appearance of Windisch's essay, the Jewish figure of Wisdom is not considered; as far as I can see, it is not mentioned either in the section on Paul, nor in the discussion of the Logos-theology.

It must be said, of course, that aspects of the complex hypostasis of Hellenistic syncretism--variously called Wisdom, Spirit, Logos, World-soul--had previously been recognized as being reflected in the Pauline Christ; e.g., O. Pfleiderer, Der Christus des urchristlichen Glaubens (Berling, 1903), pp. 16 ff.; J. Weiss, Das Urchristentum (Göttingen, 1914), pp. 368 ff.; S.N. Rostrom, The Christology of St. Paul (Library of Historic Theology; London, 1912), pp. 45-46, 109 ff., 143. However, nowhere before Windisch was very much significance attached to the personified Jewish Wisdom.

[69]We shall note the specific contributions of Windisch below, though his analysis has limited value for our specific analysis, since he devotes much space to deutero-Pauline texts.

[70]ZNW 28 (1929), pp. 324-333.

[71]"Das Christusbild (ist ganz eng) mit der Geistvorstellung und der inneren Kraft, die der Apostel seit Damaskus in sich verspürt, verwandt....Das Damaskuserlebnis ist tatsächlich der historische Ausgangspunkt für die Entstehung der Christologie des Paulus". Pp. 326, 327.

were transferred by Paul to Christ. In disagreement with Windisch, Michel does not accept the idea of a combined Messiah/Wisdom figure which Paul is said to have inherited from his pre-Christian Judaism, and maintains that the identification of the Pauline Christ with Jewish Wisdom is the result of Paul's own theologizing and speculation.[72]

Regardless of the ultimate origin of the identification, however, it has been shown to be very probable that Paul did conceive of Christ in terms of the Jewish figure of Wisdom.[73] Yet, in the various presentations of this identification, there appears to be a serious weakness. Windisch, criticizing those who postulate a "variegated hypostasis of

---

[72]P. 333. Cf. the support for Michel's rejecion of Windisch's position offered by W.D. Davies in Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, ch. 7, "The Old and the New Torah: Christ the Wisdom of God", pp. 158-162. Davies' reason for rejecting Windisch's position is other than that of Michel. Davies finds Torah and Wisdom equated in pre-Christian Judaism, and since Paul saw in Jesus a New Torah, he was able to equate him with Wisdom.

[73]Besides the literature already cited, cf. W.L. Knox, St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles (Cambridge, 1939), pp. 123 ff; idem., Some Hellenistic Elements in Primitive Christianity (Schweich Lectures, London, 1944); E. Andrews, The Meaning of Christ for Paul (New York, 1949), pp. 164-168; F.F. Bruce, "Promise and Fulfillment in Paul's Presentation of Jesus", in Promise and Fulfillment. Essays presented to S.H. Hooke, ed. by F.F. Bruce (Edinburgh, 1964), pp. 36-50; W. Berwick, The Way of Salvation in the Book of Wisdom, pp. 108 ff; L. Cerfaux, Christ in the Theology of St. Paul (New York, 1959), pp. 247-274; E. Schweizer, "Zur Herkunft der Präexistenzvorstellung bei Paulus", and "Aufnahme und Korrektur jüdischer Sophiatheologie", in Neotestamentica (Zürich-Stuttgart, 1963), pp. 105-109, 110-121. The thesis has not been without its detractors, e.g., J.G. Machen, The Origin of Paul's Religion (Grand Rapids, 1947), pp. 199-204.

Hellenistic syncretism"[74] -- including Wisdom, Spirit, Logos, World-soul -- as a background for the Pauline conception of Christ, affirms that there is already in Paul's background a "clearly defined biblical figure"[75] which serves as his model, namely Wisdom. But then, in his analysis, he constructs what seems to be a kind of hypothetical Wisdom figure, drawing upon such diverse sources as the WS, Prv, Sir and I Enoch, though it is clear that there is great diversity in the way Wisdom is perceived and presented in these various strands of the wisdom tradition.[76] It is our contention that the "clearly defined biblical figure" of Wisdom, which served Paul as a model for his conception of his exalted, as well as intimately present, Lord, was found by him in the Wisdom of Solomon.[77]

---

[74]"Die Göttliche Weisheit", p. 221.

[75]Ibid.

[76]The same methodological weakness can be traced throughout the literature that deals with the theme of Christ as the Wisdom of God.

[77]To my knowledge, there is only one scholar who has attempted to utilize the WS, exclusive of other "wisdom" texts, for the interpretative background of a Pauline text. In "Der Vorpaulinische Hymnus Phil 2, 6-11", in Zeit und Geschichte (Festschrift für R. Bultmann, Tübingen, 1964), pp. 263-292, Dieter Georgi attempts to combine the figure of Wisdom with the figure of "the Righteous One", and sees this combination as having influenced the hymn of Phil 2. He further identifies the Righteous One in WS with the Servant of Is 52/53 (both are "the divine instrument", p. 271) and sees the movement from the ἄνθρωπος (made in the "image of God's eternity", WS 2:23, (p. 272)) to the Righteous One who suffers, as equivalent to the move in Phil 2:6 f. from μορφὴ θεοῦ to μορφὴ δούλου (p. 273). Further, in both Phil 2 and WS 5 there is a reversal: the death of the "divine figure" is understood "not as end but as turning-point" (p. 274). The problem with Georgi's analysis is that in the WS the "Righteous One" and "the righteous" are freely interchangeable (see ch. III above), and it seems clear from the entire thrust of the text

For all the various characteristics of Wisdom, documented in the various texts of the wisdom tradition and attributed to the Pauline Christ, have already coalesced into the "clearly defined" figure of divine Wisdom in the WS.[78]

### 3. The Use of the Term σοφία

If it can be maintained that Paul has pictured Jesus in terms of the figure of divine Wisdom, why is it that the use of the term is so restricted in the Pauline literature, and why does Paul never explicitly designate Christ with the title "σοφία"?

The use of the term σοφία is indeed quite limited. It does not appear before I Cor, and it occurs there only in chs. 2 and 3 and in the catalog of the χαρίσματα (12:8, λογος σοφίας, as a spiritual gift). The term appears only two more times in Paul: in II Cor 1:12 and in the liturgical expression in Rom 11:33: "O the depth of the riches and wisdom

---

that the author of the WS is concerned with the righteous as a group of persons over against the godless. The "Righteous One" is not a "divine instrument". He is simply a man who, like all the righteous, responds to God and is properly related to him. Again, the reference to man made "in the image of God's eternity" is in a context that deals with the problem of death as a general human problem, and has nothing to do with a particular man, i.e., "the Righteous One". Cf. the discussion of Georgi's essay by J.T. Sanders, The New Testament Christological Hymns (Society for NTS Monograph Series, 15, Cambridge, 1971), pp. 70-73.

[78] It is possible, of course, that Paul himself combined the various characteristics associated with the (more or less) personified Wisdom throughout the wisdom tradition. But it is much more probable, in view of the strong likelihood that he knew and used the WS (cf. ch. II above), that his conception of Christ as the Wisdom of God was influenced by the figure of Wisdom in this work. This impression is seen to be strengthened by our analysis of that influence (see below).

and knowledge of God".[79] It is very likely that this latter expression has come to Paul preformed from the tradition,[80] and thus should not be used as a criterion for Paul's dependence on wisdom theology. In II Cor 1:12, the phrase ἐν σοφίᾳ σαρκικῇ has clearly nothing to do with any christological speculation, but, like the parallel expressions ἐν σοφίᾳ λογοῦ (I Cor 1:17), ὑπεροχὴν λόγου ἢ σοφίας (I Cor 2:1), and πειθοῖς σοφίας λόγοις (I Cor 2:4), refers to speculative thought and eloquence of speech.[81] Thus, Paul's use of the term -- in terms of its relevance to our discussion -- is confined to the christological controversy with the Corinthians' wisdom (i.e., τὴν σοφίαν τοῦ κόσμου, 1:20). How is this data to be explained?

U. Wilckens, in his important study on I Cor 1 and 2,[82] shows rather convincingly that behind the Corinthian proclamation stands a definite, contrary-to-Paul, Christology, a proclamation of Christ in which the concept of "Wisdom" has christological significance.[83] He assumes

---

[79] In the deutero-Paulines, the term appears several times in both Ephesians and Colossians.

[80] H. Conzelmann, "Paulus und die Weisheit", NTS 12 (1965/66), pp. 231-244.

[81] The Commentaries generally agree in this interpretation. Cf. most recently C.K. Barrett, The First Epistle to the Corinthians (HNTC; New York-Evanston, 1969); also his "Christianity at Corinth", BJRL 46/2, (1964), pp. 269-297, where he gives a detailed discussion of the uses and meanings of the term σοφία in I Cor (especially pp. 275-283).

[82] Weisheit und Torheit.

[83] Ibid., p. 25.

that, in all probability, Paul adopted the use of the Sophia-concept for his polemic from the Corinthians, among whom this concept was used in a way and in a context "wie Paulus ihn von seiner Theologie her nur leidenschaftlich ablehnen muss".[84] Because of Paul's antipathy to the particular use of the conception by the Corinthians, he first has to destroy this conception with his message of "Christ crucified" before he can employ the conception within the context of his own proclamation, and at the same time not run the risk of being misunderstood.[85]

It is probably correct to say that a Corinthian Wisdom-speculation forced Paul, in his polemic, to speak of Christ specifically as "the Wisdom of God". If this were not correct, it would be difficult to explain why Paul only here speaks of Christ in those specific terms.[86] But this does not necessarily lead to the related assumption that Paul did not -- apart from, indeed before, this controversy -- entertain a conception of Christ modelled on the figure of divine Wisdom. Is it not just as possible that Paul wants to correct the Corinthian Sophia-conception, and that he does this by pointing to the crucified Christ as "the new

---

[84] Ibid., p. 38.

[85] Ibid. Wilckens supports this argumentation by pointing out that, in terms of the movement of Paul's argument, we should have expected σοφία θεοῦ instead of δύναμις θεοῦ at 1:18; but Paul designates Christ as the Wisdom of God first at 1:24, after centering down on "Christ crucified".

[86] But cf. Conzelmann, "Paulus und die Weisheit", p. 235, who cautions that the key-word of the Corinthians, cited by Paul (I cor 8: 1 ff.), seems to be γνῶσις, and not σοφία.

revelation of the divine, redeeming Wisdom?"[87] But if Paul conceived of Christ as "Wisdom of God" even apart from his controversy with the Corinthians,[88] why is the explicit designation confined to this controversy? W.F. Howard argues that "there is some internal evidence that an inhibition was imposed on the use of the...term Wisdom", namely, the simple fact that it is of feminine gender.[89] As Windisch puts it: "Jesus the Messiah, the Son of God, was the personality that had been revealed to Paul. Upon him he bestowed the characteristics of Wisdom; or better: the Son of God displaced in Paul's consciousness the figure of Wisdom by assimilating her characteristics to himself".[90] This line of reasoning is supported by the observation that in Col 1:15 ff., where the Wisdom-figure background is unmistakable,[91] the expected declaration that Christ

---

[87]H.D. Wendland, Die Briefe an die Korinther (6th ed.; NTD 7; Göttingen, 1954), p. 19. Cf. Rolf Baumann, Mitte und Norm des Christlichen. Eine Auslegung von I Korinther 1, 1-3, 4 (NTAb, N.F. 5; Münster, 1968), pp. 108-111.

[88]Cf. H. Windisch, "Die göttliche Weisheit", pp. 225-226: "So sehr auch Paulus zu dem sehr häufigen Gebrauch des Wortes σοφία in I Kor 1-3 durch die bekannten Ansprüche der Korinther veranlasst ist, so zeight er sich doch auch hier als Kenner der jüdisch-biblischen Weisheitsspekulation".

[89]W.F. Howard, Christianity According to St. John (London, 1943), p. 43; Windisch, "Die Göttliche Weisheit", p. 227: "Paulus wird Scheu getragen haben, den κύριος mit einem weiblichen Prädikat auszustatten".

[90]Ibid., p. 227.

[91]Cf. C.F. Burney, "Christ as the APXH of Creation", JTS 27 (1926), pp. 100-177.

is Wisdom is not made.[92] Again, the Wisdom-figure is hardly concealed behind the Logos of the Johannine prologue,[93] yet the masculine Logos, rather than the feminine Wisdom, is employed.[94] Thus, though the specific designation of Christ as "Wisdom" is confined to I Cor 1:24, 30, probably in view of apologetic needs, the possibility that Paul conceived of Christ as the "Wisdom of God" outside that controversy cannot be discounted simply on the basis of the restricted use of the term.[95] We shall now proceed to show that the substance of the Wisdom-figure, as presented in the WS, very significantly informs the Pauline conception of Christ, both in I Cor and in several other Pauline letters.

---

[92]Cf. Howard, Christianity According to St. John, p. 43: "... with a side glance at the shibboleths of Gnosticism he does say that in Christ 'all the treasures of knowledge and wisdom are hidden'". See also Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, p. 173, who thinks that since Paul thought of Jesus as the New Torah, he had no need of using either the terms Logos or Wisdom. (cf. n. 90 below).

[93]This was Bultmann's earlier position, worked out in "Der religionsgeschichtlich Hintergrund des Prologs zum Johannesevangelium" in Eucharistērion, Festgabe H. Gunkel (FRLANT N.F. 19/2; Göttingen, 1923), pp. 1-26. More recently, R. Brown in The Gospel of John (Anchor Bible), has clearly demonstrated the Wisdom figure as the interpretative key for the prologue.

[94]Howard, Christianity According to St. John, p. 42, argues that it was owing to the 'Gnostic' associations of the term Logos that Paul avoided it.

[95]Cf. O. Michel, "Die Entstehung der paulinischen Christologie", p. 333: "...the use of motifs from Wisdom does not only result from polemic against the heretics; often they are developed independently of external influences".

## 4. Texts with Sophia

### a. I Corinthians 1

In radical opposition to the "wisdom of the world" (σοφία τοῦ κόσμου, 1:20) -- from which perspective "Christ crucified" is both a stumbling block (for Jews) and foolishness (for Greeks) -- Paul declares Christ to be the Wisdom of God:

> αὐτὸς δὲ τοῖς κλητοῖς
> Ἰουδαίοις τε καὶ Ἕλλησιν,
> Χριστὸν θεοῦ δύναμιν καὶ θεοῦ σοφίαν
> But to those who are called,
> both Jews and Greeks,
> Christ[96] the power of God and the wisdom of God.
> (1:24)

If, with Wilckens, it is correct to say that Paul is here combating a gnosticized Jewish wisdom speculation,[97] for which of course the proclamation of the cross is absurd, and wishes to oppose a heretical σοφία-myth with the presentation of a Christ who is indeed God's Wisdom (in a Christological sense), why does he parallel the expression θεοῦ

---

[96] The Χριστὸν is probably not to be understood as a further object of κηρύσσειν, subsequent to the series Χριστὸν, σκάνδαλον, μωρίαν (1:23), but should be understood as an independent thesis: "Christ is..." Cf. Weiss, Der Erste Korintherbrief (KEK 5/9; Göttingen, 1910), p. 33; Conzelmann, Der Erste Brief and die Korinther (11th ed., KEK 5; Göttingen, 1969), p. 63.

[97] Both Schmidthals and Wilckens, despite their differences at other points, have fairly convincingly shown that a Jewish-Gnostic mentality underlies much of the difficulty addressed by Paul in the Corinthian correspondence.

σοφία with θεοῦ δύναμις?[98] Wilckens points to Paul's polemic needs: in 1:18, where one would expect "wisdom of God" in contrast to the "folly" of those who are perishing, Paul says "power of God". Since the use of the term σοφία is loaded with implications for the Corinthians, Paul first has to destroy their concept of this σοφία.[99] Thus, in 1:18, he emphasizes the power, the effectiveness, of the cross for salvation, and only in 1:24 does he dare to make the equation of Christ with God's wisdom: In the cross-event, Christ is not only revealed to be the manifestation of the power of God,[100] but he is indeed the Wisdom of God. Correct as this argumentation may be, there could be other dynamics at work here as well. Could it be that Paul has in mind the passage in WS 7:25 where it is said of Wisdom that "she is a breath of the power of God?[101] Thus Paul may

---

[98]For Conzelmann, Korinther; p. 64, the connection between "power" and "wisdom" indicates that σοφία is not a hypostasis. Cf. Schmithals, Die Gnosis in Korinth. Eine Untersuchung zu den Korintherbriefen (2nd ed.; FRLANT N.F. 48; Göttingen, 1965), p. 131, who objects to the christological interpretation of Wilckens here by saying that the parallelism between "sign" and "wisdom" in 1:22 "excludes the personal interpretation of σοφία" in 1:24. Cf. however, Barrett, "Christianity at Corinth", pp. 281-282, who clearly demonstrates that σοφία is used in at least four different senses in these chapters, and that one of these senses, in 1:24, 30, is the personal-christological.

[99]Cf. Barrett, Corinthians, p. 52.

[100]C.T. Craig, The First Epistle to the Corinthians (IB X; New York-Nashville, 1953), p. 31, points out that in a Jewish-Gnostic context, Simon Magus had been called "a power of God which is called Great". (Acts 8:10).

[101]7:25a ἀτμὶς γάρ ἐστιν τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ δυνάμεως. Cf. Ringgren, Word and Wisdom, p. 117: ἀτμὶς denotes Wisdom as a kind of emanation from God. Cf. Conzelmann, who, even though he affirms that "Paulus (macht) ...die σοφία nicht zum christologischen Hypostasenbegriff" ("Paulus und die Weisheit", p. 237), nevertheless footnotes the exposition of the text 1:24 with a reference to WS 7:25 (Korinther, p. 63).

be saying to the Corinthians -- for whom the cross is weakness and foolishness -- that this manifestation of the Wisdom of God, in terms of the crucified Jesus, is in fact the manifestation of God's power.

We have here but the beginning of an indication that Paul may be appealing to his knowledge of the WS's conception of the figure of divine Wisdom.[102] Paul's continuing discussion seems to strengthen this initial impression. In 1:30, Wisdom is singled out as the one designation of Christ; it almost appears that due to the apologetic needs arising out of the confrontation Paul has gradually moved through the progression: power of God → power and wisdom of God → Wisdom of God. The text (1:30) reads:

ἐξ αὐτοῦ δὲ ὑμεῖς ἐστε
ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ,
ὃς ἐγενήθη σοφία ἡμῖν ἀπὸ θεοῦ
δικαιοσύνη τε καὶ ἁγιασμὸς καὶ ἀπολύτρωσις

But from him (God) you are
in Christ Jesus,
who was made (became[103]) Wisdom to us from God,
consisting of[104] righteousness and sanctification

---

[102]Cf. Cerfaux, Christ in the Theology of St. Paul, p. 274: "(Paul) saw in Wisdom a type of the divine Christ.... He was looking for words which would enable him to formulate the revelation (of Christ) in theological terms. And these he found in the thoughts of the Book of Wisdom especially".

[103]A. Robertson and A. Plummer, First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians (2nd ed.; ICC: Edinburgh, 1914), p. 27; "'who became' by His coming into the world and by what he accomplished for us".

[104]The RSV rendering is not quite accurate here. "Wisdom" is not coordinate with the following three terms. Rather, "Wisdom" stands out as the central concept, in contrast with the false σοφία of the Corinthians, and the following terms are in apposition to it and define it.

and redemption.[105]

The ἐξ αὐτοῦ indicates that the new life, the new existence of Christians (i.e., their "in Christ" existence), has its source in God. This is after all the proper activity of the Creator, who takes "things that are not" and brings about a new creation (cf. II Cor 5:17).[106] This directional movement, from God to man, is further specified by the ἀπὸ θεοῦ, which indicates the "ultimate derivation"[107] of Christ Jesus, who in his coming became -- to us -- God's Wisdom. Schlatter translates: "der uns von Gott her zur Weisheit wurde",[108] and Barrett paraphrases appropriately: "who as God's gift became wisdom for us".[109] In light of this emphasis it is wrong to say, as Craig does, that Paul is here talking about "wisdom which is given through Christ...".[110] Contrarily, it is decidedly affirmed here that Christ is the Wisdom which God has sent. In the Christ-event "God

---

[105]Craig, Corinthians, p. 33, rightly points out that these three terms do not designate successive stages of salvation, but are rather different metaphors by which Paul describes the one experience, the "new being in Christ".

[106]Barrett, Corinthians, p. 59; cf. C.F.G. Heinrich, Der Erste Brief an die Korinther (8th ed.; KEK 5; Göttingen, 1896), p. 81.

[107]Robertson and Plummer, Corinthians, p. 27.

[108]Adolf Schlatter, Die Korintherbriefe (Erläuterungen zum Neuen Testament, 6; Stuttgart: Calwer Ausgabe, 1962), p. 23.

[109]Barrett, Corinthians, p. 59.

[110]Craig, Corinthians, p. 33.

himself reveals a Wisdom that He has foreordained. This Wisdom which is contrasted with the wisdom of this world is constituted not of intellectual knowledge, but of righteousness, sanctification, and redemption".[111] That is to say that the coming of God's Wisdom creates the new existence in which "righteousness and sanctification and redemption" become realities.[112]

The passage under consideration (1:30) is preceded by a statement about the "nothingness" of those who, in the context of that nothingness, were confronted by the act of God in Christ, God's Wisdom, "so that no human being might boast in the presence of God" (1:26-29). Now, in the WS, a series of expressions about man's mortality (7:1, 5-6), man's weakness and lack of understanding (9:5), climax in the following words (9:6):

> For even if one is perfect among
> the sons of men,
> Yet without the Wisdom that comes
> from you he will be regarded as nothing.

Both context and content of this passage bear a striking resemblance to the passage in I Cor. It almost seems as if Paul had taken this concise statement and expanded it in terms of the Corinthian situation:
1) The "nothingness" of those who do not possess Wisdom (εἰς οὐδὲν λογισθήσεται) -- even though they may deem themselves to be something -- corresponds to the situation of those in Corinth who are "brought to

---

[111] Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, pp. 154-155.

[112] Conzelmann, Korinther, p. 68, points out correctly that this is only a reality "in Christ": "Wir besitzen Gottes Weisheit 'in Christus', das heist als 'fremde'".

nothing (ἵνα τὰ ὄντα καταργήσῃ), even though from a human perspective, they "are" something.

2) Conversely, it is implied that the "nothingness" that exists without the presence of Wisdom will be overcome when Wisdom has come into man's life; correspondingly, "the things that are not" (τὰ μὴ ὄντα ) are brought into a new kind of existence because of Christ, the Wisdom from God.

3) This new "life in Christ Jesus" is constituted of "righteousness, sanctification, redemption". Compare with this these passages from the WS:

> she renews all things;
> and in every generation she passes
> into holy souls[113]
> and makes them friends of God,...
> for God loves nothing so much as
> the man who lives with Wisdom.
>
> (7:27-28)

> from the throne of thy glory send her,
> that she may be with me and toil,
> and that I may learn what is
> pleasing to thee;
>
> (9:10)

> And thus the paths of those on earth
> were set right,
> and men were taught what pleaseth thee
> and were saved by Wisdom.
>
> (9:18)

---

[113]See the treatment of this phrase in section B, 1 of this chapter, above.

The over all impression from these passages is that there follows, consequent upon the coming of Wisdom into man's life, and as a result of the relation thus established, a new kind of life, a life in which man is properly related to God, a life that stands under the signature of righteousness and holiness and redemption.

4) The origin of this new possibility for man's life, by means of Wisdom/Christ, is God. Compare:[114]

I Cor 1:30 σοφία ἡμῖν ἀπὸ θεοῦ

WS 9:6 τῆς ἀπὸ σοῦ σοφίας

In view of the other correspondences, it is rather unlikely that this terminological parallel is pure coincidence.

5) The characteristic Pauline rejection of man's boasting -- in light of the fact that knowledge of God (1:21), i.e., salvation, is not something that man can attain, but can only receive -- is foreshadowed in the admission that "without the Wisdom that comes from God", man is nothing. Here, too, boasting is excluded:

> For what man can learn the
> counsel of God?
> Or who can discern what the Lord
> wills?
>
> (9:13)

Here, as there, both the redeeming agent (Wisdom/Christ), as well as the resulting redemption, are gift.

---

[114] Weiss, Korintherbrief, p. 39 already noted this parallel, without, however, making any use of it in terms of his interpretation.

6) Finally, as Davies has noted, there is in the Pauline ascription of the title Wisdom to Christ a two-fold emphasis: "it is a pre-cosmic Wisdom and a morally re-creative Wisdom that he finds in his Lord".[115] The σοφία ἀπὸ θεοῦ in Paul's thought must be judged to be identical with the "one Lord Jesus Christ, through whom are all things and through whom we exist" (I Cor 8:6). It is clearly presupposed here that all things were created through Christ.[116] This Christ/Wisdom is thus for Paul the pre-cosmic instrument in creation.[117] But he is more than this: through him the "things that are not" (1:28) receive new "life in Christ Jesus", become "new creations" (II Cor 5:17). That is to say, the creative activity of the Urzeit is repeated in the Endzeit. We have already observed

---

[115]Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, p. 155; cf. R.G. Turnball, "The Christology of Paul", USR (1945/46), pp. 121-138.

[116]Cf. Schweizer, "Herkunft der Präexistenzvorstellung", p. 106; Conzelmann, Korinther, p. 172: "Jesus ist -- als der 'Herr' -- der Mittler der Schöpfung, seine Präexistenz ist also vorausgesetzt. Die Formel lehrt den Typ der λόγος-/ εἰκών-/ σοφία-Christologie". Cf. the excellent discussion of I Cor 8:6 by Feuillet, Le Christ Sagesse De Dieu, pp. 59-85.

[117]Cf. Windisch, "Weisheit und paulinische Christologie", p. 224, who says in reference to 8:6: "Wenn nun Paulus seinen Christus als Organ oder Mittler der Schöpfung bezeichnet, so tritt auch hier zutage, dass er in Christus die Weisheit gesehen hat". In light of the many other points of contact between Paul and the WS, the assertion by Windisch could be formulated more precisely: behind 8:6 stands the concrete figure of Wisdom from the WS:

> who hast made all things by
> thy word,
> and by thy Wisdom hast formed man,
> (9:1-2)
>
> With thee is Wisdom, who knows
> thy works
> and was present when thou didst
> make the world.
> (9:9)

above[118] that the same two-fold emphasis comes through clearly in the presentation of the activity of Wisdom both in creation and redemption: she is agent of creation (9:1-2,9) as well as agent of redemption (9:18); and both of these aspects are strikingly combined in 7:27: she renews all things; and in the sphere of human lives she does this by dwelling in men who are receptive to her and thus "creates" them into friends of God.

In view of the cumulative weight of these striking correspondences, the case for Paul's dependence on the WS's presentation of Wisdom for his own conception of Christ, both in his person and work, becomes quite strong.

b. I Corinthians 2

The second chapter of I Cor has been quite a crux for the interpreter of Paul; one only has to look at the commentaries to become convinced that the last word has yet to be said on any number of problems raised by this chapter.[119] However, from the perspective of the assumption that Paul conceived of Christ in terms of the Wisdom figure, some light may be shed on one problem; namely, how we should understand the sudden shift, in 2:10, from the discussion of Christ as the Wisdom of God, the Lord of glory,[120] to the discussion of the Spirit.

---

[118] Section B/2.

[119] Cf. the excellent discussion of the problems raised by this chapter in Conzelmann, Korinther, pp. 72 ff.

[120] The detailed analysis of 2:6-9 by Wilckens, Weisheit und Torheit, pp. 52-88, resulting in the assertion that, as in 1:24 and 1:30, the θεοῦ σοφία of 2:7 should be taken in a christological sense, is quite convincing in its general thrust. Though with Barrett, "Christianity at Corinth", pp. 280-282, it is probably

The transition can be accounted for when it is recognized that the pneumatology discussion in 2:10 ff. is not the introduction of a new topic, but that the Wisdom/Christ of 1:24, 30; 2:7, in whom God's mysterious redemption became concrete reality (i.e., the cross), is at the same time the Spirit who reveals internally the deep things of God -- which, according to the context, is the deep meaning of Christ crucified, for this is declared to be the μυστήριον[121] of God (2:1). This interpretation is underlined when seen in the light of certain passages and motifs from the WS:

1) The whole tenor of the Corinthian passage recalls WS 9:13, 16.[122] Let us compare them. The obscure citation[123] in I Cor 2:9 reads:

> What no eye has seen nor ear heard,
> nor the heart of man conceived,
> (namely) what God has prepared for
> those who love him...

Here, the object of the non-comprehension, by means of human faculties,

---

best to speak not only of "Heilsgut", but also of "Heilsplan". "The overlap between Heilsplan and Heilsgut is a function of the absolute centrality of Christ crucified in Paul's conception of God and of salvation".

[121]The variant μυστήριον is to be preferred over μαρτύριον, with the text by Aland, et al., The Greek New Testament (Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1966). Though μυστήριον may have intruded from 2:7 or 4:1, it is equally likely that μαρτύριον intruded from 1:6.

[122]Cf. B. Metzger, ed., The Oxford Annotated Apocrypha (New York, 1965), p. 112, notes.

[123]The closest parallel is Is 64:4, but if this is Paul's source, he makes a very free use of it; cf. the discussion of the possible wisdom origin of this citation in A. Feuillet, Le Christ Sagesse De Dieu, pp. 37-57.

is "what God has prepared for those who love him". The context shows that the content of "what God has prepared" must be identified with that which was "hidden" (2:7), namely, the mysterious Wisdom of God (both Heilsplan and Heilsgut ). This μυστήριον τοῦ θεοῦ was revealed, in its deep meaning, by the Spirit, since,

> no one comprehends the thought
> of God except the Spirit of God.
>
> (2:11b)

> The Spirit searches everything,
> even the depths of God.
>
> (2:10b)

With the above, compare these passages from the WS:

> What man can learn the
> counsel of God?
> Or who can discern what
> the Lord wills?
>
> (9:13)

> We can hardly guess at what
> is on earth...
> but who has traced out what
> is in the heavens?
>
> (9:16)

In these words is described the inability of man, apart from the indwelling of God's Wisdom, to fathom the ways of God. But the ways of God are to be identified with his purposes for man; what this purpose is, is shown in 2: 22, where it is said of those in whom Wisdom does not dwell that "they did not know the μυστήρια θεοῦ". These are then defined in terms of God's purpose for man: life in eternal fellowship with himself (2:23-3:4). Man does not comprehend God's purposes, but

> (Wisdom) is an initiate in the
> knowledge of God.
>
> (8:4; cf. 9:4, 17a)

Therefore, one cannot be initiated into the ways of God and his purpose for man

> unless thou hast given Wisdom
> and sent thy holy Spirit from
> on high.
>
> (9:17)

2) In this latter passage, the Spirit and Wisdom are clearly identified.[124] Similarly, Paul makes the identification.[125] By means of a Scripture citation from Is 40:13, he recalls, and capsulizes, man's inability to comprehend the purposes of God:

τίς γὰρ ἔγνω νοῦν κυρίου (2:16)

Then he climaxes the entire argument of 2:6-16 with the confident answer:

ἡμεῖς δὲ νοῦν Χριστοῦ ἔχομεν (2:16b)

Craig correctly remarks that the reference to the "mind of Christ" has nothing to do with the mental faculties with which Jesus was endowed; rather, "He means that Spirit which dwelt in Christ, who was himself the

---

[124]Also at 1:6, 7; 7:7, 23: compare 11:1 and 12:1.

[125]On this general theme, especially as it relates to the presence of the Spirit/Christ in the believer's life, cf. E. Fuchs, Christus und der Geist. Eine Biblisch-Theologische Untersuchung (Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 23; Leipzig, 1932), pt. III. K. Deissner, Auferstehungshoffnung und Pneumagedanke bei Paulus (Leipzig, 1912). K. Mittring, Heilswirklichkeit bei Paulus. Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis der unio cum Christo in den Paulusbriefen (Neutestamentlich Forschung, 1/5; Gütersloh, 1929), pp. 146-155. W. Olschewski, Dei Wurzeln der paulinischen Christologie, pp. 147-151.

Spirit (II Cor 3:17)."[126] Paul probably was led to the use of νοῦς by the citation of Is 40:13.[127] But the thrust of the entire passage suggests that Paul is identifying the Spirit of 2:10 ff. as the Spirit (νοῦς) of "the Lord", i.e., "of Christ".[128]

In these passages from I Cor 2 and from the WS, we have observed several correspondences: In both there is the coming together of the two divine figures, Spirit and Wisdom/Christ. In both, the mood is one of helplessness on man's part, expressed in terms of his inability to fathom the mysterious purposes of God. In both, the combined-divine figure is said to be intimately acquainted with these mysterious purposes of God, and is therefore in a position to mediate these purposes to man. Finally, in both, the mediation takes place in that the divine figure comes from God--

WS 9:6 τῆς ἀπὸ σοῦ [i.e. θεοῦ] σοφίας

I Cor 2:12 τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἐκ τοῦ θεου

I Cor 1:30 σοφία ἀπὸ θεοῦ

--and is given to, and received by, man:

---

[126]Craig, Corinthians, p. 41; cf. Baumann, Mitte und Norm des Christlichen, p. 257: the Scripture quotation makes sense only if for Paul and his hearers νοῦς and πνεῦμα are completely identical. Cf. also O. Michel, "Der Christus des Paulus", ZNW 32 (1933), pp. 6-31, who says, in reference to II Cor 3:17, "Paul recognizes that the Spirit active in the Church is Christ himself", p. 13.

[127]Cf. Conzelmann, "Paulus und die Weisheit", p. 239, no. 4; Barrett, Corinthians, p. 78.

[128]Cf. WS 1:6-7, where πνεῦμα κυρίου = σοφία.

WS 7:7 ἦλθέν μοι πνεῦμα σοφίας
WS 9:17 σὺ ἔδωκας σοφίαν

I Cor 2:12 ἐλάβομεν ἀλλὰ τὸ πνεῦμα

The ultimate result of this coming, this gift, this indwelling is in both Paul and the WS a comprehension of God's purposes for man and a being drawn into an existence in which these purposes come to realization. Such a communality, in both conception and development, as well as in basic terminology, can hardly be considered accidental, and one is almost driven to the conclusion that in his formulation of this matter Paul was influenced extensively by the presentation of Wisdom and her mediation between God and man in the WS.

As indicated above, the employment of the term σοφία, particularly in its christological ramifications, is limited to these chapters in I Corinthians. We shall now proceed to consider briefly several passages in which the term σοφία does not appear, but in which the figure of Wisdom, as described in the WS, seems to inform the Pauline formulation.

## 5. Texts without Sophia

### a. II Corinthians 3:18; 4:4, 6[129]

---

[129]An exhaustive analysis of this, as well as the following text, is not intended here since we are not primarily interested in the use which Paul makes of the material at his disposal -- that is to say, the meaning he attaches to concepts which he borrows in the context of his over-all argumentation -- but rather in the observation that he makes use of this material, and is influenced by it.

Particularly good in their treatment of these passages are H. Wind-

It is very probable that there is one source behind the Pauline presentation of Christ in these verses[130] -- the passages from the WS 7:25-26) where the divine figure of Wisdom is described. While some scholars have completely overlooked this background in their extensive treatments of this passage,[131] others have suspected points of contact, but have largely failed to exploit this in terms of their investigation of the passage.[132]

WS 7:25-26 describes Wisdom thus:

---

isch, Der Zweite Korintherbrief (9th ed.; KEK 6; Göttingen, 1924), and H. Lietzmann, An die Korinther II (3rd ed.; HbzN , III/1; Tübingen, 1923); W.G. Kümmel and H. Lietzmann, An die Korinther II (4th ed.; Hbz NT III/1; Tübingen, 1949). For specific treatments of the εἰκών motif in this passage, see F.-W. Eltester, Eikon im Neuen Testament (BZNW 23; Berlin, 1958), pp. 22-25, 130-166; J. Jervell, Imago Dei. Gen 1,26 f. im Spätjudentum, in der Gnosis und in den paulinischen Briefen (FRLANT, N.F. 58; Göttingen, 1960), pp. 171-217; G. Kittel and H. Kleinknecht in TWNT II, s.v. "εἰκών", pp. 380-396. For discussions of δόξα see G. Kittel in TWNT II, s.v. "δόξα", pp. 236-240, 245-258; J. Schneider, Doxa. Eine Bedeutungsgeschichtliche Studie (NT Forschungen, 3/3; Gütersloh, 1932); H. Kittel, Die Herrlichkeit Gottes, Studien zur Geschichte und Wesen eines neutestamentlichen Begriffs (BZNW, 16; Giessen, 1934).

[130]This is the considered judgement of Feuillet, Le Christ Sagesse De Dieu, p. 150. We are indebted to his analysis in the following discussion.

[131]E.g., Jervell, Imago Dei, who, while referring to WS extensively in his treatment of the εἰκών concept in Judaism (pp. 15-51), never even refers to it in his analysis of II Cor 3:18-4:6 (pp. 173-217). Cf. W. Bousset, Kyrios Christos, pp. 108 ff., who does not acknowledge any wisdom background.

[132]E.g., Windisch, "Die göttliche Weisheit", p. 223; also in Der Zweite Korintherbrief, pp. 127-140; O. Michel, "Entstehung der paulinischen Christologie", p. 332 ff.; Eltester, Eikon im NT, pp. 131-136; Lietzmann, An die Korinther, loc. cit,; Romaniuk, "Le Livre de la Sagesse dans le Nouveau Testament", NTS 14 (1967-69), pp. 498-514.

She is a breath of the power
of God
and a pure emanation of the glory (δόξα)
of the Almighty...

She is a reflection (ἀπαύγασμα)
of eternal light (φωτός),
a spotless mirror (ἔσοπτρον) of the working
of God
and an image (εἰκών) of his goodness.

Five of the terms which are used in this passage are more or less equivalent to terms employed in II Cor 3:18 and 4:4, 6: reflection (ἀπαύγασμα), mirror (ἔσοπτρον), glory (δόξα), image (εἰκών), and light (φωτός). Among these five, the first two are particularly noteworthy and demand our attention. 1) The term ἀπαύγασμα corresponds to αὐγάσαι in II Cor 4:4. It is significant that the word is very rare. It is found nowhere else in the NT, nor is it present in the papyri;[133] while in the LXX it is confined to Lev 13-14.[134] In II Cor 4:4, the term is used in a context where its direct reference[135] is to "light" (φωτισμός), that is, the light of the divine "glory" and "image". Thus, we find this unusual word in a context that completely corresponds to the context where the word is found in the WS. 2) The word ἔσοπτρον ("mirror") corresponds

---

[133]Cf. M.-M. p. 90; Bauer; there are a few uses of it in Philo (cf. Leisegang, Index, Vol. VII).

[134]ἀπαύγασμα in the Greek Bible only in WS 7:26; ἄυγασμα only in Lev 13-14; αὐγάζειν in Lev 13 and Sir 43:11 (cf. Hatch-Redpath). Apart from WS 7:26, the meanings of the terms diverge from that in II Cor 4:4.

[135]This holds true whether the word is taken to mean"shine forth, reflect" or "see (something )". The commentaries are divided on the matter, though the newer ones seem to favor the latter alternative.

to κατοπτρίζομαι ("reflecting")[136] in II Cor 3:18, and almost the same observations as in the analysis of the use of the first term apply here. The term is found nowhere else in the NT, and is otherwise extremely rare in Greek literature;[137] the noun form of WS 7:26 is only found one other time in the Greek Bible.[138] Further, the contexts in which the corresponding terms occur are again the same.

It is certainly true, as Feuillet reminds us,[139] that this kind of imagery is rather frequent in the Hellenistic literature.[140] But what is so remarkable is that the WS and Paul have in common the association of the same two concepts with divine "glory", "light", and "image".

Beyond these strictly terminological correspondences, some other affinities may be noted here: 1) While in the material world "mirror" and "image" cannot be confused with each other, it seems otherwise in the

---

[136]The translation of this term is disputed: both "reflecting" and "beholding" are possible. Windisch, Korinther, p. 127; KJV; RSV, prefer former. Schlatter, Korintherbriefe, p. 257; Knox, Church of the Gentiles, p. 132; RSV margin, prefer latter. Cf. F.V. Filson, The Second Epistle to the Corinthians (IB, X; New York/Nashville, 1953), p. 313, gives both "beholding" or "reflecting as does a mirror". It seems to us that the analogy with Moses in 3:7, 12 demands the latter of the two meanings.

[137]According to Moulton-Geden, κατοπτρίζομαι is not found in Greek writers before the Christian era, nor in the Greek Bible.

[138]Sir 12:11.

[139]Le Christ Sagesse De Dieu, p. 151.

[140]Cf. Jervell, Imago Dei; Eltester, Eikon im NT.

supernatural and spiritual world. Thus, within almost the same breath, Ps-Solomon can call Wisdom both "mirror" and "image".[141] In the Corinthian passage Paul says exactly the same thing of Christ: he is the image of God (4:4); at the same time his face is the mirror which reflects God's glory.[142] 2) In both contexts we have a triple assertion in connection with the concept of δόξα: In WS 7:25 Wisdom is depicted as an emanation, an effluence of God's δόξα; in 9:11 she is described as one who in herself possesses this divine quality (τῇ δόξῃ αὐτῆς); and further, she transmits δόξα to the one who finds her and lives with her (8:9 f.).[143] Paul says virtually the same things of Christ in the Corinthian passage: The glory of God is reflected in the face of Christ (4:6); but this divine glory is also an attribute of the κύριος Christ (3:18, 4:4), through whom and in whom believers become participants in that glory (3:18).[144] 3) It is significant that the explicit identification of the πνεῦμα and the κύριος (χριστός, 4:5) in 3:17-18 occurs in the context where we have

---

[141]Though it is said of Wisdom that she is εἰκὼν τῆς ἀγαθότητος αὐτοῦ, it seems clear that Wisdom's emanation, reflection, etc., of the various attributes of God intends nothing less than an identification of Wisdom with the divine nature. Cf. Eltester, Eikon im NT, p. 133, "... she can be called εἰκὼν τῆς ἀγαθότητος ⟨ scil. τοῦ θεοῦ ⟩ ..."; cf. also H. Ringgren, Word and Wisdom, p. 116-118.

[142]In 3:18, of course, the imagery is transferred to Christians, who, by being transformed into the image of Christ, now reflect his glory.

[143]In 9:11, φυλάξει με ἐν τῇ δόξῃ αὐτῆς could mean "she will keep me in her glory", but more likely means "guard me by".

[144]Cf. O. Michel, "Der Christus des Paulus", p. 14.

found such remarkable correspondences with the WS. As we have seen, the identification there between πνεῦμα and σοφία is unequivocal.[145] 4) Finally, there is in both passages the analogy between created light and divine light: the eternal, divine light of God comes, in Christ, into the darkness of human existence, just as the created light dispelled the darkness at the beginning (4:6). So it is with Wisdom: "she is a reflection of eternal light" (7:2),[146] and compared with the (natural) light she is superior (7:29); for the latter "is succeeded by the night, but against Wisdom evil does not prevail". (7:30).[147]

On the basis of these correspondences -- coupled with the fact that we have traced the influence of the WS at other places in the earlier Corinthian correspondence -- the possibility that the verbal correspondences which we have indicated above are due to chance seems absolutely excluded.[148]

---

[145]Cf. O. Michel, "Die Entstehung der paulinischen Christologie", p. 332, who locates the affirmation "the Lord is the Spirit" (3:16) in Paul's awareness of the possession of the Spirit and of his experience of "Christ in me". While it may be correct to see the Damascus experience, and its ongoing reality in Paul's life, as the immediate context of the identification of Christ and Spirit, it is certainly possible that the identification of Wisdom and Spirit in the WS provided Paul with the conceptual imagery with which to express his subjective experience.

[146]The phrase φωτὸς ἀϊδίου could easily be replaced by φωτὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, since this is clearly the meaning intended in the context of the other divine attributes (cf. 2:23, where "eternal" is an attribute of God).

[147]Here, evil and darkness are clearly identified (cf. 17:14, 21, where Hades, the place where death reigns, is identified with the darkness-plague that enveloped the Egyptians).

[148]Thus A. Feuillet, Le Christ Sagesse De Dieu, p. 151: "...il nous semble absolument exclu que les rencontres verbales que nous venons de signaler puissent être l'effet du hasard".

Thus we have another piece of good evidence for the thesis that in this conception of his Lord, Paul was influenced by the depiction of Wisdom in the WS.

b. Galatians 4:4[149]

As in I Cor 8:6,[150] Christ's pre-existence is not explicitly expressed, but certainly presupposed in this Galatian passage. We have already had occasion to refer to the fact that Ps-Solomon clearly ascribes pre-existence to divine Wisdom.[151] Beyond this general point of contact, there is a sending which takes place in both the WS and Gal 4:4, originating in a place with God and resulting in an indwelling in men's lives. This is expressed in Gal 4:4 in terms of the "sending forth" of the Son (Christ), i.e., the sending of the Son into the world.[152] The verb employed here, ἐξαποστέλλειν, is found in Paul only in this verse and in the parallel verse 6, where Paul speaks of the sending of the Spirit into

---

[149]To my knowledge no one has seen any contact between the WS and this passage, except E. Schweizer, "Zur Herkunft der Präexistenzvorstellung bei Paulus", in Neotestamentica (Stuttgart, 1963), pp. 105-109. I am therefore solely indebted to his insight at this point.

[150]Cf. above nn. 112, 113.

[151]WS 9:9, "With thee is Wisdom, who knows thy works and was present when thou didst make the world". Cf. 7:21; 8:4.

[152]Cf. Rom 8:3, where the same concept is expressed in shortened form.

the lives of believers. Significantly, the same verb is found in WS 9: 10:

> Send her (Wisdom) forth (ἐξαπόστειλον) from the holy heavens,
> and from the throne of your glory
> send (πέμψον) her.

This statement about the sending of Wisdom is preceded by the assertion that she dwells with God and that she was already by his side when the world was created. It is followed, as in Paul, by the parallel statement that God has sent his Holy Spirit from on high (9:17). This sending of Wisdom is intended to save man (9:18), who is short-lived, weak, (the δοῦλος, 9:6), and incapable of comprehending either κρίσις or νόμος (cf. Gal 4:3). Thus we have, in both authors, not only exactly parallel or similar vocabulary, but basically the same stages of development in the argument: 1) the condition of man (δοῦλος) is one of helplessness; 2) from a place of divine glory God sends the Son/Wisdom into the world, specifically into the lives of men. This is expressed in a parallel sentence in terms of the sending of the Spirit.[153] 3) The result of this coming and indwelling is salvation.[154]

In view of these correspondences, especially of the singular use of a verb from a similar context, it is possible to suggest that Paul saw

---

[153] Paul clearly identified the indwelling Spirit with Christ, as a comparison of Gal 4:6 with 2:20 shows.

[154] In Gal 4:7, the result of the sending of the Son is freedom and sonship, and of the Spirit's coming the consciousness of this sonship. In WS it is salvation (9:18), clearly defined as deliverance in ch. 10. Also, in 2:16, 18 sonship is predicated of those in whom Wisdom dwells.

in the coming of Christ the answer to the prayer of Ps-Solomon, and formulated his conception of the coming of Christ/Spirit on the basis of these passages from the WS.

## D. UNION WITH CHRIST AND THE ESCHATOLOGICAL REALITIES

### 1. Introduction

In the foregoing discussion our attention was centered on the relationship between the figure of divine Wisdom, as depicted in the WS, and the Pauline conception of the exalted, as well as intimately present, Lord. In the context of that discussion it became clear, at several points, that the influence of the WS on Paul's thought was not confined to Paul's depiction of the person of Christ in terms of the Wisdom figure, but also flowed over into the area of Paul's conception of the relation between Christ and the believer, as well as into the close relationsip that exists between this Christ-believer relationship and the believer's present and future. It is to these latter perspectives that we will now turn our attention.

### 2. Union with Christ and the Influence of the WS

In chapter II above, part of the case for the probability of Paul's use of the WS was based on a number of passages from chs. 1 and 9 of Romans. There we were concerned merely with Paul's dependence upon the WS for the formulation of particular aspects of his thought, namely 1) the idea of Rom 1:18 ff. that the sins of the Gentiles, primarily sexual disorders, are the punishment (result) of idolatry, and 2) the idea of the impos-

sibility of resisting God's will and the exploitation of the potter-clay motif.[155]

These, however, are quite peripheral elements in terms of the central thrust of the Pauline theology. They are employed almost incidentally by Paul to further the particular argumentations, which in themselves are oriented toward other ends than those for which these same motifs are employed in the WS.[156] But what about more central aspects of Paul's thought in Romans? Did the influence of the WS extend beyond that of merely supplying Paul with material for his apologetic, and did it exert a shaping influence on some core conceptions of his understanding of the meaning of the Christ-event and the reality of the Christian's existence in faith and hope?

We saw above (section C) that this was in fact the case in the area of Paul's Christology, particularly in the Corinthian correspondence. Paul formulated some important aspects of his understanding of Christ in terms of the Wisdom figure in that he transferred to Christ characteristics of the nature and function of that figure: "Christ, the Wisdom of God". But did this conception of Christ as the Wisdom of God influence related areas of Paul's thought? Did his perception of Wisdom and her

---

[155]Ch. II, section C, 2a, b.

[156]Thus, the use of the "causes of idolatry" motif from the WS is employed in Rom 1 to establish that all men need the saving work of Christ, while in the WS it is used in the context of a denunciation of idolatry. The "potter" motif, employed in the WS in the same context, is used by Paul in an attempt to answer the question: Why did Israel not recognize the Christ?

relationship with men help him formulate his own understanding of the reality of Christ in the midst of human existence? An analysis of certain passages in Romans -- where Paul is putting forth some of his central theological convictions -- suggests that this may in fact have been the case.

It has rarely been noted that the beginning of the Adam-Christ antithesis in Rom 5:12-21 seems to preserve a particular reminiscence from the WS.[157] And even less rarely has this observation been taken seriously in terms of the attempt to understand formative influences upon crucial areas of Paul's thought.[158] It is suggested here that Paul does not only preserve a vague reminiscence, but that the development of his argument in the following chapters is influenced at critical points by his understanding and use of the WS.[159]

---

[157]E.g., Grafe, "Das Verhältnis der paulinischen Schriften zur Sapientia Solomonis", p. 280; J. Knox, The Epistle to the Romans (IB, IX; New York-Nashville, 1954), p. 463, simply cites the reference to WS 2:23 f., as does O. Michel, Der Römerbrief (12th ed.; KEK 4; Göttingen, 1963), p. 138, n. 2; E. Stauffer, Theologie des Neuen Testaments (Stuttgart, 1941), p. 248 f.: Paul has before his eyes the text of WS 2:23 f., and partially cites it verbatim. It is interesting to note that Sanday and Headlam, Romans (5th ed.; ICC; Edinburgh, 1902), who devote an extended note to Paul's dependence, in Rom 1 and 9, on the WS (pp. 51-52), and indicate the possibility of his dependence in other places, make no mention of the correspondence in their exegesis of Rom 5:12 ff.

[158]To my knowledge, only Feuillet, Le Christ Sagesse De Dieu, pp. 333-338.

[159]This is not to say that other influences were not equally present in the mind of Paul when he wrote these chapters of Romans. [Thus Lohse, Martyrer und Gottesknecht (Göttingen, 1955), clearly demonstrated dependence on the Servant motif of Is 53; cf. also the study by K. Romaniuk, L'Amour du Pere et du Fils dans la soteriologie de saint Paul (Rome, 1961);

The most apparent point of contact is between the opening of the development of Rom 5:12-21 and WS 2:24. In a passage which deals with the introduction of death into the realm of life and the world, we read:

> Through the envy of the devil
> death came into the world,
> and those who belong to his party
> experience it.[160]
>
> (WS 2:23-24)

In Rom 5:12, Paul declares:

> As sin came into the world
> through one man
> and death through sin,
> and so death spread to all men
> because[161] all men sinned.

There is, of course, nothing very unusual or unique expressed here as far as Jewish belief and thought is concerned. The ideas expressed by both writers fit well into the mainstream of Jewish speculation concerning

---

O. Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament, trans. by C. Guthrie and A.M. Hall, (rev. ed.; The New Testament Library; Philadelphia, 1963), pp. 166-172, seeks to show traces of the Son of Man conception in 5:12-20; cf. also Michel, Römerbrief, p. 137, "(man) darf nicht vergessen dass der Begriff des 'Menschensohnes' in seiner apokalyptischen Bedeutung ein Urstoff der neutestamentlichen Verkündigung ist und dass er eine Voraussetzung der paul. Christologie ist. Die Kreuzeslehre (Suffering Servant?) geht bei Paulus in die Menschensohnlehre ein..."]. We are only suggesting an influence which may have been more pervasive than has usually been recognized.

[160] See the discussion of this passage in ch. III, section C, 1.

[161] For the correctness of the RSV translation of ἐφ' ᾧ with "because" cf. Michel, Römerbrief, p. 138, who notes that ἐφ' ᾧ likely stands for ἐπὶ τούτῳ ὅτι , and should be translated "by reason of the fact that they all sinned". Cf. C.K. Barrett, The Epistle to the Romans (Blacks New Testament Commentaries; London, 1962, 1967), p. 111, who reminds us that it was the Latin redering in quo for ἐφ' ᾧ which led to the meaning "in whom".

the transgression of Adam and its consequences for mankind.[162] Not only the explication of this general idea is current in contemporary Judaism, but also, and more specifically, the tension between the idea that death hangs over mankind because of Adam's sin, and the idea that death is the punishment for each individual's sin.[163] Nevertheless, there are two considerations that set these passages apart from the contemporary Jewish discussion and point to their interdependence.

There is first of all the verbal correspondence:

WS 2:24 φθόνῳ δὲ διαβόλου θάνατος εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον

Rom 5:12 ὥσπερ δι' ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου ἡ ἁμαρτία εἰς τὸν κόσμον εἰσῆλθεν καὶ διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ὁ θάνατος

In the entire Greek Bible, the formula εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον of Rom 5:12 is nowhere else found except in WS 2:24.[164] In fact, the verb is employed by Paul only two other times,[165] and the closest verbal parallel in the New Testament is in Heb 10:5.[166] It is further to be

---

[162] Cf. the discussion of this theme in Robertson and Plummer, Romans, "The Effects of Adam's Fall in Jewish Theology", pp. 136-138. For texts, cf. Str.-Bill., III, pp. 227-228.

[163] Cf. 4 Ezra 3:7, 21 ff.; 7:118; Apoc Bar 17:3; 23:4; 48: 42-43; 54:15, for the connection between Adam's sin and death; for the idea of individual responsibility for death, cf. 4 Ezra 8:59 f.; 9:11; II Bar 54: 15b, 19. H. St. J. Thackary, The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought (London, 1900), p. 33, summarizes the view of the rabbis thus: "Though death since Adam reigns generally throughout the world, yet it only gains power over the individual on account of his own sin". Cf. Str.-Bill., III, pp. 228-229.

[164] Feuillet, Le Christ Sagesse De Dieu, p. 336.

[165] Rom 11:25; I Cor 14:23-24.

[166] Εἰσερχόμενος εἰς τὸν κόσμον. The Pauline phrase is reminiscent

noted that the formula is repeated in WS 14:14 in a description of the "entrance" of idolatry[167] "into the world", "through the vanity of men". The context (14:12 ff.) in which this echo of the phrase occurs is one which we have already seen to have strongly influenced Paul's discussion in Rom 1:18 ff.[168] Thus, Paul's use of such a unique formula, in a context paralleling the WS passage so closely, creates the strong impression that we have here a case of literary dependence.[169]

Beyond this verbal dependence in Rom 5:12 there appear a number of terms and ideas in chs. 5 and 6 of Romans which recall the formulation of parallel conceptions in the WS, and indicate that its influence on Paul's argumentation in these chapters did not confine itself to 5:12. In our analysis of WS 2:24 (ch. III),[170] it was seen that though the author clearly has physical death in his purview, his understanding of death goes essentially beyond this to a conception of death as a "relational reality" that both exists on this side of the event of "physical death" and that persists beyond that event into an eternity of separation

---

of John, but in the formulas that speak of Jesus' coming, the intensification of the double εἰς is absent; cf. 1:9, ἐρχόμενον εἰς τὸν κόσμον.

[167]The textual addition of θάνατος by $S^1A$ (Rahlfs, II, p. 366) seems to be a later attempt to accommodate the language of 14:14 to 2:24.

[168]See above, ch. II, section 2, b.

[169]Feuillet puts the matter more strongly: "La dependance litteraire de Paul a l'endroit du Pseudo-Solomon est donc indubitable, et l'on s'etonne de la voir si rarement signalee".

[170]Above, ch. III, section C, 3.

from God. Though the death that entered the world "by the envy of the devil" is the lot of all men in its physical sense, the experience of this death is restricted to those who "invite him" (1:12), "summon him" (1:16), and thus "belong to his party" (1:16, 2:24). Thus, the experience of this death must be excluded from those who are not participants in this relationship, who are led, by the indwelling divine Wisdom, into a life of holiness.[171] In other words, the punishment character of death, in terms of ultimate condemnation, is not acknowledged as applying to these. Only those who, in their own lives, ratify the sin of the first man, experience death in its punishment character, in its fullness. For these, physical death provides the transition from a "life" that already stands under the signature of death[172] into a total and ultimate relatedness with that death.

In Rom 5:12 Paul, as Ps-Solomon before him, clearly alludes to the tradition concerning the introduction of death into the world through the sin of the first man.[173] Again, as Ps-Solomon, Paul clearly has physical death in his purview. But it soon becomes apparent in the ongoing argumentation that Paul, as Ps-Solomon, is concerned with more than just

---

[171] See above, section B.

[172] 1:16; 6:13.

[173] Though Paul speaks initially of the coming of sin into the world, while Ps-Solomon speaks of the entrance of death, it is clear in both that these two concepts are so closely related as to be virtually interchangeable.

death as a physical event.[174] Death is a present reality, it is "life" apart from God, and for Paul more specifically "life" before, and apart from, Christ; it is characterized by death (6:13) and stands under its signature because death (as well as sin) is conceived as a personal power that exercises dominion over the lives of men.[175] Death is also a future reality, over and above the physical event that all men face. This aspect comes to its clearest expression in the climax of Paul's argument in these chapters. In 6:22-23, the death which results from sin is contrasted with "eternal life". Since physical death is a real possibility for Christians before the parousia,[176] the "death" which is the result of a life lived under the dominion of sin cannot be the lot of Christians.

In Paul's understanding, the physical death of Christians has lost its sting (I Cor 15:55), just as for the author of the WS the experience of death as punishment is reserved for the unrighteous.

The parallel between the WS and Paul goes beyond this general conception of the nature of this death to the respective relationships that characterize it. In the WS, as we have seen, the relationship between man and death is a personal one:

---

[174]Cf. T. Barrosse, "Death and Sin in St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans", CBQ 15 (1953), pp. 438-458, who attempts to detail the various meanings of the concept "death" in Romans.

[175]Rom 5:14, 12, 21; 6:14, 16, 20.

[176]Cf. ch. IV above.

> Ungodly men by their words and
> deeds summoned death;
> considering him a friend, they pined away
> and made a covenant with him,
> because they are fit to belong to his party.
>
> (WS1:16)

Death (in its pregnant sense) comes only to those who invite death into their lives, who enter into a life-relationship with him, yield their allegiance to him, and are subsequently controlled by him.[177] This theme of the personal relationship between man and death/sin is clearly echoed in chs. 5-6 of Romans. Though Paul states that "by one man's disobedience many were made sinners" (5:19) and that therefore "death reigns" (5:20), the antithetical parallelism of this state of affairs to what happens through Christ removes the matter from the realm of determinism into that of personal decision. That is to say, it is clear from the parallel structure of vss. 19-21 that the nature of the relationship that assigns one to the Adamic humanity is of the same kind as the relationship that brings one into the new humanity in Christ. Now it is abundantly evident throughout Paul's letters that membership in the new humanity is predicated on personal decision, on committment, on faith.[178] That is, the new humanity is not an automatic result of the Christ-event; rather it is the result of the response of faith. The antithesis of I Cor 15:22, which in compact

---

[177] Cf. 1:4; see presently on the concept of "enslavement to sin".

[178] Israel's failure to come into its inheritance is seen by Paul as the result of its refusal to take that step (Romans 9:30 ff).

form echoes Rom 5:12-21, sheds light on the matter under discussion: Just as those ἐν Ἀδάμ die, so those ἐν χριστῷ shall be made alive. More specifically, for those ἐν Ἀδάμ , despite the resurrection of Christ, death has not lost its sting, while for those ἐν χριστῷ, despite the prospect of physical death, the sting has been removed (15:55). Since there is an exact parallel in the structure of the two terms of vs. 22, the meaning of the ἐν with Ἀδάμ must be the same as the ἐν with χριστῷ. And since ἐν Ἀδάμ appears only here in Paul, the meaning of this phrase in this context must be determined from the perspective of an understanding of the common ἐν χριστῷ.

It is at once obvious that Deissmann's[179] emphasis on the "spatial" character of this formula would not satisfly the demands placed on the meaning of ἐν χριστῷ by the parallel ἐν Ἀδάμ. For if ἐν χριστῷ designates an immersion into a spiritual reality that surrounds man, similar to being surrounded by the air which he breathes,[180] then the

---

[179] A. Deissmann, Die neutestamentliche Formel "in Christo Jesu" (Marburg, 1892).

[180] Cf. ibid., p. 97; "ἐν χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ [for Deissmann, this, and the parallel expressions ἐν χριστῷ , ἐν κυρίῳ, ἐν πνεύματι , mean the same thing.] charakterisiert das Verhältnis des Christen zu Jesus Christus als ein lokal aufzufassendes Sich-Befinded in dem pneumatischen Chrisuts..."; p. 77: "....die Formel ist Ausdruck des Verhältnisses des Christen zum Heiland: die Christen sind 'in Christus', welcher gedacht ist als ihr Lebens-'Element'...".

In general, the "material" and "spatial" emphasis in Deissmann's understanding of the formula ἐν χριστῷ does not seem to represent the Pauline dynamic adequately. His later analysis of Pauline mysticism in Paul. A Study in Social and Religious History, tr. by W.E. Wilson (2nd ed; New York, 1927, cited according to the Harper Torchbook ed., 1957), pp. 135-137, provides a much more adequate framework for understanding the formula ἐν χριστῷ : "Paul is...a communio-mystic...,

meaning of the parallel ἐν Ἀδάμ is rather problematic. How are we to understand "immersion" into Adam? Such a meaning must be excluded. In an article entitled "Das paulinische 'In Christo'", F. Neugebauer[181] submits the commonly accepted[182] understanding of the ἐν χριστῷ formula -- as per Deissmann -- to a critical re-examination.[183] He correctly insists that the meaning of the preposition ἐν should not be determined by isolating it from its Pauline usage -- as was done by Deissmann[184] -- but that it should be interpreted in the context of its formula use within Paul's own writing. What meaning has ἐν in a formal prepositional construction? Paul sees man as living and existing variously ἐν σαρκί,[185] ἐν νόμῳ,[186]

---

a fellowship mystic" (p. 152). This emphasis on the dynamic-relational character of the ἐν χριστῷ existence does more justice to the various expressions of the very intimate and personal relationship existing between Paul and his Lord.

[181] NTS 4/2 (1958), pp. 124-138.

[182] For the extensive literature, cf. the list in ibid; p. 125, n. 1. Deissmann's view has of course been subject to some criticism and partial correction: e.g., J. Weiss, "Paulinische Probleme, 2. Die Formel ἐν χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ," ThSK I (1896) pp. 13 ff., demonstrated that the "spatial" meaning is not there in every case where the formula is used. Cf. also H. Böhling, "Ἐν κυρίῳ", in Neutestamentliche Studien für G. Heinrici (Leipzig, 1914), p. 170-177.

[183] Cf. F.C. Porter, The Mind of Christ in Paul (New York, 1931), p. 283 who criticizes Deissmann quite emphatically by saying that "we are not in the region of elements and their interactions, of substances, and their blending; we are in the region of personal relationships".

[184] By analyzing the ἐν in non-Pauline contexts, Deissmann came to the conclusion that Paul's readers could not but have understood it as a spatial designation (Die neutestamentliche Formel 'in Christo', p. 79).

[185] Rom 8:8, 9; 7:5.

[186] 3:19; Gal 3:11, 12.

ἐν πνεύματι.[187] But these are not "spatial spheres" in which man is immersed; rather, they are powers that control man, that determine his existence.[188] In these and similar formulations, then, the ἐν must be understood as an adverbial determinative, and may be rendered "determined by".[189] From here then the meaning of the formula ἐν Χριστῷ may be illumined: to be "in Christ" does not so much designate a form of existence, a mystical state, but a being determined by the Christ event and being drawn into it.[190]

If this is the correct understanding of the Pauline ἐν Χριστῷ, as we believe it is, particularly at I Cor 15:22,[191] then ἐν Ἀδάμ has to be understood in an analogous sense. Thus, to be "in Adam" means to be determined by the "Adam-event", to be drawn into the history of Adam's transgression, to be a participant in that history and to be subject to the ultimate penalty of that history, namely death (Rom 6:23), and that not merely in its physical form, but in the experience of its condemnatory

---

[187]Rom 8:9; Gal 3:3; 5:16, 18.

[188]This does not come through clearly in the ἐν νόμῳ formulations, though it is clear, particularly from Paul's discussion in Gal 3:19-4:11, that Paul virtually identified the law with the "elemental spirits" to which man is enslaved.

[189]Neugebauer, op. cit., p.129.

[190]Ibid; p. 134.

[191]Neugebauer, ibid., p. 133, lists I Cor 15:22 as one of the passages where the meaning of ἐν as an adverbial determinative is certain.

character (Rom 5:18), of its sting (I Cor 15:55).

Since, as we have seen above, the "in Christ" existence is predicated on personal decision, the existence as determined by the Adam-event (ἐν Ἀδάμ) must likewise be predicated on personal decision. That is, death in its physical sense is the lot of all; in that sense all are "in Adam". But on a deeper level, death in its punishment character (Rom 6:23) only comes to those who enter into personal relationship with death, who ratify in their own existence the sin of the first Adam, who submit to its enslaving power, rather than allowing their lives to be determined by Christ.

The remarkable parallel that emerges from the foregoing comparison between the WS and Paul in the conception of the relationship that is seen to exist between men and the power of death is undergirded by an even more remarkable correspondence in a whole series of constituent terms and ideas.

In the WS, those who stand in that intimate relationship with sin and death, who have affirmed, and continue to affirm, their allegiance to these powers, are said to be "enslaved to sin". (1:4) The Greek phrase denotes a condition in which existence is determined by sin.[192] Thus, those whose existence is determined by sin/death are "led astray" and

---

192 Κατάχρεω ἁμαρτίας is rendered with "enslaved to sin" by RSV; Reider, The Book of Wisdom (Dropsie College Edition; Jewish Apocryphal Literature; New York, 1957), p. 52, translates "subject to sin", and notes that the Greek phrase specifically means "mortgaged to sin"; cf. also Holmes, The Wisdom of Solomon, p. 535, who renders "held in pledge by sin". The force of all these renderings is the same.

"blinded" by the wickedness that characterizes their lives.[193] In Rom 5-6, this conception of man's condition is discussed in great detail. Man, before and outside of Christ, is "enslaved to sin" (δουλεύειν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ).[194] He is the slave of sin (6:16), -- and through it of death which reigns by means of sin (5:14, 17; 6:16), -- as long as he obeys this power in his life (6:12 ff.) and yields his allegiance to it (6:12, 16).

In terms of our investigation, it is extremely significant to note that in both the WS and in Paul this description of man's condition, apart from Wisdom/Christ, employs the concept of "royal dominion". In the same pericope that deals with the problem of death's entrance into the world and the covenant between the unrighteous and death (1:12 ff.), it is categorically affirmed that the βασίλειον ("dominion, kingdom") of death[195] is not upon the earth (1:14). The following statement (introduced by δὲ), that the ungodly "summoned him" (1:16) clearly implies that death extends his dominion only over those who submit to his reign. Paul, again, echoes the language and the conception of the WS. "Death reigned" (ἐβασίλευσεν ὁ θάνατος-5:12, 15) before Christ. But it only reigned, it

---

[193] In WS 10, where, as we have seen, the author gives a prototypical account of the workings of Wisdom in history and in the lives of men, the "first-formed father of the world" is said to have been delivered (ἐξείλατο) from his transgressions. This implies a prior bondage (cf. Gal 1:4).

[194] Rom 6:6; cf. 6:17, 20.

[195] We have shown already (ch. III, section C, 1) that Hades (ᾅδης) and death (θάνατος) are to be equated. The parallelism between ᾅδης (1:14d) and ἀθάνατος (1:15) makes this clear, as well as the alternating use of the terms: 1:12-13, death; 1:14, Hades; 2:1, Hades; 2:24, death.

only marched across (διῆλθεν) the pages of human history,[196] "because all men sinned" (5:12). But even after Christ, the possibility of the reign of sin/death continues, and even those who have been "baptized into Christ" must be warned not to let sin, which leads to death (6:12, 16) determine their existence. Those who still "live in sin" (ἐν αὐτῇ [i.e., ἁμαρτίᾳ])[197] demonstrate thereby that they have yielded their lives to sin (6:12) and continue to be its slaves (6:16).

It is further surprising to find such close correspondence in the terms used to designate the result of the reign of death in the lives of men. Ps-Solomon speaks of the "end" (τὰ τέλη) of the wicked (3:19), of their "fruit" (καρπός-3:13, 4:5) and of their "wages" (μισθός).[198] Paul ends his discussion in Rom 5-6 by speaking of the results of the dominion of sin/death in identical terms:

> What return (καρπόν) did you get from the things of which you are now ashamed? The end (τέλος) of those things is death.
> .....[199].....
> For the wages (ὀψώνια) of sin

---

[196]Cf. Michel, Römerbrief, p. 138: "...der Tod [geht] durch die Reihen der ganzen Menschheit (διῆλθεν)".

[197]Cf. the discussion above on the meaning of ἐν in various Pauline prepositional formulations.

[198]At 2:22 (cf. 10:17) we are told that the wicked did not hope for the "wages of holiness", i.e., incorruption (2:23). The clear implication is that their wage is death (2:24).

[199]Paul uses the term μισθός at Rom 4:4 and I Cor 3:8, 14 in the sense of reward/wages, and ὀψώνιον at I Cor 9:7; II Cor 11:8 in a very similar sense. The terms are virtually interchangeable.

is death.

(6:21-23)

Indeed, the rhetorical question which Paul asks in 6:21 strikingly recalls the speech of the late repentance of the wicked in WS 5:3-13:

They will speak to one another
in repentance,
and in anguish of spirit they
will groan and say:
.....
we fools!
.....
It was we who strayed from
the path of truth,
and the light of righteousness
did not shine on us.
We took our fill of the paths
of lawlessness and destruction,
.....
but the way of the Lord
we have not known.
What has our arrogance profited us?

It almost seems as if Paul has condensed this speech of remorse into his rhetorical question, paralleling the rhetorical question of the speech of the wicked. The answer to both questions is: "Death":

The end of those things is death.

(Rom 6:21)

The hope of the ungodly man is like
dust carried by the wind.

(WS 5:14)

The parallel between the WS and Paul can be detected not only on the negative side of the death-life antithesis, but also on the positive side. In union with Christ (6:3 ff.) the reign of death and sin is overcome, and the reign of grace (ἡ χάρις βασιλεύσῃ) begins (5:21). It is a reign that is characterized by life and determined by it (ἐν ζωῇ βασιλεύσουσιν--5:17), one that ultimately leads "to eternal life" (εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον --5:

21). It is possible that in this depiction Paul is bringing to expression the conviction that the dream and hope of the WS has found concrete fulfillment in the event of Christ.[200] In the WS those who are one with Wisdom are led to a "kingdom" (βασιλεία) in which they may reign forever (αἰῶνα βασιλεύσητε--6:20-21).[201] This reign of the just, resulting from their becoming disciples of Wisdom, is prefigured in Joseph, whom Wisdom "delivered from sin" and to whom she gave the "scepter of a kingdom" (10:14). Since, for Paul, Christ the Wisdom of God has come, the eschatalogical reign of the disciples of Wisdom has become "the reign of life" of the disciples of Christ, though even for Paul the futurity of this reign is preserved. Thus, just as the τέλος of those whose lives are determined by Wisdom is eternal life (εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ζῶσιν),[202] so the τέλος of those whose existence is determined by Christ is "eternal life" (ζωὴν αἰώνιον-6:22).

As noted variously above, it is in the context of a community of life with Wisdom, and as a result of that community, that salvation becomes a possibility and man is ushered into an eternal life. Now in ch. 6 of Romans, union with Christ becomes the foundation for that "reign of life" in which the Christian is ushered out of the "reign of death"

---

[200]Cf. here and below Feuillet, Le Christ Sagesse de Dieu, pp. 336-338.

[201]Cf. 5:16. This idea of the reign of the just is of course widespread in Judaism and early Christianity. What is unique in the literature under discussion is the basis of this reigning in a union with Wisdom/Christ; see below.

[202]WS 1:16c; 4:17, 5:4; 5:15.

(vs. 13) into "eternal life" (vss. 22, 23). Paul declares a veritable symbiōsis between Christ and the believer: "buried with him"(συνετάφημεν--6:4); "crucified with him" (συνεσταυρώθη--6:6); "united with him" (σύμφυτοι--6:5); "died with him" (ἀποθνήσκειν σύν--6:8). This "communio-mysticism" is most likely based on two primary factors: the primitive Christian sacrament of baptism and the personal experience of the apostle, who knew himself to have been grasped by Christ (κατελήμφθην ὑπὸ Χριστοῦ--Phil 3:12) on the Damascus road and to have been drawn into a fellowship of life with his Lord.[203] But the possibility ought not to be excluded that one other element was introduced secondarily and that Paul was influenced by Ps-Solomon's depiction of union with Wisdom in the formulation of his own experience. In effect, the language of the Apostle fairly recalls that with which Ps-Solomon describes the intimate relationship between Wisdom and her disciples. We have seen[204] how he does this in terms of a whole series of concepts compounded with σύν[205]. The Pauline συζήσομεν (Rom 6:8) is particularly reminiscent of the WS's συμβιώσις (8:9, 17). It is not necessary, with Lohmeyer[206] to interpret (Rom 6:8b ("we shall

---

[203]Cf. R. Schnackenburg, Das Heilsgeschehen bei der Taufe nach dem Apostel Paulus (Theologische Studien I; München, 1950), pp. 180 ff. A. Wikenhauser, Pauline Mysticism, pp. 109 ff.

[204]See section B, above.

[205]"Living with Wisdom" (συνοικοῦντα -7:28); "companionship with her" (συναναστροφὴν -8:16); "kinship with her" (συγγενείᾳ-8:17).

[206]E. Lohmeyer, "Σὺν Χριστῷ", in Festgabe für A. Deissmann (Tübingen, 1927), p. 221. Cf. E. Schweizer, "Die'Mystik' des Sterbens und Auferstehens mit Christus bein Paulus", EvTh 26/5 (1966), p. 239.

live with him") in an eschatological sense. The context seems to call for a present sense: Christians are "dead to sin and alive to God" (6:11), and this "aliveness" is very much related to the present existence. Thus, the use of the future tense of συζήν can be understood from the perspective of the past event of having died with Christ. "We were buried with him", so that, as he was raised, "we too might walk in newness of life" (6:4). This re-created life is "life with him"[207] a dynamic, present reality that determines one's entire existence and (ideally) results in a life of righteousness, of obedience (Rom 6). It is hardly a coincidence that union with Wisdom (ch. 8) is also intimately tied to the ethical life (cf. 8:7, δικαιοσύνη).[208]

Conclusion. The foregoing analysis suggests that Ps-Solomon's depiction of union with Wisdom may have been quite a potent influence on both Paul's conception of union with Christ and on his formulation of that conception. The quest for the source or sources of Paul's "mysticism"

---

[207] This symbiōsis is also expressed with the not very common term κοινωνία (I Cor 1:9; 10:16; WS 8:18; cf. II Cor 13:13; Phil 2:1), which designates "a particularly close relationship". Cf. H. Seesemann, Der Begriff KOINΩNIAim Neuen Testament (BZNW 14; Giessen, 1933), pp. 31-86.

[208] In this area of the ethical implication of union with the divine figure there are some interesting parallels: in WS 6:18 it is said that the "love of Wisdom" is identical with "the keeping of her laws". Ordinarily Jews spoke only of the Mosaic law (as the apostate Jew does in WS 2:12). In Gal 6:2, Paul admonishes his readers to "fulfill the law of Christ"; this "law" is clearly outlined in Gal 5:1-6:2: The law of Christ is the law of love. Cf. also the statement in WS 7:28 that "God loves nothing so much as the man who lives with Wisdom", with Rom 5:5, "God's love has been poured into our hearts through the Holy Spirit which has been given to us".

has a long history:[209] lines of contact have been drawn to the mysteries,[210] to Gnosticism, to Jewish Apocalyptic, or simply to Paul's experience of the Spirit and his understanding of the saving event. This last-named source must be seen as crucial in any understanding of Paul.[211] However, the interpretation of experience requires a conceptual framework, and the WS's presentation of union with Wisdom and her indwelling the lives of men may have provided that framework.[212]

### 3. Union with Christ as Guarantee of the Future

Thus far in this chapter we have seen how Ps-Solomon's conception of union with Wisdom, of her dwelling in men receptive to her, formed the foundation for a kind of existence in which the dominion of death is ex-

---

[209] For an excellent discussion of this history, cf. G. Wagner, Das religionsgeschichtlich Problem von Römer 6, 1-11 (AbThANT, 39; Stuttgart, 1962), pp. 13-68.

[210] It is interesting that McCown, "The Sources of Pauline Mysticism", in Munera Studiosa. Essays in Honour of W.H.P. Hatch (Cambridge, Mass., 1946), pp. 49-67, who is a representative of those who detect a terminological dependence on the mystery religions, makes this statement: "...the word μυστήριον appears frequently in Paul, usually in connexion with the idea of the revelation of divine wisdom and with that of the indwelling Christ, or the Spirit". It is surprising that he did not step through this opening into the pages of the WS!.

[211] Cf. Wagner, Das religionsgeschichtlich Problem, pp. 57-68, for a discussion of the extensive literature devoted to this area of investigation.

[212] Cf. S. Cave, The Gospel of St. Paul (New York, 1929), p. 51, who boldly declares: "St. Paul's Christ-mysticism was something new in the history of religion. It has no parallel in Judaism". But cf. Berwick, The Way of Salvation in the Wisdom Book, p. 118, "...certainly, some of the roots of Paul's teaching on the [indwelling ] Spirit are in the Book of Wisdom".

cluded and which, therefore, guarantees eternal life in the presence of God. That is to say, union with Wisdom is eschatologically oriented. We have further seen that for Paul the risen Christ, whom he experienced as a life-giving (Rom 8:9 ff.) or life re-creating (II Cor 5:17) spiritual presence was that Wisdom of God who frees men from bondage to the reign of sin and death and ushers them into an existence in which life reigns. At point after point Paul in this discussion was seen to echo concepts and formulations of the Wisdom of Solomon. It is not surprising, therefore, to find that union with Christ, conceived in analogy to union with Wisdom, is also eschatologically oriented.[213] This orientation has already been indicated at various points in the preceding discussion, so that a brief survey and analysis of the textual material will suffice.

At the outset, it must be noted that, while the conception of

---

[213]On the eschatological orientation of Paul's mysticism cf. M. Dibelius, "Paulus und die Mystik", in Das Paulusbild in der neueren deutschen Forschung, ed. by K.H. Rengstorf (Wege der Forschung, 24; Darmstadt, 1964), pp. 447-474: "...im Verhältnis des Apostels zu Christus ist alles auf das Ende hin gerichtet; darum gibt es keine Ruhe, es gibt nur Spannung; es gibt nur bedingt ein Haben, es gibt sehr wesentlich ein Bewusstsein des Nichthabens und eine Sehnsucht nach der Vollendung". (p. 470). Cf. also Stewart, A Man in Christ, pp. 199-202: "The experience of union with Christ, as Paul describes it, looks beyond the present to the future....eschatology does not begin where mysticism ends, nor does its presence argue a defect in the mystic's position. In point of fact, it proves the vitality and intensity of his union. It is not because he has had so little of Christ that he yearns for more. It is precisely because he has had so much of Christ that he is sure God intends him for the perfect experience". Weiss, Das Urchristentum, p. 404, speaks of a "Christus-Sehnsucht" in this connection.

the believer's union with Christ is predominantly expressed by the unique Pauline formula ἐν Χριστῷ ,[214] only a few passages mention the dwelling of Christ in the believer. Yet, the scarcity of references to this conception need not surprise us when we realize how frequently Paul refers to the indwelling of the Spirit of Christ, the Spirit of God, or simply the Spirit.[215] Paul conceived of the indwelling Christ, as WS conceived of the indwelling Wisdom, in terms of "Spirit".[216] Thus, in an attempt to speak of the eschatological orientation of Paul's conception of the indwelling Christ and union with him, the passages that speak of the indwelling Spirit must also be considered.[217]

Both formulations of this mystical reality come together in Rom 8:9 ff.:

> But you are not in the flesh (ἐν σαρκί),

---

[214]It occurs almost 100 times in the generally acknowledged Paulines (including the equivalent formulas "in him", "in the Lord", "in the Spirit".). Cf. Deissmann, Die neutestamentliche Formel 'In Christo', pp. 101-117, for the statistical analysis. See also N. Gäumann, Taufe und Ethik. Studien zu Römer 6 (BEvTh, 47; München, 1967), pp. 55-60, for a discussion of the literature.

[215]Wikenhauser, Pauline Mysticism, pp. 65 ff. Cf. J. Stewart, A Man in Christ. The Vital Elements of St. Paul's Religion (New York-Evanston, n.d.), ch. IV; E. Andrews, The Meaning of Christ for Paul, p. 81; Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, pp. 3 ff.; L. Cerfaux, The Christian in the Theology St. Paul, tr. by L. Soiron (London, 1967), pp. 312 ff.

[216]Cf. our discussion of this matter above, sections B and C.

[217]Cf. E. Schweizer, "Gegenwart des Geistes und eschatologische Hoffnung bei Zarathustra, Spät-jüdischen Gruppen, Gnostikern und den Zeugen des Neuen Testaments", in Neotestamentica, pp. 153-179.

> You are in the Spirit (ἐν πνεύματι),[218]
> if the Spirit of God really dwells in you (οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν)[219]
> Any one who does not have the Spirit of Christ (πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ) does not belong to him.
> But if Christ is in you (Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν)...
>
> (vss. 9-10)

Not only both formulations (Christ/Spirit) of the indwelling divine reality come together here, but also the reality of life now and life in the future, as the following statement shows:

> If the Spirit of him who raised Jesus from the dead dwells in you, he who raised Christ Jesus from the dead will give life to your mortal bodies also through his Spirit which dwells in you (ἐνοικοῦντος ἐν ὑμῖν).
>
> (vs. 11)

The indwelling Spirit/Christ[220] gives the divine life in the here and now, though this takes place in the context of "dead bodies" --i.e.,

---

[218] In the antithesis between "in the flesh" and "in the Spirit" is expressed the antithesis between "in Adam" and "in Christ" presented by Paul in Rom 5-6. Here as there, the formulations with ἐν designate an existence that is determined by the respective realities. Cf. Barrett, Romans, p. 158, "Christians are men whose lives are directed from a source outside themselves".

[219] Cf. the use of the term οἰκεῖ in the passages in the WS that speak of the indwelling Wisdom, or of the life with Wisdom, in similar terms: 1:4 b; σοφία... κατοικήσει ἐν σώματι; 7:28: τὸν σοφίᾳ συνοικοῦντα.

[220] Cf. A. Schlatter, Gottes Gerechtigkeit. Ein Kommentar zum Römerbrief (3rd ed., Stuttgart, 1959), p. 261: "Wo sein Geist ist, ist er; ist der Geist im Glaubenden heimisch, so ist Christus in ihm....ihr personhaftes Leben wird der Ort seiner Gegenwart".

bodies subject to physical disintegration.[221] However, the same indwelling presence is the basis and/or the cause[222] for the coming of life even to mortal bodies.[223] How this takes place, whether by resurrection or by transformation,[224] whether in the event of the individual's death, or at the parousia, remains here unexpressed. What is expressed unequivocally is the certainty that the indwelling Christ, who is the Spirit,[225] brings about a total redemption from death to life.[226]

Thus, the pneumatic Christian existence has its source in the πνεῦμα-Christ.[227] The ζωοποίησις of the θνητὰ σώματα of Christians is traced back to the πνεῦμα which dwells in them; but this πνεῦμα is at the

---

[221]Cf. A.W. Schmidt, Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer (Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament, VI; Berlin, 1963), pp. 139-140; O. Michel, Römerbrief, pp. 192-194; P. Althaus, Der Brief an die Römer, (9th ed., NTD, 6; Göttingen, 1959), p. 77.

[222]Cf. the debate concerning the textual variants and their meaning in Michel, Römerbrief, p. 194.

[223]The majority of commentaries agree that vs. 11 is eschatologically oriented.

[224]Schlatter, Gottes Gerechtigkeit, pp. 262-263.

[225]II Cor 3:17-18.

[226]Cf. F. Guntermann, Die Eschatologie des hl. Paulus (NTAb XIII, 4/5; Münster, 1932), pp. 192-193: "Als Bedingung der Auferstehung tritt die Lebensgemeinschaft mit Christus hervor...."; H. Molitor, Die Auferstehung der Christen und Nichtchristen nach dem Apostel Paulus (NTAb XVI, 1; Münster, 1933), pp. 16-22.

[227]For an excellent discussion of Christ's indwelling the believer as πνεῦμα, cf. Olschewski, Wurzeln Paulinischer Christologie, pp. 150 ff.

same time the πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ, i.e., Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν. I Cor. 15:45 makes this identification even more explicit. Christ is, indeed, πνεῦμα ζῳοποιοῦν. As the "life of Jesus" (ζωὴ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ) comes to expression "in our bodies" (ἐν τῷ σώματι ἡμῶν, II Cor 4:10), i.e., in the context of our mortality, our earth-bound human existence (ἐν τῇ θνητῇ σαρκὶ ἡμῶν, II Cor 4:11), so he, as the "life-giving spirit", is the guarantee that those ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ shall be made alive (ζῳοποιηθήσονται, I Cor 15: 22).

The transformation of the present of Christian existence (μεταμόρφωσις) takes place καθάπερ ἀπὸ κυρίου πνεύματος (I Cor 3:18). This Spirit/Lord is the same reality as the Spirit[228] that has been given "in our hearts" (ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν),[229] as a "pledge" (ἀρραβών, II Cor 1:22),[230] as a guarantee "that he who raised the Lord Jesus will raise us also with him" (4:14).[231] The indwelling presence is at the same time

---

[228]Cf. McCown, "Sources of Pauline Mysticism", p. 66, who identifies the "gift of the Spirit" with the "indwelling Christ".

[229]Cf. WS 9:17; 9:4, 6.

[230]Cf. Rom. 8:23, where the ἀπαρχὴν τοῦ πνεύματος is seen as the basis for the ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν.

[231]The σὺν Ἰησοῦ is probably to be understood in the sense of the σὺν αὐτῷ in Rom 8:32. That is, those who are found in that intimate relationship σὺν Χριστῷ (6:8) receive, by extension, the resurrection "with him". Cf. Schlatter, Paulus der Bote Jesus. Eine Deutung seiner Briefe an die Korinther (2nd ed.; Stuttgart, 1956), pp. 535-536; H. Windisch, II Korinther, p. 149; "Mit dem Zusatz σὺν Ἰησοῦ wird in auffälliger Weise die Gleichstellung, die Zusammengehörigkeit unserer Auferweckung und der Christi betont".

the guarantee (5:5) that "what is mortal may be swallowed up by life" (5:4) at that point when movement takes place "away from the body" to being "at home with the Lord".[232] We have here, side by side, Paul's dual eschatological orientation; and both perspectives are equally undergirded by his conception of the indwelling Christ.

In Philippians, we find the same juxtaposition of union with Christ and the dual eschatological perspectives. To be "found in Christ" (ἐναυτῷ) is the goal of Christian existence (3:9).[233] This "being found in Christ" is defined more specifically in 3:10 in terms of "knowing Christ" and the "power of his resurrection", as well as sharing in Christ's sufferings. Here we have the expression of symbiōsis, of "community of life with Christ". The goal of this sharing of the divine life is: that the resurrection from the dead may be realized (3:11). Paul expresses the reality of this "life together" somewhat differently in 1:21 ff., but the substance is the same. Life for Paul is so determined by Christ, so penetrated by him, that the very act of living is the expression of Christ's own life (cf. Gal 2:20).[234] Now it is this union in life, this

---

[232]For the interpretation of this passage, cf. ch. IV above.

[233]Cf. Andrews, The Meaning of Christ, p. 85, who says that though we have here, as in Phil 1:21 ff., statements that reflect Paul's personal experience, "Paul claimed nothing for himself which he did not expect every Christian to enjoy".

[234]Cf. the interpretation of the phrase ἐμοὶ γὰρ τὸ ζῆν Χριστός by J. Gnilka, Der Philipperbrief (Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, X/3; Freiburg, Basel, Wien, 1969), p. 71: "Grammatikalisch ist τὸ ζῆν subject und Χριστός Prädikatsaussage, aber sachlich ist Χριστός so sehr bestimmend, dass es das Subject in sich aufnimmt. Christus ist die Ermöglichung und der tragende Grund des Lebens".

being taken up into the very life of Christ, that becomes for Paul the basis for life σὺν Χριστῷ (1:23) after the departure (ἀναλῦσαι ) from life ἐν σαρκί (1:22, 24), i.e., from earth-bound existence.[235] Thus, here again comes to expression the close connection between union with Christ and the dual expression of the eschatological realities: resurrection at the parousia and immediate life with Christ on the other side of "flesh-existence".

In both Rom 14:8-9 and I Thess, the same pattern observed above could easily be demonstrated; but we need not belabor the point. The conclusion to be drawn from the above analysis lies on the surface: Union with Christ in the here and now guarantees the future: in terms of the salvation-historical perspective it is union with the Christ who was raised from the dead that ultimately leads to the believer's own resurrection at the parousia. In terms of the individual-personal perspective, union with Christ removes the present existence out from under the dominion of death. In that sense, the present existence is already the experience of the reign of life: and since death has lost its grip, the physical event is but a transition from this "life in Christ", tempered by the limitations of earthly, creaturely existence, to the "life with Christ" in the presence of God. As we have seen, union with Wisdom does both in the Wisdom of Solomon.

---

[235]See the interpretation of this passage in ch. IV above.

# CONCLUSION

As we moved from chapter to chapter throughout this study, we attempted to recapitulate the prior discussion and to state the results of that discussion. In those contexts, the conclusions of our investigation clearly emerged. Thus, at this point we shall but add a brief summary of the central thrust, concern, and contribution of this thesis.

Scholarship has long recongized the presence of a diversity of eschatological conceptions in the writings of Paul, both of an individual and of a corporate nature, and has provided various solutions for this apparently contradictory duality: It was suggested that a far-reaching development must be postulated for Paul's thought; that his contact with Hellenism forced him to reject his Jewish-apocalyptic and primitive-Christian heritage concerning the eschaton; that toward the end of his life he virtually substituted the Hellenistic conception of the immortality of the soul for his early belief in resurrection; that personal crises turned his thoughts away from end-historical considerations to the contemplation of his personal fate. A different solution was provided by attempts to reconcile the diversity in Paul's thought. These attempts centered primarily in a reinterpretation of the individualistic eschatological formulations and their subordination to the corporate, end-historical formulation. A third solution postulated that, since Paul is not a systematic theologian, the diversity and apparent contradictoriness within his eschatological thought is simply the result of an unreflective mind, and that therefore we must be content with the

recognition of an unconnected juxtaposition of contradictory elements. We have in Paul's thought, it was said, "a whole wonderful muddle, unarranged and alive".

None of these solutions (and variations thereof) proved satisfactory to this writer. In an attempt to answer the question: What made it possible for Paul to hold to two diverse eschatological conceptions without attempting to reconcile them? -- this study suggests that the apocryphal book, the Wisdom of Solomon, may have influenced Paul in his own conception and formulation of the diverse eschatological realities. It was found that the Wisdom of Solomon, with its duality of individual and corporate eschatological elements, and the undergirding of these elements by the conception of a union with the divine figure, Wisdom, provides an adequate interpretative key for an understanding of the complex Pauline eschatology.

An analysis of the eschatology of the Wisdom of Solomon revealed that the author stands within two traditions. On the one hand, he stands in the prophetic-apocalyptic tradition, and with it understands the fate of the righteous as intimately bound up with an event of God's inbreaking into history at the end of that history. On the other hand, he stands within a tradition which we have described as individual-personal-mystical, in which the fate of the individual righteous man is not seen in terms of the historical perspective of God's history with the world, but in terms of his very personal relationship to God. In this perspective, the death of the individual becomes the eschaton of <u>his</u> history, and in this death he is ushered into the presence of God. Both of these eschatological conceptions stand side by side; no attempt is made to

reconcile them. Yet there is a link between them in the author's presentation of the person and work of the hypostatized divine Wisdom. It is Wisdom that is active in history, that leads the righteous toward the climax of God's history with the world. At the same time it is Wisdom who, by dwelling in men and by entering into an intimate, life-renewing and creating relationship with them, makes them friends of God and leads them through death to incorruption.

This total configuration of individual, end-historical, and relational elements was seen to provide a strikingly informative background for the Pauline formulation of the dual eschatological realities, and the undergirding of these realities by the presentation of the Christ who is both Lord of history and the personal companion of those who open their lives to him. Indeed, our analysis revealed such close correspondences between the Wisdom of Solomon and Paul that we were driven to conclude that Paul saw in Christ the manifestation of the divine Wisdom of the Wisdom of Solomon, and that in his conception of union with Christ and its effects he was strongly influenced by that work's depiction of union with Wisdom and the effects of that union.

Thus, this study provides not only a new perspective on the vexing problem of the Pauline eschatology, but also makes a contribution toward the much-debated question concerning the source or sources of the so-called Pauline mysticism.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

## I. TEXTS AND TOOLS


Aland, K. et al., The Greek New Testament. The United Bible Societies; Stuttgart, 1966.

Bauer, W., A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature. Trans. and ed. W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich, 4th ed., Chicago, 1949-1952.

Blass, F. and A. Debrunner, A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature. Trans. and ed. R. W. Funk; Chicago, 1961.

Cohn, L. and P. Wendland, eds., Philonis Alexandrini Opera Quae Supersunt. 7 Vols. Berlin, 1930.

Colson, F. H. and G. H. Whitaker, Philo. Loeb Classical Library; New York, 1929-1962.

Charles, R. H., ed., The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament. 2 Vols. Oxford, 1913.

Delling, G., ed., Bibliographie zur jüdisch-hellenistischen und Intertestamentarischen Literatur, 1900-1965. Berlin, 1969.

Diels, H., Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker. 3 Vols. 2nd ed. Berlin, 1910.

Dupont-Sommer, A., The Essene Writings from Qumran. Trans. from 2nd ed. of 1960 by Geza Vermes. Cleveland, 1962.

Hatch, E. and H. A. Redpath, A Concordance to the Septuagint. 3 Vols. Graz-Austria, 1954.

Kittel, G. and G. Friedrich, eds., Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Stuttgart, 1932.

_____, Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Trans. G. W. Bromily, Grand Rapids, 1964.

Kittel, R., ed., Biblia Hebraica. 9th ed. Stuttgart, 1954.

Leisegang, J., Index, in Cohn-Wendland, Philonis Alexandrini.

Liddell, H. G. and R. Scott, A Greek-English Lexicon. New edition by S. Jones and R. McKenzie; Oxford, 1969.

Loewenthal, E., ed., Platon. Sämtliche Werke. 3 Vols. 6th ed. Köln, 1969.

Metzger, B. M., ed., The Oxford Annotated Apocrypha-RSV. Oxford, 1965.

Moulton, J. H. and G. Milligan, The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament; Illustrated from the Papyri and other Non-Literary Sources. London-New York, 1930.

Moulton, W. F. and A. S. Geden, eds., A Concordance to the Greek Testament. 4th ed. rev. by H. K. Moulton; Edinburgh, 1963.

Nestle, E. and K. Aland, Novum Testamentum Graece. 25th ed. Stuttgart, 1963.

Rahlfs, A., ed., Septuaginta. 2 Vols. Stuttgart, 1935.

Rienecker, F., Sprachlicher Schlüssel zum Griechischen Neuen Testament. 12th ed. Giessen-Basel, 1966.

Souilhé, ed., Platon Oevres Complètes. XIII/3; Collection Des Universites de France; Paris, 1962.

Strack, H. L. and P. Billerbeck, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch. 4 Vols. München, 1926.

Thayer, J. A., A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament. New York, 1886.

The Holy Bible. Revised Standard Version; New York, 1952.

Vermes, Geza, The Dead Sea Scrolls in English. Harmondsworth, 1962.

Ziegler, J., ed., "Sapientia Salomonis" in Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum. XII/1; Göttingen, 1962.

## II. BOOKS

Althaus, P., Der Brief an die Römer. 9th ed.; NTD 6; Göttingen, 1959.

Andrews, E., The Meaning of Christ for Paul. New York, 1949.

Barrett, C. K., The First Epistle to the Corinthians. HNTC: New York-Evanston, 1968.

_____, The Epistle to the Romans. BNTC; London, 1962.

Barth, C., Die Erretung vom Tode in den individuellen Klage und Dankleidern des AT. Basel, 1947.

Baumann, R., Mitte und Norm des Christlichen. Eine Auslegung von I Kor 1,1-3,4. NTAb NF 5; Münster, 1968.

Beare, F. W., The Epistle to the Philippians. HNTC; New York, 1959.

Berwick, W., "The Way of Salvation in the Book of Wisdom". Ph.D. Dissertation, Boston University, 1957.

Bleek, J. F., Studien und Kritiken. Berlin, 1853.

Bousset, W., Kyrios Christos. Geschichte des Christusglaubens von den Anfängen des Christentums bis Irenaeus. FRLANT NF 4, 2A; Göttingen, 1921.

_____ and H. Gressmann, Die Religion des Judenthums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter. 4th ed.; Tübingen, 1966.

Brockington, R. H., A Critical Introduction to the Apocrypha. London, 1961.

Brown, R. E., The Gospel According to John, I-XII. The Anchor Bible 29; New York, 1966.

Büchsel, F., Johannes und der hellenistische Synkretismus. Gütersloh, 1928.

Buck, C. and G. Taylor, Saint Paul: A Study of the Development of His Thought. New York, 1969.

Bückers, H., Die Unsterblichkeitslehre des Weisheitsbuches: Ihr Ursprung und ihre Bedeutung. Münster, 1938.

Bultmann, R., Exegetische Probleme des Zweiten Korintherbriefes. 2nd ed.; Darmstadt, 1963.

Burkert, W., Weisheit und Wissenschaft. Studien zu Pythagoras, Philolaos und Platon. Erlanger Beiträge zur Sprach-und Kunstwissenschaft, 10; Nürnberg, 1962.

Burrows, M., More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls. New York, 1958.

Cave, S., The Gospel of St. Paul. New York, 1929.

Cerfaux, L., The Christian in the Theology of St. Paul. Trans. L. Soiron; New York, 1967.

_____, Christ in the Theology of St. Paul. Trans. G. Webb and A. Walker; New York, 1959.

Charles, R. H., The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament. Oxford, 1913, Vol. I.

Charles, R. H., Eschatology: The Doctrine of a Future Life in Israel, Judaism, and Christianity. 2nd ed. 1913, with an Introduction by G. W. Buchanan, New York, 1963.

Conzelmann, H., Der Erste Brief an die Korinther. KEK 5/11; Göttingen, 1969.

Craig, C. T., The First Epistle to the Corinthians. IB X; New York-Nashville, 1953.

Cullmann, O., The Christology of the New Testament. Trans. C. Guthrie and A. M. Hall; rev. ed., The New Testament Library. Philadephia, 1963.

_____, Immortality of the Soul or Resurrection of the Dead. London, 1958.

Dahood, M., Psalms I. Anchor Bible 16; New York, 1966.

_____, Psalms II. Anchor Bible 17; New York, 1968.

Dalbert, P., Die Theologie der hellenistisch-jüdischen Missionsliteratur unter Auschluss von Philo und Josephus. Hamburg, 1954.

Dalman, G., Jesus-Jeshua: Studies in the Gospels. Trans. P. Levertoff; London, 1929.

Davies, W. D., Paul and Rabbinic Judaism. Torchbook Edition; New York, 1967.

Deane, W. J., The Book of Wisdom. Oxford, 1881.

Deissmann, G. A., Paul, A Study in Social and Religious History. Trans. W. E. Wilson, 2nd ed., 1927; Harper Torchbook Edition, New York, 1957.

_____, Die neutestamentliche Formel "in Christo Jesu". Marburg, 1892.

Deissner, K., Auferstehungshoffnung und Pneumagedanke bei Paulus. Leipzig, 1912.

Dibelius, M., Die Briefe des Apostles Paulus, II: An die Philipper. 3rd ed.; HbzNT 11; Tübingen, 1937.

_____, Paul. Toronto, 1953.

Dobschütz, E. von, Probleme des Apostolischen Zeitalters. Leipzig, 1904.

Dodd, C. H., Helps to the Study of the Bible. 2nd ed.; London, 1932.

Dodd, C. H., The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel. Cambridge, 1953.

_____, The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Jesus. Philadelphia, 1963.

_____, The Coming of Christ. Cambridge, 1952.

_____, New Testament Studies. Manchester, 1953.

_____, The Epistle of Paul to the Romans. MNTC; London-New York, 1932.

Duncan, G. S., Paul's Ephesian Ministry. London, 1929.

Dupont, J., SYN CHRISTŌ. L'union avec le Christ suivant Saint Paul. Paris, 1952.

Dupont-Sommer, A., The Essene Writings from Qumran. Trans. G. Vermez. Cleveland, 1962.

Eichhorn, J., Einleitung in die apokryphischen Schriften des Alten Testaments. Leipzig, 1795.

Eichrodt, W., Theologie des Alten Testaments. 2nd ed.; Berlin, 1948, Vol. III.

Eissfeldt, O., Einleitung in das Alte Testament. 3rd ed.; Tübingen, 1964.

_____, The Old Testament. An Introduction. 3rd ed.; trans. P. R. Ackroyd; New York-London, 1965.

Ellis, E. E., Paul and His Recent Interpreters. Grand Rapids, 1961.

_____, Paul's Use of the Old Testament. Grand Rapids, 1957.

Eltester, F.-W., EIKON im Neuen Testament. BZNW 23; Berlin, 1958.

Farrar, F. W., "The Wisdom of Solomon", in H. Wace, ed., Apocrypha. London, 1888, Vol. I.

Fascher, E., Seele oder Leben. Berlin, 1959.

Feine, P., Theologie des Neuen Testaments. 8th ed.; Berlin, 1951.

Feldmann, F., Das Buch der Weisheit. Die Heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments VI/4; Bonn, 1926.

_____, Textkritische Materialien zum Buche der Weisheit. Freiburg, 1902.

Feuillet, A., Le Christ Sagesse de Dieu d'Après les Épitres Pauliniennes. Études Bibliques; Paris, 1966.

Fichtner, J., Weisheit Salomos. HbzAT 2/6; Tübingen, 1938.

Fischer, J., Das Buch der Weisheit. Echter Bibel IV: Würzburg, 1950.

Focke, F., Die Entstehung der Weisheit Salomos. FRLANT, NF, 5; Göttingen, 1913.

Franck, E., Plato und die Sogenannten Pythagoräer. 2nd ed.; Tübingen, 1962.

Friedländer, M., Griechische Philosophie im Alten Testament. Berlin, 1904.

_____, Die Religösen Bewegungen Innerhalb des Judentums im Zeitalter Jesu. Berlin, 1905.

Friedrich, G., Der Brief an die Philipper. 9th ed.; NTD 8; Göttingen, 1962.

Fuchs, E., Christus und der Geist bei Paulus. Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 23; Leipzig, 1932.

Fuller, R. H., The New Testament in Current Study. New York, 1962.

Gärtner, E., Komposition und Wortwahl des Buches der Weisheit. Berlin, 1912.

Gäumann, E., Taufe und Ethik. Studien zu Römer 6. BEvTh 47; München, 1967.

Geyer, J., The Wisdom of Solomon. London, 1963.

Gnilka, J., Der Philipperbrief. Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 3; Freiburg-Basel-Wien, 1968.

Goodrick, A. T. S., The Book of Wisdom. Oxford Church Bible Commentary; New York, 1913.

Grässer, E., Das Problem der Parusieverzogerung. 2nd ed.; BZNW 22; Berlin, 1960.

Gregg, J. A. F., The Wisdom of Solomon. Cambridge Bible 30; Cambridge, 1909.

Grimm, C. L. W., Das Buch der Weisheit. Kurzgefasstes Exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen des AT 6; Leipzig, 1860.

_____, Commentar über das Buch der Weisheit. Leipzig, 1837.

Gunkel, H., Die Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes nach den populären Anschauungen der Apostolischen Zeit und der Lehre des Apostels Paulus. 2nd ed.; Göttingen, 1899.

Guntermann, F., Die Eschatologie des hl. Paulus. NTAb 13 4/5; Münster, 1932.

Guthrie, W. K. C., The Greeks and Their Gods. London, 1968.

Gutberlet, C., Das Buch der Weisheit übersetzt und erklärt. Münster, 1874.

Hamilton, N. Q., The Holy Spirit and Eschatology in Paul. SJTh Occasional Papers 6; London, 1957.

Haupt, E., Die Gefangenschaftsbriefe. 7th ed.; KEK 9; Göttingen, 1902.

Heinemann, J., Poseidonios' Metaphysische Schriften. Breslau, 1921.

Heinisch, P., Das Buch der Weisheit. ExHbzAT 24; Münster, 1912.

_____, Die griechische Philosophie im Buch der Weisheit. AltAbh 14; Münster, 1908.

Heinrici, C. F. G., Der Erste Brief an die Korinther. 8th ed.; KEK 5/8; Göttingen, 1896.

Hengel, M., Judentum und Hellenismus. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 10; Tübingen, 1969.

Hoffmann, P., Die Toten in Christus: Eine religionsgeschichtliche und exegetische Untersuchung zur Paulinischen Eschatologie. NTAb NF 2; Münster, 1966.

Holmes, S., "The Wisdom of Solomon", in Charles, Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha; Oxford, 1913, Vol. I.

Holtzamnn, H. J., Lehrbuch der Neutestamentlichen Theologie. 2nd ed.; Tübingen, 1911, Vol. II.

Howard, W. F., Christianity According to St. John. London, 1943.

Huby, P., Épître aux Romains. 2nd ed. by S. Lyonnet; Paris, 1957.

Hunter, A. M., Paul and His Predecessors. 2nd ed.; London, 1961.

Jellicoe, S., The Septuagint and Modern Study. Oxford, 1968.

Jervell, J., Imago Dei, Gen 1,26f im Spätjudentum, in der Gnosis und in den Paulinischen Briefen. FRLANT, NF 58; Göttingen, 1960.

Kabisch, R., Die Eschatologie des Paulus in ihren Zusammenhängen mit dem Gesamtbegriff des Paulinismus. Göttingen, 1893.

Kennedy, H. A. A., St. Paul's Conception of The Last Things. The Cunningham Lectures for 1904; New York, 1904.

Kittel, H., Die Herrlichkeit Gottes. BZNW 16; Giessen, 1934.

Kittel, G., Die Probleme des Pälastinischen Spätjudentums. Stuttgart, 1926.

Knox, W. L., Some Hellenistic Elements in Primitive Christianity. Schweich Lectures; London, 1944.

_____, St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles. Cambridge, 1939.

Knox, J., The Epistle to the Romans. IB, IX; New York, 1954.

Krüger, P., Hellenismus und Judentum im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter. Leipzig, 1908.

Kühl, E., Über 2 Korinther 5:1-10. Ein Beitrag zur Frage nach dem Hellenismus bei Paulus. Königsberg, 1904.

Kümmel, W. G., Die Theologie des Neuen Testaments nach seinen Hauptzeugen. Grundrisse zum Neuen Testament 3; Göttingen, 1969.

Kuss, O., Die Briefe an die Römer, Korinther und Galater. Regensburger Neues Testament 6; Regensburg, 1940.

_____, Der Römerbrief. Regensburger Neues Testament; REgensburg, 1959.

Lagrange, P., Épître aux Romains. Études Bibliques; Paris, 1916.

Larcher, C., Études sur le Livre de la Sagesse. Études Bibliques; Paris, 1969.

Lieberman, S., Greek in Jewish Palestine. New York, 1942.

_____, Hellenism in Jewish Palestine. New York, 1950.

Lietzmann, H., An die Römer. 4th ed.; HbzNT 8; Tübingen, 1933.

_____, An die Korinther I/II. Ed. W. G. Kümmel, 4th ed.; HbzNT 9; Tübingen, 1949.

Lightfoot, J. B., St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians. Rev. ed.; London-New York, 1891.

Lindblom, J., Das ewige Leben. Eine Studie über die Entstehung der religiösen Lebensidee im Neuen Testament. Uppsala, 1914.

Linforth, I. M., The Arts of Orpheus. Berkeley, 1941.

Lohmeyer, E., Der Brief an die Philipper. 9th ed.; KEK 9/1; Göttingen, 1953.

Lohse, E., Märtyrer und Gottesknecht. Göttingen, 1955.

Lueken, W., Der Brief an die Philipper. 3rd ed.; Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments; Göttingen, 1917, Vol. II.

Macgregor, G. H. C. and A. C. Purdy, Jew and Greek Tutors unto Christ. London, 1936.

Machen, J. G., The Origin of Paul's Religion. Grand Rapids, 1947.

Martin-Achard, R., From Death to Life. Trans. J. P. Smith; London, 1960.

Meyer, R., Hellenistisches in der Rabbinischen Anthropologie. BWANT, 4/22; Stuttgart, 1937.

Michael, J. H., The Epistle of Paul to the Philippians. MNTC; New York, 1929.

Michaelis, P. W., Der Brief des Paulus an die Philipper. Theologischer Handkommentar zum NT 11; Leipzig, 1935.

Michel, O., Der Brief an die Römer. 12th ed.; KEK 4; Göttingen, 1963.

_____, Paulus und Seine Bibel. BzFChrTh 2/18; Gütersloh, 1929.

Mittring, K., Heilswirklichkeit bei Paulus. Ein Beitrag zum Verstandnis der unio cum Christo in den Paulusbriefen. Neutestamentliche Forschungen 1/5; Gütersloh, 1929.

Molitor, H., Die Auferstehung der Christen und Nichtchristen nach dem Apostel Paulus. NTAb 16/1; Münster, 1933.

Montefiore, C. G., Judaism and St. Paul. London, 1914.

Moore, G. F., Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of the Tannaim. 3 Vols.; Cambridge, 1927.

Moore, A. L., The Parousia in the New Testament. Supplement to NT 13; Leiden, 1966.

Morrison, C. D., The Powers That Be. SBT 29; London, 1960.

Moule, C. F. D., The Phenomenon of the New Testament. SBT 2nd ser., I; Naperville, Illinois, 1967.

Munck, J., Paulus und die Heilsgeschichte. Aarhus, 1954.

Nachtigal, J. K., Das Buch der Weisheit. Halle, 1799.

Nickelsburg, G. W. E., "Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism". Th.D. Dissertation, Harvard Divinity School, 1967.

Nock, A. D., Conversion. The Old and New in Religion from Alexander the Great to Augustine of Hippo. Oxford, 1938.

Norden, E., Agnostos Theos. Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religiöser Rede. Stuttgart, 1913.

Oesterly, W. O. E., An Introduction to the Books of the Apocrypha. London, 1935.

_____, The Wisdom of Solomon. New York, 1918.

Olschewski, W., Die Wurzeln der paulinischen Christologie. Königsberg, 1909.

Osty, E., "Le Livre de la Sagesse", in La Sainte Bible ou Bible de Jérusalem. 2nd ed.; Paris, 1966.

Pfeiffer, R. H., History of New Testament Times. With an Introduction to the Apocrypha. New York, 1949.

Pfleiderer, O., Der Christus des urchristlichen Glaubens. Leipzig, 1903.

_____, Das Urchristentum. Seine Schriften und Lehren. Berlin, 1887.

_____, Der Paulinismus. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Urchristlichen Theologie. 2nd ed.; Leipzig, 1890.

Ploeg, J. van der, Studies on Psalms. Oudtestamentische studien 13; Leiden, 1963.

Plummer, A., The Second Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians. ICC; New York, 1915.

Porter, F. C., The Mind of Christ in Paul. New York, 1931.

Quell, G., Die Auffassung des Todes in Israel. Leipzig, 1925.

Reese, J. M., Hellenistic Influence on the Book of Wisdom and its Consequences. Analecta Biblica 41; Rome, 1970.

Reider, J., The Book of Wisdom. Jewish Apocryphal Literature Ser. 1, Vol. 6; New York, 1957.

Ringgren, H., Word and Wisdom. Studies in the Hypostatization of Divine Qualities and Functions in the Ancient Near East. Lund, 1947.

Rissi, M., Studien zum zweiten Korintherbrief. AbThANT 56; Zürich, 1969.

Robertson, A. and A. Plummer, The First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians. 2nd ed.; ICC; Edinburgh, 1914.

Robinson, J. A. T., The Body. Studies in Biblical Theology 36; London, 1952.

Romaniuk, K., L'Amour du Père et du Fils dans la sôteriologie de saint Paul. Rome, 1961.

Rostron, S. N., The Christology of St. Paul. Library of Historic Theology; London, 1912.

Rowley, H. H., The Relevance of Apocalyptic. 3rd ed.; London, 1963.

Sanday, W. and A. C. Headlam, The Epistle to the Romans. ICC; New York, 1895 [5th ed. Edinburgh, 1902].

Sanders, J. T., The New Testament Christological Hymns. Society for NTS Monograph Series 15; Cambridge, 1971.

Schlatter, A., Geschichte Israels. 3rd ed.; Stuttgart, 1925.

_____, Paulus, Der Bote Jesu. Eine Deutung Seiner Briefe an die Korinther. 2nd ed.; Stuttgart, 1956.

_____, Die Korintherbriefe. Erläuterungen zum Neuen Testament 6; Stuttgart, 1962.

_____, Gottes Gerechtigkeit. Ein Kommentar zum Römerbrief. 3rd ed.; Stuttgart, 1959.

Schmidt, H. W., Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer. Theologischer Hand-Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 6; Berlin, 1963.

Schmithals, W., Die Gnosis in Korinth. Eine Untersuchung zu den Korintherbriefen. 2nd ed.; FRLANT, NF 49; Göttingen, 1965.

Schmiedel, P. W., Die Briefe an die Thessalonicher und an die Korinther. 2nd ed.; Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament 2/1; Freiburg, 1892.

Schnackenburg, R., Das Heilsgeschehen bei der Taufe nach dem Apostel Paulus. Theologische Studien I; München, 1950.

Schneider, J., Doxa. Eine Bedeutungsgeschichtliche Studie. Neutestamentliche Forschungen 3/3; Gütersloh, 1932.

Schoeps, H. J., Paulus. Die Theologie des Apostels im Lichte der jüdischen Religionsgeschichte. Tübingen, 1959.

Schürer, E., A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ. Trans. S. Taylor and P. Christie; Edinburgh, 1885; Division II, Vol. I.

Schulz, A., Der Sinn des Todes im Alten Testament. Braunsberg, 1919.

Schütz, R., Les idées eschatologiques du Livre de la Sagesse. Strasbourg, 1935.

Schwally, F., Das Leben nach dem Tode nach den Vorstellungen des alten Israel und des Judentums. Giessen, 1892.

Schweitzer, A., The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle. Trans. W. Montgomery; London, 1931.

_____, Paul and His Interpreters. Trans. W. Montgomery; London, 1912.

_____, The Quest of the Historical Jesus. Trans. W. Montgomery; London, 1910.

Schweizer, E., Neotestamentica. English and German Essays. Zürich-Stuttgart, 1963.

Seesemann, H., Der Begriff KOINŌNIA im Neuen Testament. BZNW 14; Giessen, 1933.

Sevenster, J. N., Do You Know Greek? How Much Greek could the First Christians have Known? Suppl. to NT 19; Leiden, 1968.

Siegfried, K., "Die Weisheit Salomos", in E. Kautzsch, ed., Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments. Tübingen, 1900, Vol. I.

Stauffer, E., Theologie des Neuen Testaments. Stuttgart, 1941.

Stendahl, K., The School of Matthew. Uppsala, 1954.

_____, ed., The Scrolls and the New Testament. New York, 1957; London, 1958.

Stewart, J., A Man in Christ. The Vital Elements of St. Paul's Religion. New York-Evanston, n.d.

Stier, E. R., Die Apokryphen. Vertheidigung ihres althergebrachten Anschlusses an die Bibel. Braunschweig, 1853.

Stier, E. R., Sogar die Apokryphen im NT? Braunschweig, 1828.

Sweete, H. B., An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek. 2nd ed.; New York, 1914.

Teichmann, E., Die Paulinischen Vorstellungen von Auferstehung und Gericht. Freiburg-Tübingen, 1896.

Thackary, H. St. J., The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought. London, 1900.

Tillmann, F., Die Wiederkunft Christi nach den Paulinischen Briefen. Freiburg, 1909.

Titius, A., Der Paulinismus unter dem Gesichtspunkt der Seligkeit. Tübingen-Freiburg, 1900.

Torge, P., Seelenglaube und Unsterblichkeitshoffnung im Alten Testament. Leipzig, 1909.

Torrey, C. C., The Apocryphal Literature. New Haven, 1945.

Tresmontant, C., A Study of Hebrew Thought. New York, 1960.

Unnik, W. C. Van, Tarsus or Jerusalem: The City of Paul's Youth. Trans. G. Ogg; London, 1962.

Vilborg, E., ed., Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia. Stockholm, 1955. Vol. I.

Vincent, M. R., Epistles to the Philippians and to Philemon. ICC: Edinburgh, 1897.

Volz, P., Die Eschatologie der Jüdischen Gemeinde im Neutestamentlichen Zeitalter. Tübingen, 1934.

Wagner, G., Das religionsgeschichtliche Problem von Römer 6, 1-11. AThANT 39; Stuttgart, 1962.

Weber, J., "Le Livre de la Sagesse", in L. Pirot and A. Clamer, eds., La Sainte Bible: Livres Sapientiaux; Paris, 1946, Vol. VI.

Weiss, B., Lehrbuch der Biblischen Theologie. 7th ed.; Stuttgart-Berlin, 1903.

Weiss, J., Der Erste Korintherbrief. 9th ed.; KEK 5; Göttingen, 1910.

_____, Das Urchristentum. Göttingen, 1914.

Weizsäcker, C. von, Das Apostolische Zeitalter der Christlichen Kirche. 2nd ed.; Freiburg, 1892.

Wendland, H.-D., Die Briefe an die Korinther. 7th ed.; NTD 7; Göttingen, 1954.

Wendland, P., Die Hellenistisch-Römische Kultur in ihren Beziehungen zu Judenthum und Christentum. 2nd ed.; HbzNT 1/2; Tübingen, 1912.

Wikenhauser, A., Pauline Mysticism. Christ in the Mystical Teaching of St. Paul. 2nd ed.; trans. J. Cunningham; Freiburg, 1956.

Wilckens, U., Weisheit und Torheit. Eine exegetische-religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu 1. Kor 1 und 2. BHTh 26; Tübingen, 1959.

Windisch, H., Der Zweite Korintherbrief. 9th ed.; KEK 6; Göttingen, 1924.

Wrede, W., Paulus. Halle, 1905.

Zahn, T., Einleitung in das Neue Testament. Erlangen, 1897.

Ziener, G., Das Buch der Weisheit. Die Welt der Bibel. Kleinkommentare zur Heiligen Schrift; Düsseldorff, 1970.

_____, Die Theologische Begriffssprache im Buche der Weisheit. BBB 11; Bonn, 1956.

## III. JOURNAL ARTICLES AND ESSAYS IN COLLECTED VOLUMES

Althaus, P., "Retraktationen zur Eschatologie", ThLZ 75 (1950), 253-258.

Baily, R. E., "Is 'Sleep' the Proper Biblical Term for the Intermediate State?" ZNW 55 (1964), 161-167.

Bammel, E., "Judenverfolgung und Naherwartung: Zur Eschatologie des Ersten Thessalonicherbriefs", ZThK 56 (1959), 294-315.

Barrett, C. K., "Christianity at Corinth", BJRL 46/2 (1964), 269-297.

Barrosse, T., "Death and Sin in St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans", CBQ 15 (1953), 438-458.

Baudissin, W. Graf von, "Altetestamentliches hajjīm 'Leben' in der Bedeutung von 'Glück'", in G. Weil, ed., Festschrift Eduard Sachau. Berlin, 1915.

Beare, J. E., "Is Man as Man Immortal? A Reply", Inter. 1 (1947), 493-498.

Böhling, H., "En Kyriō" in Neutestamentliche Studien für G. Heinrici. Leipzig, 1914.

Boyd, W. J. P., "Apocalyptic and Life after Death", in F. L. Cross, ed., Studia Evangelica. Berlin, 1968, Vol. V.

Bruce, F. F., "Promise and Fulfillment in Paul's Presentation of Jesus", in F. F. Bruce, ed., Promise and Fulfillment. Edinburgh, 1964.

Brun, L., "Zur Auslegung von II Cor. 5:1-10", ZNW 28 (1929), 207-228.

Bultmann, R., "Der religionsgeschichtlicher Hintergrund des Prologs zum Johannesevangelium" in Eucharisterion. Festgabe H. Gunkel. FRLANT, NF 19/2; Göttingen, 1923.

Burney, C. F., "Christ as the APXH of Creation", JTS 27 (1926), 100-177.

Cadbury, H. J., "Intimations of Immortality in the Thought of Jesus", in K. Stendahl, ed., Immortality and Resurrection. New York, 1965.

Conzelmann, H., "Paulus und die Weisheit", NTS 12 (1965-66), 231-244.

Daube, D., "Death as a Release in the Bible", NT 5 (1962), 82-104.

Dehmke, C., Zur Auslegung von 2. Korinther 5,1-10", EvTh 29/11 (1969), 589-602.

Delcor, M., "L'immortalité de l'âme dans le Livre de la Sagesse et dans les documents de Qumrân", NRTh 77 (1955), 614-630.

Demke, C., "Zur Auslegung von 2. Kor. 5:1-10", EvTh 29 (1969), 589-604.

Dibelius, M., "Paulus und die Mystik", in K. H. Rengstorff, Das Paulusbild in der neueren deutschen Forschung. Wege der Forschung 24; Darmstadt, 1964.

DiLella, A. A., "Conservative and Progressive Theology: Sirach and Wisdom", CBQ 28 (1866), 149.

Dubarle, A. M., "Une source du livre de la Sagesse?", RSPhTh 37 (1953), 425-442.

_____, "La tentation diabolique dans le Livre de la Sagesse (2.24)", in Melanges E. Tisserant. Vatican City, 1964.

Dupont-Sommer, A., "De l'immortalité astrale dans la 'Sagesse de Salomon'", REG 62 (1949), 80-86.

Eising, H., "Der Weisheitlehrer und die Götterbilder", Bib 40 (1959), 393-408.

Fabrer, "Das Geschick des Menschen nach den Tode in AT", KerDog 14 (1968), 249-262.

Feldmann, F., "Die literarische Art von Weisheit Kap. 10-19", ThGL 1 (1909), 178-184.

Fichtner, J., "Die Stellung der Sapientia Salomonis in der Literatur und Geistesgeschichte ihrer Zeit", ZNW 36 (1937), 113-132.

_____, "Seele oder Leben in der Bibel", ThZ 17 (1961), 305-318.

_____, "Der AT-Text der Sapientia Salomonis", ZAW 57 (1939), 155-176.

Fohrer, G., "Die Struktur der alttestamentlichen Eschatologie", ThLZ 85 (1960), 402-419.

_____, "Das Geschick des Menschen nach dem Tode in A.T.", KerDog 14 (1968), 249-262.

Furnish, V. P., "Development in Paul's Thought", JAAR 38/3 (1970), 287-303.

Georgi, D., "Der vorpaulinische Hymnus, Phil 2:6-11", in Zeit und Geschichte. Festschrift für R. Bultmann. Tübingen, 1964.

Goodenough, E. R., "Philo on Immortality", HTR 39 (1946), 85-108.

Goppelt, L., "Apokalyptik und Typologie bei Paulus", ThLZ 89/5 (1964), 321-342.

Grafe, E., "Das Verhältnis der paulinischen Schriften zur Sapientia Salomonis", in Theologische Abhandlungen für Carl von Weizsäcker. Freiburg, 1892.

Grobel, K., "Sōma as 'Self, Person' in the LXX", BZNW 21 (1957), 52-60.

Gröbler, P., "Die Ansichten über unsterblichkeit und Auferstehung in der jüdischen Literatur der beiden letzten Jahrhunderte vor Christus", ThSK 52 (1879), 651-700.

Guillaumont, A., "La Sagesse de Salomon", in É. Dhorme, ed., La Bible de la Pléiade. Paris, 1959, Vol. II.

Hadas, M., "Plato in Hellenistic Fusion", JHI 19 (1958), 3-13.

Hanhart, K., "Paul's Hope in the Face of Death", JBL 88 (1969), 445-457.

Heinemann, J., "Die Allegoristik der hellenistischen Juden ausser Philo", Mnemosyne 4/5 (1952), 130-138.

Heinisch, P., "Das jüngste Gericht im Buche der Weisheit", ThGl 2 (1910), 89-106.

Hyatt, J. P., "The Old Testament View of Man", RL 14 (1945), 526-534.

Jeremias, J., "The Key to Pauline Theology", ET 76 (1964), 27-30.

_____, "Zur Gedankenführung in den Paulinischen Briefen", in Studia Paulina in honorem Johannis de Zwaan. Haarlem, 1953.

Katz, P., "The Old Testament Canon in Palestine and Alexandria", ZNW 47 (1956), 197-217.

Key, A. F., "The Concept of Death in Early Israelite Religion", JBR 32 (1964), 239 ff.

Kleinert, P., "Zur Idee des Lebens im Alten Testament", ThSK 68 (1895), 693-732.

Kuhn, G., "Beiträge zur Erklärung des Buches der Weisheit", ZNW 28 (1929), 334-340.

Lagrange, J. M., "La paternité de Dieu dans l'ancien Testament", RB (1908), 481-499.

Lange, S., "The Wisdom of Solomon and Plato", JBL 55 (1936), 293-302.

Lieberman, S., "How much Greek in Jewish Palestine?", in A. Altmann, ed., Studies and Texts, Vol. I: Biblical and Other Studies. Cambridge, 1963.

Lohmeyer, E., "Syn Christō", in Festgabe für A. Deissmann. Tübingen, 1927.

Lowe, J., "An Examination of Attempts to Detect Development in St. Paul's Thought", JThS 42 (1941), 129-142.

Lyonnet, S., "Le péché originel et l'exégèse de Rom. V, 12", RSR 44 (1956), 63-84.

_____, "Le sens de en Sap. 2.24 et la doctrine du péché originel". Bib 39 (1958), 27-33.

Lys, D., "The Israelite Soul According to the LXX", VT 16 (1966), 181-228.

Manson, W., "Eschatology in the New Testament", in Eschatology. SJTh Occasional Papers 2; Edinburgh, 1953.

Margoliouth, D. S., "The Wisdom of Ben Sira and the Wisdom of Solomon", Expositor 1 (1900), 141-186.

McCown, C. C., "The Beatitudes in the Light of Ancient Ideals", JBL 46 (1927), 50-61.

McCown, C. C., "The Sources of Pauline Mysticism", in Munera Studiosa. Essays in Honour of W. H. P. Hatch. Cambridge, Mass., 1946.

Michel, O., "Die Entstehung der Paulinischen Christologie", ZNW 28 (1929), 324-333.

_____, "Zur Lehre vom Todesschlaf", ZNW 35 (1936), 285-290.

_____, "Der Christus des Paulus", ZNW 32 (1933), 6-31.

Moeller, H. R., "Wisdom Motifs in John's Gospel", BEvTHS 6 (1963), 92-100.

Montgomery, J. W., "Wisdom as Gift. The Wisdom Concept in Relation to Biblical Messianism", Inter. 16 (1962), 43-57.

Murphy, R. E., "To Know Your Might is the Root of Immortality (Wis 15,3)", CBQ 25, 1 (1963), 88-93.

Neugebauer, F., "Das Paulinische 'In Christo'", NTS 4 (1958), 124-138.

Nilsson, M. P., "The Immortality of the Soul in Greek Religion", Eranos Jahrbuck 39 (1941), 1-16.

_____, "Early Orphism and Kindred Religious Movements", HThR 28 (1935), 18 ff.

Pfeiffer, R. H., "Canon of the Old Testament", IDB I; Nashville 1962, 498-520.

Porter, F. C., "Paul's Belief in Life after Death" RE 9 (1922), 280-309.

_____, "The Place of Apocalyptic Conceptions in the Thought of Paul", JBL 41 (1932), 183-204.

_____, "The Pre-existence of the Soul in the Book of Wisdom and in Rabbinical Writings", AJTh 12 (1908), 53-118.

Purinton. "Translation Greek in the Wisdom of Solomon", JBL 47 (1923), 276-304.

Roberts, B. J., "St. Paul and the Book of Wisdom", IJA (July, 1909), 58-60.

Romaniuk, Kasimir, "Le Livre de la Sagesse dans le Nouveau Testament", NTS 14 (1967-68), 498-514.

Scheftelowitz, I., "Der Seelen-und Unsterblichkeitsglaube im AT", ARW 19 (1916-1917), 210-232.

Schmitz, O., "Zum Verständnis von Philipper 1,21", in Neutestamentliche Studien für G. Heinrici. Leipzig, 1914.

Schnackenburg, R., "Todes-und Lebensgemeinschaft mit Christus", in Schriften zum Neuen Testament. Exegese in Fortschritt und Wandel. München, 1971.

Schubert, K., "Die Entwicklung der Auferstehungslehre von der nachexilischen bis zur frührabbinischen Zeit", BZNF 6 (1962), 177-214.

Schweizer, E., "Die Leiblichkeit des Menschen: Leben-Tod-Auferstehung", EvTh 29 (1969), 40-56.

_____, "Die 'Mystik' des Sterbens und Auferstehens mit Christus bei Paulus", EvTh 26/5 (1966), 239-257.

_____, "Dying and Rising with Christ", in R. Batey, ed., New Testament Issues. Harper Forum Books; New York, 1970.

Sellin, E., "Die alttestamentliche Hoffnung auf Auferstehung und ewiges Leben", Luthertum 30 (1919), 232-289.

Sevenster, J. N., "Some Remarks on the gymnos in II Cor. V. 3", in Studia Paulina in Honorem Johannis de Zwaan. Harlem, 1953.

_____, "Einige Bemerkungen über der 'Zwischenzustand' bei Paulus", NTS I (1954), 291-296.

Skehan, P., "Borrowings from the Psalms in the Book of Wisdom", CBQ 10 (1948), 384-397.

Skehan, P. W., "Isaiah and the Teaching of the Book of Wisdom", CBQ 2 (1940), 289-299.

Smalley, S., "New Light on the Fourth Gospel", TB 17 (1966), 35-62.

Snaith, N., "Life after Death. The Biblical Doctrine of Immortality", Inter. 1 (1947), 309-324.

Speiser, A. E., "The Hebrew Origin of the First Part of the Book of Wisdom", JQR 14 (1923-24), 455-482.

Staerk, W., "Der Schrift und Kanonbegriff der jüdischen Bibel", ZSyTh 6/1 (1928), 111-124.

Steuernagel, C., "Die Strukturlinien der Entwicklung der jüdischen Eschatologie", in Festschrift Alfred Bertholet. Tübingen, 1950.

Suggs, M. J., "Wisdom of Solomon 2:10-5: A Homily based on the Fourth Servant Song", JBL 76 (1957), 26-33.

Sundberg, A. C., "The Old Testament of the Early Church", HTR 51 (1958), 205-226.

Tennant, F. R., "The Teaching of Ecclesiastes and Wisdom on the Introduction of Sin and Death", JThS 2(1901), 207-223.

Turnball, R. G., "The Christology of Paul", Union Seminary Review 57 (1945-46), 121-138.

Weber, W., "Heimat und Zeitalter des Eschatologischen Buches der Weisheit", ZWTh 53 (1911), 322-345.

_____, "Die Seelenlehre der Weisheit Salomos", ZWTh 51 (1909), 314-332.

_____, "Die Unsterblichkeit der Weisheit Salomos", ZWTh 48 (1904-1905), 409-444.

_____, "Der Auferstehungsglaube der Weisheit Salomes", ZWTh 54 (1912), 205-239.

Weisengoff, J. P., "Death and Immortality in the Book of Wisdom", CBQ 11 (1941), 104-133.

_____, "The Impious in Wisdom 2", CBQ 11 (1949), 40-65.

Weiss, J., "Paulinische Probleme, 2. Die Formel en Christō Iēsoy", ThSK 1 (1896), 13 ff.

Windisch, H., "Die göttliche Weisheit der Juden und die paulinisch Christologie", in Neutestamentliche Studien für G. Heinrici. Untersuchungen zum NT 6; Leipzig, 1914.

Ziener, G., "Die Verwendung der Schrift im Buche der Weisheit", TrThZ 66 (1957), 138-152.

_____, "Weisheitsbuch und Johannesevangelium", Bib 38 (1957), 396-418; 39 (1958), 37-60.

Zimmermann, F., "The Book of Wisdom: Its Language and Character", JQR 57 (1966), 1-27; 101-135.

Zschokke, H., "Die Anthropologie des Buches der Weisheit", Katholik 55 (1875), 225-250.