

PART III

THE ORIGIN OF PAUL'S
SOTERIOLOGICAL PNEUMATOLOGY

INTRODUCTION

No-one would deny that Paul attributes soteriological functions to the Spirit. According to Paul, the Spirit mediates (to the recipient of the pneumatic gift) the knowledge of and ability to comply with those aspects of the divine will necessary to enter into and remain within God's covenant people-the community of salvation (1 Cor. 2.6-16; 2 Cor. 3.3-18; Rom. 8.1-17; Gal. 5.16-26). More specifically, this means that, above all, the Spirit reveals to each Christian the supreme significance of the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ in God's redemptive plan (1 Cor. 2.6-16; 12.3; Rom. 8.9) and progressively transforms him/her into the image of Christ (2 Cor. 3.18)-a process which culminates in the resurrection and ultimate transformation into *σῶμα πνευματικόν* (Rom. 8.11; 1 Cor. 15.45f.; Gal. 6.8).¹ Thus while Paul describes the Spirit as the source of the Christian's cleansing (1 Cor. 6.11; Rom. 15.16), righteousness (Gal. 5.5; Rom. 2.29; 14.17; cf. Gal. 3.14), and intimate fellowship with God (Gal. 4.6; Rom. 8.14-17), he nonetheless maintains that in this present age the gift of the Spirit remains the 'initial-installment' or 'first-fruit' (*ἀρραβών*: 2 Cor. 1.22; 5.5; Eph. 1.14; *ἀπαρχήν*: Rom. 8.23) of a more glorious transformation to come.

This is particularly significant when one compares Paul with his close contemporaries in Judaism and the early church. If my conclusions in the previous sections are correct, the soteriological dimension of the Spirit's activity which is so prominent in Paul's epistles* appears

1. J. Dunn correctly notes that this process is characterized by tension and *warfare*: 'Paul. . . sees the Christian as living in "the overlap of the ages". . . where once he lived only in the power of the *σάρξ*, now he experiences the power of the *πνεῦμα* as well. . . The Christian has indeed entered the new sphere of power (*πνεῦμα*), but not entirely; he still belongs to the old sphere of power (*σάρξ*) at the same time-simul-peccator et *justus*' ('Jesus-Flesh and Spirit: An Exposition of Romans 1. 3-4', JTS 24 (1973), p. 52; see pp. 51-54 for a good overview of Paul's soteriology).

2. Although for the purposes of this study I shall include in this category the ten epistles most frequently attributed to Paul (thus excluding only the Pastoral epistles), it should be noted that the evidence significant to this inquiry is contained in those epistles which are (virtually) universally accepted as Pauline (Romans, 1 and 2

infrequently in intertestamental Judaism (cf. Wisdom and the Hymns of Qumran) and is wholly lacking in the pneumatologies of Luke and the primitive church.' The latter judgment has profound implications for the development of pneumatological thought in the early church. It suggests that Paul was the first Christian to attribute soteriological functions to the Spirit; and that this original element in Paul's theology did not significantly influence wider (non-Pauline) sectors of the early church until after the writing of Luke-Acts (70-80 AD). Although a definitive defense of this thesis would necessitate providing *tradition-histories* of relevant Spirit-passages from numerous New Testament documents not yet treated*-a procedure clearly beyond the scope of this study-there is justification, given the fact that Paul's epistles represent the earliest written stage in the development of Christian thought, for an examination of the pneumatological content of the early Christian traditions utilized by Paul. Indeed, if it can be established with a high degree of probability that the Christian traditions (hymns, liturgical formulations, etc.) taken up by Paul do not attribute soteriological functions to the Spirit, then my our thesis concerning the originality of Paul's soteriological pneumatology will have been significantly advanced. Moreover, in view of the conclusions offered by

Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians, 1 Thessalonians and Philemon) and therefore my conclusions are not dependent upon or influenced by any of the various options commonly held pertaining to the limits of the Pauline corpus.

1. However, the prophetic pneumatology of Luke and particularly the charismatic pneumatology of the primitive church find their counterparts in Paul's concept of spiritual gifts (cf. N.Q. Hamilton, *The Holy Spirit and Eschatology in Paul* (1957), p. 85, 'The Synoptic doctrine [of the Spirit] finds its continuation in Paul in the equipment of each member of the body of Christ with gifts to fulfil his appointed function'). E. Ellis has argued that in 1 Cor. 12-14 Paul uses the term *πνευματικά* to denote a special category of *χαρίσματα* consisting of prophetic gifts of inspired speech and discernment ('"Spiritual Gifts"', pp. 128-33; *Prophecy and Hermeneutic in Early Christianity* [1978], pp. 24-27; 'Prophecy', p. 49; and 'Christ and Spirit in 1 Corinthians', in *Christ and Spirit in the New Testament* [1973], p. 274). Although an important element in Ellis's argument-his interpretation of 1 Cor. 2.6-16 as distinguishing pneumatics from believers in general-is highly improbable (see Wilkinson, 'Tongues', pp. 14-15 and Fee, *1 Corinthians*, pp. 97-120); nevertheless, his thesis remains plausible with respect to Paul's usage in 1 Cor. 12-14 (note, however, the objections raised by Carson, *Showing the Spirit*, pp. 23-24 and S. Schatzmann, *A Pauline Theology of Charismata* [1987], p. 7). If Ellis is correct at this point, then the Pauline category of *πνευματικά* is strikingly similar in function to the Lukan gift of the Spirit.

2. Most notable in this regard, apart from the Pauline epistles, is the Gospel of John.

J.S. Vos,¹ such an inquiry is essential if I am to demonstrate that my thesis is historically credible. I shall take up this task in Chapter 12.

Seyoon Kim has recently pointed out the strategic role which the Damascus road Christophany played in the formation of Paul's theological perspective.² Yet all experience, even profound religious experience, must be interpreted in language, concepts, and categories with which one is familiar. How is it then that Paul describes the dynamics of Christian life, particularly as it pertains to the work of the Spirit, in such a unique fashion? In Chapter 13 I shall address this question and attempt to place the distinctive soteriological dimension in Paul's pneumatology against the backdrop of Jewish wisdom traditions.

Chapter 12

SOTERIOLOGICAL PNEUMATOLOGY AND PRE-PAULINE TRADITION

The major difficulty in attempting to evaluate the pneumatology of the primitive-church traditions utilized by Paul, is of course, separating the traditional elements from that which is uniquely Pauline.' In the 'formula-hungry' atmosphere of present-day research one cannot hope to deal with all of the possibilities: the passages purported to contain pre-Pauline formulae are ever-increasing and the relentless, often overly zealous search for more appears to have no end.* Nevertheless, there is general agreement concerning the traditional character of a number of **formulae**,³ **hymns**,⁴ and dominical sayings' found within

1. I use the term 'tradition' here to refer to a statement formed in oral or written usage before Paul incorporated it into one or more of his epistles (cf. E.E. Ellis, 'Traditions in 1 Corinthians', NTS 32 [1986], p. 481).

2. Kim, *Origin*, p. 149: 'The search for pre-Pauline formulae seems to have gone too far, and, if it progresses at the present rate, one wonders whether before long all the sentences written in exalted language and style in the Pauline corpus will not be declared pre-Pauline or at least non-Pauline, just as some critics in the 19th century managed to declare that all the letters of the Pauline corpus were non-Pauline'. See also Hans F. von Campenhausen, 'Das Bekenntnis im Urehristentum', *ZNW* 63 (1972), p. 231.

3. I include in this category those passages from the Pauline corpus cited as containing traditional formulae in any of the works listed below. Although the same texts are generally cited in each of the works listed below, I have intentionally included references cited in any of these standard works in an effort not to exclude a text which might be recognized by a significant portion of the scholarly community as belonging to this category. The standard works consulted are: A.M. Hunter, *Paul and His Predecessors* (1961), pp. 15-36, 117-22; L. Goppelt, 'Tradition nach Paulus', *KuD* 4 (1958), pp. 213-33; V.H. Neufeld, *The Earliest Christian Confessions* (1963), pp. 42-68; K. Wegenast, *Das Verständnis der Tradition bei Paulus und in den Deuteropaulinen* (1962), pp. 51-92; and K. Wengst, *Christologische Formeln und Lieder des Urchristentums* (1972), pp. 27-143. Thus the category includes: Rom. 1.3-4; 3.24-25; 3.30; 4.24-25; 8.34; 10.9; 14.9; 1 Cor. 8.5-6; 10.16; 11.23-25; 12.3 ('Ἀνάθεμα Ἰησοῦς/Κύριος Ἰησοῦς; both O. Cullmann [*The Earliest Christian Confessions* (1949), pp. 28-30] and Neufeld interpret this passage, at least in its pre-

1. Vos, *Untersuchungen*. See Chapter 1 §2.2.3 above for a brief summary of Vos's thesis.

2. S. Kim, *The Origin of Paul's Gospel* (1981).

the Pauline corpus. A review of these texts reveals that only one passage, Rom. 1.3-4, contains material closely related to Paul's soteriological pneumatology; and, as I shall seek to establish, this material—the *κατὰ σάρκα–κατὰ πνεῦμα* antithesis—represents the redaction of Paul rather than primitive church tradition.

There is also considerable speculation that various aspects of Paul's paraenesis originate from catechetical and liturgical (baptismal) traditions of the primitive church. Although there appears to be little consensus concerning the specific elements from Paul's texts which should be placed in this category,¹ J.S. Vos has argued for the inclusion of references to the soteriological dimension of the Spirit's activity contained in 1 Cor. 6.9-11, Gal. 5.19-24, and 1 Cor. 15.44-50.² In the final portion of this chapter I shall demonstrate the improbable nature of Vos's claims.

Thus, by first examining a recognized core of pre-Pauline texts and then demonstrating the tenuous nature of the catechetical-baptismal hypothesis of Vos, I hope to offer evidence from the Pauline epistles which, when coupled with my analysis of Luke-Acts, shifts the burden

Pauline form, against the background of persecution and thus in terms of Mt. 10.17-20/Lk. 12.11-12); 15.3-7; 16.22; 2 Cor. 13.4; Gal. 3.20; Eph. 4.5-6, 8-10; 1 Thess. 1.9f.; 4.14; numerous passages which contain formulae referring to the death (e.g. Rom. 5.6) or resurrection of Jesus (e.g. Rom. 4.24); and those passages which contain the 'faith, hope, love' triad.

4. I include in this category those passages from the Pauline corpus cited as containing traditional hymns from any of the following works: Goppelt, 'Tradition', pp. 213-33; R. Deichgräber, *Gotteshymnus und Christushymnus in der frühen Christenheit* (1967); J.T. Sanders, *The New Testament Christological Hymns: Their Historical Religious Background* (1971); Wengst, *Formeln*, pp. 144-208. This category includes: Rom. 11.33-36; 2 Cor. 1.3f.; Eph. 1.3-12; 2.4-10, 14-18; 5.14; Phil. 2.6-11; Col. 1.12-14, 15-20; 2.13-15.

5. See 1 Cor. 7.10; 9.14; 11.23; and 1 Thess. 4.16. Hunter also points to almost two dozen passages which 'echo' dominical sayings (Paul, pp. 47-52; 126-128). In two of these 'echoes' (Rom. 14.17 = the Beatitudes; 1 Thess. 4.8 = Lk. 10.16) Paul has added a reference to the Spirit to the original saying.

1. Thus von Campenhausen sarcastically refers to what 'we presume to know' about the early church's *Taufunterricht* and quotes with approval the words of E. Molland ('A Lost Scrutiny in the early Baptismal Rite', *Opuscula Patristica* [1970], p. 232): 'In the NT there is no trace of a catechumenate' ('Das Bekenntnis', pp. 227-28, quote from p. 228 n. 111). The judgment of Goppelt is still valid: 'Die Forschung ist hier noch sehr im Fluß' ('Tradition', p. 227). However, two points merit comment: the traditional character of aspects of the lists of vices and virtues (as well as the household codes) is generally acknowledged, and the similarities between Col. 3.18-4.1; Eph. 5.22-6.9; and 1 Pet. 2.1 1-3.7 are often noted.

2. Although Vos's study is not limited to these texts, they form the cornerstone of his thesis. See Chapter 1 §2.2.3 above.

of proof to those who argue for the traditional character of Paul's soteriological pneumatology.

1. Romans I .3-4

. . . περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ
τοῦ γενομένου ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυὶδ κατὰ σάρκα,
τοῦ ὀρισθέντος υἱοῦ θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει κατὰ πνεῦμα ἀγιωσύνης
ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν,
Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν.

It is generally acknowledged that Rom. 1.3-4 contains a pre-Pauline confessional formula.¹ The chief arguments advanced in support of this judgment are: the parallelism of participial and relative clauses characteristic of fixed formulae; the occurrence of Semitically styled expressions normally not used by Paul; the untypically Pauline emphasis on Jesus' descent from David; the absence of any reference to the cross, so prominent in Paul's thought elsewhere; and the emphasis on Christ's exaltation at his resurrection (τοῦ ὀρισθέντος υἱοῦ θεοῦ) rather than his pre-existence.² There is, however, considerable disagreement concerning the extent to which Paul has modified the formula. Most would agree that Paul has added both the introductory reference to the 'Son' (περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ) and the closing phrase Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν.³ Yet debate continues over the origin of the phrases ἐν δυνάμει⁴ and κατὰ πνεῦμα ἀγιωσύνης.⁵

1. See the extensive list of proponents of this view offered by H. Zimmermann, *Neutestamentliche Methodenlehre—Darstellung der historisch-kritischen Methode* (3rd edn, 1970), pp. 193-94 n. 187.

2. See the summaries provided by V.S. Poythress, 'Is Romans 1.3-4 a Pauline Confession after All?', *ExpTim* 87 (1975-76), p. 180; Dunn, 'Flesh and Spirit', p. 40; and Zimmermann, *Methodenlehre*, pp. 193-94; and the literature they cite.

3. Hahn, *Titles*, p. 246; J. Becker, *Auferstehung der Toten im Urchristentum* (1976), pp. 18-20; and Dunn, 'Flesh and Spirit', p. 41.

4. The thesis that Paul has added ἐν δυνάμει to the formula in order to soften the adoptionism of τοῦ ὀρισθέντος υἱοῦ θεοῦ has received considerable support: E. Schweizer, 'Röm. 1,3f, und der Gegensatz von Fleisch und Geist vor und bei Paulus', in *Neotestamentica* (1963), p. 180; Wegenast, *Tradition*, p. 71; W. Kramer, *Christ, Lord, Son of God* (1966), p. 110; R.H. Fuller, *The Foundations of New Testament Christology* (1965), p. 165; Schlier, 'Zu Röm 1,3f', pp. 210, 215-16; H.-J. van der Minde, 'Wie geht Paulus mit der Tradition um?', *BiKi* 37 (1982), p. 8. C.K. Barrett argues on the basis of structure that the phrase is a Pauline interpolation: it breaks the antithetic parallelism of the clauses (*The Epistle to the Romans* [1957], p. 18).

The origin of the latter phrase is particularly important for this inquiry; for, by virtue of its inclusion, the text portrays the Spirit as the agent of Jesus' resurrection and the source of his exalted existence,' thereby giving voice to a central element in Paul's soteriological pneumatology.

5. Those who view the *κατὰ σάρκα–κατὰ πνεῦμα ἀγιοσύνης* antithesis as Pauline include: R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament* (1952), I, p. 49; N.A. Dahl, 'Die Messianität Jesu bei Paulus', in *Studia Paulina* (1953), p. 90; O. Michel, *Der Brief an die Römer* (1963), p. 38; O. Kuß, *Der Rdmerbrief* (2nd edn, 1963), I, p. 8; A. Sand, *Der Begriff 'Fleisch' in den paulinischen Hauptbriefen* (1967), p. 161; Wengst, *Formeln*, pp. 112-13. H. Schlier argues that the *κατὰ σάρκα–κατὰ πνεῦμα* antithesis was not a part of the original formula, but was added to the formula in the prePauline stage by the hellenistic community ('Zu Röm 1,3f', pp. 207-18). R. Jewett also views the antithesis as an interpolation of the hellenistic church (*Paul's Anthropological Terms* [1971], pp. 136-39). However, Jewett argues that Paul created the *σάρξ–πνεῦμα* antithesis 'out of exegetical materials in response to the threat posed by the Judaizer movement' (p. 108; see pp. 108-14) and thus insists that 'there are no grounds whatever for the assertion that the confession in its interpolated form was "pre-Pauline" in a strictly chronological sense. The probability is that it emerged in the Pauline congregation sometime after the development of the technical "flesh" category [by Paul] in the year 52' (p. 139). E. Linnemann asserts that Paul sought to harmonize the original formula with his pre-existence Christology; thus he inserted the *κατὰ* contrast and placed *πνεῦμα*, which originally stood in the genitive case (*πνεύματος ἀγιοσύνης*), in the accusative case ('Tradition und Interpretation in Röm. 1,3f.', *EvTh 31* [1971], pp. 264-75).

1. The Spirit's role as the agent of Jesus' resurrection is explicitly expressed in Rom. 1.4 if one interprets *κατὰ πνεῦμα ἀγιοσύνης* with instrumental ('by means of') force (e.g. Linnemann, 'Röm 1,3f.', pp. 274-75). However, it is more probable that the agency of the Spirit in Jesus' resurrection is implicit in the more general notion that the Spirit is the source of Jesus' exalted existence (see the discussion in § 1.2 below). As Vos notes, 'Die Erwähnung des Geistes in diesen Aussagen [Rom. 1.4] bezieht sich nicht nur auf den Akt der Auferweckung als solchen, sondern auch auf die durch diesen Akt eröffnete neue Daseinsweise und Funktion Christi' (*Untersuchungen*, p. 80). Although the agency of the Spirit in Jesus' resurrection is never explicitly expressed in the NT (see Dunn, *Christology in the Making*, p. 144 and 'Flesh and Spirit', p. 67), the concept is presupposed elsewhere by Paul and those in the Pauline tradition (e.g. Rom. 6.4; 8.11; 1 Cor. 15.44f.; 1 Tim. 3.16; 1 Pet. 3.18). The ambiguity of the various NT authors on this point, particularly Paul in Rom. 1.3-4, is attributable to the complexity of their conviction concerning the relationship between Jesus and the Spirit: the Spirit who inspired Jesus during his earthly ministry was instrumental in his resurrection and is now constitutive of his exalted existence.

A.M. Hunter has proposed a triadic division of the text which associates Jesus' appointment as Son of God according to the Holy Spirit with his baptism (Paul, p. 25). But, as P. Beasley-Murray notes, 'the fatal objection to this arrangement. . . is the lack of a corresponding participle in the third clause' ('Romans

Three arguments have been offered in support of the thesis that *πνεῦμα ἀγιοσύνης* forms part of the prePauline formula: (1) the phrase *πνεῦμα ἀγιοσύνης* is not characteristic of Paul;' (2) the *κατὰ σάρκα–κατὰ πνεῦμα ἀγιοσύνης* antithesis is used in a non-Pauline way;* and (3) similar references to the Spirit occur in the formulae contained in 1 Tim. 3.16 and 1 Pet. 3.18.³ I shall examine each of these arguments separately.

1.1. *πνεῦμα ἀγιοσύνης*

The phrase *πνεῦμα ἀγιοσύνης* occurs only once in the New Testament (Rom. 1.4) and is entirely absent from the LXX.⁴ Thus while the term is unusual for Paul, it is no less so for the rest of the New Testament and, we may presume, the traditions of the primitive church. Furthermore, the noun *ἀγιοσύνη* occurs only twice in the New Testament and in each instance in an epistle penned by Paul (1 Thess. 3.13; 2 Cor. 7.1).⁵ It would appear that the antecedents of *πνεῦμα ἀγιοσύνης* are to be found in the epistles of Paul rather than in the tradition of the primitive church. Indeed, in view of Paul's unique usage of *ἀγιοσύνη* prior to the writing of Romans, it is entirely probable that Paul is responsible for the phrase. In the process of editing a

1.3f.; An Early Confession of Faith in the Lordship of Jesus', *TB 31* [1980], p. 149).

1. O. Betz, *What Do We Know about Jesus?* (1968), p. 95; G. Bomkamm, *Paul* (1969), p. 248; Dunn, 'Flesh and Spirit', p. 60; Müller, 'Geisterfahrung', p. 263; J. Beker, *Auferstehung der Toten im Urchristentum* (1976), p. 21; P.W. Meyer, 'The Holy Spirit in the Pauline Letters: A Contextual Exploration', *Int 33* (1979), p. 14; see also those cited in the note which follows.

2. This viewpoint was forcefully put forth by Schweizer, 'Fleisch und Geist', pp. 180-89 (cf. *Erniedrigung und Erhöhung bei Jesus und seinen Nachfolgern* [1962], pp. 91-92) and subsequently adopted by numerous scholars: Barrett, *Romans*, p. 18; Wegenast, *Tradition*, p. 71; F.J. Leenhardt, *The Epistle to the Romans* (1961), pp. 35f.; Hahn, *Titles*, pp. 247, 249; Kramer, *Christ*, p. 109; R.H. Fuller, *Christology*, pp. 165f., 187; Hill, *Greek Words*, pp. 280-81; B. Schneider, 'Κατὰ Πνεῦμα Ἀγιοσύνης', *Bib 48* (1967), p. 369; Beasley-Murray, 'Romans 1.3f', pp. 149, 151; van der Minde, 'Tradition', p. 8.

3. Schweizer, 'Fleisch und Geist', p. 181; cf. Dunn, 'Flesh and Spirit', pp. 63-65.

4. The term is found only in *T. Levi* 18.7 and perhaps an inscription from an 'Amulett von Acre' (see E. Peterson, *Frühkirche, Judentum und Gnosis* [1959], pp. 351-52 concerning *Corpus inscriptionum graecarum*, ed. G. Kaibel [Berlin, 1873], XIV, no. 2413, 17).

5. Note also the frequency which Paul uses the terms *ἀγιασμός* (Rom. 6.19, 22; 1 Cor. 1.30; 1 Thess. 4.3, 4, 7; 2 Thess. 2.13 [1 Tim. 2.15; Heb. 12.14; 1 Pet. 1.20]) and *ἀγιότης* (2 Cor. 1.12; [Heb. 12.18]).

well-known confession of the primitive church, it would be natural for Paul to include a phrase of elevated and Semitic style in his redaction.’

1.2. *The κατὰ σάρκα–κατὰ πνεῦμα ἀγίωσύνης Antithesis*

The *κατὰ σάρκα–κατὰ πνεῦμα* antithesis is distinctively Pauline (Rom. 1.3-4; 8.4-5; Gal. 4.29).² Therefore, the Pauline origin of the antithesis is virtually assured unless substantial evidence to the contrary can be adduced. E. Schweizer sought to provide this sort of evidence by arguing that in Rom. 1.3-4 the antithesis is used in a non-Pauline way: whereas *κατὰ σάρκα*, when contrasted with *κατὰ πνεῦμα*, is always used pejoratively by Paul to denote moral inferior-

1. Poythress, ‘Confession after All?’, p. 181: ‘One could. . . argue that a confession would be less likely to exhibit peculiarities or idiosyncrasies than an individual writer’.

2. The phrases *κατὰ σάρκα* (Rom. 1.3; 4.1; 8.4, 5, 12, 13; 9.3, 5; 1 Cor. 1.26; 10.18; 2 Cor. 1.17; 5.16 (2x); 10.2, 3; 11.18; Gal. 4.23, 29; Eph. 6.5; Col. 3.22; and outside of Paul, only in Jn 8.15) and *κατὰ πνεῦμα* (Rom. 1.4; 8.4, 5; 1 Cor. 12.8; Gal. 4.29) are characteristic of Paul. Furthermore, *κατὰ σάρκα* is associated with Christ only two times in the entire NT outside of Rom. 1.3 and in each instance by Paul (Rom. 9.5; 2 Cor. 5.16).

The *σάρξ–πνεῦμα* antithesis in general is also characteristic of Paul (Rom. 1.4; 8.4-6, 9, 13; 1 Cor. 5.5; Gal. 3.3; 4.29; 5.17f.; 6.8 cf. 1 Cor. 6.17; 2 Cor. 7.1; Col. 2.5; *πνευματικός–σαρκικός/σάρκινος—Rom. 7.14*; 1 Cor. 3.1; cf. Rom. 15.27; 1 Cor. 9.11). The terms are correlated infrequently outside of Paul (Jn 3.6; 6.63; 1 Tim. 3.16; 1 Pet. 3.18; cf. Heb. 12.9; and 1 Pet. 4.6) and several of these references reflect Pauline influence (see §1.3 below). In the only instance where the correlation is found in the synoptic gospels, the terms carry meanings different from Paul’s distinctive usage (Mk 14.38 = Mt. 26.41; here *πνεῦμα* refers to the human spirit or will [cf. Mk 2.8; 8.121 and *σάρξ*, to the constraints of the body upon the will). Antecedents to the Pauline *σάρξ–πνεῦμα* antithesis can be found in pagan and Jewish sources. The closest parallels are found in the rabbinic antithesis between *דָּרֵעַ יָרַר* and *יָרַר הַטָּב* (cf. Davies, *Paul*, pp. 21-35), the matter-spirit dualism in Philo (cf. Brandenburger, *Fleisch und Geist*, pp. 114-221), and the ‘two Spirits’ doctrine of Qumran (cf. Jewett, *Anthropological Terms*, pp. 82-94, 100, 108). However, the differences between the Pauline *σάρξ–πνεῦμα* antithesis and these precedents are significant (cf. Jewett, p. 92; Davies, p. 18; F. Mußner, *Der Galuterbrief* [1974], p. 394; H.D. Betz, *Galatians* [1979], p. 278 n. 64; R. Meyer, ‘σάρξ’, *TDNT*, VII, p. 114) and indicate that the latter ‘merely provided the raw materials for Pauline usage’ (Jewett, *Anthropological Terms*, p. 108); Indeed, Jewett has argued persuasively that the *σάρξ–πνεῦμα* antithesis of the epistles was created by Paul ‘in response to the threat posed by the Judaizer movement’ (p. 108): ‘σάρξ was first used as a technical term in connection with the circumcision problem raised by the Judaizers; it developed through Paul’s typological exegesis into a full dialectical counterpart to the spirit; and after having been created as an argument against nomism, it was applied to the problem of antinomianism’ (p. 114).

ity or inadequacy, in Rom. 1.3-4 *κατὰ σάρκα* refers, in a neutral sense, to Christ’s physical and earthly existence. This led Schweizer to conclude that the antithesis in Rom. 1.3-4 refers to two distinct spheres (earthly and heavenly) rather than modes of existence determined by the sinful nature and the Spirit of God respectively.’

However, Schweizer’s argument has been decisively rebutted by J. Dunn.* Dunn demonstrates that for Paul, *κατὰ σάρκα* is a phrase of contrast and that it always ‘stands on the negative side of the contrast denoting inferiority or inadequacy’.³ This remains the case whether the phrase is principally associated with kinship (Gal. 4.23, 29; Rom. 4.1; 9.3) or conduct (e.g. Rom. 8.4f.). For this reason simple distinctions between ‘physical and moral and between neutral and pejorative’ uses of the phrase are not valid.⁴ Moreover, DUM argues persuasively that *κατὰ σάρκα* in Rom. 1.3 ‘carries its normal note of depreciation’⁵ and that the antithesis in Rom. 1.3-4 should be interpreted in light of Paul’s normal usage. Dunn’s argument centers on ‘the fact that in Paul’s view the Christian’s experience of flesh and Spirit is patterned on Christ’s’.⁶ Just as the Christian is caught in the overlap of ages, and as such experiences the conflict of flesh and Spirit, so also

1. Schweizer, *Erniedrigung*, p. 92: ‘Sie [flesh and Spirit] bezeichnen die irdische *Sphäre*, in der das im ersten Satz Ausgesagte gilt, und die himmlische *Sphäre*, in der erst die vollendete Gottessohnschaft Wirklichkeit geworden ist’ (see also Schweizer, ‘σάρξ’, *TDNT*, VII, p. 126). Kramer, following Schweizer, writes: ‘These two concepts are not to be understood in the Pauline sense as descriptions of the domain of sin and the domain of life’ (*Christ*, p. 109).

2. Dunn, ‘Flesh and Spirit’, pp. 40-68. For criticism of Schweizer’s thesis see also Linnemann, ‘Röm. 1,3f.’, pp. 265-68; Wengst, *Formeln*, pp. 112-13; and Jewett, *Anthropological Terms*, pp. 136-39.

3. Dunn, ‘Flesh and Spirit’, pp. 46-49; quote from p. 49.

4. Dunn, ‘Flesh and Spirit’, p. 49. Wengst responds to Schweizer, whom he quotes, by pointing to Gal. 4.23: ‘Wenn man so will, kann man sagen, Paulus gebrauchte *κατὰ σάρκα* “rein neutral für die menschliche Abstammung” Ishmaels, aber hier ist es ganz deutlich, daß dieses “rein neutral” für Paulus eine theologische Disqualifizierung bedeutet’ (*Formeln*, p. 113). The fact that the soteriological inadequacy of birth *κατὰ σάρκα* (Gal. 4.23; cf. Rom. 4.1) is closely associated with improper conduct in Galatians (Gal. 4.29; 5.16f.; described in Gal. 5.19 as *τὰ ἔργα τῆς σαρκός*) demonstrates the tenuous nature of distinctions drawn at this point.

5. Dunn, ‘Flesh and Spirit’, pp. 49-51. Dunn asserts that ‘the identification of Jesus as Son of David seems to have been more of an embarrassment and hindrance than a glad and central affirmation’ and that Paul never uses the title (p. 50).

6. Dunn, ‘Flesh and Spirit’, p. 54. Dunn maintains that the strand of *imitatio Christi* is ‘firmly embedded in Paul’s thought’ (cf. Rom. 15.2f.; 1 Cor. 4.17; 11.1; 2 Cor. 8.8f.; Gal. 1.10; Eph. 4.20, 32-5.2; Phil. 2.5-8; Col. 2.6; 1 Thess. 1.6) (P. 55).

Jesus came in the likeness of sinful flesh (κν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας, Rom. 8.3) and experienced the same tension.’ Jesus was victorious over the flesh and serves as both the supreme example and source of power for the Christian seeking to live κατὰ πνεῦμα, a process which—as we have noted—culminates in the resurrection (Rom. 8.11) and ultimate transformation into σῶμα πνευματικόν (1 Cor. 15.44f.). Thus Dunn asserts that κατὰ σάρκα and κατὰ πνεῦμα in Rom. 1.3-4 ‘denote not successive and mutually exclusive spheres of power, but modes of existence and relationships which overlap and coincide in the earthly Jesus’.²

Dunn bolsters his argument by pointing to the introductory υἱός in v. 3 and the unusual ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν (rather than ἐξ ἀναστάσεως ἐκ νεκρῶν) in v. 4: the former indicates that Jesus is Son at both stages (earthly and exalted) and suggests further that his Sonship is, at each stage, a function of (or, as I prefer, manifest through) the Spirit; the latter emphasizes that Jesus, by virtue of his resurrection, is the forerunner of the final resurrection of the dead, which in turn implies that Jesus in the flesh is the forerunner of the Christian caught between the ages.³ The logic of Dunn’s argument suggests not only that (in Paul’s perspective) Jesus experienced the tension between flesh and Spirit common to every Christian, but also that he, as the forerunner of the final resurrection of the dead, was resurrected by the Spirit (Rom. 8.11) and that his exalted existence is determined by the Spirit (1 Cor. 15.44f.).⁴ Indeed, the emphasis in

1. Dunn, ‘Flesh and Spirit’, pp. 52-55, and *Christology in the Making*, p. 139. One need not accept Dunn’s analysis of the κατὰ σάρκα–κατὰ πνεῦμα tension at every point, particularly concerning the extent to which the life of the individual Christian is, and the life of the earthly Jesus was (p. 57), determined by the flesh, in order to affirm the reality of the tension and the validity of the essential elements of Dunn’s interpretation of Rom. 1.3-4 (p. 53; cf. Dunn, ‘Romans 7:14-25 in the Theology of Paul’, in *Essays on Apostolic Themes* [1985], pp. 49-70 and the responses by D. Wenham, ‘The Christian Life: A Life of Tension? A Consideration of the Nature of Christian Experience in Paul’, pp. 80-94 and R.H. Gundry, ‘The Moral Frustration of Paul before His Conversion’, in *Pauline Studies* [1980], pp. 228-45).

2. Dunn, ‘Flesh and Spirit’, p. 54.

3. ‘Flesh and Spirit’, pp. 55-56.

4. As M. Turner notes, with the phrase ὁ ἔσχατος Ἄδὰμ εἰς πνεῦμα ζῶσθαι (1 Cor. 15.45) Paul indicates that Jesus is ‘an eschatological “being” vitalised by πνεῦμα which is the life-principle of the age to come’ (‘The Significance of Spirit Endowment for Paul’, *VE* 9 [1975], p. 63). In Paul’s view Jesus, resurrected as σῶμα πνευματικόν, became the representative Man for all who will bear his likeness at the final resurrection; and, by virtue of his special status, he also became the source of life κατὰ πνεῦμα, that is πνεῦμα ζῶσθαι (1 Cor. 15.45) or ‘Son of God in power’ (see Fee, *I Corinthians*, p. 789; Dunn, ‘Last Adam’

Rom. 1.3-4 is placed on the *culmination* of Jesus’ experience of the κατὰ σάρκα–κατὰ πνεῦμα tension: his resurrection and enthronement in power wrought in and by the Spirit. The period of conflict between σὰρξ and πνεῦμα in Jesus’ earthly life is a presupposition of, not the central element within, the formula as it currently stands.’

At times Dunn appears to depict the tension itself rather than the culmination and transcendence of the tension as the focal point of the formula; nevertheless, he demonstrates that Rom. 1.3-4 should be interpreted in a manner consistent with Paul’s theology in general and his antithetical use of κατὰ σάρκα and κατὰ πνεῦμα in particular. Dunn acknowledged that this interpretation could be taken as support for the view that κατὰ πνεῦμα ἀγιωσύνης was added by Paul.² Yet,

p. 132). Since the conceptual movement in Rom. 1.3-4 is from ‘existence κατὰ σάρκα and κατὰ πνεῦμα’ to ‘existence solely κατὰ πνεῦμα’, the Spirit must be viewed as integral to both stages (earthly and exalted) of Jesus’ Sonship and thus the agent of his resurrection as well as the source of his exalted existence (cf. Hamilton, *Eschatology*, p. 14, ‘we are justified in ascribing the resurrection as well as the exaltation life [of Christ] to the Spirit’. Note also the similar conclusions offered by C. Pinnock, ‘The Concept of the Spirit in the Epistles of Paul’ [1963], p. 108).

1. C.E.B. Cranfield is quite right to criticize Dunn at this point: ‘It is surely preferable to understand the times referred to in the two phrases κατὰ πνεῦμα ἀγιωσύνης and ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν as the same, rather than to assume a temporal disjunction between them, as does Professor Dunn’ (‘Some Comments on Professor J.D.G. Dunn’s *Christology in the Making* with Special Reference to the Evidence of the Epistle to the Romans’, in *The Glory of Christ in the New Testament* [1987], p. 270).

2. Dunn, ‘Flesh and Spirit’, p. 60. By demonstrating that the κατὰ σάρκα–κατὰ πνεῦμα antithesis in Rom. 1.3-4 is consistent with Paul’s theology, Dunn undermines the thesis put forth by Jewett (*Anthropological Terms*, pp. 136-38). Jewett rejected Schweizer’s analysis of Rom. 1.3-4, for he recognized that the formula could not have come from a single source: ‘If the congregation were really Hellenistic as the opposition between κατὰ σάρκα and κατὰ πνεῦμα implies, it would scarcely be interested in claiming messianic honors for the fleshly Jesus; if the congregation were Jewish Christian as the messianic interest implies, it would scarcely contradict itself by the addition of the derogatory expression “in the realm of the flesh”’ (p. 137). Nevertheless, Jewett concluded that the κατὰ σάρκα–κατὰ πνεῦμα antithesis was added to the formula by the hellenistic community, not by Paul. Two arguments were offered in support of this judgment: (1) the expression πνεῦμα ἀγιωσύνης is unusual for Paul and therefore came from another source (so also Schlier, ‘Zu Röm 1,3f.’, p. 211); (2) Paul would not have emphasized ‘the superiority of Jesus’ pneumatic existence at the expense of his earthly existence and status’, for such an emphasis would ‘conflict with his belief in the centrality of Jesus’ earthly suffering as well as with the apocalyptic belief that Jesus was the Messiah who ushered in the new aeon’ (*Anthropological Terms*, p. 137). Jewett later acknowledged the weakness of the first argument and affirmed that ἀγιωσύνης was

he rejected this position and argued that the formula reflects the faith of the wider church.' I shall examine the validity of this claim in the following section.

1.3. *Romans I. 3-4 and the Non-Pauline Church*

The parallels between the role attributed to the Spirit in Rom. 1.3-4 and similar statements in 1 Tim. 3.16 and 1 Pet. 3.18 have been cited as evidence that the pneumatological ideas present in these texts are based on a well known and early (pre-Pauline) tradition of the primitive church.² However, the force of this argument is mitigated by the fact that the parallel texts, if not directly dependent upon Rom. 1.3-4, in all probability originate from a milieu influenced by Paul. This is undoubtedly the case for 1 Tim. 3.16 and, in view of the affinities between 1 Peter and Pauline theology? most likely the case for 1 Pet. 3.18 as well. Furthermore, although the pneumatological ideas present in Rom. 1.3-4 and its parallels (i.e. the Spirit is the agent of Jesus' resurrection and the source of his exalted existence) are found elsewhere in Paul's epistles (e.g. Rom. 8.11; 1 Cor. 15.44f.), they are completely absent from the synoptic gospels and Acts.

Acts 2.33 is particularly instructive. Here the Spirit is not depicted as the agent of Jesus' resurrection (God is the agent, Acts 2.32); rather, the Spirit is given to Jesus *by virtue of* his resurrection-exaltation. Moreover, this endowment of the Spirit is not integral to Jesus' exalted existence: it is given to him 'only for distribution'.⁴ Thus Acts 2.33 presupposes a pneumatological perspective significantly different

inserted into the interpolated formula by Paul (p. 138). Thus his conclusion concerning the interpolation of the antithesis by the hellenistic church was based entirely on the second argument. However, this argument is valid only if one accepts Schweizer's interpretation of the antithesis. The argument can be turned on its head and adduced in favor of Dunn's contention and the Pauline origin of the antithesis.

1. Dunn, 'Flesh and Spirit', pp. 62-65.

2. Dunn states that the essential content of 1 Pet. 3.18 is given more formalized expression in Rom. 1.3f. and 1 Tim. 3.16: 'Jesus was put to death as flesh: it was because he was flesh that death was possible, indeed necessary for him. But he was brought to life as Spirit: it was because he possessed the Spirit, because the Spirit wrought in him and on him, that ζωοποίησις followed death' ('Flesh and Spirit', p. 65).

3. W.G. Kiimmel, *Introduction to the New Testament* (1975), p. 423: 'There can be no doubt that the author of I Peter stands in the line of succession of Pauline theology'.

4. Haenchen, *Acts*, p. 183.

from that of Rom. 1.4 (and parallels).^{*} While both texts affirm that the resurrection marks a decisive shift in Jesus' relationship to the Spirit ('from Spirit inspiring Jesus to Spirit of Jesus')? the nature of the transformed relationship is perceived in different ways. This fact, coupled with the other synoptic writers' silence concerning the Spirit's role in Jesus' resurrection, indicates that it is highly improbable that the κατὰ πνεῦμα ἀγιωσύνης of Rom. 1.4 represents primitive-church tradition.

I am now in a position to summarize my argument regarding the Pauline origin of κατὰ σάρκα and κατὰ πνεῦμα ἀγιωσύνης and, by way of conclusion, suggest a motive for Paul's redaction at this point. Paul's unique usage of ἀγιωσύνη prior to the writing of Romans, together with the Pauline nature of the κατὰ σάρκα-κατὰ πνεῦμα antithesis, and the distinctively Pauline character of the pneumatology presupposed by the inclusion of κατὰ πνεῦμα ἀγιωσύνης in Rom. 1.4 indicate that κατὰ σάρκα and κατὰ πνεῦμα ἀγιωσύνης were added to the traditional formula underlying Rom. 1.3-4 by Paul.³ These insertions, representative as they are of Paul's distinctive theological perspective, were in all probability inspired by his desire to declare a law-free gospel. Through his redactional activity Paul transformed the traditional formula, which affirmed Jesus' Davidic descent as vital to his messianic mission and status, into a declaration which gave expression to his critique of Judaism: the pedigree of Jesus, born of the seed of David, was defective as a basis for his mission and inadequate as an expression of his relationship to God as Son; it was overcome in and through the Spirit decisively at the resurrection.⁴

1. Busse notes the fundamental difference between Acts 2.33 and Rom. 1.4: 'Im Unterschied zu Röm 1,4 ist jener Geist, den der zur rechten Gottes Erhöhte empfängt, kein für ihn notwendiges Geschenk, sondern zur Weitergabe an die Jünger und Glatibigen bestimmt. Jesus leitet von Himmel her die weltweite Mission' (*Das Nazareth-Manifest Jesu*, p. 99). Dunn ('Flesh and Spirit', p. 66) and Schneider ('Κατὰ Πνεῦμα Ἀγιωσύνης', pp. 371-76) fail to acknowledge this point.

2. Dunn, 'Flesh and Spirit', p. 67.

3. Thus, although the origin of ἐν δυνάμει remains uncertain, the original formula may be reconstructed as follows:

τοῦ γενομένου ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυίδ,
τοῦ ὀρισθέντος υἱοῦ θεοῦ (ἐν δυνάμει) ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν.

4. See Wengst, *Formeln*, p. 113; and for a more radical elaboration of this idea, see Dunn, 'Flesh and Spirit', p. 57.

2. *Tradition and Redaction in I Corinthians 6.9-11; 15.44-50, and Galatians 5.19-24*

J.S. Vos maintains that Gal. 5.19-24; 1 Cor. 6.9-11, and, to a lesser extent, 1 Cor. 15.44-50 are based upon a baptismal tradition detailing conditions of entrance into the Kingdom of God. According to Vos this baptismal tradition contained a list of positive and negative conditions for entrance into the Kingdom of God in the form of a catalog of vices and virtues. And, most significant for this inquiry, Vos argues that this tradition named both Christ and the Spirit as 'Heilsfaktoren' which made entrance into the Kingdom possible.*

Vos supports his thesis by pointing to the similarities between Gal. 5.19-24 and 1 Cor. 6.9-11. Both texts enumerate conditions for entering into the Kingdom of God and name Christ and the Spirit as the agents which make this entrance possible. Moreover, since both texts refer to the baptismal rite as the decisive soteriological moment, 'man darf sogar vermuten, daß die ganze Tradition vom Einlaß in das Reich Gottes in der vorpaulinischen Gemeinde zur Taufverkündigung gehörte'.²

Vos asserts that the baptismal tradition underlying 1 Cor. 6.9-11 and Gal. 5.19-24 also stands behind 1 Cor. 15.44-50, although here the tradition is utilized in a different manner. This judgment is based upon the fact that 1 Cor. 15.44-50, like the previous texts mentioned, refers to conditions for entrance into the Kingdom of God and names Christ and the Spirit as 'Heilsfaktoren'. It finds confirmation in the εἰκῶν-53), being language of v. 49 (cf. v. 1) only employed in baptismal tradition.³

Vos finds further support for these conclusions in his analysis of the relationship between the Spirit and salvation in the Jewish literature. Pointing to a series of Jewish texts (Ps. 51; Ezek. 36.27; Isa. 44.1-5; 1QS 2.25b-3.12; 1QS 3.13-4.26; Wisdom; Joseph and Aseneth), he argues that pre-Christian Judaism commonly attributed soteriological significance to the Spirit. Therefore Vos does not find it surprising that the primitive church held similar beliefs:⁴

In light of the Old Testament-Jewish understanding of the Spirit, which we have attempted to elucidate, it is not surprising that the early church not only viewed the Spirit as the source of the miraculous, but attributed salvific significance to the Spirit as well.

1. Vos, *Untersuchungen*, pp. 26-33.
2. *Untersuchungen* p. 30.
3. *Untersuchungen* p. 32.
4. *Untersuchungen*, p. 77. ET is my own.

In spite of the vigor with which Vos argues his case, there are numerous reasons to reject his contention that prePauline baptismal tradition named the Spirit alongside Christ as a 'Heilsfaktor' which made entrance into the Kingdom of God possible.'

2.1. *The Catalogs of Vices and Virtues*

Although it is quite possible that the catalogs of vices and virtues in Gal. 5.19f. and 1 Cor. 6.9f. were influenced by similar pagan, Jewish, and Christian lists,² the *ad hoc* nature of the catalogs in Gal. 5.19f. and 1 Cor. 6.9f.³ and the diversity of the various Pauline lists in general⁴ indicate that Paul was not dependent on a single source or established tradition. For this reason we must be cautious in attributing material from these texts to tradition. Furthermore, since the New Testament catalogs are never associated with the Spirit outside of (and only infrequently within) the Pauline corpus? it is exceedingly improbable that Paul has been influenced by traditional material at this point.

1. This contention is the basis for Vos's claim that the pre-Pauline community attributed 'das gesamte Heil, die Reinigung, Heiligung und Rechtfertigung in der Vergangenheit, der gerechte Wandel in der Gegenwart und die Verwandlung in der Zukunft' to both Christ and the Spirit (*Untersuchungen*, p. 33, see also pp. 131, 144).

2. A. Vögtle, *Die Tugend- und Lasterkataloge im Neuen Testament (1936)*; B.S. Easton, 'New Testament Ethical Lists', *JBL* 51 (1932), pp. 1-12; S. Wibbing, *Die Tugend- und Lasterkataloge im Neuen Testament und ihre Traditionsgeschichte (1959)*; E. Kamlah, *Die Form der katalogischen Paränese im Neuen Testament (1964)*; M.J. Suggs, 'The Christian Two Way Tradition: Its Antiquity, Form, and Function', in *Studies in the New Testament and Early Christian Literature (1972)*, pp. 60-74. Suggs, following the lead of Kamlah, argues that the form as well as the content of the 'Two Way' tradition has influenced Gal. 5. 17-24: (1) dualistic introduction (Gal. 5.17-18); (2) double catalog (Gal. 5.19-21a, 22-23); (3) eschatological threat/promise (Gal. 5.21b, 24) (p. 69). However, since Gal. 5.17-24 is the only example from the NT which follows this pattern, the hypothesis must be judged unlikely.

3. Easton, 'Ethical Lists', p. 5: 'In Galatians 5.19-21. . . area1 attempt has been made to adapt the list to the context'. See also F.F. Bruce, *The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians (1982)*, p. 250. Fee ties elements from the list in 1 Cor. 6.9-10 to the context of the letter (I *Corinthians*, pp. 242-43). See also E. Schweizer, 'Traditional Ethical Patterns in the Pauline and Post-Pauline Letters and Their Development (Lists of Vices and House-Tables)', in *Text and Interpretation (1979)*, p. 196; and C.K. Barrett, I *Corinthians (1968)*, p. 140.

4. Fee, I *Corinthians*, p. 225 n. 27: 'The search for a "source" is futile. . . The Pauline lists are so diverse as to defy explanation'. See also P. O'Brien, *Colossians, Philemon (1982)*, p. 180 and Easton, 'Ethical Lists', p. 5.

5. The only exception, Tit. 3.3-5, is clearly in the Pauline tradition. Catalogs cited by Betz (*Galatians*, p. 281 n. 91) and Conzelman (*I Corinthians [1975]*, p. 101 n. 69) include: Mt. 15.19; Mk 7.22; Rom. 1.29-31; 13.13; 1 Cor. 5.10f.; 6.9f.: 2

This judgment is confirmed by the Pauline nature of the concepts and terms associated with the Spirit in Gal. 5.19f. and 1 Cor. 6.11. The **σάρξ-πνεῦμα** antithesis in Gal. 5.19f. is characteristic of Paul' and integral to the argument of the **epistle**.² 1 Corinthians 6.11 also has a decidedly Pauline ring: Paul frequently concludes on a positive note after a warning such as is found in 1 Cor. 6.9-10;³ the verse follows the indicative-imperative pattern characteristic of Paul;⁴ ἐδικαιώθητε, πνεύματι τοῦ θεοῦ, and the repetition of ἀλλά reflect Paul's hand.⁵

There is also little reason to accept Vos's contention that the catalogs in Gal. 5.19f. and 1 Cor. 6.9f. form part of an early tradition detailing conditions for entrance into the Kingdom of God. Catalogs are never associated with the Kingdom of God in the relevant synoptic texts.⁶

Cor. 6.6f.; 12.20f.; Gal. 5.19f.; Eph. 4.2, 31f.; 5.3f.; Phil. 4.8; Col. 3.5, 8, 12; 1 Tim. 1.9f.; 4.12; 6.11; 2 Tim. 2.22; 3.2-5, 10; Tit. 3.3; 1 Pet. 2.1; 3.8; 4.3, 15; 2 Pet. 1.5-7; Rev. 21.8; 22.15. See also *Didache* 2.1-5.2 and *Barnabas* 18-20. The Spirit is associated with the catalogs in Gal. 5.19f.; 1 Cor. 6.9f.; 2 Cor. 6.6f.; Eph. 4.2, 31f.; and Tit. 3.3-5.

1. Contra Vos, *Untersuchungen*, p. 126: 'Gemeinchristlich war die Anschauung von dem Kampf zwischen Fleisch und Geist'. The phrase **καρπὸς τοῦ πνεύματος** (v. 22) has a close parallel in Eph. 5.9 (**καρπὸς τοῦ φωτός**) and the language is familiar to Paul (**καρπός**: Rom. 6.21f.; 15.28; Phil. 1.11, 22; 4.17; **καρποφορέω**: Rom. 7.4f.; Col. 1.6, 10).

2. Jewett stresses the conceptual and verbal links between Gal. 4.21f.; 5.19f., and 6.11-16 (*Anthropological Terms*, pp. 107-108). Note also the polemic nature of the phrase **κατὰ τῶν τοιούτων οὐκ ἔστιν νόμος** (v. 23).

3. See Fee, I *Corinthians*, p. 245 n. 29, who cites numerous examples from 1 Corinthians: 3.22-23; 4.14-17 (as a conclusion to 1.18-4.21); 5.7; 6.20; 10.13; 11.32. Fee writes, 'Paul cannot bring himself to conclude on the note of warning struck in w. 8-10, especially since it might leave the impression that the Corinthians were actually still among "the wicked"' (p. 245).

4. Fee, I *Corinthians*, pp. 247-48. So also Conzelmann notes that the verse contains 'an echo of the "once-but now" schema' employed by Paul elsewhere (e.g. Rom. 11.30; Eph. 5.8; Col. 3.5-8; cf. 1 Pet. 2.10) (*I Corinthians*, pp. 106-107).

5. (1) The verb **δικαιώω** occurs with the following frequencies in the NT: Matthew, 2x; Luke-Acts, 7x; Paul, 27x; James, 3x. (2) The phrase **πνεῦμα(τοῦ) θεοῦ** is used frequently by Paul (Rom. 8.9, 14; 1 Cor. 2.11, 14; 3.16; 6.11; 7.40; 12.3; 2 Cor. 3.3; Phil. 3.3) and rarely by the other NT authors (Mt. 3.16; 12.28; 1 Pet. 4.14; 1 Jn 4.2). (3) The threefold repetition of **ἀλλά** in 1 Cor. 6.11 is closely paralleled by the sixfold repetition in 2 Cor. 7.11. These are the only occasions in the NT where **ἀλλά** occurs more than two times in a single verse. The term occurs more than once in a single verse with the following frequency in the NT: Mark, 2x; Paul, 18x; 1 Peter 1x; 2 Peter, 1x; Revelation, 1x.

6. See Mk 9.43-48/Mt. 18.8f.; Mk 10.23/Mt. 19.23/Lk. 18.24; Mt. 5.20; Mt. 7.21/Lk. 6.46; Mt. 18.3; cf. Mt. 21.31: 23.13; Lk. 13.24-30 and the comments

The association is found only in the Pauline corpus where a form of the distinctively Pauline phrase, **θεοῦ βασιλείαν ὁ β κληρονομήσουσιν**,¹ is appended to vice-catalogs (Gal. 5.21; 1 Cor. 6.9, 10; Eph. 5.5). The phrase also occurs in 1 Cor. 15.50, but here **σάρξ καὶ αἷμα**, another Pauline **idiom**,² rather than a catalog of vices excludes one from the Kingdom. In any event, the Spirit is never cited as the agent which makes entrance into the Kingdom of God possible in the **synoptics** or **Acts**.³

2.2. A Baptismal Setting?

Vos provides a liturgical setting for his hypothetical tradition by arguing that the three texts in question all refer to the baptismal rite. According to Vos, the aorist tense of **σταυρόω** in Gal. 5.24 and the three verbs in 1 Cor. 6.11, particularly **ἀπολούομαι**, indicate that the baptismal rite is in **view**.⁴ Vos also asserts that the water rite stands behind 1 Cor. 15.49 since **εἰκόν** and clothing language are commonly employed in baptismal **tradition**.⁵ Yet here again Vos's thesis is tenuous.

The discussion in Gal. 5.16-24 centers on the conflict between the flesh and the Spirit. In v. 24 Paul relates this conflict to the believer's experience of Christ: 'the presence of the crucified Christ means. . . the crucifixion of the flesh'.⁶ The parallels with Gal. 2.15-21 (esp. v. 20), where faith in Christ is related to crucifixion with Christ, confirm that Paul is thinking here of subjective spiritual transformation rather than the objective event of baptism.'

The evidence also conflicts with a sacramental interpretation of 1 Cor. 6.11. Paul uses the preposition **εἰς** rather than **ἐν** with 'baptism' (cf. 1 Cor. 1.13-15; 12.13; Gal. 3.27). Indeed, he never uses the phrase **ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι** in conjunction with baptism. Furthermore, Paul never asserts that one is sanctified or justified at-baptism; and, in view

offered by Hans Windisch in 'Die **Sprüche** von Eingehen in das Reich Gottes', *ZNW* 27 (1928), pp. 163-71.

1. The phrase occurs in Gal. 5.21; 1 Cor. 6.9, 10; 15.50; and in a modified form in Eph. 5.5: **οὐκ ἔχει κληρονομίαν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ**.

2. The phrase occurs in Gal. 1.16 and Eph. 6.12.

3. The only instance outside of Paul where this usage is found is Jn 3.5.

4. Vos, *Untersuchungen*, pp. 27, 30.

5. Vos, *Untersuchungen*, p. 32. Vos cites Gal. 3.27; Col. 3.8f.; and Eph. 4.24f. as evidence that 'die Vorstellung vom Eikon-Gewand einen festen Sitz in der **Tauftradition** hat' (p. 32).

6. Betz, *Galatians*, p. 289.

7. Dunn, *Holy Spirit*, pp. 106-107, 115. Thus Betz concludes that the 'sacramental' interpretation is as artificial here as it is elsewhere in Galatians' (*Galatians*, p. 289 n. 172).

of the prior list of vices, the verb ἀπελούσασθε must refer to spiritual cleansing.¹

With regard to 1 Cor. 15.49, even if the hortatory subjunctive rather than future indicative reading of φορέω is accepted² and the text is rendered, ‘let us bear (φορέσωμεν) the likeness (εἰκόνα) of the man from heaven’, this sort of metaphorical language is characteristic of Paul and employed in a variety of contexts, most of which have nothing to do with baptism.³ This fact, coupled with the Pauline character of the language in v. 50a,⁴ indicates that here, as in Gal. 5.19f. and 1 Cor. 6.11, there is little reason to postulate an underlying baptismal tradition.

2.3. *The Jewish Background: A Critique of Vos’s Analysis*

With his contention that pre-Christian Judaism commonly attributed soteriological significance to the Spirit, Vos seeks to lend credibility to his tradition-historical analysis. However, his analysis of the Jewish background is flawed at numerous points.

Vos places considerable emphasis on a number of Old Testament texts which appear to support his thesis (e.g. Ezek. 36.26f.; Ps. 51.13, MT; Isa. 44.3). Yet, he does not examine with sufficient detail how these texts were interpreted in the (first-century) Judaism which gave rise to Christianity. Thus he fails to recognize that the transformation of the heart referred to in Ezek. 36.26f. was viewed as a *prerequisite* for the eschatological bestowal of the Spirit, generally interpreted in

1. These points are discussed by Dunn, *Holy Spirit*, pp. 121-23; Fee, *I Corinthians*, pp. 246-47; and R.P. Carlson, ‘Baptism and Apocalyptic in Paul’ (1983), pp. 345-51.

2. Fee, *I Corinthians*, p. 795: ‘The future is found in only a few disparate MSS and is easily accounted for on the very same grounds that it is now adopted by so many, while it is nearly impossible to account for anyone’s having changed a clearly understandable future to the hortatory subjunctive so early and so often that it made its way into every textual history as the predominant reading’. Note, however, Metzger, *A Textual Commentary*, p. 569.

3. The verb φορέω occurs elsewhere in Paul, but only once in a metaphorical sense (Rom. 13.4). However, ἐνδύω is used metaphorically in Rom. 13.12, 14; 1 Cor. 15.53, 54; Gal. 3.27; Eph. 4.24; 6.11, 14; Col. 3.10, 12; 1 Thess. 5.8; and outside of Paul only in Lk. 24.49. References to the εἰκὼν of God or Christ are found exclusively in the epistles of Paul: Rom. 8.29; 1 Cor. 11.7; 15.49; 2 Cor. 3.18, 4.4; Col. 1.15; 3.10. The baptismal rite is clearly in view only in Gal. 3.27. Thus Dunn, with reference to Col. 3.5-17, writes: ‘the metaphors are so common and natural that I am not convinced of the necessity to refer them to a common source or occasion’ (*Holy Spirit*, p. 158).

4. Fee, *I Corinthians*, p. 798 n. 12: ‘the language “flesh and blood” and “inherit the kingdom of God” are both Pauline’.

light of Joel 2.28f. as restoration of the Spirit of prophecy;’ and that according to early Jewish tradition, Ps. 51.13 (MT) records David’s plea for undeserved retention of the *Spirit of prophecy*.² He also fails to recognize that Isa. 44.3 was interpreted by the rabbis as a reference to the outpouring of the *Spirit of prophecy* upon Israel.³ Furthermore, Vos does not distinguish adequately between those texts which portray the Spirit as the source of prophetic activity, producing righteousness indirectly through the prophetic word; and those which portray the Spirit as the source of inner renewal, mediating righteousness directly to the recipient of the pneumatic gift (e.g. Wis. 9.17).⁴ The distinction is important, for the pre-Pauline tradition he postulates clearly falls into the latter category. When this distinction is recognized, the Old Testament antecedents to Vos’s hypothetical baptismal tradition appear remote.

Vos also exaggerates the extent to which pre-Christian Judaism attributed soteriological functions to the Spirit by uncritically accepting evidence from *Joseph and Aseneth*, a text marked by Christian interpolation.⁵ Moreover, he emphasizes the relationship between the

1. Vos maintains that the Rabbis looked forward to the day when the ‘evil impulse’ would be conquered through the outpouring of the Spirit (*Untersuchungen*, p. 71). In numerous rabbinic texts, Ezek. 36.26 is interpreted as a prophecy concerning the *endtime* removal of the evil impulse. However, these texts usually omit any reference to the work of the Spirit. In the rabbiic literature a transformed heart (righteousness) remains a precondition for restoration of the prophetic gift. See the comments on Ezek. 36.26f. in Chapter 5 §2.1 and Chapter 10 §2 above.

2. The *Targum* on Ps. 51.13 replaces the expression ‘holy Spirit’ with ‘holy Spirit of prophecy’. See also *MHG* Gen. 242 cited in Chapter 5 §1.1.2 above. Thus, although Kaiser asserts that the text does not refer ‘to the Spirit’s gift of government and administration but rather to his [the pray-er’s] personal fellowship with God’ (‘The Promise of God’, p. 122), it appears that Ps. 51.13 was interpreted with reference to the Spirit as *Amtscharisma*. The text reflects the widespread Jewish belief that the Spirit resided only in the righteous.

Vos makes no mention of the *Targum* on Psalm 51, yet he does acknowledge that the Spirit in Ps. 51.13 functions principally as the ‘Vermittler des Heilsorakels’ (*Untersuchungen*, p. 40). Nevertheless, he also maintains that the Psalm presents the Spirit as the agent of the pray-er’s justification and cleansing.

3. See *Midr. Ps.* 111.1.

4. See for example Vos’s treatment of Ps. 51 as outlined above.

5. Vos is undoubtedly correct when he writes: ‘Damit Aseneth in die den *Auserwählten* bereitete *κατάπαυσις* eingehen kann, so heißt es in Josephs Gebet. . .[8.10f], mu8 sie *zunächst* durch das *göttliche* Pneuma neugeschaffen werden’ (*Untersuchungen*, p. 69). However, Holtz has argued persuasively for Christian influence on *Joseph and Aseneth* at this point: ‘Es ist mir *nicht* zweifelhaft, daß die Darstellung der Form von Aseneths Aufnahme in die neue Religion durch eine *Speisung* mit Honig = *Mana* und ihre Deutung als Neuerungung oder *Wiedergeburt*

'spirit of truth' (1QS 3.13–4.6; cf. 2.25b–3.12) and the Spirit of God; although the 'spirit of truth', as the anthropological counterpart to the 'spirit of falsehood', is more closely related to the rabbinic 'good impulse' (יצר הטוב).² The picture which emerges from Vos's analysis is distorted further by the limited scope of his inquiry. By focusing on those texts which tend to support his thesis, Vos obscures the fact that the Spirit is **almost** always portrayed as the source of prophetic inspiration in the relevant Jewish texts. As we have seen, the only Jewish texts which attribute soteriological functions to **the** Spirit in a manner analogous to the Pauline epistles are **the** Hymns of Qumran and Wisdom.

It has become apparent **that** Vos has built his thesis on a foundation of sand. The Pauline character of the principal terms and concepts contained in the three texts, the improbable nature of a common baptismal setting, and the general lack of Jewish parallels indicate that a pre-Pauline baptismal tradition does not form the basis of 1 Cor. 6.9–11; 15.44–50; and Gal. 5.19–24. These texts, together with the distinctive soteriological pneumatology which they reflect, find their origin in the mind of Paul.

Chapter 13

WISDOM OF SOLOMON
AND PAUL'S SOTERIOLOGICAL PNEUMATOLOGY

In the examination of the Jewish literature in the intertestamental period we found that references to the soteriological dimension of the Spirit's activity were limited to a narrow strand within the wisdom tradition: Wisdom and the Hymns of Qumran. Although these texts are closely related in many respects, they originate from different milieus. Wisdom illustrates how wisdom concepts influential in the Qumran community were appropriated in a hellenistic setting. It is my contention that wisdom traditions from the hellenistic Jewish milieu which produced Wisdom were known to Paul either through this text or related (oral or written) sources and provided the conceptual framework for his distinctive pneumatology. I shall seek to support this judgment by establishing the unique character of the conceptual parallels which unite Wis. 9.9–18 with 1 Cor. 2.6–16 and Gal. 4.4–6, and by noting other striking conceptual and linguistic similarities which suggest Paul's indebtedness to Wisdom or traditions contained within it.

1. *Wisdom 9.9–18 and 1 Corinthians 2.6–16*

In 1 Cor. 2.6–16 Paul discusses the nature of the wisdom of God, previously identified with the crucified Christ (1 Cor. 1.23–24, 30). Paul declares that the wisdom of God is redemptive (v. 7) and stands against the wisdom of this age, which is coming to nothing (v. 6). Furthermore, Paul insists that only those who have received the Spirit of God can understand God's wisdom (i.e. his redemptive purpose in the cross of Christ), for only the Spirit of God knows the mind of God (vv. 11–12).¹ Although the people of this age pursue wisdom, since they do not possess the Spirit it remains hidden from them (vv. 6–10a). They are utterly incapable of understanding true wisdom (v. 14)

(zum ewigen **Leben**) nicht jüdisch ist, sondern mindestens die christliche Umprägung eines ursprünglich andersartigen jüdischen Berichts' ('Christliche Interpolationen', pp. 482–97; quote from p. 486).

1. Vos, *Untersuchungen*, pp. 61–64, see also pp. 56–58.

2. See Chapter 4 §1 above.

1. E. Cothenet, 'Les prophètes chrétiens', p. 97: 'L'Écriture devient lettre morte pour qui n'est pas illuminé par l'Esprit du Seigneur'.

and making valid judgments (v. 15); as a result, their rulers crucified Christ (v. 8). However, in accordance with God's salvific plan, the hidden wisdom of God has been revealed to every Christian by the Spirit of God (vv. 7, 10b-13).¹ Through the Spirit the Christian knows 'the mind of Christ' (v. 16). Paul thus reminds the Corinthians that they are Christians possessing the Spirit of God and implicitly exhorts them to act **accordingly**.²

Although it is quite likely that Paul's language in 1 Cor. 2.6-16 has been influenced by Corinthian usage, the theological perspective which emerges is undoubtedly **Paul's**.³ His perspective may be summarized as follows: (1) anthropology-man by nature is utterly incapable of understanding the wisdom of God; (2) pneumatology-only by receiving the gift of the Spirit can man comprehend the wisdom of God; (3) soteriology-the gift of the Spirit, as the transmitter of God's wisdom, is redemptive.

When we turn to Wisdom we find a perspective remarkably similar to that of Paul as outlined above. Chapter 9 records Solomon's description of God's wisdom in the form of a prayer. Verses 9-18 are particularly striking and will form the basis of our **comparison**.⁴

1. Scroggs maintains that Paul is speaking of an 'esoteric wisdom' unrelated to the kerygma and reserved for a spiritual elite (**ἹΙΝΕΥΜΑΤΙΚΟΣ**, pp. 33-55, esp. 37-40, 54; see also Conzelmann, I **Corinthians**, p. 57, and Ellis as cited in p. 331 n. 2 above). However, Fee argues persuasively that a distinction between a special class of pneumatics and believers in general is not in view in these verses: 'the real contrast is. . . between Christian and non-Christian, between those who have and those who do not have the Spirit' (I **Corinthians**, pp. 99-103, 122-23, quote from p. 101). Fee notes that: (1) the **τέλειοι** of v. 6 are those who have received the Spirit (v. 12) and related to the 'spiritual man' (**πνευματικός**) of v. 15; (2) 'the argument of the whole paragraph, particularly the language "for our glory" (v. 7), "for those who love him" (i.e. "us"; v. 9), "revealed it to us" (v. 10), and "we have received the Spirit who is from God" (v. 12), implies that Paul is. . . addressing the whole Church' (p. 102); and (3) Paul's concern in 3.1-4 is 'not to suggest classes of Christians or grades of spirituality, but to get them [the Corinthians] to stop thinking like the people of this present age' (p. 122). So also Davis argues that in 1 Cor. 2.14-16 Paul 'redefines the **πνευματικός-ψυχικός** antithesis [of his Corinthian opponents] so as to change the **nature** of the distinction from a qualitative distinction among believers, into an absolute distinction between Christian and pagan' (**Wisdom**, p. 125).

2. See Fee, I **Corinthians**, pp. 100-101.

3. See Fee, I **Corinthians**, p. 100 and Brandenburger, **Fleisch und Geist**, p. 106: 'Die positive Verwendung der Verbindung von Pneuma und Sophia [in 1 Cor. 2.6f.] . . . ist kaum nur ein **polemisches** Produkt'.

4. The influence which Wisdom exerted upon Paul's thought, particularly his pneumatology, was noted as early as 1887 by **Pfleiderer** in his **Das Urchristentum**, pp. 158-68, 257. The link which **Pfleiderer** proposed between the pneumatology of

1.1. Anthropology

The author of Wisdom clearly shares Paul's conviction concerning humanity's inability to comprehend the wisdom of God. He contrasts the redemptive power of wisdom with the 'feebleness of human reason' (v. 14).¹ Human thoughts are fallible, 'for the mortal body weighs down the soul and the tent of clay burdens the active mind' (**φθαρτὸν γὰρ σῶμα βαρύνει ψυχὴν, καὶ βρῖθει τὸ γεῶδες σκῆνος νοῦν πολυφρόντιδα**, v. 15).

The extreme pessimism characteristic of this anthropological perspective is rarely found in pre-Christian Judaism and is absent from the synoptic gospels and Acts. Although Jewish wisdom theology in the intertestamental period identified wisdom with the **Torah**,² and thus viewed wisdom as a revelatory gift from **God**,³ it still emphasized the human capacity to acquire wisdom by rational means through study of the Torah! Humanity's culpability for sin is grounded in its capacity to understand and appropriate the wisdom of the Torah (e.g. Sir. 15.15). Luke and the primitive church also stress humanity's ability to

Wisdom and Paul was subsequently criticized by Gunkel (**Die Wirkungen**, pp. 86-88) and E. Sokolowski (**Geist und Leben bei Paulus** [1903], p. 200). Their criticisms may be summarized with the words of Gunkel: 'Weisheit lemt der **Mensch**; der Geist ergreift ihn' (p. 87). However, Gunkel and Sokolowski clearly underestimated the power of Spirit-revealed wisdom in Wis. 9.17-18 (cf. Nickelsburg, **Jewish Literature**, p. 184-85: 'Paul's doctrine of the Holy Spirit as. . . God's power for the godly life (e.g. Rom 8) parallels [the author of Wisdom's] understanding of Wisdom'), and the cognitive aspect of the revelation of the Spirit in 1 Cor. 2.6-16. As we shall see, they have also failed to recognize the distinctive nature of the parallels which unite the pneumatological perspectives of the author of Wisdom and Paul. More recently the parallels between Wis. 9.9-18 and 1 Cor. 2.6-16 have been noted by Scroggs: 'content and context are similar in striking ways. . . the least to be said is that ix. 9-18 and I Cor. ii. 6-16 arise out of the same context of wisdom theology' (**ἹΙΝΕΥΜΑΤΙΚΟΣ**, pp. 48-50, quote from p. 49).

1. Cf. Wis. 9.6: 'Even if one is perfect (**τέλειος**) among the sons of men, without the wisdom that comes from [God] he will be regarded as nothing'.

2. Schnabel notes that the identification of the Law with wisdom is clearly made in Baruch, I **Enoch**, **Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs**, the **Letter of Aristeas**, the **Jewish Third Sibylline Oracle**, **4 Maccabees**, **Pseudo-Philo**, **4 Ezra**; and the **Apocalypse of Baruch (Law and Wisdom**, p. 162).

3. Rylaarsdam has shown that a gradual shift occurred in the orientation of Jewish wisdom theology during the late- and post-OT periods: wisdom was increasingly viewed as a revelatory gift from God rather than knowledge acquired through empirical study of nature (see **Revelation**). Rylaarsdam notes that while the wisdom tradition generally identifies this revelatory gift with the Torah, the author of Wisdom equates it with the Spirit (pp. x, 116-18).

4. See for example Sir. 3.22; 6.36; 15.1; 21.11f.; 32.15; Bar. 3.9; 4 **Macc.** 1.15-19; 18.1-2. Note also Chapter 2 §2.2 and Chapter 3 §1 above.

grasp the true significance of Christ, renounce sin, and follow him.’ The perspective of the author of Wisdom and Paul is quite different: the wisdom of God expressed in the Torah (Wisdom) or Christ (Paul) cannot be apprehended by the human mind apart from the illumination of the Spirit.²

The author of Wisdom and Paul not only share similar assumptions regarding the nature of humankind, they also employ similar anthropological terms. E. Brandenburger has argued that Paul’s *σάρξ-πνεῦμα* language reflects the influence of the ‘dualistische Weisheit’ found in the Hymns of Qumran, Wisdom, and ultimately in the writings of Philo;³ and K.-G. Sandelin and B. Pearson have traced

1. Thus R. Mohrlang (*Matthew and Paul: A Comparison of Ethical Perspectives* [1984], esp. pp. 11 l-25) and J.W. Taeger (‘Paulus und Lukas über den Menschen’, *ZNW* 71 [1980], pp 96-108; and *Der Mensch*) contrast the pessimistic anthropology of Paul with the more positive appraisals of man given by Matthew and Luke respectively. Mohrlang notes that for Paul human beings do not have the capacity to live a moral life; ethical living is made possible by the Spirit (p. 115). Matthew, however, affirms humanity’s capacity for ethical behavior and attributes it to ‘an essential inner goodness’ (p. 123). Taeger argues that whereas Paul views the natural human being as completely dominated by the power of sin, in Luke’s perspective the individual is capable of deciding to follow Christ and renounce sin (*Der Mensch*, esp. pp. 85- 103; 184-87; 220-28). He concludes: ‘Diese Sicht des Apostles ist mit der lukanischen sachlich nicht vereinbar’ (‘Paulus und Lukas’, p. 108). I would affirm, however, that for the purpose of formulating a holistic biblical theology, the differences between the anthropological and pneumatological perspectives of Luke and Paul are ultimately reconcilable. They represent different (theological rather than **chronological**) stages in the progressive and harmonious development of God’s revelation: Luke’s understanding of the nature of humanity and its experience of the Spirit must be augmented by Paul’s more pervasive treatment of the Spirit’s role in the dynamics of spiritual life. The task of synthesizing these perspectives into a coherent biblical theology is beyond the scope of this study. On the issue of theological diversity within the canon see I.H. Marshall’s analysis of *Sachkritik*: ‘An Evangelical Approach to “Theological Criticism”’, *Them* 13 (1988), pp. 79-85.

2. Brandenburger notes that 1QH 4.31, *Leg. All. 1.38*, *Wisd. 9.17*, and 2 Cor. 2.11 all employ variations of the **form**, ‘who/no one can know. . . except (εἰ μὴ, אִם כִּי)’, and in a context which refers to humanity’s inability to know the will or wisdom of God apart from God’s giving of his Spirit (*Fleisch und Geist*, p. 152). Although these texts probably find their origin in a common tradition, it is important to note that they represent different trajectories of development: the author of 1QH (in 1QH 4.31) and Philo associate this gift of the Spirit with the act of creation, whereas the author of Wisdom and Paul do not.

3. See Brandenburger, *Fleisch und Geist*, pp. 24, 119-235 (on Philo); pp. 106-16 (on Wisdom); and pp. 86-106, 114-16 (on the Hodajot). Brandenburger concludes: ‘Die Ergebnisse der vorliegenden Untersuchung zeigen jedenfalls, daß Paulus gewichtige Partien seiner Theologie im Rahmen dualistisch-weisheitlicher

many of the anthropological terms in 1 Cor. 15 to a similar milieu.’ The linguistic similarities between Wis. 9.15 and 2 Cor. 5.1-5 are particularly striking: both texts refer to the earthly tent (σκῆνος) which burdens (βαρύνω, Wis. 9.15; βαρέω; 2 Cor. 5.4) humanity and which is overcome by the Spirit of God (Wis. 9.17; 2 Cor. 5.5).²

1.2. Pneumatology

Like many of the Jewish wisdom teachers of his day, the author of Wisdom associates sapiential achievement with the revelation of the Spirit. However, while the esoteric wisdom of the prophet or sage is frequently attributed to the inspiration of the Spirit in the literature; lower levels of sapiential achievement are ascribed to human effort unaided by the Spirit, such as the study of the Torah.³ The author of Wisdom breaks from his Jewish contemporaries⁴ (excluding the Qumran community) and shows his unique affinity to Paul (1 Cor. 2.11f.)⁵ by attributing every level of sapiential achievement, from the lowest to the highest, to the gift of the Spirit: ‘Who has learned your will, unless you gave him wisdom, and sent your Holy Spirit from on high? In this

Gedanken-freilich sachlich in höchst kritischer Aufnahme -versteh und entfaltet’ (p. 228).

1. K.-G. Sandelin, *Die Auseinandersetzung mit der Weisheit in I. Korinther 15* (1976) and B.A. Pearson, *The Pneumatikos-Psychikos Terminology in I Corinthians* (1973).

2. The parallels between Wis. 9.15 and 2 Cor. 5.1-5 have been observed by E. Grafe, ‘Das Verhältnis der paulinischen Schriften zur Sapientia Salomonis’, in *Theologische Abhandlungen* (1892), pp. 274-75; A. Feuillet, *Le Christ Sagesse de Dieu d’après les Épîtres Pauliniennes* (1966), p. 333; and Scroggs, ‘TINEYMATIKOS’, p. 49. Note also that the term τέλειος is employed in 1 Cor. 2.6 in a manner quite similar to Wis. 9.6.

3. Davis, *Wisdom*, pp. 9-62. See Sir. 24.23f. and Bar. 4.1-2.

4. D. Winston, *The Wisdom of Solomon* (1979), p. 43: ‘When he [the author of Wisdom] insists that unless God send his Wisdom down from on high men would not comprehend God’s will (9:17), he is certainly implying that the Torah is in need of further interpretation for the disclosure of its true meaning, interpretation which Wisdom alone is able to provide’.

5. Davis, *Wisdom*, p. 106: ‘For Paul, the Spirit alone is a complete and reliable guide to all of divine wisdom’. See also Jaubert, *La notion dalliance*, p. 372 and Scroggs, ‘TINEYMATIKOS’, p. 54: ‘So close is Paul here [1 Cor. 2.6-16] to ideas in Wisd. ix. 9-18 that one must judge this passage figured in an important way in Paul’s thinking. Particularly is this so with respect to the close relationship between σοφία and πνεῦμα and the absolute revelatory quality of wisdom.’ Although Scroggs correctly notes that the ‘absolute revelatory quality of wisdom’ is affirmed by Paul, he incorrectly distinguishes this wisdom from the kerygma.

way people on earth have been set on the right path, have learned what pleases you, and have been saved by wisdom' (Wis. 9.17-18).

In addition to the important conceptual parallel outlined above, the author of Wisdom and Paul portray the Spirit as the functional equivalent of wisdom and Christ respectively: wisdom (Wisdom)' and Christ (Paul)² are experienced through the Spirit. This is particularly significant, since Paul draws upon the wisdom speculation so prominent in Wisdom for many of his christological formulations.³ Together these facts suggest that Wisdom or related traditions

1. Note the way in which wisdom is equated with πνεῦμα in Wis. 1.4-7; 7.7, 22; and 9.17 (see B.L. Mack, *Logos und Sophia: Untersuchungen zur Weisheitstheologie in hellenistischer Judentum* [1973], p. 64). The author of Wisdom also attributes functions normally reserved for the Spirit, such as the inspiration of rulers (*Amtscharisma*) and prophets, to wisdom (cf. 10.14, 16; 11.1).

2. Pointing to Rom. 1.1-5; 8.9-11; 1 Cor. 6.17; 15.45; and particularly 2 Cor. 3.17, I. Hermann argues for the functional identification of the Spirit and the resurrected Christ by Paul: 'Christus wird erfahrbar als Pneuma' (*Kyrios und Pneuma* [1961], p. 49). See also Dunn, 'Last Adam', pp. 127-41 and *Jesus and the Spirit*, pp. 318-26; Kim, *Origin*, pp. 228-29; Hamilton, *Eschatology*, pp. 3-16; J.L. Leuba, 'Der Zusammenhang zwischen Geist und Tradition nach dem Neuen Testament', *KuD 4* (1958), pp. 238-39; W. Wright, 'The Source of Paul's Concept of Pneuma', *CovQ 41* (1983), pp. 23-25; H.S. Benjamin, 'Pneuma in John and Paul', *BTB 6* (1976), p. 47; and more cautiously, Turner, who speaks of 'some degree of functional identification' ('Spirit Endowment for Paul', p. 64). Note also A. Deissmann's assertion that Paul employs the phrases 'in Christ' and 'in the Spirit' synonymously (*Paul: A Study in Social and Religious History* [2nd edn, 1926], pp. 138-40; cf. E. Ellis, 'Christ and Spirit', p. 273 and Y. Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit* [1983], I, pp. 37-38).

3. Rom. 8.3; 1 Cor. 1.24, 30; 8.6; 10.4; 15.22-28, 44b-59; Gal. 4.4-6; and Col. 1.15f. are often cited in this regard. See H. Windisch, 'Die göttliche Weisheit der Juden und die paulinische Christologie', in *Neutestamentliche Studien* (1914), pp. 220f.; W.L. Knox, *St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles* (1939), pp. 111-24, 133f., 163f.; Davies, *Paul*, pp. 147-176; three articles by E. Schweizer, 'Zur Herkunft der Präexistenzvorstellung bei Paulus', in *Neotestamentica* (1963), pp. 105-109, 'Aufnahme und Korrektur jüdischer Sophiatheologie im Neuen Testament', in *Neotestamentica* (1963), pp. 110-11, and 'Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Hintergrund der "Sendungsformel"', in *Beiträge zur Theologie des Neuen Testaments: Neutestamentliche Aufsätze (1955-1970)* (1970), pp. 83-95; H. Conzelmann, 'Paulus und die Weisheit', *NTS 12* (1965-66), pp. 231-44; Feuillet, *Le Christ, passim*; C. Romaniuk, 'Le Livre de la Sagesse dans le Nouveau Testament', *NTS 14* (1967-68), pp. 511-13; Sandelin, *Weisheit in 1. Korinther 15, passim*; M. Hengel, *The Son of God* (1976), pp. 72-74; Dunn, *Christology in the Making*, pp. 163-96 and '“A Light to the Gentiles”: the Significance of the Damascus Road Christophany for Paul', in *The Glory of Christ in the New Testament* (1987), p. 265; Schnabel, *Law and Wisdom*, pp. 236-64; and Kim, *Origin*, pp. 114-20, 127-28, 258-60, 266-68.

provided the conceptual background for the close connection between Christ and Spirit envisioned by Paul.' The striking correlation of light, image, and Spirit/breath motifs in 2 Cor. 3.18; 4.4, 6 and Wis. 7.25-26 lends further support to this thesis.² These texts associate Christ/Wisdom with a bright φῶς,³ the δόξα of the Lord, the εἰκὼν of God, and the divine πνεῦμα or ἀτμίς.⁴

1.3. Soteriology

According to the author of Wisdom, wisdom 'knows and understands all things' (οἶδε γὰρ ἐκείνη πάντα καὶ συνίει, v. 11),⁵ including that which pleases God (v. 9). For this reason Solomon can confidently declare that wisdom 'will guard me in her glory' (φυλάξει με ἐν τῇ δόξη αὐτῆς, v. 11) and that by her the people of the earth 'are saved' (τῇ σοφίᾳ ἐσώθησαν, v. 18).⁶ Although the σφῶζω of v. 18, like φυλάσσω in v. 11, may refer principally to physical preservation, the eschatological significance of these verses should not be minimized.' For elsewhere the eschatological dimension of wisdom's redemptive

1. Isaacs, *Spirit*, p. 145: 'The close association (and possible identification) of Christ with the spirit which we find in Johannine and Pauline writings, may have arisen out of an identification of Christ with the wisdom figure of Hellenistic Judaism'.

2. See Romaniuk, 'Le Livre', p. 511; Kim, *Origin*, pp. 117, 128-29, 258 and, on the Pauline origin of 2 Cor. 3.18-4.6, pp. 141-44.

3. Cf. ἀπαύγασμα (Wis. 7.26) with ἀυγάζω (2 Cor. 4.4). Romaniuk notes that 2 Cor. 4.4 represents the only occurrence of ἀυγάζω in the NT, the term occurs infrequently in the LXX, and 'le contexte dans lequel se trouve ce mot chez saint Paul est le même que dans le livre de la Sagesse' ('Le Livre', p. 511). Romaniuk also observes that mirror language appears in both texts: ἔσοπτρον (Wis. 7.26); κατοπτρίζω (2 Cor. 3.18) (p. 511).

4. In view of Wis. 7.22, ἀτμίς should be seen as a synonym for πνεῦμα. The interpretation of 2 Cor. 3.17-18 is problematic. However, even if the text does not explicitly identify the resurrected Christ with πνεῦμα, a functional identification is implicit in the naming of both πνεῦμα (3.18) and Christ (4.4, 6) as the source of God's glory.

5. Cf. 1 Cor. 2.10, τὸ γὰρ πνεῦμα πάντα ἐραυνᾷ, and v. 15a, ὁ δὲ πνευματικὸς ἀνακρίνει [τὰ] πάντα.

6. A. Van Roon notes that in the following chapter (Wis. 10) wisdom is 'presented as God's saving power in the history of mankind and Israel' ('The Relation between Christ and the Wisdom of God according to Paul', *NovT 16* [1974], p. 209).

7. The term σφῶζω appears frequently in the remaining chapters of Wisdom (10.4; 14.4, 5; 16.7, 11; 18.5) and the sense of physical preservation is always paramount. Yet this is due to the fact that the following verses chronicle Wisdom's saving power in history. In view of the passages cited above and in the following note, it is evident that these examples of the salvific power of wisdom drawn from Israel's history are merely symbols which convey a more profound message.

power is given prominence: immortality' and authority over the nations² are promised to the righteous (3.1-9; cf. 5.1-23), 'his chosen ones' (τοῖς ἐκλεκτοῖς αὐτοῦ, 3.9).³ Therefore, by presenting the Spirit as the functional equivalent of wisdom, the author of Wisdom affirms with (and in a manner similar to) Paul the soteriological necessity of the pneumatic gift (9.17-18; cf. 1 Cor. 2.7).⁴

We have already noted that the soteriological pneumatology found in Wisdom and the Pauline corpus is absent from the synoptic gospels and Acts. This perspective is also unparalleled in the literature of intertestamental Judaism (excluding the scrolls from Qumran). The precondition for eschatological redemption, righteousness, is elsewhere associated with devotion to the Torah unaided by the inspiration of the Spirit.⁵ Philo, with his conception of πνεῦμα as the rational and immortal aspect of the soul, offers the closest Jewish parallel to the perspective outlined above. However, unlike Philo, the author of Wisdom clearly distinguishes the gift of the Spirit which is given to all at creation (15.11) from the gift of the Spirit which enables one to comprehend the wisdom of God and attain immortality (9.17).⁶

1. Note also Wis. 6.18, 'to keep her [wisdom's] laws is to be certain of immortality [ἀφθαρσία], and immortality brings a man near to God'; 8.17, 'there is immortality in kinship with wisdom' (cf. 8.13); and 15.3, 'to acknowledge your [God's] power is the root of immortality'.

2. D. Georgi highlights the apocalyptic character of Wis. 3.7-9 (*Weisheit Salomos* [1980], pp. 410-11). It is important to note that the union of wisdom and apocalyptic is found in Wisdom as well as in the writings of Paul (Scroggs, 'IINEYMATIKOC', p. 35 n. 3). The close connection between wisdom and apocalyptic is noted by Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, I, p. 206 and *Between Jesus and Paul* (1983), p. 50; G. von Rad, *Old Testament Theology* (1965), II, pp. 306-308; and Manns, *Symbole*, p. 108.

3. Thus Sandelin notes that 'die Errettung des Menschen kann in Sap. sowohl irdisch (Kap. 10-19) als auch himmlisch (5,1ff.; 3,1ff.) aufgefasst werden' (*Weisheit in 1. Korinther 15*, p. 43).

4. Knox notes that according to the author of Wisdom, the gift of the Spirit is needed as the means of attaining immortality rather than as a special gift of government (St. Paul, p. 79).

5. See for example 4 *Ezra* 7.78-99; 2 *Macc.* 7; 4 *Macc.* 18; 2 *Bar.* 51; *Sib. Or.* 4.25-45; 1 *En.* 108; *T. Mos.* 9-10; *Jub.* 23.24-31; *Pss. Sol.* 3; 13; 14; 15. Note also G.W.E. Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism* (1972), pp. 93-143.

6. This distinction is presupposed in Wis. 15.11. However, according to Philo the πνεῦμα breathed into every human soul at creation makes the mind (νοῦς) rational and thus capable of knowing God and immortal (e.g. Leg. All. 1.31-38; Op. Mund. 135; Der. Pot. Ins. 80-90; Plant. 18-22; Congr. 97). See Chapter 2 §5.1 above. Sandelin maintains that Philo (in Leg. All.), in a manner similar to the author of Wisdom, refers to two distinct receptions of the Spirit: the first sustains physical life:

My suggestion that Paul was influenced by Wisdom or related traditions is supported by three additional observations. First, the fall of man is described by the author of Wisdom in language reminiscent of Paul. Wisdom 2.24 states that humankind was originally created to live forever, but through the Devil 'death entered into the world' (θάνατος εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον, Wis. 2.24). The formula, εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον, is also found in Wis. 14.14 with reference to idols. Outside of Wisdom the formula is found neither in the LXX nor in the rabbinic literature.⁷ The phrase occurs occasionally in early non-Christian Greek sources, but never in a context pertaining to death.⁸ However, Paul employs the formula with reference to the fall of man and death in Rom. 5.12: ἡ ἁμαρτία εἰς τὸν κόσμον εἰσῆλθεν καὶ ἡ θάνατος. It is unlikely that the similarities between Rom. 5.12 and Wis. 2.24 are the product of chance.⁹

Second, the book of Wisdom may help explain how Paul came to view the Spirit as the agent of the resurrection. We have already noted

the second enables one to comprehend the wisdom of God and attain immortality (*Weisheit in 1. Korinther 15*, pp. 26-44). However, Sandelin notes that Philo, unlike the author of Wisdom, associates both of these divine inbreathings with the creation event (p. 36). Sandelin summarizes the main points from Leg. All. as follows: 'Jeder menschliche νοῦς hat bei der Schöpfung eine göttliche πνοή durch den Logos bekommen. Diese πνοή war aber sehr schwach. Der νοῦς des Menschen ist auch nach der Einhauchung bei der Schöpfung vergänglich. Er kann aber stärker werden, sich von dem Körper zu lösen anfangen durch tugendhaftes Leben. Die Bedingung für das wahrhaftige und unvergängliche Leben ist aber noch eine zweite Einhauchung durch die Sophia, welche den νοῦς vollkommen, unvergänglich und weise macht. Der νοῦς erreicht dadurch dieselbe Stellung wie der himmlische Mensch, der nach dem Abbild des Abbildes Gottes geschaffen worden ist' (p. 37). Sandelin's interpretation, particularly with reference to the second inbreathing of the Spirit, is based on his contention that Philo in Leg. All. 1.32, 37-38 describes the creation of the Pneumatiker or wise one rather than the creation of the natural person. Although Sandelin's interpretation of Leg. All. 1.32-42 is open to question (see the alternative views presented by Brandenburger, *Fleisch und Geist*, pp. 148-54, esp. p. 149 n. 2; Weaver, 'Πνεῦμα in Philo', pp. 75-77, 110-12; Tobin, *The Creation of Man*, esp. pp. 48f., 77f., 102-34 and Runia, *Philo*, pp. 334-40) he correctly recognizes that the text is a 'Mischung von Schöpfungs- und Erlösungslehre' (p. 35, quoting J. Pascher, *H ΒΑΣΙΛΙΚΗ ΟΔΟΣ. Der Königsweg zu Wiedergeburt und Vergottung bei Philon von Alexandria* [Paderborn, 1931], p. 127).

1. Romaniuk, 'Le Livre', p. 504.

2. Variations of the formula are found in Anaxagoras Phil. 75; Galen 10.2.122; Marcus Aurelius Antoninus 6.56; Plotinus, *Ennead*, 2.9.12; and Philo, *Op. Mund.* 78; *Spec. Leg.* 1.294-95 (this information was obtained from the TLG disc by Ibycus [Tyndale House, Cambridge]). Philo utilizes the phrase with reference to humans' entrance into the world.

3. Romaniuk, 'Le Livre', p. 505.

that Paul was probably the first Christian to give voice to this perspective.' Jewish precursors to Paul at this point do exist. However they are exceedingly rare. The intertestamental texts which make a connection between the Spirit and resurrection are limited to 2 Bar. 23.5 and a handful of rabbinic citations generally based on Ezekiel 37.² Two significant points of contact suggest that the association between immortality and the gift of the Spirit found in Wisdom rather than these Jewish resurrection-texts formed the basis for Paul's thought. (1) Neither Paul nor the author of Wisdom associates resurrection/immortality with the divine breath received at creation (Philo) or after death (Ezek. 37, 2 Bar. 23.5, and the rabbinic texts). Rather, both declare that the righteous attain immortality by virtue of the gift of the Spirit which they have received during their natural life (Rom. 8.11; Wis. 8.17; 9.17).³ (2) The terminology of Wisdom is employed by Paul. A survey of the LXX and the New Testament reveals that the terms ἀφθαρσία, ἄφθαρτος, and ἀθανασία are employed almost exclusively by the author of Wisdom and Paul.⁴ Although the author of Wisdom never refers to the resurrection of the body, the concept is not incompatible with his emphasis on immortality.⁵

1. See Chapter 12 above.

2. Müller concludes his survey of the evidence by stating that 'der heilige Geist bei der Totenaufstehung vor Paulus keine quantitative bedeutende Rolle spielt' ('Geisterfahrung', pp. 11-32, quote from p. 131). See also Sokolowski, *Geist und Leben*, p. 203. Note that 2 Baruch was probably penned in the 2nd century AD.

3. The author of Wisdom, like Paul, insists that humans are mortal by nature (Wis. 7.1; 9.15; 15.8, 17; 16.14). Immortality is thus a divine gift reserved for the righteous (J.M. Reese, *Hellenistic Influence on the Book of Wisdom and Its Consequences* [1970], p. 64). Furthermore, the indwelling presence of wisdom/Spirit 'makes the eschatological gift of immortality a reality in the present life of the righteous' (Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, pp. 176, 181).

4. The frequency with which the terms ἀφθαρσία, ἄφθαρτος, and ἀθανασία occur in the LXX and the NT are as follows: ἀφθαρσία (LXX: Wisd, 2x-2.23; 6.19; 4 Maccabees, 2x-9.22; 17.12; NT: Paul, 7x), ἄφθαρτος (LXX: Wisdom, 2x-12.1; 18.4; NT: Paul, 4x; 1 Peter, 3x), ἀθανασία (LXX: Wisdom, 5x-3.4; 4.1; 8.13,17; 15.3; 4 Maccabees, 2x-14.5; 16.13; NT: Paul, 3x). Josephus never employs ἀφθαρσία, but ἄφθαρτος (4x) and ἀθανασία (7x) appear occasionally throughout his works. Philo frequently utilizes all three terms. Pfeleiderer, pointing to 2 Cor. 5.1f. and Phil. 1.23, suggested that Paul's doctrine of the resurrection was influenced by Wisdom (*Das Urchristentum*, pp. 161f.).

5. Reese, *Hellenistic Influence*, p. 68: 'The Sage refrains from going into specific aspects of this salvation, such as the resurrection. He makes no attempt to exclude it, but he does not affirm it explicitly'. A number of studies produced in the early part of this century argued that the resurrection of the body is implied in Wis. 3-5 and alluded to in 16.13-14 (for bibliography see R.H. Pfeiffer, *History of New Testa-*

ment Times with an Introduction to the Apocrypha [1949], p. 339 n. 15), but these views have been largely rejected (Nickelsburg, *Resurrection*, p. 88).

Third, the description of the future reign of the righteous in Wis. 3.8, κρινούσιν ἔθνη, is closely paralleled by Paul's statement in 1 Cor. 6.2, οἱ ἅγιοι τὸν κόσμον κρινούσιν.¹

2. *Wisdom 9.9-18 and Galatians 4.4-6*

E. Schweizer has argued persuasively that the early Christian formula concerning God's sending of his pre-existent Son (Gal. 4.4-6; Rom. 8.3-4; Jn 3.16-17; 1 Jn 4.9) is rooted in Jewish wisdom speculation.* The similarities between Wis. 9.10-17 and Gal. 4.4-6 form a crucial part of Schweizer's argument.³ He notes two significant points of contact between these texts. First, the only parallel to the double sending of the Son and Spirit in Gal. 4.4-6 is found in the double sending of wisdom and Spirit in Wis. 9.10-17. Second, the verb ἐξαποστέλλω, which Paul employs only in conjunction with the double sending in Gal. 4.4-6, also appears in Wis. 9.10 (and in connection with a ἵνα-clause as in Gal. 4.4): ἐξαπόστειλον αὐτὴν ἐξ ἁγίων οὐρανῶν . . . ἵνα συμπαραούσῃ μοι κοπιάσῃ.⁴

R.H. Fuller has challenged Schweizer's thesis? Fuller contends that the sending of the Son Christology originated in salvation-historical thinking" rather than 'the mythological thinking of Jewish wisdom speculation'? An important aspect of Fuller's critique is his suggestion that in Jewish wisdom speculation sophia was never sent: 'She always comes on her own initiative'. However, the explicit references to

ment Times with an Introduction to the Apocrypha [1949], p. 339 n. 15), but these views have been largely rejected (Nickelsburg, *Resurrection*, p. 88).

1. Rev. 20.4, Dan. 7.27, and 1 En. 96.1 express thoughts similar to Wis. 3.8 and 1 Cor. 6.2, but these texts employ different terms. Mt. 19.28 records Jesus' promise that his disciples shall be given authority to judge the twelve tribes of Israel. In contrast, the future authority promised in Wis. 3.8 and 1 Cor. 6.2 extends over the 'nations' and 'the world' respectively.

2. Schweizer, ' "Sendungsformel" ', pp. 83-95. See also Schnabel, *Law and Wisdom*, pp. 240-42 and Kim, *Origin*, pp. 117-20.

3. See Schweizer, ' "Sendungsformel" ', pp. 91-92 and 'Zur Herkunft', p. 108.

4. Schweizer's case is strengthened by Philo's identification of the Logos, 'the firstborn Son of God', with the angel sent by God in Exod. 23.30 (*Agr.* 51).

5. Fuller, 'Christological Moment', pp. 42-43.

6. Thus Fuller argues that the sending of the Son schema exhibits a striking affinity to the synoptic parable of the vineyard (Mk 12.1-2 & par.): 'Here the sending of the Son is the last in a series of sendings, and the Son is no more pre-existent than were the Old Testament prophets before him' ('Christological Moment', p. 43).

7. Fuller, 'Christological Moment', p. 43.

8. Fuller, 'Christological Moment', p. 42. In n. 19 Fuller states that M.D. Johnson ('Reflections on a Wisdom Approach to Matthew's Christology', *CBO* 36

God's sending of wisdom and Spirit in Wis. 9.10-17 reveal the weakness of Fuller's argument and the uniqueness of the parallels between Wis. 9.10-17 and Gal. 4.4-6.

The sending scheme in Wis. 9.10-17 not only confirms Schweizer's contention that the New Testament sending **formula** is rooted in Jewish wisdom speculation; but also, by virtue of its close affinity to Gal. 4.4-6, it suggests that Paul, at the earliest stage of his literary activity, had been influenced by Wisdom or related traditions. For the language in Gal. 4.4 concerning God's sending of his pre-existent Son is unparalleled in the synoptic Gospels and Acts, and probably originated with Paul.' The Pauline origin of the double sending of the Son and Spirit can hardly be **questioned**.²

3. Conclusion

We have seen **that** the anthropological, soteriological, and above all, pneumatological perspectives shared by the author of Wisdom and Paul, particularly as they are expressed in Wis. 9.9-18 and 1 Cor. 2.6-16, are unparalleled in intertestamental Judaism and in the non-Pauline church prior to the writing of Luke-Acts. The Hymns of Qumran represent a notable exception. However, the reference to God's double sending of wisdom/the Son and Spirit in Wis. 9.10, 17 and Gal. 4.4-6, along with many striking linguistic parallels, suggests that Wisdom or related sources rather than the Hodajot provided the framework for Paul's distinctive thought.

This conclusion is consistent with the large body of scholarship which affirms that Paul knew either Wisdom or traditions contained within it. The question of Paul's knowledge and use of Wisdom has been the source of lively debate since the publication of E. Grafe's influential work, 'Das Verhältnis der paulinischen Schriften zur Sapientia Salomonis', in 1892.³ Although it would be premature to speak

[1974], pp. 44-64) 'demonstrated that the sending of wisdom is foreign to Jewish wisdom speculation, where wisdom always comes on her own initiative'. However, Johnson's discussion centers on wisdom's sending of envoys rather than the actual sending of wisdom herself.

1. Kim, *Origin*, pp. 111-36, 258-60, contra Fuller, 'Christological Moment', pp. 41-45; see also Hengel, 'Christologie und neutestamentliche Chronologie: Zu einer Aporie in der Geschichte des Urchristentums', in *Neues Testament und Geschichte* (1972), pp. 62f., 66.

2. See Chapter 12 above.

3. Published in *Theologische Abhandlungen* (1892), pp. 251-86.

of any established conclusions,¹ the more negative appraisals of H. Gunkel, E. Gärtner, and F. Focke have been largely **rejected**.² It is generally recognized that Paul was, at the very least, aware of traditions which had a profound impact on the author of **Wisdom**;³ and, following Grafe, it is frequently asserted that Paul had direct contact with the **book**.⁴

1. Brief **surveys** of scholarly opinion on the question are provided by Romaniuk, 'Le Livre', pp. 503-504 and E. Ellis, *Paul's Use of the Old Testament* (1957), pp. 77-80.

2. Gunkel, *Die Wirkungen* (1899 edn), p. 76; E. Gärtner, *Komposition und Wortwahl des Buches der Weisheit* (1912), pp. 37-46; F. Focke, *Die Entstehung der Weisheit Salomos* 1 1 3 - 2 6 .

3. See G. Kuhn, 'Beiträge zur Erklärung des Buches der Weisheit', *ZNW* 28 (1929), pp. 334-41; J. Fichtner, 'Die Stellung der Sapientia Salomonis in der Literatur und Geistgeschichte ihrer Zeit', *ZNW* 36 (1937), pp. 113-32; and several other works cited by Romaniuk, 'Le Livre', p. 503. Note also Ellis, *Paul's Use*, p. 80; Conzelmann, 'Paulus und die Weisheit', p. 244; Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, p. 185; Schwabel, *Law and Wisdom*, p. 232; and Kim, *Origin*, pp. 118-19.

4. Grafe, 'Das Verhältnis', esp. p. 285; F.W. Farrar, *Life and Work of Paul* (1879), II, pp. 643f.; H.J. Thackeray, *The Relation of Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought* (1900), p. 78; R.B. Hoyle, *The Holy Spirit in St. Paul* (1927), p. 213; A.E.J. Rawlinson, *The New Testament Doctrine of Christ* (1949), pp. 133f.; S. Lyonnet, *Saint Paul. Épître aux Romains* (1959), p. 90; W. Sanday and A.C. Headlam *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (2nd edn, 1896), pp. 51-52; L. Ligier, *Péché d'Adam et péché du monde* (1961), II, p. 268; Romaniuk, 'Le Livre', pp. 503-14; Feuillet, *Le Christ*, pp. 150-52. Significant parallels between Wisdom and Paul frequently cited in the literature and not mentioned above include: Rom. 1.18-27 and Wis. 13-15; Rom. 2.4 and Wis. 11.23-24 (cf. 12.10, 19-21; 15.1); Rom. 3.25 and Wis. 11.23; Rom. 9.20f. and Wis. 15.7; 1 Cor. 10.1-4 and Wis. 10.17f.; 11.4.

Chapter 14

CONCLUSION

We have noted that Paul attributes soteriological significance to the gift of the Spirit. According to Paul, reception of the Spirit enables one to enter into and remain within the community of salvation. For, in Paul's perspective, the Spirit reveals to each Christian the true meaning of the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, and progressively transforms him/her into the image of Christ. Thus Paul declares that the Spirit is the source of the Christian's cleansing, righteousness, intimate fellowship with God, and ultimate transformation through the resurrection.

We have also noted that the soteriological dimension of the Spirit's activity which forms such a prominent part of Paul's pneumatology appears infrequently in the literature of intertestamental Judaism. The literature is united in its description of the Spirit as a prophetic endowment. As the source of special insight and inspired speech, the Spirit enables the prophet, sage, or messiah, to fulfill special tasks. Thus the gift of the Spirit is presented as a *donum superadditum* rather than a soteriological necessity. The only significant exceptions to this perspective are found in later sapiential writings: Wisdom and the Hymns of Qumran.

The soteriological dimension is entirely absent from the *pneumatology* of Luke. In accordance with the Jewish perspective outlined above, Luke consistently portrays the gift of the Spirit as a prophetic endowment which enables its recipient to fulfill a particular task. The Spirit equips John for his role as the prophetic precursor, Jesus for his task as messianic herald, and the disciples for their vocation as witnesses. Furthermore, we have seen that Luke not only fails to refer to soteriological aspects of the Spirit's work, his narrative presupposes a pneumatology which excludes this dimension. Therefore, it cannot be maintained that Luke recognized the soteriological significance of the pneumatic gift, but simply chose to emphasize the prophetic and *missiological* implications of the gift. Luke's 'prophetic' pneumatology must be distinguished from the 'soteriological' pneumatology of Paul.

We have observed that the traditions of the primitive church utilized by Luke and Paul also fail to attribute soteriological functions to the Spirit. Although the primitive church, following the lead of Jesus, broadens the functions traditionally ascribed to the Spirit in first-century Judaism and thus presents the Spirit as the source of *miracle-working* power (as well as prophetic inspiration), the 'charismatic' pneumatology of the primitive church is otherwise essentially the same as the 'prophetic' pneumatology of Luke. The gift of the Spirit is viewed as an endowment for special tasks granted to those already *within* the community of salvation.

These observations have led me to conclude that Paul was the first Christian to attribute soteriological functions to the Spirit. Although Paul's unique insight into the work of the Spirit was undoubtedly stimulated by his experience on the Damascus road, I have suggested that wisdom traditions from the *hellenistic* Jewish milieu which produced Wisdom provided the conceptual framework for his distinctive thought. Reflecting upon his own experience in light of these traditions, Paul came to the realization that Christ, the embodiment of divine wisdom, is experienced in and through the Spirit. Indeed, according to Paul the existence of the exalted Christ is shaped by the Spirit, and the true significance of the person and mission of Christ cannot be ascertained apart from the illumination of the Spirit. Thus Paul associated Christ with the Spirit as no other Christian before him, and came to view the Spirit as a soteriological agent.

A further implication of these findings is that this original element of Paul's pneumatology did not influence wider (non-Pauline) sectors of 'the early church until after the writing of Luke-Acts (70-80 AD). This should not surprise us given the striking fact that Luke apparently was not acquainted with Paul's epistles.' And, since other distinctive aspects of Paul's theology have not significantly influenced Luke or the other synoptic evangelists,² this suggestion is all the more *credible*.³

1. Hengel, *Acts*, pp. 66-67; J.C. O'Neill, *The Theology of Acts in Its Historical Setting* (1970), p. 135; C.K. Barrett, 'Acts and the Pauline Corpus', *ExpTim* 88 (1976), pp. 2-5; and Maddox, *Purpose*, p. 68: 'It is today generally recognized that Luke did not know the Pauline letters'. A. Lindemann, however, suggests that Luke did know a few of Paul's letters (Romans, 2 Corinthians, and perhaps Galatians), but that Luke, like Matthew and Mark, was not significantly influenced by Paul's theology (*Paulus im ältesten Christentum*[1979], pp. 171-73).

2. See for example Lindemann, *Paulus*, pp. 149-73.

3. Nevertheless, some who identify the author of Luke-Acts as the traveling companion of Paul might question whether Luke could have remained untouched by the influence of the Apostle at this point. It is therefore worth noting that Luke's summaries of Paul's preaching—generally viewed as accurate representations of Paul's

The exclusion of the Joharmino corpus from our study does not lessen the force of these conclusions. Since these writings originate from a geographical environment in which Paul was active and an era considerably later than the period under discussion, I am justified in assuming that the soteriological elements of John's pneumatology reflect Pauline influence.'

One must therefore affirm that the pneumatology of the early church was not as homogeneous as most of the major post-Gunkel studies have maintained. On the contrary, the texts of the formative period from the church's inception to the writing of Luke-Acts indicate that three distinct pneumatological perspectives co-existed: the 'charismatic' pneumatology of the primitive church; the 'prophetic' pneumatology of Luke; and the 'soteriological' pneumatology of Paul. The differences between the pneumatologies of the primitive church and Luke on the one hand, and the perspective of Paul on the other, are particularly acute.

This conclusion has important implications for the theological reflection of the contemporary church. It indicates that the task of articulating a holistic biblical theology of the Spirit is more complex than is often assumed. More specifically, it calls into question attempts at theological synthesis which do not adequately account for the distinctive pneumatological perspectives of the primitive church (Mark, Matthew), and particularly Luke-Acts. Indeed, as we re-examine the foundations upon which our theologizing is built, we are reminded that the church, by virtue of its reception of the Pentecostal gift, is a prophetic community empowered for a missionary task.

gospel by those who affirm that Luke traveled with Paul-do not contain any traces of Paul's soteriological pneumatology. This indicates that if indeed Luke heard Paul preach or entered into discussions with the Apostle and thereby came to an accurate understanding of his gospel, it is entirely possible, indeed probable, that he did so without coming to terms with Paul's distinctive pneumatological perspective. In any event, assumptions concerning the extent to which Luke was influenced by Paul must be judged in light of the evidence we have available to us.

1. See U. Schnelle, 'Paulus und Johannes', *EvTh* 47 (1987), pp. 212-28. In view of the similarities in the theological perspectives of Paul and John (e.g. the Spirit as the controlling factor of the new life), Schnelle argues that the Pauline tradition reached John's school through oral tradition and that this transmission of tradition reflects a dominant geographical environment, probably Ephesus.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abelson, J., *The Immanence of God in Rabbinic Literature* (London: Macmillan, 1912).
- Achtemeier, Paul J., 'The Lukan Perspective on the Miracles of Jesus: A Preliminary Sketch', in *Perspectives on Luke-Acts* (ed. Charles H. Talbert; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1978), pp. 153-67.
- Adler, N., *Das erste christliche Pfingstfest: Sinn und Bedeutung des Pfingstberichtes Apg. 2,1-13* (Münster: Aschendorff'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1938).
- Aker, Ben, 'New Directions in Lukan Theology: Reflections on Luke 3:21-22 and Some Implications', in *Faces of Renewal: Studies in Honor of Stanley M. Horton* (ed. P. Elbert; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1988). pp. 108-27.
- Aland, K., 'Zur Vorgeschichte der christlichen Taufe', in *Neues Testament und Geschichte: Historisches Geschehen und Deutung im Neuen Testament* (FS for O. Cullmann; ed. H. Baltensweiler and B. Reicke; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1972). pp. 1-14.
- Albertz, R., 'Die "Antrittspredigt" Jesu im Lukasevangelium auf ihrem alttestamentlichen Hintergrund', *ZNW* 74 (1983). pp. 182-206.
- Alexander, P.S., 'Rabbinic Judaism and the New Testament', *ZNW* 74 (1983) 237-47.
- Allen, Leslie C., *The Books of Joel, Obadiah, Jonah and Micah* (NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976).
- Enoch', in *Pseudepigrapha*, I (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; London: Longman, 1980). pp. 91-221.
- Anderson, A.A., 'The Use of "Ruah" in 1QS, 1QH, and 1QM', *JSS* 7 (1962), pp. 293-303.
- Anderson, H., '4 Maccabees', in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, II (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; London: Darton, Longman, & Todd, 1985), pp. 531-64.
- Aune, David E., *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983).
- 'Magic in Early Christianity', in *ANRW* II 23.2, pp. 1507-57.
- Avigad, Nahman. *Discovering Jerusalem* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2nd edn, 1984; 1st edn, 1980).
- Bachmann, M., *Jerusalem und der Tempel: Die geographisch-theologischen Elemente in der lukanischen Sicht des jüdischen Kultzentrums* (BWANT, 109; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1980).
- Baer, Heinrich von, *Der heilige Geist in den Lukasschriften* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1926).
- Barrett, C.K., *The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition* (London: SPCK, 1947).
- A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (HNTC; New York: Harper & Row, 1957).