

WISDOM MOTIFS AND JOHN'S GOSPEL

HENRY R. MOELLER, Th.D.¹

For the last fifteen years the attention of many biblical scholars has focussed upon the Qumran materials and their possible relevance for biblical interpretation, especially for the interpretation of John's Gospel.² Within the past decade, however, several studies have opened again discussion of an older question,³ namely, the question of the relation of the Jewish Wisdom Literature to the structure and thought of the Gospel of John.⁴

This paper proposes (1) to set forth a number of parallels between motifs which appear in the Judaic Wisdom writings and similar motifs appearing in the Gospel of John; and (2) to raise the question as to whether John's presentation of the person and work of Christ may not have been influenced by these Wisdom motifs. For this purpose, four motifs will be examined: 1) the creative-revelatory activity of the Wisdom-Word of God; 2) the descending-ascending Wisdom and transcendent "Son of man"; 3) Wisdom as the divine arbiter of human destinies; and 4) Wisdom as "Prosagogeus" to God. A *motif* will be understood as a prominent idea or theme of the Wisdom Literature, or some portions of it, which reappears in the fourth Gospel as an interpretive concept relative to the person and work of Jesus Christ.

The main sources which will be used in this study (not excluding others) are: Proverbs 1-9 (esp. chs. 1 & 8); Daniel (esp. ch. 7); Ecclesiasticus (the Wisdom of Jesus ben Sirah); Sapientia (the Wisdom of Solomon); and 1st, or Ethiopic, Enoch, (esp. the "Similitudes" of secs. 37-71).⁵ Daniel and Enoch are included because they belong to a special branch of the Wisdom tradition, and are relevant to our purpose. Although classified as *apocalyptic*, there is a heavy emphasis upon Wisdom both in Daniel and the Enochian Similitudes.⁶ One branch of the apocalyptic movement shared the same general creation tradition and spirit of universalism (see below) that characterized the Wisdom school and, like the latter, cultivated an understanding of "the times and seasons" (cf. Sap. 7:18-22). The apocalyptists differed from the ordinary wisdom teachers in exaggerating the interest in "times and seasons" and claiming esoteric wisdom: a knowledge of the secrets of the universe which the ordinary Wisdom tradition admitted it could not know, together with a knowledge of the details of God's program for the future. This last constituted the preeminent wisdom for the apocalyptists.

The Jewish Wisdom tradition was ancient, with a long history of development and of influence upon Judaic thought. The Wisdom movement in Israel is clearly traceable from the time of Solomon, perhaps having arisen before his times. The activity of the Wisdom group in Israel paralleled the prophetic movement, and continued as a force in Judaic religious thought after the prophetic movement waned. It became, in a real sense, the heritor and continuator of a number of important emphases of the prophetic tradition. Among other things, the movement was characterized by: 1) a special creation tradition; 2) a spirit of universalism; 3) concern for the higher life of man; and 4) the belief that Wisdom was of divine origin. In its later pre-Christian developments, two important tendencies appeared: 1) to personify, even to hypostatize, Wisdom; and 2) to fuse Wisdom both with the Word of God and with the Torah of Moses.⁷ These later trends, and especially the first, although clearly in evidence in Proverbs 1, 3, 8-9, Eccles. 24:23 *et passim*, and Sapientia 7-9 ff., find a striking expression in the representation of Wisdom by the "Son of man" figure in the Enochian Similitudes. With the foregoing prolegomena, we turn to the first motif.

I. GOD'S WISDOM-WORD in CREATION and REVELATION

As is well known, the O.T. passages which treat of creation also implicitly, sometimes explicitly, speak of revelation since, in Hebraic thought, creation was one form of God's self-revelation. It is assumed that, in the E.T.S., there is a general familiarity with the O.T. concept of the Word of God as agent in creation and revelation. For brevity's sake, we merely refer to some fairly clear references in our literature. On *creation* (including the providential maintenance of what is created), cf. Gen. 1; Psa. 33:6-9; 148:5; Isa. 45:12; Eccles. 42:15; 43:10 ff.; Sap. 16:12, 26. In regard to *revelation*, the entire Pentateuch and the prophetic literature are involved. We cite a few samples only with reference to the Word of God in the revelation of His moral will and purpose: Ex. 20:1-7; Amos 3:1-2; 5:4-5; Hosea 6:5; Micah 6:8.

The major Wisdom passages may be summarized as follows:

A. *Wisdom in the Beginning and in Creation*

1. Wisdom was originated before the creation of the world and was associated with God in the beginning: Prov. 8:22 ff., Eccles. 23:9, Sap. 8:4; 9:9.

2. Wisdom assisted in Creation; Prov. 8:27-30a; Sap. 7:22; 8:6; 9:1-2; Prov. 3:19; Psa. 104:24; Jer. 10:12. In the first three references, Wisdom is personified; in the others, it is God's instrument.

Since God is the originator of Wisdom, the gift of Wisdom from Him is a form of revelation (cf. Job 11:5-6; Sap. 9:9-18). Without this revelation, a man cannot live pleasing to God. In some passages, Wisdom is intimately related to God's Spirit who not only gives life to men but illuminates their minds (cf. Job 33:3; Sap. 9:17); and also with God's Torah (Eccles. 24:19-29, esp. vs. 23). Thus, it is through Wisdom itself, or wisdom imparted by God's Spirit or by the Torah, that to man is revealed how he may live acceptably before God. The oft-repeated summary of this idea is: "The fear of the Lord is the beginning (or, first principle) of Wisdom."⁷

C. *The Motif in JOHN*

The Prologue is, of course, the prime illustration of this motif in the Gospel of John. Announced in vs. 14-18, this theme is the principle one of the whole Gospel. What John set out to prove, namely that "Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God" (20:31), is here introduced by a preliminary announcement that the pre-existent Wisdom-Word of God who was with God in the beginning and in creation became incarnate in Jesus (vs. 14) and revealed the Father (vs. 18).⁸

As Rendel Harris and, more recently, B.P.W. Stather-Hunt and others have demonstrated, immediately behind John's Prologue stands a catena of testimonia drawn from the Psalms and Wisdom Literature.⁹ This catena was evidently a very early form of scriptural proof to support the Christian claim that Jesus was the Son of God and therefore pre-existent.¹⁰

The identification of Wisdom with the Word, which could have been suggested easily by bringing Psa. 33:6 into conjunction with Psa. 104:24b or Prov. 3:19, is carried a step further in Sap. 9:1-2: "O God . . . who has made all things by thy word and by thy wisdom has formed man . . ." The process is completed in John's Prologue, where the Wisdom become Word is now the Word become "flesh" in Jesus. But the leading ideas of the Prologue seem to come principally from the Wisdom sources.¹¹

The point does not have to be expatiated here, I am sure, that according to John, Jesus acts and speaks in the character of the creative and revelatory Wisdom and Word of God. One has only to recall the creative character of the signs and

the revelatory nature of the discourses, especially the "I am" sayings. And even though a number of the discourses bear the external characteristics of the Greek dialogue, internally they are marked by the characteristics of the Hebraic *maschal* style whose prototypes appear in the Wisdom literature of Judaism.^{11a} Not only is Jesus in Himself the incarnation of God's Word and Wisdom, but He also speaks and teaches in the characteristic style of the Wisdom tradition.

II. DESCENDING-ASCENDING WISDOM and TRANSCENDENT "SON OF MAN"

This motif is fairly pronounced in John, and we wish to look at the Johannine evidence first. If the pre-Passion section of the Gospel (chs. 1-17) be divided into the three stages of development which are suggested in vss. 10-12 of the Prologue, we gain a practical framework for our subsequent exposition. The divisions will then be: Part I. Christ in the World, chs. 1-4 ("he was in the world," vs. 10); Part II. Christ Among the Jews, chs. 5-12 ("he came unto his own, and his own received him not, vs. 11); Part III. Christ With His Disciples, chs. 13-17 ("as many as received him," etc., vs. 12). We can then relate the expressions of our motif to each of these three major parts of the Gospel.

Apart from the Prologue, two clear expressions of this motif occur in Part I. In Jo. 3:12-13, only the Son of man, who descended from heaven, is able to tell of heavenly things. In Jo. 3:25-36 (esp. vs. 31), Jesus is declared to be the one who "comes from above" and who, having been sent from God, "utters the words of God." In Part II, the motif appears first in the discourses following the Feeding, Jo. 6:25-65. In vs. 27, Jesus identifies himself as "Son of man"; in vs. 47, he declares himself to be the bread which "came down from heaven," and affirms (vs. 57) that "the living Father sent me"; while in vs. 62 he asks, "Then what if you were to see the Son of man ascending where he was before?" Jo. 8:23 gives a straightforward statement of Jesus: "I am from above . . . I am not of this world." Finally in Part III there occur several similar expressions, of which Jo. 16:5 and 28 may serve as illustrations: "I am going to him who sent me"; "I came from the Father and have come into the world; again, I am leaving the world and going to the Father." (Cf. 13:1, 3, 31; 17:11, 13.) The important points are: 1) Jesus is the "Son of man"; 2) he is sent down, or comes, from the Father; 3) he is going to return, or ascend, to the Father, or to "Where he was before" (6:62).

Have similar ideas appeared in the Wisdom writings? Since Wisdom is of divine character and transcendent status (cf. above), it follows that if Wisdom is to have any relationship to men, it must be sent, or come, down to them. Note then the following, and observe the close similarity to ideas already observed in John:

1. Sap. 9:16-17, "We can hardly guess at what is on earth . . . but who has traced out what is in the heavens? Who has learned thy counsel, unless thou hast given wisdom and sent thy holy spirit from on high?" (cf. John 3:11-13).

2. Eccles. 24:8, "Then the Creator of all things gave me (Wisdom) a commandment, and the one who created me assigned a place for my tent. And he said, 'Make your dwelling in Jacob . . .'" (cf. Jo. 1:14)

3. Sap. 9:10, "Send her (Wisdom) forth from the holy heavens, and from the throne of thy glory send her." (cf. Jo. 6:57; 8:23; 16:28)

4. Apocryphal Baruch 3:37. "Afterward she appeared upon earth and lived among men"—equating Wisdom with Torah in the verse following (4:1).

It will be observed by now that nothing has been said of the *ascent* of Wisdom. However, one discovers the following in Enoch 42:

- “1. Wisdom found no place where she might dwell;
Then a dwelling-place was assigned her in the heavens.
2. Wisdom went forth to make her dwelling among the children of men, and found no dwelling-place;
Wisdom returned to her place and took her seat among the angels.”

Here the complete pattern that has occurred in John appears: Wisdom descended, was among men, and ascended again.

But what of the “Son of man”? In the “Similitudes” of Enoch (secs. 37-71) the “Son of man” (the “Elect One”) is the central figure.¹² Now in the opening section of these Similitudes it is emphatically indicated that the subject-matter of that which follows is Wisdom, a point which recurs at several significant places.¹³ This “Son of man” appears before the Lord of Spirits, sits on the throne of glory, is given divine honor, is praised by the saints in heaven, upon whom he also bestows wisdom (cf. 39:7 ff., *et passim*). In short, all the attributes and functions (except creation) which are predicated of Wisdom in such passages as Prov. 8:22 ff., Eccles. 24, and Sap. 6-9 are found to be transferred to this “Son of man”. It is for this reason, among others, that one scholar has recently suggested (I believe rightly) that in Enoch and Daniel the “Son of man” figure is the apocalyptic representation of Wisdom.¹⁴ However, the “Son of man” of Daniel and Enoch does not *descend*. But this is because the visions of the Son of man are visions of judgment, in heaven, at the time of the End. It is enough to establish here the intimate relationship of this “Son of man” with Wisdom which, elsewhere, does descend; and we pass on to the third and closely-related motif.

III. WISDOM as ARBITER of HUMAN DESTINIES

Wisdom as the arbiter of human destinies is a theme strong in the Wisdom sources. This concept is closely related, of course, to the notion of Wisdom as divine revelation. Whether it is Wisdom *per se*, or whether it is Wisdom identified with Torah, by their response to Wisdom men seal their destinies. This appears plainly in the two main personification passages in Proverbs. In Prov. 1:20-33, Wisdom stands and exhorts men, urging them to accept her counsel and warning them against refusing to heed. She concludes: “For the simple are killed by their turning away, and the complacency of fools destroys them; but he who listens to me will dwell secure and will be at ease, without dread of evil” (vss. 32-33). In Prov. 8:36, Wisdom declares: “For he who finds me finds life and obtains favor from the Lord; but he who misses me injures himself: all who hate me Love death.” The issue is clearly that of life or death, determined by whether one accepts or rejects Wisdom. The idea appears again and again in our sources (cf. Eccles. 7:12; Eccles. 4:12-3, 19; 15:1-8, 17; Sap. 1:6; 3:4, 11).

Out of the Wisdom-visions of the “Son of man” in Enoch come certain statements about judgment which we shall meet again in an earthly setting. Let us note carefully that in these visions of final judgment, it is the Son of Man by whom the judgment is accomplished, in the presence of the Lord of Spirits (sec. 45:3). In sec. 49:4 we read that the Elect One (“Son of man”), in whom is the spirit of wisdom, “shall judge the secret things [of men’s hearts? — cf. Rom. 2:16] . . . For he is the Elect One before the Lord of spirits . . .” And in the closing section of these visions we read: “And he (Son of man) sat on the throne of His glory, And the sum of judgment was given unto the Son of Man” (69:27). Do similar ideas appear in John?

Part I of John informs us, among other things, of the emergence of Jesus upon the public scene and his acceptance by the first disciples; the failure of a typical Jewish Leader to understand him; and his later acceptance by non-Jews.

It is after the unsatisfactory interview with Nicodemus, who does not understand Jesus and, presumably, at this point fails to accept him, that we read these words: "God sent the Son into the world, not to condemn the world, but that the world might be saved through him. He who believes in him is not condemned; he who does not believe is condemned already, because he has not believed in the name of the only Son of God. And this is the judgment, that light has come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light . . ." (Jo. 3:17-19). A similar statement occurs at the end of the chapter (Jo. 3:36).

Part II is concerned almost exclusively with Judaism's reaction to Jesus. The controversies of chapters 5, 6, 8, 9-10, and the conclusion of chapter 12 make this evident. It is in this section, too, that the idea of the Son of Man as *judge* comes to the fore. Observe 5:22-27: "The Father judges no one, but has given all judgment to the Son . . . and (the Father) has given him authority to execute judgment because he is the Son of Man." This sounds like Enoch 49:4 and 69:27 brought down to earth. Passing over other references which might be cited, let us hear John 12:44-48:

"And Jesus cried out and said, 'He who believes in me, believes not in me but in him who sent me. (45) And he who sees me sees him who sent me. (46) I have come as light into the world, that whoever believes in me may not remain in darkness. (47) If any one hears my sayings and does not keep them, I do not judge him; for I did not come to judge the world but to save the world. (48) He who rejects me and does not receive my sayings has a judge: the word that I have spoken will be his judge on the last day.'

In section III, Jesus is with "His own", those who have believed in Him as the one who has the words of eternal life. In two places our motif comes to the fore: John 15:24 and 16:8-9. Speaking in retrospect of the result of his ministry, Jesus declares that they (i. e., the Jews) have seen and heard and hated both himself and the Father, therefore they stand guilty of sin. Then he declares that the work of the Holy Spirit is to be, in part, to convict men of sin "because they did not believe on me." Just as we saw that Wisdom made herself the decision-point of human destiny, so Jesus, the Son, bears the revelation of the Father and stands as the critical encounter of human experience: what men do with him and the revelation he brings determines their eternal destinies. But more: he and his words shall once more confront men, as their judge in eternity, since he is the Son of man, the embodiment of the saving wisdom of God. It would be interesting to show, if time allowed, how John works out this motif in highly dramatic style in his report of the Passion. But we must turn to the final motif.

IV. WISDOM as "PROSAGOGEUS" to GOD

The last theme which we wish to examine is that of Wisdom as "prosagogeus" (i. e., introducer) of men to God.¹⁵ This theme includes several related elements. While it would be interesting and impressive to quote *in extenso* from our literature, we must be content with summary statements of the main points. First, Wisdom proclaims herself, calls, invites men to accept her, to partake of her riches, to come to her banquet, while warning those who spurn the invitation (Prov. 1:20-23 ff.; 8:1-21; 9:1-6; Eccus. 24:19-22). On the other hand, men are admonished to seek Wisdom diligently; yet, upon seeking, they discover that Wisdom has been seeking them, ready to disclose herself (Prov. 3:13; 8:17; Eccus. 4:12b; 6:27; 14:22 ff.; Sap. 6:12-16). The end of the invitations, the seeking, the finding, is that men may be introduced to God (cf. Sap. 6:17-19), and to receive the blessings he reserves for those who let Wisdom bring them to Him (Prov.

8:35; Eccclus. 4:12-14; Sap. 7:14, 27b-28). Men are made friends of God, and become assured of His love for them.

However, Wisdom puts her followers to the test, subjects them to discipline to see if they are worthy (Eccclus. 4:11-18; 2:1-6; 6:18-31; Prov. 3:11-12). If one endures the discipline acceptably, Wisdom opens to him her best secrets (Eccclus. 4:18). Finally, the spirit of Wisdom, which is also the Spirit of God, enters into their souls, confirming their relationship with God and leading them into the treasures of Wisdom (cf. Sap. 1:6-7; 7:7, 22ff., 27).

In John the elements of this theme appear in the development of Jesus' relationships with his disciples. In Part I, the Baptist's testimony, Jesus' self-declaration and signs, all attracts followers. Interestingly enough, Jesus' first recorded words to his first followers are: "What do you seek?"; and the next are an invitation: "Come and see" (Jo. 1:29-38 ff.) On the next day Jesus does the seeking and finds Philip, calling him to discipleship (1:43). Each major event of the first part of John includes the attraction of disciples.¹⁶

Part II (chh. 5-12) reports the events and controversies by which the followers are tested. The discourses which follow the Multiplication of the Loaves (6:47-71) deliberately test the sincerity of the crowds, and become a crisis of commitment for the Twelve. Many were offended and forsook Jesus, so that he asks the Twelve: "Will you also go away?" Peter, for the group, responds with a confession of conviction and commitment (vss. 67-69). The Twelve had successfully passed this test, but Jesus continued to test the sincerity of the commitment of his followers, as chapter 8, in particular, indicates.¹⁷

This section also records two great public proclamations made by Jesus: one of invitation, the other of warning. On the "great day" of the Feast of Tabernacles, Jesus invited all who were athirst to come to him and drink, with the promise that within the believer a life-giving fountain would spring up, "as the scripture has said."¹⁸ This the evangelist interprets as a promise of the Spirit (7:37-38). The second, and last, public "call" by Jesus is the concluding word of his public ministry. It is a warning to those who reject him and his words (12:44-50) in the spirit of Prov. 1:20-23 ff.

In the third major section (13-17), the final elements of our motif appear. In the discourses after the Supper, Jesus assures His disciples of the Father's love for them, while at the same time urging them to continue in obedience to His commandments (14:21-24; 15:4, 14 *et passim*). He confirms them as "friends" (15:14-15); and He promises them the Holy Spirit (14:25 ff.; 15:26). While disclosing some of the mysteries of the divine relationships, He promises further illumination when the Holy Spirit comes (16:12-15). Except for the fulfillment of the promise following the Resurrection, the parallels with the motif as found in the Wisdom literature seem to be complete.

CONCLUSION

In the foregoing we have attempted to draw out the parallels between four motifs drawn from the Judaic Wisdom Literature and similar motifs in John. It will no doubt be admitted that the similarities are striking. This exposition has left out of account many other suggestive details noted in F. M. Braun's study, cited above. Nor has it attempted to deal at all with G. Ziener's detailed discussion of the remarkable similarities between Sapiaientia and John in the following: 1) selection of the "signs" and manner of interpreting them; 2) the concepts of spiritual life and death; and 3) the concept of faith, or belief.¹⁹ When these are taken together with the motifs upon which attention has been focussed above, the correspondences are impressive indeed.

It is true that parallels do not necessarily prove influence on the one hand or dependence on the other, in and of themselves. However, when we consider the *purpose* of all the early Christian witnesses (beginning with the apostles): to prove that Jesus was the Christ promised by the scriptures of Judaism; and the standard *method* adopted to realize this purpose: showing that Jesus fulfilled the picture which the scriptures gave of the Coming One; it is hard to resist the conclusion that John consciously set out to show that Jesus not only fulfilled the messianic implications of the Torah, Prophets, and Psalms, but also that Jesus incarnated the Wisdom of God in a unique way. In so doing, he brought the Judaic Wisdom of God in a unique way. In so doing, he brought the Judaic Wisdom heritage into the treasury of Christianity in a way in which no other New Testament writer managed to do.

Some uneasiness may be felt about an apostolic writer's using materials that we are accustomed to consider as "uncanonical" (as, e.g., Ecclesiasticus or Wisdom of Solomon). It may well be that for the apostles and their associates the notion of "canon" was not as rigidly defined as it is among some groups of Christians today. The Palestinian canon of the Pharisees, apparently established by the close of the 1st century A.D., was determined on arbitrary and artificial grounds, and was not wholly accepted even within Judaism.²⁰ That it was not accepted by the Church is attested by the persistence of the use of the Septuagint, which contained most of the books of our standard Apocrypha (including Eccles. and Sapientia), and by the esteem in which some of these books were held by the early fathers of the Church. Sapientia (Wisdom of Solomon) was included in the Muratorian Canon (2nd century) as among the scriptures received by the Church.²¹ Origen of Alexandria, in the chapter on Christ in his *De Principiis*, opens one section with the words: "Let us now ascertain how these statements which we have advanced are supported by the authority of holy Scripture." He then proceeds to quote from Col. 1:15, Heb. 1:3, and Sapientia 7:25. A good deal of what follows is a christological exposition of Prov. 8:22, Heb. 1:1-3, and Sapientia 7:25-26, to prove that Christ was the incarnate Wisdom of God and that the attributes ascribed to Wisdom were rightly ascribed to Christ, as in Col. 1:15 and Heb. 1:3.²² According to Moffatt, the books of Enoch, Ecclesiasticus and Sapientia were exceedingly popular in the early Church for a long time, a fact to which the sub-apostolic and Patristic literature testifies.²³ This usage had its rootage in apostolic times, as a close study of the New Testament itself will disclose.

Whether one feels justified in considering this literature as canonical today is perhaps another matter. It is not this that is being urged. But it ought to be frankly recognized that for the first Christians these writings formed part of their living scriptural heritage, and they used it to explain the person and work of Jesus as the promised Messiah of Israel and Son of God. It does the evangelical cause no good to close our eyes defensively against facts and their reasonable interpretation, even though these may challenge our traditional theories. Jesus Himself constantly demanded the revision of tradition to square with truth; and I do not think He has exempted us from that demand.

The foregoing presentation has raised the question as to our conception of the authorship of the Gospel. Could John the former Galilean fisherman have written such a Gospel, which involves so many evidences of literary acumen and subtlety? First, it should be admitted frankly that literary and historical criticism is hopelessly helpless to answer this question definitively, since it has too few facts upon which to base a clear-cut *Yes* or *No* answer. That he was a fisherman; that he became a follower of Jesus and an apostle; that he was accounted by the Jewish

Sanhedrin, with Peter, as an unschooled person (Acts. 4:13); and that later Paul recognized him as one of the three "pillars" of the Jerusalem church (Gal. 2:9)—these are the principal facts supplied by the New Testament historical materials which bear on the question. However, even if the early and strong tradition that John carried on a long ministry in Ephesus where he wrote the Gospel be discounted (as it has been), this will not allow a categorical *No* to the question as to whether he could have written the fourth Gospel.²⁴

Under favorable circumstances, personality and intellectual development may be rapid and dramatic. This we all know. The callow farm youth of today may, and often enough does, become the erudite scholar, the skilful writer, the brilliant thinker by or before early middle age. There are even those who have begun in middle age who have gone on to attain eminence in letters. We have no grounds for saying that this could not have been John's experience. What we do know is that he became a leader of the Church, and that an early tradition, vouched for by eminent Fathers, associates the fourth Gospel with John the Apostle. In the light of considerations now being brought to bear on Gospel criticism by the Qumran materials, this tradition still seems more credible than some of the arguments which have tried to overthrow it.

Central Baptist Seminary
Kansas City Kansas

FOOTNOTES

1. The present paper was read at the meeting of the Midwestern section of ETS, April 19, 1963, and has been partially revised in the light of comments from the floor.
2. For the Qumran materials see, among others, Frank M. Cross, Jr., *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, rev. ed. (N.Y.: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1961); J. T. Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea*, tr. by J. Strugnell (Naperville, Ill.: Alec. R. Allenson, Inc., 1959); including the works documented in footnotes and bibliographies of these books; also cf. Wm. S. LaSor, *Bibliography of the Dead Sea Scrolls, 1948-57* (Pasadena, Calif.: Library of the Fuller Theological Seminary, 1958); and recent discussions in such journals as *HUCA*, *New Testament Studies*, *Revue Biblique*, *Revue de Qumran*, *Novum Testamentum*, *Vetus Testamentum*, and others.
3. C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel According to John* (London: S.P.C.K., 1955), pp. 128 ff.; Alf Corell, *Consummatum Est: Eschatology and Church in the Gospel of John* (London: S.P.C.K., 1958), ch. V; C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: The University Press, 1953), pp. 263 ff.; M. E. Boismard, *St. John's Prologue* (London: Aquin Press, 1957); F.-M. Braun, "Saint Jean, la Sagesse et l'histoire," in *Neotestamentica et Patristica*, Supplement to *Novum Testamentum*, VI (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1962), pp. 123 ff.; G. Ziener, "Weisheitsbuch und Johannesevangelium," *Biblica* 38:396-417; vol. 39:37-60.
4. Cf. Charles Foster Kent, *The Wise Men of Ancient Israel and Their Proverbs* (Boston: Silver, Burdett & Co., 1899), pp. 176-201; J. A. F. Gregg, *The Wisdom of Solomon* (Cambridge: The University Press, 1909), Introduction pp. liii-lvi; J. Rendel Harris, *The Origin of the Prologue to St. John's Gospel* (Cambridge: The University Press, 1917); B.P.W. Stather-Hunt, *Primitive Gospel Sources* (London: Jas. Clarke & Co., Ltd., 1951) and *Some Johannine Problems* (London: Skeffington & Son, Ltd., 1958), esp. ch. 7.
5. Unless otherwise noted, quotations of the canonical and apocryphal writings are given in the Revised Standard Version rendering. Enoch is quoted from R. H. Charles, *The Book of Enoch* (London: S.P.C.K., 1960).
6. Cf. Dan. 1:17, 20-23; 5:11-12; Enoch, secs. 37-69.
7. For studies of the Judaic Wisdom tradition cf.: W. O. E. Oesterley, *The Books of the Apocrypha* (London: Robert Scott, 1915), and *The Jews and Judaism During the Greek Period* (London: S.P.C.K., 1941); O. S. Rankin, *Israel's Wisdom Literature* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1936). More recently: J. Coert Rylaarsdam, *Revelation in Jewish Wisdom Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1946); M. Noth and D. Winton Thomas, eds., *Wisdom in Israel and the Ancient Near East*, Supplement to *Vetus Testamentum*, III (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1955). For a detailed study of the history of the Near Eastern figure of personified Wisdom, some elements of which seem to appear in the O. T. (and more of which passed into later Gnosticism), cf. W. F. Albright, "The Goddess of Life and Wisdom," *American Journal of Semitic Language and Literature* 36 (1919-20): 258 ff.
8. Cf. Harris, *op. cit.*; Stather-Hunt, *Some Johannine Problems*, chapter 7.
9. Besides Harris and Stather-Hunt, notably C. H. Dodd, *op. cit.*, pp. 263 ff. We do not accept, however, Dodd's plea for seeing the ideas of John's Prologue mediated through Philo (cf. pp. 274-5). For a study of the development of the Christian use of O. T. testimonia as proof for christological claims, cf. Dodd's *According to the Scriptures* (N.Y.: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1953).
10. On the Christian claim and its proof, cf. Stather-Hunt, *Primitive Gospel Sources*, ch. XXIV.
11. J.A.F. Gregg, *The Wisdom of Solomon*, Introduction, p. liv. Cf. also his discussion of Pauline allusions, pp. lvi ff. For a more recent discussion, see W.D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism* (London: S.P.C.K., 1948), pp. 150-176.
- 11a. Much of the discourse material qualifies, in form, for Kent's "gnomic essay" category. Cf. Kent, *op. cit.*, ch. 11, esp. 40-41, and discussions in other sources cited in fn. 7, above.

12. It is true that neither scrolls nor fragments of the Similitudes of Enoch have been found at Qumran, although fragmentary portions of the other sections of Enoch are represented. However, it seems to me that Milik's theory, followed by Cross (that the Similitudes "are probably to be considered the work of a Jew or a Jewish Christian of the first or second century A.D.")—and Cross even omits the possibility that this could be Jewish), is singularly ill-founded. (Cf. comment by Milik in *Bib. Arch.* XIX:4:89, and in *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea* (Allenson, Inc., 1959), pp. 33-34; Cross, *op. cit.*, in fn. 2, above, p. 202, note 7.) The presence or absence of a document, (especially one which obviously existed originally in parts such as Enoch) at Qumran cannot be made the final test of its age or origin. The very fact that, as Cross notes (*ibid.*) no "Son of man" materials were found at Qumran should give one pause before suggesting that they did not then exist. It would seem better to conclude, as E. Schweizer suggested in "Son of Man" (*JBL* 79:122, note 8) that these materials were simply not congenial to the Qumran viewpoint. It is significant that so good a scholar as Joseph Klausner unqualifiedly accepted the Similitudes as Jewish and pre-Christian (*The Messianic Idea in Israel*, Macmillan, 1955, pp. 277 and 289 ff.). As Klausner and other scholars long ago pointed out, there were more than three sects of the Jews, in the times of Jesus and the apostles, and more than one center of apocalyptic activity. Cf. Oesterley, *The Books of the Apocrypha*, pp. 206-7.
13. Observe esp. 46:3; 48:1-2, 7; 49:1-3; 51:3; but *all* of this material belongs to the esoteric wisdom of apocalyptic, not just the specific places where "wisdom" happens to be mentioned.
14. James Muilenburg, "The Son of Man in Daniel and the Ethiopic Apocalypse of Enoch," *JBL* 79 (160):197-209. For a different viewpoint, cf. T.W. Manson, *The Teaching of Jesus*, 2d ed. (Cambridge: The University Press, 1959), pp. 211-36; and Joseph Bonsirven, *Le Judaïsme palestinien au temps de Jesus-Christ*, ed. abregé (Paris: Beauchesne, 1950). I believe, when all factors are taken into consideration, that Muilenburg's suggestion is the correct one. Just as in the Beginning God, with His attendant Wisdom, created the world and instructed man, so Wisdom appears in the End as God's associate and instrument in the judgment.
15. In the following I am much indebted to F.M. Braun's most stimulating article (cf. note 2, above). However, I have gone over the materials myself, and have worked out my own exposition. Some details which Braun included I have had to omit.
16. Cf. 1:23 and 4:41, besides references already cited.
17. This testing of the disciples appears also in the Synoptic narrative very strongly. Cf. T.W. Manson, *The Servant Messiah* (Cambridge: The University Press, 1961), pp. 71-75.
18. Cf. Kent, *op. cit.*, p. 180 for a suggestion as to the Scripture referred to (*i.e.*, Prov. 18:4); and a recent discussion of John 7:37-38 by J. Blenkinsopp, "John vii. 37-39: Another Note on a Notorious Crux," *NTS* VI:95-98. Blenkinsopp reports that Origen connected this saying with quotations from the Wisdom literature rather than with quotations from the prophets (*op. cit.*, p. 98). In "Some Observations Favoring the Palestinian Origin of the Gospel of John," *HTR* XVII (1924):189-95, and esp. 191-93, W. F. Albright dealt with the Oriental imagery lying behind Jesus' metaphor of the living water coming from within one, and showed it to be one very understandable to an Oriental audience.
19. Cf. article cited in fn. 3, above.
20. Some illuminating discussions of this subject appear in Max Margolis, *The Hebrew Scriptures in the Making* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1922), esp. ch. VI; Hugh Schonfield, *A History of Biblical Literature* (N.Y.: The New American Library of World Literature, 1962), ch. IV; George Foote Moore, "The Definition of the Jewish Canon and the Repudiation of Christian Scriptures," in *Essays in Modern Theology and Related Subjects: Papers in Honor of Charles Augustus Briggs* (N.Y.: Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1911):99-125.
21. The text of the Muratorian Canon appears conveniently translated in Daniel J. Theron, *Evidence of Tradition* (London: Bowes and Bowes, 1957).
22. Origen, *De Principiis*, Book 1, ch. 11 in *The Writings of Origen*, tr. by Frederick Crombie; Vol. X of *The Ante-Nicene Christian Library*, Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, editors (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1871), pp. 22 ff.
23. James Moffatt, *An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament* (N.Y.: Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1917), p. 26.
24. For the tradition, cf. Eusebius! *Ecclesiastical History*, pp. 104-109 in the translation by Christian Frederick Cruse (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1958); also the discussion in Henry C. Thiessen, *Introduction to the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1948), pp. 162-67.