

School of Theology at Claremont



1001 1335781

Birger Albert Pearson

THE PNEUMATIKOS-PSYCHIKOS TERMINOLOGY

SBL Dissertation Series 12



The Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT

WEST FOOTHILL AT COLLEGE AVENUE
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

THE PNEUMATIKOS-PSYCHIKOS TERMINOLOGY
IN 1 CORINTHIANS

BS
2675.2
P4

THE PNEUMATIKOS-PSYCHIKOS TERMINOLOGY IN 1 CORINTHIANS.
A STUDY IN THE THEOLOGY OF THE CORINTHIAN OPPONENTS
OF PAUL AND ITS RELATION TO GNOSTICISM

by

Birger Albert Pearson

Published by

SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE

for

The Nag Hammadi Seminar

DISSERTATION SERIES, NUMBER TWELVE

1973

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

THE PNEUMATIKOS-PSYCHIKOS TERMINOLOGY IN 1 CORINTHIANS.
A STUDY IN THE THEOLOGY OF THE CORINTHIAN OPPONENTS
OF PAUL AND ITS RELATION TO GNOSTICISM

by

Birger Albert Pearson
Department of Religious Studies
The University of California
Santa Barbara, Calif. 93106

Ph.D., 1968
Harvard University

Advisor:
Helmut Koester

Copyright © 1973

by

The Society of Biblical Literature

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 73-92202

ISBN: 0-88414-034-2

Printed in the United States of America

Printing Department, University of Montana, Missoula, Mt. 59801

PREFACE

This dissertation was completed and presented to the Committee on Higher Degrees in the Study of Religion, Harvard University, in the Spring of 1968. It was subsequently defended before a committee consisting of my thesis advisor, Professor Helmut Koester, and Professors Thomas Lambdin and John Strugnell of Harvard, and Professor George MacRae, S.J., then of Weston College (and now of Harvard). I was encouraged by the committee to submit it to a monograph series for publication, and it was my plan to do that. However, I wanted to revise it somewhat and expand it before publishing it, and this decision was the beginning of a considerable delay in its publication.

Also in the Spring of 1968 I was invited by Professor James M. Robinson, Director of the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity of the Claremont Graduate School in California, to participate in a team project involving the publication of the Coptic Gnostic Codices from Nag Hammadi. I began work on the Coptic Project of the Institute immediately, and have been engaged in this project ever since. The fruits of these labors will be the publication of a volume containing Codices IX and X of the Nag Hammadi Library.

During the last five years the publication of this dissertation has periodically entered my mind, but I have not been able to commit the necessary time to the revisions which, as time passed, seemed more and more to be required. In the meantime I have gained access to much more of the gnostic material than I had had during the preparation of my dissertation, and I have therefore come to project for future publication a separate monograph growing out of Chapter Six of the present work.

Now with the propitious birth of the SBL Dissertation Series --a series which has great importance not only for scholarly publication but also for the preparation in institutions of higher learning of doctoral dissertations--new incentive has been provided to publish this dissertation without large-scale revisions, more or less in the form in which it was originally presented. The encouragement of friends and colleagues has also been an important factor. For regardless of what will ultimately come of my plan for an enlargement of the material in Chapter Six, I do not envision much further work on my part on the focal problem of this dissertation, i.e. the problem of the theology of the Corinthian opponents of Paul. I am content to let the judgments I made

five years ago on that question stand.

Naturally, much important work has appeared on 1 Corinthians and on the problem of the opponents of Paul during the last five years. Schmithals' major work has appeared in English translation; important commentaries have been published by Conzelmann and Barrett; and the monograph by Luise Schottroff is a very important contribution. Nevertheless I have not revised the substance of my work. Such revisions as I have made include such items as providing, in a few cases, English translations for texts and quotations which I had originally left in other languages, providing in the footnotes references to English-language materials which had not previously been available in English (e.g. all references to the Kittel *Wörterbuch* are now to *TDNT*), and revising a few footnotes to take into account important recent publications.

It is my pleasant duty to tender my sincere thanks to persons who have helped to make this work possible. Helmut Koester provided much helpful criticism during the preparation of this dissertation. One could hardly wish for a kinder, but more exacting, *Doktorvater*. Thomas Lambdin, with whom I studied Coptic and Ethiopic, is surely everything one could desire in a teacher of languages; without his contribution this work would have been impossible. George MacRae has been a close friend over the years, providing encouragement during the preparation of this dissertation and helpful suggestions during its examination; and now, in his capacity as Executive Secretary of the SBL, he has helped to make the publication of this work possible. John Strugnell, who came to Harvard after I had left my residency there, made some very fine suggestions during the examination, and has encouraged the publication of this work in the years since. Krister Sten-dahl, now Dean of Harvard Divinity School, has been one of the most powerful influences upon my scholarly development, not only while I was at Harvard but ever since as well. To whatever extent I have not measured up to the standards set by these scholar-teachers, the fault is entirely my own. My indebtedness to them-- but also to many other teachers left unnamed at Harvard and elsewhere-- is immeasurable.

I gratefully acknowledge here the financial aid I received during my residence at Harvard: a Martin Luther Fellowship (1962-64) from the National Lutheran Council, a Harvard University Fellowship (1963-64), and a Rockefeller Doctoral Fellowship

(1964-66).

My thanks, also, go to my friend and colleague, Walter H. Capps, Director of the Institute of Religious Studies, UCSB, for the use of the Institute's typewriter. And to my student and friend, Deborah Sills, my sincere thanks for excellent and conscientious work in typing this dissertation in its present form.

I have lovingly dedicated this book to the two most important women in my life:

To Mildred, my mother of blessed memory. She gave unstintingly and selflessly in the nurture of her children, but did not live to see her labors come to maturity. If I have learned anything in my life of Truth, Goodness, and Beauty, I have learned it especially from her.

To Karen, my wife. Not only has she done, and is still doing, for my children what my mother did for me, but she has borne over many years, faithfully and with relative good humor, the burden of living with a man who is too often preoccupied with scholarly pursuits.

Mulierem fortem quis inveniet? . . .

*Surrexerunt filii eius, et beatissimam praedicaverunt,
Vir eius, et laudavit eam.*

July, 1973
Santa Barbara, California

Birger A. Pearson

CONTENTS

Abbreviations	ix
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	1
A. The Problem	1
B. On "Gnosis" and "Gnosticism"	2
C. The Bounds of This Dissertation	4
CHAPTER TWO: ON THE TERM ΨΥΧΙΚΟΣ	7
A. Introduction	7
B. Wilckens on ψυχικός	7
C. ψυχικός in the LXX	9
D. Plutarch on the δαιμόνιον of Socrates	10
E. Posidoniüs, <i>et al.</i>	11
F. Hellenistic-Jewish Genesis Exegesis	11
G. The "Mithras-Liturgy"	12
H. Jude 19	13
I. James 3.15	13
CHAPTER THREE: IMMORTALITY AND RESURRECTION IN 1 CORINTHIANS 15	15
A. The Context	15
B. Hellenistic-Jewish Genesis-Exegesis	17
C. Genesis 2.7 in Qumran and in Rabbinic Exegesis	21
D. Paul's Re-interpretation of Genesis 2.7	24
E. Summary	26
CHAPTER FOUR: WISDOM AND THE ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΙΚΟΣ IN 1 CORINTHIANS 2	27
A. Introduction	27
B. The Τέλειοι and the Νήπιοι	27
C. Σοφία as Content, Previous Positions	30
D. Σοφία as Content, κύριος τῆς δόξης	32
E. Σοφία as Content, 1 Corinthians 2.9	34
F. Σοφία as Πνεῦμα	35
G. Excursus: Σοφία as Holy Spirit in Early Patristic and Gnostic Literature	37
H. Πνευματικός-Ψυχικός in 1 Corinthians 2.13b	37
I. Excursus: Εὐγένεια in 1 Corinthians 1.26 f.	40
J. The Πνευματικός and the Ψυχικός, Paul's Re-interpretation	40
K. Γνώσις in 1 Corinthians 8	42
CHAPTER FIVE: ON SPIRITUAL GIFTS IN 1 CORINTHIANS 12-14	44

A. "Prophecy" in Corinth	44
B. Ἀπόκρυφα Ἰησοῦς in 1 Corinthians 12.1 ff.	47
CHAPTER SIX: GENESIS 2.7 IN GNOSTIC EXEGESIS	51
A. Introduction	51
B. The <i>Apocryphon of John</i>	51
C. Adam as <i>Q̄olem</i> in Rabbinic Tradition	55
D. Saturninus	56
E. Simonian Gnosticism	58
F. Sethian-Ophites	59
G. The Mandaean Literature	61
H. Manichaean Literature	62
I. Valentinus, Fragment No. 1	63
J. The <i>Gospel of Truth</i>	63
K. The <i>Apocalypse of Adam</i>	64
L. The Naassene Commentary	65
M. Justin, <i>Baruch</i>	67
N. The <i>Sophia Jesu Christi</i>	69
O. The <i>Hypostasis of the Archons</i>	71
P. The <i>Untitled Text, Codex II</i>	73
Q. The Valentinian Literature	76
CHAPTER SEVEN: CONCLUSIONS AND RAMIFICATIONS	82
NOTES TO CHAPTER ONE	87
NOTES TO CHAPTER TWO	90
NOTES TO CHAPTER THREE	94
NOTES TO CHAPTER FOUR	101
NOTES TO CHAPTER FIVE	113
NOTES TO CHAPTER SIX	116
NOTES TO CHAPTER SEVEN	135
BIBLIOGRAPHY	137

ABBREVIATIONS

Journals, Series, Reference Works, etc.

BFCT	Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie
B G	<i>Codex Bezae Cantabrigiae</i>
BHT	Beiträge zur historischen Theologie
Billerbeck	H. Strack and P. Billerbeck. <i>Kommentar zum Neuen Testament zum Talmud und Midrasch</i>
BZ	<i>Biblische Zeitschrift</i>
BZNW	Beihefte zur <i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
CG	<i>Codex Cairensis Gnosticus</i>
CBQ	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
Crum	W. E. Crum. <i>A Coptic Dictionary</i>
CSCO	Corpus scriptorum Christianorum orientalium
CSEL	Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum Latinorum
ET	<i>Expository Times</i>
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
GCS	Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte
HNT	Handbuch zum Neuen Testament. Begr. v. H. Lietzmann
HTR	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
IEJ	<i>Israel Exploration Journal</i>
JBL	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
JHS	<i>The Journal of Hellenic Studies</i>
KlT	Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Übungen
LCL	The Loeb Classical Library
LSJ	H. G. Liddell and Robert Scott. <i>A Greek-English Lexicon</i> . Revised edition by H. S. Jones and R. McKenzie, 1940
Meyer	Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament. Begr. v. H. A. W. Meyer
NHS	Nag Hammadi Studies
NTS	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
NT	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
NTT	<i>Norsk Teologisk Tidsskrift</i>
PGL	G. W. H. Lampe. <i>A Patristic Greek Lexicon</i>
PGM	K. Preisendanz. <i>Papyri Graecae Magicae</i>
PTS	Patristische Texte und Studien
RevQum	<i>Revue de Qumran</i>
RGG	<i>Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart</i> (3 Aufl. 1957 ff.)
RSV	The Revised Standard Version of the Bible
SBT	Studies in Biblical Theology

SPCIC	<i>Studiorum Paulinorum Congressus Internationalis Catholicus, 1961.</i>
StTh	<i>Studia Theologica</i>
SVF	<i>H. von Arnim. Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta</i>
TDNT	<i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Trans. G. W. Bromiley, of Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, Begr. v. G. Kittel.</i>
ThF	<i>Theologische Forschung. Wissenschaftliche Beiträge zur kirchlich-evangelischen Lehre</i>
ThLZ	<i>Theologische Literaturzeitung</i>
ThPh	<i>Theologie und Philosophie</i>
ThZ	<i>Theologische Zeitschrift</i>
TU	<i>Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur</i>
VF	<i>Verkündigung und Forschung</i>
VigChr	<i>Vigiliae Christianae</i>
WMANT	<i>Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament</i>
ZNW	<i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche</i>
ZRGG	<i>Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte</i>
ZTK	<i>Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche</i>

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

A. The Problem

Ever since W. Lütgert in 1908 proposed the theory that the opponents of Paul in his Corinthian congregation were Gnostics,¹ there has been no lack of scholarly argument to support that contention.² Indeed, it has become almost standard now to refer to the opponents of Paul in Corinth as "Gnostics." So, for example, E. Dinkler in his article in *RGG* on "Korintherbriefe" says that Paul was polemicizing in his Corinthian letters against a single front of opponents, "gegen christliche Pneumatiker . . . ; diese sind Gnostiker . . . wahrscheinlich judenchristliche Gnostiker."³ Again, W. Kümmel in the standard isagogic work on the New Testament, "Feine-Behm-Kümmel," maintains that Paul in 1 Corinthians is arguing against "a new Gnostic interpretation which ascribed complete salvation and unconditional moral freedom to the 'pneumatikos,' as one who had been freed from the σάρξ."⁴ And in 2 Corinthians, according to Kümmel, Paul is faced with "a definite Gnostic, Palestinian, Jewish-Christian opposition created by new additional opponents . . ."⁵

One very important aspect of the argument has been the issue of "gnostic terminology."⁶ And by far the most important set of terms involved in the argument is the πνευματικός - ψυχικός terminology, the allegedly "gnostic" differentiation between the πνεῦμα of man and his ψυχή, and between the πνευματικός man and the ψυχικός.⁷

The issue of "gnostic terminology" has played a decisive role in the two recent full-scale monographs by W. Schmithals⁸ and U. Wilckens,⁹ both of which have as their main thesis that the opponents of Paul in Corinth were Gnostics. It may be suggested that these two books suffer from an over-emphasis on the use of certain allegedly "gnostic" terms in the Corinthian correspondence, and that Schmithals and Wilckens frequently fall into the trap of reading into a passage from the Corinthian letters a whole theological system or philosophical Weltanschauung just on the basis of the occurrence of certain terms--not the least of which are the terms πνευματικός and ψυχικός.¹⁰ I shall be taking up their arguments in detail in the appropriate places in the following chapters.

It should parenthetically be remarked here that D. Georgi has recently argued that Paul in 2 Corinthians was facing a

different front of opponents from those reflected in 1 Corinthians.¹¹ He does not regard the opponents of 2 Corinthians as "Gnostics," but rather as Hellenistic-Jewish-Christian missionaries. I have found no reason to disagree with the major thrust of his arguments, and this will be one additional factor¹² in limiting my own study to 1 Corinthians.¹³

Whenever one encounters an argument to the effect that such-and-such a terminology is "gnostic," certain inevitable questions present themselves: What is there about this terminology that makes it "gnostic"? Is there a terminology that can be considered to be "gnostic" in itself? Or, where did the Gnostics get a given terminology, and how did they use it?

In this dissertation I undertake a study of the use of the terms πνευματικός and ψυχικός (and χοϊκός) in order to determine (1) the original context of this terminology, (2) how this terminology functions in the theology of the Corinthian opponents of Paul, (3) how Paul himself uses this terminology in his argumentation against his opponents, and (4) how the same terminology and its context functions in gnostic literature. In the process I think something more can be learned about the nature of the theology against which Paul polemicizes in 1 Corinthians, and about Paul's own theological milieu and how this milieu governs his own use of language. And perhaps something can be learned also about the nature of "Gnosticism."

B. On "Gnosis" and "Gnosticism"

The use of the adjective "gnostic" and the noun "Gnosticism" is not particularly helpful unless it is made clear what the definition of "Gnosticism" is. Indeed, this is one of the principal tasks of the present generation of scholarship.¹⁴ Fortunately, this task has been made more promising (though perhaps also a little more complex) by the well-known discovery of a library of original gnostic documents near the site of the ancient city of Chenoboskion.¹⁵ As more of these texts are published, more and more light can be expected to be shed on the problem of the origins and nature of Gnosticism.

It is becoming increasingly evident, however, that a proper definition of "Gnosticism" must go beyond the issues of "terminology" and history-of-religions motifs. Indeed, it can legitimately be asked whether there really is any such thing as a "gnostic terminology," as seems to be assumed particularly by Schmithals and Wilckens in their respective studies. For the

creative genius of Gnosticism does not seem to consist in the invention of new terminologies or new history-of-religions categories or motifs. It can be shown that every history-of-religions motif which occurs in gnostic texts has been taken over from prior non-gnostic sources and has been re-interpreted. It is this *interpretation* of traditional terms, motifs, myths, etc. in which that which is typically gnostic can be discovered. Gnosticism must not, therefore, be understood primarily as a syncretistic collection of history-of-religions motifs,¹⁶ nor can it be said that Gnosticism is everywhere expressed in a certain predictable terminology. With considerable perspicacity, E. Haenchen has remarked, "Der gnostische Mythos hat für seine Seele keinen eigenen Leib gefunden."¹⁷ For Gnosticism must be viewed primarily on the basis of intentionality, its way of viewing the world and the self, and the way in which the intentionality manifests itself in the various texts and systems as a hermeneutical principle.

This methodology and its importance for a proper definition of "Gnosticism" is coming more and more to the fore, as is illustrated by the important international colloquium on the origins of Gnosticism held in Messina, Italy, in April, 1966.¹⁸ One of the most important papers at that colloquium was read by Hans Jonas, "Delimitation of the Gnostic Phenomenon--Typological and Historical." In this paper, Jonas summarizes in a brilliant manner the phenomenon of Gnosticism and its mythology, subsequently remarking as follows:

Against this immoderate emotionalism, we must observe the non-naivete of gnostic myth: with all its crudities it is a work of sophistication, consciously constructed to convey a message, even to present an argument, and deliberately made up of the pirated elements of earlier myth. It is, in short, secondary and derivative mythology, its artificiality somehow belonging to its character. . . . But then again, there is great ingenuity in adapting the borrowed detail to the grand gnostic design which in all the extravagance of embroidery is never lost sight of. All this is possible only in a historically 'late,' distinctly literate, and thoroughly syncretistic situation, which thus belongs to the phenomenology of gnosticism, over and above its doxography. This situation includes the free-floating availability of traditions that are no longer binding, but pregnant with redefinable meaning.¹⁹

What Jonas says above about "pirated elements of earlier myth" and borrowed "traditions" applies equally well, in many cases, to "terminology." That this is so as regards the πνευματικός - ψυχικός terminology reflected in 1 Corinthians and in Gnosticism I shall attempt to demonstrate.

Finally, my own presuppositions on the definition of "Gnosticism" should here be made clear. I have in this dissertation accepted the definitions formulated in a tentative way by the Messina Colloquium. A distinction was made at Messina between *gnosis* and "Gnosticism." The former was defined as "knowledge of the divine mysteries reserved for an elite."²⁰ "Gnosticism" (and "not every *gnosis* is Gnosticism")²¹ was seen to involve

a coherent series of characteristics that can be summarized in the idea of a divine spark in man, deriving from the divine realm, fallen into this world of fate, birth and death, and needing to be awakened by the divine counterpart of the self in order to be finally reintegrated. Compared with other conceptions of a 'devolution' of the divine, this idea is based ontologically on the conception of a downward movement of the divine whose periphery (often called Sophia or Ennoia) had to submit to the fate of entering into a crisis and producing--even if only indirectly--this world, upon which it cannot turn its back, since it is necessary for it to recover the *pneuma*--a dualistic conception on a monistic background, expressed in a double movement of devolution and reintegration.²²

Further, it was specified at Messina that the type of *gnosis* involved in Gnosticism is conditioned by the various factors delineated above. Only that *gnosis* is Gnosticism

which involves in this perspective the idea of the divine consubstantiality of the spark that is in need of being awakened and reintegrated. This *gnosis* of Gnosticism involves the divine identity of the *knower* (the Gnostic), the *known* (the divine substance of one's transcendent self), and the *means by which* one knows (*gnosis* as an implicit divine faculty is to be awakened and actualized. This *gnosis* is a revelation-tradition of a different type from the Biblical and Islamic revelation-tradition).²³

It should further be remarked that my use of the adjective "gnostic" will be governed by my presuppositions concerning the definition of "Gnosticism." I shall also, for the sake of clarity, try not to use the more general designation, *gnosis*, except where the context makes it absolutely clear what is meant.

C. The Bounds of This Dissertation

An investigation of the πνευματικός - ψυχικός (- χοϊκός) terminology in Paul must be limited to 1 Corinthians. The use of the word ψυχικός in Paul is confined to 1 Corinthians.²⁴ The word χοϊκός is found in the New Testament only in 1 Corinthians 15.47-49.²⁵ The word πνευματικός is used as an anthropological category mainly in 1 Corinthians (but also in Galatians 6.1).²⁶

The fact that this terminology is limited to 1 Corinthians is important, for it gives us a clue as to the situation in which

the terminology arises, i. e., in the context of a discussion between Paul and his opponents in Corinth.

The occurrence of the term πνευματικοί in Galatians probably belongs to the same temporal context in Paul's missionary activity, in that 1 Corinthians and Galatians were probably written at about the same time.²⁷ The occurrence of the term πνευματικός in Galatians does show that the term was not uncongenial to Paul, and that he could make use of the term by applying to its use his own criterion as to what it means to be "spiritual."²⁸ According to the context of Galatians 5.16 - 6.10, οἱ πνευματικοί in Galatians 6.1 are those who "walk by the Spirit" and do not "fulfill the desire of the flesh" (5.16).²⁹ They are "led by the Spirit" (5.18), and produce the "fruit of the Spirit" (5.22) in their lives. Therefore they belong to Christ Jesus, having crucified the flesh with its passions and desires (5.24). They "sow to the Spirit" (6.8) by bearing one another's burdens (6.2) and by unwearied well-doing (6.9). They can therefore look forward to reaping from the Spirit eternal life (6.8). In short, it is clear that for Paul οἱ πνευματικοί are those who are ἐν Χριστῷ (his more usual expression), and who have received the eschatological gift of his Spirit.

With these remarks on the use of πνευματικός in Galatians, it seems justifiable to limit our study of the πνευματικός - ψυχικός terminology in Paul to 1 Corinthians, and to conclude that we are correct in assuming that this terminology arises out of a polemical context in Corinth.

Our investigation assumes the following outline: In Chapter Two something will be said of the conceptual background in the Hellenistic world of the use of the term ψυχικός in the contrast πνευματικός - ψυχικός. A number of texts in which the term ψυχικός occurs will be examined as well. Chapter Three is an exegetical study of the relevant verses of 1 Corinthians 15, in which we examine in detail the original context out of which the πνευματικός - ψυχικός terminology develops, namely a Hellenistic-Jewish tradition of exegesis of Genesis 2.7, and show how this context illumines the situation in Paul's Corinthian congregation. In Chapter Four this study is continued in the context of an exegetical study of 1 Corinthians 2 and the "Wisdom" theology of the Corinthian opponents. In Chapter Five the use of the term πνευματικός in 1 Corinthians 12 - 14 is discussed. In Chapter Six there is set forth in detail the variegated manner in which Genesis 2.7 functions in gnostic exegetical tradition. Finally,

a short chapter of conclusions sums up the argument.

Throughout the dissertation all English translations of texts are my own, except where explicitly stated otherwise.

CHAPTER TWO: ON THE TERM ΨΥΧΙΚΟΣ

A. Introduction

The term ψυχικός as it occurs in 1 Corinthians 2 and 15 has been a notoriously difficult one to interpret. It is, of course, not enough merely to observe that it is an adjective derived from the noun ψυχή; what must be discovered is how and why the ψυχή comes to be contrasted with πνεῦμα, and how the ψυχικός aspect of man is viewed in contrast to the πνευματικός. In other words we are after the origins of the technical usage of the term ψυχικός as it is used in connection with the correlative term πνευματικός.

This must be made clear at once because the adjective ψυχικός occurs in Greek texts as early as the pre-Socratic philosophers, though not in a way which can shed light on the origins of the "technical" usage described above. For example, Democritus speaks of a θερμότης ψυχική,¹ and Anaxagoras says, of sleep, σωματικὸν γὰρ εἶναι τὸ πάθος, οὐ ψυχικόν.² Indeed the adjective πνευματικός is also used in Greek literature in a sense that bears little or no relation to the meaning it carries in the πνευματικός - ψυχικός terminology we are here investigating.³

So it is our task in this chapter to seek out a conceptual background out of which the πνεῦμα - ψυχή contrast develops, and so to uncover the origins of the technical usage of the adjective ψυχικός.

B. Wilckens on Ψυχικός

To his discussion of 1 Corinthians 2.10-16, Ulrich Wilckens⁴ appends an excursus entitled "Der Begriff ψυχικός," in which he makes the following remarks:

Vor allem ist der Begriff ψυχικός ein gnostischer Term. techn. für den Nichtpneumatiker. Wir sahen, wie in CH 1 der Aufstieg des Gnostikers so vor sich geht, dass er in den sieben Zonen jeweils eigene, welthafte Qualitäten abzulegen hat, bis er γυμνωθεὶς in den Bereich des rein Pneumatischen eintreten kann. Was hier abgestreift werden muss, ist nicht nur das rein somatisch Materielle, sondern damit zugleich auch die 'Seele'. Erlösung als Wiedergeburt zum Pneumatiker bedeutet für die Gnosis Befreiung von der ψυχή, d.h. Abstreifen der 'psychischen' Umklammerung, Vermischung bzw. Depotenziierung des Pneuma, das in die untere Welt abgefallen ist; der *gefallene* Pneumatiker, von seinem Ursprung isoliert und dem Machtbereich des Nichtpneumatischen ausgeliefert, heisst ψυχικός.⁵

In referring us to the *Corpus Hermeticum* and its doctrine of the ascent of the self through the seven spheres, an unnecessary unclarity is introduced. For, in point of fact, nothing at all

is said of the deliverance of a "pneumatic" self from the shackles of the "soul" in the *Corpus Hermeticum*. The word πνευματικός does not occur in the *Poimandres*; neither does the word ψυχικός.⁶ The word ψυχή does occur, but not in the sense which Wilckens ascribes to it. In *Corpus Hermeticum* 1.17 we are told that the Man--referring to the one created initially by Nous which bore the εἰκὼν τοῦ πατρὸς⁷--became soul and mind from life and light, ἐκ μὲν ζωῆς ψυχὴν, ἐκ δὲ φωτὸς νοῦν. Salvation, in the *Poimandres*, consists in learning of one's essential origin from light and life:

ὡς καὶ ζωὴ ἐστὶν ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατήρ, ἐξ οὗ ἐγένετο ὁ ἄνθρωπος. ἐὰν οὖν μάθῃς αὐτὸν ἐκ ζωῆς καὶ φωτὸς ὄντα, καὶ ὅτι ἐκ τούτων τυγχάνεις, εἰς ζωὴν πάλιν χωρήσεις.⁸

This salvation comes, according to the *Poimandres*, only to the ἔννοος ἄνθρωπος.⁹

Thus it appears that the meaning attached to ψυχή in *Corpus Hermeticum* 1 is something different from what Wilckens implies in the statement quoted above. The ascent to which Wilckens refers is not described in terms of a stripping-off of the "soul" at all. It involves a dissolution of the body (ἀνάλυσις τοῦ σώματος τοῦ ὕλικου) and an ascent through the spheres during which all of the bodily senses, energies, and vices are yielded up.

When Wilckens tells us that "Erlösung als Wiedergeburt zum Pneumatiker bedeutet für die Gnosis Befreiung von der ψυχή," he refers us to a footnote in which we are informed that "der ganze Traktat CH XIII beschreibt denselben Vorgang als ἀναγέννησις."¹⁰ But this reference does not appear to be relevant, for no use is made in this tractate of the term ψυχή; the dualism in this tract is throughout a dualism of σῶμα and νοῦς. Nor does the notion of ἀναγέννησις or παλιγγενεσία provide us with any help in interpreting the term ψυχικός in 1 Corinthians, for the idea of rebirth is absent not only from 1 Corinthians, but also from all of the genuine Pauline epistles.¹¹

Moving from the Hermetic literature, Wilckens proceeds to illuminate the meaning of the term ψυχικός from the Valentinian material, concluding that "Wir stehen hier in unmittelbarer Nähe zu 1 Kor. 2."¹² The Valentinian texts which Wilckens adduces do, of course, maintain a distinction between the πνευματικὴ and the ψυχικὴ οὐσία, stating further that all of the "psychics" are ὁμοούσιοι αὐτῷ (i.e. τῷ δημιουργῷ), in contrast to the "pneumatics" who are ὁμοούσιοι αὐτῇ (i.e. τῇ Σοφίᾳ). This, indeed, is one of the bases upon which the Valentinians make

their distinction between "pneumatics" and "psychics." But there is no evidence that the opponents in Corinth distinguished between the higher God and the Demiurge, nor is there any evidence in 1 Corinthians for a Sophia who functions as a "redeemed-redeemer." Indeed, if the redemptive function of "wisdom" be granted for the doctrines of the Corinthian opponents--which seems probable¹³--there is still no evidence in 1 Corinthians that Sophia is a fallen creature, whose very fall is responsible for the genesis of the psychic (including the Demiurge) and hylic levels of existence, and who herself needs a "Redeemer."¹⁴

It is therefore not enough merely to say that the word ψυχικός is in itself "ein gnostischer Terminus technicus."¹⁵ It is a "gnostic" term when it is used in a gnostic context and with a gnostic intentionality. Insofar as the soul of man is regarded as a creation of an evil demiurge or of evil creator-angels, it will be regarded as bad or inferior, and the adjective ψυχικός will also share in the same connotation of the noun ψυχή.¹⁶ But such a use of the terms ψυχή and ψυχικός is not evident in 1 Corinthians. It is not justifiable to argue that since the term ψυχικός occurs in gnostic texts it is therefore a gnostic term, and that therefore it is used in a "gnostic" way in 1 Corinthians. Nor is it satisfactory to account for the derivation of the πνευματικός - ψυχικός terminology just by arguing its "gnostic" character.

C. ψυχικός in the LXX

The term ψυχικός occurs in the LXX only in 4 Maccabees 1.32. It occurs there in a connotation somewhat different from that found in the New Testament, but ultimately, I believe, related to the New Testament meaning:

Moderation is indeed mastery of one's desires. Some of these desires are of the soul (ψυχικαί);¹⁷ some are bodily (σωματικά); over both reason (ὁ λογισμός) is clearly the master.¹⁸

This statement is to be understood in the context of popular Hellenistic philosophy. *Sophrosyne*, one of the cardinal virtues in Hellenistic Greek ethics, is regarded as acting as a controlling factor against all inordinate desires, both those pertaining to the body and those pertaining to the soul. That any such "desires" are attributed to the soul at all presupposes another popular idea, namely, the division of the soul into a higher and a lower portion. The higher portion of the soul is usually denoted as the νοῦς, or the sovereign (ἡγεμονικόν) portion of the soul.¹⁹

D. Plutarch on the δαιμόνιον of Socrates

In Plutarch's *de genio Socratis*, Simmias, one of the characters in the dialogue, recounts an oracular vision of one Timarchus of Chaeroneia. Timarchus, desirous of learning the nature of Socrates' famous inner voice, had consulted the oracle of Trophonius in Boeotia on the matter,²⁰ and had experienced there a vision of the celestial regions in which he saw various kinds of stars sinking down or shooting up from below. A mysterious voice explained what these were:

Every soul partakes of mind (ψυχὴ πᾶσα νοῦ μετέσχευ); none is completely irrational or deprived of mind. But whatever part of it is mixed with the flesh and passions is changed according to the pleasures and pains it undergoes and becomes irrational (ἄλογον). Not every soul is mixed in the same way. Some sink completely into the body and, becoming thoroughly disordered, are their whole life-long disrupted by passions. Others are mixed up somewhat, but leave outside their purest element, which is not drawn in but is like a buoy floating on the surface, attached to the top of a man's head, while he is as it were submerged in the deep. The soul is sustained around it and held fast insofar as it is obedient, and is not overcome with passions. Now that which is borne about submerged in the body is called the "soul" (τὸ μὲν οὖν ὑποβρούχιον ἐν τῷ σώματι φερόμενον ψυχὴ λέγεται), but that which is left free from corruption the many call "mind" (τὸ δὲ φθορᾶς λειψθὲν οἱ πολλοὶ νοῦν καλοῦντες), thinking it resides within themselves, just as they think that reflected images are in the mirrors that reflect them. But those who consider the matter correctly call it a daemon, regarding it as something external. Thus, Timarchus, . . . the stars that seem to be extinguished you must regard as the souls that sink completely into the body. The stars that re-appear from below and are lighted again are the souls which rise from the body again after death, shaking off a sort of dimness and gloom as one shakes off mud. But the stars that move about above are the daemons of men who are said to "have mind" (οἱ δὲ ἄνω διαφερόμενοι δαίμονες εἰσι τῶν νοῦν ἔχειν λεγομένων ἀνθρώπων).²¹

The latter category of men is later referred to as τὸ μαντικὸν καὶ θεοκλυτούμενον γένος (592C), a race which presumably includes Socrates.

What is of special import in this passage is the division between the ψυχὴ and the νοῦς of man, the latter regarded as the heavenly element of man, the former as subject to the passions of the body. Men are differentiated from one another according to whether or not they allow the νοῦς to rule over them; and it is even suggested that men's souls can be so submerged in the passions of the body that they are completely bereft of νοῦς.

This ψυχὴ-νοῦς differentiation is regarded as a commonplace; indeed what is new in the revelation received by Timarchus is the

idea that the νοῦς is really a δαίμων, something external to man. Where Plutarch got this idea is not important for our purposes, though Leisegang may have been correct in attributing it to Posidonius.²²

E. Posidonius, *et al.*

We do know that Posidonius drew the conclusion from the premise of an irrational element in the soul that wickedness has its roots in the soul itself. This we have according to the testimony of Galen:

Posidonius is not of the opinion that wickedness comes to man from an external source, but on the contrary that it has its root in our own souls (ἔχουσαν ἰδίαν ῥίζαν ἐν ταῖς ψυχαῖς ἡμῶν). Once it is set in motion (ὀρρωμένη) it sprouts and grows. Thus the seed of wickedness is to be found within ourselves.²³

And Galen himself wrote a treatise entitled περὶ ψυχῆς πάθων καὶ ἀμαρτημάτων, in which at one point he quotes the proverb Πάντων δὲ μάλιστ' αἰσχύνεο σαυτὸν, and gives advice on how to tame the ἀλογος δύναμις in one's soul.²⁴

Philo reflects the view of contemporary philosophy of an ἀλογον μέρος ψυχῆς,²⁵ which he defines as the θυμικόν and the ἐπιθυμητικόν.²⁶ Philo goes beyond the normal bounds of Hellenistic philosophy in that he can even speak of the death of the soul, ψυχικὸς θάνατος.²⁷

It is this complex of ideas which informs the use of the word ψυχικός in Justin Martyr. In *Dialogue* 30.1 he speaks of the ψυχικὴ νόσος of the people of Israel.²⁸

The word ψυχικός, therefore, if used to apply to the "irrational" or earth-bound part of the soul, can be understood as referring to an element in man which is inferior to the higher element, i. e., the νοῦς. So Marcus Aurelius, in his *Meditations*, can speak of man as tri-partite, consisting of σῶμα, ψυχή, and νοῦς. The σῶμα in this case is the seat of αἰσθήσεις, the ψυχή of ὄρμαί, and the νοῦς of δόγματα.²⁹

F. Hellenistic-Jewish Genesis Exegesis

When we move onto Hellenistic-Jewish soil, we tend to find (as in Philo above) the same use of the term soul, but for the higher, rational part a preference for the term πνεῦμα instead of νοῦς is observable.³⁰ The *locus classicus* in the Old Testament which suggests this usage is Genesis 2.7 (in the LXX). For example, Josephus seems to suggest that man is basically a trichotomy, but for Josephus this trichotomy consists of dust

from the earth, ψυχή, and πνεῦμα. This is evident in his paraphrase of Genesis 2.7:

ἔπλασεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον χοῦν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς
λαβών, καὶ πνεῦμα ἐνήκεν αὐτῷ καὶ ψυχὴν. ὁ
δ' ἄνθρωπος οὗτος "Ἀδαμος ἐκλήθη."³¹

If, indeed, πνεῦμα and ψυχή do not constitute a hendiadys, there is a strong possibility that πνεῦμα functions in this passage (as it does elsewhere in Hellenistic Judaism) exactly as νοῦς does in non-Jewish Hellenistic thought, from which examples have been given above. If so, it is the Greek text of Genesis 2.7 that brings about this terminological shift.

A similar understanding of man's ψυχή and πνεῦμα, again probably based on a tradition of exegesis of Genesis 2.7, enables Justin Martyr in *Dialogue* 5 to deny qualifiedly the immortality of the ψυχή. The matter is clarified in 6.2 (note particularly the term τὸ ζωτικὸν πνεῦμα):³²

But just as a man does not live for all time, nor is body always joined to the soul, for when this union must be dissolved the soul leaves the body and the man is no more, so also when the soul must cease to exist, the life-giving spirit (τὸ ζωτικὸν πνεῦμα) is removed from it and the soul is no more but returns again whence it was taken.

Philo, alternating between νοῦς and πνεῦμα, also bases his usage of the latter term (when it is used instead of νοῦς) on his understanding of Genesis 2.7. For Philo the νοῦς or the πνεῦμα is the divine element in man.³³

G. The "Mithras-Liturgy"

Reitzenstein suggested that the πνευματικός - ψυχικός contrast in Paul was derived from the terminology of the Hellenistic mystery-religions.³⁴ The one "mystery" text he brings to bear in his argument is from the so-called "Mithras Liturgy," dating from around the third century.³⁵ The relevant phrase in this text is τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης μου ψυχικῆς δυνάμεως.³⁶ In the context the *mystes* (if one may call him that) prays his mortal nature stand still so that he may attain to the vision of immortal *Aion* by means of immortal spirit. This is an interesting passage, for it may very well reflect a terminology arising originally from the Hellenistic-Jewish exegesis of Genesis 2.7. The Jewish character of this magical text has been established by Erik Peterson, who hypothesizes that the "actor" in the text is Adam.³⁷ A further possible allusion to Genesis 2.7 in this text is the phrase, πνεύση ἐν ἐμοὶ τὸ ἱερόν πνεῦμα, in line 14 of the same page in Dieterich's edition.³⁸

Thus the portion of the Paris Papyrus containing the so-called "Mithras Liturgy" cannot supply us with the root of the ψυχικός terminology, but itself may reflect an exegetical tradition whose lines we have now begun to establish, and about which more will be said in the next chapter.

H. Jude 19

The word ψυχικός occurs in the New Testament outside of Paul only twice, and does not occur at all in the Apostolic Fathers. In Jude 19 the heretics against whom the author is inveighing are described as οἱ ἀποδιορίζοντες, ψυχικοί, πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες. The term ψυχικός here is defined in a manner that conforms to the Pauline definition: the ψυχικός man is the one who does not have the Spirit of God.³⁹ The term seems to be one that the heretics (probably Gnostics) used to apply to non-gnostic Christians; this is suggested by the word ἀποδιορίζοντες. Jude has wrested the term from his opponents and used it against them, defining it in a Pauline way. The reference in 17-18 to "apostles" may indicate that a use of Paul was involved on the part of the opponents. Second Peter 3.15 indicates, at least, that the heretics of that epistle relied on Paul for their authority, and the heresies described in Jude and 2 Peter seem to be quite similar. However, a reference to Paul in Jude cannot be pressed too far, since Paul is not explicitly mentioned. Nor does the πνευματικός-ψυχικός terminology occur in 2 Peter.⁴⁰

I. James 3.15

The use of the word ψυχικός in James 3.15 is fraught with difficulties. It is used not as an anthropological term (except in a derivative sense), but simply as a pejorative adjective. One thing seems quite clear: neither "James" nor the recipients of his letter can in any sense be referred to as "Gnostics."⁴¹

Dibelius attempts to solve the problem by saying simply that ψυχικός is a technical term taken over and used out of context, just as the expression προχός τῆς γενέσεως in James 3.6.⁴²

Can it be legitimately argued that the source of this "technical term" is to be located in an environment of Jewish-Christian wisdom theology which is closely related to the discussion between Paul and his opponents in 1 Corinthians?⁴³ Is there any "Pauline" tradition discernible in James 3?⁴⁴ The relation between the Epistle of James and Paul is a question of debate. If Dibelius is right, *some* relationship can be posited, for he says that James 2.14 ff. is unintelligible "ohne dass Paulus zuvor

die Losung 'Glaube, nicht Werke' ausgegeben hatte."⁴⁵ This is, in my view, a correct judgment.

But further, the relationship between James and Paul is not limited to James 2 and the faith/works contrast exemplified in Romans and Galatians. Indeed there does seem to be a considerable relationship between James 3.13-18 and other Pauline passages, notably 1 Corinthians 2-3. For example, compare τὶς σοφὸς καὶ ἐπιστῆμων ἐν ὑμῖν; (Jas. 3.13) and εἰ τις δοκεῖ σοφὸς εἶναι ἐν ὑμῖν . . . (1 Cor.3.18). Again, compare μὴ κατακαυχᾶσθε (Jas. 3.14) and the warnings against boasting in 1 Corinthians 1.29-31 and 3.21.⁴⁶ The word ἐπύγριος occurs frequently in Paul,⁴⁷ and outside of Paul only in John 3.12 and James 3.15. The occurrence of the vices ζῆλος and ἐριθεία in James 3.14,16 are parallel to the Corinthian ζῆλος and ἐρις against which Paul speaks in 1 Corinthians 3.3. Furthermore the term ἐριθεία itself is a favorite in Paul⁴⁸ and occurs outside of Paul only in James in the New Testament.⁴⁹ James 3, therefore, is seen to contain elements which are peculiarly Pauline, and not easily explainable as common elements of a wider context of early Christian language. Herein lies the explanation for the occurrence of the expression ψυχικὴ σοφία in James 3.15. ψυχικὴ σοφία is itself not an attested Pauline expression, but it is reminiscent of σαρκικὴ σοφία in 2 Corinthians 1.12, also in a context of warning against καύχησις. And, of course, σοφία forms the subject of Paul's remarks in 1 Corinthians 2-3. The occurrence of the term ψυχικός in this context could account for the phrase ψυχικὴ σοφία in James.

Thus the occurrence of the term ψυχικός in James is best explained on the basis of a dependence of James' language upon Pauline terminology. This dependence is, in my opinion, best understood as a literary one; i. e. the author of James has read 1 Corinthians. But if this is going too far, Conzelmann's theory of a "school of Paul" would also adequately explain the relationship between the terminology of James and that of Paul.⁵⁰

CHAPTER THREE: IMMORTALITY AND RESURRECTION IN 1 CORINTHIANS 15

A. The Context

The crucial passage for our purposes is 1 Corinthians 15. 44-49, but it is necessary to see it in its context, i.e. in the context of Paul's argument on the resurrection of the dead. An outline of the entire chapter is helpful here, and that of J. Weiss commends itself:¹

- vv. 1-11: "Grundliegende Einleitung"
- vv. 12-34: Part I, answering the opponents' assertion, ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν οὐκ ἔστιν.
- vv. 35-57: Part II, πῶς ἐγείρονται οἱ νεκροί;
- v. 58: "Ein kerniges Schlusswort"

Part II I would break up into two parts, as follows:

- vv. 35-50: πρὸς σῶματι;
- vv. 51-57: τὸ μυστήριον

Verse 50 belongs to the argument in the preceding verses, but also functions as a transitional passage to what follows.

I see no reason not to take the statement in 15.12 as it stands, i.e. that there were people in Corinth who actually said ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν οὐκ ἔστιν. To be sure, this passage has often been interpreted in terms of a "realized resurrection" such as that which seems to have been advocated by Hymenaeus and Philetus, according to 2 Timothy 2.18 (ἀνάστασιν ἤδη γεγονέναι).² It seems to me preferable, on the basis of the clear statement in 15.12 and the whole context of Paul's argument, to posit the existence in Corinth of people who denied the resurrection of the body, people for whom the doctrine of an ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν was an impossible and superfluous notion.³

On the other hand, it is quite unlikely that the opponents denied categorically any doctrine of afterlife at all.⁴ Paul's rather hyperbolic argument appears at places (19, 30-34) to be directed against such a denial, but this can be understood when his Pharisaic background is taken into account.⁵ Paul believed that "he that says that there is no resurrection of the dead" has "no share in the world to come."⁶ Paul reminds the Corinthians that they have received and affirmed the Christian gospel as he proclaimed it to them, and argues from the standpoint of a common affirmation that Christ is not dead, but alive.⁷ On the Corinthian side this need not have included a belief in the bodily resurrection of Christ, for it was apparently possible from the beginning in the primitive church to interpret the exaltation of Christ in terms which did not necessarily include his bodily resurrection.⁸

What, then, did the opponents believe concerning life after death? By far the most probable assumption is that they affirmed a doctrine of immortality and regarded a resurrection of the body as superfluous, if not altogether repugnant.⁹ Johannes Weiss has summed up succinctly the prevailing thinking in the Hellenistic world on this point:

Eine Wiederbelebung des Körpers ist dem rationalistischen Sinne der Hellenen nicht nur höchst unwahrscheinlich . . . sondern dieser spiritualistischen Richtung nicht einmal erwünscht; sie würde ja nur eine neue Einkerkering der Seele bedingen.¹⁰

Weiss thought that Paul's arguments were directed against two sides: a Hellenistic denial of bodily resurrection on the one hand, and a crass Jewish belief in bodily resuscitation on the other.¹¹ As we shall see, he was quite correct on the first point, but incorrectly interpreted 15.50 in positing a second front of opponents.¹²

On 1 Cor. 15.46, Schmithals argues that Paul is polemicizing here, and it is probable that the opponents are indeed arguing for the priority of their pneumatic existence over their psychic. Schmithals' interpretation, however, goes beyond the evidence in the mythological details he reads into it.¹³

The difficulty of this passage is the use of the neuter τὸ πνευματικόν, τὸ ψυχικόν, which according to the preceding context seems to modify σῶμα. Thus, Eduard Schweizer thinks that Paul is arguing against opponents who viewed the σῶμα πνευματικόν as something already given to the believer, something hidden beneath the "psychic" body, and which survives death.¹⁴ But it is difficult to understand the specific context of such a belief. The closest thing to it would be the neo-Platonic doctrine of the πνεῦμα as the ὄχημα τῆς ψυχῆς. It is this philosophical context in which the use of the term τὸ πνευματικόν σῶμα in Philoponus' introduction to Aristotle's *De Anima* is to be placed.¹⁵ Such a doctrine, however, is not attested as early as 1 Corinthians, nor can this passage in 1 Corinthians 15 be adduced as evidence for it once the context has been clarified.

According to the context, the words πνευματικόν σῶμα and ψυχικόν σῶμα cannot be attributed to the opponents at all, but only to Paul. These terms are governed by Paul's diatribic question in v. 35 and his statement in v. 37 about τὸ σῶμα γενησόμενον on the one hand, and the polarity in v. 45 between ψυχὴν ζῶσαν and πνεῦμα ζωοποιόν on the other. The basic point of contact between Paul and his opponents is not the concept of a

"spiritual body" but the exegesis of Genesis 2.7b.

B. Hellenistic-Jewish Genesis-Exegesis

It is now possible to make more concrete what has heretofore been only the most probable assumption: the opponents of Paul in Corinth believed in the immortality of the soul, and not the resurrection of the body. And they held to this doctrine on the basis of Scripture! For a careful study of the way in which Paul quotes Genesis 2.7b in 1 Corinthians 15.45 leads to the conclusion that his use of this passage from Genesis is a polemic one. Paul quotes it, "targumizes" upon it, and re-interprets it to refute his opponents' use of Genesis 2.7b to prove their doctrine of immortality. What this doctrine was, and how they interpreted Genesis 2.7, is presently to be examined.

Some scholars have seen in 1 Corinthians 15.45ff. a polemic against the Philonic doctrine of two Adams, based on the two creation accounts in Genesis.¹⁶ Paul is made to reverse the Philonic order: the first, heavenly man is really the second, i.e. Christ.

But this is an interpretation that must be clarified. It is important to note that Philo had two different--even contradictory--interpretations of Genesis 1.27. This has been admirably elucidated by J. Jervell, who has shown that the "Platonic" interpretation of Genesis 1.27 (where the *ἄνθρωπος* is referred to as *ἰδέα τις*, as in *Op.* 134) plays no role at all in Philo's anthropology; it has only an ethical function.¹⁷ Philo's anthropology can be seen best in those passages in which he merges Genesis 1.27 and Genesis 2.7. In this case the Logos is the *εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ*, and God creates man *οὐχὶ εἰκόνα θεοῦ, ἀλλὰ κατ' εἰκόνα* (Genesis 1.27).¹⁸ The "man" referred to here is the *λογικὸν μέρος τῆς ψυχῆς*, i.e. the *νοῦς* or *πνεῦμα* in man (Genesis 2.7).¹⁹

It is this latter spectrum of ideas in Philo which has relevance for the theories of Paul's opponents in 1 Corinthians 15, inasmuch as these ideas have to do with a widespread Hellenistic-Jewish exegesis of Genesis 2.7.²⁰ This Hellenistic-Jewish exegesis of Genesis 2.7 is of crucial importance for an understanding of the Corinthian opponents' anthropology, and of their use of the *πνευματικὸς - ψυχικὸς (-χοϊκός)* terminology.²¹

The advantage of this thesis is not only that it gives us a theological context in which to understand Paul's argumentation in 1 Corinthians 15, with his obviously polemical exegesis of

Genesis 2.7, but that it provides us with a very plausible historical context as well. For there is solid evidence of the existence in Corinth of a Hellenistic Jewish synagogue,²² and we are well-informed concerning the activity in Corinth of the Alexandrian Jew, Apollos.²³ I am of the opinion that Apollos' role in Corinth is a factor of great importance for the development there of a Christianity influenced by the traditions of Diaspora Judaism. The description in Acts of Apollos' exegetical ability I take to be genuine and of great moment for our understanding of the doctrines of the Corinthian opponents.²⁴

The following survey of texts illustrating the Hellenistic-Jewish exegesis of Genesis 2.7 will make clear not only the origins of the πνευματικός-ψυχικός terminology, but the theological background and context for the basic contrasts in 1 Corinthians 15.45ff.: ψυχή-πνεῦμα; πρῶτον τὸ πνευματικόν-τὸ ψυχικόν; πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος-δεύτερος ἄνθρωπος; χοϊκός-ἐπουράνιος; φθορά-ἀφθαρσία; θνητόν-ἀθάνασία; εἰκὼν τοῦ χοϊκοῦ-εἰκὼν τοῦ ἐπουράνιου.

In *Op.* 135 Philo interprets Genesis 2.7 to mean that man is a composite creation made up of earthly substance and divine spirit (ἐκ τε γεώδους οὐσίας καὶ πνεύματος θεοῦ) and that man was

made both mortal and immortal at the same time, mortal as regards the body, but as regards the mind, immortal (κατὰ δὲ τὴν διάνοιαν ἀθάνατον).

In *Leg. All.* 3.161 Philo says,

For there are two things of which we consist, soul and body. The body is fashioned from the earth (ἐκ γῆς δεδημιούργηται), but the soul is of the upper air, a divine fragment (ἡ δὲ ψυχή ἀθέρος ἐστίν, ἀπόσπασμα θεῶν); 'for God breathed into his face a breath of life (πνεῦμα ζωῆς), and man became a living soul.'²⁵

In *Som.* 1.34, commenting on the incorporeal mind within man (the context is an allegorical interpretation of Leviticus 19.24), Philo says,

For that which is holy among things that have come into being is, in the universe, the heaven, and in man, the mind, since it is a divine fragment (νοῦς, ἀπόσπασμα θεῶν ὧν), as Moses, especially, says: 'He breathed into his face a breath of life (πνοήν ζωῆς), and man became a living soul.'

In *Her.* 55 ff., Philo grapples with a problem which would naturally be a difficult one to a Hellenistic exegete; namely, the radical difference between the Old Testament view of ψυχή (*nephesh*) and the Greek view. Because Moses states in Leviticus 17.11 that ψυχή πάσης σαρκὸς αἷμα ἐστίν, Philo must posit two

senses for the word "soul":

ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ψυχὴ διχῶς λέγεται, ἢ τε ὅλη καὶ τὸ ἡγεμονικὸν αὐτῆς μέρος, ὃ κυρίως εἰπεῖν ψυχὴ ψυχῆς ἐστὶ . . . (*Her.* 55).

The dominant part of the soul, i.e. the mind, is according to Philo that which is referred to in Genesis 2.7:

ἐνεφώσησε γὰρ φησὶν ὁ ποιητῆς τῶν ὄλων εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ πνοὴν ζωσαν, ἧ καὶ κατὰ τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ ποιητοῦ λόγος ἔχει τυπωθῆναι (*Her.* 56).

Notice that Philo here expressly treats the νοῦς of man as that which was created κατὰ τὴν εἰκόνα (Gen. 1.27). Furthermore, from his statements about the two-fold quality of man's soul, he draws the conclusion that there are two kinds of men (διτιτὸν εἶδος ἀνθρώπων), those who live θεῖω πνεύματι λογισμῶ, and those who live αἵματι καὶ σαρκὸς ἡδονῆ. The latter reflect their origin as a πλάσμα γῆς; the former their origin as an ἐμυαγεῖον θείας εἰκόνας.²⁶

In *Spec. Leg.* 4.123, Philo remarks that blood is prohibited because οὐσία ψυχῆς ἐστίν, but not of the νοεράς καὶ λογικῆς soul, only of that soul which man has in common with irrational animals. But the essence of the former is πνεῦμα θεῖον, as Moses says:

ἀνθρώπων τῷ πρώτῳ καὶ ἀρχηγέτῃ τοῦ γένους ἡμῶν ἐμφυσησάτω πνοὴν ζωῆς τὸν θεὸν εἰς τὸ . . . πρόσωπον . . .

Again, in *Det.* 80, Philo deals with the apparent contradiction in Moses concerning the soul, that the οὐσία τῆς ψυχῆς is πνεῦμα (Gen. 2.7). Philo solves this contradiction by asserting that each of us is two in number (ἕκαστον ἡμῶν . . . ἀριθμῶ δύο εἶναι), a vital (ζωτικὴ) element which we share with other creatures, and a rational (λογικὴ) element which we have from God (*Det.* 82). Insofar as man's soul is spirit (ἀνθρώπου δὲ ψυχὴν πνεῦμα) we are a θεοειδὲς δημιουργημα, whose roots are in heaven (*Ibid.*).

μόνον γὰρ δὴ τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς φυτὸν οὐράνιον ὁ θεὸς ἀνθρώπων εἰργάσατο.²⁷

Finally, in *Plant.* 18, Philo quotes Genesis 2.7 in proof of his statement that man's λογικὴ ψυχὴ is affirmed by Moses

τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἀόρατου πνεύματος ἐκείνου δόκιμον εἶναι νόμισμα σημειωθὲν καὶ τυπωθὲν σφραγίδι θεοῦ, ἧς ὁ χαρακτήρ ἐστὶν ὁ αἰδιος λόγος,

and that man is therefore κατ' εἰκόνα θεοῦ γεγενῆσθαι.

All of these passages demonstrate that Genesis 2.7 is a crucial text for showing on a scriptural basis that man is not only mortal but also immortal. In some of these passages, we have noted that Genesis 2.7 is brought into conjunction with

Genesis 1.27 and the doctrine of the εἰκόν.²⁸ In other references to Genesis 2.7, no mention is made of the εἰκόν, and Genesis 1.27 is not brought into the picture,²⁹ except perhaps by implication. In either case Genesis 2.7 is the crucial text, for it is used to explain the essence of empirical man, man as he is on this earth, a creature of both *mortal soul* and *immortal spirit*.³⁰ Earthly man, deriving his body and lower part of the soul from the earth, is secondary to heavenly man, the νοῦς or πνεῦμα which inhabits empirical man. Thus we have in the exegesis of Genesis 2.7 the germ of the contrast held out by the Corinthian opponents of Paul between the πνευματικός man and the ψυχικός - χοϊκός man, and the priority of the former over the latter, by virtue of his sharing in the divine Spirit, or the divine εἰκόν (the Logos, as in Philo, or Wisdom, as in the Wisdom of Solomon 7.26).

Philo is not the only witness of the Hellenistic-Jewish exegesis of Genesis 2.7. There is in passages of the Wisdom of Solomon additional evidence of the use of Genesis 2.7 (in conjunction with Genesis 1.27, as in some of the Philonic texts) as a proof-text for the immortality of man's higher being.

In Wisdom of Solomon 2.1-5 there is set forth the basis upon which ungodly men feel free to pursue a life of hedonism (vv. 6-9) and to oppress the weak and the righteous (vv. 10 ff.). The basis for their conduct is alleged by the author of the Wisdom of Solomon to be their view of the impermanence and mortality of man. Wisdom of Solomon 2.2b-3 is probably pertinent for our purposes, since it seems to reflect Genesis 2.7:

Because the breath in our nostrils is smoke, and reason is a spark kindled by the beating of our hearts. When it is extinguished, the body will turn to ashes, and the spirit will dissolve like empty air (RSV).

Here the πνοή which God breathed ἐν ῥοσίν ἡμῶν³¹ is regarded by the ungodly as mere "smoke" (καπνός), and man's rational soul (λόγος) as a spark (σπινθήρ) which has its seat only in man's καρδιά, rather than in the divine Spirit. The spirit (πνεῦμα) in man, says the ungodly oppressor, becomes as much like thin air (χαῦνος ἀήρ) as the body becomes ashes (τέφρα).

This impious view of man is regarded by the author of Wisdom of Solomon to be a reflection of the culpable ignorance of the ungodly, for the true view of man is, according to Wisdom of Solomon 2.23,

for God created man for incorruption, and made him in the image of his own eternity (RSV).

Here we observe that Genesis 2.7 and 1.27 are both in the

background, and that that part of man as was created ἐπ' ἀφθαρσίᾳ and as an εἰκὼν τῆς ἀϊδιότητος τοῦ θεοῦ is man's λόγος or πνεῦμα, or in Philo's terms, his λογικὴ ψυχὴ or his νοῦς.³² Man is, therefore, potentially³³ immortal and incorruptible. The death of the righteous is only an apparent death (Wis. Sol. 3.2), for in reality their souls are in the hand of God and their hope is full of immortality (ἀθανασίας, Wis. Sol. 3.4). The idolatrous man, however, will die; his hope is cheaper than dirt (γῆς εὐτελεστέρα), and his life of less value than clay (πηλοῦ τε ἀτιμότερος, Wis. Sol. 15.10),

ὅτι ἠγνόησεν τὸν πλάσαντα αὐτόν, καὶ τὸν ἐμπνεύσαντα αὐτῷ ψυχὴν ἐνεργοῦσαν καὶ ἐμφουσήσαντα πνεῦμα ζωτικόν (15.11).

Wilfully ignorant of man's potential for immortality given him in creation by God, the idolatrous and ungodly will forfeit it and perish. But those whose souls harbor Wisdom become friends of God (7.27) and are assured of their immortality (8.13,17).

This evidence of the use of Genesis 2.7 (and 1.27) in Hellenistic Diaspora-Judaism for the doctrine of immortality is conclusive. But here we must parenthetically make absolutely clear what the immortality of man in Diaspora Judaism meant, and what it did not mean. No Jew, not even Philo, could go so far as to assert with Plato that the soul was immortal by its very nature and therefore incapable of mortality. For even the most Hellenized of Jews, immortality was conditional. This we have already observed in the case of the Wisdom of Solomon, in the texts cited above, in which it is the soul's participation in Wisdom which guarantees immortality.³⁴ In 4 Maccabees, it is εὐσέβεια which is the ὁδὸς ἐπ' ἀθανασίας (14.5). The seven martyred brothers, by their εὐσέβεια, attain immortality for their souls while their bodies come into dissolution (14.6-10). For Philo, also, immortality is ultimately granted to the soul by God conditionally. Immortality is conditional upon εὐσέβεια and ὁσιότης,³⁵ ἀρετὴ,³⁶ or φιλοσοφία.³⁷ Thus, for Philo, eternal death is the lot of the souls of the impious.³⁸ As we shall see, this feature of the doctrine of immortality is evident also in the teaching of Paul's opponents in Corinth, where σοφία seems to be one of the deciding factors.³⁹

C. Genesis 2.7 in Qumran and in Rabbinic Exegesis

Very instructive is the use of Genesis 2.7 in Qumran and by the Rabbis, for it forms a striking contrast to the interpretations we have noted above.

In the Qumran texts man is never regarded as the "image of God," nor is Genesis 2.7b ever used--as in Diaspora Judaism--to prove man's immortality. Indeed, insofar as Genesis 2.7 functions at all in Qumran, it functions only on the basis of the first part of the verse, where man's earthly origin is emphasized.⁴⁰

For example, in IQS XI.20 f. there is this estimate of man:

And what is the son of man himself
amidst all thy marvellous works?
And he that is born of woman,
what is his worth before thee?
Truly, this man was shaped from dust
and his end is to become the prey of worms.⁴¹

When we turn to the Rabbinic materials, we discover, first of all, that Genesis 2.7b is quoted very seldom. Billerbeck states that "in der rabbinischen Literatur hat die Stelle nur wenig Verwendung gefunden."⁴² And of the few references there are to this passage, Genesis 2.7b is never--so far as I have been able to determine--used as a proof-text for immortality.

Indeed, at one place at least it is concluded that man is mortal--not immortal--precisely because of the fact that Adam was endowed with life "by breathing" (בְּנִפְיָהוּ). Man's mortality in this world (בְּעוֹלָם הַזֶּה) is contrasted with his reception of life in the time to come (לְעוֹלָם לְבוֹא), when he shall receive life as a gift (בְּנִחְיָהוּ); the proof-text for this latter assertion is Ezekiel 37.14.⁴³

At *Genesis Rabba* 14.7 we read that R. Jose b. R. Halafta (ca. 150 A.D.), in answering a heretic who denied the resurrection by quoting Psalm 2.9, likened man to a glass vessel which can be repaired because it is made by blowing:⁴⁴

If what is made with the breath of a mere mortal (lit. "flesh and blood"--בֶּשֶׂר וְדָם) can be repaired, how much the more what is made with the breath of the Holy One, blessed be He!⁴⁵

Thus, the Rabbi argues, man's body is repairable, like a glass vessel, because it is made by blowing, in contrast to a potter's vessel which cannot be repaired. Therefore there shall be a resurrection. Note, however, that there is here no trace of the notion that man has within him an immortal soul or a divine spirit on account of the inbreathing of God, as was the case in the Hellenistic Jewish exegesis noted above.⁴⁶

Indeed, such a doctrine seems to be deliberately avoided in the Targums on Genesis 2.7. This passage in *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* reads as follows:

And the Lord God created man with two inclinations. And he took dust from the place of the Temple and from the four winds of the world, and he mixed them from all the waters of the world and he created him ruddy, black and white. And he breathed into his nostrils the breath of life: and the living breath was in the body of Adam for a spirit able to speak (לרוח ממללא = πνεῦμα λογικόν), for the enlightening of the eyes, and for the hearing of the ears.⁴⁷

The same expression (לרוח ממללא) occurs also in *Targum Onkelos*⁴⁸ on Genesis 2.7 and in *Targum Neofiti*.⁴⁹

The most important use of Genesis 2.7 in Rabbinic circles revolves around the doctrine of resurrection. Here we encounter interpretations which are early enough in point of time to have been known by the Pharisee Paul.

On the word וייצר in Genesis 2.7a there evolved a controversy between the school of Hillel and the school of Shammai. Both Hillel and Shammai agreed that there were

two formations, one in this world and one in the future world (ב' יצירה, יצרה בעולם הזה ויצירה לעולם הבא).

But according to Shammai,

His formation in the next world will not be like that of this world. In this world skin and flesh are formed first, the sinews and bones last; but in the future, he will commence with sinews and bones and finish with the skin and flesh, for thus it says in connection with the dead of Ezekiel: 'And I beheld, and lo, there were sinews upon them, and flesh came up, and skin covered them above (Ezek. 37.8). Said R. Jonathan: We cannot learn from the dead of Ezekiel, for what did they resemble? A man who enters a bath; what he takes off first he puts on last. The School of Hillel said: Just as he is formed in this world, so will he be formed in the next world. In this world the skin and flesh came first, the sinews and bones last; so in the future will he begin with the skin and flesh and end with the sinews and bones.⁵⁰

The conflict between Hillel and Shammai here reflected is of no concern to us, but what is important for our purposes is the clear reference to Genesis 2.7 in a discussion concerning the resurrection, and further, the consistent polarity of the two aeons, "this world" and "the world to come."

That Genesis 2.7 was quoted in connection with the doctrine of resurrection even earlier than the two famous Pharisaic teachers Hillel and Shammai is shown from 2 Maccabees 7.23, where it is reflected in the speech of the pious mother to her seven sons about to suffer martyrdom:

Therefore the Creator of the world, who shaped (ὁ πλάσας, cf. Heb. וייצר) the beginning of man and devised the origin of all things, will in his mercy give life and breath (τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ τὴν ζωὴν) back to you again, since you now forget yourselves for the sake of his laws (RSV).⁵¹

D. Paul's Re-interpretation of Genesis 2.7

It is now possible to see exactly how Paul is arguing in 1 Corinthians 15, and what role the quotation from Genesis 2.7 plays in his argument. His opponents in Corinth, under the influence of teachers who had grown up in Diaspora Judaism, were espousing a doctrine of a-somatic immortality, and denying the bodily resurrection. In stating their case, they were using a current exegesis of Genesis 2.7 to show from Scripture that their view was the correct one. This exegetical tradition stressed the divine, spiritual "inbreathing" in man, by which earthly man participated in the spiritual εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ (Gen. 1.27).

Paul's use of Genesis 2.7 is entirely polemical,⁵² and based on traditions of interpretation which we have seen in connection with Qumran and especially Rabbinic teaching. Paul inserts ὁ πρῶτος . . . Ἄδὰμ into the quotation in order to affirm his belief that the Adam of Genesis 2.7 is the only "Adam" in which created man participates, in contrast to the δεύτερος ἄνθρωπος who, for Paul, is Christ (but for the opponents was the earthly man of Genesis 2.7).⁵³ He reinforces this by means of the parenthesis⁵⁴ in which he stresses, against his opponents, the priority in time of the psychic element in man (i.e. man as the ψυχή of Genesis 2.7 in contrast to the πνοή ζωῆς) over the πνευματικὸς element--which man is to possess only in the resurrection, but which the opponents thought constituted man's real immortal self by virtue of the divine "inbreathing." For Paul, man's complete πνευματικὸς existence, which he describes as τὸ πνευματικὸν σῶμα (15.44), will be given only in the resurrection by the ἔσχατος Ἄδὰμ, i.e. Christ, who by virtue of his resurrection has become the πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν.⁵⁵

1 Corinthians 15.45 is actually an eschatological "targum" on Genesis 2.7. καὶ ἐνεφύσησεν εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ πνοὴν ζωῆς and καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἄνθρωπος εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν are transposed; to the latter Paul adds ὁ πρῶτος . . . Ἄδὰμ. The former Paul reconstructs on the model of the latter; πνοὴν ζωῆς becomes πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν: ὁ ἔσχατος Ἄδὰμ εἰς πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν. This reconstruction expresses Paul's dualism of the two ages, the "present age" and the "age to come."

Paul further reinforces his arguments by stressing that the first man, not the second, is ἐκ γῆς χοϊκός,⁵⁶ and that the second man, Christ, not the first Adam or any part of him, is ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, ἐπουράνιος.⁵⁷ For Paul, man as he is now can in no sense be said to partake of or bear the εἰκὼν τοῦ ἐπουρανοῦ

άνθρώπου (15.49; cf. Gen. 1.27); man now bears only the image of Adam, the χοϊκὸς ἄνθρωπος, and can become ἐπουράνιος only in the resurrection.⁵⁸ To "bear the image" means here more than simply to exhibit an external form; εἰκὼν has the connotation of "essential character," and can be understood as equivalent to μορφή.⁵⁹

Thus Paul can say similarly in Philippians 3.21 that Christ μετασχηματίσει τὸ σῶμα τῆς ταπεινώσεως ἡμῶν σύμμορφον τῷ σώματι τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ.

The use of the word σῶμα throughout the passage from vv. 35-46 is deliberate, and belongs to Paul's own argument. The term σῶμα comes neither from the opponents' theology nor, of course, from Genesis 2.7; it is Paul who introduces the term. For Paul a bodiless existence is unthinkable; for him man's individuality is expressed not in terms of ψυχή or πνεῦμα, but in terms of σῶμα.⁶⁰ Man in the old aeon and in the new aeon as well is σῶμα. To the opponents' view that a πνευματικὸς element in man's soul is that which guarantees his continuity after death, Paul must answer that man both in body and soul, as a ψυχικὸν σῶμα, belongs still to the old Adam through whom sin and death came into the world.⁶¹ Man's full spiritual existence as a πνευματικὸν σῶμα lies in the future with the resurrection; it is an eschatological hope.

Paul must make this eschatological dimension very clear because he is confronted by opponents who regard bodily and earthly existence *per se* as an inferior existence. One can perceive this attitude behind v. 35. Paul's angry outburst ἄφρων indicates that although the question is framed in diatribe style some such attitude existed in Corinth, the implication being that anyone who argues for a resurrection of the body is arguing for a continuation of an inferior existence.

It is for this reason, too, that Paul stresses from vv. 35-50 the totally different quality of the resurrection body as opposed to the present body.⁶² Paul is ready to admit that bodily existence--he would add, as things are now--is under the grip of mortality and corruption. This is clearly enunciated in v. 50:

This I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, nor can corruption inherit incorruption.⁶³

By the expression "flesh and blood" (a Semitism) Paul means "man as he is now."⁶⁴ Paul's point is that the resurrection body (τὸ σῶμα τὸ γενησόμενον, τὸ σῶμα τὸ πνευματικόν) will be

different from the body we now have as a result of our kinship with the first Adam (as Paul understands the matter). For in the resurrection we will share the life given to us by Christ, the second Adam, the πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν who will change our present bodies into new, glorified, "spiritual" bodies.

E. Summary

We can see at work in our passage a conflict of dualisms. The opponents were operating on a non-eschatological plane in dividing man's present existence into a duality of heavenly-earthly, spiritual-psychic, incorruptible-corruptible, immortal-mortal, levels.⁶⁵ Paul can use the *same* terminology, but employs it in a completely eschatological fashion, in which a dualism of "the present age" and "the age to come" are the principal factors. For Paul man's existence now is characterized by a ψυχικὸν σῶμα and is marked by φθορά, ἀτιμία, ἀσθένεια etc. That is because man as he is now still belongs to the aeon of sin and death, to the "first Adam." Man's existence in the resurrection, however, will be characterized by a πνευματικὸν σῶμα (= τὸ σῶμα τὸ γενησόμενον v. 37), to which will belong the attribute of ἀφθαρσία, δόξα, δύναμις, etc. Then man--i.e. man ἐν Χριστῷ--will belong entirely to the new aeon of life, to the Man through whom is the ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν (15.21) and who himself as the resurrected one is the ἀπαρχὴ τῶν κεκοιμημένων (15.20).

Thus, we see that the use of the terms πνευματικός-ψυχικός-χοϊκός in 1 Corinthians 15 is governed entirely by the polemical situation, involving rival interpretations of Genesis 2.7. Paul's own use of this terminology constitutes, 'as it were, a re-interpretation of the opponents' own terminology. It is for this reason, as we noted above (p. 4f.), that Paul's use of this terminology is confined to his letter to the Corinthian congregation.

In the following chapter another context in which the same terminology appears is treated. As we have observed with respect to the Hellenistic-Jewish doctrine of immortality, man's higher element must be nurtured by activities and attitudes which are consistent with its nature. The same state of affairs pertains in Paul's Corinthian congregation, where the emphasis is upon "wisdom."

A. Introduction

The key passage in this study is 1 Corinthians 2.6-16, which in turn belongs to a larger context running from 1.10 to 4.21. This whole passage is an answer to the problem of the Corinthian factions and an *apologia* for Paul's own apostolic office and authority.¹

Not the least of the problems in interpreting 2.6 ff. is the fact that in 2.1-5 Paul seems to disclaim any "wisdom" for himself, placing σοφία ἀνθρώπων in contrast to the δύναμις θεοῦ.² But then in 2.6 Paul says, σοφίαν δὲ λαλοῦμεν ἐν τοῖς τελείοις

Is Paul contradicting himself? At first glance it seems so, but it is important to note that in this passage he is making a point which is crucial for an understanding not only of his idea of what "wisdom" is, but also for an insight into the wisdom theology of his opponents. The argumentation is as follows: I did not preach wisdom, . . . but I have wisdom I can preach to the "perfect." The structure of this argument can be found elsewhere in Paul's letters, as e.g. in 2 Corinthians 11.18 ff. and Philipians 3.3.³ Furthermore, Paul's disclaimer to wisdom in 1.18 ff. must be regarded as hyperbolic, for in fact he is himself using "wisdom" tradition in his argumentation!⁴ So Paul does present "wisdom" in 2.6 ff., and does so in a very striking manner: he presents his "wisdom" using the opponents' terminology and turning it back against them. In doing so the terminology of the opponents remains, thus enabling us to reconstruct their arguments, but the essence and content of the "wisdom" is Paul's own.

B. The Τέλειοι and the Νήπιοι

The use of the term τέλειος in 2.6 is a polemical one, as is shown by 3.1 ff.⁵ The opponents in Corinth had claimed to be τέλειοι, and the context of the passage shows that they made this claim on the basis of their σοφία. There were undoubtedly some in Corinth who claimed to be a spiritual elite (οἱ τέλειοι = οἱ πνευματικοί), over against those who had not yet arrived, the νήπιοι. How is this claim to be interpreted?

First of all, the τέλειος-νήπιος contrast which Paul wrests from his opponents must be placed into a contextual background. It has been frequently suggested that this terminology is taken

from the context of the Hellenistic mystery-religions.⁶ But this view cannot be sustained, simply because the term τέλειος is not the usual term used for one who has been initiated into the mysteries. In "mystery" terminology, the initiate is referred to as τετελεσμένος, or τελεσθείς, or τελούμενος.⁷ The "mystery" terminology had, since Plato, been used metaphorically in philosophical or theological discourse.⁸ Philo uses "mystery" terminology in a number of places in his writings.⁹ In the "mystery" passages, however, the terms τέλειος-νήπιος do not occur. The opposite of a τετελεσμένος is not νήπιος, but ἀμήτοσ.

The τέλειος-νήπιος contrast is to be placed in the larger context of Hellenistic philosophical paraenetic usage--particularly that of Stoicism.¹⁰ The immediate background of the use of this terminology by the Corinthian opponents of Paul is Hellenistic Diaspora Judaism, as represented particularly by Philo.

The meaning of τέλειος is enlarged by Philo from its secular usage in Stoicism to denote one who has achieved the highest religious attainments, including especially "wisdom." The metaphor is that of "adulthood," over against "infancy," and wherever Philo uses this τέλειος-νήπιος terminology, there is no "mystery" terminology at all in the context.¹¹

For example, commenting allegorically on Genesis 12.1 (*Mig.* 46), Philo says that one "place" is for νήπιοι, another place for τέλειοι. The former is ἀσκησις, and the latter is called σοφία. Again, (at *Mig.* 28 f.), Philo says,

. . . but you must become a migrant, journeying to your fatherland, the land of the holy Word, the father, as it were, of those who are in training (τῶν ἀσκητῶν). That land is Wisdom (ἡ δ' ἐστὶ σοφία), fairest abode of virtue-loving souls. In this place there is for you the self-taught, self-learning nature, free from the milk-fed diet of infancy.

We note here that the idea of perfection, maturity, is tied to the achievement of σοφία. Those who have achieved wisdom have changed abodes, and have arrived at a higher, heavenly plane of existence, to become a γένος both αὐτομαθῆς and αὐτοδιδασκτον.¹² In contrast there are the νήπιοι, who still need to be fed γαλακτώδης τροφή.

This passage sheds much light on the notions of the Corinthian pneumatics whose tenets Paul combats in 1 Corinthians. For them, too, σοφία was reserved for the τέλειοι, whereas the νήπιοι still needed to be fed with elementary instruction, under the metaphor of γάλα (1 Cor. 3.1-2).¹³ It is a likely conjecture that Paul's emphasis on the cross of Christ would have been

regarded by the Corinthian pneumatics as part of the γάλα, necessary for the "babes" in the congregation, but outgrown by the τέλειοι.

Further light on the theology of the Corinthian opponents is afforded by Philo (in *Leg. All.* 1.90 ff.) where he speculates on the meaning of Genesis 2.16-17, the command of God addressed to Adam. Philo says that this command was addressed to the πλαστικός άνθρωπος, the man who was moulded from the earth. In contrast, Philo says that the mind which was created κατ' εἰκόνα is not the earthly, but heavenly (οὐ γήϊνος, ἀλλ' οὐράνιος). He then proceeds to draw a distinction between three different kinds of men: the φαῦλος, for whom ἀπαγόρευσις and πρόσταξις are necessary, the neutral (μέσος) or νήπιος, who has need of παραίνεσις and διδασκαλία, but

to the perfect man, created according to the image (τῷ μὲν οὖν τελεῖῳ τῷ κατ' εἰκόνα) there is no need to give injunctions or prohibitions or exhortations, for the perfect man has need of none of these things (1.94).

Similarly, in his discussion of "soul-agriculture" (ψυχῆς γεωργική, in *Agr.* 8f.), Philo remarks that its aims are to sow and plant such things as are likely to bear fruit to man, the ruler of nature.

But who else might the man that is in each of us be except the mind (νοῦς), who is accustomed to reaping the benefits from the things sown or planted? But since milk is food for babes, and wheat-cakes for grown men, there is also milky nourishment for the soul suitable for the grown men in the form of guidance through wisdom and moderation and all virtue.

Here, again, γάλα is for the νήπιοι, solid food for the τέλειοι who live on the higher plane of life according to the propensities of the νοῦς within man, which Philo calls the άνθρωπος ὁ ἐν ἐκάστῳ ἡμῶν (*Agr.* 9) and the άνθρωπος τέλειος ὁ κατ' εἰκόνα (*Leg. All.* 1.94).¹⁴

One more text I adduce from Philo for the illumination of the τέλειος terminology in 1 Corinthians 2. Philo comments (in *Leg. All.* 3.196) on Numbers 28.2 and the two terms τὰ δῶρά μου and δόματα μου in the LXX text as follows:

. . . 'gifts' differ from 'grants' (δῶρα δομάτων διαφέρει). For δῶρα emphasizes the magnitude of perfect goods which God bestows upon the perfect (τελείων ἀγαθῶν . . . ἃ τοῖς τελείοις χαρίζεται ὁ θεός); δόματα are relegated to a much smaller compass, denoting the things of which those naturally suited men who are practising and making progress partake (ὅν μετέχουσιν οἱ εὐφρεῖς ἀσκηταὶ οἱ προκόπτοντες).

In this passage the τέλειοι are distinguished not from the

νήπιοι, but from those who are progressing toward τελειότης, the προκόπτοντες.¹⁵ Especially interesting, however, is the clause, τελείων ἀγαθῶν . . . ἃ τοῖς τελείοις χαρίζεται ὁ θεός, when it is compared with 1 Cor. 2.9-12:

. . . ἃ ὀφθαλμὸς οὐκ εἶδεν κτλ. . . τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ χαρισθέντα ἡμῖν.¹⁶

These texts from Philo provide us with ample background for an understanding of the Corinthian opponents' use of the τέλειος terminology and its context in a claim to a spiritual σοφία. There is in Philo's usage a mystical-religious quality which lends to the term σοφία far more than a merely conventional, philosophical connotation. One who had attained to "wisdom" was already abiding on a higher level of existence, and as τέλειος was the recipient of τέλεια ἀγαθά from the beneficence of God.¹⁷ Such ideas of σοφία one can confidently attribute to the Corinthian opponents. It is at any rate clear that Paul was not addressing a group of self-styled philosophers or rhetoricians, or even polemicizing against "Greek wisdom," i.e. philosophy.¹⁸ When Paul attacks his opponents' "wisdom" as a σοφία ἀνθρώπων, he is engaging in polemics, on the basis of the conduct exemplified by the "wise" and "perfect" within the community.¹⁹

It remains now to investigate further the whole passage, 1 Corinthians 2.6 ff., and to determine if possible what form this σοφία took for the Corinthian τέλειοι and what was its content.

C. Σοφία as Content, Previous Positions

The crucial question here is: How much of 1 Corinthians 2.6 ff. should be attributed to the opponents of Paul, and how much to Paul himself?

It has most recently been argued that little or nothing of the content of the opponents' wisdom can be seen in this passage, or even in the whole context in chapters 1-4.²⁰ On the other hand, Wilckens has argued that 1 Corinthians 2.6 ff. reflects the theology of the ("gnostic") opponents, which Paul refutes in 3.1 ff.²¹ Both positions seem to me to miss the mark, in that (1) one can see active in the passage the opponents' terminology, and glimpses of their wisdom theology, but (2) Paul is in this passage also expressing his own views.

Wilckens sees in the use of the plural λαλοῦμεν in 2.6 evidence that this passage is not to be taken as reflecting Paul's own view.²² This view of the matter is improbable, and Scroggs is correct in his opinion that Paul's argumentation would have been in such a case "completely incoherent to the Corinthians."²³

That Paul would so completely be governed in this passage by the theology of the opponents, without attempting at the same time to refute this theology, is most unlikely. What is decisive in this passage is that Paul is dependent upon the opponents' terminology, but uses this terminology to express his own radically different theological point of view.²⁴

Yet it is equally clear that his opponents' theology is reflected in this section, albeit in a form already modified by Paul's own emphases for the purpose of showing his opponents how far he can accommodate his own intentions to their language and further, what the consequences of their manner of speaking would be, i.e. that though Paul can speak σοφία to the τέλειοι, he cannot yet speak σοφία to them, for they are still νήπιοι as regards their behavior in the congregation (3.1 ff.)!²⁵

Decisive against Wilckens' thesis is the form of 2.6: σοφίαν ὁε̅ λαλοῦμεν . . . σοφίαν δὲ οὐ²⁶ Paul is here speaking of a wisdom which, on the basis of content, he contrasts with that of his opponents whose wisdom Paul contemptuously refers to as σοφία ἀνθρώπων and a σοφία τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου. As will be shown presently, the content of Paul's version of the wisdom of God is nothing else than the salvatory crucifixion of Christ as the center of God's salvific plan (2.8).²⁷

D. Lührmann has recently studied the form of 1 Corinthians 2.6 ff. and has tried to show that Paul is here taking over a piece of his opponents' esoteric preaching and is emending it, mainly by means of additions, to conform more to his own theology.²⁸ According to Lührmann, the opponents were using a *Revelationsschema* such as occurs also in some deutero-Pauline passages,²⁹ a form of preaching characterized by the contrast, "previously hidden/now revealed," and which, according to Lührmann, cannot be ascribed to Paul himself.³⁰

There are at least two reasons why Lührmann cannot be followed completely. First, in the details of his argument he seems to be assuming that this preaching *schema* can be treated as a *Vorlage* arrived at by adding certain elements to the text and subtracting others from it.³¹ But if it be granted that a preaching form is behind 1 Corinthians 2.6 ff. (which is certainly possible), it must nevertheless be recognized that we are not confronted here with a fixed piece of oral tradition such as a hymn or a creed, and certainly not with a literary piece which Paul would have at his disposal to emend critically.³²

Secondly, the preaching form posited here was undoubtedly

one of the most common forms of preaching in the primitive church.³³ It is quite arbitrary to take this preaching form which is rooted in Jewish Apocalyptic³⁴ and apply it to "gnostic" opponents of Paul in Corinth.³⁵ The form of 1 Corinthians 2.6 ff. must rather be ascribed to Paul, who in turn is merely employing an apocalyptic type of preaching form common in the primitive church from its very beginnings. That Paul here states that this "wisdom" is reserved for the "perfect" is pure irony, for in fact Paul elsewhere stresses that the secrets of God's salvific plan belong to the entire congregation of the elect.³⁶

What, then, was the σοφία against which Paul polemicizes? And how did this σοφία serve to make the Corinthians τέλειοι and πνευματικοί? A Hellenistic-Jewish background has already been posited for the terminology in which their ideas were formulated, but one must go beyond this background for the content of the Corinthians' "wisdom" for, after all, they were Christians. Although it is not possible to discern through 1 Corinthians 2.6 ff. the entire content of what for the opponents constituted "wisdom," Paul gives us enough clues in the way he re-formulates the opponents' claims for us to discern some of the constituent elements. I would posit in this connection the use of the Christological title κύριος τῆς δόξης³⁷ along with the context in which the phrase εἰς δόξαν ἡμῶν occurs, and the use of the quotation in 2.9a.

D. Σοφία as Content, κύριος τῆς δόξης

The title κύριος τῆς δόξης is an unusual one in that it occurs in the New Testament only here and in James 2.1. It is essentially a divine appellation, and though it does not occur in the LXX in precisely the same form,³⁸ it does occur in 1 Enoch several times both in the Greek and in the Ethiopic versions.³⁹ Especially significant are the occurrences of the title in the Similitudes of 1 Enoch. In 40.3 it appears in the context of a vision of the heavenly throne and the praises of the angelic attendants who "were uttering praises before the Lord of glory" (*'enza yesebeḥu qedem 'egzi'a sebḥat*). In 63.2 God is called "the Lord of glory and the Lord of wisdom" (*'egzi'a sebḥat wa'egzi'a ṭebab*). These texts may shed some light on the Corinthians' experiences of "glory" in their claim to "wisdom," and in their claim to speaking the "language of the angels."⁴⁰

In 1 Corinthians 2.8, however (as well as in James 2.1), this title is applied to Christ.⁴¹ The theological context out

of which an understanding of Christ as "Lord of glory" arises is the primitive Hellenistic-Jewish-Christian confession of Jesus as the exalted one. The most important witness to this pre-Pauline confession is Philippians 2.9-11, a hymnic passage describing the exaltation of Jesus and the bestowal upon him of the divine name.⁴² D. Georgi has recently laid bare the history-of-religions background of this hymn,⁴³ and I find his arguments convincing. I would venture to apply the Christology underlying the hymn in Philippians 2 to the church in Corinth as well.⁴⁴ The error of the Corinthians was not the Christology itself, but the conclusions they were drawing from it *vis-a-vis* their own existence and self-understanding. They were applying the exalted state of Christ to themselves, εἰς τὴν δόξαν αὐτῶν.

The way in which Paul uses the title κύριος τῆς δόξης in 1 Corinthians 2.8 shows that he is interested in applying another criterion to the life of the community rather than the δόξα of the exalted Lord; namely, the cross of Christ. For the Corinthian τέλειτοι, in their "wisdom" concerning the exalted identity of Jesus Christ as κύριος τῆς δόξης, were placing their own experiences in the community under the banner of the δόξα of Christ, and were in danger of distinguishing their higher Christological insights from the kerygma of the cross. Hence Paul's concern lest the Corinthian claim to wisdom result in the "emptying" of the cross of Christ (1.17). Hence his ironical statement in 4.8: ἤδη κεκορεσμένοι ἐστέ· ἤδη ἐπλουτήσατε· χωρὶς ἡμῶν ἐβασιλεύσατε.⁴⁵ Hence, also, his affirmation of the *crucifixion* of the κύριος τῆς δόξης. Indeed, Paul claims that the higher insight is in fact nothing else than the understanding of the cross, and not a speculation that is concerned with wisdom beyond the kerygma of the cross.

The background of Paul's argumentation is Jewish apocalyptic.⁴⁶ He understands the crucifixion of Christ as the center of a mystery belonging to God's redemptive plan. This plan none of the ἄρχοντες τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου knew, for if they had known this mysterious σοφία they would not have crucified the "Lord of glory," thus bringing defeat upon themselves and opening the way of salvation to God's elect.

The ἄρχοντες τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου are demonic powers, understood by Paul as standing behind the human, political rulers of the world.⁴⁷ Paul does not say that the ἄρχοντες did not recognize the Lord of glory and therefore accidentally crucified him.⁴⁸ The ἦν in 2.8 clearly precludes this, for the relative

pronoun refers not to the "Lord of glory"⁴⁹ but to the hidden plan of God, σοφίαν ἐν μυστηρίῳ τὴν ἀποκεκρυμμένην, by which the "Lord of glory" was to be crucified in order thereby to defeat the demonic powers and redeem the elect.⁵⁰ According to Paul, the "rulers" crucified the "Lord of glory" knowing full well who he was; what they did not know was God's salvific plan.

Paul has thus taken an enthusiastic Christological affirmation of the opponents, "Lord of glory," and has emphasized that the decisive point is his crucifixion. The implication of this for the Christian life in the present is that the *cross* of Christ is the decisive factor now, and the *glory* is promised for the future (cf. 1 Cor. 15.43; Phil. 3.21; Rom. 5.2, 8.18; etc.). Two different ways of understanding the Christian existence are in evidence, the one characterized by eschatological tension (Paul), the other characterized by a type of mysticism (the opponents). This becomes even clearer in 1 Corinthians 2.9 ff.

E. Σοφία as Content, 1 Corinthians 2.9

I am inclined to agree with Wilckens⁵¹ that Paul's use of the apocryphal quotation in 1 Corinthians 2.9 reflects a use of this same quotation on the part of his opponents.⁵² It is probable that part of what constituted for them σοφία was a mystical vision of

ὃ ὀφθαλμοῖς οὐκ εἶδον καὶ οὖς οὐκ ἤκουσεν καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἀνέβη.⁵³

The content of the ὃ remains unspecified, and Wilckens goes beyond the evidence when he makes it refer to the gnostic redeemer-myth.⁵⁴ Even in the "gnostic" materials he cites where the quotation occurs,⁵⁵ there is no reference at all to the "redeemer-myth," but only to a knowledge of, or visions of, or promises of, heavenly realities. There is nothing inherently "gnostic" about this quotation. As Conzelmann has recently pointed out,

An sich ist es weder apokalyptisch noch gnostisch. Es stellt einfach Verborgenheit und übernatürlichen Einblick fest. Dass kann natürlich leicht sowohl von Apokalyptic als Gnosis aufgenommen werden.⁵⁶

The quotation is widespread, and occurs in divergent types of material, not only in "gnostic circles."⁵⁷ If an analysis of the various contexts in which the citation occurs is carried out, one discovers that two main types stand out: a type which I would call "mystical," in which the content of what is hidden to mortal eyes and ears is of heavenly realities divulged only to a mystical elite. The other type is "eschatological," in which the

content of what is hidden to mortal eyes and ears is promised for *future* revelation. Of course, these two contexts can overlap insofar as the speaker implicitly claims that he has been privy to at least part of what yet remains to be revealed in its fullness in the eschatological future.⁵⁸

The origin of this quotation is obscure, and I cannot go into this question here.⁵⁹ It is clearly poetic in style, and may originate in a Jewish liturgy.⁶⁰ One thing is certain: Whether or not the quotation is a construct based on Is. 64.4 (LXX 64.3), as Jerome thought, or a passage quoted from an "Apocalypse of Elijah," as was Origen's opinion,⁶¹ the quotation is not a construct composed by Paul,⁶² but was already to hand when Paul used it. This is shown by the occurrence of the quotation (i.e. the first part of it = 1 Cor. 2.9a) in a first-century Jewish work which cannot have been influenced by Paul. In pseudo-Philo, *Biblical Antiquities* 26.13, there occurs the following sentence:

*. . . et tunc accipiam et istos et alios plures valde meliores, ex eo quod oculus non vidit nec auris audivit, et in cor hominis non ascendit, quousque fieret tale aliquid in seculo . . .*⁶³

It seems safe to posit that the "wisdom" of the Corinthian "perfect" included such things as the identity of the exalted Christ as "Lord of glory," as well as the heavenly surroundings of the Lord of glory--such things as no mortal eye had been permitted to see, no ear to hear, nor have ever entered the mind of man.⁶⁴ The glory of the "Lord of glory," his exalted heavenly state, the Corinthians were eagerly claiming for themselves, not willing to wait for the glory which Paul insisted was yet to come.⁶⁵ This emphasis on the futuristic aspect of glory--the eschatological tension which characterizes Paul's own theology--seems to me to be expressed in the last part of the citation in 2.9: ὅσα ἠτοίμασεν ὁ θεὸς τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν. That is not to say, of course, that Paul composed this part and added it.⁶⁶ But what makes this appear to be an addition to 2.9a is the redundant occurrence of ὅσα.⁶⁷ Paul is saying, in effect, that the heavenly things which eye has not seen, etc., are not a present possession and do not characterize our life now, as though they could be conjured up in a mystical experience.⁶⁸ They are ὅσα ἠτοίμασεν ὁ θεός for the *future* possession of those who love him.⁶⁹

F. Σοφία as Πνεῦμα

It is clear from the foregoing that "wisdom" was regarded by

the Corinthian opponents and by Paul as basically a content. But there remains the possibility that σοφία was also regarded as a semi-hypostatic existence or personification.

While it is impossible for me to agree with Wilckens in his identification of hypostatized Wisdom with the κύριος τῆς δόξης,⁷⁰ it is probable that the Corinthian opponents held to a semi-hypostatic Wisdom-figure which they identified with the Holy Spirit.⁷¹

There is ample background for this identification in Hellenistic Judaism. For example, in the Wisdom of Solomon σοφία is called a φιλόανθρωπον πνεῦμα (1.6) and a πνεῦμα νοερόν, ἅγιον (7.22).⁷² In Wisdom of Solomon 9.17 Wisdom is identified, by means of *parallelismus membrorum*, with the Holy Spirit:

βουλὴν δέ σου τίς ἔγνω, εἰ μὴ σὺ ἔδωκας σοφίαν καὶ ἐπεμψας τὸ ἅγιόν σου πνεῦμα ἀπὸ ὑψίστων;

Aristobulus⁷³ regards σοφία as a personified hypostasis, the source of all light,⁷⁴ and associates σοφία with the θεῖον πνεῦμα by which Moses is acclaimed a prophet.⁷⁵ Philo, on the other hand, usually refers to the "Holy Spirit" only in terms of prophecy,⁷⁶ and tends to equate Sophia with the Logos. But he does use the expression τὸ σοφίας πνεῦμα θεῖον (*Gig.* 47), in the context of a prayer that the divine Spirit of Wisdom

not readily depart and be gone, but abide with us a very long time, as she did with Moses the wise.

This background enables us to reconstruct the Corinthian doctrine of the Spirit which underlies the arguments of Paul in 1 Corinthians 2.10 ff. In this passage Paul stresses that it is the Spirit of God who alone knows τὰ βάθη τοῦ θεοῦ,⁷⁷ and who reveals to the elect τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ χαρισθέντα ἡμῖν. But for Paul the "Spirit of God" is not identical with σοφία, as it seems to have been with his opponents.⁷⁸ For the opponents Sophia, the Holy Spirit, was the source of their knowledge of heavenly wisdom. Wisdom of Solomon 7.21-22 expresses quite adequately what their view would have been:

I learned both what is secret and what is manifest, for wisdom, the fashioner of all things, taught me. (RSV)

To such a doctrine Paul is obliged to reply--by positing a complete differentiation between Sophia and the Holy Spirit--

ἃ καὶ λαλοῦμεν οὐκ ἐν διδακτοῖς ἀνθρωπίνης σοφίας λόγου, ἀλλ' ἐν διδακτοῖς πνεύματος (2.13).⁷⁹

The word ἀνθρωπίνης is polemical. The Corinthians were not claiming a purely human philosophy, but they were describing their own experience of the Holy Spirit in the religious terms of

their background in Hellenistic Judaism: The Spirit is the Wisdom of God, and the Spirit-Wisdom bestows the gift of wisdom upon those who choose to cultivate her gifts, and to live upon her supra-mundane level. The use of the word *άνθρώπινοσ* is not without significance, however, nor does it entirely miss the mark, for it is a polemical dismissal of any notion that man has within himself a spiritual capacity for divine wisdom, a notion which is reflected in 1 Corinthians 2.13b.

G. Excursus: Σοφία as Holy Spirit in Early Patristic and Gnostic Literature

The identification of "wisdom" with the Holy Spirit, originating in Hellenistic Judaism, occurs also in patristic and gnostic texts. For example, in *Demonstratio* 5, Irenaeus states

. . . So the Word is fitly and properly called the Son, but the Spirit the Wisdom of God.⁸⁰

Similarly, in *Adversus Haereses* 4.20.1 (= Harvey ed., 4.34.1), Irenaeus says,

*Adest enim ei (i.e. with God the Father) semper Verbum et Sapientia, Filius et Spiritus, per quos et loquitur, dicens, 'Faciamus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram' . . .*⁸¹

Theophilus of Antioch, too, equates the Holy Spirit with the Wisdom of God. At *Ad Autolyceum* 1.7 Theophilus says,

ὁ θεὸς διὰ τοῦ λόγου αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς σοφίας ἐποίησε τὰ πάντα. τῷ γὰρ λόγῳ αὐτοῦ ἐστερεώθησαν οἱ οὐρανοὶ καὶ τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ πᾶσα ἡ δύναμις αὐτῶν (cf. Ps. 32.6 LXX).

And at 2.15 Theophilus refers to the Trinity (τριάσ) in the following terms:

ὡσαύτως καὶ αἱ τρεῖς ἡμέραι τῶν φωστήρων γεγонуσαι τύποι εἰσὶν τῆς τριάδος, τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ λόγου αὐτοῦ, καὶ τῆς σοφίας αὐτοῦ.⁸²

On the other hand, Justin Martyr equates σοφία with the Son (*Dial.* 61 and 100), as do Athenagoras (*Suppl.* 24), Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* 4.25), Origen (*De Princ.* 1.2.3), et al.⁸³

The identification of Sophia with the Holy Spirit is well attested in Gnostic literature. See, for example, Irenaeus' account of the "Barbelo-gnostics" (*Adv. Haer.* 1.29.4 = Harvey ed. 1.27.2):

ἐκ δὲ τοῦ πρώτου ἀγγέλου προβληθῆναι λέγουσι πνεῦμα ἅγιον, ὁ σοφίαν καὶ προυνικὸν προσηγόρευσαν.

A similar doctrine is attested for the Valentinians (*Adv. Haer.* 1.4.1) and later for the Simonians (Epiphanius, *Pan.* 21.214).

H. Πνευματικὸς-Ψυχικὸς in 1 Corinthians 2.13b

The difficulty with 1 Corinthians 2.13b-16 is--as is indeed the case with the whole passage, 2.6 ff.--that it is Paul's own statement, yet it must be regarded as incorporating the terminology of the opponents, albeit in a manner which Paul can use in his own argumentation. This is a striking phenomenon,⁸⁴ all the more so when it is observed that this passage actually forms a transition in preparation for his own defense of his apostolic office and authority (4.1-5).⁸⁵

It is, in any case, unlikely that Paul himself coined the expression, πνευματικοῦς πνευματικὰ συγκρίνοντες. This phrase is thoroughly Greek in its intent,⁸⁶ and although Paul is himself influenced by the Stoic-Cynic diatribe style,⁸⁷ the idea expressed in 1 Corinthians 2.13 is nowhere else attested in his writings. For this reason, it is safe to assign it to his opponents. This becomes even more evident when it is recalled that the πνευματικός-ψυχικός terminology elsewhere in 1 Corinthians has already been established (in Chapter 3) as belonging to Paul's opponents.

It remains now to place the expression πνευματικοῦς πνευματικὰ συγκρίνοντες, and the πνευματικός-ψυχικός contrast in 2.13-14, in the proper contextual background. As we have seen in the case of 1 Corinthians 15, the πνευματικός-ψυχικός terminology stems from a Hellenistic-Jewish exegesis of Genesis 2.7. It is the same exegetical tradition which stands back of the terminology in 1 Corinthians 2. For, in addition to the affirmation of man's immortality--i.e. the immortality of his νοῦς or πνεῦμα, which God breathed into him in creation--the very possibility of knowing God and his wisdom are affirmed on the basis of the same passage in Genesis, by which a very basic doctrine of Hellenistic philosophy is given expression.

For example, Philo, using Scripture-exegesis to express a Greek philosophical commonplace regarding man's νοῦς,⁸⁸ discourses as follows (*Det.* 86):

Let us, therefore, the pupils of Moses, no longer be in doubt as to how man has attained a conception of the invisible God. For Moses himself learned the means by a divine oracle and has communicated it to us, putting it thus. The Creator prepared for the body no soul (ψυχὴν οὐδεμίαν) sufficient of itself to perceive its Maker, but considering that it would be of great benefit for his creature if he could attain a conception of the One who made him--since this is the determining factor in achieving happiness and blessedness--breathed into him from above of his own divinity (ἀνωθεν ἐπέπνευε τῆς ἰδίου θεϊότητος).

In what follows Philo explains that this is why so small a thing as the mind of man has room for the whole of the universe in its conceptions, for it is a "fragment" (ἀπόσπασμα) of the Deity (*Det.* 90). The crucial scripture text, for Philo, is Genesis 2.7, the "oracle" to which he refers in the passage quoted above.⁸⁹

Again, Philo (in *Leg. All.* 1.36) interprets the word ἐνεφύσησεν in Genesis 2.7 as involving three things, τὸ ἐμπνεόν, τὸ δεχόμενον, and τὸ ἐμπνεόμενον.

That which inbreathes is God, that which receives is the mind (ὁ νοῦς), that which is inbreathed is the spirit (τὸ πνεῦμα). What, therefore, follows from these premises? There comes to be a union (ἔνωσις) of the three, as God extends the power from himself through the mediating spirit until it reaches the subject. And for what purpose, except that we might receive a conception of him? For how could the soul have thought of God, if he had not inbreathed it and grasped it with power?

Thus, for Philo, man has within him--breathed into him by God--the capacity for knowing God and the higher truths of the universe. This ability does not belong to man's soul by nature; it was given to him by God, who breathed into man from his own divine spirit. Man has a higher soul, a νοῦς or πνεῦμα, which enables him to rise above the level of his earthly and sense-perceptive soul⁹⁰ and to receive impressions from the heavenly sphere.

These texts illuminate for us the background of 1 Corinthians 2.13b-14. The basis of man's ability to receive the Wisdom of God, the Holy Spirit, is his own πνευματικός nature given him in creation (*Gen.* 2.7). The principle of "like known by like" which we have encountered in the Philonic texts above explains the phrase in 13b: πνευματικοῖς πνευματικὰ συγκρίνοντες and the Philonic distinction between man's higher soul, his νοῦς or πνεῦμα, and his earthly soul, account for the distinction between the πνευματικός and ψυχικός natures reflected in 1 Corinthians 2.13-14.

The opponents of Paul in Corinth were teaching that they had the potentiality of becoming πνευματικοί within themselves by virtue of the πνευματικός nature given them by God, and that by a cultivation of Wisdom they could rise above the earthly and "psychic" level of existence and anticipate heavenly glory. Those who had attained these experiences were πνευματικοί and τέλειοι,⁹¹ in contradistinction to the νήπιοι who were still living on the ψυχικός level of existence.

I. Excursus: Εὐγένεια in 1 Corinthians 1.26 f.

It is possible that the term εὐγενεῖς in 1 Corinthians 1.26 f. does not simply refer to aristocratic birth, but to a claim of the Corinthian opponents to εὐγένεια, a technical term whose background is to be found in Hellenistic Judaism. In Philo's *De Virtutibus*, in the section entitled περὶ εὐγενείας, this terminology is laid bare. Philo begins this section by remarking that natural or bodily εὐγένεια is of no consequence, but what is important is the εὐγένεια which comes to one whose soul has received wisdom. There follows this passage:

When God on account of his kindness and love for man desired to establish this (*scil.* τὴν εὐγένειαν ὡς μέγιστον ἀγαθόν) among us also, he found no worthier temple (νεών) on earth than the mind (λογισμοῦ). For as the better part it alone bears an image of the Good (ἀγαλματοφορεῖ τ' ἀγαθόν), even though some of those who have never tasted--or have only sipped--of wisdom may disbelieve (*Virt.* 188).

This passage provides one more example of the capacity of the higher soul of man (here called λογισμός a synonym for νοῦς) to receive wisdom. But it also tells us that the one whose soul has received wisdom is the one who is truly εὐγενής. It is this notion of εὐγένεια that Paul may be polemicizing against in 1 Corinthians 1.26 f. This would explain why the Jeremianic triad of ὁ σοφός, ὁ ἰσχυρός, ὁ πλούσιος becomes in Paul's application of Jeremiah 9.22 f. the σοφοί, the δυνατοί, and the εὐγενεῖς.⁹²

In the same section of *De Virtutibus* Philo speaks of Abraham and the inspiration he received from the Spirit which enhanced his appearance and provided his words with persuasive power (τοῖς δὲ λόγοις πειθῶ, *Virt.* 217). This may provide some background for Paul's disclaimer of eloquence in 1 Corinthians 2.4,⁹³ if indeed the Corinthian opponents were claiming for themselves πειθῶ λόγων as one of the signs of their pneumatic status as σοφοί and εὐγενεῖς.⁹⁴

J. The πνευματικός and the ψυχικός, Paul's Re-interpretation

In 1 Corinthians 2.13b ff. Paul is accommodating himself to the opponents' terminology, but is radically re-interpreting it. For Paul the πνευματικός man is the one who walks according to the Spirit of God in the light of what he has received from God (v. 12, cf. Rom. 8) apart from any created potentiality in himself.⁹⁵ The gift of the Spirit is a gift of free grace, and is an eschatological event. The "psychic" man, for Paul, is the one who has only natural possibilities apart from the eschatological

gift of the Spirit, and cannot attain to "the things of the Spirit of God" by virtue of anything within himself. To such a man, who has not received the Spirit, the things of the Spirit are μωρία (2.14).⁹⁶ Paul thus affirms the radical break between God and natural man, a break which can be bridged only from God's side, by his love and by his decisive act in Christ.⁹⁷

For Paul the term πνεῦμα is understood in apocalyptic fashion (as has already been observed with the term σοφία). The Spirit is the divine eschatological gift which has been poured out among the elect of the last times. In no case can it be said --in Paul's view of the matter--that man has a divine or "spiritual" element within him. This Paul explicitly denies in 2.11, where he distinguishes between the πνεῦμα ἀνθρώπων (with its ability to know τὰ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου), and the πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ who alone has natural knowledge of τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ. Never the twain shall meet, on a natural basis. The supernatural and eschatological gift of the Spirit God gives to whom he will, frequently to the "fools" and "base-born" of this world (1.27-29). He who has received this gift can be proleptically referred to as πνευματικός,⁹⁸ though man's full attainment of the πνευματικός existence is yet to be realized in the future, in the resurrection from the dead (1 Cor. 15.46 ff.).

For Paul, too, the gift of the Spirit of God has consequences not only for the "spirit" of man, or for the elated experiences one can have, but for his entire existence, and especially his conduct in the body. So Paul stresses that the Christian's σῶμα, not only his νοῦς, is the "temple" of the Spirit of God (6.20).⁹⁹ Further, Paul states in a passage heavy with irony that his opponents in Corinth cannot be called τέλειοι or πνευματικοί, because of their conduct in the community, their ζῆλος καὶ ἔρις, which is a sign that they are still νήπιοι, still σαρκικοί (3.1,3).¹⁰⁰

In summary, it has been determined that Paul, in 1 Corinthians 2.1-6, has skillfully used the language of his opponents, and has turned it back against them by interpreting their language in an apocalyptic fashion. In doing so, Paul has not succumbed to the theology of his opponents, but has substituted his own concept of "wisdom" for that of his opponents.¹⁰¹ Using their terminology, he has robbed them of their claim to a *sapientia propria*, and has stressed in contrast that the true wisdom, which is "foolishness" for men governed by the values of this world, is a *sapientia aliena*, given by God to man by the

Spirit, and whose content is simply: the word of the cross. Thus, there is no ground for boasting at all. The Christian is, in Dahl's phrase, *simul sapiens et stultus*.¹⁰²

K. Γνώσις in 1 Corinthians 8

One further item must be noted, in view of the attempts by some scholars to posit a "gnostic" provenance for Paul's Corinthian opponents: The context in which the technical terms πνευματικός and ψυχικός occur is one in which γνώσις is conspicuous for its absence. This can be no accident, for Paul would scarcely have omitted a reference to γνώσις in this context if it had been technically used as part of the opponents' claim to be πνευματικοί. The opponents claimed σοφία, and not a γνώσις, technically understood, and it was their possession of σοφία which led them to claim for themselves a "pneumatic" status.

Of course, there is evidence that both the Corinthians and Paul used the term γνώσις, and both valued it as part of their Christian experience. The question is, what did γνώσις mean for the opponents and for Paul?

One thing is quite clear: It did not mean the same as σοφία.¹⁰³ This is evident from the distinction which Paul makes between γνώσις and σοφία in 1 Corinthians. In 1 Corinthians 1.5 Paul praises the Corinthians that they have been enriched by God ἐν παντί λόγῳ καὶ πάσῃ γνώσει. Is this a compliment which he later retracts when he denies his opponents a share in the σοφία which is reserved for the τέλειοι?¹⁰⁴ The only explanation is that for Paul and for the opponents as well, γνώσις is not the same as σοφία.

This is clear also from 1 Corinthians 12.8, where λόγος σοφίας is differentiated from λόγος γνώσεως. Similarly in 13.2 τὰ μυστήρια πάντα are mentioned alongside of πᾶσα ἡ γνώσις. τὰ μυστήρια πάντα here are all of the individual "mysteries"¹⁰⁵ which together comprise the plan of God in his dealings with his people now and in the future, the knowledge of which is called σοφία.¹⁰⁶

What, then, is γνώσις? The answer to this can be found in 1 Corinthians 8.1 ff. Both for the opponents and for Paul, γνώσις is Christian insight into the realities of Christian existence here and now and its practical consequences.¹⁰⁷ Its basis is the knowledge of the One God, and the Christian confession of Christ as Lord (8.6), with the concomitant affirmation that idols are not gods at all.¹⁰⁸

The Corinthians had formulated their γνώσις as follows:

οἴδαμεν ὅτι οὐδέν εἶδωλον ἐν κόσμῳ, καὶ
ὅτι οὐδεὶς θεὸς εἰ μὴ εἶς.

This is a "knowledge" which they assumed that all Christians possess: πάντες γινώσκιν ἔχομεν (8.2).¹⁰⁹ The trouble was that some of the Corinthians concluded from this that everyone in the community had sufficient *gnosis* so as to enable them to eat meat that had been sacrificed to idols, a piece of *gnosis* which they had undoubtedly received from Paul himself,¹¹⁰ for they were all agreed on the non-reality of idol gods. Here Paul is constrained to remind them that not all Christians do in fact have sufficient *gnosis* for that:

ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐν πᾶσιν ἡ γνώσις· τινὲς δὲ τῆ συνθηκῆ
ἕως ἄρτι τοῦ εἰδώλου ὡς εἰδωλῶθυτον ἔσθουσιν, καὶ
ἡ συνελθῆσις αὐτῶν ἀσθενῆς οὔσα μολύνεται (8.7).

Paul's concern for the "weak" in conscience constrains him to remind those with a greater proportion of γνώσις that ἀγάπη, after all, is a greater standard of conduct in the Christian community than γνώσις. And if anyone does not know this, he is really ignorant of a necessary item in the Christian faith:

εἰ τις δοκεῖ ἐγνωκῆναι τι, ὁπω ἔγνω καθὼς
δεῖ γινῶναι· εἰ δὲ τις ἀγαπᾷ τὸν θεόν,
οὗτος ἔγνωσται ὑπ' αὐτοῦ (8.2-3).

And when *gnosis* is claimed to the detriment of love, the claimants to *gnosis* become "puffed up" (8.1), and the brother's salvation is placed in jeopardy (8.11). For, after all, *gnosis* is not complete for anyone in this life (13.9); it will pass away (13.8), and be replaced by a perfect vision πρόσωπον πρὸς πρόσωπον. Love alone, of all the spiritual gifts, is permanent, and this is the highest standard of Christian conduct,¹¹¹ so that even faith and hope are less enduring than, and inferior to, love.

In any case, the term γνώσις in 1 Corinthians 8.1 cannot be regarded as a "gnostic" technical term.¹¹² The consequences of this are, in my opinion, quite clear: Paul's opponents in Corinth were not "Gnostics" in the technical sense. Indeed, the affirmation--as the basis of the Corinthian γνώσις--that there is "one God," of whom all things exist, excludes this possibility.

CHAPTER FIVE: ON SPIRITUAL GIFTS IN 1 CORINTHIANS 12-14

A. "Prophecy" in Corinth

There is one further context in 1 Corinthians (in addition to 1 Cor. 2 and 15) in which the claim on the part of Paul's opponents to "pneumatic" status occurs; *viz.*, the passage dealing with spiritual gifts, 1 Corinthians 12-14. There is no question here of an interpretation of Genesis 2.7, nor does the contrasting term ψυχικός occur in this context. Indeed, the term πνεῦμα itself bears a rather different connotation from that established for those contexts in which Genesis 2.7 exegesis is a deciding factor. In 1 Corinthians 12-14 πνεῦμα is an external force, in the view of the opponents, which possesses a subject and enables him to engage in ecstatic speech. The opponents of Paul in Corinth evidently placed a high premium on the gift of ecstatic "prophecy," so much so that Paul finds it necessary to counter their enthusiasm with the observation that ecstatic speech is not the only, nor even the most important, "spiritual gift."

The claim on the part of the Corinthian opponents to the designation πνευματικός on the basis of their facility in ecstatic speech is documented at 1 Corinthians 14.37. Paul says, εἰ τις δοκεῖ προφήτης εἶναι ἢ πνευματικός κτλ. One can conclude from this that there were people in the Corinthian congregation who regarded themselves as "prophets" and "spiritual," and that they defined their status as "spiritual" in terms of "prophecy." From the context in 1 Corinthians 14, it can be inferred that for them "prophecy" consisted in ecstatic utterances and "speaking in tongues." This ability was characterized by them as a major "spiritual gift," a πνευματικόν, and this endowment was the ground for an enthusiastic boasting.

Furthermore, Paul's use of the word τέλειος in 14.20--and the contrasting words παιδία, νηπιάζετε--is an indication that the Corinthians conceived of their role as "perfect" in terms of "prophetic" endowments as well as "wisdom."¹

The Corinthians' definition of "prophecy" in terms of ecstatic speaking is not, of course, limited to Corinth. It is taken for granted in, e.g., Acts 19.6 (cf. 10.45-46).² Paul, however, makes a sharp distinction between prophecy and ecstatic utterance (14.1-5), and regards "prophecy" (as *he* understands it) as greater than the gift of tongues. Furthermore, he undercuts any ground of enthusiastic boasting by insisting that the

πνευματικὰ are not the special property of a spiritual elite, but that there is only one Spirit who is operative--albeit in different manifestations--in all Christians.³

It is important to stress that Paul does not reject ecstatic speech outright; Paul is thankful that he himself speaks in tongues more than any of the Corinthians (14.8)! For Paul glossalalia is a legitimate charisma (12.10,28) which must not be summarily prohibited (14.39), since it can be a manifestation of the end-time (14.21), and is a vehicle of private prayer (14.14; cf. Rom. 8.15, 26 f.). Paul's overarching concern, however, is that the community be edified, that all things be done in the community for its οἰκοδομή.

The history-of-religions background of ecstatic prophecy has been thoroughly discussed by others.⁴ As to the phenomenon in Paul's Corinthian congregation Schmithals is correct in stating,

Dass es Gnostiker im technischen Sinne dieser Wortes sind, gegen die Pls angeht, lässt sich freilich aus Kp. 14 nicht bindend beweisen.⁵

Nevertheless Schmithals does go on to interpret the phenomenon of glossalalia in 1 Corinthians 14 as a gnostic manifestation, thus remaining consistent with his over-all approach to the problem of the opponents of Paul in 1 and 2 Corinthians. This, in my view, is quite arbitrary, especially when a more probable background for the practice of ecstatic speech in Corinth can be found; *viz.*, in the pagan Hellenistic world in general, and in a Hellenistic Judaism strongly influenced by this broader sphere in particular.

The most fruitful place to look for a background to the enthusiastic practices of the Corinthian opponents of Paul is, once again, Philo. Philo regards prophetic ecstasy as the highest manifestation of the divine Spirit, given only to a relatively few good and wise persons. In an interesting allegory on Genesis 15.12 (in *Her.* 249 ff.) Philo engages in a lengthy discourse upon the various types of ecstasy. He distinguishes four different types:⁶ (1) madness (λύττα μανιώδης παράνοϊαν ἐμποιοῦσα), (2) extreme amazement (σφόδρα κατάπληξις), (3) passivity of mind (ἡρεμία διανοίας), and (4) divine possession (ἔνθεος κατοκωχή), the kind of μανία to which the prophets are subject (ἢ τὸ προφητικὸν γένος χρῆται). The latter type of ecstasy Philo calls ἡ δὲ πασῶν ἀρίστη, which comes to those who are chosen to be prophets.⁷

Philo describes this prophetic ecstasy, by way of commenting on Genesis 15.2, περὶ ἡλίου δυσμῶς ἔκστασις ἐπέπεσεν, as follows:

He refers to our mind (νοῦς) under the symbol 'sun.' For what the mind (λογισμός) is in us, the sun is in the world, for each is a light-bearer, the one sending forth to the whole world a sense-perceptible beam, the other sending forth to us by means of its apprehensions mental rays. So long as the mind surrounds us with its illumination, pouring forth as it were a noon-time beam into the whole soul, we remain in ourselves and are not possessed. But when it comes to its setting, there falls upon us in all likelihood an ecstasy, a divine possession, a madness (ἔκστασις καὶ ἡ ἔνθεος . . . κατοκωχή τε καὶ μανία). For when the divine light shines, the human light sets; and when the former sets, the latter rises and dawns. This is what regularly happens to the race of prophets (τῷ δὲ προφητικῷ γένει), for the mind is evicted from us at the arrival of the divine Spirit (ἐξοικίζεται μὲν γὰρ ἐν ἡμῖν ὁ νοῦς κατὰ τὴν τοῦ θείου πνεύματος ἀφίξιν), but at its departure the mind enters once again. Mortal may not cohabit with immortal. Therefore the setting of the mind and the darkness around it produce ecstasy and divinely-inspired madness (ἔκστασιν καὶ θεοφόρητον μανίαν). He (Moses) connects the following passage to this scripture by saying, 'it was said to Abraham' (ἔρρέθη πρὸς Ἀβραάμ). For in reality the prophet, even when he seems to be speaking, is actually silent, while Another makes use of his organs of speech, the mouth and the tongue, expressing what he wishes. With an invisible musical skill, he plays on these organs and produces pleasant and elaborate sounds full of every harmony.⁸

This passage (and others cited above) provides us with a background for an understanding of the prophetic self-understanding of the Corinthian enthusiasts. Even some of Philo's specific statements supply us with a key for interpreting Paul's arguments in 1 Corinthians 14. For example, Philo's statement that the νοῦς in us departs at the coming of the Spirit illumines Paul's counterstatement in 14.15: . . . προσεύξομαι δὲ καὶ τῷ νοῖ. Philo's reference to the organs of speech as instruments of God⁹ sheds light on Paul's reference to musical instruments in 14.7 ff. And Paul's use of the verb μάνεσθαι in 14.23 is probably an ironic reference to the prophetic μανία of which Philo (and numerous other Hellenistic writers on prophecy) speaks.

In short, a background in Hellenistic Judaism--itself only part of a wider context of Hellenistic ecstatic practices--is most plausible as an explanation for the phenomenon of glossalalia in 1 Corinthians. The Corinthians claimed to be πνευματικοί on the basis of their ability to manifest certain πνευματικά, chief among which was the ecstatic speech which they deemed to be "prophecy" *par excellence* (1 Cor. 14.37). Perhaps they thought of themselves as speaking under the inspiration of the Spirit a type of ἀγγελικὴ διάλεκτος. This is at least suggested by 1 Corinthians 13.1.¹⁰

Nor is this claim completely unconnected with the theme of σοφία delineated above. For the Corinthian enthusiasts, σοφία and γλῶσσαι belonged together; both were signs of a truly spiritual existence. This interconnection between wisdom and ecstatic "prophecy" is attested in Hellenistic Judaism,¹¹ in which the Corinthians were apparently well-schooled.

Paul is as critical of the Corinthians' claim to "prophecy" as he is of their claim to "wisdom." Indeed he redefines the term for them, opposing "prophecy" to speaking in tongues. For Paul, prophecy involves speaking clearly and understandably (and in a manner consonant with the confession of faith, Rom. 12.6) for the exhortation and edification of all in the community (1 Cor. 14.2 ff.). In 1 Corinthians 12-14 Paul is facing a dangerous understanding of the church and its worship. As Lührmann puts it,

Für die Gegner war der Gottesdienst eine Versammlung von Ekstatikern, die die Sprache der oberen Welt beherrschten und in der Ekstase diese Welt verliessen. Solch ein Gottesdienst verlöre aber den missionarischen Charakter (14.23); Paulus rechnet mit nicht zur Gemeinde gehörenden ἰδιῶται und ἄπιστοι; die Gemeinde ist damit eine Grösse in der Geschichte. Ziel des Gottesdienstes sind οἰκοδομή, παράκλησις und παραμυθία (14.3), die nur durch Charismen ἐν νοῦ erreicht werden können.¹²

Further, it appears that the Corinthians were bent on emphasizing a hyper-individualistic approach to worship, bound up as they were with their own individual experiences of tongue-speaking. Paul responds by calling them back to their missionary task, to a concern for the church's *corporate* οἰκοδομή and to her common pursuit of ἀγάπη (14.12,1).

B. Ἀνάθεμα Ἰησοῦς in 1 Corinthians 12.1 ff.

It is in this same context that 1 Corinthians 12.1-3 also belongs. Inasmuch as it has been suggested that τῶν πνευματικῶν in 12.1 is masculine in gender, it is desirable to deal with this passage to see if it does shed further light on the πνευματικῶς self-understanding of Paul's Corinthian opponents.

I refer here particularly to Schmithals' arguments on this passage. In affirming the masculine gender for τῶν πνευματικῶν Schmithals states that Paul never used the term πνευματικῶς in the sense of χαρίσματα.¹³ He regards this passage as a reply to a question from the Corinthian congregation as to whether it were possible to make in church such an utterance as "Jesus be cursed" and still be speaking ἐν πνεύματι θεοῦ.¹⁴ According to Schmithals such an acclamation was a regular feature of Corinthian worship,

and indeed served as a type of confession of faith.¹⁵

To the question, "Wie konnte ein guter Christ Jesus verfluchen?" Schmithals answers that this is possible in the context of a specific understanding of Christianity for which an anathema against Jesus is not excluded; namely, the gnostic Christianity prevailing in Corinth.¹⁶ Schmithals posits the existence in Corinth of gnostic Christians who could, paradoxically, confess Χριστός but still cry out, ἀνάθεμα Ἰησοῦς. This phenomenon Schmithals interprets in the context of an alleged dualism between πνεῦμα and σὰρξ, and a Christological distinction between the heavenly Spirit-Christ and the man Jesus. He cites 1 John 2.22 and 4.2 as N. T. parallels.¹⁷ Especially ingenious is his reference to Origen's *Contra Celsum* 6.28 as another parallel, in which reference is made to Gnostics who do not allow anyone into their congregation ἐὰν μὴ ἀράς θῆται κατὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ.¹⁸

It seems to me, however, that Schmithals' question "Wie konnte ein guter Christ Jesus verfluchen?" must receive a negative answer. It is impossible for *any* kind of Christian to curse Jesus, no matter how erroneous his views or how loose his behavior.¹⁹ Indeed, the very impossibility of such a thing is precisely the basis upon which our Pauline passage must be understood.

First of all, there is not to be found in 1 Corinthians 12.1-3 any distinction at all between Χριστός and Ἰησοῦς. It is not a matter of variant confessions or variant Christologies. The only confession of faith referred to is the one that was undoubtedly used in all of the Pauline churches, including the church in Corinth; *viz.*, κύριος Ἰησοῦς, "Jesus is Lord."²⁰ The one distinction that is made in our passage is not one of variant confessions, but it is the distinction between the Corinthians' heathen past (ὅτε ἔθνη ἦτε) and their Christian present.²¹ Paul understands their heathen past to have been determined by their devotion to εἰδωλα ἄφωνα, or rather to demonic powers. In their past, before their baptism,²² they had been led by (ἠγεσθε), indeed were under restraint to (ὡς ἂν ἀπαγόμενοι), the demonic powers which are the real forces behind pagan idols.

That demonic forces are referred to here is evident from the use of the key expressions ἠγεσθε and ἀπαγόμενοι to which in an opposite sense can be compared the phrase in Romans 8.14, πνεύματι θεοῦ ἄγονται. This is clear even if the text is corrupt at this point.²³ Paul is shown to be sharing the typical Jewish attitude toward idols and heathen gods current in late antiquity;

namely, the view that behind the heathen gods and idols stand demonic powers. This is already clear from the way that the LXX translates certain Hebrew terms. For example, Ps. 95.5 (LXX 96.5) translates the Hebrew דִּילִלִּיִּם (vain, empty, idols) with the Greek word δαιμόνια. Similarly at Ps. 105.37 (LXX 106.37) the Hebrew דִּיִּשׁוּׁל (to lords, to idols) is rendered δαιμονίους. At Isaiah 65.11 the Hebrew תַּל (to 'Fortune' = Babylonian Jupiter) is rendered simply τῷ δαίμονι. In Baruch 4.7, there is a reference to sacrifice δαιμονίους καὶ οὐ θεῶν which should doubtless be understood as a reference to idolatry. That this is also Paul's understanding of idolatry is shown not only from the present passage in 1 Corinthians 12 but also from 1 Corinthians 10.20 f. In 8.4 Paul had referred to the "knowledge" of the Corinthians²⁴ that an εἰδωλον is οὐδέν, and that οὐδεὶς θεὸς εἰ μὴ εἶς. But in 1 Corinthians 10.20-21 he informs them that, whereas an idol is nothing in itself (εἰδωλον τί ἐστίν;), nevertheless the powers behind the idols are demonic powers, and to participate in a pagan cultic meal is to become a κοινωνὸς τῶν δαιμονίων.²⁵

[Thus, 1 Corinthians 12.2 refers to demonic powers, and to the control these powers had exercised over the lives of the Corinthians before they had become Christians.]

The importance of this remark by Paul is clear when we perceive the total context; namely, the whole discussion of "spiritual gifts" in 1 Corinthians 12-14, and the implication that the demonic powers are capable of producing ecstatic prophecy of a sort which resembles that so highly vaunted by the Corinthian pneumatics. Ecstatic prophecy, glossalalia, as a phenomenon is not restricted to the Christian community, and ought not, therefore, be made a criterion for special status in the community. For Paul is saying that this demonic variety of ecstatic speech as such is not capable of leading men to confess Jesus as Lord; on the contrary, such ecstatic speaking could also lead to cursing Jesus. For Paul the demons not only "believe and tremble"²⁶ but are actively engaged in venting their curses against Jesus--possibly through ecstatic phenomena!--and against those who belong to him.²⁷ This they are capable of doing even by simulating the "spiritual gift" of ecstatic prophecy. [Paul's point is simply that possession of the Spirit is not to be judged by the occurrence of ecstatic speaking "in tongues" but by the utterance of the common Christian (baptismal) confession.]

The key to a proper understanding of 1 Corinthians 12.1-3 is the recognition that it belongs to the whole context in chapters

12-14. If it is interpreted in isolation, as is done by Schmithals, the point of Paul's argument is lost. That it does belong to the wider context is clear from περί δὲ τῶν πνευματικῶν in 12.1, a heading that governs the entire argument in 12-14. τῶν πνευματικῶν is to be taken as a neuter; the πνευματικά in 12.1 are the same as the χαρίσματα in 12.4²⁸ and the whole context concerns "spiritual gifts."

Paul's argument is a shocking one, and was undoubtedly intended to be such. Paul is arguing that the gift of ecstatic speech is not to be unduly exalted above other spiritual gifts, since ecstatic speech--*qua* ecstatic speech--is not a distinguishing mark of "spiritual" Christians at all. It is a phenomenon that is known among pagans as well--perhaps had even played a part in the Gentile Christians' own previous religious background--and which can even be used as a demonic vehicle by which the demons can vent their curses against Jesus Christ. Conversely, from the very fact that it is only the Spirit of God who can lead men to a confession of Jesus as Lord, all Christians, *all* who participate in the congregational confession of faith in Jesus as Lord, are in effect speaking "in the Spirit of God." Therefore there can be no distinctions made in the congregation between those with "spiritual" gifts and those without "spiritual" gifts, for it is a gift of the Holy Spirit itself to be able to confess Jesus as Lord.

So, Paul argues, there is only one Spirit, and all Christians share this Spirit by virtue of their baptism and common confession. The expression ἀνάθεμα Ἰησοῦς is to be understood as a Pauline antithesis²⁹ to the common Christian confession, an antithetical expression used to shock the Corinthian enthusiasts into placing the phenomenon of ecstatic "prophecy" into a proper perspective, to see it as a possible vehicle for demons as well as for the Spirit, and to understand that this is not by any means a distinguishing mark of "spiritual" Christianity.

In 12.4 ff. Paul goes on to explain that there is one Spirit, but there is given to all Christians different gifts of the Spirit by which, acting in concert, the whole body of Christians can be built up and strengthened. γένη γλωσσῶν and ἐρμηνεῖα γλωσσῶν are gifts of the Spirit, but they are noticeably placed last in Paul's list.

CHAPTER SIX: GENESIS 2.7 IN Gnostic EXEGESIS

A. Introduction

It has already been shown, in previous chapters, that the πνεῦμα-ψυχή, πνευματικός-ψυχικός contrast develops out of a Hellenistic-Jewish exegesis of Genesis 2.7 (in the Greek text). The πνοή of 2.7a is regarded as identical with the πνεῦμα, and constitutes the heavenly and immortal part of man.

This chapter carries this further and explores the πνευματικός-ψυχικός terminology in Gnostic texts and its relation to the Gnostic exegesis of Genesis 2.7. Genesis 2.7 is a focal text for gnostic speculation (a fact which, nevertheless, has not heretofore been noticed by scholars).¹ This chapter can thus be considered to supplement what has been discovered by others concerning gnostic exegesis of another important passage in Genesis, i.e. 1.26f.²

Actually the πνευματικός-ψυχικός terminology is not always employed in gnostic materials, and the gnostic exegesis of Genesis 2.7 is quite varied. What follows are the most important examples of how the various gnostic groups interpreted Genesis 2.7, and how the πνευματικός-ψυχικός terminology, when it is used, fits into the context of Genesis 2.7 exegesis.

It will be useful to begin our discussion with the *Apocryphon of John*, rather than with the earliest examples, for in this document a number of traditions of Genesis-exegesis have been utilized, and we can therefore see at once the various ways in which gnostic mythology can develop as scripture interpretation.

B. The *Apocryphon of John*

The bulk of this document is essentially a "commentary" on the text of the opening chapters of Genesis.³ Using the version from the Berlin Codex (=BG)⁴ as a basis, we find that the passage which interprets Genesis 2.7 runs from 48.14 to 52.1. The parallel passage in Codex II from Nag Hammadi⁵ is 63.5-67.33, with 63.29-67.10 representing an expansion not found in BG.

In the context immediately preceding BG 48.14, the creator-archons say to one another,

Let us create a man according to the image and appearance of God.⁶

The "commentary" jumps immediately to Genesis 2.7, as can be seen from the language in which the creation of man is depicted: They created from themselves and from all their powers, they formed a formation (ἀπλασά ἡνωπλασμα) from

themselves. And [each one] of [all the powers created from] the power [the soul]1.7

It is clear from this passage, and from what follows, that we have to do here with the creation of man's soul by the archons. The fall of Adam into materiality is treated only in 52.15-17 and following.⁸ The words *απλασσα*, *πλασμα*, and *τεφτηχη* are all derived from the Greek text of Genesis 2.7:

καὶ ἐπλασεν τὸν ἄνθρωπον . . . καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἄνθρωπος εἰς ψυχὴν

It is this "psychic" creature which fulfills the exhortation in the immediately preceding context (Gen. 1.26); the text in the lines immediately following refer back to Genesis 1.27:

They created it (*ατταμιος*, fem., i.e. the *ψυχή*) according to the image which they had seen, by way of an imitation (*κατα ομιμωσις*)⁹ of the one who was from the beginning, the perfect Man. They said, "Let us call him Adam so that the name of this (being) and his power may become for us a light."¹⁰

This passage is an interpretation of the *εἰκών* of Genesis 1.27. In the *Apocryphon of John* Anthropos is the highest God.¹¹ Jaldabaoth,¹² the abortive product of Sophia, had surveyed his creative work, and had declared, "I am a jealous God, and beside me there is no other" (*BG* 44.14 f.; cf. Ex. 20.5; Is. 45.5,6; 46.9). The Mother (Sophia) realizes her deficiency and repents, and a voice comes to her, "There exists the Man, and the Son of Man" (*BG* 47.15 f.). Jaldabaoth and the other archons see in the water an image (*εἰκών*) of the Man, i.e. the highest God, and resolve to imitate it, thereby to illuminate their own darkness. Their psychic creation they resolve to call "Adam," in order to capture the magic of this name for themselves.¹³

What follows in the text is a further elaboration of the work of the creator-archons in fashioning man's soul. At this point there are two different versions. In *BG* each of the creator-angels is referred to as a *ψυχή*.¹⁴ In *CG* II each of the angels creates a different feature of man's soul.¹⁵ I present first the text of *BG* 49.9-51.1:

And the powers began from below. The first is Deity, a soul of bone; the second is Lordship,¹⁶ a sinew-soul; the third is Fire, a soul of flesh; the fourth is Pronoia, a soul of marrow and the whole constitution of the body; the fifth is Kingdom, a soul of blood; the sixth is Understanding, a soul of skin; the seventh is Sophia, a soul of hair. And they adorned the whole body. And their angels came to them from (among) those who had been prepared at first by the powers. (And they received)¹⁷ the hypostases of soul for the ordering of the joint-members. And they created the entire body, joined together from the multitude of angels which I

mentioned at first. And it remained inert a long time, for the seven powers were unable to raise it up, nor could the 360 angels who had put together the joint-members.

The same passage in *CG II* reads as follows:

And the powers began. The first, Goodness, created a soul of bone; the second, Pronoia, created a soul of sinew; the third, Deity, created a soul of flesh; the fourth, Lordship, created a soul of marrow; the fifth, Kingdom, created a soul of blood; the sixth, Zeal, created a soul of skin; the seventh, Wisdom, created a soul of hair. And the multitude of angels stood up before it. They received from the Powers the seven psychic hypostases¹⁸ in order to make the joining of the limbs and the joining of the pieces and the synthesis of the adornment of each of the members¹⁹ And all the angels and demons worked until they had adorned the psychic body (*ἄψυχικὸν ἦσωμα*), but their entire work was inert and motionless for a long time (67.10-14).

Though these texts are slightly different, they both refer to the creation of the soul, or the "psychic body," of man.²⁰ In so far as they are working with ψυχή they themselves are referred to as "souls," and their "hypostasis" is a psychic hypostasis. I have hesitated to translate ὑπόστασις with the usual (Latin cognate) "substance." What seems to be meant by ὑπόστασις is something like "underlying reality behind something."²¹

The description of the work of the seven powers in creating the various parts of the body (bone, sinew, marrow, flesh, etc.) may stem from a Jewish wisdom tradition such as is reflected also in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, especially at *Testament of Reuben* 2-3, where the seven πνεύματα given to man in creation are enumerated; the seven πνεύματα τῆς πλάνης are considered as resident in various parts of the body.

There may also be in the *Apocryphon of John* some distant reflection of a speculation on Plato's *Timaeus*. At *Timaeus* 69C ff. there is a description of the activity of the created gods in fashioning the various parts of the body of man which will house the immortal element of the soul created by the Demiurge himself.

That we are dealing here with an involved commentary upon Genesis 2.7 is confirmed by the passage immediately following, wherein we are informed of the origin of man's πνεῦμα. The text continues:

And the Mother wished to get back the power which she had given to the archon of Prounikos. She came in innocence; begged the Father of All rich in mercy, the God of Light. He sent by a holy decree the Autogenes²² and the four lights (*CG II*: "the five lightbearers") in the form of the angels of the first archon. They advised him so that they might bring forth from him the power of the mother.

They said to him, "Breathe into his face from the spirit (πνεῦμα) that is in you, and the thing (φωβ) will rise up." And he breathed upon him from his spirit, which is the power from the Mother, into the body, and it immediately moved (BG 51.1-52.1 = CG II 67.15-33).

Compare the end of this passage in the CG II version:

And he blew into him his spirit, which is the power of his Mother; he did not know, because he was in ignorance. And the power of the mother went out from Altabaoth into the psychic body which they had made for him according to the image of him who was from the beginning. The body moved, and received strength, and shone.

The sequel to this passage describes how as a result of this inbreathing the man was stronger and wiser than all of the archons, who thereupon became jealous and cast man down into the lower depths of materiality.

For our purposes it is important to point out how the account in the *Apocryphon of John* of the reception by man of his spiritual nature is based upon an interpretation of Genesis 2.7, especially: καὶ ἐνεφύσησεν εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ πνοήν (= πνεῦμα) ζωῆς. The πνεῦμα has been placed over against the ψυχή, the ψυχικός nature of man. The πνεῦμα is the heavenly part of man, derived from the Mother (Sophia) and ultimately from the Pleroma, whereas the ψυχή is a creation of Ialdabaoth and his creator-angels. Though the adjective πνευματικός does not occur in *Apocryphon of John*, the term ψυχικός²³ is used--but only in the immediate context of the gnostic commentary upon Genesis 2.7.

The πνεῦμα-ψυχή contrast does not play any role in the editorial framework of *Apocryphon of John*, nor are gnostic men distinguished from non-gnostic men on the basis of a πνευματικός-ψυχικός differentiation. The gnostic class of men is referred to as the "unwavering generation," and the non-gnostics are regarded as having a "counterfeit spirit" (ἀντιμιμον μίτῆα).²⁴ This terminology is not explicitly related to the Genesis exegesis delineated above, though of course it presupposes that the gnostic men have the true πνεῦμα.

The passage here treated is a highly-developed mythopoetic synthesis of several Jewish traditions of Genesis exegesis. These include (1) the Hellenistic-Jewish distinction between the higher πνεῦμα and the lower ψυχή based on the Greek text of Genesis 2.7 (discussed above), (2) the tradition (probably Palestinian)²⁵ that Adam was created as a "formless mass" (*gōlem*) into which God breathed his life-giving breath, and (3) the Hellenistic-Jewish tradition (interpreting Gen. 1.26) that God relegated the creation of man's body to the angels.²⁶ All of these traditions

of exegesis are widely taken over and variously interpreted in gnostic literature. The *Apocryphon of John* reflects a continuing stage in an already gnosticized synthesis. What makes these speculations "gnostic" is not the traditions themselves, but how they are interpreted and reformulated in the gnostic context and with the gnostic intentionality.²⁷

The speculation that God addressed the angels when he said "Let us make man" (Gen. 1.26) is attested in Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho* 62, where he rejects this doctrine, along with the concomitant teaching that the body of man is the creation of the angels (ὅτι ἀγγέλων ποίημα ἦν τὸ σῶμα τὸ ἀνθρώπειον). The earliest extant witness to this doctrine is Philo, who states it no less than three times (*Op.* 72-75; *Conf.* 168 ff.; *Fug.* 68 ff.), and that in the interest of preventing one from ascribing to the transcendent and holy God the making of a mixed creature such as man. More precisely, God fashioned man's immortal element, but delegated to the "powers" or "angels" subsidiary to him the creation of man's body, the seat of the vices.²⁸ For the origin of this doctrine one can point to a direct influence from Plato's *Timaeus* 41A, wherein it is stated that the body of man is fashioned by lower beings ("gods" in Plato, "powers" or "angels" in Philo), but that the immortal soul is created directly by the Demiurge (*Timaeus* 41D).

It is not difficult to see how such speculations on Genesis 1.26 by Philo and other exegetes could be interpreted with a gnostic twist. Such Genesis-speculations, indeed, are the primary building-blocks for the fabrication of gnostic myths and systems.

C. Adam as *Gōlem* in Rabbinic Tradition

According to a tradition of exegesis of Genesis 2.7 current in the rabbinic schools at least from the second century, Adam was first created as a "shapeless mass" (מַלְלָה). The Midrash on Genesis 2.7 comments as follows:

This teaches that he set him up as a lifeless mass (מַלְלָה) reaching from earth to heaven and then infused a soul into him.²⁹

And again:

R. Tanhuma in the name of R. Banayah and R. Berekiah in the name of R. Leazar said: He created him as a lifeless mass (מַלְלָה) extending from one end of the world to the other; thus it is written, "Thine eyes did see mine unformed substance" (Ps. 139.16).³⁰

The latter passage is particularly important, for it provides us with a key to the origin of the description of Adam as a *gōlem*,

and it gives us an indication that this tradition is relatively early. On the latter point, the attribution of this doctrine to Banayah and Leazar puts us at least back to the second century, for both of these sages were *Tanna'im*. As to the use of the term *gōlem*, it occurs only once in the Old Testament, at Psalm 139.16, where it says of Adam,³¹

Thy eyes beheld my unformed substance (גֹּלֶם); in thy book were written, every one of them, the days that were formed for me, when as yet there was none of them.³²

One further text, of many that could be adduced,³³ contains the following, put into the mouth of R. Acha b. Chanina:³⁴

The day consisted of twelve hours. In the first hour, his [Adam's] dust was gathered; in the second, it was kneaded into a shapeless mass; in the third, his limbs were shaped; in the fourth, a soul was infused into him; in the fifth he arose and stood on his feet; in the sixth, he gave [the animals] their names; in the seventh, Eve became his mate; in the eighth, they ascended to bed as two and descended as four;³⁵ in the ninth, he was commanded not to eat of the tree; in the tenth, he sinned; in the eleventh, he was tried; and in the twelfth, he was expelled [from Eden] and departed, for it is written, "Man abideth not in honour."³⁶

Our interest centers upon the second and fourth hours in R. Acha's schema: Adam is first a lifeless mass (גֹּלֶם), and then is animated by the inbreathing into him of his soul (נְשֻׁמָּה).³⁷ This colorful tradition concerning the creation of Adam³⁸ is to be found in the background of many gnostic accounts, including the one treated above from the *Apocryphon of John*.³⁹ But in the gnostic sources, it is because of the basic inferiority of the creator (or creator-powers) that the body of Adam lies inert and unable to move. The essential life-principle is breathed into him from a source ultimately higher than and superior to the creator(s), and is that which enables man to rise above his creaturely existence and even to despise his creator(s). This is the pattern in the *Apocryphon of John*--where, however, the distinction has already been made between the ψυχή and the πνεῦμα--and it is the pattern in many other gnostic texts as well, some of them reflecting earlier stages in the development of the tradition in gnostic circles.

D. Saturninus

Probably the earliest stage⁴⁰ in the gnostic reinterpretation of this tradition of Genesis 2.7 exegesis is that represented by Saturninus.⁴¹ Irenaeus records the following concerning the heresy of Saturninus (or Satornilus, as he is sometimes called):

Saturninus, like Menander, set forth one Father, unknown

to all, who created the angels,⁴² archangels, powers, and authorities. By seven of the angels was made the world, and all things in it. And man was created by the angels, when a luminous image appeared below from the highest power. When they were unable to grasp it (he says), for it immediately darted upward again, they exhorted one another saying, "Let us make man according to the image and likeness." When he was fashioned, and the creature was not able to stand erect, due to the feebleness of the angels (*et non potuisset erigi plasma propter imbecillitatem angelorum*),⁴³ but wriggled like a worm (*quasi vermiculus scarizaret*), the power from above, taking pity on him because he was made in its⁴⁴ image, sent forth a spark of light (*scintillam vitae* = σπιυθῆρα τῆς ζωῆς) which raised the man erect, gave him limbs, and caused him to come to life.⁴⁵

This myth contains a re-interpretation of two of the Jewish traditions mentioned above, the creation of man's body by the angels (Gen. 1.26 f.) and the speculation based on Genesis 2.7 that man was formed as a shapeless, inert mass, and vivified by the inbreathing of God. The curious idea that the πλάσμα of the angels "wriggled like a worm" (cf. Hippolytus, *Ref.* 7.28.3, ὡς σκώληκος σκαρίζοντος) may not only be a picturesque extension of the idea of Adam as an inert *gōlem*, but may represent a separate Jewish tradition. This has been stated by G. Quispel, though without supporting evidence.⁴⁶ R. M. Grant is probably on the right track in his suggestion that Saturninus may have derived this from Psalm 22.7, applying the passage to Adam: ἐγὼ δὲ εἶμι σκώληξ καὶ οὐκ ἄνθρωπος (LXX 21.7).⁴⁷ But I would suggest that Psalm 22.7 had already been applied to Adam in Jewish tradition before Saturninus, in a manner analogous to the use of Psalm 139.16. We now have some evidence from Qumran that points in this direction. A verse from one of the Thanksgiving Hymns (1QH XI.12) reads as follows:

. . . that the worm of the dead may be raised from the dust to thy eternal counsel⁴⁸

The "worm" (ὄλιγον, the same word used in Ps. 22.7, and translated in the LXX σκώληξ) is in this Qumran hymn a reference to mortal man. Influence from Psalm 22.7 (perhaps also from Job 25.6) I find to be quite probable.

Saturninus' myth is thoroughly "gnostic"; the creator-angels (of whom the Jewish God is one)⁴⁹ are inferior beings working independently of the highest God, and the essential immortal essence of man is derived not from his creator(s) but from a higher power. It is this "spark of life"--essentially identical to God--which must be retrieved and saved.

Absent from the system of Saturninus, however, is the dif-

ferentiation of πνεῦμα, πνευματικός and ψυχή, ψυχικός. The πνοή ζωῆς of Genesis 2.7 is referred to as a σπινθήρ ζωῆς,⁵⁰ which alone is immortal and which is placed over against the bodily creation of the angel-powers. This doctrine functions in the system of Saturninus to distinguish between classes of men, based on whether or not they possess the "spark of life" and are thus ὁμόφυλοι with the highest power (Hipp. Ref. 7.28.4). The sign of this "spark" is faith in Christ (Iren. Adv. Haer. 1.24.2)!

Can one attribute these speculations of Saturninus to earlier gnostic teachers, e.g. to Simon Magus? Though Saturninus is the first actually to incorporate Christ into his system,⁵¹ the tradition of the creation of man by the angels and the inbreathing from above of his "spark of life" may perhaps go back to Simon.⁵² But if it does⁵³ there is little extant evidence, apart from a statement attributed to Simon by Epiphanius⁵⁴ to the effect that he created the angels through the mediation of Ennoia, and the angels created the world and man.

E. Simonian Gnosticism

Genesis 2.7 is treated exegetically in an important Simonian source, though in a manner quite unlike that we have seen in Saturninus and *Apocryphon of John*. The exegesis occurs in the context of a commentary, preserved by Hippolytus (Ref. 6.9.3-6.18.7), on a revelatory document ascribed to Simon Magus and entitled *Megale Apophasis* ("The Great Proclamation").⁵⁵ The material is highly syncretistic and philosophized, and probably quite late (end of the second century?).⁵⁶

Genesis 2.7a is quoted at *Refutatio* 5.14.4 f.:

This is⁵⁷ the seventh power⁵⁸ concerning which Moses says, 'καὶ πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἐπέφερετο ἐπάνω τοῦ ὕδατος' [Gen. 1.2], i.e. the πνεῦμα which holds all things in itself, the image (εἰκῶν) of the unbounded power, concerning which Simon says, 'εἰκῶν ἐξ ἀφάρτου μορφῆς. κοσμοῦσα μόνη πάντα.' For this power, which hovers over the water, originating from an incorruptible form, alone orders all things (κοσμεῖ μόνη πάντα). When some such construction of the world had taken place 'God formed man' taking 'dust from the earth.' He formed (him) not simple but two-fold (οὐχ ἀπλοῦν ἀλλὰ διπλοῦν) 'according to the image and according to the likeness' (κατ' εἰκόνα καὶ καθ' ὁμοίωσιν).

Genesis 2.7a is used in conjunction with Genesis 1.2 and 1.26. The "seventh power" which resides in all men as the power that "stands, has come to stand, and will stand,"⁵⁹ is related via the εἰκῶν and ὁμοίωσις to the Spirit which hovered over the waters of creation. The second part of Genesis 2.7 is not

quoted, and no reference is made to the ἐμφύσημα of the πνοή ζωῆς.

By the διπλοῦς⁶⁰ nature of man, κατ' εἰκόνα and καθ' ὁμοίωσιν, is meant man as having fallen into the world of becoming (cf. στας κάτω ἐν τῇ ῥοῇ τῶν ὑδάτων ἐν εἰκόνι γεννηθεῖς, 17.1) and man from the standpoint of his salvation (cf. στησόμενος ἄνω παρὰ τὴν μακαρίαν ἀπέραντον δύναμιν, ἐὰν ἐξεικονισθῆ . . . ὁ καθ' ὁμοίωσιν ἀναπεπλασμένος τέλειος ἐπουράνιος, 17.1 f.). Salvation is accomplished when one "is fully formed" (ἐξεικονισθῆ) and thus becomes ἴσος καὶ ὅμοιος τῇ ἀγεννήτῳ καὶ ἀπεράντῳ δυνάμει (16.5).⁶¹ But if one does not achieve his full potentiality, he perishes with the world:

ὁ ἐὰν μὴ ἐξεικονισθῆ μετὰ τοῦ κόσμου ἀπολεῖται, δυνάμει μεῖναν μόνον καὶ μὴ ἐνεργεία γενόμενον-- τοῦτό ἐστι . . . τὸ εἰρημένον· ἵνα μὴ σὺν τῷ κόσμῳ κατακριθῶμεν (14.6, quoting 1 Cor. 11.32).

Salvation resides as a potential force (δύναμις)⁶² in all men, and need only be brought to full ἐνεργεία by a process of self-realization, aided by the "right word" (ὁ προσήκων λόγος = the Simonian teaching) and the "place of the Lord" (τόπος κυρίου = the Simonian community).⁶³

Genesis 2.7a is quoted again in 14.7: πῶς οὖν καὶ τίνα τρόπον . . . πλάσσει τὸν ἄνθρωπον ὁ θεός; The answer: ἐν παραδείσῳ (Gen. 2.8). There follows an allegory on Genesis 2.8 ff. in which "Paradise" is equated with the womb (cf. Is. 44.2), and which employs the latest medical science on embryology.⁶⁴

In summary⁶⁵ the Simonian use of Genesis 2.7 is quite unique; there is no trace of the traditions we found in Saturninus. Furthermore, the πνευματικός-ψυχικός terminology does not occur in Simonian Gnosticism. Thus, the πνευματικός-ψυχικός terminology seems to occur only if Genesis 2.7 is interpreted accordingly, which is not the case in Simon.

F. Sethian-Ophites

The Sethian-Ophite⁶⁶ system as described by Irenaeus (in *Adv. Haer.* 1.30) contains a Genesis 2.7 exegesis which is somewhat similar to that of the *Apocryphon of John*. The system as a whole seems to be a modified--essentially more Christianized--version of that which underlies the *Apocryphon of John*.

This Genesis 2.7 commentary occurs in 1.30.6. In the preceding context Jaldabaoth has boasted, "I am Father and God, and there is no one above me."⁶⁷ "The Mother" (Sophia-Prounikos, 1.30.3) rebukes Jaldabaoth with the words, "Do not lie, Ialda-

baoth, there exists above you the Father of all, the First Man, and Man, son of Man." Ialdabaoth thereupon says to the other powers, "Come, let us make man according to our image."⁶⁸ Our text continues at this point:

The six powers heard this, and since the Mother was giving them the idea of man (*excogitationem hominis*) in order that through him she might empty them of their original power, they came together and fashioned (*formaverunt* = ἔπλασαν) a man of immense dimensions in breadth and length. But since he was only wriggling (*scarizante autem eo tantum*)⁶⁹ they brought him to his father. Sophia was operating in this way in order that she might empty him of the moisture of light (*humectatione luminis*), that he might not be able to raise himself up against those who are above by having power. He was⁷⁰ secretly emptied of his power when he breathed into man the breath of life (*Illo autem insufflante in hominem spiritum vitae*). Thus man has mind and thought (*Nun et Enthymesis*),⁷¹ and it is this that partake of salvation. Immediately he gave thanks to the First Man, and abandoned those who had created him.

In this passage are certain elements that we have noted in the *Apoeryphon of John* and Saturninus: the lifeless (or writhing) body of Adam created by Ialdabaoth and the angels, and the in-breathing by which man is endowed with his essential nature, superior to that of his creators, and which is eventually to be redeemed. As in *Apoeryphon of John* this inbreathing derives ultimately from "the Mother" (i.e. Wisdom), and the inbreathing of this power into man by Ialdabaoth deprives him and the creator-archons of all the power they had received originally from the fallen Mother, Wisdom. The Jewish tradition of the immense size of the Adam-gölem is here retained, though it had played no role in *Apoeryphon of John* or in Saturninus.

The terminology by which the πνοή (πνεῦμα) ζωῆς of Genesis 2.7 is described is, however, different both from that in *Apoeryphon of John* (πνεῦμα, *σομ* = δύναμις) and in Saturninus (σπινθηρ ζωῆς). Though the term "power" does occur⁷² the technical term employed for this inbreathing is "moisture of light" (*humectatio luminis*), which embraces also *nous* and *enthymesis*. It is this "moisture of light" which has overflowed from the Pleroma from the "First Woman" (Upper Sophia) and has fallen from above, incorporated as Prounikos-Sophia (Cf. 1.30.3), and overflowing even into the son of Sophia-Prounikos, Ialdabaoth. Ialdabaoth is tricked into breathing this "moisture of light" into man, thus depriving himself of power, and initiating the possibility of salvation.

The system has become Christianized by the introduction of

Jesus Christ, who now sits at the right hand of the ignorant Ialdabaoth, receiving the "holy souls" from the world:

For he (Jesus Christ) will not receive the holy souls only to send them back into the world; but (he will receive) only those who are of his substance (*ex substantia eius*), i.e. those who are from the inbreathing (*ex insufflatione* = ἔξ ἐμφοσῆματος cf. ἐνέφυσεν, Gen. 2.7). The consummation will occur when the totality of the moisture of the spirit of light (*humectatio spiritus luminis*) will be collected, and carried away into the Aeon of incorruptibility (1.30.14 = Harvey 1.28.7).

In this system there is no terminological distinction between πνεῦμα and ψυχή, between πνευματικὸς and ψυχικὸς,⁷³ even though Genesis 2.7 (from which such a distinction in some systems does arise) plays a crucial role in the speculation of the "Sethian-Ophite" system.

G. The Mandaean Literature

In the Mandaean literature are to be found some of the traditions of Genesis-exegesis we have encountered above. In Book 3 of the right-hand *Ginza*⁷⁴ one passage,⁷⁵ though greatly enlarged with specifically Mandaean motifs, bears a remarkable resemblance to the passages quoted above from the *Apocryphon of John* and Saturninus. Ptahil,⁷⁶ the Mandaean demiurge, addresses the Planets:⁷⁷ "We will create Adam, that he may be King of the world (מאלכא באלמא)."⁷⁸ So they create Adam. He is the image (*dmuta*) of Ptahil and his father, the "Father of the Uthras."⁷⁹ But he is lifeless, without a soul, and the Planets are unable to make him stand up firmly on his feet.⁸⁰ Finally the lifeless body (עוצנא דפאגריא) is enlived with a soul (*manā*) by Adakas-Mānā and Manda-d-Haiye, with the cooperation of the Uthras, Hibil, Šitil, and Anōš.⁸¹

While Ptahil was laying hold of Adam, I raised up his bones. While he was laying hands on him, I let him smell the scent of the powerful (Life). The Body filled with Marrow and the Splendour of Life spoke in him.⁸²

This myth is based on an ancient gnostic exegesis of Genesis 1.26 f. and 2.7, much as it occurs in the *Apocryphon of John*, Saturninus, and the Sethian-Ophite text referred to above. The figure of Wisdom is missing in the Mandaean text,⁸³ as it is also in Saturninus.

This myth occurs with variations in other Mandaean texts as well. For example, in *GR*, Book 10,⁸⁴ Ptahil creates Adam according to his own image, and Eve according to the image of Adam. Ptahil casts his own spirit (*ruḥa*) into Adam, and the Planets

also add of their own substance. But Ptahil and the Planets cannot raise up the lifeless body. Ptahil goes to his father Abatur, takes a hidden *mana* from the House of Life, and casts it into Adam and Eve.⁸⁵

The tradition that Adam's body could only writhe before it received the inbreathing from above is also found in Mandaean literature. In one of the hymns of the *Ginza*, the "Mana of the great life" laments,

Who hath made me dwell on earth, who hath cast me into the physical body ('*štūn pagria*) which hath no hands or feet and knoweth not how it will walk? It lies there and crawls.⁸⁶

When these Mandaean creation-myths are understood for what they are, namely, remnants of older gnostic exegetical traditions on Genesis, then it can be understood also why it is that in Mandaean anthropology the spirit (*ruḥa*) is the lower soul, the power of the natural life, the seat of natural desire and lust, whereas the soul (*mānā* = *nišimṭā*) is the higher, immortal element which derives from above. *Mānā* is an Iranian word for soul, a synonym of the Semitic *nišimṭā* which of course is also frequent in the Mandaean literature.⁸⁷ In my opinion the latter is the more original term in the Mandaean anthropological vocabulary. On first glance it would appear that this is a terminological reversal of the roles of πνεῦμα and ψυχή in other gnostic systems.⁸⁸ The reason for this is clear: In Greek-speaking Gnosticism πνεῦμα = the πνοή of Genesis 2.7; but in Mandaean Gnosticism, *nišimṭā* is the exact equivalent of the נַחְמָה of Genesis 2.7 in the Hebrew text.⁸⁹ It seems strange that the vital role played by the text of Genesis 2.7 (whether in Hebrew or in Greek) in these speculations has been so completely overlooked by scholars working with the gnostic materials.

H. Manichaeian Literature

Remnants of speculations on Genesis 1.26 f. and 2.7 are also found in Manichaeian texts. They resemble those described above, though they are heavily overlaid with specifically Manichaeian mythologoumena. I adduce here a passage from Theodore bar Konai, reputedly exposing a writing of Mani himself:⁹⁰

And Ashaklun,⁹¹ Son of the King of Darkness, said to the abortions: "Give me your sons and your daughters and I shall make you a figure like the one you have seen."⁹² They brought them and gave them to him. He ate the male ones and handed the female ones over to Nebroel,⁹³ his companion. Nebroel and Ashaklun came together; Nebroel became pregnant and bore Ashaklun a son to whom she gave

the name Adam. And she became pregnant (again) and bore a daughter to whom she gave the name Havva (Eve).

The ultimate dependence of this passage upon Genesis 1.26 f. is clear.⁹⁴ The account of the giving to Adam of his soul is omitted in bar Konai's account, but has been preserved in one of the Turfan fragments, whose cosmogony is parallel to that of bar Konai.⁹⁵ I quote only the relevant passage:

. . . und sie gestaltete einen Körper männlicher Gestalt mit (aus) Knochen, Nerven (oder Fett), Fleisch, Adern und Haut. Und (ein Teil) von jener Lichttheit der Götter, die durch Früchte und Knospen mit jenen Kindern der Mazan⁹⁶ vermischt war, wurde in seinen Körper als Seele gefesselt . . .

There is in the distant background an exegesis of Genesis 2.7. The soul (πνοή - πνῦν) of man belongs to the light-substance which the King of Darkness had captured, and must eventually be redeemed.

I. Valentinus, Fragment No. 1⁹⁷

And there came upon the angels a fear, as it were, of that creature (ἐπ' ἐκείνου τοῦ πλάσματος) when he made utterances greater than was suited to his formation (πλάσεως) on account of the One who had invisibly put into him the seed of the substance from above (σπέρμα . . . τῆς ἀνωθεν οὐσίας), the One who speaks freely. So also among the generations of earthly men, the works of men become fears to those who make them as, for example, statues and images and all things which the hands fashion in the name of a god. For Adam, formed (πλασθεὶς) in the name of Man, produced fear of the pre-existing Man, as though he were existing in him, and the angels were terrified and quickly removed their work.

This passage is best understood against the background of the passages from the *Apocryphon of John* and Saturninus treated above. Adam, formed (πλάσμα, πλάσις, πλασθεὶς, ἐπλασεν, Gen. 2.7a) by the angels as an image (εἰκῶν) of, and in the name of, the divine Anthropos (Gen. 1.26 f.) had secretly been given a substance from above (Gen. 2.7b) which enabled him to rise above his plasmatic creation and to despise the angels of creation.⁹⁸ As a result of this the angels are terrified and cast their creative work down into the lowest depths of materiality.⁹⁹ Nothing is said specifically of the mediation of Sophia; in this respect the fragment resembles Saturninus' system.¹⁰⁰

J. The Gospel of Truth

The motif of the raising up of lifeless Adam is treated homiletically in the Valentinian *Gospel of Truth* (= *EV*) 30.16-26: And the Spirit¹⁰¹ ran to him in haste to raise him up.

Giving its hand to the one lying on the ground, it stood him upright on his feet, for he had not yet stood up. It gave them the possibility of knowing the knowledge of the Father and the revelation of his Son.

The mythological substratum shows through clearly, although the theme is treated from a very different perspective, proper to the genre of *EV* as an esoteric homily.¹⁰² Its purpose is to edify the Valentinian congregation by a celebration of the blessings of gnosis which is accessible to those who have the "spirit."¹⁰³

K. The *Apocalypse of Adam*

In the *Apocalypse of Adam* from Codex V of the Chenoboskion library,¹⁰⁴ there occurs the following passage (66.14-25):

And the Lord, the God who had created us,¹⁰⁵ came up to us and said to us, "Adam, why do you groan in your hearts? Don't you know that I am the God who created you? And I have breathed into you a spirit of life (αἰνίχε εἶσθη ἐρωτῆν νοσῆτῆνα ἄτε πῶνε) so that you might become a living soul (εἶραῖ εἴψιτῆ εἶσθη)." Then a darkness came over our eyes. Then the God who had [cre]ated us made a . . .

The text breaks off at this point. When it resumes in pl. 67, Adam is saying that he recognized a sweet desire for (Seth's) mother. But--

then was lost to us the vigor of our eternal knowledge (67.4-8).

The use of Genesis 2.7 seems at first glance quite peculiar for a gnostic document. The πνεῦμα is described as the product of the creator-god himself and nothing is said of a higher power working independently of, or secretly through, the creator. But this first impression is corrected in 76.17 ff., in the context of the apocalypse proper:¹⁰⁶

For the whole formation (πιπλασμα τηρῶ) which originated from the dead earth will come under the power of death. But those who think in their hearts the gnosis of the eternal God will not perish. For they have not received the spirit from this same kingdom, but they have received it from one of the eternal angels . . .¹⁰⁷

Thus (gnostic) man's πνεῦμα derives not from the creator-god or his kingdom, but from a realm higher than that of Saclas, the Creator. The reference to "one of the eternal angels" and the occurrence of the word φωστῆρ in the following line suggest that behind the *Apocalypse of Adam* there is a myth akin to that of the *Apocryphon of John*.¹⁰⁸ This latter passage is a corrective to what, after all, was Saclas' own claim in the passage quoted first.

However, the Gnostics of the *Apocalypse of Adam* are not referred to as πνευματικοί, but rather as the "kingless generation" (82.19 f.) and the progeny of Seth (65.5-9; 85.20-22).¹⁰⁹

L. The Naassene Commentary

From the Naassene commentary on a hymn to Attis preserved by Hippolytus,¹¹⁰ the following passage is of particular import (Ref. 5.7.6. f.):

The Assyrians say that fish-eating Oannes was born among them (as the first man); the Chaldaeans say Adam, and this was the only man whom Earth brought forth.¹¹¹ But he lay without breath (ἀπνους) motionless, immovable, like a statue, being an image of that Man above, the celebrated Adamas, having been made by many powers, concerning whom there is much to be said separately. In order, therefore, that the great Man from above might be completely overpowered . . . there was given to him a soul also (ἐδόθη αὐτῷ καὶ ψυχὴ) in order that the creature (πλάσμα) of the great and glorious and perfect Man might suffer and be punished in bonds through the soul (διὰ τῆς ψυχῆς).

Several motifs are familiar: the creation of Adam's body by many powers¹¹² as an image of the Man above, but lifeless and immovable so long as it is without the divine inbreathing (ἀπνους). Speculations on Genesis 1.26 f. and 2.7 similar to those of Saturninus, the *Apocryphon of John*, etc., are evident, though there are differences in points of detail. This is confirmed in other parts of the commentary: the spirit-less Adam is πλάσμα τὸ πῆλινον (7.30), πλάσμα τῆς λήθης, τὸ χοῦικον (7.36; cf. 8.14). The latter designations reflect the words ἐπλασε and χοῦν from the text of Genesis 2.7.

The term ψυχὴ also reflects a particular understanding of Genesis 2.7, though the manner in which this term is introduced presents difficulties in understanding the passage as a whole. Reitzenstein suggested that Hippolytus was confused here and stated the Naassene position incorrectly. In Reitzenstein's view, the ψυχὴ is actually to be understood as the heavenly Man who is bound to the earthly Adam and thus enslaved.¹¹³ This interpretation would presuppose a dichotomy in the passage of body and soul.¹¹⁴ But since a trichotomous anthropology is explicitly attributed to the Naassenes elsewhere, it seems best to assume that the passage is incomplete,¹¹⁵ in that it omits any specific mention of the heavenly πνεῦμα or νοῦς. The relation of the πλάσμα to the heavenly Man is simply expressed through the word εἰκῶν (7.6). The ψυχὴ, therefore, is one of three aspects of man and is evaluated negatively.

This is consistent with what Hippolytus says elsewhere (Ref. 5.6.6):

They [the Naassenes] divide him [i.e. Man] as Geryon¹¹⁶ into three parts. There are, of this Man, the intelligent (τὸ νοερόν), the psychic (τὸ ψυχικόν), and the earthy (τὸ χοϊκόν), and they think that the knowledge of him is the beginning of the ability to know God¹¹⁷

In a passage from the commentary on the Attis-hymn (Ref. 5.8.1-5) it is stated that all of reality including man is three-fold: heavenly above, mortal below, and the middle sphere of mixture and potentiality. Note especially the exegesis of the mysterious words, Καυλακαῦ, Σαυλασαῦ, and Ζηησάρ, (8.4):¹¹⁸

Kaulakau is the name of the one above, *Adamas*, *Saulasau* of the mortal below, *Zeesar* of the upward flowing Jordan. This is the male-female man in all, whom the ignorant call three-bodied Geryon, as though Geryon meant 'flowing from the earth.' The Greeks commonly call him 'heavenly horn of the moon'¹¹⁹ because he has mixed and blended all things with all

Compare also the opening lines of the Naassene "Hymn of the Soul" (10.2):

Νόμος ἦν γενικὸς τοῦ παντός ὁ πρωτότοκος νόος·
ὁ δὲ δεῦτερος ἦν τοῦ πρωτότοκου τὸ χυθὲν χάος.
τριτάτη ψυχὴ δ' † ¹²⁰ ἔλαβεν ἐργαζομένην νόμον, . . .

In spite of the unfortunate state of the text one can still discern a doctrine of three principles: νοῦς (= νοερός); χάος (= χοϊκός, cf. χυθὲν) and ψυχὴ (= ψυχικός). The soul is representative of man in his unredeemed state, caught and enmired in the world of chaotic materiality. Potentially salvable it languishes in the sphere of death and evil until it is redeemed by *gnosis*. In the "Hymn of the Soul" the Redeemer is Jesus. Surveying the plight of the soul Jesus says,

"Look, Father, a prey of evils upon the earth she wanders, away from your breath (ἀπὸ σῆς πνοῆς) she seeks to flee the bitter chaos, and knows not how to traverse it. Therefore send me, Father; I will descend . . . and deliver, under the name of *gnosis*, the hidden mysteries of the sacred way" (10.2).

The term ψυχικός occurs for the first time in the Naassene commentary (at 8.26) in a quotation from 1 Corinthians 2.14; the term is used to describe those without the experience of salvation (*gnosis*, "rebirth," etc.). Thus the term is compatible with the understanding of the word ψυχὴ which we have encountered in the system as a whole, and confirms the interpretation advanced for ψυχὴ above (7.7). The term ψυχικός occurs again (8.34) in reference to the non-gnostic, unredeemed Phrygians who do not understand the true meaning of their own hymn to Attis!¹²¹

The term πνευματικός occurs for the first time in the

Naassene commentary (at 7.40) in the context of an appropriation of John 3.5 f. and a discussion of "birth from above." The term is used consistently throughout the rest of the commentary¹²² to refer to those who have been redeemed, who have experienced ἀναγέννησις, and the Gospel of John is frequently quoted in these contexts. According to the Naassene system one *becomes* πνευματικός by the reception of *gnosis*. The Naassene teaching does not provide for a class of men who are πνευματικοί and "saved by nature" as is the case with the Valentinians.¹²³

In summary: a traditional exegesis of Genesis 2.7 (and 1.26 f.) occurs at the beginning of the Naassene commentary preserved by Hippolytus. Though nothing is said there explicitly of man's πνεῦμα, the ψυχή is treated negatively, and throughout the system the ψυχή is symbolic of man's helplessness apart from heavenly redemption. The term ψυχικός--which actually occurs first in a quotation from Paul--denotes man in his helpless condition, only potentially salvable. The term χοϊκός is used characteristically to denote the earthly and bodily nature of man. The term πνευματικός is used to denote redeemed man, man as having achieved "rebirth"; its usage is conditioned by the use and interpretation of the Gospel of John as well as selected quotations from Paul.

M. Justin, *Baruch*

In a gnostic system described by Hippolytus¹²⁴ and ostensibly derived from a book entitled *Baruch* by a gnostic called "Justin,"¹²⁵ there occurs the following exegesis of Genesis 2.7 (Ref. 5.26.7 f.):

When Paradise had come into being¹²⁶ from the mutual satisfaction of Elohim and Eden, the angels of Elohim took of the most beautiful earth--i.e. not from the beastly (θηριωδῶν) portions of Eden but from the upper (lit. "above the groin," ὑπὲρ βουβῶνα) anthropoid and cultivated regions of earth--and made man.¹²⁷ From the beastly portions the wild beasts and other living creatures derived their origin. Man, therefore, they made as a symbol of their unity and love, and deposited in him their own powers, Eden the soul and Elohim the spirit (Ἐδὲμ μὲν τὴν ψυχὴν, Ἐλωεὶμ δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα). Thus man, Adam, became as it were a seal and memorial of their love and an eternal symbol of the marriage of Eden and Elohim.

In the passage following Eve is created similarly, and both Adam and Eve are given a command to "increase and multiply" (Gen. 1.28). In the passage just quoted the most important of several traditional Jewish interpretations are the creation of Adam's body by the angels (though here without explicit reference to Genesis 1.26 f.) and the Hellenistic-Jewish distinction

between man's πνεῦμα and his ψυχή.

In the system as a whole three first-principles are posited: the Good, the Father Elohim, and the female Eden.¹²⁸ The sexually-oriented nature of the system can be seen among other things in the identification of the Good with Priapus (26.32 f.)! Elohim is the second male principle, the father of all things begotten (26.1); and Eden is the female principle, a personification of Earth (cf. γῆ γὰρ οὖσα, 26.14). Scholem is probably correct in seeing in the name "Eden" ('Εδέμ as in the LXX) a fusion with Hebrew 'adamah.¹²⁹ Creation is a result of the sexual union between Elohim and Eden. Man derives his πνεῦμα from Elohim and his ψυχή from Eden. This means that the psychic nature is earthly, derived from earth, and is thus virtually identical with the χοϊκός part of man (χοῦς ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς Gen. 2.7).

The presence of evil in the world is a result of the "repentance" of Elohim. When he ascended to the highest part of heaven to view his creation he discovered that there existed something higher than himself (i.e. the Good), and that he was really not the Lord (26.15).¹³⁰ So he ascended through the gates, leaving Eden behind¹³¹ frustrated, and was seated at the right hand of the Good, having seen "what eye has not seen, nor ear heard, nor has entered the heart of man" (26.16).¹³² Meanwhile Eden, in her rage, torments the spirit of Elohim in man through her angel Naas (26.19-21). As a result,

the soul is set against the spirit, and the spirit against the soul (ἡ ψυχή κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τέταται καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα κατὰ τῆς ψυχῆς, 26.25).¹³³

Elohim counters by sending his own angel Baruch "to help the spirit which is in all men" (26.21). Baruch works through Moses, the prophets, and Heracles, but all of them are seduced by Naas, the angel of Eden--until finally Baruch is sent to Jesus who alone remains faithful to Baruch.

Therefore Naas became angry, because he was unable to seduce him, and he caused him to be crucified.¹³⁴ He, leaving the body of Eden on the cross, ascended to the Good, saying to Eden, "Woman, you have your son" (Jn. 19.26), i.e. the psychic and earthly man (τοῦτέστι τὸν ψυχικὸν ἄνθρωπον καὶ τὸν χοϊκόν). Entrusting his spirit to the hands of his father (cf. Lk. 23.46), he ascended to the Good.

The ψυχικός and χοϊκός nature of man (Jesus, in this passage) are so closely related as to be identical, both deriving from the Earth-figure "Eden." The πνεῦμα, belonging to Elohim, is that which is saved and ultimately ascends to the Good. It is

to be noted that Elohim (not Jesus) is the real prototype of salvation in the system of "Justin."¹³⁵

The πνευματικός-ψυχικός-χοϊκός terminology occurs in one other passage from "Justin" in the context of a description of salvation. The adherents of Justin's congregation are required to swear an oath of secrecy (5.27.2-3):¹³⁶

And this is the oath: "I swear by the one above all things, the Good, to keep these mysteries and to babble them to no one, and not to return from the Good to the creation. When he swears this oath, he enters into the Good and sees "what eye has not seen, nor ear heard, and what has not entered the heart of man," and he drinks of the living water, which is a washing for them (as they think), a bubbling spring of living water (Jn. 4.10,14). For there was a division made between earth and water (cf. Gen. 1.6), and the water below the firmament pertains to the evil creation in which are washed the earthly and psychic men (έν φ̄ λούονται οἱ χοϊκοὶ καὶ ψυχικοὶ ἄνθρωποι), but the living water above the firmament pertains to the Good, in which are washed the pneumatic and living men (έν φ̄ λούονται οἱ πνευματικοὶ καὶ ζῶντες ἄνθρωποι), in which Elohim washed, and having washed did not change his mind.

The πνευματικοὶ and ζῶντες (the terms are used synonymously) are those who have participated in the salvation of Elohim, who have been washed in the "living water" in which Elohim was washed.¹³⁷ The χοϊκοὶ and ψυχικοὶ (again, one can posit a synonymous use) are those not participating in salvation, who belong to the "evil creation" below, the sphere of Eden.¹³⁸

In summary, the πνευματικός-ψυχικός-(χοϊκός) terminology in Justin, *Baruch*, arises out of an exegesis of Genesis 2.7, in which the πνεῦμα contributed by Elohim is sharply distinguished from the earthly ψυχή contributed by Eden (=Earth). The use of this terminology in "Justin" is, in many respects, distinct from that of other gnostic systems, and the exegesis of Genesis 2.7 is handled in a unique manner. The importance of Genesis 2.7 as a focal text for anthropological and theological speculation and the close relation of the technical use of ψυχικός to the exegesis of Genesis 2.7 is thereby impressively underscored.

N. The *Sophia Jesu Christi*

The document entitled *Sophia Jesu Christi* was first published by W. Till in his edition of the *Codex Berolinensis 8502*, of which it forms a part.¹³⁹ Another version has turned up amongst the Chenoboskion texts similar to that of BG. In addition a Greek fragment is known.¹⁴⁰ The essential contents of the *Sophia Jesu Christi* are represented in the *Epistle of Eugnostos*, of which

there are two copies in the Chenoboskion library.¹⁴¹ Indeed, the *Sophia Jesu Christi* is essentially the *Epistle of Eugnostos* cast in the form of a dialogue between Jesus and his disciples.¹⁴² *Sophia Jesu Christi* is thus secondary to the *Epistle of Eugnostos*.¹⁴³ The text of *Sophia Jesu Christi* from Chenoboskion has not as yet been published and the pages with our text are missing anyway;¹⁴⁴ thus we are limited to the text in BG.

In *Sophia Jesu Christi* the term ψυχικός occurs only once (the adjectives πνευματικός and χοϊκός do not occur) in a passage which also involves an exegesis of Genesis 2.7. The passage reads (119.2-121.17):

Out of the Aeon, above the emanation of light which I have mentioned earlier,¹⁴⁵ there came a drop (τᾶψλαε) from the Light and the Spirit down to the parts below, (to the region) of the Almighty of Chaos, in order that it might reveal their¹⁴⁶ formation (ἄνεπλάσμα). From this drop was condemned the Archigenetor, who is usually called Ialdabaoth. This drop revealed their formation (ἄνεπλάσμα) by means of the breath (ζιτῆ πνιγε) as a living soul (εἴψρχη εσονε, Gen. 2.7b). It withered and slumbered because of the oblivion of the soul. As it became warm from the breath of the great Light of the Male, then he (i.e. Ialdabaoth) conceived a thought that all those in the world of chaos and everything in it should be named by that Immortal One (cf. Gen. 2.19 f.), since the breath had been breathed into him. These things, when they happened, (happened) by that will of Sophia in order that the Immortal Man might regulate the garment¹⁴⁷ which was there, since the robbers were condemned. And they greeted the breath (τεπνοη) from this breath (πνιγε). Since he (Adam) was psychic (εἴψρχικος δεπε) he was not able to receive for himself this power until the number of chaos is fulfilled, when its own time has been fulfilled through the great angel. But I have explained to you the Immortal Man, and I have broken the fetters of the robbers from him.

Also compare the statement of the Redeemer in 122.5-123.1:

For this reason I have come to this place, that they might be united with this Spirit and with the breath (μῆ πιπῆνα ετῆματ μῆ πνιγε) and both become a unity as from the beginning, that you might bear rich fruit and ascend to the One who was from the beginning, to the unspeakable joy, glory, honor, and grace of the Father of the All.

The first passage quoted is a very difficult one both to translate and to interpret, partly because there is in *Sophia Jesu Christi* no systematic myth or schema. It reflects a myth, but does not present it systematically.¹⁴⁸ Nevertheless those portions of the text which are of special interest to us are clear enough: the term ψυχικός is based on a particular understanding of the word ψυχή in Genesis 2.7. The ψυχή is the

creative product of the "robber" angels, and that which causes the "drop" from above in the inbreathing (Gen. 2.7b) to slumber and to diminish. The *πνοή* (*νιγε*) is distinguished from the *ψυχή*, and in 122.8 ff. is brought into conjunction with the term *πνεῦμα*. The awakening of the immortal element in man is connected with the coming and revelation of the Redeemer (Jesus Christ, 77.8 *et passim*). The work of the Redeemer is similarly described in 104.8-17:

But I have come from the place above, according to the will of the great Light. I liberated the creation; I broke the handiwork of the robber-grave. I awakened him, i.e. that drop which was sent from the Sophia, so that he might through me bear rich fruit

What is reflected in all of these passages is a system similar to that of the *Apocryphon of John*,¹⁴⁹ but somewhat more Christianized in that Jesus Christ plays a more crucial role.

One item of peculiarity is the use of the word "drop" (*τῶν λε* = Gr. *ὄανις*)¹⁵⁰ as a key term to describe the heavenly part of man, though here in connection with the *πνοή* of Genesis 2.7. The term *ὄανις* or *τῶν λε* is not a common one in gnostic texts.¹⁵¹ Since *ὄανις* can be understood as a synonym for *σπέρμα*,¹⁵² one can conjecture that *τῶν λε* carries a meaning and provenance similar to that of *σπέρμα* in other gnostic texts.¹⁵³

One further observation: In *Sophia Jesu Christi* the gnostics are not referred to as *πνευματικοί*, but as a "kingless generation," a designation that appears in a number of gnostic texts and systems.¹⁵⁴

O. The *Hypostasis of the Archons*

The document entitled *Hypostasis of the Archons*¹⁵⁵ from Codex II of the Chenoboskion library represents a gnostic system somewhat akin to that of the *Apocryphon of John*. It opens with a reference to "the great apostle Paul" and a quotation from Ephesians 6.12! The intent of the document is to describe the nature and function of these *πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας*, referred to in the treatise itself variously as *ἐξουσίαι* and *ἄρχοντες*.¹⁵⁶ Their chief, Samael, is blind and foolish because he thought that he was the only God (134.27-135.1),¹⁵⁷ a notion which is rebuked by a voice from above (135.1 ff.).¹⁵⁸

The *πνευματικῶς-ψυχικῶς-χοϊκῶς* terminology occurs in the following passage containing speculations on Genesis 2.7 (135.11-136.16):

Imperishability¹⁵⁹ looked down upon the regions of the waters. Its image appeared in the waters and the Powers

of Darkness loved it. But they were not able to grasp that image which had appeared to them in the waters because of their weakness, for the psychics (ψυχικός) will not be able to grasp the Spiritual One (πνευματικός),¹⁶⁰ for they are from below, but He is from above. For this reason Imperishability looked down upon the regions, in order that by the will of the Father it might unite the All with the Light. The Archons took counsel and said, "Come, let us create a man of dust from the earth." They formed [their man]¹⁶¹ as a completely earthly being. But the [body] which the Archons have is neither female nor [male]; their faces are those of beasts.¹⁶² They took [dust] from the earth and formed [their man] according to their body and [according to the image] of God which appeared [to them] in the waters. They said, ["Come, let us] grasp it with our creature (πλάσμα) [in order that]¹⁶³ it might see its fellow-[image . . . and that] we might lay hold of it with our creature (πλάσμα)," not perceiving the power of God on account of their weakness. And he breathed into his face, and the man became psychic upon the earth (αγνιζε εροτην εμ πεγρο αρω απρωμε ωωπε ψυχικός εμ πκαρ) for many days. Now they were unable to raise him on account of their weakness; they persisted, like the whirlwinds, in their attempt to snare that image which had appeared to them in the waters, but they did not know what its power was. But all these things took place by the will of the Father of the All. After this the Spirit saw the psychic man upon the earth, and the Spirit came forth from the adamantine earth. It came down and dwelt within him, and that man became a living soul (απρωμε ετμματ ωωπε αρωτηχη [ε]conr).

Some problems of this passage are very likely due to the fact that it presents a highly developed myth in which various items already traditional in gnostic systems are put together somewhat illogically. This is the case, especially with the interpretation of Genesis 2.7b. At 136.3 f. the inbreathing of the archon (Samael) is connected with man's psychic nature, a nature which is similar to that of the archons themselves, who are "psychic."¹⁶⁴ The term ψυχικός here--and throughout the passage --is derived from the word ψυχή in Genesis 2.7. Nevertheless at 136.11-16 the same text, Genesis 2.7b, is connected with the reception by Adam of the πνεῦμα, reflecting a previous tradition wherein the πνεῦμα was identified with the πνοή of Genesis 2.7, and sharply distinguished from the ψυχή.¹⁶⁵ The πνεῦμα is almost personified,¹⁶⁶ and is to be understood as equivalent to the εἰκὼν of the "incorruptibility" which was reflected in the waters (cf. πνεῦμα in Gen. 1.2). It performs in *Hypostasis of the Archons* the same function as Sophia in the *Apocryphon of John*. Indeed, it is clear that the εἰκὼν-πνεῦμα is a female entity.¹⁶⁷ This can be seen from the erotic motif that is found at 135.14,

and from the fact that she is identified with the "spiritual woman" at 137.11.¹⁶⁸

The term ψυχικός is used again at 137.10 f. The archons have plotted together: "Come let us bring a sleep of forgetfulness over Adam" (cf. Gen. 2.21). While Adam sleeps his sleep of forgetfulness, defined further as "ignorance" (137.6), the archons reveal his rib as a "living woman" (ΖΩΜΕ ΕΧΟΝΤΕ 137.9; cf. Gen. 2.21 f.), and close up Adam's flesh. "And Adam became completely psychic" (ΑΘΩ ΑΔΑΜ ΩΩΠΕ ΜΨΥΧΙΚΟΣ ΤΗΡῆ , 137.10 f.). I.e. his "spiritual" essence has been withdrawn by the creation of Eve from his rib! But once again his πνεῦμα is restored, when the "spiritual woman" (ΤΖΩΜΕ ΜΠΝΕΪΜΑΤΙΚΗ) comes to Adam and says, "Get up, Adam!" Adam replies, "You are the one who has given me the life; you shall be called the 'Mother of the Living'" (137.14 f.; cf. Gen. 2.23 and 3.20).

This myth is actually framed in such a manner that--though based on other texts from Genesis as well--it becomes an exegetical comment on Genesis 2.7, i.e. on how man has derived his spiritual nature. Once the πνεῦμα, standing over against the ψυχή created by the archons, has been identified with the female figure of Wisdom (the Mother) as a spiritual projection of Eve, the handling of these texts in such a manner becomes understandable.

The text continues to comment upon further passages from the opening chapters of Genesis, but for our purposes it suffices to say, in summary, that the use of the terms πνευματικός and (particularly) ψυχικός in *Hypostasis of the Archons* occurs in the vicinity of the document's exegetical comment upon the text of Genesis 2.7. Traditional exegesis of Genesis 2.7 has, however, been overlaid with new interpretations peculiar to this document.

P. The Untitled Text, Codex II

The so-called *Untitled Text* from Chenoboskion¹⁶⁹ is in many respects a companion document to *Hypostasis of the Archons*, and there are many parallel passages between them. But the *Untitled Text* is a much further developed--and much less unified¹⁷⁰--document than *Hypostasis of the Archons*, and is probably quite late (mid-third century?).

The passage which reflects an exegesis of Genesis 2.7 is 162.29-164.8:¹⁷¹

From that day on the seven archons fashioned (ῥπλασσε) the man; his body was like their body, but his appearance was like the Man which had been revealed to them.¹⁷² His

formation (πεγπλάσμα) was accomplished partially by each of them, but their chief created the brain and the marrow. Then he made his appearance, as <the one> before him; he became a psychic man (αψωωπε νοθρωμε μψυχικος) and was called Adam, i.e. "the Father," according to the name of the one before him (162.29-163.3).

There are numerous points of contact with other gnostic systems treated above; the only new item is the spurious explanation of the name "Adam." The text of Genesis 2.7 is in the background: ῥπλασσε reflecting ἐπλασεν and αψωωπε νοθρωμε μψυχικος reflecting ἐγένετο (ὁ) ἄνθρωπος εἰς ψυχήν But the distinction between the πνοή/πνεῦμα and the ψυχή has become obscured, as is evident from what follows (163.3-164.8):

When they had finished Adam, they put him in a vessel, for he had been formed like these abortions,¹⁷³ having no spirit (πνεῦμα) in him. For that reason the chief archon was afraid, as he thought about the word of Pistis,¹⁷⁴ lest the true (Man) come to his creature (πεγπλάσμα) and rule over him. Therefore he left his creature (πεγπλάσμα) forty days without soul (χωρίς ψυχή), departed and left him. But during these forty days Sophia-Zoe sent her breath to Adam (ατσοφια ἠζωη τῆνοοθ μπεσνιγε εζοθν ααδαμ, cf. Gen. 2.7), in whom was no soul. He began to move on the ground, but was unable to get up. When the seven archons came and saw him, they were very disturbed. They came to him, grasped him, and said to the breath (ἄπνιγε) that was in him, "Who are you? And whence have you come to this place?" He answered and said, "I come from the power of the Man for the purpose of destroying your work." When they heard that, they gave glory to him because he had given them rest from their fear and anxiety. Then they called that day "the Rest" (ταναπαθσις), for they had rested from their trouble.¹⁷⁵ When they saw that Adam could not get up, they were glad. They took him and placed him in Paradise (Gen. 2.15); and returned to their heaven. After the day of rest Sophia sent Zoe, her daughter, who was called Eve (cf. Gen. 3.20 Ζωή; 4.1 Ἔβα) as instructor (ρεγαμο)¹⁷⁶ to raise up Adam, in whom there was no soul (ψυχή), so that those whom he would beget might become a vessel of light. When Eve saw her fellow-image lying prostrate, she had compassion for him, and said, "Adam, live! Get up off the ground!" Immediately her word became a deed. For Adam stood up, he straightway opened his eyes. And when he saw her, he said, "You shall be called 'the Mother of the living' (cf. Gen. 3.20) because you have given me life."

Here the πνεῦμα and the ψυχή are equated. The surprising thing is that when Sophia-Zoe comes and gives her breath (νιγε = πνοή) to Adam--an idea which reflects Genesis 2.7b--he still remains "without soul," unable to raise himself up from the ground,¹⁷⁷ and that in spite of the fact that the "breath" comes from the *dynamis* above.¹⁷⁸

The passage is understandable only on the basis of the par-

allel passage in *Hypostasis of the Archons* wherein Adam is enlivened ultimately by the coming of the "spiritual woman." It is, indeed, a fanciful enlargement of the tradition which occurs in *Hypostasis of the Archons*. The personified πνεῦμα of *Hypostasis of the Archons*, there equated with Sophia, is split into two in the *Untitled Text*. Sophia-Zoe, already a spiritual projection of Eve, and Zoe-Eve, the "daughter" of Sophia, are thus differentiated. As in *Hypostasis of the Archons*, the first inbreathing of Genesis 2.7 is ineffectual, and it is only when Zoe-Eve comes to Adam and commands him to get up that he is able to arise and recognize that he has received life.

In short, older traditions of interpretation are here included, but are to some extent no longer functioning in their original meanings, because of newer interpretations and re-mythifications.

The πνευματικός-ψυχικός-χοϊκός terminology occurs in two other passages. In 165.28-166.6 three Adams are mentioned; and in 170.6-33 "three men and their generations," pneumatic, psychic, and earthly, are compared to "the three phoenixes of Paradise." But the only passage which really deals with the gnostic group out of which the document as a whole arises, i.e. the "blessed ones" who possess *gnosis* (172.11 f.), sets this class over against the three classes of men mentioned before. The passage (172.30-173.14) reads as follows:

They have found that they each have a seed over against the seed of the powers which as been mixed with it.¹⁷⁹ For the Savior¹⁸⁰ has formed each one individually in all of them, and their spirits are manifested as elect and blessed, and they are distinct according to the elections, along with many others who are without a king, superior to everyone before. So there are four classes. Three belong to the kings of the Ogdoad. But the fourth class is a perfect, kingless one which is higher than all of them. For these will enter into the holy place of their Father and will come to rest in rest, in eternal inexpressible glory and in imperishable joy. They are the kings, immortal though in mortality. They shall condemn the gods of chaos and their powers.

The three Adams and the three generations have given way to a new γένος, not πνευματικόν, ψυχικόν, or χοϊκόν, but άβασίλευτον.¹⁸¹ One terminology has been discarded for another, and that in a way which suggests a polemic against Gnostics who use the other terminology. Is the *Untitled Text*, i.e., its latest redaction, a witness to a rivalry between gnostic sects, those represented in this writing (who are they?) and . . . the valentinians?¹⁸²

Q. The Valentinian Literature

For the Valentinians the classification of mankind into the three categories, πνευματικοί, ψυχικοί, and χοϊκοί (ὕλικοί), lay at the very base of their theology, "indispensable à l'intelligence de la gnose valentinienne."¹⁸³ This classification undoubtedly goes back to Valentinus himself, for Valentinus is said to have written a treatise περὶ τῶν τριῶν φύσεων.¹⁸⁴

A complete description here of the Valentinian anthropology is not possible, nor is it needed, since much has been written on Valentinianism. What I shall do, therefore, is discuss how the πνευματικός-ψυχικός-χοϊκός terminology is related to the Valentinian exegesis of Genesis 2.7.¹⁸⁵ In this area, I believe, new ground can be broken.

I begin with a passage from the Valentinian myth as preserved by Irenaeus,¹⁸⁶ with which I shall compare a parallel passage from the *Excerpta ex Theodoto*.¹⁸⁷ Much of this material (though how much, it is impossible to say) goes back to Valentinus himself.¹⁸⁸ I have already treated a fragment of Valentinus which contained speculation on Genesis 2.7, and which was seen to reflect earlier gnostic tradition.¹⁸⁹

It is universally recognized that the Valentinian myth is based essentially on an older gnostic myth resembling that of the *Apocryphon of John*.¹⁹⁰ What is presented by Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria (*Exc. Th.*), and even Hippolytus, is a more highly developed system, Christianized, and reflecting the philosophical milieu of the Hellenistic world, particularly Alexandria.¹⁹¹

I quote first from Irenaeus. In the preceding context (1.5.4) it is stated that the Demiurge performed his creative work in the mistaken idea that he was the only god, saying "through the prophets": ἐγὼ θεός, πλὴν ἐμοῦ οὐδεὶς (Is. 45.5; 46.9). This is, of course, a traditional feature, belonging to a pre-Valentinian stage in the myth.¹⁹² The text follows (1.5.5-6):¹⁹³

5. When he had fashioned the world, he made the earthly (χοϊκόν) man also, not from this dry earth, but from the invisible substance, taking from the liquid and fluid (part) of matter. And into him he breathed the psychic man (καὶ εἰς τοῦτον ἐμφυσῆσαι τὸν ψυχικόν). And this is the one who was made 'according to the image and likeness' (Gen. 1.26); 'according to the image' is the hylic, similar to, but not of the same substance (ὁμοούσιον) as God; but 'according to the likeness' is the psychic, whence also his substance is called πνεῦμα ζωῆς, since it is from a pneumatic emanation. Afterward he clothed him with the coat of skin (cf. Gen.

3.21); this is the flesh of sense-perception.

6. The embryo of their mother Achamoth which she had conceived according to the vision of the angels around the Savior, being pneumatic of the same substance as the Mother (ὁμοούσιον ὑπάρχον τῇ Μητρὶ πνευματικόν) the Demiurge did not know, and it was secretly put into him (i.e. Adam) without his knowledge, in order that through him it might be sown into the soul from him and into the hylic body, and growing and increasing in them it might be ready for the reception of the perfect Logos. The Demiurge was unaware of the pneumatic man which was sown with his inbreathing by Sophia with ineffable power and foreknowledge. As he was ignorant of the Mother, so also is he ignorant of her seed, which is the Ecclesia, corresponding to the Ecclesia above . . . So they have the soul from the Demiurge, the body from the earth (ἀπὸ τοῦ χόσ), the flesh from matter, but the pneumatic man from the Mother Achamoth.

Parallel to this is the account in *Excerpta ex Theodoto* 50. 1-55.1, although it is broken up with further comment on the basis of sayings of the Savior and quotations from Paul. I present only the material parallel to the passage quoted above:¹⁹⁴

50.1-3. 'Taking dust from the earth'--not from the dry ground, but a part of the manifold and complex matter--he created an earthly and hylic soul, irrational and of the same substance with that of the beasts. This is the man 'according to the image' (Gen. 1.26). But the man 'according to the likeness,' the likeness of the Demiurge himself, is that one which he has breathed and sowed into the former, having placed into him something of the same substance with the help of the angels. As he is invisible and incorporeal he called his substance πνοή ζωσα. As something formed (μορφωθέν) it became a ψυχή ζωσα. This he says himself in the prophetic scriptures.

53.2-5. Adam had, unbeknownst to him, the pneumatic seed sown by Sophia into the soul For as the Demiurge, who is moved by Sophia without his knowledge, thinks that he is self-moving, similarly also men. Therefore Sophia first put forth the pneumatic seed which is in Adam, in order that it might be 'the bone' (τὸ ὀστούον, Gen. 2.23),¹⁹⁵ the rational and heavenly soul, not empty, but full of pneumatic marrow.

55.1. Upon Adam, over the three incorporeal elements, was put on a fourth, the earthly (ὁ χοϊκός), as the 'garments of skins' (Gen. 3.21).¹⁹⁶

A third version is preserved by Hippolytus, representing a separate stream of the Valentinian system (*Ref.* 6.34.4-6):¹⁹⁷

From the hylic and diabolical substance the Demiurge made the bodies for the souls. This is what is said, "and God fashioned the man, taking dust from the earth, and breathed into his face the breath of life; and the man became a living soul" (Gen. 2.7). This is the inner man, the psychic dwelling in the hylic body, which is hylic, perishable, completely fashioned out of diabolical substance (ἐκ τῆς διαβολικῆς οὐσίας πεπλασμένος).

This hylic man is like an inn or dwelling, sometimes of the soul alone, sometimes of the soul and demons, sometimes of the soul and *logoi*¹⁹⁸ which are the *logoi* sown from above (ἀνωθεν κατεσπαρμένοι) into this world from Karpos, unity of the Pleroma and Sophia, dwelling in the earthly body (ἐν σώματι χοϊκῷ) with the soul, whenever the demons are not dwelling with the soul.¹⁹⁹

The terminology used in the Valentinian versions of the myth is heavily overlaid with the jargon of Hellenistic philosophy (mainly Middle-Platonic), and is considerably influenced by Plato's *Timaeus* and contemporary speculation thereon.²⁰⁰ In addition to such obvious terms as Δημιουργός, ὕλη, etc., note the following examples:

Adv. Haer. 1.5.5: ἀπὸ τῆς ἀοράτου οὐσίας. Cf. Plato, *Timaeus* 51A on the ὑποδοχή of the generated world as ἀνόρατον εἶδος τι καὶ ἄμορφον.²⁰¹

Adv. Haer.: ἀπὸ τοῦ κεχυμένου²⁰² καὶ ῥευστοῦ τῆς ὕλης. Cf. Damascius on Archytas, Diels-Kranz, *Vorsokratiker*, I, 425, 1,18 f.: Ἀριστοτέλης δὲ ἐν τοῖς Ἀρχυτείοις ἱστορεῖ καὶ Πυθαγόραν ἄλλο τὴν ὕλην καλεῖν ὡς ῥευστὴν καὶ ἀεὶ ἄλλο <καὶ ἄλλο> γιγνόμενον. Sextus Pyrrhus on Protagoras, Diels-Kranz, *Vorsokratiker*, II, 258: φησὶν οὖν ὁ ἀνὴρ τὴν ὕλην ῥευστὴν εἶναι. Also Numenius, Fr. 30, from Chalcidius in *Timaeum*, Leemans (ed.), p. 92, 1.18 f.: *Igitur Pythagoras quoque, inquit, fluidam et sine qualitate silvam esse censet . . .*

Exc. Theod. 50.1: ἀλλὰ τῆς πολυμεροῦς καὶ ποικίλης ὕλης μέρος. Cf. Plato, *Timaeus* 50D: ποικίλου πάσας ποικιλίας. Cf. also the *Chaldaean Oracles*, Kröll (ed.), p.20: πολυποικίλου ὕλης.²⁰³

Exc. Theod. 53.4: κινούμενος . . . αὐτοκίνητος. Cf. Aristotle, *Physics* 258a and his discussion whether the first cause can be κινούμενος or even αὐτοκίνητος. (He rejects both in favor of the ἀκίνητος Mover).

Exc. Theod. 50.1; 53.5: ψυχὴν . . . ἄλογον; ἢ λογικὴ . . . ψυχὴ. Cf. Numenius, Fr. 36, Leemans (ed.), p. 98, 124 f.: δύο ψυχᾶς . . . τὴν μὲν λογικὴν, τὴν δὲ ἄλογον.

Exc. Theod. 53.5: ἀλλὰ μυελοῦ γέμουσα πνευματικοῦ. Cf. Plato, *Timaeus* 73BC on μυελός and its relation to θεῖον σπέρμα.

Hipp. Ref. 6.34.4: ἐκ τῆς ὕλικῆς οὐσίας. Cf. Galen *peri plēthous* 3, von Arnim *SVF* II, 144, 1.25-27: ὡς οἱ Στωϊκοί, τὸ μὲν συνεχόμενον δὲ ἄλλο· τὴν μὲν γὰρ πνευματικὴν οὐσίαν τὸ συνέχον, τὴν δὲ ὕλικὴν τὸ συνεχόμενον.

Beneath the philosophical dilettantism displayed in these passages, all three of them are based ultimately on the same

mythopoeic interpretation of Genesis 2.7 familiar to us from the *Apocryphon of John* and other gnostic texts. The Demiurge (= Ialdabaoth) with his angels fashions a man from the dust of the ground. Sophia works secretly through the Demiurge to get him to breathe into the man the substance from above. This he does unbeknownst to himself, in addition to the inbreathing of the "psychic" substance proper to his own existence. Thus man has within himself a "spiritual seed," a "spiritual emanation,"²⁰⁴ and is to that extent greater than the Creator. The "inbreathing" of Genesis 2.7 bears a double function: it is the means by which the Demiurge endows man with his ψυχικός existence (ψυχή), and it is the means whereby Sophia endows man with his πνευματικός existence (πνεῦμα). It is the πνευματικὴ ἀπόρροια "sown along with" the Demiurge's ἐμφύσημα.²⁰⁵

One new feature in the Valentinian material is the use of the term σπέρμα, and the verbs σπεύρω, ἐνσπεύρω, κατασπεύρω, etc. This terminology arises in the context of the Valentinian exegesis of Genesis 2.7, in conjunction with the ἐμφύσημα,²⁰⁶ but one must look outside the book of Genesis for its origin.

Here again the influence of Plato's *Timaeus* comes to the fore. For in the *Timaeus* (especially in 41CD) it is stated that the Demiurge sowed the immortal part of man's soul as a seed, which was then encapsulated by the gods to whom he delegated the work of creating the mortal part of man. Of course the Valentinians "correct" Plato's account--as they do the Genesis account--by denying to the Demiurge the role of providing man with the immortal seed. This function is reserved for Sophia, and in this the Valentinians follow the older gnostic myth. The introduction of the σπέρμα terminology is Valentinian, and based on the *Timaeus*.

It should also be remarked that all three aspects of man's existence, πνευματικός, ψυχικός, and χοϊκός are in reality understood as incorporeal elements of man's inner being (see especially *Exc. Th.* 50.3). The body is a fourth entity housing the tripartite soul; this is clear from *Exc. Th.* 55.1 and the exegesis of Genesis 3.21.²⁰⁷

It remains to inquire how it is that the Valentinians divide all of mankind into three different classes, since in the myth thus far it is clear that all three aspects of human existence reside in one man. The answer is that only Adam represents in himself all three levels of existence, but the three sons of Adam represent the three types of men subsequently to be born:

From Adam three natures were begotten (τρεις φύσεις γεννῶνται); the first was the irrational (ἄλογος = χοϊκός, ὕλικός), represented by Cain; the second was the rational and righteous (λογικὴ καὶ ἡ δικαία),²⁰⁸ represented by Abel; and the third was the pneumatic, represented by Seth (*Exc. Th.* 54.1).²⁰⁹

As a result men are referred to as οἱ πνευματικοί (*Iren. Adv. Haer.* 1.6.1 *et passim*), οἱ ψυχικοί (*Adv. Haer.* 1.6.2 *et passim*), and οἱ χοϊκοί (*Adv. Haer.* 1.8.3), or ὕλικοι (*Exc. Th.* 56.2; *Adv. Haer.* 1.5.1; *EV* 31.4).²¹⁰ The use of the term ὕλικός as a synonym for χοϊκός reflects a philosophical usage.²¹¹

According to the Valentinians most men are "hylic"; less are "psychic"; and only a few are "pneumatic" (*Exc. Th.* 56.2). The "pneumatics" are "saved by nature" (φύσει σωζόμενοι, *Exc. Th.* 56.3; *Adv. Haer.* 1.6.2).²¹² The "hylics" cannot be saved at all; they "perish by nature" (φύσει ἀπόλλυται, *Exc. Th.* 56.3), for τὸ χοϊκὸν ἀδύνατον σωτηρίας (*Adv. Haer.* 1.6.2). The "psychics" occupy a position midway between the "pneumatics" and the "hylics," and can extend in either direction--toward salvation or destruction--according to their will and inclination. In order to be saved they require "faith" and "righteousness" (*Adv. Haer.* 1.6.2).²¹³

The three classes of men also receive other designations in Valentinian literature. The "pneumatics" are referred to as the ἐκλεκτοί (*Exc. Th.* 1.2; 39 etc.) and the ἐκλογή (*Exc. Th.* 21.1; Heracleon Fr. 37). The ψυχικοί are called the κλητοί (*Exc. Th.* 39) and the κλησις (*Exc. Th.* 21.1; Heracleon Fr. 13 and 27). This terminology reflects what appears to be an exegesis of Matthew 22.14.²¹⁴ Herein is a clue to the rigid system of classification employed by the Valentinians: it is a Jewish-apocalyptic doctrine of predestination understood in categories of φύσις and οὐσία!

The ultimate origin of the πνευματικός-ψυχικός-χοϊκός terminology in Valentinian gnosticism is, as we have seen, a particular understanding of Genesis 2.7, already existing before the Valentinian system. This terminology the Valentinians took over and expanded, so that it is difficult to place one's finger on the locus of this terminology in the Valentinian system as a whole, unless one has studied its pre-history in the context of exegesis of Genesis 2.7.

Indeed, the Valentinians themselves probably forgot the ultimate source of their terminology. At one point, at any rate, they attribute it to Paul:

And Paul very clearly spoke of the "choics," "psychics," and "pneumatics," when he said, οἶος ὁ χοϊκός, τοιοῦτοι καὶ οἱ χοϊκοί, and where he said, ψυχικὸς δὲ ἄνθρωπος οὐ δέχεται τὰ τοῦ πνεύματος, and where he said, πνευματικὸς ἀνακρίνει τὰ πάντα (Iren. *Adv. Haer.* 1.8.3).²¹⁵

This brings us full circle, back to the usage of the Corinthian opponents and the appropriation of their terminology by Paul. In the concluding chapter we shall delineate the points of continuity--and discontinuity--between the theology and anthropology of the Corinthian opponents of Paul and the speculations of the various gnostic groups treated in this chapter.

CHAPTER SEVEN: CONCLUSIONS AND RAMIFICATIONS

Is there any continuity between the use of the πνευματικός-ψυχικός terminology on the part of Paul's Corinthian opponents and the use of the same terminology by the various gnostic groups studied in the previous chapter? Can the opponents of Paul be described as "Gnostics" on the basis of their use of this terminology? The first question must receive a positive answer. There is, indeed, such a continuity. But it remains to define with precision what that continuity is.

It has been established above that the πνευματικός-ψυχικός terminology arises in the context of a Hellenistic-Jewish exegesis of Genesis 2.7, and that the use of the terminology by the Corinthian opponents must be understood against that religious-historical background. One can perhaps term that sphere of ideas "Hellenistic-Jewish wisdom speculation" or "Hellenistic-Jewish speculative mysticism."¹ Basic to this wisdom theology, or "speculative mysticism," is the sharp distinction between the higher, heavenly realm and the earthly realm, between the higher πνεῦμα or πνευματικός nature of man, and his lower ψυχή or ψυχικός nature. A similar dualism occurs in Gnosticism and is similarly tied to an exegesis of Genesis 2.7, a crucial text, as we have seen, for gnostic speculation. To that extent the Gnostics--at least those who use the πνευματικός-ψυχικός terminology--and the Corinthian opponents of Paul are on common ground, since they share not only a common terminology, a common scripture-text, but also a common dualism. As we have seen, Paul can accommodate himself to the terminology of his Corinthian opponents, though he re-interprets it in categories derived from a Jewish-apocalyptic background and from primitive-Christian eschatology.

But to the second question posed above, whether the Corinthian opponents--and Paul himself, for he uses their terminology--can be characterized as "Gnostics," a negative answer must be given. It is at this point that more precision is required than has usually been the case heretofore. It has already been shown above that the πνεῦμα-ψυχή differentiation is basically a Jewish version of the νοῦς-ψυχή differentiation of common Hellenistic parlance. Indeed, there is a sense in which "Hellenistic-Jewish speculative mysticism," including the anthropological speculations of the Corinthian opponents of Paul, can be said to belong to the mainstream of what has been called "the spirit of late anti-

quity."² It is indeed a Jewish by-product of, and dialogue with, the dominant world-view of late antiquity, a world-view characterized by a marked pessimism vis-à-vis earthly existence and a longing for the purer etherial regions of pure spirit above.³ The point at issue, therefore, revolves around the definition of "Gnosticism." In my opinion to define "Gnosticism" as "the spirit of late antiquity" is not to define it at all.

Now in spite of the continuities noted between the speculations of the Corinthian opponents of Paul and the various gnostic groups treated in the previous chapter, the differences between them are so marked as to be decisive. For inasmuch as the Gnostics separate the πνευματικός nature of man from the realm of God's activity as Creator, inasmuch as they posit man's ψυχικός or χοϊκός nature as the product of an inferior or fallen being working in defiance of, or in ignorance of, the highest Deity, the continuity between the Corinthian opponents of Paul and the Gnostics has been broken. [The speculations of the opponents of Paul in Corinth cannot successfully be placed in the same category as those treated in Chapter Six.] In fine, the Corinthian opponents of Paul were not "Gnostics."⁴

What, then, is "Gnosticism"? Indeed, I believe this investigation has contributed to a better understanding of what "Gnosticism" is, in that it has corroborated what was set forth as a tentative definition in Chapter One. Especially to the point were the remarks by Hans Jonas quoted there⁵ concerning the *derivative* character of gnostic mythology. This has been everywhere the case in our study of the gnostic exegesis of Genesis 2.7. Older traditions of exegesis--and an older terminology--have been taken over and re-interpreted to express something radically new and different, something which goes beyond the "spirit of late antiquity." For what is expressed in Gnosticism is not only a pessimism vis-à-vis the world, but a positive revulsion of, and hostility against, the world and its fallen creator(s). Concomitantly there is expressed in Gnosticism a defiant exaltation of man's ego to the status of godhead. The world and earthly existence is viewed as the product of a tragic fall within the Deity, and salvation consists in a reversal of this fall, the restoration of man's ego to the divine fulness whence it emanated. And this salvation is accomplished through *gnosis*.

As has been observed, this *gnosis* takes on multifarious forms, so that one cannot in any sense define what is "gnostic"

simply on the basis of mythological motifs or terminologies. Gnosticism involves, therefore, a "new hermeneutic," a new way of looking at older traditions and older mythologies. The essence of this "new hermeneutic" is *revolt*.⁶

What, precisely, is Gnosticism in revolt against? It is becoming more and more clear that the revolt is basically and primitively against *Judaism*.⁷ And it is this insight, in my opinion, that offers the possibility of solving the long-standing riddle of the origins of Gnosticism. This dissertation has broken new ground in illuminating the origins of Gnosticism in that it has added new data to corroborate the view which is more and more coming to the fore; *viz.*, that Gnosticism arises on *Jewish* soil out of a profound disillusionment with the God of the covenant, the God of time and history and the created order.⁸ Our investigation of the Gnostic exegesis of Genesis 2.7 showed that this was a crucial text in the development of Gnostic anthropology; but further, it has been established that the Gnostics took over and re-interpreted older *Jewish* traditions of interpretation. There was in evidence what MacRae calls "a conscious perversion of the Jewish sources," and "a residual Jewish atmosphere that is only on the way to being overcome."⁹ But, as MacRae also points out, there is no real "Jewish Gnosticism." When the Gnostics have added their new insights to the older materials, there emerges something which can no longer be called Judaism. "Out of the old materials a new religion emerges."¹⁰

In view of what has been said above, it is evident that Gnosticism is originally a non-Christian--and perhaps even pre-Christian--phenomenon. But from an early date there were also "Christian" Gnostics. In Christian Gnosticism the figure of Jesus Christ becomes of central importance in the drama of redemption included as part of the gnostic mythology.¹¹ Though the text of Genesis retains a central place in the Christian-gnostic speculation, Christian traditions and literature are also subjected to gnostic re-interpretation, and Christian apostles are venerated as authorities for their doctrines.

By far the most important apostolic authority for the Christian Gnostics was the apostle Paul. Examples of the use of Paul in gnostic sources are found in Chapter Six.¹² It is apparent that the Gnostics found Paul's language and terminology --some of which actually derives from Paul's opponents!--congenial for the expression of their own views. Indeed, it was already observed long ago that Paul could justifiably be termed the

haereticorum apostolus.¹³ Modern scholars, too, have noted the popularity of Paul amongst the Gnostics and have suggested that it is the connection between Gnosticism and Paul which made the apostle suspect in the catholic church of the mid-second century.¹⁴ Some have even gone so far as to suggest that Gnosticism is the heir of Paul.¹⁵

Now that a greater understanding is being achieved concerning the nature of Gnosticism and its origins, and now that new sources have become available, there is evidently need for further research on the use and appropriation of Paul by the Gnostics of the second century.¹⁶ And concomitantly, there is also room for further study on the use--or non-use--of Paul on the part of "catholic" writers of the second century.¹⁷ But with these observations we move beyond the scope of this dissertation.

NOTES: CHAPTER ONE (pp. 1-6)

1. *Freiheitspredigt und Schwarmgeister in Korinth* (BFCT 12.3; Gütersloh, 1908).
2. For a brief, but useful, summary of the history of scholarship on the Corinthian opponents of Paul, see D. Georgi, *Die Gegner des Paulus im 2. Korintherbrief* (WMANT 11; Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1964), pp. 7-16; also W. Schmithals, *Gnosticism in Corinth*, trans. J. Steely (Nashville, 1971), pp. 117-124.
3. *RGG*³, IV, 18, citing in parentheses Lütgert, Reitzenstein, Bultmann, and Schmithals.
4. P. Feine, J. Behm, W. Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament*, trans. A. Mattill, Jr. (Nashville, 1966), p. 202.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 209.
6. This was not the main concern of Lütgert's work. He had proposed his theory on the basis of a study of the "Christ party" in Corinth (2 Cor. 10.7; cf. 1 Cor. 1.12), and understood the debate between Paul and his opponents to have centered on Christological differences (see 2 Cor. 11.4, and *Freiheitspredigt*, pp. 52 ff.) as well as basic differences in self-understanding between Paul and his parishioners (see especially *Freiheitspredigt*, pp. 68 ff.).
7. Cf. R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, trans. K. Grobel (New York, 1951), I, 165 ff., 174, 181 (where the phrase "the Gnostic terminology" expressly occurs), and 204. Cf. also H. Jonas, *Gnosis und spätantiker Geist*³ (Göttingen, 1964), I, 210-14; R. Reitzenstein, *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen*³ (Stuttgart, 1927; r.p. Darmstadt, 1956), pp. 340 ff; and E. Haenchen, *RGG*³, II, 1652.
8. *Die Gnosis in Korinth*² (FRLANT 66, Göttingen, 1965); ET *Gnosticism in Corinth*, *op. cit.*
9. *Weisheit und Torheit* (BHT 26; Tübingen, 1959).
10. Schmithals prefers to view the essential anthropological contrast in terms of πνευματικός-σαρκικός, rather than πνευματικός-ψυχικός.
11. *Op. cit.* See also J. M. Robinson, "Kerygma and History in the New Testament," in J. P. Hyatt (ed.), *The Bible in Modern Scholarship* (Nashville, 1965), pp. 141 ff.
12. See below, p. 4.
13. I might add that Schmithals' arguments are based more upon 2 Corinthians than upon 1 Corinthians. I find Georgi's views on 2 Corinthians more convincing.

14. H. Koester, "Paul and Hellenism," in *The Bible in Modern Scholarship*, p. 190.
15. The most important town near the site of the find is the modern *Nag' Hammadi*; hence the documents are frequently referred to under this name. On the discovery and the documents uncovered see W. C. van Unnik, *Newly Discovered Gnostic Writings* (SBT 30; London, 1960); J. Doresse, *The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics*, trans. P. Mairé (New York, 1960); and J. M. Robinson, "The Coptic Gnostic Library Today," *NTS* 14 (1968), 383-401. For a complete bibliography see D. Scholer, *Nag Hammadi Bibliography 1948-1969* (Leiden, 1971); annual supplements in *NT*.
16. Cf. D. Georgi's review of Schmithals' *Die Gnosis in Korinth* in *Verkündigung und Forschung*, Bericht 1958/59, pp. 90-96. Cf. also H. Hegermann's methodological remarks in his study of the hymn in Col. 1, *Die Vorstellung vom Schöpfungsmittler im hellenistischen Judentum und Urchristentum* (TU 82; Berlin, 1961), pp. 2-5.
17. In "Das Buch Baruch," *ZTK* 50 (1953), 131.
18. For reports on the colloquium see U. Bianchi, "Le Colloque international sur les origines du gnosticisme (Messine, Avril 1966)," *Numen* 13 (1966), 151-160; and G. MacRae, "Gnosis in Messina," *CBQ* 28 (1966), 322-333. The papers read at the colloquium have now been published as volume 12 in the series "Studies in the History of Religions" (Supplements to *Numen*), under the title, *Le Origini dello Gnosticismo*, ed. U. Bianchi (Leiden, 1967).
19. *Le Origini*, pp. 100 f.
20. *Ibid.*, p. xxvi. Thus one can legitimately speak of a "gnosis in Corinth" which, however, was called "wisdom"--σοφία. See below, p. 28; on γνῶσις, see p. 42 f.
21. *Ibid.*, p. xxvii.
22. *Ibid.*, xxvi f. One can detect here the influence of Hans Jonas; cf. his paper cited above.
23. *Ibid.* Cf. also the very succinct remarks by Hans Jonas in his "Response to G. Quispel's 'Gnosticism and the New Testament'" (in *The Bible in Modern Scholarship*, p. 293).
 "A Gnosticism without a fallen god, without benighted creator and sinister creation, without alien soul, cosmic captivity and acosmic salvation, without the self-redeeming of the Deity--in short: a Gnosis without divine tragedy will not meet specifications."
24. 1 Cor. 2.14; 15.44, 46. It is applied to σοφία in James 3.15 and used of men in Jude 19. On these two passages see

below, p. 13.

25. The use of the word σαρκικός as an anthropological category, i.e. applied to men, is also confined to 1 Corinthians: 1 Cor.

3.3. σάρκινος is used in 3.1, clearly as a synonym of σαρκικός. Cf. also Rom 7.14. On 1 Cor. 3.3, see below, p. 41.

26. 1 Cor. 2.13,15; 3.1; 14.37. Cf. also σῶμα πνευματικόν in 1 Cor. 15.44,46. τῶν πνευματικῶν in 1 Cor. 12.1 I take to be a neuter and not a masculine, as τὰ πνευματικά in 14.1; 9.11; and 2.13. See below, p. 50.

27. From Ephesus in the year 53 A. D. See D. Georgi, *Die Geschichte der Kollekte des Paulus für Jerusalem* (ThF 38; Hamburg, 1965), p. 95. I find Georgi's treatment of Pauline chronology as convincing as any, and subscribe to it here. For another point of contact between 1 Cor. and Gal., see ἐν πνεύματι πραΰτητος in Gal. 6.1 and 1 Cor. 4.21.

28. I can find no evidence in Galatians of the use of the term πνευματικός as playing any role in Paul's controversy with his Galatian opponents. But for a contrary view, see W. Schmithals, *Paulus und die Gnostiker* (ThF 35; Hamburg, 1965), pp. 32 ff.; ET *Paul and the Gnostics*, trans. J. Steely (Nashville, 1972), pp. 46 ff.

29. By analogy, the τελούντες ἐπιθυμίαν σαρκός could be regarded as οἱ σαρκικοί, though this term does not occur in Galatians.

NOTES: CHAPTER TWO (pp. 7-14)

1. H. Diels and W. Kranz, *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*⁷, II, 137, line 2.
2. Diels and Kranz, II, 30, 11.
3. The lexicon supplies several different meanings of the word πνευματικός, including "causing flatulence," LSJ, 1424. A glance at the index to *SVF* will show how frequently the adjective πνευματικός occurs in Stoic texts.
4. Curiously, the term ψυχικός is not discussed by Schmithals. He mentions the term ψυχικός once, in his discussion of 1 Cor. 15, but there he is satisfied with equating the term with σαρκικός. See *Gnosis*, p. 159.
5. *Weisheit*, p. 89.
6. Cf. however the reference in the *Kore Kosmou* (*Corpus Hermeticum* [hereafter cited as *CH*], Stobaeian Extract 23.20, Nock-Festugiere, ed., IV, 7) to ψυχικὰ κινήσεις, mentioned in connection with a description of the establishment of the Zodiac. The use of the adjective ψυχικός here has no relation to the terminology we are investigating. What is involved in this passage of the *Kore Kosmou* is the Platonic view of soul as that which produces motion. See e.g. *Timaeus* 34B and especially *Laws* X 896A.
7. *CH*, 1.12, an allusion to Gen. 1.27.
8. *CH*, 1.21.
9. *Ibid.* Cf. below, p. 10, on νοῦν ἔχειν in Plutarch, *de genio Socratis* 591F.
10. *Weisheit*, p. 89, n. 2. The tractate actually uses the term παλιγγενεσία and not ἀναγέννησις.
11. But cf. Titus 3.5.
12. *Weisheit*, p. 90.
13. On 1 Cor. 2.6 ff., see Chapter Four.
14. Actually, in the Valentinian system Christ is always the redeemer, not Sophia.
15. *Weisheit*, p. 89.
16. As it does in numerous texts, usually in connection with a gnostic exegesis of Gen. 2.7. On this see Chapter Six.
17. Cf. 2.1, αἱ τῆς ψυχῆς ἐπιθυμίαι.
18. 4 Macc. 1.31 f.
19. Cf. A. D. Nock, *Sallustius. Concerning the Gods and the Universe* (Cambridge, Eng., 1926), p. lxvi, where it is stated that the idea of a reasonable and unreasonable soul both existing

- simultaneously in man is a "commonplace of Hellenistic philosophy." The doctrine has its roots in Plato; see e.g. *Timaeus* 69CD.
20. For a good discussion of this oracle, see W. K. C. Guthrie, *The Greeks and Their Gods* (Boston, 1961), pp. 223-231. The fullest ancient account is that of Pausanias 9.39.5-14.
21. *De genio Socratis* 591 D-F.
22. H. Leisegang, *Der Heilige Geist* (Leipzig, 1919, r.p. Darmstadt, 1967), I, 109. He suggests this because of the similarity between this passage and some of the ideas of Philo who, he says, was profoundly influenced by Posidonius. On the vexatious problem of Posidonius--to whom so much has been attributed and from whom so little is actually preserved--see now Marie Laffranque, *Poseidonios d'Apamée* (Publications de la faculté des lettres et sciences humaines de Paris, Série "Recherches," XIII; Paris, 1964). On Philo see below.
23. Galen, *Quod animi mores corporis temperamenta sequantur* (Scr. min. II, 78, 8 ff., Müller), translated from the Greek text as quoted in C. de Vogel, *Greek Philosophy* (Leiden, 1964), III, 262 (No. 1186).
24. J. Marquardt, *Observationes Criticae in Cl. Galeni Librum ΠΕΡΙ ΨΥΧΗΣ ΠΑΘΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΑΜΑΡΤΗΜΑΤΩΝ* (Leipzig, 1870), p. 40.
25. *Leg. All.* 1.24.
26. *Leg. All.* 1.72. The background of this statement is Plato's myth of the charioteer in *Phaedrus* 253D ff. For a full discussion of the rational and irrational soul in Philo, see Wolfson, *Philo* (Cambridge, Mass., 1947), I, 389 ff.
27. *Leg. All.* 1.76. On this see below, p. 21. The possibility of the death of the soul is hinted at in the text from Plutarch quoted above. But such a doctrine is quite unusual in Hellenistic philosophy.
28. Cf. Philo, *Leg. All.* 1.45 and *Vit. Cont.* 2 for the same expression.
29. *Meditations* 3.16. At 12.3 he refers to the πνεύματιον instead of the ψυχή, but νοῦς is retained as the highest part of man. See de Vogel, *Greek Philosophy*, III, 331.
30. Eduard Schweizer, in his Kittel article on πνεῦμα, says that no Greek parallels exist to the superiority of πνεῦμα over ψυχή. The opposition of "spirit" and "soul" is possible only in Jewish or Christian literature, or in literature influenced by Judaism or Christianity; see *TDNT*, VI, 396. The reason for this

is now clear, as is suggested above.

31. *Ant.* 1.34.

32. Justin is arguing here on the basis of Gen. 2.7, and probably Eccl. 12.7.

33. See below, pp. 18 ff., for full discussion of the relevant texts.

34. *Mysterienreligionen*, p. 70. He argues that the technical use of the adjectives πνευματικός and ψυχικός makes a direct derivation from the Semitic impossible (*ibid.*, p. 71). To this it may be replied that there are Rabbinic adjectives corresponding to πνευματικός and ψυχικός; namely, נְיָנִי and שִׁפְנִי. He is right, however, in saying that Paul did not derive his adjectives from the Semitic, since these Rabbinic terms are demonstrably later than Paul. On this see Billerbeck, III, 329.

35. Ed. by A. Dieterich, *Eine Mithrasliturgie*³ (Leipzig, 1923, r. p. Darmstadt, 1966). It is not a "liturgy" at all, but a magico-theurgic text dealing with ἀπαθανατισμός. See M. P. Nilsson, *Geschichte der griechischen Religion* (Munich, 1961), II², 686 ff.; and especially Erik Peterson, "Die Befreiung Adams aus der 'Ανάγκη," in *Frühkirche, Judentum und Gnosis* (Freiburg, 1959), pp. 107-128.

36. Dieterich (ed.), p. 4, line 24.

37. In *Frühkirche, Judentum und Gnosis*, pp. 110 ff. E. Schweizer conjectures that magic texts using the ψυχή-πνεῦμα terminology are influenced by Judaism or Christianity. See *TDNT*, VI, 396.

38. Cf. also in the Leiden Papyrus (*PGM*, XII, 238 ff.) an invocation to Helios-Aeon-Iao-Sabaoth:

δεῦρό μοι, ὁ ἐκ τῶν δ' ἀν[έ]μων, ὁ παντοκράτωρ θεός,
ὁ ἐνφύσησας πνεύματα ἀνθρώποις εἰς ζωὴν, δέσποτα τῶν
ἐν κόσμῳ καλῶν, ἐπάκουσόν μου, κύριε

39. Cf. 1 Cor. 2.6 ff. and the discussion thereon below, especially p. 40 f.

40. J. Dupont, *Gnosis. La connaissance religieuse dans les épîtres de saint Paul*² (Louvain, 1960), p. 153, also thinks that there is some Pauline influence behind Jude 19.

41. *Contra* Wilckens, *Weisheit*, p. 91. This has been correctly perceived by Dibelius, *Der Brief des Jakobus*¹⁰ (Meyer, Göttingen, 1959), p. 195. For the argument that the opponents in the epistles are Gnostics, see also H. Schrammberger, *Die Einheitlichkeit des Jk. im antignostischen Kampf* (1936), which, however, was unfortunately inaccessible to me.

42. *Jakobus*, p. 195. On Jas. 3.6 see p. 182 in Dibelius'

commentary.

43. U. Luck has recently posited a common background in "wisdom" theology as the constitutive factor in explaining the parallels between James and Paul; see "Weisheit und Leiden," *ThLZ*, 92 (1967), 253-258.
44. Cf. H. Conzelmann, "Paulus und die Weisheit," *NTS*, 12 (1965/66), 231-244, and his theory of an on-going "Schule des Paulus" (p. 233).
45. *Jakobus*, p. 167. He does point out, however, that there is no question in James of a direct polemic against Paul, or against the epistle to the Romans.
46. The compound verb κατακαυχᾶσθαι occurs in the N. T. only in Rom. 11.8 and in Jas. 2.13 and 3.14; it does not occur in the Apostolic Fathers. The verb καυχᾶσθαι is a favorite word in the Pauline corpus, but outside of Paul it occurs in the N. T. only in James 1.9 and 4.16.
47. See especially Phil. 3.19 where the word is used in a manner similar to that of James 3.15.
48. Rom. 2.8; 2 Cor. 12.20; Gal. 5.20; Phil. 1.17 and 2.3.
49. In the Apostolic Fathers it occurs only in Ignatius *Phld.* 8.2, and only very rarely in later patristic literature; see *PGL*, p. 549.
50. Either of these theories has important consequences for the study of the epistle of James as a whole, its date and its provenance.

NOTES: CHAPTER THREE (pp. 15-26)

1. See J. Weiss, *Der erste Korintherbrief*⁹ (Meyer, Göttingen, 1910), pp. 345, 353, 367, and 380.
2. Again recently by B. Schneider, "The Corporate Meaning and Background of 1 Cor. 15.45b," *CBQ*, 29 (1967), 144. For other literature see E. Brandenburger, *Adam und Christus* (WMANT 7; Neukirchen, 1962), p. 70.
3. νεκρός means, basically, "corpse." To people whose native tongue was Greek, the doctrine of the ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν would probably be repugnant.
4. This thesis, proposed by Albert Schweitzer, has recently been revived by K. Smyth, "Heavenly Man and Son of Man in St. Paul," *SPCIC I* (Rome, 1961), 229.
5. Cf. Phil. 3.5. The picture of Paul's affirmation of the resurrection presented in Acts 17.32 and especially 23.6, though possibly not historically factual, is entirely credible. An interesting point of contact with the sentiments attacked in v. 32 has recently been turned up in the form of a "Sadducean" tomb which includes amongst its inscriptions one in Greek: εὐφραίνεστε οἱ ζῶντες/[τ]ὸ δὲ (λοι)πὸ[ν] πεῖν ὄμα φα[γεῖν]. The inscription dates from Hasmonean times. See on this inscription Benoit, "L'inscription grecque du tombeau de Jason," *IEJ* 17 (1967), 112-113.
6. Cf. *Mishnah Sanhedrin* 10.1.
7. Cf. K. Wegenast, *Das Verständnis der Tradition bei Paulus und in den Deuteropaulinen* (WMANT 8; Neukirchen, 1962), pp. 66 f.
8. On this Christology and its Hellenistic-Jewish background see D. Georgi, "Der vorpaulinische Hymnus Phil 2, 6-11," in *Zeit und Geschichte* (Tübingen, 1964), pp. 263-293. Such a Christology may underlie the exaltation doctrine of the Epistle to the Hebrews as well. That such a Christology was alive in Corinth is very probable. This is why Paul stresses so firmly the resurrection of Christ from the dead. The clause καὶ ὅτι ἐτάφη may also function as a Pauline affirmation of Christ's bodily resurrection.
9. Cf. here the statement of Justin Martyr, for whom the doctrine of resurrection has already become a necessary sign of orthodoxy: in *Dialogue* 80.4, he refers to λεγόμενοι Χριστιανοί . . . οἳ καὶ λέγουσι μὴ εἶναι νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν, ἀλλὰ ἅμα τῷ ἀποθνήσκειν τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν ἀναλαμβάνεσθαι εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν. In Justin's opinion, these "so-called Christians" blaspheme the God

of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in denying the resurrection, and should no more be called "Christians" than Sadducees and other Jewish sectarians should be called "Jews." The reference to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in connection with resurrection may be traditional; see Mt. 22.31-32; Mk. 12.26-27; Lk. 20.37-38.

10. *Korintherbrief*, p. 344.

11. *Ibid.*, pp. 308, 345.

12. W. L. Knox correctly perceived the situation in 1 Cor. 15, but then went on to say that Paul changed his mind in 2 Cor. 5, abandoning the doctrine of resurrection in favor of the immortality of the soul. *St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles* (Cambridge, 1939), p. 127. C. F. D. Moule has recently--incorrectly, in my opinion--argued that there is a change of view from 1 Cor. 15 to 2 Cor. 5; see "St. Paul and Dualism," *NTS* 13 (1965/6), 106-123.

13. *Gnosis*, p. 159. The form of the sentence (ἀλλ' οὐ . . . ἀλλά) indicates a polemical thrust, but Schmithals' interpretation, referring to the incarceration of the heavenly self by demonic powers, is entirely gratuitous. Schmithals also makes this verse, with its allegedly "antignostischen Tendenz" the proof of his interpretation of 2 Cor. 11.4, and the basis of his interpretation of the rest of the passages in 1 and 2 Cor. which refer to the Spirit (cf. p. 160). But then he undercuts his own thesis in a footnote by saying that v. 46 "als Glosse auszuscheiden ist" (p. 160, f.n. 2). He says this because he had argued previously (pp. 146 f.) that Paul wrote 1 Cor. 15 at a time when he was not informed as to the opponents' teachings in their denial of the resurrection, believing that the Corinthian denial of resurrection was actually the triumphant message of those who considered themselves to be φύσει σωζόμενοι. In a note on p. 325 of the revised edition, Schmithals refers to E. Brandenburg's *Adam und Christus*, p. 74, with the comment, "Gehört v. 46 zum ursprünglichen Text, so ist er formal als Parenthese zu beurteilen."

14. *TDNT*, VI, 420. Cf. also H. Clavier, "Brèves remarques sur la notion de σῶμα πνευματικόν," in *The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology* (Cambridge, 1954, r.p. 1964), pp. 342-362.

15. Quoted in J. J. Wetstein, *Novum Testamentum Graecum* (Amsterdam, 1751-2), II, 171. Philoponus flourished in the sixth century A.D. On the earlier neo-Platonic doctrine of the vehicle of the soul see E. R. Dodds, *Proclus: The Elements of*

Theology (Oxford, 1963), Appendix II, pp. 313-321.

16. See Philo, *Leg. All.* 1.31 ff.; *Op.* 134; *Quaest. Gen.* 1.4.

Among those who see a polemic against such a doctrine as is known from these Philonic texts are H. Lietzmann, *An die Korinther I.* II⁴ (HNT; Tübingen, 1949), p. 85, and J. Héring, *The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians*, trans. A. Heathcote and P. Allcock (London, 1962), p. 178.

17. J. Jervell, *Imago Dei* (FRLANT 58; Göttingen, 1960), pp. 53 ff. Cf. Brandenburger, *Adam und Christus*, p. 118. Brandenburger stresses that the Platonizing aspect of Philo's anthropological speculations should not be brought into the background of 1 Cor. 15.

18. *Her.* 231.

19. Jervell, p. 55. Jervell sees Gnostic influence here, but these speculations are easily accounted for on the basis of the modified Stoic philosophy which Philo uses as a hermeneutical tool. Of course, these speculations are to be understood as one of the matrices out of which Gnosticism developed. On Gnostic exegesis of Gen. 2.7 see Chapter Six.

20. See Chapter Two, pp. 11 ff.

21. After my ideas on this had already congealed, I noticed that J. Dupont had already arrived at a somewhat similar position: see *Gnosis*, pp. 172 ff. Though the originality that I had assumed for my argument has thereby been dissipated, I nevertheless rejoice in seeing these views essentially corroborated. I believe, however, that I am arguing the case more fully and clearly than he; in addition he has not seen the importance of this spectrum of ideas as one of the matrices of gnostic speculation. On this see Chapter Six.

22. The famous inscription from the Corinthian excavations (No. 111 in *Corinth*, VIII.1, p. 78, [Ευνα]γωγὴ Ἐβρα[αίων], is probably too late, due to the style of lettering, to be used as first-century evidence. But we know of such a synagogue from Acts 18.4 ff., and also from 1 Cor. 1.14, where Crispus, the *archisynagogos* (cf. Acts 18.8), is mentioned. On the role of the Diaspora synagogue in Hellenistic-Jewish scripture exegesis, see e.g. Georgi, *Gegner*, pp. 99 ff. And on the influence of Hellenistic Jewish synagogue theology in 1 Cor. in particular, see N. Dahl, "Paulus apostel og menigheten i Korinth (1 Kor. 1-4)," *NTT* 54 (1953), 7.

23. Acts 18.24 ff. and 19.1; 1 Cor. 1.12 and 3.4 ff., 22; 4.6;

and 16.12. Of course, the Acts account concerning Apollos' knowing only the baptism of John is erroneous. On this see E. Käsemann, "The Disciples of John the Baptist in Ephesus," in *Essays on New Testament Themes* (SBT 41; London, 1964), pp. 136 ff. R. M. Grant stresses the role of Apollos in the discussions between Paul and his opponents on "Wisdom"; see "The Wisdom of the Corinthians," in *The Joy of Study* (New York, 1951), pp. 55. Also on the role of Apollos in this connection see H. Koester's review of Wilckens' *Weisheit und Torheit in Gnomon* 33 (1961), 591.

24. Is 1 Cor. 4.6 a reflection of Apollos' exegetical activity? On the other hand, τὸ μὴ ὑπὲρ ἃ γέγραπται may be a scribal gloss. On this see e.g. J. Ross, "Not Above What is Written. A Note on 1 Cor. 4.6," *ET* 82 (1971), 215 ff.

25. The phrase ἀόσπασμα θεῶν is a Stoic term. See e.g. Epictetus, *Diss.* 1.14.6; 2.8.11; see also on this F. Cumont, *Lux Perpetua* (Paris, 1949), p. 113; and M. Pohlenz, *Die Stoa* (Göttingen, 1955), I, 229 ff. On the aetherial substance of the soul according to Philo, see further *Her.* 281-284.

26. *Ibid.* 57. This passage cannot be harmonized with Philo's statements concerning the two kinds of men in *Leg. All.* 1.31. What is involved in these two passages is two different and contradictory interpretations of *Gen.* 1.27. The passage in *Leg. All.* I would regard as "Platonic"; the one in *Her.*, "Stoic." Cf. the text from Plutarch's *de genio Socratis* quoted in Chapter Two, p. 10.

27. *Ibid.* 85. This sentence must be compared to Plato's *Timaeus* 90A, where it is stated that we are, so far as our soul is concerned, ὄντας φωτὸν οὐκ ἔγγειον ἀλλὰ οὐράνιον. Cf. *Plant.* 17, where Philo quotes the same Platonic passage more fully: φωτὸν οὐκ ἐπίγειον ἀλλ' οὐράνιον.

28. *Her.* 55 ff.; *Plant* 18.

29. *Op.* 135; *Leg. All.* 3.161; *Som.* 1.34; *Spec. Leg.* 4.123; and *Det.* 84.

30. Though this was not explicit in all of the passages quoted above, the testimony of all of them together is clear on this point.

31. Cf. Heb. of *Gen.* 2.7, יְרֵאֵל, whereas the LXX has εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον.

32. *Det.* 80 ff.; *Som.* 134; etc.

33. This is important; see below.

34. This is the background for the Corinthian opponents' boasting of Wisdom. See Chapter Four.
35. *Op.* 155.
36. *Quaest. Gen.* 1.57; *Conf.* 149; etc.
37. *Op.* 77; *Gig.* 14.
38. *Post.* 39; *Quaest. Gen.* 1.16,51; cf. *Leg. All.* 1.107 f.
39. Genesis 2.7 plays a major role in the doctrine of the immortality of the soul in patristic literature; see H. Wolfson, "Immortality and Resurrection in the Philosophy of the Church Fathers," in K. Stendahl (ed.), *Immortality and Resurrection* (New York, 1965), p. 80. In patristic theology, however, the immortality of the soul is usually wedded (somewhat illogically) to the doctrine of the resurrection of the body.
40. See Jervell, *Imago Dei*, p. 17, n. 6, and pp. 59 f.
41. Trans. by G. Vermes in A. Dupont-Sommer, *The Essene Writings from Qumran* (Cleveland, 1962), p. 103; for the text I have used E. Lohse, *Die Texte aus Qumran* (Darmstadt, 1964), p. 42. Similar references to man as "dust" are to be found in 1 QH III.21; X.4 ff.; XII.24; etc.
42. Billerbeck, III, 477.
43. *Genesis Rabba* 14.8, trans. H. Freedman and M. Simon (Soncino, London, 1939), p. 116; for the text I have used C. Albeck, *Midrash Bereshit Rabba* (Jerusalem, 1965), p. 132.
44. The same parable of earthen and glass vessels occurs in the *Gospel of Philip* 51.
45. Soncino, p. 115; Albeck, p. 131; (parentheses mine).
46. On Adam as *golem* see Chapter Six, pp. 55 ff.
47. Translation from J. Bowker, *The Targums and Rabbinic Literature* (Cambridge, 1969), p. 110. Italics reflect the Biblical text; parentheses are my own.
48. Text in A. Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic*, vol. 1 (Leiden, 1959).
49. Text in A. Diez Macho, *Neophyti I: Targum palistinense*, *Ms de la Biblioteca Vaticana. Tomo I: Genesis*, (Textos y estudios 7; Madrid, 1968).
50. *Gen. Rabba* 14.5: Soncino, p. 113; Albeck, pp. 128 f.
51. Cf. 4 Macc. 14.5-6, where the brothers are assured of immortality for their souls, rather than resurrection.
52. R. Scroggs, in his recent book, *The Last Adam* (Philadelphia, 1966), pp. 86 ff., has missed the significance of the function of Gen. 2.7 in 1 Cor. 15, for he fails to take into account the

polemical situation.

53. Cf. Philo, *Op.* 134: "There is a great difference between the man now formed (πλασθέντος, Gen. 2.7) and the one who came into being earlier (πρότερον, cf. Gen. 1.27) according to the image of God."
54. Following Brandenburger, *Adam und Christus*, p. 74.
55. Cf. 15.22: ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ πάντες ζωοποιηθήσονται.
56. Cf. Philo, *Op.* 135 ἔκ τε γεώδους οὐσίας; *Leg. All.* 1.31 ὁ γήϊνος (ἄνθρωπος).
57. Cf. Philo, *Det.* 85, where it is stated that the πνεῦμα in man is the θεοειδὲς δημιουργημα, that which makes man a φωτὸν οὐράνιον. Man is "heavenly" by virtue of the divine "inbreathing" and his participation thereby in the οὐράνιος ἄνθρωπος of Gen. 1.27.
58. Note the importance of the future, φορέσομεν, certainly the original Pauline reading.
59. Cf. Brandenburger, *Adam und Christus*, p. 147.
60. Cf. Weiss, *Korintherbrief*, p. 373; also Bultmann, *Theology*, I, 192 ff.
61. 1 Cor. 15.21-22; Rom. 5.12,18.
62. In this Paul goes beyond the rather naive view of the "two formations" held by the Pharisees of the schools of Hillel and Shammai, referred to above.
63. Cf. Rom. 7.24.
64. J. Jeremias is right in his argument that the sentence, "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God," does not refer to the resurrection of the dead, but rather to living persons; see *Abba, Studien zur neutestamentlichen Theologie* (Göttingen, 1966), pp. 298-307. The second part of the verse refers to the bodies of those who have died before the Parousia. I should like to add, however, that this verse does belong to the discussion begun in v. 35, "What kind of body . . . ?" It functions as the transition from the argument begun in v. 35 to the statement of the "mystery" in vv. 51 ff. (See outline above, p. 15.) The point of the verse is, as Jeremias says (p. 299): "Neither the living nor the dead can take part in the Kingdom of God--as they are." One can see here also a polemic against the view of the opponents that they have inherited the Kingdom already (cf. 1 Cor. 4.8).
65. According to H. Almqvist, *Plutarch und das Neue Testament* (Uppsala, 1946), p. 104, the antithesis θνητός-θάνατος, φθαρτός-

ἀφθαρτος is current in the Stoic diatribe. He refers in this connection to Plutarch, *Mor.* 960B (*De soll. an.* 2).

NOTES: CHAPTER FOUR (pp. 27-43)

1. See N. Dahl, *NTT* 54, pp. 1-23 and especially p. 11; a revised form of Dahl's essay is now in English, "Paul and the Church at Corinth according to 1 Corinthians 1-4," *Christian History and Interpretation: Studies Presented to John Knox* (Cambridge, 1967), 313-335. See also R. Funk, *Language, Hermeneutic, and Word of God* (New York, 1966), pp. 277 ff.
2. Which for Paul is nothing other than "Jesus Christ crucified" (2.2); cf. 1.24, however, where *Χριστὸς ἐσταυρωμένος* is both the *δύναμις θεοῦ* and the *σοφία θεοῦ*.
3. 1. 2. Cor. 11.18 ff.: *ἐπεὶ πολλοὶ καυχῶνται κατὰ τὴν σάρκα, κἀγὼ καυχῆσομαι*. Phil. 3.3: *καὶ οὐκ ἐν σαρκὶ πεποιθότες, κἀπερ ἐγὼ ἔχων πεποιθήσιν καὶ ἐν σαρκί . . .*
4. This point is made by H. Conzelmann, "Paulus und die Weisheit," *NTS* 12 (1965/6), 234 ff. Cf. also A. Feuillet, "Les 'chefs de ce siècle' et la Sagesse divine d'après 1 Co. II, 6-8," in *Le Christ Sagesse de Dieu d'après les épîtres pauliniennes* (Paris, 1966) 25-36, where numerous contacts between 1 Cor. 1-2 and Baruch 3.9-4.4 are pointed out.
5. For Paul himself, *τελειότης* belongs to God (Rom. 12.2), and will belong to man only in the eschatological future (1 Cor. 13.10; cf. Phil. 3.12 *οὐκ . . . ἤδη τετελείωμαι*), though Christian "perfection" is to be striven for (Phil. 3.15; 1 Cor. 14.20, both of these passages reflecting opponents' usage, However). Paul nowhere else makes a distinction between the *τέλειοι*, who are capable of higher wisdom, and the *νήπιοι*, who are able to receive only elementary instruction. But cf. Heb. 5.14, reflecting a provenance similar to that of the Corinthian opponents.
6. E.g. D. Lührmann, *Das Offenbarungsverständnis bei Paulus und in paulinischen Gemeinden* (WMANT 16; Neukirchen, 1965), p. 113; cf. Wilckens, *Weisheit*, pp. 53 ff.; and Reitzenstein, *Mysterienreligionen*, pp. 338 ff.
7. Cf. already J. Weiss, *Korintherbrief*, p. 74; M. Dibelius, *Die Geisterwelt im Glauben des Paulus* (Göttingen, 1909), p. 88; and now G. Wagner, *Pauline Baptism and the Pagan Mysteries*, trans. J. Smith (Edinburgh, 1967), p. 274. The latter takes up in detail the problem of the possible influences of the Mysteries on the religion of the N. T. On this see also A. D. Nock, *Early Gentile Christianity and Its Hellenistic Background* (New York, 1964), pp. 109 ff.
8. Cf. e.g. Plato, *Symp* 210A ff., Diotima's revelation concern-

ing the nature of ἔρως.

9. See especially *Cher.* 48-49, where the following "mystery" terms appear: μύστης, ἱερὰ μυστήρια, ἀμύητος, τετελεσμένος, τελετή, μηθείς, τὰ μέγαρα μυστήρια, ἱεροφάντης, etc.; cf. also *Leg. All.* 3.100 and *Sacr.* 62. In Clement of Alexandria, see *Protr.* 12.92-93 (LCL), where Christ is referred to as a "hierophant."

10. Cf. Weiss, *Korintherbrief*, p. 74; and Delling in *TDNT*, VIII, 69 ff. For a full-scale treatment of the term τέλειος, see P. J. du Plessis, *TEAEIOΣ. The Idea of Perfection in the New Testament* (Kampen, 1959); his treatment of 1 Cor. 2.6 (pp. 178 ff.), however, I do not find entirely convincing.

11. Cf. the purely non-metaphorical usage in *Spec. Leg.* 2.32 where, commenting on Lev. 27.2-8, Philo refers to the Law's distinctions between men and women and between children and adults (νηπίους τελείων) in the matter of payments for vows.

12. αὐτοδίδακτος and αὐτομαθής are attributes of σοφία. Cf. *Post.* 78; *Sac.* 79; etc.

13. Of course, this is Paul speaking to the Corinthians, but he is engaging here in an ironic use of the opponents' own language.

14. Cf. Chapter Three and the discussion there of the Philonic exegesis of Gen. 2.7 and 1.27. See also below for the implications of this exegesis for an interpretation of the πνευματικός-ψυχικός terminology in 1 Cor. 2.

15. The language, as noted before, is common to the terminology of Hellenistic philosophy, especially Stoicism. Cf. especially Epictetus in *Diss.* 1.4.4:

ἀεὶ γὰρ πρὸς ὃ ἀν' ἡ τελειότης τινὸς καθάπαξ ἀγῆ,
πρὸς αὐτὸ ἡ προκοπὴ συνεγγισμὸς ἐστίν.

Paul, though he eschews the application of τελειότης to himself, or to anyone short of the eschatological future, uses the term προκοπή and προκόπτω to describe his own life (Gal. 1.14) and the life of the Christians in Philippi who stand to benefit from his continued work among them (Phil. 1.25); and in Phil. 1.12 he uses the term προκοπή for the advance of the Gospel.

16. See further on 1 Cor. 2.9 below, pp. 34 f.

17. See especially *Mig.* 28 f. and *Leg. All.* 3.196 quoted above.

18. Against J. Munck, *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind*, trans. F. Clarke (Richmond, 1959), pp. 148 ff. Cf. literature cited by Wilckens, *Weisheit*, p. 1. Wilckens is quite right in his critique of this position. See also N. Dahl in *NTT* 54, p. 9; and H. Koester, *Gnomon* 33, p. 590.

19. This is clear from 3.1 ff., and the boasting in which they engaged as though their "wisdom" were their own achievement (3.18-21; and 4.7 f.).
20. R. Scroggs, "Paul: Σοφός and Πνευματικός," *NTS* 14 (1967/8), 33-55; see especially p. 34. In a footnote on p. 34, Scroggs says, "The difficult problem of the opponents' views cannot be discussed here, but a fresh analysis is pressingly needed." One can hardly help but wonder how this analysis can be carried out if the text itself is seen in advance as not providing information on this problem.
21. *Weisheit*, pp. 52-96.
22. *Ibid.*, p. 52, n. 1. He also reads κηρύσσομεν in 1.23 as referring to "we Christians." Κηρύσσομεν in 1.23 is formally parallel to λαλοῦμεν in 2.6. On the use of the plural see below.
23. *NTS* 14, p. 33.
24. See now Funk's perceptive study, *Language, Hermeneutic, and Word of God*, especially pp. 289 ff.
25. Others who have seen in 1 Cor. 2.6 ff. an amalgamation of the opponents' theology with Paul's own emphases are R. Bultmann, *TDNT* I, 709, also *Glauben und Verstehen* (Tübingen, 1933), pp. 42-44; G. Bornkamm, *TDNT*, IV, 819 f.; and E. Sjöberg, *Der verborgene Menschensohn in der Evangelien* (Skrifter Utgivna av kungl. humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet i Lund 53; Lund, 1955), pp. 20 ff.
26. See now also Funk, *Language*, p. 291. Paul's use of the first person plural where he simply means ἐγώ is well-known and frequent in his letters. For a standard discussion see Stauffer in *TDNT* II, 356 ff. For a striking example, see 1 Thess. 2.18: ἠθέλησαμεν . . . ἐγὼ μὲν Παῦλος.
27. See below, pp. 33 f.
28. *Offenbarungsverständnis*, especially pp. 114 ff.
29. Col. 1.26 f.; Eph. 3.4 f., 9 f.; Rom. 16.25 f. Luhrmann bases his study on an article by Nils Dahl, "Formgeschichtliche Beobachtungen zur Christusverkündigung in der Gemeindepredigt," in *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann* (BZNW 21; Berlin, 1954), pp. 3-9.
30. "Wenn es richtig ist, dass Paulus in diesem Abschnitt seine Gegner, die korinthischen Gnostiker, zitiert, lässt sich vermuten, dass ihm bei ihnen auch das Revelationsschema in der festen Form, wie wir es in der späteren Tradition gefunden haben, vorgelegen hat. Er hat es dann korrigiert." See *Offenbarungsverständnis*, p. 133.

31. Lührmann's version of the original form of 1 Cor. 2.6 ff. and Paul's corrections are presented on pp. 134 ff. For example, he thinks that after 1 Cor. 2.8a the original form had $\nu\upsilon\iota\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\kappa\alpha\lambda\upsilon\phi\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\sigma\alpha\nu\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$, which Paul changes in v. 10, further inserting the statement on the crucifixion of the "Lord of Glory" and the citation in v. 9.
32. For a possible example of the latter, see Georgi, *Gegner*, pp. 274-282, on 2 Cor. 3.7-18.
33. This has been shown by Nils Dahl's careful study cited above, and also by E. Sjöberg, *verborgene Menschensohn*, pp. 1 ff.
34. Sjöberg, *loc. cit.*
35. See H. Conzelmann's critique of Lührmann's position, *NTS* 12, p. 239. Conzelmann argues against a "vorpaulinischen Belege," asserting that "vielmehr sehen wir es in I Kor. 2.6ff. in statu nascendi." Further, he states, "Die Aufnahme durch die Gnosis ist sekundär. Das Schema ist nicht an sich gnostisch sondern: es kann leicht im Sinne der Gnosis verwendet werden" (p. 239, n. 6). For an interesting example of a gnostic use of this form, see *Evangelium Veritatis* 18.10 ff.
36. See above all 2 Cor. 4.3 f. Of course, the notion of "perfection" occurs also in apocalyptic, the background that is assumed for Paul. For a good study of the idea of "perfection" in Qumran, for example, see Du Plessis, *TEABIOE*, pp. 104-155.
37. I agree with Lührmann, *Offenbarungsverständnis*, p. 137, that this title was used by Paul's opponents.
38. The phrase $\delta\acute{\omicron}\xi\alpha\ \kappa\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon$ is found throughout the LXX. Ps. 23.7-10 is an important text, in that the title $\acute{\omicron}\ \beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \delta\acute{\omicron}\xi\eta\varsigma$ is juxtaposed with $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$.
39. E.g. in 1 Enoch 22.14 Enoch responds to a vision with praises to God: $\tau\acute{\omicron}\tau\epsilon\ \eta\acute{\upsilon}\lambda\acute{\omicron}\gamma\eta\sigma\alpha\ \tau\acute{\omicron}\nu\ \kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\nu\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \delta\acute{\omicron}\xi\eta\varsigma$ (Eth: 'egzi'a sebhāt), $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\ \epsilon\acute{\iota}\pi\alpha,\ \epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\lambda\omicron\gamma\eta\tau\acute{\omicron}\varsigma\ \epsilon\acute{\iota},\ \kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\epsilon\ .\ .\ .$. Again, in 1 Enoch 25.3 God is called "the Holy Great One, the Lord of Glory, the Eternal King" (Eth., but Gr. has $\acute{\omicron}\ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \delta\acute{\omicron}\xi\eta\varsigma$ instead of $\acute{\omicron}\ \kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \delta\acute{\omicron}\xi\eta\varsigma$). The title "Lord of Glory" occurs also in 1 Enoch 27.3,5; 36.4; 40.3; 63.2; and 83.8. For the Greek and Ethiopic texts I have used the editions of R. H. Charles, *The Book of Enoch* (Oxford, 1912), and *The Ethiopic Version of the Book of Enoch* (Anecdota Oxoniensia, Semitic Series XI; Oxford, 1906).
40. See 1 Cor. 13.1, and the discussion of 1 Cor. 12-14 in Chapter Five.

41. As a Christological title it is quite rare even outside of the N. T. In Barnabas 21.9 it is not clear whether it refers to God or to Christ:

ὁ κύριος τῆς δόξης καὶ πάσης χάριτος μετὰ τοῦ
πνεύματος ὑμῶν.

In Justin Martyr, *Dial.* 29.1, the related title βασιλεὺς τῆς
δόξης (Ps. 23.7-10 LXX) is applied to Jesus:

Δοξάσωμεν τὸν θεόν, ἅμα τὰ ἔθνη συναλεθόντα, ὅτι καὶ
ὑμᾶς ἐπεσεκέφατο· δοξάσωμεν αὐτὸν διὰ τοῦ βασιλέως
τῆς δόξης, διὰ τοῦ κυρίου τῶν δυνάμεων.

See also *Dial.* 85.1 and 127.5. In the *Ascension of Isaiah* 9.32, Christ is referred to as "the Lord of all glories" ('*egzi' zak^wellu sebhāt*); the context is especially interesting for it describes a vision of Isaiah in the seventh heaven, surrounded by angels, glory, etc. This is not far from the mystical concerns of the Corinthian opponents.

42. See also Heb. 1.2 ff.

43. In *Zeit und Geschichte*, pp. 263-293.

44. Paul, of course, shares this Christology, coupling it with an affirmation of Christ's resurrection, and thus placing it in a historical and eschatological perspective. See above, p. 15.

45. "That the Corinthians understood *sophia* as bringing salvation into the present there can be no doubt (cf. 4.8)," is Funk's statement of the case; see *Language*, p. 290. The background for such a belief can be seen in Wis. Sol. 8.17 *et passim*, where participation in wisdom guarantees immortality and salvation. A striking parallel to 4.8 is found in Philo's description of the Therapeutae *Vit. Cont.* 13: διὰ τὸν τῆς ἀθανάτου καὶ μακαρίας ζωῆς ἕμερον τετελευτηκῆναι νομίζοντες ἤδη τὸν θνητὸν βίον κτλ. Here is where the self-understanding of the Corinthian opponents can be said to be similar to that of those who argued that "the resurrection has already occurred" (2 Tim. 2.18).

46. The Jewish-apocalyptic background of Paul's use of μυστήριον and σοφία is explored by Bornkamm in *TDNT*, IV, 815 ff.; on 1 Cor. 2.6 ff. see pp. 819 f. See also Anton Fridrichsen, "Gnosis. Et Bidrag til Belysning av den Paulinske Terminologie og Erkjennelsesteori," in *Religionshistoriska Studier Tillägnade Edvard Lehmann* (Lund, 1927), pp. 85-109, especially p. 92. See also R. Brown, *The Semitic Background of the Term "Mystery" in the New Testament* (Facet Books, Biblical Series 21; Philadelphia, 1968).

47. The Jewish-apocalyptic background of this terminology has been thoroughly discussed by M. Dibelius, *Die Geisterwelt im*

Glauben des Paulus (Göttingen, 1909), pp. 90 ff. For further background material from Qumran see now D. Flusser, "The Dead Sea Sect and Pre-Pauline Christianity," *Scripta Hierosolymitana* IV, 218 ff. The argument of Feuillet that the ἀρχοντες are Jewish and pagan rulers, I find unconvincing; cf. his article, "Les 'chefs de ce siècle' et la Sagesse divine d'après 1 Co. II, 6-8," (*op. cit.*).

1 Cor. 2.8, therefore, contradicts what is said of the agencies of Christ's death in 1 Thess. 2.14 f. On the latter passage see now my article, "1 Thessalonians 2:13-16: A Deutero-Pauline Interpolation," *HTR* 64 (1971), 79-94.

48. This version appears in *Asc. Is.* 11.19 ff.; cf. also *Epistula Apostolorum* 13.

49. *Contra* Wilckens, *Weisheit*, pp. 71 ff. He equates the "Lord of glory" with a personified Sophia. See the criticism of Funk, *Language*, pp. 292, 295, who stresses that what is hidden from the powers and from the "uninitiated" is the mystery of the cross. Cf. also Hegermann, *Schöpfungsmittler*, pp. 119 f.; and Lührmann, *Offenbarungsverständnis*, p. 137.

50. Cf. 1 Cor. 4.1, where Paul refers to himself (though the plural is used) as a "steward of the mysteries." On this see J. Reumann, "Οἰκονομία-Terms in Paul in Comparison with Lucan *Heilsgeschichte*," *NTS* 13 (1966/7), 160.

51. *Weisheit*, p. 80.

52. Lührmann, on the other hand, attributes its use to Paul himself who, according to Lührmann, inserts it into the opponents' *Revelationsschema*; cf. *Offenbarungsverständnis* p. 139.

53. ὅσα ἠτοίμασεν ὁ θεὸς τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν seems to me, on the other hand, to be a Pauline addition. See below, p. 35.

54. *Weisheit*, p. 80.

55. These include the *Baruch* of "Justin," Hippolyt. *Ref.* 5.23.3; 5.24.1; 5.26.16 f.; *Acta Thom.* 36; *Actus Petri cum Simone* 39; *Asc. Is.* 11 (Lat.); see *Weisheit*, pp. 76-80. The passage from the Mandaeen *Qolastā* is a doubtful witness to our text, at best (p. 79). The Manichaean Turfan fragment (p. 79) bears a striking resemblance to Log. 17 of the Gospel of Thomas in that it ascribes the saying to the Redeemer and contains an extra member, ". . . und nicht ergriffen mit der Hand"; cf. Thomas, Log. 17: . . .
 ⲁⲗⲱ ⲡⲉⲧⲉ ⲙⲡⲉⲃⲓϭ̅ ⲃⲙⲃⲱⲙⲉ̅.

56. *NTS* 12, pp. 239 f.

57. Wilckens, *Weisheit*, p. 80. For example, in addition to the texts referred to in the previous note, one can adduce: 1 Clem.

- 34.8; 2 Clem. 11.7; Clem. Alex. *Protr.* 10.76 (LCL), *Protr.* 12.91 (LCL), and *Quis dives* 23.948 (LCL); *Apostolic Constitutions* 7.32; *Mart. Pol.* 2.3.
58. As Paul does in v. 10: ἡμῖν γὰρ ἀπεκάλυψεν ὁ θεός including in the content of σοφία as its main point the eschatological significance of the cross of Christ in the salvatory plan of God.
59. The latest contributions to this question are P. Prigent, "Ce que l'oeil n'a pas vu, 1 Cor 2,9," *ThZ* 14 (1958), 416-429; and M. Philonenko, "Quod oculus non vidit, 1 Cor. 2,9," *ThZ* 14 (1958), 51-52.
60. Prigent, *ThZ* 14, pp. 426-428.
61. Cf. Prigent, *ThZ* 14, pp. 421-424; and Wilckens, *Weisheit*, pp. 75 f.
62. Cf. Oepke's discussion in *TDNT* III, 988 f. Haenchen is probably wrong in deriving the quotation in Justin's *Baruch* from Paul; see "Das Buch Baruch," *ZTK* 50 (1953), 139.
63. G. Kisch (ed.), *Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* (Publications in Medieval Studies, University of Notre Dame 10; Notre Dame, Indiana, 1949), referred to by Philonenko, *ThZ* 14, p. 51. Underlining is mine. Philonenko also sees in the phrase, *quantum bonum fecit Deus hominibus* in 26.14, a trace of a formula analogous to the second part of the Pauline citation.
64. Of course, Paul himself is no stranger to such mystical concerns, as witness 2 Cor. 12 and the ἄροητα ὄρηματα which he claims to have heard (v. 4). Bousset was correct in comparing 1 Cor. 2 with 2 Cor. 12; see *Die Himmelsreise der Seele* (*Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 4 [1901], 136-169 and 229-273; r.p. Darmstadt, 1960), pp. 13-15. The crucial point is, however, that Paul did not regard these experiences as of central concern in his Christian faith and understanding of existence.
65. See above, p. 34, and passages cited.
66. 1 Clem. 34.8 is against this, as is *Acta Thom.* 36 and Clem. Alex. *Quis Dives* 23.948 (LCL). Of course the first part of the quotation can be used eschatologically, as in Clem Alex. *Protr.* 10.76 (LCL): ἡ γραφή εἰκότως εὐαγγελίζεται τοῖς πεπιστευκόσιν· οἱ δὲ ἅγιοι κυρίου κληρονομήσουσι τὴν δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὴν δύναμιν αὐτοῦ . . . ἦν ὀφθαλμὸς κτλ. Cf. also *Apostolic Constitutions* 7.32. Likewise, the second part of the quotation can be used "mystically," as in *Quis dives* 23.948 (LCL).
67. Nestle text, BApe; ᾑ in P⁴⁶ B⁷⁵² C⁶³ D⁶ G¹⁷ L¹.
68. Erik Peterson has conjectured that Paul is using the quo-

tation in a polemic against Jewish mystics in Corinth; see "1 Kor. 1,18f. und die Thematik des jüdischen Busstages," in *Frühkirche, Judentum und Gnosis*, pp. 48 f. Cf. also E. Werner, "Post-Biblical Hebraisms in the Prima Clementis," in *Harry Austryn Wolfson Jubilee Volume II* (Jerusalem, 1965), pp. 799 f. 69. There may be in this an implicit polemic against an idea such as is expressed in Wis. Sol. 6.12: λαμπρὰ καὶ ἀμάραντός ἐστιν ἡ σοφία καὶ εὐχερῶς θεωρεῖται ὑπὸ τῶν ἀγαπῶντων αὐτήν

Note also that in *Thomas* 17, the last part of the quotation is missing, another indication that Paul is adding this to a form of the quotation used by his opponents. The use of this quotation in *Thomas* and by Paul's opponents is probably very similar.

70. For criticisms, see in addition to the literature cited in n. 49 Koester's review in *Gnomon* 33, p. 593; Schmithals, *Gnosis*, pp. 130 ff.; and Conzelmann, *NTS* 12, p. 237. Actually, Paul comes closer to equating σοφία with Christ than do the opponents, as Koester points out (*loc. cit.*).

71. Wilckens also identifies σοφία with πνεῦμα, *Weisheit*, p. 81; cf. p. 92 where he says Paul also identifies πνεῦμα with the exalted Lord, citing 2 Cor. 3.17 as proof. So, according to Wilckens, in 1 Cor. 2 σοφία = κύριος τῆς δόξης = πνεῦμα.

72. Text: ἔστιν γὰρ ἐν αὐτῇ πνεῦμα νοερόν, ἅγιον. Eusebius (*Praep. Ev.* 7.12.4 and 11.14.4) quotes this passage as: ἔστιν γὰρ αὐτῇ πνεῦμα . . . ; cf. J. Reider, *The Book of Wisdom* (Dropsie College edition; New York, 1957), p. 114.

73. On Aristobulus, see now N. Walter, *Der Thoraausleger Aristobulus* (TU 86; Berlin, 1964).

74. Fr. No. 2, Stearns ed., *Fragments from Graeco-Jewish Writers* (Chicago, 1908), a passage that shows dependence upon Prov. 8.22 ff.

75. Fr. No. 3, 11.15-17.

76. But the role of σοφία in prophecy, according to other witnesses of Hellenistic Judaism, is important for our illumination of the theology of the Corinthian opponents, not only in 1 Cor. 2, but also in their understanding of prophecy in 1 Cor. 12-14. See e.g. Aristobulus, Fr. No. 3 cited in the preceding note, and Wis. Sol. 7.27. On 1 Cor. 12-14 see Chapter Five.

77. According to Wilckens, the phrase τὰ βάθη τοῦ θεοῦ is "typisch gnostisch." The gnostic texts to which he refers only

show that the phrase was used by some Gnostics. That the phrase is inherently "gnostic" cannot be maintained. As a matter of fact, the expression is attested earlier in Jewish apocalyptic, which appears to be the source for both Gnostics and Paul. The apocalyptic provenance Wilckens himself admits in a footnote (*Weisheit*, p. 83):

"Die Vorstellung von den 'Tiefes Gottes' findet sich recht vielfach belegt auch in jüdisch-apokalyptischen Texten: Vgl. die bereits angeführten Stellen I Hen. 63,2f. . . . sowie I QS XI, 18ff. Ausserdem z.B. noch IV Esr. 4, 10,21; 10,35ff; Syr. Bar. 14,8f . . . und 54,12f. . . . Die Tiefen Gottes sind hier überall die unerforschlichen eschatologischen Ratschlüsse Gottes In diesem Sinne ist der Begriff βάθος in dem einzigen anderen paulinischen Beleg Rö. 11,33ff. zu verstehen" To this I have only to add that this is precisely the context in which Paul uses the term in I Cor. 2.10; note also the use of Is. 40.13 in 2.16 as in Rom. 11.34.

One further note: Wilckens is probably wrong in placing the Valentinian aeon βυθός in the same context as the term βάθη τοῦ θεοῦ (*Weisheit*, p. 82, n. 1). Βυθός and Σιγή are terms which refer to the highest world of being in the *Chaldean Oracles* (cf. H. Lewy, *Chaldaean Oracles and Theurgy* [Cairo, 1956], pp. 77 and 160). The history-of-religions background of these designations is the same for the *Chaldaean Oracles* and Valentinianism; viz. Pythagorizing Platonism. (See Lewy, p. 397).

78. Also Wilckens, *Weisheit*, p. 81.

79. The text is problematical here; Blass may be correct in deleting λόγους. See Blass-Debrunner-Funk, p. 98.

80. Trans. J. Smith, *St. Irenaeus, Proof of the Apostolic Preaching* (Ancient Christian Writers 16; Westminster, Maryland, 1952).

81. Cf. also 4.20.2-4 and 4.7.4.

82. Cf. also ps.-Clem. *Hom.* 16.12 for the same doctrine.

83. One can see the beginnings of this in the Synoptic gospels. See e.g. on Lk. 11.49 J. M. Robinson, "Logoi Sophon. On the Gattung of Q," in Robinson and H. Koester, *Trajectories through Early Christianity* (Philadelphia, 1971), p. 72. On Wisdom christology in Matthew see now especially M. J. Suggs, *Wisdom, Christology, and Law in Matthew's Gospel* (Cambridge, Mass., 1970).

84. On this phenomenon in the Pauline letters, see Koester's remarks in *The Bible and Modern Scholarship*, pp. 192 ff.

85. Funk, *Language*, p. 296.

86. See Conzelmann, *NTS* 12, p. 240; he refers to the motif

- "Gleich durch Gleiches" as "ein wesentliches spezifisch griechisches Motiv." Cf. also Almqvist, *Plutarch und das N. T.*, p. 93: "Die rhetorische Zusammenstellung verschiedener Formen desselben Wortes (Paronomasie) ist in der Diatribe sehr beliebt." As to the content of the phrase, see A. D. Nock, *Sallustius*, p. lxvii: "That nothing mortal can know what is immortal is a thought commonly expressed. Such knowledge is in virtue of divine Nous, used by every good soul." And see below.
87. R. Bultmann, *Der Stil der paulinischen Predigt und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe* (FRLANT 13; Göttingen, 1910).
88. See p. 9, n. 19, for the reference to A. D. Nock. This idea, according to Dörrie, goes back to Parmenides, and his equation of Being and thinking. So, from Plato and Aristotle on, the investigation of Being is τῷ τῆς διανοίας λογισμῷ or by means of νοῦς. See H. Dörrie, "Emanation. Ein unphilosophisches Wort im spätantiken Denken," in *Parusia. Studien zur Philosophie Platons und zur Problemgeschichte des Platonismus* (Festschrift J. Hirschberger; Frankfurt, 1965), p. 132, n. 43.
89. For the preceding context of *Det.* 86 see above, p. 19.
90. αἰσθητικὴ ψυχὴ, cf. e.g. *Spec. Leg.* 4.123.
91. And εὐγενεῖς; see excursus below.
92. Cf. also 1 Sam. 2.10 LXX, where φρόνιμος is used instead of σοφός as in Jeremiah, and δυνατός instead of ἰσχυρός.
93. I would prefer the reading, οὐκ ἐν πειθοῖ σοφίας λόγων even though its attestation is minimal (440 it sy^P sa Or). Note the consequent balance between πειθοῖ and ἀποδείξει. Cf. also G. Zuntz, *The Text of the Epistles* (London, 1953), 23 ff.
94. The ecstatic, or "prophetic," aspect of their speaking ability is documented in 1 Cor. 12-14. See Chapter Five.
95. Strictly speaking, Paul is referring in 2.15 primarily to himself. He is the one who has the "mind (=Spirit) of Christ" and is therefore not subject to the criticism of the Corinthians (4.3 and 9.3). See Funk, *Language*, pp. 297 ff.; and Dahl, *NTT* 54, p. 13.
96. Clearly Paul's own expression; cf. 1.18, 21, 23, 25, 27; 3.18-19; 4.10.
97. Cf. in this connection Luck's observations on the differences in the manner in which the wisdom tradition is appropriated in James and in the letters of Paul, *ThLZ* 92, p. 256.
98. Cf. Paul's references to the eschatological gift of the Spirit as an ἀροαβών, 2 Cor. 1.22; 5.5; retained in the deutero-

Pauline Eph. 1.14.

99. Cf. Philo's reference (*Virt.* 188) to man's λογισμός or νοῦς as the νεός of God and his Wisdom, quoted above, p. 40.

100. Cf. Gal. 5.20, where ἔργα and ζῆλος occur side by side in a list of "works of the flesh." It is clear that for Paul σαρκικός and ψυχικός mean the same thing, and that σαρκικός is Paul's own term; cf. Funk, *Language*, p. 296. For Paul's view of the spheres of "Spirit" and "Flesh" see Bultmann, *Theology*, I, 232 ff., 207, 333 ff. For the background in Jewish eschatology, see A. Schweitzer, *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*, trans. W. Montgomery (London, 1931), pp. 160 ff.; W. D. Davies, "Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Flesh and Spirit," in *The Scrolls and the New Testament*, pp. 157 ff.; Jacob Licht, "An Analysis of the Treatise of the Two Spirits in DSD," *Scripta Hierosolymitana*, IV, 88 ff.; David Flusser, "The Dead Sea Sect and pre-Pauline Christianity," *Scripta Hier.*, IV, 215 ff.; and J. Pryke, "'Spirit' and 'Flesh' in the Qumran Documents and Some New Testament Texts," *Rev Qum* 19,5 (1965), 345 ff.

101. Admirably argued by Funk, *Language*, pp. 303 ff.

102. N. Dahl, *NTT* 54, p. 6.

103. Cf. Wilckens, *Weisheit*, p. 3, where Schmithals is criticized for erroneously equating σοφία with γνῶσις, and letting it go at that; cf. Schmithals, *Gnosis*, pp. 130 ff., for a reply.

104. This point is made by A. Fridrichsen, "Gnosis," p. 89. Much of my argument I owe to this perspicacious contribution.

105. Cf. 1 Cor. 2.7; 15.51; Rom. 11.25.

106. Fridrichsen, "Gnosis," p. 92. Cf. above, pp. 33 ff.

107. Fridrichsen, "Gnosis," p. 93.

108. This idea of γνῶσις is widespread in Judaism: Cf. Wis. Sol. 12.23-14.31; Judith 8.20; Ep. Jer. 22,28,50,64,71; and cf. Gal. 4.8; see Bultmann, *TDNT*, I, 702. But I cannot agree with his view that γνῶσις in 1 Cor. 8.1 is a gnostic technical term, *ibid.*, p. 709, followed by Wilckens, *Weisheit*, p. 212, and Schmithals, *Gnosis*, pp. 134 ff. The whole context is against this view.

109. See now also U. Mauser, "Galater iii.20: die Universalität des Heils," *NTS* 13 (1966/7), 266. The basis of this "knowledge" is the baptismal confession, "One God, One Lord." Cf. on this confession E. Peterson, *EIE ΘΕΟΣ* (FRLANT 24; Göttingen, 1926), p. 255. Cf. also Hegermann, *Schöpfungsmittler*, p. 111.

110. Whether Paul was ignorant of the "Apostolic Decree" (Acts

- 15.29; cf. 21.25) or deliberately ignored it (Gal. 2.6), the effect in his congregations was the same. On the significance of Paul's position on this issue in the context of early Christianity see my remarks on this in *VigChr* 24 (1970), 146 f.
111. I take μένει in 13.13 to be conditioned by οὐκ ἔστι; cf. the transitory sense of μένειν in 1 Corinthians 15.6.
112. Cf. Fridrichsen, "Gnosis," for the use of the term γνῶσις in other Pauline contexts.

NOTES: CHAPTER FIVE (pp. 44-50)

1. See Chapter Four.
2. It probably lies in the background of the "Pentecost" account in Acts 2; note especially vv. 4,15.
3. See below, on 1 Cor. 12.1 ff.
4. See the articles by Oepke, *TDNT* II, 449 ff., and Behm, *TDNT* I, 719 ff.; see also Leisegang, *Der Heilige Geist*, pp. 113 ff.; and especially Erich Fascher, *ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ* (Giessen, 1927), a linguistic and historical study which is still a standard work. Fascher, however, has little to say about 1 Cor. 14. In his view, the Corinthians interpreted προφητεία simply as "die von Gott oder dem heiligen Geist inspirierte Rede." He finds in the N. T. generally no occurrence of the view that the νοῦς should be banished so that the prophet as κατεχόμενος or ἔνθεος can speak, nor is there to be found in the N. T., in his view, a complex psychology such as is found in Plato, Plutarch, and Philo. See *ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ*, pp. 168 f.; and see below, p. 46.
5. *Gnosis*, p. 164.
6. Corresponding exactly to the four different types of μανία in Plato, *Phaedrus* 240A-250C, cf. 265B ff. See on this M. Pulver, "The Experience of the Pneuma in Philo," *Spirit and Nature* (Papers from the Eranos Yearbooks I; New York, 1954), p. 119.
7. Only to the δίκαιοι and σοφοί, *Her.* 259 f. Cf. also Wis. Sol. 7.27, where we are informed that it is Wisdom which makes men ("holy souls") "friends of God and prophets." In Philo (and in Wis. Sol.) we can observe a difference between what is called a "prophet" and the *nabhi'* of the O. T. The O. T. prophets play scarcely any role in Philo, since most of his Scripture quotations are from the Torah. Cf. Lührmann, *Offenbarungsverständnis*, pp. 34 f.
8. *Her.* 263-266. A similar comment on Gen. 15.12 occurs in *Quaest. Gen.* 3.9. On prophetic ecstasy, see also *Her.* 69 f.; *Vita Cont.* 12; etc. For Philo's own experience, see *Mig.* 34 ff.
9. A very common Hellenistic metaphor; cf. e.g. Plutarch, *De Orac.* 9. On Porphyry and the Chaldaean Oracles, see H. Lewy, *Chaldaean Oracles*, pp. 41 ff.; and in general, see literature cited above.
10. Cf. Job's daughter in the *Testament of Job* 48: . . . ἀπεφθέξατο δὲ τῆ ἀγγελικῆ διαλέκτω, . . .
11. Cf. above, p. 36.

12. *Offenbarungsverständnis*, p. 38.
13. *Gnosis*, pp. 161-165. 1 Cor. 14.1ab he regards as an interpolation (p. 163). On the question of gender, see below.
14. *Gnosis*, p. 117. He includes this passage in his "Letter B." For his literary-critical analysis of the Corinthian letters, see pp. 81-94; for a good critique, see Georgi's review, in *VF* (1958/59), p. 96.
15. *Gnosis*, p. 119.
16. For Schmithals' reconstruction of the Corinthian "gnostic system," see especially *Gnosis*, pp. 44-49, 58-65, and 117 ff.
17. That some form of docetism is being combatted in 1 John is quite probable, but that 1 Cor. 12.1-3 refers to a heretical Christology is, as I shall show, improbable.
18. It is doubtful that even the Ophites, against whom Origen polemicizes in *Contra Celsum* 6.28, actually cursed Jesus. On *Contra Celsum* 6.28, and the question of its applicability to 1 Cor. 12.1-3, see my article, "Did the Gnostics Curse Jesus?" in *JBL* 86 (1967), 301-305. In the ET, *Gnosticism*, p. 350, Schmithals adds a note in which he rejects my argument, without, however, showing that he has understood the point I was making.
19. Schmithals' arguments on this passage have been accepted by Wilckens, *Weisheit*, p. 121, n. 1; and Georgi regards his exegesis of 12.1-3 as the best and most persuasive argument in his whole book; see Georgi's review in *VF*. Others have rejected Schmithals' interpretation, including Lührmann, *Offenbarungsverständnis*, pp. 28 ff. See now especially H. Conzelmann, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther* (Meyer; Göttingen, 1969), p. 242, where Schmithals' interpretation is rightly dismissed as "phantastisch." Conzelmann's interpretation of this passage turns out to be somewhat similar to mine. Schmithals attempts to answer Conzelmann, *Gnosticism*, p. 350 f., but unsuccessfully.
20. Cf. Rom. 10.9; Phil. 2.11; 1 Cor. 8.6; Rom. 1.4; etc.; see also U. Neufeld, *The Earliest Christian Confessions* (New Testament Tools and Studies 5; Grand Rapids, 1963), pp. 43 ff. On 1 Cor. 2.8, κύριος τῆς δόξης, see above, pp. 32 ff.
21. J. Massingberd Ford, in "The First Epistle to the Corinthians or the First Epistle to the Hebrews," *CBQ* 38 (1966), 410, comments that 1 Cor. 12.2 "may not imply that the Corinthians were heathen when Paul converted them: Paul may be thinking of the ancestors of Abraham . . ." Her argument here seems to me far-fetched; the vast amount of important Jewish material she has discovered in 1 Cor. can just as easily be explained if one

posits that the leadership in the Corinthian church had grown up in Hellenistic Judaism, but that most of the members were in fact Gentiles.

22. This passage should be added to the long list supplied by N. Dahl in his description of the preaching form which he calls "das soteriologische Kontrast-Schema." This preaching form is marked by the contrast between the "once" and the "now," oriented soteriologically, with baptism as the turning point. See *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann*, pp. 5 ff. On the revelation-schema discussed by Dahl in the same article, see above, pp. 31 f.

23. Better sense can be made of the text if one conjectures either πρὸς τὰ εἶδωλα τὰ ἄφωνα ἤγεσθε ὡς ἄν ἀπαγόμενοι or ὡς ἄν ἀπαγόμενοι ἤγεσθε.

24. See above, p. 43.

25. τραπέζης δαιμονίων in 10.21 seems to be an allusion to Is. 65.11, cited above.

26. James 2.19, a commonplace, as can be seen from Justin, *Dial.* 49.

27. For Paul the demonic ἄρχοντες knew who the "Lord of glory" was; what they did not know was that by crucifying him they would bring their own domain to defeat and open up the way of salvation to men. Cf. above on 1 Cor. 2.8.

28. For the neuter πνευματικά see also 9.11 and 14.1; in 14.12 a good case can be made for πνευματικῶν (Ppe g m syP sa) instead of πνευμάτων. I see no merit in Schmithals' argument that 14.1 is an interpolation; see *Gnosis*, p. 163.

29. See now also J. Sweet, "A Sign for Unbelievers: Paul's Attitude to Glossolalia," *NTS* 13 (1966/67), 251 f.; and K. Maly, "1 Kor 12,1-3, eine Regel zur Unterscheidung der Geister?" *BZ* 10 (1966), 92. It is possible that this striking expression was influenced by Paul's interpretation of Deut. 21.23; cf. Gal. 3.13. For a Jew, death by crucifixion would conjure up the "curse" of Deut. 21.23. This seems to be the case in 4QpNah I.7 f., on which see Maly, *ibid.*, p. 94.

NOTES: CHAPTER SIX (pp. 51-81)

1. For example, in the scriptural index to Jonas, *Gnosis und spätantiker Geist*, Gen. 2.7 does not appear at all.
2. See especially J. Jervell, *Imago Dei*, pp. 122-170, and H. -M. Schenke, *Der Gott Mensch in der Gnosis* (Göttingen, 1962).
3. See Now A. Kragerud, "Apocryphon Johannis. En Formanalyse," *NTT* 16 (1965), 15-38; especially helpful is the table given on p. 34, wherein the various portions of *AJ* are set beside the relevant verses in Gen. On the "commentary" character of *AJ*, see also N. Petersen, "The Literary Problematic of the *Apocryphon of Hohn*" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard, 1967), pp. 104 ff.; and S. Giversen, "The Apocryphon of John and Genesis," *Studia Theologica* 17 (1963), 60-76.
4. W. Till (ed.), *Die gnostischen Schriften des koptischen Papyrus Berolinensis 8502* (TU 60.5; Berlin, 1955); hereafter cited as *BG* (*Berolinensis Gnosticus*). This edition has now been revised and improved by H. -M. Schenke (Berlin, 1972).
5. On the numbering of the Nag-Hammadi codices, it is now becoming common usage to follow Krause in *Mitteilungen des deutschen archäologischen Instituts, Abteilung Kairo* 18 (1962), 121-132. See also J. M. Robinson, "The Coptic Gnostic Library," *NT* 12 (1970), 81-85. By the time this dissertation is published, Codex II will have been published in facsimile: *The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices, Codex II* (Leiden, 1973). It should be noted that in this dissertation the tractates from Codex II will be cited according to the number of the plate in P. Labib, *Coptic Gnostic Papyri in the Coptic Museum at Old Cairo*, vol. 1 (Cairo, 1961; no other volumes published), rather than by page number in the original codex. The reason for this is that early editions followed this practice. The actual page of the codex can be determined by subtracting 48. In this dissertation the Nag Hammadi codices are cited *CG* (*Cairensis Gnosticus*).
6. *BG* 48.11-14; cf. Gen. 1.26a. In *CG* II Jaldabaoth addresses the other powers.
7. *BG* 48.14-49.2. Till's text from 48.17-49.2, in spite of the lacunae, is established on the basis of *CG* III. The reading in *CG* II is somewhat different.
8. Cf. 55.2 ff., where reference is made to "another formation" (ἄνεπλασις).
9. A Platonic idea though used in an un-Platonic way. See

- Plato, *Timaeus* 48E, for example, on the relationship between παράδειγμα and μίμημα; cf. also 28B ff.
10. BG 49.2-9. Cf. CG II: "a power of light."
 11. Cf. BG 22.9, and especially BG 47.14 ff.
 12. On Jaldabaoth, see W. Bousset, *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis* (Göttingen, 1907), pp. 351-355, where the planetary aspect of Jaldabaoth and the seven archons is discussed. The name "Jaldabaoth" is probably to be translated, "Child of Chaos," as was suggested by A. Hilgenfeld, *Die Ketzergeschichte des Urchristentums* (Leipzig, 1884; r. p. Darmstadt, 1963), p. 238. See now, for an explicit connection between Jaldabaoth and chaos, the *Untitled Text* from CG II, 151.24, where Ialdabaoth is addressed as a child of the abyss, i.e. chaos (ΠΝΟΤΝ). The meaning "child of chaos" (ילדא בַּחֹרָה) is supported also by Frank Cross of Harvard (in an oral communication).
 13. On the εἰκὼν doctrine in AJ, see especially H. -M. Schenke, *Der Gott Mensch*, pp. 32-43; I find myself in basic agreement with his conclusions.
 14. This version is paralleled in CG III 22.18 ff.
 15. This version is paralleled in CG IV 24.2 ff.
 16. Following Till's emendation of $\bar{\kappa}\epsilon$ to $\bar{\chi}\epsilon$; cf. also CG II 63.18.
 17. Cf. CG II 63.24 f.
 18. Taking $\bar{\nu}\tau\alpha\gamma\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\ \bar{\nu}\epsilon\pi\sigma\tau\alpha\sigma\iota\varsigma\ \bar{\nu}\tau\epsilon\ \psi\chi\iota\kappa\eta$ as object of the verb $\alpha\tau\chi\iota$, as does Giversen in his translation, *Apocryphon Johannis* (Acta Theologica Danica 5; Copenhagen, 1963), p. 75.
 19. At this point there occurs in CG II a very long section describing how each of the 365 angels (though the full number is not represented) contributed a part of the psychic body of man. The angels are given various names, most of them sounding more like Egyptian names than Hebrew or Aramaic (according to Thomas Lambdin, in an oral communication). This section runs from 63.29-67.10.
 20. The reference in these passages to σῶμα is a remnant of an earlier tradition concerning the creation by the angels of man's body. See below, p. 54.
 21. See H. Koester, *TDNT* VIII, 582.
 22. (=Christus); cf. BG 32.9.
 23. In CG II 63.9,26; 67.5,12,30; 68.14; cf. CG IV 23.26. The adjective χοῦμός does not occur in AJ, nor is anything made of the phrase in Gen. 2.7, χοῦν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς.

24. On the "unwavering generation" (BG 22.12-17; 75.20; etc.) see N. Petersen's dissertation, "The Literary Problematic of the *Apocryphon of John*," pp. 122 ff., and the literature cited there. For a still-useful discussion of various gnostic classifications of men, see R. Liechtenhan, *Die Offenbarung im Gnosticismus*, pp. 84 ff., and E. Schweizer's article on πνεῦμα in TDNT VI.
25. Because based on the Hebrew text of the Old Testament. On the rabbinic doctrine of the *golem*, see below.
26. See below.
27. See my remarks on "Gnosticism" in Chapter One. Note that these speculations are based on *Jewish* traditions, and, of course, the *Jewish* scripture. The *AJ*, for example, must have many more reflections of Jewish tradition. Cf. e.g. the sequel to the passage treated above, where Adam is stronger and wiser than all the creator-angels. To this should be compared the rabbinic tradition concerning the "image," interpreted to mean that Adam was larger, more glorious, and wiser than all the angels, e.g. *Genesis Rabba* 17.4. On this see Jervell, *Imago Dei*, p. 96.
28. Cf. the reference to the seven πνεύματα and the vices of man from the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, cited above, p. 53.
29. *Genesis Rabba* 14.8, Soncino ed., p. 116; text Albeck ed., p. 132.
30. *Genesis Rabba* 8.1, Soncino ed., p. 54; Albeck, p. 55.
31. In the Jewish tradition this psalm was regularly put into the mouth of Adam. See G. Scholem, "The Idea of the Golem," in Scholem, *On the Kabbalah and Its Symbolism*, trans. R. Manheim (London, 1965), p. 161.
32. RSV translation. The other idea, that Adam extended from earth to heaven (or from one end of the world to the other) is also read out of Scripture, from Deut. 4.32: ברא אלהים אדם ... על הארץ ולמקצה השמים. Cf. *b. Sanh.* 38b, where Deut. 4.32 is quoted in connection with this tradition. Adam's reduction in size is derived from Ps. 139.5, and connected to his fall into sin. On the latter, see G. Scholem *Ibid.*; cf. W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism* (London, 1962), p. 45.
33. See the enumeration of texts in Jervell, *Imago Dei*, p. 105, and the literature cited there.
34. So Scholem, *loc. cit.*
35. I.e., with Cain and his twin sister; cf. *Yeb* 62a, cited in

a note on p. 242 of Soncino ed. of the tractate *Sanhedrin*.

36. *Sanhedrin* 38b, Soncino ed., p. 242, quotation from Ps. 49.12 (Heb. 49.13).

37. Cf. also 4 Ezra 3.5. On the interpretation of the rabbinic doctrine of the *gōlem*, see Jervell, pp. 105 ff., and especially G. Scholem's article cited above. Jervell's arguments, that this doctrine underscores the collectivity of Adam's person, I find quite convincing.

38. In this tradition, as in others discussed by the rabbis, I think we should allow for a bit of humor. The study of Torah was, for the sages, not a burden but sheer joy.

39. See esp. *BG* 50.15-19; *CG* II 67.10-14. Cf. also Brandenburger, *Adam und Christus*, pp. 89 ff., and p. 85, n. 2, where he remarks concerning the rabbinic *gōlem* speculation that "gnostische Vorstellungen stehen damit--wie auch immer, sei es nehmend oder gebend--in Verbindung." Nothing further is said on the origins of this speculation in rabbinic tradition; furthermore, he has missed the importance of Gen. 2.7 in his discussion of the evidence. The recent study by L. Schottroff is equally disappointing in this respect. See *Der Glaubende und die feindliche Welt* (WMANT 37; Neukirchen, 1970), pp. 4-41, esp. 39-41. Cf. my review in *JBL* 91 (1972), 567-569.

40. So far as our extant materials permit us to determine. See in this connection K. Rudolph, "Ein Grundtyp gnostischer Urmensch-Adam-Spekulation," *ZRGG* 9 (1957), 7; and G. Quispel, "Der gnostische Anthropos und die jüdische Tradition," *Eranos-Jahrbuch* 22 (1953), 202.

41. And probably Menander; cf. Tertullian, *de carnis resurrectione* 5: "Futile et frivolum istud corpusculum, quod malum denique appellare non horrent, etsi angelorum fuisset operatio, ut Menandro et Marco placet . . ." "Marcus" is probably not the Valentinian of the same name. Rudolph pushes the tradition back to Simon Magus; *ZRGG* 9 (1957), 7.

42. Though not explicitly represented, one must posit the interposition here of a female principle corresponding to Simon's (and Menander's) *ἔννοια*.

43. Cf. Hippolytus *Ref.* 7. 28.3: καὶ μὴ δυναμένου ἀνορθοῦσθαι τοῦ πλάσματος διὰ τὸ ἀδρανὲς τῶν ἀγγελῶν.

44. "His" or "her"? Cf. *AJ* where Wisdom, the Mother, is the agent. But in the system of Simon and Menander--and perhaps now also in Saturninus--ἡ ὑπὲρ πάντα δύναμις is a fatherly principle,

the *πρωτος θεος*. Cf. Justin 1 *Apol.* 26.3; and on Simon and Menander, see H. Schlier, "Das Denken der frühchristlichen Gnosis," in *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann* (Berlin, 1954), p. 69.

45. Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* 1.24.1 = Harvey ed., 1.17.

46. See *Eranos Jb* 22 p. 205, where he refers in a note to an article by E. Preuschen, "Die Apokryphen gnostischen Adam-Schriften aus dem Armenischen übersetzt und untersucht," in *Festgruss Bernhard Stade* (Giessen, 1900), p. 227. Preuschen, in treating the creation of man by Jaldabaoth and the angels in the Sethian-Ophite system (*Iren. Adv. Haer.* 1.30) as "ein riesenförmiges Monstrum, das sich nur kriechend bewegen kann," states in a note that this is "eine jüdische Fabel," referring to Eisenmenger, *Entdecktes Judentum I* (1700), 365 ff. But Eisenmenger's collection of material sheds no further light, besides referring to the usual rabbinic texts describing Adam as a *gōlem*, or as two-faced (*Ps.* 139.5!).

47. R. M. Grant, *Gnosticism and Early Christianity* (rev. ed.; New York, 1966), p. 101. Cf. also, for the use of *Ps.* 22.7, the Naasene system, *Hipp. Ref.* 5.8.18.

48. I have used the edition of Lohse, which is based on the *editio princeps* published by E. L. Sukenik (Jerusalem 1954).

49. Cf. 1.24.2: *Et Judaeorum Deum unum ex angelis esse ait.*

50. Cf. Epiphanius *Pan.* 23.1.8, speaking of Saturninus: *δῆθεν τὸν σπινθήρα ψυχὴν τὴν ἀνθρωπεῖαν φάσκων*. Already in *Wis. Sol.* 2.2-3 the *πνοή* of *Gen.* 2.7 is put into parallel with *σπινθήρ* and *πνεῦμα*; see above, p. 20.

51. Simon claims to be the "Great Power" himself; Menander claims to be a savior sent from above; cf. *Iren. Adv. Haer.* 1.23.

52. So K. Rudolph; cf. Tertullian's statement, cited above, n.

41. Cf. here also *Iren. Adv. Haer.* 1.24.1: "*Ex iis* (i.e. Simon and Menander) *Saturninus . . . et Basilides . . .*" One must, of course, take with a grain of salt the attempt of the heresiologists to make personal connections between the great heretical teachers.

53. J. Jervell, *Imago Dei*, p. 143, n. 83, denies that Simon taught that the angels created man.

54. . . . "Ἐννοῖαν, ἥτις ἐστὶν ἡ καὶ Προῦνικος, καὶ πνεῦμα ἅγιον καλουμένη, δι' ἧς τοὺς ἀγγέλους ἔκτισα, οἱ δὲ ἄγγελοι τὸν κόσμον ἔκτισαν καὶ τοὺς ἀγγέλους, *Pan.* 21.2.4.

55. The title occurs in *Hipp. Ref.* 6.11, *ἐν τῇ Ἀποφάσει τῇ*

μεγάλη; cf. *Ref.* 5.9.5 where the Naassenes cite the same document as 'Ἀπόφασις τῆς μεγάλης δυνάμεως.

56. It reflects the Heraclitic-Stoic doctrine of fire, the Platonic dualism of νοητόν and αἰσθητόν, the Aristoteleian distinction between δύναμις and ἐνεργεία, the doctrine of Empedocles that like is known by like, Pythagorean speculations, and at the same time contains a plethora of quotations from the O. T., N. T., and Homer. See esp. E. Haenchen, "Gab es eine vorchristliche Gnosis?" *ZTK* 49 (1952), 336. It should be remarked here that Haenchen, in his very fine article, does not in my opinion distinguish enough between the quotations from "Simon" and the Simonian commentary; he thus finds it necessary to deny that the *Megale Apophasis* can go back to Simon, a matter which perhaps should be left open. The *Megale Apophasis* itself is apparently quoted in three places in Hippolytus: *Ref.* 6.9.4; 14.4; and 18.2-7. On the *Megale Apophasis* see now also J. Frickel, "Die Apophasis Megale, Eine Grundschrift der Gnosis?" in *Le origini*, 197-202.

57. Omitting φησίν here and elsewhere; also παρ' αυτοῖς below.

58. The emanation of νοῦς and ἐπίνοια (οὐρανός and γῆ as allegorized in ch. 13), and further delineated as ἔστως, στάς, and ἡτησόμενος. In 14.3 the seventh power is identified with the με of *Prov.* 8.23,25 (Wisdom).

59. On **this** formula see Haenchen, *ZTK* 49, pp. 330 f.

60. Cf. *Potmandres* 15: . . . διπλοῦς ἔστιν ὁ ἄνθρωπος. θνητὸς μὲν διὰ τὸ σῶμα, ἀθάνατος δὲ διὰ τὸν οὐσιώδη ἄνθρωπον.

61. Cf. the Valentinian doctrine of μόρφωσις, on which see F. Sagnard, *La gnose valentinienne* (Paris, 1947), pp. 400 ff.

62. Other terms: ἀμέριστος στιγμή (14.6); cf. the Naassene use of Simonian material in *Ref.* 5.9.5 ff.; and σπινθήρ ἐλάχιστος (17.7). The latter term may offer a point of contact with Saturninus.

63. Haenchen, *ZTK* 49, p. 333.

64. I.e. Galen; cf. Wendland's notes to this passage in the GCS ed., and Haenchen's remark (p. 328, n. 2): "Das dürfte für die Altersbestimmung der Gr. V. wichtig sein"; to this cf. above, n. 56.

65. For further material on Simon Magus, see especially J. Jervell, *Imago Dei*, pp. 143-147; H. Schlier, "Das Denken der frühchristlichen Gnosis," *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann*, pp. 70 ff., in addition to Haenchen's article in *ZTK*.

66. The exact relationship between "Sethian" and "Ophite" Gnosticism is difficult, if not impossible, to determine. The characterization "Sethian-Ophite" is based on Theodoret of Cyrus, *Haereticorum Fabularum Compendium* 1.14 (cf. Harvey ed. of Irenaeus, I, 226), who is in his work largely dependent upon Irenaeus: οἱ δὲ Σεθιανοὶ οὕς Ὀφριανοὺς ἢ Ὀφίτας τινὲς δνομάζουσιν The Latin text of Irenaeus has simply "Alii" (1.30.1 = Harvey 1.28).
67. Cf. *AJ*, *BG* 44.14, and above, p. 52.
68. Compare and contrast *AJ*, *BG* 48.11-14; cf. above, p. 51.
69. Cf. Saturninus in *Hipp. Ref.* 7.28.3: ὡς σκώληκος σκαρίζοντος and above, p. 57.
70. Omitting *dicunt* here and in the next sentence.
71. Cf. the six roots or powers in the Simonian system: first νοῦς, and the sixth ἐνθύμησις (*Hipp. Ref.* 6.12.2). The totality of these is the ἑβδόμη δύναμις, ἔστως, σιάς, σπησόμενος (*Ref.* 6.13).
72. In the phrase *uti non posset [Ialdabaoth] erigi adversus eos qui sursum [sunt], habens virtutem* (= δύναμις).
73. In 1.30.13 the resurrection body of Jesus is described as *animale et spiritale*, in distinction from the worldly elements (*mundalia*) which remain in the world. Cf. the Valentinian speculation on the nature of Jesus' resurrection-body.
74. Hereafter referred to as *GR*. The left-hand *Ginza* will be cited *GL*.
75. Petermann ed., I, 100-102; Lidzbarski tr., pp. 107-111; cf. K. Rudolph, *ZRGG* 9, pp. 9-11. English translations used in this section are from R. Haardt, *Gnosis, Character and Testimony*, trans. J. Hendry (Leiden, 1971), 370 ff.
76. On Ptahil see especially K. Rudolph, *Theogonie, Kosmogonie und Anthropogonie in den mandäischen Schriften* (FRLANT 88; Göttingen, 1965), pp. 138 ff.
77. The archontic angels of *AJ*, which, in turn, are actually planetary spirits. See above, n. 12.
78. Cf. *AJ*, *CG* II 63.1 ff.
79. *GR* 101, *ZRGG* 9, p. 10. Cf. the Sethian-Ophite system, *Iren. Adv. Haer.* 1.30.3, where Adam is created according to the image of Ialdabaoth and the archons; see above, p. 60.
80. Cf. *AJ*, *BG* 50.15 ff.
81. Cf. *AJ*, *BG* 51.1 ff. and the role of the Mother and the Autogenes (= Christ), and the four lights.

82. Haardt, p. 374. "I" = Manda-d-Haiye.
83. It is probable that the demonic *Ruḥa-d-Qudṣa* is actually a demonized "Sophia" of Judaism; so H. Ringgren, *Word and Wisdom* (Lund, 1947), p. 137; cf. also Rudolph, *ZRGG* 9, p. 13, n. 73, and literature cited.
84. Pp. 241 ff., Petermann; pp. 242 ff., Lidzbarski; cf. Rudolph, *Theogonie*, p. 252.
85. Cf. Rudolph, *Theogonie*, pp. 252 ff., for other variations; see also E. Drower, *The Secret Adam* (Oxford, 1960), p. 35.
86. Quoted from Drower, *Secret Adam*, p. 48.
87. Cf. Drower, *Secret Adam*, p. 47; and Rudolph, *Die Mandäer* (Göttingen, 1960), I, 165 f. Indeed *Ruḥa* is personified as a demonic figure, mother of the planets, and enemy of the *niṣimṭā* in man (Drower, *loc. cit.*). The ultimate connection with Sophia-Prounikos-Holy Spirit is very clear. See above, n. 83.
88. The same is true in Manichaeism, according to K. Rudolph, *Die Mandäer*, I, 166, n. 3.
89. Rudolph refers to Scholem's statement that in some heretical Jewish systems the $\Pi\aleph$ of man was considered a vital potency of the earth (based on Gen. 1.24), whereas the $\eta\mu\omega\aleph$ is the gift of God himself (Gen. 2.7!); cf. Scholem, *Eranos Jb* 22, pp. 241 ff.; and Rudolph, *ZRGG* 9, p. 16.
90. This passage comes at the end of a long and involved cosmogony. On the whole cosmogony, see H. Jonas, *Gnosis* I, 284 ff., and *The Gnostic Religion* (Boston, 1963), pp. 206 ff.; the latter is in many respects an improvement over his earlier discussion. Cf. also H.-M. Schenke, *Der Gott Mensch*, pp. 108 ff., and lit. cited. I quote from the English translation in Haardt, *Gnosis*, p. 294.
91. A. Adam, *Texte zum Manichäismus* (KlT 175; 2nd ed. Berlin, 1969), suggests in a note (p. 21, n. 65) that *Aṣaklūn* is a Syriac transliteration of Iranian *Aṣōḱar*, one of the three emanations of Zervan, and has the meaning, "der die Zeugungskraft verleiht." In the first edition (Berlin, 1954) he had noted that the name resembles the place-name "Askelon," but perhaps may be related to Mandaean *astaklūn* = *puer phosphorus*. Far more likely is "Saklas," the Demiurge in many gnostic systems, e.g. *AJ*, *CG* II, 59.17. This is confirmed in a parallel text, in Augustine, *De haeresibus ad Quodvultdeum* 46.4 (cf. Haardt, p. 347).
92. I.e., the image of the divine Messenger.
93. Haardt renders "Nekbael," though the text he used has

- "Nebroel." Cf. Adam, *Texte*, p. 22, n. 66: variant readings at this point are *Nakbāel*, *Akbāel*, *Namrāel*. Adam does not attempt to explain this figure. In the *Gospel of the Egyptians* from Nag Hammadi, CG IV, 69.1-2 *σακλα* and *μεβρ[οτηλ]* occur together. This text will shortly be published in an edition with English translation by A. Böhlig and F. Wisse.
94. So also H.-M. Schenke, *Der Gott Mensch*, pp. 108 f.; and H. Jonas in *Gnostic Religion*, p. 227 (but not in *Gnosis*).
95. Turfan Fragment TIII 260. The translation is that of Andreas and Henning, *Mitteliranische Manichaica aus Chinesisch-Turkestan I* (Sitz. Heid. Ak. Wiss, Phil. Hist. Kl. 1932), pp. 175-222; I quote from H.-M. Schenke, *Der Gott Mensch*, p. 111.
96. (= "Dämonart") according to Schenke's note 16, p. 111.
97. Preserved in Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 2.36.2-4; cf. W. Völker, *Quellen zur Geschichte der christlichen Gnosis* (Tübingen, 1932), pp. 57 ff.
98. Cf. *Evangelium Veritatis* (EV) 17.28 f.: *καταφρονι ἡϋπλανη*. *πλάνη* refers to the Demiurge and the powers of creation; see below, n. 134.
99. For parallels in *AJ*, see especially *BG* 48.11-49.9; 51.4-52.17. On the motif of secrecy, see the *Gospel of Philip* 16 on the operation of the Holy Spirit (Wisdom) over against the archons. See also on the motif of the worship by men of their own creations the *Gospel of Philip* 85. And on the treachery of the archons, see the *Gospel of Philip* 13.
100. On the term *σπέρμα* in connection with the *πνοή-πνεῦμα* of Gen. 2.7, see below, p. 79.
101. Wisdom? Cf. the *Gospel of Philip* 16 on the secrecy of the Holy Spirit, a role assumed by Wisdom elsewhere, e.g. in the Sethian-Ophite passage treated above.
102. By far the best short treatment of *EV* as a whole, its genre and its character as a Valentinian document, is that of Hans Jonas, "Evangelium Veritatis and the Valentinian Speculation," *Studia Patristica VI* (TU 81; Berlin, 1962), 96-111.
103. For other Valentinian texts and discussion thereof, see below, pp. 76 ff.
104. A. Böhlig (ed.), *Koptisch-Gnostische Apokalypsen aus Codex V von Nag Hammadi* (Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg; Halle, 1963).
105. Cf. 64.16: "For we were higher than the God who had created us and the powers that were with him" At 74.3,7

he is given the name "Saclas"; at 69.5; 72.25; and 73.9 he is referred to as παντοκράτωρ.

106. The actual apocalypse is attributed to three men who appeared to Adam in a dream (65.25 ff.; 67.15-21); it begins at 67.22 and continues to 85.18. The larger framework is, in genre, a "testament," addressed by Adam to his son Seth.

107. At this point, line 27, the text breaks off. All that is left of line 28 is: . . .]φωστη[ρ

108. Cf. the role of the "angels" and the φωστῆρες in the giving of the πνεῦμα to man in *AJ*; see above, p. 53.

109. For "Kingless generation" see further below, n. 181. The figure of Seth occupies a very large place in gnostic speculation; on this see in general, and in Mandaean texts in particular, K. Rudolph, *Theogonie*, p. 304, n. 4. A look at the index under "Seth" in J. Doresse, *Secret Books*, is also very instructive. In the Bruce Codex 26, C. Baynes (ed. Cambridge, 1933), "Setheus" is referred to as God!

110. The text of the hymn itself occurs in 5.9.8. of Hippolytus' *Refutatio*. The hymn has been assigned by Wilamowitz to the time of the emperor Hadrian; see Nilsson, *Geschichte* II, 606. The Naassene-gnostic commentary on the non-gnostic hymn to Attis underlies the material in *Ref.* 5.7.3-5.9.6. For an important attempt to reconstruct the Naassene system see R. Reitzenstein's contribution in Reitzenstein and H. Schaeder, *Studien zum antiken Synkretismus aus Iran und Griechenland* (Studien der Bibliothek Warburg 7; Leipzig, 1926); and for an equally important critique of the same see A. D. Nock's review in *JHS* 49 (1929), 111-116, now reprinted in his collected essays.

111. Cf. the opening lines of the commentary: Γῆ δέ, φασὶν οἱ Ἕλληνες, ἄνθρωπον ἀνέδωκε πρώτη καλὸν ἐνεγκαμένη γέρας The reference to "Chaldaeans" cannot be taken to indicate a Mesopotamian origin for the theologoumena herein, as opposed to a Jewish origin; see Quispel, *Eranos Jb* 22, p. 204, n. 17; Rudolph, *ZRGG* 9, pp. 8 f.; Schenke, *Der Gott Mensch*, pp. 57-59.

112. Chief of whom is Esaldaios, a "god of fire" (7.30). Is there a play in this name on the Hebrew word for "fire" (אֵשׁ)?

113. Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, p. 84.

114. So Rudolph, *ZRGG* 9, pp. 8, 14.

115. So Brandenburger, *Adam und Christus*, p. 84, who attempts to gain a more complete picture of the Naassene myth with references from Zosimos. Brandenburger correctly posits a negative

evaluation of the ψυχή; see p. 85, n. 2.

116. Cf. Γηροδότην . . . τρισώματον, 8.4.

117. The passage immediately following explains how all three came together into one man, Jesus.

118. Perhaps these three words were used in Naassene worship services as "mystery" terms. As Epiphanius (*Pan.* 25.4, discussing the Nicolaitan sect) perceived, the words are actually a phonetic representation of the Hebrew text of Is. 28.10: צו לצו צו לקו קו לקו זעיר שם זעיר שם. According to Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* 1.24.3, the Basilideans gave the name *Kaulakau* to the Savior.

119. The commentary is here dealing with the phrase in the Attis-hymn, ἐπουράνιον μηνὸς κέρας Ἑλληνὶς σοφία. Cf. 9.8.

120. Wendland's indication (in the GCS ed.) that the text is corrupt here.

121. See also 8.44 f. on the Eleusinian Mysteries.

122. The Gospel of John is quoted in connection with the doctrine of ἀναγέννησις; see e.g. 8.10-12; 8.18-21; 8.36-38. Synonyms for ἀναγέννησις are ἀνοδος (8.18, quoting from Ps. 23. 7-10 LXX) and ἀνάστασις (8.24-28, quoting from 2 Cor. 12.2-4 and 1 Cor. 2.13 f.).

123. The Naassene teaching thus resembles that of the Simonians. Note that at *Ref.* 5.9.5 the *Megale Apophasis* of Simon is quoted. On the Valentinian doctrine, see below, pp. 79 ff.

124. *Ref.* 5.23-28. Hippolytus is our only source for the system.

125. *Ref.* 5.23.1; 24.2. Hans Jonas refers to a theory of Schultz that the name "Justin" was a mis-application of the name of Justin Martyr to the author of a system described in Justin's lost *Syntagma*; see *Gnosis* I, 335, n. 2. Against this see Haenchen, *ZTK* 50, p. 123.

126. Omit φησί here and elsewhere.

127. Cf. here Philo's speculations on the materials God used to form man's body, *Op.* 136-138.

128. On the system as a whole see especially E. Haenchen, "Das Buch Baruch," *ZTK* 50 (1953), 123-158; R. M. Grant, *Gnosticism and Early Christianity*, pp. 191 ff., and *After the New Testament* (Philadelphia, 1967), pp. 197-207.

129. "The Idea of the Golem," p. 164.

130. Elohim says, ἀνοίξατέ μοι πύλας, ἵνα εἰσελθῶν ἐξομολογήσωμαι τῷ κυρίῳ (cf. Ps. 118.19 = LXX 117.19): ἐδόκου

γὰρ ἐγὼ κύριος εἶναι. Here we encounter the familiar notion of the ignorance of the Demiurge, and his claim to be the only God; see Schenke, *Der Gott Mensch*, pp. 87 ff. Elohim is a repentant figure, somewhat akin to Sabaoth in the *Untitled Text* from Cod. II (see 151.32-155.17 and also *Hypostasis of the Archons* 143.13-144.3).

131. Cf. on this motif *CH* 1.10: the Logos forsakes Physis. And on the eroticism of Physis, see *CH* 1.14. Cf. also the Valentinian system, wherein Christ forsakes Achromoth (*Iren. Adv. Haer.* 1.4.1).

132. On this quotation, see Chapter 4, p. 34 f.

133. Haenchen, *ZTK* 50, p. 139, sees here a reflection of Gal. 5.17: ἡ γὰρ σὰρξ ἐπιθυμεῖ κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα κατὰ τῆς σαρκός. The verbal similarity does not seem to me to be enough to argue for a use of Paul here. In fact none of the passages Haenchen adduces to show influence from Pauline literature (pp. 139 f.) are convincing. Of course, other N. T. writings are certainly used without a doubt; on this see Haenchen, pp. 139-141. It is probable that Paul's writings were known to the gnostic author, or the latest redactor, but that he quoted from them has not been demonstrated.

134. Cf. the similar motif in *EV* 17, where Πλάων crucifies Jesus; but there the serpent-role is reversed. See my article, "Did the Gnostics Curse Jesus?" *JBL* 86 (1967), 304.

135. Jesus is a redeemer figure only in a secondary sense. The whole system could stand very well by itself with all of the Christian references removed, though that is not to say that the N. T. citations and Christian references are necessarily interpolations into the text.

136. Cf. 24.1: "For our Father, seeing the Good and having been made perfect with him, guarded the ineffable things of silence, and swore, as it is written, 'the Lord swore and will not change his mind' (Ps. 110.4 = LXX 109.4)."

137. There seems to be reflected some sort of gnostic baptism in which the baptismal water is also drunk. The same practice is attested for the Sethians according to Hippolytus, *Ref.* 5.19. 21 and for the Mandaeanes. On the latter see E. Segelberg, *Masbūtā* (Uppsala, 1958), pp. 59 ff.

138. 26.14, 18 f. Is their "washing" to be understood as a reference to Christian baptism as practiced in the catholic Church?

139. TU 60.5. *SJC* follows immediately upon the *AJ*, beginning with p. 77 of the codex.
140. *P.Ox.* 1081; cf. H.-C. Puech in Hennecke-Schneemelcher, *New Testament Apocrypha* I, trans. R. Wilson (Philadelphia, 1965), 244.
141. Cf. Doresse, *Secret Books*, p. 192.
142. The parallel material in *Eugnostos* extends from BG 80.5 to 117.12, thus not including the passage we are about to quote. Cf. Till's ed. of *BG*, p. 52.
143. So Doresse, p. 198; cf. also M. Krause, "Das literarische Verhältnis des Eugnostosbriefes zur Sophia Jesu Christi," *Mullus* (Festschrift Th. Klausner; Münster, 1964), pp. 215-223.
144. The two missing pages from the Chenoboskion version contain precisely the passage which we are quoting! Cf. Till's table, p. 54.
145. Cf. 90.4 ff.
146. I.e., the archons, referred to in this passage as "robbers"; cf. also 94.18 and 104.12. Cf. also at 125.16 f.: "the Archigenetor . . . and his angels."
147. I.e. the soul. Cf. *Gospel of Maria*, BG 15.8, where the ψυχή is explicitly referred to as a ζῆω .
148. Cf. Till's remarks on the difficulties in *SJC* for this reason, p. 56.
149. On the relation between the systems of *AJ* and *SJC*, and the reconstruction of the system underlying both, see now H.-M. Schenke, "Die Spitze des dem Apokryphen Johannis und der Sophia Jesu Christi zugrundeliegenden gnostischen Systems," *ZRGG* 14 (1962), 352-361.
150. Cf. Crum, 411b; also σταγών. Cf. in this connection the term "moisture of light" in the "Sethian-Ophite" system treated above, pp. 59-61.
151. I have found it outside of *SJC* only in the *Apocalypse of Adam*. In *ApAd* 79.19 we are told that the fifth kingdom (of thirteen, plus the "kingless generation," 77.27-83.4) "originated from a seed of heaven" (τῆς ἄνω σπέρματος). In 80.11,17 the seventh kingdom is called "a drop" (ὀστῆς); cf. 81.20, in connection with the tenth kingdom.
152. See *LSJ*, p. 1565.
153. On σπέρμα in the Valentinian material, see below, p. 79. Incidentally, such a usage of the term "drop" is exactly opposite that which occurs in rabbinic anthropological speculation. In

- Pirke Aboth* 3.1, 'Akabia ben Mahalalel (first generation Tanna) is quoted as saying: "Keep in view three things and thou wilt not come into the power of sin. Know whence thou comest and whither thou goest and before whom thou art to give strict account. Whence thou comest,--from a fetid drop (ממפה טרוחף). Whither thou goest,--to the place of dust, worms and maggots: and before whom thou art to give strict account,--Before the king of the kings of kings, the Holy one blessed be He" (ed. and trans. by R. Travers Herford). On this see R. Meyer, *Hellenistisches in der rabbinischen Anthropologie* (Stuttgart, 1937), pp. 33-39.
154. See below, p. 75, and n. 181.
155. This title is derived from the colophon at the end, Pl. 145: $\tau\theta\tau\pi\omicron\sigma\tau\alpha\varsigma\iota\varsigma\ \bar{\nu}\bar{\nu}\alpha\rho\chi\omega\bar{\nu}$. The document begins, however, $\epsilon\tau\beta\epsilon\ \theta\tau\pi\omicron\sigma\tau\alpha\varsigma\iota\varsigma\ \bar{\nu}\bar{\nu}\epsilon\zeta\omicron\tau\iota\alpha$.
156. The document probably is an epistolary treatise. See 134. 26, which Schenke restores, "[Ich habe] dies verfasst, weil du nach dem wesen der Mächte fragst"; J. Leipoldt and H.-M. Schenke, *Koptisch=gnostische Schriften aus den Papyrus-Codices von Nag Hammadi* (Hamburg, 1960), p. 76. In what follows I am using, with some modifications, the edition of R. Bullard, *The Hypostasis of the Archons* (PTS 10; Berlin, 1970).
157. Cf. Schenke, *Der Gott Mensch*, pp. 87 ff.
158. From Pistis Sophia, according to 142.5 ff.; cf. the *Untitled Text* 157.17-21. This pattern has already been observed in *AJ* and in the Sethian-Ophite system of *Iren. Adv. Haer.* 1.30.
159. Gr. = ἀφθαρσία. Here a reference to the highest deity is probably intended; cf. Schenke, *Der Gott Mensch*, p. 62.
160. Cf. in an exactly analogous context *Iren. Adv. Haer.* 1.8.3, where the ignorance of the psychic Demiurge is explained on the basis of 1 Cor. 2.14. Is 1 Cor. 2.14 in the background here as well?
161. Reading $\bar{\mu}\pi\omicron\{\tau\rho\}\omega\{\mu\epsilon\}$ in line 26 instead of $\bar{\mu}\pi\varsigma\ \omega\{\mu\}\{\alpha\}$. Cf. line 30.
162. Cf. 142.14 ff.; also *AJ*, *BG* 41.18 ff., where the (planetary) rulers are described as having animal faces. On Ialdabaoth as a lion-figure, cf. Bousset, *Hauptprobleme*, pp. 351 ff.
163. Reading $\chi\epsilon\kappa\alpha\alpha\varsigma$ in the lacuna at the end of line 34.
164. Cf. the same motif in *AJ*, discussed above, p. 52 f.
165. As in, e.g., *AJ*.
166. Cf. the same view of the role of the spirit in *EV* 30.16-26 and in the *Gospel of Philip* 16. See above, p. 63, and n. 101.

167. This reflects the oldest level of speculation on the εἰκὼν according to G. Quispel, *Eranos Jb* 22, pp. 202 f.
168. On the gnostic Wisdom-figure as a pleromatic projection of Eve, see now G. MacRae, "The Jewish Background of the Gnostic Sophia Myth," *NT* 12 (1970), 86-101, esp. 93, 99-101. See also his doctoral dissertation, "Some Elements of Jewish Apocalyptic and Mystical Tradition and Their Relation to Gnostic Literature" (Cambridge University, 1966, unfortunately still unpublished). I am grateful to Fr. MacRae for permitting me to see his dissertation during the time that I was completing my own work on this dissertation.
169. Ed., A. Böhlig, *Die Koptisch-gnostische Schrift ohne Titel aus Codex II von Hag Hammadi* (Berlin, 1962). See pp. 19-35 for a good introduction to the material. This text has now acquired the title, "On the Origin of the World." Cf. J. M. Robinson, *NTS* 14, p. 391, and *NT* 12, p. 83.
170. On the source analysis, see Böhlig, pp. 26 ff. *et passim*. The source problems in this document are almost insoluble.
171. Cf. 160.30-161.5 which probably comes from a different source (Böhlig, p. 29), but which contains the exhortation to the archons based on Gen. 1.26; cf. *HA* 135.23-26. Something like this should be understood as having preceded the passage quoted above. Preceding that would belong the blasphemy of the Demiurge and his rebuke, followed by the appearance of the "image." The "blasphemy" occurs at 151.2-32 and again at 155.17-156.2, but in material reflecting different sources. Cf. Böhlig, p. 29.
172. Cf. the appearance of the Light-Adam at 156.2-157.1, a passage which shows many similarities to the Manichaean cosmogony (Böhlig, pp. 58-61). Note that the εἰκὼν was feminine in *HA*, but masculine in the *Untitled Text*.
173. The archons. Cf. also 147.9,26; and the creation of Ialdabaoth in *HA* 142.14-19.
174. Cf. 151.17-28.
175. Perhaps the logical anomaly created by this statement can be alleviated by transferring it to a point after the next sentence.
176. On the etymological connection between Eve and "instructor" (הקח connected with Aramaic ארמא "to instruct"), see Böhlig's note, p. 73. The term is also used of the θηρίον in Paradise (Gen. 3.1): 162.2-4; 167.7; 168.2 f. On the etymological connection between the θηρίον, i.e. the serpent (cf. Aram. ארמא,

"animal" and ἄλιον "serpent") and the function of the "instructor" see Böhlig's note, p. 74. In HA the role of the serpent and the "spiritual woman" are amalgamated: 137.31 f.; 138.11. Cf. also *Iren. Adv. Haer.* 1.30.15, where Sophia is brought into close connection with the serpent.

177. A motif we have already seen with Saturninus and other texts; see above.

178. Cf., e.g., Saturninus; above, p. 57.

179. Cf. 172.24.

180. Jesus Christ? He is referred to only once, at 153.26, where he is called σωτήρ.

181. A designation found in various gnostic documents, e.g. *Apoc Ad* 82.19 f.; HA 145.4; *SJC* 92.4-7; Naassenes, *Hipp. Ref.* 5.8.1, 30; cf. also Codex Bruce 42. In the Liturgy in the *Apostolic Constitutions* 8.5.1, the term is used of God: ὁ θεός . . . ὁ μόνος ἀβασίλευτος. See PGL *ad loc.*

182. Although the Naassenes held that the "kingless" race was the highest of three (cf. *Ref.* 5.8.1,30), they allegorically connected this (gnostic) race, also called οἱ πνευματικοί, with the fourth river of Paradise, cf. *Ref.* 5.9. In the *Untitled Text* we have to do, apparently, with a fourth γένος.

183. F. Sagnard, *La gnose valentiniennne*, p. 139.

184. Anthimus, *De sancta ecclesia* 9; cf. Voelker, *Quellen*, p. 60.

185. On Valentinian gnosticism, see especially F. Sagnard, *La gnose valentiniennne*; and H. Jonas, *Gnosis und spätantiker Geist*, I, 362-375; and 408-418; also *The Gnostic Religion*, pp. 174-205. For a good treatment of Valentinian anthropology, see G. Quispel, "La conception de l'homme dans la gnose Valentinienne," *Eranos Jb* 15 (1947), 249-286.

186. Probably reflecting the doctrine of Ptolemy; cf. Förster, *Von Valentin zu Herakleon* (Giessen, 1928), p. 84, *et passim*; C. Barth, *Die Interpretation des Neuen Testaments in der Valentinianischen Gnosis* (TU 37.3; Leipzig, 1911), p. 11; F. Sagnard, *La gnose*, p. 232.

187. *Exe. Th.* 43-65 runs parallel at many points to *Adv. Haer.* 1.4.1-1.6.3. Both are dependent on a common source, according to O. Dibelius, *ZNW* 9 (1908), 230 ff. Cf. G. Quispel, "The Original Doctrine of Valentine," *VigChr* 1 (1947), 44 f.

188. So also F. Sagnard, *La gnose*, p. 232. See also G. Quispel's attempt to reconstruct "the original doctrine of Valentine,"

cited in the previous note.

189. See above, p. 63.

190. See e.g. F. Sagnard, *La gnose*, p. 446; Förster, *Von Valentin*, p. 98; Jonas, *Gnostic Religion*, p. 301. See also the testimony of the Fathers on the origins of Valentinian gnosticism: Iren. *Adv. Haer.* 1.11.1; 1.30.15; and 1.31.3; Tertullian *Adv. Val.* 39; Hippolytus *Ref.* 6.42.2.

191. Cf. Quispel, *VigChr* 1 (1947), 47; and especially Sagnard, *La gnose*, pp. 567-618.

192. As can be seen from the texts treated above. Cf. Hipp. *Ref.* 6.33, where the Demiurge is referred to as ἄνοος καὶ μωρός reminding us of the name "Saclas" which is given to the Demiurge in other systems (cf. *AJ*, C II 59.15-18). Cf. also *Exc. Th.* 49.1, where in the same context Rom. 8.20 is quoted and adapted: ὑπετάγη τῇ ματαιότητι τοῦ κόσμου, οὐχ ἐκῶν, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ὑποτάξαντα. In *EV* the blasphemy and ignorance of the Demiurge can be seen behind the figure of *Planē* ("Error"); see especially *EV* 17.14-21.

193. Omitting such additions as διορίζονται, λέγουσιν, ὡς φασί, etc.

194. Based on the text as edited by F. Sagnard, *Extraits de Théodote* (Sources Chrétiennes 23; Paris, 1948).

195. Cf. *HA* 137.9 and the speculation on the spiritual nature of the rib taken from Adam; and see below.

196. One would expect here, as in *Adv. Haer.* 1.5.5, the term σάρκινος. But *Exc. Th.* does have this speculation on Gen. 3.21 at a more logical place, i.e. at the end.

197. On the system represented by Hippolytus, see C. Barth, *Die Interpretation des Neuen Testaments in der Valentinianischen Gnosis*, p. 27, and Förster, *Von Valentin*, p. 100.

198. I.e. the ἄγγελοι ἐπουράνιοι (34.3).

199. This passage is dependent upon Valentinus' metaphor of the heart as an inn (πανδοχεῖον) which is sometimes occupied by unclean spirits, but which can be purified by God through the Son; see Fr. 2, Voelker, *Quellen*, p. 58.

200. This represents a secondary philosophizing of a more primitive exegetical tradition which was already influenced by Hellenistic philosophy. Philo, a century earlier than Valentinus, is a good example of the influence of Hellenistic philosophy on his exegesis of Genesis, as we have already seen. On the influence of the *Timaeus* on Valentinian doctrine, see the remarks of

- Hippolytus, *Ref.* 6.22.1: ἡ μὲν οὖν ἀρχὴ τῆς ὑποθέσεως ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ Τιμαίῳ τῷ Πλάτῳ σοφία Αἴγυπτίων
201. Plato does not use the term ὕλη. Cf. F. Cornford, *Plato's Cosmology, The Timaeus of Plato* (Indianapolis [n. d.]), p. 181.
202. Probably a play on χοῦς in Gen. 2.7, a noun related to the verb χέω. Thus a distinction is made between the χοῦς of Gen. 2.7 and the ξηρό of Gen. 1.10.
203. See H. Lewy, *The Chaldean Oracles*, p. 118 and p. 297, n. 143. On the relation of the *Chaldaean Oracles* to Middle Platonism, see his discussion, pp. 312 ff.
204. Cf. *Exc. Th.* 2.1-2, where the term ἀπόρροια is also used of the πνευματικὸν σπέρμα. On the term ἀπόρροια see now H. Dörrie, "Emanation. Ein unphilosophisches Wort im spätantiken Denken," in *Parusia. Studien zur Philosophie Platons und zur Problemgeschichte des Platonismus*, pp. 119-141.
205. Cf. *Iren. Adv. Haer.* 1.5.6: συγκατασπαρεῖς τῷ ἐμφυσήματι αὐτοῦ. See also Heracleon, Fr. 16, Brooke, p. 71, 1.9: τὸ ἐμφύσημα καὶ τὸ ἐν τῷ ἐμφυσήματι σπέρμα.
206. See already the fragment of Valentinus quoted above, p. 63.
207. This understanding of Gen. 3.21 is known already to Philo, *Post.* 137. On the tripartite soul, and other aspects of Valentinian anthropology, see G. Quispel, *Eranos Jb* 15, pp. 249-286.
208. This use of λογικὴ contradicts 53.5! The psychics, in order to be saved, need faith and righteousness (*Adv. Haer.* 1.6. 2).
209. Seth is the representative of spiritual humanity in many gnostic systems. See above, n. 109.
210. At *EV* 31.4 the word **ΘΡΛΗ** must be taken on the basis of the plural verb **νεμῆποτροπωνῆ** to reflect the Greek οἱ ὕλικοί.
211. See above all the Hermetic distinction between the ὑλικός and the ἐννοῦς ἄνθρωπος, *CH* 9.5.
212. According to Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* 4.13.89) Basilides as well as Valentinus taught a φύσει σφζόμενον γένος. In the Valentinian system salvation is effected by μόρφωσις or τελείωσις in γνῶσις, and is thoroughly Christocentric. See on this F. Sagnard, *La gnose valentinienne*, pp. 400 ff., and G. Quispel, *Eranos Jb* 15, pp. 274 ff.
213. That is not to say that the "psychics" participate in the same kind or degree of salvation as do the "pneumatics." On the destiny of the saved "psychics" see F. Sagnard, *La gnose valentinienne*, pp. 397 ff. Of course the "psychics" are the members

of the non-gnostic catholic church!

214. So also F. Sagnard, *La gnose valentinienne*, p. 303, n. 1.

215. The Pauline passages are 1 Cor. 15.48; 1 Cor. 2.14; and 1 Cor. 2.15. 1 Cor. 2.14 is also cited in Hippolytus' account at Ref. 6.34.8.

NOTES: CHAPTER SEVEN (pp. 82-85)

1. "Hellenistisch-jüdische spekulative Mystik" is a phrase used by D. Georgi in his study of the religious-historical background of the hymn in Philippians 2, in *Zeit und Geschichte*; see especially p. 268. Georgi rightly understands this as a matrix (he would see it as *the* matrix) out of which Gnosticism develops, but he has not precisely enough defined at what point such mysticism becomes "Gnosticism." See below.
2. The phrase ("spätantiker Geist") belongs to Hans Jonas. It seems to me that Jonas' later writings on Gnosticism are better, because more precise, than his epoch-making *Gnosis und spätantiker Geist*, first published in 1934.
3. See now E. R. Dodds, *Pagan and Christian in an Age of Anxiety* (Cambridge, 1965). In addition to the general "disjointedness" of the times, a very important factor in this common world view was the prevailing "scientific" view of the universe held by astronomers, astrologers, and philosophers. On this see M. P. Nilsson, "The New Conception of the Universe in Late Greek Paganism," *Eranos* 44 (1946), 20-27; see also *Geschichte der Griechischen Religion*, II, 702-711.
4. See above, especially p. 42 f.
5. See p. 3.
6. See H. Jonas' contribution in *The Bible in Modern Scholarship*, pp. 286-293, and also his paper read at Messina, in *Le Origini dello Gnosticismo*, pp. 101 f.; see also G. MacRae's dissertation, "Some Elements of Jewish Apocalyptic and Mystical Tradition and Their Relation to Gnostic Literature," I, 290, *et passim*.
7. Perceived by Jonas, but he does not draw the proper historical and genetic conclusion from this observation; MacRae has perceived the matter correctly.
8. MacRae's dissertation has gone a long way toward establishing this without further room for doubt. See now also B. Pearson, "Jewish Haggadic Traditions in *The Testimony of Truth* from Nag Hammadi (CG IX, 3)" in *Ex Orbe Religionum. Studia Geo Widengren I* (Numen Suppl. 21; Leiden, 1972), 457-470; also "Friedländer Revisited: Alexandrian Judaism and Gnostic Origins," *Studia Philonica* 2 (1973); and literature cited in these studies.
9. MacRae, I, 301 f.; cf. also *NT* 12, 97 f.
10. MacRae, diss. I, p. 304.
11. When this occurred cannot be answered with certainty. But see above, p. 58 on Simon, Menander, and Saturninus. Haenchen is

correct in his judgment that Simon Magus was never a Christian, and that the Acts narrative is in this respect unhistorical; see *ZTK* 49 (1952), 316-349.

12. E.g. the Simonians, p. 59; the Naassenes, p. 66 f.; *Hypostasis of the Archons*, p. 71; and especially the Valentinians, p. 80 f.

13. Tertullian, *adv. Marc.* 3.5. Tertullian refers to the appropriation of Paul by the Marcionites. On the Marcionite use of Paul, see the classic work of Adolf von Harnack, *Marcion, Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott*² (Leipzig, 1924; r.p. Darmstadt, 1960).

14. W. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*⁵ (Göttingen, 1965), p. 192.

15. E. Aleith, *Paulusverständnis in der alten Kirche* (Berlin, 1937), p. 40.

16. When I began research for this dissertation I planned to investigate the use of Paul by the Gnostics of the second century. It then became evident to me that the problem of the relationship between Paul and his Corinthian opponents would have to be investigated, and the present work is the result. Meanwhile others are working on the problem of the use of Paul by Gnostics, e.g. E. H. Pagels, "The Valentinian Claim to Esoteric Exegesis of Romans as Basis for Anthropological Theory," *VigChr* 26 (1972) 241-258, an article which serves as a preview to her forthcoming monograph on Paul and Valentinian Gnosticism.

17. The recent book by M. F. Wiles, *The Divine Apostle, The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistles in the Early Church* (Cambridge, 1967), only takes up from Irenaeus and thus omits a discussion of that obscure but crucial period preceding Irenaeus. See my review in *VigChr* 24 (1970), 144-147.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

The first part contains the texts and, in some instances, the translations used in citing or quoting source material. I have also included English translations of ancient sources consulted in the preparation of my own translations. Entries are listed according to editor.

The second part contains only those books and articles cited in the dissertation. The absence of any particular book or article does not necessarily indicate that it has not been consulted. I have not included in the Bibliography the standard reference works, such as lexica, grammars, encyclopedias, etc. Some of these occur in the list of abbreviations.

A. Sources

- Adam, Alfred. *Texte zum Manichäismus*. (K1T 175.) Berlin, 1954. 2nd ed., Berlin, 1969.
- Albeck, Ch. and J. Theodor. *Midrash Bereshit Rabba*. Jerusalem, 1965. (First published in 1929: Berlin.)
- Arnim, Hans von. *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta*. 4 vols. Leipzig, 1905-24.
- Baynes, Charlotte. *A Coptic Gnostic Treatise Contained in the Codex Brucianus*. Cambridge, 1933.
- Blackman, Philip. *Mishnayoth*. 7 vols. London, 1951-56.
- Böhlig, A., and P. Labib. *Koptisch-Gnostische Apocalypsen aus Codex V von Nag Hammadi*. *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg*. Halle, 1963.
- _____. *Die koptisch-gnostische Schrift ohne Titel aus Codex II von Nag Hammadi*. Berlin, 1962.
- Bowker, J. *The Targums and Rabbinic Literature*. Cambridge, 1969.
- Brooke, A. E. *The Fragments of Heracleon*. (Texts and Studies 1) Cambridge, 1891.
- Bullard, Roger A. *The Hypostasis of the Archons. The Coptic Text with Translation and Commentary*. (PTS 10.) Berlin, 1970.
- Burnet, John. *Platonis Opera*. 5 vols. Oxford, 1958. (First published in 1900.)
- Casey, R. P. *The Excerpta ex Theodoto of Clement of Alexandria*. (Studies and Documents 1.) London, 1934.
- Chadwick, Henry. *Origen: Contra Celsum*. Cambridge, 1953.
- Charles, R. H. *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*. 2 vols. Oxford, 1913.
- _____. *The Ascension of Isaiah*. London, 1900.
- _____. *The Book of Enoch*. Oxford, 1912.
- _____. *The Ethiopic Version of the Book of Enoch*. *Anecdota Oxoniensia*. (Texts, Documents, and Extracts, Semitic Series, Part 11.) Oxford, 1906.

- _____. *The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. Darmstadt, 1966. (First published in 1908: Oxford.)
- Cohn, Leopold, and Paul Wendland. *Philonis Alexandrini Opera Quae Supersunt*. 6 vols. Berlin, 1896-1915.
- Colson, F. H., and G. H. Whitaker. *Philo*. 10 vols. (The Loeb Classical Library.) Cambridge, Mass., 1929-62.
- Cornford, Francis. *Plato's Cosmology. The Timaeus of Plato*. Indianapolis, n. d.
- Danby, Herbert. *The Mishnah*. London, 1958.
- De Lacy, Phillip, and Benedict Einarson. *Plutarch's Moralia*. Vol. 7. (The Loeb Classical Library.) Cambridge, Mass., 1959.
- Diels, Hermann, and Walther Kranz. *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*. 3 vols. 7th ed. Berlin, 1954.
- Dietrich, Albrecht. *Eine Mithrasliturgie*. Darmstadt, 1966. (Reprint of 3rd ed., Leipzig, 1923.)
- Diez Macho, A. *Neophyti I: Targum palistinense, Ms. de la Biblioteca Vaticana. Tomo I: Genesis*. (Textos y estudios 7.) Madrid, 1968.
- Dupont-Sommer, A. *The Essene Writings from Qumran*. Trans. G. Vermes. Cleveland, 1962.
- Epstein, I. *The Babylonian Talmud. Seder Nezikin*. London, 1935.
- Evans, Ernest. *Tertullian's Treatise on the Resurrection*. London, 1960.
- Freedman, H., and M. Simon. *Midrash Rabbah*. Vol. 1. London, 1939.
- Funk, F. X., and Karl Bihlmeyer. *Die Apostolischen Väter*. Tübingen, 1956.
- Giversen, Søren. *Apocryphon Johannis*. (Acta Theologica Danica 5.) Copenhagen, 1963.
- Goodspeed, E. J. *Die ältesten Apologeten*. Göttingen, 1914.
- Grant, R. M. *Gnosticism, an Anthology*. London, 1961.
- Haardt, Robert. *Gnosis. Character and Testimony*. Trans. J. Hendry. Leiden, 1971.
- Harvey, W. Wigan. *Sancti Irenaei, Libros quinque adversus Haereses*. 2 vols. Cambridge, 1857.
- Hennecke, Edgar, and Wilhelm Schneemelcher. *New Testament Apocrypha*. Trans. R. M. Wilson. 2 vols. Philadelphia, 1963-65.
- Herford, R. Travers. *The Ethics of the Talmud: Sayings of the Fathers*. New York, 1962.
- Holl, Karl. *Epiphanius, Ancoratus und Panarion*. 3 vols. (GCS 25, 31, 37.) Leipzig, 1915-33.
- James, M. R. *Apocrypha Anecdota (Second Series)*. (Texts and Studies 1.) Cambridge, 1897.
- Kisch, Guido. *Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*. (Publications in Medieval Studies, University of Notre Dame, Indiana, 1949.
- Koetschau, Paul. *Gegen Celsus in Origines Werke*. Vols. 1 and 2.

- (GCS 2, 3.) Leipzig, 1899.
- Krause, Martin, and P. Labib. *Die drei Versionen des Apokryphon des Johannes im koptischen Museum zu Alt-Kairo.* (Abhandlungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts Kairo, Kopt. Reihe 1.) Wiesbaden, 1962.
- Kroll, Wilhelm. *De Oraculis Chaldaicis.* (Breslauer Philologische Abhandlungen 7.1.) Breslau, 1894.
- Kroymann, Emil. *Tertulliani Opera. Pars III.* (CSEL 47.) Leipzig, 1906.
- Labib, Pahor. *Coptic Gnostic Papyri in the Coptic Museum at Old Cairo.* Vol. 1 (no other volumes published). Cairo, 1961.
- Leemans, E.-A. *Studie over den Wijsgeer Numenius van Apamea met Uitgave der Fragmenten.* (Memoires de l'Acad. royale de Belgique, Cl. des Lettres 37.2.) Brussels, 1937.
- Leipoldt, J., and H.-M. Schenke. *Koptisch-gnostische Schriften aus den Papyrus-Codices von Nag Hammadi.* Hamburg, 1960.
- Lidzbarski, Mark. *Ginza.* Göttingen, 1925.
- Lohse, Eduard. *Die Texte aus Qumran.* Darmstadt, 1964.
- Marcus, Ralph. *Philo.* Supplement, 2 vols. (The Loeb Classical Library.) Cambridge, Mass., 1953.
- Marquardt, Johannes. *Observationes criticae in Cl. Galeni librum ΠΕΡΙ ΨΥΧΗΣ ΠΑΘΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΑΜΑΡΤΗΜΑΤΩΝ.* Leipzig, 1870.
- Meritt, B. D. *Corinth.* Vol. 8.1, *Greek Inscriptions.* Cambridge, 1931.
- Nestle, E., and K. Aland. *Novum Testamentum Graece.* 25th ed. Stuttgart, 1963.
- Nock, A. D., and A.-J. Festugière. *Corpus Hermeticum.* 4 vols. Paris, 1954-60.
- Nock, A. D. *Sallustius. Concerning the Gods and the Universe.* Hildesheim, 1966. (First published in 1926: Cambridge.)
- Oldfather, W. A. *Epictetus. The Discourses as Reported by Arrian, the Manual, and Fragments.* 2 vols. (The Loeb Classical Library.) Cambridge, Mass., 1961.
- Preisendanz, Karl. *Papyri Graecae Magicae. Die Griechischen Zauberpapyri.* 2 vols. Leipzig, 1928-31.
- Rahlfs, Alfred. *Septuaginta.* 2 vols. Stuttgart, 1952.
- Reider, Joseph. *The Book of Wisdom.* (Dropsie College Edition, Jewish Apocryphal Literature.) New York, 1957.
- Roberts, Alexander, and James Donaldson. *The Ante-Nicene Fathers.* (American Edition, 10 vols.) Grand Rapids, n. d.
- Robinson, James M. et al. *The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices. Codex II.* Leiden, 1973.
- Rose, Valentine. *Aristotelis Qui Ferebantur Librorum Fragmenta.* Leipzig, 1886.
- Ross, W. D. *Aristotle's Physics.* Oxford, 1955.
- Sagnard, F. *Clément d'Alexandrie Extraits de Théodote.* (Sources Chrétiennes 23.) Paris, 1948.
- Smith, Joseph P. *St. Irenaeus. Proof of the Apostolic Preaching.* (Ancient Christian Writers 16.) Westminster, Maryland, 1952.

- Sperber, Alexander. *The Bible in Aramaic. Vol. 1: The Pentateuch according to Targum Onkelos.* Leiden, 1959.
- Stearns, W. N. *Fragments from Graeco-Jewish Writers.* Chicago, 1908.
- Thackeray, H. St. J., and Louis Feldman. *Josephus.* 9 vols. (The Loeb Classical Library.) Cambridge, Mass., 1926-65.
- Theodoret of Cyrus. *Haereticarum Fabularum Compendium.* In J. P. Migne. *Patrologiae Graecae.* Vol. 83, cols. 335-556. Paris, 1864..
- Till, Walter C. *Das Evangelium nach Philippos.* (PTS 2.) Berlin, 1963.
- _____. *Die gnostischen Schriften des koptischen Papyrus Berolinensis 8502.* (TU 60.5.) Berlin, 1955. Rev. ed. H.-M. Schenke, Berlin, 1972.
- Völker, Walther. *Quellen zur Geschichte der christlichen Gnosis.* Tübingen, 1932.
- Vogel, C. J. de. *Greek Philosophy. A Collection of Texts.* Vol. 3: *The Hellenistic-Roman Period.* 2nd ed. Leiden, 1964.
- Wendland, Paul. *Hippolytus Werke.* Vol. 3: *Refutatio omnium Haeresium.* (GCS 26.) Leipzig, 1916.
- Ziegler, Joseph. *Sapientia Salomonis.* (Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Societatis Litterarum Göttingensis editum 12.1.) Göttingen, 1962.

B. Literature

- Aleith, Eva. *Paulusverständnis in der alten Kirche.* Berlin, 1937.
- Almqvist, Helge. *Plutarch und das Neue Testament.* Uppsala, 1946.
- Barrett, C. K. *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians.* New York, 1968.
- Barth, Carola. *Die Interpretation des Neuen Testaments in der Valentinianischen Gnosis.* (TU 37.3.) Leipzig, 1911.
- Benoit, P. "L'inscription grecque du tombeau de Jason," *IEJ* 17 (1967), 112-113.
- Bianchi, Ugo. "Le colloque international sur les origines du gnosticisme (Messine, Avril 1966)," *Numen* 13 (1966), 151-160.
- Bousset, Wilhelm. *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis.* Göttingen, 1907.
- _____. *Die Himmelsreise der Seele.* Darmstadt, 1960.
- _____. *Kyrios Christos.* 5th edition. Göttingen, 1965.
- Brandenburger, Egon. *Adam und Christus.* (WMANT 7.) Neukirchen, 1962.
- Brown, Raymond. *The Semitic Background of the Term "Mystery" in the New Testament.* (Facet Books, Biblical Series 21.) Philadelphia, 1968.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. "Karl Barth, 'Die Auferstehung der Toten,'" in *Glauben und Verstehen* (Tübingen, 1933), pp. 38-64. ET in *Faith and Understanding*, vol. 1. R. Funk (ed.) New York, 1969.
- _____. *Der Stil der paulinischen Predigt und die kynisch-*

- stoische Diatribe. (FRLANT 13.) Göttingen, 1910.
- _____. *Theology of the New Testament*. Trans. K. Grobel. 2 vols. New York, 1951-55.
- Clavier, H. "Breves remarques sur la notion de $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$ πνευματικόν," in W. D. Davies and D. Daube (eds.), *The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology* (Cambridge, 1954.), 342-362.
- Conzelmann, Hans. *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*. (Meyer, 11th ed.) Göttingen, 1969.
- _____. "Paulus und die Weisheit," *NTS* 12 (1965/66), 231-244.
- F. L. Cross (ed. and trans.). *The Jung Codex*. London, 1955.
- Cumont, Franz. *Lux Perpetua*. Paris, 1949.
- Dahl, Nils. "Formgeschichtliche Beobachtungen zur Christusverkündigung in der Gemeindepredigt," in *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann* (BZNW 21, Berlin, 1954), 3-9.
- _____. "Paul and the Church at Corinth according to 1 Corinthians 1-4," in *Christian History and Interpretation. Studies Presented to John Knox* (Cambridge, 1967), 313-335.
- _____. "Paulus apostel og menigheten i Korinth (1 Kor. 1-4)," *NTT* 54 (1953), 1-23.
- Davies, W. D. *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*. London, 1962.
- Dibelius, Martin. *Der Brief des Jakobus*. (Meyer, 10th edition.) Göttingen, 1959.
- _____. *Die Geisterwelt im Glauben des Paulus*. Göttingen, 1909.
- Dodds, E. R. *Pagan and Christian in an Age of Anxiety*. Cambridge, 1965.
- _____. *Proclus: The Elements of Theology*. 2nd edition. Oxford, 1963.
- Dörrie, Heinrich. "Emanation. Ein unphilosophisches Wort im spätantiken Denken," in K. Flasch (ed.), *Parusia. Studien zur Philosophie Platons und zur Problemgeschichte des Platonismus* (Frankfurt, 1965), 119-141.
- Doresse, Jean. *The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics*. Trans. P. Miret. New York, 1960.
- Drower, E. S. *The Secret Adam. A Study of Naṣoræan Gnosis*. Oxford, 1960.
- Du Plessis, P. J. ΤΕΛΕΙΟΣ. *The Idea of Perfection in the New Testament*. Kampen, 1959.
- Dupont, Jacques. *Gnosis. La connaissance religieuse dans les épîtres de saint Paul*. 2nd edition. (Universitatis Catholicae Lovaniensis Dissertationes ad gradum magistri in Facultate Theologica. Ser. II, 40.) Louvain, 1960.
- Einsengemeng, J. A. *Entdecktes Judentum*. Vol. 1. 1700.
- Fascher, Erich. ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ. Giessen, 1927.
- Feine, Paul, Johannes Behm, and Werner G. Kümmel. *Introduction to the New Testament*. Trans. A. J. Mattill, Jr. Nashville, 1966.
- Feuillet, André. "Les 'Chefs de ce siècle' et la Sagesse divine d'après 1 Co. II, 6-8," in *Le Christ Sagesse de Dieu d'après les épîtres pauliniennes* (Paris, 1966), 25-36.

- Flusser, David. "The Dead Sea Sect and Pre-Pauline Christianity," in *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 4 (Jerusalem, 1958), 215-266.
- Foerster, Werner. *Von Valentin zu Herakleon*. Giessen, 1928.
- Ford, J. M. "The First Epistle to the Corinthians or the First Epistle to the Hebrews?" *CBQ* 28 (1966), 402-416.
- Frickel, J. H. "Die Apophasis Megale, eine Grundschrift der Gnosis?" in U. Bianchi (ed.), *Le Origini dello Gnosticismo, Colloquio di Messina 13-18 Aprile 1966* (Studies in the History of Religions, Supplements to *Numen* 12, Leiden, 1967), 197-202.
- Fridrichsen, Anton. "Gnosis. Et Bidrag til Belysning av den Paulinske Terminologi og Erkjennelsesteori," in *Religionshistoriska Studier tillägnade Edvard Lehmann* (Lund, 1927), 85-109.
- Funk, Robert W. *Language, Hermeneutic, and Word of God*. New York, 1966.
- Georgi, Dieter. *Die Gegner des Paulus im 2. Korintherbrief*. (WMANT 11.) Neukirchen, 1964.
- _____. *Die Geschichte der Kollekte des Paulus für Jerusalem*. (ThF 38.) Hamburg-Bergstedt, 1965.
- _____. "Der vorpaulinische Hymnus Phil 2, 6-11," in E. Dinkler (ed.), *Zeit und Geschichte* (Tübingen, 1964), 263-293.
- _____. W. Schmithals, *Die Gnosis in Korinth*, a review, *Verkündigung und Forschung* (Bericht 1958/59), 90-96.
- Giversen, Søren. "The Apocryphon of John and Genesis," *StTh* 17 (1963), 60-76.
- Grant, R. M. *After the New Testament*. Philadelphia, 1967.
- _____. *Gnosticism and Early Christianity*. Rev. edition. New York, 1966.
- _____. "The Wisdom of the Corinthians," in Sherman Johnson (ed.), *The Joy of Study* (New York, 1951), 51-55.
- Guthrie, W. K. C. *The Greeks and Their Gods*. Boston, 1961.
- Haenchen, Ernst. "Das Buch Baruch," *ZTK* 50 (1953), 123-158.
- _____. "Gab es eine vorchristliche Gnosis?" *ZTK* 49 (1952), 316-349.
- Harnack, Adolf von. *Marcion. Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott*. Darmstadt, 1960. (Reprint of 2nd edition, Leipzig, 1924.)
- Hegermann, Harald. *Die Vorstellung vom Schöpfungsmittler im Hellenistischen Judentum und Urchristentum*. (TU 82.) Berlin, 1961.
- Héring, Jean. *The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians*. Trans. A. Heathcote and P. Allcock. London, 1962.
- Hilgenfeld, Adolf. *Die Ketzergeschichte des Urchristentums*. Darmstadt, 1963. (First published in 1884: Leipzig.)
- Jeremias, Joachim. "Flesh and Blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God," in *Abba. Studien zur neutestamentlichen Theologie* (Göttingen, 1966), 151-159.
- Jervell, Jacob. *Imago Dei*. (FRLANT, 58.) Göttingen, 1960.

- Daas, Hans. "Delimitation of the gnostic phenomenon--
typological and historical," in U. Bianchi (ed.), *Le
Origini dello Gnosticismo, Colloquio di Messina 13-18
Aprile 1966* (Studies in the History of Religions, Supple-
ments to Numen 12, Leiden, 1967), 90-108.
- _____. "Evangelium Veritatis and the Valentinian Speculation,"
in F. L. Cross (ed.), *Studia Patristica*, vol. 6 (TU 81,
Berlin, 1962), 96-111.
- _____. *Gnosis und spätantiker Geist*. Vol. 1, 3rd edition.
(FRLANT 51.) Göttingen, 1964.
- _____. *The Gnostic Religion*. Boston, 1963.
- _____. "Response to G. Quispel's 'Gnosticism and the New
Testament,'" in J. P. Hyatt (ed.), *The Bible in Modern
Scholarship* (Nashville, 1965), 279-293.
- Käsermann, Ernst. "The Disciples of John the Baptist in Ephesus,"
in *Essays on New Testament Themes* (SBT 41, London, 1964),
136-148.
- Knox, W. L. *St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles*. Cambridge,
1939.
- Koester, Helmut. "Paul and Hellenism," in J. P. Hyatt (ed.),
The Bible in Modern Scholarship (Nashville, 1965), 187-195.
- _____. U. Wilckens, *Weisheit und Torheit*, a review, *Gnomon*
33 (1961), 590-595.
- Kragerud, Alv. "Apocryphon Johannis. En formanalyse," *NTT*
66 (1965), 15-38.
- Krause, Martin. "Das literarische Verhältnis des Eugnostosbriefes
zur Sophia Jesus Christi," in *Mullus* (Jahrbuch für Antike und
Christentum Ergänzungsband 1, Munster, 1964), 215-223.
- Laffranque, Marie. *Posidonios d'Apamée*. (Publications de la
Faculté des Lettres et Sciences Humaines de Paris. Serie
"Recherches," 13.) Paris, 1964.
- Leisegang, Hans. *Der heilige Geist*. Vol. 1. Darmstadt, 1967.
(First published in 1919: Leipzig.)
- Levy, Hans. *Chaldaean Oracles and Theurgy*. Cairo, 1956.
- Licht, Jacob. "An Analysis of the Treatise of the Two Spirits
in DSD," in *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 4 (Jerusalem, 1958),
88-99.
- Liechtenhan, Rudolf. *Die Offenbarung im Gnosticismus*. Göttingen,
1901.
- Rietzmann, Hans, and W. G. Kümmel. *An die Korinther 1. II*. 4th
edition. (HNT 9.) Tübingen, 1949.
- Luck, Ulrich. "Weisheit und Leiden. Zum Problem Paulus und
Jakobus," *ThLZ* 92 (1967), 253-258.
- Lütgert, W. *Freiheitspredigt und Schwarmgeister in Korinth*.
(BFCT 12.3.) Gütersloh, 1908.
- Lührmann, Dieter. *Das Offenbarungsverständnis bei Paulus und in
paulinischen Gemeinden*. (WMANT, 16.) Neukirchen, 1965.
- MacRae, George. "Gnosis in Messina," *CBQ* 28 (1966), 322-333.
- _____. "The Jewish Background of the Gnostic Sophia Myth,"
NT 12 (1970), 86-101.

- MacRae, George. "Some Elements of Jewish Apocalyptic and Mystical Tradition and Their Relation to Gnostic Literature." 2 vols. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Cambridge, 1966.
- Maly, Karl. "1 Kor 12,1-3, eine Regel zur Unterscheidung der Geister?" *BZ* 10 (1966), 82-95.
- Mausner, Ulrich. "Galater III.20: Die Universalität des Heils," *NTS* 13 (1966/67), 258-269.
- Meyer, Rudolf. *Hellenistisches in der rabbinischen Anthropologie*. Stuttgart, 1937.
- Moule, C. F. D. "St. Paul and Dualism," *NTS* 12 (1965/66), 106-123.
- Munck, Johannes. *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind*. Trans. F. Clarke. Richmond, Va., 1959.
- Neufeld, V. H. *The Earliest Christian Confessions*. (New Testament Tools and Studies 5.) Grand Rapids, 1963.
- Nilsson, Martin P. *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*. Vol. 2. 2nd edition. Munich, 1961.
- _____. "The New Conception of the Universe in Late Greek Paganism," *Eranos* 44 (1946), 20-27.
- Nock, Arthur Darby. *Early Gentile Christianity and Its Hellenistic Background*. New York, 1964.
- _____. *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World*. Z. Stewart (ed.) Cambridge, Mass., 1972.
- _____. R. Reitzenstein and H. H. Schaeder, *Studien zum antiken Synkretismus aus Iran und Griechenland*, a review, *JHS* 49 (1929), 111-116.
- Pagels, Elaine H. "The Valentinian Claim to Esoteric Exegesis of Romans as Basis for Anthropological Theory," *VigChr* 26 (1972), 241-258.
- Pearson, Birger A. "Friedlander Revisited: Alexandrian Judaism and Gnostic Origins," *Studia Philonica* 2 (1973).
- _____. "Jewish Haggadic Traditions in *The Testimony of Truth* from Nag Hammadi (CG IX,3)" in *Ex Orbe Religionum. Studia Geo Widengren*, vol. 1 (Studies in the History of Religions, Supplements to *Numen* 21, Leiden, 1972), 457-470.
- _____. L. Schottroff, *Der Glaubende und die feindliche Welt*, a review, *JBL* 91 (1972), 567-569.
- _____. "1 Thessalonians 2:13-16: A Deutero-Pauline Interpretation," *HTR* 64 (1971), 79-94.
- _____. M. F. Wiles, *The Divine Apostle*, a review, *VigChr* 24 (1970), 144-147.
- Petersen, Norman R. "The Literary Problematic of the Apocryphon of John." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1967.
- Peterson, Erik. "Die Befreiung Adams aus der 'Ανύμνη,' in *Frühkirche, Judentum und Gnosis* (Freiburg, 1959), 107-128.
- _____. ΕΙΕ ΘΕΟΣ. (FRLANT 41.) Göttingen, 1926.
- _____. "1 Kor. 1.18f. und die Thematik des jüdischen Busstages," in *Frühkirche, Judentum und Gnosis* (Freiburg, 1959), 43-50.

- Philonenko, Marc. "Quod oculus non vidit, 1 Cor. 2,9." *ThZ* 14 (1958), 51-52.
- Pohlenz, Max. *Die Stoa*. 2 vols. 2nd edition. Göttingen, 1950.
- Preuschen, E. "Die apocryphen gnostischen Adamschriften aus dem Armenischen übersetzt und untersucht," in W. Diehl (ed.), *Festgruss Bernhard Stade* (Giessen, 1900), 163-252.
- Prigent, P. "Ce que l'oeil n'a pas vu, 1 Cor 2,9," *ThZ* 14 (1958), 416-429.
- Pryke, J. "'Spirit' and 'Flesh' in the Qumran Documents and Some New Testament Texts," *RevQum* 19,5 (1965), 345-360.
- Pulver, Max. "The Experience of the Pneuma in Philo," in *Spirit and Nature* (Papers from the *Eranos Yearbooks*, vol. 1, ed. J. Campbell, New York, 1954), 107-121.
- Quispel, G. "La conception de l'homme dans la gnose Valentinienne," in *Eranos-Jahrbuch* 15 (1947), 249-286.
- _____. "Der gnostische Anthropos und die jüdische Tradition," in *Eranos-Jahrbuch* 22 (1953), 195-234.
- _____. "The Original Doctrine of Valentine," *VigChr* 1 (1947), 43-73.
- Reitzenstein, R. *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen*. 3rd edition. Stuttgart, 1927.
- _____. *Poimandres*. Darmstadt, 1966. (First published in 1904: Leipzig.)
- _____, and H. Schaeder. *Studien zum antiken Synkretismus aus Iran und Griechenland*. (Studien der Bibliothek Warburg 7.) Leipzig, 1926.
- Resch, Alfred. *Agrapha*. (TU 5.4.) Leipzig, 1889.
- Reumann, J. "Οἰκονομία-Terms in Paul in Comparison with Lucan *Heilsgeschichte*," *NTS* 13 (1967), 147-167.
- Ringgren, Helmer. *Word and Wisdom*. Lund, 1947.
- Robinson, James M. "The Coptic Gnostic Library," *NT* 12 (1970), 81-85.
- _____. "The Coptic Gnostic Library Today," *NTS* 14 (1967/68), 383-401.
- _____. "Kerygma and History in the New Testament," in J. P. Hyatt (ed.), *The Bible in Modern Scholarship* (Nashville, 1965), 114-150.
- _____. "Logoi Sophon. On the Gattung of Q," in J. M. Robinson and H. Koester, *Trajectories through Early Christianity* (Philadelphia, 1971), 71-113.
- Ross, J. M. "Not Above What is Written. A Note on 1 Cor. 4.6," *ET* 82 (1971), 215-217.
- Rudolph, Kurt. "Ein Grundtyp gnostischer Urmensch-Adam-Spekulation," *ZRGG* 9 (1957), 1-20.
- _____. *Die Mandäer*. Vol. 1: *Prolegomena: Das Mandäerproblem*. Göttingen, 1960.
- _____. *Theogonie, Kosmogonie und Anthropogonie in den mandäischen Schriften*. (FRLANT 88.) Göttingen, 1965.
- Sagnard, François. *La gnose Valentinienne et le Témoignage de saint Iréné*. (Etudes de Philosophie Médiévale 36.) Paris, 1947.

- Schenke, H.-M. *Der Gott "Mensch" in der Gnosis*. Göttingen, 1962.
- _____. "Die Spitze des dem Apokryphen Johannis und der Sophia Jesu Christi zugrundeliegenden gnostischen Systems," *ZRGG* 14 (1962), 352-361.
- Schlier, Heinrich. "Das Denken der frühchristlichen Gnosis," in W. Eltester (ed.), *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann* (BZNW 21, Berlin, 1954), 67-82.
- Schmithals, Walter. *Die Gnosis in Korinth*. (FRLANT 66.) 2nd edition. Göttingen, 1965. ET: *Gnosticism in Corinth* Trans. J. Steely. Nashville, 1971.
- _____. *Paulus und die Gnostiker*. (ThF 35.) Hamburg-Bergstedt, 1965. ET: *Paul and the Gnostics*. Trans. J. Steely. Nashville, 1972.
- Schneider, B. V. "The Corporate Meaning and Background of 1 Cor. 15.45b," *CBQ* 29 (1967), 450-467.
- Scholem, Gershom. "The Idea of the Golem," in *On the Kabbalah and Its Symbolism*, trans. R. Manheim (London, 1965), 158-204.
- Scholer, David M. *Nag Hammadi Bibliography 1948-1969*. (NHS 1.) Leiden, 1971.
- Schottroff, Luise. *Der Glaubende und die feindliche Welt. Beobachtungen zum gnostischen Dualismus und seiner Bedeutung für Paulus und das Johannesevangelium*. (WMANT 37.) Neukirchen, 1970.
- Schweitzer, Albert. *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*. Trans. W. Montgomery. London, 1931.
- Scroggs, Robin. *The Last Adam. A Study in Pauline Anthropology*. Philadelphia, 1966.
- _____. "Paul: Σοφός and Πνευματικός," *NTS* 14 (1967/68), 33-55.
- Segelberg, Eric. *Mašbuta. Studies in the Ritual of the Mandaean Baptism*. Uppsala, 1958.
- Sjöberg, Erik. *Der verborgene Menschensohn in der Evangelien*. (Skrifter Utgivna av kungl. humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet i Lund 53.) Lund, 1955.
- Smyth, Kevin. "Heavenly Man and Son of Man in St. Paul," in *SPCIC*. vol. 1 (Rome, 1963), 219-230.
- Strack, Hermann, and Paul Billerbeck. *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash*. Vol. 3. München, 1954.
- Suggs, M. Jack. *Wisdom, Christology, and Law in Matthew's Gospel*. Cambridge, Mass., 1970.
- Sweet, J. P. M. "A Sign for Unbelievers: Paul's Attitude to Glossolalia," *NTS* 13 (1966/67), 240-257.
- van Unnik, W. C. *Newly Discovered Gnostic Writings*. (SBT 30.) London, 1960.
- Wagner, Günter. *Das Religionsgeschichtliche Problem von Römer 6, 1-11*. (ATANT, 39.) Zürich, 1962. ET: *Pauline Baptism and the Pagan Mysteries*. Trans. J. Smith. Edinburgh, 1967.
- Walter, Nikolaus. *Der Thoraausleger Aristobulos*. (TU 86.) Berlin, 1964.

- Wegenast, Klaus. *Das Verständnis der Tradition bei Paulus und in den Deuteropaulinen.* (WMANT 8.) Neukirchen, 1962.
- Weiss, Johannes. *Der erste Korintherbrief.* (Meyer, 9th edition.) Göttingen, 1910.
- Werner, Eric. "Post-Biblical Hebraisms in the Prima Clementis," in *Harry Austryn Wolfson Jubilee Volume.* Vol. 2 (Jerusalem, 1965), 793-818.
- Wetstein, John J. *Novum Testamentum Graecum.* 2 vols. Amsterdam, 1751-52.
- Wilckens, Ulrich. *Weisheit und Torheit.* (BHT 26.) Tübingen, 1959.
- Wiles, M. F. *The Divine Apostle. The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistles in the Early Church.* Cambridge, 1967.
- Wolfson, Harry A. "Immortality and Resurrection in the Philosophy of the Church Fathers," in K. Stendahl (ed.), *Immortality and Resurrection* (New York, 1965), 54-96.
- _____. *Philo.* 2 vols. Cambridge, Mass., 1947.
- Zuntz, G. *The Text of the Epistles. A Disquisition upon the Corpus Paulinum.* London, 1953.

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
CALIFORNIA

A13665

09090
5-01
C

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
CLAREMONT, CALIF.

A13665

BS2675.2 .P4
Pearson, Birger Albert.
The pneumatikos-psychikos terminology i

BS
2675.2
P4

Pearson, Birge: Albert.

The pneumatikos-psychikos terminology in 1 Corinthians; a study in the theology of the Corinthian opponent of Paul and its relation to gnosticism. (Missoula, Mo. Published by Society of Biblical Literature for the Hamamadi Seminar, 1973.

xii, 147 p. 22 cm. (Society of Biblical Literature. Dissertation series, no.12)

Thesis—Harvard University, 1968.

Bibliography: p. 137-147.

1. Bible. N. T. 1 Corinthians—Criticism, interpretation, etc.
2. Gnosticism. I. Title. II. Series.

A13665

CCSC/jc

