

MONOTHEISM AND CHRISTOLOGY

IN I CORINTHIANS 8. 4-6

by

Paul Andrew Rainbow
The Queen's College
D.Phil. Thesis, Oxford
Trinity Term, 1987

ABSTRACT

‘Monotheism and Christology in I Corinthians 8. 4–6’

Paul Andrew Rainbow
The Queen’s College
D.Phil. Thesis, Oxford
Trinity Term, 1987

The thesis is a description of the relationship between the ‘one God, the Father’ and the ‘one Lord, Jesus Christ’ in I Cor. 8. 4–6. It analyses Paul’s language about God and Christ against the background of contemporary Jewish language about the one God, making use of methodic concepts gleaned eclectically from the structural movement in linguistics and the social sciences. Accordingly, the study falls into two parts: a determination of Paul’s Jewish monotheistic presuppositions, and an analysis of I Cor. 8. 4–6 itself.

Part one uses the Greek Old Testament, the Apocrypha, the Pseudepigrapha, the Dead Sea Scrolls, Philo, Josephus, and the New Testament, in particular some two hundred statements of monotheism collected from these sources (presented in an appendix), to illumine the oblique references to monotheistic belief in Paul’s letters. This part of the study concentrates on answering a series of nine questions about Jewish monotheism designed to shed light on Paul’s language in our chosen passage.

Part two combines the familiar grammatical-historical methods of biblical scholarship with newer, structural methods of exegesis to investigate the doctrinal content of the quasi-confessional language about God and Christ in I Cor. 8. 4–6 in the light of our results from part one.

The major conclusions of the study can be summarized in three statements. (1) I Cor. 8. 6 contains two classic statements of monotheism using traditional Jewish language, one in reference to the Father and one in reference to Jesus Christ; in each case, the language of monotheism comprehends not only the explicit confession with ‘one’, but also the prepositional phrases, which contain elements closely associated with belief in one God in Jewish thought. (2) Paul’s paradoxical language about God and Christ in this passage certainly expresses the functional subordination of Christ to God, but it very probably presupposes an identity of these two figures at some undefined point, an identity which may well be essential in nature (by comparison especially with Gal. 4. 8). (3) The language about Christ in I Cor. 8. 6 is informed not so much by Jewish Wisdom speculation as by Jewish language about the one God: it is best labelled a ‘monotheism christology’.

Hence the contribution of the thesis to knowledge lies in three areas. (1) It clarifies the nature and associations of Jewish monotheistic language. (2) It provides scientific support for the view, by no means generally accepted, that the New Testament adumbrates the concept of the ontological deity of Christ, using the most current methods of exegesis and working with a comprehensive selection of comparative Jewish materials. (3) It brings to the fore a christological category—the language of monotheism—which has been largely overlooked by researchers in the field of the origins and development of christology in the early church.

ABSTRACT REQUIRED BY THE BOARD OF THE FACULTY OF THEOLOGY IN THE
UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

‘Monotheism and Christology in I Corinthians 8. 4–6’

Paul Andrew Rainbow
The Queen’s College
D.Phil. Thesis, Oxford
Trinity Term, 1987

I Cor. 8. 4–6 is a text of great importance both for Christian theology and for modern inter-faith dialogue, for it played a key role in the formation of the Niceno-Constantinopolitan creed (A.D. 381) and it raises in an acute way the question whether Christian devotion to Jesus stands in continuity with the Jewish monotheistic tradition. NT scholars have variously supposed that Paul’s inherited Jewish monotheism either required him to assume the identity of the divine Christ with the Father, or, conversely, prevented him from divinizing Jesus, or, again, was compromised by Paul’s high view of Christ. Scholarly reconstructions of Paul’s view of the relationship between God and Jesus spread over a spectrum from the ontological deity of Christ on one side to the essential humanity of Jesus on the other. In our attempt to decide among these conflicting opinions, we approach the passage with a structural method gleaned eclectically from linguistics and the social sciences, a method which we apply in analysing the Jewish language of monotheism which shaped Paul’s language in I Cor. 8. 4–6, then in analysing the passage itself.

Accordingly, the study falls into two parts: the first focuses on Paul’s Jewish monotheistic presuppositions, and the second is a structural-exegetical analysis of I Cor. 8. 4–6.

After reviewing what is currently known about Jewish monotheism in secondary literature touching on this topic, we build part one around a series of nine questions about Jewish monotheism which are designed to illuminate I Cor. 8. 4–6. The first question seeks to identify the forms of explicit speech in which monotheistic belief comes to expression in Jewish sources. A survey of a wide selection of sources discloses several forms of monotheistic speech. Using these as our criteria, we collect some two hundred representative passages (appendix one) to serve as our main data-base for answering the remaining

questions. Answers based primarily on the Jewish sources can then be used to confirm hypotheses about Paul's Jewish monotheistic presuppositions based on, in most cases, oblique traces in his letters. This analysis leads to the following results for part one:

1. As a Christian, Paul continued to use several traditional Jewish forms of monotheistic speech when referring to God.
2. In particular, he used more than once the standard Jewish juxtaposition of the adjective εἷς (or μόνος) with the divine titles θεός and κύριος. When the formula with θεός is used, it always refers to God the Father; when with κύριος, the reference is to Christ.
3. Statements by several contemporary Jewish writers to the effect that belief in one God was the 'first' tenet of Judaism shed light on the shape of Paul's thought. The associations which monotheism had in Paul's language and the way in which he applied the confession of one God to a variety of issues important to him tend to confirm indirectly that monotheism was not, for Paul, just one traditional element among many, but remained fundamental to his Christian theology.
4. Explicit monotheistic language is found in a few places in Paul's writings, as also in Jewish sources, in prayers and semi-confessional statements, but not in acclamations.
5. Paul, with many Jewish writers, would have subscribed to the definition of monotheism as the belief that there is but one transcendent creator of all things, and the commitment to offer religious worship to no other being. He believed in the existence of heavenly, angelic beings created by God to exercise ruling power over human affairs on earth, and in at least one place other than I Cor. 8. 5 (II Cor. 4. 4) he used the title θεός for one of these beings.
6. An examination of the contexts in which statements of monotheism occur in the epistles shows that Paul shared the schema of concepts characteristically associated with the idea of one God in the collective Jewish mind. Apart from those in I Cor. 8. 4–6, the following associations may be noted: a negative attitude towards idolatry; the relation of God to all men, Jews and Gentiles; the idea that God's will and purpose determine the course of human history and that God will consummate history as the sole judge, saviour, and king acknowledged by all; and the idea that God is sovereign in the election of a people for

himself, grounds their unity in himself, and dwells on earth in them as his special temple.

7. Paul used the prepositional ‘all’-device of Hellenism in one or more places to sum up many elements of the monotheism schema.

8. Paul did not apply monotheistic speech to any intermediary apart from Christ, except to the Holy Spirit, who was not, in Paul’s thought, clearly independent of God himself. This fact suggests that Paul shared the Jewish awareness that the specific language of monotheism is intrinsically non-transferable.

9. While functional modes of speech about God are preponderant in Paul’s writings, his language about God shows traces of the philosophical theology current in Hellenism, and one passage (Gal. 4. 8) indirectly alludes to the concept of God’s essence or nature. These philosophical elements occur in more than one place where monotheism or the contrast between God and the gods is at issue.

Part two makes use of these results to shed light on I Cor. 8. 4–6. A preliminary chapter on the critical and historical assumptions which inform the exegesis of this passage gives reasons which legitimate our isolating the doctrinal content of vv 4–6 for special consideration. A brief investigation of the basic structure of the passage concentrating on bipolar oppositions among the many gods and lords, the one God, and the one Lord, concludes that its structure hinges, both linguistically and theologically, on a fundamental antithesis between the many divinities of polytheism and the one God (together with the one Lord) of Christian monotheism. This insight sets the stage for more detailed exegesis of the antitheses between the many gods and the one God, and between the many lords and the one Lord, in preparation for a final inquiry into the way in which Paul conceived of the relationship between the one God and the one Lord. The most significant result of these preparatory studies is the conclusion that I Cor. 8. 6 contains two classic statements of monotheism using traditional Jewish language, one containing the title ‘God’ and the other the title ‘Lord’, the first with reference to the Father and the second, in non-Jewish fashion, with reference to the man Jesus Christ. In each case, the language of monotheism comprehends not only the explicit confession with $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$, but also the prepositional phrases, which contain elements closely associated with belief in God in Jewish statements of monotheism.

The final chapter explores the significance of this dual statement of monotheism against the background of Paul's inherited presuppositions as determined in part one. This study leads to the following conclusions.

Paul's view of the relationship between God and Christ in I Cor. 8. 4–6 requires to be summarized in a series of propositions, not all of which cohere with one another. There is one God. The one God is the Father, and the Father alone is God. The Lord Jesus Christ is not the Father. God and Christ are two distinct persons. Therefore the one God is not the Lord Jesus Christ, and the Lord Jesus Christ is not the one God. It is certain that Paul expresses the functional subordination of the Lord Jesus Christ to the one God. Yet it is also virtually certain that Paul's language implies the identity of God and Christ at some point left undefined in this passage. The Lord Jesus Christ is one with the one God. As suggested by Gal. 4. 8 in conjunction with I Thess. 1. 9, it is more than a mere possibility that Paul presupposes an identity of essence.

In the context of the antithesis with polytheism, an antithesis which highlights the divine unity confessed by Christians, the stress in I Cor. 8. 6 falls on the identity of God and Christ, not on the distinction. Paul presupposes that the identity is the primary fact, and the distinction secondary.

In relation to idols, false gods, the world, and believers, the Father and Christ are seen to form an indissoluble unity. But within the internal relation between the Father and Christ, the Father retains his unique place as the one God. Thus the Father is the ultimate principle of unity, first with respect to the divine life he shares with Christ, then, together with Christ, with respect to the world created and consummated by both persons in union. The oneness of the Lord Jesus Christ with God is grounded in the oneness of God.

Paul's answer to the problem of monotheism and christology would therefore be dialectical. Insofar as Christ shares in the Father, monotheism requires Christ to be identical at some point with the one God himself. Insofar as Christ is a person distinct from the Father, monotheism requires the functional role of Christ to be subordinate to that of the Father.

On the basis of these conclusions, we append a few critical remarks about the

consensus among NT scholars that I Cor. 8. 6 presupposes a wisdom christology, suggesting instead that to speak of a monotheism christology would be nearer the mark.

The thesis contains approximately 107, 500 words.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	p. iv
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	p. v
INTRODUCTION	
Chapter One: Introduction	pp. 1–23
I. Monotheism and Christology in Paul (especially in I Cor. 8. 4–6)	
II. The Relationship between God and Christ in Paul	
III. Method to be Used	
IV. Summary of the Introduction	
PART ONE: PAUL'S JEWISH MONOTHEISTIC PRESUPPOSITIONS	
Chapter Two: Historical Perspectives on Monotheism in and beyond Israel	pp. 24–31
I. General Perspectives on Monotheism	
II. Monotheism in Israel	
III. Monotheistic Tendencies in Greece	
IV. The Encounter of Israelite Monotheism and Greek Culture	
V. The Place of Monotheism in Judaism	
Chapter Three: Special Questions about Jewish Monotheism	pp. 32–43
I. Forms of Monotheistic Speech	
II. The εἰς θεός/κύριος Formula	
III. The Primacy of Monotheism for Judaism	
IV. Functions of Monotheistic Statements	
V. The Definition of Monotheism	
VI. The Associations of Monotheism	
VII. The Hellenistic Prepositional Device	
VIII. Jewish Intermediaries and Monotheistic Language	
IX. Jewish Monotheism and Ontology	
Chapter Four: The Nature and Use of Ancient Jewish Monotheistic Language	pp. 44–103
I. Forms of Jewish Monotheistic Speech	
II. The εἰς θεός/κύριος Formula	
III. The Primacy of Monotheism for Judaism	
IV. Functions of Monotheistic Statements	
V. The Definition of Monotheism	
VI. The Monotheism Schema of Judaism	
VII. Monotheism and the Prepositional Device of Hellenism	
VIII. Jewish Intermediaries and Monotheistic Language	
IX. Metaphysical Elements in Jewish Monotheism	
X. Conclusions	
Chapter Five: Jewish Monotheism in the Writings of Paul	pp. 104–23
I. Forms of Pauline Monotheistic Speech	
II. The εἰς θεός/κύριος Formula	
III. The Primacy of Monotheism for Paul	
IV. Functions of Monotheistic Statements	
V. The Definition of Monotheism	
VI. The Associations of Pauline Monotheism	
VII. Pauline Monotheism and the Prepositional Device of Hellenism	
VIII. Pauline Intermediaries and Monotheistic Language	

- IX. Metaphysical Elements in Paul's Concept of God
- X. Conclusions to Part One

PART TWO: ANALYSIS OF I CORINTHIANS 8. 4–6

Chapter Six: Critical and Historical Assumptions	pp. 124–35
I. The Date of the Material	
II. The Integrity of the Context	
III. The Original Text of I Corinthians 8. 4–6	
IV. The Literary Forms in the Text	
V. The Situation in Corinth	
VI. The Viewpoints in the Corinthian Congregation	
VII. The Function of I Corinthians 8. 4–6 in Its Context	
Chapter Seven: The General Structure of I Corinthians 8. 4–6	pp. 136–38
I. The Antithesis between the Many Gods and the One God	
II. The Antithesis between the Many Lords and the One Lord	
III. The Distinction between the One God and the One Lord	
IV. Conclusions	
Chapter Eight: The Antithesis between the Many Gods and the One God	pp. 139–54
I. The Non-Divinity of the Many Gods (vv 4–5)	
II. The Reality of the Many Gods (v 5)	
III. The Uniqueness of the One God	
IV. Synthesis	
Chapter Nine: The Antithesis between the Many Lords and the One Lord	pp. 155–65
I. The Nature of the Many Lords	
II. The Uniqueness of the One Lord	
III. Synthesis	
Chapter Ten: The Relationship between the One God and the One Lord	pp. 166–83
I. The Distinction between the One God and the One Lord	
II. The Identity of the One God and the One Lord	
III. Conclusions	
IV. Wisdom Christology or Monotheism Christology in I Corinthians 8. 4–6?	
NOTES TO CHAPTERS ONE TO TEN	pp. 184– 211
APPENDICES	
Appendix One: Ancient Jewish Monotheistic Texts	pp. 212–67
I. List of Sources Surveyed for Monotheistic Texts	
II. List of Texts	
III. Table A: Themes Associated with Monotheistic Statements More than Twice	
IV. Table B: Concepts Infrequently Associated with Monotheistic Statements	
V. Table C: Graph of Common Theme Occurrence	
VI. Table D: Graph of Common Theme Frequency	
Appendix Two: Historical and Archaeological Note: Gods and Goddesses of Corinth in the Time of Paul	pp. 268–74
I. Pausanias	
II. Archaeology: The Greek and Roman Divinities	
III. Archaeology: The Oriental Religions	
IV. The Isthmian Games	
V. Use of Divine Titles	
VI. Conclusions	

BIBLIOGRAPHY

pp. 275–321

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Biblical quotations throughout are taken from the Revised Standard Version of the Bible (full publication details in the bibliography).

Completion of this thesis would have been impossible without financial support from Tyndale House, Cambridge (Tyndale House Research Grant, 1984–86) and from the Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals of the Universities of the United Kingdom (ORS Award, 1984–86).

My special thanks are due to Professor G.B. Caird, Dr G. Vermes, and Professor E.P. Sanders of the University of Oxford for their academic supervision; to Dr. M.J. Harris, Warden of Tyndale House, Cambridge, for his personal advice and encouragement; and most of all to my parents for support of every kind.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

References in the notes contain a minimum of information, according to the specifications of the *IMHRA Style Book: Notes for Authors, Editors, and Writers of Dissertations*, ed. by A.S. Maney and R.L. Smallwood, in consultation with the Committee of the Modern Humanities Research Association, third edition (London, 1981). Full details of books and articles may be found by consulting the bibliography.

Commentaries on the First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians are abbreviated throughout simply by the names of their authors/editors in italics, e.g., *Calvin, Wolff*. When no additional page specification is given, the reference is to the author/editor's comment on the verse under consideration at that point in the thesis.

The following abbreviations are used in the notes for oft-cited books.

Bauer/Arndt/Gingrich/Danker: W. Bauer, W.F. Arndt, and F.W. Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, revised and augmented by F.W. Gingrich and F.W. Danker

Blass/Debrunner/Rehkopf: F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, revised by F. Rehkopf

Bousset/Gressmann: W. Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter*, ed. by Hugo Gressmann

Liddell/Scott: H.G. Liddell and R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*

OTPs: J.H. Charlesworth, ed., *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 2 vols

Schürer/Vermes/Millar/Black: E. Schürer, *A History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C. – A.D. 135)*, *A New English Version*, revised and edited by G. Vermes, F. Millar, M. Black

Str./B.: H.L. Strack and P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash*

CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION

Before his conversion to Christianity, Paul outstripped his Jewish comrades in zeal for the traditions of his fathers (Gal. 1. 14). Among those traditions none was more cardinal than the dogma that God is one. Also as a Christian, Paul not only confessed the unity of God, but also based theological arguments on it.¹

After his vision of Jesus (Gal. 1. 16; I Cor. 9. 1; 15. 8), Paul began to preach a message which centred on Jesus as the crucified and risen Son of God (Gal. 1. 15–16; Rom. 1. 3–5; cf. Acts 9. 20; see also I Cor. 2. 2; I Cor. 4. 4–6). Hence in Paul's epistles, Jesus has an exalted place next to God. Perhaps he is even called θεός in one or two passages.²

These two facts—Paul's adherence to monotheism and his high christology—define the problem to be investigated in the following chapters. How did Paul understand the relationship between God's oneness and the Lordship of Christ?

The most illuminating single passage in Paul's writings for the problem of monotheism and christology—indeed, it is one of the key texts in the whole NT for this subject—is I Cor. 8. 4–6.

⁴ Hence, as to the eating of food offered to idols, we know that 'an idol has no real existence', and that 'there is no God but one'. ⁵ For although there may be so-called gods in heaven or on earth—as indeed there are many 'gods' and many 'lords'—⁶ yet for us there is one God, the Father, from whom are all things and for whom we exist, and one Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom are all things and through whom we exist.

Yet despite the fact that various aspects of this passage have attracted a fair degree of attention in the secondary literature, there still does not exist a thoroughgoing investigation of the relationship between God and the Lord Jesus Christ according to this passage, against the background of Paul's inherited Jewish monotheism. We shall make that our task.

Such a study promises to be rewarding in at least two respects. First, in regard to Christian theology and liturgy, it may go a little distance towards answering the question, which is being pressed anew in our day, whether the traditional orthodox doctrine of the deity

of Christ can legitimately claim to have a basis in the canonical scriptures. Every Sunday believing Christians around the world intone the so-called Nicene Creed, which opens with these words.

We believe in *one God* (ἓνα θεόν),
the Father, the almighty,
 maker of heaven and earth,
of all that is (πάντων),
 seen and unseen.

We believe in *one Lord, Jesus Christ* (ἓνα κύριον, Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν),
 the only Son of God,
 eternally begotten of the Father,
 God from God, Light from Light,
 true God from true God,
 begotten, not made,
 of one Being (ὁμοούσιον) with the Father.
Through him all things (δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα) were made.³

The italicized words reflect verbal influence from I Cor. 8. 6.⁴ To these words have been added expansions which outline the Athanasian doctrine that won out over other views at the Council of Constantinople in A.D. 381. From early times it has been debated whether these expansions, in particular the ὁμοούσιος-clause, reflect the meaning of the biblical text. Did Paul intend to give Jesus a part in the being of the one God? Modern doubts on this score, which are shared by many exegetes and historians, achieved public notoriety when *The Myth of God Incarnate* was published in 1977. The time is ripe for a fresh inquiry into the doctrinal content and implications of this important passage, on which the creed has stood.

Second, in regard to inter-faith dialogue, a study of the christology of the apostle to the Gentiles in the light of Jewish monotheism ought to shed light on the primary issue which divides Judaism and Christianity. From the Jewish side David Daube has written:

The conflict between Synagogue and Church always was and still is about the question of the divinity of Jesus, not about any minor issues. Even the authority of the Law is a secondary matter, our view of which must depend on our answer to the main challenge.⁵

This is in full agreement with the traditional Christian perception of the agenda. Ever since the last NT documents were written, the belief in Jesus, together with monotheism, has been just as central to orthodox Christian faith as unitarian monotheism has been to orthodox Judaism (I John 2. 22–23). An answer to the question about Paul’s monotheism and christology may or may not smooth the way towards greater *rapprochement* between Jews and Christians in our day, but at least it might help to clarify our historic differences.⁶

Thus a study of Paul’s monotheism and christology may have implications for both dogmatics and inter-faith dialogue. But these ramifications, which go beyond the NT text, will not be explored directly in the following pages. Our project will be defined as an exegetical investigation of I Cor. 8. 4–6 in its own cultural milieu, with a view to describing as accurately as possible the way in which Paul conceived of the relationship between the ‘one God, the Father’ and the ‘one Lord, Jesus Christ’ (v 6).

In order to sharpen our questions about the passage, we begin with a glance at existing literature to determine (i) in what ways monotheism and christology might be supposed to have qualified one another in Paul’s thought, and (ii) in what ways Paul’s view of the relationship between God and Jesus has been construed by scholars.

MONOTHEISM AND CHRISTOLOGY IN PAUL (ESPECIALLY IN I COR. 8. 4–6)

The various suppositions about the interplay between monotheism and christology in Paul’s thought may be surveyed under four heads: the answer of the orthodox Christian tradition, that of radical criticism, the reconstruction of the History of Religions school, and the solution of modified orthodoxy.

Traditional Christianity

In a statement about the equality of the Son of God with God the Father in our passage, Theodoret wrote:

The divine Apostle demonstrates their equality, both by predicating the ‘one’ of Father and Son in the same way, and by showing that the title of κύριος is equal in might to that of θεός.⁷

For our immediate purpose the crucial words are ‘predicating (τεθεικώς) the "one" (τὸ ἓῖς) of the Father and the Son in the same way (ὁμοίως)’. In context this could hardly mean that the confession of the one Lord in I Cor. 8. 6 was modelled after the confession of the one God as to verbal form only, for in that case the Lord-statement would remain open to the subordinationist interpretation which saw Christ as a unitary being inferior to God, and which Theodoret was apparently concerned to counteract. Theodoret’s argument seems rather to be to this effect: since the unity of neither the Father nor the Son is compromised by the other, they must share a common oneness, and this proves the Son’s equality with the Father (as does the use of a divine title of equal majesty with θεός). This is as much as to say that Paul’s unwillingness to compromise his monotheism demanded that the divinity of the Son be all of a piece with the deity of the Father.

This line of thought was fully expressed by H.P. Liddon. Liddon held that Paul was ‘as strict a monotheist as any unconverted pupil of Gamaliel’, and that he not only professed belief in one God, but was ‘especially devoted’ to that belief and ‘sensitively jealous’ of it.

What then is the position which he assigns to Jesus Christ in the scale of being? That he believed Jesus Christ to be merely a man is a paradox which could be maintained by no careful reader of his Epistles. But if, according to St. Paul, Christ is more than man, what is He? Is He still only an Arian Christ? or is He a Divine Person? In St. Paul’s thought this question could not have been an open one. His earnest, sharply-defined faith in the One Most High God must force him to say either that Christ is a created Being, or that He is internal to the Essence of God.⁸

B.B. Warfield argued similarly from the words of I Cor. 8. 4–6, where Paul first states, ‘there is no God but one’ (v 4), then goes on to profess his belief in both one God and one Lord (v 6). Since the duality in v 6 cannot be supposed to contradict the divine unity confessed in v 4, ‘these two may together be subsumed under the category of the one God who alone exists’.⁹ This argument is reproduced with some exegetical elaboration in an essay by the early J.M. Robinson, who infers, partly from the ‘one plus one equals one’ of I Cor. 8. 4–6, that Paul used the term κύριος to denote the full deity of Jesus Christ.¹⁰

Most recently D. Wells has again pressed the logic which moves from Jewish monotheism to the highest possible view of Christ, in a remark about I Cor. 8. 6: ‘Yet to a Jewish mind, imbued with the sense that there was only one God who was Creator of all, this identification was an unmistakable assertion of Jesus’ ontological unity with the Father.’¹¹

We might summarize the traditional Christian view of Paul’s monotheism and christology in the proposition: monotheism requires the complete deity of the divine Christ, his share in God’s own being.

Radical Criticism

But that is not the only line of thought which has been championed. Some of the more radical critics of Christian orthodoxy have deemed it possible to see Paul’s reasoning as moving in precisely the opposite direction. The Arians, for example, argued on the basis of the phrase ‘one God, the Father’ in I Cor. 8. 6 that the Lord Jesus Christ must be thereby excluded from the unique deity of the Father.¹² In similar fashion W. Beyschlag stated that Paul was absolutely consistent in avoiding the use of the term θεός in reference to Christ, and that the ‘one God’ of I Cor. 8. 6 precludes a reference of θεός to any being other than the Father.¹³

This point of view was formulated with singular clarity in F.C. Baur’s conclusion about the reference of θεός in Rom. 9. 5.

When we consider how absolute the idea of God is to the apostle, how powerfully the absoluteness of God had taken possession of his mind, and how distinctly and consistently he represents the relation of Christ to God as one of subordination, we cannot possibly believe that in this one passage [Rom. 9. 5] he meant to describe Christ as the absolute God exalted above all. The Pauline mode of thought on such subjects recognizes the limits of the monotheism of Judaism, and such an expression would be simply inconsistent with that monotheism.¹⁴

This understanding of Paul’s monotheism and christology did not pass away with Arianism or with the influence of the Tübingen school. To D. Cupitt it is ‘unthinkable’ that the Jewish monotheists who wrote the NT could have entertained the notion of ‘coequal persons within the one God’.¹⁵ And A.E. Harvey has devoted an entire chapter of a recent

book on Jesus to making this very point: ‘The immediate followers of Jesus [the NT writers, including Paul] were strictly bound by the constraint of that monotheism which, as Jews, they instinctively professed, and in their attempts to declare who Jesus was they stopped well short of describing him as "divine"’.¹⁶

These scholars represent the view that Paul’s monotheism prevented the complete divinization of Jesus.

The History of Religions School

W. Bousset worked out a solution different from both the orthodox answer and that of the radical critics. Against orthodoxy he agreed with the critics that Paul’s use of θεός for God and κύριος for Christ, especially in I Cor. 8. 6, marked a clear separation between the two figures and indeed meant a ‘vigorous subordination of the figure of Christ to God’. On the other hand, Bousset’s researches into the cultic use of the κύριος-title in pagan Egypt and Syria made it impossible to dismiss the element of divinization implied by Paul’s application of this term to Jesus, particularly in view of the fact that for pagan converts to Christianity, the title κύριος gained additional divine associations from the Septuagint, associations which began ‘to obliterate all boundary lines between the Old Testament God and the Christ’. So far did this deification of Christ proceed that in I Cor. 8. 6, ‘the spirit of unconquerable and stalwart Old Testament monotheism is transferred to the Kyrios worship and the Kyrios faith!’. That is, Paul had now two objects of faith: the supreme God of Judaism, and a Lord who was a ‘gradation within the divine essence’, ‘a divine being ... at a level below God’, ‘a half-god, if we wish to put it crudely’. Paul tried to reconcile his belief in Christ with his monotheism by adopting the mythological concept of a son-deity, calling Christ the ‘Son of God’. But his monotheism was inevitably put under strain.

As conceivable as this whole development is, and as much as it appears to have occurred with an immanent necessity, still it signifies a remarkable complicating and burdening of that simplicity and plainness of religion which appears at the high points of Old Testament religion and in the gospel of Jesus.¹⁷

Bousset published these views in the first edition of *Kyrios Christos* (1913) only six years after his major study of Gnosticism, *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis* (1907). From his use of the concept of levels of being within the deity, as also from his references to Gnosticism and mystery cults in the discussion of I Cor. 8. 6, it appears that he found in Gnosticism or Hellenistic polytheism the theological model by analogy to which he sought to interpret Paul's monotheism and christology.¹⁸

Many of the elements of Bousset's thesis were taken up into the widely influential Gnostic redeemer myth which R. Bultmann posited to explain the evolution of christology in the pre-Pauline Hellenistic Christian community.¹⁹ Although the implications of this christological hypothesis for the monotheism of the early church were neglected in the focus of Bultmann's disciples on soteriology, the Christ presented in Paul's epistles continues to be seen by many as a pre-existent divine being subordinate to God the Father.

Bousset's answer—implicitly that of the History of Religions school—to the problem of monotheism and christology in Paul was: Paul's monotheism was threatened or obscured by his devotion to the separate, divine Christ.

Modified Orthodoxy

Under this heading this we shall summarize the position of J.D.G. Dunn, who seeks to integrate the results of critical NT scholarship within the broad framework of traditional Christianity. Since Dunn's exposition of Paul's monotheism and christology is built upon the hypothesis of an early wisdom christology, we must begin by sketching that hypothesis.

The use which the History of Religions school made of the Gnostic redeemer myth as an explanatory model for early NT christology has come under heavy criticism in recent decades and has been largely abandoned in its original form.²⁰ But the search for possible christological models has continued. With the surge of interest in the Jewish environment of the NT since the middle of this century, ancient Jewish speculation about personified wisdom has come to the fore as a locus of attention (note I Cor. 1. 24: 'Christ ... the wisdom of God?'). Although the figure of Lady Wisdom has been subjected to a variety of interpretations by scholars (see chapter four, section VIII), there is virtually unanimous agreement that some

NT writers in certain respects identified Jesus with the personification of pre-cosmic wisdom found in several well known Jewish documents (Job chapter 28; Prov. 8. 22–31; *Sir.* chapter 24; *Wisd. Sol.* chapters 6–9) and that this identification influenced their belief in Christ's role in the creation of the world (note esp. John 1. 1–3; Col. 1. 15–17; Heb. 1. 2–3).²¹ Obviously the hypothesis of a wisdom christology has great potential for illuminating I Cor. 8. 6, where it is said of the Lord Jesus Christ that all things are 'through him'.

With the History of Religions scholars, Dunn recognizes that this language ascribes to Christ the creative role which belonged to wisdom in one strand of Jewish theology. But Dunn does not draw their conclusion, namely, that Paul thought of Christ as a pre-cosmic, divine being by the side of God. That would have been, in Dunn's judgement, to infringe Jewish monotheism from the start. Jewish wisdom, according to him, was neither a being separate from God, nor an hypostasis in the Christian trinitarian sense, but a way of speaking of God's own action in the world.²² Since Paul begins I Cor. 8. 6 with a firm affirmation of Jewish monotheism, his language here about Christ's role in creation must really be a statement about the action of the one God. The God who was dynamically present in Jesus is the same God who was at work as the eternal wisdom through which the world was made.²³ In this carefully defined sense Paul's Christ is pre-existent and divine: as the personal embodiment of God's wisdom, Christ is the final and most perfect expression of that divine power which was operative from the foundation of the world.²⁴

Because the man Jesus was from the first at the centre of Christianity, Christianity had to redefine its monotheism. But because it was the one God of Jewish faith whom those first Christians recognized in and through this Jesus it was a redefinition and not an abandoning of that monotheism.²⁵

Here the orthodox answer to the problem of monotheism and christology, critically purged of traditional assumptions about the personal, pre-cosmic existence of Christ and the ontological deity of Christ, comes back in the modified form: Paul's Jewish monotheism required the functional identification of Christ with the action of the one God.

Scepticism

One other view deserves mention. It is that of K. Stendahl, who writes about Paul: ‘To him the later questions, both Jewish and Christian, concerning monotheism versus Christology, is [*sic*] nowhere present in his letters.’ Stendahl thinks that Paul has added the statement about Christ to the monotheistic confession in I Cor. 8. 6 ‘in an almost unreflective manner’, and he ‘cannot see that this expanded Shema□ has any corrective function over against Jewish monotheism’.²⁶

While one might agree that the expansion of the Shema in I Cor. 8. 6 is not ‘corrective’, it is extremely difficult to suppose that it does not involve at least a redefinition of monotheism from the Christian point of view. Stendahl has done a service in raising the question whether monotheism and christology constituted an issue for Paul, and the kernel of truth behind his scepticism is the literary fact that Paul’s epistles nowhere—not even in I Cor. 8. 4–6—exhibit reflections on this problem for its own sake in the manner of a modern systematic theology. But it would impoverish historical research to share Stendahl’s scepticism on this point. It seems very unlikely that a Jew as theologically acute as Paul was would have failed to explore the implications of making Jesus the mediator of creation side by side with the one God who had formed the very centre of his Jewish faith before he became a Christian. We shall therefore proceed to our investigation assuming that this was an issue for Paul.

Summary

There have been three basic lines of thought about Paul’s monotheism and christology: (i) monotheism plus the divinity of Christ equals the full divinity of Christ (either in the ontological or in the functional sense); (ii) monotheism excludes the divinity of Christ; and (iii) monotheism plus the divinity of Christ equals a compromised monotheism.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN GOD AND CHRIST IN PAUL

However Paul construed the logical problem of monotheism and christology, the result would have been that he held a certain view about the relationship between Christ and

God. In the preceding section we concentrated on various lines of reasoning by means of which Paul might have reached (or supported) his conclusion; in this section we shall survey views among scholars about that conclusion itself. A whole range of possibilities opens up.

The Ontological Deity of Christ

Many writers, both old and new, Christian and non-Christian, professing ecclesiastical commitments and claiming only scientific integrity, have held that Paul believed in the ontological deity of Christ. The following compendium is just a sample of various formulations of this view.

Theodoret: ἰσότης of God and Christ (see note 7). *Olshausen* (on I Cor. 8. 6): ‘the element of the doctrine of the Trinity’ is discernible. *Godet* (on I Cor. 8. 6): ‘community of nature’ between God and Christ. *Liddon* (on I Cor. 8. 6): Christ is ‘consubstantial with ... the eternal Father’. *Warfield* (on I Cor. 8. 6): God is ‘subsistent in both’ the one God and the one Lord; ‘there is the clear presupposition of some such doctrine as that of the Trinity here.’ *Wrede* (on Christ as the ‘Son of God’ in Paul): ‘He is metaphysically conceived’; ‘his origin lies ... in God’; he ‘has his share in the spiritual, insensible nature of the one God’. *Bethune-Baker* (on Father, Son, and Holy Spirit in the NT): ‘There are distinctions within the Godhead, but the distinctions are such as are compatible with unity of being.’ *Baker* (on Phil. 2. 6): Jesus ‘is essentially Divine’. *Cotter*: ‘Christ as Son of God proceeds from the Father.’ *Prat* (on Christ as ‘image of God’ and ‘Son of God’ in Paul): ‘He proceeds, therefore, from the divine essence, and is consubstantial with the Father.’ *Andrews* (on the relationship between the Father and the Son in Paul): ‘a metaphysical relationship’, ‘a fundamental unity of nature’. *Feine/Aland* (on Christ as the ‘image of God’): [er] ‘kann nur als Gott vorgestellt sein. Als Sohn ist er gleichen Wesens wie der Vater’. *Bonsirven* (on Col. 2. 9): ‘...une portée métaphysique, ici il signifie: la divinité dans toute sa perfection’. *Morris* (on I Cor. 8. 6): Paul is ‘including the Lord Jesus within that one Godhead’. *Taylor*: Paul’s monotheism ‘is destined to become an enriched version of Old Testament monotheism, one in which personal distinctions are implicit within the unity of the Godhead’. *Cerfaux* (on Christ as ‘Son of

God' in Paul): this term points to a 'metaphysical reality' which is 'in harmony with Paul's monotheistic belief'. *Schoeps* (on Christ as 'Son of God' in Paul): this title is 'an ontological affirmation' designating Christ's 'substantial divinity', showing that Christ stands 'in closest relation metaphysically to God'. (On Phil. 2. 6): 'Christ was and is equal with God.' (On the relationship between Christ and God in general according to Paul): because of 'the equation of the Χριστός with God Himself', Jesus 'has become ἰσότης, and has His essential being in God'. *Fuller* (on Phil. 2. 9–11): Jesus 'is given the name (ὄνομα, denoting the being) of God himself'. *Fitzmyer* (on Christ as 'Son of God' in I Cor. 15. 24–28): this title 'transcends any functional soteriology'. *Bornkamm*, quoting Käsemann (on the 'name' Lord bestowed on Christ in Phil. 2. 9–11): it indicates 'honor and essence, and at the same time radiates essentiality and makes it manifest'. *Longenecker* (on the title 'Lord' in early Jewish Christianity): 'the implications of deity contained in the ascription as yet lay in the substratum of thought.' *Schnackenburg* (on Christ in Phil. 2. 5–11): '[er] so gottnah gesehen wird, dass nur ein kleiner Schritt zur Aussage seiner Göttlichkeit bleibt.... Aus der Konditionsaussage die Wesensaussage sich erheben konnte'. *Ladd*, quoting C.A.A. Scott (on Christ as the 'Son of God' in Paul): this title indicates 'a community of nature between the Father and the Son'. *Moule* (on Jesus in the NT): '(in Nicene or Chalcedonian terms) the *homoousios* rightly reflects the implications of New Testament experience'; 'a binitarian conception of the Deity'; Jesus is 'one with God in some exceptional and absolute way'. *Guthrie* (on Jesus' Sonship in Paul): it is 'an essential relationship'; 'a functional explanation cannot be entirely divorced from the reality implied by the function.' *Kim*: 'Himself being divine, Christ is the perfect revelation of God.... Both functional and ontological categories of understanding are combined.' *Schelkle* (on I Cor. 8. 6): 'der Sohn ist mit dem Vater in der ewigen Einheit des Wesens.' *Wells* (on I Cor. 8. 6): 'an unmistakable assertion of Jesus' ontological unity with the Father.²⁷

The Functional Divinity of Christ

Many other writers think that Paul believed in the divinity of Christ but are uncertain whether the evidence warrants the conclusion that he believed in Christ's divinity in an

ontological sense. Some of these authors operate with the historical premise that ontological categories of thought did not influence the thinking of the earliest church to a significant degree until the church came into contact with Greek philosophy beginning in the second century A.D. Others do not deny that ontological overtones are implicit in NT expressions about God and Christ—these writers sometimes defend the statements of the later church councils on the ground that those statements only drew consequences from the NT evidence which became inevitable once the Bible came to be read by minds shaped by Hellenistic thought—but in their capacity as NT scholars they restrict their observations to the explicit language of the NT about Christ, which is primarily functional.

Calvin (on I Cor. 8. 6): ‘Paul wished to ascribe a common activity to the Father and the Son.’ *A. Richardson* (on I Cor. 1. 24): Christ is ‘*the activity of God par excellence*. Christ is God’s most characteristic, most revealing, action’. *Schweizer* (on I Cor. 8. 6): this verse contains ‘a more accurate definition of him who has acted in Christ’. *Williams* (on I Cor. 8. 6): ‘Father and Son are one in creation and redemption.’ *Cullmann*: ‘The New Testament hardly ever speaks of the person of Christ without at the same time speaking of his work.’ ‘The New Testament unquestionably presupposes the deity of Christ, but it does so ... primarily in connection with his work rather than with his being.’ *Delling*: one must speak of ‘das Handeln Gottes’ in Christ. *Thrall* (on I Cor. 8. 6): Christ ‘shared the powers and functions of God’. *Fitzmyer* (on the title ‘Lord’): ‘it is predominantly a functional title, expressing Christ’s dominion over men and his present vital influence in their lives and conduct.’ *Brown*: all the uses of θεός for Jesus in the NT denote functional, not essential, deity. *Goppelt* (on the transfer of OT passages to Christ in Rom. 10. 13; Phil. 2. 10): ‘Der Erhöhte erscheint von ihnen her gesehen nicht als ein göttliches Wesen neben Gott, sondern als *der, durch den Gottes endzeitliches Werk geschieht*.’ *Grant* (on I Cor. 8. 6): ‘functionally the Lord Jesus Christ can be described as God.’ *Schelkle* (on Christ in I Cor. 8. 6): ‘[seine] göttliche Würde ist gleichwohl funktional, nicht metaphysisch aufgefasst’. *M. Barth* (on Eph. 1. 2): God is ‘revealed, present, active in the Lord Jesus Christ’. There is an ‘essential operative unity’. *Whiteley* (on the title ‘Lord’ for Christ): ‘He was associated with His Father

in the exercise of authority.’ *Orr/Walther* (on I Cor. 8. 6): ‘Jesus was in an essential unity of activity with God from the beginning of the universe.’ *Thurén* (on I Cor. 8. 6): ‘Durch Jesus und die Kirche wird nach dem Neuen Testament die Einheit/Einzigkeit Gottes eine eschatologische Wirklichkeit.’ *Dunn* (on I Cor. 8. 6): ‘Christ is the action of God, Christ embodies the creative power of God.’ *Wolff* (on I Cor. 8. 6): ‘Gott ist der durch den Kyrios Wirkende.’ *Hengel* (on I Cor. 8. 6): here we see Christ’s ‘mediation in creation’; only later in the Logos christology do we find ‘a concern to bring the “divine functions” of the Son of God into line with the conceptuality and thought patterns of the Greek metaphysics of being’.²⁸

The Anthropological Divinity of Christ

A number of scholars have felt that Paul’s understanding of Christ was conditioned by his self-understanding and have emphasized the significance of Christ to the religious consciousness in Paul’s religion.

Somerville: because ‘in mind and heart and will the Son is absolutely one with the Father’, ‘He is to us as God’, and he and the Father are ‘spoken of as to the religious consciousness one’. *Cave*: ‘Yet so inseparable are God and Christ in his experience that his faith in Christ in no way perplexes his monotheism.’ For Paul, Christ had ‘the value of God’; ‘nor did his faith in Christ impinge upon his faith in God.’ *Moffatt* (on I Cor. 8. 6): ‘For Paul the one Lord is vitally one with the one God, in the experience of Christians.’ *Fuchs*: ‘Die Beziehung zwischen Gott und Jesus wird freilich im Neuen Testament nicht so eindeutig formuliert wie die Bedeutung Jesu für den Glauben.’ *Schlatter* (on Paul’s religion in general): ‘So gibt es keine Beziehung zum Christus, die nicht Beziehung zu Gott wäre, keine Beziehung zu Gott, die nicht Beziehung zum Christus wäre.’ ‘In dem Sein im Christus lebt immer das volle Gottesbewusstsein.’ *Evans* (on God and Jesus in the NT): ‘faith swung between faith in Christ and faith in God, and yet was felt to be one faith.’ *Osborn*: ‘Christ is in no sense a mediator but rather intensifies the unity of God, in his righteousness towards man.’²⁹

Other Formulations of the Deity of Christ according to Paul

A number of writers on Paul describe his belief in the deity of Christ in ways which cannot be easily categorized as ontological, functional, or anthropological.

1. Some speak simply of the deity, divinity, or Godhead of Christ in Paul without specifying the sense intended.

Nock (on Phil. 2. 5): ‘Godhead must be predicated of Jesus.’ *Stauffer*: θεός in Rom. 9. 5 refers to Christ, and κύριος in Paul is a title of divinity. *Hegermann* (on I Cor. 8. 6): ‘Dieser “monotheistische” Kyriosgedanke ist hier durchaus ein Ausdruck für die Gottheit Jesu.’ *Amiot* (on Paul’s christology): ‘We can therefore hardly refuse him the title of God.’ *Goppelt*: the early Christians, including Paul, can mention Christ beside God without infringing monotheism, ‘weil sie beide von der alttestamentlichen Gottesvorstellung her sehen’. *Thrall*: Paul’s christological subordinationism ‘provides him with a means of asserting Christ’s divinity without appearing to deny his faith in the one God’.³⁰

2. Some divide reality between the creator and the creation and place Paul’s Christ on the side of the creator.

Stevens: if Paul’s christological statements ‘do not categorically assert his absolute eternity and deity, they do, in my judgment, place him outside the category of creation and affirm of him an absolutely unique kinship with God’. *Morgan*: ‘for Paul, Christ belongs to the side of reality we call divine.’ *Caird* (on I Cor. 8. 6): already Paul ‘thought of Christ as being on the divine side of reality’. *Goppelt* (on Paul’s christology): ‘Jesus did not belong to the side of that which was created but to that of the Creator.’³¹

3. A small number of authors stress the transcendent but otherwise undefined unity of God and Christ.

Sabourin (on I Cor. 8. 6): ‘une majesté unique et transcendante’. *McKenzie* (on I Cor. 1. 24): ‘the identity between Jesus and the Father is more firmly stated, an identity which is everything but personal.’³²

4. A small number of authors state that there is in Paul a unique relationship between God and Christ but do not venture beyond that.

Kuss: Paul’s christological terms indicate a ‘Bestreben, die schlechthin exzeptionelle “Verwandtschaft” Jesu mit Gott auszudrücken, ohne doch zu einer Identifikation zu gelangen’. *Stanton*: in Paul’s thought, ‘Jesus stood in the closest possible relationship to God, for his favourite phrase “his Son” points to the similarity, as it were, of God and Jesus, rather than to their “difference”.’³³

5. A small number of authors content themselves to deny that Paul’s christology threatened his monotheism. It is not always clear whether these writers suppose that Paul believed in the deity of Christ or did not believe in the deity of Christ.

Michel: ‘Paulus hat nie eine Spannung zwischen dem Herrentum Christi und seinem Gottesgedanken empfunden.’ *Stauffer* (on I Cor. 8. 4–6): ‘no trace of ditheism in that’.³⁴

Christ a Mode of God

One writer interprets Paul’s christology using the Logos of Philo as a model, assuming a particular view of Philo’s Logos in so doing. S. Sandmel is a Philo expert and a disciple of E.R. Goodenough. According to Goodenough, Philo’s Logos doctrine was an early precursor to what later became the Christian heresy of modalistic monarchianism.³⁵ Although Sandmel does not repeat Goodenough’s exact terminology in his exposition of Paul’s christology, a modalistic conception of Christ informs his treatment throughout.

Sandmel (on the title ‘Son of God’ in Paul): the Son of God ‘is an offshoot of God, not identical with Him, but subject to the Father (I Cor. 15:28), just as the Logos was a manifestation of God’s mind, not identical with God’. (On the title ‘Lord’ in Paul): ‘Lord, somewhat as in Philo, is an attribute, or facet, of God, but not God Himself. Christ, then, is an aspect of God; godly, yet not God.’³⁶

The Subordinate Divinity of Christ

Some scholars have spoken of Christ in Paul’s epistles as divine, not intending to put him on a par with the one, supreme God of Jewish belief, but asserting his secondary and subordinate divinity. In recent decades this view of Paul’s christology has sometimes been connected with the recognition that Paul sees Christ as exercising divine functions on behalf of God. Ontological subordinationism and an acknowledgement of the functional divinity of Christ are not mutually exclusive. Therefore we must distinguish, among writers who find a functional divinity of Christ in Paul, between those who think that this implies Christ’s equality with God (see the section above on The Functional Divinity of Christ) and those who combine this position with subordinationism.

The Arians (according to Ps.-Jerome; [note 12])(on I Cor. 8. 6): ‘*Filius a deitate sejunctus est.*’ *Weinel* (on Phil. 2. 5–11): ‘Jesus’ nature was divine.’ ‘Jesus still stands for Paul below God.’ ‘There are two separate beings: “God” ... and subordinate to Him “the Son,” who has been called into life and endowed with power by Him for the creation and redemption of mankind’. *Bousset*: Paul’s Christ is ‘a divine being ... at a level below God’. *Edman*: ‘Christ is ... a divine being.... But God himself remains, as he was for Judaism, the sole and universal God.’ *Bultmann*: ‘While the term “Son of God” secondarily serves to differentiate Christ from the one true God and to indicate Christ’s subordinate relation to God, it also serves—and this is the primary thing—to assert his divinity.’ *Barclay*: ‘There is a sense for Paul in which Jesus is subordinate to God.’ ‘Nothing was ever allowed to detract from the lonely supremacy of God.’ *Conzelmann*: ‘On the one hand, Jesus exercises the functions of God as Lord: he rules over the world. On the other hand, however, he is clearly

distinguished from God.’ ‘If we measure the christology of Paul by later dogma, it appears to be subordinationist.’ *Kümmel* (on Phil. 2. 5–11): ‘Jesus the Christ was in essence like God’ [compare the Arian ὁμοιούσιος]. ‘God has exalted the humiliated One even above his previous divine nature’ [in which case his previous ‘divine’ nature could not have been the supreme nature of God]. *Hengel* (on Christ in Phil. 2. 5–11): ‘*of divine nature*’, ‘clearly subordinate’. *Ziesler*: ‘God’s powers and reign are exercised through Christ as God’s plenipotentiary representative, but Christ is not identical with God ... for the element of subordination remains.’³⁷

Angel Christology

One modern scholar holds that Paul regarded Christ, not as a divine being, but as an exalted angel.

Werner: ‘The Pauline portrait of Christ corresponds in many respects to the apocalyptic concept of the heavenly Messiah as Prince of the Angels and an angelic being.’³⁸

Christ a Unique Man

A significant minority of scholars have held that Paul believed Christ to be a human being entrusted with divine prerogatives or uniquely related to God in his ethical perfection, but in no sense divine.

Baur: Christ for Paul was ‘essentially and substantially man’. *Beyschlag*: God is actively present in the church in the same sense that he was present in Christ. *Case*: ‘κύριος does not imply that Christ is elevated to the place of Yahweh, but is descriptive of his heavenly authority over the community in the spiritual sphere.’ *Rodhe*: ‘Christus ist nicht Gott, wird von Paulus nicht vergottet.’ Rather he is an exalted Man at God’s right hand through whom the mystery of God’s love is made known. *Ross*: Paul’s doctrine of the person of Christ is not to be taken literally at face value, for it was only an articulation of ‘his experience of the love of God in Christ’. *Schonfield*: because Paul’s Jesus was the

‘archetypal man’, he did not threaten God’s unity. *Boobyer*: Jesus, according to the NT writers, ‘did God’s work’, but titles of honour applied to him expressed only ‘his soteriological significance’, not a truly divine status. *Young*: Paul’s christology ‘could be given the anachronistic tag “adoptionist”’. Jesus was created and elected by God to be ‘the archetypal man’. *Cupitt*: in Paul, Jesus is ‘God’s right hand man: all God does he does through Christ’. ‘Christ is the perfect heavenly Man.’ *Austin*: ‘If we are to speak of Jesus as divine we must define divinity in terms not of his identity of nature with the Father (in the Chalcedonian sense of “being of one substance with the Father”) but in terms of his doing the Father’s work of salvation.’ ‘If Jesus is divine then so are those who believe in and receive the divine salvation.’³⁹

Summary

Scholarly suppositions about how Paul conceived of the relationship between God and Christ spread themselves over a spectrum from a Son of God who was divine in the highest and fullest sense to a Jesus who was related to God as an exemplary human being. Not all of the positions outlined above are mutually exclusive. In particular the recognition that for Paul Christ was able to exercise divine functions can be combined with any of the ontological gradations from human through angelic to modally or hypostatically divine.

METHOD TO BE USED

Since there is so little agreement among interpreters about how Paul related his christology to his monotheism, there is still a need for patient, detailed exegesis of key christological texts. In the most recent decade or two it has become increasingly plain that the standard philological and historical methods inherited by NT scholarship from the last century, fruitful as they have been in many respects, need to be complemented by other tools if the task of textual analysis is to be executed adequately. The current encroachment of literary and structural methods on the field of NT studies has opened up new directions for inquiry. Our study of I Cor. 8. 4–6 will make use of several methodic principles gathered eclectically from the structuralist movement in the linguistic and social sciences.

In particular, our study will (i) emphasize binary correlations or oppositions between elements of the text as a primary locus of meaning, (ii) focus on the the text as it stands rather than attempt to trace its content diachronically from source material, and (iii) seek ultimately to grasp the text systemically as a single, complex unit of meaning rather than analyse it into many units of meaning isolated from one another. In so doing we shall be following methodological lines laid down by L. Keck in his programmatic essay, ‘Toward the Renewal of New Testament Christology,’ *New Testament Studies*, 32 (1986), pp. 362–77. It may enhance clarity at the outset if we elaborate briefly on each of these three principles.

Relations

Keck, writing about NT christology, makes use of some key terms and concepts drawn from the field of structural linguistics, especially the concept of relations.⁴⁰

‘Significance’ is intelligible only in relation to something or someone. Accordingly, the subject-matter of christology is really the syntax of relationships or correlations. In developed christology this structure of signification is expressed in relation to God (the *theological* correlation proper), the created order (the cosmological correlation). [*sic*] and humanity (the anthropological correlation).

He goes on to point out that two of these correlations ‘have not got their due—the cosmological and the theological’ (p. 363).⁴¹

I Cor. 8. 6 highlights the relation between Christ and the world, and it at least raises pressing questions about the relation between Christ and God. In these respects our study will answer Keck’s call directly. I Cor. 8. 4–6 also brings to the fore oppositions between the many idols/gods and the one God, between the many lords and the one Lord, and between the many gods and lords together and the one God and one Lord together. Since the christology of the text is expressed in this peculiar network of relations, our exegesis of this passage (part two) will be divided into sections in such a way as to make the most fundamental relations apparent.

Synchronic Approach

Again Keck makes use of a methodological assumption of structural linguistics when he emphasizes the value of studying NT christology synchronically rather than diachronically.⁴² For linguists it is an axiom that the meaning of a unit is not known so much from its history (etymology) as from its synchronic relations to other units in language and speech. Applying this insight, Keck writes, ‘Concentrating on the christology of existing texts in a systemic way makes it manifest that the decisive questions are not the origin of christology or of particular christologies’ (p. 372).

Accordingly in our study of I Cor. 8. 4–6 we shall leave to one side such burning issues as the origins of wisdom christology or of the concept of Christ’s pre-temporal existence. These problems and others have been carefully explored already, and we shall make use of the results of scholarship in these areas where pertinent. But we shall focus primarily on establishing exactly what is stated or clearly implied (and what is not stated or clearly implied) about God and Christ in our passage.

That is not to say that our vision will be restricted to I Cor. 8. 4–6 alone. It will be necessary to take into account contemporary Jewish statements of monotheism in our preparatory study (part one). The point is that these materials will be used to illuminate Paul’s statements synchronically and not diachronically, that is, not to trace a line or lines of evolving theological and christological ideas along which to situate the concepts in I Cor. 8. 4–6, but to sketch the sphere of Jewish and Christian theological and christological presuppositions in the mind of Paul which intersect at the point of our passage.

Holistic Synthesis

Finally, Keck identifies a ‘central’ question for the christology of any given passage: ‘What is the overall construal of Jesus’ identity and significance in the text? ... A systemic approach will make it clear that a text’s christology is not simply the sum of its parts but a construal of Jesus which must be seen as a whole’ (p. 372).

A glance at the commentaries and the secondary literature on I Cor. 8. 4–6 shows that most of the elements of this text have already received due attention individually. These

issues include the Jewish monotheistic background of the confessions εἷς θεός and εἷς κύριος, the significance of the titles κύριος and Χριστός, the Stoic or Hellenistic background of the several prepositional phrases in conjunction (ἐξ οὗ, εἰς αὐτόν, δι' οὗ, δι' αὐτόν), the question whether the phrase τὸ πάντα refers to the universe or to the people of God, the parallels between Christ's mediatorship of creation in this passage and Hellenistic Jewish concepts of a mediator of creation, as well as a host of other related philological and historical matters. Again, the results of the work of others on these isolated issues will only be summarized in the present study. What is still needed is a closer investigation of the big, integrative theological and christological problems that are left when all the spade work has been done. This concern about wholes rather than parts will pervade the study throughout.

SUMMARY OF THE INTRODUCTION

In short, our study will be an attempt to find a way through the bewildering array of opinions about a theological/christological text of central importance using a new, structural method of approach.

The study will fall into two parts. Part one will seek to determine Paul's inherited monotheistic presuppositions by using Jewish sources to fill in gaps left by his letters. Part two will involve an exegesis of I Cor. 8. 4–6 itself.

NOTE INTRODUCTORY TO PART ONE

Part one will sharpen our grasp of some aspects of Paul's inherited Jewish monotheism which are especially pertinent to a study of I Corinthians 8. 4–6. After we have surveyed existing secondary literature on monotheism (chapter two) and delimited our inquiry (chapter three), we shall turn to primary sources in an attempt to come to grips with Jewish monotheism (chapter four) as the basis for understanding Paul's statements on the subject (chapter five). The reconstruction of ancient Jewish monotheism is an integral part of this project. A number of inevitable difficulties attend to such a reconstruction, however, and it may be useful to draw together at the start some methodological observations which otherwise occur only in scattered form throughout the following treatment.

Any use of ancient Jewish writings as historical documents entails some general problems. Only a fraction of the literary output of antiquity has come down to us, and it is hard to establish whether extant Jewish works are representative of the Judaism of the period. A great many of the Jewish books which survive were preserved during the Middle Ages by scribes in Christian monasteries, with the consequence that Jewish writings useful for Christian purposes (e.g. those by Philo, Josephus) were better preserved than others, and also that many Jewish works have suffered Christian interpolations. It can be hard in some cases to classify a given document as belonging to any one of the streams of Judaism (Pharisaism, Essenism and the Qumran community, Alexandrian philosophical Judaism, sundry apocalyptic groups, the rabbinic movement, Jewish Christianity). Related to these factors are the standard critical problems concerning the date, provenance, and authenticity of a document. Moreover, there is the question whether literary sources offer a true picture of the popular Jewish religion of the time. A justification of the sources chosen for our study in the light of these problems may be found in the Additional Note, pp. 227a–227e.

Other problems accompany an attempt at theological reconstruction from ancient Jewish sources. Jewish authors were even less oriented to the systematic exposition of theological concepts than were early Christian writers, and they rarely spelled out their central assumptions or ordered their thoughts according to a hierarchy of importance. Very often their most fundamental tenets were hidden as presuppositions behind the text rather than expressed in the text, especially when Jews wrote for other Jews about matters of domestic concern. Often we are no longer in a position to determine in detail the extent to which a given Jewish idea was commonly held or exceptional, and in our period (c. 200 B.C. to A.D. 100) there was no formal body or magisterium of authorities to decide between orthodoxy and heresy. It is widely accepted that ancient Judaism as a whole placed more emphasis on right action, i.e. performance of the commandments of the Torah, than on subscription to a right belief system, and such confessions as existed played a different role in Judaism from that of the formal creeds in the Christian church (see Ferdinand Dexinger, 'Limits of Tolerance in Judaism: The Samaritan Example'; Lawrence H. Schiffman, 'At the Crossroads: Tannaitic Perspectives on the Jewish-Christian Schism'; and Ephraim E. Urbach, 'Self-Isolation or Self-Affirmation in Judaism in the First Three Centuries: Theory and Practice', all in E.P. Sanders, A.I. Baumgarten, and Alan Mendelson, eds., *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition, Volume Two: Aspects of Judaism in the Graeco-Roman Period* [London: SCM Press, 1981], esp. pp. 111–12, 139–40, 289–90; see also my discussion below on pp. 29–30 and the literature cited in note 2.50).

Nevertheless, 'behind such orthopraxy there is always a significant amount of orthodoxy' (Dexinger, p. 112). Jews from Spain to Mesopotamia were clearly marked in the

eyes of non-Jews by certain common characteristics, including their practice of circumcision, observance of the sabbath, adherence to certain food laws, and insistence on monotheism (E.P. Sanders, 'Jesus and the Law (Revised)', lecture delivered to the New Testament Seminar, The University of Oxford, 26 November, 1987). While most of these characteristics had to do with behaviour, monotheism involved an item of belief as well as the avoidance of idolatrous rites. As we shall see, monotheism came to concrete expression in the daily recitation by every male Jew of the *Shema*: 'Hear, O Israel: the Lord our God, the Lord is one...' (see below, pp. 28–29, 48–49, and the literature cited in notes 2.35 and 2.37–43). 'The belief common to all Jews at the beginning of the first century was that their God was the only God' (Urbach, p. 273; see also my discussion on pp. 29–30). Therefore, keeping in view the obstacles, we may still expect to get meaningful answers to our questions about a common pattern of Jewish monotheistic affirmation which would have been received by Paul.

PART ONE
PAUL'S JEWISH MONOTHEISTIC
PRESUPPOSITIONS

CHAPTER TWO
HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVES ON MONOTHEISM IN AND BEYOND ISRAEL

In part one we shall examine certain aspects of Jewish monotheism which will shed light on Paul's statements in I Cor. 8. 4–6. Our method will be to use Jewish source material to fill in gaps in Paul's theology left because of the laconic and incidental manner of his language about God. First-century Judaism was the environment in which Paul the Pharisee acquired many of his theological presuppositions, presuppositions about which he later said little in his letters, and which we can seek to discover today only by going behind his correspondence to the Jewish sources themselves before returning to look for confirmatory traces of them in Paul. M.D. Hooker has recently pointed out that the distinctive theological emphases expressed by Paul are likely to yield a distorted impression of his total thought unless they are placed in the larger context of the beliefs and tenets of Judaism, of which he considered himself a member.¹ Hence the purpose of part one is to gain insight into the nature of Paul's monotheism indirectly by studying Jewish monotheism.

Part one (chapters two to five) will be organized as follows: the present chapter (two) will summarize existing secondary literature on the subject of Jewish monotheism. Chapter three will pose specific questions about this subject to guide our study of I Cor. 8. 4–6. Chapter four will survey Jewish monotheistic texts in the light of these questions (with special reference to the data in appendix one). Chapter five will mesh the results with the Pauline correspondence.

GENERAL PERSPECTIVES ON MONOTHEISM

Monotheism, the confession and worship of the only God, is usually distinguished from the closely related phenomenon of henotheism (or monolatry: the terms are correlative),

the latter being the confession (henotheism) or worship (monolatry) of only one god (out of many).² It can be difficult in studying some religions to decide whether recognition of a High God which does not exclude beliefs or practices connected with lesser superhuman powers deserves to be classified as monotheistic or as henotheistic. Nevertheless there is widespread agreement that only Judaism and the other two world religions it spawned, Christianity and Islam, are truly monotheistic (some adherents of Judaism and Islam would question whether even Christian trinitarianism can qualify as strict monotheism). Ancient near eastern language addressing a particular mythological deity as the creator of other gods, the greatest god, the only true god, or the only god—language which sounds monotheistic to modern ears—was often only an elative form of monolatrous speech.³ Developments such as the early elevation of Zeus to the head of the Greek pantheon, the subordination of minor deities under Vishnu or Shiva in Hinduism, the syncretistic absorption of a plurality of gods into the figure of Isis in late Hellenism, or similar ideas in Babylonian, Persian and Chinese religions, did not rule out a multiplicity of cults oriented towards secondary or local gods. Perhaps the nearest approach to a pure monotheism on pagan soil was achieved in Egypt in the solar cult of Akhenaten,⁴ but even the sole worship of the Sun-Aten (or of the Pharaoh as his son) contrasted with Israel's devotion to the invisible, transcendent creator.⁵ Judaic monotheism, then, is a reasonably well defined entity in the history of religions, though there remain some problems of definition, as will become clear in chapter three.

According to Jewish tradition, monotheism was the original religion of the human race (Gen. 1. 27–31; 4. 26; 9. 8–17). The legends say that it was lost temporarily by Noah's descendants until rediscovered by Abraham, who passed it on to the Hebrew nation (e.g., *Jubilees*, chapters 11–12). The Roman Catholic anthropologist P.W. Schmidt claimed to have found support for the hypothesis of an *Ur*-monotheism in the fact that some form of belief in a high, supreme God is virtually universal in primitive cultures.⁶ Although Schmidt's work effectively called in question many of the oversimplified nineteenth-century theories of the evolution of monotheism out of a primitive animism or polytheism, his conclusions have failed to gain acceptance among most German and North American scholars.

MONOTHEISM IN ISRAEL

The modern critical reconstruction of the development of Israelite religion is very different from the final form of the tradition as presented in the Bible.⁷ The leading exponents of OT criticism in this century have generally held that Israelite religion at the time of Moses was monolatrous rather than strictly monotheistic, in that it did not deny the theoretical existence of gods other than Yahweh. However, it was monolatrous in the narrow sense, in that Israel was permanently and exclusively bound to Yahweh among the host of deities belonging to the nations. The figure of Yahweh was at times enriched, at times threatened by assimilation of many characteristics of the Canaanite Baals. On this theory, it was not until the Hebrews were forced by the military and political events of the eighth and seventh centuries B.C. to reflect on Yahweh's international significance, that writing prophets such as Amos and Isaiah began to adumbrate a clear 'practical monotheism' which reckoned seriously with the universal sovereignty of Israel's God and tacitly left other gods out of account. Most critics find the first breakthrough of a clear denial of the existence of other gods in II Isaiah, during the period of the exile, though one classic study is notable for its dating of Deuteronomic monotheism already to the late pre-exilic period.⁸ This picture, with its late dating of the emergence of monotheism, has been contested by some (notably by W.F. Albright, according to whom Moses was a monotheist),⁹ but it still holds the field.

The belief in one God who was sovereign over the nations had to be reconciled with Jewish national feeling. It has been suggested that the author of II Isaiah unified these apparently disparate points of view by putting forth the concept of Israel's election by God to be a light to the Gentiles.¹⁰

MONOTHEISTIC TENDENCIES IN GREECE

Parallel to the stream of Israelite religion, and mingling with it in the Hellenistic period, were monotheistic tendencies in Greek culture. This development is less familiar and needs to be illustrated by means of a few texts. It has been maintained that the Greek Zeus was inherited from an Indo-European sky god which was recognized as one and supreme prior to the influence of Greek polytheism.¹¹ Even scholars who consider the hypothesis of a

Minoan monotheism dubious or untenable grant that in Mycenaean religion Zeus was already one of the most important of the gods, if not the head of the pantheon.¹² Belief in the unity of the divine among the Greeks was expressly formulated at least from the time of Xenophanes of Colophon (sixth century B.C.): ‘There is one God (ἓῖς θεός), greatest among gods and men, | Unlike mortals either in shape or in thought.’¹³ The factors which M.P. Nilsson pointed towards to account for the increasing popularity of this conception in later centuries were the fading of vital faith in the traditional gods, the rise of monarchical-imperial government following the conquests of Alexander, and the influx of astrological beliefs from the Orient which imagined God at the apex of the universe.¹⁴ In the Graeco-Roman period, quasi-monotheistic language about God took hold so strongly as to become the common property of both the educated and the lower classes, as we know from the evidence of inscriptions, magical papyri, monuments, and literary sources.¹⁵

In Greece such language had from early days a pantheistic ring. An ancient Orphic fragment demonstrates how closely the Greeks associated the one God with the universe: ‘There is one Zeus (ἓῖς Ζεύς), one Hades, one Sun, one Dionysos, one God (ἓῖς θεός) in everything.’¹⁶ Indeed, for the Greeks the divine was manifest in whatever was singularly beautiful, strong, or extraordinary, and the word θεός could refer equally to a particular superhuman being such as Apollo or Athena, to the plenitude of divine power shared by all the gods regarded as a unified totality, or to concrete human experiences, as, for example, mutual recognition among friends.¹⁷

The demythologized, metaphysical concepts of God taught by the philosophers, especially by Xenophanes, Plato, and Aristotle, were further articulated by the Stoics and Neo-Platonists in a way which tended to identify God and the world. Naturally the search for a ground of being (τὸ ὄν) behind the multiple aspects of visible reality resulted in an emphasis on the unity of the divine (τὸ θεῖον), but there was a corresponding loss of the sense of God’s personality.¹⁸

Worship of the old mythological deities persisted in practice alongside of this theoretical quest for a fundamental unity from the time of the very beginnings of philosophy.¹⁹ The philosopher, because he had no cult of his own, had to be content with the

existing ones, and participated in them while making appropriate redefinitions. Some Stoics, for example, reasoned that each local divinity represented an isolated aspect of the world-Logos: all temples ultimately served the true God.²⁰ There emerged a doctrine of the ‘reciprocity’ (ἀντακολουθία) of the gods, according to which no individual god was complete apart from the others.²¹ By the second century A.D., syncretistic tendencies had long been under way in which the many gods were either allegorized as so many local names for one all-embracing deity, such as Isis, or were regarded as subordinate powers or hypostases through which the mysterious One maintained control over the cosmos.²² Plutarch could speak of ‘the one Reason ordering this world, the one Providence governing it, and the subordinate powers set over all’,²³ and Maximus of Tyre wrote: ‘One sees in the whole world a unanimous rule and teaching: that there is one God, the King and Father of all things, and many gods, God’s sons, God’s viceroys. So says the Greek, so says the barbarian.’²⁴ Pagan confessions of one God (εἷς θεός or μόνος θεός), most of which come from the early Christian centuries, did not indicate a monotheistic faith in the Judeo-Christian sense, but either expressed enthusiastic praise of a god, or recognition of a god’s sovereignty in a certain sphere, or belief in an amalgamation of divine functionaries under a leading figure.²⁵ T.R. Glover aptly summarizes this tendency in pagan religion as ‘a movement toward monotheism—but not the Hebrew’s passion for One God,’²⁶ and R. Bultmann is not far from the truth in observing that ‘the Christian mission first reached those classes in which polytheism was still a living force’.²⁷ This statement of Bultmann is confirmed as far as Paul’s Corinth is concerned by the archaeological note in appendix two.

THE ENCOUNTER OF ISRAELITE MONOTHEISM AND GREEK CULTURE

It is customary to contrast Hebrew monotheism with the Greek speculative search for an ultimate unity behind the universe by pointing out that the Jews learned through historical experience to know God as personal and as standing in a religious-ethical relationship to man, while the Greeks rose via theoretical reflection to an aesthetic-mystical vision of the divine.²⁸ When these two traditions came into direct contact in the Hellenistic period, the Jewish conception of God absorbed elements from the Greek without sacrificing its most

characteristic features. There were a few broad-minded apologists for Judaism (notably Pseudo-Aristeas and Aristobulus) who were willing to join in the theocracy of the day by identifying their God with Zeus, but by far the majority of the Jews adopted a negative, separationist attitude towards pagan religion.²⁹ The modifications of Jewish monotheism which Y. Amir has been able to identify were the following: the belief in one God took on a cosmological aspect through its connection with the doctrine of creation, though it remained essentially within the historical mode of Hebrew thought; the anthropomorphisms of the Bible became an embarrassment; Philo allowed philosophy to intrude by making God's oneness imply simplicity of nature; and Josephus used monotheism to address a problem of Greek political philosophy by offering the concept of theocracy as the ideal commonwealth.³⁰

It was at this time, when the Jewish Diaspora encountered a polytheistic environment ripe for moral and spiritual reform, that the Jews began to undertake in earnest their mission to the Gentiles,³¹ with its propaganda sounding a clarion call to belief in the one God of creation.³² A collection of starkly monotheistic 'oracles' attributed to the revered Greek sibyl sprang into existence, and the writings of certain Greek poets—among them Aeschylus, Sophocles, Orpheus and Homer—suffered interpolations by Jewish (perhaps, in some cases, later Christian) hands, proving that these pagans had attained to belief in one God or kept the Jewish sabbath.³³ Many proselytes were won, but at a price: the intensive anti-polytheistic propaganda may have been one of the factors which contributed to a drop in Jewish popularity, even creating hostility towards the Jews on the part of some pagans between about 200 B.C. and A.D. 150.³⁴

Two passages of scripture were brought to the fore in the campaign against polytheism and idolatry.³⁵ The first commandment of the Decalogue, 'You shall have no other gods except me (LXX πλὴν ἐμοῦ)' (Ex. 20. 3), had been 'the commandment *par excellence*' since ancient times.³⁶ Many modern interpreters suppose that it was originally a summons to monolatrous devotion to Yahweh, but by the time of the rabbis it surely had unambiguously monotheistic overtones.

The other passage was the opening words of the *Shema*: ‘Hear, O Israel! The Lord our God, the Lord is one.’³⁷ The Mishnah required that the *Shema*, consisting of all of Deut. 6. 4–6 together with two other passages (Deut. 11. 13–21 and Num. 15. 37–41), be recited twice a day by every male Israelite, and already in the days of the Second Temple it formed part of the priestly sacrificial liturgy (*Mishnah Tamid* 4. 3; 5. 1). How early this declaration came to be the central creed of Judaism is uncertain. Some contemporary scholars are cautious and do not date it much before the fall of Jerusalem to Rome,³⁸ but older scholars were quite confident in dating its liturgical use well back into the Second Temple period or earlier,³⁹ and there is some evidence in their support.⁴⁰ If Deut. 6. 4 circulated independently before finding its place in its present framework, it could be understood, like the first commandment, as originally henotheistic. But taken in connection with its context (esp. Deut. 4. 35, 39; 32. 39), there can be no doubt about its monotheistic tenor, at least in the mind of the final editor. By the time the Gospel of Mark was written the opening phrases of the *Shema* had come to stand alone as a Jewish confession of a particular worldview and were no longer just a preamble to the love-command (Mk. 12. 32).⁴¹ The essential content of this confession could be summarized in abbreviated formulae such as εἰς θεός or μόνος θεός.⁴² In the encounter with Hellenistic religions this confession was understood as an affirmation of the arithmetical oneness of God over against polytheism, and of God’s qualitative uniqueness vis-à-vis the world.⁴³ There is general agreement among scholars that the *Shema* (in the narrow sense—Deut. 6. 4) functioned as the nearest thing in rabbinic Judaism to a creed and represented the quintessence of Jewish faith in God.⁴⁴

In his classic inquiry into the causes of the persecution of the Jews under Antiochus Epiphanes, E. Bickerman has interpreted the Maccabean war as a struggle between two Jewish factions: the liberals who were willing to assimilate their religion to its pagan environment, and the strict monotheists who resisted all compromise.⁴⁵ The victory of the latter party was followed by a hardening of attitudes and a concentration on the Torah by the Hasids and their heirs, the Pharisees, from the mid-second century B.C. to the time of the Tannaim.⁴⁶ Though a host of critical obstacles bewitches any attempt to trace in detail the history of Jewish theology through this period,⁴⁷ it seems that what was emerging as

normative Jewish monotheism may have been more and more closely defined as the religious leaders were forced to confront a variety of interpretations of monotheism both within and beyond Jewish bounds. Philo and other Alexandrian Jews, the Christian sect, and a number of apocalyptic and mystical circles all produced ideas about divine hypostases, angelic mediators, or exalted human figures which seemed to the rabbis to infringe upon the oneness of God. What can be known with some certainty is that by the second century A.D. the sages were polemicizing against Christians and perhaps against (other) intra-Jewish groups, calling them *minim* (heretics) who believed in ‘two powers’ in heaven. Into the Amoraic period this category continued to be used to defend Judaism against Gnosticism and pagan polytheism as well.⁴⁸

During the first few centuries of the Common Era monotheistic formulae were used in popular Jewish inscriptions, sometimes for an apotropaic, and therefore magical, purpose.⁴⁹

THE PLACE OF MONOTHEISM IN JUDAISM

Through this whole historical development, the belief in one God came into prominence as a cardinal doctrine of Judaism, the basis of Jewish faith and practice. Questions have been raised by some scholars about the validity of speaking of a Jewish *orthodoxy* (rather than an *orthopraxy*) or of supposing that pre-mishnaic Judaism, with its multiplicity of sects and opinions, had any unifying centre.⁵⁰ Still, the variety of interpretations to which the phrase ‘one God’ was subject was not an infinite variety, nor did the different views lack a common substratum which distinguished all monotheistic professions from pagan beliefs. At least one sociologist has found a correlation between the confession of the one God and the well defined boundaries of the Hellenistic Jewish community.⁵¹ Modern Jewish authors consider monotheism ‘the central dogma’, ‘the watchword’, ‘the basic doctrine’, ‘the chief teaching’, ‘the supreme creed’ of Judaism.⁵² To the extent that the Jewish religion was articulated theologically, ‘when once the great doctrine of monotheism emerged in Israel, all other beliefs ... were destined sooner or later to be brought into unison with it’.⁵³ Even if from monotheism outwards Judaism becomes

primarily an orthopraxy (or a congeries of orthopraxies), probably at the point of monotheism we speak with justification of a basis of Judaism.

CHAPTER THREE

SPECIAL QUESTIONS ABOUT JEWISH MONOTHEISM

The purpose of the present chapter is to define the specific questions about Jewish monotheism which will guide our investigation in the chapter which follows.

Nine questions need to be raised about Jewish monotheism in relation to I Cor. 8. 4–6.

1. In what forms of speech did Jewish monotheism come to expression explicitly?
2. In particular, does the evidence of Jewish sources bear out the widespread view that εἰς θεός and εἰς κύριος were standard monotheistic formulae?
3. Does the evidence confirm the judgment that monotheism was regarded by the Jews as a central tenet?
4. Does the literary evidence suggest that monotheistic confessions had any definite function or functions in Jewish life?
5. What definition of monotheism best accords with the primary data?
6. With what other theological concepts was the belief in one God most nearly associated in the Jewish mind? To phrase this question another way: was there a constellation of concepts which was characteristic of monotheism?
7. In particular, was there any special relation between the language of monotheism and the cluster of prepositions (ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα, εἰς αὐτόν, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα, δι' αὐτόν) adapted from Hellenistic cosmology?
8. Given the fact that the language of divinity in general could be applied by professing monotheistic Jews to beings other than the one God, such as intermediaries or human beings, does the same hold true for specifically monotheistic language?
9. Did Jewish language about God carry any ontological overtones in the time of Paul?

It may help to clarify the following study if we expand a bit on each of these questions.

I. FORMS OF MONOTHEISTIC SPEECH

To place our study of Jewish monotheism on an objective basis we need to define at the outset those forms of speech which are to be regarded as monotheistic. There is no way of guessing in advance how the ancient Jews formulated their monotheism apart from reading the sentences they wrote. Hence our first task will be to survey a broad selection of ancient Jewish literature with an eye for statements which express or imply the belief that God is numerically singular or qualitatively unique. To aid scientific analysis a restrictive criterion for monotheistic language is more satisfying than a broad one having blurry edges. In the first instance, we shall be looking for simple words or phrases which clearly and indisputably state something about God's oneness. Divine titles, such as 'Most High' or 'Ruler of the World', which probably had a monotheistic force in the hands of Jewish writers, do not intrinsically require a monotheistic interpretation and will be overlooked in this study.¹ On the other hand, no definition of monotheism will be presupposed as a criterion for excluding certain classes of passages. For example, if a phrase which clearly speaks of the singularity or the uniqueness of God stands adjacent to another phrase which speaks of many gods, the whole text must be included as a monotheistic passage. Only in this way can our definition of monotheism, as well as the answers to all our other questions, be placed on a firmly inductive basis.

Once we have identified the Jewish forms of speech in which belief in one God came to expression, we can survey the literature again with a view to generating a list of monotheistic passages which will serve as the data base for the following study.

This list forms the basic contents of Appendix One.

II. THE ΕΙΣ ΘΕΟΣ/ΚΥΡΙΟΣ FORMULA

It is now customary in books and articles for scholars to call the phrases εἰς θεός and εἰς κύριος in I Cor. 8. 6 examples of a Jewish monotheistic 'formula' with εἰς.² Often a few texts are cited, but usually not enough of them are given to justify speaking of a formula. Sometimes there is a reference to E. Peterson's classic study *ΕΙΣ ΘΕΟΣ, Epigraphische, formgeschichtliche und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen* (1926). But the

overwhelming majority of Peterson's inscriptions are Christian, not Jewish, dating from the second to the sixth centuries of the Common Era, and his half-dozen or so Jewish examples are also late. There remains a need to expose such evidence as may exist that already in pre-Christian Judaism a monotheistic formula with $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ was current.

III. THE PRIMACY OF MONOTHEISM FOR JUDAISM

If monotheism was as fundamental for the faith of ancient Jews as has been claimed in secondary literature, we might expect the data to confirm this fact. Monotheistic statements should then be found distributed frequently and pervasively throughout the literature produced by Jewish writers. Moreover, we might hope to encounter at least a few direct statements by Jewish authors to the effect that monotheism was their basic tenet. Should these expectations not be realized, it will behove us to soften our claims about the importance of monotheism for Judaism (and hence for Paul).

IV. FUNCTIONS OF MONOTHEISTIC STATEMENTS

At least three suggestions have been made by scholars about how statements of monotheism might have functioned.

1. Interpreted as confessions of faith, statements that God is one might serve to define the belief of the Jewish community over against the polytheistic beliefs of other peoples. This use of monotheistic confessions has been highlighted, e.g., in the chapter on Jewish confessions of faith in V.H. Neufeld, *The Earliest Christian Confessions*, pp. 38–41.

2. When addressed to God in prayer or in hymns, confessions of the unity of God may have had a doxological intent. G. Delling brings out this devotional function of monotheistic speech in his brief essay 'ΜΟΝΟΣ ΘΕΟΣ', pp. 397, 399–400.

3. One specific form of ancient prayer which has caught the attention of biblical scholars in this century is the acclamation. In his book *ΕΙΣ ΘΕΟΣ*, E. Peterson defines an acclamation as a spontaneous cry of the worshipping community in response to what the community perceives as a numinous manifestation of the deity (pp. 141–45). Thus the characteristics which distinguish the acclamation from other forms of prayer are its choral

nature and the fact that it arises suddenly out of a particular group experience. A number of scholars suppose that the Jewish confession $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ began as an acclamation.

If it can be ascertained that one or another of these functions of monotheistic language predominates in Jewish books from the time of Paul, we shall have a clue as to what connotations Paul intended to communicate to his Corinthian readers when he wrote I Cor. 8. 6.

V. THE DEFINITION OF MONOTHEISM

The definition of monotheism generally accepted in current scholarship is: the denial of the existence of all gods but one.³

The minority definition which is in competition with the first is: belief in the qualitative uniqueness of one God and the worship of him alone, without, however, necessarily negating the existence of lesser superhuman beings which might also be called gods. W.F. Albright defined monotheism as ‘the belief in one God’. This does not ‘exclude the coexistence of other spiritual or superhuman powers in the world, as long as these entities are in no way comparable with God in his essential qualities, such as power and goodness’.⁴

According to the accepted definition, Paul could not be classified as a monotheist, for in II Cor. 4. 4 he refers to a lesser being (Satan) as ‘the god ($\acute{o}\ \theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$) of this age’. Moreover, as the detailed exegesis of our passage will show, in I Cor. 8. 5 he concedes the real existence of many gods and lords.

What needs to be determined is whether Paul differs in this respect from the Judaism out of which he came. Did Jewish writers who affirmed the oneness of God consistently deny the existence of all other superhuman beings and refuse to use the term $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ for any but the one God? If so, then Paul must be classified as a henotheist who believed in one High God. If not, we shall have to reckon seriously with the possibility that the accepted definition of monotheism is historically unsound and illegitimately excludes Paul from the company of the ancient Jewish monotheists.

In order to insure that our definition of monotheism is derived inductively, we shall pay special attention to the cosmological beliefs and religious practices reflected in those Jewish documents which contain statements that God is one.

VI. THE ASSOCIATIONS OF MONOTHEISM

The statements ‘there is no God but one’ and ‘there is one God’ in I Cor. 8. 4, 6 are, of course, monotheistic. These confessions are embedded in a context of associated words and phrases. There is an anti-idolatry slogan in v 4. There is a contrast between polytheism and the belief in one God/Lord in vv 5–6. In v 6 the confessions are joined syntactically to relative clauses which further define the relations between the one God/Lord and the world. Are these contextual words and phrases to be regarded as additions or appendages to monotheistic confessions, brought together here in a combination peculiar to I Cor. 8. 4–6? Or are some of them so frequently and characteristically associated with monotheistic statements in Jewish contexts that they, together with the confessions, can be said to form a matrix of extended monotheistic language? This question concerns the scope of the language in I Cor. 8. 4–6 which may be appropriately classified as monotheistic.

In order to answer this question we must focus on words and concepts which are contextually associated in Jewish sources with statements that God is one.

It will be helpful to use a technical term to designate what has been referred to as a constellation of associated concepts or a context of words and phrases. Fortunately some terms have been coined by researchers in the fields of Linguistics and Cognitive Science for exactly this psycho-linguistic phenomenon. A brief review of current developments in this area will help both to suggest appropriate terms and further to sharpen the methodological concept itself.

Word association and idea association have long been of keen interest to philosophers and psychologists. Since the rise of experimental psychology in the last century, many experiments have sought insight into this feature of the human mind.⁵ One of the enduring results of this research is the distinction between *paradigmatic* relations among words (the grouping of words in the mind according to classes, such as grammatical parts of speech),

and *syntagmatic* relations, which concern words in linear sequence.⁶ In the 1950s the Oxford linguist J.R. Firth, who is credited with having given a decisive stimulus to the study of linguistics in Britain, noticed a peculiar kind of syntagmatic relationship among words to which he gave the name *collocation*.⁷ What he observed was the way in which certain combinations of words become natural and expected through habitual co-occurrence. The example he gave was the collocation of ‘dark’ with ‘night’, but an even more striking example given by some recent writers is the affinity of ‘indelible’ for ‘ink’.⁸ Although a logical relationship might demand the habitual association of some words (such as ‘bite’ with ‘teeth’),⁹ habit alone seems to explain why we prefer to describe ink as ‘indelible’ rather than ‘permanent’ or ‘non-erasable’. Collocation is not mere juxtaposition, for the associated elements mutually expect one another and constitute a higher unity. Yet a collocation is not a fixed series of words such as an idiom or a compound, for its elements have independent meanings and can be used separately in other contexts.¹⁰ A collocation may be defined as the ‘habitual association of words, the characteristic company they keep’, due to the fact that the brain stores not only individual words, but also ‘whole chunks’, ‘coded units’, holistically.¹¹ One of the distinctive contributions of the Firthian school to the whole field of semantics is the recognition that collocations form an integral aspect of meaning. ‘A collocation is a composite structural element in its own right.’¹²

The fact that other models originating in basic linguistics have been successfully applied at the higher level of discourse analysis encourages an application of the concept of collocations at higher levels too.¹³ The constellation of associated concepts we shall try to identify for Jewish monotheism may be expected to share several features of lexical collocations of words. These concepts must be syntagmatically rather than paradigmatically related (mentioned together in linear pieces of text rather than ideally associated in classes of theological concepts). In some cases they may be linked logically, but in other cases the characteristic association may be established primarily by simple co-occurrence. As with collocations, the elements of a Jewish monotheistic concept-cluster when taken together may be expected to constitute a structural whole which can be treated as a locus of meaning in its own right, even if the constituent concepts can exist as theologically meaningful units in

independent contexts. Thus the model of word collocation can help us to describe three characteristics of the concept-cluster which we shall try to discover. Nevertheless the term *collocation* as generally used has to do with words, not whole concepts, and so is unsuitable for our purpose.

Cognitive psychologists since Bartlett and Piaget have used the term *schema* to designate a mental network of associated bits of knowledge into which fresh items of information are integrated in the learning process.¹⁴ As computer scientists, linguists and anthropologists join with psychologists in the new interdisciplinary field of Cognitive Science, the word *schema* is taking on broader connotations. It is becoming clear that some schemata are culturally shared and therefore transcend individual knowledge structures.¹⁵ An example might be the schema which underlies commercial transactions in modern Britain, having the variables *buyer, seller, money, goods, and exchange*.¹⁶ A related term, *frame*, refers to the linguistic forms in which a schema or a part of one is brought to expression. The frame for the commercial schema, for example, would include a special group of words (including ‘cash’, ‘credit’, ‘product’, ‘sale’, ‘discount’, ‘store’, etc.) as well as phrases of a higher order (such as ‘Will that be everything?’) which highlight parts of the schema and are held together in the mind. The usage of the terms *schema* and *frame* in Cognitive Science has not yet become standardized, but in general a *schema* refers to a structural framework of knowledge at any level of complexity ‘from simple stimulus-response sequences to highly complex hierarchic organizations’.¹⁷ A *frame* refers to a corresponding pattern of language. This suggests that the schema/frame terminology is what we need to denote a constellation of concepts associated with Jewish statements of belief in one God.

One curious feature of a schema/frame is that all the constituent elements need not be present in order to activate the whole schema in the mind. Mention of a beak activates the schema of a bird; conversely, a face lacking a nose will still be recognizable as a face.¹⁸ A part is meaningful by virtue of its relation to the whole, and mention of a part can evoke the entire schema. On the other hand, the schema is presupposed and understood even behind an incomplete assemblage of its parts.

We noted in passing that schemata/frames can have social status. Language is essentially social in nature, and as the knowledge of a social group expands over time, fresh elements are integrated into schemata and frames in the collective consciousness. When a schema has come to maturity in this socio-historical process, each new generation will apprehend the schema as a cohesive whole without recapitulating the earlier stages of its development.¹⁹

The schema/frame model provides a broad cognitive perspective within which to place the narrower linguistic phenomenon of collocations. ‘Collocations are meaning schemata.’²⁰ Hence what was said above about the characteristics of collocations will apply to at least some schemata as well. From the study of schemata/frames in general we derive the following stipulations for the schema/frame of ancient Jewish monotheism.

1. The Jewish monotheism schema, if it existed, would have manifested itself linguistically in a frame consisting of words, concepts and contexts habitually associated with explicit monotheistic language.

2. Such a frame will lie in discourse related syntagmatically to statements of monotheism. We are not concerned with logical or paradigmatic relations of the concept of one God which can only be explored theologically. There may or may not be a necessary logical link between the concept of one God and the other elements of a monotheism schema.

3. The various concepts in a monotheism schema may have independent significance when isolated but will constitute a cohesive body of meaning when associated.

4. A given text might contain only one, two or three of the concepts which comprise a complex monotheistic frame. The total frame can be determined only by examining a large selection of texts together.

5. It must be demonstrable that a monotheistic frame was socially shared by a large number of Jewish authors. We are not interested in idiosyncratic associations.

Our stipulations for determining the frame of Jewish monotheism arise from the general study of schemata in Cognitive Science and will be applied *a priori* in our analysis of Jewish monotheistic discourse. It is not assumed that Judaism had a monotheism schema. If there is not an identifiable group of concepts which were repeatedly and habitually associated

with statements of monotheism according to the constraints just listed, then the data will belie any expectation of discovering a monotheism schema. We shall seek to determine whether Judaism at the time of Paul had such a monotheism schema and, if so, what constituent concepts made it up. Our method for getting at this schema will be to search for a linguistic frame in which the schema discloses itself.

Either way, the result will illuminate I Cor. 8. 4–6.

VII. THE HELLENISTIC PREPOSITIONAL DEVICE

Also related to the scope of monotheistic language in I Cor. 8. 4–6 is the question whether it was typical to speak of God's relations to the world using a series of prepositional phrases, as Paul does in 8. 6. This question, like the former, concerns language associated with Jewish statements of belief in one God, but it narrows the focus to prepositions used as a stylistic device.

From the time of E. Norden until recently it has been a standard conclusion of NT scholarship that behind I Cor. 8. 6 and a number of other NT passages (Rom. 11. 36; Col. 1. 16–17; Eph. 4. 5–6; Heb. 2. 10) stood a Stoic prepositional formula. Originally it expressed the pantheistic conception of a divine unity permeating all things, as it does in Marcus Aurelius, *Ad se ipsum* IV, 23: ὃ φύσις ἐκ σοῦ πάντα ἐν σοὶ πάντα εἰς σὲ πάντα. This formula, it is supposed, was adapted by Hellenistic Judaism to be a vehicle for its own belief in God and was thereby transmitted to the NT writers.²¹

Of late, J. Murphy-O'Connor has questioned the fitness of the Stoic parallels.²² Others have highlighted a similar philosophical motif which offers a closer parallel. It is the cluster of prepositional phrases used in the Platonic tradition to analyse the various causes or primal principles of the universe. This motif consisted of a group of prepositions, fluid from author to author and from passage to passage, which designated the efficient cause, the instrumental cause, the final cause, etc., of the world. Philo uses prepositions in this way when he speculates about the relation between Sophia/Logos and the world. The device could have been passed on to Paul through Hellenistic Judaism. It provides a striking background for Paul's use of ἐκ, διὰ, and εἰς in I Cor. 8. 6.²³

Whether we choose to look to Stoic pantheism or to Platonic speculation about the *archai* as the most informative linguistic backdrop for our passage, there can be no doubt that there was a tendency in Hellenistic literature to play with prepositions when making cosmological statements.²⁴ Since no two examples are alike, perhaps it is best to speak of a ‘stylistic device’ rather than a ‘formula’.

For our purpose what needs to be determined is whether in Jewish literature this prepositional device was frequently connected with statements of monotheism. Was it characteristic of monotheistic language? The answer to this question will affect our interpretation of I Cor. 8. 6.

VIII. JEWISH INTERMEDIARIES AND MONOTHEISTIC LANGUAGE

By putting the latter two questions to the Jewish sources we hope to learn something about the sense of monotheistic language. Our next question concerns the reference of this language. It asks whether the language of monotheism was applied by Jewish authors to beings which were not strictly to be identified with the one God. The answer to this question will shed light on Paul’s statement about the Lord Jesus Christ in I Cor. 8. 6.

Christian scholars have long been interested in Jewish beliefs about intermediaries because of their possible formative role in the development of the christology of the early church. By ‘intermediary’ is meant here any instrumentality by which the divine immanence in the world was thought to be realized.²⁵ This includes exalted human beings (e.g., Enoch, Moses), angelic figures (e.g., Michael, Metatron), hypostatized divine attributes (e.g., Wisdom), and modes of the divine activity (e.g., the Word/Logos of God, the Spirit of God, the Shekinah). Second Temple Judaism had a host of such figures.²⁶ One modern study suggests that despite their number, intermediaries may have been less important for ancient Jewish religion than previous generations of scholars thought.²⁷ The most recent discussions centre round two issues: whether the emergence of these figures in Jewish faith threatened monotheism,²⁸ and whether the growing belief in an exalted being in the heavens, angelic or human, could have influenced NT christology.²⁹

It is agreed on all sides, however, that some Jewish authors used the language of divinity for some intermediaries, at least to a limited extent: beings other than the one God might share divine titles or functions.³⁰ M. Casey observes that the transfer of divine titles and functions to intermediaries in Judaism was limited.³¹ It is hard to find an example, other than the Son of Man, Philo's Logos, or personified wisdom in the *Wisdom of Solomon*, where multiple divine titles or functions were ascribed to a single intermediary. The exact nuance which such language had in the minds of the original authors is no longer recoverable—which makes this debating ground for scholars today—but the fact that the language of divinity could be used in this way is indisputable.

No one has yet inquired whether monotheistic statements, forming as they do a narrow sub-category of the language of divinity, could be transferred to intermediaries with even the restricted freedom that individual divine titles and functions were. The degree of tightness with which Jewish monotheistic language was bound to the concept of the one God as distinguished from intermediaries would have been an important presupposition which Paul carried into the writing of I Cor. 8. 6.

IX. JEWISH MONOTHEISM AND ONTOLOGY

In I Cor. 8. 4–6 Paul clearly does not speak of God in metaphysical terms. Instead he uses traditional titles (Father, Lord) and dynamic phraseology (the prepositional phrases) to describe both the one God and the one Lord in relation to the world. But the fact that explicit metaphysical terms are not used in a given statement about God does not in itself count as evidence that ontological presuppositions were absent from the mind of the writer. Paul's other theological pronouncements need to be considered as well, seen in the wider context of the milieu in which he lived.

When Paul wrote of one God, was he thinking of a person who was unique in respect of his powers, functions and works? Or did he have in mind a being possessed of a nature or essence which was qualitatively different from all that could not be called the one God? Paul's basic belief in the uniqueness of God is not affected by the answer to this question, but for precision of understanding it is necessary that we raise it.

During the existentialist phase of New Testament studies in the middle of this century, many scholars adopted the view that there was a gulf between Greek thought, with its theoretical interest in static being, and Hebrew-biblical thought, which stressed existential involvement with reality, regarded as process, event or history.³² This contrast is now commonplace. One can speak of ‘the general tendency of semitic thought to follow more functional than speculative lines’.³³ Indeed, the question has been raised whether the Hebrews had the concept of being.³⁴ In the ancient Near East, ‘the deity was by definition “He who *does* x”’.³⁵ The OT God has been called a ‘dynamically active Deity’ in contrast to the ‘static Absolute of much Graeco-European philosophy’.³⁶

But however valid such generalizations may be for pre-exilic Israel, it has recently been emphasized afresh that the Jews of the Hellenistic period absorbed some aspects of theological thought from the Greeks.³⁷ This was true not only in the Diaspora, but also in Palestine itself.³⁸

In the course of our survey of the Jewish sources, we shall lift out a few passages which will help to answer the question whether the Hellenization of Jewish thought affected monotheism. The answer to this question will in turn provide a context for assessing the likelihood that Paul’s God-language could have concealed metaphysical presuppositions. This will sharpen our understanding of I Cor. 8. 4–6.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE NATURE AND USE OF ANCIENT JEWISH MONOTHEISTIC LANGUAGE

Our study of Jewish monotheism in this chapter will involve an analysis of theological language in Jewish literature from the second century B.C. to the end of the first century A.D. It will seek to answer the nine questions posed in the last chapter with a view to illuminating I Cor. 8. 4–6, without supposing that the information generated by those questions gives an adequate picture of Jewish monotheism as a whole. There will be no attempt to give a diachronic account of the changes and fluctuations in Jewish monotheism during these centuries, nor shall we pay close attention to individual differences from author to author. We shall focus on structural patterns and commonalities in monotheistic belief which were socially shared by all or most Jewish authors of the period and which we may expect to have been shared by Paul.

Appendix one designates the writings on which this study is based, and offers a list of some two hundred monotheistic texts which serve as the primary body of data for many of the conclusions reached here. For the convenience of the reader, references to passages in the appendix will be given both by chapter and verse, and by numbers keyed to the list there.

I. FORMS OF JEWISH MONOTHEISTIC SPEECH

Ten forms of explicit monotheistic speech may be identified in Jewish documents from our period. Statements which in themselves are henotheistic may be treated as monotheistic when they occur in documents containing clearly monotheistic language elsewhere.

A. Phrases which link a divine title with the adjective ‘one’, ‘only’, ‘sole’, ‘alone’, etc. Examples: ‘The Lord our God, the Lord is *one*’ (Deut. 6. 4 [number 6]). ‘Lord God of Israel, who sit upon the cherubin, you are the *only* God’ (II Kings 19. 15 [number 15]). ‘All submit themselves to my *sole* rule and work my *sole* dominion’ (*II En.* (A) 33. 7 [number 72]). ‘You *alone* are the Most High over all the earth’ (Psa. 83. 18 [number 18]).

B. Statements describing God as ‘monarch’. Example: ‘There is one God, *sole ruler* (μόναρχος)’ (*Sib. Or.* III, 11 [number 77]).

C. Phrases which link a divine title with the adjective ‘living’ or ‘true’. Such phrases imply either that other gods are non-existent, or that they are qualitatively incapable of comparison with the one God. Examples: ‘I do not revere man-made idols, but the *living* God, who created heaven and earth’ (*Bel and the Dragon* 5 [number 60]). ‘The LORD is the *true* God, he is the *living* God and the everlasting King’ (Jer. 10. 10 [number 33]).

D. The positive confessional formula ‘Yahweh is God’, or ‘He is God’. This formula in many contexts gives to the simple title ‘God’ an absolute sense tantamount to ‘true God’. Examples: ‘Truly *the Lord is God, he is God* (I Kings 18. 39 [number 14]). ‘*I am the Lord God, and there is no God else except me*’ (Isa. 45. 5 [number 26]).

E. Explicit denials of the existence of other Gods besides the God of Israel. Example: ‘*Except me there is no God ... You are witnesses, whether there is a God except me*’ (Isa. 44. 6, 8 [number 24]).

F. Statements to the effect that the glory of God is not transferable. Examples: ‘I am the Lord God, that is my name. *I shall not give my glory to another, nor my excellences to carved things*’ (Isa. 42. 8 [number 22]). ‘[Idolaters] bestowed on objects of stone or wood *the name that ought not to be shared*’ (*Wisd. Sol.* 14. 21 [number 53]).

G. Statements that God has no rival or opposition which can impede his will. These statements imply that the will of the one God is the decisive force in history. Example: ‘Thou art Lord of all, and *there is no one who can resist thee, who art the Lord*’ (*Additions to Esther* 13. 11 [number 46]).

H. Phrases which express the incomparability of God. Such language emphasizes God’s absolute uniqueness. Examples: ‘*For what god is there in heaven or on earth, who will do as you have done, according to your strength?*’ (Deut. 3. 24 [number 4]). ‘O God of Israel, *who is like thee in heaven or on earth? Who accomplishes deeds and mighty works like Thine?*’ (1QM 10. 8–9 [number 140]).

I. Passages of scripture which are known to have been used by Jews to express their monotheism, even if on a strict interpretation the wording does not demand this meaning: the First Commandment and the *Shema*.

J. Passages which restrict worship to the God of Israel, when they are found in documents which elsewhere give evidence that their authors (or final editors) were monotheists and not only monolaters. Example: ‘Urge on your minds in your breasts and shun unlawful worship. *Worship the Living One*’ (*Sib. Or.* III, 762–3 [number 84]; compare the passage from *Sib. Or.* III quoted above under B).

These ten forms of monotheistic speech occur interchangeably in the literature. This can be best seen in passages where two or more such forms of speech are used in close proximity with no apparent change in fundamental meaning.

We find one-God phrases juxtaposed with the title monarch (*Sib. Or.* III, 11–12 [number 77]), with true-God phrases (II Kings 19. 15–19; *Sib. Or.*, frag. 1, 7–11, 15–22; *II Baruch* 21. 7–10; *Let. Arist.* 132, 134–35, 139–40; 4QDibHam 5. 6–9 [numbers 15, 89–90, 96, 113, 151]), with absolute predications of divinity (Isa. 44. 24–26; Dan. 2. 47; *Song of the Three Young Men* 20–22 [numbers 25, 34, 59]), with denials of other Gods (Deut. 32. 12; Isa. 44. 24–26; *Sir.* 18. 1–5; *II En.* (A) 33. 3–8; *Sib. Or.* III, 628–31; III, 757–61; Pseudo-Orpheus, fragment, 7–16, 32–41; 1QH 10. 8–12; Philo, *Leg. all.* II, 1–2; Mark 12. 28–32; I Cor. 8. 4–6 [numbers 9, 25, 55, 72, 80, 83, 131, 145, 154, 179, 187]), with a denial of rivals (*II En.* (A) 33. 3–8 [number 72]), with incomparability phrases (1QH 10. 8–12; Philo, *Leg. all.* II, 1–2; *Confus. ling.* 170 [numbers 145, 154–55]), with the *Shema* (Mark 12. 28–32 [number 179]), and with monolatrous language (Pseudo-Philo, *Bibl. Antiq.* 6. 4; Philo, *Decal.* 64–65; Josephus, *Antiq.* III, 91 [numbers 124, 157, 171]).

We find true-God phrases juxtaposed with absolute predications of divinity (Deut. 4. 32–40; *Lives of the Prophets* 21. 8 [numbers 5, 126]), with a denial of other Gods (Deut. 4. 32–40 [number 5]), with incomparability phrases (Jer. 10. 6–12 [number 33]), and with monolatrous language (Pseudo-Diphilus/Menander, fragment [number 138]).

We find absolute predications of divinity juxtaposed with denials of others Gods (Deut. 4. 32–40; 32. 37–39; I Kings 8. 59–60; Isa. 43. 10–13; 44. 24–26; 45. 4–7, 14–15, 18,

21–24; 46. 9–11; *Judith* 9. 14; *Test. Abr.* (A) 8. 7; *Asc. Isa.* 4. 6–8 [numbers 5, 10, 13, 23, 25–30, 44, 110, 120]), with a statement of the non-transferability of God’s glory (*Isa.* 42. 5–9 [number 22]), and with denials of rivals (*Deut.* 32. 37–39; *Isa.* 43. 10–13; *Sib. Or.* V, 172–76 [numbers 10, 23, 86]).

We find denials of other Gods juxtaposed with denials of rivals (*Wisd. Sol.* 12. 12–14; *II En.* (A) 33. 3–8 [numbers 51, 72]), with incomparability phrases (*II Sam.* 7. 21–22; *Isa.* 44. 6–8 [numbers 12, 24]), and with monolatrous language (*Hos.* 13. 4 [number 36]).

We find a denial of rivals juxtaposed with incomparability phrases (*1QH* 7. 28–29 [number 142]).

In not a few passages we find at least three such forms of speech together in a cluster (*Deut.* 4. 32–40; 32. 37–39; *Isa.* 43. 10–13; 44. 24–26; *II En.* (A) 33. 3–8; *1QH* 10. 8–12; *4QDibHam* 5. 6–9; Philo, *Leg. all.* II, 1–2 [numbers 5, 10, 23, 25, 72, 145, 151, 154]).

Thus each of the ten forms of monotheistic speech occurs together with at least one other form, and most of them with several. This interchangeability shows that these various forms of speech were all associated in the minds of the Jewish writers who used them.

II. THE ΕΙΣ ΘΕΟΣ/ΚΥΡΙΟΣ FORMULA

Phrases which link εἰς or μόνος with θεός or κύριος occur in the literature with a high frequency. Focusing on the one hundred and forty-nine passages from Greek sources alone, we find a conjunction of εἰς with θεός (*Sib. Or.* III, 11–12; IV, 27–32; V, 284–85; frag. 1, 7–11, 32–34; frag. 3, 3–6; Pseudo-Phocylides, 54; Pseudo-Pythagoras, fragment; Pseudo-Sophocles, fragment; Philo, *Opif. mundi*, 170–72; *Leg. all.* II, 1–2; *Decal.* 64–65; *Spec. leg.* I, 30; *Leg. ad Gaium* 115; Josephus, *Cont. Ap.* II, 190–93; *Antiq.* I, 155; III, 91; IV, 200–1; V, 111–12; *Matt.* 19. 17 (par.); *Mark* 2. 7; *John* 8. 41; *Rom.* 3. 29–30; *I Cor.* 8. 4–6; *Gal.* 3. 20; *Eph.* 4. 4–6; *I Tim.* 2. 3–6; *James* 2. 19 [numbers 77, 85, 87, 89, 91–2, 127, 135–6, 153–4, 157, 160, 165, 168–9, 171–3, 175, 178, 181, 184, 187, 189–90, 193, 196]) or a conjunction of εἰς with κύριος (*Deut.* 6. 4–6; *Zech.* 14. 9; *Mark* 12. 28–32; *I Cor.* 8. 4–6; *Eph.* 4. 4–6 [numbers 6, 37, 179, 187, 190]) in a total of thirty-one passages.

We find a conjunction of *μόνος* with *θεός* (*Song of the Three Young Men* 20–22; *II Maccabees* 7. 37; *Sib. Or.* III, 571–72, 628–31, 757–61; V, 284–85; frag. 3, 3–6; *Let. Arist.* 132, 139; Philo, *Leg. all.* II, 1–2; John 5. 44; 17. 3; Rom. 16. 27; I Tim. 1. 17; Jude 24–25 [numbers 59, 64, 78, 80, 83, 87, 92, 113, 154, 180, 183, 186, 192, 199]) or a conjunction of *μόνος* with *κύριος* (Ex. 22. 19; Deut. 32. 12; Neh. 9. 6; Isa. 2. 11, 17; *I Esdras* 8. 25; *Sir.* 18. 1–5; *Song of the Three Young Men* 20–22; *Test. Jos.* 6. 5; Jude 4 [numbers 3, 9, 16, 21, 38, 55, 59, 108, 198]) in a total of twenty-three passages.

Thus we encounter the collocations of *εἷς/μόνος* with *θεός/κύριος* in fifty-four out of one hundred and forty-nine, or more than a third, of all the Greek passages listed. Although there are variations in word order and syntax due to the context in each case, the frequency with which we encounter these collocations provides confirmation of the hypothesis that these were already standard formulae in our period.

III. THE PRIMACY OF MONOTHEISM FOR JUDAISM

Monotheistic language is distributed broadly throughout all categories of ancient Jewish literature, as the list of passages in appendix one indicates. Of the authors or works chosen for our survey, there were some which failed to yield a passage suitable for inclusion in appendix one,¹ but a good percentage of these contain divine titles or other probable indications of monotheistic belief which did not fit our restrictive criteria. Most of the major sources surveyed contain data for a study of Jewish monotheism. This in itself does not prove that the Jews regarded monotheism as a primary tenet, but it will corroborate that judgement if there are other grounds for it.

Only sometimes is monotheism treated as a subject in its own right. More often this belief comes to the surface in connection with other concerns. This shows that belief in the unity of God was a deeply held assumption of the Jewish writers under review.

We have already seen that the *Shema* was singled out for special attention both at Qumran and by the unknown writer(s) of the Nash papyrus. But the most decisive evidence that the Jews themselves gave to monotheism a primary place in their faith comes from several authors who make express statements to this effect. According to Pseudo-Aristeas,

when Eleazar the priest was asked by members of the court of Ptolemy in Egypt to explain the Jewish religion, he ‘began *first of all* (πᾶντων πρῶτον) by demonstrating that God is one...’ (*Let. Arist.* 132 [number 113]). Likewise Philo can exhort his readers: ‘Let us, then, engrave deep in our hearts this as the *first* (πρῶτον) and *most sacred* of commandments, to acknowledge and honour one God’ (*Decal.* 65 [number 157]). In his exposition of the commandments he takes as his starting point ‘those ... with which it is well to begin, namely, those the subject of which is the sole sovereignty (μοναρχία) of God’ (*Spec. leg.* I, 12 [number 158]). When asked by a scribe which commandment was the *first* (πρώτη) of all, Jesus replied by quoting the *Shema*; this answer met with approval and a solemn repetition of the matter (Mark 12. 28–32 [number 179]). These statements are found in literature from Palestine to the Diaspora, including both Gentile propaganda and intra-Jewish halachic discussion. In view of these facts, the later rabbis must have been drawing on a theological perception which was already well established when they branded the infidel who negates the unity of God ‘one who denies the Root’.²

This evidence roundly supports the judgement of many that monotheism was foundational for Judaism.

IV. FUNCTIONS OF MONOTHEISTIC STATEMENTS

In just over half of our two hundred passages, monotheistic language functions either in credal/confessional statements or in prayers.

Third-person declarations which solemnly affirm the oneness of God, either for the consolidation of this faith in the Jewish community or for the instruction of outsiders, may be loosely classified as credal/confessional, whether or not they give direct evidence of having been actually used in a liturgical setting. There are fifty-eight such statements (*Deut.* 4. 35, 39; 6. 4; 7. 9; *Psa.* 100. 3; *Isa.* 45. 18; *Dan.* 6. 26; (*Judith* 6.2); *Judith* 8. 20; *Bar.* 3. 35; *Bel and the Dragon* 5, 25; *II Macc.* 7. 37; *IV Macc.* 5. 24; *II En.* (A) 47. 3–5; *Sib. Or.* III, 11–12, 629, 718, 760; frag. 1, 7, 16, 32; frag. 3, 3; *II Bar.* 85. 14; *Apoc. Elijah* 2. 10, 49; *Let. Arist.* 132; *Jub.* 15. 32; 21. 4; *Asc. Isaiah* 4. 8; Pseudo-Philo, *Bibl. Antiq.* 6. 4; 23. 14; Pseudo-Phocylides, *Sentences*, 54; Pseudo-Orpheus, fragment, 10–16; fragment; fragment; Hesiod,

fragment; Pseudo-Sophocles, fragment; Sophocles, fragment; Philo, *Opif. mundi*, 171; *Confus. ling.*, 170; *Decal.* 65; *Spec. leg.* I, 30, 52; Josephus, *Cont. Ap.* II, 193; *Antiq.* III, 91; IV, 201; Matt. 19. 17; Mark 12. 32; John 8. 41; Rom. 3. 30; 10. 12; I Cor. 8. 6; Gal. 3. 20; Eph. 4. 4–6; I Tim. 2. 5; James 2. 19; 4. 12 [numbers 5–6, 8, 20, 28, 35, 42–43, 57, 60–61, 64, 69, 74, 77, 80, 82–83, 89–92, 103, 106–07, 113, 118–20, 124–25, 127, 131–34, 136–37, 153, 155, 157, 160, 162, 168, 171–72, 175, 179, 181, 184–85, 187, 189–90, 193, 196–97]).

There are fifty-eight prayers which contain an address to God using monotheistic language (Ex. 15. 11; Deut. 3. 24; I Sam. 2. 2; II Sam. 7. 22; I Kings 8. 60; II Kings 19. 15, 19; Neh. 9. 6; Psa. 83. 18; Psa. 89. 6–8; Isa. 45. 14–15; 64. 4; Jer. 10. 6–10; *I Esdras* 8. 25; *IV Ezra* 8. 7; *Judith* 9. 14; 16. 14; *Additions to Esther* 13. 9–11, 14; 14. 3, 14, 18; *Wisd. Sol.* 11. 21; 12. 12–13; *Sir.* 36. 5; *Let. Jeremiah* 6; *Song of the Three Young Men* 22; *Bel and the Dragon* 41; *II Macc.* 1. 24–25; *III Macc.* 2. 2; *II En.* (J) 69. 4; *II Bar.* 21. 7–10; 48. 3, 23–24; 54. 1, 12; 75. 1; *Apoc. Abr.* 17. 8; *Jub.* 10. 6; 12. 19; *Joseph and Aseneth* 12. 13; *Life of Adam and Eve* 28. 2; 1QS 11. 17–20; 1QM 10. 8–9; 1QM 13. 13–16; 1QH 7. 28–29, 31–32; 9. 15–18; 10. 8–12; 12. 29–31; 13. 16–17; 15. 14–15; 4QDibHam 3. 4–5; 5. 6–9; Philo, *Spec. leg.* I, 42; John 17. 3; Rom. 16. 27; I Tim. 1. 17; 6. 15–16; Jude 25; Rev. 15. 4 [numbers 1, 4, 11–13, 15–16, 18–19, 27, 32–33, 38, 40, 44–48, 50–51, 56, 58–59, 62–63, 66, 76, 96–100, 102, 104, 116–17, 122–23, 139–45, 147–51, 161, 183, 186, 192, 194, 199–200]).

If an acclamation be defined as the spontaneous cry of a group of people in response to a numinous manifestation of the deity, only one of our passages can be regarded as acclamatory (I Kings 18. 39 [number 14]). Two other passages have such cries by individuals (Dan. 2. 47; *Bel and the Dragon* 41 [numbers 34, 62]). This paucity gives slim support indeed to the notion that the profession of belief in one God had any important acclamatory overtones in the time of Paul. That is not to deny that Paul and his readers might have experienced an acclamatory use of monotheistic professions in the cult; but, if such a usage existed, virtually no trace of it has survived in the literary sources now available to the historian. It must remain a scholarly guess and nothing more.

We have firm evidence, on the other hand, that monotheistic language was used by ancient Jews in both prayers and confessions of faith.

V. THE DEFINITION OF JEWISH MONOTHEISM

In order to determine whether ancient Jewish monotheism entailed the denial that any gods exist except the one God (the accepted view) or an affirmation of the absolute uniqueness of the one God among many gods (Albright), we must take into account the assumptions of Second Temple Judaism about the supernatural world and the ways in which Jewish writers used titles of divinity.

Jewish Assumptions about the Supernatural World

Virtually all ancient Jewish sources which contain monotheistic texts also give evidence of belief in supernatural beings such as angels or demons. So ample and pervasive is this evidence throughout the literature that documentation of it would be tedious.³ Even in Isaiah 40–66, where the many denials of the existence of Gods other than the Lord are often taken to be the classic formulation of stark monotheism, the Septuagint version speaks in one passage of a host of personalized stars in heaven (40. 26), and in another refers to the Angel of God's presence (63. 9). This traditional figure of the Angel of the Lord gained such an exalted status in some post-biblical Jewish circles (see in section VIII below) that it came to be perceived by the rabbis as a threat to their unitarianism, and they made an attempt to excise it from the Jewish consciousness.⁴ But during our period, Jewish monotheism was not understood in such a way as to exclude belief in the Angel of the Lord, much less in angels or demons in general.⁵

A special case in point is the cosmic dualism reflected at Qumran, especially in 1QS 3–4. This worldview sees the world as under the dominion of two spirits, the Prince of Light and the Angel of Darkness, which vie in the hearts of men so as to make human endeavours in part noble, in part sinful. But God is sovereign over both spirits and has fixed a time when the reign of the Angel of Darkness will be brought to an end. This worldview is thus a 'modified dualism' which does not compromise the unity or power of God.⁶

A number of monotheistic texts presuppose the existence of angelic beings in heaven under God (Neh. 9. 6; Psa. 89. 5–8; Hos. 13. 4; *Bar.* 3. 32–35; *III Macc.* 2. 2; *II En.* (A) 33.

3–8; *Jub.* 10. 6; 12. 19–20; 15. 31–32; 1QM 10. 8–12; 1QM 13. 13–16; 1QH 12. 29–31; 4QSI 40, lines 6–7; Philo, *Decal.* 64–65; *Spec. leg.* I, 14 [numbers 16, 19, 36, 57, 66, 72, 116–18, 140–41, 147, 152, 157, 159]). It is clear, then, that monotheism and the belief in angels co-existed in Judaism.

Use of Divine Titles by Jewish Writers

From time to time titles of divinity were applied by Jewish authors to beings other than the one God. The following examples are taken mostly from books which contain statements of monotheism.

In the Bible, the Greek version of Exodus 7. 1 kept the literal sense of God's remarkable declaration to Moses: 'I have *made you God* to Pharaoh' (δέδωκά σε θεὸν Φαραῶν).⁷ The Angel of the Lord bore God's name (Ex. 23. 21). Israelite rulers have the title θεοί in Ex. 22. 27.⁸ The phrase τὰ γλυπτὰ τῶν θεῶν αὐτῶν in Deut. 7. 5, 25 seems to assume the real existence of gods who are represented by carved images. God is 'King of the gods' (LXX Deut. 9. 26; this title was repeated in later Jewish literature, as in *Additions to Esther* 14. 12). He is also called the 'God of gods' (Deut. 10. 17; compare the later *Song of the Three Young Men* 68; *Jub.* 8. 20). In LXX Psalm 44. 7 the king of Israel is probably addressed as ὁ θεός (compare the quotation of this verse in Heb. 1. 8).⁹

In the Apocrypha, a Hebrew fragment of *Sir.* 45. 2 says that God deified Moses: 'And he [magnified him as] a god'.¹⁰ Ezra addresses the angel Uriel as 'my lord' in *IV Ez.* 4. 3, 5.

Turning to pseudepigraphical literature, *I Enoch* makes God 'Lord of lords' and 'God of gods' (9. 4). The same book points out how people wrongly offer sacrifices to demons as to gods (19. 1). An unusual phrase in *Sib. Or.* III, 278 designates God as 'the immortal Begetter of gods and of all men' (γενετῆρα θεῶν πάντων τ' ἀνθρώπων). Later in the same document the existence of gods (θεοῦς, III, 429) is acknowledged. The sibyl describes the king of Rome as ἰσόθεος (V, 138–39). A class of angels are given the title κύριοι in the *Apocalypse of Zephaniah* (see Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata*, 5. 11. 77). In the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, God addresses his chief angel as 'Iaoel of the same name', making this angel the bearer of God's own ineffable name (10. 3). In *Test. Abr.* 11. 4, Adam appears

glorious in heaven like God. Joseph is described as the ‘son of God’ in *Joseph and Aseneth* 6. 3, 5; 13. 13; 21. 4.

At Qumran the title ‘God of gods’ continued to be used (1QM 14. 16; 18. 6; 4QSI 39, lines 19, 26); compare also ‘Prince of gods’ (1QH 10. 8). Frequently in the Dead Sea Scrolls we find angels referred to as *elim* (1QM 1. 10, 11; 14. 15, 16; 15. 14; 17. 7; 18. 6; 4QSI 39, lines 18, 26; 4Q181, lines 3–4; 11QMelch 10, 11, 14, 16, 24, 25).¹¹ The Qumran sectaries could apply Old Testament passages (Psa. 82. 1–2 and Isa. 52. 7) to the eschatological deliverer Melchizedek (11QMelch 10, 15–19) in much the same way that New Testament writers applied scriptures to Jesus.¹²

Philo in one place gives Moses the honoured position of being θεὸς καὶ βασιλεύς of the whole nation.¹³ Josephus calls Moses a θεῖος ἀνὴρ.¹⁴

The data just given are far from exhaustive, but they are sufficient to demonstrate that in the works of Jewish monotheists, divine titles could be applied on rare occasions to human beings or to angels.¹⁵ A few of these examples involve nothing more than the adoption by a Jewish writer of current pagan terminology in reference to polytheistic beliefs. But in not a few cases, plural titles of divinity are used to refer to the angels or heroes of Jewish faith. Notably we find this in liturgical portions of the Qumran documents which were intended for use primarily within the community.

We might suppose that these were inadvertent inconsistencies but for the fact that in several instances we find explicit monotheistic language and language about many deities side by side. Turning to the two hundred passages in appendix one and excluding from consideration all those passages where ‘gods’, etc. could conceivably refer simply to physical images,¹⁶ there remain a number of monotheistic texts which actually make use of the terms ‘god(s)’ or ‘immortals’ in the immediate context to refer, presumably, to angels or demons (Ex. 15. 11; Deut. 3. 24; Dan. 2. 47; Hesiod, fragment; Sophocles, fragment; 1QH 7. 28–29; 10. 8–12; I Cor. 8. 4–6 [numbers 1, 4, 34, 134, 137, 142, 145, 187]). This usage is perhaps most striking of all in those documents which contain both vigorous denials of the existence of many divinities and applications of the term ‘gods’ to superhuman spiritual powers (Deuteronomy: compare 4. 35, 39 with 3. 24 [number 5 with 4]; the Hymn scroll from

Qumran: compare 1QH 7. 31–32; and 12. 9–11 with 7. 28–29 and 10. 8–12 [numbers 143, 146 with 142, 145]). These examples would seem to preclude any supposition that such writers were simply careless. Rather we are driven to the conclusion that ancient Jewish monotheists could speak of many gods as existing under the one God.

Differences between the Many Gods and the One God

Expressions such as ‘King of the gods’ or ‘God of gods’ were common to both Jewish and pagan usage. Taken by themselves they are ambiguous and could be interpreted to mean either that the God of Israel, like Zeus, is the head of a pantheon by virtue of superior powers, or that he is uniquely transcendent with respect even to the gods. Was the difference between the one God and the many gods for Jewish writers a matter of degree or of kind?

There are several indications that the Jews regarded their Deity as different in kind from others. The creation-phrase ‘begetter of gods and of all men’ in *Sib. Or.* III, 278 places the God of Israel in a category by himself. Some writers belittle the gods on the ground that they did not make heaven and earth, as God did (Jer. 10. 11–12; *II En.* (A) 2. 2–3; Pseudo-Pythagoras, fragment [numbers 33, 70, 135]). Other passages point out that the gods have limited functions in contrast to the universal sovereignty and plenitude of powers vested in God (Sophocles, fragment; Philo, *Spec. leg.* I, 14 [numbers 137, 159]). The comparison formula ‘Who is like God?’ found so frequently throughout the literature implies that there is an absolute qualitative difference between the God of Israel and all others. Moreover, although Jewish writers were able to use titles of divinity in reference to beings other than the one God, we find in their books a repeated emphasis on offering worship, especially sacrifices, to God alone (Ex. 20. 2–3; 22. 19; Deut. 6. 13–14; 32. 37–39; *Judith* 8. 18–20; *Additions to Esther* 13. 14; *Let. Jer.* 5–6; *Bel and the Dragon* 5, 23–25; *IV Macc.* 5. 24; *II En.* (A) 2. 2–3; 9. 1; 66. 1–4; *Sib. Or.* III, 591–94, 762–63; V, 493–500; fragment 1, 15–22; fragment 3, 34–37, 43–47; *Apoc. Elijah* 2. 49; *Test. Joseph* 6. 5; *Let. Arist.* 134–35, 139–40; *Joseph and Aseneth* 8. 5–6; Pseudo-Diphilus/Menander, fragment; Philo, *Decal.* 64–65; *Virtut.* 179; Josephus, *Antiq.* III, 91; V, 111–12; Matthew 4. 10; I Thess. 1. 9 [numbers 2–3, 7, 10, 43, 47, 58, 60–61, 69–71, 75, 79, 84, 88, 90, 93–94, 107–08, 113, 121, 138, 157, 164,

171, 173–74, 191)).¹⁷ This exclusive worship of the incomparable creator implies that he was regarded as uniquely worthy of divine honours, i.e., as divine in a unique sense.

It would appear, then, that the Jews conceived of their God as different in kind from all others. In texts which speak of many gods along with the one God, the assumed existence of angels or gods, far from threatening belief in the one God, sets up a foil against which the unique excellences of the one God can be highlighted.

Ancient Jews in a Polytheistic Society

Modern Jewish and Christian theologians use the word ‘God’ more narrowly than ancient Jewish writers did. The use of divine titles for beings other than God seems to us to belong to a polytheistic or immanentist worldview at odds with the belief in one transcendent creator of whom alone divinity may be truly predicated. How did the ancient Jewish mind differ from ours?

In Hellenistic and Roman society the influence of polytheistic assumptions reached right down into the very language which Jewish writers had to share with their pagan counterparts. For Greek speakers, θεός was ‘a generic term for a personal being superior to man’,¹⁸ and, as we have seen, it could be applied to any human or spiritual force which acted beyond the limits of ordinary human capacity. Because of the influence of polytheism on the language, then, the word ‘god’ had a broader referential range in ancient times than it has nowadays. A Jewish monotheist who was alert to the accepted meanings of words and who wished to write about angels might innocently apply to them the word ‘god’ in the generic sense with no intention whatsoever of surrendering his belief that there was one being for whom this word was supremely appropriate. Because the ancient Jew distinguished clearly in thought between the one God who was the unique, transcendent creator and the many gods who were beings superior to man in power but incapable of comparison with God in kind, he would not have sensed any fundamental inconsistency in using the generally accepted term θεός for both referents. He might well have been conscious that he was using the word in stricter and looser senses, depending on the context. S. Liebermann has summed up the matter well.

The ancients were much less sensitive to the term god than our modern society. Mortals are styled ‘gods’ during their lifetime. The Jews living in a polytheistic society were very well aware of it. The term ‘small god’ would be shocking to us, but it was not so to the ancient mind. As long as no worship is involved the ‘small god’ remains a mere title.¹⁹

In the course of day-to-day communication or in oblique written references the philosophical ramifications of generally accepted terms are left unexplored. For this reason it would be difficult or impossible to answer the question to what extent the generic use of divine titles among Jewish writers implied the acceptance on the part of some of them, perhaps unconsciously, of the pagan view of divinity as a quality diffused throughout the universe.

Provided that an ancient Jew stated his monotheism clearly in situations where the relationship between the one God and the many gods was at issue, he was free to make use of customary modes of speech without causing any raising of eyebrows.

Conclusion

The evidence suggests that Jewish monotheism in the Second Temple period should be defined as the belief that there is (objectively) but one transcendent creator of all things, and the commitment (subjectively) to offer religious worship and service to no other being but him. This view allows for the existence, under God, of other supernatural beings which, in accordance with prevailing usage, might be legitimately designated gods in the wider sense of the word. Ancient Jewish monotheists, living in a linguistic environment shaped by polytheistic assumptions, spoke of one God and of many gods simultaneously, without in thought setting the many gods beside the one God as equals or rivals.

This conclusion is indirectly confirmed by I. Zeitlin’s recent study of Israelite monotheism in the biblical period. His result likewise underscores the qualitative uniqueness of the God of Israel:

The distinguishing characteristic of ethical monotheism is that Yahweh is the source of all being, independent of all other orders and free of the limitations of magic and mythology.²⁰

Should this view be classified as monotheistic or as henotheistic? The henotheist professes special, perhaps exclusive devotion to one god among many local or national deities which, however much they may differ in degrees of power, are alike in kind. But the strong Jewish emphasis on the creatorship of God, even with respect to the gods, affirms his qualitative uniqueness and absolute transcendence. The Jewish God is the sole member belonging to the class of deity in the strict sense. His unicity, either qualitative or numerical, is not called in question by the broader use of the word ‘god’ for referents which belong to the category of creature even though they are of a higher order than the human. Jewish theism of the post-biblical period, then, deserves to be called monotheism.

The critical consensus makes denials of the existence of other gods the criterion for monotheism, and therefore holds that Israelite monotheism first broke into the daylight in Isaiah 40–66 or Deuteronomy, whichever is to be dated earlier. But we have seen that references to spiritual powers as ‘gods’ could co-exist in a single document or indeed in a single passage with truly monotheistic denials of other Gods. Acceptance of the real existence of other beings called ‘gods’ does not necessarily compromise true monotheism. The commonly accepted criterion of the denial of other gods is therefore too restrictive. It excludes from the category of monotheism statements which ancient Jewish writers used as compatible with their monotheism.

On the whole, then, Albright’s definition is more accurate historically than that of most scholars, despite the fact that it is not as neat and trim. One reason why scholars such as Albright and Zeitlin are free to date the emergence of monotheism in Israel back into the Mosaic period, where we find language about the gods of other nations, is because they operate with a definition of monotheism which is nuanced by the way in which the language of divinity was actually used by ancient monotheists in a polytheistic environment.

VI. THE MONOTHEISM SCHEMA OF JUDAISM

In order to determine whether ancient Judaism had a monotheism schema, we must turn to the two hundred passages in appendix one and look for recurring words, themes, and concepts which might point to a cluster of ideas habitually associated with the idea of one God in the collective Jewish mind. When we do this, we find, not surprisingly, that most of the elements of Jewish belief about God are associated with statements of monotheism at least once or twice somewhere in the list. A complete tabulation of these elements accompanies the list in the appendix and may be consulted there.

Analysis

We begin by observing that some themes occur more frequently than others. The themes which occur with the highest frequency in the immediate vicinity of monotheistic statements are the following: God as the proper object of human religion, including in this category the human worship, fear, reverence, or recognition of God (73); God as present at the beginning of time (57); the antithesis between God and the many gods (57); God as creator (52); God as Lord, including in this category the images of God as king, ruler, governor, sovereign, master, or shepherd, or as having a throne (46); God as having a relation to the cosmos, or to 'all things' (43); God as the eschatological consummator (42); the power or might of God (40); the greatness of God, including in this category his glory, exaltation, majesty, or eminence (37); God as living or as giving life (36); God as saviour, including in this category language about God as helper, deliverer, protector, or the object of hope (36); the reality or existence of God (35); the knowledge, wisdom, or self-revelation of God (34); the antithesis between God and idols (31); God as eternal or immortal (30). Each of these themes or categories occurs in at least thirty out of two hundred, or fifteen per cent., of the passages surveyed. Although it is difficult to be sure where to draw the line, it seems safe to suppose provisionally that themes which are associated with monotheistic statements at least fifteen per cent. of the time may be regarded as characteristic of Jewish monotheism.

One could be tempted to conclude that the fifteen themes each of which occurs fifteen per cent. of the time comprise the monotheism schema of Judaism. But a number of other

factors enter in to complicate the picture. It is hoped that the selection of passages in the appendix is large enough and sufficiently typical to represent Jewish monotheism as a whole even though certain classes of literature—the Septuagint, the voluminously preserved legacies of Philo and Josephus, and the more obscure of the Qumran writings—have not been surveyed exhaustively. Still, we may not assume that our statistics based on these two hundred passages would be precisely the same if all Jewish monotheistic statements from our period could have been taken into account, even if we can have reasonable confidence that our results are not seriously skewed.

Another factor which affects the interpretation of frequency counts is the relative broadness or narrowness of the categories used. The concepts of God as creator or as life-giver, for example, are far more specific than those categories which are made up of groups of related words or concepts, such as God as the proper object of human religion, or God as saviour. For this reason it is important not to exaggerate the significance of the high frequencies with which the latter two categories occur. Conversely, references to God's relation to 'all things'—a highly specific theme—are so many that they can be divided into other categories more specific yet (God and the cosmos, God omnipresent, God omnipotent, God and all happenings, God and all nations), some of which produce substantial counts in their own right (see appendix one). Simple frequency counts, then, are not an adequate criterion for determining which associations are characteristic of monotheism. A more trustworthy criterion would be the frequency with which highly specific themes occur in monotheistic statements. The creator-idea and the connection of God with 'all things' in the sense of the cosmos surely qualify as characteristic according to this criterion.

In a few cases the significance of a high frequency count may be diminished if it were possible to compare the frequency of a given concept in statements of monotheism with the frequency of that same concept in statements about God in general. Without having carried out the experiment with a body of control data, one might still wonder whether the category of God as the object of human worship, or that of God as saviour, or that of God's greatness, really favour the company of monotheism: such concepts might be expected to come up wherever God as such is mentioned. By contrast, statements of monotheism are especially

appropriate in the context of polemics against idols or polytheism. Unfortunately the arduous task of placing these ruminations on an inductive basis would take us too far afield.

On the other hand, mere infrequency of occurrence is not in itself an indication of unimportance either. Passages which join the unity of God with mention of one people of God or one temple are not especially frequent, nor are they widely distributed beyond Philo, Josephus, and the New Testament. But a number of these passages use quasi-formulaic language that has a solemn ring (*II Bar.* 48. 23–24; Josephus, *Cont. Ap.* II, 193; *Antiq.* IV, 201; V, 111–12; John 10. 16; Eph. 4. 4–6 [numbers 98, 168, 172–73, 182, 190]). The weighty style of such passages combines with the known prominence of community and temple in Jewish life to give these concepts an association with Jewish monotheism too characteristic, in spite of their relative paucity, to be neglected.

Also important for assessing our data is the fact that concepts in a schema have relations to one another as well as to the central defining concept. Some of these relations may be logical in nature; others arise through simple co-occurrence. Using the tabulation in appendix one of data from our two hundred passages (Table C), it is possible at a glance to compare the fifteen themes listed above with one another and with other, less frequent themes.

The antithesis between God and idols and that between God and false gods, obviously analogous, coincide in some eleven passages. In roughly half of its occurrences, the idea of God's real existence is in a context which inveighs against either idols or polytheism. In no fewer than thirty places the creator idea and the relation of God to the cosmos are mentioned together in a single passage (this conjunction could stand as a characteristic feature of monotheistic language in its own right, according to our criterion of fifteen per cent. occurrence). In seven places the creator idea is joined to a reference to God's purpose or will in history.

Sometimes a theme which appears infrequently can gain significance by virtue of its affinity and co-occurrence with a more frequent theme. In three of its seven occurrences, the one-temple idea is in an anti-idolatry or anti-polytheism context. In four of its nine occurrences, reference to the aseity of God strengthens an anti-idolatry or an anti-polytheism

statement; likewise with the spirituality of God in five of its fourteen occurrences. In twelve of its fifteen occurrences, mention of God's purpose in history is found in conjunction with statements linking God with the beginning or the end of the world, or both.

Speaking more generally, those themes which continue, after critical sifting, to be characteristic of Jewish monotheism tend to fall into just a few big sub-clusters. The antithesis between the one God and false gods, the antithesis between the one God and idols, and the concept of the reality or existence of God group themselves into what we might call an *anti-polytheism* cluster. Likewise the concepts of God as creator and life-giver and his connection with the cosmos form a *cosmology* group. God's command of both protology and eschatology, the priority of his purpose in history, and his personal eternity or immortality fit together into a *time and history* cluster.

It will have been noted that some themes can associate themselves with more than one other theme or cluster of themes. At this point the exceeding complexity of the network of ideas surrounding Jewish statements of monotheism becomes evident. If we had time we could enter into a great labyrinth of ideas, overlapping, intersecting, arranged in hierarchies, in chains, in groups and sub-groups. It is unnecessary for our purpose to attempt a detailed, scientific quantification of this tangle of associations. Simply by reading through the list of monotheistic passages gathered in appendix one, one can rapidly gain an impression of the nest of concepts which filled the mind of the ancient Jewish monotheist. Certain features do in fact recur so regularly as to be characteristic. They include: anti-idolatry and anti-polytheism contexts, the concept of God as the creator of all things, the universality of God's rule both in space and in time, and the unity of God's people and temple.

At this point it already looks very much as though Judaism had a monotheism schema made up of these elements. But to confirm this result one more test can be run. Do these themes, which often appear with statements of monotheism either individually or in twos and threes, ever occur conglomerately? We recall that not all elements in a given schema need be realized in every concrete speech situation. Therefore if a number of frames can be found which realize many or most elements of a suspected schema, we shall have convincing evidence that the schema exists.

Our test will involve scanning the passages in the appendix to see whether there are any in which at least three of the following four themes are realized: anti-polytheism/-idolatry contexts, God as creator, God as related to ‘all things’, and the extension of God’s rule through time. In fact a dozen passages qualify (Isa. 42. 5–9; 44. 6–8; 45. 21–24; *Sib. Or.* V, 493–500; frag. 1, 15–22; *Let. Arist.* 132–40; Pseudo-Orpheus, fragment; Sophocles, fragment; Pseudo-Diphilus/Menander, fragment; 1QH 12. 9–11; Josephus, *Cont. Ap.* II, 190–93; I Cor. 8. 4–6) [numbers 22, 24, 29, 88, 90, 113, 131, 137–38, 146, 168, 187]). These passages represent the Old Testament, Palestinian Judaism, Hellenistic Jewish propaganda, and Christianity. Thus we have widespread evidence for a monotheism schema in ancient Judaism.

Conclusions

Ancient Judaism had a monotheism schema consisting of the following elements: a negative attitude towards idolatry and polytheism, the belief in one creator of all things, in one Lord of all the earth, whose will determines the course of history from beginning to end, and who stands in a special relationship to the one people of Israel with one temple in Jerusalem. While all aspects of the Jewish doctrine of God were implied by mention of God’s unity, these associations were the most characteristic. This schema was socially shared by Jews inside and beyond Palestine.

Hence the language of monotheism did not stop with explicit mention of one God (in any of the forms identified in section I. above), but comprised these other associated elements as well. This is borne out by passages which present monotheism through use of the schema rather than through explicit formulae.

And (the Elect One) will summon all the forces of the heavens, and all the holy ones above, and the forces of the Lord.... They shall all say in one voice, ‘Blessed (is he) and may the name of the Lord of the Spirits be blessed forever and evermore’.... For the mercy of the Lord of the Spirits is great in quantity, and he is long-suffering. All his works and all the dimensions of his creation, he has revealed to the righteous and the elect ones in the name of the Lord of the Spirits (*I En.* 61. 10, 11, 13).

Blessed are you, O Great King,

you are mighty in your greatness,
 O Lord of all the creation of heaven,
 King of kings and God of the whole world.
 Your authority and kingdom abide forever and ever....
 For you have created (all),
 and all things you rule (*I En.* 84. 2–3).

From every land they will bring incense and gifts
 to the house of the great God. There will be no other
 house among men, even for future generations to know,
 except the one which God gave to faithful men to honor (*Sib. Or.*
 III, 772–75).

Is there any doubt that such passages express a monotheistic faith? An exhaustive study of Jewish monotheism would have to take into account all passages which express the monotheism schema, whether with or without explicit forms of monotheistic speech.

Various scholars have recognized something like what we have called a monotheism schema in ancient Judaism. Though this construct is nowhere worked out with the degree of formality attempted here, enough has been written to provide informal confirmation of our result.

For the Old Testament period, S. Cohon speaks of ‘the monotheistic faith that *the universe was called into existence by the living God, who preserves the highest heavens and sustains the earth, and directs the destinies of men and of nations*’.²¹ Other associations pointed out by writers on biblical monotheism include God’s transcendence and the prohibition of images, God’s supremacy over foreign gods, and man’s duty to fulfill the commandments.²²

As for the Second Temple period, themes which come up again and again in the secondary literature include the denunciation of polytheism, the transcendence of God as creator, his omnipotence, and his Lordship over ‘all things’ and over history.²³

Much the same picture is given by studies of rabbinic monotheism. The new element here is a marked emphasis on unitarianism as over against Christian trinitarianism and Gnostic mythology.²⁴

From these brief observations we can see that the monotheism schema underwent a few shifts in matters of detail as Israel’s broadening experience brought her into contact with

changing circumstances and challenges. But in the time of Paul, the core was essentially the same as in other periods. The explicit formulae and the schema, then, together make up the language of monotheism.

VII. MONOTHEISM AND THE PREPOSITIONAL DEVICE OF HELLENISM

Only four of our two hundred monotheistic passages make use of the prepositional device of Hellenism. In *IV Ezra* 6. 6 (number 39), God claims that both the beginning and the end are brought to pass *per me et non per alium*. In I Cor. 8. 6 (number 187), Paul describes God as the one ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτόν and the Lord as the one δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς δι' αὐτοῦ. Eph. 4. 6 (number 190) describes the one God and Father of all as ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων καὶ διὰ πάντων καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν. And Heb. 2. 10–11 (number 195) speaks of the one origin of Christ and Christians as the God δι' ὃν τὰ πάντα καὶ δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα.

The first two of these passages belong to the category of statements about God which span the beginning and the end. In this respect they invite comparison with other monotheistic passages which repeat the old Orphic idea, popularized by Plato and famous in antiquity, that God is the beginning, the middle, and the end of all things (Pseudo-Orpheus, fragment, 39; Sophocles, fragment; Josephus, *Cont. Ap.* II, 190 [numbers 131, 137, 168]).²⁵ In using either the prepositional device or the dictum of Plato, Jewish and Christian writers were expressing their belief that God is the creator and consummator. This motif is not uncommon in the Bible, and in Isaiah 40–66 it is explicitly connected with monotheism in several places: ‘Who has performed and done this, calling the generations from the beginning? I, the LORD, the first, and with the last; I am He’ (Isa. 41. 4; see also 42. 5–9; 43. 10–13; 44. 6–8; 46. 9–11 [numbers 22–24, 30]). C. Westermann has devoted an entire monograph to language about the beginning and the end in the Old Testament, and concludes that this idiom expresses the universality of God’s claim on history and the creation, and points to the essential unity of all history, directed to a single goal by a single divine will.²⁶

The last three passages quoted at the beginning of this section bring out the relation between the one God and πάντα or τὰ πάντα. In this respect they belong to the category

of monotheistic statements about God in relation to ‘all things’. M. Dibelius observed that an oscillation between ‘one’ and ‘all’ is typical in Hellenistic texts which make use of the prepositional device.²⁷ H. Hommel has shown how this Hellenistic ‘all’-formula, as he calls it, informs the meaning of the word παντοκράτωρ.²⁸ This word is found in nine of our monotheistic texts (see Table A in appendix one) and is thus an important way of stating the relationship between all things and the one God.

Thus the idea of God as creator, the relation between God and ‘all things’, and the decisive role of God at the beginning and the end all come to expression in the prepositional device which Judaism and Christianity inherited from Hellenism. These are key members of the monotheism schema of Judaism. Although the prepositional device is hardly common enough in Jewish monotheistic statements to be regarded as characteristic, it powerfully and elegantly expresses the monotheism schema in the few places where it is used.

VIII. JEWISH INTERMEDIARIES AND MONOTHEISTIC LANGUAGE

In order to determine whether or to what extent the language of monotheism was applied by Jewish writers to beings not otherwise identified with the God of Israel, we must focus on those passages where exalted speech or the language of divinity is used of intermediaries. We shall look for either explicit forms of monotheistic speech or the occurrence of elements from the monotheism schema in such language.

The number of celestial beings with which post-biblical Judaism filled its upper universe was large and is perhaps indefinable in the present state of research. Our survey aims to include all of the major figures and most of the obscure ones. For convenience we shall adopt a fourfold classification as follows: glorified heroes (in the order in which they appear in the biblical history), angelic beings, ideal-eschatological figures, and abstracted attributes or hypostases of God. For the purpose of this section we omit consideration of Jewish-Christian beliefs about Jesus and the Holy Spirit.

Glorified Heroes

A number of human personages from the Bible grew in stature in post-biblical Judaism.

1. Adam

Test. Abr. (A) has Adam ‘seated on a golden throne’ before the two gates of heaven. His appearance is ‘terrifying, like the Master’s’ (11. 4). He ‘looks at the world, since everyone has come from him’ (11. 9), and he either laments for the damned or rejoices for the souls of the righteous as they enter the respective gates.

In the *Life of Adam and Eve*, Adam before his fall is given the title ‘the image of God’ (13. 3; 14. 1–2; 15. 2). That this is intended as a title of majesty is indicated by the fact that all the angels, including their leader Michael, are expected to ‘worship’ Adam (chapters 13–15). According to one group of manuscripts the name ‘Yahweh’ is affixed to the title (see the comment by M.D. Johnson in *OTPs*, II, 262, note 14b). But Adam is clearly portrayed in the same document as a created being made of clay (27. 2), who fell into sin and was driven out of paradise (e.g., chapter 1).

Later the rabbis speculated about an ‘enormous, world-filling Adam’.²⁹ The Gnostics made Adam an ideal, primal man.³⁰

2. Abel

Abel plays a role as heavenly judge of souls in *Test. Abr.* (A) chapters 12–13. He is a ‘wondrous man, bright as the sun, like unto a son of God’ (12. 5), and sits on a ‘terrifying throne’ (12. 4) ‘to judge the entire creation’ (13. 3) and ‘sentence souls’ (12. 11). He decides whether they are to enter torment or Paradise at the time of death. But final judgement, ‘eternal and unalterable’, is reserved for God alone at the end of history (13. 4).

In *Asc. Isa.* 9. 8–9, Isaiah sees ‘the holy Abel and all the righteous’ in heaven ‘like the angels who stand there in great glory’. Perhaps Abel, as the first martyr, is here regarded as a kind of archetype of all saints.

3. Enoch

The few cryptic words about Enoch in Gen. 5. 24 ('he was not, for God took him') gave rise to an elaborate set of Enoch legends in post-biblical Judaism. The notion that Enoch was a scribe who bore witness against the heavenly Watchers is found already in the oldest strand of *I Enoch* (12. 4; 15. 1–12). In *I En.* chapters 13–14 he functions as a mediator between heaven and earth, conveying divine messages to the Giants and prayers of the Giants to God. In *Jub.* 4. 16–26 we read that Enoch, 'the first who learned writing and knowledge', was led by angels into the garden of Eden to record the evil deeds of mankind for the rest of time. Later it was thought that Enoch had been taken to heaven to serve as scribe in God's court (*I En.* 89. 70–71; *II En.* 22. 11; 64. 5; *Test. Abr.* [B] 11. 3–10).

When once Enoch had been exalted to so high a position, it was natural that other powers and functions should be ascribed to him. In *I En.* 71. 14 he appears to be identified with the son of man of the *Similitudes* (see the section below on the son of man). He is very highly exalted in *II Enoch*. Angels bow to him and request his intercession (7. 4–5). Michael sets him before God's face for ever, anoints him with oil and clothes him in celestial garments so that he becomes 'like one of the glorious ones' (22. 6–10; cf. 67. 2). He stands nearer to God than Gabriel, and receives secrets not available even to angels (24. 1, 3). He will be the witness at the great assize (36. 3). He claims omniscience (40. 2). According to 64. 5 he is 'the one who carried away the sin of mankind'.³¹ Enoch and Elijah together destroy the anti-messiah in *Apoc. Elijah* 5. 32. Enoch and Abel, dressed in glorious robes, seem to represent all the righteous in *Asc. Isa.* 9. 8–9.

At a later time Enoch was to be identified with the archangel Metatron, 'the lesser YHWH' (*III En.* 4. 2)(see the section below on God's principal angel).³²

4. Jacob-Israel

The *Prayer of Joseph* identifies Jacob-Israel with God's chief angel. This indicates a remarkable degree of exaltation (see the section below on God's principal angel).

5. Levi

Levi is said to be appointed as a ‘son’ to God in *Test. Levi* 4. 2, probably echoing the messianic language of Psalm 2. 7.

According to *Joseph and Aseneth* 23. 8, Levi has supernatural knowledge: one group of manuscripts has, ‘he used to read what is written in the heart of men’, while another group reads, ‘he saw in advance all the (things) to come’ (see the comment by C. Burchard in *OTPs*, II, 240, note 23q).

6. Joseph

Joseph is described in *Joseph and Aseneth* as ‘the sun from heaven’, ‘(a) son of God’ (6. 2, 3). He is omniscient: ‘every hiding place, he sees and nothing escapes him, because of the great light that is inside him’ (6. 6).

7. Job

In *Test. Job*, Job describes his throne as being located ‘in the upper world, and its splendor and majesty come from the right hand of the Father’ (33. 3). It will not pass away, as earthly thrones will, for Job’s kingdom ‘is forever and ever’ (33. 4–9).

8. Moses

Because of his foundational role in the Bible as the leader and lawgiver of Israel, Moses drew an unusual amount of attention in post-biblical Judaism. Here only a few typical examples can be given of the language of exaltation which was used in reference to him.³³

In LXX Ex. 3. 10–12 Moses is the human instrument through whom God delivers Israel from bondage. After passing through the Red Sea on foot, the people are said to ‘believe in’ Moses (ἐπίστευσαν ... Μωϋσῆ) as well as in God (14. 31). Moses is the mediator between God and Israel at the giving of the law on Mount Sinai (Ex. chapter 19; Deut. chapter 5).

The pseudepigrapha elaborate considerably on this biblical picture. Moses is said to have been designed, devised, and prepared ‘from the beginning of the world’ to be the

mediator of God's covenant (*Test. Mos.* 1. 14). He can be called a 'sacred spirit, worthy of the Lord, manifold and incomprehensible, master of leaders, faithful in all things, the divine prophet for the whole earth, the perfect teacher in the world' (*Test. Mos.* 11. 16). A number of sources contain speculations about what Moses experienced in the cloud at the top of Mount Sinai. According to *Jub.* 1. 4, 26, Moses received there an apocalyptic revelation concerning history from the beginning to the end. Pseudo-Philo interprets Moses' emergence from the cloud as a descent from heaven, out of 'invisible light', past the sun and moon on the way back down to the sons of Israel (*Bibl. Antiq.* 12. 1). In similar vein but even more dramatic is the portrayal of Moses' Sinai experience by Ezekiel the Tragedian. God himself relinquishes his own throne to Moses atop the mountain; Moses, as he sits, gazes upon 'the whole earth round about', and at his feet a host of stars fall down. This is interpreted to mean that Moses 'rules and governs men' and sees 'things present, past and future' (lines 68–89).

Philo offers some of the most intriguing material on Moses. Some scholars think that the prayer to the Sacred Guide (ἱεροφάντα) in *Somn.* I, 164–65 is addressed to Moses, conceived of as a living, present power.³⁴ Philo once calls Moses the θεὸς καὶ βασιλεύς of the whole nation (*Vit. Mos.* I, 158).

The idealization and, perhaps, at least partial or incipient divinization of Moses evidenced in such passages has been much discussed in this century against the background of the 'divine man' type in Hellenistic hagiography. Not all are convinced, but others have few doubts that Moses was regarded by some Jews as more than a human being.³⁵ This issue remains a storm centre of debate, as it seems likely to do for some time unless fresh data come to light.

9. Solomon

Solomon appears throughout the *Testament of Solomon* as a magician who has power to control demons by means of a special ring. Traces of a developing legend of Solomon as exorcist or magician can be found in Josephus and rabbinic writings as well (see the study by D.C. Duling in *OTPs*, I, 944–51).

10. Elijah

The biblical account of Elijah's assumption into heaven while still alive (II Kings 2. 11), together with the prophecy that Elijah would come before the day of the Lord (Mal. 4. 5–6), gave rise to a variety of eschatological expectations about him. Probably the 'men who were taken up', whose re-appearance will be a sign of the end of the world according to *IV Ezra* 6. 26, are Enoch and Elijah. *Sirach* 48. 10 assumes that Elijah is alive in heaven, 'ready at the appointed time' to return and perform his prophesied role.

Elijah takes on a yet larger profile in *Apoc. Elijah* 4. 7; 5. 32, where it is said that he, with Enoch, will come down to fight with the antichrist and slay him. Already in the early first century A.D. it was popularly believed that one could pray to Elijah and receive help (Mark 15. 35). Some who had contact with Jesus thought he was Elijah of old come back (Mark 6. 15; 8. 28; 9. 11; John 1. 21).

Later there were rabbis who supposed that Elijah would be the one to anoint the Messiah and wake the dead. At its most extreme, speculation arose that Elijah may be a pre-existent angelic being who became incarnate on a number of occasions and returned to heaven each time.³⁶

11. Isaiah

The intermittent flow of water from the Gihon spring in Jerusalem is ascribed to prayers offered to God by Isaiah after his death on behalf of the living, in *Lives of the Prophets* 1. 8.

12. Jeremiah

In *II Macc.* 15. 13–15 Judas Maccabeus receives in a vision a golden sword from Jeremiah. Jeremiah is described in this vision as one who 'prays [note the present tense] much for the people and the holy city'. Matt. 16. 14 shows that the popular imagination at the time of Jesus did not hesitate to see in Jesus a Jeremiah *redivivus*.

13. Nebuchadnezzar

In a Jewish work probably written in the days of the Diadochi and Epigoni, who claimed divine honours, Nebuchadnezzar is fictitiously represented as having allowed the destruction of idolatrous shrines and groves in order that people might call on him as the only God (*Judith* 3. 8 [number 41]). His general Holofernes confesses his deity with the words, ‘Who is God except Nebuchadnezzar?’ (*Judith* 6. 2 [number 42]). Here explicit monotheistic language and the anti-idolatry and anti-polytheism motifs from the Jewish monotheism schema occur in reference to a human individual. But it is clear that the Jewish author of this story strongly disapproves of such claims by a human being. Indeed he uses Israel’s arch-enemy Nebuchadnezzar and his preposterous claims simply as a foil over against which to emphasize the unique divinity of the God of Israel (*Judith* 9. 14; 16. 14 [numbers 44–45]). From this example we learn something about the Jewish attitude towards the transfer of explicitly monotheistic language to a human being.

14. The Seven Brothers

The deaths of the seven famous brothers who became martyrs under Antiochus Epiphanes came to be viewed as propitiatory on behalf of the whole Jewish nation (*II Macc.* 7. 37–38; *IV Macc.* 17. 20–22).

15. The Teacher of Righteousness

At Qumran the Teacher of Righteousness was viewed as an inspired, authoritative guide to God’s revelation (e.g. CD 1. 11–12; 1QH 18. 10–12). Possibly he is to be identified as the ‘Interpreter of the Law’ in whom the prophecy of a star out of Jacob (Num. 24. 17) was thought to find its fulfilment (CD 7. 18–20), though this phrase may refer to a different, eschatological figure. Faith in the Teacher of Righteousness (*emunatam b^emoreh hatz-tzedek*) together with suffering formed a basis for the sectarians’ hope of deliverance from judgement, as they deduced from Hab. 2. 4b (1QpHab 7. 17 - 8. 3).

16. Interceding Saints

It was widely believed among the Jews of our period that departed saints were making intercession for the holy people. We have already noted that Isaiah and Jeremiah were among the major figures regarded by some as heavenly intercessors. Another was Onias (*II Macc.* 15. 12). Also the souls of the righteous in general were thought to be offering prayers for their brethren on earth (*I En.* 39. 5; *II Bar.* 85. 2, 12).

Summary

There was a tendency in the post-biblical period to magnify, to idealize, or to exalt and glorify famous people from the pages of the Bible. In a few cases such exaltation reached a remarkable degree, and a hero was given a divine title (θεός, υἱὸς θεοῦ), was imagined as occupying a place in heaven higher than the angels, was allowed to share in an isolated divine attribute (e.g. omniscience) or function (e.g. universal rule or judgement of all mankind), or became an object of supplication for favours. The pagan environment may well have encouraged these conceptions. But in such cases it is probably safe to assume, using the analogy of the apotheosis of human beings in pagan thought, that such honours were understood by the Jewish writers to be conferred on men by God. Certainly it is hard to find a clear statement to the effect that any of these exalted human beings was intrinsically divine by nature.

But in no case is an explicit form of monotheistic speech used to describe a hero, nor is a glorified hero ever played off against false gods or otherwise associated with a constellation of concepts from the monotheism schema of Judaism. The one contrary instance—Nebuchadnezzar in *Judith*—concerns an enemy of Israel in a context of firm disapproval. We have deferred to the appropriate sections below full treatment of those rare persons who were coalesced with angelic or eschatological figures. In all other cases the conclusion holds: while men could be allowed in Jewish thought to share in certain individual aspects of divinity, they were not in any way identified with the one God as such.

Angelic Beings

In the Jewish view of the relationship between God and man, angels, as is well known, came to play a mediatorial role, taking on various divine functions as delegates sent to accomplish God's will in the world. Far from pointing to the inaccessibility of a remote God, this religious conception shows how concretely the Jew imagined God's intervention in the affairs of his creation.³⁷

1. Angels as Messengers or Intercessors

Because the message which an angel bears to man is God's message, biblical texts often use some variant of the formula 'the LORD said' when narrating an angelophany (e.g., compare Ex. 3. 2 with 3. 7; Josh. 5. 14 with 6. 2).³⁸ While this formula does not establish the identity of an angel with God, it does give an angel a share in the divine function of revelation. Ancient Jewish exegesis of the Bible often assumes the activity of angels in places where the Hebrew text does not express it (e.g., LXX Deut. 33. 2, where angels are credited with the events on Mount Sinai).

Frequently in extra-biblical writings, angels make intercession to God on behalf of man (*Tobit* 12. 15; *I En.* 9. 3; 15. 2; 40. 6; 47. 2; 99. 3; 104. 1; *Test. Levi* 3. 5–6; 5. 6–7; *Test. Dan* 6. 2 [evidence from the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* must be used with care, however, for it may reflect Christian influence]; *Joseph and Aseneth* 15. 7). A few texts make a distinction between the angels of the presence, who actually present human prayers to God, and inferior angels who carry the prayers from earth to the former (*III Bar.* chapters 11–12; *Test. Levi* 3. 7; cf. 1QH 6. 13).

2. Angels as Objects of Prayer or Sacrifice

The step from praying *through* angels to praying *to* angels is a small one. *Tob.* 11. 14 contains a doxology to God and to his angels ('blessed are all thy holy angels'). *Test. Levi* 5. 5 speaks of making a direct request to an angel for help in the day of tribulation (it is uncertain whether evidence from this document is purely Jewish without Christian influence; note the brief comments on the debate by H.C. Kee in *OTPs*, I, 777–78). There is an example

of a prayer to an angel in *Test. Job* 3. 5–6, where Job requests authority to purge his locality of idolatry. Pseudo-Philo, *Bibl. Antiq.* 13. 6 prescribes an offering for the watchers of Israel as part of the yearly round of festivals. Josephus relates how the Essenes offer prayers εἰς τὸν ἥλιον; they might have regarded the sun as an angelic being (*Bel. jud.* II, 128).

Later evidence that some Jews worshipped angels comes from Clement of Alexandria and Celsus. The rabbis disapproved of these practices. The fact that the rabbinic writings contain admonitions not to cry to Michael or Gabriel and prohibitions of sacrificial offerings to Michael indicates that there was sharp division of opinion among certain Jews over these issues.³⁹

3. The Role of Angels in Creation

It is possible to trace through time an increasing tendency to ascribe to angels some role in creation. The plural form of the verb ‘let us make’ in Gen. 1. 26 (MT, *na-aseh*; LXX, ποιήσομεν) was always a matter of exegetical curiosity. *Jub.* 3. 4, echoing the language of Gen. 1. 26, includes angels in the deliberation over making Eve; yet in neither description of God’s act of creation (*Jub.* 2. 14; 3. 5) is any actual role given to angels. Philo, when expounding Gen. 1. 26, allows limited scope for angelic participation: an ‘artificer’, he says, formed the body of Adam from clay, though of course the breath of life came from God alone.⁴⁰ The creation account in *II Enoch* posits two primal beings, Adoil and Arkhas, light and darkness, who step out of the invisible things at God’s command and become the double source of all things in the visible world (*II En.* chapters 25–26).

4. God’s Principal Angel

With the proliferation of beliefs about angels in post-biblical Judaism came also attempts to classify the angels according to their supposed ranks. By analogy to the courts of the near eastern rulers by whom Israel had been governed for several centuries, it was most natural that reflection about the heavenly realm should organize the angels into a hierarchy under the administration of a sole, highest angel as God’s grand vizier.

Pregnant for this whole development was Ex. 23. 20–21: ‘I shall send my angel (τὸν ἄγγελόν μου) ... Listen to him and do not disobey him. For he will not shrink from you, for my name (τὸ ὄνομά μου) is upon him (ἐπ’ αὐτῶ)’ . As bearer of the divine name, this angel has authority to act as God’s functionary in the world, in this context as protector and punisher of Israel. In Isa. 63. 9 the ‘angel of God’s presence’ is said to have ‘saved’ and ‘redeemed’ Israel of old. In post-biblical literature this angel is mentioned by title again and again, sometimes as ‘the angel of the Lord’, sometimes as ‘the angel of the presence’ (*Let. Jer. 7; Song of the Three Young Men 26; Bel and the Dragon 34; Apoc. Zeph. 2. 1* and other passages; *Test. Judah 25. 2; Jub. 1. 27, 29; 2. 1*). At *Test. Mos. 10. 2* he is mentioned as an avenger of Israel.

Various names and prerogatives were given to this angel at different times and places. The name Michael has biblical roots: in Dan. 12. 1 Michael is ‘the great prince who has charge of your people’, and he will intervene supernaturally in the end time to save Israel from oppression. In the pseudepigrapha Michael executes judgement on Azazel (with help from Raphael, Gabriel, and Phanuel) (*I En. 54. 6*), performs intercession or mediation for Enoch (*II En. 33. 10*), and gives a blessing to Abraham (*Apoc. Abr. 10. 17*). In the Qumran documents Michael is regarded as prince of the angelic realm (‘the kingdom of Michael’, 1QM 17. 6), and he gains the title ‘Prince of Light’ (CD 5. 18; 1QM 13. 10 and other passages).

The ineffable name of God dwells in the chief angel according to *Apoc. Abr. 10. 3, 8*, which calls him Iael. His functions here include keeping peace among the cherubim, teaching the angelic choir, controlling the Leviathans, loosening Hades, executing judgement on necrolaters, and blessing Abraham and the promised land (10. 9–13).

God’s principal angel is described in *Prayer of Joseph (A)* as ‘the archangel of the power of the Lord’, ‘the chief captain among the sons of God’, and ‘the first minister before the face of God’ (7–8). He is also called ‘Israel, an angel of God and a ruling spirit’ (1), but it is difficult to be certain whether an identification with the biblical individual is intended. He claims to be a pre-existent being, ‘the firstborn of every living thing to whom God gives life’ (3).

Someone at Qumran gave God's angel the name 'Melchizedek', and looked for his advent at the end of time to fight for Israel (11QMelch). Full treatment of this figure is deferred to the following section.

Philo identifies the angel of the Lord of Ex. 23. 20 with the Logos (e.g., *De agr.* 51; *De migr. Abr.* 174).⁴¹ Some pseudepigrapha provide evidence for a related figure, an angel called the Voice of God.⁴²

Targum Neofiti on Genesis 32. 25–31 has Jacob wrestle with the angel Sariel, who identifies himself as 'the chief of those who praise'. For Jacob's statement 'I have seen God' (Gen. 32. 30) the Targum substitutes, 'I have seen angels from before the Lord'. This shows again how God's representative can stand in for God.

Thus we see that belief in a principal angel was common to a number of Jewish groups. He was variously identified as Michael, Iaoel, Israel, Melchizedek, and the Word or Voice of God. He was exalted above the ranks of other angels, stood in the presence of God, and could be sent to accomplish God's will on earth.⁴³

The concept of a principal angel of God was further enriched in later times. In talmudic sources this figure was given the names Jahoel, Michael, or Metatron; in the haggadic and targumic traditions it could be identified with the ascended Enoch. These streams flowed together in *III Enoch*, where Enoch-Metatron was given the title 'the lesser YHWH' (12. 5; 48C. 7) and was so filled with divine attributes that monotheism came under strain as a result. In late medieval Jewish mysticism he became an emanation from the Absolute.⁴⁴

Summary

In sources from the Second Temple period the only points at which angels impinged on deity proper were these: some angels received offerings or prayers for help from some Jews; they were sometimes thought to have been the first principles called into existence by God, or to have participated in the work of creation to the extent of forming Adam's body (not his rational soul); some Jews expected angels to execute judgement on God's enemies at the end of history; in a few instances an angel could bear divine names or titles (Iaoel, *el*,

Kyrios, or could be a personalized form of an isolated divine hypostasis such as the Name or the Voice of God.

In no case is an explicit monotheistic formula used of an angel, nor is the round of concepts which make up the Jewish monotheism schema associated with an angel. Thus while angels could be allowed in Jewish thought to share in certain individual aspects of divinity, they were not in any way identified with the one God as such.

Ideal-Eschatological Figures

Within Judaism eschatological hope pinned itself to a variety of figures. These included earthly, transcendent-human, and angelic beings.

1. The Prophet Like Moses

The prophecy in Deut. 18. 15–19 (‘[God] will raise for them a prophet like [Moses]’) was interpreted literally in our period, and was thought to refer to an individual prophet whose coming would herald the advent of the Messiah (possibly in *I Macc.* 4. 46; 14. 41; certainly in 4QTestim 5–8; John 1. 21; Acts 3. 22–23). In Samaritan belief this prophet was actually to be the Messiah (John 4. 25).⁴⁵ But though the prophet was expected to be able to solve all riddles of biblical interpretation, there is no evidence that this figure was invested with divine attributes.

2. The Messianic Son of David/Son of Levi

The Hebrew Bible contains a number of messianic passages which present an exalted picture of the coming king. Since on Jewish presuppositions the various biblical passages would have been read as all inspired by a single divine author, for our purpose we may combine them to form a unified portrait of the Messiah which a pre-Christian Jewish scribe might have found in the pages of the Bible.

Psalm 2 gives to God’s Messiah (*m^eshicho*, v 2) the title of God’s ‘son’ (*b^eni*, v 7). While this terminology could be used in Jewish literature to refer to ordinary righteous people (e.g., *Wisd. Sol.* 2. 18) or to angels (e.g., Job 1.6), the intrinsic sense of the phrase ‘son

of God' denoted someone derived from God in some way and sharing one or more of God's qualities. In Psalm 2 the Israelite king derives his authority from God (vv 7–9) and is like God insofar as he is God's regent (*malki*, v 6) who reigns over all the nations (v 8) and will execute universal judgement (v 9); to kiss the son in obeisance (*nashsh^equ—bar*, v 12) is to serve YHWH with fear (v 11). In MT Psalm 45. 7 the anointed king (note the verb *mashach*, v 8) is probably addressed as *elohim*.⁴⁶ The ideal king is called *adoni* or, on a different pointing, *adonay* in Psa. 110. 1, where he is said to sit at God's right hand in heaven.⁴⁷ A series of remarkable titles is piled onto the coming son of David in Isa. 9. 5: 'Wonderful Counsellor, Mighty God (*el gibbor*, Everlasting Father (*abi—ad*), Prince of Peace'. According to Isa. 11. 1–5 the 'shoot from the stump of Jesse' will possess the Spirit of YHWH (v 2) and will 'smite the earth with the rod of his mouth' (v 4). The Servant of the Lord in Isaiah will judge the proud (41. 15–16), he functions as God's agent for bringing revelation and redemption to the nations (42. 6–8; 49. 6), he makes atonement for Israel by the sacrifice of himself (53. 1–12),⁴⁸ and after his death he will rise again to surprise kings (52. 13–15; 53. 10) and to bring justification to many (53. 11–12).⁴⁹ Some of these passages show that there was a tendency in the biblical period to conceive of the Messiah in divine and not merely human terms, but they fall short of applying to the Messiah monotheistic language in either the narrow or the broad sense.

From this biblical messianism sprang two divergent conceptions in post-biblical Judaism: that of a human, earthly conqueror, and that of a transcendent, heavenly redeemer.⁵⁰ The rest of this section will be concerned with the language of exaltation which was used to describe the former figure; the latter will be considered in the next section.

The coming of the Messiah will introduce four hundred years of earthly rejoicing, at the end of which the Messiah will die with all humanity, according to *IV Ezra* 7. 28–30. In *Sib. Or.* III, 286, 652–56 the messianic king is to be sent by God to execute judgement on all people, slaying some and enforcing God's will on those who remain. *II Baruch* envisages a messianic age before the end of the world in which the anointed one will uproot the wicked, judge between nations, and bring about a time of universal prosperity, ending with the resurrection of the dead (29. 3—30. 5; 39. 7—40. 4; 70. 9; 72. 2–6). *Apoc. Abr.* 31. 1 calls

him God's 'chosen one', allows him to share in 'one measure of all [God's] power', and expects him to vindicate humiliated Israel. The secular realm of the ruler from Judah is expressly subordinated to the authority of God's high priest in *Test. Judah* 21. 2–4; nevertheless the same document sees the 'Star from Jacob' as sinless and a source of righteousness for the nations (24. 1–6). It is possible that the Davidic exorcist of Pseudo-Philo, *Bibl. Antiq.* 60. 3 is the Messiah, but this may be a reference to the legend of Solomon (as found in *Test. Sol.* and elsewhere). The ideal 'Lord Messiah' of *Psa. Sol.* 17. 21–44 will, like the Messiah of *Test. Judah*, be sinless (καθαρὸς ἀπὸ τῆς ἀμαρτίας, v 36); as universal king of all the earth, he will expel the wicked 'with the word of his mouth' (vv 24, 35) and will discipline Israel in righteousness (cf. 18. 7). The *Damascus Rule* has a Messiah who will make known the holy spirit to Israel (2. 10), wield the sword against the unrighteous (9. 10B), and pardon sins (18. 8).⁵¹ Throughout the Qumran documents we find an expectation of a Davidic ruler who will smite the enemies of the community; he will rule for ever (1QS 9. 11; CD 7. 20; 1QSa 2. 14, 20; 1QM 11. 4–7; 4QP Bless 3–4; 4QTestim). In view of the fact that Psalm 2, which was interpreted messianically at Qumran (4QFlor 1. 18–19), speaks in v 7 of God's 'begetting' (*yalad*) the Messiah with reference to the Messiah's enthronement, it is hard to imagine why some writers have felt it necessary to seek any other interpretation of the much disputed *yoled* of 1QSa.⁵² The NT bears witness to Jewish hopes surrounding an earthly son of David (Mark 12. 35–37; John 6. 15; Acts 1. 6).

In sectarian literature of the Hasmonean period there flourished temporarily a belief in a priestly Messiah alongside of the mainstream belief in a royal, Davidic Messiah. This expectation is clearest in *Test. Levi* 18. 2–14 (which may be Jewish or Christian), where it is prophesied that the priest whom God raises up will understand 'all the words of the Lord' (v 2) and make knowledge to cover the earth (v 5), will cause sin to cease (v 9) and open the gates of Paradise for the righteous (v 10), will bind Beliar (v 12) and reign for ever (v 8). Also *Test. Benj.* 11. 2–5 ascribes to him knowledge and illumination. *Test. Judah* gives him primacy over the royal messiah (21. 2–4). This seems to be the case also in 1QSa 2. 11. Several Qumran writings mention a Messiah of Aaron (e.g., 1Qs 9. 11; CD 12. 23) without

much elaboration.⁵³ The Aaronic Messiah appears to have been an idealized man rather than a divine being.

In general, then, we might summarize by saying that pre-tannaitic Judaism followed the Bible in expecting the predicted son of David to be a human being endowed with superhuman, indeed a few divine powers and characteristics. This picture lived on in parts of Jewry into the common era.⁵⁴ But from at latest the beginning of the second century onwards, there was an increasing tendency in official circles to emphasize the human limitations of the Messiah.⁵⁵ The Targums systematically counteracted Christian exegesis of messianic biblical passages.⁵⁶ The Mishnah contains formulaic references to ‘the days of the Messiah’, but it does not develop any theory of history oriented towards this figure.⁵⁷ With time the idea of the Messiah became vague.⁵⁸ The earthicizing direction of later Jewish messianism hence reversed even what modest inclination there might once have been to use the language of divinity for the son of David.

3. The One Like a Son of Man

The other stream of messianic thought which sprang from the OT took its impetus from Daniel’s vision of ‘one like a son of man’ who came ‘with the clouds of heaven’ (Dan. 7. 13).⁵⁹ By the time the book of Daniel was written, the expectation of a heavenly redeemer had become intertwined with motifs from the Wisdom tradition.⁶⁰ The transcendental figure who descends from above to smash the kingdoms of the world (cf. Dan. 2. 44–45) and receive universal dominion for ever (7. 14) is conceived differently from the son of David whose origins are traceable to the royal lineage of Israel. The ‘one like a son of man’ is related to the whole nation of Israel in vv 22, 27, but this collective dimension should no more be pitted against the seemingly obvious reference of the phrase elsewhere to an individual king who represents the nation in his person than the collective interpretation of the four beasts as ‘kingdoms’ in vv 23–24 should be pitted against the explicit ‘kings’ of v 17. Subsequent Jewish writers in antiquity, in any case, understood an individual person here, as will be shown below. His coming with the clouds may be significant: clouds are a characteristic feature of OT theophanies, and so suggest the divinity of the being whom

Daniel pictures as a man from heaven.⁶¹ A small group of critical scholars connect Daniel's vision with the vision of the *Merkavah* in Ezekiel chapter 1 and see Daniel's 'one like a son of man' as a concretization of the 'likeness of the glory of the LORD' (Ezek. 1. 28) already hypostatized in the earlier work.⁶² It has been observed recently that the unique Aramaic term *elyonin* ('Most High') in Dan. 7. 18, 22, 25, 27 can be read as a title, not for the 'Ancient of Days', but for the 'one like a son of man', which, in this context, would definitely place the latter in the realm of divinity.⁶³ Such an interpretation may be reflected in one of the Septuagintal versions of 7. 13, where 'one like a son of man' is expanded by the addition of καὶ ὡς παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν. It is not our intention here to offer this admittedly maximalist interpretation of the figure in Daniel 7 as the only possible one or even as likely, but only to see whether the language of this vision can be stretched into yielding a cluster of monotheistic language.

In fact it cannot. The one like a son of man may be a celestial being; he may come to occupy one of the (two?) thrones of 7. 9, together with the Ancient of Days (though this is not stated); he definitely receives universal and everlasting rule. Specifically monotheistic language and other key elements of the monotheism schema are wanting. The most that could be claimed for Daniel's one like a son of man is that he can be interpreted to be divine. He is not identified with the one God.

The vision in Daniel left its mark on several later Jewish apocalypses. Foremost among them is the *Similitudes of Enoch* (*I En.* chapters 37–71). Here the Elect One of God is pictured as sitting on God's own throne of glory to judge the works of both men and angels, not only in the sense that he executes God's sentence against them, but in the stronger sense that he himself weighs their deeds (45. 3; 55. 4; 61. 8). At this point an especially characteristic function of God has been ascribed to this being.⁶⁴ That son of man is the 'source of kingship' for the rulers of the world (46. 5). His name is 'the Before-Time', given before creation (48. 2–3), and he has been concealed in the presence of God since before the world (48. 6; 62. 7). 'All those who dwell upon the earth shall fall and worship before him' (48. 5); he receives praise (62. 6) and supplications for mercy (62. 9). The righteous 'will be saved in his name and it is his good pleasure that they have life' (the reference in this case

may be, however, to the Lord of Spirits)(48. 7). ‘In him dwells the spirit of wisdom’ (49. 3): this statement seems to have weightier ontological implications than the view that God bestows wisdom on the Messiah (cf. Isa. 11. 2). That son of man in the *Similitudes* appears to be identified with the ascended Enoch (70. 1; 71. 13–14).⁶⁵

Although the phrase ‘son of man’ does not occur in *IV Ezra* 13, this apocalypse shows clear indications of dependence on Daniel. The great man from the sea flies with the clouds of heaven (13. 3) and is called ‘my [God’s] son’ (13. 32, 37, 52). He has been kept by the Most High for many ages (13. 26). His coming brings pervasive destruction of the godless (13. 8–11) by the word of his mouth alone (13. 10, 27–28), and delivers God’s creation (13. 26).⁶⁶

Another figure which may be in part modelled on Daniel’s one like a son of man, albeit faintly, is the king from heaven of *Sib. Or.* V. This king is said to be ‘sent from God’ (108), ‘a great star ... from heaven’ (158), an ‘exceptional man from the sky’ (256—this line, like 257, may, however, be a Christian interpolation), ‘a blessed man ... from the expanses of heaven’ (414). His primary function is to destroy all kings and nations (109, 156–61, 418–19), after which he also rules the world to the benefit of the righteous, rebuilding Jerusalem and the temple (415–17, 420–27). He is said to act ‘alone’ (156) and is described as ‘one’ (256), but in neither case are these qualifiers linked with specifically divine titles or functions, so they fall short of expressing monotheism.

In summary, we may observe that the heavenly redeemer figure in Judaism was often graced with a divine aureola. Especially the one like a son of man in Daniel and in the *Similitudes of Enoch* bore a striking array of divine characteristics. The tendency towards deification of the Messiah may have had room to develop in connection with this apocalyptic figure because he was viewed as celestial in origin and was entirely to be awaited in the future, whence he could not threaten devotion to the one God in the present. Nevertheless we look in vain for an application to this figure either of explicit monotheistic formulations, or of that particular round of attributes which was most closely associated with the one God.

4. The Angelic Deliverer

At Qumran there flourished a belief in a coming angelic deliverer. According to 1QM 13. 10, God has appointed the ‘Prince of Light’ from ancient times to come to the aid of Israel in the great war at the end of history. Later in the same document this angel is given the name of Michael (17. 6–7), showing the influence of Dan. 12. 1–3. It seems likely that this archangel is to be identified with the ‘Prince of Light’ of 1QS 3. 20; CD 5. 18, to whom God has committed sovereignty over the world (balanced by the ‘Angel of Darkness’) until the divine purpose in history comes to completion.

Almost certainly it is this same figure that goes by the alternative name of Melchizedek in 11Q Melchizedek. Again here he appears as a heavenly agent of God who wars against Belial and his spirits to deliver the people of God (lines 9–15). Repeatedly throughout the document he is given the title *el*, ‘god’, and in two places OT scriptures are applied directly to him (Psa. 82. 1–2 and Isa. 52. 7, in lines 10, 15–19, respectively). He proclaims liberty to the people of Israel, ‘forgiving them [the wrongdoings] of all their iniquities’ (line 6). The fact that he ‘will, by his strength, judge the holy ones of God’ (line 9; cf. lines 10–11) indicates that he is exalted far above the heavenly council of gods.⁶⁷

The angelic redeemer expected at Qumran has much in common with other speculations about a principal angel of God. This being shares a few divine titles and functions while remaining distinct from God and subordinate to God. Nevertheless the divine titles and functions of this being are not those which are most characteristic of God as one.

5. The Anti-Messiah

The Jewish and Christian belief in the emergence of a godless ruler at the end of history who would persecute the elect people and set himself up in the place of God is well known. This anti-messiah is clearly portrayed already in Dan. 7. 19–26; 8. 23–25; 9. 27; 11. 36–45, and the conception is widespread in later Jewish and Christian literature. In two places language modelled on monotheistic statements is put into the mouth of the anti-messiah by Jewish writers. The sibyl has the city of Rome, hostess to Nero *redivivus*, boast,

‘I alone am, and no one will ravage me’ (*Sib. Or.* V, 173 [number 86]). In *Asc. Isa.* 4. 6–8 (number 120), Beliar claims, ‘I am the LORD, and before me there was no one’. Clearly both Jewish authors regard this self-application of the language of monotheism by beings other than the one God as a form of hybris, for in both cases the boasts of the anti-messiah are immediately followed by prophecies of destruction.

Summary

A tendency among some Jews to ascribe divine characteristics to eschatological figures was more marked than with ordinary mortals from the past or angels. Especially the Son of Man tradition stemming from Daniel 7 and proceeding through the *Similitudes of Enoch* into the mystical Enochic literature of later centuries, and the tradition of an angelic deliverer, closely bound with speculations about a principal angel in heaven, present the reader with phenomena which might be labelled ‘divine’ or at least ‘semi-divine’. It is therefore understandable that the rabbis of the early second century A.D. initially directed their ‘Two Powers’ polemic against those groups which were interested in the implications of verses such as Ex. 23. 20–21 (the Angel of the Lord) or Dan. 7. 9 (plural thrones in heaven), groups which found in these passages a biblical basis for their belief in two co-ordinated powers in heaven.⁶⁸ But even in these traditions the language of monotheism continued to be reserved for God alone.

It is a striking fact that the language of monotheism belonged specifically to the God of Israel, not only according to those orthodox circles which were later to define rabbinic unitarianism, but also in fringe circles which were comfortable with the transference of sometimes several divine functions to a key intermediary. The only exceptions we have found in this section have been in references to the anti-messiah, whose rivalry to the true God came under the most unsparing censure on the part of the Jewish writers.

Divine Hypostases

For our purpose a divine hypostasis may be defined as a title, attribute, function, or activity of God which at the level of linguistic discourse is abstracted from the person of God

in such a way as to be treated as a conceptual entity in its own right. This purely phenomenological definition avoids begging vexed questions about the historical origins, ontological status, or religious importance of divine hypostases for the Jews. Judaism had a number of such hypostases.

1. The Face of God

In *Life of Adam and Eve* 25. 3, Adam tells Seth that he was once carried off into Paradise where he saw the LORD sitting. God's appearance 'was unbearable flaming fire'. 4QSI 40, line 2 describes how the cherubim in heaven fall down and worship before 'the Glorious Face'. In *Merkavah* visions of this sort the face of God is the means by which the spiritual essence of God becomes manifest to the eyes of the mystic. But the references to the face of God are brief, and monotheistic language is absent.

2. The Glory of God

Often spoken of simply as an attribute, God's glory was hypostatized in at least two ways. It was present in the cloud which settled on Mount Sinai (Ex. 24. 16–17; *Jub.* 1. 2–3), it covered the tabernacle (Ex. 40. 34–38), and it led the Israelites in the wilderness (Ex. 13. 21; Num. 9. 16–23). The cloud-glory of God went on in the tannaitic period to become the *Shekinah*. This conception has been carefully described as 'a particular mode of God's presence in the world'.⁶⁹ A.M. Goldberg points out that the *Shekinah* was never regarded as a personal being, never gained attributes of its own, and was never independent of God.⁷⁰

The other hypostatization of God's glory was in the *Merkavah* tradition, which took as its starting-point Ezekiel's vision of an enthroned man called 'the appearance of the likeness of the glory of the LORD' (Ezek. 1. 28). But while some have conjectured that this figure may have influenced the conception of the one like a son of man in Daniel 7 (see note 62), there is no evidence that it played a major role in Jewish mysticism prior to the second century A.D.⁷¹ The description in Ezekiel 1 (and Daniel 7) in any case contributes nothing to our inquiry into monotheistic language.

3. The Name of God

In the OT a name sometimes functions as an abstraction which ‘expresses the living essence, the vital energy, the power of the human person or the deity’.⁷² This is certainly true in the classic text on the angel of the Lord, who has God’s name in or upon him (Ex. 23. 20–21). God can swear by his own great name (*I En.* 55. 2). Pseudo-Abraham sees a temple and a priesthood devoted to the name of God’s glory (*Apoc. Abr.* 25. 4). *Jub.* 36. 7 speaks of ‘the glorious and honored and great and splendid and amazing and mighty name which created heaven and earth and everything together’. According to 1QM 11. 2, David trusted in God’s name rather than in weapons. God’s name receives praise (1QH 1. 30; 1QapGen 21. 2). In Philo the name of God is knowable and is distinguished from the divine φύσις, which is beyond knowledge; the name is equated with the ‘interpreting Logos’, also called ‘the θεός of us who are imperfect [i.e., who are unable to attain to a rational grasp of God’s reality]’ (*Leg. alleg.* III, 207–08).

Because these functions of God’s name include creation, a key element in the monotheism schema, as well as the acceptance of human religious devotion, it is necessary to raise here the question of the relation between God and his name. Was the name regarded as a being distinct from (even if dependent on) God, or was it rather a way of speaking of God himself? J. Fossum points out that in Samaritan and Gnostic sources there is evidence that God’s name became enmeshed with current philosophical speculations about a demiurge and took on personal characteristics.⁷³ He is inclined to find such a reification already in the Jewish material as well. On the other hand, Jewish scholars have long protested against the view among Continental theologians that the name of God was reified among the Jews.⁷⁴ In this case it must be admitted that the Jewish material alone affords a slim basis for the view that the name of God was a separate being. The usage in the passages quoted can be fully and adequately explained on the hypothesis that for the Jews God’s name was that side of his ineffable being which was turned towards the world in revelation and intervention, available to the tongue of man. In some cases the name of God was perhaps thought of as an extension of God’s transcendent nature into the cosmos. It is by no means clear that the ascription of a

creative role to the name of God entailed a transfer of monotheistic language to a different being.

What was true of God's name in general holds good also for specific divine names or titles which became foci of special attention. For Philo the title θεός denoted God's creative potency, his goodness or mercy, while κύριος referred to God's ruling and judging power (e.g., *De Abr.* 121–22). A similar scheme informed the exegetical work of some of the earlier rabbis, though by the time of the Amoraim a reversal had taken place so that *elohim* was now God's justice and the Tetragrammaton his mercy. Personification of God's attributes of justice and mercy went to such an extent that they were sometimes represented as consulting with God about what course of action to take.⁷⁵ It seems plain, however, that in the rabbinic idiom this was nothing more than a vivid, picturesque way of portraying God himself in the mental activity of self-deliberation. Hence it appears to be unnecessary to investigate further the possible use of monotheistic language in connection with these titles and attributes as though they were mythical beings beside the one God.

4. The Power of God

Not infrequently in Jewish speech 'the Power' serves as a circumlocution for God himself (e.g., Mark 14. 62).⁷⁶ Occasionally, however, God's power is spoken of as something distinguished from his person. Aristobulus, in his exegesis of several OT passages which mention the 'hand' of God, says the reference is to 'the power of God', on the analogy of human beings, whose 'entire strength' and 'active powers' are in their hands (Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 8. 10. 8; see *OTPs*, II, 838); this power of God is a principle of the divine immanence 'throughout all things' (*Praep. ev.* 13. 13. 7; see *OTPs*, II, 840). In *Test. Sol.* 2. 4 the demon Ornias claims to be descended from 'an archangel of the power of God', indicating that God's power could be viewed as an angelic being. This conception also occurs at *Prayer of Joseph* (A) 7, where Israel describes himself as 'the archangel of the power of the Lord', and at Acts 8. 10, where the Samaritans confess that Simon (Magus) is 'that power of God which is called Great'. But monotheistic language is lacking in all cases.

5. The Spirit of God

One of the most important of the Jewish intermediaries for our concern was the spirit of God. The spirit is the means by which God creates: ‘When thou sendest forth thy Spirit, they are created’ (Psa. 104. 30; cf. *Judith* 16. 14); ‘my spirit creates the living’ (*II Bar.* 23. 5); ‘we have all (πάντες) been created by his holy spirit.... From the presence of God his spirit went forth, and the world (κόσμος) came into being’ (*Assump. Mos.*, quoted by Gelasius in his commentary on the acts of the council of Nicaea, II, 21. 7: see the Heinemann ed., p. 86, lines 13–18). The spirit is present everywhere: ‘Whither shall I go from thy Spirit?’ (Psa. 139. 7); ‘the Spirit of the Lord has filled the world (οἰκουμένην), and that which holds all things (τὰ πάντα) together knows what is said’ (*Wisd, Sol.* 1. 7; cf. 12. 1); ‘the spirit of God ... is throughout the world’ (*Sib. Or.* III, 701). At Qumran the spirit is the source of inspiration and revelation (1QS 8. 16; CD 2. 12). In the book of *Wisdom* God’s spirit is interwoven with the concept of cosmic wisdom (1. 6–7; 7. 22; 9. 17); in this context God’s spirit is seen to be ‘all-powerful’ (παντοδύναμον), ‘overseeing all’ (πανεπίσκοπον), and ‘penetrating through all spirits’ (διὰ πάντων χωροῦν πνευμάτων)(7. 23). To the spirit are ascribed the saving acts of God, the exodus and the conquest (Isa. 63. 10–14), and in one place the spirit is nearly equated with the Angel of God’s presence which accompanied Israel of old (Isa. 63. 9–10). The holy spirit receives praise (*Odes of Sol.* 6. 7). The rhetorical question, ‘Who has directed the Spirit of the LORD, or as his counsellor has instructed him?’ (Isa. 40. 13) implies the uniqueness and transcendence of God’s spirit.

Here the language of monotheism is applied to an intermediary. Therefore it is necessary, as in the instance of the name of God, to raise the question whether the spirit of God was regarded as a separate entity. Despite all the shades and variations of opinion among scholars about how the Jews conceived of the spirit of God, there is general agreement that it was never a fully independent being, not even in passages where it/he could be spoken of concretely as a personal divine agent of God.⁷⁷ The application of the language of monotheism to this hypostasis is not a transfer of such language to someone or something clearly other than God himself.

6. The Torah

The identification of cosmic wisdom with the book of God's commandments in two passages (*Sir.* 24. 23; *Bar.* 3. 37—4. 1) shows that already in the pre-Christian period that movement of thought was under way which was later to culminate in the rabbinic ascription of a pre-cosmic existence to the Torah. A parallel has been drawn between the Platonic doctrine of a *κόσμος νοητός* on which the visible world is ontologically based and the rabbinic conception of the Torah as the revelation of God's all-embracing plan for his creation.⁷⁸ But monotheistic language is wanting in connection with the Torah in the two passages from our period.

7. The Truth of God

In the OT itself we find the first step towards the hypostatization of God's truth: 'Oh send out thy light and thy truth; let them lead me, let them bring me to thy holy hill and to thy dwelling!' (*Psa.* 43. 3). This attribute of God is personified in *I Esdras* 4. 35—40, where lady truth is described as great, strong, eternal and righteous; she receives doxologies: 'The whole earth calls upon truth, and heaven blesses her' (4. 36); 'To her belongs the strength and the kingship and the power and the majesty of all the ages. Blessed be the God of truth!' (4. 40). Because of the obscurity of the poetic style in the *Odes of Solomon* it is difficult to be sure whether the male Truth in *Ode* 38. 1—16 is a cipher for God or for Christ, or is a personified abstraction. God's 'Angel of Truth' at Qumran (1QS 3. 24; 4QCatAf 12—13, column 1, 7) is a world principle. In no case, however, do we find monotheistic language.

8. The Voice of God

J.H. Charlesworth has recently gathered evidence from several pseudepigrapha suggesting that by A.D. 100 some Jews 'believed in the existence of a celestial being they called "the Voice"'.⁷⁹ The only passage about the voice of God which uses monotheistic language is *Apoc. Abr.* chapter 9. Here the speaking voice claims the titles 'Before-the-World', 'Mighty', and 'God', and presents himself as the creator of the world and the protector of Abraham. Since this passage is an expansion of *Gen.* 15. 1, where the biblical

text says ‘the word of the LORD came to Abram’ and Abram addresses the speaker as ‘Lord GOD’ (v 2), it seems that the ‘voice of God’ is not a being other than God himself. Why Charlesworth, after rightly stating that ‘the Voice is identified with God’ in this passage, proceeds a few lines later to say, ‘The Voice is a hypostasis separate from God’ (p. 35) is not clear to me.

9. The Wisdom of God

Together with the spirit of God, hypostatized wisdom was one of the most important Jewish intermediaries.⁸⁰ In Job 28 wisdom is a precious commodity which man unaided is unable to discover, but which God ‘saw’, ‘declared’, ‘established’, and ‘searched out’ from the beginning of the creation (note esp. vv 25–27) and makes available to man by revelation (v 28).⁸¹ The theme of wisdom’s existence with God before the world is elaborated in Prov. 8. 22–31, where lady wisdom claims to have been the first thing brought into being by God, thereafter a partner of some sort as he created.⁸² Pre-existent wisdom gains omnipresence and a heavenly throne in *Sirach* (1. 1–10; 24. 1–9); here she is also identified with the book of the law (24. 23).⁸³ A similar conception is found at *Bar.* 3. 9–4. 4. Using the pictorial language of a descent of wisdom from heaven, her failure to find a dwelling-place on earth, and her re-ascent, *I En.* chapter 42 makes the point that mankind has rejected God’s will; it is not certain whether a rejection of the Torah, or of Enoch (and his circle of disciples), or of some other form of revelation is meant. All of these relatively early statements lend themselves to the interpretation of wisdom as the purpose or will of God expressed in revelation; wisdom has not yet become an hypostasis of God himself.⁸⁴ Nevertheless, the characteristics of pre-existence, omnipresence, and partnership with God found here inform later developments.

Our fragment of Aristobulus preserved in Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 13. 12. 10–11 (see *OTPs*, II, 841) is too short and enigmatic to allow firm conclusions to be drawn about whether Aristobulus understands wisdom to be anything more concrete or personal than a pre-existent source of all light, intellectual as well as physical. For the first time in the *Wisdom of Solomon* we may be sure that we are dealing with hypostatization of divine

functions in the sense in which we have defined it above. In this book wisdom is interchangeable with ‘God’, ‘his power’, ‘spirit’, ‘the Spirit of the Lord’, and God’s ‘word’ (1. 3–7; 9. 1–2). It is ‘a breath of the power of God’, ‘a pure emanation (ἀπόρροια) of the glory of the Almighty’, ‘a reflection (ἀπαύγασμα) of eternal light’, a ‘mirror of the working of God’, ‘an image (εἰκὼν) of his goodness’ (7. 25–26). Wisdom is ‘the fashioner of all things (τεχνίτις πάντων)’ (7. 22; cf. 8. 6). Cosmological attributes of God are heaped upon wisdom: it is ‘all powerful (παντοδύναμον)’, ‘overseeing all (πανεπίσκοπον)’ (7. 23), it ‘pervades and penetrates all things (διὰ πάντων)’ (7. 24), it ‘can do all things (πάντα δύναται)’ (7. 27), it ‘reaches mightily from one end of the earth to the other’ (8. 1), ‘orders all things (διοικεῖ τὰ πάντα)’ (8. 1), ‘effects all things (τὰ πάντα ἐργαζομένης)’ (8. 5), is an ‘associate in [God’s] works’ (8. 3–4), and knows both the past and the future (8. 8). Her dwelling-place is the throne of God’s glory (9. 10). Saving acts ascribed to God in the Pentateuch are said to have been accomplished by wisdom (e.g., chapter 10). Wisdom is explicitly described as ‘unique (μονογενής)’ (7. 22) and ‘but one (μία)’ (7. 27). These unity-predications fall short of stating that wisdom is one *in divinity*, but taken in the context of the round monotheism schema expressed in neighbouring passages about wisdom, they come as near as anything in the Jewish literature considered here to applying the language of monotheism unreservedly to an hypostasis.⁸⁵

Wisdom appears as an hypostasis elsewhere, though with less elaboration. God can command his wisdom to create man (*II En.* (A) 30. 8). Wisdom is possibly viewed as an angelic being in the *Testament of Solomon*, where it is an ‘attendant’ of God’s thrones (3. 5). In Philo, wisdom and the Logos overlap at many points, though wisdom never appears, according to F. Keferstein, as a nature- or world-spirit or as an angel, as the Logos does.⁸⁶ But wisdom for Philo is definitely an instrument of God in creation: Philo can speak of ‘mother Wisdom, through whom (δι’ ἧς) the universe (τὰ ὅλα) came into existence’ (*De fuga et inventione*, 109); people ought to give ‘a mother’s honour to Wisdom, by whose agency (δι’ ἧς) the universe (τὸ πᾶν) was brought to completion’ (*Quod deterius potiori insidiari soleat*, 54).

Monotheistic language is clearly applied to the figure of wisdom.⁸⁷ Therefore we must raise the question of the relation between this hypostasis and God. The key text is the *Wisdom of Solomon*. Regarding the relationship between God and wisdom in this book, there is a quagmire of conflicting opinions. Some suppose that wisdom here is nothing more than a literary personification of God's immanent working in the world.⁸⁸ Others see wisdom in this book as an emanation or principle in which God's activity becomes effectual.⁸⁹ Yet others are willing to ascribe to wisdom some measure of discreteness or even of conscious personality.⁹⁰ But along all of these ontological gradations, there is general agreement that the figure of wisdom, whatever else it might be, is not a fully independent divine being beside God analogous to the consort of a high god in pagan thought.⁹¹ Wisdom shares to a greater or to a lesser extent in God's own being. The stark monotheistic statements in *Wisd. Sol.* 11. 21; 12. 12–14; 12. 27, and 14. 21 (numbers 50–53) would seem to require that any entity as richly endowed with divine cosmological functions and attributes as wisdom bears cannot be entirely separate from the God to whom these attributes properly belong. Even if it should be true that the concept of wisdom in Israel absorbed features of pagan deities from Israel's environment, it seems plain that in the thought of Pseudo-Solomon these elements have been integrated within a basically monotheistic framework. That is not to say that Pseudo-Solomon was a unitarian as the later rabbis were. We cannot exclude *a priori* the possibility that the Jewish philosophers of Alexandria might have arrived at the concept of multiple centres of rational energy within the unitary divine life already prior to Christianity (though the evidence for this in *Wisd. Sol.* and Philo seems to me to be quite tenuous). It is to say, however, that in concretizing the figure of wisdom and making it a divine plenipotentiary, our author probably did not understand himself to be committing the very sin which he himself regarded as the cardinal one: bestowing on something other than God 'the name that ought not to be shared' (14. 21). H.F. Weiss speaks for many when he writes:

Precisely the *Wisdom of Solomon* makes it clear that Jewish thought about hypostases saw other possibilities between the two extremes of 'poetic personification' on the one hand and 'independent *Gestalt* beside God' on the other, without thereby regarding these speculations or similar ones as contradictory to the premise of God's unity.⁹²

With a reasonable degree of probability we can conclude, then, that Jewish wisdom speculation did not involve transferring the language of monotheism to a being essentially other than the one God.

10. The Word of God

Along with the spirit of God and the divine wisdom, the word of God is of special interest for our study. These three hypostases provided a biblically based vocabulary to aid Jewish reflection on the relationship between God and the cosmos. The word of God is hypostatized already in Isaiah chapters 40–66: it ‘will stand for ever’ (40. 8); it gets sent from God’s mouth with a mission and will return when the mission has been successfully accomplished (55. 10–11). In *Wisdom of Solomon* the destroying angel who slew the Egyptian first-born on Passover night is identified with God’s ‘all-powerful word’ which ‘leaped from heaven, from the royal throne’ (18. 14–16).

By far the most curious speculation about God’s word to be found in pre-Christian Judaism is in Philo’s doctrine of the Logos. We need not summarize again the many facets of Philo’s teaching on this subject.⁹³ But we wish to determine whether Philo used the language of monotheism in connection with the Logos.

According to Philo, the Logos existed before the universe (e.g., *Migr. Abr.* 6). Sometimes Philo distinguishes the Logos from created reality, thus placing it on the side of God (e.g., *Opif.* 139), but in other places he makes God its ‘fountain’ (e.g., *Det.* 82) or calls it the firstborn son of God (πρωτόγονον υἱόν)(e.g., *Agricult.* 51). It was God’s instrument (ὄργανον) by means of which (δι’ οὗ) he created the world (τὸν κόσμον)(e.g., *Cher.* 127; cf. *Migr. Abr.* 6). We have seen that Philo, while allowing angels to participate in forming Adam’s body of clay, reserves the breath of life for God alone. The Logos differs from angels in this respect. According to *Opif.* 139 the creator employed for the creation of Adam’s soul ‘no pattern taken from among created things, but solely (μόνῳ) ... His own Word (λόγῳ)’. Besides sharing in the uniquely divine work of making the soul, the Logos was that through which (δι’ οὗ) God made the whole (σύμπας) world (*Sacr.* 8; *Spec. leg.* I,

81; cf. *Migr. Abr.* 4–6). The Logos is eternal (ἀίδιος, *Plant.* 8, 18), is everywhere present as the ‘prop of the Whole’ (ἔρεισμα τῶν ὅλων) or as the ‘Bond of the Universe’ (δέσμον τοῦ παντός)(*Plant.* 8–9), and is the ‘ruler and steersman of all’ (ὁ δίοπος καὶ κυβερνήτης τοῦ παντός)(*Cher.* 36). The frequent identification of the Logos as an angel or an archangel (e.g., *Somn.* I, 239) suggests that it may be more than an impersonal principle, but because of Philo’s propensity for allegorizing we cannot be absolutely sure of this. God dwells in his Logos as in a house (οἶκος, *Migr. Abr.* 4–5). Thus the Logos can be described as ‘divine’ (θεῖος, e.g., *Cher.* 36) and can bear the titles κύριος (*Leg. all.* III, 218), δεύτερος θεός (*Quaest. et sol. in Gen.* II, 62), and even θεός (as distinguished from ὁ θεός)(*Somn.* I, 229).

Despite this clear monotheism schema associated with the Logos, it is not easy to locate any passage in Philo which applies an explicit monotheistic confession to the Logos.⁹⁴ This may be explained in part by Philo’s presupposition that ‘He that is truly God is One (εἷς ἔστιν), but those that are *improperly so called* [including the Logos among the multiple ‘powers’ of God] are more than one’ (*Somn.* I, 229–30 [italics mine]).

Again it is necessary to ask whether the Logos was a being other than God. Among Philo scholars there is no consensus of opinion on this subject. Some suppose that Philo’s Logos was nothing more than God himself as apprehended by human reason, God in one of his many aspects or modes of self-manifestation.⁹⁵ Others, especially German scholars, see in the Logos a semi-personal being between God and the world.⁹⁶ There are whole classes of passages in Philo which seem incontrovertibly to support each of these positions, and it is hard, given the nature of the evidence, to decide which side represents his real intention, or whether indeed we have to reckon with inconsistency of thought on his part. In Philo the doctrine of hypostases was joined to a metaphysical distinction between God and his powers, between the essence of the deity and his modes of self-manifestation; this may tip the scale slightly in favour of the view that Philo’s Logos, however concretely portrayed by him in some passages for the sake of the intellectually dull, was in fact internal to the divine life, though distinct from the ineffable divine essence. With the study of Philo’s Logos in its present unsettled state it would be unwary to venture any more of a conclusion than that this is the one, isolated instance in all the literature considered here where there is a *possible*, if

slightly improbable, transfer of the monotheism schema—but not of explicit forms of monotheistic speech—to an intermediary other than God.

In the Targumim the word of God (Aramaic *memra*) is often substituted where the text of the Bible speaks of God anthropomorphically. In some cases the *memra* appears to be more than a mere circumlocution: it can be a personified abstraction of the divine presence and power. To quote Moses ben Nachman: the *memra* is ‘God himself in certain modes of self-manifestation’.⁹⁷

After Jesus had been identified with the Logos in the Fourth Gospel (John 1. 1–18), this concept went on in the Christian tradition to become one of the primary categories for expressing the relationship between him and God.⁹⁸

Summary

The language of monotheism is not found to be associated with most of the divine hypostases recognized in Second Temple Judaism. To the name of God was ascribed a role in the creation of the world, but other significant elements of the monotheism schema are wanting in this case in the sources datable to our period. The monotheism schema is more completely represented in connection with God’s spirit, wisdom, and word. But with the possible exception of Philo’s Logos—and this is not a certain or even a very probable exception—there is no evidence to suggest that these hypostases were regarded as beings separate from God. Indeed a recent study of God’s glory, word, power, spirit, and wisdom by Jewish scholars concluded that these hypostases were ‘interchangeable because they all designate God’s immanence or the deity itself’.⁹⁹ Therefore in all probability the occurrence of the monotheism schema in association with God’s name, spirit, wisdom, and word is not to be viewed as a transfer of the language of monotheism away from God himself, though it may involve a transfer of monotheistic language away from the transcendent divine essence to God’s modes of revelation.

Wisdom is described as *μονογενές* and *μῖα*, but this is as close as the sources come to applying explicit forms of monotheistic speech to any hypostasis.

Conclusions

This survey of Jewish intermediaries has focused on the tendency to apply to them the language of divinity, with a view to discovering whether or to what extent the specific language of monotheism was regarded by Jewish authors as transferable. Several conclusions can be drawn.

First, we have found abundant evidence that isolated divine titles, attributes, and functions could be shared by intermediaries. In certain cases (especially Moses, the principal angel, the Messiah, the expected one like a son of man, and God's spirit/wisdom/word) we may speak of a complex of divine features suggesting some degree of divinization. All of this stands in contrast to the unitarian form of monotheism defined by the sages. Clearly not all Jews in the pre-Christian period were offended by the ascription of the language of divinity in general to beings other than the one God. It is possible that the roots of rabbinic unitarianism stretch well back into the pre-Christian centuries, for there are many statements of monotheism which lend themselves to a unitarian interpretation. But we have no evidence of a campaign by unitarian Jews against the views of other Jewish monotheists until the controversy arose in the early second century A.D. about two powers in heaven. We must assume that prior to that time unitarian monotheism and more open forms of monotheism existed side by side in the various branches of Judaism.

Second, where a complex of divine features is associated with a Jewish intermediary, it is not usually made up of those elements which we have found to be most characteristic of Jewish monotheism. The monotheism schema is applied to intermediaries solely in the case of certain hypostases which are not clearly independent of the one God (Philo's Logos being a possible but not a certain exception).

Third, we have found no example where an explicit form of monotheistic speech is applied to any intermediary in a context of approval. On the contrary, monotheistic claims in the mouths of Nebuchadnezzar, the anti-messiah Beliar, and Nero's Rome take on a tone of hybris and are punished with divine judgement. These instances only prove the rule.

It seems safe to draw the general conclusion that there was no *tendency* whatsoever among Jewish monotheists to transfer the language of monotheism to beings other than the

one God. Our evidence points strongly in the opposite direction. Representative of the Jewish attitude as a whole are Isa. 42. 8 (number 22): ‘I shall not give my glory to another’ (cf. 48. 11 [number 31]), or *Wisd. Sol.* 14. 21 (number 53): the name of God is ‘the name that ought not to be shared’. This is as true in apocryphal, pseudepigraphical, and Alexandrian literature produced by circles other than the unitarian rabbis as it is of those documents which fed the main stream of emerging Jewish orthodoxy. Apparently Jews living in a polytheistic society, including those who were ready to use the language of divinity more generously than modern Jews or Christians do, were nevertheless extremely sensitive on the point of God’s unity as such. In the works they have left us, the language of monotheism is very tightly bound indeed to the concept of the one God. In this respect, Jewish usage of the language of monotheism was markedly different from that of pagan writers, for whom monotheistic language in its merely relative sense could be applied to more than one god at a time.

This may be due in part to the reactionary attitude of the Jewish community which had to live as a minority group under the empires of the ancient world with their polytheistic ideologies. But there is an inner reason as well, an explanation which is inherent in the concept of one God. The divine attribute of unity, which implies the unique transcendence of God over against all else, is the one attribute of God which, by its very definition, cannot be shared. To share it would be by that very fact to surrender it, to empty it of all meaning. In this respect, God’s unity is unique among even the divine attributes. The actual usage of the language of monotheism in the sources indicates that ancient Jewish authors were well aware of this.

IX. METAPHYSICAL ELEMENTS IN JEWISH MONOTHEISM

Finally we tackle the question of whether Jewish monotheism, which for the most part made use of functional language about God, was influenced to any significant extent by ontological categories of thought. In particular we shall wish to note whether the concept of God’s being or essence was familiar to Jewish monotheists. Since there is widespread agreement that Jewish statements about God were usually couched in functional terms, the task in this section must be to marshal such evidence as there might be on the other side.

Although because of practical limitations it will not be possible here to explore all possible lines of evidence comprehensively, enough data can be brought forward to supply the basis for a general conclusion.

Analysis

A good starting-point is the translation of God's special name in the septuagintal version of Ex. 3. 14. When Moses asks after God's own name, God replies: 'I am Being (ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ὢν) ... You shall say to the sons of Israel, "Being (ὁ ὢν) has sent me to you"'. Here the Jewish translator puts forward the Hebrew God YHWH (MT: *ehyeh*, a play on *yahweh*) as the answer to the Greek quest for true, ultimate being. C.H. Dodd has written, 'Hellenistic Judaism was thus provided with a designation for the Deity of profoundly philosophical import'.¹⁰⁰ Because this name for God occurs in the translation of a key passage of the Torah, it would have been read in Greek-speaking synagogues throughout the Diaspora, and perhaps in parts of Palestine as well.

This passage certainly had a major effect on Egyptian Judaism. Philo paraphrases the meaning of God's declaration thus:

First tell them that I am He Who IS (ἐγώ εἰμι ὢν ὢν), that they may learn the difference between what IS (ὄντος) and what is not (μὴ ὄντος), and also the further lesson that no name at all can properly be used of Me, to Whom alone existence belongs (ὧ μόνῳ πρόσκειται τὸ εἶναι)(*De vit. Mos.* I, 75).

The ontological concept of God impinges on Philo's monotheism in this passage: God *alone* has a full share in Being. This perspective coloured Philo's doctrine of God throughout, and through Philo reached a host of his readers in the ancient world.

The view of God which lies behind LXX Ex. 3. 14 has also left its mark on other septuagintal passages. For our purpose the most significant are the monotheistic declarations in LXX Isaiah chapters 40–66. Note, for example, Isa. 43. 10 (number 23): '*I am* (ἐγώ εἰμι), before me no other God came to be, and there shall be none after me', or Isa. 45. 18 (number 28): '*I am* (Ἐγώ εἰμι), and there is none else'. The latter of these passages is noteworthy in

that the phrase ἐγὼ εἰμι translates MT *ani yahweh*, showing that the Tetragrammaton itself could be understood as denoting God's being.

This ontological emphasis is found again and again in other monotheistic texts. 'Thou alone dost exist (*Solus enim es*)' (*IV Ezra* 8. 7 [number 40]). 'O my Lord our King, you only are (σὺ εἶ μόνος)' (*Additions to Esther* 14. 3 [number 48]).¹⁰¹ The Jews worship 'the only real God (μόνον τὸν ὄντα θεόν)' (*IV Macc.* 5. 24 [number 69]).¹⁰² Mimicking divine speech, the city of Rome is represented as saying, 'I alone am (μόνη εἰμί), and no one will ravage me' (*Sib. Or.* V 173 [number 86]). The God of Israel is 'the true and real God (ὁ ἀληθινὸς καὶ ὄντως θεός)' (*Lives of the Prophets* 21. 8 [number 126]). He is 'the real Lord (τὸν ὄντα κύριον)' (Pseudo-Diphilus/Menander, fragment [number 138]). 'He that really IS is One (εἷς ὁ ὢν ὄντως ἐστὶ)' (Philo, *Opif.* 172 [number 153]). 'It is good that He Who IS should be alone (τὸ μόνον εἶναι τὸν ὄντα καλόν ἐστὶ)' (Philo, *Leg. all.* II, 1 [number 154]).

Titles of God in Jewish writings sometimes showed the influence of speculative philosophy. Pseudo-Solomon once calls God τὸν ὄντα (*Wisd. Sol.* 13. 1). Philo frequently uses the same title (e.g., *Opif.* 172; *Leg. all.* II, 1; *Vit. Mos.* 75 [numbers 153–54, 156]; *Spec. leg.* I, 53), but he varies it with other divine titles having similar metaphysical import: 'the real God (ὁ ὢν θεός)' (e.g., *Spec. leg.* I, 31; cf. I, 28), or the abstract τὸ θεῖον (e.g., *Opif.* 170 [number 153]; *Dec.* 63; *Spec. leg.* I, 32). Very often in Philo φύσις is a cipher for 'God'.¹⁰³ According to Philo, certain attributes are vested in God by nature (πέφυκε) (*Spec. leg.* I, 30). That the philosophical view of God was not foreign to Palestine is shown by the frequent use of the title τὸ θεῖον in Josephus, as well as Josephus's close association of God with Fate and Fortune, and his use of the Stoic theological phrases 'not far removed' and 'stands in need of nothing'.¹⁰⁴

A number of Jewish authors mention in statements of monotheism attributes of God which concern God in himself rather than God in relation to the world. Hence we read that God is 'ineffable (ἀθέσφατος)' (*Sib. Or.* III, 11 [number 77]), 'self-begotten (αὐτοφυής)' (*Sib. Or.* III, 12 [number 77]), 'unbegotten (ἀγέννητος)' (*Sib. Or.* fragment 1, lines 7, 17 [numbers 89–90]), 'inscrutable' (*II Bar.* 21. 9–10 [number 96]), 'self-originate',

‘unbegotten’, ‘self-perfected’, ‘self-devised’, etc. (*Apoc. Abr.* 17. 9–10 [number 104]), ‘self-completing (αὐτοτελής)’ (Pseudo-Orpheus, fragment, 10 [number 131]), and ‘self-sufficing (αὐτῷ ἀτάρκης)’ (Josephus, *Cont. Ap.* II, 190 [number 168]). ‘His form and magnitude surpass our powers of description’ (Josephus, *Cont. Ap.* II, 190 [number 168]).

Philo explicitly distinguishes the essence (οὐσία) of God from the divine attributes. There is an extended meditation on this distinction in *Spec. leg.* I, 32–50. In our search for God, Philo says, two questions arise: the first, ‘whether the Deity exists’, the second, ‘what the Deity is in essence’ (κατὰ τὴν οὐσίαν). The second of these questions is ‘probably impossible’ (ἴσως ἀδύνατον) to answer (32). When Moses inquired (Ex. 33. 13–16) about what God is in his essence (κατὰ τὴν οὐσίαν)(41), he received the firm answer, ‘Do not, then, hope to be ever able to apprehend Me or any of My powers in Our essence’ (κατὰ τὴν οὐσίαν)(49). God, according to Philo, may only be known insofar as he manifests himself in his creation (49). Likewise in *Legatio ad Gaium* 114 Philo accents the hybris of Gaius Caligula, who claimed divine honours: Philo points out that Caligula differs from the gods in both nature (φύσις) and substance (οὐσία). Philo only goes far enough in his speculation about the divine essence to suppose that God’s oneness implies the simplicity of his nature, the absence of composition in his substance (e.g., God is a φύσις ἀπλῆ in *Leg. all.* II, 2 [number 154]).¹⁰⁵

We find a similar set of ideas in Josephus. Evidence of Greek philosophical influence on Josephus is found in his use of the terms οὐσία and, more frequently, φύσις to denote the divine essence. A. Schlatter comments: ‘Through [Josephus’s] use of the formula “nature”, a Being was posited behind God’s attributes and actions by which they subsist’.¹⁰⁶ Like Philo, Josephus regards the essence of God as unknowable: ‘the nature of His real being (ὅποῖος δὲ κατ’ οὐσίαν) passes knowledge’ (*Cont. Ap.* II, 167 [number 167]).

The writers of the NT, while not deeply influenced by this philosophical trend, were not untouched by it. Echoes of the view of God as true being may be heard in the Johannine literature: in John 8. 58 Jesus claims, ‘Before Abraham was, *I am* (ἐγὼ εἰμι)’, where the unexpected present tense sounds like a deliberate allusion to the OT passages cited above. Several times in the book of Revelation God is described as ὁ ὢν (Rev. 1. 4, 8; 4. 8; 16. 5).

In a speech on the lips of Paul to a Greek audience, the author of Acts refers to God using the abstract τὸ θεῖον (Acts 17. 29). The terminology of the divine ‘nature’ has left its stamp on II Peter 1. 4, though in this verse φύσις denotes attributes of God which are communicable to believers, precisely the opposite of the unknowable divine essence of Philo and Josephus. The several indications of a metaphysical view of God to be found in the Pauline corpus will be considered in the appropriate section of the following chapter. In addition to these explicit words and phrases, there are many places in the NT where functional expressions used to describe God seem to presuppose some kind of being behind God’s action. As long ago as the end of the last century, H.S. Nash wrote an article to correct the unhistorical and theologically motivated anti-metaphysical bias of Ritschlian NT scholars. He concluded that the apologetic concern of the NT authors to establish the truth claims of Christianity within a monotheistic worldview required them to use mental processes which ‘inevitably contain a native metaphysical element’.¹⁰⁷ R.N. Longenecker sums up the evidence of the NT: ‘Though it was necessarily elemental and dominantly functional, the earliest Christian faith contained certain implicit metaphysical presuppositions and carried ontological overtones’.¹⁰⁸

Conclusion

The data gathered here are nothing more than a few scattered gems which have come to the writer’s attention while engaged with a limited selection of source material. A systematic investigation of all the available Jewish sources, including the entire Septuagint, Philo, and Josephus, taking into account the several other ways in which ontological assumptions about God might have come to expression, would doubtless disclose a wealth of additional evidence. But already here we have collected enough evidence to provide a firm footing for the conclusion of W. Pannenberg: the Greek concept of true, unitary, divine Being ‘is not excluded by the biblically grounded understanding of reality, but is taken up and refined by it’.¹⁰⁹ Jews who were in the habit of speaking about God in functional terms were not necessarily unfamiliar with or averse to more speculative or static modes of theological expression.

This result may be illuminated by a general philosophical principle. Function and nature, existence and essence, becoming and being belong together,¹¹⁰ for ‘you cannot define everything in terms of events, because events happen to things’.¹¹¹ In the words of R.H. Fuller:

It is not just a quirk of the Greek mind, but a universal human apperception, that action implies prior being—even if, as is also true, being is only apprehended in action. Such ontic reflection about Yahweh is found even in the OT, e.g. ‘I AM’ (Exodus and Deutero-Isaiah).¹¹²

CONCLUSIONS

The results of our study of Jewish monotheism may be summarized as follows.

1. Ten forms of explicit monotheistic speech may be identified in the sources. These forms of speech were interchangeable and associated with one another.
2. Among them, the juxtaposition of the adjective ἕἰς (or μόνος) with either of the divine titles θεός or κύριος was a standard and popular form of monotheistic speech.
3. The sources confirm the judgement that belief in one God was a primary tenet of Jewish faith.
4. Explicit monotheistic language is found frequently in prayers and in credal or confessional statements, but very rarely in acclamations.
5. Ancient Jewish monotheism may be defined as the belief that there is but one transcendent creator of all things, and the commitment to offer religious worship and service to no other being. This did not exclude belief in heavenly, angelic beings created by God to exercise ruling power over human affairs on earth, nor did it prevent the use of the title ‘gods’ for these beings. The sporadic literary evidence of Jewish prayers or sacrifices to angels is probably to be understood as a declension from an ideal which is clearly stated in most of our sources, though work remains to be done on the epigraphical and iconographical evidence for popular Jewish syncretism in the Graeco-Roman period.
6. In collective Jewish thought there was a schema of concepts characteristically associated with the idea of one God. These concepts included: a negative attitude towards

idolatry and polytheism; the concept of God as creator; a distinction between God and ‘all things’, over which he rules; the idea that God is the beginning and the end; and God’s unique relationship to the one people of Israel with one temple in Jerusalem.

7. The prepositional ‘all’-device of Hellenism was used infrequently but strikingly by Jews and Christians to sum up many elements of the monotheism schema.

8a. Prior to the great controversy of the sages with Christianity and Gnosticism, open forms of monotheism which allowed divine titles, attributes and functions to be shared by intermediaries co-existed alongside of unitarianism.

8b. In non-christian Jewish texts, explicit forms of monotheistic speech were not applied to intermediaries of any kind. Many elements of the monotheism schema were associated with certain divine hypostases (the name, spirit, wisdom, and word of God) which were not clearly independent of God himself. These facts suggest that the Jewish writers were aware that the specific language of monotheism, in contrast to the language of divinity in general, is intrinsically non-transferable. In this respect, Jewish usage of the language of monotheism was markedly different from that of pagan writers, for whom monotheistic language in its merely relative sense could be applied to more than one god at a time.

9. While functional modes of speech about God are preponderant in Jewish sources, many Jewish writers were familiar with the ontological concept of God’s being, essence, or nature, and expressed this concept in their writings.

CHAPTER FIVE

JEWISH MONOTHEISM IN THE WRITINGS OF PAUL

To complete part one there remains the task of examining the data of Paul's letters in the light of what we have learned about Jewish monotheism. In this chapter we shall put to the Pauline material the same questions which guided our inquiry in the last.

Because scholarly opinion about the authenticity of some of the letters ascribed to Paul in the NT continues to be unsettled and there is no universal agreement on where to draw the line, we shall consider the evidence of the disputed letters in the Pauline corpus (Ephesians, Colossians, II Thessalonians, I Timothy, II Timothy, Titus) alongside of the seven generally accepted epistles. The doubts of many in the academic community about the authenticity of some or all of these six documents will be indicated by enclosing data from them in brackets []. This procedure will enable the reader to make his own critical decisions, without excluding evidence which, from the most inclusive standpoint (my own), ought to be considered. It will be apparent that our conclusions about the monotheism of Paul are in no significant way affected by the inclusion or exclusion of the material in question.

I. FORMS OF PAULINE MONOTHEISTIC SPEECH

Six forms of explicit monotheistic speech may be identified in the Pauline corpus.

A. Phrases which link a divine title with the adjective *ἕως* or *μόνος*: *ἕως ὁ θεός* (Rom. 3. 30); *μόνω σοφῶ θεῶ* (Rom. 16. 27); *ἕως θεός, ἕως κύριος* (I Cor. 8. 4, 6); *ὁ θεός ἕως ἔστιν* (Gal. 3. 20); [*ἕως κύριος, ἕως θεός* (Eph. 4. 5–6); *μόνω θεῶ* (I Tim. 1. 17); *ἕως θεός* (I Tim. 2. 5); *ὁ μόνος δυνάστης ... ὁ μόνος ἔχων ἀθανασίαν* (I Tim. 6. 15–16)].

B. Phrases which speak of God as 'living' or 'true': *θεοῦ ζῶντος* (Rom. 9. 26; II Cor. 3. 3; 6. 16; [I Tim. 3. 15; 4. 10]); *θεῶ ζῶντι καὶ ἀληθινῶ* (I Thess. 1. 9).

C. Statements that God has no rival or opposition which can impede his will: 'It is God who justifies; who is to condemn?' (Rom. 8. 33–34; cf. vv 35–39); 'Who can resist his will?' (Rom. 9. 19).

D. Quotations from the OT text Isa. 45. 23 (note the monotheistic context in Isa. 45. 22–25 [number 29]): with reference to God (Rom. 14. 10–11); with reference to Christ (Phil. 2. 10–11).

E. A passage which implies that human devotion to the Lord is to be undivided: ‘to secure your undivided devotion to the Lord’ (I Cor. 7. 35). In categories D and E, the sense of the language is monotheistic (or monolatrous) even if it refers to Christ rather than God.

F. Various statements which ground the unity of the universal church in a divine unity: ‘The same Lord is Lord of all’ (Rom. 10. 12); ‘We, though many, are one body in Christ’ (Rom. 12. 5); ‘Is Christ divided?’ (I Cor. 1. 13); ‘There are varieties of gifts, but the same Spirit ... the same Lord ... the same God.... All these are inspired by one and the same Spirit’ (I Cor. 12. 4–6, 11); [‘... that he might create in himself one new man in place of the two, so making peace, and might reconcile us both to God in one body through the cross ... for through him we both have access in one Spirit to the Father’ (Eph. 2. 15–16, 18)].

The first three of these forms of monotheistic speech (A, B, C) are drawn straight from Jewish usage. The fifth (E) is reminiscent of the Jewish language of monolatry. The sixth (F) may be compared to those statements in *II Baruch*, Philo and Josephus which correlate the unity of God with the unity of God’s people. Thus Jewish monotheism has left its stamp on Paul’s monotheistic language.

II. THE ΕΙΣ ΘΕΟΣ/ΚΥΡΙΟΣ FORMULA

Paul shows acquaintance with the Jewish formula in four [eight] passages, listed above under sub-section A of the first section.

When Paul speaks of εἷς or μόνος θεός, the referent is always God the Father, never the Lord Jesus Christ. Christ is the referent of the formula only in I Cor. 8. 6 [and Eph. 4. 5], where we find the form εἷς κύριος.

III. THE PRIMACY OF MONOTHEISM FOR PAUL

Did Paul regard monotheism as his primary dogma? Paul nowhere states this explicitly. Certain themes related to christology, soteriology, and ecclesiology are discussed in his letters more frequently and in greater detail than monotheism as such.

It is now generally recognized that the Pauline correspondence is occasional in nature, each letter having been addressed to a concrete situation and containing matter specially suited to that situation. But it is also widely, though not universally, acknowledged that the lack of system exhibited by the epistles does not in itself count as evidence that Paul's own mind suffered from theological disorganization. In fact there has been no end of attempts by scholars in this century to determine what was the ruling *centrum* of Paul's thought, without, however, reaching any consensus.¹ Our study of Jewish monotheism suggests an hypothesis which may contribute something to this debate, an hypothesis which has been overlooked perhaps because of its very simplicity. If monotheism was the first tenet of Judaism, if Paul came out of the womb of Pharisaic Judaism, and if he continued to use the language of monotheism after he became—as he would have put it—a Jew who believed in Jesus, is it not reasonable to suppose that the unity of God remained for him a dogma of supreme importance?

The data of the epistles give indirect confirmation of this view. It appears from I Thess. 1. 9 that repentance from idolatry and turning to the one God was a prominent feature of Paul's missionary preaching to Gentiles; I Cor. 8. 4–6 supports this inference.² The fact that Paul could appeal without elaboration to the principle of the divine unity to ground his arguments about other matters (Rom. 3. 30; Gal. 3. 20; [Eph. 4. 5–6]) shows that it was a deeply held presupposition of his. Monotheistic language came readily to his mind in confessional (I Cor. 8. 4–6; [Eph. 4. 4–6; I Tim. 2. 5]) and doxological statements (Rom. 16. 27; [I Tim. 1. 17; 6. 15–16]; cf. Rom. 15. 6). Most impressive of all, Paul's monotheistic language occurs, as we shall see below, in a variety of contexts which manifest its association with several elements of the Jewish monotheism schema. Monotheism therefore seems to hold the same key place in Paul's Jewish-Christian thought that it had before he put his faith in Jesus.

In suggesting that monotheism was fundamental to Paul's theology, we are not affirming that it formed the keynote of his evangelistic message (which was probably rather the death and resurrection of the Son of God: I Cor. 2. 1–2; 15. 3–5, 11; Gal. 3. 1), nor was it the most dominant preoccupation of his personal religion (which may have been union with the crucified and risen Lord through the mediation of the Holy Spirit: II Cor. 4. 7–15; Gal. 2. 20; 5. 24–25). Nor do we suppose that belief in one God was for Paul an axiom from which all his other doctrines could be systematically derived or even to which all his other doctrines could be logically related. Of course Paul's monotheism does not help us to answer the modern question about what constitutes the distinctive character of Paulinism among the other expressions of early Christianity in the NT.³ In the somewhat unfocussed discussions of NT scholars, the term *centre* (*Mitte*) has done service for all these different issues. If we designate the term *centre* to mean Paul's dominant existential concern, the theme to which his attention as a Christian worker was predominantly devoted, the language-matrix which he mostly used for carrying out his mission to the Gentiles, then monotheism probably was not his centre. What we mean to say about monotheism in Paul's thought is that Paul, if asked which doctrine was the 'first' (πρώτη), would probably have replied instinctively with a statement of monotheism, without necessarily defining 'first' any more closely than did Pseudo-Aristeas, Philo, or Jesus; and that the concepts which were associated with monotheism in Jewish thought generally made up the framework of his inherited world-view which shaped and coloured everything else. The belief in one God lay like a great ganglion among all his other beliefs, joining them into a coherent, even if not always a self-consistent, whole.

IV. FUNCTIONS OF MONOTHEISTIC STATEMENTS

Since the function of the monotheistic language in I Cor. 8. 4–6 will be discussed in some detail in the exegesis of that passage, it will be excluded from the present discussion. We shall not attempt a detailed classification of all the statements of monotheism in Paul, but a survey of the data in the light of those three functions in which contemporary scholarship

has developed a special interest: confessions, prayers, and acclamations. To what extent is each of these functions represented in Paul's writings?

There are not many passages where Paul's monotheistic language has a confessional ring. Rom. 3. 30 is probably an appeal to a recognized formula, but it occurs in the context of an argument about justification and therefore can be described as obliquely confessional at most. Much the same must be said about Gal. 3. 20. The declarative statements in Rom. 10. 12; [Eph. 2. 14–18;] and Phil. 2. 9–11 are embedded in didactic material, but again their purpose is not to instill monotheistic beliefs as such. [Only in I Tim. 2. 5 do we find language which in tone, form, and purpose borders on confession.]

Monotheistic language occurs in the Pauline corpus in prayers or doxologies (Rom. 16. 27; [I Tim. 1. 17; I Tim. 6. 15–16]; cf. Rom. 15. 6).

No passage in the Pauline corpus (excluding from consideration I Cor. 8. 4–6) is acclamatory. It is possible that Paul would have heard the formula $\hat{\epsilon}\iota\varsigma/\mu\acute{o}\nu\omicron\varsigma\ \theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma/\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ used in acclamations in worshipping communities, but his letters supply no evidence for that supposition.

V. THE DEFINITION OF MONOTHEISM

Did Paul hold that no gods whatsoever existed besides the one God? Or did he affirm the uniqueness of the one God as creator among a host of subordinate deities?

Paul's Assumptions about the Supernatural World

Paul's upper universe included God, the Lord Jesus Christ, the Holy Spirit, and hosts of angelic beings. In his writings the latter go by such titles as $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\omicron\iota$ (in 10 [14] places), $\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\acute{\alpha}\iota$ (Rom. 8. 38; I Cor. 15. 24; [Eph. 1. 21; 3. 10; 6. 12; Col. 1. 16; 2. 15]), $\delta\upsilon\nu\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ (Rom. 8. 38; I Cor. 15. 24; [Eph. 1. 21]), or $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\omicron\upsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha\iota$ (I Cor. 15. 24; [Eph. 1. 21; 3. 10; 6. 12; Col. 1. 16; 2. 15]). [Compare $\theta\rho\acute{o}\nu\omicron\iota$ (Col. 1. 16), $\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\omega\nu$ (Eph. 2. 2), $\kappa\omicron\sigma\mu\omicron\kappa\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\rho\epsilon\varsigma$ (Eph. 6. 12), $\kappa\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\omicron\tau\eta\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ (Eph. 1. 21; Col. 1. 16), and $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\acute{\alpha}$ (Eph. 6. 12)].

Paul's lower universe included Satan and his angels or demons. Satan is mentioned by name in some 7 [10] passages. He is called an $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ in II Cor. 11. 4. Satan's helpers

are given the title ἄγγελος in II Cor. 12. 7 and δαιμόνια in I Cor. 10. 20–22 [and I Tim. 4. 1]; in addition, some of the passages listed in the above paragraph have in view spiritual powers hostile to God. It is not clear whether Paul distinguished between evil angels and demons as two classes of infernal beings.⁴

Paul's monotheism, then, was compatible with belief in angels and demons. In this respect his view was identical to that of Judaism.

Paul's Use of Divine Titles

The exegesis of the terms θεοί and κύριοι in I Cor. 8. 5 will be deferred to the appropriate section in part three.

Ordinarily Paul reserves the title θεός for the Father and uses κύριος for Jesus Christ (except in quotations from the Septuagint, where κύριος usually refers to the Father).⁵ The possible reference[s] of θεός to Christ in Rom. 9. 5 [and Titus 2. 13] are sharply contested by scholars.⁶

There are no uses of κύριοι for angelic or demonic beings in the Pauline corpus (apart from I Cor. 8. 5), though in some of the disputed letters this plural form can denote human masters ([Eph. 6. 5, 9; Col. 3. 22; 4. 1]).

In a handful of passages Paul applies the title θεός to beings other than the one God. The most important of these is II Cor. 4. 4, where Satan is said to be ὁ θεός τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου who 'has blinded the minds of the unbelievers, to keep them from seeing the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the likeness of God'. The phrase 'this age' (ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος) in Paul always denotes the present world-age prior to the second coming of Christ, a time which is filled with sin and is passing away (Rom. 12. 2; I Cor. 1. 20; 2. 6 [twice], 8; 3. 18; [Eph. 1. 21; 2. 2]; cf. Gal. 1. 4; [I Tim. 6. 17; II Tim. 4. 10]). Satan is the 'god' of this age in the sense that he is its controlling power whose malicious will for the human race is achieved everywhere that he is successful in maintaining human unbelief. Implicit in the phrase 'this age' is Paul's conviction that this state of affairs is only temporary, for God has fixed a day when he will trample down Satan under the feet of the church (Rom. 16. 20). In Paul, then, we find a modified dualism similar to that of Qumran, in which Satan is allowed

to rival God as ruler of the world only so long as God wills. The absolute supremacy of the one God is not in question.

Paul uses the plural form θεοίς in Gal. 4. 8 to refer to the gods of pagan polytheism, albeit in a context of disapproval. Before they knew God, the Galatians served ‘beings that by nature are no gods’. Paul does not believe that these beings deserve the title of gods.

In Phil. 3. 19 Paul describes his opponents as having their belly for their θεός.

[According to II Thess. 2. 4 the ‘man of lawlessness’ will ‘exalt himself against every so-called god or object of worship (λεγόμενον θεὸν ἢ σέβασμα)’. The qualification λεγόμενον indicates that the author does not accept the term θεός to denote these beings.]

If we exclude I Cor. 8. 4–6 from consideration, then, there is one passage in the Pauline corpus where Paul applies the title θεός to a personal being other than the one God in a context assuming its legitimacy (II Cor. 4. 4).

Differences between the Many Gods and the One God

There is no statement in Paul’s writings to the effect that God created Satan or the angelic realm. But Paul makes a formal distinction between the creator and the creation (Rom. 1. 25; [cf. Col. 3. 10; I Tim. 4. 3–4]), and in a number of places he says that God created τὰ πάντα (Rom. 11. 36; I Cor. 11. 12; II Cor. 5. 18; [Eph. 3. 9]). One passage specifies angels as belonging to the all-embracing whole (τὰ πάντα) which must be subjected to God at the end of time in order that God might be all in all (I Cor. 15. 24–28). As we have seen, Satan too will be destroyed (Rom. 16. 20). Hence there is no doubt that Paul viewed angels, including Satan, as belonging to the creation which came from God in the beginning and will be under his rule at the end.

In the Pauline correspondence as in Jewish writings, God in his capacity as creator is absolutely different from his creation.

Conclusions

Paul believed that there was only one God who created all things. Usually when referring to the gods of pagan belief he made it clear that he did not approve of the term θεοί.

Yet in at least one place—we have not investigated I Cor. 8. 5—he was willing to call a being other than the one God θεός in a qualified sense. This places Paul among the Jewish monotheists of the post-biblical period whose affirmation of God’s unity implied the qualitative uniqueness of God and did not exclude belief in subordinate spiritual powers which might be called gods.

VI. THE ASSOCIATIONS OF PAULINE MONOTHEISM

With what concepts are statements of monotheism associated in the Pauline epistles? The data of the epistles alone are too few to afford a sufficient basis for concluding that Paul shared the monotheism schema of Judaism. But if we hypothesize that Paul, with his Jewish education, probably shared the schema, we can find confirmatory evidences of it in his writings.

The associations of the monotheistic language in I Cor. 8. 4–6 will be determined in part two. In this section we shall concentrate on the other Pauline monotheistic passages.

In Rom. 3. 30, the premise ‘God is one’ leads to the inference that God treats Jews and Gentiles alike as far as justification is concerned, i.e., he justifies all by faith.⁷ Here the doctrine of monotheism enables Paul both to define the people of God (in the premise) and to buttress a conclusion about the nature of God’s saving work. Though in both cases Paul’s thought has become specifically Christian—the people of God includes Gentiles; God justifies by faith, not by works of the law—nevertheless the basic theological categories with which he associates monotheism—one God and one people; God as eschatological judge and saviour—are typical of Jewish monotheism.

Rom. 8. 33–34 also associates monotheism with God’s role as the judge who justifies, making the point that God’s verdict is incontestable.

Rom. 9. 19, 26 highlight the sovereignty of divine predestination and reprobation in the larger context of God’s ruling purpose behind the saving history of nations. Again Paul’s position is Christian—God has hardened part of Israel but has gathered a remnant who believe in Christ both from Israel and from the Gentiles (cf. 9. 24; 11. 25)—but the

underlying theological category—God being the one whose will and word set the destinies of men and nations—comes from Jewish monotheism.

In Rom. 10. 12 the point made is similar to that in Rom. 3. 30. The one Lord is Lord of Jews and Gentiles and he treats them both alike, ‘bestowing his riches upon all who call upon him’. This text associates monotheism with the unity of the people of God and uses the language of universalism (πάντων, παντός), both important elements of the Jewish monotheism schema.

The doxology in Rom. 16. 27 associates monotheism with the mystery of God’s saving plan for the nations.

I Cor. 1. 13 emphasizes the unity of the people of God by asking rhetorically whether Christ, the foundation of ecclesiastical unity, is himself divided.

A concern that Christians not be distracted by the burdens of marriage from their duty of service and devotion to the Lord alone is apparent in I Cor. 7. 35. Although what endangers devotion to the Lord according to this passage is an idolatry of worldly care rather than literal idols, Paul’s concern is monolatrous.

In II Cor. 6. 16 there is an implied contrast between the nothingness of idols and the reality of the ‘living God’. The living God is also associated with the unique temple in which he dwells, different from all the temples of the idols, but Paul now makes that dwelling place to be the people of God rather than the building in Jerusalem.

Paul’s statement ‘God is one’ in Gal. 3. 20 is so laconic as to be obscure in meaning.⁸ The general context of Gal. 3. 15–22 contrasts the law with God’s promise to Abraham and his offspring, and the antithetical structure of 3. 20 makes it clear that the statement ‘God is one’ must contain, for Paul, some positive implication bearing on the promise. For our purpose it is unnecessary to decide on the precise nuance of this verse. It is sufficient to have established that monotheism is here joined once again with the saving plan or purpose of God.

Phil. 2. 9–11 simply takes over the monotheistic content of Isa. 45. 23—at the end of time, every (πᾶν) knee will bow and every (πᾶσα) tongue confess that the one God is God—and says that it will be fulfilled in a universal acclamation of the Lordship of Jesus Christ.

I Thess. 1. 9 underlines the reality of the one God in an anti-idolatry context. It may be worth noting here that Paul inveighs against idolatry in several other places as well (Rom. 1. 21–23; II Cor. 6. 16; Gal. 4. 8–9).

On the basis of these passages from the undisputed letters of Paul we may draw some conclusions. Statements of monotheism in Paul are often associated with specifically Christian positions of his, but the language in which he frames the issues is drawn from the monotheism frame of ancient Judaism.⁹ Behind Paul's pronouncements, even behind some of those which are most distinctive of Pauline Christianity (justification by faith, unity of Jews and Gentiles in the church, exaltation and Lordship of the Crucified) we discern a Jewish view of God as the *one* God who is real in contrast to idols and is alone worthy of worship, whose will and purpose determine the course of human history, who is sovereign in the election of a people for himself and grounds their unity in himself, who dwells on earth in a special temple (albeit a metaphorical one), who has dominion over all (πάντες) people, and will consummate history as the sole judge, saviour, and king acknowledged by all. Thus the monotheism schema of Judaism shines through Paul's Christian applications of monotheistic language.

[The associations of monotheistic statements in the disputed epistles—with the unity of Jews and Gentiles in the church (Eph. 2. 14–18); with the patience, sovereignty, immortality, and invisibility of God (I Tim. 1. 17); with the universal offer of God's salvation (I Tim. 2. 5); with the church (I Tim. 3. 15); with the hope of salvation (I Tim. 4. 10); with the eschatological consummation and glorious kingdom of God (I Tim. 6. 15–16)—for the most part simply confirm the conclusions already reached.]

VII. PAULINE MONOTHEISM AND THE PREPOSITIONAL DEVICE OF HELLENISM

Apart from I Cor. 8. 4–6, which will be considered in part three, Paul uses the prepositional device of Hellenism in Rom. 11. 36; [Col. 1. 16–17; and Eph. 4. 5–6]. Does he use it to express his monotheism?

[The only one of these three passages which is explicitly monotheistic is Eph. 4. 4–6: '*one God and Father* of us all, who is above all and through all and in all'.]

Rom. 11. 36 does not use explicit monotheistic language, but the monotheism schema of Judaism is present: ‘For from him (ἐξ αὐτοῦ) and through him (δι’ αὐτοῦ) and to him (εἰς αὐτόν) are all things (τὰ πάντα)’. Elements of the monotheism schema which occur here include the belief in God as creator and consummator, the cosmological relationship between God and ‘all things’, and the belief that God is providentially accomplishing his will in all that happens.

[Likewise in Colossians 1. 16–17 the prepositional device is used to express the concept of Christ as the pre-existent creator and present sustainer of τὰ πάντα. These features suggest the monotheism schema even in the absence of explicit monotheistic language.]

Depending on our critical stance, we can find here from one to three passages in which Paul uses the prepositional device of Hellenism to express his belief in one God or Lord, either directly or indirectly.

VIII. PAULINE INTERMEDIARIES AND MONOTHEISTIC LANGUAGE

Did Paul use the language of monotheism to describe intermediaries? In order to answer this question we must survey the exaltation language he used for beings other than the one God.

The number of intermediaries mentioned by Paul is small in comparison with other Jewish literature taken as a whole. By far the most important intermediary for Paul is the Lord Jesus Christ. Since the possible use of monotheistic language in reference to Christ in I Cor. 8. 4–6 will be investigated in part three, this subject will be omitted from consideration here.

Glorified Human Beings

1. Moses

According to I Cor. 10. 2, the Israelites were baptized into Moses (εἰς τὸν Μωϋσῆν ἐβαπτίσθησαν) at the Red Sea. This phrase uses the language of a Christian sacrament to

expand on the OT biblical text which speaks of the people ‘believing in Moses’ (LXX Ex. 14. 31). In II Cor. 3. 7, 13, Paul draws on the biblical account of how Moses’ skin shone when he descended from Mount Sinai (Ex. 34. 29–35); Paul uses the word δόξα to denote this phenomenon. Probably Moses is in view as the μεσίτης through whom God gave the law to Israel in the difficult passage Gal. 3. 19–20.

Paul’s exaltation language for Moses represents little advance beyond the OT. It falls short of divinization and has no monotheistic features.

2. Paul Himself

Paul was strongly convinced of his calling by God to preach the gospel to the nations. After a vision in which God was ‘pleased to reveal his Son to’ Paul (Gal. 1. 16), the apostle knew that he was being sent to ‘bring about the obedience of faith ... among all the nations (ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν)’ (Rom. 1. 5; cf. I Cor. 15. 10; II Cor. 2. 14–17; 5. 19; Gal. 1. 16; 2. 7–9; [Eph. 3. 1–9]; I Thess. 2. 16; [I Tim. 2. 7; II Tim. 4. 17]). The universal scope of Paul’s mission to the Gentiles recalls the phraseology of the servant songs in Isaiah, where the servant is made a ‘light to the nations’. Thus the quotation of Isaiah 49. 6 placed on Paul’s lips in Acts 13. 47 may well be grounded in the historical consciousness of the apostle.

Paul claimed moreover to have been assumed into heaven to receive special revelations (II Cor. 12. 1–7), according to the pattern of several of the apocalyptic revealers behind various Jewish sects.

There is no evidence, however, that Paul regarded himself as in any sense divine.

3. The Church

Members of the church have their citizenship (πολίτευμα) not on earth, but in heaven (Phil. 3. 20). [The Prison Epistles draw a direct parallel between the ascension of Christ and the ascension of believers with him (Eph. 2. 6; Col. 3. 1). In Eph. 1. 23 the church is even described as the πλήρωμα of Christ, though it is uncertain whether this word has an active or a passive meaning in this context.¹⁰]

The eschatological glorification of believers is not only to be awaited in the future (Rom. 8. 30), but has also begun as a present process which progressively transforms them into the image (εἰκῶν) of the Lord (II Cor. 3. 18). The ‘image’ vocabulary could be interpreted as indicating some degree of divinity, as it seems to do when used of Christ in some contexts (II Cor. 4. 4; [Col. 1. 15]), but more probably it harks back to the ideal humanity of Adam (Gen. 1. 26) as it is fulfilled and transcended in Christ (I Cor. 15. 45–49).

In several places the unity of the church is emphasized (Rom. 12. 5; 15. 6; I Cor. 10. 17; [Eph. 2. 14–18; 4. 4–6;] Phil. 2. 1–2). But since a clear statement of the divinity of the church is wanting, such expressions could hardly qualify as *monotheistic*.

Angels

For our immediate purpose there is little of interest about angels in the generally accepted Pauline letters. In Gal. 3. 19 they are given a role in the revelation of the law at Mount Sinai. Some recent commentators suppose that Paul intends in this passage to denigrate the law by saying that it was ordained by angels,¹¹ but in view of parallel passages such as Acts 7. 38 or Heb. 2. 2 where the mention of angels at Sinai in fact enhances the glory of the law, this interpretation is by no means incontestible. Still, the angels clearly are not deified in Gal. 3. 19.

[Col. 2. 18 mentions in a derogatory manner the fact that some engage in the ‘worship of angels’ (θρησκεία τῶν ἀγγέλων).

[According to II Thess. 1. 7 the parousia of Christ will be accompanied by ‘mighty angels in flaming fire’.

[In I Tim. 5. 21 the author appeals to God, Christ Jesus, and the elect angels together as part of an oath/charge formula. This formula indicates that the elect angels are, in the mind of the writer, intimately involved in enforcing the will of God.]

Monotheistic language is not used of angels in the Pauline corpus.

Eschatological Figures

1. The Church

According to I Cor. 6. 2–3, the church will judge the world and angels. From the context, which has to do with litigation, it would appear that Paul expects the church to be given some role in the decision process and not only in the enactment of divine verdicts. Thus a function which belongs to God alone in most Jewish sources is here transferred by Paul to the church.

[2. The Man of Lawlessness]

[In II Thess. 2. 4 it is said that the eschatological man of lawlessness will exalt himself over all objects of worship and proclaim himself to be God. But the author considers this to be an act of hybris, as is evident from his connecting the man of lawlessness with the activity of Satan (2. 9) and his prophecy that this figure will be destroyed by Christ at his coming (2. 8).]

In neither of these passages do we find either a full divinization or a use of monotheistic terminology.

Divine Hypostases

1. The Name of God

It is not certain whether Paul regarded the name of God as an hypostasis. In a number of passages he mentions the name of God or of Jesus Christ as a power which reaches into the world and effects the will of God. Christians call upon it (I Cor. 1. 2); Paul appeals by it (I Cor. 1. 10); by it judgement is pronounced on the incestuous man (I Cor. 5. 4); it washes, sanctifies, and justifies (I Cor. 6. 11); [in it Christians give thanks to God (Eph. 5. 20); in it Christians are to do everything (Col. 3. 17); it is glorified when Christians walk worthy of their calling (II Thess. 1. 12); church leaders can command by it (II Thess. 3. 6); it can be

defamed if slaves are disobedient to their masters (I Tim. 6. 1); those who use it are obligated to depart from iniquity (II Tim. 2. 19)].

The name above every name bestowed on Jesus Christ by God the Father (Phil. 2. 9; [cf. Eph. 1. 21]) is highly exalted.

2. The Spirit of God

Next to the Lord Jesus Christ, the Spirit of God is the second most important intermediary in Paul's thought. The frequent title πνεῦμα θεοῦ indicates the close association between this personal agent and God himself; one passage gives him the title of κύριος (II Cor. 3. 17–18). Taken together with passages where God, Christ, and the Spirit form a triad (I Cor. 12. 4–6; II Cor. 13. 14), these titles seem to imply divinity. The Spirit searches πάντα (I Cor. 2. 10). He is a life-giver (ζωοποιεῖ, II Cor. 3. 6; cf. Rom. 8. 11). The relation to 'all things' and the ability to create life are elements of the monotheism schema of Judaism. In I Cor. 12. 9, 11, 13 the unity of the Spirit (ἐν πνεύμα) is made the basis for the unity of the church (cf. [Eph. 4. 3–4]; Phil. 1. 27). Thus the language of monotheism is used by Paul to describe the Spirit of God.

Here we must raise the question whether Paul regarded the Holy Spirit as being fully independent of God himself. The Spirit is fully personal for Paul, having a φρόνημα and interceding for the saints before God (Rom. 8. 26–27). A passage such as this points to a definite distinction between God and his Spirit. On the other hand, I Cor. 2. 11 draws an analogy between the unique self-knowledge a man has in his spirit and the unique self-knowledge God has in his Spirit. It is hard to imagine a more indissoluble unity short of complete identification. Paul, then, sometimes expresses the relationship between God and the Spirit of God in terms of distinction, sometimes in terms of unity. For our purpose it is unnecessary to attempt a systematization of the various statements. Paul viewed the Spirit of God as divine, distinct from God, yet not a second God. Clearly he was not, in Paul's thought, a separate being.¹²

3. The Wisdom of God and the Word of God

Because of the great importance of the wisdom of God and the word of God in some Jewish, Gnostic, and Christian circles, it may be worth pointing out by contrast that Paul has no doctrine of hypostatic Sophia or Logos. In I Cor. 1. 24 and 2. 6–8 he uses language which has sometimes been interpreted in this way,¹³ but all the features of these passages can be adequately accounted for by the simpler assumption that the wisdom of God here is the divine plan of redemption which came to fulfilment in the death and resurrection of Christ.¹⁴ Wisdom and word are not hypostatized by Paul.¹⁵

4. Other Abstractions

Paul speaks in a very concrete way about a large number of attributes or actions of God. Some of the more common ones are the grace of God, the power of God, and the righteousness of God. E. Käsemann's description of the righteousness of God as a 'power' which invades the world has become well known.¹⁶ Because these attributes and actions belong, in Paul's view, to the living God, they have a personal character without being regarded as persons. To my knowledge no one has seriously compared Paul's vivid manner of expression for these concepts to Jewish intermediaries. This may be because Paul's theological expressions do not present themselves as readily to the eye of the Christian scholar who is searching for possible christological models as the analogous expressions in Jewish sources do. Nevertheless there is a need for such a comparative study. Indeed, Paul's concrete manner of speech about divine attributes and functions may shed more light on the true nature of Jewish language for intermediaries than the alleged personalization of Jewish so-called hypostases has to tell us about the development of christology in the early church.

Conclusions

Of the relatively small number of intermediaries mentioned in the epistles of Paul, the only one (apart from Christ, to be considered in part two) of which he used the language of monotheism was the Holy Spirit. It is not clear that the Holy Spirit for Paul, any more than for Judaism, was a separate being fully independent of God.

In this respect Paul's usage of the language of monotheism is fully in accord with that of non-Christian Judaism. For Paul too the language of monotheism was very tightly bound to the concept of the one God. He seems to have realized that such language has the intrinsic property of being incapable of transference to another being while retaining its sense.

IX. METAPHYSICAL ELEMENTS IN PAUL'S CONCEPT OF GOD

In this final section we shall seek to determine whether or to what extent Paul's language about God, which is usually dynamic or functional, exhibits metaphysical elements.

In I Thess. 1. 9 there is an antithesis between idols and the 'living and true God'. Paul may be contrasting the dynamism of him who is genuinely divine to the deadness and ineffectiveness of statues of wood and stone; or he may be contrasting the reality, the actuality, of the true God to the non-existence of the gods which the pagan imagination posited behind their images. In either case, the traditional Jewish phraseology expresses a concern about the being or the real divinity of the one God. This concern is broadly ontological.

As we have already had occasion to note, Rom. 1. 25 makes a formal distinction between the creator and what he has created (ὁ κτίσας versus ἡ κτίσις), and shows that only the creator is worthy of religious devotion. Implicit in the distinction is the insight that the creator is qualitatively superior to his work, and not just more powerful or sovereign *de facto*, as was Zeus among the gods and goddesses of the Greek pantheon. Paul held the doctrine of *creatio ex nihilo*, for he describes God as the one 'who gives life to the dead and calls into existence the things that do not exist (καλοῦντος τὰ μὴ ὄντα ὡς ὄντα)' (Rom. 4. 17). The latter expression—which itself turns on the ontological distinction between being and the absence of being—understood in the context of Paul's creator/creation polarity clearly implies that God possesses being in an absolute sense, setting him apart from all else, which is dependent on him. This absolute qualitative difference between the creator God and the world comes to expression also in the prepositional phrases of the Hellenistic device: all things come 'from God (ἐξ αὐτοῦ)' Rom. 11. 36; [God is 'above all' (Eph. 4. 6); Christ is 'before all things' (Col. 1. 17)].

Although Paul ordinarily speaks concretely of God's deeds, in Rom. 1. 20 we find the abstraction 'deity' (θειότης; cf. θεότης, Col. 2. 9).¹⁷ The deity of God is his 'invisible nature' (τὰ ἄόρατα) which is not available to sense-perception, but is observed theoretically by the eye of reason (νοούμενα καθορᾶται), albeit on the basis of nature (τοῖς ποιήμασιν). It is generally recognized among NT scholars that this natural theology owes something to the Hellenistic popular philosophy which was current at the time of Paul, with its origins in Stoic metaphysics.

But God cannot be penetrated by human reason. The scriptural verse 'Who has directed the Spirit of the LORD, or as his counsellor has instructed him?' (Isa. 40. 13) seems to have been a favourite one of Paul, for he quotes or paraphrases it twice in different letters (Rom. 11. 34; I Cor. 2. 16). A philosophical term creeps into his language to describe the incomprehensibility of God: βάθος (Rom. 11. 33; I Cor. 2. 10). Paul's God is a great depth or abyss, some of whose mysterious purposes are revealed, at least in part, but whose full intention is not susceptible of exhaustive inquiry (ἀνεξεραύνητος), and whose ways are unfathomable (ἀνεξιχνίαστος, Rom. 11. 33).

The ontological absoluteness, the theoretical deity, and the incomprehensibility of God must be among the aspects of God's being assumed in the metaphysical term φύσις, 'nature, essence', which is indirectly applied to God in Gal. 4. 8.¹⁸ What disqualifies the gods of paganism from being gods indeed is the fact that they lack the divine essence (τοῖς φύσει μὴ οὔσιν θεοῖς). By the time Paul wrote this phrase, Greek Sophists and Atomists had long since introduced the distinction between 'gods that are so by their true nature [φύσει] and those that become so by human positing [θέσει]', and Paul may well be alluding to this contrast.¹⁹ In this passing reference Paul does not discriminate between the ineffable essence of God and God's knowable attributes in the same way that Philo and Josephus do; we do not know whether he was familiar with such a distinction. Significant for interpreting I Cor. 8. 4–6 is the fact that this metaphysical term φύσις comes to the surface in Paul precisely where monotheism as such, and more particularly the antithesis between the many gods and the one God, is at issue.

We conclude, then, that Paul was aware of trends which speculated about metaphysical aspects of God's being. This is evident only in a few scattered places in Paul's epistles. Paul was not a philosopher as Philo was, and there is no evidence that he ever attempted to work out a synthesis between the biblical-existential view of God, which is typical of Paul's theology, and the philosophical view of the divine. But Paul made use of theological language laden with metaphysical overtones in more than one context where the contrast between the one God and idols or false gods had to be spelt out (Rom. 1. 20–25; Gal. 4. 8; I Thess. 1. 9). He was able to denote the divine essence as such (Gal. 4. 8).

CONCLUSIONS TO PART ONE

In part one we have used Jewish sources in conjunction with the data of the Pauline epistles to clarify certain aspects of Jewish monotheism which Paul would have presupposed in writing I Cor. 8. 4–6. The results are as follows.

1. As a Christian, Paul continued to use several traditional Jewish forms of monotheistic speech when referring to God.
2. In particular, he used more than once the standard Jewish juxtaposition of the adjective ἕως (or μόνος) with the divine titles θεός and κύριος. When the formula with θεός is used, it always refers to God the Father; when with κύριος, the reference is to Christ.
3. Statements by several contemporary Jewish writers to the effect that belief in one God was the 'first' tenet of Judaism shed light on the shape of Paul's thought. The associations which monotheism had in Paul's language and the way in which he applied the confession of one God to a variety of issues important to him tend to confirm indirectly that monotheism was not, for Paul, just one traditional element among many, but remained fundamental to his theology.
4. Explicit monotheistic language is found in a few places in Paul's writings, as also in Jewish sources, in prayers and semi-confessional statements, but not in acclamations.
5. Paul, with many Jewish writers, would have subscribed to the definition of monotheism as the belief that there is but one transcendent creator of all things, and the commitment to offer religious worship to no other being. He believed in the existence of

heavenly, angelic beings created by God to exercise ruling power over human affairs on earth, and in at least one place (II Cor. 4. 4) he used the title θεός for one of these beings. In this connection, I Cor. 8. 5 has yet to be investigated.

6. An examination of the contexts in which statements of monotheism occur in the epistles shows that Paul shared the schema of concepts characteristically associated with the idea of one God in the collective Jewish mind. Apart from those in I Cor. 8. 4–6, the following associations may be noted: a negative attitude towards idolatry; the relation of God to all men, Jews and Gentiles; the idea that God’s will and purpose determine the course of human history and that God will consummate history as the sole judge, saviour, and king acknowledged by all; and the idea that God is sovereign in the election of a people for himself, grounds their unity in himself, and dwells on earth in them as his special temple.

7. Paul used the prepositional ‘all’-device of Hellenism in one or more places to sum up many elements of the monotheism schema.

8. The possible application of monotheistic speech to the Lord Jesus Christ by Paul will form the subject of part two. Otherwise, Paul did not apply monotheistic speech to any intermediary except to the Holy Spirit, who was not, in Paul’s thought, clearly independent of God himself. This fact suggests that Paul shared the Jewish awareness that the specific language of monotheism is intrinsically non-transferable.

9. While functional modes of speech about God are preponderant in Paul’s writings, his language about God shows traces of the philosophical theology current in Hellenism, and one passage (Gal. 4. 8) indirectly alludes to the concept of God’s essence or nature. These philosophical elements occur in more than one place where monotheism or the contrast between God and the gods is at issue.

Any scientific exegesis of I Cor. 8. 4–6 must in turn presuppose these understandings.

PART TWO
ANALYSIS OF I CORINTHIANS 8. 4–6

CHAPTER SIX
CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL ASSUMPTIONS

The purpose of chapter six is to establish the critical and historical assumptions about I Cor. 8. 4–6 which will inform our exegesis of the theological and christological aspects of this passage in the following chapters. These assumptions involve: the date of the material, the integrity of the context, the original form of the text, the literary forms in the passage, the situation in Corinth, and the function of 8. 4–6 in its context.

THE DATE OF THE MATERIAL

Since the time of Deissmann's classic study of Pauline chronology, it has been standard to date the Corinthian correspondence by reference to Acts 18. 1–18 together with information supplied by the so-called Gallio inscription. This method leads to the conclusion that Paul was arraigned before the proconsul Gallio (Acts 18. 12–17) in the summer of A.D. 51; subtracting eighteen months (Acts 18. 11), Paul must have arrived in Corinth in the winter/spring of A.D. 50. This date is confirmed by Orosius's comment that Claudius expelled the Jews from Rome in his ninth year, i.e., A.D. 49, shortly before Paul's friend Aquila appeared in Corinth (Acts 18. 2).¹ Further confirmation arises from the hunch that Paul may have set up his tentmaking trade in Corinth in anticipation of the arrival of crowds of people for the imminent Isthmian Games, which were celebrated in the spring of A.D. 51.² Paul's stay in Corinth may be tentatively dated from early in A.D. 50 to some time after the summer of A.D. 51.³

After a journey to Antioch and a return to Ephesus (Acts 18. 19—19. 10), Paul wrote the letter we now know as I Corinthians from Ephesus (I Cor. 16. 8), during his two-year stay there (Acts 19. 10). On the basis of a careful reconstruction of Paul's stay in Ephesus, M.J.

Harris estimates that the epistle was written in the spring of A.D. 55, while H. Koester places it in the winter of A.D. 53–54.⁴

Questions have recently been raised about the historical reliability of Acts chapter 18 on the ground that Dio Cassius (60. 6. 6) mentions Claudius's prohibition of the Jews' right to assemble near the beginning of Claudius's reign rather than at the end, as Acts would seem to indicate. Hence one scholar, working only from scant information supplied by the Pauline epistles, suggests a much earlier date for Paul's arrival in Corinth and places the writing of I Corinthians around Easter, A.D. 49 or 52.⁵ But extreme scepticism about the record in chapter 18 of Acts has been rejected by other critics,⁶ and F. Millar, who has made special studies of Dio Cassius, thinks that the remark which has caused the doubts is not to be taken chronologically after all.⁷

Though estimates may vary by a factor of one or two years, it seems safe to assume that I Corinthians was written not earlier than A.D. 53 and not later than A.D. 55. The ideas contained in I Cor. 8. 4–6 may well be much earlier, however, for the lack of any obvious development in Paul's christological thought from the earliest to the latest of his epistles supports the judgement that 'all the essential features of Paul's christology were already fully developed towards the end of the 40s, before the beginning of his great missionary journeys in the West'.⁸

THE INTEGRITY OF THE CONTEXT

The literary and theological integrity of I Cor. chapters 8–10 is pertinent for the exegesis of our passage in so far as it will enable us to appeal to 10. 19–20 (Paul's belief that there are demons behind idols) to clarify the statement in 8. 5b that there are in fact many gods.

Most scholars consider I Corinthians to be a unity.⁹ A minority have concluded that two or more different letters lie behind chapters 8–10, generally following lines laid down by J. Weiss in his comments on this passage in *Der erste Korintherbrief*. Weiss supposed that Paul's prohibition in 10. 1–22 of the consumption of meat which had been sacrificed to idols is less enlightened than his liberal attitude in the rest of the passage (8. 1–13; 10. 23—11. 1)

and therefore represents an earlier view. More recent partition theories likewise take their stance on alleged differences of outlook between 10. 1–22 and the rest of the section.¹⁰

The crucial issue is whether the differences are of such a nature as to require the hypothesis that 10. 1–22 was written independently of its present surroundings. In a classic article published in 1931, H. von Soden dealt with these differences one by one and concluded that they do not require such an hypothesis.¹¹ Several generations of scholars have judged von Soden's arguments and others to have answered doubts about the unity of chapters 8–10, and the most recent and thorough study of the whole question by H. Merklein decides in favour of the unity of the passage.¹² On this point there is a near consensus in recent scholarship.

THE ORIGINAL TEXT OF I CORINTHIANS 8. 4–6

The text of the passage as given in the twenty-sixth edition of the Nestle-Aland *Novum Testamentum graece* (1979) is not in serious question.

⁴ Περὶ τῆς βρώσεως οὖν τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων, οἶδαμεν ὅτι οὐδὲν εἰδωλον ἐν κόσμῳ καὶ ὅτι οὐδεὶς θεὸς εἰ μὴ εἷς. ⁵ καὶ γὰρ εἴπερ εἰσὶν λεγόμενοι θεοὶ εἴτε ἐν οὐρανῷ εἴτε ἐπὶ γῆς, ὡσπερ εἰσὶν θεοὶ πολλοὶ καὶ κύριοι πολλοί,
⁶ ἀλλ' ἡμῖν εἷς ὁ θεὸς ὁ πατήρ
 ἔξ οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτόν,
 καὶ εἷς κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς
 δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς δι' αὐτοῦ.

The omission of *Textus Receptus*'s ἕτερος after θεός in v 4 is well supported by the earliest and best manuscripts. The inclusion of ἀλλ' at the beginning of v 6, although it is wanting in a few outstanding sources, is justified on the ground that it is stylistically the *lectio difficilior*. *Codex Vaticanus*'s ὄν for οὗ in the last line of v 6 may be explained as a stylistic attempt to avoid the repetition of the genitive in that line. The additional clause about the Holy Spirit found at the end of the verse in several minuscules and church fathers is obviously late and owes its existence to the trinitarian debates of the third or fourth centuries.¹³ Other minor variations recorded in scattered nineteenth-century critical commentaries (such as the

addition of δέ after περὶ in v 4 [D³, E, 17, Vulg] or the omission of τὰ before πάντα in v 6 [D] are poorly attested and insignificant.

THE LITERARY FORMS IN THE TEXT

Two issues come under the heading of literary forms: the possibility of quotations of statements made by members of the Corinthian congregation in v 4, and the hypothesis that v 6 is based on an early Christian liturgical fragment.

Quotations in Verse 4?

In the latter part of I Corinthians, Paul responds to written questions from some unknown person or persons in the Corinthian congregation, as we know from 7. 1 ('the matters about which you wrote') and from Paul's repeated use of the phrase περὶ (δέ) to introduce the subjects about which they had inquired (7. 1, 25; 8. 1, 4; 12. 1; 16. 1, 12).¹⁴ Can we hear echoes of the Corinthian letter in Paul's reply? If so, it may be possible to reconstruct in part the view held by at least some members of Paul's readership.

Several criteria have been suggested in the attempt to separate words of the Corinthians from those of Paul in 8. 4–6.

1. The plural οἴδαμεν¹⁵ (8. 1, 4) could be taken to indicate the voice of the Corinthian congregation.¹⁶ But there is good attestation elsewhere in the Pauline epistles for a use of οἴδαμεν to mark 'a well-known fact that is generally accepted',¹⁷ and a similar interpretation would yield an excellent sense here. All the partners in this dialogue know that there is only one God. The plural form of the verb is an insufficient basis for supposing that Paul is quoting.

2. It has been noted that the vocabulary and style of the clauses οὐδὲν εἰδωλον ἐν κόσμῳ and οὐδεὶς θεὸς εἰ μὴ εἷς in v 4 are atypical of Paul.¹⁸ But the amount of verbal matter is so small, and anti-idolatry and anti-polytheism statements are so rare in Paul, that this consideration by itself cannot prove the clauses in question to be quotations, though it may support that result if it can be reached on other grounds.

3. The strongest criterion for identifying Corinthian material in 8. 1–6 is that of contradictions. In using this criterion care is needed, however. Some scholars think that the stark monotheistic statements in v 4 are contradicted by Paul’s concession in v 5 that many gods and lords exist.¹⁹ But as we saw in part one, the belief in many subordinate gods was not necessarily incompatible with Jewish monotheism. There is no material contradiction between v 4 and v 5. Moreover, Paul introduces corrections of Corinthian views with ἀλλά or δέ (6. 12, 13; 7. 2; 8. 7, 9[?]; 15. 13), not with γάρ as in v 5. The statement in vv 5–6 is meant to elucidate rather than to contradict the statements in v 4.

There is a contrast, however, between v 1 (‘we all have knowledge’) and v 7 (‘not all have this knowledge’) marked by ἀλλά (v 7), which shows that Paul, while agreeing with the first statement in a limited sense, wants to emphasize a major qualification.²⁰ This difference of emphasis suggests that the first statement comes from the Corinthians. The way in which v 4 resumes v 1 gives us reason to conclude that we hear Corinthian sentiments in v 4 as well.²¹ On the other hand, there is no strong reason to suppose that v 4 contains verbatim quotations from the Corinthian letter. At the most we can conclude that v 4 contains statements which Paul expects his readers to accept as representing their view and as assuring them that he has heard them sympathetically.²²

A Liturgical Fragment Behind Verse 6?

I Cor. 8. 6 falls into two halves, one about God and one about the Lord, which exhibit extended word-for-word parallelism.

εἷς θεὸς	εἷς κύριος
ὁ πατήρ	Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς
ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα	δι’ οὗ τὰ πάντα
καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτόν	καὶ ἡμεῖς δι’ αὐτοῦ

This striking symmetry and the economy with which fundamental concepts are compressed into a few terse phrases show that Paul’s writing of this verse was preceded by

careful forethought on the part of someone, whether Paul himself or another before him. It is therefore understandable that many scholars find in I Cor. 8. 6 evidence of a primitive Christian formula or confession of faith.²³ Yet there are still scholars who regard Paul as the original author.²⁴

The factors which some regard as tipping the scale of probability in favour of a citation may be listed and evaluated as follows.

1. The sudden occurrence of κύριοι with θεοί in v 5 has been taken as evidence that Paul was anticipating the double confession in v 6.²⁵ But it is equally possible that what Paul was anticipating in v 5 was a formulation which was crystallizing in his mind as he was dictating this very passage.

2. The syntactical connection of v 5 with v 6 has been alleged to be anacolouthic (Kerst). But this factor, even if it can be justified exegetically, would not be decisive, for anacolouthon is characteristic of Pauline style (Murphy-O'Connor).

3. The *parallelismus membrorum* is considered formal and atypical of Paul's prose (Kerst, Horsley, Murphy-O'Connor). Since all of the places in Paul's epistles which exhibit this feature are under suspicion of coming from liturgical sources, it is impossible *ipso facto* to point to clearly contrary examples. It remains possible, however, that this feature was typical of certain passages in Paul's prose.

4. The *hapax legomenon* εἰς θεὸς ὁ πατήρ has been urged as evidence of non-Pauline provenance (Murphy-O'Connor). But since Paul produced a number of *hapax legomena*, this in itself cannot be a decisive consideration.

5. Likewise the concept of Christ as the mediator of creation is asserted to be non-Pauline because it is mentioned only here in the undisputed epistles (Murphy-O'Connor, Wolff). This is strange logic. The fact that Paul affirms this concept in one place shows that it is in fact Pauline, whatever its source, and therefore it is no criterion for determining provenance.

6. Finally, the fact that the theological content of 8. 6 is richer than would have been required by the context has been taken to indicate its credal nature (Conzelmann). But Paul's

digressive argumentation frequently provided more than ample theological grounding for the points he was making (e.g., I Cor. 15. 24–28).

None of these factors is weighty enough to confirm the hypothesis that Paul is quoting a formula. Nor do they form a very impressive cumulative case, for only the *parallelismus membrorum* has any real substance as an argument for this purpose, and it falls far short of being telling. Even after arguing for the convergent force of several of these considerations, Murphy-O'Connor admits, 'the evidence is not as strong as one could wish' (p. 225), and he candidly judges that all of the attempts to pry into the tradition-history of this material before it found its way into our passage amount to 'nothing more than suggestive speculation' (p. 262).²⁶ The confidence with which some exegetes treat I Cor. 8. 6 as a pre-Pauline formula rests more on the pervasiveness of this hypothesis in the scholarly community than it does on the compelling quality of the evidence. While we cannot conclude that this hypothesis is improbable, still it would be unsafe to build upon it any arguments about Paul's use of tradition or about what ideas this formula may or may not have expressed in the period prior to Paul's epistles.

THE SITUATION IN CORINTH

The situation which Paul addressed in Corinth can be treated under two heads: the issue of εἰδωλόθυτα, and the opinions of the factions in the Corinthian church.

The Issue

The issue named by Paul is the eating of meat which had been sacrificed to idols (8. 1, 4).

A normal Mediterranean diet consisted of 'barley-meal, olives, a little wine, fish as a relish, meat only on high holidays', though among wealthy upper classes meat may have been included more regularly.²⁷ If a citizen of an ancient Greek city wished to enjoy meat there were two options: one could dine in the temple of a favourite god, or one could go to the meat-market to buy some and prepare it at home.

The practice of going to an εἰδωλεῖον for a meal is presupposed in I Cor. 8. 10. In ancient Greece the temple-precinct was the equivalent of a modern restaurant.²⁸ That certain meals in the temple were in honour of deities is clear from I Cor. 10. 14–22,²⁹ but at least some were largely social in purpose and function (I Cor. 8. 8–10).³⁰ The whole life of ancient clubs and societies was placed on a religious basis, and all of the meat which was sold in temples would have come from animals, parts of which had been offered in sacrificial rituals.³¹

I Cor. 10. 25 alludes to the possibility of buying meat in the μάκελλον (Latin *macellum*). One of the best preserved *macella* from the Roman world is that at Pompeii, which was an enclosed area ‘with two-story shops on at least three sides’ where meat, fish, fruit, bread, and sometimes non-edible goods were sold; it also contained a chapel for emperor worship.³² The American excavation team has identified several *macella* in the city of Corinth.³³ I Cor. 10. 25 indicates that some secular meat might be sold in a *macellum*.³⁴ But much of the meat on sale in the market would have had heathen religious associations: the simple act of slaughter had a religious connotation in the Graeco-Roman world, and at the very least a few hairs from the victim’s forehead might be cast into a fire to honour some god.³⁵

Hence a large percentage of the meat available came from what pagans called ἱερόθυτα or θεόθυτα and what Jews in their protest against idolatry called εἰδωλόθυτα.³⁶ Jews understood their law to teach that they were not to eat such meat (Ex. 34. 15; IV Macc. 5. 2).³⁷ The question which arose in the church at Corinth was whether it was right for a Christian to do so. From the echoes of Corinthian thinking in 8. 4, it is clear that at least some of them were eating εἰδωλόθυτα.

THE VIEWPOINTS IN THE CORINTHIAN CONGREGATION

Who were these Christians who ate idol-meat, and what did they believe? An attempt to identify Paul’s Corinthian addressees has become one of the controversial tasks of NT scholarship.³⁸ Following with minor modifications Yamauchi’s categorization of scholarly views, we can distinguish three basic options: (i) the Corinthians had been influenced by pre-

christian Gnosticism;³⁹ (ii) their thought was characterized by a gnosticizing tendency which was not yet a system analogous to those of the second century A.D.;⁴⁰ (iii) they were pneumatic enthusiasts who had more in common with Hellenistic or apocalyptic Judaism or with Jewish Christianity than with pagan Gnosticism.⁴¹ There have also been a few scattered suggestions of other sorts.⁴² Because of the close historical relationships among Judaism, Christianity, and Gnosticism, the three basic options are not mutually exclusive. Most of the recent discussion has been between the second and the third options, with the third gaining ground.

As for the ‘weak’ brethren referred to in 8. 7, 9–12, scholars divide into two camps: (i) those who suppose that they were Jewish Christians unable to overcome scruples about eating εἰδωλόθυτα inherited from their Jewish background;⁴³ and (ii) those who regard them as converted Gentiles not yet free from superstitious belief in the reality and power of idols.⁴⁴

Recently G. Theissen has analysed the strong and the weak at Corinth from a sociological point of view. His result is that the strong were members of the wealthy, social elite, while the ‘weak’ were less privileged in wealth and education.⁴⁵ This study opens up a fresh dimension for understanding the Corinthian church, but it admittedly sheds minimal light on the theological issue in which the difference between the groups came to expression. The latter is of primary concern in interpreting the theological arguments and counter-arguments in I Corinthians chapters 8–10.

The fact that equally competent experts after several decades of discussion are still so far from a consensus about the groups in the church at Corinth indicates the problematic nature of the issue. Several subsidiary issues are involved in the attempt to find ancient religious categories in which the Corinthian groups can be placed.

1. Were the opponents whom Paul dealt with in II Corinthians also active at the time of the earlier I Corinthians? Some think they were,⁴⁶ others, more probably, think they were not.⁴⁷ Valid doubts have been voiced about the term ‘opponent’ for Paul’s addressees in I Corinthians.⁴⁸ C. Machalet has observed that not even 1. 12–17 indicates deep antagonisms within the community, nor does the third-person reference to opponents in 9. 2 (as ἄλλοις)

provide evidence of opposition to Paul in Corinth.⁴⁹ In I Corinthians, Paul had to do—in Ellis’s phrase—with ‘somewhat confused children’ (“Wisdom” and “Knowledge”, p. 83).

2. Was a single group responsible for all the errors which Paul tried to put right in I Corinthians? Again scholars divide into those who would answer in the affirmative,⁵⁰ and those who think not.⁵¹ Some of the Corinthian errors, such as tolerance of fornication (chapter 5; 6. 12–20) and sexual asceticism (chapter 7) are mutually incompatible. The Corinthian congregation was made up of a large body of people drawn from all social classes. They were living in a licentious port city and in a syncretistic religious atmosphere. Is it reasonable to assume that a single group with a coherent ideology lies behind all the corrections and reprimands in Paul’s correspondence with this church?

3. Finally, do we have enough data to enable us to classify any of the groups at Corinth under a known religious type? A survey of current scholarship shows that apocalyptic and mystical Judaism, Hellenistic Judaism, and all grades and shades of Gnosticism have been claimed as possible backgrounds. Machalet concludes his evaluation of opinions with the sane remark that we really have no way of reconstructing in detail the beliefs of Paul’s Corinthian addressees.⁵²

From the text of 8. 4 we know that Paul’s Corinthian partners in dialogue supported their right to eat idol-meat by an appeal to the doctrine of monotheism. The precise nuance of their argument—whether it entailed the denial that pagan gods exist, or only the denial that pagan deities have power over devotees of the one true God, or whether it revolved around the doctrine of God as creator and the corollary that all food is good—is not known. Nor can we be sure on what other grounds they might have argued for the legitimacy of their practice.

THE FUNCTION OF I CORINTHIANS 8. 4–6 IN ITS CONTEXT

Throughout chapters 8–10 Paul addresses his reply to those who eat idol-meat, not to the ‘weak’.⁵³ In chapter 8 his pastoral method is first to agree with them in principle, then to qualify their assertions by pointing to those aspects of the matter which they have failed to consider.⁵⁴ Thus in 8. 1–3, he first agrees with them that Christians know the truth about meat sacrificed to idols (8. 1a), but he goes on to show that theoretical knowledge alone is an

insufficient basis for ethical conduct and needs to be complemented by that love for others which one learns by being an object of the divine love (8. 1b-3).⁵⁵ Likewise in 8. 4–7, he first agrees that Christians are united in the confession of the one God (8. 4–6), but he immediately highlights the fact that a weaker brother’s conscience might be hindered by past patterns from boldly living out the implications of monotheism in relation to idol-meat (8. 7). In 8. 8–13, he begins by affirming with his readers that food in itself is not a religious issue (8. 8),⁵⁶ but he then insists that one ought to take responsibility for one’s over-scrupulous brother, for whom eating what has been sacrificed to idols might be destructive (8. 9–13).

Recognizing that the primary thrust of the context as a whole is ethical rather than doctrinal, a number of recent commentators on 8. 4–6 have sought to find in this passage itself criticisms of the Corinthians’ thinking or some basis from which to draw positive ethical implications. To give a few examples, it has been suggested that Paul’s concession of the existence of many gods in v 5 is intended to correct an overly enthusiastic monotheism on the part of the Corinthians and to prepare for warnings about the demonic side of idolatry in 10. 1–22;⁵⁷ that 8. 6 stresses ‘the unity of creation and salvation, to prevent a split in the Corinthians’ thinking between their experience of spiritual power and their attitude to the material world’;⁵⁸ or that the entire passage speaks of the unity of God as the ground for unity between the strong and the weak in Corinth and presents the one God/one Lord as the sphere within which the Corinthians ought to live and love one another.⁵⁹ All such readings find the beginning of Paul’s qualifications of the Corinthians’ position already in vv 4–6.

Attractive as some of these readings are, it is highly questionable whether they correspond to the flow of thought indicated by Paul’s use of particles in the context of vv 4–6. The οὖν at the beginning of v 4 is resumptive, as Paul repeats what he has said in v 1, namely, that he is taking up the subject of eating idol-meat. οἶδμεν ὅτι (v 4) expresses his agreement with the monotheism of the Corinthians. The following words are linked by γάρ (v 5); this makes the long sentence in vv 5–6 an expansion about monotheism, not a corrective to the Corinthian view. Not until v 7 does Paul write an ἀλλά which turns around the direction of the argument and introduces his qualifications. Nowhere in vv 7–13 is there any appeal back to the principles in vv 4–6. Therefore we have no evidence whatever that 8.

4–6 is intended to contain either criticism of Corinthian enthusiasm or positive ethical principles applicable to their problem. The most recent studies of the function of this early confessional formula rightly classify I Cor. 8. 6 as a basis for paraenetic argumentation—as a basis, however, not for Pauline restriction of freedom, but for precisely that license to eat idol-meat which the Corinthians correctly deduced from monotheism.⁶⁰

The rhetorical function of 8. 4–6 in this context is to emphasize common ground before Paul proceeds to challenge his readers to go beyond their present, immature understanding. Paul wishes to underscore what is right in their thinking, partly to win his audience, and partly to assure them that what he is about to say on the subject of eating idol-meat in no way compromises the instruction in monotheism which he gave them as Gentile converts.

Admittedly this passage lies between the main accents in chapter 8, which are ethical and not doctrinal. But in commending his Corinthian readership for their adherence to monotheism, Paul reaches back to the great fundamentals of Christian belief which must have formed part of the core of their catechesis. Whether 8. 6 is a formal confession or not, it contains material which is inherently confessional. This justifies us in isolating 8. 4–6 and studying its theological contents for their own sake.

CHAPTER SEVEN

THE GENERAL STRUCTURE OF I CORINTHIANS 8. 4–6

The first task of a structural exegesis must be to determine the basic relations which obtain among the elements of the passage. I Cor. 8. 4–6 mentions one θεός, one κύριος, and many θεοί and κύριοι who are associated with εἰδωλα. As our perspective and focus shift we see various relations among these subjects in different combinations.

1. There is a contrast between idols and false gods on the one hand, and the true God on the other (v 4).

2. Also there is a contrast between the many gods and lords taken together (v 5), and the one God and one Lord taken together (v 6).

3. A contrast is implied between the many lords (v 5) and the one Lord (v 6).

4. Variations in the parallel clauses of v 6 point to a distinction between the one God and the one Lord.

All these relations promise to be significant for an investigation of monotheism and christology.

THE ANTITHESIS BETWEEN THE MANY GODS AND THE ONE GOD

Are there grounds for supposing that one of these relations is more fundamental in defining the overall structure of the passage than the others? An examination of the syntactical junctures of the text suggests that this is the case. Verse 4 sets forth an antithesis between the many heathen gods with their idols, and the one God ('an idol has no real existence', 'there is no God but one'). The particle γάρ at the head of v 5 introduces a longer sentence (vv 5–6) which repeats the antithesis of v 4 with some elaboration. This complex sentence falls into two contrasting parts with the division marked by ἀλλ' ἡμῖν (v 6). The first part (v 5) concedes the existence of many gods and lords, corresponding to the idols and gods of pagan belief referred to in v 4. The second part (v 6) places over against this polytheism the one God and the one Lord confessed by Christians, corresponding in a rough way to the one God of v 4. That is not to suggest that Paul identifies the one God of v 4 with

the one God plus the one Lord of v 6,¹ but only underlines the close association of the two figures of v 6 in the structural contrast with polytheism. The fact that this bi-polar opposition between the false divinities of polytheism and the true God is first sketched in v 4 and then expanded in vv 5–6 shows that it is the main relation in the passage.

This is confirmed by several points about the other relations.

THE ANTITHESIS BETWEEN THE MANY LORDS AND THE ONE LORD

If we designate occurrences of θεός, -οι with the letter A and occurrences of κύριος, -οι with the letter B, we find that vv 5–6 exhibit an A-B/A-B structure (θεοί, κύριοι in v 5, θεός, κύριος in v 6). Thus even as the many gods stand over against the one God (A/A), so also the many lords are contrasted to the one Lord (B/B).

But the conjunction ἀλλά occurs only once, between the mention of θεοί and κύριοι together in v 5 (A-B) and the mention of θεός and κύριος together in v 6 (A-B). This means that we have in vv 5–6 one basic contrast: A-B/A-B (between polytheism and Christian monotheism) and not two separate contrasts: A/A and B/B. While a contrast between the many lords and the one Lord is distinguishable, then, it is not highlighted by the syntactic particles which define the basic structure of vv 5–6. Moreover, this contrast is logically—or, better: analogically—dependent on the antithesis between the many gods and the one God. It is not emphasized independently in this context.

THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN THE ONE GOD AND THE ONE LORD

The one God and the one Lord are distinguished from each other by differences in title ('God'/'Lord'), appellation ('Father'/'Jesus Christ'), and prepositions ('from—to'/'through—through'). On the other hand, these differences should not be exaggerated, for they remain within the linguistic categories indicated (title, appellation, prepositions) and hence the sustained parallelism of the twelve-word clauses relating to God and Christ is maintained despite secondary variations at four points. The accent falls heavily on the resemblance between these two clauses.² It is a resemblance which serves the purpose of creating a strong antithesis to polytheism.

CONCLUSIONS

The distinction between the one God and the one Lord (v 6) is of tertiary importance in this context. A contrast between the many lords and the one Lord is discernible (vv 5–6), but it is derived analogically from that between the many gods and the one God, and therefore cannot take first place. The fundamental relation in our passage is the antithesis between the many gods and the one God (v 4; vv 5–6). This antithesis is enriched by the analogous contrast between the many lords and the one Lord to form a grand bi-polar opposition between the many gods and lords regarded as a group (v 5) and the one God and one Lord regarded together. This conclusion is supported in the secondary literature by all authors who have addressed the issue of the structure of 8. 4–6, and has been disputed, to my knowledge, by no one.³

Discussion of the significance of this conclusion for the issue of monotheism and christology will be deferred to chapter ten.

The analysis of I Cor. 8. 4–6 in the following chapters will be organized according to the levels of meaning suggested by these conclusions about its structure. First we shall examine the basic antithesis between the many gods and the one God; then the secondary antithesis between the many lords and the one Lord; and finally the relation between the one God and the one Lord.

CHAPTER EIGHT

THE ANTITHESIS BETWEEN THE MANY GODS AND THE ONE GOD

Chapter eight will involve the exegesis of those parts of I Cor. 8. 4–6 which bear on the antithesis between the many gods and the one God. The material to be examined falls under three rubrics: the non-divinity of the many gods (vv 4–5), the reality of the many gods (v 5), and the uniqueness of the one God (vv 4c, 6).

THE NON-DIVINITY OF THE MANY GODS (VV 4–5)

That no rivals to the one God exist is stated by both of the propositions introduced by οἶδαμεν ὅτι in v 4 and is implied by the phrase λεγόμενοι θεοί in v 5. We shall consider each of these elements in turn.

οὐδὲν εἶδωλον ἐν κόσμῳ (v 4)

This negation is an anti-idolatry statement. Its precise meaning is difficult to pinpoint with certainty, for several syntactical and lexical ambiguities surround the parts which make it up. Does οὐδὲν function as a predicate noun, or as an attributive adjective? Does εἶδωλον refer to a physical image, or to the divine being thought to be represented by the image? How does ἐν κόσμῳ modify the statement?

It has been traditional to understand οὐδὲν as a predicate (‘an idol is *nothing*’, Vulg. *nihil est idolum*).¹ But at least four considerations favour taking it attributively here (‘[there is] *no* idol’).² (i) It is simplest to assume that οὐδὲν εἶδωλον is parallel to οὐδεὶς θεός in the next clause, where οὐδεὶς is necessarily attributive. (ii) The word order is entirely natural for an attributive use of οὐδὲν, less so (but not impossible) for a predicative use. (iii) The absence of a copulative ἐστίν is not a weighty factor, but its inclusion would have prevented taking οὐδὲν attributively. (iv) If οὐδὲν εἶδωλον meant ‘an idol is nothing’, it is hard to imagine what ἐν κόσμῳ could contribute to the meaning. The suggestion that ἐν κόσμῳ would in that case put stress on the quality of createdness or reality (‘an idol has no *real* existence’)³ gives to the word κόσμος a nude ontological sense which is unattested in the

NT. κόσμος means ‘world’,⁴ and to say, ‘an idol is nothing—in the world’ would be a pleonasm. On the other hand, if οὐδὲν εἰδωλον means ‘there is no idol’, then the addition of ‘in the world’ specifies the sphere within which this negation holds good: the entire created universe. ‘There is no idol in the world’ is an intelligible denial of the existence of idols. It states that, however real idols may seem to their worshippers, they are not objectively there, anywhere.

Exactly what is denied in this negation of idols? Any visitor to Corinth, including Paul, could see that the streets of the city were lined by statues, temples, and shrines of all kinds. But εἰδωλον does not mean simply a physical statue. It has a religious connotation. Nor, at the other extreme, does it ever refer to a deity, apart from the image which represents it.⁵ It was generally believed in the ancient world that a divinity and its physical image interpenetrated one another and thus formed a sort of unity. The god, of course, transcended the physical object, but it was embodied in it in such a way that it could be contacted through the object.⁶ Hence pagans could refer to religious statues loosely as ‘gods’, and the Jews in their polemic against polytheistic idolatry could call them εἰδωλα, probably capitalizing on the connotation which this word sometimes bore in Classical usage: ‘phantoms’.⁷

What is denied in the statement οὐδὲν εἰδωλον ἐν κόσμῳ, then, is the existence of any idol-god in the sense in which pagans understood gods to be present in images.⁸ Idols are not what they are claimed to be. They in fact put their worshippers in contact with demons, not God (I Cor. 10. 19–20). As avenues to the divine, they do not exist. A stark negation of the existence of idols is perhaps a somewhat crude way of making the point that they are not what they are claimed to be. But in refuting Gentile idolatry, Paul (or his source) may not have felt a need for academic niceties.

οὐδεὶς θεὸς εἰ μὴ εἶς (v 4)

This is an anti-polytheism statement. It consists of a negation (οὐδεὶς θεός) followed by an exception (εἰ μὴ εἶς).

As we saw in part one, the word θεός in Jewish usage usually referred to the supreme creator God, but it could refer on occasion to lesser superhuman powers. How is the word

used here? Clearly the concept of divinity must be the same in both the negation and the exception. Since the exception in effect affirms the existence of the one God who is the creator (cf. v 6), what is negated in the first part is the existence of any other deity on a par with him, any other God. οὐδεὶς θεός does not necessarily deny the existence of other, lesser beings which might be called gods in a secondary sense (cf. v 5; II Cor. 4. 4). This anti-polytheism statement is not any more iconoclastic with regard to the many gods and lords than the statement which follows in v 5, but it is plainly monotheistic. True divinity belongs only to one, and he has no rival.

λεγόμενοι θεοί (v 5)

In v 5 Paul concedes the existence of beings which are spoken of as divine. The participle λεγόμενοι expresses the fact that people regard them as divine and speak of them in this way. This in itself need not constitute a denial that they are legitimately so called, but following on from the anti-polytheism statement in v 4 and setting the θεοί in antithesis to the one God of v 6, λεγόμενοι carries an overtone of falsity.⁹

The limitation λεγόμενοι does not minimize the significance of the gods for their worshippers, who wrongly, in Paul's opinion, consider them to be truly divine. Nor does it call in question their objective existence as superhuman powers (see below). λεγόμενοι points to a contrast with the one God of v 4 in the matter of genuine deity. Whatever these beings may be, they, in comparison with him, are not divine.

In Gal. 4. 8, the only other passage in Paul's writings where the plural θεοί occurs, the gods are described as οἱ φύσει μὴ ὄντες θεοί. These beings, however powerful they are objectively, lack that divine essence (φύσις) by virtue of which God alone can be and act as God.

Summary

The three phrases just examined emphasize Paul's conviction that idols are not windows into heaven, that there is only one God, and that other beings which people call

gods are, in comparison with the true God, wrongly so called. These points may be summarized in the statement that true divinity belongs to one and only one.

THE REALITY OF THE MANY GODS (V 5)

In v 5 Paul concedes that many gods and lords exist. The verse is part of the complex sentence which comprises vv 5–6. It contains two clauses, one introduced by *καὶ γὰρ εἴπερ* and the other by *ὥσπερ*, both subordinate to the double main clause in v 6. We shall examine them in turn.

καὶ γὰρ εἴπερ εἰσὶν λεγόμενοι θεοὶ εἴτε ἐν οὐρανῶ εἴτε ἐπὶ γῆς (v 5)

Attention must first be given to the particles which open v 5. The nuance will shift slightly depending on whether the logical division comes between *καὶ γὰρ* and *εἴπερ*, or between *γὰρ* and *καὶ εἴπερ*. (i) *καὶ γὰρ* means ‘for’ (Latin *etenim*).¹⁰ This would co-ordinate vv 5–6 with v 4. *εἴπερ* by itself would then introduce a simple condition: ‘if it is the case that....’¹¹ The problem with this reading is that one would expect a simple ‘if’-clause to be followed by a ‘then’-clause, whereas v 6 answers v 5 with an antithetical ‘but’-clause. In that case we would have to assume that the ‘but’-clause is asyndetic. But there is a simpler solution. (ii) *γὰρ* by itself also means ‘for’ and co-ordinates vv 5–6 with v 4. If Paul wished to use this particle but also wished to introduce v 5 using the compound phrase *καὶ εἴ(περ)*, stylistic considerations would have required him to place *καί* first in its clause followed by *γὰρ*, thus splitting the compound phrase.¹² *καί εἴ* ordinarily has a concessive force, but it is more specific than the merely concessive *εἰ καί* or *καίπερ*: it connotes that ‘the conclusion must hold even in the extreme case which these words introduce’.¹³ *περ*, which can stand alone in concessive clauses,¹⁴ is added to *εἰ* to form the compound word *εἴπερ* with a concessive force here. The whole phrase *καὶ εἴπερ* would then yield the sense: ‘even if it is the case that....’¹⁵ So confident is Paul of his one God, that he is willing to play with the possibility that other gods of some sort might exist.

The verb *εἰσὶν* stands in the emphatic position immediately after the connecting particles at the beginning of its clause to show that the existence of the so-called gods is

supposed.¹⁶ On the other hand, their existence remains a supposition; Paul does not yet grant that they actually exist. This is clear from the hypothetical tone of the following εἴτε—εἴτε rather than καί—καί.¹⁷ The meaning is: ‘For even should there be so-called gods....’

These gods, Paul supposes, might have as their abode either heaven or earth. Many older commentators tried to define classes of gods which Paul might have had in mind when speaking of each of these spheres, the division between heaven and earth corresponding to a division between celestial bodies above and human rulers or heroes below, or between Olympian deities in the sky and the minor divinities of woods or rivers, etc.¹⁸ More likely the collocation of heaven and earth, a common idiom among both Jews and Greeks, simply specifies the entire cosmos as the realm in which these beings live.¹⁹ Paul regards the gods as part of the worldly order. Contemporary pagans would not have disputed this, because having no doctrine of a transcendent creator, they viewed the gods as being all of a piece with the cosmos.

ὥσπερ εἰσὶν θεοὶ πολλοί (v 5)

The second clause in v 5 transfers what is conceded out of the realm of hypothesis into that of actuality. The change from καὶ εἴπερ εἰσὶν to ὥσπερ εἰσὶν effects this transfer: ‘even if there should be—as in fact there are’.²⁰ This rules out the view that Paul denies the existence of the gods and recognizes them as forces of evil only because people wrongly believe in them.²¹ He thinks they are really there in some sense.²²

The qualification λεγόμενοι carries over in thought from the preceding phrase into this one as well: in comparison with the one God, these beings are wrongly spoken of as divine.²³ Yet that is not to deny that they are gods in a secondary sense. Paul’s use of the compound phrase καὶ εἴπερ at the beginning of v 5 shows that he wishes to concede the extreme case on the side of polytheism in order rhetorically to enhance his contrasting confession of monotheism in v 6. Hence the mounting tension as he moves from hypothesis (εἴπερ) to actuality (ὥσπερ) in v 5. In view of the fact that Paul, like other Jews of the period, was aware of the broad Hellenistic usage of the word θεός for superhuman beings, and was able in another passage himself to use the word in this way for Satan (II Cor. 4. 4), it

is likely that here too he intends to grant to these beings some genuine power. The title ‘gods’ is not entirely unjustified. Paul for a moment allows the word to have its wider reference.²⁴ O. Everling struck the nail on the head: these beings have an objective existence but are improperly regarded as gods when compared to the one God, nevertheless it is not illegitimate to call them θεοί, κύριοι.²⁵

To what sort of beings do the words θεοί and κύριοι in 8. 5 refer? In the writings of Paul, the plural θεοί occurs only here and in Gal. 4. 8, while this use of κύριοι to refer to beings worshipped by pagans is unique. The gods of Gal. 4. 8 could possibly be the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου mentioned in Gal. 4. 3, 9, but this is uncertain, and in any case the meaning of στοιχεῖα in Galatians chapter 4 is still debated. Hence Paul’s use of terminology elsewhere gives us no clue as to the meaning of his terms in our passage.

In I Cor. 10. 19–20 Paul states that idolatry brings the worshipper into contact with demons, a view common in Judaism.²⁶ This is the only passage in Paul’s undisputed epistles which uses the term δαιμόνιον [cf. I Tim. 4. 1], and it offers a minimum of information about them. Because Paul views some of the gods as dwelling on earth (v 5), the possibility that he includes demons in the reference of the phrase ‘many gods and many lords’ cannot be ruled out.²⁷ But a contrast to demons alone would not cast the confession of the one God in v 6 in very impressive relief. Moreover, it is at least questionable whether Paul would have conceived of demons as inhabiting heaven as well as earth (v 5).²⁸ Presumably, then, Paul is also thinking of great, celestial authorities which people might be tempted to worship.²⁹ On the basis of 8. 5 some scholars rightly list θεοί and κύριοι among the many terms Paul uses for angelic principalities and powers.³⁰

Summary

In 8. 5 Paul concedes the existence of many gods in order to heighten his confession of one God in 8. 6. These angelic and demonic beings are part of the world order, albeit some of them are very exalted. In comparison with the creator God they are not truly divine, and pagans are mistaken when they call them gods and worship them. But because of their authority and power to influence human life they can be called gods in a secondary, popular

sense. Far from compromising monotheism, this rhetorical device lends added force to the confession of the divine unity in the following clauses.

(For a brief list of the gods and goddesses which we know to have been revered in the Corinth of Paul's day, see appendix two.)

THE UNIQUENESS OF THE ONE GOD (V 6)

The unique transcendence of the one God is stated or implied by almost every phrase in the first part of v 6. We shall consider these phrases in the order of their occurrence.

ἡμῖν

Paul limits the confession of the one God by prefacing to it the dative ἡμῖν. In this context, where Paul is moving from an indication of pagan beliefs to a statement of Christian faith, ἡμῖν expresses that this is 'our' view and not 'theirs'.³¹ Grammatically ἡμῖν should be classified as a dative of relation which designates 'the person judging or with reference to whom a statement is made' or a dative of reference which designates the person 'in whose opinion a statement holds good'.³² It presupposes the peculiarity of the Christian community as a body of people conscious of their election by God, a body of people whose identity and boundaries can be defined with reference to this common faith.³³

Some expositors have interpreted this word differently. A few, reflecting the influence of Ritschlian anti-metaphysics, have found in ἡμῖν a denial that the following words comprise a theoretical statement. On this view, v 6 is taken to be a value-judgement about God's significance for Christians rather than a statement about his objective nature and relations to the world.³⁴ Such a reading of v 6, with its cosmological language (see below), is simply unconvincing, and this way of interpreting ἡμῖν appears to be motivated by theological bias rather than by attention to the context. Others, following R. Bultmann's existentialist hermeneutic, suppose that ἡμῖν points to God as being 'significant-for-man'.³⁵ This theological presupposition is certainly present, but it ought not to be set in antithesis to the objective import of the following language, as tends to happen among Bultmann's followers.

ἓἰς θεός

This affirmation of monotheism is the grammatical centre of vv 5–6. There are several syntactical possibilities, each having its own nuance. ἓἰς could (improbably) be understood as the subject and θεός as the predicate: ‘One [being] is God’. Better, ἓἰς could be taken either as the predicate (‘God is *one*’) or as an attributive adjective (‘[There is] *one* God’). Against making ἓἰς the predicate is the absence of the article before θεός (compare Rom. 3. 30; Gal. 3. 20; James 2. 19). Formal analogies in other passages support taking ἓἰς attributively (I Cor. 8. 4; I Tim. 2. 5).

What was said negatively in v 4 (‘there is no God except one’) is now articulated positively as ‘there is one God’. This expresses briefly the thought of the opening words of the Jewish *Shema*. The terminology of the formula ἓἰς θεός is not directly related to that of LXX Deut. 6. 4, but the shorter phrase is a ‘concise confession’ which could be used in place of the whole *Shema*, and the idea is the same.³⁶

In these words the antithesis which Paul began in v 5 to build for rhetorical effect comes to its climax. In contrast to the *many* gods, God is ἓἰς in the exclusive sense, ‘single’, ‘only one’. In contrast to the *so-called* gods, this one is θεός in the sense, ‘the real God’, ‘the true God’, divine not only in name or in human estimation, but in fact.³⁷ Unlike the gods who are not gods by nature (Gal. 4. 8), this God is God by virtue of the divine φύσις. He can act as God, can create, is therefore transcendent with respect to the world (see below), and so is ἓἰς also in the sense of ‘unique, incomparable, wholly other’.³⁸ He is one God, not only as the chosen object of worship for Christians, but absolutely and universally, to the exclusion of all possible rivals (v 5).³⁹

ὁ πατήρ

This is the standard Pauline epithet for God, found 24 times in the accepted epistles [and 18 times in the disputed ones]. It designates God in relation to Jesus Christ (cf. Rom. 15. 6; II Cor. 1. 3; 11. 31; [Eph. 1. 3]),⁴⁰ in relation to believers (cf. ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτόν),⁴¹ and in relation to the universe (cf. ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα).⁴² In the parallelism between the two parts

of v 6, the appellation ὁ πατήρ corresponds to Ἰησοῦς Χριστός and thus serves to distinguish this figure from that of Jesus Christ.⁴³ In almost every other instance where πατήρ refers to God in Paul's epistles, Jesus too is mentioned in the immediate context, suggesting that Paul felt a need to distinguish between the two figures.⁴⁴

That is not to say that θεός and ὁ πατήρ are so closely conjoined in thought as to form a compound phrase ('God-the-Father', which might logically imply a corresponding 'God-the-Son').⁴⁵ The explicit phrase 'God the Son' is absent from Paul's writings. ὁ θεός in Paul always signifies the person of God rather than a divine essence shared by the Father and the Son, in contrast to later patristic usage.⁴⁶ Because of the formulaic ring of εἷς θεός, it is preferable to take ὁ πατήρ in apposition to the whole phrase εἷς θεός, defining who is meant by the one God. It identifies the one God as the one who is also called the Father.

ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα

This prepositional phrase delineates the one God further by describing his relation to τὰ πάντα. The two cruxes of interpretation are: (i) the meaning of ἐκ, and (ii) the scope of τὰ πάντα.

1. The Meaning of ἐκ

ἐκ is used with God as the object in twelve places in the accepted Pauline epistles [and once in Ephesians]. Things which are said to be ἐκ God include praise (Rom. 2. 29), believers (I Cor. 1. 30), the Spirit (I Cor. 2. 12), the gift of either married or celibate life (I Cor. 7. 7), apostolic speech (II Cor. 2. 17), ability for the apostolic ministry (II Cor. 3. 5), the resurrection body (II Cor. 5. 1), [all fatherhood (Eph. 3. 15)], righteousness (Phil. 3. 9), and τὰ πάντα (Rom. 11. 36; I Cor. 8. 6; 11. 12; II Cor. 5. 18). When used with God, then, ἐκ denotes origination of various sorts.

The nearest parallel to our passage is in Rom. 11. 36, where the same three prepositions which occur in I Cor. 8. 6 (ἐκ, διὰ, εἰς) similarly describe the relation of God to τὰ πάντα. We have seen that the prepositional device of Hellenism was used by Jews and Christians to express belief in God as the creator and consummator (chapter four, part VII).

The context of Rom. 11. 36 concerns the sweep of history, if not from the very beginning, at least to the very end (e.g., Rom. 11. 25–27). Elsewhere Paul indicates his belief in God as the creator (e.g., Rom. 1. 20, 25; 4. 17). The prepositional phrases in Rom. 11. 36 outline a pattern which involves the origination, sustenance, and return of all things to God. ἐξ αὐτοῦ directs attention to the beginning of God’s work from the time of creation and onwards.⁴⁷

Likewise in I Cor. 8. 6, the coupling of ἐκ with εἰς probably expresses movement from origin to goal, from the beginning to the end of history.⁴⁸ This connects ἐξ οὗ with God’s act of creation. There is no emanation idea here.⁴⁹ In the theological context of Paul’s belief in *creatio ex nihilo* (cf. Rom. 4. 17), ἐκ designates God as the efficient cause of all things, not as the material source.⁵⁰ ἐκ describes the one God as the one who brings into existence τὰ πάντα.⁵¹

2. The Scope of τὰ πάντα

In the NT the articular τὰ πάντα occurs frequently in the sense, ‘the whole of creation’, ‘all things’, ‘the universe’.⁵² In our passage it occurs as part of a phrase which expresses the creatorship of God, as we have just seen. Hence there can be little reasonable doubt that it denotes the universe made by God.⁵³ In Paul’s historical mode of thinking it may include the totality of events as well as things.⁵⁴ This interpretation gives to the phrase ‘from whom are all things’ a cosmological import.⁵⁵

In a recent, important article, J. Murphy-O’Connor has challenged this dominant view.⁵⁶ He argues that the phrase has reference only to God’s soteriological action: from God come all things necessary to accomplish his redemptive plan. Though it is impossible to do justice to Murphy-O’Connor’s detailed arguments, it will be worthwhile to review and evaluate the six basic considerations which he urges against the majority interpretation.

(i) He holds that τὰ πάντα does not mean ‘all things’ simply, but “‘all things’ within a given framework’ (p. 259), and that any assumption we make about the given framework ‘must be justified contextually’ (p. 263). Now in our context, τὰ πάντα is left unqualified and is joined to the prepositional phrase ἐξ οὗ referring to God and indicating origin. The natural inference is that it signifies all that God has made. This is confirmed if the subject of

the following phrase, ἡμεῖς, be understood as specifying a narrower group who benefit from God's saving action. That is sufficient contextual justification for the usual view. It might be asked further if Murphy-O'Connor's demand for contextual justification is fair in the first place. Arguably, in a context which does not positively suggest a framework by which to limit the reference of τὰ πάντα, it is unreasonable to insist that some such limitation must be understood.

(ii) According to Murphy-O'Connor, (τὰ) πάντα has 'an exclusively soteriological sense' elsewhere in Paul: in Rom. 8. 28, 31–32; 11. 36; I Cor. 2. 10–13; 11. 12; 12. 4–6; II Cor. 4. 14–15; 5. 18 (p. 263). But while it is true that these passages all occur in sections dealing with salvation, we cannot conclude on that basis alone that τὰ πάντα itself has an exclusively soteriological reference. In fact the sense 'the whole creation' suits most of them admirably.

(iii) Murphy-O'Connor supposes that the 'scientific foundation' for a cosmological reading is the widespread assumption that our passage contains echoes of a Stoic formula. He thinks that the Stoic texts cited as parallels by Norden and others fail to warrant such an assumption (pp. 260–62). But the scientific foundation for the majority view has nothing to do with alleged Stoic parallels, which might only shed light on the text: the real foundation is the natural grammatical sense of the text as it stands in I Corinthians, as outlined above.

(iv) He classifies 8. 6 as an acclamation, not a confession, and infers that to think 'in terms of cosmology is to introduce an abstract and theoretical element which is not in keeping with the nature of the literary form' (p. 258). But in part one we found scant evidence to support the notion that monotheistic speech had an acclamatory function in Judaism or Christianity. However the material in 8. 6 might have originated, moreover, in its present context it is surely not acclamatory. It is written by Paul, not spoken by a worshipping community; its setting is an epistle, not a worship service; it is a group of propositions responding to theoretical assertions of the Corinthian church, not a response to the sensed divine power or presence. We must hold to the basic linguistic rule that the diachronic use of language does not determine its synchronic meaning. Here we have confession.

(v) Cosmology, argues Murphy-O'Connor, would go 'beyond the needs of the situation' (p. 265); further, it would be counterproductive if Paul was seeking to persuade the Corinthians to base their ethics on love rather than gnosis (p. 266). But if our analysis of the function of 8. 4–6 in its context (chapter six) is correct, Paul's emphatic qualification of their rationalist ethics comes after ἀλλά in v 7; in vv 4–6 he is underlining his agreement with his readers' principles. It is characteristic of Paul's discursive style to elaborate on doctrines which go beyond the needs of the situation.

(vi) Murphy-O'Connor allows the following phrase, καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτόν, to determine the meaning of ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα: the 'meaning of the verse can be summarized in the following paraphrase: From one God come all things which enable us to return to him' (p. 265). But this illegitimately restricts the scope of τὰ πάντα on the basis of a separate phrase with a narrower subject (ἡμεῖς). The meaning of ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα is clear on its own.

The considerations advanced by Murphy-O'Connor do not establish his thesis. τὰ πάντα is most naturally understood to denote the cosmos, the totality of all that is, events as well as things. This implies the universal relation of God to all that he has made. Where God is concerned, 'universality is the correlate of unity'.⁵⁷ In contrast to polytheism, which assigned to each god a city, nation, sphere of human life, or part of nature, Paul sees his one God in relation to the whole.⁵⁸

The phrase 'from whom are all things' implies the absolute transcendence of God over against his creation. Paul draws a sharp dividing line between the creator and the creation (Rom. 1. 25), between the one God and all things. Many gods and lords there may be, but they dwell 'either in heaven or on earth' (v 5), that is, inside the boundary of all things. As such they are from God; they are created beings. They cannot be set alongside of the one. He alone is outside of the boundary.⁵⁹ That may be in part how Paul would have spelt out what he meant in saying that the gods are not divine in essence (φύσις, Gal. 4. 8). God is the qualitatively unique creator.

καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτόν

This phrase further describes God by showing the relationship of ἡμεῖς to him. On the analogy of the preceding clause, we would have expected another relative clause: καὶ εἰς ὃν ἡμεῖς. The choice of αὐτόν instead of the relative pronoun is pleonastic.⁶⁰ It makes it possible for the pronouns referring to God to stand at the beginning and at the end of their respective phrases, creating a literary inclusion which corresponds elegantly with the theological theme of God as the creator and consummator of the world (see below).

The two questions which need to be answered are: (i) who is included in the scope of ἡμεῖς, and (ii) what is meant by εἰς αὐτόν?

1. ἡμεῖς

A few commentators have taken ἡμεῖς to refer to the whole natural human race as distinguished from the sub-rational creation,⁶¹ but the overwhelming majority think it refers to Christian believers.⁶² Both interpretations are based on the contrast between τὰ πάντα and ἡμεῖς. Since ἡμῖν at the beginning of v 6 specifies Christians as the group who subscribe to this statement of faith, it is most natural to assume that ἡμεῖς too indicates believers.⁶³

2. εἰς αὐτόν

The ecclesial reference of ἡμεῖς suggests a redemptive sense for εἰς αὐτόν. The placing of cosmology and soteriology side by side is common in the OT,⁶⁴ and it occasions no surprise if Paul follows suit.⁶⁵ Older commentators tended to understand εἰς αὐτόν statically, either as describing the Christian life as lived in the sustaining power of God,⁶⁶ or as making God the point of orientation for the ethical life.⁶⁷ But Paul also held that God is the τέλος of history (I Cor. 15. 24–28). Because the ἐκ-phrase, which refers to creation, and the εἰς-phrase in v 6 thus mutually define one another in such a way as to comprehend the course of history from origin to goal, most modern exegetes give to εἰς αὐτόν an eschatological thrust. It makes God the holder of his people's destiny: they will glorify him

in his perfect kingdom.⁶⁸ This salvation-historical connotation of the phrase ‘to him’ does not exclude the sense of ethical finality, but presupposes it.

The famous Orphic dictum that all things come from God and return to him (ἐξ ἑνὸς πάντα καὶ εἰς ἓν πάντα)⁶⁹ is modified in v 6 to say that the universe comes from God and those whom he has redeemed return to him. In the language of ancient philosophy, God is the efficient cause of the world and the final cause of his people.

SYNTHESIS

It remains to integrate these exegetical results with our findings about Paul’s monotheism from part one. For this purpose we turn again to the nine issues which guided our inquiry there.

Forms of Pauline Monotheistic Speech/The ΕΙΣ ΘΕΟΣ/ΚΥΡΙΟΣ Formula

In the material in I Cor. 8. 4–6 bearing on God, the explicit monotheistic formula which occurs is εἷς θεός, positively in v 6 and in the negative form οὐδεὶς θεὸς εἰ μὴ εἷς in v 4. This, as we have seen, is Paul’s most common way of stating his belief in one God. It is drawn directly from Judaism.

The Centrality of Monotheism for Paul

I Cor. 8. 4–6 gives evidence that Paul’s Gentile converts in Corinth shared his monotheism, even though they lived in a polytheistic environment and could see many idols throughout the city. Probably many of them, like the Thessalonians, had, under the influence of Paul’s preaching, turned from idols to serve Paul’s God. The material in v 6 is carefully constructed, indicating that either Paul or someone before him gave forethought to its expression. Perhaps it was a formula used in catechetical instruction or was modelled on such a formula. This in turn would support our inference from Paul’s Jewish background and the scattered references to monotheism in his epistles that he regarded monotheism as the first tenet of right religion.

Functions of Monotheistic Statements

The professions of monotheistic belief in I Cor. 8. 4–6 have a confessional ring. In their present, epistolary setting, at least, there is nothing acclamatory about them. Whether the original readers would have heard connotations associated with the use of monotheistic formulae in Christian worship we do not know. The confessional use of these monotheistic statements in I Cor. 8. 4–6 fits in well with what we discovered in part one about the ways in which statements of monotheism functioned in Judaism generally and in Paul’s letters.

The Definition of Monotheism

The phrase θεοὶ πολλοί in I Cor. 8. 5 stands alongside of II Cor. 4. 4 as evidence that Paul, like other Hellenistic Jews, could use the term θεός positively to refer to powerful beings other than the creator God. As elsewhere in Judaism and in Paul, this wider reference of the word does not conflict with its strict and proper reference to the unique, transcendent creator (εἷς θεός), in comparison to whom all others are mere λεγόμενοι θεοί.

The Associations of Pauline Monotheism

In I Cor. 8. 4–6, explicit professions of monotheism are associated with the following items: an antithesis with idols (οὐδὲν εἰδωλον ἐν κόσμῳ); an antithesis with the many gods of polytheistic belief (οὐδεὶς θεὸς εἰ μὴ εἷς; λεγόμενοι θεοί; θεοὶ πολλοί, ἀλλὰ εἷς θεός); the fatherhood of God (ὁ πατήρ); the creatorhood of God (ἐξ οὗ); the relation of God to ‘all things’ in the cosmic sense (τὰ πάντα); the special relation of God to his people (ἡμεῖς); the role of God as consummator at the end of history (εἰς αὐτόν); language about both the beginning and the end.

With the exception of the appellation ‘Father’, all of these items are elements of the Jewish monotheism schema, and most of the important elements of that schema are here represented. I Cor. 8. 4–6, then, contains a classic statement of Jewish monotheism.

Pauline Intermediaries and Monotheistic Language

Since in the present chapter we have focused on those parts of our passage which concern only God, this category is here irrelevant.

Metaphysical Elements in Paul's Concept of God

There is no metaphysical language about God in I Cor. 8. 4–6. The 'father' metaphor is concrete, and the prepositions used to describe God's relations to the universe and to his people are dynamic.

Nevertheless, metaphysical implications are not far from the surface. The prepositional phrases, which are probably derived from Hellenistic popular philosophy, raise the issues of protology and teleology, setting God beyond the time-boundaries of history. There is an implicit distinction between the creator and the creation which places God outside of the visible universe and gives him absolute transcendence over against it. The antithesis between the many gods, which are described in Gal. 4. 8 as wanting the divine essence (φύσις), and the one God implies that the one God is possessor of the divine essence. Though that essence is not mentioned here as such, the description of the one God in these verses makes it possible to fill in some of the details of the divine essence mentioned in Gal. 4. 8. In contrast to the creaturely quality of the many gods, the true divine essence is transcendent *vis-a-vis* the world, qualitatively unique, and fully personal.

CHAPTER NINE

THE ANTITHESIS BETWEEN THE MANY LORDS AND THE ONE LORD

Chapter nine will involve the exegesis of those parts of I Cor. 8. 4–6 which bear on the antithesis between the many lords and the one Lord. The material to be examined falls under two rubrics: the nature of the many lords (v 5), and the uniqueness of the one Lord (v 6).

THE NATURE OF THE MANY LORDS (V 5)

I Cor. 8. 4–6 contains less material about the many lords than about the many gods, the only reference being in the brief phrase καὶ κύριοι πολλοί at the end of v 5. It would be helpful for sketching Paul's view if we could assume that what he said about the many gods held good for the many lords as well. Yet if Paul had in mind a different category of beings when speaking of lords, then we should have to consult other sources in order to fill in the details of Paul's conception of them. We begin by examining the relationship between the many gods and the many lords.

A number of commentators have supposed that the many lords are a separate group of beings from the many gods. The distinction has been variously drawn. One reading takes its cue from Paul's description of the gods as dwelling 'either in heaven or on earth' (v 5). It has been suggested that the θεοὶ πολλοί live in heaven and the κύριοι πολλοί on earth.¹ In favour of this interpretation it could be urged that the dual mention of θεοὶ πολλοί and κύριοι πολλοί occurs in the clause which immediately follows the phrase 'either in heaven or on earth'; moreover, that the polarity of heaven and earth seems to carry through to v 6, where the one God is the transcendent creator and the one Lord is the man Jesus Christ. But other considerations cast doubt on this exegesis. As we have seen, the collocation of heaven and earth is better understood as a periphrasis for the whole of created reality than as a specification of two distinct spheres. And as we shall see presently, the title κύριος was used in pagan religion to denote heavenly as well as earthly deities. The accidental parallel between 'on earth' and 'many lords', then, does not help us to identify the many lords.

Older expositors sometimes assumed that the κύριοι πολλοί were divine beings of lower rank than the θεοὶ πολλοί.² The notion that κύριος was a less elevated title than θεός in pagan religions appears to have been a sheer supposition throughout the nineteenth century and into the twentieth, when at last H. Böhlig attempted to place it on a religio-historical basis in his study of the religions current in Anatolia in Paul's day. He found there an ancient oriental concept of an exalted High God having a divine son who functioned as his agent and active principle in the world (cf. Acts 14. 11). Paul presumably could have absorbed this conception in Tarsus.³

What Böhlig failed to consider, however, was the fact that it was the High God at Tarsus, not his son, who received the title *Baal*, equivalent to the Greek κύριος.⁴ Further studies of the use of the title κύριος in pagan religions by Bousset, Deissmann and Foerster have shed further light on the problem.⁵ We find θεός and κύριος used side by side to describe rulers in inscriptional and papyrological evidence from the pre-Christian period, indicating that these terms were at least to some extent synonymous.⁶ High gods given the title κύριος included Isis and Sarapis,⁷ Osiris, Jupiter Heliopolitanus, and, in Syria, Zeus.⁸ Olympian deities for the most part continued to be called θεοί, but in various places local usage might apply the term κύριοι to such Olympians as Apollo, Artemis, Athena, and Hermes, as well as to the highly venerated Greek gods Asklepios, Chronos, and Dionysos.⁹ Now that these facts have been brought to light, scholars generally have abandoned the view that the titles θεός and κύριος connoted any differences of status.¹⁰

It is likely that for Paul the κύριοι πολλοί did not belong to a different category from the θεοὶ πολλοί. The divine beings denoted by the word θεοί in the first part of v 5 can be variously called θεοί or κύριοι.¹¹ The two phrases are synonymous and simply establish a formal antithesis to the one God and one Lord of v 6.

If this exegesis is correct, then many of our conclusions about the many gods in the last chapter will apply *mutatis mutandis* to the many lords. In 8. 5 Paul concedes the existence of many lords in order to heighten his confession of one Lord in 8. 6. These angelic beings are part of the world order, albeit very exalted. In comparison with the one Lord they are not true lords, and pagans are mistaken when they call them lords and worship

them. But because of their authority and power to influence human life they can be legitimately called lords in a more general sense.

THE UNIQUENESS OF THE ONE LORD (V 6)

The unique transcendence of the one Lord is stated or implied by almost every phrase in the second part of v 6. We shall consider these phrases in the order of their occurrence.

καὶ εἷς κύριος

This affirmation of the unique Lord is co-ordinated grammatically (καί) with the statement εἷς θεός in the first part of the verse, and thus shares its role as the grammatical centre of vv 5–6. Because the two phrases are parallel, it is best to take εἷς again as an attributive adjective: ‘[There is] *one* Lord’.

This declaration is closer in wording to the LXX *Shema* (κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν κύριος εἷς ἐστίν, Deut. 6. 4) than the former statement εἷς θεός. In part one we saw that the collocation of εἷς or μόνος with κύριος in Jewish statements of monotheism was only somewhat less frequent than the corresponding formula with θεός (chapter four, section II). εἷς κύριος, like εἷς θεός, is drawn from the traditional language of Jewish monotheism.

In these words the antithesis which Paul began in v 5 to build for rhetorical effect completes its climax (in conjunction with εἷς θεός). In contrast to the *many* lords, this Lord is εἷς in the exclusive sense, ‘single’, ‘only one’. This Lord can mediate creation, is therefore transcendent with respect to the world (see below), and so is εἷς also in the sense of ‘unique, incomparable, wholly other’. He is one Lord, not only as the chosen object of worship for Christians, but absolutely and universally, to the exclusion of all possible rivals (v 5).¹²

How high a rank is indicated by the title κύριος? The basic meaning of the word is ‘master’, denoting ownership and authority over someone or something. During the Hellenistic period, under the influence of eastern religious usage, it came to be applied to gods as well as to human beings who had positions of authority. Its exact connotation depends on its referent.¹³ In v 6 it stands in a monotheistic formula and is applied to one who

is said to be the mediator of creation (see below). These associations with the OT language of monotheism and the OT doctrine of creation suggest that the use of κύριος for God in the Septuagint informs the connotation here.

It has long been known that when post-biblical Jews read the scriptures in their synagogues, they substituted the word ‘Lord’ orally for the Tetragrammaton.¹⁴ In his classic study of the use of the Kyrios title in Judaism, W.W. Baudissin pointed out that κύριος not only served as the usual translation of *yhwh* in septuagintal texts, but in Isaiah and the Psalms especially it came to be used for *el* and thus became virtually an equivalent for θεός as a general term for deity.¹⁵ Since the time of Baudissin, a few scholars have taken a critical view of his results on the ground that our six pre-Christian Jewish manuscripts of Greek OT texts render the Tetragrammaton in Hebrew/Aramaic characters or transliterate it as ΙΑΩ, raising the question whether κύριος might be a later, Christian substitution.¹⁶ But the most recent and comprehensive studies of the development of κύριος as a divine title in Judaism and early Christianity, based on the use of *mara* in pre-Christian Aramaic sources and κύριος in Philo, Josephus, the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, the *Letter of Aristeas*, and Aquila’s translation of the Old Testament, show that the Christian use of κύριος as a divine title was derived from pre-Christian Judaism.¹⁷

In any case, by the time of Paul, κύριος had become the ordinary translation of the Tetragrammaton in septuagintal texts used by the early church, as Paul’s OT quotations show (Rom. 4. 8; 9. 28–29; 11. 34; 15. 11; I Cor. 2. 16; 3. 20; 10. 26; [II Tim. 2. 19]). This is the usage which is decisive for I Cor. 8. 6. Here a title is used which Paul himself certainly, and his readers probably, understood to be a general substitute for *yhwh* in the scriptures.¹⁸ In this particular context, redolent of the language of monotheism, κύριος must be given its loftiest connotation of deity.¹⁹ The application of this monotheistic language to a human referent in the following phrase does not affect its intrinsic sense.

Ἰησοῦς Χριστός

These two words stand in apposition to the monotheistic formula and identify the figure whom Paul has in mind. The κύριος is identified, somewhat curiously, as the man

Jesus revered by the early Christian churches. This is consistent with Paul's general usage of κύριος, which, outside of septuagintal quotations, virtually always refers to Jesus rather than God.²⁰

This appellation combines the personal name of Jesus of Nazareth with the messianic title Χριστός with which he was honoured in the faith of Jewish Christianity. It is possible that for Paul the latter title still spoke of the eschatological functions of the Messiah as the saviour and leader of the people of God, and had not yet been entirely toned down to a mere second name or formal title.²¹

By the application of the Jewish monotheistic formula εἷς κύριος to the man Jesus whom the Christians believed to be the Messiah, traditional Jewish monotheism is taken over and given a Christian interpretation. Jewish monotheism provides a linguistic category by means of which to express the significance of the Lord Jesus Christ.²²

δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα

This prepositional phrase delineates the one Lord further by describing his relation to τὰ πάντα. It is identical to the corresponding phrase ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα in the first part of the verse, except that the preposition ἐκ relating to God has been replaced by διὰ relating to the Lord. The three cruxes of interpretation are: (i) the scope of τὰ πάντα, (ii) the meaning of διὰ, and (iii) the referent of οὗ. These issues cannot be divorced from one another, nor can they be treated as independent of the corresponding issues surrounding the phrase ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα.

1. The Scope of τὰ πάντα

We take up this issue first because it can be disposed of the most readily. Because of the deliberate, verbal parallel between ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα and δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα, it is reasonable to assume that τὰ πάντα has the same sense in both clauses unless there are overriding reasons to the contrary. Hence we shall assume, pending any modifications which might be suggested by the exegesis of the other items, that τὰ πάντα here again denotes the whole of created reality.

2. The Meaning of διὰ

At first glance, δι' οὗ looks like an ordinary use of διὰ with the genitive to express agency or instrumentality. But when used with God or Christ in the NT, it can, on occasion, indicate the originator of an action: Paul can use διὰ to describe one's calling as due to God or Christ or both, without implying agency on behalf of any other subject (e.g., Rom. 1. 5; I Cor. 1. 9; II Cor. 1. 1). Significantly, John and the author of Colossians use διὰ for Christ's role in creating τὰ πάντα, again without any hint that Christ acts on behalf of another (John 1. 3, 10; Col. 1. 16). Likewise God himself is described as the one δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα in Heb. 2. 10.²³ If that is the meaning in I Cor. 8. 6, then δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα will have nearly the same sense as ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα, and will describe the referent of the clause as the creator of the world,²⁴ the preposition being varied simply to distinguish formally this acting subject from the one God.

A few scholars, however, have doubted whether the work of creation is in view here. δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα could just as well refer to the work of providence, of governing and preserving all things and guiding all events. This interpretation can adduce δι' αὐτοῦ in Rom. 11. 36 as a parallel.²⁵

Attractive as these readings may be, the fact remains that διὰ with the genitive more often than not signifies agency or instrumentality,²⁶ and such a reading yields an excellent sense in v 6. Because of the parallelism between the first and the second parts of the verse, it is natural to understand 'through' as expressing the agency by which all things come 'from' the Father.²⁷ This gives to the referent of the clause a mediatorial role in creation.

3. The Referent of οὗ

It would be pernicky to insist on a choice among κύριος, Ἰησοῦς, or Χριστός as the most likely referent for the relative pronoun οὗ. The pronoun refers to the person who is designated by all three words.

According to this exegesis, the phrase δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα describes the person of the Lord Jesus Christ as the mediator of creation. This makes I Cor. 8. 6 perhaps the earliest

documentary evidence for the Christian belief in the personal pre-cosmic existence of Christ. This is the interpretation favoured by virtually all expositors throughout history.²⁸

Of late, however, a few voices have queried whether the early church had arrived at the conception of Christ's personal pre-existence already in the 50s A.D.²⁹ The most outstanding critic of the consensus is J.D.G. Dunn, whose monograph *Christology in the Making* (1980) expounds the thesis that this concept did not become clear in the church until the end of the first century, in the Johannine literature. It will be worth while to review and evaluate his exegesis of the phrase in question. Dunn thinks that δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα does not express the thought of Christ's personal pre-existence, for the following reasons.

(i) Dunn belongs to those expositors who suppose that 8. 4–6 is at least partly intended to correct an imbalance in the Corinthians' ethical thinking. He says that Paul's basic aim is to assert the unity of creation and redemption (pp. 180, 182). 'The implication of all this for the Corinthians, and one which Paul proceeds to draw out in vv. 7–13, is that the knowing ones must have a sense of responsibility in their handling of created things before God, conscious that their Lord is Lord also of creation, and with due respect for their fellow believers (the rest of "us")' (pp. 180–81). But as we have seen (chapter six, section on the function of 8. 4–6), such a view is not based on the indications in the passage. In vv 4–6, Paul agrees with his readers about fundamentals (οἴδαμεν ὅτι, v 4; γάρ, v 5), and does not take issue with their thinking until v 7 (ἀλλά). Contrary to what Dunn asserts, vv 7–13 do not draw out implications from vv 4–6; rather vv 7–13 present other, independent considerations which balance the wrong inferences that the Corinthians drew from monotheism.

(ii) The accent in v 6, according to Dunn, falls on the present Lordship of Christ, not on events in the past. This can be seen in Paul's use of the title κύριος, which was recognized in the early church to have been bestowed on Christ only after his resurrection; in Paul's adaptation of the current Christian confession 'Jesus is Lord' to produce the monotheistic formula; and in his use of the word ἡμεῖς in both parts of v 6 (pp. 181–82). But none of these points will stand. κύριος, the supposed adaptation of 'Jesus is Lord', and ἡμεῖς do not occur in the crucial phrase which is under scrutiny. The emphasis on Christ's

present Lordship in other parts of the verse in no way calls in question the clear import of the phrase δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα. Dunn acknowledges that it refers to creation in the past, for he elsewhere classifies it as evidence for a wisdom christology in Paul (pp. 165, 182–83).

(iii) Dunn points to the argument of chapters 1–2 of I Corinthians as a possible parallel to the thought in 8. 6. Even as in 1. 24 Christ is the wisdom of God in the sense that his death and resurrection fulfill God's plan of salvation (pp. 176–79), so also in 8. 6, according to Dunn, Christ is the creative power of God in the sense that his present Lordship entails his sharing in God's creative and governmental functions (p. 182).

(iv) Paul speaks of Christ allusively using language from the Jewish wisdom tradition, Dunn suggests, in order to show that creation and redemption are united. The effect of this is not to make Christ a pre-existent divine being, but to establish the continuity of Christ with the creative wisdom and power of God (p. 182). Against both this point and the former one, we maintain that the grammar of the passage requires us to understand the referent of the relative pronoun as the person of the Lord Jesus Christ. Had Paul wished to assert merely the continuity of God's creative wisdom in the past with Christ's rule in the present, he could have written, clearly and unmistakably, εἰς κύριος Ἰησοῦς σοφία, δι' ἧς τὰ πάντα. That the expression Paul actually used refers to the person of Christ is conceded by Dunn when he writes, 'when we remove I Cor. 8. 6 from this context it readily becomes a vehicle for a christology of pre-existence—that is certainly true' (p. 183).

In short, then, none of the factors which Dunn advances casts serious doubt on the natural interpretation of δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα which has been adopted almost universally by others.³⁰ The clause δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα describes the one Lord Jesus Christ as the mediator of creation who was present with the Father before the world came into being. This implies the universal relation of the Lord to all that he has made. A comprehensive dominion is the correlate of the exclusive, unitary Lordship of Christ.³¹ In contrast to polytheism, which assigned to each lord a city, nation, sphere of human life, or part of nature, Paul sees his one Lord in relation to the whole.³²

The phrase 'through whom are all things' implies the transcendence of the Lord over against his creation. The sharp dividing line which Paul draws between the creator and the

creation (Rom. 1. 25) applies to the Lord as well as to God. Many lords there may be, but they dwell ‘either in heaven or on earth’ (v 5), that is, inside the boundary of all things. As such they are from God through the Lord; they are created beings. They cannot be set alongside of the one. He alone is outside of the boundary. The Lord is the qualitatively unique mediator of creation.

καὶ ἡμεῖς δι’ αὐτοῦ

This phrase further describes the Lord by showing the relationship of ἡμεῖς to him. On the analogy of the preceding clause, we would have expected another relative clause: καὶ εἰς ὃν ἡμεῖς. The choice of αὐτόν instead of the relative pronoun is pleonastic.³³ It makes it possible for the pronouns referring to the Lord to stand at the beginning and at the end of their respective phrases, creating a literary inclusion which corresponds elegantly with the theme of the Lord as the mediator of both creation and consummation (see below).

The two questions which need to be answered are: (i) who is included in the scope of ἡμεῖς, and (ii) what is meant by δι’ αὐτοῦ?

1. ἡμεῖς

As with ἡμεῖς in the first part of v 6, a few commentators have taken ἡμεῖς here to refer to the whole natural human race as distinguished from the sub-rational creation,³⁴ but the overwhelming majority think it refers to Christian believers.³⁵ Since this word is exactly parallel to the former ἡμεῖς, it too denotes believers, for the same reason (see chapter eight, *in loc.*).

2. δι’ αὐτοῦ

Older commentators tended to understand δι’ αὐτοῦ statically, either as expressing the thought that Christians are dependent upon Christ for all things pertaining to their existence,³⁶ or as making Christ the point of orientation for the ethical life.³⁷ But because of the parallelism between the first and second parts of v 6, it is preferable to take δι’ αὐτοῦ in conjunction with εἰς αὐτόν: Christians go to the Father through Jesus Christ. Since, as we

saw, εἰς αὐτόν points to the Father as the consummator of all things, δι' αὐτοῦ makes Jesus Christ the mediator of God's eschatological work.³⁸ Paul spells out this idea in greater detail in I Cor. 15. 24–28.

The famous Orphic dictum that all things come from God and return to him is modified in v 6 to say that the universe comes from God through the Lord Jesus Christ and those whom he has redeemed return to God through the Lord Jesus Christ. In the language of philosophy, the Lord is the instrumental cause of the world's being and becoming from its origin to its goal in God.

SYNTHESIS

It remains to integrate these exegetical results with our findings about Paul's monotheism from part one. For this purpose we turn again to the nine issues which guided our inquiry there.

Forms of Pauline Monotheistic Speech/The ΕΙΣ ΘΕΟΣ/ΚΥΡΙΟΣ Formula

In the material in I Cor. 8. 4–6 bearing on the Lord, the explicit monotheistic formula εἷς κύριος occurs. This statement is drawn from the traditional language of Jewish monotheism and is reminiscent of the *Shema*.

The Importance of Monotheism for Paul

Functions of Monotheistic Statements

The Definition of Monotheism

The material about the Lord in I Cor. 8. 4–6 adds nothing to our conclusions for these subjects from chapter eight.

The Associations of Pauline Monotheism

In the material in I Cor. 8. 5–6 bearing on the Lord, the use of monotheistic language is associated with the following items: an implied antithesis with idols (οὐδὲν εἰδωλον ἐν κόσμῳ); an explicit antithesis with the many lords of polytheistic belief (κύριοι πολλοί

ἀλλὰ εἷς κύριος); the messiahship of the Lord (Χριστός); the mediatorial creatorhood of the Lord (δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα); the relation of the Lord to 'all things' in the cosmic sense (τὰ πάντα); the special relation of the Lord to his people (ἡμεῖς); the mediatorial role of the Lord in bringing about the consummation at the end of history (ἡμεῖς δι' αὐτοῦ); language about both the beginning and the end.

With the exception of the title 'Christ' and the mediatorial sense of the preposition 'through', all of these items are elements of the Jewish monotheism schema, and most of the important elements of that schema are here represented. I Cor. 8. 5–6, then, contains not one but two statements making use of the traditional language of Jewish monotheism, one concerning God and the other concerning the Lord.

Pauline Intermediaries and Monotheistic Language

Paul thus applies both an explicit form of monotheistic speech and the monotheism schema of Judaism to the figure of the Lord Jesus Christ alongside of God the Father. If Paul here applies the language of monotheism to an intermediary, this is a departure from Jewish usage. If it be in accordance with Jewish usage, Paul here presupposes that the Lord Jesus Christ is not an intermediary. This question will be fully discussed in the next chapter.

Metaphysical Elements in Paul's Concept of God

There is no metaphysical language about Christ in I Cor. 8. 4–6. The name-title 'Jesus Christ' is concrete, and the prepositions used to describe the Lord's relations to the universe and to his people are dynamic.

Nevertheless, metaphysical implications are not far from the surface. The prepositional phrases, which are probably derived from Hellenistic popular philosophy, raise the issues of protology and teleology, setting the Lord beyond the time-boundaries of history. Also there is an implicit distinction between the mediator of creation and the world which places the Lord outside of the visible universe and makes him transcendent over against it.

CHAPTER TEN

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE ONE GOD AND THE ONE LORD

In this final chapter we reach the goal of our study: a description of the relationship between the one God and the one Lord in I Cor. 8. 4–6. The previous two chapters have prepared for this description by analysing separately the material about God and the material about the Lord in the passage. But as we saw in chapter seven, I Cor. 8. 4–6 is so constructed that neither the God-material nor the Lord-material is independently highlighted. It is now necessary to fuse together the results of all foregoing chapters, and especially the results of chapters eight and nine, into an integrated picture.

So far we have concluded that I Cor. 8. 6 contains two classic statements of monotheism using traditional Jewish language, one containing the title ‘God’ and the other the title ‘Lord’, the first with reference to the Father and the second, in non-Jewish fashion, with reference to the man Jesus Christ. In each case, the language of monotheism comprehends not only the explicit confession with $\hat{\epsilon}\iota\varsigma$, but also the prepositional phrases, which contain elements closely associated with belief in one God in the Jewish monotheism schema.

The fact that the language of monotheism is used in both cases distinguishes this statement of Paul from other bipartite formulae which have sometimes been adduced as parallels. In the Hellenistic declaration $\text{Ε}\iota\varsigma \text{Ζ}\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma \text{Σ}\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha\pi\iota\varsigma, \text{μ}\epsilon\gamma\acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta \hat{\iota}\sigma\iota\varsigma \eta \text{κ}\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha$, the word ‘one’ is applied to Zeus simply as an elative adjective with roughly the same meaning as the word ‘great’ which is predicated of Isis, without any intention of excluding other gods or goddesses.¹ E. Rodhe states that a *Zusammenstellung* of the one God with the one Lord such as we find in I Cor. 8. 6 is unparalleled in pagan Kyrios cults.² Jewish and Christian bipartite formulae include: ‘One God, one temple’ (Philo, *De spec. leg.* I, 77); ‘God is one, and the race of the Hebrews is one’ (Josephus, *Antiq.*, IV, 201 [number 172]); ‘There is one God, and there is one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus’ (I Tim. 2. 5 [number 193]).³ But such formulae likewise fall short of providing real parallels.

The double use of monotheistic language in I Cor. 8. 4–6 sharpens the problem raised by the passage: in what sense can this language be truly monotheistic when it is applied to two different figures? If Paul had juxtaposed merely language about ‘God’ with language about ‘the Lord’, we might conclude that he held an incipient ditheism. Yet the strong emphasis on the divine unity confessed by Christians over against pagan polytheism, an emphasis which comes to expression both in the phrase ‘one God’ and in the phrase ‘one Lord’ in their antithesis to the ‘many gods and many lords’, rules out that possibility. Paul does not have two foci of divinity, but two foci of divine unity. How does he conceive of the relationship between the *two* foci of *uni*-ty?

As we saw in chapter six, Paul’s purpose in writing I Cor. 8. 4–6 was not to address the theoretical problem of the relation between God and the Lord for its own sake, but to concede what was correct in the thought of his Corinthian addressees. Moreover, we concluded in chapter seven that the basic structure of the passage is defined by the antitheses between the many gods and lords of polytheism and the one God (and one Lord) of Christian belief, making the relation between the two objects of Christian belief of tertiary importance in this context. But even if Paul had other concerns in view at the moment of writing, he appears to have been appealing to traditional material of a confessional nature, and this material taken in its own right inevitably raises the issue of how God and the Lord are to be related to one another in Christian thought. Indeed, the passage, when it has been justifiably abstracted from its immediate context, ‘looks like such an explanation’.⁴

Certain features of I Cor. 8. 4–6 show that Paul viewed God and the Lord as two distinct figures, the Lord being subordinate to God. Other features suggest that the two figures were in some way coalesced in his mind. We begin by observing both sides of this paradox.

THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN THE ONE GOD AND THE ONE LORD

At the outset it is important to mark one respect in which Paul does not distinguish between God and the Lord. Neither figure has unique responsibility for either creation or redemption. To each is assigned a phrase in v 6 having to do with cosmology (containing τὰ

πάντα) and also a phrase having to do with soteriology (containing ἡμεῖς). Unlike the Nicene Creed, which associates creation with the Father and redemption with Christ, Paul associates both operations with the Father and both with Christ.

The distinction between God and the Lord is expressed by the use of different titles (θεός/κύριος), different appellations (ὁ πατήρ/Ἰησοῦς Χριστός), and different prepositions (ἐξ—εἰς/διὰ—διά). In particular, the divine title θεός belongs to the Father in I Cor. 8. 4, 6. Linguistically, B.B. Warfield was off on the wrong foot when he criticized liberal scholars for maintaining the distinction between the one God and the Lord throughout the passage:

The fallacy of writers like Beyschlag, *Christologie d. N.T.*, 1866, consists in treating the phrase ‘to us there is one God the Father’ [v 6] as taking up and repeating the ‘There is no God but One,’ [v 4] and the phrase ‘and one Lord Jesus Christ,’ [v 6] as a kind of afterthought added to it.... In truth it is the double clause: ‘There is one God the Father ... and one Lord Jesus Christ for us,’ [v 6] which takes up and develops the phrase, ‘None is God but One’ [v 4].⁵

In the light of Paul’s use of θεός in this passage and elsewhere for the Father, it is better to understand the one who is God according to v 4 to be the ‘one God’ of v 6, without attempting to include the one Lord. The one God is the Father, not the Lord Jesus Christ.

Several factors indicate the subordination of the Lord to God. The title κύριος, as we have seen, does not in itself connote any gradation below θεός: Fitzmyer rightly concludes his magisterial study of κύριος by saying that this title signifies a *Gleichsetzung* of Christ with God (albeit not an *Identifizierung* of the two).⁶ But subordination of the Lord to God is suggested by the simple fact that the Lord is mentioned in second place after God in v 6, as happens regularly in the Pauline greetings (Rom. 1. 7; I Cor. 1. 3; II Cor. 1. 2; Gal. 1. 3; [Eph. 1. 2]; Phil. 1. 2; [II Thess. 1. 2; I Tim. 1. 2; II Tim. 1. 2; Titus 1. 4;] Philem. 3). God alone is the Father, the one who has ultimate authority, even over his Christ (cf. the phrase, ‘Father of our Lord Jesus Christ’, e.g., Rom. 15. 6; II Cor. 1. 3; 11. 31). God’s fatherhood of the Lord may also point to origination: the Lord’s lordship, perhaps his person and nature too, are derived from God (Phil. 2. 9–11). The preposition διὰ, in contrast to ἐξ and εἰς, gives to the

Lord a penultimate role in both the divine operations of creation and redemption; the ultimate source and goal is the Father.⁷ These features of v 6 must be read in the larger context of Paul's language about Christ in I Corinthians, where we find the statements, 'Christ is God's' (3. 23); 'the head of Christ is God' (11. 3); 'when all things are subjected to him, then the Son himself will also be subjected to him who put all things under him, that God may be everything to every one' (15. 28).

Can we determine more nearly the sense in which Paul views Christ as subordinate to the Father? In I Cor. 8. 6, as usual, his language about God and the Lord is concrete or functional. Neither from the concept of God as Father nor from the concept of the Lord's penultimate role as agent of the divine operations can we obtain knowledge about how Paul might have described an essence of the Lord relative to that of God. Therefore it would be beyond the evidence to conclude that Paul held Christ to have a nature or essence inferior to that of the Father. Bousset comes close to this when he speaks of the Lord as a 'divine being ... at a level below God', a 'half-god', representing a 'gradation within the divine essence'.⁸ More accurately, Paul assigns to Christ a functionally subordinate role in the exercise of the divine works of creation and redemption.

From all of this we can see that Bousset was correct, at least in part, to speak of a 'thoroughgoing duplication' of the object of religious faith in Paul.⁹ He was also correct to speak of a 'vigorous subordination of the figure of Christ to God in a fundamentally formulated manner',¹⁰ though this needs to be understood in a functional and not an essential sense. Paul's monotheism prevented him from ascribing to the Lord Jesus Christ the ultimate role in creation and redemption which belonged to God. With this we have reached a partial answer to our initial question (chapter one) about how monotheism and christology qualified one another in Paul's thought. To the extent that the Lord was functionally subordinate, Paul's monotheism stood in the way of an outright identification of the Lord with the one God.

THE IDENTITY OF THE ONE GOD AND THE ONE LORD

Factors which Indicate Identity

Six factors in I Cor. 8. 4–6 indicate that Paul’s one God and one Lord share some point of identity. We list these factors in order of increasing weight.

(i) The titles θεός and κύριος, which are distributed between the Father and Jesus Christ in v 6, both belong to God in the Greek OT. A possible linguistic background for I Cor. 8. 5–6 is provided by LXX Deut. 10. 17, where the superiority of God to the many gods and lords is couched in the formula: θεὸς τῶν θεῶν καὶ κύριος τῶν κυρίων.¹¹ We might also compare Psa. 136. 2–5, which combines similar phraseology with an explicit monotheistic statement and a reference to God’s creatorship. The compound title κύριος ὁ θεός, frequent for God in the Greek OT (in our list of monotheistic passages, note Deut. 4. 35, 39; 6. 4–5, 13; II Kings 19. 19; Isa. 42. 6, 8; 43. 10; 45. 5–7 [numbers 5, 6, 7, 15, 22, 23, 26]) is not characteristic of NT speech, being found in the NT in OT quotations or in passages which reflect biblical style. E. von Dobschütz observes: ‘die Formel “Gott der Herr” spaltet sich sozusagen in “Gott” und “der Herr”’.¹² The NT development may have been foreshadowed or paralleled by Philonic and rabbinic speculation about ‘God’ and ‘Lord’ as two powers of the one God, though it is more than doubtful whether either Philo or the rabbis intended thereby to posit two self-determining principles within the divine unity.¹³ Paul could not have been unaware that these divine titles were used in Judaism, often together side by side, as synonyms for the one God.

(ii) The prepositions of the Hellenistic device, which are ordinarily applied to a single cosmological power, are distributed in v 6 between God and the Lord. This betrays a presupposition that God and the Lord are united.¹⁴

(iii) The verbal parallelism between the first and the second part of v 6 is studied and sustained. Despite variations at four points which establish the distinction between God and the Lord, the accent falls heavily on the analogy between these two figures. Each is confessed to be one. Both bear titles of divinity, and the titles have equal dignity. Both were active in creation. Both are active in redemption. Thus they both participate in a unified way in uniquely divine titles and operations.¹⁵

(iv) A comparison of the relations which God and the Lord each have to the many gods and lords, to the world, and to the people of God, shows that these two figures have identical relations. Even as God is exclusively divine over against the many gods of polytheistic belief, so also the Lord is exclusively divine over against the many lords. Even as God is uniquely transcendent to ‘all things’, so also the Lord is uniquely transcendent to ‘all things’. Both stand together on the side of the creator rather than the creation. Even as God is the unique object of Christian hope, so also is the Lord the unique object of Christian hope. The variation of prepositions from ἐξ and εἰς to διὰ distinguishes God and the Lord from each other, but not with respect to the external relations which they unitedly bear to created reality.

(v) In chapter seven we saw that the primary relation in I Cor. 8. 4–6 is the antithesis between the many gods and lords regarded as a group (v 5), and the one God and one Lord regarded together. The basic structure of the passage corresponds, then, to that of Jewish texts which contrast pagan polytheism with the Jewish belief in one God. Clearly Paul the Jewish-Christian monotheist has no intention of setting over against pagan polytheism a belief in two Gods rather than one. He wishes to define Jewish-Christian faith, in continuity with Old Testament faith, as belief in a divine unity. Significantly, in Paul’s confession, God and the Lord together take the place which belongs to God alone in Jewish confessions. Paul is unconscious of anything in this Christian confession which might threaten or compromise the divine unity.

This highlights the kernel of truth in the position of B.B. Warfield and the early J.M. Robinson. These writers have argued, we recall, that the duality in I Cor. 8. 6 cannot be supposed to contradict the divine unity confessed in v 4. As we just noted above, this argument can be faulted on a linguistic score: Paul speaks and doubtless thinks of the Father, not Jesus Christ, as God. It is therefore imprecise to say, as Warfield does, ‘these two may together be subsumed under the category of the one God who alone exists’, or as Robinson says, ‘The Christian theology, as set forth in I Cor. 8:4–6, consists in one God, composed of, or in some unexplained way subsisting in, one God the Father and one Lord Jesus Christ’.¹⁶ Such language smacks of patristic theology, which used the word ‘God’ abstractly to denote

the one divine essence which was thought to subsist in the three persons of the Trinity (see below). Paul speaks of one God, who is the unique divine person, not an essence as such, and whom Paul does not identify with the Lord Jesus Christ. But when this criticism has been registered, there is still a great deal of force in the basic Warfield-Robinson argument. Though Paul does not draw a forking line from the one God of v 4 to the God and the Lord of v 6, he puts God and the Lord together in v 6 where the structure of traditional Jewish monotheistic statements would demand one deity. Paul plainly means to affirm a divine unity in contrast to pagan polytheism; he states his conviction that God is one; his Lord Jesus Christ shares in divine titles and operations; the juxtaposition of this one, divine Lord Jesus Christ with the one God on that side of the antithesis which stresses the divine unity is felt to be a further affirmation of God's unity and not a surrender of it. How can this be, unless Paul presupposes that the Lord Jesus Christ is in some undefined sense what the one God is?

(vi) Finally and most importantly, Paul applies to Jesus Christ, as well as to the Father, monotheistic language, which cannot be applied to any being other than the sole deity. Key elements of the monotheism schema of Judaism are present in the christological statement in I Cor. 8. 4–6. As we saw in chapter four, the monotheism schema was associated in Jewish sources with only the one God himself and certain hypostases, such as the wisdom and word of God, which were not clearly independent of God. Paul also calls Jesus Christ the 'one Lord', echoing the *Shema*. As we saw in chapter four, the use of explicit monotheistic speech for any subject other than the one God, including even God's wisdom or word, is totally unattested in a wide selection of Jewish sources. Either Paul is using monotheistic language with reference to a glorified human being in a way unacceptable to Judaism, or he presupposes that the Father and Jesus Christ share some point of identity.

Could Paul be using OT and Jewish monotheistic language in a new and free way? As a Christian, Paul was not always bound to Jewish positions. His background in Pharisaism did not prevent his departing, for example, from strict adherence to the Torah when he became a follower of Jesus. Could he have departed from Pharisaic monotheism as well? Moreover, it is not necessary to assume that his use of OT passages about God in reference to the Lord Jesus Christ always and everywhere presupposes the strict identity of

the two figures.¹⁷ In calling Jesus Christ the ‘one Lord’, is Paul the Christian simply applying the language of monotheism to an intermediary in a non-Jewish way?

Several considerations tell against such a view. In the first place, Paul generally uses the title θεός and explicit forms of monotheistic speech in characteristic Jewish fashion for God. There is a complete absence in Paul’s letters of any controversy with Judaism or Jewish Christians over the matter of monotheism. In these respects, Paul’s willingness to set aside the Jewish view of, say, the law is not paralleled by any similar concern to establish a new doctrine of God. The fact that one of the two referents of monotheistic language in I Cor. 8. 5–6 is a man does not in itself prove that monotheistic language is here applied to a being separate from God in all respects. If in Jewish usage the language of monotheism is never applied to a being clearly separate from God, then its use in this passage for the Lord Jesus Christ may tell us more about the relationship between that man and God in Paul’s conception than it tells us about Paul’s willingness to adopt a new and foreign linguistic habit.

In the second place, monotheism was for Paul, as we saw in chapter five, a primary tenet. However much Paul may have modified his thought in key areas when he became a Christian, he was slow to abandon basic Jewish presuppositions completely. In regard to the Torah, for example, despite his strong antinomian language in places, Paul never surrendered his conviction that the standard of righteousness revealed in the law was to be fulfilled (e.g., Rom. 8. 4; 13. 8–10; Gal. 5. 13–14). Now the application of the language of monotheism to a man whom Paul did not suppose to be in some way united to God would be a departure from Jewish monotheism of the most radical kind, a virtual assimilation to the pagan environment which apotheosized heroes and ascribed titles of divinity to emperors. On the other hand, the application of the language of monotheism to a man whom Paul thought to be somehow united to God would entail a modified use of language—the referent of this monotheistic language would be the one God only insofar as he was somehow present in this man—but it would not be a total apostasy from monotheism. The idea that divinity could become something else without ceasing to be itself was formulated by the Jewish author of the *Wisdom of Solomon*: ‘Though she [the divine wisdom] is but one, she can do all things, and

while remaining in herself, she renews all things' (7. 27), and it might lie behind other modalistic conceptions such as the Angel of the Lord, the Spirit of God, or the *Shekinah*. It may be asked whether such a dynamic concept of the divine unity was ever offensive to Judaism until Christian Jews made the claim that the one God had become permanently and personally present in the crucified sabbath-breaker Jesus. Given the fact that monotheism remained a deeply held presupposition of Paul, is it more probable that his language in I Cor. 8. 5–6 entails a radical departure from monotheism, or that it involves a re-interpretation of monotheism with reference to Jesus Christ?

There is a third factor which makes it unlikely that Paul uses the language of monotheism loosely in reference to Jesus Christ in I Cor. 8. 5–6. We observed in chapter four that there was a theologico-linguistic reason why Jewish writers could not allow the language of monotheism to be transferred to subjects other than the one God. The exclusive language of monotheism is inherently bound to one referent. To distribute it to more than one referent would be by that very act to empty it of meaning. In this respect, the language of monotheism constitutes a special case within the language of divinity. This is true for any sentence about God, whether written by a Jewish or a non-Jewish author. Now in I Cor. 8. 4–6, the language of monotheism has an exclusive sense: it excludes the gods and lords of polytheistic belief from the true divine unity. If the language of monotheism is here applied to two referents, and if it is to be understood in both cases as expressing its inner sense of exclusive divine unicity, then the two referents must be in some sense one. Otherwise the two statements of monotheism would mutually cancel one another rather than support one another. In other words, if Paul were simply applying the language of monotheism in a non-Jewish way to God on the one hand and to a glorified human intermediary on the other, he would be more than breaking a Jewish theological habit. He would be cutting off the branch on which he sits.

I Cor. 8. 4–6 contains two statements of monotheism applied to two referents. But because it is monotheism that is confessed in both cases, the two statements have the same sense: both alike exclude all referents but one. Therefore they must ultimately have the same referent. That makes the Lord Jesus Christ one with the one God.

Paul nowhere formulates his meaning in a syllogism of this sort. But if we are to understand a text, we must be able to re-state its content in terms of our own categories of thought. Can Paul's language about Christ, interpreted against the backdrop of his Jewish monotheistic presuppositions as discovered in part one of our study, carry a different implication with any shine of probability? If it be granted that Paul's language does imply the unity of the one Lord with the one God, the further question might be raised whether our drawing this inference from his words corresponds to his own psychological intention. But that is a moot question. If Paul's words cannot be taken as a guide to his intention, on the basis of what sort of evidence are we to determine what his meaning was? How then could Paul communicate with us?

As far as the identity of God and the Lord is concerned, then, I Cor. 8. 4–6 must be read in the light of the other key monotheistic text in I Corinthians: 'Now there are varieties of gifts, but the same Spirit; and there are varieties of service, but the same Lord; and there are varieties of working, but it is the same God who inspires them all in every one' (12. 4–6).

The Nature of the Identity

To say that the Lord Jesus Christ is one with the one God is to say that Christ 'belongs, in a manner which is not defined, to Deity itself'.¹⁸ Granted that Paul does not define the point of identity of God and the Lord in this passage, can we get a clue to his thought by looking elsewhere?

Since the structure of I Cor. 8. 4–6 is defined by the antithesis between the many gods (and lords) and the one God (and one Lord), the passage which comes nearest to its basic meaning is Gal. 4. 8, the only other passage in Paul's writings which mentions gods (plural) and which likewise presupposes a contrast between them and God: 'Formerly, when you did not know God, you were in bondage to beings that by nature are no gods (τοῖς φύσει μὴ οὐσιν θεοῖς)'. Here, we recall, the philosophical terminology of 'essence' helps Paul to pinpoint the respect in which the gods of polytheism are deficient. They lack the divine essence by virtue of which God alone can be and act as God.

The other closely related passage is I Thess. 1. 9: ‘For they themselves report concerning us what a welcome we had among you, and how you turned to God from idols, to serve a living and true God’. Putting this passage together with the former, we can conclude that for Paul, the living and true God of monotheism, who is alone God in contrast to the idols and gods of pagan religion, is uniquely divine by virtue of his essence.¹⁹

When we place the high christology of I Cor. 8. 4–6 alongside of the concept of the unique divine essence from Gal. 4. 8 and I Thess. 1. 9, we see that all the necessary elements are present for concluding that Paul’s Christ is ontologically divine. Do these elements remain independent of one another in Paul’s mind, waiting until men of a different background from Paul’s will reflect on the unresolved tensions created by his christology and formulate a bolder doctrine than his? Or do we find in Paul the inchoate adumbrations of the concept of a divine essence shared by the Father and Christ? Or has Paul consciously formulated this concept, and is it only accidental that he does not express it? However we may decide, the structural similarity of I Cor. 8. 4–6 to Gal. 4. 8 makes it more than just a neutral possibility that Paul views Christ as essentially related to God. Although Paul does not articulate this concept directly, it is virtually certain in the light of Gal. 4. 8 that he regards the gods and lords mentioned in I Cor. 8. 5 as lacking the divine essence, and the one God of v 6 as possessing it. Now if Jesus Christ stands together with the Father over against gods and lords which lack the divine essence, indeed if the one Lord is one with the one God over against the others, is it incautious to suggest that Paul’s Lord Jesus Christ is understood by him to share in a unity of essence with God?²⁰

This suggestion may be dismissed by some on the grounds that Paul’s language about both God and Christ is usually functional rather than ontological; that this, at any rate, is incontestably the case in I Cor. 8. 4–6 taken by itself; and that the very idea of an essential unity of God and Christ is a later patristic notion which must not under any circumstances be read back into the NT period.²¹ Yet our study in part one of ontological aspects of Jewish language about God showed that already before and during the first century A.D. the Jewish as well as the Hellenistic environment of the church was nursing the materials necessary for the essentialist theologies of the second century. Perhaps it will lend a little more colour to

our suggestion if we observe that H.-J. Schoeps, a Jewish NT critic who describes himself as ‘an impartial historian of religion’ who is ‘dependent on sheer critical understanding’ and who is ‘not hindered by confessional allegiances from thinking through, to the end, dangerous trains of thought’, can, in his exposition of Paul’s christology, speak of Christ’s ‘substantial divinity as Son of God’, of his ‘standing in closest relation metaphysically to God’, of his being ‘essentially divine’, and of his having a θεῖα φύσις—reflecting the terminology of Gal. 4. 8.²² Of course there have been many committed Christian scholars who have found in I Cor. 8. 4–6 a basis for asserting the ontological deity of Christ, as we saw in chapter one.

I Corinthians 8. 4–6 and Later Theology

When the fathers of western Christianity from the second to the fourth century reflected on the problem of monotheism and christology (and monotheism and pneumatology), their solution was to posit a unitary divine substance which was shared by a plurality of divine persons, God the Father, God the Son, and, by analogy to the Son, God the Holy Spirit. This conceptual development gradually brought about a shift in the reference of the word ‘God’ from the person of the Father to the abstract divinity which was thought to subsist in all three persons. Thus Tertullian could lay down the definition, ‘God is the name for the substance, that is, the divinity’,²³ and Gregory of Nyssa followed suit: ‘God signifies not the person (πρόσωπον), but the being (οὐσίαν)’.²⁴

Paul’s thought is not speculative. As we have seen, he uses the word θεός to denote the person of the Father throughout I Cor. 8. 4–6 and almost always elsewhere. The one God is the Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ is not the one God (though he is one with the one God). If the concept of a divine essence shared by the Father and Jesus Christ is present, it might be an unformulated intuition, and at most it is a nameless presupposition hidden below the surface. The language of Jewish monotheism has provided for Paul a christological category, but the resulting high christology has not yet forced him to bring about a mutation in his language about the one God, the Father. Paul is a very Jewish monotheist whose concept of the Christ in relation to God has already burst through the old linguistic

boundaries within which he so faithfully tries to express his theology and christology.²⁵ With these observations we can see how near, yet how far, Paul is from the formulations of later western dogma.

Summary

Besides indications that God and the Lord are two distinct persons, I Cor. 8. 4–6 exhibits features showing that Paul held them to be one. The related passage Gal. 4. 8 invites us to consider the possibility that Paul viewed God and the Lord as sharing a unity of essence. Although the concept of the unity of Christ with the Father is present already in Paul's writings, as it is in the later discussions of the church, Paul's linguistic conservatism prevented him from expressing it in quite the same terms they used. With this we have arrived at another part of the answer to our initial question (chapter one) about monotheism and christology in Paul's thought. His use of the language of monotheism for Christ implies that the one Lord is all of a piece with the one God. His monotheism requires the highest possible view of the divine Christ.

CONCLUSIONS

We must now cull from these exegetical results final answers to the two main questions posed in the introduction. How, according to I Cor. 8. 4–6, did Paul view Christ in relation to God? How did monotheism and christology interact together in his thought? In neither case is it possible to give a simple answer.

Paul's view of the relationship between God and Christ in I Cor. 8. 4–6 requires to be summarized in a series of propositions, not all of which cohere with one another. There is one God. The one God is the Father, and the Father alone is God. The Lord Jesus Christ is not the Father. God and Christ are two distinct persons. Therefore the one God is not the Lord Jesus Christ, and the Lord Jesus Christ is not the one God. It is certain that Paul expresses the functional subordination of the Lord Jesus Christ to the one God. Yet it is also virtually certain that Paul's language implies the identity of God and Christ at some point left undefined in this passage. The Lord Jesus Christ is one with the one God. As suggested by

Gal. 4. 8 in conjunction with I Thess. 1. 9, it is more than a mere possibility that Paul presupposes an identity of essence.

In the context of the antithesis with polytheism, an antithesis which highlights the divine unity confessed by Christians, the stress in I Cor. 8. 6 falls on the identity of God and Christ, not on the distinction. Paul presupposes that the identity is the primary fact, and the distinction secondary.

In relation to idols, false gods, the world, and believers, the Father and Christ are seen to form an indissoluble unity. But within the internal relation between the Father and Christ, the Father retains his unique place as the one God. Thus the Father is the ultimate principle of unity, first with respect to the divine life he shares with Christ, then, together with Christ, with respect to the world created and consummated by both persons in union. The oneness of the Lord Jesus Christ with God is grounded in the oneness of God.

Paul's answer to the problem of monotheism and christology would therefore be dialectical. Insofar as Christ shares in the Father, monotheism requires Christ to be identical at some point with the one God himself. Insofar as Christ is a person distinct from the Father, monotheism requires the functional role of Christ to be subordinate to that of the Father.

There are obvious tensions here. How can the Father and Christ have a common oneness if the Father alone is the ultimate principle of the divine unity, the one God? How can Christ be functionally subordinate to the Father, if he is one with him? How can the premise of monotheism lead to corollaries as disparate as the identity of Christ with the Father and the functional subordination of Christ to the Father? It is not our purpose either to accuse or to defend Paul's language about God and Christ before the bar of logic. It is paradoxical language. Let each reader of Paul make of it what he or she will.

Curiously enough, exactly the same tensions exist in the Johannine language about God and Christ. According to the Fourth Gospel, Jesus says both: 'I and the Father are one' (John 10. 30) and 'This is eternal life, that they know thee the only true God' (John 17. 3). Indeed, these two verses together give a fair summary of the view of God and Christ, of monotheism and christology, found in I Cor. 8. 4–6.²⁶

WISDOM CHRISTOLOGY OR MONOTHEISM CHRISTOLOGY IN I CORINTHIANS 8.
4–6?

If these conclusions are correct, then a few critical remarks may be made concerning the consensus among NT scholars that I Cor. 8. 6 presupposes a wisdom christology.²⁷ This view is now part and parcel of a broader theory about how christological reflection evolved during the first century. According to this theory, which has come to be widely accepted, the identification of Christ with pre-cosmic wisdom in Paul was a bridge between early belief in Jesus's exaltation and the later complete divinization of the Logos of God.²⁸ The attentive reader will have noted that our exegesis of I Cor. 8. 4–6 has been carried out in complete independence of the hypothesis of a wisdom christology. Jewish statements of monotheism by themselves were found to furnish enough comparative materials to shed light on Paul's language about Christ.

Although a few scholars have pointed out that the language of Jewish monotheism decisively shaped Paul's christology in v 6,²⁹ only one writer has submitted the thesis that "wisdom christology" is not found in pauline writing'.³⁰ According to A. van Roon, those features of Paul's christology in I Cor. 8. 6 which are usually assigned a wisdom background are in fact 'divine predicates' in Judaism. What this passage contains, he thinks, is not an identification of Christ with Jewish wisdom, but an equation of Christ with God (pp. 231–33).

In view of the foregoing analysis, it is hard to dispute this point. The only christological element in I Cor. 8. 6 which finds a parallel in Jewish wisdom speculation is the concept of the mediator of creation ('through whom are all things'). A personification of pre-cosmic wisdom is indeed found in some important Jewish sources which might have influenced Paul directly or indirectly (Job chapter 28; Prov. 8. 22–31; *Sir.* chapter 24; *Wisd. Sol.* chapters 6–9; Philo, *De fuga et inventione*, 109; also *Quod deterius potiori insidiari soleat*, 54). In several of these sources wisdom is said to be the fashioner of all things (*Wisd. Sol.* 7. 22; 8. 6) or the instrument of God in creation (the Philo passages). But we found the concept of God as creator to be directly associated with statements of monotheism in some fifty-two of our two hundred Jewish texts, or in more than a quarter of all the Jewish

statements of monotheism surveyed (chapter four, part VI). The nearest verbal parallels to δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα in I Cor. 8. 6 are the *per me* of *II Esdras* 6. 6 [number 39] and the exact equivalent δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα in Heb. 2. 10 [number 195], where in both cases the subject is God. On what ground, then, is it assumed throughout the world of NT scholarship that Paul in I Cor. 8. 6 makes use of the language of Jewish wisdom rather than the language of Jewish monotheism?

Moreover, in our study of exaltation language applied to intermediaries in Jewish sources (chapter four, section VIII), we failed to find any example of an explicit form of monotheistic speech applied to personified wisdom. In I Cor. 8. 6, Jesus Christ is confessed to be the 'one Lord'. This element of Paul's christological language is not derivable from the wisdom tradition, but it does derive from the language of Jewish monotheism. Nor, for that matter, did we find Jewish wisdom to be set in antithesis to the idols or gods of polytheism, as the one Lord is in I Cor. 8. 6. If, then, the wisdom hypothesis can account for only one isolated element in Paul's christological statement in v 6, while the monotheism hypothesis has the power to illumine all the key elements of this text, not only providing more abundant background parallels, but also explaining why these elements are brought together in conjunction in just this way, does it not follow by Occam's razor that the monotheism hypothesis is to be preferred? At this point it becomes apparent that the analytic methods of traditional NT scholarship have stood in the way of our grasping I Cor. 8. 4–6 as a totality and have led generations of NT scholars into uncritical acceptance of an inadequate paradigm.

Other early Christian texts likewise apply the language of monotheism to the figure of Jesus Christ.

'But you are not to be called rabbi, for you have one teacher, and you are all brethren. And call no man your father on earth, for you have one Father, who is in heaven. Neither be called masters, for you have one master, the Christ' (Matt. 23. 8–10).

'And I have other sheep, that are not of this fold; I must bring them also, and they will heed my voice. So there shall be one flock, one shepherd' (John 10. 16; cf. Ezek. 34. 15, 23; 37. 24).

‘I and the Father are one’ (John 10. 30).

‘For there is no distinction between Jew and Greek; the same Lord is Lord of all and bestows his riches upon all who call upon him’ (Rom. 10. 12; cf. 3. 29–30).

‘Now there are varieties of gifts, but the same Spirit; and there are varieties of service, but the same Lord; and there are varieties of working, but it is the same God who inspires them all in every one’ (I Cor. 12. 4–6).

‘There is one body and one Spirit, just as you were called to the hope that belongs to your call, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of us all, who is above all and through all and in all’ (Eph. 4. 4–6).

‘Therefore God has highly exalted him and bestowed on him the name which is above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, in heaven and on earth and under the earth, and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father’ (Phil. 2. 9–11; cf. Isa. 45. 21–24; Rom. 14. 11).

‘For admission has been secretly gained by some who long ago were designated for this condemnation, ungodly persons who pervert the grace of our God into licentiousness and deny our only Master and Lord, Jesus Christ’ (Jude 4).

‘The Son of the Most High appeared in the perfection of his Father. And light dawned from the Word that was before time in him. The Messiah in truth is one. And he was known before the foundations of the world, that he might give life to persons forever by the truth of his name’ (Odes of Solomon 41. 13–15).

There is no space here to comment in detail on all of these passages. Not all scholars will agree that every one of them must be seen as an application of the language of monotheism to Christ (some think, for example, that Rom. 10.12 refers to the Father), though it is arguable that each of them does refer to Christ in monotheistic terms. Suffice it to say that the use of monotheistic language for Jesus was widespread in the church of the first century. It is now fashionable among students of the history of NT religion to speak of the several christological categories which were used by the writers of the NT to express their beliefs about Jesus. We hear of a Son of Man christology in the Gospels; of a Son of God christology in Paul; of a wisdom christology in Colossians and Hebrews; of a Logos christology in the Fourth Gospel. The present study highlights the importance of recognizing monotheism as a christological category. It is appropriate to speak in this connection of a monotheism christology.³¹

In fact, the documentary evidence for a monotheism christology is rather earlier than for some of the others. I Cor. 8. 4–6 dates, as we saw, from the early to the mid-50s A.D., and it may draw on missionary catechesis which Paul or another had formulated already in the 40s. Many scholars believe that Phil. 2. 5–11 makes use of an early hymn which was current in Gentile churches prior to the work of Paul. The dating of the material from the Gospels is more intricate. What can be said with certainty is that our clearest evidence for monotheism christology (I Cor. 8. 4–6; Phil. 2. 9–11) pre-dates our clearest evidence for either a cosmological wisdom christology or the Logos christology (Colossians 1. 15–17; Hebrews 1. 1–3; John 1. 1–3). This is entirely natural. The very earliest theologians of the church must have been, like Paul, Jewish monotheists or their Gentile converts (I Thess. 1. 9; I Cor. 8. 4–6). It might have been expected that one of their first theological questions was how to relate the Lord Jesus Christ to the one God who was still the basis of their faith. When the NT documents are critically arranged in chronological order, the picture they suggest is one of development from a mature monotheism christology, among other christological categories, in the early middle part of the century to more precise expositions of that christology by means of the categories of Jewish Sophia and Logos as the century wore on. In the writings of the apologists of the second century, the category of the Logos became a primary one for speculating about the relationship between God and, as Christ was then coming to be called under the influence of the old monotheism christology, God the Son.

If we trace a line backwards from the relatively late Logos and Sophia christologies, through the monotheism christology of the mid-century, into the ‘tunnel’ period prior to the 40s and 50s, what can we find which might have provided the stimulus for the application of the language of Jewish monotheism to Christ? The origins of monotheism christology lie outside the scope of the present study.³² Our structural analysis of I Cor. 8. 4–6, seen in the light of other passages, raises pressing questions about the whole development of christology in the earliest epoch of the church.

NOTES TO CHAPTERS ONE TO TEN

NOTES TO CHAPTER ONE

1.1. Monotheistic statements about God occur in the undisputed Pauline epistles at Rom. 3. 30; 16. 27; I Cor. 8. 4–6; 12. 4–6; Gal. 3. 20; I Thess. 1. 9; and in the disputed epistles at Eph. 4. 4–6; I Tim. 1. 17; 2. 5; 6. 15–16.

1.2. This is a debated point. The *locus classicus* for an application of the word θεός to Jesus by Paul is Rom. 9. 5. On this passage, compare E. Abbot, ‘On the Construction of Romans ix. 5.’ (against the reference of θεός to Christ) with T. Dwight, ‘On Romans ix. 5.’ See also the magisterial article by B.M. Metzger, ‘The Punctuation of Rom. 9. 5’ (in favour of the reference of θεός to Christ). Those scholars who accept the authenticity of Titus would also include Titus 2. 13. On this passage, compare E. Abbot, ‘On the Construction of Titus ii. 13’ (against the reference of θεός to Christ) with M.J. Harris, ‘Titus 2. 13 and the Deity of Christ’ (in favour of the reference of θεός to Christ). For a critical sifting of all the passages in the NT which have been supposed to call Jesus θεός, see R.E. Brown, *Jesus: God and Man*, pp. 1–38. Brown agrees with those who think that Paul calls Jesus θεός in Rom. 9. 5.

1.3. The English text quoted is that of the International Consultation on English Texts, as found in *The Alternative Service Book 1980*, p. 123. For the Greek text see H. Denzinger, ed., *Enchiridion symbolorum*, document 150, pp. 66–67.

1.4. On the importance of I Cor. 8. 6 in the formation of the first and second articles of the Old Roman Creed (‘One God’ and ‘One Lord’ respectively), see F. Kattenbusch, *Das apostolische Symbol*, II, 601; H. Lietzmann, ‘Symbolstudien I–VII’, pp. 7–8, 10–11; P. Feine, *Die Gestalt des apostolischen Glaubensbekenntnisses in der Zeit des Neuen Testaments*, pp. 80–96; J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*, pp. 62–99 (esp. pp. 78–81). On the use of I Cor. 8. 6 by Irenaeus, Ambrosiaster, Chrysostom, Apollinarius, and Pelagius, see M.F. Wiles, *The Divine Apostle: The Interpretation of St Paul’s Epistles in the Early Church*, pp. 80, 84–85.

1.5. See the Preface (by D. Daube) to J. Jocz, *The Jewish People and Jesus Christ: A Study in the Controversy between Church and Synagogue*, pp. ix–x. H.-J. Schoeps, also Jewish, wrote of ‘the impossibility of Christological doctrine for strict Jewish transcendental monotheism’, in *The Jewish-Christian Argument*, p. 25. Even the relatively dispassionate article on ‘God’ by M. Fox in *Encyclopaedia Judaica* characterizes Christian trinitarianism as a declension from pure monotheism (cols 671–2). A. Segal, while recognizing that the question of the nature of monotheism was a ‘central defining issue in the split between the two communities’, points out that other factors of a sociological nature also played an important part in the schism. See ‘Ruler of This World: Attitudes about Mediator Figures and the Importance of Sociology for Self-Definition’, p. 263.

1.6. For the results of one recent discussion of monotheism by Jews and Christians see *Der Herr ist Einer, Unser gemeinsames Erbe*, edited by K.-J. Illman and J. Thurén.

1.7. See the quotation from Theodoret in *Catena graecorum patrum in Novum Testamentum*, edited by J.A. Cramer, V, 160.

1.8. *The Divinity of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ*, pp. 310, 311, 313.

1.9. *The Lord of Glory*, p. 210.

1.10. ‘The Witness of Paul: Christ, the Lord’, p. 143.

1.11. *The Person of Christ*, p. 62.

1.12. In his commentary on I Cor. 8. 6, Pseudo-Jerome (Pelagius?) attacks the Arians, who, he says, stir up calumny out of this passage by insisting that, because the one God is called the Father, therefore ‘the Son is separated from deity’ (*Filius a deitate sejunctus sit*)(Migne, vol. 30 [1846 edition], col. 741 D).

- 1.13. *Die Christologie des Neuen Testaments*, p. 204.
- 1.14. *Paul, the Apostle of Jesus Christ*, II, 240–41.
- 1.15. *The Debate About Christ*, p. 90.
- 1.16. *Jesus and the Constraints of History*, p. 167.
- 1.17. *Kyrios Christos* (English), pp. 205, 149, 151; p. 206, note 136; pp. 147, 206, 206–08, 205, 147.
- 1.18. There was an emerging monotheistic tendency within Hellenistic polytheism which posited an ultimate unity of divine power behind the many gods. See chapter two.
- 1.19. *Theology of the New Testament*, I, 164–83.
- 1.20. See C. Colpe, *Die religionsgeschichtliche Schule*; E.M. Yamauchi, *Pre-Christian Gnosticism*.
- 1.21. This hypothesis is ancient and goes back at least to the time of the pre-Nicene church fathers. Among modern scholars it has been articulated with special force by H. Windisch, ‘Die göttliche Weisheit der Juden und die paulinische Christologie’; R. Bultmann, ‘Der religionsgeschichtliche Hintergrund des Prologs zum Johannes-Evangelium’; J. Lebreton, *History of the Dogma of the Trinity*, I, 90–98; A. Richardson, *An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament*, pp. 155–59; U. Wilckens, *Weisheit und Torheit, passim*; E. Schweizer, ‘Zur Herkunft der Präexistenzvorstellung bei Paulus’; L. Sabourin, *Les noms et les titres de Jésus*, pp. 265–72; H. Conzelmann, ‘Paulus und die Weisheit’; P.-E. Bonnard, *La Sagesse en personne annoncée et venue: Jésus Christ, passim*; also ‘De la Sagesse personifiée dans l’Ancien Testament à la Sagesse en personne dans la Nouveau’; A. Feuillet, *Le Christ sagesse de Dieu d’après les épîtres pauliniennes, passim*; J.T. Sanders, *The New Testament Christological Hymns, passim*; U. Wilckens and G. Fohrer, ‘ΣΟΦΙΑ’; R.G. Hamerton-Kelly, *Pre-existence, Wisdom, and the Son of Man, passim*; R.S. Barbour, ‘Creation, Wisdom and Christ’; M. Hengel, *The Son of God*, pp. 66–76; also ‘Christology and New Testament Chronology’, p. 43; H. Gese, ‘Wisdom, Son of Man, and the Origins of Christology’; S. Kim, *The Origin of Paul’s Gospel*, pp. 114–36; G. Schimanowski, *Weisheit und Messias, passim*.
- 1.22. *Unity and Diversity*, p. 221; also *Christology in the Making*, pp. 168–76.
- 1.23. ‘Was Christianity a Monotheistic Faith From the Beginning?’, pp. 329–30.
- 1.24. *Christology*, p. 182.
- 1.25. ‘Monotheistic?’, pp. 335–36.
- 1.26. ‘Paul at Prayer’, p. 247.
- 1.27. *Olshausen*, p. 138; *Godet*, I, 418; Liddon, *Divinity*, p. 319, note x; Warfield, *Lord of Glory*, p. 210; W. Wrede, *Paul*, p. 87; J.F. Bethune-Baker, *An Introduction to the Early History of Christian Doctrine*, p. 14; A.E. Baker, *St. Paul and His Gospel*, p. 40; A.C. Cotter, ‘The Divinity of Jesus Christ in Saint Paul’, p. 286; F. Prat, *The Theology of St. Paul*, II, 130; E. Andrews, *The Meaning of Christ for Paul*, pp. 126, 131; P. Feine/K. Aland, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, p. 166; J. Bonsirven, *Théologie du Nouveau Testament*, p. 253; *Morris*, p. 123; V. Taylor, *The Person of Christ in New Testament Teaching*, p. 61; L. Cerfaux, *Christ in the Theology of St. Paul*, p. 453; H.J. Schoeps, *The Theology of the Apostle in the Light of Jewish Religious History*, pp. 150, 152, 153, 154; R.H. Fuller, *The Foundations of New Testament Christology*, p. 248; J.A. Fitzmyer, *Pauline Theology: A Brief Sketch*, p. 33; G. Bornkamm, ‘On Understanding the Christ-Hymn, Philippians 2. 6–11’, p. 117; R.N. Longenecker, *The Christology of Early Jewish Christianity*, p. 135; R. Schnackenburg, ‘Christologie des Neuen Testaments’, p. 316; G.E. Ladd, *A Theology of the New Testament*, p. 418; C.F.D. Moule, ‘The New Testament and the Doctrine of the Trinity: a short report on an old theme’, pp. 17, 18, 19; D. Guthrie, *New Testament Theology*, pp. 317, 405; Kim, *Origin*, p. 259; K.H. Schelkle, *Paulus*, p. 180; Wells, *Person of Christ*, p. 62.
- 1.28. *Calvin*, p. 175; A. Richardson, *Theology of NT*, p. 63; E. Schweizer, *Lordship and Discipleship*, p. 95; *Williams*, sec. 835c, p. 959; O. Cullmann, *The Christology of the New Testament*, pp. 3, 235; G. Delling,

Die Botschaft des Paulus, pp. 57–83, *passim*; Thrall, p. 63; Fitzmyer, *Pauline Theology*, p. 37; R.E. Brown, *Jesus*, p. 37; L. Goppelt, ‘Die Herrschaft Christi und die Welt’, p. 115; R. Grant, ‘The Doctrine of God in Early Christian Thought’, p. 58; K.H. Schelkle, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, II, 227; M. Barth, *Ephesians*, I, 73; D.E.H. Whiteley, *The Theology of St. Paul*, p. 106; Orr/Walther, pp. 233–34; J. Thurén, ‘“Der Herr ist Einer” in neutestamentlicher Sicht’, p. 98; Dunn, *Christology*, p. 182; Wolff, p. 7; Hengel, ‘Chronology’, p. 40.

1.29. D. Somerville, *St. Paul’s Conception of Christ*, pp. 140, 142, 141; S. Cave, *The Doctrine of the Person of Christ*, p. 48; also *The Gospel of St. Paul*, pp. 82, 84; Moffatt, p. 108; E. Fuchs, ‘Muss man an Jesus glauben, wenn man an Gott glauben will?’, p. 254; A. Schlatter, *Jesus und Paulus*, pp. 84, 88; C.F. Evans, ‘Christology and Theology’, p. 29; E.F. Osborn, ‘The Unity of God in Pauline Thought’, p. 47.

1.30. A.D. Nock, ‘Early Gentile Christianity and Its Hellenistic Background’, p. 101; E. Stauffer, *New Testament Theology*, pp. 114, 115; H. Hegemann, *Die Vorstellung vom Schöpfungsmittler im hellenistischen Judentum und Urchristentum*, p. 135; F. Amiot, *The Key Concepts of St. Paul*, p. 92; Goppelt, ‘Herrschaft Christi’, p. 114; M. Thrall, ‘The Origin of Pauline Christology’, p. 316.

1.31. G.B. Stevens, *The Theology of the New Testament*, p. 395; W. Morgan, *The Religion and Theology of Paul*, p. 56; G.B. Caird, ‘Everything to Everyone. The Theology of the Corinthian Epistles’, p. 392; L. Goppelt, *Theology of the New Testament*, II, 76.

1.32. Sabourin, *Noms et titres*, p. 290; J.L. McKenzie, *The Power and the Wisdom*, p. 137.

1.33. O. Kuss, *Paulus. Die Rolle des Apostels in der theologischen Entwicklung der Urkirche*, pp. 360–61; G. Stanton, ‘Incarnational Theology in the New Testament’, p. 157.

1.34. O. Michel, ‘Der Christus des Paulus’, p. 12; Stauffer, *NT Theology*, p. 252.

1.35. E.R. Goodenough, *By Light, Light*, pp. 37–38.

1.36. S. Sandmel, *A Jewish Understanding of the New Testament*, pp. 53–54.

1.37. H. Weinel, *St. Paul: The Man and His Work*, pp. 321–23; Bousset, *Kyrios Christos* (English), p. 206; I. Edman, *The Mind of St. Paul*, pp. 71–72; Bultmann, *Theology of NT*, I, 129; W. Barclay, *The Mind of St. Paul*, p. 57; H. Conzelmann, *An Outline of the Theology of the New Testament*, pp. 84, 202; W.G. Kümmel, *The Theology of the New Testament*, p. 153; Hengel, *Son of God*, p. 76; J. Ziesler, *Pauline Christianity*, pp. 37–38.

1.38. M. Werner, *The Formation of Christian Dogma*, p. 122.

1.39. Baur, *Paul*, II, 253; Beyschlag, *Christologie*, p. 204; S.J. Case, ‘ΚΥΡΙΟΣ as a Title for Christ’, p. 160; E. Rodhe, ‘Gottesglaube und Kyriosglaube bei Paulus’, pp. 54, 53–57; D.M. Ross, *The Faith of St. Paul*, pp. 185–86; H.J. Schonfield, *The Jew of Tarsus: An Unorthodox Portrait of Paul*, p. 210; G.H. Boobyer, ‘Jesus as “Theos” in the New Testament’, pp. 250, 260; F. Young, ‘A Cloud of Witnesses’, pp. 20, 21; Cupitt, *Debate*, pp. 103, 104; M.R. Austin, ‘Salvation and the Divinity of Jesus’, p. 275.

1.40. For excellent general descriptions of structuralism which centre on the concept of a network of relations, see J. Lyons, *Semantics*, I, 231–32; R.M. Polzin, *Biblical Structuralism*, pp. 2–3; A.C. Thiselton, ‘Structuralism and Biblical Studies: Method or Ideology?’, pp. 329, 331; J. Barr, ‘Biblical Language and Exegesis—How Far does Structuralism Help Us?’; D. Crystal, *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*, p. 290.

1.41. The last-mentioned point takes up a concern of an erstwhile colleague of Keck: see N. Dahl, ‘The Neglected Factor in New Testament Theology’. Dahl emphasizes the need for more attention to NT language about God.

1.42. On the importance of synchronic analysis for structuralism in biblical studies see Polzin, pp. 16–18; R. Coggins, ‘The Literary Approach to the Bible’, pp. 11–12; H. Boers, ‘The Meaning of Christ in Paul’s Writings. A Structuralist-Semiotic Study’.

NOTES TO CHAPTER TWO

- 2.1. M.D. Hooker, *Pauline Pieces*, pp. 11–13.
- 2.2. On monotheism in general, see the encyclopaedia articles entitled ‘monotheism’ or ‘Monotheismus’ by J. Royce; W. Holsten and others; M. Gusinde and others; P. van Imschoot; G. Ruhbach; and J. Schneider. Helpful on henotheism and monolatry are the quotations in *The Oxford English Dictionary* under both words. See also W. Holsten, ‘Monolatrie’, cols 1106–07.
- 2.3. M. Smith, ‘The Common Theology of the Ancient Near East’, pp. 137–40.
- 2.4. W.F. Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity*, pp. 165–69.
- 2.5. A. Deissler, ‘Gottes Selbstoffenbarung im Alten Testament’, pp. 234–35.
- 2.6. P.W. Schmidt, *Der Ursprung der Gottesidee*, e.g., VI, 389.
- 2.7. The results of research in this field from the first half of the twentieth century are ably summarized in R. Bultmann, *Primitive Christianity in its Contemporary Setting*, pp. 15–16. For fuller treatments see H. Gressmann, *The Development of the Idea of God in the Old Testament*; R.H. Pfeiffer, ‘The Dual Origin of Hebrew Monotheism’; O. Eissfeldt, *Vom Werden der biblischen Gottesanschauung*; W.O.E. Oesterley and T. Robinson, *Hebrew Religion: Its Origin and Development*, pp. 299–301, 328–30; B. Balscheit, *Alter und Aufkommen des Monotheismus in der israelitischen Religion*; C.A. Simpson, review of the foregoing; T.J. Meek, ‘Monotheism and the Religion of Israel’; W. Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament*, I, 220–27; B.W. Anderson, ‘God, OT View of’, pp. 427–28; G. von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, I, 210–12; Deissler, ‘Selbstoffenbarung’, pp. 233–34; F. Hahn, ‘The Confession of the One God in the New Testament’, pp. 69–72; H. Vorländer, ‘Der Monotheismus Israels als Antwort auf die Kirche des Exils’; B. Lang, *Monotheism and the Prophetic Minority*, pp. 13–59.
- 2.8. Balscheit, p. 135.
- 2.9. Albright, *Stone Age*, p. 207; R.K. Harrison, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, pp. 351–414, esp. pp. 399–403; I.M. Zeitlin, *Ancient Judaism: Biblical Criticism from Max Weber to the Present*, esp. p. 280. I include myself among those who are dissatisfied with many aspects of the current reconstruction of the development of Israelite monotheism. This is not the place to undertake a thoroughgoing critique of it. But my investigation of the definition of monotheism (section V of chapter four) will suggest that the definition of Hebrew monotheism on which the whole critical structure rests is unhistorical.
- 2.10. G.F. Moore, *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era*, I, 226–29; N.A. Dahl, ‘The One God of Jews and Gentiles’, p. 181.
- 2.11. K. Prümm, *Religionsgeschichtliches Handbuch für den Raum der altchristlichen Umwelt*, pp. 37–48.
- 2.12. B.C. Dietrich, *The Origins of Greek Religion*, p. 65; cf. p. 10; W. Burkert, *Greek Religion: Archaic and Classical*, p. 126; cf. pp. 39–46.
- 2.13. This quotation is preserved in Eusebius, *Praeparatio evangelica* XIII, 13. 36 (the whole of section 13 is helpful for its collection of quotations from pagan authors used by early Christian apologists to prove monotheism). On the quasi-monotheism of Xenophanes and the other pre-Socratic philosophers, see Burkert, pp. 305–11; R.M. Grant, *Gods and the One God*, pp. 75–83.
- 2.14. M.P. Nilsson, *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*, II, 571–72.
- 2.15. Nilsson, *Geschichte*, II, 569. See also M.P. Nilsson, ‘The High God and the Mediator’, pp. 111–15. Additional texts illustrative of this tendency in Hellenistic thought have been gathered in J. Dupont, *Gnosis*, pp. 330–33, 335–41.
- 2.16. *Orphicorum fragmenta*, ed. by O. Kern, text number 239b, p. 251.

- 2.17. H.M. Kleinknecht and others, 'ΘΕΟΣ', pp. 67–69; A.J. Festugière, *Personal Religion Among the Greeks*, p. 9; C.H. Dodd, *The Bible and the Greeks*, pp. 5–7; E.R. Goodenough, *The Politics of Philo Judaeus*, p. 111; M. Smith, 'Prolegomena to a Discussion of Aretologies, Divine Men, the Gospels and Jesus', p. 184; D. Georgi, 'Socioeconomic Reasons for the "Divine Man" as a Propagandistic Pattern', p. 33, p. 40, note 2.
- 2.18. Kleinknecht, pp. 71–9; Burkert, p. 311.
- 2.19. Burkert, pp. 305, 337.
- 2.20. Y. Amir, 'Die Begegnung des biblischen und des philosophischen Monotheismus als Grundthema des jüdischen Hellenismus', p. 5; H.W. Attridge, 'The Philosophical Critique of Religion under the Early Empire', p. 66.
- 2.21. H.-J. Horn, 'Antakoluthie der Tugenden und Einheit Gottes', p. 18.
- 2.22. Nilsson, 'High God', pp. 107–09; E. Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, III, 161; J. Ferguson, *The Religions of the Roman Empire*, pp. 65, 70–71; N. Dahl, 'One God', p. 180.
- 2.23. *De Iside et Osiride*, 67. The translation quoted is from A.D. Nock, 'Early Gentile Christianity and Its Hellenistic Background', p. 61.
- 2.24. *Dissertation XI*, 5. See *Maximi Tyrii philosophoumena*, ed. by H. Hobein, p. 132.
- 2.25. E. Peterson, ΕΙΣ ΘΕΟΣ, p. 134; M. Smith, 'Common Theology', p. 139, note 14; G. Delling, 'ΜΟΝΟΣ ΘΕΟΣ', pp. 391–95; Grant, *Gods*, pp. 75–76.
- 2.26. T.R. Glover, *The Mind of St. Paul*, p. 8.
- 2.27. R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, I, 65.
- 2.28. G.F. Moore, *Judaism*, I, 360–62; Eissfeldt, *Gottesanschauung*, p. 4; Bultmann, *Primitive Christianity*, p. 15.
- 2.29. M. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, I, 261–67; F. Millar, in Schürer/Vermes/Millar/Black, III.1, 138.
- 2.30. Amir, pp. 12–14.
- 2.31. On the Jewish mission, see Schürer, *Geschichte*, III, *passim*; Bultmann, *Theology*, I, 65–78; P. Dalbert, *Die Theologie der hellenistisch-jüdischen Missions-literatur*; Bousset/Gressmann, pp. 76–86; G. Schneider, 'Urchristliche Gottesverkündigung in hellenistischer Umwelt'; C. Bussmann, *Themen der paulinischen Missionspredigt auf dem Hintergrund der spätjüdisch-hellenistischen Missionsliteratur*; D. Rokeah, *Jews, Pagans and Christians in Conflict*, *passim*; Schürer/Vermes/Millar/Black, III.1, pp. 150–64.
- 2.32. K. Wengst, *Christologische Formeln und Lieder des Urchristentums*, pp. 136–37.
- 2.33. Schürer, *Geschichte*, III, 595–603.
- 2.34. Rokeah, p. 210.
- 2.35. S.S. Cohon, 'The Unity of God. A Study in Hellenistic and Rabbinic Theology', p. 425; A.F. Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven*, p. 152; Amir, p. 12.
- 2.36. G. von Rad, *OT Theology*, I, 204.
- 2.37. For an analysis of various ways of translating the *Shema*, see Str./B., II, 28–30; M. Peter, 'Dtn 6, 4—ein monotheistischer Text?', pp. 253–56. The version I have given was chosen arbitrarily.
- 2.38. E.E. Urbach, *The Sages*, I, 19–20; Schürer/Vermes/Millar/Black, II, 455.

2.39. A. Marmorstein, 'The Unity of God in Rabbinic Literature', p. 467; W.O.E. Oesterley, *The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy*, pp. 44–46; Str./B., IV, part 1, 191–92.

2.40. A first-century (A.D.) phylactery from cave eight at Qumran has the *Shema* printed in a rectangle surrounded by other passages, and the *Community Rule* (10. 10) seems to order that it be recited twice a day. See F.E. Vokes, 'Creeds in the New Testament', p. 583. The Nash papyrus, which Albright dated on palaeographical and epigraphical grounds to the second half of the second century B.C., contains the entire Decalogue and Deut. 6. 4–5 on a single leaf which must have been used as a lectionary or for pedagogical purposes. See W.F. Albright, 'A Biblical Fragment from the Maccabean Age: The Nash Papyrus', pp. 171–72, 175.

2.41. G. Bornkamm, 'Das Doppelgebot der Liebe', p. 87.

2.42. E. Stauffer, *New Testament Theology*, p. 242; V.H. Neufeld, *The Earliest Christian Confessions*, pp. 36–37.

2.43. Deissler, 'Selbstoffenbarung', p. 234, note 3; M.H. Vogel, 'Monotheism', col. 262.

2.44. Str./B., IV, part 1, pp. 189–207, esp. p. 190; Urbach, I, 19 ('the belief in the Unity of God as the supreme creed').

2.45. E. Bickerman, *The God of the Maccabees*, esp. pp. 91–92.

2.46. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, I, 305–09.

2.47. J. Neusner, *From Politics to Piety*, pp. 3–4.

2.48. Marmorstein, 'Unity of God', *passim*; A.F. Segal, *Two Powers*, p. 153. But caution about assuming that the rabbis polemicized against Gnosticism is urged in I. Gruenwald, 'The Problem of Anti-Gnostic Polemic in Rabbinic Literature'.

2.49. Peterson, ΕΙΣ ΘΕΟΣ, pp. 276–99.

2.50. See, for example, the debate among N.J. McEleney, 'Orthodoxy in Judaism of the First Christian Century'; D.E. Aune, 'Orthodoxy in First Century Judaism? A Response to N.J. McEleney'; L.L. Grabbe, 'Orthodoxy in First Century Judaism?'; and McEleney, 'Orthodoxy in Judaism of the First Christian Century. Replies to David E. Aune and Lester L. Grabbe'.

2.51. W. Meeks, *The First Urban Christians*, pp. 165, 167.

2.52. Marmorstein, 'Unity of God', p. 498; Cohon, pp. 425, 428, 438, 441; Urbach, I, 19.

2.53. R.H. Charles, *Religious Development Between the Old and the New Testament*, p. 101.

NOTES TO CHAPTER THREE

3.1. On the divine titles see R. Marcus, 'Divine Names and Attributes in Hellenistic Jewish Literature'; P. Dalbert, *Die Theologie der hellenistisch-jüdischen Missions-literatur*, pp. 124–26.

3.2. The literature which touches on the formulaic use of ἕἰς θεός etc. is large. See, in addition to the Peterson work cited in the text, J. Dupont, *Gnosis*, pp. 329–47; M. Smith, 'The Common Theology of the Ancient Near East', p. 139, note 14; G. Bornkamm, 'Das Doppelgebot der Liebe', p. 88; Stauffer, *New Testament Theology*, pp. 242–44; V.H. Neufeld, *The Earliest Christian Confessions*, pp. 34–41; H. Schlier, *Der Brief an die Epheser*, pp. 185–89; W. Kramer, *Christ, Lord, Son of God*, sections 22b-c, pp. 95–97; L. Goppelt, 'Die Herrschaft Christi und die Welt', p. 114; Dellling, 'ΜΟΝΟΣ ΘΕΟΣ'; H. Schlier, *Grundzüge zu einer paulinischen Theologie*, pp. 29–32; H.F. von Campenhausen, 'Das Bekenntnis im Urchristentum', p. 223, note 27; Wolff, pp. 7–10.

3.3. The definition of monotheism as the denial of all gods except the one God can be found in R.H. Pfeiffer, 'The Dual Origin of Hebrew Monotheism', p. 194; T. Meek, 'Monotheism and the Religion of Israel', pp. 22–23; W. Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament*, I, 220 ('apart from Yahweh no gods whatever existed'); B.W. Anderson, 'God, OT View of', p. 427 ('a reflective judgment that there are no other gods at all'); M. Gusinde, 'Monotheismus', col. 565 ('ohne jedwede Nebengötter'); P. van Imschoot, 'Monotheismus', col. 1167 ('Ausschliessung all jener Wesen, die im Polytheismus verehrt werden'); G. Ruhbach, 'Monotheismus', col. 1416; A. Deissler, 'Gottes Selbstoffenbarung im Alten Testament', p. 233.

3.4. This excerpt from a personal letter is quoted in Meek, p. 23.

3.5. For the history of research on this topic from Aristotle to the present, see G.F. Stout, 'Association (of ideas)', p. 78; D. Rapaport, *The History of the Concept of the Association of Ideas*. Among the more important modern studies are B.L. Whorf, 'On the Connection of Ideas'; C. Clifton, 'The Implications of Grammar for Word Associations'; J.C. Marshall, 'Psychological Linguistics: Psychological Aspects of Semantic Structure'; S.M. Ervin-Tripp, 'Substitution, Context, and Association'; H. Hörmann, *Psycholinguistics*, pp. 111–36.

3.6. The distinction between paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations among words was made by the linguist F. de Saussure in his famous *Course in General Linguistics*, and is often used by psychologists. See, for example, H.H. Clark, 'Word Associations and Linguistic Theory', *passim*; H.H. Clark and E.V. Clark, *Psychology and Language*, pp. 481–82.

3.7. J.R. Firth, 'Modes of Meaning', pp. 123–34; 'A Synopsis of Linguistic Theory, 1930–1955', pp. 11–13. For further material on collocations, see, in addition to the works cited in notes 61–63 below, A. McIntosh, 'Patterns and Ranges'; J. Lyons, *Semantics*, I, 261–66; R.H. Robins, *General Linguistics*, pp. 53–55; D. Crystal, *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*, p. 55. The Firthian concept of collocations has been compared to the concept of selection restrictions in transformational grammar. For an exposition of the latter, see R. Huddleston, *An Introduction to English Transformational Syntax*, pp. 152–54.

3.8. D. Bolinger and D.A. Sears, *Aspects of Language*, p. 58.

3.9. W. Porzig, 'Wesenhafte Bedeutungsbeziehungen'.

3.10. T.F. Mitchell, 'Linguistic "Goings On": Collocations and Other Lexical Matters Arising on the Syntagmatic Record', pp. 53, 60–64.

3.11. Bolinger and Sears, p. 53.

3.12. Mitchell, p. 52.

3.13. Z.S. Harris, 'Discourse Analysis'. [For this reference I am grateful to Dr. John Cohen of The Queen's College, Oxford.]

3.14. D.A. Norman and D.E. Rumelhart, *Explorations in Cognition*, pp. 6–7.

3.15. R.W. Casson, 'Schemata in Cognitive Anthropology'.

3.16. Casson, p. 432.

3.17. S.A. Tyler, *The Said and the Unsaid: Mind, Meaning, and Culture*, p. 109.

3.18. These examples are taken from C.J. Fillmore, 'Topics in Lexical Semantics', p. 84; P.W. Thorndyke and B. Hayes-Roth, 'The Use of Schemata in the Acquisition and Transfer of Knowledge', p. 83. See also M. Hunt, *The Universe Within*, pp. 117–20.

3.19. P.L. Berger and T. Luckmann, *The Social Construction of Reality*, p. 87. These writers worked before the 'schema' terminology had been applied widely outside the psychological literature, but their notion of 'collective sedimentations' can easily be united with the schema concept as understood by anthropologists.

3.20. Tyler, p. 233. See also Fillmore, p. 130.

3.21. Additional texts with full documentation can be found in E. Norden, *Agnostos Theos*, pp. 240–50; M. Dibelius, ‘Die Christianisierung einer hellenistischen Formel’; Dupont, pp. 335–41; O. Michel, *Der Brief an die Römer*, p. 255; H. Hommel, *Schöpfer und Erhalter*, pp. 99–107; B. Reicke, ‘ΠΑΣ’, pp. 892–93; R. Kerst, ‘1 Kor 8:6—ein vorpaulinisches Taufbekenntnis?’, pp. 130–32.

3.22. ‘1 Cor., VIII, 6: Cosmology or Soteriology?’, p. 260 (‘the immediate impression is not of similarity but of difference’).

3.23. For texts and discussion see R.M. Grant, ‘Causation and “The Ancient World View”’; R.A. Horsley, ‘The Background of the Confessional Formula in I Kor [sic] 8:6’.

3.24. M. Barth, *Ephesians*, II, 467.

3.25. The term ‘intermediary’ need not imply that Judaism required mediation between a supposedly remote God and the world, according to Moore, *Judaism*, I, 438. See also E.P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, p. 215.

3.26. Among the major studies of Jewish intermediaries are P. Volz, *Der Geist Gottes und die verwandten Erscheinungen im Alten Testament und im anschließenden Judentum*; J. Abelson, *The Immanence of God in Rabbinical Literature*; P. Heinisch, *Personifikationen und Hypostasen im Alten Testament und im Alten Orient*; G.F. Moore, ‘Intermediaries in Jewish Theology: Memra, Shekinah, Metatron’; also *Judaism*, I, 401–42; G.H. Box, ‘The Idea of Intermediation in Jewish Theology: A Note on Memra and Shekinah’; A.R. Johnson, *The One and the Many in the Israelite Conception of God*; H. Ringgren, *Word and Wisdom*; also ‘Hypostasen’; Bousset/Gressmann, pp. 320–57; G. Pfeifer, *Ursprung und Wesen der Hypostasenvorstellungen im Judentum*; J.T. Sanders, *The New Testament Christological Hymns*; M. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, I, 153–75; J.D.G. Dunn, *Christology in the Making, passim*; also ‘Was Christianity a Monotheistic Faith from the Beginning?’; M. Casey, ‘Chronology and the Development of Pauline Christology’; C. Rowland, *The Open Heaven*, pp. 94–113; J.E. Fossum, *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord*; L.W. Hurtado, ‘The Binitarian Shape of Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism’; C. Rowland, *Christian Origins*, pp. 35–39; G. Schimanowski, *Weisheit und Messias*; J.H. Charlesworth, ‘The Jewish Roots of Christology: The Discovery of the Hypostatic Voice’.

3.27. Pfeifer, pp. 66, 102.

3.28. For the position that intermediaries threatened Jewish monotheism, see Bousset/Gressmann, pp. 318–20, 357. According to Bousset, the intermediaries made up a ‘Rankenwerk’ which ‘beginnt den reinen Gottesglauben zu überwuchern’ (p. 319). A strenuous argument against this position is offered in Dunn, ‘Monotheistic?’, pp. 307–22. Dunn basically holds that none of the intermediaries which were clearly distinct from God himself were truly divinized by the Jews. Something of a middle position is taken by Rowland, *Open Heaven*, pp. 111–113. According to Rowland, the belief in a divine angel did not exactly threaten belief in one God, but it came so perilously close to doing so that it must have been very open to this misunderstanding.

3.29. For the view that Jewish beliefs about intermediaries were catalysts for early christology, see now Casey, ‘Chronology’; Rowland, *Open Heaven*, pp. 112–13. Dunn recognizes the influence of the Jewish wisdom concept, but denies the influence of most other intermediaries on early christology. See ‘Monotheistic?’, pp. 322–33.

3.30. For a few examples of intermediaries which shared divine titles and functions, see sections V and VIII of chapter four below.

3.31. ‘Chronology’, p. 130.

3.32. The outstanding monograph on this subject was T. Boman, *Hebrew Thought Compared with Greek*. For some philological criticisms of Boman’s book, see J. Barr, *The Semantics of Biblical Language* (1961), *passim*.

The tendency to exaggerate the contrast between Hebrew and Greek thought, often subtly combined with a value judgement which preferred Hebrew thought with its existential orientation, was one of the many influences which the anti-metaphysical Ritschlian theology of the turn of the century continued to exercise. See

W. Pannenberg, 'The Appropriation of the Philosophical Concept of God as a Dogmatic Problem of Early Christian Theology', pp. 119–22.

3.33. R.N. Longenecker, *The Christology of Early Jewish Christianity*, p. 134.

3.34. D.B. MacDonald, *The Hebrew Philosophical Genius: A Vindication*, p. 16.

3.35. M. Smith, 'Common Theology', p. 137, note 8 (italics mine).

3.36. A.E.J. Rawlinson, 'Hebraic Theism as Presupposed by the Christian Movement', p. 16.

3.37. Y. Amir, 'Die Begegnung des biblischen und des philosophischen Monotheismus als Grundthema des jüdischen Hellenismus'; W. Pannenberg, 'What is Truth?', p. 9.

3.38. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, I, 261–67.

NOTES TO CHAPTER FOUR

4.1. The sources which contained no statements of monotheism are indicated in section 2 of appendix one. It will be noted that many of them are fragmentary.

4.2. E.E. Urbach, *The Sages*, p. 26.

4.3. For studies of Jewish beliefs about the supernatural world, see W.O.E. Oesterley, 'The Belief in Angels and Demons'; H. Bietenhard, *Die himmlische Welt in Urchristentum und Spätjudentum*, pp. 101–42; Bousset/Gressmann, pp. 320–42; H.-F. Weiss, *Untersuchungen zur Kosmologie des hellenistischen und palästinischen Judentums*; C. Rowland, *Christian Origins*, pp. 33–34.

4.4. For this observation about the negative attitude of the rabbis towards the figure of the Angel of the Lord, I am initially indebted to Dr. Menachim Fisch of the University of Tel Aviv, who passed it on to me in conversation as something he had learned from his father. See A.F. Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven*, esp. p. 149.

4.5. W. Bousset and H. Gressmann suppose that the flowering of such beliefs in the post-exilic period threatened the strict monotheism attained in the OT (Bousset/Gressmann, pp. 329–31, 341–42). But it is by no means certain that the denials of *elohim* beside YHWH in Isa. chapters 40–66 were intended as denials of the existence of angels or demons, especially in the light of 40. 26 and 63. 9. Since these chapters present God as the transcendent creator of the world and redeemer of Israel, probably the denials of other *elohim* amount to denials that there is any other God in this qualitative sense. Could it be that Bousset and other scholars of his time read the scorn of the Enlightenment towards belief in angels and demons back into II Isaiah?

4.6. J.H. Charlesworth, 'A Critical Comparison of the Dualism in 1QS III, 13 - IV, 26 and the "Dualism" Contained in the Fourth Gospel', pp. 390–402.

4.7. This translation may have influenced Philo's estimate of Moses as a 'divine man'. See *Sac. Ab. et Cain. 8–10*. The meaning of the Philo passage is debated. Compare F.H. Colson and G.H. Whitaker, *Philo*, II, 488; E.R. Goodenough, *By Light, Light*, p. 199; W.A. Meeks, *The Prophet-King*, p. 104–05; also 'The Divine Agent and His Counterfeit in Philo and the Fourth Gospel', p. 47; D.L. Tiede, *The Charismatic Figure as Miracle Worker*, p. 125; C.H. Holladay, *Theios Aner in Hellenistic-Judaism*, pp. 136–41; J.D.G. Dunn, *Christology in the Making*, pp. 17, 19.

4.8. The application of the title θεός to Israelite judges is found elsewhere. Note Psalm LXX 81. 1, 6, and the interpretation of this passage among Jewish Christians in the first century A.D., as seen in John 10. 35.

4.9. M.J. Harris offers a thorough discussion of optional translations of ὁ θεός in LXX Psalm 44. 7, in 'The Translation of *Elohim* in Psalm 45:7–8', p. 89.

4.10. This passage is quoted in J. Jeremias, 'ΜΩΥΣΗΣ', p. 852, note 62.

4.11. Y. Yadin discusses the use of *elim* for angels in the War Scroll, in *The Scroll of the Sons of Light Against the Sons of Darkness*, p. 230.

4.12. M. de Jonge and A.S. van der Woude, '11Q Melchizedek and the New Testament', pp. 304–05; M. Casey, 'Chronology and the Development of Pauline Christology', pp. 126, 128, 129.

4.13. *Vit. Mos. I, 158*. The exact significance of the phrase θεὸς καὶ βασιλεύς is debated. Compare M.P. Charlesworth, 'Some Observations on Ruler-Cult Especially in Rome', p. 13; Goodenough, *Light*, pp. 186, 223–29; W.A. Meeks, 'Moses as God and King'; Holladay, *Theios Aner*, pp. 108–29; Dunn, *Christology*, pp. 17, 19.

4.14. *Antiq. III, 180*. On this phrase, compare Tiede, *Charismatic Figure*, p. 232 with Holladay, *Theios Aner*, pp. 47–67.

4.15. For further discussion of the use of θεός and κύριος for angels in Judaism, see O. Everling, *Die paulinische Angelologie und Dämonologie*, pp. 26–27; M. Dibelius, *Die Geisterwelt im Glauben des Paulus*, pp. 77–78; Héring, pp. 68–69; M. Werner, *The Formation of Christian Dogma*, pp. 123–24. Many Jews held that the gods of the heathen were angels or demons wrongly deified and worshipped by men. For the evidence see Str.-B., III, 48–51; Bousset/Gressmann, pp. 304–06.

4.16. The word 'gods' refers to physical images in II Kings 19. 18 (number 15); Jer. 10. 11 (number 33); *Judith* 8. 18 (number 43); *Sib. Or. V*, 496 (number 88); *Joseph and Aseneth* 12. 12 (number 122). In many other cases it is difficult to be sure whether 'gods' refers to physical images or to spiritual beings (or both).

4.17. Prayers, however, were sometimes addressed to God via an angelic mediator. This will be discussed in section VIII below.

4.18. C.H. Dodd, *The Bible and the Greeks*, p. 5. To be even more specific, the word θεός connoted the exercise of power. Note the popular Greek maxims preserved on a papyrus of the second century A.D.: τί θεός; τὸ κρατοῦν. τί βασιλεύς; ἰσόθεος (cited in S.R.F. Price, 'Gods and Emperors: The Greek Language of the Roman Imperial Court', p. 95).

4.19. S. Liebermann, 'Appendix 1', p. 237.

4.20. I.M. Zeitlin, *Ancient Judaism*, p. 35. Zeitlin supports his own result with the following quotation from Max Weber (*Economy and Society*, II, 552): biblical monotheism teaches a 'transcendental, absolutely omnipotent God, implying the utterly subordinate and creaturely character of the world created by him out of nothing' (quoted in Zeitlin, pp. 34–35).

4.21. S. Cohon, 'The Unity of God. A Study in Hellenistic and Rabbinic Theology', p. 425 (italics mine).

4.22. F. Danker, *Creeds in the Bible*, pp. 16–24; Y. Amir, 'Die Begegnung des biblischen und des philosophischen Monotheismus als Grundthema des jüdischen Hellenismus', pp. 3–4.

4.23. There is little, surprisingly, on monotheism as such in H.J. Wicks, *The Doctrine of God in the Jewish Apocryphal and Apocalyptic Literature*, which emphasizes the transcendence, justice, and grace of God; or in N. Johnson, *Prayer in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha* (but note pp. 67–76). See rather G. Hölscher, *Geschichte der israelitischen und jüdischen Religion*, p. 244; R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, I, 65–78; P. Dalbert, *Die Theologie der hellenistisch-jüdischen Missions-literature*, pp. 124–30; Cohon, 'Unity of God', pp. 425–27, 446–47; E.K. Lee, 'Unity in Israel and Unity in Christ', pp. 36–41; Amir, p. 12. Where his publications on the theology of Josephus touch on Josephus's monotheism, A. Schlatter underlines the emphasis on God's creatorhood, the unity of the world, God as the end or goal, God's sovereignty over all, the unity of time under God, the unity of Israel and the temple, the independence, aseity, and eternity of God, and the distinction between God and the gods. See *Wie sprach Josephus von Gott?*, pp. 16–20; *Die Theologie des Judentums nach dem Bericht des Josephus*, pp. 1–7. The only distinctive note sounded in treatments of Philo's monotheism is his insistence that the oneness of God implied simplicity of nature or absence of composition (as in *Leg. all. II*, 1–2 [number 154]). See J. Drummond, *Philo Judaeus*, II, 37–38; H.A. Wolfson, *Philo*, I, 27–55, 171–75; II, 98–100, 149–53; H. Chadwick, 'Philo', pp. 141–42. The influence of Greek thought on Philo's

doctrine of God is brought out in the abstract of F. Kuhr, 'Die Gottesprädikationen bei Philo von Alexandrien', p. 240.

4.24. F. Weber, *Jüdische Theologie auf Grund des Talmud*, pp. 151–54; A. Marmorstein, 'The Unity of God in Rabbinic Literature', *passim*; R.A. Stewart, *Rabbinic Theology*, pp. 20–23.

4.25. On this dictum, see H.M. Kleinknecht, 'ΘΕΟΣ', pp. 77–78.

4.26. C. Westermann, *Anfang und Ende in der Bibel*, pp. 44–45.

4.27. M. Dibelius, 'Die Christianisierung einer hellenistischen Formel', p. 25.

4.28. H. Hommel, *Schöpfer und Erhalter*, pp. 99–107.

4.29. S. Niditch, 'The Cosmic Adam: Man as Mediator in Rabbinic Literature', p. 137. Additional material relating to Jewish and Christian beliefs about Adam may be found in C.K. Barrett, *From First Adam to Last*, *passim*; R. Scroggs, *The Last Adam*, pp. 1–58.

4.30. See, for example, the Nag Hammadi tractate *On the Origin of the World*, throughout. Gnostic beliefs about Adam are ably summarized in Dunn, *Christology*, pp. 98–100.

4.31. Bietenhard considers the view of Enoch in *II Enoch* to be on the way to ditheism (*Himmlische Welt*, p. 158, note 1).

4.32. On the identification of Enoch with Metatron in the Gaonic period, see G.F. Moore, 'Intermediaries in Jewish Theology: Memra, Shekinah, Metatron', pp. 76–77.

4.33. On the view of Moses in Second Temple Judaism, see I. Efros, 'Prophecy, Wisdom, and Apocalyptic', p. 219; J. Goldin, 'The First Chapter of *Abot de Rabbi Nathan: Appendix*'; H.M. Teeple, *The Mosaic Eschatological Prophet*; J. MacDonald, 'The Samaritan Doctrine of Moses'; also *Memar Marqah*, I, xvii; also *The Theology of the Samaritans*, pp. 147–222, 420–46; J. Jeremias, 'ΜΩΥΣΗΣ'; I. Abrahams and others, 'Moses', esp. the sections by D. Winston, L. Jacobs, and A. Rothkoff, cols 388–98; J.G. Gager, *Moses in Greco-Roman Paganism*; K. Haacker and P. Schäfer, 'Nachbiblische Traditionen vom Tod des Mose'; S.E. Loewenstamm, 'The Death of Moses'. See also the secondary literature cited in notes 34–35 below.

4.34. Goodenough, *Light*, p. 233; R. Williamson, 'Philo and New Testament Christology', p. 364; M. Casey, 'Chronology', pp. 127, 130.

4.35. For the debate, compare F.H. Colson and G.H. Whitaker, *Philo*, II, 488; Goodenough, *Light*, pp. 180–234; L. Bieler, ΘΕΙΟΣ ANHP, II, 30–36; W.A. Meeks, *The Prophet-King*, pp. 100–75; also 'Moses as God and King'; also 'Divine Agent', pp. 45, 47; Tiede, *Charismatic Figure*, pp. 101–240; E. Schweizer, 'Menschensohn und eschatologischer Mensch im Frühjudentum', pp. 104–05, 107; Holladay, *Theios Aner*; W.R. Telford, review of the foregoing; Williamson, 'Philo and the New Testament'; Dunn, *Christology*, p. 19; also 'Was Christianity a Monotheistic Faith from the Beginning?', pp. 309–10; I. Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism*, p. 128–29; Casey, 'Chronology', pp. 127, 129–130; A.E. Harvey, *Jesus and the Constraints of History*, p. 157; G. Mussies, 'The Interpretatio Judaica of Thot-Hermes', p. 91; H. Jacobson, *The Exagoge of Ezekiel*, pp. 89–97; P.W. van der Horst, 'Moses' Throne Vision in Ezekiel the Dramatist'; also 'Some Notes on the *Exagoge* of Ezekiel'.

4.36. For substantiation of the last two sentences, see G. Molin, 'Elijah. Der Prophet und sein Weiterleben in den Hoffnungen des Judentums und der Christenheit', pp. 79–86.

4.37. Many modern writers on Judaism are concerned to correct the late nineteenth-century view which saw in the celestial retinue evidence that the Jew no longer felt close to God. For this correction, see J. Abelson, *The Immanence of God in Rabbinical Literature*, pp. 12–16; G.F. Moore, *Judaism*, I, 405, 423–42; E.P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, p. 215. Abelson, in his zeal to establish the nearness of God in Judaism, stated concerning angels, 'The angel is not the intermediary nor the mediator, but is an emanation of the Divine, a portion of the immanent God' (p. 129, note). This exaggeration is curtailed by I. Efros's more careful statement that angels were 'true intermediators', carrying God's messages to earth and bearing human prayers to heaven (p. 218).

- 4.38. The use of this formulation therefore does not blur the distinction between God and the angel. For a different view, see Abelson, p. 129, note; W. Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament*, II, 24–27; J.D.G. Dunn, ‘Monotheistic?’, p. 312.
- 4.39. References to document the assertions in this paragraph can be found in J.E. Fossum, *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord*, p. 193.
- 4.40. *De opificio mundi* 135. See the related passages in Fossum, *Name of God*, pp. 197–204.
- 4.41. Fossum, *Name of God*, p. 110.
- 4.42. J.H. Charlesworth, ‘The Jewish Roots of Christology: The Discovery of the Hypostatic Voice’.
- 4.43. On the subject of the Angel of the Lord, or God’s principal angel, see W.G. MacDonald, ‘Christology and “The Angel of the Lord”’; A.F. Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven*, pp. 180, 186–201; also ‘Ruler of This World: Attitudes about Mediator Figures and the Importance of Sociology for Self-Definition’; C. Rowland, *The Open Heaven*, pp. 94–113; P.W. van der Horst, ‘Moses’ Throne Vision in Ezekiel the Dramatist’, p. 26; Fossum, *Name of God*, esp. pp. iii, 307–21, 333.
- 4.44. On belief in God’s principal angel in non-official circles of Judaism from the second century of the common era into the medieval period, see Abelson, pp. 172–73, note 30; G.F. Moore, ‘Intermediaries’, pp. 62–79; Bietenhard, *Himmlische Welt*, pp. 149–60; G. Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*, pp. 67–70; also *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition*, pp. 41–51; J. Daniélou, *The Theology of Jewish Christianity*, pp. 117–46; S. Liebermann, ‘Appendix 1’.
- 4.45. On the Samaritan expectation of the coming *Taheb*, see J. MacDonald, ‘Samaritan Doctrine of Moses’, pp. 155–58; also *Theology of the Samaritans*, pp. 362–71.
- 4.46. The entire array of possible translations for the relevant phrase in Psa. 45. 6 is thoroughly discussed in M.J. Harris, ‘Translation of *Elohim*’.
- 4.47. That this passage was understood messianically by at least some post-biblical Jews is clear from the septuagintal translation of v 3, which echoes Psa. 2. 7 and Num. 24. 17: ‘The rule is with you in the day of your power amid the splendours of your holy ones; I gave you birth (ἐξεγέννησά σε) from the womb before the morning-star (πρὸ ἑωσφόρου)’.
- 4.48. The self-sacrifice of this individual for the nation is clearly stated in v 8 in the phrase *mip-pesha ammi nega lamo* (‘for the transgression of my people—the blow was to him’). The second and last words (‘my people’, ‘to him’) distinguish the servant in this context from corporate Israel; the third-person reference throughout distinguishes the servant from the speaking prophet. This interpretation of Isa. 53 now has the support of no less an OT scholar than W. Zimmerli (*Old Testament Theology in Outline*, p. 223). We have little evidence to suggest that Isa. 53 was understood by post-biblical Jews to refer to a suffering, individual Messiah. J. Jeremias points to a few traces in the rabbinic writings of a belief in a leprous messiah, based, he thinks (with the support of H.-J. Schoeps), on Isa. 53. 4 (‘ΠΑΙΣ ΘΕΟΥ’, pp. 689–91).
- 4.49. In Palestinian Judaism a messianic interpretation of parts of the servant passages in Isaiah co-existed with other interpretations. It was limited to the exaltation texts (42. 1ff.; 43. 10; 49. 1–2, 6–7; 52. 13–15). Diaspora Judaism as a whole followed the lead of LXX Isa. 42. 1, 19 and supposed that the servant represented corporate Israel. All the relevant material is marshalled in Jeremias, ‘ΠΑΙΣ ΘΕΟΥ’, pp. 682–700.
- 4.50. On the two streams of expectation, see J. Klausner, ‘The Jewish and the Christian Messiah’; S. Mowinckel, *He That Cometh*, pp. 267–79; Schürer/Vermes/Millar/Black, II, 518–22. The standard distinction between a human messiah and a transcendent redeemer is questioned, however, in H. Riesenfeld, ‘The Mythological Background of New Testament Christology’, p. 34.
- 4.51. These references follow the edition in R.H. Charles, ed., *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English*, II.

4.52. For attempts to find other interpretations, see M. Smith, “‘God’s Begetting the Messiah” in 1QSa’; Y. Yadin, ‘A Crucial Passage in the Dead Sea Scrolls: 1QSa ii. 11–17’; G. Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective*, p. 196.

4.53. On the doctrine of two messiahs at Qumran, see M. Black, ‘Messianic Doctrine in the Qumran Scrolls’; R.E. Brown, ‘The Messianism of Qumran’; J. Liver, ‘The Doctrine of the Two Messiahs in Sectarian Literature in the Time of the Second Commonwealth’; W.S. LaSor, ‘The Messianic Idea in Qumran’; E.A. Wcela, ‘The Messiah(s) of Qumran’; M. de Jonge, ‘The Role of Intermediaries in God’s Final Intervention in the Future according to the Qumran Scrolls’; Vermes, *Qumran in Perspective*, pp. 184–85, 195–96; Schürer/Vermes/Millar/Black, II, 550–54.

4.54. Liver, p. 179.

4.55. A.J.B. Higgins, ‘Jewish Messianic Belief in Justin Martyr’s *Dialogue with Trypho*’, p. 299.

4.56. S.H. Levey, *The Messiah: An Aramaic Interpretation*, p. 152, note 10.

4.57. Neusner, ‘Mishnah and Messiah’, pp. 4–7.

4.58. G. Scholem, *The Messianic Idea in Judaism*, p. 17.

4.59. On this passage, see M. Casey, *Son of Man: The Interpretation and Influence of Daniel 7*.

4.60. On the flowing together of messianic and sapiential themes, see H. Gese, ‘Wisdom, Son of Man, and the Origins of Christology: The Consistent Development of Biblical Theology’; G. Schimanowski, *Weisheit und Messias*.

4.61. See S. Kim, ‘The “Son of Man” as the Son of God’, p. 15. Kim quotes a study of Feuillet which concluded that thirty out of about a hundred occurrences of clouds in the OT have in view the natural phenomena; the rest (seventy or so) are all in theophanies.

4.62. See Kim, *Son of God*, pp. 16–18. Kim refers also to studies by O. Procksch, H.R. Balz, and C.C. Rowland.

4.63. C.C. Caragounis, *The Son of Man*, p. 75.

4.64. Bietenhard, *Himmlische Welt*, p. 69; M. Stone, ‘The Concept of the Messiah in IV Ezra’, p. 302, note 1; E. Lohse, ‘Christus als der Weltenrichter’, pp. 476–78; B. Lindars, *Jesus Son of Man*, p. 14.

4.65. Having pointed out those features of the son of man in Enoch which can be interpreted as impinging on divinity, we need not here enter into the current debates about the date of the material, whether ‘son of man’ was a recognized title, the nature of the pre-existence of this figure in the *Similitudes*, or the directions of influence among the *Similitudes*, the Gospels, and Jewish *Merkavah* literature. On these topics, see, from the enormous body of secondary literature, T.W. Manson, ‘The Son of Man in Daniel, Enoch and the Gospels’; Klausner, *Messianic Idea*, pp. 277–301; Mowinkel, pp. 346–450; H.E. Tödt, *The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition*; Bousset/Gressmann, pp. 353–54; R.G. Hamerton-Kelly, *Pre-existence, Wisdom, and the Son of Man*, pp. 17–18; N. Perrin, ‘The Son of Man in Ancient Judaism and Primitive Christianity: A Suggestion’; G. Vermes, ‘The “Son of Man” Debate’; B. Lindars, ‘Enoch and Christology’; Gese, ‘Origins of Christology’, pp. 39–40; G.W.E. Nickelsburg, ‘The Books of Enoch in Recent Research’; Schimanowski, pp. 95–106, 153–94; Caragounis, *The Son of Man*.

4.66. See Stone, ‘Messiah in IV Ezra’.

4.67. On the angelic redeemer of Qumran, see de Jonge and van der Woude, ‘11Q Melchizedek and the New Testament’; J.A. Fitzmyer, ‘Further Light on Melchizedek from Qumran Cave 11’; Laubscher, ‘God’s Angel of Truth and Melchizedek’; F.L. Horton, *The Melchizedek Tradition*, pp. 64–82; P.J. Kobelski, *Melchizedek and Melchiresa*, pp. 49–83, 139–41; Schürer/Vermes/Millar/Black, III, 449–50.

4.68. Segal, *Two Powers*, p. 149.

- 4.69. A.M. Goldberg, *Untersuchungen über die Vorstellung von der Schekhinah in der frühen rabbinischen Literatur*, p. 537 (trans. mine). This study corrects the extreme position taken by G.F. Moore in 'Intermediaries', where he explained away the *Shekinah* as a rabbinic circumlocution for God (pp. 55–59).
- 4.70. Goldberg, p. 534.
- 4.71. All the evidence in J. Fossum, 'Jewish-Christian Christology and Jewish Mysticism', comes from the second century A.D. or later. Note the brief comments on *merkavah* mysticism in Dunn, 'Monotheistic?', pp. 312–14.
- 4.72. Fossum, *Name of God*, p. 84.
- 4.73. Fossum, *Name of God*, pp. 76–191.
- 4.74. See, e.g., Abelson, pp. 131–32, note.
- 4.75. K. Kohler, *Jewish Theology Systematically and Historically Considered*, pp. 202–03; A. Marmorstein, 'Philo and the Names of God'; N.A. Dahl and A.F. Segal, 'Philo and the Rabbis on the Names of God'.
- 4.76. On this circumlocution in rabbinic usage, see Kohler, p. 202.
- 4.77. On the spirit of God in Jewish belief, see P. Volz, *Der Geist Gottes*; Abelson, pp. 174–277; W. Foerster, 'Der heilige Geist im Spätjudentum'; Eichrodt, *OT Theology*, II, 46–68; M.E. Isaacs, *The Concept of Spirit: A Study of Pneuma in Hellenistic Judaism and Its Bearing on the New Testament*.
- 4.78. On the rabbinic ontologization of the Torah, see S. Schechter, *Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology*, p. 129 (but compare p. 136); Kohler, p. 199; M. Maher, 'Some Aspects of Torah in Judaism'; M. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, I, 169–75.
- 4.79. J.H. Charlesworth, 'Hypostatic Voice', p. 37.
- 4.80. The secondary literature on Jewish wisdom teaching is immense and is ridden with controversy about many aspects. Works which have informed my discussion include J.A.F. Gregg, *The Wisdom of Solomon*, pp. xxxi–xxxvi; W. Schenke, *Die Chokma (Sophia) in der jüdischen Hypostasenspekulation*; P. Heinisch, *Personifikationen und Hypostasen im Alten Testament und im Alten Orient*, pp. 28–32; R. Bultmann, 'Der religionsgeschichtliche Hintergrund des Prologs zum Johannes-Evangelium'; H. Ranston, *The Old Testament Wisdom Books and Their Teaching*; W. Baumgartner, *Israelitische und altorientalische Weisheit*; D.B. MacDonald, *The Hebrew Philosophical Genius: A Vindication, passim*; O.S. Rankin, *Israel's Wisdom Literature*; W.L. Knox, 'The Divine Wisdom'; J. Lebreton, *History of the Dogma of the Trinity*, pp. 90–98; H. Ringgren, *Word and Wisdom*, pp. 89–171; also 'Hypostasen'; R. Marcus, 'On Biblical Hypostases of Wisdom'; U. Wilckens, *Weisheit und Torheit, passim*; G. von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, I, 441–53; also *Wisdom in Israel*; P.-E. Bonnard, *La Sagesse en personne annoncée et venue: Jesus Christ*; also 'De la Sagesse personifiée dans l'Ancien Testament à la Sagesse en personne dans le Nouveau'; Bousset/Gressmann, pp. 343–46; H.H. Schmid, *Wesen und Geschichte der Weisheit*; H.-F. Weiss, *Kosmologie*, pp. 188–211; Eichrodt, *OT Theology*, II, 80–92; G. Pfeifer, *Ursprung und Wesen der Hypostasenvorstellungen im Judentum*, pp. 24, 26–28, 31, 37, 44, 46, 51–52; B.L. Mack, 'Wisdom Myth and Mythology'; also *Logos und Sophia*; U. Wilckens and G. Fohrer, 'ΣΟΦΙΑ', pp. 476–509; J.T. Sanders, *The New Testament Christological Hymns*, pp. 29–98; Hamerton-Kelly, pp. 19–21; J.L. Crenshaw, 'Wisdom'; Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, I, 153–75; R.S. Barbour, 'Creation, Wisdom and Christ'; R. Murphy, 'Wisdom—Theses and Hypotheses'; also 'Hebrew Wisdom'; Dunn, *Christology*, pp. 168–76; Gese, 'Origins of Christology'; J.A. Davis, *Wisdom and Spirit, passim*; R.M. Grant, *Gods and the One God*, pp. 100–04; E.A. Johnson, 'Jesus, the Wisdom of God: A Biblical Basis for Non-Androcentric Christology', pp. 263–76; Schimanowski, *Weisheit und Messias*, pp. 13–106.
- 4.81. Von Rad has rightly pricked the bubble of the pervasive view that wisdom in Job 28 is a divine hypostasis (Wisdom in Israel, pp. 147–48). Even his own influential view that wisdom in this poem denotes the all-embracing meaning behind the creation goes beyond the text.
- 4.82. On the meaning of the key words *qanah* (v 22) and *amon* (v 30), see, in addition to the literature cited above which touches on Proverbs, R. Stecher, 'Die persönliche Weisheit in den Proverbien Kap. 8', pp.

420–23, 431–36; B. Gemser, *Sprüche Salomos*, p. 46; R.N. Whybray, *Wisdom in Proverbs*, pp. 98–103; von Rad, *Wisdom in Israel*, pp. 151–52. For our purpose a decision about these nuances is unnecessary.

4.83. J. Marböck argues that wisdom in *Sir.* chapter 24 is a poetic personification of God's presence, work, and claim on man. In an illuminating glance at secondary literature he shows that, while a majority of writers on the subject of Jewish hypostases find a reified wisdom in this chapter, most commentators on the book who approach it without this special interest prefer an interpretation along the line he too has suggested (*Weisheit im Wandel: Untersuchungen zur Weisheitstheologie bei Ben Sira*, pp. 129–30).

4.84. This generalization is now partly confirmed by a conclusion of Schimanowski: almost always in Palestinian texts wisdom appears as a 'Wesen' clearly distinguishable from and independent of God (p. 105).

4.85. For special studies of hypostatic wisdom in *Wisd. Sol.*, see F.W. Farrar, 'The Wisdom of Solomon', pp. 465–66; P. Heinisch, *Die griechische Philosophie im Buche der Weisheit*; also *Das Buch der Weisheit*; Gregg, pp. xxxi–xxxvi; A.T.S. Goodrick, *The Book of Wisdom*, pp. 416–19; S. Holmes, 'The Wisdom of Solomon', pp. 527–28; D.B. MacDonald, pp. 94–127; J. Fichtner, *Weisheit Salomos*, pp. 9, 31–33; G. Ziener, *Die theologische Begriffssprache im Buche der Weisheit*, pp. 34–36, 109–13; J. Reider, *The Book of Wisdom*, pp. 35–36; T. Finan, 'Hellenistic Humanism in the Book of Wisdom'; J. Geyer, *The Wisdom of Solomon*, pp. 26–35; J.M. Reese, *Hellenistic Influence on the Book of Wisdom and Its Consequences*, pp. 36–50.

4.86. Keferstein's conclusion is quoted in Pfeifer, p. 51. On the general exchangeability of Sophia and the Logos in Philo, see the many passages cited in Goodenough, *Light*, p. 22; Ringgren, *Word and Wisdom*, pp. 124–25; Pfeifer, pp. 51–52; L.K.K. Dey, *The Intermediary World and Patterns of Perfection in Philo and Hebrews*, pp. 8–17.

4.87. Several elements of the monotheism schema appear in J.T. Sanders's summary concerning the figure of Wisdom/Word/Adam: 'Within this emerging mythical configuration, it was possible to say of the divine figure that it was in the image (likeness, form) of God, i.e. that it possessed equality with God, that it participated in creation and embodied the All, that it descended from the sphere of the divine to the sphere of the mortal, that it in some way entered into human existence, i.e. became identified with human existence for the sake of the revelatory task' (Hymns, p. 97).

4.88. E.g., Dunn, *Christology*, p. 176.

4.89. E.g., Gregg, pp. xxxv–xxxvi; Reider, pp. 36, 116.

4.90. E.g., Ziener, p. 35.

4.91. Possible exceptions to the majority view can be found in D.B. MacDonald, pp. 99, 112–13, 118; Wilckens, *Weisheit und Torheit*, pp. 160–97; Whybray, p. 11; Wilckens in 'ΣΟΦΙΑ', p. 509: 'a single, harmonious complex of ideas which are alien to the faith of Israel'.

4.92. *Kosmologie*, pp. 199–200 (trans. mine).

4.93. See J. Drummond, *Philo Judaeus*, II, 88–183, 201–73; Abelson, pp. 61–73; Kohler, p. 198–99; E. Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung*, 3. Teil, 2. Abteilung, pp. 407–34; also *Outlines of the History of Greek Philosophy*, pp. 260–61; I. Leisegang, 'Logos', cols 1072–78; Goodenough, *Light*, pp. 24–29, 35–38; H.A. Wolfson, *Philo*, I, 200–94; A.W. Argyle, 'The Logos of Philo: Personal or Impersonal?'; W. Kelber, *Die Logoslehre von Heraklit bis Origenes*, pp. 98–143; H. Hegemann, *Die Vorstellung vom Schöpfungsmittler im hellenistischen Judentum und Urchristentum*, pp. 6–87; H. Chadwick, 'Philo', pp. 143–45; Kleinknecht in A. Debrunner and others, 'ΛΕΓΩ, ΛΟΓΩΣ', pp. 88–90; Pfeifer, pp. 48–51; D.E. Gershenson, 'Logos', cols 461–62; Dey, pp. 8–17; Segal, *Two Powers*, pp. 159–81; S. Sandmel, *Philo of Alexandria: An Introduction*, pp. 94–99.

4.94. This statement is based on a survey of the entries for εἷς, μόνος, and λόγος in Leisegang's *Indices* (volume VII of the standard Cohn-Wendland edition of Philo's works), and is subject to correction by Philo experts. The nearest thing to explicit monotheistic language I could find associated with Philo's Logos in the research time available was the passage from *Opif.* 139 quoted above in the text (using μόνω of the Logos as the sole pattern for Adam).

- 4.95. e.g., Dunn, *Christology*, pp. 220–28.
- 4.96. e.g., Zeller, *Outlines*, pp. 260–61.
- 4.97. On *memra* in the Targumim, see Abelson, pp. 150–73; Kohler, p. 198; G.F. Moore, ‘Intermediaries’, pp. 41–55; Str.-B., II, 302–33; G.H. Box, ‘The Idea of Intermediation in Jewish Theology: A Note on Memra and Shekinah’; M. McNamara, ‘Logos of the Fourth Gospel and *Memra* of the Palestinian Targum (Ex 12⁴²)’; R. Hayward, ‘The *Memra* of YHWH and the Development of its Use in Targum Neofiti I’. The quotation of Ben-Nachman is given in Box, p. 118.
- 4.98. J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, pp. 95–101 and *passim*.
- 4.99. D. Flusser and S. Safrai, ‘The Essene Doctrine of Hypostasis and Rabbi Meir’. The quotation in the text is from *New Testament Abstracts*, 28 (1984), number 1180, p. 291.
- 4.100. C.H. Dodd, *The Bible and the Greeks*, p. 4.
- 4.101. Note the punctuation preferred by editor Robert Hanhart in the Göttingen LXX Esther, p. 164: Κύριε μου ὁ βασιλεὺς ἡμῶν, σὺ εἶ μόνος. The alternative punctuation is preferred in RSV: ‘O my Lord, thou only art our king’.
- 4.102. G. Dellling comments on this passage, ‘The divine οὐσία belongs only to the God honoured by the Jewish people.’ See ‘ΜΟΝΟΣ ΘΕΟΣ’, p. 397 (trans. mine).
- 4.103. See G. Dellling, ‘Wunder-Allegorie-Mythus bei Philon von Alexandria’, pp. 81, 89–95.
- 4.104. R.J.H. Shutt, ‘The Concept of God in the Works of Flavius Josephus’, pp. 173–79, 183–86.
- 4.105. On Philo’s doctrine of the simplicity of God, see the pages in Drummond and Wolfson referred to in note 23 above.
- 4.106. A. Schlatter, *Theologie des Josephus*, p. 6 (trans. mine); cf. *Wie sprach Josephus von Gott?*, pp. 20–21.
- 4.107. H.S. Nash, ‘Is There a Native Metaphysical Element in the New Testament?’, p. 93.
- 4.108. R.N. Longenecker, *The Christology of Early Jewish Christianity*, p. 9.
- 4.109. W. Pannenberg, ‘What is Truth?’, p. 9.
- 4.110. D.E.H. Whiteley, *The Theology of St. Paul*, p. 107.
- 4.111. A.T. Hanson, *The Image of the Invisible God*, p. 16.
- 4.112. R.H. Fuller, *The Foundations of New Testament Christology*, pp. 248–49.

NOTES TO CHAPTER FIVE

5.1. For brief but well informed reviews of scholarship on the issue of the *Mitte* of Pauline theology, see G. Hasel, *New Testament Theology: Basic Issues in the Current Debate*, pp. 140–64; J.C. Beker, *Paul*, pp. 13–15; R. Martin, *Reconciliation*, pp. 1–3, 32–47; E.P. Sanders, *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People*, pp. 4–6. The important German debate about the righteousness of God as centre for Paul is summarized in E.P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, pp. 434–42.

5.2. For exegesis of the passages which reflect Paul’s missionary preaching (I Thess. 1. 9–10; Gal. 4. 8–9; I Cor. 8. 4–6; 15. 3–5; Rom. 1. 18–32), see C. Bussmann, *Themen der paulinischen Missionspredigt auf den Hintergrund der spätjüdisch-hellenistischen Missionsliteratur*, pp. 39–123.

5.3. The very form of this question may have obscured our grasp of Paulinism. Would the apostle who penned I Cor. 15. 11 ('so we preach and so you believed') have thought that what was distinctive in his Christianity was as important as what he shared with the whole church?

5.4. General NT teaching on the subject of angels and demons is discussed in J.S. Stewart, 'On a Neglected Emphasis in New Testament Theology'; W. Manson, 'Principalities and Powers: The Spiritual Background of the Work of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels'; T. Ling, *The Significance of Satan*; H. Schlier, *Principalities and Powers in the New Testament*; O. Böcher, *Das Neue Testament und die dämonischen Mächte*. On angels and demons in Paul, see O. Everling, *Die paulinische Angelologie und Dämonologie*; M. Dibelius, *Die Geisterwelt im Glauben des Paulus*; G.H.C. MacGregor, 'Principalities and Powers: The Cosmic Background of Paul's Thought'; G.B. Caird, *Principalities and Powers*; T.W. Manson, 'The Cosmic Significance of Christ'; J. Kallas, *The Satanward View*; D.E.H. Whiteley, *The Theology of St. Paul*, pp. 18–31; A.W. Carr, *Angels and Principalities*.

5.5. This old rule of thumb was confirmed by S. Herner's study *Die Anwendung des Wortes ΚΥΡΙΟΣ im Neuen Testament*, pp. 27–28, 48.

5.6. See the literature cited in note 2 of chapter one above.

5.7. N.A. Dahl, 'The One God of Jews and Gentiles', pp. 188–91.

5.8. Both F.F. Bruce (*The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians*, p. 178) and H.D. Betz (*Galatians*, p. 171, note 78) quote older commentators who spoke of hundreds of different interpretations of this statement.

5.9. For a similar point, see S. Ben-Chorin, *Paulus: Der Völkerapostel in jüdischer Sicht*, pp. 9, 168, 181. Paul's Christian application of traditional Jewish theological language is explored with reference to one divine attribute in J.M. Bassler, *Divine Impartiality: Paul and a Theological Axiom*.

5.10. See the brief discussion of πλήρωμα in Eph. 1. 23 in C.F.D. Moule, *The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Colossians and to Philemon*, pp. 167–69.

5.11. See, e.g., Betz, pp. 168–70; Bruce, p. 177.

5.12. H.B. Swete, *The Holy Spirit in the New Testament*, pp. 289–94; A. Richardson, *An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament*, pp. 120–24.

5.13. See, e.g., U. Wilckens, *Weisheit und Torheit*, pp. 71–74.

5.14. R. Baumann, *Mitte und Norm des Christlichen*, pp. 110–111; J.D.G. Dunn, *Christology in the Making*, pp. 176–79.

5.15. A. van Roon, 'The Relation between Christ and the Wisdom of God according to Paul'.

5.16. E. Käsemann, "'The Righteousness of God" in Paul', in *New Testament Questions of Today*, pp. 168–82.

5.17. Note the comment of K.H. Schelkle on the word θεϊότης: 'wodurch die Gottheit nach ihrer Natur, die Göttlichkeit, bezeichnet wird' (*Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, II, 228, note 23).

5.18. W. Pannenberg, 'The Appropriation of the Philosophical Concept of God as a Dogmatic Problem of Early Christian Theology', p. 136.

5.19. H. Koester, 'ΦΥΣΙΣ', pp. 255, 272. See also the excellent discussion of this part of Gal. 4. 8 in Betz, pp. 214–15.

NOTES TO CHAPTER SIX

- 6.1. G.A. Deissmann, *St. Paul: A Study in Social and Religious History*, pp. 235–60; see also G. Ogg, *The Chronology of the Life of Paul*, pp. 104–15; R. Jewett, *Dating Paul's Life*, pp. 38–40, 96–100; J. Murphy-O'Connor, *St. Paul's Corinth*, pp. 129–52 (sceptical of Orosius and Acts, but agrees that Paul went before Gallio in the summer of A.D. 51).
- 6.2. O. Broneer, 'Paul and the Pagan cults at Isthmia', p. 169.
- 6.3. But see now C. Hemer, 'Observations on Pauline Chronology'; H. Koester, *Introduction to the New Testament*, II, 102–04 (both writers conclude that Paul's eighteen months in Corinth ended in A.D. 52).
- 6.4. M.J. Harris, '2 Corinthians', pp. 306–07; Koester, *Introduction*, II, 120–21.
- 6.5. G. Lüdemann, 'A Chronology of Paul', pp. 303–04. This article summarizes the basic argument of Lüdemann's book, *Paul, Apostle to the Gentiles. Vol. I: Studies in Chronology*, which may be consulted for full details.
- 6.6. Koester, *Introduction*, II, 109; A.J.M. Wedderburn, 'Some Recent Pauline Chronologies', pp. 105–06.
- 6.7. In Schürer/Vermes/Millar/Black, III, 1, p. 77, note 91.
- 6.8. M. Hengel, 'Christology and New Testament Chronology', p. 31; cf. p. 39.
- 6.9. Representative is the treatment of I Corinthians in Koester, *Introduction*, II, 120–26, which assumes throughout that the epistle is a unity.
- 6.10. The most notable exponent of this line of criticism is W. Schmithals. See *Gnosticism in Corinth*, pp. 87–96. There is an able summary of some nine partition theories by modern German scholars in H. Merklein, 'Die Einheitlichkeit des ersten Korintherbriefes', pp. 154–56.
- 6.11. 'Sakrament und Ethik bei Paulus. Zur Frage der literarischen und theologischen Einheitlichkeit von 1 Kor. 8–10'.
- 6.12. See J. Hurd, *The Origin of I Corinthians*, pp. 131–37, 141–42; C.K. Barrett, 'Things Sacrificed to Idols', pp. 148–49; G.D. Fee, 'Εἰδωλόθυτα Once Again: An Interpretation of I Corinthians 8–10', pp. 174–78; J.C. Brunt, 'Love, Freedom, and Moral Responsibility: The Contribution of I Cor. 8–10 to an Understanding of Paul's Ethical Thinking', pp. 19–20; F.M. Young, 'Notes on the Corinthian Correspondence', pp. 563–65; Merklein, pp. 163–73.
- 6.13. On the trinitarian clause, see G. Lindeskog, *Studien zum neutestamentlichen Schöpfungsgedanken*, pp. 208–09; G. Zuntz, *The Text of the Epistles*, p. 164.
- 6.14. See Hurd, pp. 65–74.
- 6.15. The alternative reading οἶδα μὲν (revived in J. Jeremias, 'Zur Gedankenführung in den paulinischen Briefen', p. 273) founders on the absence of a corresponding δέ after either v 1 or v 4.
- 6.16. It is not clear whether this is what A. Ehrhardt means in 'Social Problems in the Early Church', p. 277.
- 6.17. Bauer/Arndt/Gingrich/Danker, on οἶδα, meaning 1. e, p. 556; see also J. Munck, *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind*, p. 126. C.E.B. Cranfield is cautious about this connotation of οἶδαμεν in I Cor. 8. 1, 4 ('Changes of Person and Number in Paul's Epistles', p. 285).
- 6.18. C.H. Giblin, 'Three Monotheistic Texts in Paul', p. 530.
- 6.19. See, e.g., J. Weiss, p. 219; Hurd, pp. 120–23; Conzelmann (German), p. 169.

6.20. Jeremiah speaks too starkly of a contradiction between v 1 and v 7, but succeeds thereby in highlighting the contrast ('Gedankenführung', p. 273).

6.21. Barrett, p. 191; C. Bussmann, *Themen der paulinischen Missionspredigt*, p. 76.

6.22. For the same conclusion, see Bousset; Ruef.

6.23. See, e.g., O. Cullmann, *The Earliest Christian Confessions*, p. 42; V.H. Neufeld, *The Earliest Christian Confessions*, p. 44; H. Hegemann, *Die Vorstellung vom Schöpfungsmittler im hellenistischen Judentum und Urchristentum*, p. 111; W. Kramer, *Christ, Lord, Son of God*, sec. 22b, p. 95; R. Deichgräber, *Gotteshymnus und Christushymnus in der frühen Christenheit*, pp. 79, 116; Conzelmann (German), p. 170; J.G. Gibbs, *Creation and Redemption*, p. 59; J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*, p. 19; K. Wengst, *Christologische Formeln und Lieder des Urchristentums*, p. 136; R. Kerst, 'I Kor. 8:6—ein vorpaulinisches Taufbekenntnis?', p. 130; R.A. Horsley, 'The Background of the Confessional Formula in I Kor 8:6', p. 130; J. Murphy-O'Connor, 'I Cor., VIII, 6: Cosmology or Soteriology?', pp. 254–55; Wolff, pp. 7–10; G. Haufe, 'Funktion und Interpretation urchristlicher Bekenntnissätze', cols 786–87. The references in following paragraphs of the text are to these works.

6.24. See, e.g., J. Weiss, pp. 223–24; J. Dupont, *Gnosis*, p. 346; Héring, pp. 68–71; A. Feuillet, *Le Christ sagesse de Dieu*, pp. 59–85; W. Thüsing, *Per Christum in Deum*, p. 225; E.E. Ellis, 'Traditions in 1 Corinthians', pp. 494–95.

6.25. Barrett, p. 192.

6.26. For suggestions about the pre-history of the material, see Cullmann, *Confessions*, p. 32; Kramer, secs 22b–g, pp. 95–99; Deichgräber, p. 116; P.H. Langkammer, 'Literarische und theologische Einzelstücke in I Kor. VIII. 6'; K. Wengst, *Formeln*, pp. 136–43; Kerst, 'Taufbekenntnis?'; H.F. von Campenhausen, 'Das Bekenntnis im Urchristentum', p. 223, note 27, p. 232, p. 235, note 89.

6.27. Barrett, 'Things Sacrificed', pp. 145–46.

6.28. Ehrhardt, p. 279.

6.29. On Greco-Roman cult meals at which the god was believed to be the host, see K. Maly, *Mündige Gemeinde*, pp. 93–96; Lietzmann, pp. 49–51. The emphasis of W.L. Willis on the purely socio-religious significance of Hellenistic cult-meals (*Idol Meat in Corinth*, pp. 62–64, 218–20) is one-sided, in the light of I Cor. 10. 14, 18–20.

6.30. N. Walter, 'Christusglaube und heidnische Religiosität in paulinischen Gemeinden', p. 427; Willis, pp. 62–64.

6.31. J. Weiss, pp. 211–12.

6.32. H.J. Cadbury, 'The Macellum of Corinth', pp. 140–41.

6.33. See, e.g., the comments on the commercial building north of the basilica on the west side of the Lechaion Road in O. Broneer, 'Corinth. Center of Paul's Missionary Work in Greece', pp. 89–90.

6.34. Note also the information from non-biblical sources supporting this point in Barrett, 'Things Sacrificed', pp. 145–46.

6.35. J. Weiss, p. 211.

6.36. On the terminology, see F. Büchsel, 'ΕΙΔΩΛΟΝ', p. 378.

6.37. See also the Jewish prohibitions concerning idol-meat gathered in Str./B., III, 377–78.

6.38. For surveys, see D. Georgi, *Die Gegner des Paulus im 2. Korintherbrief*, pp. 7–16; D. Guthrie, *New Testament Introduction*, pp. 422–24; J.J. Gunther, *Paul's Opponents and Their Background*; C. Machalet,

‘Paulus und seine Gegner. Eine Untersuchung zu den Korintherbriefen’; E.M. Yamauchi, *Pre-Christian Gnosticism*, pp. 39–43; E.E. Ellis, ‘Paul and His Opponents: Trends in the Research’.

6.39. D.W. Lütgert, *Freiheitspredigt und Schwarmgeister in Korinth*, pp. 87–96; R. Bultmann, ‘ΓΙΝΩΣΚΩ’, pp. 708–11; U. Wilckens, *Weisheit und Torheit*, pp. 205–13; Barrett, ‘Things Sacrificed’, pp. 151–52; H.H. Koester, ‘Paul and Hellenism’, pp. 190–91; K. Niederwimmer, *Der Begriff der Freiheit im Neuen Testament*, pp. 200–05; W. Schmithals, *Gnosticism in Corinth*, p. 36–86, 229; also *Paul and the Gnostics*, pp. 239–45.

6.40. R.M. Wilson, *The Gnostic Problem*; also *Gnosis and the New Testament*; also ‘How Gnostic Were the Corinthians?’; also ‘Gnosis at Corinth’; [abstract of] W.T. Sawyer, ‘The Problem of Meat Sacrificed to Idols in the Corinthian Church’; S. Arai, ‘Die Gegner des Paulus im I. Korintherbrief und das Problem der Gnosis’; H.-J. Klauck, *Herrenmahl und hellenistischer Kult*, p. 244.

6.41. Dupont, pp. 283–85; W. Bieder, ‘Paulus und seine Gegner in Korinth’; E.E. Ellis, “‘Wisdom’ and ‘Knowledge’ in I Corinthians”, pp. 86–98; also ‘Paul and His Opponents’, pp. 284–98; Gunther, p. 315; B.A. Pearson, *The Pneumatikos-Psychikos Terminology in I Corinthians*, pp. 43, 83; R.A. Horsley, ‘Consciousness and Freedom Among the Corinthians: 1 Corinthians 8–10’; also “‘How Can Some of You Say That There is No Resurrection of the Dead?’” Spiritual Elitism in Corinth’; also ‘Gnosis in Corinth: I Corinthians 8:1–6’.

6.42. H.E.W. Turner: Paul was addressing unprincipled libertines typical of a port city (cited in Yamauchi, p. 42); J. Painter: Paul’s addressees were influenced by pagan mysteries (‘Paul and the Πνευματικοί at Corinth’); P. Marshall: Paul’s enemies were hybrists (‘Hybrists Not Gnostics in Corinth’).

6.43. Dupont, pp. 320–21; T.W. Manson, ‘The Corinthian Correspondence. (1)’, pp. 200, 207; M. Coune, ‘Le problème des idolothytes et l’éducation de la syneidêsis’, pp. 503–05; K. Maly, *Mündige Gemeinde*, p. 97; [abstract of] W.T. Sawyer, p. 1285–A.

6.44. Gouge, p. 69; J. Weiss, p. 211; Bultmann, ‘Gnosis’, p. 20; Brunt, ‘Love’, p. 21.

6.45. G. Theissen, ‘The Strong and the Weak in Corinth: A Sociological Analysis of a Theological Quarrel’. See also Walter, ‘Christusglaube’.

6.46. W. Lütgert, *Freiheitspredigt*, pp. 87–96; Schmithals, *Paul and the Gnostics*, pp. 239–45; Ellis, ‘Paul and His Opponents’, p. 291, note 92.

6.47. Georgi, p. 301; Koester, *Introduction*, II, 121, 126–27.

6.48. D. Guthrie, *Introduction*, p. 424; Ellis, “‘Wisdom’ and ‘Knowledge’”, p. 83; also ‘Paul and His Opponents’, pp. 286–87.

6.49. Machalet, pp. 191–95. See also Munck, pp. 135–67 [overstated]; Brunt, ‘Love’, p. 20.

6.50. Barrett, ‘Things Sacrificed’, pp. 150–52; Horsley, ‘Gnosis in Corinth’, p. 43; Koester, *Introduction*, II, 121.

6.51. See, e.g., Guthrie, *Introduction*, p. 424.

6.52. Machalet, p. 195.

6.53. Hurd, pp. 117–25; Brunt, ‘Love’, p. 20.

6.54. Jeremias, ‘Gedankenführung’, pp. 273–74.

6.55. See J.C. Brunt, ‘Rejected, Ignored, or Misunderstood? The Fate of Paul’s Approach to the Problem of Food Offered to Idols in Early Christianity’, pp. 113–15.

6.56. For careful exegesis of this difficult verse, see Jeremias, ‘Gedankenführung’, p. 274; J. Murphy-O’Connor, ‘Food and Spiritual Gifts in 1 Cor. 8:8’.

6.57. *Conzelmann* (German), pp. 169–70.

6.58. Dunn, *Christology in the Making*, p. 180. For a similar point, see *Héring*, p. 71.

6.59. Bussmann, pp. 76–80. For similar views, see Gibbs, *Creation and Redemption*, p. 66; Giblin, pp. 530, 533.

6.60. Haufe, col. 790; Ellis, ‘Traditions’, p. 494.

NOTES TO CHAPTER SEVEN

7.1. For such an exegesis, see B.B. Warfield, *The Lord of Glory*, pp. 215–16. Warfield’s assertions are effectively criticized by Beyschlag’s observations about Paul’s use of the word θεός in 8. 4–6, alluded to on the same page in Warfield. See also my criticisms in chapter ten.

7.2. F.M.M. Sagnard, ‘A propos de I Cor., VIII, 6’, p. 56; W. Schrage, ‘Theologie und Christologie bei Paulus und Jesus auf dem Hintergrund der modernen Gottesfrage’, p. 123.

7.3. See *Ellicott*, *Meyer*, *Robertson/Plummer*, *Orr/Walther*; also H.P. Liddon, *The Divinity of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ*, p. 310, note h; J. Dupont, *Gnosis*, p. 333; Schrage, p. 133; H. Hegermann, *Die Vorstellung vom Schöpfungsmittler im hellenistischen Judentum und Urchristentum*, p. 135; C. Bussmann, *Themen der paulinischen Missionspredigt*, p. 77; J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*, p. 19.

NOTES TO CHAPTER EIGHT

8.1. *Ambrosiaster*; *Jerome*; *Ephraem Syrus*; *Photius*; *Abelard*; *Atto de Verceil*; *Luther*; *Calvin*; the King James version; *Bengel*; *Godet*; *Stanley*; *Allo*; and J. Murphy-O’Connor, ‘Freedom or the Ghetto’, p. 546 [Photius and Luther are cited by other commentators and have not been consulted directly].

8.2. In favour of the attributive construction, see *Meyer*; *Ellicott*; *Bachmann*; *J. Weiss*; *Robertson/Plummer*; *Groscheide*; *Héring*; *Barrett*; H.-J. Klauck, *Herrenmahl und hellenistischer Kult*, p. 244, note 20.

8.3. C.H. Giblin, ‘Three Monotheistic Texts in Paul’, p. 531; Murphy-O’Connor, ‘Freedom’, p. 546.

8.4. See Bauer/Arndt/Gingrich/Danker, pp. 445–47; H. Sasse, ‘ΚΟΣΜΕΩ, ΚΟΣΜΟΣ’, p. 889; G.E. Ladd, *A Theology of the New Testament*, p. 397.

8.5. With *T.C. Edwards*. Against F.C. Baur, *Paul*, II, 257, note 1; *J. Weiss*; *E. Evans*; A. Schlatter, *Paulus: Der Bote Jesu*, p. 253; *Moffatt*; *Groscheide*; K. Maly, *Mündige Gemeinde*, p. 105; *Conzelmann*; H. Schlier, *Grundzüge einer paulinischen Theologie*, p. 30; *Wolff*; Klauck, p. 242.

8.6. See J.L. McKenzie, ‘The Hebrew Attitude Towards Mythological Polytheism’, pp. 332–34; H. Funke, ‘Götterbild’, cols 714–16; M. Robertson, ‘Greek Art and Religion’, p. 169.

8.7. See Liddell/Scott; *Bachmann*; *J. Weiss*; C.H. Dodd, *The Bible and the Greeks*, p. 23.

8.8. So *Bachmann*; A. Feuillet, *Le Christ sagesse de Dieu*, p. 61, note 2; *Héring*; *Barrett*.

8.9. So *Chrysostom*; *Olshausen*; *Stanley*; *Godet*; *J. Weiss*; J.G. Gibbs, *Creation and Redemption*, p. 62; Klauck, p. 244.

8.10. Blass/Debrunner/Rehkopf, sec. 452.3, p. 382.

8.11. Commentators who read the text in this way include *Godet*; *Meyer*; *Ellicott*; *Héring*.

- 8.12. See Giblin, p. 533; Blass/Debrunner/Rehkopf, sec. 475.2, pp. 405–06.
- 8.13. H.W. Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, first edition (1916), sec. 1435, p. 352; see also secs 1436, 1281a, 1310a, on pp. 353, 315, 322, respectively.
- 8.14. Smyth, sec. 1281a, p. 315.
- 8.15. See Blass/Debrunner/Rehkopf, sec. 452.3, p. 382; Bauer/Arndt/Gingrich/Danker, on εἶ, meaning VI, 11, p. 220; *De Wette*; *Edwards*; *Bachmann*; *Robertson/Plummer*; Maly, p. 105; *Conzelmann*; *Klauck*, p. 244.
- 8.16. *Edwards*; *Heinrici*; Maly, p. 105; *Wolff*.
- 8.17. Blass/Debrunner/Rehkopf, sec. 454.3, p. 384; *J. Weiss*; Maly, p. 105, note 32.
- 8.18. See, e.g., *Edwards*; *Ellicott*.
- 8.19. As in Genesis 1. 1. See *Conzelmann*.
- 8.20. *J. Weiss*; *Schlatter*, *Bote Jesu*, p. 254.
- 8.21. For this view, see *J. Moffatt*; H. Schlier, *Principalities and Powers in the New Testament*, pp. 26–27; *Bruce*; *Orr/Walther*.
- 8.22. So most commentators. See also Baur, *Paul*, II, 256; H. Weinel, *St. Paul: The Man and His Work*, p. 22; M. Dibelius, *Die Geisterwelt im Glauben des Paulus*, p. 77; H. von Soden, ‘Sakrament und Ethik’, p. 241.
- 8.23. Feuillet, *Christ sagesse*, p. 63.
- 8.24. *Theodoret*: κατὰ τὴν Ἑλλήνων θιλοσοφίαν λέγει. See also *Bengel*.
- 8.25. *Die paulinische Angelologie und Dämonologie*, pp. 25–26.
- 8.26. See the passages collected from the LXX, *Baruch*, *I Enoch*, *Jubilees*, *Sibylline Oracles*, and the Targumim, in Str./B., III, 51–52; Bousset/Gressmann, pp. 304–06.
- 8.27. *Kuss*; K.H. Schelkle, ‘Gott der Eine und Dreieine’, p. 83; also ‘Die Schöpfung in Christus’, p. 209.
- 8.28. See the comments on ancient demonology in Dibelius, *Geisterwelt*, pp. 67–71.
- 8.29. This is the conclusion of most commentators. See Everling, p. 29; Dibelius, *Geisterwelt*, pp. 77–78; *Chrysostom*; *Olshausen*; *Meyer*; *Edwards*; *Godet*; *Ellicott*; *Heinrici*; *Robertson/Plummer*; *Lietzmann*; *Morris*; *Wendland*; *Barrett*.
- 8.30. G.H.C. MacGregor, ‘Principalities and Powers: The Cosmic Background of Paul’s Thought’, p. 18; H. Schlier, *Principalities and Powers in the New Testament*, p. 11.
- 8.31. *Bachmann*.
- 8.32. See Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, first edition (1916), sec. 941, p. 243; and *Greek Grammar*, revised edition (1956), sec. 1496.
- 8.33. W.A. Meeks, *The First Urban Christians*, pp. 165–70.
- 8.34. *J. Weiss*; Giblin, p. 534; J. Murphy-O’Connor, ‘I Cor., VIII, 6: Cosmology or Soteriology?’, p. 258.

- 8.35. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, I, 229; Conzelmann; W. Schrage, 'Theologie und Christologie bei Paulus auf dem Hintergrund der modernen Gottesfrage', p. 124; E. Grässer, "'Ein Einziger ist Gott'", pp. 198–99.
- 8.36. V.H. Neufeld, *The Earliest Christian Confessions*, pp. 36–37. See also W. Kramer, *Christ, Lord, Son of God*, sec. 22b, p. 95.
- 8.37. H. Schlier, *Grundzüge*, pp. 30–32.
- 8.38. See E. Stauffer, 'ΕΙΣ', pp. 434–35; G.A.F. Knight, 'The Lord is One', p. 8; M. Barth, *Ephesians*, II, 464.
- 8.39. L. Goppelt, 'Die Herrschaft Christi und die Welt', p. 114.
- 8.40. G. Delling, 'Zusammengesetzte Gottes- und Christusbezeichnungen in den Paulusbriefen', p. 418, note 8; p. 419, note 13; Parry.
- 8.41. *Heinrici*; Godet; Schlatter, *Bote Jesu*, p. 255; Morris; L. Cerfaux, *Christ in the Theology of St. Paul*, p. 450, note 11; Maly, p. 108; Barrett.
- 8.42. G. Schrenk, 'ΠΑΤΗΡ', p. 1012; Edwards; Conzelmann; R. Kerst, '1 Kor 8:6—ein vorpaulinisches Taufbekenntnis?', pp. 132–33; Wolff.
- 8.43. *Chrysostom*; *Bachmann*.
- 8.44. The four exceptions are: Rom. 8. 15; II Cor. 1.3b; 6. 18; Gal. 4. 6.
- 8.45. This view has been defended in J. Coppens, 'Dieu le Père dans le théologie paulinienne'.
- 8.46. K. Rahner, 'Theos in the New Testament', pp. 125–48; M.J. Harris, 'Use of ΘΕΟΣ in the New Testament', pp. 28–41.
- 8.47. On the whole passage, see G. Bornkamm, 'The Praise of God. Romans 11. 33–36'.
- 8.48. F.M.M. Sagnard, 'A propos de I Cor., VIII, 6'; A. Feuillet, *Christ sagesse*, pp. 63–64; Murphy-O'Connor, 'Cosmology?', p. 264.
- 8.49. Against *J. Weiss*. With W. Thüsing, *Per Christum in Deum*, pp. 228–29; *Héring*; *Conzelmann*.
- 8.50. Against *Héring*.
- 8.51. So *Chrysostom* and nearly all commentators.
- 8.52. See Bauer/Arndt/Gingrich/Danker, 'ΠΑΣ', meaning 2. b. β., p. 633; B.F. Westcott, *Saint Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians*, pp. 186–87; G. Lindeskog, *Studien zum neutestamentlichen Schöpfungsgedanken*, pp. 178–86, 208.
- 8.53. So *Bengel*; Bauer/Arndt/Gingrich/Danker, p. 633; B. Reicke, 'ΠΑΣ', pp. 893–94; H. Sasse, 'ΚΟΣΜΕΝ, ΚΟΣΜΟΣ', p. 884; *Ambrosiaster*; *Ellicott*; *Bachmann*; *Parry*; Cerfaux, pp. 419–20; O. Cullmann, 'Die Schöpfung im Neuen Testament', p. 60; G. Delling, *Die Botschaft des Paulus*, p. 28, note 5 ('zuerst die Menschenwelt'); *Conzelmann*; J. Gibbs, 'Pauline Christology and the Ecological Crisis', p. 473, note 27; also *Creation and Redemption*, p. 61; M. Barth, 'Christ and All Things', p. 163 with p. 171, note 9; H.S. Hwang, *Die Verwendung des Wortes πᾶς in den paulinischen Briefen*, pp. 13, 88–89; E.E. Ellis, 'Traditions in I Corinthians', p. 501, note 105.
- 8.54. Thüsing, *Per Christum in Deum*, pp. 226–28.
- 8.55. *Parry*; J. Dupont, *Gnosis*, p. 345.
- 8.56. 'I Cor., VIII, 6: Cosmology or Soteriology?' Page references in the text are to this article.

- 8.57. E.F. Osborn, 'The Unity of God in Pauline Thought', p. 40. For a similar point, see D.R. deLacey, "'One Lord" in Pauline Christology', p. 199.
- 8.58. *Morris*.
- 8.59. For a similar point, see *Bengel*.
- 8.60. N. Turner, in J.H. Moulton, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, III, 325.
- 8.61. See, e.g., N. Rostron, *The Christology of St. Paul*, p. 112; H. Hommel, *Schöpfer und Erhalter*, p. 100 [?].
- 8.62. So, e.g., *Chrysostom; Theodoret; Bengel; Meyer; Godet; Bachmann; Parry; Groscheide; Orr/Walther; Wolff*.
- 8.63. *Robertson/Plummer*. On Paul's use of ἡμεῖς for 'us as distinct from others', see E.P. Sanders, *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People*, p. 175; and p. 201, note 12.
- 8.64. Feuillet, *Christ sagesse*, pp. 66–67.
- 8.65. A. Vögtle, *Das Neue Testament und die Zukunft des Kosmos*, pp. 169–70; J.G. Gibbs, *Creation and Redemption, passim*.
- 8.66. *Calvin*.
- 8.67. *Meyer; Godet; Ellicott; Gibbs, Creation and Redemption*, p. 61; *Wolff*. A. Vögtle sees no clear implications in this phrase for the future of the world in an objective sense, but thinks it expresses an interest in the church's finding salvation in God (*NT und Zukunft*, pp. 169–70).
- 8.68. *J. Weiss; Schlatter, Bote Jesu*, pp. 255–56; G. Dellinger, 'Zur paulinischen Teleologie', col. 709; *Craig; Thrall; Thüsing, Per Christum in Deum*, pp. 230–31; *Conzelmann*.
- 8.69. H.M. Kleinknecht, 'ΘΕΟΣ', pp. 77–78.

NOTES TO CHAPTER NINE

- 9.1. J.M. Robinson, 'The Witness of Paul: Christ, the Lord', pp. 141–42.
- 9.2. F.C. Baur, *Paul*, II, 242–43; *Godet; J. Weiss; W. Bousset, Kyrios Christos* (English), p. 147, note 103.
- 9.3. *Die Geisteskultur von Tarsos im augusteischen Zeitalter*, pp. 18–19. For an application of this result to I Cor. 8. 6, see 'Zum Begriff Kyrios bei Paulus', p. 23.
- 9.4. E. von Dobschütz, 'ΚΥΡΙΟΣ ΙΗΣΟΥΣ', p. 105.
- 9.5. W. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos* (English), pp. 138–47; G.A. Deissmann, *Light From the Ancient East*, pp. 338–78; W. Foerster, 'ΚΥΡΙΟΣ', pp. 1046–58.
- 9.6. See the examples in Deissmann, *Light*, pp. 352, note 6; p. 353; p. 361, notes 5, 6.
- 9.7. See Deissmann, *Light*, p. 352, note 6; Dobschütz, 'ΚΥΡΙΟΣ ΙΗΣΟΥΣ', p. 116.
- 9.8. See Foerster, 'ΚΥΡΙΟΣ', p. 1050.
- 9.9. *Ibid*.

- 9.10. See the generalizations in Foerster, p. 1051; S. Schulz, 'Maranatha und Kyrios Jesus', p. 127.
- 9.11. Stanley; Craig; Groscheide; Morris; L. Cerfaux, *Christ in the Theology of St. Paul*, p. 476; L. Sabourin, *Les noms et les titres de Jésus*, p. 245; Wendland; K. Maly, *Mündige Gemeinde*, p. 107; Conzelmann; Wolff.
- 9.12. For the material in this paragraph, see Bousset; Wendland; G.A.F. Knight, 'The Lord is One', p. 8; J.G. Gibbs, *Creation and Redemption*, p. 63; O. Kuss, *Paulus*, p. 360, note 2; G.E. Ladd, *A Theology of the New Testament*, p. 416; L. Goppelt, 'Herrschaft', p. 114; also *Theology of the New Testament*, p. 83.
- 9.13. A.D. Nock, 'Early Gentile Christianity and Its Hellenistic Background', pp. 84, 87; Foerster, 'ΚΥΡΙΟΣ', pp. 1041–46.
- 9.14. See, e.g., G. Dalman, *The Words of Jesus*, pp. 182–83; L. Goppelt, 'Herrschaft', p. 114; D.R. de Lacey, "'One Lord" in Pauline Christology', pp. 191–95.
- 9.15. *KΥΡΙΟΣ als Gottesname im Judentum und seine Stellung in der Religionsgeschichte*, III, 698.
- 9.16. See B.J. Roberts, *The Old Testament Text and Versions*, pp. 173–74; P.E. Kahle, *The Cairo Geniza*, pp. 218–28 (esp. p. 222); Schulz, pp. 128–34; P. Vielhauer, 'Zur Frage der christologischen Hoheitstitel', cols 571–72; H. Conzelmann, *An Outline of the Theology of the New Testament*, pp. 83–84.
- 9.17. M. Black, 'The Christological Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament', p. 10; C.F.D. Moule, *The Origin of Christology*, pp. 35–46; J.A. Fitzmyer, 'The Semitic Background of the New Testament Kyrios-Title'. Some Jewish scholars suggest that the avoidance of κύριος by Josephus and the rabbis may have been due to reaction against its use by Christians. See S. Zeitlin, 'The Liturgy of the First Night of Passover', p. 443; L. Feldman, *Josephus and Modern Scholarship, 1937–1980*, p. 425.
- 9.18. Goppelt, 'Herrschaft', p. 114; R.E. Brown, *Jesus: God and Man*, p. 29, note 50.
- 9.19. Theodoret, in *Catena graecorum patrum in Novum Testamentum*, edited by J.A. Cramer, V, 160; Bengel; V. Taylor, *The Person of Christ in New Testament Teaching*, pp. 42–43. See also F. Kattenbusch, *Das apostolische Symbol*, II, 599, 601; J.G. Machen, *The Origin of Paul's Religion*, pp. 306–09; O. Cullmann, *The Christology of the New Testament*, p. 234–37; Fitzmyer, 'Semitic Background', p. 130–32.
- 9.20. In I Corinthians, J. Weiss adduced 4. 19; 3. 5; 7. 17 for a reference of κύριος to God. But see the critical comments in D. Somerville, *St. Paul's Conception of Christ*, p. 135, note 3; B.B. Warfield, *The Lord of Glory*, p. 208, note. S. Herner considers 3. 5; 4. 19; 7. 17; 10. 9; 11. 32; 16. 7 to be ambiguous, possibly referring to either God or Christ, but he thinks that a reference to God is probable only in 3. 5 (*Die Anwendung des Wortes KΥΡΙΟΣ im Neuen Testament*, pp. 27–28, 48). On Paul's use of κύριος in general, see Foerster, 'ΚΥΡΙΟΣ', pp. 1086–95.
- 9.21. N.T. Wright, 'The Messiah and the People of God', pp. 10–32; against, e.g., W. Kramer, *Christ, Lord, Son of God*, sec. 15c, p. 68.
- 9.22. F.F. Bruce speaks of 'christianizing the Shema'. See also Wright, pp. 42–44; p. 279, notes 180–84; de Lacey, pp. 195–97, 200–01; R.M. Grant, *Gods and the One God*, pp. 150–51.
- 9.23. On the use of διὰ to indicate origin, see A.E.F. Schettler, *Die paulinische Formel 'durch Christus'*, pp. 14–15; W. Thüsing, *Per Christum in Deum*, pp. 168–69; Blass/Debrunner/Rehkopf, section 223, meaning 3 and note 7, pp. 180–81; Bauer/Arndt/Gingrich/Danker, 'διὰ', meanings A. III. 2. b. β. and γ., p. 180.
- 9.24. Kugelmann.
- 9.25. On the phrase in Rom. 11. 36, see H. Hommel, *Schöpfer und Erhalter*, p. 106. For a similar exegesis of I Cor. 8. 6, see Baur, *Paul*, II, 242–44; C. Holsten, *Das Evangelium des Paulus*, I, 309–10, note ***; H.N.B. Ridderbos, *Paul: An Outline of His Theology*, p. 82.
- 9.26. Schettler, p. 15; Blass/Debrunner/Rehkopf, section 223, meaning 3 and note 6, p. 181; Bauer/Arndt/Gingrich/Danker, 'διὰ', meaning A. III. 2. a, p. 180.

9.27. So *Chrysostom; Locke; Bengel; Godet; Thüsing, Per Christum in Deum*, pp. 229–30; *Bruce; Gibbs, Creation and Redemption*, pp. 60–62.

9.28. Note especially Schettler, *‘Durch Christus’*, pp. 17–18; G. Lindeskog, *Studien zum neutestamentlichen Schöpfungsgedanken*, pp. 207–16, 243; H. Hegermann, *Die Vorstellung vom Schöpfungsmittler*, p. 113, note 1; O. Cullmann, ‘Die Schöpfung im Neuen Testament’, p. 60; B. Jendorff, *Der Logosbegriff*, pp. 127–28; P. Benoit, ‘Préexistence et Incarnation’, pp. 14–15; K.H. Schelkle, ‘Die Schöpfung in Christus’, p. 209; Gibbs, *Creation and Redemption*, pp. 59, 71; R.G. Hamerton-Kelly, *Pre-existence, Wisdom, and the Son of Man*, pp. 130–31; A. Oepke, ‘Δι’ Α’, p. 67; R.S. Barbour, ‘Creation, Wisdom and Christ’, p. 31; N.A. Dahl, ‘Christ, Creation, and the Church’, p. 131; P.-E. Bonnard, ‘De la Sagesse personnifiée dans l’Ancien Testament à la Sagesse en personne dans le Nouveau’, p. 141; G. Schimanowski, *Weisheit und Messias*, pp. 317–20; R.M. Grant, *Gods and the One God*, pp. 100–01, 112–13.

9.29. See, e.g., G.B. Caird, ‘The Development of the Doctrine of Christ in the New Testament’; C.H. Giblin, ‘Three Monotheistic Texts in Paul’, p. 534; p. 535, note 41; J.A. Ziesler, *The Jesus Question*, pp. 75–77. For similar doubts about the personality of the pre-cosmic Logos in John 1. 3 and related NT passages, see M. Teschendorf, ‘Der Schöpfungsgedanke im Neuen Testament’, p. 370.

9.30. Note also the critical reviews of Dunn’s treatment of Paul’s pre-existence passages in J.F. Balchin, ‘Paul, Wisdom and Christ’; A.T. Hanson, *The Image of the Invisible God*, pp. 59–76. Dunn replies to his critics in ‘In Defence of a Methodology’, but their criticisms of his specific exegetical results stand.

9.31. De Lacey, p. 199.

9.32. *Morris*.

9.33. N. Turner, in J.H. Moulton, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, III, 325.

9.34. See note 61 to chapter eight. In addition to the commentators listed there, see *Héring*.

9.35. For authorities, see note 62 to chapter eight.

9.36. Schettler, p. 27.

9.37. *Meyer; Godet; Ellicott*.

9.38. See note 68 to chapter eight, and especially Thüsing, *Per Christum in Deum*, p. 232.

NOTES TO CHAPTER TEN

10.1. This statement is quoted in E. Peterson, ΕΙΣ ΘΕΟΣ, p. 230, and is exegeted on p. 231.

10.2. ‘Gottesglaube und Kyriosglaube bei Paulus’, pp. 48–49.

10.3. See the list of Jewish and Christian parallels in Peterson, pp. 254–56.

10.4. R.M. Grant, *Gods and the One God*, p. 150.

10.5. *The Lord of Glory*, p. 216, note *.

10.6. ‘The Semitic Background of the New Testament *Kyrios-Title*’, p. 130.

10.7. This was argued effectively by the Arians, and *Jerome’s* attempt to confute them by appealing to Rom. 11. 36 fell short of establishing the role-equality of the Lord with God in I Cor. 8. 6. See also W. Morgan, *The Religion and Theology of Paul*, pp. 58–60; V. Taylor, *The Person of Christ in New Testament Teaching*, p. 51; E. Grässer, “‘Ein einziger ist Gott’ (Röm 3, 30): Zum christologischen Gottesverständnis bei Paulus’, p. 201.

- 10.8. *Kyrios Christos* (English), pp. 206, 147.
- 10.9. *Kyrios Christos* (English), p. 205; cf. p. 147.
- 10.10. *Kyrios Christos* (English), p. 205.
- 10.11. This LXX passage is highlighted in A. Schlatter, *Paulus: Der Bote Jesu*, p. 254; Barrett, p. 192.
- 10.12. ‘ΚΥΡΙΟΣ ΙΗΣΟΥΣ’, p. 99; also ‘Zwei- und dreigliedrige Formeln. Ein Beitrag zur Vorgeschichte der Trinitätsformel’, p. 141. See also V.H. Neufeld, *The Earliest Christian Confessions*, p. 57.
- 10.13. See A. Marmorstein, ‘Philo and the Names of God’; N.A. Dahl and A.F. Segal, ‘Philo and the Rabbis on the Names of God’. Note also the brief remarks about the two titles for God in Judaism in L. Cerfaux, *Christ in the Theology of St. Paul*, pp. 475–76, 506.
- 10.14. Bousset, p. 112; W.D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*, pp. 180–81, note 2; H. Hegemann, *Die Vorstellung vom Schöpfungsmittler*, p. 111; R. Grant, ‘The Doctrine of God in Early Christian Thought’, p. 58.
- 10.15. Orr/Walther: ‘an essential unity of activity’.
- 10.16. Warfield, *The Lord of Glory*, p. 210; Robinson, ‘The Witness of Paul: Christ, The Lord’, pp. 142–43.
- 10.17. For comments on the significance of Paul’s use of OT language for Christ, see F.C. Porter, *The Mind of Christ in Paul*, pp. 230–31; O. Cullmann, *The Christology of the New Testament*, p. 235; C.F.D. Moule, *The Birth of the New Testament*, pp. 77–91.
- 10.18. Taylor, p. 53.
- 10.19. J. Dupont points out the interrelatedness of I Cor. 8. 4–6; Gal. 4. 8; and I Thess 1. 9, in *Gnosis*, pp. 333–35.
- 10.20. Note the following words of H. von Soden: ‘Er [the monotheistic statement in v 4] gilt für uns Christen, die Gott-Erkantten, die nur den Vater (gleichsam der Name des jüdisch-christlichen Gottes) zum Gott und (was der Einheit Gottes nicht abbricht) nur Jesus Christus zum Herrn haben; für andere gibt es manche sachlich nicht mit Recht so genannten Götter und Herren (Gal. 4, 8: φύσει μὴ ὄντες θεοί)’ (‘Sakrament und Ethik bei Paulus’, p. 241).
- 10.21. See, e.g., A. Vögtle, *Das Neue Testament und die Zukunft des Kosmos*, p. 170. C.H. Giblin describes Paul’s monotheism in I Cor. 8. 4–6 as ‘personalistic rather than ontological’, ‘functional’, and ‘non-metaphysical’ (‘Three Monotheistic Texts in Paul’, pp. 537, 546).
- 10.22. *Paul: The Theology of the Apostle in the Light of Jewish Religious History*, preface, p. xi, and pp. 150, 152, 151, 154.
- 10.23. *Adv. Hermog.* 3, quoted in J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, p. 114.
- 10.24. *Adversus graecos ex communibus notionibus* (M. 45. 177C), quoted in Lampe, ed., *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, θεός, meaning E. 5, p. 634.
- 10.25. For a similar way of making this point, see J.A. Fitzmyer, *Pauline Theology*, p. 34.
- 10.26. I am grateful to Professor J.V. Dahms of Canadian Theological Seminary for suggesting the comparison of I Cor. 8. 6 with John 17. 3, in a personal letter of 24 July, 1985.
- 10.27. See, e.g., O. Michel, ‘Der Christus des Paulus’, p. 25, note 19; M. Werner, *The Formation of Christian Dogma*, p. 122; E. Schweizer, *Lordship and Discipleship*, p. 102; A. Feuillet, *Le Christ sagesse de Dieu*, pp. 59–85; Kramer, sec. 22f, p. 98; K.H. Schelkle, ‘Die Schöpfung in Christus’, pp. 209–10, 217; J.G.

Gibbs, *Creation and Redemption*, pp. 69–72; R.G. Hamerton-Kelly, *Pre-existence, Wisdom, and the Son of Man*, p. 130; R.S. Barbour, 'Creation, Wisdom and Christ', pp. 30–31; G.W.H. Lampe, *God as Spirit*, p. 126; F. Young, 'A Cloud of Witnesses', p. 21 ('unintelligible except against a "wisdom" background'); P.-E. Bonnard, 'De la Sagesse personnifiée dans l'Ancien Testament à la Sagesse en personne dans le Nouveau', p. 141; E.A. Johnson, 'Jesus, the Wisdom of God: A Biblical Basis for Non-Androcentric Christology', pp. 261, 278; G. Schimanowski, *Weisheit und Messias*, pp. 317–20; Grant, *Gods*, pp. 100–01, 112–13.

10.28. For summaries of this theory with references to the literature, see J.D.G. Dunn, *Christology in the Making*, pp. 163–67; E.A. Johnson, pp. 261, 276.

10.29. W. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos* (English), p. 151; Hegermann, p. 135; H. Boers, 'Where Christology is Real. A Survey of Recent Research on New Testament Christology', p. 317; F. Hahn, 'The Confession of the One God in the New Testament', pp. 78–79.

10.30. A. van Roon, 'The Relation between Christ and the Wisdom of God according to St. Paul', p. 207.

10.31. The term 'monotheism christology' is not strictly parallel to the others, in that Jesus is called 'Son of Man', 'Logos', etc., but he is not called 'monotheism'. On the other hand, he is not called 'the one God' either. Hence the softer 'monotheism christology'.

10.32. Regrettably, the recently published book by L. Hurtado on early Christian binitarianism and the development of christology has remained unavailable to me.

APPENDIX ONE
ANCIENT JEWISH MONOTHEISTIC TEXTS

In appendix one we have collected and analysed the most important Jewish monotheistic texts from the period *c.* 200 B.C. to A.D. 100. The contents of the appendix are organized as follows:

- I. List of Sources Surveyed for Monotheistic Texts
- II. List of Texts
- III. Table A: Themes Associated with Monotheistic Statements More than Twice
- IV. Table B: Concepts Infrequently Associated with Monotheistic Statements
- V. Table C: Graph of Common Theme Occurrence
- VI. Table D: Graph of Common Theme Frequency

I. LIST OF SOURCES SURVEYED FOR MONOTHEISTIC TEXTS

Since the primary goal of our analysis is to obtain a synchronic picture of certain aspects of Jewish monotheism rather than to sketch the development of those beliefs through time, there is no need to place the documents in chronological order. We focus on those writings which can be known with a reasonable degree of probability to have come into existence and to have been used by Jews before A.D. 100 or very shortly thereafter. Later writings which may contain traditions stemming from our period but which entail difficult problems of criticism and dating, such as the rabbinic writings or the many Jewish inscriptions, are overlooked here. That is not to deny their possible relevance, but to maintain the principle that our investigation must begin from the known and the highly probable.

Not all of the Jewish writings included in our survey have been searched exhaustively. For books of the Old and New Testaments, it seemed sufficient to gather just those monotheistic statements which stand out at key points, or which are known to have been quoted among the Jews or by Paul in particular. Again, Philo and Josephus have been better preserved than many ancient authors, and exhaustive inclusion of statements about God from their voluminous corpora would skew the results toward the peculiar usage of these two individuals. On the other hand, it was important that English translations of the apocryphal, pseudepigraphical, and sectarian books be searched as comprehensively as possible to discover how the teaching of the Old

Testament about God's unity was grasped by Jewish readers of the post-biblical period. It is hoped that this method has produced a list of passages which is large enough and typical enough to represent Judaism as a whole during our period. In the list which follows, writings which have not been surveyed exhaustively for statements of monotheism are enclosed in brackets: []. To writings which were searched carefully but offered no data for our purpose is appended the indication: —none.

Books of the Old Testament

[Exodus]
 [Deuteronomy]
 [I Samuel]
 [II Samuel]
 [I Kings]
 [II Kings]
 [Nehemiah]
 [Psalms]
 [Isaiah]
 [Jeremiah]
 [Daniel]
 [Hosea]
 [Zechariah]

Apocrypha (Following the Order in Metzger's Edition)

I Esdras
II Esdras = IV Ezra
Tobit —none
Judith
Additions to Esther
Wisdom of Solomon
Sirach
Baruch
Letter of Jeremiah
Prayer of Azariah/Song of the Three Young Men
Susanna —none
Bel and the Dragon
Prayer of Manasseh —none
I Maccabees —none
II Maccabees
III Maccabees
IV Maccabees
Psalms 151 —none

Pseudepigrapha (Following the Order in Charlesworth's Edition)

I Enoch —none
II Enoch
Sibylline Oracles, Books III, IV, V, and fragments
Treatise of Shem
Apocryphon of Ezekiel —none
Apocalypse of Zephaniah —none
II Baruch
Apocalypse of Abraham
Apocalypse of Elijah

<i>Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs</i>	
<i>Testament of Job</i>	
<i>Testament of Abraham</i>	
<i>Testament of Moses</i>	
<i>Testament of Solomon</i>	—none
<i>Letter of Aristeas</i>	
<i>Jubilees</i>	
<i>Martyrdom and Ascension of Isaiah</i>	
<i>Joseph and Aseneth</i>	
<i>Life of Adam and Eve</i>	
<i>Pseudo-Philo, Biblical Antiquities</i>	
<i>Lives of the Prophets</i>	
<i>Eldad and Modad</i>	—none
<i>Ahiqar</i>	—none
<i>Pseudo-Phocylides, Sentences</i>	
<i>More Psalms of David</i>	—none
<i>Psalms of Solomon</i>	—none
<i>Prayer of Joseph</i>	—none
<i>Odes of Solomon</i>	
<i>Philo the Epic Poet</i>	—none
<i>Theodotus</i>	—none
<i>Orphica</i>	
<i>Ezekiel the Tragedian</i>	—none
<i>Fragments of Pseudo-Greek Poets</i>	
<i>Aristobulus</i>	
<i>Demetrius the Chronographer</i>	—none
<i>Aristeas the Exegete</i>	—none
<i>Eupolemus</i>	—none
<i>Pseudo-Eupolemus</i>	—none
<i>Cleodemus Malchus</i>	—none
<i>Artapanus</i>	—none
<i>Pseudo-Hecateus</i>	—none

Qumran Documents (Following the Order in Vermes's Edition)

1QS	= The Community Rule	
CD	= The Damascus Rule	—none
1QSa	= The Messianic Rule	—none
1QM	= The War Rule	
1QH	= The Hymns	
4QDibHam	= The Words of the Heavenly Lights	
1QLitPr	= A Liturgical Prayer	—none
1QSb	= The Blessings	—none
1QMyst	= The Triumph of Righteousness	—none
4QSirSabb	= SI 39-40 = The Angelic Liturgy	
1QapGen	= The Genesis Apocryphon	—none
4QP Bless	= The Blessings of Jacob	—none
1QDirMo	= The Words of Moses	—none
4QpIsa ^{a, b, c, d}	= Commentaries on Isaiah	—none
4QPrNab	= Prayer of Nabonidus	—none
4QpHos ^a	= Commentary on Hosea	—none
1QpMic	= Commentary on Micah	—none
4QpNah	= Commentary on Nahum	—none
1QpHab	= Commentary on Habakkuk	—none
4QpPs ^a	= Commentary on Psalm 37	—none
4QFlor	= A Midrash on the Last Days	—none
4QTestim	= A Messianic Anthology	—none
4QOrd	= A Commentary on Biblical Laws	—none
11QTemple	= The Temple Scroll	—none
4Q?	= 4Q 181 = The Wicked and the Holy	—none

4Q 286-87	= Blessings and Curses	—none
4Q 280-82	= Melchiresha	—none
4QQapLam	= 4Q 179 = A Lamentation	—none
4QWiles=4Q184	= The Seductress	—none
4Q?	= 4Q 185 = Exhortation to Seek Wisdom	—none
4QAgnesCreat	= 4Q 180 = The Ages of Creation	—none
4QTQahat	= The Testament of Amram	—none
5QJN ar	= 5Q 15 = The New Jerusalem	—none
11QPs ^a	= An Account of David's Poems	—none
11QMelch	= The Heavenly Prince Melchizedek	—none
4QCryptic	= 4Q 186 = The Horoscopes	—none

Philo (Following the Order in the Loeb Edition)

[De opificio mundi]
 [Legum allegoriae]
 [De confusione linguarum]
 [De vita Mosis]
 [De decalogo]
 [De specialibus legibus]
 [De virtutibus]
 [De legatione ad Gaium]
 [Quaestiones et solutiones in Genesin]

Josephus (Following the Order in the Loeb Edition)

[Contra Apionem]
 [Antiquitates Judaicae, Books I, III, IV, V]

Books of the New Testament

[Matthew]
 [Mark]
 [John]
 [Romans]
 [I Corinthians]
 [Galatians]
 [Ephesians]
 [I Thessalonians]
 [I Timothy]
 [Hebrews]
 [James]
 [Jude]
 [Revelation]

ADDITIONAL NOTE ON JEWISH SOURCES

The purpose of this additional note is to explain more fully the critical and methodological assumptions which underlie the use of Jewish sources in chapter four and in appendix one. Three basic issues need to be addressed: (1) why certain documents showing Christian influence have been included in a study of Jewish monotheism; (2) why the works of Philo and Josephus have not been used more extensively than the pseudepigrapha; and (3) why targumic and rabbinic sources, which represent important streams of Judaism, have not been used at all.

(1) Most of the documents listed on pp. 225–28 are clearly Jewish and can be dated with reasonable confidence to within the period 200 B.C. to A.D. 100. However, the *Apocalypse of Elijah*, the *Odes of Solomon*, and the *Ascension of Isaiah* contain material which some scholars consider to be later and which shows Christian influence. The *Apocalypse of Elijah* probably reached its final form A.D. 150–275, but the hypothesis that it stems from an older Jewish base is possible (K.H. Kuhn, in H.F.D. Sparks, ed., *The Apocryphal Old Testament*, pp. 757–59), or even probable, for O.S. Wintermute holds that the Jewish stratum existed prior to A.D. 117 and can be separated textually from the later additions, though this project has not yet been carried out (*OTPs*, I, 729–30). In dating the highly disputed *Odes of Solomon*, I have followed J.H. Charlesworth, who brings forward cumulative evidence for a Syriac or Aramaic original from around A.D. 100 (*OTPs*, II, 726–27). When studying monotheism in old Jewish documents which have suffered Christian interpolations, we must observe whether a given statement of monotheism accords with similar statements in non-Christian Jewish works; if so, then we may assume that it at least reflects an authentic Jewish tradition in the work under scrutiny. I am satisfied that the language of monotheism in *Apoc. Elijah*. 2. 10, 49; *Odes of Sol.* 6. 3–5; 38. 20; 41. 13–15 (numbers 106–07, 128–30—five passages in all) shows no Christian influence (with one exception, to be mentioned directly) and therefore may be accepted as evidence for Jewish monotheism. The only exception is *Odes of Sol.* 41. 13–15, which associates monotheistic language with the Son of God/Messiah in Christian fashion; for this reason, this passage was excluded from consideration in our analysis of the use of monotheistic language for intermediaries by Jewish authors (see p. 67, top).

In some cases I have included extracts from Christian works datable to the first century A.D. This is obviously true of all of the New Testament passages (numbers 174–200), while the passage in the Christian *Ascension of Isaiah* which uses monotheistic language (4. 6–8 [number 120]) is drawn from the most ancient stratum of the work (3. 13 – 4. 22) dating from around the end of the century (see the discussion by M.A. Knibb, in *OTPs*, II, 149). Inclusion of these early Christian passages in a study of Jewish monotheism as the background to Paul's thought is justifiable on the ground that the early church took over its monotheistic belief and language from its parent Judaism. Except at points where the early Christians applied the language of monotheism to Jesus, for the most part they simply assumed Jewish monotheism without significant changes. Certainly Paul's epistles show no trace of polemics with Judaism on the score of monotheism as such. One of the inevitable ambiguities facing the modern scholar who tries to apply the categories 'Jewish', 'Christian', 'Jewish Christian', etc., to people, movements or beliefs from this period is the fact that Jews and Christians still had much in common and the categories were therefore not clear-cut.

Moreover, for the purpose of the thesis we are interested in Jewish monotheism not in its own right as a phenomenon isolated from Christianity, but insofar as it shaped the mind of Paul. In Paul's time, the emerging Christian movement and the evolving rabbinic movement, which eventually defined themselves over against each other, were both still laying claim to continuity with the religion of the Old Testament and were taking over and applying to themselves titles belonging to the Old Testament people of God (cf. Gal. 6. 16). It would be methodologically incorrect to trace direct parallels from non-Christian Judaism to Paul without taking into account the way in which contact with the early Christian community modified or, in some cases, such as monotheism, reinforced Paul's apprehension of truths which first came to him from pre-Christian Judaism. Paul himself regarded Christ as the fulfilment of Old Testament religion and consciously stood in solidarity with his own Jewish past (Rom. 9. 1–5). Therefore, if we as exegetes are to adopt Paul's perspective, we must include Christian documents as part of the evidence for that stream of religious thought to which Paul would have acknowledged his debt.

In short, when I use the term 'Jewish' in chapter four and appendix one, I am using the term broadly with no intention of excluding texts which demonstrate the continuity of Christianity with pre-Christian Judaism at the point of the belief in one God. That Jewish monotheism lived on in Christianity is disputed by no one. In collecting evidence for Jewish monotheism of the early Christian period it is a matter of judgement whether we choose to work with a minimum of assured Jewish (in the narrow sense, i.e., non-Christian) data, or cast a wide net encompassing Christian sources and critically rule out of consideration those rare aspects of monotheistic language which were modified by the usage of the church. Since the thesis is written from the point of view of Paul the Christian, it seems advisable to follow the latter course.

(2) I have not searched Philo or Josephus exhaustively for monotheistic passages, in contrast to the many pseudepigrapha, from which I have drawn as many monotheistic texts as I could find. This is in keeping with the purpose of the inquiry, which is, in part: ‘to focus on structural patterns and commonalities in monotheistic belief which were socially shared by all or most Jewish authors of the period and which we may expect to have been shared by Paul’ (p. 44). ‘Philo and Josephus have been better preserved than many ancient authors, and exhaustive inclusion of statements about God from their voluminous corpora would skew the results toward the peculiar usage of these two individuals’ (pp. 224–25). In any attempt to trace diachronic lines of influence from pre-Christian or non-Christian Judaism to Paul, Philo looms larger in importance than many of the esoteric scriptures found among the pseudepigrapha (though it is doubtful that Paul had direct knowledge of Philo: see H. Chadwick, ‘St. Paul and Philo of Alexandria’), and Josephus has unique importance as a witness to Palestinian Jewish beliefs of the middle to late first century A.D. But ‘the primary goal of our analysis is to obtain a synchronic picture of certain aspects of Jewish monotheism’ (p. 224), and for that purpose a statistically representative cross-section of sources is paramount.

Given the fragmentary nature of our evidence for Judaism in the ancient world, it is impossible to know exactly what percentage of the total Jewish population would have subscribed to the views of any given tradition or sect, whether it be Pharisaism, Essenism (and the Qumran community), Alexandrian philosophical Judaism, sundry apocalyptic groups, the emerging rabbinic movement (which may not have been a direct and simple continuation of Pharisaism), or the largely unknown varieties of popular religion to be found in Palestine and many places in the Diaspora. What we can do is to make adjustments at points where there are obvious inequalities in the state of preservation of the evidence, and the fourteen passages selected from Philo (numbers 153–66) and the seven from Josephus (numbers 167–73) put these authors roughly on a scale with the most important of the pseudepigrapha—which, by the way, do not necessarily stand on the periphery of ancient Jewish theology (e.g. seven passages from *II Enoch* [numbers 70–76], eighteen from the *Sibylline Oracles* [numbers 77–94], eight from *II Baruch* [numbers 96–103], five from *Jubilees* [numbers 115–19]). The more unusual of the pseudepigrapha in most cases contribute only one or two texts each, so that lumped together they only contribute a sum of fifteen passages, roughly equivalent to the number drawn from Philo alone (*Treatise of Shem* [number 95], *Apocalypse of Abraham* [numbers 104–05], *Apocalypse of Isaiah* [numbers 106–07], *Testament of Joseph* [number 108], *Testament of Job* [number 109], *Testament of Abraham* [numbers 110–11], *Testament of Moses* [number 112], *Ascension of Isaiah* [number 120], *Joseph and Aseneth* [numbers 121–22], *Life of Adam and Eve* [number 123], *Lives of the Prophets* [number 126]). Likewise there are some fourteen passages from the Dead Sea Scrolls (numbers 139–52). Hence the two writers Philo and Josephus by themselves receive half again as much space in our list of texts (twenty-one passages in all) as either the more esoteric apocalypses together or the entire Qumran community.

Should the reader wish to ascertain that the examples I have chosen from Philo and Josephus are representative of these authors, specialist studies of the monotheism of both authors may be consulted: see H.A. Wolfson, *Philo*, I, 27–55, 171–75; II, 98–100, 149–53; A. Schlatter, *Wie sprach Josephus von Gott?*, pp. 16–20; also *Die Theologie des Judentums nach dem Bericht des Josephus*, pp. 1–7. Since these studies already exist and are cited in the notes (4. 23), I thought it unnecessary to plough over this ground again.

An important part of my method is the exclusion of idiosyncratic elements of monotheistic language from consideration (pp. 39, 44; a list of such elements is given on p. 279). By definition, then, aspects of monotheism in the pseudepigrapha which are not representative of Jewish monotheism as a whole are not allowed to affect my conclusions.

It is hoped that these methodological strictures have assured rather than skewed my results.

(3) In a study of Jewish monotheism it might be expected that extensive use should be made of those sources which express Jewish tradition as it crystallized in the late second and early third centuries C.E., i.e. targumic and rabbinic sources. Collections of monotheistic passages from these writings can be conveniently found in translation in Strack/Billerbeck, IV, part 1, pp. 189–207 (German), in C.J.G. Montefiore and H. Loewe, eds., *A Rabbinic Anthology*, in R.A. Stewart, *Rabbinic Theology*, and in E.E. Urbach, *The Sages: Their Concepts and Beliefs*, as well as in other secondary literature on Jewish theology (especially F.W. Weber, A. Marmorstein, G.F. Moore, S.S. Cohon, Bousset/Gressmann: see also the references in notes 2–10 and 25–53 for chapter two and notes 20–24 for chapter four) even before consulting the many accessible translations.

But even if one grants in principle that traditions from first century Judaism have been preserved in later Jewish works, there remains much sifting to be done before the New Testament scholar who is not a specialist in Judaica could responsibly make full use of this material to illuminate Paul. The crucial task of separating the material in the Mishnah and the Targums into chronological strata has yet to be done. This in itself puts a question mark over the value of some of the evidence gathered in the books just mentioned. Before deciding whether to venture into rabbinic sources, I scanned the three volumes of J. Neusner’s *The Rabbinic Traditions about the Pharisees before 70*, and failed to turn up any passages relevant to my inquiry. Many scholars, of course, will regard Neusner’s critically assured minimum of data as too minimal. Still it points to

the unsettled state of criticism in early Judaica. The non-expert cannot enter this field without leaving his results open to objection from someone.

In defence of the omission of targumic and rabbinic sources for the argument of this particular thesis a number of points may be made. First, it would be a mistake to suppose that sources providing evidence for widespread Jewish beliefs have been entirely neglected in my selection of sources. The Greek Bible was widely used throughout the ancient Jewish world, and from it I have included some thirty-seven texts (numbers 1–37)—more than from any other single source. There are three passages from *Sirach* (numbers 54–56), which, as is well known, was highly regarded by the sages. The author of *II Baruch*, from which source I have drawn eight texts (numbers 96–103), was an ‘expert on both apocalyptic imagery and rabbinic teaching, and, as such, was one of the Jews who managed to bring Judaism into a new era’ (A.F.J. Klijn, in *OTPs*, II, 620). *Jubilees* supplies another six samples (numbers 115–19); this work has been described as Proto-Essene or proto-Hasidic (therefore proto-Pharisaic), dating as it does from a time before the Essenes and the Pharisees went their separate ways (O.S. Wintermute, in *OTPs*, II, 45–48). The work of Pseudo-Philo ‘seems to reflect the milieu of the Palestinian synagogues at the turn of the common era’ (D.J. Harrington, in *OTPs*, II, 300); from it I have taken two passages (numbers 124–25). Josephus lived in Palestine and spent some time as a member of the sect of the Pharisees; he provides seven texts (numbers 167–73). At least three of our New Testament passages put monotheistic language on the lips of Jews (Mark 2. 7; 12. 28–32; John 8. 41 [numbers 178–79, 181]). From these sources we have a sum of sixty-six texts. If we include the fourteen passages from Philo, as an orthodox Jew in the Alexandrian tradition, and exclude the rest of the New Testament texts and the one from the *Odes of Solomon* which shows clear Christian influence, then eighty out of one hundred and seventy-five, or nearly half, of our purely Jewish texts represent broad and influential strands of ancient Judaism. Many of the remaining works contain material which doubtless was held in common by many Jews of the period.

Second, it must be emphasized that our study concentrates on one cluster of Jewish language, namely that having to do with monotheism. ‘At no point is later [!] Judaism more united than in fidelity to the confession εἰς ὁ θεός’ (E. Stauffer, in H.M. Kleinknecht and others, ‘Θεός’, p. 98). As the study shows, ‘normative’ Judaism and ‘heretical’ Jewish sects were in fact in fundamental agreement in this belief. Where my study goes beyond the language of monotheism to explore various beliefs about intermediary figures, the conclusion reached is negative in so far as modifications of monotheistic speech were concerned. Moreover, to re-state a point made in a different connection above, the method of approach is defined in such a way as deliberately to prevent the few and insignificant idiosyncrasies in monotheistic language from affecting my results. In a diachronic study of *other* aspects of Judaism intended to highlight *differences or peculiarities* among Jewish groups at various times, it would be important to include material from the rabbis to make comparisons possible. In this *synchronic* study of *monotheistic language*, being the basic confession which united all Jews, intended to isolate *commonalities in that belief*, the addition of each body of data actually had the effect of expanding the total data base while only strengthening the conclusions being formed. The handy collections of rabbinic monotheistic texts cited above and the secondary literature cited in the notes to chapters two and four provide confirmation *prima facie* that rabbinic sources have little new to offer to the study undertaken here. Sooner or later a scholar finds himself faced by the pragmatic question whether his investment of time and energy in research will be repaid by important findings. Given the sheer number of rabbinic sources, the inherent problems in the critical study of them, the fledgling state of criticism of these writings at the present time, the methodological delimitations of my inquiry, the solidity of the results already obtained, the confirmation provided by secondary literature touching on rabbinic monotheism, and the limitations of my own time and competence, I have determined to leave the plumbing of rabbinic monotheistic language to others.

Finally, mindful that large and important bodies of evidence have not been exhaustively used in the study, I have written guardedly at the appropriate places. In my methodological preface to appendix one, I point out the relevance of the rabbinic writings but fall back on ‘the principle that our investigation must begin from the known and the highly probable’ (p. 224). My assessment of the evidence for a monotheism schema in Judaism takes into account the incompleteness of the sources (pp. 59–60). I allow for the possibility that experts on Philo may correct my inferences about monotheism in relation to Philo’s Logos (p. 96 and note 94 to chapter four). My conclusion about the non-application of the language of monotheism to intermediaries by Jewish writers is stated in terms of a ‘tendency’ (p. 99), and when I apply this finding to the discussion of I Cor. 8. 4–6, I write cautiously of ‘a wide selection of Jewish sources’ (p. 179). The result of my investigation of ontological aspects of Jewish monotheistic language is tentative (p. 104). In sum, I have taken pains not to overstep the evidence in drawing conclusions. It is hoped that this procedure will be deemed consistent with responsible scholarship.

Fortunately, no one is alone in the community of scholars. A modern critical study of rabbinic monotheism would be an important and worthy project in its own right. But in my judgement the Jewish data surveyed here, though admittedly incomplete, provide more than ample support for the inferences drawn about Paul’s monotheism in I Cor. 8. 4–6, which is the real concern of this thesis.

LIST OF TEXTS

The texts are listed in the order suggested by the preceding list of books surveyed. They are numbered for convenient reference. The monotheistic phrases are underlined for ready identification. The letters following each text are coded to Table A: Themes Associated with Monotheistic Statements, and give a description of the contents of each passage.

In a few cases texts have been included which apply monotheistic language to beings other than the God of Jewish belief (numbers 41–42, 86, 120). These statements are modelled on ordinary expressions of monotheism and must be included in any attempt to determine the characteristics of the Jewish language of monotheism.

Passages from the Old Testament (Numbers 1–37) (LXX Translations Mine, Based on the Edition of Rahlfs)

1. Exodus 15. 11 [From the poem celebrating the Lord's triumph over his enemies at the Red Sea (Ex. 15. 1–18)]

Who is like you among the gods (ἐν θεοῖς), Lord?
Who is like you, glorified among the holy ones (ἐν ἁγίοις),
 Amazing in glories, doing wonders?

[B3, B4, F1, F2]

2. Exodus 20. 2–3 [The opening of the Decalogue, spoken to Israel at Mount Sinai (Ex. 20. 2–17)]

² I am the Lord your God, who led you out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of slavery. ³ You shall have no other gods except me (οὐκ ἔσονται σοι θεοὶ ἕτεροι πλὴ ἐμοῦ).

[B1, F1, F2, G1, G4]

3. Exodus 22. 19 [One of the stipulations of the Covenant Code (Ex. chapters 21–23), not directly connected to those before or after it]

He who sacrifices to gods, except to the Lord alone [or: except to the only Lord](πλὴν κυρίῳ μόνῳ), he shall be destroyed with death.

[B1, B6]

4. Deuteronomy 3. 24 [A prayer of Moses following the conquest of the trans-jordanian kingdoms of Sihon and Og]

Lord, Lord, you have begun to show your servant your strength and your power and hand and might and exalted arm. For what god is there in heaven or on earth, who will do as you have done, according to your strength?

[B3, B4, F1, F2]

5. Deuteronomy 4. 32–40 [The conclusion of Moses` speech recalling God`s mighty acts on behalf of Israel]

³² Consult the former days which were prior to you since the day when God created man on earth, and [search] from the height of heaven to the height of heaven, [and see] whether anything has happened corresponding to this great matter, whether such a thing has been heard of: ³³ whether a people has heard the voice of the living God (θεοῦ ζῶντος) speaking from the midst of the fire in the way you have heard it, and lived; ³⁴ whether God has attempted to enter and take for himself a people from the midst of a people by chastisement and signs and wonders and war and a strong hand and an exalted arm and great spectacles, according to all that the Lord our God did in Egypt before you as you watched; ³⁵ that you might know that the Lord your God (κύριος ὁ θεός σου [MT: *yahweh*]), he is God (οὗτος θεός ἐστιν [MT: *hu ha-elohim*]), and there is no other except him. ³⁶ From heaven his voice became audible to instruct you, and on earth he showed you his great fire, and you heard his words from the midst of the fire. ³⁷ Because he loved your fathers, he also chose you, their descendants, with them, and led you himself by his great strength out of Egypt ³⁸ to destroy peoples great and stronger than you before your face, to lead you in, and to cause you to inherit their land, as you have it today. ³⁹ And you shall know today and repent in your heart, for the Lord your God (κύριος ὁ θεός σου [MT: *yahweh*]), he is God (οὗτος θεός [MT: *hu ha-elohim*]) in heaven above and on earth below, and there is no other except him. ⁴⁰ And you shall keep his statutes and his commandments, as many as I command you today, that it might be well with you and your sons after you, that you might have long life on the land which the Lord your God gives you for all days.

[B1, B2, B4, B5, D2, E3, F1, F2, G1, G4]

6. Deuteronomy 6. 4–6 [From Moses`s exhortation to Israel to keep the commandments of God (Deut. 6. 1–9)]

⁴ Hear, Israel! The Lord our God, the Lord is one (κύριος ὁ θεός ἡμῶν, κύριος εἷς ἐστιν). ⁵ And you shall love the Lord your God with your whole (ὅλης) heart, and with your whole soul, and with your whole might. ⁶ And these words, as many as I command you today, shall be in your heart and in your soul.

[B6, E1, G4]

7. Deuteronomy 6. 13–14 [From the same context as the foregoing]

¹³ You shall fear the Lord your God and serve him and cleave to him and swear by his name. ¹⁴ You shall not go after other gods from among the gods of the nations which encircle you.

[B1, B6]

8. Deuteronomy 7. 9 [From Moses`s reminder to Israel that they are chosen by God to be God`s own possession (Deut. 7. 6–11)]

And you shall know that the Lord your God, he is God (οὗτος θεός [MT: *hu ha-elohim*]), a faithful God, who keeps covenant and mercy with those who love him.

[G1, G2]

9. Deuteronomy 32. 12 [From the song of Moses about God`s faithfulness to an unfaithful Israel (Deut. 32. 1–43), specifically from the section about Israel`s wandering in the wilderness]

The Lord alone (κύριος μόνος) led them,
 And no strange god was with them.

[B1, F1, F2]

10. Deuteronomy 32. 37–39 [From the same context as the foregoing]

³⁷ And the Lord said, Where are their gods,
 Upon which they trusted,
³⁸ The suet of whose sacrifices you ate
 And you drank the wine of their libations?
 Let them rise up and help you,
 And let them become your protectors!
³⁹ Behold, behold that I am (ἐγώ εἰμι),
And there is no God except me (καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν θεὸς πλὴν ἐμοῦ).
 I shall kill, and I shall make to live;
 I shall strike, and I shall heal,
 And there is none who will snatch out of my hands.

[A1, B1, B4, F1, F2]

11. I Samuel 2. 2 (= LXX I Kings 2. 2) [From Hannah's prayer of thanksgiving for the birth of Samuel (I Sam. 2. 1–10)]

For there is none holy as the Lord,
 And there is none righteous as our God;
There is none holy except you.

[I3]

12. II Samuel 7. 21–22 (= LXX II Kings 7. 21–22) [From David's prayer of thanksgiving for the promise of a dynasty (II Sam. 7. 18–29)]

²¹ On account of your word you have wrought, and according to your heart you have wrought all this greatness, to make it known to your servant ²² in order to magnify yourself, my Lord Lord [*sic*], for there is none like you and there is no God except you among all whom we have heard of with our ears.

[B1, H2, I2]

13. I Kings 8. 59–60 (= LXX III Kings 8. 59–60) [From the conclusion to Solomon's prayer of dedication for the temple]

⁵⁹ And let these words, which I have prayed before the Lord our God, come near the Lord our God day and night to accomplish the justification of your servant and the justification of your people Israel, each day's matter in its day, ⁶⁰ so that all (πάντες) the peoples of the earth might know that the Lord our God, he is God (αὐτὸς θεός [MT: *hu ha-elohim*]) and there is no other.

[B1, E6, F1, F3]

14. I Kings 18. 39 (= LXX III Kings 18. 39) [The response of the people of Israel on Mount Carmel to Elijah's challenge to choose between the Lord and Baal, after fire has fallen from heaven and consumed the Lord's altar]

Truly the Lord is God (κύριός ἐστιν ὁ θεός [MT: *hu ha-elohim*]), he is God (αὐτὸς θεός [MT: *hu ha-elohim*]).

[A1, B1]

15. II Kings 19. 15–19 (= LXX IV Kings 19. 15–19) [King Hezekiah's prayer in response to the blasphemous challenge of Rapsakes]

¹⁵ And he said, Lord God of Israel, who sit upon the cherubin, you are the only God (σὺ εἶ ὁ θεὸς μόνος) in all (πάσας) the kingdoms of the earth; you made heaven and earth. ¹⁶ Incline, Lord, your ear and hear; open, Lord, your eyes and see, and hear the words of Sennacherim, which he sent to reproach the living God (θεὸν ζῶντα). ¹⁷ For in truth, Lord, the kings of the Assyrians have made desolate the nations ¹⁸ and given their gods to the fire, because they are not Gods (οὐ θεοὶ εἰσιν), but rather works of the hands of men, wooden and stone objects, and they destroyed them. ¹⁹ And now, Lord our God, save us from his hand, and all (πάσαι) the kingdoms of the earth will know that you are the only Lord God (ὅτι σὺ κύριος ὁ θεὸς μόνος).

[A1, B2, B6, D1, D2, E6, F1, F3, H3]

16. Nehemiah 9. 6 (= LXX II Esdras 19. 6) [The opening of Ezra's confession of Israel's sins]

You are the only Lord (Σὺ εἶ αὐτὸς κύριος μόνος [MT: *attah-hu yahweh l'baddeka*]). You made heaven and the heaven of heavens and all (πάντα) that is placed in them, the earth and all (πάντα) that is in it, the seas and all (πάντα) that is in them, and you give life to all things (τὰ πάντα); and the hosts of the heavens worship you.

[B3, D1, D2, D3, E2, H3]

17. Psalm 18. 30–32 (= LXX Psalm 17. 31–33) [From a song rejoicing in deliverance from enemies by God's help]

³⁰ My God—his way is blameless;
The words of the Lord are tried in the fire.
He is a shielder of all who hope on him.
³¹ For who is God except the Lord (τίς θεὸς πλὴν τοῦ κυρίου)?
And who is God except our God (τίς θεὸς [MT: *tzur*, 'rock'] πλὴν τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν)?—
³² The God who binds me round with power
And made my way blameless.

[B4, B5, F1, F3, G2, I3]

18. Psalm 83. 16–18 (= LXX Psalm 82. 17–19) [An imprecation upon enemies]

¹⁶ Fill their faces with dishonour,
And they will seek your name, Lord.
¹⁷ Let them be put to shame and troubled for ever and ever,
Let them be ashamed and be destroyed.
¹⁸ And let them know that your name is the Lord,
You alone are the Most High (σὺ μόνος ὑψιστος) over all (πάντα) the earth.

[B6, E6, I1, I2, I4]

19. Psalm 89. 5–8 (= LXX Psalm 88. 6–9) [A response to God’s promise to David (Psa. 89. 3–4)]

- ⁵ The heavens will confess your wonders, Lord,
And your truth in the assembly of holy ones (ἁγίων).
- ⁶ For who in the clouds will be equated (ἰσωθήσεται) with the Lord,
And who will be likened (ὁμοιωθήσεται) to the Lord among the sons of God (ἐν υἱοῖς
θεοῦ)?—
- ⁷ The God glorified in the council of holy ones (ἁγίων),
Great and fearsome over (ἐπί) all those around him.
- ⁸ Lord God of the powers (θεὸς τῶν δυνάμεων), who is like you?
You are powerful, Lord, and your truth is about you.
[The psalm goes on in vv 9–12 to celebrate God’s work of creation.]

[B3, B4, D1, G2, H3, I2]

20. Psalm 100. 3 (= LXX Psalm 99. 3)

Know that the Lord, he is God (αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ θεός),
He himself made us, and not we,
His people and the sheep of his pasture.

[D1, G1, H3, I1]

21. Isaiah 2. 11b, 17 [From a passage about the day of judgement]

- ¹¹ ... And the loftiness of men will be humbled, and the Lord alone (κύριος μόνος) will be exalted in that day.
- ¹² And every man will be humbled, and the loftiness of men will fall, and the Lord alone (κύριος μόνος) will be exalted in that day.

[H4, I2, I4]

22. Isaiah 42. 5–9

⁵ Thus says the Lord God who made the sky and fixed it in place, who made solid the earth and what is in it, and gives breath to the people on it and spirit to those who walk on it: ⁶ I am the Lord God (κύριος ὁ θεός [MT: *yahweh*]). I have called you in righteousness, and I shall take your hand and strengthen you, and I have given you to be a covenant of the races, to be a light of the nations ⁷ to open the eyes of the blind, to lead those who are bound out of bonds and to lead out those who sit in darkness in the prison-house. ⁸ I am the Lord God (κύριος ὁ θεός [MT: *yahweh*]), that is my name. I shall not give my glory to another nor my excellences to carved things. ⁹ Behold, the things which were from the beginning have arrived, and new things which I shall announce, and before they come to light they have been made clear to you.

[A1, A3, B4, B5, D1, D2, D3, E6, G1, H2, H3, H4, H5, I3]

23. Isaiah 43. 10–13

¹⁰ You have become my witnesses (I too am a witness, says the Lord God [κύριος ὁ θεός (MT: *yahweh*))] and the servant whom I chose, that you might know and believe and understand that I am (ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι), before me no other God came to be, and there shall be none after me. ¹¹ I am God (ἐγὼ ὁ θεός), and there is none except me who saves. ¹² I announced and I saved, I reproached, and there was no strange [god] among you. You are my witnesses and I am a witness, says the Lord God. ¹³ Still from the beginning [sic], and there is none who can snatch out of my hand. I shall do it, and who will turn it back?

[B1, B4, B5, B6, F1, G1, H2, H3, H4, H5]

24. Isaiah 44. 6–8

⁶ Thus says God, the King of Israel who saved him, God Sabaoth: I am the first and I am after these things. Except me there is no God. ⁷ Who is as I am (τίς ὡσπερ ἐγὼ)? Let him stand and call and make ready for me since the time when I made man for ever, and let them announce to you the things to come before they come. ⁸ Do not cover it up! Have you not heard it from the beginning, and I proclaimed it to you? You are witnesses, whether there is a God except me. And they did not exist at that time. [The following section (vv 9–20) is an extended polemic against idolatry.]

[A1, B1, B5, B6, D1, F1, H2, H3, H4, H5, I1]

25. Isaiah 44. 24–26a

²⁴ Thus says the Lord who ransoms you and who forms you from the womb: I am the Lord (ἐγὼ κύριος) who accomplish all things (πάντα). I stretched out the sky alone (μόνος) and made the earth solid. Who else ²⁵ scatters the signs of ventriloquists and oracles from the heart, turning the clever backwards and making their counsel foolish ²⁶ and establishing the words of his servant and making the counsel of his messengers (or: angels [ἄγγέλων]) come true?

[A1, D1, E5, F1, H2, H3, I4]

26. Isaiah 45. 4–7 [Addressed to Cyrus]

⁴ For the sake of Jacob my servant and Israel my chosen one I shall call you by your name and accept you, but you have not known me. ⁵ For I am the Lord God (κύριος ὁ θεός [MT: *yahweh*]), and there is no God else except me, and you have not known me, ⁶ that from the rising of the sun to its setting they might know that there is none except me. I am the Lord God (κύριος ὁ θεός [MT: *yahweh*]), and there is none else. ⁷ It is I who have formed light and made darkness, who make peace and create evil. I am the Lord God (κύριος ὁ θεός [MT: *yahweh*]) who do all (πάντα) these things.

[B1, B6, D1, E5, E6, G1, H3]

27. Isaiah 45. 14b-15 [The Gentiles will come to Israel and pray]

¹⁴ ... because God is in you, and they will say, There is no God except you. ¹⁵ For you are God (σὺ γὰρ εἶ θεός), and we did not know, the God of Israel, the saviour.

[B1, F1, G3]

28. Isaiah 45. 18

Thus says the Lord who made the sky—he is God (ὁὐτος ὁ θεός [MT: *hu ha-elohim*])—who established the earth and made it—he drew its boundary, he did not make it to be empty but to be inhabited—I am (Ἐγὼ εἰμι [MT: *ani yahweh*]), and there is none else.

[B1, D1, H3]

29. Isaiah 45. 21b-24a

²¹ ... Then it was announced to you, I am God (Ἐγὼ ὁ θεός), and there is no other except me. There is none righteous or a saviour except me. ²² You turned to me and you will be saved, you who are from the extremity of the earth. I am God (Ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ θεός), and there is no other. ²³ By myself I swear: in truth righteousness will go forth from my mouth, my words will not turn back: to me every (πᾶν) knee will bend and every (πᾶσα) tongue will confess to God ²⁴ saying, Righteousness and glory will come to him.

[B1, B5, B6, E6, F1, H4, I2, I3]

30. Isaiah 46. 9–11 [After mocking those who worship idols]

⁹ And remember the former things from eternity, that I am God (Ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ θεός), and there is none else except me ¹⁰ proclaiming the last things from the first before they happen, and they were accomplished together. And I said, All my purpose will stand, and all things that I have purposed I shall do. ¹¹ Calling a bird from the east and from the earth afar concerning the things which I have purposed [*sic*], I spoke and I led, I created and I made.

[A1, B1, B5, D1, H2, H3, H4, H5]

31. Isaiah 48. 11 [Following a statement that God has brought affliction upon Israel, but will restrain his anger (Isa. 48. 9–10)]

For my sake I shall do it for you, because my name is profaned, and I shall not give my glory to another.

[F4, I2]

32. Isaiah 64. 4 (= LXX Isaiah 64. 3)

From eternity we have not heard, nor have our eyes seen a God except you and your works, which you do for those who wait for your mercy.

[F4, H3]

33. Jeremiah 10. 6–12a (RSV translation of MT—wanting in LXX)

⁶ There is none like thee, O LORD;
 thou art great, and thy name is great in might.
⁷ Who would not fear thee, O King of the nations?
 For this is thy due;

- For among all the wise ones of the nations
and in all (MT: kol) their kingdoms
there is none like thee.
- 8 They are both stupid and foolish;
the instruction of idols is but wood!
- 9 Beaten silver is brought from Tarshish,
and gold from Uphaz.
They are the work of the craftsman and of the hands of the goldsmith;
their clothing is violet and purple;
they are all the work of skilled men.
- 10 But the LORD is the true God (MT: *elohim emet*);
he is the living God (MT: *elohim chayyim*) and the everlasting King.
At his wrath the earth quakes,
and the nations cannot endure his indignation.
- 11 Thus shall you say to them: ‘The gods who did not make the heavens and the earth shall
perish from the earth and from under the heavens’.
- 12 It is he who made the earth by his power.

[A1, B1, B2, B4, B5, D1, D2, E6, H1, H3, I1, I2, I4]

34. Daniel 2. 47 [A confession of Nabouchodonosor]

Truly your God is God of gods (ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν θεὸς τῶν θεῶν) and Lord of kings, who alone (μόνος)
makes plain hidden mysteries.

[B3, B5, I1]

35. Daniel 6. 26 (= LXX Daniel 6. 27) [Darius decrees that all people in his kingdom must worship the God of Daniel]

... for he is the God who abides and lives (θεὸς μένων καὶ ζῶν) for generations of generations for
ever.

[B6, D2, H1, H4]

36. Hosea 13. 4

I am the Lord your God [LXX adds to the Hebrew text: ‘making solid the sky and creating the earth,
whose hands created all (πᾶσαν) the host of heaven, and I did not exhibit them to you so that you
might go after them; and I led you’] out of the land of Egypt, and you shall know no God except me,
and there is none who saves except me.

[B1, B6, D1, E2, F1, F2, H3]

37. Zechariah 14. 9 [From a prophecy about the consummation of history]

And the Lord will become king over all (πᾶσαν) the earth. In that day the Lord will be one (ἕσται
κύριος ἓίς) and his name one (έν).

[E6, H4, I1]

Passages from the Apocrypha (Numbers 38–69) (RSV)

38. *I Esdras* 8. 25 [A prayer of Ezra]

Blessed be the Lord alone (Εὐλογητὸς μόνος ὁ κύριος), who put this into the heart of the king, to glorify his house which is in Jerusalem.

[F5]

39. *II Esdras* (= *IV Ezra*) 6. 6 [God describes his purpose from the beginning of the creation]

Then I planned these things, and they were made through me and not through another (*per me et non per alium*), just as the end shall come through me and not through another (*per me et non per alium*).

[D1, H2, H3, H4, H5]

40. *II Esdras* (= *IV Ezra*) 8. 7 [A prayer of Ezra]

For thou alone dost exist (*Solus enim es*), and we are a work of thy hands, as thou hast declared.

[B2, B5, D1, H3]

41. *Judith* 3. 8 [Holofernes, commander of Nebuchadnezzar's forces, has gone down to the seacost]

And he demolished all their shrines and cut down their sacred groves; for it had been given to him to destroy all the gods of the land, so that all nations (πάντα τὰ ἔθνη) should worship Nebuchadnezzar only (μόνῳ), and all (πάνσοι) their tongues and tribes should call upon him as god.

[A1, B1, B6, E6, I4]

42. *Judith* 6. 2b [Holofernes challenges the Moabites]

Who is God (τίς θεός) except Nebuchadnezzar?

[B1]

43. *Judith* 8. 18–20 [From a speech of Judith]

¹⁸ For never in our generation, nor in these present days, has there been any tribe or family or people or city of ours which worshiped gods made with hands, as was done in days gone by—¹⁹ and that was why our fathers were handed over to the sword, and to be plundered, and so they suffered a great catastrophe before our enemies. ²⁰ But we know no other god but him (ἡμεῖς δὲ ἕτερον θεὸν οὐκ ἐγνώκαμεν πλὴν αὐτοῦ), and therefore we hope that he will not disdain us or any of our nation.

[A1, A3, B1, B6, F1, F3]

44. *Judith* 9. 14 [The conclusion of Judith's prayer for help]

And cause thy whole (παντός) nation and every (πάσης) tribe to know and understand that thou art God (σὺ εἶ ὁ θεός), the God of all (πάσης) power and might, and that there is no other who protects the people of Israel but thou alone (εἰ μὴ σὺ)!

[B4, E1, E4, F1, F3]

45. *Judith* 16. 14 [From Judith's song of praise]

Let all (πάντα) thy creatures serve thee,
 for thou didst speak, and they were made.
 Thou didst send forth thy Spirit, and it formed them;
there is none that can resist (οὐκ ἔστιν ὅς ἀντιστήσεται) thy voice.

[B4, B6, D1, E2, H3]

46. *Additions to Esther* 13. 9–11 [The opening of a prayer of Mordecai]

⁹ O Lord, Lord, King who rulest over all things (πάντων), for the universe (τὸ πᾶν) is in thy power and there is no one who can oppose (ἀντιδοξῶν) thee if it is thy will to save Israel. ¹⁰ For thou hast made heaven and earth and every (πᾶν) wonderful thing under heaven, ¹¹ and thou art Lord of all (πάντων), and there is no one who can resist (ἀντιτάξεται) thee, who art the Lord.

[B4, D1, E2, F1, F3, H3, I1]

47. *Additions to Esther* 13. 12b, 14a [From a prayer of Mordecai]

¹² ... I did this, and refused to bow down to this proud Haman.

¹⁴ But I did this, that I might not set the glory of man above the glory of God, and I will not bow down to any one but to thee, who art my Lord.

[B1, B6, I2]

48. *Additions to Esther* 14. 3b, 14, 18 [From Esther's prayer for help]

³ ... O my Lord, thou only art our King [or: thou only art](Κύριε μου ὁ βασιλεὺς ἡμῶν σὺ εἶ μόνος); help me, who am alone and have no helper but thee.

¹⁴ But save us by thy hand, and help me, who am alone and have no helper but thee, O Lord.

¹⁵ Thy servant has had no joy since the day that I was brought here until now, except in thee, O Lord God of Abraham.

[F1, F3, I1]

49. *Additions to Esther* 16. 16 [From a letter of Artaxerxes testifying that the Jews are righteous]

[The Jews] are sons of the Most High, the most mighty living God (ζῶντος θεοῦ), who has directed the kingdom both for us and for our fathers in the most excellent order.

[B2, B4, D2, I1]

50. *Wisdom of Solomon* 11. 21

For it is always in thy power to show great strength, and who can withstand (ἀντιστήσεται) the might of thy arm?

[B4]

51. *Wisdom of Solomon* 12. 12–14

¹² For who will say, ‘What hast thou done?’
 Or who will resist thy judgment?
Who will accuse thee for the destruction of nations which thou didst make?
 Or who will come before thee to plead as an advocate for unrighteous men?
¹³ For neither is there any god besides thee, whose care is for all men [or: all things] (πάντων),
 to whom thou shouldst prove that thou hast not judged unjustly;
¹⁴ nor can any king or monarch confront thee about those whom thou hast punished.

[B1, D3, E6, I4]

52. *Wisdom of Solomon* 12. 27a [On the unrighteous]

For when in their suffering they became incensed
 at those creatures which they had thought to be gods,
 being punished by means of them,
 they saw and recognized as the true God (θεὸν ἀληθῆ)
 him whom they had before refused to know.

[A1, B1, B2, B6]

53. *Wisdom of Solomon* 14. 21 [From a passage on the evils of idolatry]

And this became a hidden trap for mankind,
 because men, in bondage to misfortune or to royal authority,
 bestowed on objects of stone or wood the name that ought not to be shared (τὸ ἀκοινώνητον ὄνομα).

[A1]

54. *Sirach* 1. 8–9

⁸ There is One (εἷς ἔστιν) who is wise, greatly to be feared,
 sitting upon his throne.
⁹ The Lord himself created wisdom,
 he saw her and apportioned her,
 he poured her out upon all his works.

[B5, B6, D1, E2, H3, I1]

55. *Sirach* 18. 1–4

¹ He who lives for ever created the whole universe (τὰ πάντα);

² the Lord alone (κύριος μόνος) will be declared righteous.

[Other authorities add: and there is no other beside him; ³ he steers the world (τὸν κόσμον) with the span of his hand, and all things (πάντα) obey his will; for he is king of all things (πάντων), by his power separating among them the holy things from the profane.]

⁴ To none has he given power to proclaim his works;
and who can search out his mighty deeds?

[B1, B3, B4, D1, D2, E2, E5, H1, H3, I1, I3]

56. *Sirach* 36. 3–5

³ Lift up thy hand against foreign nations
and let them see thy might.

⁴ As in us thou hast been sanctified before them,
so in them be thou magnified before us;

⁵ and let them know thee, as we have known
that there is no God but thee, O Lord.

[B1, B4, B6, E6, I2, I3, I4]

57. *Baruch* 3. 32–35 (= LXX *Baruch* 3. 33–36) [From a poem about wisdom]

³² But he who knows all things (τὰ πάντα) knows her,
he found her by his understanding.
He who prepared the earth for all time
filled it with four-footed creatures;
³³ he who sends forth the light, and it goes,
called it, and it obeyed him in fear;
³⁴ the stars shone in their watches, and were glad;
he called them, and they said, ‘Here we are!’
They shone with gladness for him who made them.
³⁵ This is our God;
no other can be compared to him!

[B3, B5, B6, D1, E2, H3]

58. *Letter of Jeremiah* 5–6 (= LXX vv 4–5)

⁵ So take care not to become at all like the foreigners or to let fear for these gods possess you, when you see the multitude before and behind them worshipping them. ⁶ But say in your heart, ‘It is thou, O Lord, whom we must worship’ (Σοὶ δεῖ προσκυεῖν).

[A1, B6]

59. *Song of the Three Young Men* 20b-22 (= LXX Daniel 3. 44–45)

20 ... Let all who do harm to thy servants be put to shame;
 21 let them be disgraced and deprived of all power and dominion,
 and let their strength be broken.
 22 Let them know that thou art the Lord, the only God (κύριος ὁ θεὸς μόνος),
 glorious over the whole (ὅλην) world.

[E6, I2, I4]

60. *Bel and the Dragon* 5 [A conversation between King Cyrus and Daniel]

And the king said to him, ‘Why do you not worship Bel?’ He answered, ‘Because I do not revere man-made idols, but the living God (τὸν ζῶντα θεόν), who created heaven and earth and has dominion over all (πάσης) flesh’.

[A1, B2, B6, D1, D2, E2, H3]

61. *Bel and the Dragon* 23–25 [Another such conversation]

²³ There was also a great dragon, which the Babylonians revered. ²⁴ And the king said to Daniel, ‘You cannot deny that this is a living God; so worship him’. ²⁵ Daniel said, ‘I will worship the Lord my God, for he is the living God (οὗτός ἐστι θεὸς ζῶν)’.

[B1, B2, B6, D2]

62. *Bel and the Dragon* 41 [After God has preserved Daniel in a lions’ den for six days]

And the king shouted with a loud voice, ‘Thou art great, O Lord God of Daniel, and there is no other besides thee’.

[B1, F1, F3, I2]

63. *II Maccabees* 1. 24b-25 [The opening of a prayer of Jonathan and the priests of Israel as the prelude to a sacrifice]

²⁴ ... O Lord, Lord God, Creator of all things (πάντων), who art awe-inspiring and strong and just and merciful, who alone art King and art kind, ²⁵ who alone (μόνος) art bountiful, who alone (μόνος) art just and almighty (παντοκράτωρ) and eternal, who dost rescue Israel from every evil, who didst choose the fathers and consecrate them

[B4, B6, D1, E2, E4, F1, F4, G1, H1, H3, I1, I3]

64. *II Maccabees* 7. 37 [From the speech of the youngest and last of the seven brothers martyred in the presence of the king]

I, like my brothers, give up body and life for the laws of our fathers, appealing to God to show mercy soon on our nation and by afflictions and plagues to make you confess that he alone is God (μόνος αὐτὸς θεός ἐστιν).

[B6, I4]

65. *II Maccabees* 15. 4 [A group of Jews speak to Nicanor]

... It is the living Lord himself (ὁ κύριος ζῶν αὐτός), the Sovereign in heaven, who ordered us to observe the seventh day.

[A3, B2, D2, G4, I1]

66. *III Maccabees* 2. 2 [The opening of a prayer of Simon the high priest, that the temple be delivered]

Lord, Lord, king of the heavens, and sovereign of all (πάσης) creation, holy among the holy ones, the only ruler (μόναρχε), almighty (παντοκράτωρ)...

[A3, B3, B4, E2, E4, F1, F3, I1, I3]

67. *III Maccabees* 6. 18a [From a passage about the intervention of God to save the Jews who have been gathered in a hippodrome to be destroyed]

Then the most glorious, almighty (παντοκράτωρ), and true God (ἀληθινὸς θεός) revealed his holy face and opened the heavenly gates....

[B2, B4, E4, F1, F3, I2, I3]

68. *III Maccabees* 6. 28 [The repentant king says]

Release the sons of the almighty (παντοκράτορος) and living God (θεοῦ ζῶντος) of heaven, who from the time of our ancestors until now has granted an unimpeded and notable stability to our government.

[A3, B2, B4, D2, E4, I1]

69. *IV Maccabees* 5. 24 [Eleazar describes the Jewish philosophy to Antiochus]

... and it teaches us piety, so that with proper reverence we worship the only real God (μόνον τὸν ὄντα θεόν).

[B2, B6]

Passages from the Pseudepigrapha (Numbers 70–138) (Translations from the Charlesworth Edition)

70. *II Enoch* (A) 2. 2e-3 [Enoch instructs his sons]

² ... Do not turn away from the LORD, nor worship unreal gods, who did not create either the heaven or the earth. [They will perish.] ³ And may the LORD make your hearts true in reverence for him.

[A1, B6, D1]

71. *II Enoch* (A) 9. 1 [Angels explain to Enoch his vision of Paradise]

This place has been prepared, Enoch, for the righteous, who suffer every kind of tribulation in this life and who afflict their souls, and who avert their eyes from injustice, and who carry out righteous judgment, to give bread to the hungry, and to cover the naked with clothing, and to lift up the fallen, and to help the injured, who walk before the face of the LORD, and who worship him only—for them this [place] has been prepared as an eternal inheritance.

[B6, G4, H4]

72. *II Enoch* (A) 33. 3–8 [From a passage in which God makes known to Enoch the secrets of his work of creation]

³ And now, Enoch, whatever I have explained to you, and whatever you have seen in the heavens, and whatever you have seen on earth, and whatever I have written in the books—by my supreme wisdom I have contrived it all—I created from the lowest foundation and up to the highest and out to their end. ⁴ There is no counselor and no successor, only myself, eternal, not made by hands. My unchanging thought is (my) counselor, and my word is (my) deed. And my eyes behold all things. If I turn my face away, then all falls into destruction; but if I look at it, then all is stable. ⁵ Apply your mind, Enoch, and acknowledge the One who is speaking to you. And you take the books which I (!) have written. ⁶ And I give you Semeila and Rasuila, who brought you up to me. And you go down onto the earth and tell your sons all that I have told you, everything that I (!) have seen, from the lowest heavens up to my throne. ⁷ All the army I created. There is no one who opposes me or who is insubordinate; and all submit themselves to my sole rule and work my sole dominion. ⁸ And deliver to them the books in your handwriting, and they will read them and know their Creator. And they will understand this also how that there is no other Creator except myself.

[B1, B4, B5, D1, D3, E2, H1, H2, H3, I1]

73. *II Enoch* (J) 36. 1b [From the same context as the preceding]

And they will read and understand that there is no other God apart from myself, so that they may carry out all your instructions and study the books in your handwriting [accurately and attentively].

[B1, B6, G4]

74. *II Enoch* (A) 47. 2–5 [Enoch instructs his household]

² And receive these books, the books in your father's handwriting, and read them. And in them you will learn the deeds of the LORD, ³ that there is no one besides the LORD alone, ⁴ who laid the foundations upon the unknown things, and who spread out the heavens above the invisible things. ⁵ And the earth he solidified above the waters, basing it upon the unfixed things; and who alone created the uncountable creatures. Who is it who has counted the dust of the earth or the sand of the sea or the drops of the clouds?

[B1, D1, H3]

75. *II Enoch* (A) 66. 1–4 [Enoch instructs his household]

¹ Now therefore, my children, guard your souls from every kind of injustice, from everything which the LORD hates. ² Walk in front of the face of the LORD, and worship him alone. And bring every oblation in front of the face of the LORD. ³ [wanting] ⁴ For if [you] look [upon the sky], the LORD is

there; for the LORD created the sky. If [you] look upon the earth and upon the ocean, and if [you] meditate upon the things beneath the earth, the LORD is there as well. For the LORD created all things.

[B6, D1, E2, E3, G4, I3]

76. *II Enoch* (J) 69. 4 [A prayer of Methusalom]

... O LORD, the only One of the whole world, who has taken away my father Enoch, you raise up a priest for [your] people, and give their heart understanding to fear your glory and to perform everything in accordance with your will.

[B6, E6, G4, I2]

77. *Sibylline Oracles* III, 11–12

There is one God (εἷς θεός ἐστι), sole ruler (μόναρχος), ineffable (ἀθέσφατος), who lives in the sky, self-begotten (αὐτοφυής), invisible, who himself sees all things.

[A2, A3, A4, B5, E2, I1]

78. *Sibylline Oracles* III, 571–72

What God alone (θεός γε μόνος) has planned will not go unfulfilled. A strong necessity will insist that everything be fulfilled.

[H2]

79. *Sibylline Oracles* III, 591–94 [From a passage describing the Jewish people]

For on the contrary, at dawn they lift up holy arms toward heaven, from their beds, always sanctifying their flesh with water, and they honor only the Immortal who always rules (τιμῶσι μόνον τὸν ἀεί μεδέοντα), and then their parents....

[B6, D2, H1, I1]

80. *Sibylline Oracles* III, 628–31

But propitiate him, the immortal God, so that he may have pity for he alone is God (αὐτὸς γὰρ μόνος ἐστὶ θεός) and there is no other. Honor righteousness and oppress no one, for so the Immortal bids wretched mortals.

[B1, D2, F4, G4, H1]

81. *Sibylline Oracles* III, 703–06

But the sons of the great God will all live
peacefully around the Temple, rejoicing in these things
which the Creator, just judge and sole ruler (μόναρχος), will give.
For he alone (αὐτὸς μόνος) will shield them, standing by them magnificently
as if he had a wall of blazing fire round about.

[D1, F1, H3, H4, I1, I2, I3, I4]

82. *Sibylline Oracles* III, 716–23 [The people of the world will say]

‘Come, let us all fall on the ground and entreat
the immortal king, the great eternal God.
Let us send to the Temple, since he alone (μόνος) is sovereign
and let us all ponder the Law of the Most High God,
who is most righteous of all throughout the earth.
But we had wandered from the path of the Immortal.
With mindless spirit we revered things made by hand,
idols and statues of dead men’.

[A1, B6, D2, E6, G4, G5, H1, H4, I1, I2, I3]

83. *Sibylline Oracles* III, 757–61

The Immortal in the starry heaven will put in effect
a common law for men throughout the whole (ἅπασαν) earth
for all that is done among wretched mortals.
For he himself alone is God (μόνος ἐστὶ θεός) and there is no other,
and he himself will burn with fire a race of grievous men.

[A3, B1, D2, E6, G4, H1, H4, I4]

84. *Sibylline Oracles* III, 762–63

But urge on your minds in your breasts
and shun unlawful worship. Worship the Living One (τῷ ζῶντι).

[A1, B2, B6, D2]

85. *Sibylline Oracles* IV, 27–32

They will reject all temples when they see them;
altars too, useless foundations of dumb stones
defiled with blood of animate creatures, and sacrifices
of four-footed animals. They will look to the great glory of the one God (ἐνὸς θεοῦ)
and commit no wicked murder, nor deal in
dishonest gain, which are most horrible things.

[A1, G4, H4, I2]

86. *Sibylline Oracles* V, 172–76 [From an oracle against the city of Rome]

Did you not know what God can do, what he devises?
 But you said, ‘I alone am, and no one will ravage me’.
 But now God, who is forever, will destroy you and all your people,
 and there will no longer be any sign of you in that land,
 as there was formerly, when the great God found your honors.

[B2, B4]

87. *Sibylline Oracles* V, 284–85

For with great piety and faith they put their hope
 in the one begetter, God, who alone is eminent (εἰς ἓνα γὰρ
 γενετήρα θεὸν μόνον ἕξοχον ὄντα).

[B6, D1, F1, H3, I2]

88. *Sibylline Oracles* V, 493–500 [A priest calls Egypt to repentance]

‘Come, let us erect a sanctuary of the true God (θεοῦ ἀληθοῦς).
 Come, let us change the terrible custom we have received from our ancestors
 on account of which they performed processions and rites
 to gods of stone and earthenware, and were devoid of sense.
 Let us turn our souls, singing out the praises of the imperishable God
 himself, the begetter who is eternal,
 the ruler of all, the true one, the king,
 the begetter who nourishes souls, the great eternal God’.

[A1, B2, B6, D1, D3, E2, G5, H1, H3, H4, I1, I2]

89. *Sibylline Oracles*, fragment 1, 7–11

There is one God (εἷς θεός), who rules alone (ὃς μόνος ἄρχει),
 exceedingly great, unbegotten (ἀγέννητος),
 universal ruler (παντοκράτωρ), invisible, who himself sees all
 things (ἅπαντα).
 He is not seen by any mortal flesh.
 For what flesh can see with eyes the true and heavenly
immortal God (ἐπουράνιον καὶ ἀληθῆ θεόν), who inhabits the vault
 of heaven?

[A2, A3, B2, B5, D2, E2, E4, H1, I1, I2]

90. *Sibylline Oracles*, fragment 1, 15–22

Revere him who alone (μόνον) is ruler of the world.
He is alone (μόνος), from age to age,
 self-generated (αὐτογενής), unbegotten (ἀγέννητος), ruling
 everything (ἅπαντα) throughout.
 Administering judgment to all mortals in common light.
 You will have the appropriate reward of wickedness

because you abandoned the true (ἀληθινόν) and eternal God
and (ceased) to honor him and sacrifice sacred hecatombs
but made the sacrifices to the demons in Hades.

[A2, B1, B2, B6, E2, E6, H1, H4, I1, I3, I4]

91. *Sibylline Oracles*, fragment 1, 32–34

There is one God (εἷς θεός ἐστὶ) who sends showers, winds, and earthquakes,
lightnings, famines, pestilence, and mournful woes,
snowstorms and ice....

[D4]

92. *Sibylline Oracles*, fragment 3, 3–6

But God (is) alone (μόνος), unique (εἷς), supreme over all
(πανυπέριστος). He has made
heaven and sun and stars and moon,
fruitful earth and waves of water of the sea,
lofty mountains, perennial streams of springs.

[D1, E2, H3, I2]

93. *Sibylline Oracles*, fragment 3, 34–37

But he is life and imperishable eternal light,
and he pours out a delight sweeter than honey for men ...
Bend the neck to him alone (μόνω)
and you will incline your path among the pious ages.

[B6, D2, F4, H1, I3]

94. *Sibylline Oracles*, fragment 3, 43–47

Therefore the gleam of blazing fire comes upon you.
You will be burned with torches all day, throughout eternity,
Shamed by lies on account of useless idols.
But those who honor the true (ἀληθινόν) eternal God
inherit life, dwelling in the luxuriant garden.

[A1, B2, B6, D2, H1, H4, I4]

95. *Treatise of Shem* 8. 3 [Part of the horoscope for a year which begins in Scorpio]

And rain will diminish until people recite petition(s) and prayer(s), and beseech with alms the living
God.

[B2, B6, D2, D4]

96. *II Baruch* 21. 7–10 [From a prayer of Baruch]

⁷ For you alone (all) this exists so that you may create at once all that you want. ⁸ You are the one who causes the rain to fall on earth with a specific number of raindrops. You alone know the end of times before it has arrived. Hear my prayer. ⁹ For only you can sustain those who exist, those who have gone and those who will come, those who sin and those who have proved themselves to be righteous, since you are the Living One, the Inscrutable One. ¹⁰ For you are the only Living One, the Immortal One and the Inscrutable One, and you know the number of men.

[A4, B2, B5, B6, D1, D2, D3, D4, H1, H3, H4]

97. *II Baruch* 48. 3 [From a prayer of Baruch]

Only you know the length of the generations,
and you do not reveal your secrets to many.

[B5, G1, H4]

98. *II Baruch* 48. 23b-24a [From the same prayer as the foregoing]

For we are all a people of the Name;
we, who received one Law from the One.

[G3, G4]

99. *II Baruch* 54. 1 [From another prayer of Baruch]

... You alone, O Lord, knew the heights of the world beforehand and that which will happen in the times which you bring about by your word. And against the works of the inhabitants of the earth you hasten the beginnings of the times. And the ends of the periods you alone know.

[B5, H2, H3, H4, H5]

100. *II Baruch* 54. 12 [From the same prayer as the foregoing]

For who is able to imitate your miracles, O God, or who understands your deep thoughts of life?

[B4, B5]

101. *II Baruch* 69. 2 [Part of the angel Ramael's interpretation of Baruch's vision of the waters]

For the Most High made a division at the beginning
for only he knows what will happen in the future.

[B5, H3, H4, H5, I2]

102. *II Baruch* 75. 1 [From a prayer of Baruch]

Who can equal your goodness, O Lord? for it is incomprehensible.

[A4, F4]

103. *II Baruch* 85. 14–15 [From Baruch’s letter to the Jewish brothers in captivity]

¹⁴ Therefore, there is one Law by One, one world and an end for all those who exist. ¹⁵ Then he will make alive those whom he has found, and he will purge them from sins, and at the same time he will destroy those who are polluted with sins.

[D2, E6, G4, H4, I3, I4]

104. *Apocalypse of Abraham* 17. 8–10a [The opening of the song recited by Abraham under the direction of his angel-guide before God’s presence in heaven]

⁸ Eternal One, Mighty One, Holy El, God autocrat ⁹ self-originate, incorruptible, immaculate, unbegotten, spotless, immortal,
¹⁰ self-perfected, self-devised, etc.

[A2, B4, D2, H1, I3]

105. *Apocalypse of Abraham* 19. 1–3 [When Abraham has attained to the seventh heaven, he hears a voice]

¹ And a voice came to me out of the midst of the fire, saying, ‘Abraham, Abraham!’ ² And I said, ‘Here I am!’ ³ And he said, ‘Look at the expanses which are under the firmament to which you have now been directed and see that on no single expanse is there any other but the one whom you have searched for or who has loved you’.

[B6, F4]

106. *Apocalypse of Elijah* 2. 10 [In the days of the king of peace]

[He will give] peace to these who are holy, [saying], ‘The name of [God] is one’.

[H4]

107. *Apocalypse of Elijah* 2. 49 [From the description of the triumph of the Persians over the Assyrians and the reforms which follow]

They will give double gifts to the house of God. They will say, ‘The name of God is one’.

[B6, G5, H4]

108. *Testament of Joseph* 6. 5 [Potiphar’s wife asks Joseph why he did not eat the food she offered him. He replies]

‘Because you filled it with a deadly enchantment. How can you say, “I do not go near the idols, but only to the Lord”’ (κυρίῳ μόνῳ).

[A1, B6]

109. *Testament of Job* 37. 1–2 [Baldad tests Job’s sanity with a question]

¹ So he said, ‘In whom do you hope?’ ² And I said, ‘In the God who lives’ (θεῶ τῷ ζῶντι).

[B2, B6, D2, F1]

110. *Testament of Abraham* (A) 8. 7 [A message from God to Abraham]

Truly I say to you that blessing I will bless you and multiplying I will multiply your seed, and I will give to you whatever you ask of me; for I am the Lord your God (ἐγὼ εἰμι κύριος ὁ θεός σου) and besides me there is no other.

[B1, F5]

111. *Testament of Abraham* (A) 17. 11 [Abraham speaks to Death]

Abraham said, ‘Yes, I shall be able to behold all your ferocity, on account of the name of the living God (τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος), because the power of my heavenly God is with me’.

[A3, B2, B4, D2]

112. *Testament of Moses* 10. 7 [From an apocalyptic description of the last day]

For God Most High will surge forth,
the Eternal One alone (*quia exurgit summus deus aeternus solus*).
 In full view will he come to work vengeance on the nations.
 Yea, all their idols will he destroy.

[A1, E6, H1, H4, I2, I4]

113. *Letter of Aristeas* 132, 134–35, 139–40 [The scripture scholars sent from Jerusalem to the court of King Ptolemy II answer initial inquiries about their religion]

¹³² (Eleazar) began first of all (πάντων πρώτον) by demonstrating that God is one (μόνος ὁ θεός ἐστι), that his power is shown in everything (διὰ πάντων), every place (παντός τόπου) being filled with his sovereignty, and that none of the things on earth which men do secretly are hidden from him, but rather that all the deeds of any man are manifest to him, as well as that which is to come to pass.

¹³⁴ This was his introduction: He proceeded to show that all the rest of mankind (‘except ourselves’, as he said) believe that there are many gods, because men themselves are much more powerful than the gods whom they vainly worship; ¹³⁵ they make images of stone and wood, and declare that they are

likenesses of those who have made some beneficial discovery for their living, and whom they worship, even though the insensibility (of the images) is close at hand to appreciate.

¹³⁹ In his wisdom the legislator, in a comprehensive survey of each particular part, and being endowed by God for the knowledge of universal truths, surrounded us with unbroken palisades and iron walls to prevent our mixing with any of the other peoples in any matter, being thus kept pure in body and soul, preserved from false beliefs, and worshipping the only God omnipotent over all creation (τὸν μόνον θεὸν καὶ δυνατὸν σεβόμενοι παρ' ὅλην τὴν πᾶσαν κτίσιν). ¹⁴⁰ Hence the leading priests among the Egyptians, conducting many close investigations and with practical experience of affairs, gave us the title 'men of God', which is ascribed exclusively to those who worship the true God (ἀλήθειαν θεόν), and not to those who are concerned with meat and drink and clothes, their whole attitude (to life) being concentrated on these concerns.

[A1, B1, B2, B4, B5, B6, E2, E3, G4, H4, I1]

114. *Letter of Aristeas* 143 [From the same context as the foregoing]

In general everything is similarly constituted in regard to natural reasoning, being governed by one supreme power (ὑπὸ μιᾶς δυνάμεως οἰκονομούμενα), and in each particular everything has a profound reason for it, both the things from which we abstain in use and those of which we partake.

[E2, E4, G4, I1]

115. *Jubilees* 1. 24–25a [The LORD speaks to Moses about Israel]

²⁴ And their souls will cleave to me and to all my commandments. And they will do my commandments. And I shall be a father to them, and they will be sons to me. ²⁵ And they will all be called 'sons of the living God'.

[B2, B6, C, D2, G1, G4]

116. *Jubilees* 10. 6 [From a prayer of Noah for protection from the Watchers]

And let them not rule over the spirits of the living because you alone know their judgment, and do not let them have power over the children of the righteous henceforth and forever.

[B1, B5, F1]

117. *Jubilees* 12. 19–20 [A prayer of Abraham]

¹⁹ ... My God, the Most High God, you alone are God to me.
And you created everything,
and everything which is was the work of your hands,
and you and your kingdom I have chosen.
²⁰ Save me from the hands of evil spirits
which rule over the thought of the heart of man,
and do not let them lead me astray from following you, O my God;
but establish me and my seed forever,
and let us not go astray henceforth and forever.

[B1, B6, D1, E2, F1, H3, I2]

118. *Jubilees* 15. 31–32a [From a passage about God’s choosing Israel]

³¹ And he sanctified them and gathered them from all of the sons of man because (there are) many nations and many people, and they all belong to him, but over all of them he caused spirits to rule so that they might lead them astray from following him. ³² But over Israel he did not cause any angel or spirit to rule because he alone is their ruler.

[B1, E6, G1, I1]

119. *Jubilees* 21. 3–4 [From Abraham’s farewell testament for Isaac]

³ I hated idols, and those who serve them I have rejected. And I have offered my heart and spirit so that I might be careful to do the will of the one who created me ⁴ because he is the living God. And he is holy, and faithful, and he is more righteous than all (others) and there is no accepting of persons with him or accepting of gifts because he is a righteous God and he is the one who executes judgment with all who transgress his commandments and despise his covenant.

[A1, B2, B6, D1, D2, G2, G4, H3, I3, I4]

120. *Ascension of Isaiah* 4. 6–8 [From a prophecy about the reign of Beliar]

⁶ And he will do everything he wishes in the world; he will act and speak like the Beloved, and will say, ‘I am the LORD, and before me there was no one’. ⁷ And all men in the world will believe in him. ⁸ They will sacrifice to him and will serve him, saying, ‘This is the LORD, and besides him there is no other’.

[B1, B6, E6, H3]

121. *Joseph and Aseneth* 8. 5–6 [On being introduced to Aseneth, Joseph refuses to kiss her]

⁵ ... And Joseph said, ‘It is not fitting for a man who worships God, who will bless with his mouth the living God (τὸν θεὸν τὸν ζῶντα) and eat blessed bread of life and drink a blessed cup of immortality and anoint himself with blessed ointment of incorruptibility to kiss a strange woman who will bless with her mouth dead and dumb idols and eat from their table bread of strangulation and drink from their libation a cup of insidiousness and anoint herself with ointment of destruction. ⁶ But a man who worships God will kiss his mother and the sister (who is born) of his mother and the sister (who is born) of his clan and family and the wife who shares his bed, (all of) who(m) bless with their mouths the living God (θεὸν ζῶντα).

[A1, B2, B6, D2]

122. *Joseph and Aseneth* 12. 12–13 [From Aseneth’s prayer of repentance]

¹² ... Rescue me, Lord,
the desolate and solitary,
because my father and my mother disowned me and said,
‘Aseneth is not our daughter’,
because I have destroyed and ground (to pieces) their gods,
and have come to hate them.
¹³ And I am now an orphan and desolate,
and I have no other hope save in you, Lord,
and no other refuge except your mercy, Lord,

because you are the father of the orphans,
and a protector of the persecuted
and a helper of the afflicted.

[A1, B6, F1, F3, F4]

123. *Life of Adam and Eve* 28. 1–2 [A prayer of Adam]

¹ ... You are the eternal and most high God and all creatures give you honor and praise. ² You are the true light (*vera lux*) shining above all lights, living life (*vita vivens*), incomprehensively great excellence. To you the spiritual powers give honor and praise. You perform among all humanity the miracles of your mercy.

[A4, B2, B3, B6, D2, E2, E6, F4, H1, I2]

124. Pseudo-Philo, *Biblical Antiquities* 6. 4 [Abraham and others, when questioned about their refusal to make bricks for the tower of Babel, say]

... We are not casting in bricks, nor are we joining in your scheme. We know the one LORD (*Unum Dominum novimus*) and him we worship.

[B6]

125. Pseudo-Philo, *Biblical Antiquities* 23. 14 [At the renewal of the covenant under Joshua (cf. Josh. chapter 24) the people of Israel answer]

... The Lord is our God (*Dominus est Deus noster*), and him alone (*ipsi soli*) we will serve!

[B6, G1]

126. *Lives of the Prophets* 21. 8 [From the section about Elijah]

When the question was posed by him and the prophets of Baal concerning who is the true and real God (τίς ἄν εἴη ὁ ἀληθινὸς καὶ ὄντως θεός), he proposed that a sacrifice be offered both by him and by them, and that fire not be placed under (it), but that each should pray, and the one answering him would be God (εἶναι θεόν).

[A1, B1, B2, B6]

127. Pseudo-Phocylides, *Sentences* 54

The only God (εἷς θεός) is wise and mighty and at the same time rich in blessings.

[B4, B5, F5]

128. *Odes of Solomon* 6. 3–5

³ For he destroys whatever is foreign,

4 and everything is of the Lord.
 For thus has it been from the beginning,
 and (will be) until the end.
 5 So that nothing will be contrary,
and nothing will rise up against him.

[B4, E2, H3, H4, H5, I4]

129. *Odes of Solomon* 38. 20 [From a passage in which the poet describes himself as a plant tended by the Lord]

And the Lord alone was praised,
 in his planting and in his cultivation.

[B6]

130. *Odes of Solomon* 41. 13–15

13 The Son of the Most High appeared
 in the perfection of his Father.
 14 And light dawned from the Word
 that was before time in him.
 15 The Messiah in truth is one.
 And he was known before the foundations of the world,
 that he might give life to persons forever by the truth of his name.

[D2, H3]

131. Pseudo-Orpheus, fragment, quoted by Aristobulus (Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* XIII, 12. 5), lines 7–16, 32–41 (*OTPs*, II, 799–800)

7 ... Set out firmly
 8 On the path, and look only (μοῦνον) at the undying shaper of the universe.
 9 There is an ancient saying about him:
 10 ‘He is one’ (εἷς ἐστ’)—self-completing, and all things (πάντα) completed by him,
 11 In them he himself circulates. But no one has seen him
 12 With the souls mortals have, he is seen [only] by Mind.
 13 He does not take good things and make them into evil
 14 For people, but he comes in company with love and hate,
 15 ‘And war and plague and weeping pain’—
 16 ‘And there is no other’....
 32 Yes he after this is established in the great heaven
 33 On a golden throne. He stands with his feet on the earth.
 34 He stretches out his right hand to the ends of the ocean.
 35 The foundation of the mountains trembles within at [his] anger,
 36 And the depths of the gray sparkling sea.
 37 They cannot endure the mighty power. He is entirely
 38 Heavenly, and he brings everything (πάντα) to completion on earth,
 39 Being ‘the beginning, the middle, and the end (ἀρχὴν αὐτὸς ἔχων, καὶ μέσσατον, ἡδὲ
 τελευτήν)’,
 40 As the saying of the ancients, as the one water-born has
 described it,
 41 The one who received [revelations] from God in aphorisms, in the form of a double law.

[A2, A3, B1, B4, B6, D1, E2, E3, E4, E5, F4, H1, H3, H4, H5, I1, I4]

132. Pseudo-Orpheus, fragment, quoted by Aristobulus (Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* XIII, 13. 55 [trans. from the edition of Gifford])

One power (ἐν κράτος), one god (εἰς δαίμων), one vast and flaming
heav'n,
One universal frame (ἐν δὲ τὰ πάντα), wherein revolve
All things (πάντα) which here we see, fire, water, earth.

[B4, E2, E3]

133. Pseudo-Orpheus, fragment, quoted by Aristobulus (Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* XIII, 13. 62 [trans. from the edition of Gifford])

There is none other save the mighty King.

[B1, B4, I1]

134. Hesiod, fragment, quoted by Clement of Alexandria in *Stromata* V, 14. 112–13 and in *Protrepticus* VI, 73. 3 (*OTPs*, II, 824)

For he is king and master of all (πάντων)
and none of the immortals contends with him in power.

[B3, B4, E2, I1]

135. Pseudo-Pythagoras, fragment, quoted by Pseudo-Justin in *De monarchia* 2 (*OTPs*, II, 824)

If anyone says, 'I am God', apart from the One (πᾶρεξ ἑνός), he should
set up a world equal to this and say, 'This is mine'.
He should not only set it up and call it 'mine', but also should himself dwell
in that which he has made. For it has been made by this one.

[B1, D1, E2, E3, H3]

136. Pseudo-Sophocles, fragment, quoted by Clement of Alexandria in *Protrepticus* VII, 74. 2 and in *Stromata* V, 14. 113–14, and by Pseudo-Justin in *De monarchia* 2 and in the *Cohortatio ad gentiles* 18 (*OTPs*, II, 825–26)

God is one, one in very truth (εἰς τᾶς ἀληθείαισιν, εἰς ἐστιν θεός),
who fashioned heaven and the broad earth,
the depth's gray swell and the winds' might.
But many of us mortals, erring in our heart,
have set up consolation for calamities,
statues of gods made of stone, or figures of bronze,
wrought gold or ivory.
Sacrifices do we grace with these as well as
lovely holy days, and think we thus act piously.

[A1, D1, H3]

137. Sophocles, fragment, quoted by Clement of Alexandria (Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* XIII, 13. 55 [trans. from the edition of Gifford])

Not even the gods have all things (πάντα) at their will,
Save Zeus, the final and first cause of all (κεῖνος γὰρ ἔχει τέλος ἡδὲ καὶ ἀρχήν).

[B3, D1, E2, H3, H4, H5, I1]

138. Pseudo-Diphilus/Menander, fragment, quoted by Clement of Alexandria in *Stromata* V, 14. 133, 3, by Eusebius in *Praep. ev.* XIII, 13. 62, and by Pseudo-Justin in *De monarchia* 5 (*OTPs*, II, 829)

Wherefore honor only (μόνον) the one who is forever Lord (τὸν ὄντα κύριον) of all (πάντων) and father for all time, who discovered and established so many pleasant things.

[B6, C, D1, E2, H1, H3, H4, H5, I1]

Passages from the Qumran Documents (Numbers 139–52) (Translations from the Vermes Edition)

139. 1QS 11. 17–20 (= Vermes, p. 94)

For without Thee no way is perfect,
and without Thy will nothing is done.
It is Thou who hast taught all knowledge
and all things (*kol han-nihyah*) come to pass by Thy will.
There is none beside Thee to dispute Thy counsel
or to understand all Thy holy design,
or to contemplate the depth of Thy mysteries
and the power of Thy might.
Who can endure Thy glory,
and what is the son of man
in the midst of Thy wonderful deeds?

[B3, B4, B5, E5, H2, I2]

140. 1QM 10. 8–9, 11–12 (= Vermes, pp. 136–37)

O God of Israel, who is like Thee
in heaven or on earth?
Who accomplishes deeds and mighty works like thine?...

[Thou, O God, hast created] the expanse of the heavens
and the host of heavenly lights,
the tasks of the spirits
and the dominion of the Holy Ones,
the treasury of glory
[and the canopy of the] clouds.

[B3, B4, D1, G3, H3]

141. 1QM 13. 13–16 (= Vermes, p. 141)

O God of Israel, who can compare with Thee in might? Thy mighty hand is with the poor. Which angel or prince can compare with Thy [redeeming] succour? [For Thou has appointed] the day of battle from ancient times ... [to come to the aid] of truth and to destroy iniquity, to bring Darkness low and to magnify Light ... to stand for ever, and to destroy all the sons of Darkness...

[B3, B4, F1, F4, G3, H2, H3, H4, H5, I3, I4]

142. 1QH 7. 28–29 (= Vermes, p. 175)

Who is like Thee among the gods (*elim*), O Lord,
and who is according to Thy truth?
Who, when he is judged,
shall be righteous before Thee?
For no spirit can reply to Thy rebuke
nor can any withstand Thy wrath.

[B3, G2, I4]

143. 1QH 7. 31–32 (= Vermes, p. 175)

For Thou art an eternal God;
all Thy ways are determined for ever [and ever]
and there is none other beside Thee.

[B1, H1, H2, H4]

144. 1QH 9. 15–18 (= Vermes, p. 180)

Though one man be more just than another,
one person [more] wise [than another],
one mortal more glorious
than another creature [of clay],
yet there is no power to compare with Thy might.
There is no [bound] to Thy glory,
and to Thy wisdom, no measure;
[to Thy truth] there is no ...
and all who forsake it ...

[B3, B4, B5, G2, I2]

145. 1QH 10. 8–12 (= Vermes, p. 183)

Behold, Thou art Prince of gods (*elim*)
and King of majesties,
Lord of all spirits,
and Ruler of all (*kol*) creatures;
nothing is done without Thee,
and nothing is known without Thy will.
Beside Thee there is nothing,
and nothing can compare with Thee in strength;

in the presence of Thy glory there is nothing,
and Thy might is without price.

Who among Thy great and marvellous creatures
can stand in the presence of Thy glory?
How then can he who returns to his dust?
For Thy glory's sake alone (raq) hast Thou made all (*kol*) these
things.

[B3, B4, D1, E2, H2, H3, I1, I2]

146. 1QH 12. 9–11 (= Vermes, p. 189)

[Periods, ages, and seasons are appointed]
... by the certain law from the mouth of God,
by the precept which is and shall be
for ever and ever without end.
Without it nothing is nor shall be,
for the God of knowledge established it
and there is no other beside Him.

[B1, B5, E5, H1, H2, H4]

147. 1QH 12. 29–31 (= Vermes, p. 190)

Not even [the wonderful] Heroes (*g^ebu[rin]*) [can] declare all Thy glory
or stand in face of Thy wrath,
and there is none among them
that can answer Thy rebuke;
for Thou art just and none can oppose Thee.

[B3, I2, I3, I4]

148. 1QH 13. 16–17 (= Vermes, p. 192)

By Thy goodness alone (raq) is man righteous,
and with Thy many mercies [Thou strengthenest him].

[F4]

149. 1QH 15. 14–15 (= Vermes, p. 195)

Thou alone (raq) didst [create (*[bara]ta*—cf. M. Mansoor, *The Thanksgiving Hymns*, p. 183)] the just.

[D1, H3]

150. 4QDibHam 3. 4–5 (= Vermes, p. 203)

We have called on Thy Name alone (raq). Thou hast created us for Thy glory and made us Thy
children in the sight of all (*kol*) the nations.

[B6, C, D1, E6, G1, I2]

151. 4QDibHam 5. 6–9 (= Vermes, p. 204)

Yet notwithstanding all this, Thou didst not reject the seed of Jacob neither didst Thou cast away Israel to destruction, breaking Thy Covenant with them. For Thou alone (*l'badde^ekah*) art a living God (*el chay*) and there is none beside Thee. Thou didst remember Thy Covenant....

[B1, B2, D2, G1, G2]

152. 4QSI 40, lines 6–7 (= Vermes, pp. 212–13)

The spirits of the Living God (*[e]lohim chayyim*) move perpetually with the glory of the wonderful Chariot.

[B2, D2, I2]

Passages from Philo (Numbers 153–66) (Translations from the Loeb Edition)

153. Philo, *De opificio mundi* 170–72 (Loeb vol. 1, pp. 134–37) [Philo's summary of his treatise on creation]

¹⁷⁰ ... By his account of the creation of the world of which we have spoken Moses teaches us among many other things five that are fairest and best of all. Firstly that the Deity (τὸ θεῖον) is and has been from eternity.... ¹⁷¹ Secondly, that God is one (θεὸς εἷς ἐστι). This with a view to the propounders of polytheism, who do not blush to transfer from earth to heaven mob-rule, that worst of evil polities. Thirdly, as I have said already, that the world came into being.... Fourthly, that the world too is one as well as its Maker (ἐπειδὴ καὶ εἷς ὁ δημιουργός), who made His work like Himself in its uniqueness (<ὁ> ἕξομοιώσας αὐτῷ κατὰ τὴν μόνωσιν τὸ ἔργον), who used up for the creation of the whole (τοῦ ὅλου) all (ἀπάσῃ) the material that exists; for it would not have been a whole (ὅλον) had it not been formed and consisted of parts that were wholes.... Fifthly, that God also exercises forethought on the world's behalf....

¹⁷² He that has begun by learning these things with his understanding rather than with his hearing, and has stamped on his soul impressions of truths so marvellous and priceless, both that God is and is from eternity, and that He that really IS is One (εἷς ὁ ὧν ὄντως ἐστί), and that He has made the world and has made it one world, unique as Himself is unique (κατὰ τὴν μόνωσιν ἕξομοιώσας ἑαυτῷ), and that He ever exercises forethought for His creation, will lead a life of bliss and blessedness, because he has a character moulded by the truths that piety and holiness enforce.

[B1, B2, B5, D1, D3, E2, G4, H1, H3, I1]

154. Philo, *Legum allegoriae* II, 1–2 (Loeb vol. 1, pp. 224–25) [Philo offers an exegesis of Gen. 2. 18]

¹ ... ‘And the Lord God said, It is not good that the man should be alone, let us make for him a helper corresponding to him’ (Gen. ii. 18). Why, O prophet, is it not good that the man should be alone? Because, he says, it is good that the Alone should be alone (τὸν μόνον εἶναι μόνον): but God, being one (εἷς ὧν), is alone and unique (μόνος δὲ καὶ καθ' ἑαυτόν), and like God there is nothing. Hence, since it is good that He Who IS should be alone—for indeed with regard to Him alone can the statement ‘it is good’ be made—it follows that it would not be good that the man should be alone. ² There is another way in which we may understand the statement that God is alone. It may mean that neither before creation was there anything with God, nor, when the universe had come into being, does anything take its place with Him; for there is absolutely nothing which He needs. A yet better interpretation is the following. God is alone (μόνος), a Unity (ἓν), in the sense that His nature is

simple not composite, whereas each one of us and of all other created beings is made up of many things.

[A2, B2, D1, E2, H3]

155. Philo, *De confusione linguarum* 170 (Loeb vol. 4, pp. 102–03) [Philo sets out to interpret the problematic plural forms in Gen. 1. 26; 3. 22, and 11. 7]

Now we must first lay down that no existing thing is of equal honour to God and that there is only one (εἷς) sovereign ruler and king, who alone (μόνῳ) may direct and dispose of all things (τὰ σύμπαντα). For the lines:

It is not well that many lords should rule;
Be there but one, one king,

could be said with more justice of the world and of God than of cities and men. For being one it must needs have one maker and father and master.

[C, D1, E2, H3, I1]

156. Philo, *De vita Mosis* I, 75 (Loeb vol. 6, pp. 314–15) [From Philo's treatment of the episode of the burning bush (Ex. 3. 13–14)]

God replied: 'First tell them that I am He Who IS (ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ὢν), that they may learn the difference between what IS and what is not (ὄντος τε καὶ μὴ ὄντος), and also the further lesson that no name at all can properly be used of Me, to Whom alone (μόνῳ) existence belongs.

[A4, B2]

157. Philo, *De decalogo* 64–65 (Loeb vol. 7, pp. 38–39) [From a passage against the deification of the heavenly bodies]

⁶⁴ Let us then reject all such imposture and refrain from worshipping those who by nature are our brothers, even though they have been given a substance purer and more immortal than ours, for created things, in so far as they are created, are brothers, since they have all (ἀπάντων) one (εἷς) Father, the Maker of the universe (τῶν ὅλων). Let us instead in mind and speech and every faculty gird ourselves up with vigour and activity to do the service of the Uncreated, the Eternal, the Cause of all (τῶν ὅλων), not submitting nor abasing ourselves to do the pleasure of the many who work the destruction even of those who might be saved. ⁶⁵ Let us, then, engrave deep in our hearts this as the first (πρῶτον) and most sacred of commandments, to acknowledge and honour one God (ἓνα θεόν) Who is above all, and let the idea that gods are many never even reach the ears of the man whose rule of life is to seek for truth in purity and guilelessness.

[A2, B1, B6, C, D1, E2, H1, H3, I2]

158. Philo, *De specialibus legibus* I, 12 (Loeb vol. 7, pp. 106–07) [Philo introduces the subject of his treatise]

... We must now turn to the particular laws, taking those first with which it is well to begin, namely those the subject of which is the sole sovereignty (μοναρχία) of God.

[I1]

159. Philo, *De specialibus legibus* I, 14 (Loeb vol. 7, pp. 106–07) [From a passage contesting the view that the sun, moon, and stars are gods]

The said magistrates, however, in his [Moses's] view have not unconditional powers, but are lieutenants (ὑπάρχους) of the one (ένός) Father of all (πάντων).

[B1, B3, C, E2, I1]

160. Philo, *De specialibus legibus* I, 30 (Loeb vol. 7, pp. 116–17) [Moses instructs people not to believe in many gods]

... This lesson he continually repeats, sometimes saying that God is one (θεός εἷς ἐστὶ) and the Framer and Maker of all things (τῶν ὅλων), sometimes that He is Lord of created beings, because stability and fixity and lordship are by nature vested in Him alone (περὶ αὐτὸν μόνον πέφυκε).

[D1, E2, H3, I1]

161. Philo, *De specialibus legibus* I, 42 (Loeb vol. 7, pp. 122–23) [From an imagined prayer of Moses]

Therefore I pray and beseech Thee to accept the supplication of a suppliant, a lover of God, one whose mind is set to serve Thee alone (μόνον).

[B6]

162. Philo, *De specialibus legibus* I, 52 (Loeb vol. 7, pp. 128–29) [From a passage about how the Jewish community embraces proselytes]

... For the most effectual love-charm, the chain which binds indissolubly the goodwill which makes us one is to honour the one God (τοῦ ένός θεοῦ).

[B6, G3]

163. Philo, *De specialibus legibus* I, 67 (Loeb vol. 7, pp. 138–39)

... But he [Moses] provided that there should not be temples built either in many places or many in the same place, for he judged that since God is one (ἐπειδὴ εἷς ἐστὶν ὁ θεός), there should be also only one temple.

[G5]

164. Philo, *De virtutibus* 179 (Loeb vol. 8, pp. 272–73) [Another passage about proselytes]

... So therefore all these who did not at the first acknowledge their duty to reverence the Founder and Father of all (τοῦ παντός), yet afterwards embraced the creed of one instead of a multiplicity of sovereigns (μοναρχίαν ἀντὶ πολυαρχίας), must be held to be our dearest friends and closest kinsmen.

[B1, B6, C, D1, E2, G3, H3, I1]

165. Philo, *De legatione ad Gaium* 115 (Loeb vol. 10, pp. 56–57) [Gaius hated the Jews because they alone had been trained]

... to acknowledge one God who is the Father and Maker of the world (ἕνα νομίζειν τὸν πατέρα καὶ ποιητὴν τοῦ κόσμου θεόν).

[B6, C, D1, E2, G1, H3]

166. Philo, *Quaestiones et solutiones in Genesin* IV, 8, selections (Loeb suppl. vol. 1, pp. 281–82)

So that truly and properly speaking, God alone is the measure of all things, both intelligible and sense-perceptible, and He in His oneness is likened to a triad because of the weakness of the beholders.

[The soul's vision] is not able to attain to the One as one but finds it natural to receive an impression of the triad in accordance with the appearances that attend the One like ministers, (namely) the chief powers [the creative and the kingly].

[E2]

Passages from Josephus (Numbers 167–73) (Translations from the Loeb Edition)

167. Josephus, *Contra Apionem* II, 167 (Loeb vol. 1, pp. 358–59) [From a passage presenting Moses as the most ancient and perfect lawgiver, specifically on Moses' view of God]

He represented Him as One (ἕνα), uncreated and immutable to all eternity; in beauty surpassing all mortal thought, made known to us by His power, although the nature of His real being (οὐσίαν) passes knowledge.

[A2, A4, B4, B5, H1]

168. Josephus, *Contra Apionem* II, 190–93 (Loeb vol. 1, pp. 368–71) [From a passage on the law of Moses as the perfect theocratic constitution of the Jewish people]

¹⁹⁰ What, then, are the precepts and prohibitions of our Law? They are simple and familiar. At their head (πρώτη) stands one of which God is the theme. The universe (τὰ σύμπαντα) is in God's hands; perfect and blessed, self-sufficing and sufficing for all, He is the beginning (ἀρχή), the middle (μέσα), and the end (τέλος) of all things (τῶν πάντων). By His works and bounties He is plainly seen, indeed more manifest than ought else; but His form and magnitude surpass our powers of description.

¹⁹¹ No materials, however costly, are fit to make an image of Him; no art has skill to conceive and represent it. The like of Him we have never seen, we do not imagine, and it is impious to conjecture.

¹⁹² We behold His works: the light, the heaven, the earth, the sun, the waters, the reproductive creatures, the sprouting crops. These God created, not with hands, not with toil, not with assistants of whom He had no need; He willed it so, and forthwith they were made in all their beauty. Him must we worship by the practice of virtue; for that is the most saintly manner of worshipping God.

¹⁹³ We have but one temple for the one God (ἓς ναὸς ἑνὸς θεοῦ)(for like ever loveth like), common to all as God is common to all.

[A1, A2, A3, A4, B5, D1, D3, E2, F5, G4, G5, H3, H4, H5]

169. Josephus, *Antiquitates judaicae* I, 155 (Loeb vol. 4, pp. 76–77) [In his history of the Jewish people, based on the biblical account, Josephus comes to the record of Abraham. Abraham is described as intelligent and determined to reform prevalent polytheistic conceptions about God]

... He was thus the first boldly to declare that God, the creator of the universe (τῶν ὅλων), is one (ἓν).

[B1, D1, E2, H3]

170. Josephus, *Antiquitates judaicae* I, 156 (Loeb vol. 4, pp. 78–79) [Abraham inferred from the regularity of land and sea, sun, moon and stars that they move]

... not in virtue of their own authority, but through the might of their commanding sovereign, to whom alone (ὃς μόνος) it is right to render our homage and thanksgiving.

[B1, B4, B6, I1]

171. Josephus, *Antiquitates judaicae* III, 91 (Loeb vol. 4, pp. 360–61) [From Josephus's summary of the Decalogue (Ex. chapters 19–20)]

The first word (ὁ πρῶτος λόγος) teaches us that God is one (θεός ἐστιν εἷς) and that he only (μόνον) must be worshipped.

[B6]

172. Josephus, *Antiquitates judaicae* IV, 200–01 (Loeb vol. 4, pp. 570–73) [When he reaches the end of his account of Moses' life, Josephus offers a summary of the 'constitution' which Moses wrote for Israel. From that summary]

²⁰⁰ Let there be one holy city in that place in the land of Canaan that is fairest and most famous for its excellence, a city which God shall choose for himself by prophetic oracle. And let there be one temple therein, and one altar of stones, not worked but picked out and put together, and which, coated with plaster, will be seemly and neat to look upon; ²⁰¹ and let the approach to this altar be not by steps but by a sloping embankment. In no other city let there be either altar or temple; for God is one (θεός γὰρ εἷς) and the Hebrew race is one.

[G3, G5]

173. Josephus, *Antiquitates judaicae* V, 111–112 (Loeb vol. 5, pp. 52–53) [From Josephus's treatment of the incident of the altar built by the trans-jordanian tribes (Josh. 22. 21–29). The tribes protested their innocence, saying]

¹¹¹ ... nor had they erected the altar with revolutionary intent: ¹¹² nay, they recognized but the one God (θεόν τε ἓν), owned by all Hebrews alike, and the brazen altar before the tabernacle whereon the sacrifices should be offered.

[B6, G3, G5]

Passages from the New Testament (Numbers 174–200) (RSV)

174. Matthew 4. 10/Luke 4. 8 [Jesus quotes Deut. 6. 13 to the tempter]

... You shall worship the Lord your God and him only (μόνον]absent in both MT and LXX) shall you serve.

[B1, B6]

175. Matthew 19. 17 (cf. Mark 10. 18; Luke. 18. 19) [Jesus replies to the rich young man]

... Why do you ask me about what is good? One there is who is good (εἷς ἐστὶν ὁ ἀγαθός) [Mark, Luke: 'No one is good but God alone (εἷς ὁ θεός)].

[F4]

176. Matthew 23. 8–10 [Jesus teaches]

⁸ But you are not to be called rabbi, for you have one teacher, and you are all brethren. ⁹ And call no man your father on earth, for you have one (εἷς) Father, who is in heaven. ¹⁰ Neither be called masters, for you have one (εἷς) master, the Christ.

[A3, B5, C, I1]

177. Matthew 24. 36 (cf. Mark 13. 32) [Jesus teaches]

But of that day and hour no one knows, not even the angels of heaven, nor the Son, but the Father only (μόνος).

[B5, C, H4]

178. Mark 2. 7 (cf. Luke 5. 21) [Some scribes question in their hearts]

Why does this man speak thus? It is blasphemy! Who can forgive sins but God alone (εἷς ὁ θεός [Luke: μόνος ὁ θεός])?

[B1, F4]

179. Mark 12. 28–32

²⁸ And one of the scribes came up and heard them disputing with one another, and seeing that he answered them well, asked him, 'Which commandment is the first (πρώτη) of all?' ²⁹ Jesus answered: 'The first (πρώτη) is, "Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God, the Lord is one (κύριος εἷς ἐστὶν); ³⁰ and you shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind, and with all your strength". ³¹ The second is this, "You shall love your neighbor as yourself". There is no other commandment greater than these'. ³² And the scribe said to him, 'You are right, Teacher; you have truly said that he is one (εἷς ἐστὶν), and there is no other but he'....

[B1, B6, E1, G4]

180. John 5. 44

[Jesus says to the Jews:] How can you believe, who receive glory from one another, and do not seek the glory that comes from the only God (τοῦ μόνου θεοῦ)?

[see Table B]

181. John 8. 41

[The Jews say to Jesus] ... we have one (ἓνα) Father, even God.

[C]

182. John 10. 16 [An application of Ezek. 34. 15, 23; 37. 24 to himself by Jesus]

And I have other sheep, that are not of this fold; I must bring them also, and they will heed my voice. So there shall be one flock, one (ἓίς) shepherd.

[G1, G3, G4, I1]

183. John 17. 3 [From a prayer of Jesus]

And this is eternal life, that they know thee the only true God (τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν θεόν), and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.

[B2, B6, D2]

184. Romans 3. 29–30 [From a proof that justification is by faith and not by works of the law]

²⁹ Or is God the God of Jews only? Is he not the God of Gentiles also? Yes, of Gentiles also, ³⁰ since God is one (ἓίς ὁ θεός); and he will justify the circumcised on the ground of their faith and the uncircumcised through their faith.

[E6, F1, G3]

185. Romans 10. 12

For there is no distinction between Jew and Greek; the same (ὁ αὐτός) Lord is Lord of all (πάντων) and bestows his riches upon all (πάντες) who call upon him.

[B6, E6, F5]

186. Romans 16. 27 [The conclusion of a doxology]

... to the only wise God (μόνω σοφῶ θεῶ) be glory for evermore through Jesus Christ! Amen.

[B5, H1, H4, I2]

187. I Corinthians 8. 4–6

⁴ Hence, as to the eating of food offered to idols, we know that ‘an idol has no real existence’, and that ‘there is no God but one’. ⁵ For although there may be so-called gods in heaven or on earth—as indeed there are many ‘gods’ and many ‘lords’—⁶ yet for us there is one God (εἷς θεός), the Father, from whom are all things (τὰ πάντα) and for whom we exist, and one Lord (εἷς κύριος), Jesus Christ, through whom are all things (τὰ πάντα) and through whom we exist.

[A1, B1, C, D1, E2, H3, H4, H5]

188. I Corinthians 12. 4–6, 9, 11–13

⁴ Now there are varieties of gifts, but the same (τὸ αὐτό) Spirit; ⁵ and there are varieties of service, but the same (ὁ αὐτός) Lord; ⁶ and there are varieties of working, but it is the same (ὁ αὐτός) God who inspires them all (τὰ πάντα) in every one (ἐν πᾶσιν)....

⁹ ... to another [are given] gifts of healing by the one (τῷ ἐνί) Spirit....

¹¹ All (πάντα) these are inspired by one (τὸ ἓν) and the same (τὸ αὐτό) Spirit, who apportions to each one individually as he wills. ¹² For just as the body is one and has many members, and all the members of the body, though many, are one body, so it is with Christ. ¹³ For by one (ἐνί) Spirit we were all (πάντες) baptized into one body—Jews or Greeks, slaves or free—and all (πάντες) were made to drink of one (ἐν) Spirit.

[E1, G3]

189. Galatians 3. 20 [From a passage contrasting God’s promise with the old covenant, given through an intermediary]

Now an intermediary implies more than one; but God is one (ὁ δὲ θεὸς εἷς ἐστίν).

[F1]

190. Ephesians 4. 4–6 [From a passage urging unity in the church]

⁴ There is one body and one Spirit, just as you were called to the one hope that belongs to your call, ⁵ one Lord (εἷς κύριος), one faith, one baptism, ⁶ one God (εἷς θεός) and Father of us all (πάντων), who is above all (ἐπὶ πάντων) and through all (διὰ πάντων) and in all (ἐν πᾶσιν).

[C, E2, E3, E5, G3, H4, I2]

191. I Thessalonians 1. 9

For they themselves report concerning us what a welcome we had among you, and how you turned to God from idols, to serve a living and true God (θεῷ ζῶντι καὶ ἀληθινῷ).

[A1, B2, B6, D2]

192. I Timothy 1. 17

To the King of ages, immortal, invisible, the only God (μόνω θεῶ), be honor and glory for ever and ever. Amen.

[A3, H1, H4, I1, I2]

193. I Timothy 2. 3–6 [From a passage urging that prayers be made for all men]

³ This is good, and it is acceptable in the sight of God our Savior, ⁴ who desires all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth. ⁵ For there is one God (ἓς γὰρ θεός), and there is one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, ⁶ who gave himself as a ransom for all (πάντων).

[E6, F1]

194. I Timothy 6. 15–16 [Following mention of the future appearing of Christ]

... ¹⁵ and this will be made manifest at the proper time by the blessed and only (μόνος) Sovereign, the King of kings and Lord of lords, ¹⁶ who alone (μόνος) has immortality and dwells in unapproachable light, whom no man has ever seen or can see. To him be honor and eternal dominion. Amen.

[A3, B5, D2, F5, H1, H4, I1, I2, I3]

195. Hebrews 2. 10–11

¹⁰ For it was fitting that he, for whom (δι' ὅν) and by whom (δι' οὗ) all things (τὰ πάντα) exist, in bringing many sons to glory, should make the pioneer of their salvation perfect through suffering. ¹¹ For he who sanctifies and those who are sanctified have all (πάντες) one origin (ἐξ ἑνός).

[D1, E1, E2, F1, H3]

196. James 2. 19

You believe that God is one (ἓς θεός ἔστιν); you do well. Even the demons believe—and shudder.

[I4]

197. James 4. 12

There is one (ἓς) lawgiver and judge, he who is able to save and to destroy.

[F1, G4, I4]

198. Jude 4

For admission has been secretly gained by some who long ago were designated for this condemnation, ungodly persons who pervert the grace of our God into licentiousness and deny our only Master and Lord (τὸν μόνον δεσπότην καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν), Jesus Christ.

[I1]

199. Jude 24–25

²⁴ Now to him who is able to keep you from falling and to present you without blemish before the presence of his glory with rejoicing, ²⁵ to the only God (μόνω θεῷ), our Savior through Jesus Christ our Lord be glory, majesty, dominion, and authority, before all time and now and for ever. Amen.

[F1, H1, H4, I1, I2]

200. Revelation 15. 3–4 [A hymn of praise]

³ ... Great and wonderful are thy deeds,
O Lord God the Almighty (παντοκράτωρ)!
Just and true are thy ways,
O King of the ages!
⁴ Who shall not fear and glorify thy name, O Lord?
For thou alone (μόνος) art holy.
All (πάντα) nations shall come and worship thee,
For thy judgments have been revealed.

[B4, B5, B6, E4, E6, G2, H1, H4, I1, I2, I3, I4]

III. TABLE A: THEMES ASSOCIATED WITH MONOTHEISTIC STATEMENTS MORE THAN TWICE

Each theme has been assigned a code letter and number in the left column. The various themes have been grouped together by affinity. The number of occurrences of each theme is given in parentheses in the right column.

A1	<i>The Antithesis between the One God and Idols</i>	(31)
A2	Aseity of God	(09)
A3	Spirituality, invisibility, heavenliness of God	(14)
A4	Ineffability of God	(07)
B1	<i>The Antithesis between the One God and False Gods</i>	(57)
B2	Reality, existence of God	(35)
B3	Superiority of God to angels or gods	(19)
B4	Power, might of God	(40)
B5	Knowledge, wisdom, self-revelation of God	(34)
B6	God as the proper object of human religion [including: worship, fear, reverence, recognition of God]	(73)
C	<i>God as Father</i>	(13)
D1	<i>God as Creator</i>	(52)
D2	God as living, life-giver	(36)
D3	God as sustainer, provider	(08)
D4	God in control of natural phenomena	(03)
E	<i>The Relation between the One God and All Things</i>	
E1	Miscellaneous [excluding passages in E2–6]	(05)
E2	God in relation to the cosmos (πάντα, τὰ πάντα)	(43)
E3	Omnipresence of God	(07)
E4	Omnipotence of God (παντοκράτωρ)	(09)
E5	God in control of all happenings	(07)
E6	God in relation to all nations on earth	(26)
F1	<i>God as Saviour</i> [including: God as helper, deliverer, protector, the object of hope]	(36)
F2	God as saviour at the exodus and/or conquest	(07)
F3	God as saviour in current situations	(11)
F4	Mercy, goodness, pity, love of God	(14)
F5	God as ground or source of blessing	(06)
G	<i>God and the People of God</i>	
G1	Election, peculiarity of Israel, covenant relationship between God and Israel	(16)
G2	Faithfulness, truth of God	(08)
G3	One people of God	(12)
G4	Keeping the commandments of the one God	(23)
G5	One temple, one altar	(07)
H	<i>God as the Beginning and the End</i>	
H1	Eternity, immortality of God	(30)
H2	Purpose, counsel, word, or will of God controlling history	(15)
H3	God present at the beginning of time	(57)
H4	God present at the end of time, consummator	(42)
H5	Statements about God spanning both beginning and end	(14)
I1	<i>God as Lord</i> [including: God as king, ruler, governor, sovereign, master, shepherd, and throne of God]	(46)
I2	Greatness, glory, exaltation, majesty, eminence of God	(37)
I3	Holiness, righteousness, justice of God	(21)
I4	God as judge	(24)

IV. TABLE B: CONCEPTS INFREQUENTLY ASSOCIATED WITH MONOTHEISTIC STATEMENTS

Concepts infrequently associated with statements of monotheism may be simply listed: God directing the heart of the king (number 38); God as source of joy for humans (number 48); God directing the kingdom for the king (numbers 49, 68); God taking away Enoch and appointing another priest in his place (number 76); God having a unique position in the heavens (number 105); use of a monotheistic formula as a benediction (number 106); God giving Abraham power in the face of death (number 111); Abram and others refuse to make bricks for the tower of Babel on the basis of their monotheism (number 124); God as the one who ‘plants’ [?] (number 129); a reference to the *Merkavah* (number 152); the unity of the world derived from the divine unity (numbers 153, 155; cf. 103); the unity of God interpreted as an absence of composition in his simple nature (number 154); Jews and proselytes joined together by their common confession of one God (numbers 162, 164; cf. 184, 185); the one God hidden from human perception by the multiplicity of his powers (number 166); the immutability and beauty of God (number 167); the perfection of God (number 168); one holy city (172); God as source of glory for men (number 180); monotheism implies that the Torah, being peculiar to Israel, is not the means of justification for either Jews or Gentiles (number 184); the one God as the principle of unity behind the variety of spiritual gifts in the church (number 188); the unity of God implies that God’s grace operates monergistically, without human co-operation [?] (number 189); one body, one Spirit, one hope, one faith, one baptism (number 190); God dwelling in unapproachable light (number 194); all things for God (number 195).

V. TABLE C: GRAPH OF COMMON THEME OCCURRENCE

The accompanying graph plots the codes for the common themes against the numbers of the passages, to make comparisons possible at a glance.

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
	1234	123456	1234	1234	123456	12345	12345	12345	1234
001.		xx				xx			
002.		x				xx	x x		
003.		x	x						
004.		xx				xx			
005.		xx xx	x		x	xx	x x		
006.					x			x	
007.		x x							
008.							xx		
009.		x				xx			
010.	x	x x				xx			
011.									x
012.		x						x	x
013.		x				x x x			
014.	x	x							
015.	x	x x	xx			x x x		x	
016.		x	xxx		x			x	
017.		xx				x x	x		x
018.		x				x			xx x
019.		xx	x				x	x	x
020.			x				x	x	x
021.								x	x x
022.	x x	xx	xxx		x		x	xxxxx	x
023.		x xxx				x	x	xxxxx	
024.	x	x xx	x			x		xxxxx	x
025.	x		x		x x			xxx	x
026.		x x	x		xx		x	x	
027.		x				x			
028.		x	x					x	
029.		x xx			x x			x	xx
030.	x	x x	x					xxxxx	
031.						x			x
032.						x		x	
033.	x	xx xx	xx		x			x x	xx x
034.		x x							x
035.			x					x x	
036.		x x	x		x	xx		x	
037.					x			x	x
038.							x		
039.			x					xxxxx	
040.		x x	x					x	
041.	x	x x			x				x
042.		x							
043.	x x	x x				x x			
044.		x			x x	x x			
045.		x x	x		x			x	
046.		x	x		x	x x		x	x
047.		x x							x
048.						x x			x
049.		x x	x						x
050.		x							

1234 123456 1234 123456 12345 12345 12345 1234
A B C D E F G H I

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
	1234	123456	1234	1234	123456	12345	12345	12345	1234
051.		x		x		x			x
052.	x	xx x							
053.	x								
054.			xx	x	x			x	x
055.		x xx	xx	x	x			x x	x x
056.		x x x				x			xxx
057.		x xx	x	x				x	
058.	x		x						
059.					x				x x
060.	x	x x	xx	x				x	
061.		xx x	x						
062.		x				x x			x
063.			x x	x	x x	x x	x	x x	x x
064.			x						x
065.	x	x		x			x		x
066.	x	xx			x x	x x			x x
067.		x x			x	x x			xx
068.	x	x x	x		x				x
069.		x x							
070.	x		x	x					
071.			x				x	x	
072.		x xx	x x	x				xxx	x
073.		x x					x		
074.		x	x					x	
075.			x	x	xx				x
076.			x		x				x
077.	xxxx		x		x				x
078.								x	
079.			x	x				x	x
080.		x		x		x	x	x	
081.				x		x		xx	xxxx
082.	x		x	x		x	xx	x x	xxx
083.	x	x		x		x	x	x x	x
084.	x	x x		x					
085.	x						x	x	x
086.		x x							
087.			x			x		x	x
088.	x	x x	x x	x	x		x	x xx	xx
089.	xx	x x	x		x x			x	xx
090.	x	xx x			x x			x x	x xx
091.				x					
092.			x	x				x	x
093.			x			x		x	x
094.	x	x x	x	x				x x	x
095.		x x	x x						
096.		x xx	xxxx					x xx	
097.			x				x	x	
098.							xx		
099.			x					xxxxx	
100.		xx							

1234 123456 1234 123456 12345 12345 12345 12345 1234
A B C D E F G H I

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
	1234	123456	1234	1234	123456	12345	12345	12345	1234
101.		x						xxxx	x
102.	x					x			
103.				x		x		x	xx
104.	x	x		x				x	x
105.			x			x			
106.								x	
107.			x					x	
108.	x		x						
109.		x	x	x		x			
110.		x					x		
111.	x	x x		x					
112.	x					x		x x	x x
113.	x	xx xxx			xx		x	x	x
114.					x x		x		x
115.		x x	x	x			x x		
116.		x x				x			
117.		x x	x		x	x		x	x
118.		x				x			x
119.	x	x x	xx				x x	x	xx
120.		x x				x		x	
121.	x	x x	x	x					
122.	x		x			x xx			
123.		x	xx x	x	x x	x		x	x
124.			x						
125.			x				x		
126.	x	xx	x						
127.			xx				x		
128.			x		x			xxxx	x
129.			x						
130.				x				x	
131.	xx	x x x	x		xxxx	x		x xxx	x x
132.		x			xx				
133.		x x							x
134.		xx			x				x
135.		x		x	xx			x	
136.	x			x				x	
137.		x		x	x			xxx	x
138.			x x	x	x			x xxx	x
139.		xxx				x		x	x
140.		xx		x			x	x	
141.		xx				x x	x	xxxxx	xx
142.		x					x		x
143.		x						xx x	
144.		xxx					x		x
145.		xx		x	x			xx	xx
146.		x x				x		xx x	
147.		x							xxx
148.							x		
149.				x				x	
150.			x x	x			x		x

1234 123456 1234 123456 12345 12345 12345 1234
A B C D E F G H I

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
	1234	123456	1234	123456	12345	12345	12345	12345	1234
151.		xx		x			xx		
152.		x		x					x
153.		xx	x	x	x		x	x	x
154.	x	x		x	x			x	
155.			x	x	x			x	x
156.		x							
157.	x	x	x	x	x			x	x
158.									x
159.		x	x	x	x				x
160.				x	x			x	x
161.			x						
162.			x					x	
163.								x	
164.		x	x	x	x		x	x	x
165.			x	x	x		x	x	
166.					x				
167.	x	x	xx					x	
168.	xxxxx		x	x	x		x	xx	xxxx
169.		x		x	x				x
170.		x	x	x					x
171.			x						
172.								x	x
173.			x					x	x
174.		x	x						
175.							x		
176.	x		x	x					x
177.			x	x					x
178.		x					x		
179.		x	x		x			x	
180.									
181.				x					
182.							x	xx	x
183.		x	x	x					
184.						x	x	x	
185.						x			
186.			x					x	x
187.	x	x		x	x			xxx	
188.					x			x	
189.						x			
190.				x	xx	x		x	x
191.	x	x	x	x					
192.	x							x	x
193.						x	x		xx
194.	x		x	x			x	x	xxx
195.				x	xx	x		x	
196.									x
197.						x		x	x
198.									x
199.						x		x	x
200.			xxx		x	x	x	x	xxxxx

1234 123456 1234 123456 12345 12345 12345 1234
A B C D E F G H I

VI. TABLE D: GRAPH OF COMMON THEME FREQUENCY

B6	Obj. of religion(73)
H3	Pres. at begng.(57)
B1	Antith. w. gods(57)
D1	Creator(52)
I1	Lord(46)
E2	Rel. to cosmos(43)
H4	Pres. at end(42)
B4	Power, might(40)
I2	Greatness(37)
D2	Life(36)
F1	Saviour(36)
B2	Reality(35)
B5	Knowledge(34)
A1	Antith. w. idols(31)
H1	Eternity(30)
E6	All nations(26)
I4	Judge(24)
G4	Commandments(23)
I3	Holiness(21)
B3	Superiority(19)
G1	Election(16)
H2	Purpose, will(15)
A3	Spirituality(14)
F4	Mercy(14)
H5	Begng. and end(14)
C	Father(13)
G3	One people(12)
F3	Saviour (current)(11)
A2	Aseity(09)
E4	Omnipotence(09)
D3	Sustainer(08)
G2	Faithfulness(08)
A4	Ineffability(07)
E5	All happenings(07)
F2	Saviour (past)(07)
G5	One temple(07)
E3	Omnipresence(07)
F5	Blessor(06)
E1	All things(05)
D4	God over nature(03)

APPENDIX TWO

HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL NOTE:

GODS AND GODDESSES OF CORINTH IN THE TIME OF PAUL

Because of the diligent labours of archaeologists on the site of old Corinth since 1896, it is now possible to name specifically some of the gods and goddesses which Paul might have had in mind when he wrote to the Corinthian church that there were ‘many gods and many lords’ (I Cor. 8. 5). Much archaeological material has been published in the multi-volume series, *Corinth: Results of the Excavations* (Harvard University Press, 1896–), in articles in the *American Journal of Archaeology*, and in annual excavation reports in *Hesperia*, which continue to the present day. A complete assemblage of all the relevant data from the many other scattered sources where it might be found is not the aim of the present sketch. Nor shall we attempt to go into the cults, ceremonies, and beliefs associated with the various pagan deities of Corinth in the first century of our era. We shall simply list the names of the deities and draw a few general conclusions related to I Cor. 8. 4–6.

PAUSANIAS

It is natural to begin with our most valuable historical source for ancient Corinth. Pausanias, a traveller of the second century A.D., has left a detailed description of the temples and statues of the city.¹ This report, intended as a guide book for other travellers of his own day, concentrates more on traditional myths and shrines than on the newer buildings which were erected in the hundred years or so between the time of Paul and Pausanias, and is generally regarded as containing information largely valid for Paul’s Corinth.²

Before entering the city—Pausanias does not indicate on which road—he found a precinct of Bellerophon and a temple of Aphrodite Melanion. In the *agora* were statues of Artemis Ephesia, Dionysos, Poseidon, Apollo Klarios, Aphrodite, Hermes (two), Zeus (three), and Athena with some Muses. Also in the *agora* were temples dedicated to Tyche, All the Gods, and Octavia the sister of Julius Caesar, who re-founded the city.

The roads radiating outwards from the city centre were likewise lined with religious sculptures and architecture. Along the road to Lechaion, Pausanias mentions statues of Phaëthon the son of Helios, Helios,

Herakles, Peirene, Apollo (in an enclosure), Odysseus, Hermes, Poseidon, Leukothea, Palaimon, Artemis, Bellerophon, and Pegasus. Many temples stood along the road to Sicyon: temples dedicated to Apollo, Athena Chalinitis, Zeus Capitolinus, Zeus, Asklepios, and a burnt temple of either Apollo or Zeus Olympios; there were statues of Mermerus and Pheres, Deima (Terror), Herakles, and Hygeia, and there was a well of Glauke.

The ascent of the majestic *akrokorinth* had two precincts for each of the Egyptian divinities Isis and Sarapis, as well as statues of Helios, Ananke, Bia, and the Mother of the gods. Temples for the Moiroi, Demeter and Kore, and Hera Bunia rose along the way. At the summit stood the temple of Aphrodite with statues of Helios and Eros.

Pausanias's account goes on to give similar lists of gods and goddesses for the towns surrounding Corinth, from which may be selected for mention the sanctuary of Poseidon at Lechaion and the temple of Aphrodite at Kenchreai.

ARCHAEOLOGY: THE GREEK AND ROMAN DIVINITIES

Archaeology has confirmed many of the details of Pausanias's description, and has added others. For centuries the seven columns of the ruined temple of Apollo, constructed not long after 550 B.C.,³ have stood erect over the Corinthian plain and have been remarked on by travellers through the area. The Asklepieion at the western edge of town still has two couches and a hearth which were meant for the comfort of the ill who sought healings, and it yielded up an impressive array of terra cotta likenesses of parts of the body, brought there as thank offerings.⁴ Foundations of several religious buildings have been identified in or near the *agora*, including the Peribolos of Apollo and the temples of Venus Fortuna, the Pantheon, Hermes, and—less certainly—Hera Akraia and Octavia.⁵

No copies of the statue of Aphrodite on the *akrokorinth* are known to be extant, but from pictures of it on several lamps, coins, and a fragmentary figurine, we know, among other things, that the goddess bore a shield to use as a mirror.⁶ It seems improbable that the prostitution practiced in Aphrodite's name for which Corinth was so famous was officially tied to the cult of her temple, but it doubtless went on unofficially in the time of Paul.⁷

The name of Dionysos has been found on a marble slab with a fragmentary inscription from the Roman period; it also appears on sherds of drinking vessels discovered in the area of the Southern Stoa, where there may have been taverns;⁸ the cult of Dionysos is attested at nearby Isthmia.⁹ Part of the classical temple of Demeter and Kore was remodelled in Roman times, and eleven *defixiones*, or leaden curse tablets, addressed to the chthonic gods and dating from the Roman period have been discovered in building T.¹⁰ A stone which perhaps dates from the first century C.E. shows the name ΗΡΑΚΛΗΣ.¹¹ The popularity of Poseidon is attested by two Latin inscriptions having the name NEPTVNO.¹² The Thracian goddess Kotyto may have had a following in Corinth.¹³ A number of heroes were venerated at Corinth; in particular, traces have been found which point to a revival of the hero-cult of Zeuxippos in the Roman period.¹⁴ Many of the gods and goddesses mentioned by Pausanias are pictured on contemporary coins—too many to list here.¹⁵

ARCHAEOLOGY: THE ORIENTAL RELIGIONS

Archaeological data for the oriental religions at Corinth is more sparse. We have enough general evidence to conclude that there was a concentration of Egyptian cults in the Peloponnese during our period.¹⁶ Corinth, with its port of Kenchreai, appears to have been an important centre for the worship of Isis.¹⁷ D.E. Smith has charted the thin strand of evidence we have for the worship of Isis and Sarapis at Corinth from the third or second century B.C. through the NT period to its flowering in the second century A.D.¹⁸ Our extant gilded head of Sarapis dates from the end of this development.¹⁹

THE ISTHMIAN GAMES

Another aspect of the religious life of ancient Corinth which Paul was probably aware of was the Isthmian Games, a biennial athletic contest second only to the Olympics in fame. The games had religious overtones in more ways than one. They were held in honour of the sea-god Poseidon, whose temple at neighbouring Isthmia was ancient and elaborately decorated with statues.²⁰ A major event in the celebration was the nocturnal sacrifice of a bull to the boy-hero Palaimon, mythical founder of the contest, amid flames from lamps and three burning pits.²¹ The games were also connected with worship of the emperor.

Worship of the imperial family had begun in the outlying provinces in the time of Augustus and during the first century A.D. was encroaching upon the West.²² One of its manifestations was a complex of games called the Caesarea held in honour of the emperor every four years. The Caesarea included the Nemean Games at Argos, the Asclepiea at Epidauros, the Ptoan Games at Acraephia, and the Isthmian Games at Isthmia near Corinth. While Regulus was governor of Achaia (A.D. 35–44), the celebration of the Caesarea on the Isthmus received fresh impetus, making this area a centre of the imperial cult by the time of Paul’s visit.²³ Indeed, the Caesarea were held in the year 51, and it seems likely that Paul attended, to judge by the athletic metaphors in his correspondence with the Corinthians.²⁴

If the Isthmian Games had these associations, it is not surprising that Plutarch considered them nearer to a τελετή than to a πανηγυρισμός.²⁵

USE OF DIVINE TITLES

A number of the figures venerated at Corinth were accorded titles of divinity. It is difficult to know to what extent Pausanias’s usage follows that of the inhabitants of the city, but it doubtless reflects a general linguistic atmosphere which would have been familiar to them. In his descriptions of Corinth and nearby Sicyon we find the word (ὁ, ἡ) θεός applied to Dionysus (II. 2. 7), All the Gods (II. 2. 8), Athena Chalinitis (II. 4. 1), Hera Bunaea (II. 4. 7), Athena (II. 6. 3), Heracles (II. 10. 1), Pan (II. 10. 2), and the apotropaic gods (II. 11. 1); and it is used in the longer title, ‘the Mother of the gods’ (II. 4. 7).

The use of divine titles at Corinth for members of the imperial family is confirmed by archaeology. A Greek inscription found at Corinth which is probably to be dated to the reign of Claudius, and surely before Paul’s stay in the city, calls the emperor Tiberius ‘the august son of God’ and Julia ‘the august goddess’.²⁶ Latin inscriptions from prior to A.D. 55 refer to Caesar Augustus (or perhaps his genius) as AVGVST[O], to Claudius as *divo Claudio*, and to Julius as *Divi Iuli*.²⁷

CONCLUSIONS

The above list of gods and goddesses of ancient Corinth is representative rather than exhaustive. A glance at this group shows that the divinities known and honoured in and around ancient Corinth, whether they

had actual cults there or not, ran the gamut of Olympian and lesser Graeco-Roman deities. Also foreign divinities, heroes, and members of the imperial family were venerated. Polytheism was very much a living force in the environment in which Paul worked.

NOTES TO APPENDIX TWO

1. *Description of Greece*, II. 2. 4—II. 5. 5.
2. O. Broneer, 'Corinth. Center of St. Paul's Missionary Work in Greece', p. 88; H.-J. Klauck, *Herrenmahl und hellenistischer Kult*, pp. 234–35.
3. S.S. Weinberg, 'On the Date of the Temple of Apollo at Corinth'.
4. Broneer, 'Corinth', p. 81, fig. 3, p. 83, fig. 4; A.E. Hill, 'The Temple of Asclepius: An Alternative Source for Paul's Body Theology?'.
5. W. Elliger, *Paulus in Griechenland*, Bildteil, number 33.
6. O. Broneer, 'The "Armed Aphrodite" on Acrocorinth and the Aphrodite of Capua'.
7. H. Conzelmann, 'Korinth und die Mädchen der Aphrodite'; H.D. Saffrey, 'Aphrodite a Corinthe: Réflexions sur une idée reçue'.
8. B.D. Meritt, *Greek Inscriptions 1896–1927*, p. 4, number 4; Elliger, p. 218.
9. O. Broneer, 'The Apostle Paul and the Isthmian Games', p. 21; also 'Paul and the Pagan Cults at Isthmia', p. 179.
10. N. Bookidis, 'The Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore on Acrocorinth', pp. 302–04.
11. Meritt, p. 53, number 69.
12. A.B. West, *Latin Inscriptions 1896–1926*, pp. 5–6, numbers 2, 3.
13. S. Srebrny, 'Kult der thrakischen Göttin Kotyto in Korinth und Sicilien'.
14. O. Broneer, 'Hero Cults in the Corinthian Agora'.
15. K.M. Edwards, *Coins 1896–1929*, pp. 16–26.
16. Elliger, p. 237.
17. F. Dunand, *Le cult d'Isis dans le bassin oriental de la méditerranée*, II, 157.
18. 'The Egyptian Cults at Corinth'.
19. T.A. Brady, 'A Head of Sarapis from Corinth'.

20. Elliger, p. 211.
21. Broneer, 'Pagan Cults at Isthmia', pp. 175–78.
22. B.A. Mastin, 'The Imperial Cult and the Ascription of the Title θεός to Jesus', p. 359; D. Fishwick, 'The Development of Provincial Ruler Worship in the Western Roman Empire'.
23. West, pp. 30–31.
24. Broneer, 'Paul and the Pagan Cults at Isthmia', pp. 183–87.
25. *Theseus*, 25. 4.
26. Meritt, number 19, p. 28.
27. West, numbers 14, 68, pp. 12, 50 respectively.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Entries throughout are in strict alphabetical order, e.g., McDonald will be found under Mc, not under Mac, and umlauts are not resolved; only the words ‘a’ and ‘the’ at the beginnings of titles, and the corresponding words in German and French, are excluded from this rule. *Festschriften*, memorial volumes, etc., are alphabetized under the surnames of their honourees. Primary sources are alphabetized under the names of their purported original authors, even when pseudonymous; otherwise the titles of these documents, not the names of their editors, provide the key. Minor book reviews immediately follow the entries for the books being reviewed.

Abbot, Ezra, ‘On the Construction of Romans ix. 5.’, *Journal of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis*, 1 (1881), pp. 87–154

—, ‘On the Construction of Titus ii. 13’, *Journal of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis*, 1 (1881), pp. 3–19

Abbott, T.K., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Colossians*, International Critical Commentary (Edinburgh, 1897)

Abelard: *Commentarius Cantabrigiensis in epistolas Pauli e schola Petri Abaelardi*, ed. by Artur Landgraf, University of Notre Dame Publications in Medieval Studies, 2, 4 vols (Notre Dame, Indiana, 1937–45)

Abelson, Joshua, *The Immanence of God in Rabbinical Literature* (London, 1912)

Abraham: *The Testament of Abraham*, trans. by W.A. Craigie, Ante-Nicene Christian Library, 25 (Edinburgh, 1897), pp. 181–201

—, *The Testament of Abraham: The Greek Text Now First Edited With an Introduction and Notes*, ed. by M.R. James, Texts and Studies, volume 2, part 2 (Cambridge, 1892), pp. 1–130

Abrahams, Israel, and others, ‘Moses’, in **Encyclopaedia Judaica*, XII, 371–411

Aland, Kurt, ed., *Vollständige Konkordanz zum griechischen Neuen Testament*, Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Textforschung, 4, 2 vols in 3 (Berlin/New York, 1975–83)

Albright, William Foxwell, ‘A Biblical Fragment from the Maccabean Age: The Nash Papyrus’, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 56 (1937), pp. 145–76

—, *From the Stone Age to Christianity: Monotheism and the Historical Process*, second edition (Baltimore, 1946)

Allan, John A., ed., *The Epistle to the Ephesians*, Torch Bible Commentaries (London, 1959)

Allo, E.-B., ed., *Saint Paul première épître aux Corinthiens*, Etudes bibliques (Paris, 1935)

The Alternative Service Book 1980 (Oxford, 1980)

Ambrosiaster: *Sancti Ambrosii Mediolanensis episcopi opera omnia*, ed. by J.-P. Migne, Bibliotheca patrum latina, 17 (Paris, 1845)

Amiot, Francois, *The Key Concepts of St. Paul* (Edinburgh/London, 1962)

Amir, Yehoshua, ‘Die Begegnung des biblischen und des philosophischen Monotheismus als Grundthema des jüdischen Hellenismus’, *Evangelische Theologie*, 38 (1978), pp. 2–19

Anderson, A.A., *The Book of Psalms*, New Century Bible, 2 vols (London, 1972)

- Anderson, B.W., 'God, OT View of', in *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. by G.A. Buttrick and others, 4 vols (New York/Nashville, 1962), II, 417–30
- Andrews, Elias, *The Meaning of Christ for Paul* (New York/Nashville, 1949)
- Arai, Sasagu, 'Die Gegner des Paulus im I. Korintherbrief und das Problem der Gnosis', *New Testament Studies*, 19 (1972–73), pp. 430–37
- Argyle, Aubrey William, *God in the New Testament*, Knowing Christianity Series (London, 1965)
- , 'The Logos of Philo: Personal or Impersonal?', *Expository Times*, 66 (1954), pp. 13–14
- Aristeas: *The Letter of Aristeas: A Linguistic Study*, ed. by Henry G. Meecham, Publications of the University of Manchester, 241 (Manchester, 1935)
- , *La lettre d'Aristée a Philocrate. Texte critique et traduction, introduction, notes et index*, ed. by André Pelletier (Paris, 1962)
- Athenagoras: *Zwei griechische Apologeten* [Aristides, Athenagoras], ed. by J. Geffcken, Sammlung wissenschaftlicher Kommentare zu griechischen Schriftstellern (Leipzig/Berlin, 1907)
- Atto de Verceil: *Attonis Vercellensis episcopi opera omnia*, in J.-P. Migne, ed., *Bibliotheca patrum latina*, 134 (Paris, 1853)
- Attridge, Harold W., 'The Philosophical Critique of Religion under the Early Empire', in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, second series, vol 16, part 1 (Berlin/New York, 1978), pp. 45–78
- Aune, David E., 'Orthodoxy in First Century Judaism? A Response to N.J. McEleney', *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods*, 7 (1976–77), pp. 1–10
- Aurelius Antoninus, Marcus, *The Communings with Himself of Marcus Aurelius Antoninus, Emperor of Rome, Together with His Speeches and Sayings*, ed. and trans. by C.R. Haines, Loeb Classical Library (London/New York, 1916)
- Austin, Michael R., 'Salvation and the Divinity of Jesus', *Expository Times*, 96 (1984–85), pp. 271–75
- Bachmann, Philipp, ed., *Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther*, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, ed. by Theodor Zahn (Leipzig, 1905)
- Bacon, Benjamin Wisner, 'Jesus as Lord', *Harvard Theological Review*, 4 (1911), pp. 204–28
- Baker, Albert Edward, *St. Paul and His Gospel* (London, 1940)
- Balchin, John F., 'Paul, Wisdom and Christ', in * Guthrie volume, pp. 204–19
- Ball, Charles James, ed., *The Book of Job: A Revised Text and Version* (Oxford, 1922)
- Balsheit, Bruno, *Alter und Aufkommen des Monotheismus in der israelitischen Religion*, Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 69 (Berlin, 1938)
- (Simpson, C.A., review of the foregoing, in *Anglican Theological Review*, 21 (1939), pp. 50–51)
- Barbour, R.S., 'Creation, Wisdom and Christ', in *Creation, Christ and Culture: Studies in Honour of T.F. Torrance*, ed. by Richard W.A. McKinney (Edinburgh, 1976), pp. 22–42
- Barclay, William, *The Mind of St Paul* (London, 1958)
- Barr, James, 'Biblical Language and Exegesis—How Far Does Structuralism Help Us?', *King's Theological Review*, 7 (1984), pp. 48–52

- , *The Semantics of Biblical Language* (Oxford, 1961)
- Barrett, C.K., ‘Christianity at Corinth’, *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 46 (1963–4), pp. 269–297
- , *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, Black’s New Testament Commentaries (London, 1968)
- , *From First Adam to Last: A Study in Pauline Theology* (London, 1962)
- , ‘Things Sacrificed to Idols’, *New Testament Studies*, 11 (1964–65), pp. 138–53
- Barrett volume: *Paul and Paulinism: Essays in honour of C.K. Barrett*, ed. by M.D. Hooker and S.G. Wilson (London, 1982)
- Barth, Gerhard, ‘Erwägungen zu 1. Korinther 15, 20–28’, *Evangelische Theologie*, 30 (1970), pp. 515–27
- Barth, Markus, ‘Christ and All Things’, in * Barrett volume, pp. 160–72
- , ed., *Ephesians*, Anchor Bible, 34–34A, 2 vols (Garden City, New York, 1974)
- , ‘St. Paul—A Good Jew’, *Horizons in Biblical Theology*, 1 (1979), pp. 7–45
- Bassler, Jouette M., *Divine Impartiality: Paul and a Theological Axiom*, Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series, 59 (Chico, California, 1982)
- Batey, Richard, ‘Paul’s Interaction with the Corinthians’, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 84 (1965), pp. 139–46
- Bauckham, Richard, ‘The Sonship of the Historical Jesus in Christology’, *Scottish Journal of Theology*, 31 (1978), pp. 245–60
- Baudissin, Wolf Wilhelm, *KΥΠΙΟΣ als Gottesname im Judentum und seine Stelle in der Religionsgeschichte*, ed. by Otto Eissfeld, 4 vols (Giessen, 1926–29)
- Bauer, Walter Felix, *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*, ed. by R.A. Kraft and G. Krodel, New Testament Library (London, 1972)
- Bauer, Walter, William F. Arndt, and F. Wilbur Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, second edition, revised and augmented by F.W. Gingrich and F.W. Danker (Chicago/London, 1979)
- Baumann, Rolf, *Mitte und Norm des Christlichen: Eine Auslegung von 1 Korinther 1, 1–3, 4*, Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen, new series, 5 (Münster, 1968)
- Baumgartner, Walter, *Israelitische und altorientalische Weisheit* (Tübingen, 1933)
- Baur, Ferdinand Christian, *Paul, the Apostle of Jesus Christ, His Life and Works, His Epistles and Teachings*, Theological Translation Fund Library, 2, 2 vols (London, 1873–75)
- , *Vorlesungen über die christliche Dogmengeschichte*, 3 vols in 4 (Leipzig, 1865–67)
- Beare, Francis W., ‘The Epistle to the Ephesians’, in * *The Interpreter’s Bible*, X, 595–749
- Beker, Johan Christiaan, *Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in Life and Thought* (Edinburgh, 1980)
- (Thrall, M., review of the foregoing, *Journal of Theological Studies*, 33 (1982), pp. 268–70)
- Ben-Chorin, Schalom, *Paulus: Der Völkerapostel in jüdischer Sicht* (Munich, 1970)
- Bengel, Johann Albrecht, *Gnomon Novi Testamenti*, second edition (Tübingen, 1759)

- Gnomon of the New Testament*, trans. by A.R. Fausset, Clark's Foreign Theological Library, 5 vols (Edinburgh, 1857)
- Benoit, Pierre, 'Préexistence et Incarnation', *Revue biblique*, 77 (1970), pp. 5–29
- Berger, Klaus, 'Zum traditionsgeschichtlichen Hintergrund christologischer Hoheitstitel', *New Testament Studies*, 17 (1970), pp. 391–425
- Berger, Peter L., *The Social Reality of Religion* (London, 1969)
- Berger, Peter Ludwig and Thomas Luckmann, *The Social Construction of Reality* (London, 1967)
- Bernardin, Joseph Buchanan, 'A New Testament Triad', *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 57 (1938), pp. 273–79
- Best, Ernest E., *One Body in Christ: A Study in the Relationship of the Church to Christ in the Epistles of the Apostle Paul* (London, 1955)
- Bethune-Baker, James Franklin, *An Introduction to the Early History of Christian Doctrine to the Time of the Council of Chalcedon*, fifth edition (London, 1933)
- Betz, Hans Dieter, *Galatians: A Commentary*, Hermeneia (Philadelphia, 1979)
- Betz, Otto, 'The Problem of Variety and Unity in the New Testament', *Horizons in Biblical Theology*, 2 (1980), pp. 3–14
- Beyschlag, Johann Heinrich Christoph Willibald, *Die Christologie des Neuen Testaments: Ein biblisch-theologischer Versuch* (Berlin, 1866)
- , *Hat der Apostel Paulus die Heidengötter für Dämonen gehalten?* Osterprogramm der Universität Halle-Wittenberg (Halle, 1894)
- Bible, English: *The New Oxford Annotated Bible With the Apocrypha, Revised Standard Version, Containing the Second Edition of the New Testament and an Expanded Version of the Apocrypha*, ed. by Herbert G. May and Bruce M. Metzger (New York, 1973, 1977)
- Bickerman, Elias Joseph, *The God of the Maccabees: Studies on the Meaning and Origin of the Maccabean Revolt*, trans. by H.R. Moehring, *Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity*, 32 (Leiden, 1979)
- Bieder, Werner, *Die Verheissung der Taufe im Neuen Testament* (Zurich, 1966)
- , 'Paulus und seine Gegner in Korinth', *Theologische Zeitschrift*, 17 (1961), pp. 319–33
- Bieler, Ludwig, ΘΕΙΟΣ ΑΝΗΡ: *Das Bild des 'göttlichen Menschen' in Spätantike und Frühchristentum*, 2 vols (Vienna, 1935–36)
- Bietenhard, Hans, *Die himmlische Welt im Urchristentum und Spätjudentum*, *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament*, 2 (Tübingen, 1951)
- Black, David Alan, 'A Note on "the Weak" in 1 Corinthians 9, 22', *Biblica*, 64 (1983), pp. 240–42
- Black, Matthew, 'Messianic Doctrine in the Qumran Scrolls', in *Studia Patristica, Volume I, Part I*, ed. by Kurt Aland and F.L. Cross, *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*, volume 63, part 1 (Berlin, 1957), pp. 441–59
- , 'The Christological Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament', *New Testament Studies*, 18 (1971–72), pp. 1–14
- Blakeney, Edward Henry, *The Praises of Wisdom* (Oxford, 1937)

- Blass, Friedrich and Albert Debrunner, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, revised by Friedrich Rehkopf, fourteenth edition (Göttingen, 1976)
- , *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, trans. and revised by R.W. Funk (Cambridge, 1961)
- Böcher, Otto, *Das Neue Testament und die dämonischen Mächte*, Stuttgarter Bibelstudien, 58 (Stuttgart, 1972)
- Boers, Hendrikus, 'Jesus and the Christian Faith: New Testament Christology Since Bousset's *Kyrios Christos*', *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 89 (1970), pp. 450–56
- , 'The Meaning of Christ in Paul's Writings: A Structuralist-Semiotic Study', *Biblical Theology Bulletin*, 14 (1984), pp. 131–44
- , 'Where Christology is Real. A Survey of Recent Research on New Testament Christology', *Interpretation*, 26 (1972), pp. 300–27
- Böhlig, Hans, *Die Geisteskultur von Tarsos im augusteischen Zeitalter, mit Berücksichtigung der paulinischen Schriften* (Göttingen, 1913)
- , 'Zum Begriff Kyrios bei Paulus', *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 14 (1913), pp. 23–37
- Boismard, M.-E., 'Christ's Divinity in Saint Paul', in *Son and Saviour: The Divinity of Jesus Christ in the Scriptures*, a symposium by A. Gelin and others, trans. by Anthony Wheaton (London, 1960), pp. 86–112
- Bolinger, Dwight and Donald A. Sears, *Aspects of Language*, third edition (New York and others, 1981)
- Boman, Thorlief [*sic*], *Hebrew Thought Compared with Greek*, trans. by J.L. Moreau, Library of History and Doctrine (London, 1960)
- Bonnard, Pierre-E., 'De la Sagesse personnifiée dans l'Ancien Testament à la Sagesse en personne dans le Nouveau', in *La Sagesse de l'Ancien Testament*, ed. by M. Gilbert, Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum Lovaniensium, 51 (Gembloux, 1972), pp. 117–49
- , *La Sagesse en personne annoncée et venue: Jésus Christ*, Lectio Divina, 44 (Paris, 1966)
- Bonsirven, Joseph, *Théologie du Nouveau Testament*, Théologie, 22 (Paris, 1951)
- , *Theology of the New Testament*, trans. by S.F.L. Tye (London, 1963)
- Boobyer, G.H., *Jesus as 'Theos' in the New Testament*, Manson Memorial Lecture, 1968 [reprinted from *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 50 (1968), pp. 47–61]
- Bookidis, Nancy, 'The Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore on Acrocorinth. Preliminary Report IV: 1969–1970', *Hesperia*, 41 (1972), pp. 283–317
- Borchert, Gerald L., *Paul and His Interpreters: An Annotated Bibliography*, TSF-IBR Bibliographic Study Guides Series (Madison, Wisconsin, 1985)
- Born, Willi, 'Der eine Herr', in *Kleine Predigt-Typologie*, ed. by Ludwig Schmidt, 3 vols (Stuttgart, 1965), III, 72–79
- Bornkamm, Günther, 'Das Doppelgebot der Liebe', in *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann*, Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, 21 (Berlin, 1954), pp. 85–93
- , 'On Understanding the Christ-Hymn, Philippians 2. 6–11', in *Early Christian Experience*, articles trans. by Paul L. Hammer, New Testament Library (London, 1969), pp. 112–22 [originally published in German in *Studien zu Antike und Urchristentum*, Gesammelte Aufsätze, II, Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie, 28 (Munich, 1959), pp. 177–87]

- , ‘The Praise of God. Romans 11. 33–36’, in *Early Christian Experience*, articles trans. by Paul L. Hammer, New Testament Library (London, 1969), pp. 105–111 [originally published in German in *Für Arbeit und Besinnung*, 5 (1951), pp. 178ff., and again in *Göttinger Predigtmeditationen*, (1955–56), pp. 155ff.]
- Bousset, Wilhelm, ed., ‘Der erste Brief an die Korinther’, in *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, ed. by Wilhelm Bousset and Wilhelm Heitmüller, third edition, 3 vols (Göttingen, 1917), II, 74–167
- , *Kyrios Christos: Geschichte des Christusglaubens bis Irenaeus*, fifth edition (Göttingen, 1965)
- , *Kyrios Christos: A History of the Belief in Christ from the Beginnings of Christianity to Irenaeus*, trans. by John E. Steely (New York/Nashville, 1970)
- , *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter*, ed. by Hugo Gressmann, Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, 21, fourth edition (Tübingen, 1966)
- Box, G.H., ‘The Idea of Intermediation in Jewish Theology: A Note on Memra and Shekinah’, *Jewish Quarterly Review*, 23 (1932), pp. 103–19
- Brady, Thomas A., ‘A Head of Sarapis from Corinth’, *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 51 (1940), pp. 61–69
- Braun, Herbert, ‘Die Problematik einer Theologie des Neuen Testaments’, in *Gesammelte Studien zum Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt* (Tübingen, 1962), pp. 325–41 [reprinted from Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche, 2]
- Broneer, Oscar, ‘The Apostle Paul and the Isthmian Games’, *Biblical Archaeologist*, 25 (1962), pp. 2–31
- , ‘The “Armed Aphrodite” on Acrocorinth and the Aphrodite of Capua’, in *University of California Publications in Classical Archaeology, Volume I: 1929–1944*, ed. by J.T. Allen and others (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1944), pp. 65–84
- , ‘Corinth. Center of St. Paul’s Missionary Work in Greece’, *Biblical Archaeologist*, 14 (1951), pp. 78–96
- , ‘Hero Cults in the Corinthian Agora’, *Hesperia*, 11 (1942), pp. 128–61
- , ‘Paul and the Pagan Cults at Isthmia’, *Harvard Theological Review*, 64 (1971), pp. 169–87
- Brown, Francis, S.R. Driver, and Charles Briggs, eds., *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Oxford, 1907)
- Brown, Raymond E., *Jesus: God and Man. Modern Biblical Reflections*, Impact Books (London/Dublin, 1968)
- , ‘The Messianism of Qumran’, *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 19 (1957), pp. 53–82
- Brownlee, William H., ‘The Cosmic Role of Angels in the 11Q Targum of Job’, *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods*, 8 (1977), pp. 83–84
- Broyles, Stephen E., ‘What Do We Mean by “Godhead”?’’, *Evangelical Quarterly*, 50 (1978), pp. 223–229
- Bruce, F.F., ed., *1 and 2 Corinthians*, New Century Bible (London, 1971)
- , ed., *The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians*, New International Greek Testament Commentary, 2 (Exeter, 1982)
- , *Paul: Apostle of the Free Spirit* (Exeter, 1977)
- Bruce volume: *Pauline Studies: Essays Presented to F.F. Bruce on His 70th Birthday*, ed. by D.A. Hagner and M.J. Harris (Exeter, 1980)

- Brunt, John C., 'Love, Freedom, and Moral Responsibility: The Contribution of Cor. 8–10 to an Understanding of Paul's Ethical Thinking', in *Society of Biblical Literature 1981 Seminar Papers*, ed. by K.H. Richards (Chico, 1981), pp. 19–33
- , 'Rejected, Ignored, or Misunderstood? The Fate of Paul's Approach to the Problem of Food Offered to Idols in Early Christianity', *New Testament Studies*, 31 (1985), pp. 113–24
- Büchsel, Friedrich, 'ΕΙΔΩΛΟΝ', in * *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, II, 375–80
- Bultmann, Rudolf, 'Die Bedeutung des geschichtlichen Jesus für die Theologie des Paulus', *Theologische Blätter*, volume 8, number 6 (June, 1929), pp. 138–51
- , 'Γινώσκω', in * *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, I, 689–719
- , 'Gnosis', *Journal of Theological Studies*, new series, 3 (1952), pp. 10–26
- , *Primitive Christianity in its Contemporary Setting*, trans. by R.H. Fuller (London/New York, 1956)
- , 'Der religionsgeschichtliche Hintergrund des Prologs zum Johannes-Evangelium', in *EΥΧΑΡΙΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ: Studien zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments. Festschrift Hermann Gunkel*, ed. by Hans Schmidt, *Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments*, new series, 19, 2 vols (Göttingen, 1923), II, 1–26
- , *Theology of the New Testament*, trans. by Kendrick Grobel, 2 vol s(London, 1952–55)
- Burdick, Donald W., 'Οἶδα and γινώσκω in the Pauline Epistles', in *New Dimensions in New Testament Study*, ed. by Richard N. Longenecker and Merrill C. Tenney (Grand Rapids, 1974), pp.344–56
- Burkert, Walter, *Greek Religion: Archaic and Classical*, trans. by John Raffan (Oxford, 1985)
- Bussmann, Claus, *Themen der paulinischen Missionspredigt auf dem Hintergrund der spätjüdisch-hellenistischen Missionsliteratur*, Europäische Hochschulschriften, series 23: Theologie, volume 3 (Frankfurt/Bern, 1971)
- Cadbury, Henry J., 'The Macellum of Corinth', *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 53 (1934), pp. 134–41
- Caird, George Bradford, 'The Development of the Doctrine of Christ in the New Testament', in *Christ for Us Today*, ed. by W. Norman Pittenger (London, 1968), pp. 66–80
- , 'Everything to Everyone. The Theology of the Corinthian Epistles', *Interpretation*, 13 (1959), pp. 387–99
- , *The Language and Imagery of the Bible*, Duckworth Studies in Theology (London, 1980)
- , *Paul's Letters from Prison: Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Philemon in the Revised Standard Version*, New Clarendon Bible, New Testament (Oxford, 1976)
- , *Principalities and Powers: A Study in Pauline Theology*, Chancellor's Lectures, 1954, Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario (Oxford, 1956)
- Calvin, John, ed., *The First Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians*, trans. by John W. Frazer, Calvin's Commentaries Series (Edinburgh, 1960)
- Campenhause, Hans Freiherr von, 'Das Bekenntnis im Urchristentum', in *Urchristliches und Altkirchliches: Vorträge und Aufsätze* (Tübingen, 1979), pp. 217–72 [reprinted from *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 63 (1972), pp. 210–53]
- , 'Der Herrentitel Jesu und das urchristliche Bekenntnis', in *Urchristliches und Altkirchliches: Vorträge und Aufsätze* (Tübingen, 1979), pp. 273–77 [reprinted from *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 66 (1975), pp. 127–29]

- Caragounis, Chrys C., *The Son of Man: Vision and Interpretation*, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 38, (Tübingen, 1986)
- Carr, Arthur Wesley, *Angels and Principalities: The Background, Meaning and Development of the Pauline Phrase *hai archai kai hai exousiai**, Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas Monograph, 42 (Cambridge, 1981)
- Case, Shirley J., 'KYPIOΣ as a Title for Christ', *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 26 (1907), pp. 151–61
- Casey, Maurice, 'Chronology and the Development of Pauline Christology', in * Barrett volume, pp. 124–34
- , *Son of Man: The Interpretation and Influence of Daniel 7* (London, 1979)
- , 'The Use of the Term "Son of Man" in the Similitudes of Enoch', *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods*, 7 (1976), pp. 11–29
- Casson, Ronald W., 'Schemata in Cognitive Anthropology', *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 12 (1983), pp. 429–62
- Cave, Sydney, *The Doctrine of the Person of Christ* (London, 1925)
- , *The Gospel of St. Paul: A Reinterpretation in the Light of the Religion of His Age and Modern Missionary Experience* (London, 1928)
- Cerfaux, Lucien, *Christ in the Theology of St. Paul*, trans. by Geoffrey Webb and Adrian Walker (New York/Edinburgh/London, 1959)
- Chadwick, Henry, 'Philo', in *The Cambridge History of Later Greek and Early Medieval Philosophy*, ed. by A.H. Armstrong (Cambridge, 1967), pp. 137–57
- , 'St. Paul and Philo of Alexandria', *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 48 (1965–6), pp. 286–307
- Charles, Robert Henry, ed., *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English*, 2 vols (Oxford, 1913)
- , *Religious Development Between the Old and the New Testament*, Home University Library of Modern Knowledge (London, 1914)
- Charlesworth, James Hamilton, 'A Critical Comparison of the Dualism in 1QS III, 13—IV, 26 and the "Dualism" Contained in the Fourth Gospel', *New Testament Studies*, 15 (1968–9), pp. 389–418
- , 'The Jewish Roots of Christology: The Discovery of the Hypostatic Voice', *Scottish Journal of Theology*, 39 (1986), pp. 19–41
- , ed., *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 2 vols (London, 1983–85)
- , *The Pseudepigrapha and Modern Research, with a Supplement*, by J.H. Charlesworth, assisted by P. Dykers and M.J.H. Charlesworth, reprinted in Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies, 75 (Missoula, 1981)
- Charlesworth, Martin Percival, 'Some Observations on Ruler-Cult Especially in Rome', *Harvard Theological Review*, 28 (1935), pp. 5–44
- Chilton, Bruce D., 'Regnum Dei Deus Est', *Scottish Journal of Theology*, 31 (1978), pp. 261–70
- Chomsky, Noam, 'The Formal Nature of Language', in *Language and Mind*, second edition (New York and others, 1972), pp. 115–60 [reprinted from an appendix to Eric H. Lenneberg, *Biological Foundations of Language* (New York/London/Sydney, 1967), pp. 397–442]

- Clark, Herbert H., 'Word Associations and Linguistic Theory', in *New Horizons in Linguistics*, ed. by John Lyons, Pelican Books, 1223 (Harmondsworth, Middlesex, 1970), pp. 271–86
- Clark, Herbert H. and Eve V. Clark, *Psychology and Language: An Introduction to Psycholinguistics* (New York and others, 1977)
- Clifton, Charles, 'The Implications of Grammar for Word Associations', in *Research in Verbal Behavior and Some Neurophysiological Implications*, ed. by Kurt Salzinger and Suzanne Salzinger (New York/London, 1967), pp. 221–37
- Coggins, Richard, 'The Literary Approach to the Bible', *ExpositoryTimes*, 96 (1984–85), pp. 9–14
- Cohen, Abraham, *Everyman's Talmud*, Schocken Books, 497, reprinted from the 1949 reprint of the 1937 original (New York, 1978)
- Cohon, Samuel S., 'The Unity of God. A Study in Hellenistic and Rabbinic Theology', *Hebrew Union College Annual*, 26 (1955), pp. 425–79
- Collins, Adela Yarbro, 'Composition and Redaction of the Testament of Moses 10', *Harvard Theological Review*, 69 (1976), pp. 179–86
- Colpe, Carsten, *Die religionsgeschichtliche Schule: Darstellung und Kritik ihres Bildes vom gnostischen Erlösermythus*, Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, new series, 60 (Göttingen, 1961)
- Conzelmann, Hans, 'Christus im Gottesdienst der neutestamentlichen Zeit', in *Theologie als Schriftauslegung: Aufsätze zum Neuen Testament*, Beihefte zur evangelischen Theologie, 65 (Munich, 1974), pp. 120–30 [reprinted from *Bild und Verkündigung: Festschrift H. Jursch* (Berlin, 1962), pp. 21ff. and from *Pastoraltheologie*, 55 (1966), pp. 355–65]
- , ed., *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*, Meyer's Kritisch-Exegetischer Kommentar, 5, eleventh edition (Göttingen, 1969)
- , 'Korinth und die Mädchen der Aphrodite. Zur Religionsgeschichte der Stadt Korinth', *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen: Philologisch-historische Klasse* (1967), pp. 245–61
- , *An Outline of the Theology of the New Testament*, trans. by J. Bowden, New Testament Library (London, 1969)
- , 'Paulus und die Weisheit', *New Testament Studies*, 12 (1965–66), pp. 231–44
- Coppens, J., 'Dieu le Père dans la théologie paulinienne', in *La notion biblique de Dieu: Le Dieu de la Bible et le Dieu des philosophes*, ed. by J. Coppens, Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum Lovaniensium, 41 (Gembloux, 1976), pp. 331–35
- Cotter, Anthony C., 'The Divinity of Jesus Christ in Saint Paul', *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 7 (1945), pp. 259–89
- Coune, Michel, 'Le problème des idolâtres et l'éducation de la syneidésis', *Recherches de science religieuse*, 51 (1963), pp. 495–534
- Craig, Clarence T., 'The First Epistle to the Corinthians', in * *The Interpreter's Bible*, X, 1–262
- Cramer, John Antony, *Catena graecorum patrum in novum testamentum*, 8 vols (Oxford, 1844)
- Cranfield, C.E.B., 'Changes of Person and Number in Paul's Epistles', in * Barrett volume, pp. 280–89
- Crawford, R.G., 'Is the Doctrine of the Trinity Scriptural?', *Scottish Journal of Theology*, 20 (1967), pp. 282–94

- Crenshaw, James L., 'Wisdom', in *Old Testament Form Criticism*, ed. by John H. Hayes (San Antonio, Texas, 1974), pp. 225–64
- Crystal, David, *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*, second edition (Oxford, 1985)
- Cullmann, Oscar, *Christ and Time: The Primitive Christian Conception of Time and History*, trans. by F.V. Filson (London, 1951)
- , *The Christology of the New Testament*, trans. by S.C. Guthrie and C.A.M. Hall, New Testament Library, second English edition (London, 1963)
- , *The Earliest Christian Confessions*, trans. by J.K.S. Reid (London, 1949)
- , 'Die Schöpfung im Neuen Testament', in *Ex Auditu Verbi: Theologische Opstellen aangeboden aan G.C. Berkouwer* (Kampen, 1965), pp. 56–72
- Cupitt, Don, *The Debate About Christ* (London, 1979)
- Dahl, Murdoch Edgcombe, *The Resurrection of the Body: A Study of I Corinthians 15*, Studies in Biblical Theology, 36 (London, 1962)
- Dahl, Nils Alstrup, 'Christ, Creation, and the Church', in *Jesus in the Memory of the Early Church* (Minneapolis, 1976), pp. 120–40 [reprinted from *The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology: In Honour of Charles Harold Dodd*, ed. by W.D. Davies and D. Daube (Cambridge, 1956), pp. 422–43]
- , 'The Neglected Factor in New Testament Theology', *Reflection*, volume 73, number 1 (1975), pp. 5–8
- , 'The One God of Jews and Gentiles', in *Studies in Paul: Theology for the Early Christian Mission*, by N.A. Dahl, assisted by P. Donahue (Minneapolis, 1977), pp. 178–91
- Dahl, N.A. and Alan F. Segal, 'Philo and the Rabbis on the Names of God', *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods*, 9 (1978), pp. 1–28
- Dalbert, Peter, *Die Theologie der hellenistisch-jüdischen Missions-literatur, unter Ausschluss von Philo und Josephus*, Theologische Forschung, 4 (Hamburg/Volksdorf, 1954)
- Dalman, Gustaf, *The Words of Jesus, Considered in the Light of Post-Biblical Jewish Writings and the Aramaic Language*, trans. by David Miller Kay (Edinburgh, 1902)
- Daniélou, Jean G.L.M., *The Theology of Jewish Christianity*, trans. and ed. by John A. Baker, The Development of Christian Doctrine Before the Council of Nicaea, 1 (London, 1964)
- Danker, Frederick William, *Creeds in the Bible*, Biblical Monographs (St. Louis, Missouri, 1966)
- Davies, W.D., *Christian Origins and Judaism* (London, 1962)
- , *Jewish and Pauline Studies* (London, 1984)
- , *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology* (London, 1948)
- Davis, James A., *Wisdom and Spirit: An Investigation of I Corinthians 1. 18–3. 20* (London/Lanham, Maryland, 1984)
- Dead Sea Scrolls, Angelic Liturgy: Strugnell, J., 'The Angelic Liturgy at Qumran—4Q Serek *sirot olat hassabbat*', in *Congress Volume, Oxford, 1959*, Supplements to *Vetus Testamentum*, 7 (Leiden, 1960), pp. 318–45
- , *Genesis Apocryphon: A Genesis Apocryphon*, ed. by Nahman Avigad and Yigael Yadin, trans. by Sulamith Schwartz Nardi (Jerusalem, 1956)

- , Liturgical Fragments: Baillet, Maurice, ‘Un recueil liturgique de Qumrân, Grotte 4: “Les paroles des lumineuses”’, *Revue biblique*, 68 (1961), pp. 195–250
- , Manual of Discipline: *The Manual of Discipline, Translated and Annotated With an Introduction*, ed. by P. Wernberg-Moeller, Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, 1 (Leiden, 1957)
- , Manual of Discipline: *Megillath ha-serakhim mi-megalloth Midbar Yehudah: Serekh ha-yahad, Serekh ha-□edah, Serekh ha-berakhoth [The Rule Scroll: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judea, 1Q S, 1Q Sa, 1Q Sb]*, text, introduction, and commentary, by J. Licht (Jerusalem, 1965)
- , 11QMelchizedek: M. de Jonge and A.S. van der Woude, ‘11Q Melchizedek and the New Testament’, *New Testament Studies*, 12 (1966), pp. 301–26
- , Thanksgiving Hymns: *Osar ha-megilloth ha-genuzoth*, ed. by E.L. Sukenik (Jerusalem, 1954)
- , Thanksgiving Hymns: *The Thanksgiving Hymns*, trans. and annot. with introduction by Menachim Mansoor, Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, 3 (Leiden, 1961)
- , War Scroll: *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light Against The Sons of Darkness*, ed. by Yigael Yadin, trans. by Batya and Chaim Rabin (London, 1962)
- , 4Q 181: *Qumrân Cave 4, I (4Q 158 – 4Q 186)*, ed. by John Marco Allegro and Arnold A. Anderson, Discoveries in the Judean Desert of Jordan, 5 (Oxford, 1968), pp. 79–80
- Debrunner, A., and others, ‘Λέγω, λόγος’, in * *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, III, 69–143
- Deichgräber, Reinhard, *Gotteshymnus und Christushymnus in der frühen Christenheit: Untersuchungen zu Form, Sprache und Stil der frühchristlichen Hymnen*, Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments, 5 (Göttingen, 1967)
- Deissler, Alfons, ‘Gottes Selbstoffenbarung im Alten Testament’, *Mysterium Salutis*, II, 226–69
- , ‘The Image of God in the Old Testament’, in *Bauer Encyclopedia of Biblical Theology*, ed. by Johannes B. Bauer, 3 vols (London, 1970), I, 298–309
- Deissmann, Gustav Adolf, *Light From the Ancient East: The New Testament Illustrated by ... Texts of the Graeco-Roman World*, trans. by L.R.M. Strachan, revised edition (London, 1927)
- , *The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul*, trans. by William E. Wilson, The Selly Oak Lectures (London, 1923)
- , *St. Paul: A Study in Social and Religious History*, trans. by Lionel R.M. Strachan (London and others, 1912)
- Delling, Gerhard, ‘Die Altarinschrift eines Gottesfürchtigen in Pergamon’, *Novum Testamentum*, 7 (1964), pp. 73–80
- , ed., *Bibliographie zur jüdisch-hellenistischen und intertestamentarischen Literatur 1900–1965*, ed. by G. Delling with G. Zschuber and H. Berthold, Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, 106 (Berlin, 1969)
- , *Die Botschaft des Paulus* (Berlin, 1965)
- , ‘Geprägte partizipiale Gottesaussagen in der urchristlichen Verkündigung’, in * Delling, *Studien zum Neuen Testament*, pp. 401–16 [an abbreviated form of ‘Partizipiale Gottesprädikationen in den Briefen des Neuen Testaments’, *Studia Theologica*, 17 (1963), pp. 1–59]
- , ‘ΜΟΝΟΣ ΘΕΟΣ’, in * Delling, *Studien zum Neuen Testament*, pp. 391–400 [reprinted from *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 77 (1952), cols 469–76]

- , *Studien zum Neuen Testament und zum hellenistischen Judentum: Gesammelte Aufsätze 1950–1968*, ed. by Ferdinand Hahn, Traugott Holz, and Nikolaus Walter (Göttingen, 1970)
- , ‘Wunder-Allegorie-Mythus bei Philon von Alexandria’, in * Delling, *Studien zum Neuen Testament*, pp. 72–129 [reprinted from *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg, Gesellschafts- und sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe*, 6 (1957), pp. 713–39]
- , ‘Zur paulinischen Teleologie’, *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 75 (1950), cols 705–10 [reprinted in * Delling, *Studien zum Neuen Testament*, pp. 311–17]
- , ‘Zusammengesetzte Gottes- und Christusbezeichnungen in den Paulusbriefen’, in * Delling, *Studien zum Neuen Testament*, pp. 417–24 [reprinted from *Kirche-Theologie-Frömmigkeit: Festgabe für G. Holz zum 65. Geburtstag* (Berlin, 1965), pp. 65–71]
- Demke, C., ‘Ein Gott und viele Herren’, *Evangelische Theologie*, 36 (1976), pp. 473–84
- Denis, Albert-Marie, ed., *Fragmenta pseudepigraphorum quae supersunt graeca*, Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti graece, ed. by A. M. Denis and M. de Jonge, 3 (Leiden, 1970), pp. 45–246
- Denzinger, Heinrich, ed., *Enchiridion symbolorum, definitionum et declarationum de rebus fidei et morum*, revised by Adolf Schönmetzer, thirty-sixth edition (Barcelona and others, 1976)
- Dey, Lala Kalyan Kumar, *The Intermediary World and Patterns of Perfection in Philo and Hebrews*, Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series, 25 (Missoula, 1975)
- Dhorme, Édouard P., *A Commentary on the Book of Job*, trans. by H. Knight (London, 1967)
- Dibelius, Martin, *An die Kolosser, Epheser, An Philemon*, ed. by H. Greeven, Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, 12, third edition (Tübingen, 1953)
- , ‘Die Christianisierung einer hellenistischen Formel’, in *Botschaft und Geschichte: Gesammelte Aufsätze von Martin Dibelius*, ed. by Heinz Kraft and Günther Bornkamm, 2 vols (Tübingen, 1956), II, 14–29 [reprinted from *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, Geschichte und deutsche Literatur*, 35 (1915), pp. 224ff.]
- , *Die Geisterwelt im Glauben des Paulus* (Göttingen, 1909)
- Dick, Karl, *Der schriftstellerische Plural bei Paulus* (Halle, 1899)
- Dietrich, Bernard Clive, *The Origins of Greek Religion* (Berlin/New York, 1974)
- Dobschütz, Ernst von, ‘Zwei- und dreigliedrige Formeln. Ein Beitrag zur Vorgeschichte der Trinitätsformel’, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 50 (1931), pp. 117–47
- , ‘ΚΥΡΙΟΣ ΙΗΣΟΥΣ’, *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 30 (1931), pp. 97–123
- Dodd, Charles Harold, *The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments: Three Lectures* (London, 1936)
- , *The Bible and the Greeks* (London, 1935)
- Dombrowski, B.W., ‘The Idea of God in Q Serek’, *Revue de Qumran*, 7 (1969–71), pp. 515–31
- Driver, Samuel Rolles, and George Buchanan Gray, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Job*, International Critical Commentary (Edinburgh, 1921)
- Drummond, James, *Philo Judaeus; Or, The Jewish-Alexandrian Philosophy in Its Development and Completion*, 2 vols (London, 1888)
- Dunand, Françoise, *Le culte d’Isis dans le bassin oriental de la Méditerranée*, Etudes préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l’empire romain, 26, 3 vols (Leiden, 1973)

- Dunn, James D.G., *Baptism in the Holy Spirit: A Re-examination of the New Testament Teaching on the Gift of the Spirit in Relation to Pentecostalism Today*, Studies in Biblical Theology, second series, 15 (London, 1970)
- , *Christology in the Making: A New Testament Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation* (London, 1980)
- (Holladay, Carl R., review of the foregoing, in *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 101 (1982), pp. 609–12)
- (C.F.D. Moule, review of the foregoing, in *Journal of Theological Studies*, new series, 33 (1982), pp. 258–63)
- , ‘In Defence of a Methodology’, *Expository Times*, 95 (1983–84), pp. 295–99
- , *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament: An Inquiry into the Character of Earliest Christianity* (London, 1977)
- , ‘Was Christianity a Monotheistic Faith from the Beginning?’, *Scottish Journal of Theology*, 35 (1982), pp. 303–36
- Dupont, Jacques, *Gnosis: La connaissance religieuse dans les épîtres de saint Paul*, Universitas catholica Lovaniensis, Dissertationes ad gradum magistri in facultate theologica, series 2, volume 40 (Paris/Louvain, 1949)
- Dwight, Timothy, ‘On Romans ix. 5’, *Journal of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis*, 1 (1881), pp. 22–55
- Dykstra, William, ‘Corinthians 15:20–28, An Essential Part of Paul’s Argument Against Those Who Deny the Resurrection’, *Calvin Theological Journal*, 4 (1969), pp. 195–211
- Edman, Irwin, *The Mind of Paul* (London, 1936)
- Edwards, Katharine M., ed., *Coins, 1896–1929, Corinth*, 6 (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1933)
- Edwards, Thomas Charles, *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, second edition (London, 1885)
- Efros, Israel, ‘Prophecy, Wisdom, and Apocalypse’, in *Mordecai M. Kaplan Jubilee Volume on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday*, 2 vols (New York, 1953), English section, pp. 215–23
- Eichholz, Georg, *Die Theologie des Paulus im Umriss*, second edition (Neukirchen, 1977)
- Eichrodt, Walther, *Theology of the Old Testament*, trans. by J.A. Baker, 2 vols (London, 1961–67)
- Eissfeldt, Otto, *The Old Testament: An Introduction, Including the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, and also the Works of Similar Type from Qumran. The History of the Formation of the Old Testament*, trans. by Peter R. Ackroyd (Oxford, 1965)
- , *Vom Werden der biblischen Gottesanschauung und ihrem Ringen mit dem Gottesgedanken der griechischen Philosophie*, Hallische Universitätsreden, 42 (Halle, 1929)
- Elijah: *The Apocalypse of Elijah, Based on P. Chester Beatty 2018*, ed. and trans. by Albert Pietersma and Susan Turner, with Harold W. Attridge, Society of Biblical Literature Texts and Translations, 19, Pseudepigrapha Series, 9 (Chico, 1981)
- , *Die Apokalypse des Elias: Eine unbekannte Apokalypse und Bruchstücke der Sophonias-Apokalypse. Koptische Texte, Uebersetzung, Glossar*, ed. by Georg Steindorff, Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, 17 = second series, 2, fascicle 3 (Leipzig, 1899)
- Ellicott, Charles John, ed., *St. Paul’s First Epistle to the Corinthians: With a Critical and Grammatical Commentary* (London, 1887)

- Elliger, Winfried, *Paulus in Griechenland*, Stuttgarter Bibelstudien, 92–93 (Stuttgart, 1978)
- Ellis, E. Earle, ‘Paul and His Opponents: Trends in the Research’, in *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty*, ed. by Jacob Neusner, Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity, 12, 4 vols (Leiden, 1975), I, 264–98
- , ‘Traditions in 1 Corinthians’, *New Testament Studies*, 32 (1986), pp. 481–502
- , ‘“Wisdom” and “Knowledge” in I Corinthians’, *Tyndale Bulletin*, 25 (1974), pp. 82–98
- Elwell, Walter, ‘The Deity of Christ in the Writings of Paul’, in *Current Issues in Biblical and Patristic Interpretation: Studies in Honor of Merrill C. Tenney Presented by His Former Students*, ed. by Gerald F. Hawthorne (Grand Rapids, 1975), pp. 297–308
- Encyclopaedia Judaica*, 16 vols (Jerusalem, 1971–72)
- The Encyclopedia of the Jewish Religion*, ed. by Raphael Jehuda Werblowsky and Geoffrey Wigoder (London, 1967)
- Enoch: *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4*, ed. by J.T. Milik, with the collaboration of Matthew Black (Oxford, 1976)
- Ephraem Syrus: *S. Ephraem Syri commentarii in epistolas d. Pauli, nunc primum ex armenio in latinum sermonem a patribus Mekitharistis translati* (Venice, 1893)
- Erhardt, Arnold, ‘Social Problems in the Early Church’, in *The Framework of the New Testament Stories* (Manchester, 1964), pp. 275–312 [translated from ‘Soziale Fragen in der alten Kirche’, in *Existenz und Ordnung: Festschrift für Erik Wolf zum 60. Geburtstag*, ed. by Thomas Würtenberger, Werner Maihofer, and Alexander Hollerbach (Frankfurt, 1962), pp. 155–82]
- Ernst, Josef, *Anfänge der Christologie*, Stuttgarter Bibelstudien, 57 (Stuttgart, 1972)
- Ervin-Tripp, Susan M., ‘Substitution, Context, and Association’, in *Norms of Word Association*, ed. by Leo Postman and Geoffrey Keppel (New York/London, 1970), pp. 383–467
- Eusebius: *Eusebii Pamphili evangelicae praeparationis libri XV*, ed. and trans. by E.H. Gifford, 4 vols in 5 (Oxford, 1903)
- , *Die Praeparatio Evangelica*, ed. by Karl Mras, Eusebius Werke, 8, Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte, 43, second edition, revised and edited by Eduard des Places, 2 vols (Berlin, 1982)
- Evans, C.F., ‘Christology and Theology’, Albert Stumpff Memorial lecture, Queen’s College, Birmingham, 1959, in *The Communication of the Gospel in New Testament Times*, with contributions by Austin Farrer and others, Theological Collections (SPCK), 2 (London, 1961), pp. 11–33 [reprinted in *Explorations in Theology: C.F. Evans* (London, 1977), pp. 101–120]
- Evans, Ernest, ed., *The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians in the Revised Version, with Introduction and Commentary*, The Clarendon Bible (Oxford, 1930)
- Everling, Otto, *Die paulinische Angelologie und Dämonologie: Ein biblisch-theologischer Versuch* (Göttingen, 1888)
- Ewald, Paul, ed., *Die Briefe des Paulus an die Epheser, Kolosser und Philemon*, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, ed. by Theodor Zahn, 10, second edition (Leipzig, 1910)
- Ezra: *Les dires prophétiques d’Esdras (IV. Esdras)*, ed. by L.Gry, 2 vols (Paris, 1938)
- , *The Fourth Book of Ezra: The Latin Version Edited from the MSS*, by Robert L. Bensly, with an introduction by Montague Rhodes James, Texts and Studies, volume 3, number 2 (Cambridge, 1895)

- Farmer, Herbert H., 'Monotheism and the Doctrine of the Trinity', *Religion in Life*, 29 (1959–60), pp. 32–41
- Farnell, Lewis Richard, *Greek Hero Cults and Ideas of Immortality*, The Gifford Lectures, 1920 (Oxford, 1921)
- Farrar, F.W., 'The Wisdom of Solomon', in *The Holy Bible, according to the Authorized Version (A.D. 1611), with an Explanatory and Critical Commentary and a Revision of the Translation, by Clergy of the English Church: Apocrypha*, ed. by Henry Wace, 2 vols (London, 1888), pp. 403–534
- Fascher, Erich, ed., *Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther. Erster Teil: Einführung und Auslegung der Kapitel 1–7*, Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament, 7 (Berlin, 1975)
- Fee, Gordon D., 'Εἰδωλόθυτα Once Again: An Interpretation of 1 Corinthians 8–10', *Biblica*, 61 (1980), pp. 172–97
- Feine, Karl Eduard Paul, *Der Apostel Paulus: Das Ringen um das geschichtliche Verständnis des Paulus*, Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie, series 2, volume 12 (Gütersloh, 1927)
- , *Die Gestalt des apostolischen Glaubensbekenntnisses in der Zeit des Neuen Testaments* (Leipzig, 1925)
- , *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, second edition (Leipzig, 1911)
- , *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, eighth edition, revised by K. Aland (Berlin, 1951)
- Feldman, Louis H., *Josephus and Modern Scholarship, 1937–1980* (Berlin, 1984)
- , *Scholarship on Philo and Josephus, 1937–1962*, Studies in Judaica, 1 (New York, 1963)
- Ferguson, John, *The Religions of the Roman Empire*, Aspects of Greek and Roman Life (London, 1970)
- Festugière, Andre-Marie Jean, *Personal Religion Among the Greeks*, Sather Classical Lectures, 26 (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1954)
- Feuillet, André, *Le Christ sagesse de Dieu d'après les épîtres pauliniennes*, Etudes bibliques (Paris, 1966)
- (Stanley, David, review of the foregoing, in *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 30 (1968), pp. 254–56)
- , 'La profession de la foi monothéiste de 1 Cor. 8, 4–6', *Studii biblici Franciscani liber annuus*, 13 (1962–63), pp. 7–32
- Fichtner, Johannes, *Die altorientalische Weisheit in ihrer israelitisch-jüdischen Ausprägung: Eine Studie zur Nationalisierung der Weisheit in Israel*, Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 62 (Giessen, 1933)
- , *Weisheit Salomos*, Handbuch zum Alten Testament, second series, 6 (Tübingen, 1938)
- Fillmore, Charles J., 'Topics in Lexical Semantics', in *Current Issues in Linguistic Theory*, ed. by Roger W. Cole, (Bloomington, Indiana/London, 1977), pp. 76–138
- Finan, Thomas, 'Hellenistic Humanism in the Book of Wisdom', *Irish Theological Quarterly*, 27 (1960), pp. 30–48
- Firth, J.R., 'Modes of Meaning', in *Essays and Studies 1951*, collected by Geoffrey Tillotson for The English Association, Essays and Studies, new series, 4 (London, 1951), pp. 118–49
- , 'A Synopsis of Linguistic Theory, 1930–1955', in *Studies in Linguistic Analysis: Special Volume of the Philological Society* (Oxford, 1957), pp. 1–32
- Fischer, J.B., 'The Term ΔΕΣΠΟΤΗΣ in Josephus', *Jewish Quarterly Review*, 49 (1958–59), pp. 132–38

- Fishwick, Duncan, 'The Development of Provincial Ruler Worship in the Western Roman Empire', in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, second series, vol 16, part 2 (Berlin/NewYork, 1978), pp. 1201–53
- Fitzmyer, Joseph Augustine, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Major Publications and Tools for Study*, Sources for Biblical Study, 8 (Missoula, 1977)
- , 'Further Light on Melchizedek from Qumran Cave 11', in *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament* (London, 1971), pp. 245–67
- , *An Introductory Bibliography for the Study of Scripture*, Subsidia biblica, 3, second edition, revised (Rome, 1981)
- , *Pauline Theology: A Brief Sketch* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1967)
- , 'The Semitic Background of the New Testament Kyrios-Title', in *A Wandering Aramean: Collected Aramaic Essays*, Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series, 25 (Missoula, 1979), pp. 115–42 [translated, revised and expanded from 'Der semitische Hintergrund des neutestamentlichen Kyriostitels', in *Jesus Christus in Historie und Theologie: Neutestamentliche Festschrift für Hans Conzelmann zum 60. Geburtstag*, ed. by Georg Strecker (Tübingen, 1975), pp. 267–98]
- Flusser, D. and S. Safrai, 'The Essene Doctrine of Hypostasis and Rabbi Meir', *Immanuel*, 14 (1982), pp. 47–57 [unavailable to me; synopsis in *New Testament Abstracts*, 28 (1984), p. 291]
- Foerster, Werner, 'Der heilige Geist im Spätjudentum', *New Testament Studies*, 8 (1962), pp. 117–34
- , 'ΚΥΡΙΟΣ', in * *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, III, 1039–98
- Fohrer, Georg, ed., *Das Buch Hiob*, Kommentar zum Alten Testament, 16 (Gütersloh, 1963)
- Fossum, Jarl, 'Jewish-Christian Christology and Jewish Mysticism', *Vigiliae christianae*, 37 (1983), pp. 260–87
- , *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord: Samaritan and Jewish Concepts of Intermediation and the Origin of Gnosticism*, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 36 (Tübingen, 1985)
- Foulkes, Francis, ed., *The Epistle of Paul to the Ephesians*, Tyndale New Testament Commentaries (London, 1963)
- Fox, Marvin, and others, 'God', in * *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, VII, 641–74
- Fuchs, Ernst, *Christus und der Geist bei Paulus: Eine biblisch-theologische Untersuchung*, Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 23 (Leipzig, 1932)
- , 'Muss man an Jesus glauben, wenn man an Gott glauben will?', in *Glaube und Erfahrung: Zum christologischen Problem im Neuen Testament*, Gesammelte Aufsätze, II (Tübingen, 1965), pp. 249–79 [reprinted from *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, 58 (1961), pp. 45–67]
- , 'Der Ursprung des christlichen Glaubens', in *Zum hermeneutischen Problem in der Theologie: Die existentielle Interpretation*, Gesammelte Aufsätze, 1 (Tübingen, 1959), pp. 45–64
- Fuchs, Leo, *Die Juden Aegyptens in ptolemäischer und römischer Zeit*, Veröffentlichungen der A.S. Bettelheim Memorial Foundation (Vienna, 1924)
- Fuller, Reginald Horace, *The Foundations of New Testament Christology*, Lutterworth Library (London, 1965)
- Funke, Hermann, 'Götterbild', in *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, ed. by Theodor Klauser and others, vols 1- (Stuttgart, 1950-), XI, 659–828
- Furnish, Victor Paul, ed., *II Corinthians*, Anchor Bible (Garden City, New York, 1984)
- Gábris, Karol, 'Zur Kraft der Verheissungen (Zum Gal 3, 15–22)', *Communio viatorum*, 11 (1968), pp. 251–64

- Gager, John Goodrich, *Moses in Greco-Roman Paganism*, Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series, 16 (Nashville/New York, 1972)
- Gaston, Lloyd, 'Angels and Gentiles in Early Judaism and in Paul', *Studies in Religion*, 11 (1982), pp. 65–75
- Gelasius Cyzicenus: *Gelasius Kirchengeschichte*, ed. by Margret Heinemann, on the basis of papers left by Gerhard Loeschke, *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte*, 28 (Leipzig, 1918)
- Gemser, Berend, *Sprüche Salomos*, Handbuch zum Alten Testament, series 1, volume 16, second edition (Tübingen, 1963)
- Georgi, Dieter, *Die Gegner des Paulus im 2. Korintherbrief: Studien zur religiösen Propaganda in der Spätantike*, Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament, 11 (Neukirchen/Vluyn, 1964)
- , 'Socioeconomic Reasons for the "Divine Man" as a Propagandistic Pattern', in *Aspects of Religious Propaganda in Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. by Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, University of Notre Dame Center for the Study of Judaism and Christianity in Antiquity, 2 (London/Notre Dame, 1976), pp. 27–42
- Gershenson, Daniel E., 'Logos', in * *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, II, 460–62
- Gese, Hartmut, 'Wisdom, Son of Man, and the Origins of Christology: The Consistent Development of Biblical Theology', *Horizons in Biblical Theology*, 3 (1981), pp. 23–58 [trans. by Ulrich Mauser from 'Die Weisheit, der Menschensohn und die Ursprünge der Christologie als konsequente Entfaltung der biblischen Theologie', *Svensk Exegetisk årsbok*, 44 (1979), pp. 77–114]
- Geyer, John, ed., *The Wisdom of Solomon*, Torch Bible Commentaries, Apocrypha (London, 1963)
- Gibbs, John G., 'The Cosmic Scope of Redemption According to Paul', *Biblica*, 56 (1975), pp. 13–29
- , *Creation and Redemption: A Study in Pauline Theology*, Supplements to Novum Testamentum, 26 (Leiden, 1971)
- , 'Pauline Cosmic Christology and Ecological Crisis', *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 90 (1971), pp. 466–79
- Giblin, C.H., 'Three Monotheistic Texts in Paul', *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 37 (1975), pp. 527–47
- Gingrich, F. Wilbur, *Shorter Lexicon of the Greek New Testament*, second edition, revised by Frederick W. Danker (Chicago/London, 1983)
- Girdlestone, Robert Baker, *Monotheism: Hebrew and Christian*, Judaism and Christianity Short Studies, 7 (London, 1907)
- Glover, Terrot Reavely, *The Mind of St. Paul*, Annual Lecture, Henriette Hertz Trust, Proceedings of the British Academy, 27 (London, 1941)
- Godet, Frédéric Louis, *Commentary on St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians*, trans. by A. Cusin, Clark's Foreign Theological Library, new series, 27, 2 vols (Edinburgh, 1886–87)
- Goldberg, Arnold M., *Untersuchungen über die Vorstellung von der Schekhinah in der frühen rabbinischen Literatur, Talmud und Midrasch*, Studia Judaica, 5 (Berlin, 1969)
- Goldin, Judah, 'The First Chapter of *Abot de Rabbi Nathan*: Appendix', in *Mordecai M. Kaplan Jubilee Volume on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday*, 2 vols (New York, 1953), English section, pp. 278–80
- Goodenough, Erwin R., *An Introduction to Philo Judaeus*, Louis Stern Memorial Fund (New Haven, 1940)
- , *By Light, Light: The Mystic Gospel of Hellenistic Judaism* (New Haven, 1935)

- , *The Politics of Philo Judaeus: Practice and Theory*, with a general bibliography of Philo, by Howard L. Goodhart and Erwin R. Goodenough (New Haven/London, 1938)
- Goodrick, Alfred Thomas Scrope, ed., *The Book of Wisdom, with Introduction and Notes*, Oxford Church Bible Commentary (London, 1913)
- Goodspeed, Edgar Johnson, *The Key to Ephesians* (Chicago, 1956)
- Goodwin, William Watson, *A Greek Grammar*, new edition, revised and enlarged (London/New York, 1894)
- Goppelt, Leonhard, ‘Die Herrschaft Christi und die Welt’, in *Christologie und Ethik: Aufsätze zum Neuen Testament* (Göttingen, 1968), pp. 102–36 [revised and reprinted from *Lutherische Rundschau*, 17 (1967), pp. 22–50]
- , *Theology of the New Testament*, trans. by John E. Alsup, ed. by J. Roloff, 2 vols (Grand Rapids, 1981–82)
- Goudge, Henry Leighton, ed., *The First Epistle to the Corinthians, with Introduction and Notes*, Westminster Commentaries (London, 1903)
- Grabbe, Lester L., ‘Orthodoxy in First Century Judaism?’, *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods*, 8 (1977), pp. 149–53
- Grant, Robert M., ‘Causation and “The Ancient World View”’, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 83 (1964), pp. 34–40
- , ‘The Doctrine of God in Early Christian Thought’, in *Studia Evangelica, Volume V*, ed. by F.L. Cross, *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*, 103 (Berlin, 1968), pp. 57–68
- , *Gods and the One God: Christian Theology in the Graeco-Roman World* (London, 1986)
- Grässer, Erich, ‘“Ein einziger ist Gott” (Röm 3, 30): Zum christologischen Gottesverständnis bei Paulus’, in *‘Ich will euer Gott werden.’ Beispiele biblischen Redens von Gott*, Stuttgarter Bibelstudien, 100 (Stuttgart, 1981), pp. 177–205
- Gregg, John Allen Fitzgerald, *The Wisdom of Solomon in the Revised Version, with Introduction and Notes*, Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges (Cambridge, 1909)
- Gressmann, Hugo, *The Development of the Idea of God in the Old Testament*, lecture delivered at Selly Oak Colleges in October, 1925 (London, [1926]) [reprinted from *The Methodist Review*]
- Groscheide, F.W., *Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, New London Commentary, second edition (London, 1954)
- Gruenwald, Ithamar, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism*, Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums, 14 (Leiden/Cologne, 1980)
- , ‘The Problem of Anti-Gnostic Polemic in Rabbinic Literature’, in *Studies in Gnosticism and Hellenistic Religions: Presented to Gilles Quispel on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, ed. by R. van den Broek and M.J. Vermaseren, *Etudes préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l’empire romain*, 91 (Leiden, 1981), pp. 171–89
- Gunther, John J., *St. Paul’s Opponents and Their Background: A Study of Apocalyptic and Jewish Sectarian Teachings*, Supplements to Novum Testamentum, 35 (Leiden, 1973)
- Gusinde, M. and others, ‘Monotheismus’, in *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, ed. by Michael Buchberger and others, second edition, 10 vols (Freiburg, 1957–67), VII, 565–70
- Guthrie, Donald, ‘The Development of the Idea of Canonical Pseudepigrapha in New Testament Criticism’, in *The Authorship and Integrity of the New Testament*, Theological Collections (SPCK), 4 (London, 1965), pp. 14–39 [reprinted from *Vox Evangelica*, 1(1962)]

- , *New Testament Introduction*, third edition, revised (London, 1970)
- , *New Testament Theology* (Leicester, 1981)
- Guthrie volume: *Christ the Lord: Studies in Christology Presented to Donald Guthrie*, ed. by Harold H. Rowdon (Leicester, 1982)
- Haaker, Klaus and Peter Schäfer, 'Nachbiblische Traditionen vom Tod des Mose', in *Josephus-Studien: Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament, Otto Michel zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet*, ed. by Otto Betz, Klaus Haaker, and Martin Hengel (Göttingen: 1974), pp. 145–74
- Hahn, Ferdinand, 'The Confession of the One God in the New Testament', *Horizons in Biblical Theology*, 2 (1980), pp. 69–84
- Hamerton-Kelly, Robert Gerald, *Pre-existence, Wisdom, and the Son of Man: A Study of the Idea of Pre-existence in the New Testament*, Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas Monograph Series, 21 (Cambridge, 1973)
- Hanson, Anthony Tyrrell, *The Image of the Invisible God* (London, 1982)
- Harris, Murray J., '2 Corinthians', in *The Expositor's Bible Commentary, With the New International Version of the Holy Bible*, ed. by Frank E. Gaebelein, vols 1– (London, 1976–), X, 299–406
- , 'Titus 2. 13 and the Deity of Christ', in * Bruce volume, pp. 262–77
- , 'The Translation of *Elohim* in Psalm 45. 7–8', *Tyndale Bulletin*, 35 (1984), pp. 65–89
- , 'Use of θεός in the New Testament', chapter one of a projected book on θεός as a christological title in the NT, unpublished
- Harris, Zellig S., 'Discourse Analysis', *Language*, 28 (1952), pp. 1–30
- Harrison, Roland Kenneth, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (London, 1970)
- Harvey, Anthony Ernest, *Jesus and the Constraints of History*, Bampton Lectures, 1980 (London, 1982)
- Hasel, Gerhard, *New Testament Theology: Basic Issues in the Current Debate* (Grand Rapids, 1978)
- Haufe, Günter, 'Funktion und Interpretation urchristlicher Bekenntnissätze', *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 110 (1985), cols 785–94
- Hayward, Robert, 'The *Memra* of YHWH and the Development of its Use in Targum Neofiti I', *Journal of Jewish Studies*, 24 (1974), pp. 412–18
- Hegermann, Harald, *Die Vorstellung vom Schöpfungsmittler im hellenistischen Judentum und Urchristentum, Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*, 82 (Berlin, 1961)
- Heinisch, Paul, *Das Buch der Weisheit*, Exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament, 24 (Münster in Westfalen, 1912)
- , *Die griechische Philosophie im Buch der Weisheit*, Alttestamentliche Abhandlungen, volume 1, fascicle 4 (Münster, 1908)
- , *Personifikationen und Hypostasen im Alten Testament und im Alten Orient*, Biblische Zeitfragen, ninth series, 10/12 (Münster in Westfalen, 1921)
- Heinrici, C.F. Georg, ed., *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*, Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament, 5, eighth edition (Göttingen, 1896)

- Hemer, Colin J., ‘Observations on Pauline Chronology’, in —Bruce volume, pp. 3–18
- Hengel, Martin, ‘Christology and New Testament Chronology’, in *Between Jesus and Paul: Studies in the Earliest History of Christianity*, articles trans. by J. Bowden (London, 1983), pp. 30–47
- , *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period*, trans. by J. Bowden, 2 vols (London, 1974)
- , *The Son of God: The Origin of Christology and the History of Jewish-Hellenistic Religion*, trans. by J. Bowden (London, 1976)
- Herford, Robert Travers, *Judaism in the New Testament Period* (London, 1928)
- Héring, Jean, ed., *The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians*, trans. by A.W. Heathcote and P.J. Allcock (London, 1962)
- Hermann, Ingo, *Kyrios und Pneuma: Studien zur Christologie der paulinischen Hauptbriefe*, Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testament, 2 (Munich, 1961)
- Herner, Sven, *Die Anwendung des Wortes KYPIΟΣ im Neuen Testament*, Lunds Universitets årsskrift, 38 (Lund, 1903)
- Higgins, A.J.B., ‘Jewish Messianic Belief in Justin Martyr’s *Dialogue with Trypho*’, *Novum Testamentum*, 9 (1967), pp. 298–305
- Hilgert, E., ‘Bibliographia Philoniana 1935–1981’, in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung*, ed. by Hildegard Temporini and others, second series, volume 21, part 1 (Berlin, 1984), pp. 47–97
- Hill, Andrew E., ‘The Temple of Asclepius: An Alternative Source for Paul’s Body Theology?’, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 99 (1980), pp. 437–39
- Hillyer, Norman, ‘1 and 2 Corinthians’, in *The New Bible Commentary, Revised*, third edition, revised and edited by D. Guthrie and others (London, 1970), pp. 1049–88
- Holladay, Carl H., *Theios Aner in Hellenistic-Judaism: A Critique of the Use of This Category in New Testament Christology*, Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series, 40 (Missoula, 1977)
- (Telford, William R., review of the foregoing, in *Journal of Theological Studies*, 30 (1979), pp. 246–52)
- Holmes, Samuel, ed., ‘The Wisdom of Solomon’, in * *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, ed. by R.H. Charles, I, 518–68
- Hölscher, Gustav, *Das Buch Hiob*, Handbuch zum Alten Testament, first series, 17, second edition (Tübingen, 1952)
- , *Geschichte der israelitischen und jüdischen Religion*, Sammlung Töpelmann: Die Theologie im Abriss, first series, 7 (Giessen, 1922)
- Holsten, C., *Das Evangelium des Paulus*, 2 vols (Berlin, 1880–98)
- Holsten, W., ‘Monolatrie’, in * *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, IV, 1106–07
- Holsten, W., F. Baumgärtel, and W. Schmauch, ‘Monotheismus und Polytheismus’, in * *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, IV, 1109–16
- Hommel, Hildebrecht, *Schöpfer und Erhalter: Studien zum Problem Christentum und Antike*, Sonderausgabe, Theologia viatorum (Berlin, 1956)
- Hooker, Morna D., *Pauline Pieces* (London, 1979)

- Horbury, W., 'The Messianic Associations of "The Son of Man"', *Journal of Theological Studies*, new series, 36 (1985), pp. 34–55
- Hörmann, Hans, *Psycholinguistics: An Introduction to Research and Theory*, trans. by H.H. Stern and Peter Leppmann, second English edition, revised (New York/Heidelberg/Berlin, 1979)
- Horn, Hans-Jürgen, 'Antakoluthie der Tugenden und Einheit Gottes', *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum*, 13 (1970), pp. 5–28
- Horsley, Richard A., 'The Background of the Confessional Formula in I Kor 8:6', *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 69 (1978), pp. 130–35
- , 'Consciousness and Freedom among the Corinthians: 1 Corinthians 8–10', *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 40 (1978), pp. 574–89
- , 'Gnosis in Corinth: Corinthians 8:1–6', *New Testament Studies*, 27 (1980–81), pp. 32–51
- , "'How Can Some of You Say That There is No Resurrection of the Dead?' Spiritual Elitism in Corinth', *Novum Testamentum*, 20 (1978), pp. 203–31
- Horst, Pieter W. van der, 'Moses' Throne Vision in Ezekiel the Dramatist', *Journal of Jewish Studies*, 34 (1983), pp. 20–29
- , 'Some Notes on the *Exagoge* of Ezekiel', *Mnemosyne*, series 4, 37 (1984), pp. 354–75 [review article of * H. Jacobson, *The Exagoge of Ezekiel*]
- Horton, Fred L., *The Melchizedek Tradition: A Critical Examination of the Sources to the Fifth Century A.D. and in the Epistle to the Hebrews*, Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas Monograph Series, 30 (Cambridge, 1976)
- Houlden, J.L., ed., *Paul's Letters from Prison: Philippians, Colossians, Philemon and Ephesians*, Pelican New Testament Commentaries, Pelican Books, 1198 (Harmondsworth, Middlesex, 1970)
- Huddleston, Rodney D., *An Introduction to English Transformational Syntax*, English Language Series, 10 (London, 1976)
- Hunt, Morton M., *The Universe Within: A New Science Explores the Human Mind* (Brighton, Sussex, 1982)
- Hurd, John Coolidge, *The Origin of I Corinthians* (London, 1965)
- Hurtado, Larry, 'The Binitarian Shape of Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism', in *Society of Biblical Literature 1985 Seminar Papers*, ed. by K.H. Richards (Atlanta, 1985), pp. 377–91
- , 'The Study of New Testament Christology: Notes for the Agenda', in *Society of Biblical Literature 1981 Seminar Papers*, ed. by K.H. Richards (Chico, 1981), pp. 185–97
- Hwang, Hyon Suk, *Die Verwendung des Wortes πᾶς in den paulinischen Briefen* (Inaugural-Dissertation, Erlangen-Nürnberg, 1985)
- Illmann, Karl-Johann, and Jukka Thurén, eds., *Der Herr ist Einer, Unser Gemeinsames Erbe*, Meddelanden från Stiftelsens för Åbo Akademi Forskningsinstitut (= Publications of the Research Institute of the Åbo Akademi Foundation), 47 (Åbo, 1979)
- Im Schoot, P. van, 'Monotheismus', in *Bibel-Lexikon*, ed. by Herbert Haag, second edition (Einsiedeln and others, 1968), pp. 1167–70
- The Interpreter's Bible: The Holy Scriptures in the King James and Revised Standard Versions, with General Articles and Introduction, Exegesis, Exposition for Each Book of the Bible*, ed. by George Arthur Buttrick and others, 12 vols (New York/Nashville, 1952–57)

- Isaacs, Marie Elizabeth, *The Concept of Spirit: A Study of Pneuma in Hellenistic Judaism and Its Bearing on the New Testament*, Heythrop Monographs, 1 (London, 1976)
- Isaiah: *The Ascension of Isaiah: Translated from the Ethiopic Version, Which, together with the New Greek Fragment, the Latin Versions and the Latin Translation of the Slavonic, is Here Published in Full*, edited with introduction, notes and indices by R.H. Charles (London, 1900)
- Jacobson, Howard, *The Exagoge of Ezekiel* (Cambridge, 1983)
- [For the review article of the foregoing by P.W. van der Horst, see above under Horst.]
- Jendorff, Bernhard, *Der Logosbegriff: Seine philosophische Grundlegung bei Heraklit von Ephesos und seine theologische Indienstnahme durch Johannes des Evangelisten* (Frankfurt, 1969)
- Jeremias, Joachim, ‘Μωϋσῆς’, in * *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, IV, 848–73
- , ‘Παῖς θεοῦ’, in * *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, V, 654–717
- ‘Zur Gedankenführung in den paulinischen Briefen’, in *Abba: Studien zur neutestamentlichen Theologie und Zeitgeschichte* (Göttingen, 1966), pp. 269–76 [reprinted from *Studia Paulina in honorem Johannis de Zwaan septuagenarii*, ed. by J.N. Sevenster and W.C. van Unnik (Haarlem, 1953), pp. 146–54]
- Jerome: *S. Eusebii Hieronymi Stridonensis presbyteri opera omnia*, in J.P. Migne, ed., *Bibliotheca patrum latina*, 30 (Paris, 1846)
- Jewett, Robert, *Dating Paul’s Life* (London, 1979)
- Job: *Testamentum Iobi*, ed. by Sebastian Paul Brock, *Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti graece*, 2 (Leiden, 1967), pp. 1–59
- Jocz, Jakób, *The Jewish People and Jesus Christ: A Study in the Controversy between Church and Synagogue*, reprinted with some revisions (London, 1954)
- Johnson, Aubrey Rodway, *The One and the Many in the Israelite Conception of God* (Cardiff, 1942)
- Johnson, Elizabeth A., ‘Jesus, the Wisdom of God: A Biblical Basis for Non-Androcentric Christology’, *Ephemerides theologicae Lovaniensis*, 61 (1985), pp. 261–94
- Johnson, George, *Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians and Philemon*, Century Bible (London/Edinburgh, 1967)
- Johnson, Norman Burrows, *Prayer in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha: A Study of the Jewish Concept of God*, *Journal of Biblical Literature Monograph Series*, 2 (Philadelphia, 1948)
- Jones, Arnold Hugh M., *The Greek City from Alexander to Justinian* (Oxford, 1940)
- de Jonge, M., ‘Jewish Expectations about the “Messiah” according to the Fourth Gospel’, *New Testament Studies*, 19 (1972), pp. 246–270
- , ‘The Role of Intermediaries in God’s Final Intervention in the Future according to the Qumran Scrolls’, in *Studies on the Jewish Background of the New Testament*, by O. Michel and others, preface by H. van Praag (Assen, 1969), pp. 44–63
- de Jonge, M., and A.S. van der Woude, ‘11Q Melchizedek and the New Testament’, *New Testament Studies*, 12 (1966), pp. 301–26
- Joseph et Aséneth: Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes*, ed. by Marc Philonenko, *Studia post-biblica*, 13 (Leiden, 1968)
- Josephus: *Josephus, with an English Translation*, ed. by H. St. J. Thackeray and others, Loeb Classical Library, 10 vols (London/Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1958–61)

- Jubilees: The Ethiopic Version of the Hebrew Book of Jubilees, Otherwise Known among the Greeks as 'Ἡ λεπτὴ Γενεσις': Edited from Four Manuscripts ... and Further Emended ... in accordance with the Hebrew, Syriac, Greek and Latin Fragments which are Here Published in Full*, ed. by R.H. Charles, *Anecdota Oxoniensia, Semitic Series*, 8 (Oxford, 1895)
- Justin: *The Writings of Justin Martyr and Athenagoras*, trans. by Marcus Dods, George Reith, and B.P. Pratten, *Ante-Nicene Christian Library*, 2 (Edinburgh, 1867)
- Kahle, Paul E., *The Cairo Geniza*, second edition (Oxford, 1959)
- Kallas, James G., *The Satanward View: A Study in Pauline Theology* (Philadelphia, 1966)
- Käsemann, Ernst, *Leib und Leib Christi: Eine Untersuchung zur paulinischen Begrifflichkeit*, *Beiträge zur historischen Theologie*, 9 (Tübingen, 1933)
- , *New Testament Questions of Today*, trans. by W.J. Montague, *New Testament Library* (London, 1969)
- , *Perspectives on Paul*, trans. by M. Kohl, *New Testament Library* (London, 1971)
- Kattenbusch, Ferdinand, *Das apostolische Symbol: Seine Entstehung, sein geschichtlicher Sinn, seine ursprüngliche Stellung im Kultus und in der Theologie der Kirche. Ein Beitrag zur Symbolik und Dogmengeschichte*, 2 vols (Leipzig, 1894–97)
- Katz, Jerrold J., *The Philosophy of Language*, *Studies in Language* (New York/London, 1966)
- Keck, Leander E., 'Toward the Renewal of New Testament Christology', *New Testament Studies*, 32 (1986), pp. 362–77
- Keferstein, Friedrich, *Philo's Lehre von den göttlichen Mittelwesen: Zugleich eine kurtze Darstellung der Grundzüge des philonischen Systems* (Leipzig, 1846) [not available to me]
- Kelber, Wilhelm, *Die Logoslehre von Heraklit bis Origenes* (Stuttgart, 1958)
- Kelly, John Norman D., *Early Christian Creeds*, third edition (London, 1972)
- , *Early Christian Doctrines*, fifth, revised edition (London, 1977)
- Kenny, Anthony, *A Stylometric Study of the New Testament* (Oxford, 1986)
- Kerst, Rainer, '1 Kor 8:6—ein vorpaulinisches Taufbekenntnis?', *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 66 (1975), pp. 130–39
- Kidner, Derek, *Psalms 73–150: A Commentary on Books III–V of the Psalms*, *Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries* (London, 1975)
- Kim, Seyoon, *The Origin of Paul's Gospel*, *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament*, second series, 4 (Tübingen, 1981)
- , 'The "Son of Man"' as the Son of God, *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament*, 30 (Tübingen, 1983)
- Kirby, John Charles, *Ephesians, Baptism and Pentecost: An Inquiry into the Structure and Purpose of the Epistle to the Ephesians* (London, 1968)
- Kitchen, K.A., 'Some Egyptian Background to the Old Testament', *The Tyndale House Bulletin*, 5 (1960), pp. 4–18
- Klauck, Hans-Joseph, *Herrenmahl und hellenistischer Kult: Eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum ersten Korintherbrief*, *Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen*, new series, 15 (Münster, 1982)

- Klausner, Joseph, 'The Jewish and the Christian Messiah', appendix to *The Messianic Idea in Israel, From Its Beginning to the Completion of the Mishnah*, trans. by W.F. Stinespring (London, 1956), pp. 519–31
- , *The Messianic Idea in Israel, From Its Beginning to the Completion of the Mishnah*, trans. by W.F. Stinespring (London, 1956)
- Kleinknecht, Hermann Martin, and others, 'Θεός', in * *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, III, 65–123
- Knight, George Angus F., *A Biblical Approach to the Doctrine of the Trinity*, Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional Papers, 1 (Edinburgh/London, 1953)
- , 'The Lord is One', *Expository Times*, 79 (1967–68), pp. 8–10
- Knowling, Richard John, *The Testimony of St. Paul to Christ, Viewed in Some of Its Aspects*, Boyle Lectures, 1903–05 (London, 1905)
- Knox, Wilfred L., 'The "Divine Hero" Christology in the New Testament', *Harvard Theological Review*, 41 (1948), pp. 229–49
- , 'The Divine Wisdom', *Journal of Theological Studies*, 38 (1937), pp. 230–37
- , *St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles* (Cambridge, 1939)
- Kobelski, Paul J., *Melchizedek and Melchiresa*, Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series, 10 (Washington, D.C., 1981)
- Koehler, Ludwig Hugo and Walter Baumgartner, eds., *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti libros, with a Supplement* (Leiden, 1958)
- Koester, Helmut H., *Introduction to the New Testament*, 2 vols (Philadelphia/Berlin/New York, 1982)
- , 'Paul and Hellenism', in *The Bible in Modern Scholarship: Papers Read at the 100th Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, December 28–30, 1964*, ed. by James Philip Hyatt (Nashville/New York, 1965), pp. 187–95
- , 'Φύσις', in * *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, IX, 251–77
- Kohler, Kaufmann, *Jewish Theology Systematically and Historically Considered*, reprinted from the edition of 1918 (New York, 1968)
- Kramer, Werner, *Christ, Lord, Son of God*, trans. by B. Hardy, Studies in Biblical Theology, 50 (London, 1966)
- Kretschmar, Georg, *Studien zur frühchristlichen Trinitätstheologie*, Studien zur historischen Theologie, 21 (Tübingen, 1956)
- Kugelmann, Richard, 'The First Letter to the Corinthians', in *The Jerome Biblical Commentary*, ed. by Raymond E. Brown, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, and Roland E. Murphy (London, 1968), pp. 254–75
- [Abstract of:] Kuhr, Friedrich, 'Die Gottesprädikationen bei Philo von Alexandrien' (Dissertation, Marburg, 1944) [in *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 24 (1949), p. 240]
- Kümmel, Werner Georg, 'Die Gottesverkündigung Jesu und der Gottesgedanke des Spätjudentums', *Judaica*, 1 (1945), pp. 40–68
- , *Introduction to the New Testament*, trans. by Howard Clark Kee, revised edition (London, 1975)
- , *The Theology of the New Testament according to Its Major Witnesses: Jesus, Paul, John*, trans. by J.E. Steely, New Testament Library (London, 1974)

- Kuss, Otto, ed., *Die Briefe an die Römer, Korinther und Galater*, Das Neue Testament, 6 (Regensburg, 1940)
- , *Paulus: Die Rolle des Apostels in der theologischen Entwicklung der Urkirche*, Auslegung und Verkündigung, 3 (Regensburg, 1971)
- de Lacey, D.R., “‘One Lord’ in Pauline Christology”, in * Guthrie volume, pp. 191–203
- Ladd, George Eldon, *A Theology of the New Testament* (Guildford/London, 1975)
- Lambrecht, J., ‘Paul’s Christological Use of Scripture in I Cor. 15. 20–28’, *New Testament Studies*, 28 (1982), pp. 502–27
- Lampe, Geoffrey William H., *God as Spirit*, Bampton Lectures, 1976 (Oxford, 1977)
- , ed., *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford, 1961)
- Landman, Leo, ed., *Messianism in the Talmudic Era*, selected with an introduction by L. Landman (New York, 1979)
- Lane, William L., ‘Covenant: The Key to Paul’s Conflict with Corinth’, *Tyndale Bulletin*, 33 (1982), pp. 3–29
- Lang, Bernhard, *Monotheism and the Prophetic Minority: An Essay in Biblical History and Sociology*, Social World of Biblical Antiquity Series, 1 (Sheffield, 1983)
- Lange, Stella, ‘The Wisdom of Solomon and Plato’, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 55 (1936), pp. 293–302
- Langkammer, P.H., ‘Literarische und theologische Einzelstücke in Kor. VIII. 6’, *New Testament Studies*, 17 (1970–71), pp. 193–97
- Larcher, Chrysostome, ‘Divine Transcendence: Another Reason for God’s Absence’, *Concilium: An International Review of Theology*, number 5, volume 10 [sic] (1969), pp. 26–33
- LaSor, William Sanford, ‘The Messianic Idea in Qumran’, in *Studies and Essays in Honor of Abraham A. Neumann*, ed. by Meir Ben-Horin, B.D. Weinryb, and S. Zeitlin (Leiden, 1962), pp. 343–64
- Laubscher, F. du Toit, ‘God’s Angel of Truth and Melchizedek’, *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods*, 3 (1972), pp. 46–51
- Lauterbach, Jacob Zallel, *Rabbinic Essays*, Alumni Association, Hebrew Union College, Jewish Institute of Religion (Cincinnati, 1951)
- Lebreton, Jules, *History of the Dogma of the Trinity From Its Origins to the Council of Nicaea. Volume I: The Origins*, trans. by Algar Thorold from the eighth French edition (London, 1939)
- Lee, E. Kenneth, ‘Unity in Israel and Unity in Christ’, in *Studies in Ephesians*, ed. by F.L. Cross (London, 1956), pp. 36–50
- Leisegang, ‘Logos’, in *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Alterthumswissenschaft*, ed. by August F. von Pauly, G. Wissowa, and others, vols 1– (Stuttgart, 1894–), volume 13, part 1, cols 1035–81
- Levey, Samson H., *The Messiah: An Aramaic Interpretation. The Messianic Exegesis of the Targum*, Monographs, Hebrew Union College, 2 (Cincinnati and others, 1974)
- Lias, John James, ed., *The First Epistle to the Corinthians, with Notes, Map and Introduction*, Cambridge Bible for Schools (Cambridge, 1878)
- Liddell, Henry George and R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon, with a Supplement*, revised and augmented by Sir H.S. Jones, with the assistance of R. McKenzie (Oxford, 1968)

- Liddon, H.P., *The Divinity of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ*, Bampton Lectures, 1866, fourteenth edition (London, 1890)
- Liebermann, S., 'Appendix 1', in *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism*, by Ithamar Gruenwald, *Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums*, 14 (Leiden/Cologne, 1980), pp. 235–41
- Lietzmann, Hans, *An die Korinther I, II, revised and augmented by Werner Georg Kümmel*, *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament*, 9, fifth edition (Tübingen, 1969)
- , 'Symbolstudien I–VII', *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 21 (1922), pp. 1–34
- Life of Adam and Eve*: Wilhelm Meyer, ed., 'Vita Adae et Evae', *Abhandlungen der philosophisch-philologischen Klasse der königlich bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 14, part 3 (1878), pp. 185–250
- Lindars, Frederick Chevallier (Barnabas), 'Enoch and Christology', *Expository Times*, 92 (1980–81), pp. 295–99
- , *Jesus Son of Man: A Fresh Examination of the Son of Man Sayings in the Gospels in the Light of Recent Research* (London, 1983)
- Lindeskog, Gösta, *Studien zum neutestamentlichen Schöpfungsgedanken, I*, *Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift*, 11 (1952) [entire]
- Ling, Trevor Oswald, *The Significance of Satan: New Testament Demonology and Its Contemporary Relevance*, S.P.C.K. Biblical Monographs (London, 1961)
- Liver, J., 'The Doctrine of Two Messiahs in Sectarian Literature in the Time of the Second Commonwealth', *Harvard Theological Review*, 52 (1959), pp. 149–85
- Lives of the Prophets: Prophetarum vitae fabulosae, indices apostolorum discipulorumque Domini, Dorotheo, Epiphanio, Hippolyto aliisque vindicata*, ed. by Theodor Schermann, *Bibliotheca scriptorum graecorum et romanorum Teubneriana* (Leipzig, 1907)
- Lock, Walter, ed., *The Epistle to the Ephesians, with Introduction and Notes*, *Westminster Commentaries* (London, 1929)
- Locke, John, *A Paraphrase and Notes on the Epistles of St. Paul to the Galatians, I and II Corinthians, Romans, Ephesians, to which is Prefix'd, An Essay for the Understanding of St. Paul's Epistles, by Consulting St. Paul Himself*, sixth edition (London, 1763)
- Loewenstamm, Samuel E., 'The Death of Moses', in *Studies on the Testament of Abraham*, ed. by George W.E. Nickelsburg, Jr., *Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies*, 6 (Missoula, 1976), pp. 185–217
- Lohmeyer, Ernst, *Kyrios Jesus: Eine Untersuchung zu Phil. 2, 5–11*, *Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften: Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Jahrgang 1927/28*, 4. Abhandlung (Heidelberg, 1928)
- Lohse, Eduard, 'Christus als der Weltenrichter', in *Jesus Christus in Historie und Theologie: Neutestamentliche Festschrift für Hans Conzelmann zum 60. Geburtstag*, ed. by Georg Strecker (Tübingen, 1975), pp. 475–86
- , ed., *Die Texte aus Qumran, hebräisch und und deutsch: Mit masoretischer Punktation*, second edition, revised (Munich, 1971)
- Longenecker, Richard Norman, *The Christology of Early Jewish Christianity*, *Studies in Biblical Theology*, second series, 17 (London, 1970)

- Lösch, Stephan, *Deitas Jesu und antike Apotheose: Ein Beitrag zur Exegese und Religionsgeschichte* (Rottenburg, 1933)
- Lüdemann, G., 'A Chronology of Paul', in *Colloquy on New Testament Studies: A Time for Reappraisal and Fresh Approaches*, edited with an introduction by Bruce Corley (Macon, Georgia, 1983), pp. 289–307
- , *Paul, Apostle to the Gentiles. Volume I: Studies in Chronology*, trans. by F. Stanley Jones (London, 1984)
- Lührmann, Dieter, ed., *Der Brief an die Galater*, Zürcher Bibelkommentar, Neues Testament, 7 (Zurich, 1978)
- Lütger, Wilhelm, *Freiheitspredigt und Schwarmgeister in Korinth: Ein Beitrag zur Charakteristik der Christuspartei* (Gütersloh, 1908)
- , 'Der Mensch aus dem Himmel. Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis der paulinischen Christologie', in *Greifswalder Studien: Theologische Abhandlungen Hermann Cremer zum 25jährigen Professorenjubiläum dargebracht* (Gütersloh, 1895), pp. 207–28
- Lyons, John, *Semantics*, 2 vols (Cambridge, 1977)
- MacDonald, Duncan Black, *The Hebrew Philosophical Genius: A Vindication* (Princeton, 1936)
- MacDonald, John, 'The Samaritan Doctrine of Moses', *Scottish Journal of Theology*, 13 (1960), pp. 149–62
- , *The Theology of the Samaritans*, New Testament Library (London, 1964)
- MacDonald, William Graham, 'Christology and "The Angel of the Lord"', in *Current Issues in Biblical and Patristic Interpretation: Studies in Honor of Merrill C. Tenney Presented by His Former Students*, ed. by Gerald F. Hawthorne (Grand Rapids, 1975), pp. 324–35
- MacGregor, G.H.C., 'Principalities and Powers: The Cosmic Background of Paul's Thought', *New Testament Studies*, 1 (1954), pp. 17–28
- Machalet, Christian, 'Paulus und seine Gegner. Eine Untersuchung zu den Korintherbriefen', in *Theokratia: Festgabe für Karl Heinrich Rengstorf zum 70. Geburtstag*, Jahrbuch des Institutum Judaicum Delitzschianum, II, 1970–72 (Leiden, 1973), pp. 183–203
- Machen, John Gresham, 'The God of the Early Christians' [review article of * A.C. McGiffert, *The God of the Early Christians*], *Princeton Theological Review*, 22 (1924), pp. 544–88
- , *The Origin of Paul's Religion*, James Sprunt Lectures (London, 1921)
- Mack, Burton Lee, *Logos und Sophia: Untersuchungen zur Weisheitstheologie im hellenistischen Judentum*, Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments, 10 (Göttingen, 1973)
- , 'Wisdom Myth and Mythology', *Interpretation*, 24 (1970), pp. 46–60
- MacRae, George W., 'A Note on 1 Corinthians 1:4–9', in *Harry M. Orlinsky Volume*, Eretz-Israel Archaeological, Historical and Geographical Studies, 16 (Jerusalem, 1982), pp. 171–75
- , 'The Jewish Background of the Gnostic Sophia Myth', *Novum Testamentum*, 12 (1970), pp. 86–101
- Maher, 'Some Aspects of Torah in Judaism', *Irish Theological Quarterly*, 38 (1971), pp. 310–25
- Maly, Karl, *Mündige Gemeinde: Untersuchungen zur pastoralen Führung des Apostels Paulus im 1. Korintherbrief*, Stuttgarter biblische Monographien, 2 (Stuttgart, 1967)
- Manson, Thomas Walter, 'The Christology of the New Testament', *The Congregational Quarterly*, 13 (1935), pp. 153–64

- , ‘The Corinthian Correspondence. (1)’, in *Studies in the Gospels and Epistles*, ed. by Matthew Black, Rylands Lectures (Manchester, 1962), pp. 190–209 [reprinted from *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 26 (1941–42), pp. 101–120]
- , ‘The Cosmic Significance of Christ’, in *On Paul and John: Some Selected Theological Themes*, ed. by Matthew Black, *Studies in Biblical Theology*, 38 (London, 1963), pp. 15–28
- , ‘The Son of Man in Daniel, Enoch and the Gospels’, in *Studies in the Gospels and Epistles*, ed. by Matthew Black, Rylands Lectures (Manchester, 1962), pp. 123–45 [reprinted from *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 32 (1949–50), pp. 171–93]
- Manson, W., ‘Principalities and Powers: The Spiritual Background of the Work of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels’, *Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas Bulletin*, 3 (1952), pp. 7–17
- Marböck, Johann, *Weisheit im Wandel: Untersuchungen zur Weisheitstheologie bei Ben Sira*, Bonner biblische Beiträge, 37 (Bonn, 1971)
- Marcus, Ralph, ‘Divine Names and Attributes in Hellenistic Jewish Literature’, *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research*, 3 (1931–32), pp. 43–120
- , ‘On Biblical Hypostases of Wisdom’, *Hebrew Union College Annual*, 23 (1950–51), pp. 157–71
- Marmorstein, Arthur, *The Doctrine of Merits in Old Rabbinical Literature, and The Old Rabbinic Doctrine of God, Two Volumes in One*, reprinted from the originals of 1920 and 1927, respectively (New York, 1968)
- , ‘Philo and the Names of God’, *Jewish Quarterly Review*, new series, 22 (1931–32), pp. 295–306
- , ‘The Unity of God in Rabbinic Literature’, *Hebrew Union College Annual*, 1 (1924), pp. 467–99 [reprinted in *Studies in Jewish Theology*, ed. by J. Rabinowitz and M.S. Lew, Arthur Marmorstein Memorial Volume (London/New York/Toronto, 1950), pp. 72–105]
- Marqah: *Memar Marqah: The Teaching of Marqah*, ed. and trans. by John MacDonald, Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 84, 2 vols (Berlin, 1963)
- Marshall, Ian Howard, ‘The Development of Christology in the Early Church’, *Tyndale Bulletin*, 18 (1967), pp. 77–93
- , ‘Incarnational Christology in the New Testament’, in * Guthrie volume, pp. 1–16
- , *The Origins of New Testament Christology* (Leicester, 1976)
- Marshall, J.C., ‘Psychological Linguistics: Psychological Aspects of Semantic Structure’, in *Encyclopaedia of Linguistics, Information and Control*, ed. by A.R. Meetham (Oxford and others, 1969), pp. 442–44
- Marshall, Peter, ‘Hybrists Not Gnostics in Corinth’, in *Society of Biblical Literature 1984 Seminar Papers*, ed. by K.H. Richards (Chico, 1984), pp. 275–87
- Martin, Ralph P., *Reconciliation: A Study of Paul’s Theology*, Marshalls Theological Library (London, 1981)
- (C.F.D. Moule, review of the foregoing, in *Journal of Theological Studies*, 34 (1983), 599–601)
- Martitz, Wilhelm von, and others, ‘Υἱός’, in * *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, VIII, 334–99
- Mastin, B.A., ‘The Imperial Cult and the Ascription of the Title θεός to Jesus (John XX. 28)’, in *Studia Evangelica, Volume VI*, ed. by Elizabeth E. Livingstone, *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*, 112 (Berlin, 1973), pp. 352–65
- Maurer, Christian, ‘Τίθημι’, in * *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, VIII, 152–68

- Maximus of Tyre: *Maximi Tyrii philosophoumena*, ed. by H. Hobein, Bibliotheca scriptorum graecorum et romanorum Teubneriana (Leipzig, 1910)
- Mayer, Günther, *Index Philoneus* (Berlin, 1974)
- McDonald, William A., 'Archaeology and St. Paul's Journeys in Greek Lands. Part III—Corinth', *Biblical Archaeologist*, 5 (1942), pp. 36–48
- McEleney, Neil J., 'Orthodoxy in Judaism of the First Christian Century', *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods*, 4 (1973–74), pp. 19–42
- , 'Orthodoxy in Judaism of the First Christian Century. Replies to David E. Aune and Lester L. Grabbe', *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods*, 9 (1978), pp. 83–88
- McGiffert, Arthur Cushman, *The God of the Early Christians*, N.W. Taylor Lectures, 1922 (Edinburgh, 1924)
- [For the review article of the foregoing by J.G. Machen, see above under Machen.]
- McIntosh, Angus, 'Patterns and Ranges', in *Patterns of Language: Papers in General, Descriptive and Applied Linguistics*, by A. McIntosh and M.A.K. Halliday, Longman's Linguistics Library (London, 1966), pp. 183–99 [reprinted from *Language*, 36 (1961), pp. 325–37]
- McKenzie, John Lawrence, 'The Hebrew Attitude Towards Mythological Polytheism', *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 14 (1952), pp. 323–35
- , *The Power and the Wisdom: An Interpretation of the New Testament*, Deacon Books (London, 1965)
- McLelland, Joseph C., *God the Anonymous: A Study in Alexandrian Philosophical Theology*, Patristic Monograph Series, 4 (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1976)
- McNamara, Martin, 'Logos of the Fourth Gospel and Memra of the Palestinian Targum (Ex 12⁴²)', *Expository Times*, 79 (1967–68), pp. 115–17
- Meek, Theophile James, 'Monotheism and the Religion of Israel', *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 61 (1942), pp. 21–43
- Meeks, Wayne A., 'The Divine Agent and His Counterfeit in Philo and the Fourth Gospel', in *Aspects of Religious Propaganda in Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. by Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, University of Notre Dame Center for the Study of Judaism and Christianity in Antiquity, 2 (London/Notre Dame, 1976), pp. 43–67
- , *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul* (New Haven/London, 1983)
- , 'Moses as God and King', in *Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough*, ed. by Jacob Neusner, Studies in the History of Religions (Supplements to Numen), 14 (Leiden, 1968), pp. 354–71
- , *The Prophet-King: Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology*, Supplements to Novum Testamentum, 14 (Leiden, 1967)
- , 'The Social Context of Pauline Theology', *Interpretation*, 36 (1982), pp. 266–77
- Meritt, Benjamin Dean, ed., *Greek Inscriptions, 1896–1927, Corinth*, volume 8, part 1 (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1931)
- Merklein, Helmut, 'Die Einheitlichkeit des ersten Korintherbriefes', *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 75 (1984), pp. 153–83

- Metzger, Bruce M., ed., *Index of Articles on the New Testament and the Early Church Published in Festschriften*, Journal of Biblical Literature Monograph Series, 5, 1 volume with a supplement (Philadelphia, 1951–55)
- , ed., *Index to Periodical Literature on the Apostle Paul*, New Testament Tools and Studies, 1 (Leiden, 1960)
- , ed., *The Oxford Annotated Apocrypha*, The Revised Standard Version, second edition (New York and others, 1977)
- , ‘The Punctuation of Rom. 9:5’, in *Christ and the Spirit in the New Testament: In Honour of Charles Francis Digby Moule*, ed. by Barnabas Lindars and Stephen S. Smalley (Cambridge, 1973), pp. 95–112 [reprinted in Bruce M. Metzger, *New Testament Studies: Philological, Versional, and Patristic*, New Testament Tools and Studies, 10 (Leiden, 1980), pp. 57–74]
- , *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (London/New York, 1971)
- Meyer, Heinrich August Wilhelm, *Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistles to the Corinthians*, trans. by D.D. Bannerman and D. Hunter, Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament, 2 vols (Edinburgh, 1877–79)
- , *Kritisch-exegetisches Handbuch über den Brief an die Epheser*, Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament, 8 (Göttingen, 1867)
- , *Kritisch-exegetisches Handbuch über den ersten Brief an die Korinther*, Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament, 5, third edition (Göttingen, 1856)
- Michel, Otto, ed., *Der Brief an die Römer, übersetzt und erklärt*, Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament, 4, tenth edition, 2 parts (Göttingen, 1955)
- , ‘Der Christus des Paulus’, *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 32 (1933), pp. 6–31
- , ‘Die Entstehung der paulinischen Christologie’, *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 28 (1929), pp. 324–33
- Mishnah: *The Mishnah*, translated, with notes, by H. Danby (Oxford, 1933)
- Mishnah, Pirke Aboth: *Pirke Aboth: Chapters of the Fathers*, edited, with introduction, translation, and commentary, by R. Travers Herford (New York, 1945)
- Mitchell, T.F., ‘Linguistic “Goings On”: Collocations and Other Lexical Matters Arising on the Syntagmatic Record’, *Archivum Linguisticum*, new series, 2 (1971), pp. 35–69
- Mitton, Charles Leslie, *Ephesians*, New Century Bible, 24 (London, 1976)
- , *The Epistle to the Ephesians: Its Authorship, Origin and Purpose* (Oxford, 1951)
- Moffatt, James, ed., *The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians*, Moffat’s New Testament Commentary (London, 1938)
- Molin, Georg, ‘Elijahu. Der Prophet und sein Weiterleben in den Hoffnungen des Judentums und der Christenheit’, *Judaica*, 8 (1952), pp. 65–94
- Montefiore, Claude Joseph G., and H. Loewe, eds., *A Rabbinic Anthology* (London, 1938)
- Moore, George Foot, ‘Christian Writers on Judaism’, *Harvard Theological Review*, 14 (1921), pp. 197–254
- , ‘Intermediaries in Jewish Theology: Memra, Shekinah, Metatron’, *Harvard Theological Review*, 15 (1922), pp. 41–85

- , *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of the Tannaim*, 3 vols (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1927–30)
- Moore, W.E., ‘One Baptism’, *New Testament Studies*, 10 (1964), pp. 504–16
- Morgan, W., *The Religion and Theology of Paul*, Kerr Lectures, 1914–15 (Edinburgh, 1917)
- Morris, Leon Lamb, *The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians: An Introduction and Commentary*, Tyndale New Testament Commentaries, second edition (London, 1985)
- Moses: *Die Himmelfahrt des Mose*, ed. by Carl Clemen, Kleine Texte für theologische und philologische Vorlesungen und Uebungen, 10, reprinted from the first edition of 1904 (Bonn, 1924)
- Moule, Charles Francis Digby, *The Birth of the New Testament*, Black’s New Testament Commentaries, third edition, revised (London, 1981)
- , *The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Colossians and to Philemon: An Introduction and Commentary*, Cambridge Greek Testament Commentary (Cambridge, 1957)
- , ‘God, NT’, in *The Interpreter’s Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. by G.A. Buttrick and others, 4 vols (New York/Nashville, 1962), II, 430–36
- , *The Holy Spirit*, Mowbrays Library of Theology (London/Oxford, 1978)
- , ‘The New Testament and the Doctrine of the Trinity: a short report on an old theme’, *Expository Times*, 88 (1976–77), pp. 16–20
- , *The Origin of Christology* (Cambridge, 1977)
- Moulton, James Hope, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, 4 vols, vol. I by J.H. Moulton and Wilbert Francis Howard, vols III-IV by Nigel Turner (Edinburgh, 1906–76)
- Moulton, W.F., and A.S. Geden, eds., *A Concordance to the Greek Testament according to the Texts of Westcott and Hort, Tischendorf and the English Revisers*, fifth edition, revised by H.K. Moulton (Edinburgh, 1978)
- Mowinckel, S., *He That Cometh*, trans. by G.W. Anderson, Blackwell Theological Publications (Oxford, 1956)
- Moxnes, Halvor, *Theology in Conflict: Studies in Paul’s Understanding of God in Romans*, Supplements to Novum Testamentum, 53 (Leiden, 1980)
- Müller, Christian, *Gottes Gerechtigkeit und Gottes Volk: Eine Untersuchung zu Römer 9–11*, Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, 86 (Göttingen, 1964)
- Munck, Johannes, *Christus und Israel: Eine Auslegung von Röm 9–11*, Acta Jutlandica: Aarsskrift for Aarhus Universitet, 28, Theological Series, 7 (Copenhagen, 1956)
- , ‘Israel and the Gentiles in the New Testament’, *Journal of Theological Studies*, new series, 2 (1951), pp. 3–16
- , *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind*, trans. by F. Clarke (London, 1959)
- , ‘Pauline Research Since Schweizer’, in *The Bible in Modern Scholarship: Papers Read at the 100th Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, December 28–30, 1964*, ed. by James Philip Hyatt (Nashville/New York, 1965), pp. 166–77
- Murphy, Roland E., ‘Wisdom—Theses and Hypotheses’, in *Israelite Wisdom: Theological and Literary Essays in Honor of Samuel Terrien*, ed. by John G. Gammie and others (Missoula, 1978), pp. 35–42
- , ‘Hebrew Wisdom’, *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 101 (1981), pp. 21–34

- Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome, 'I Cor., VIII, 6: Cosmology or Soteriology?', *Revue biblique*, 85 (1978), pp. 253–67
- , 'Food and Spiritual Gifts in 1 Cor 8:8', *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 41 (1979), pp. 292–98
- , 'Freedom or the Ghetto', *Revue biblique*, 85 (1978), pp. 543–74
- , *St. Paul's Corinth: Texts and Archaeology*, introduction by John H. Elliott, Good News Studies, 6 (Wilmington, Delaware, 1983)
- Mussies, Gerard, 'The Interpretatio Judaica of Thot-Hermes', in *Studies in Egyptian Religion Dedicated to Professor Jan Zandee*, ed. by M. Heerma van Voss and others, *Studies in the History of Religions (Supplements to Numen)*, 43 (Leiden, 1982), pp. 89–120
- Mussner, Franz, *Christus, das All, und die Kirche: Studien zur Theologie des Epheserbriefes*, Trierer theologische Studien, 5 (Trier, 1955)
- Mysterium Salutis: Grundriss heilsgeschichtlicher Dogmatik*, ed. by Johannes Feiner and Magnus Löhrer, 5 vols in 7, with Ergänzungsband (Zurich/Einsiedeln/Cologne, 1965–81)
- Nash, Henry S., 'Is there a Native Metaphysical Element in the New Testament?', *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 16 (1897), pp. 78–93
- , 'Θειότης ἰσοθεότης, Rom. i. 20; Col. ii. 9', *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 18 (1899), pp. 1–34
- Needham, Rodney, *Belief, Language, and Experience* (Oxford, 1972)
- Neufeld, Vernon H., *The Earliest Christian Confessions*, New Testament Tools and Studies, 5 (Leiden, 1963)
- Neusner, Jacob, *From Politics to Piety: The Emergence of Pharisaic Judaism* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1973)
- , 'Mishnah and Messiah', *Biblical Theology Bulletin*, 14 (1984), pp. 3–11
- , *The Rabbinic Traditions about the Pharisees before 70*, 3 vols (Leiden, 1971)
- New Testament, Greek: *Novum Testamentum graece*, ed. by Eberhard Nestle and Erwin Nestle, twenty-sixth edition, ed. by Kurt Aland and others (Stuttgart, 1979)
- Nickelsburg, George W.E., 'The Books of Enoch in Recent Research', *Religious Studies Review*, 7 (1981), pp. 210–17
- , *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah* (London, 1981)
- Niditch, Susan, 'The Cosmic Adam: Man as Mediator in Rabbinic Literature', *Journal of Jewish Studies*, 34 (1983), pp. 137–46
- Niederwimmer, Kurt, *Der Begriff der Freiheit im Neuen Testament*, Theologische Bibliothek Töpelmann, 11 (Berlin, 1966)
- Nilsson, Nils Martin P., *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*, Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, 5, part 2, second edition, revised and augmented, 2 vols (Munich, 1961)
- , 'The High God and the Mediator', *Harvard Theological Review*, 56 (1963), pp. 101–20
- , *A History of Greek Religion*, trans. by F.J. Fielden, second edition (Oxford, 1949)
- Nock, Arthur Darby, 'The Cult of Heroes', *Harvard Theological Review*, 37 (1944), pp. 141–74

- , ‘Early Gentile Christianity and Its Hellenistic Background’, in *Essays on the Trinity and the Incarnation*, ed. by A.E.J. Rawlinson (London, 1928), pp. 51–156
- Norden, Eduard, *Agnostos Theos: Untersuchungen zur Formgeschichte religiöser Rede* (Leipzig/Berlin, 1913)
- Norman, Donald Arthur, and David E. Rumelhart, eds., *Explorations in Cognition* (San Francisco, 1975)
- Oehler, Johann, ‘Epigraphische Beiträge zur Geschichte des Judentums’, *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums*, new series, 53 (1909), pp. 292–302, 443–52, 525–38
- Oepke, Albrecht, ‘Ἀνίστημι’, in * *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, I, 368–72
- , ‘Διὰ’, in * *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, II, 65–70
- , *Die Missionspredigt des Apostels Paulus: Eine biblisch-theologische Untersuchung*, *Missionswissenschaftliche Forschungen*, 2 (Leipzig, 1920)
- Oesterley, William Oscar Emil, ‘The Belief in Angels and Demons’, in *Judaism and Christianity*, ed. by W.O.E. Oesterley, 3 vols (London, 1937), I, 191–209
- , *The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy* (Oxford, 1925)
- Oesterley, W.O.E., and G.H. Box, *The Religion and Worship of the Synagogue: An Introduction to the Study of Judaism from the New Testament Period*, second edition, revised (London, 1911)
- Oesterley, W.O.E., and Theodore Henry Robinson, *Hebrew Religion: Its Origin and Development*, second edition (London, 1937)
- Ogg, George, *The Chronology of the Life of Paul* (London, 1968)
- Old Testament, Greek: *Septuaginta: id est, Vetus Testamentum graeca iuxta LXX interpretes*, ed. by Alfred Rahlfs, 2 vols (Stuttgart, 1935)
- , *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum graecum*, auctoritate academiae scientiarum Göttingensis editum, vols 1– (Göttingen, 1931-)
- Old Testament, Hebrew: *Biblia hebraica Stuttgartensia*, ed. by K. Elliger and W.R. Rudolf, second edition, revised by W. Rudolf and H.P. Rüger (Stuttgart, 1983)
- Olshausen, Hermann, *Biblical Commentary on St. Paul’s First and Second Epistles to the Corinthians*, trans. by John Edmund Cox, Clark’s Foreign Theological Library (Edinburgh, 1851)
- On the Origin of the World*: Bethge, Hans-Gebhard, and Orval S. Wintermute, eds., ‘On the Origin of the World’, in *The Nag Hammadi Library in English*, translated by members of the Coptic Gnostic Library Project of the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity, James M. Robinson, director (Leiden, 1977), pp. 161–79
- Origen: *Origenis hexaplorum quae supersunt; sive veterum interpretum graecorum in totum Vetus Testamentum fragmenta*, ed. by Frederick Field, 2 vols (Oxford, 1875)
- Orpheus: *Orphicorum fragmenta*, ed. by Otto Kern (Berlin, 1922)
- Orr, William Fridell, and J.A. Walther, eds., *I Corinthians*, Anchor Bible, 32 (Garden City, New York, 1976)
- Osborn, Eric F., ‘The Unity of God in Pauline Thought’, *Australian Biblical Review*, 28 (1980), pp. 39–56
- The Oxford English Dictionary*, ed. by J.A.H. Murray and others, 12 vols with supplement, second issue, corrected (Oxford, 1961)
- Painter, John, ‘Paul and the πνευματικοί at Corinth’, in * Barrett volume, pp. 237–50

- Pannenberg, Wolfhart, 'The Appropriation of the Philosophical Concept of God as a Dogmatic Problem of Early Christian Theology', in *Basic Questions in Theology*, trans. by George H. Kehm and R.A. Wilson, Library of Philosophy and Theology, 3 vols (London, 1970–73), II, 119–83
- , 'What Is Truth?', in *Basic Questions in Theology*, trans. by George H. Kehm and R.A. Wilson, Library of Philosophy and Theology, 3 vols (London, 1970–73), II, 1–27
- Parry, Reginald St. John, ed., *The First Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians*, Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools and Colleges (Cambridge, 1916)
- Pausanias: *Pausanias, Description of Greece*, trans. by W.H.S. Jones and H.A. Ormerod, vol. V prepared by R.E. Wycherley, Loeb Classical Library, 5 vols (London/New York, 1918–35)
- Pearson, Birger Albert, *The Pneumatikos-Psychikos Terminology in 1 Corinthians: A Study in the Theology of the Corinthian Opponents of Paul and Its Relation to Gnosticism*, Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series, 12, second printing (Missoula, 1973)
- Perrin, Norman, 'The Son of Man in Ancient Judaism and Primitive Christianity: A Suggestion', in *A Modern Pilgrimage in New Testament Christology* (Philadelphia, 1974), pp. 23–40 [reprinted from *Biblical Research*, 11 (1966), pp. 17–28]
- Peter, Michal, 'Dtn 6, 4—ein monotheistischer Text?', *Biblische Zeitschrift*, new series, 24 (1980), pp. 252–62
- Peterson, Erik Adolf G., *ΕΙΣ ΘΕΟΣ: Epigraphische, formgeschichtliche und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*, Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, new series, 24 (Göttingen, 1926)
- , *Der Monotheismus als politisches Problem: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des politischen Theologie im Imperium Romanum* (Leipzig, 1935)
- Pfammatter, Joseph, 'Eigenschaften und Verhaltensweisen Gottes im Neuen Testament', in * *Mysterium Salutis*, II, 272–90
- Pfeifer, Gerhard, *Ursprung und Wesen der Hypostasenvorstellungen im Judentum*, Arbeiten zur Theologie, first series, 31 (Stuttgart, 1967)
- Pfeiffer, Robert H., 'The Dual Origin of Hebrew Monotheism', *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 46 (1927), pp. 193–206
- , 'The Polemic Against Idolatry in the Old Testament', *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 43 (1924), pp. 229–40
- Pherigo, Lindsey P., 'Paul and the Corinthian Church', *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 68 (1949), pp. 341–50
- Philo (Pseudo): *Les antiquités bibliques*, ed. by Daniel J. Harrington, trans. by Jaques Cazeaux, Sources chrétiennes, 229–30, 2 vols (Paris, 1976)
- Philo: *Philo*, trans. by F.H. Colson and G.H. Whitaker, Loeb Classical Library, 10 vols and 2 supplementary vols (London/Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1929–62)
- , *Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt*, ed. by Leopold Cohn, Paul Wendland, and S. Reiter, vol. VI prepared by Johannes Leisegang, 7 vols (Berlin, 1896–1930)
- Philostratus, *The Life of Apollonius of Tyana*, trans. by F.C. Conybeare, Loeb Classical Library, 2 vols (London/New York, 1912)
- Phocylides: *The Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides*, ed. by P.W. van der Horst, Studia in Veteris Testamenti pseudepigrapha, 4 (Leiden, 1978)
- Plutarch: *Plutarch's Lives*, with an English Translation by Bernadotte Perrin, Loeb Classical Library, 11 vols (Cambridge, Massachusetts/London, 1918–67)

- Polzin, Robert M., *Biblical Structuralism: Method and Subjectivity in the Study of Ancient Texts*, Semeia Supplements, 5 (Philadelphia/Missoula, Montana, 1977)
- Porter, Frank Chamberlin, *The Mind of Christ in Paul* (New York/London, 1930)
- Porzig, W., ‘Wesenhafte Bedeutungsbeziehungen’, *Beiträge zur deutschen Sprache und Literatur*, 58 (1934), pp. 70–97 [not available to me]
- Prat, Ferdinand, *The Theology of Saint Paul*, trans. from the eleventh French edition by J.L. Stoddard, 2 vols (London/Dublin, 1945)
- Prestige, George Leonard, *God in Patristic Thought*, second printing (London, 1952)
- Price, S.R.F., ‘Gods and Emperors: The Greek Language of the Roman Imperial Court’, *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 104 (1984), pp. 79–95
- Prümm, K., ‘Herrscherkult und Neues Testament. Ein Beitrag zum sprachlichen Problem der Pastoralbriefe und zum Frage nach den Wurzeln des paulinischen Christusbekenntnisses ΚΥΡΙΟΣ ΙΗΣΟΥΣ’, *Biblica*, 9 (1928), pp. 3–25, 129–42, 289–301
- , *Religionsgeschichtliches Handbuch für den Raum der altchristlichen Umwelt* (Freiburg, 1943)
- Rad, Gerhard von, *Old Testament Theology*, trans. by D.M.G. Stalker, 2 vols (Edinburgh and others, 1962–65)
- , *Wisdom in Israel*, trans. by J.D. Martin, second impression (London, 1975)
- Rahner, Karl, ‘Theos in the New Testament’, in *Theological Investigations*, trans. with an introduction by C. Ernst and others, second edition, vols 1– (London, 1965–), I, 79–148
- Ramsey, Arthur Michael, ‘Jesus and God’, in *Jesus and the Living Past*, Hale Lectures, 1978 (Oxford, 1980), pp. 39–50
- Rankin, Oliver Shaw, *Israel’s Wisdom Literature: Its Bearing on Theology and the History of Religion*, Kerr Lectures, 1933/36 (Edinburgh, 1936)
- Ranston, Harry, *The Old Testament Wisdom Books and Their Teaching* (London, 1930)
- Rapaport, David, *The History of the Concept of Association of Ideas* (New York, 1974)
- Rawlinson, Alfred Edward J., ‘Hebraic Theism as Presupposed by the Christian Movement’, in *Essays on the Trinity and the Incarnation*, ed. by A.E.J. Rawlinson (London, 1928), pp.1–22
- , ‘The Interpretation of the Christ in the New Testament’, in *Foundations: A Statement of Christian Belief in Terms of Modern Thought. By Seven Oxford Men*, ed. by Burnett Hillman Streeter (London, 1912), pp. 147–210
- , *The New Testament Doctrine of the Christ*, Bampton Lectures, 1926 (London, 1926)
- Reese, James M., *Hellenistic Influence on the Book of Wisdom and Its Consequences*, Analecta Biblica, 41 (Rome, 1970)
- Reicke, Bo, and Georg Bertram, ‘Πᾶς’, in * *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, V, 886–96
- Reider, Joseph, ed., *The Book of Wisdom*, Dropsie College Jewish Apocryphal Literature (New York, 1957)
- Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, ed. by Kurt Galling and others, third edition, 6 vols with index (Tübingen, 1956–65)
- Rengstorf, Karl Heinrich, ed., *A Complete Concordance to Flavius Josephus*, 4 vols with supplements (Leiden, 1968–)

- Richardson, Alan, *An Introduction to The Theology of the New Testament* (London, 1958)
- Richardson, Neil, *Was Jesus Divine?* (London, 1979)
- Ridderbos, Herman Nicolaas Bernhard, *Paul: An Outline of His Theology*, trans. by John Richard de Witt (London, 1977)
- Riesenfeld, Harald, 'The Mythological Background of New Testament Christology', in *The Gospel Tradition* (Oxford, 1970), pp.31–49 [reprinted from *The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology: Studies in Honour of C.H. Dodd*, ed. by W.D. Davies and D. Daube (Cambridge, 1956), pp. 81–95]
- Ringgren, Karl Vilhelm Helmer, 'Hypostasen', in * *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, III, 505–06
- , *Word and Wisdom: Studies in the Hypostatization of Divine Qualities and Functions in the Ancient Near East*, Inaugural Th.D. Dissertation, Uppsala, 1947 (Lund, 1947)
- Roberts, Bleddyn J., *The Old Testament Texts and Versions: The Hebrew Text in Transmission and the History of the Ancient Versions* (Cardiff, 1951)
- Robertson, Archibald Thomas, *Paul the Interpreter of Christ* (London, 1921)
- Robertson, Archibald, and Alfred Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians*, International Critical Commentary, second edition (Edinburgh, 1914)
- Robertson, J.A., 'Paul's Knowledge of Jesus', *The Congregational Quarterly*, 13 (1935), pp. 301–10
- Robertson, Martin, 'Greek Art and Religion', in *Greek Religion and Society*, ed. by Patricia Elizabeth Easterling and J.V. Muir (Cambridge, 1985), pp. 155–90
- Robins, Robert Henry, *General Linguistics: An Introductory Survey*, Longmans Linguistics Library, 2, third edition (London, 1980)
- Robinson, Joseph Armitage, ed., *St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians: A Revised Text and Translation, With Exposition and Notes*, second edition, third impression (London, 1962)
- Robinson, J.A.T., 'The One Baptism as a Category of New Testament Soteriology', *Scottish Journal of Theology*, 6 (1953), pp. 257–74
- Robinson, James M., 'How My Mind Has Changed (Or Remained the Same)', in *Society of Biblical Literature 1985 Seminar Papers*, ed. by Kent Harold Richards (Atlanta, 1985), pp. 481–504
- , 'The Witness of Paul: Christ, The Lord', in *Who Say Ye That I Am? Six Theses on the Deity of Christ, Written in Competition for the Robert A. Dunn Award*, ed. by William Childs Robinson (Grand Rapids, 1949), pp. 131–45
- Robinson, William Childs, 'The Theocentric Theology Implicit in the Name of the Trinity', *Princeton Theological Review*, 6 (1934), pp. 225–254
- Rodhe, Edv., 'Gottesglaube und Kyriosglaube bei Paulus', *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 22 (1923), pp. 43–57
- Rokeah, David, *Jews, Pagans and Christians in Conflict*, Studia post-biblica, 33 (Jerusalem/Leiden, 1982)
- Roon, Aart van, *The Authenticity of Ephesians*, trans. by S. Prescod-Jokel, Supplements to Novum Testamentum, 39 (Leiden, 1974)
- , 'The Relation between Christ and the Wisdom of God according to Paul', *Novum Testamentum*, 16 (1974), pp. 207–39
- Ross, David Morison, *The Faith of St. Paul: A Study of St. Paul as the Interpreter of Jesus* (London, 1923)

- Rostron, Sydney Nowell, *The Christology of St. Paul*, Hulsean Prize Essay, Library of Historic Theology (London, 1912)
- Rowland, Christopher Charles, *Christian Origins: An Account of the Setting and Character of the most Important Messianic Sect of Judaism* (London, 1985)
- , *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity* (London, 1982)
- , ‘The Visions of God in Apocalyptic Literature’, *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods*, 10 (1979), pp. 137–54
- Royce, Josiah, ‘Monotheism’, in *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, ed. by James Hastings, with the assistance of J.A. Selbie, 12 vols and an index (Edinburgh, 1908–26), VIII, 817–21
- Ruef, John Samuel, ed., *Paul’s First Letter to Corinth*, Pelican New Testament Commentaries, Pelican Books, 1329 (Harmondsworth, Middlesex, 1971)
- Ruhbach, Gerhard, ‘Monotheismus’, in *Der Kleine Pauly: Lexicon der Antike, auf der Grundlage von Pauly’s Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, ed. by Konrat Julius F. Ziegler and Walter Sontheimer, 26 fascicles in 5 vols (Stuttgart, 1962–75), III, 1416–17
- Rylaarsdam, John Coert, *Revelation in Jewish Wisdom Literature* (Chicago, 1946)
- Sabourin, Léopold, *Les noms et les titres de Jésus: Thèmes de théologie biblique* (Bruges/Paris, 1963)
- Saffrey, H.D., ‘Aphrodite a Corinthe: Réflexions sur une idée rec*ue’, *Revue biblique*, 92 (1985), pp. 359–74
- Sagnard, F.M.M., ‘A propos de I Cor., VIII, 6’, *Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses*, 26 (1950), pp. 54–58
- Sanders, Ed Parish, ‘Literary Dependence in Colossians’, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 85 (1966), pp. 28–45
- , *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (London, 1977)
- , *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People* (Philadelphia, 1983)
- Sanders, J.A., ‘Dissenting Deities and Philippians 2:1–11’, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 88 (1969), pp. 279–90
- Sanders, Jack Thomas, *The New Testament Christological Hymns: Their Historical Religious Background*, Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas Monograph Series, 15 (Cambridge, 1971)
- Sandmel, Samuel, *A Jewish Understanding of the New Testament*, augmented edition (London, 1977)
- , *Philo of Alexandria: An Introduction* (New York/Oxford, 1979)
- Sasse, Hermann, ‘Κοσμέω, κόσμος’, in * *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, III, 867–98
- De Saussure, Ferdinand, *Course in General Linguistics*, ed. by C. Bally and A. Sechehaye, in collaboration with A. Reidlinger, trans. by W. Baskin (London, 1960)
- [Abstract of:] Sawyer, William Thomas, ‘The Problem of Meat Sacrificed to Idols in the Corinthian Church’ (Th.D. Dissertation, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary) [in *Dissertation Abstracts*, 29 (1968), pp. 1285-A–1286-A]
- Schechter, Solomon, *Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology* (London, 1909)
- Schelkle, Karl Hermann, ‘Gott der Eine und Dreieine’, in *Wort und Schrift: Beiträge zur Auslegung und Auslegungsgeschichte des Neuen Testaments*, Kommentare und Beiträge zum Alten und Neuen Testament (Düsseldorf, 1966), pp. 81–95
- , *Paulus: Leben, Briefe, Theologie*, Erträge der Forschung, 152 (Darmstadt, 1981)

- , ‘Die Schöpfung in Christus’, in *Die Zeit Jesu: Festschrift für Heinrich Schlier*, ed. by Günther Bornkamm and Karl Rahner (Freiburg/Basel/Vienna, 1970), pp. 208–17
- , *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, Kommentare und Beiträge zum Alten und Neuen Testament, 4 vols in 5 (Düsseldorf, 1968–76)
- Schencke, Wilhelm, *Die Chokma (Sophia) in der jüdischen Hypostasenspekulation*, Skrifter udgifna af videnskabselskabet i Kristiania, 1912, II. Hist.-filos. klasse, 6 (Oslo, 1913)
- Schettler, Adolph Ernst Friedrich, *Die paulinische Formel ‘durch Christus’*, Part 1, Inaugural Dissertation, Heidelberg (Tübingen, 1906)
- Schierse, Franz Joseph, ‘Die neutestamentliche Trinitätsoffenbarung’, in * *Mysterium Salutis*, II, 85–129
- Schille, Gottfried, *Frühchristliche Hymnen* (Berlin, 1965)
- Schimanowski, Gottfried, *Weisheit und Messias: Die jüdischen Voraussetzungen der urchristlichen Präexistenzchristologie*, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, second series, 17 (Tübingen, 1985)
- Schlatter, Adolf, *Jesus und Paulus: Eine Vorlesung und einige Aufsätze*, Kleinere Schriften von Adolf Schlatter, 2, third edition (Stuttgart, 1961)
- , *Die korinthische Theologie*, Beihefte zur Förderung christlicher Theologie, volume 18, part 2 (Gütersloh, 1914)
- , *Paulus: Der Bote Jesu: Eine Deutung seiner Briefe an die Korinther* (Stuttgart, 1934)
- , *Die Theologie des Judentums nach dem Bericht des Josephus*, Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie, second series, 26 (Gütersloh, 1932)
- , *Wie sprach Josephus von Gott?*, Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie, volume 14, part 1 (Gütersloh, 1910)
- Schlier, Heinrich, *Der Brief an die Epheser: Ein Kommentar*, fifth edition (Düsseldorf, 1965)
- , ‘Die Erkenntnis Gottes nach den Briefen des Apostels Paulus’, in *Gott in Welt: Festgabe für Karl Rahner*, ed. by J.B. Metz and others, 2 vols (Freiburg/Basel/Vienna, 1964), I, 515–35
- , *Grundzüge einer paulinischen Theologie* (Freiburg/Basel/Vienna, 1978)
- , *Principalities and Powers in the New Testament*, Quaestiones disputatae, 3 (Freiburg/Edinburgh/London, 1961)
- Schlier, Heinrich and P. Viktor Warnach, *Die Kirche im Epheserbrief*, Beiträge zur Kontroverstheologie, 1 = *Catholica*, 1 (Münster, 1949)
- Schmid, Hans Heinrich, *Wesen und Geschichte der Weisheit: Eine Untersuchung zur altorientalischen und israelitischen Weisheitsliteratur*, Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 101 (Berlin, 1966)
- Schmidt, Wilhelm, *Der Ursprung der Gottesidee*, second edition, enlarged, 12 vols (Münster, 1926–1955)
- Schmithals, Walter, *Gnosticism in Corinth: An Investigation of the Letters to the Corinthians*, trans. by John Steely (Nashville/New York, 1971)
- , *Paul and the Gnostics*, trans. by John E. Steely (Nashville/New York, 1972)
- Schnackenburg, Rudolf, ‘Christologie des Neuen Testamentes’, in * *Mysterium Salutis*, volume 3, part 1, pp. 227–388

- , ‘The Image of God in the New Testament’, in *Bauer Encyclopedia of Biblical Theology*, ed. by Johannes B. Bauer, 3 vols (London, 1970), I, 309–16
- Schneider, Gerhard, ‘Urchristliche Gottesverkündigung in hellenistischer Umwelt’, *Biblische Zeitschrift*, new series, 13 (1969), pp. 59–75
- Schneider, Johannes, ‘Monotheismus’, in *Calwer Bibellexikon*, ed. originally by Th. Schlatter, fifth edition (Stuttgart, 1985), pp. 917–19
- Schniewind, Julius Daniel, ‘Die eine Botschaft des Alten und des Neuen Testaments’, in *Nachgelassene Reden und Aufsätze*, ed. by Ernst Kähler, Theologische Bibliothek Töpelmann, 1 (Berlin, 1952), pp. 58–71
- , ‘Die Leugner der Auferstehung in Korinth’, in *Nachgelassene Reden und Aufsätze*, ed. by Ernst Kähler, foreword by Gerhard Heinzelmann, Theologische Bibliothek Töpelmann, 1 (Berlin, 1952), pp. 110–39
- Schoeps, Hans Joachim, *The Jewish-Christian Argument: A History of Theologies in Conflict*, trans. by David E. Green, third edition (London, 1965)
- , *Paul: The Theology of the Apostle in the Light of Jewish Religious History*, trans. by H. Knight (London, 1961)
- Scholem, Gershom G., *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition*, based on the Israel Goldstein Lectures, Jewish Theological Seminary of America (New York, 1960)
- , *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*, based on the Hilda Stroom Lectures delivered at the Jewish Institute of Religion, New York, third edition (London, 1955)
- , *The Messianic Idea in Judaism and Other Essays on Jewish Spirituality* (London, 1971)
- Schonfield, Hugh Joseph, *The Jew of Tarsus: An Unorthodox Portrait of Paul* (London, 1946)
- Schrage, Wolfgang, ‘Theologie und Christologie bei Paulus und Jesus auf dem Hintergrund der modernen Gottesfrage’, *Evangelische Theologie*, 36 (1976), pp. 121–54
- Schrenk, Gottlob, and Gottfried Quell, ‘Πατήρ’, in * *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, V, 945–1022
- Schulz, Siegfried, ‘Maranatha und Kyrios Jesus’, *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 53 (1962), pp. 125–44
- Schürer, Emil, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, fourth edition, 3 vols and an index (Leipzig, 1901, 1909, 1911)
- , *A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*, trans. by J. Macpherson, Sophia Taylor and P. Christie, Clark’s Foreign Theological Library, new series, 23–25, 41, 43, 5 vols (Edinburgh, 1885–91)
- , *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.–A.D. 135)*, *A New English Version*, revised and edited by Geza Vermes and Fergus Millar, organizing editor Matthew Black, various translators, 3 vols in 4 (Edinburgh, 1973–86)
- Schütz, John H., ‘Apostolic Authority and the Control of Tradition: Corinthians xv’, *New Testament Studies*, 15 (1968–69), pp. 439–57
- Schweizer, Eduard, ‘Discipleship and Belief in Jesus as Lord from Jesus to the Hellenistic Church’, trans. by H.F. Peacock, *New Testament Studies*, 2 (1955–56), pp. 87–99
- , *Lordship and Discipleship*, trans., with revisions, by the author, *Studies in Biblical Theology*, 28 (London, 1960)

- , ‘The Lordship of Christ’, in *From Faith to Faith: Essays in Honor of Donald Miller on his Seventieth Birthday*, ed. by Dikran Y. Hadidian, Pittsburgh Theological Monograph Series, 31 (Pittsburgh, 1979), pp. 53–64
- , ‘Menschensohn und eschatologischer Mensch im Frühjudentum’, in *Jesus und der Menschensohn: Für Anton Vögtle*, ed. by Rudolf Pesch, Rudolf Schnackenburg, and Odilo Kaiser (Freiburg/Basel/Vienna, 1975), pp. 100–116
- , ‘Paul’s Christology and Gnosticism’, in * Barrett volume, pp.115–23
- , ‘What is Meant by “God”?’’, *Interpretation*, 21 (1967), pp. 421–34
- , ‘Zur Herkunft der Präexistenzvorstellung bei Paulus’, in *Neotestamentica: German and English Essays 1951–1963* (Stuttgart/Zurich, 1963), pp. 105–09
- Schwertner, Siegfried, *Internationales Abkürzungsverzeichnis für Theologie und Grenzgebiete: Zeitschriften, Serien, Lexica, Quellenwerke mit bibliographischen Angaben* (Berlin/New York, 1974)
- Scobie, Charles H.H., ‘The Place of Wisdom in Biblical Theology’, *Biblical Theology Bulletin*, 14 (1984), pp. 43–48
- Scott, Charles Archibald Anderson, *Saint Paul: The Man and the Teacher* (Cambridge, 1936)
- Scott, Ernest Findlay, ed., *The Epistles of Paul to the Colossians, to Philemon and to the Ephesians*, Moffatt New Testament Commentary (London, 1930)
- Scott, Robert Balgarnie Young, *The Way of Wisdom in the Old Testament*, MacMillan Paperbacks, 08928 (London, 1971)
- Scranton, Robert L., ‘The Corinth of the Apostle Paul’, *Emory University Quarterly*, 5 (1949), pp. 72–83
- Scroggs, Robin, *The Last Adam: A Study in Pauline Anthropology* (Oxford, 1966)
- , ‘The Sociological Interpretation of the New Testament: The Present State of Research’, *New Testament Studies*, 26 (1979), pp. 164–179
- Seeberg, Alfred, *Der Katechismus der Urchristenheit* (Leipzig, 1903)
- Segal, Alan F., ‘Ruler of This World: Attitudes about Mediator Figures and the Importance of Sociology for Self-Definition’, in *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition*, ed. by E.P. Sanders, vols 1– (London, 1980–), II, 245–68
- , *Two Powers in Heaven: Early Rabbinic Reports About Christianity and Gnosticism*, Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity, 25 (Leiden, 1977)
- Sellin, Ernst Franz M.J.F.W., *Introduction to the Old Testament*, tenth edition, revised and rewritten by Georg Fohrer, trans. by David Green (London, 1970)
- Senft, Christophe, *La première épître de Saint-Paul aux Corinthiens*, Commentaire du Nouveau Testament, second series, 7 (Neuchâtel/Paris, 1979)
- Shutt, R.J.H., ‘The Concept of God in the Works of Flavius Josephus’, *Journal of Jewish Studies*, 31 (1980), pp. 171–89
- Sibylline Oracles: *Die oracula sibyllina*, ed. by Johannes Geffcken, Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte, 8 (Leipzig, 1902)
- Silva, Moises, ‘The Pauline Style as Lexical Choice: γινώσκειν and Related Verbs’, in * Bruce volume, pp. 184–207

- Simon, William Glyn Hughes, ed., *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, Torch Bible Commentaries (London, 1959)
- Simpson, C.J., ‘The Cult of the Emperor Gaius’, *Latomus*, 40 (1981), pp. 489–511
- Simpson, Edmund Kidley, and F.F. Bruce, *Commentary on the Epistles to the Ephesians and the Colossians: The English Text with Introduction, Exposition and Notes*, New London Commentary on the New Testament (London/Edinburgh, 1957)
- Smith, Dennis Edwin, ‘The Egyptian Cults at Corinth’, *Harvard Theological Review*, 70 (1977), pp. 201–31
- Smith, J.A., ‘The Meaning of κύριος’, *Journal of Theological Studies*, 31 (1930), pp. 155–60
- Smith, Morton, ‘The Common Theology of the Ancient Near East’, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 71 (1952), pp. 135–47
- , ‘“God’s Begetting the Messiah” in 1Q Sa’, *New Testament Studies*, 5 (1958–59), pp. 218–24
- , ‘The Image of God: Notes on the Hellenization of Judaism, with Especial Reference to Goodenough’s Work on Jewish Symbols’, *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 40 (1958), pp. 473–512
- , ‘Prolegomena to a Discussion of Aretologies, Divine Men, the Gospels and Jesus’, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 90 (1971), pp. 174–99
- Smyth, Herbert Weir, *Greek Grammar*, first edition, 1916, revised by Gordon M. Messing (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1956)
- Soden, Hans von, ‘Sakrament und Ethik bei Paulus. Zur Frage der literarischen und theologischen Einheitlichkeit von 1 Kor. 8–10’, in *Urchristentum und Geschichte: Gesammelte Aufsätze und Vorträge*, ed. by Hans von Campenhausen, 2 vols (Tübingen, 1951), I, 239–75 [reprinted from *Marburger Theologische Studien*, 1 (1931), pp. 1–40]
- Somerville, David, *St. Paul’s Conception of Christ: Or, The Doctrine of the Second Adam*, sixteenth series of Cunningham Lectures (Edinburgh, 1897)
- Sparks, Hedley Frederick D., ed., *The Apocryphal Old Testament* (Oxford, 1984)
- Srebrny, Stefan, ‘Kult der thrakischen Göttin Kotyto in Korinth und Sicilien’, in *Mélanges Franz Cumont: Annuaire de l’Institute de Philologie et d’Histoire Orientales et Slaves*, 4 (1936), pp. 423–47
- Stanley, Arthur Penrhyn, ed., *The Epistles of St. Paul to the Corinthians, with Critical Notes and Dissertations*, fourth edition, 2 vols (London, 1876)
- Stanton, Graham, ‘Incarnational Christology in the New Testament’, in *Incarnation and Myth: The Debate Continued*, ed. by Michael Goulder (London, 1979), pp. 151–65
- Stauffer, Ethelbert, ‘Ἐἷς’, in * *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, II, 434–42
- , *New Testament Theology*, trans. by John Marsh (London, 1955)
- Stecher, Reinhold, ‘Die persönliche Weisheit in den Proverbien Kap. 8’, *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, 75 (1953), pp. 411–51
- Steinmetz, Franz Josef, *Protologische Heils-Zuversicht: Die Strukturen des soteriologischen und christologischen Denkens im Kolosser- und Epheserbrief*, Frankfurter theologische Studien, 2 (Frankfurt am Main, 1969)
- Stendahl, Krister, ‘Paul at Prayer’, *Interpretation*, 34 (1980), pp. 240–49

- Stevens, George Barker, *The Theology of the New Testament*, The International Theological Library (Edinburgh, 1899)
- Stewart, James S., 'On a Neglected Emphasis in New Testament Theology', *Scottish Journal of Theology*, 4 (1951), pp. 292–301
- Stewart, Roy A., *Rabbinic Theology: An Introductory Study* (Edinburgh/London, 1961)
- Stone, Michael, 'The Concept of the Messiah in IV Ezra', in *Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough*, ed. by Jacob Neusner, Studies in the History of Religions (Supplements to Numen), 14 (Leiden, 1968), pp. 295–312
- Stout, G.F., 'Association (of ideas)', in *Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology*, ed. by James Mark Baldwin, 3 vols (New York/London, 1901), I, 78
- Strack, Hermann Leberecht, and Paul Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, index volumes prepared by Kurt Adolf and edited by Joachim Jeremias, 6 vols in 7 (Munich, 1922–61)
- Suter, David Winston, 'Weighed in the Balance: The Similitudes of Enoch in Recent Discussion', *Religious Studies Review*, 7 (1981), pp. 217–21
- Swete, Henry Barclay, *The Holy Spirit in the New Testament: A Study of the Primitive Christian Teaching* (London, 1909)
- Synge, Francis Charles, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians: A Theological Commentary* (London, 1941)
- Talbert, Charles H., 'The Concept of Immortals in Mediterranean Antiquity', *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 94 (1975), pp. 419–36
- Taylor, Vincent, *The Person of Christ in New Testament Teaching* (London/New York, 1958)
- Teeple, Howard Merle, *The Mosaic Eschatological Prophet*, Journal of Biblical Literature Monograph Series, 10 (Philadelphia, 1957)
- Terrien, Samuel, and Paul Scherer, 'The Book of Job', in * *The Interpreter's Bible*, III, 875–1198
- Teschendorf, M., 'Der Schöpfungsgedanke im Neuen Testament', *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, 104 (1932), pp. 337–72
- Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text*, by M. de Jonge and others, Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti graece, volume 1, part 2 (Leiden, 1978)
- Theisohn, Johannes, *Der auserwählte Richter: Untersuchungen zum traditionsgeschichtlichem [sic] Ort des Menschensohngestalt der Bilderreden des Aethiopischen Henoch*, Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments, 12 (Göttingen, 1975)
- Theissen, Gerd, 'The Strong and the Weak in Corinth: A Sociological Analysis of a Theological Quarrel', in *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity: Essays on Corinth*, ed. and trans. with introduction by John H. Schütz, Studies in the New Testament and Its World (Edinburgh, 1982), pp. 121–43
- Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, ed. by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, trans. and ed. by G.W. Bromiley, 10 vols (Grand Rapids, 1968–76)
- Thiselton, Anthony C., 'Realized Eschatology at Corinth', *New Testament Studies*, 24 (1977–78), pp. 510–26
- , 'Structuralism and Biblical Studies: Method or Ideology?', *Expository Times*, 89 (1977–78), pp. 329–35
- , *The Two Horizons: New Testament Hermeneutics and Philosophical Description With Special Reference to Heidegger, Bultmann, Gadamer, and Wittgenstein* (Exeter, 1980)

- Thorndyke, Perry W., and Barbara Hayes-Roth, 'The Use of Schemata in the Acquisition and Transfer of Knowledge', *Cognitive Psychology*, 11 (1979), pp. 82–106
- Thrall, Margaret E., *The First and Second Letters of Paul to the Corinthians*, The Cambridge Bible Commentary, New English Bible (Cambridge, 1965)
- , 'The Origin of Pauline Christology', in *Apostolic History and the Gospel: Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F.F. Bruce on his 60th Birthday*, ed. by W. Ward Gasque and Ralph P. Martin (Exeter, 1970), pp. 304–16
- Thurén, Jukka, "'Der Herr ist Einer" in neutestamentlicher Sicht', in * *Der Herr ist Einer, Unser gemeinsames Erbe*, ed. by Karl-Johan Illmann and Jukka Thurén, pp. 98–121
- Thüsing, Wilhelm, 'Das Gottesbild des Neuen Testaments', in *Die Frage nach Gott*, ed. by Joseph Ratzinger, *Quaestiones disputatae*, 56, third edition (Freiburg/Basel/Vienna, 1973), pp. 59–86
- , 'New Testament Approaches to a Transcendental Christology', in *A New Christology*, by Karl Rahner and Wilhelm Thüsing, trans. by D. Smith and V. Green (London, 1980), pp. 43–234
- , *Per Christum in Deum*, Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen, new series, 1, second edition (Münster Westfalen, 1969)
- Tiede, David Lenz, *The Charismatic Figure as Miracle Worker*, Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series, 1, second printing (Missoula, 1973)
- Tödt, Heinz Eduard, *The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition*, trans. by D.M. Barton, New Testament Library (London, 1965)
- Turner, Nigel, *Grammatical Insights into the New Testament* (Edinburgh, 1965)
- Tyler, Stephen Alfred, *The Said and the Unsaid: Mind, Meaning, and Culture* (New York/San Francisco/London, 1978)
- Unnik, W.C. van, 'Jesus: Anathema or Kyrios (Cor. 12:3)', in *Christ and the Spirit in the New Testament: In Honour of Charles Francis Digby Moule*, ed. by Barnabas Lindars and Stephen S. Smalley (Cambridge, 1973), pp. 113–26
- Urbach, Ephraim E., *The Sages: Their Concepts and Beliefs*, trans. by Israel Abrahams, Publications of the Perry Foundation in the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 2 vols (Jerusalem, 1975)
- Vallentine's Jewish Encyclopaedia*, ed. by Albert M. Hyamson and A.M. Silbermann (London, 1938)
- Vermes, Geza, 'The Archangel Sarial. A Targumic Parallel to the Dead Sea Scrolls', in *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty*, ed. by Jacob Neusner, *Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity*, 12, 4 vols (Leiden, 1975), III, 159–66
- , ed. and trans., *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, Penguin Books, A551, second edition (Harmondsworth, Middlesex, 1975)
- , *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective*, by G. Vermes in collaboration with P. Vermes (London, 1977)
- , 'The "Son of Man" Debate', *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, 1 (1978), pp. 19–32
- Vielhauer, Philip, 'Zur Frage der christologischen Hoheitstitel', *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 90 (1965), cols 569–88
- Vogel, Manfred H., 'Monotheism', in * *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, XII, 260–63

- Vögtle, Anton, *Das Neue Testament und die Zukunft des Kosmos*, Kommentare und Beiträge zum Alten und Neuen Testament (Düsseldorf, 1970)
- Vokes, F.E., 'Creeds in the New Testament', in *Studia Evangelica, Volume IV*, ed. by Elizabeth E. Livingstone, Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, 112 (Berlin, 1973), pp. 580–88
- Volz, Paul, *Der Geist Gottes und die verwandten Erscheinungen im Alten Testament und im anschliessenden Judentum* (Tübingen, 1910)
- Vorländer, Hermann, 'Der Monotheismus Israels als Antwort auf die Krise des Exils', in *Der einzige Gott: Die Geburt des biblischen Monotheismus*, ed. by Bernhard Lang (Munich, 1981), pp. 84–113
- Wagner, Günther, ed., *An Exegetical Bibliography on Paul's First Letter to the Corinthians* (Rüschlikon/Zürich: Baptist Theological Seminary, 1975)
- Wainwright, Arthur William, *The Trinity in the New Testament* (London, 1962)
- Walter, Nikolaus, 'Christusglaube und heidnische Religiösität in paulinischen Gemeinden', *New Testament Studies*, 25 (1978–79), pp. 422–42
- Warfield, Benjamin B., *The Lord of Glory: A Study of the Designations of Our Lord in the New Testament, with Especial Reference to His Deity* (London, 1907)
- Wcela, Emil A., 'The Messiah(s) of Qumran', *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 26 (1964), pp. 340–49
- Weber, Ferdinand W., *Jüdische Theologie auf Grund des Talmud und verwandter Schriften*, second edition, ed. by F. Delitzsch and G. Schnedermann (Leipzig, 1897)
- Wedderburn, A.J.M., 'Some Recent Pauline Chronologies', *Expository Times*, 92 (1981), pp. 103–08
- , 'The Problem of the Denial of the Resurrection in I Corinthians XV', *Novum Testamentum*, 23 (1981), pp. 229–41
- Weinberg, Saul S., 'On the Date of the Temple of Apollo at Corinth', *Hesperia*, 8 (1939), pp. 191–99
- Weinel, Heinrich, *Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments: Die Religion Jesu und des Urchristentums*, Grundriss der theologischen Wissenschaften, Teil 3, Band 2, third edition (Tübingen, 1921)
- , *St. Paul: The Man and His Work*, trans. by G.A. Bienemann, ed. by W.D. Morrison, Theological Translation Library (London, 1906)
- Weiss, Hans-Friedrich, *Untersuchungen zur Kosmologie des hellenistischen und palästinischen Judentums*, Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, 97 (Berlin, 1966)
- Weiss, Johannes, ed., *Der erste Korintherbrief*, Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament, 5, ninth edition (Göttingen, 1910)
- Wells, David Falconer, *The Person of Christ: A Biblical and Historical Analysis of the Incarnation*, Foundations for Faith (Westchester, Illinois, 1984)
- Wendland, Heinz-Dietrich, *Die Briefe an die Korinther, übersetzt und erklärt*, Das Neue Testament Deutsch, 7, eighth edition (Göttingen, 1962)
- Wengst, Klaus, *Christologische Formeln und Lieder des Urchristentums*, Studien zum Neuen Testament, 7 (Gütersloh, 1972)
- Werner, Martin, *The Formation of Christian Dogma: An Historical Study of Its Problem*, rewritten in shortened form by the author, trans. with an introduction by S.G.F. Brandon (London, 1957)

- West, Allen Brown, ed., *Latin Inscriptions, 1896–1926*, Corinth, volume 8, part 2 (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1931)
- Westcott, Brooke Foss, ed., *The Epistles of St. John: The Greek Text with Notes*, third edition of 1892, reprinted with a new introduction by F.F. Bruce (Appleford and others, 1966)
- , ed., *Saint Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians: The Greek Text with Notes and Addenda*, ed. by J.M. Schulhof (London/New York, 1906)
- Westermann, Claus, *Anfang und Ende in der Bibel*, Calwer Hefte, 100 (Stuttgart, 1969)
- de Wette, Wilhelm Martin Leberecht, *Kurze Erklärung der Briefe an die Corinthier*, Kurtzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, volume 2, part 2, second edition (Leipzig, 1845)
- Whiteley, Denys Edward H., *The Theology of St. Paul*, second edition (Oxford, 1974)
- Whorf, Benjamin Lee, 'On the Connection of Ideas', in *Language, Thought, and Reality: Selected Writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf*, ed. by John B. Carroll (New York/London, 1956), pp. 35–39
- Whybray, Roger Norman, *Wisdom in Proverbs: The Concept of Wisdom in Proverbs 1–9*, Studies in Biblical Theology, 45 (London, 1965)
- Wicks, Henry J., *The Doctrine of God in the Jewish Apocryphal and Apocalyptic Literature* (London, 1915)
- Wilckens, Ulrich, *Weisheit und Torheit: Eine exegetisch-religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu I. Kor., 1 und 2*, Beiträge zur historischen Theologie, 26 (Tübingen, 1959)
- Wilckens, Ulrich, and Georg Fohrer, 'Σοφία', in * *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, VII, 465–528
- Wiles, Maurice Frank, *The Divine Apostle: The Interpretation of St Paul's Epistles in the Early Church* (Cambridge, 1967)
- , 'Eternal Generation', *Journal of Theological Studies*, new series, 12 (1961), pp. 284–91
- , 'Some Reflections on the Origins of the Doctrine of the Trinity', *Journal of Theological Studies*, new series, 8 (1957), pp. 92–106
- Williams, C.S.C., 'I and II Corinthians', in *Peake's Commentary on the Bible*, ed. by Matthew Black and H.H. Rowley (London and others, 1962), pp. 954–72
- Williams, R.R., 'Overlapping Binitarianisms in the New Testament' in *Studia Evangelica, Volume V, Part II*, ed. by F.L. Cross, Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, 103 (Berlin, 1968), pp. 30–36
- Williamson, R., 'Philo and New Testament Christology', *Expository Times*, 90 (1978–79), pp. 361–65
- Willis, Wendellee, *Idol Meat in Corinth: The Pauline Argument in 1 Corinthians 8 and 10*, Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series, 68 (Chico, 1985)
- Wilson, R.D., 'The Names for God in the New Testament', *Princeton Theological Review*, 19 (1921), pp. 392–433
- Wilson, Robert McLachlan, *Gnosis and the New Testament* (Oxford, 1968)
- , 'Gnosis at Corinth', in * Barrett volume, pp. 102–14
- , *The Gnostic Problem: A Study of the Relations between Hellenistic Judaism and the Gnostic Heresy* (London, 1958)
- , 'How Gnostic Were the Corinthians?', *New Testament Studies*, 19 (1972–73), pp. 65–74

- Windisch, Hans, 'Die göttliche Weisheit der Juden und die paulinische Christologie', in *Neutestamentliche Studien G. Heinrici zu seinem 70. Geburtstag (14 März 1914) dargebracht von Fachgenossen, Freunden und Schülern*, Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 6 (Leipzig, 1914), pp. 220–34
- Wink, Walter, *Naming the Powers: The Language of Power in the New Testament*, The Powers, 1 (Philadelphia, 1984)
- [Abstract of:] Wire, Antoinette C., 'Pauline Theology as an Understanding of God: The Explicit and the Implicit' (Ph.D. Dissertation, Claremont Graduate School, 1974) [in *Dissertation Abstracts*, 35 (1975), p. 5520-A]
- Wolff, Christian, ed., *Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther. Zweiter Teil: Auslegung der Kapitel 8–16*, Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament, volume 7, part 2 (Berlin, 1982)
- Wolfson, Harry Austryn, *Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*, Structure and Growth of Philosophical Systems from Philo to Spinoza, 2 (Cambridge, 1947)
- , 'The Philonic God of Revelation and His Latter Day Deniers', *Harvard Theological Review*, 53 (1960), pp. 101–24
- Wrede, William, *Paul*, trans. by Edward Lummis (London, 1907)
- Wright, Nicholas Thomas, 'The Messiah and the People of God: A Study in Pauline Theology with Particular Reference to the Argument of the Epistle to the Romans' (D.Phil. Thesis, Oxford, 1980)
- , "'Constraints" and the Jesus of History', *Scottish Journal of Theology*, 39 (1986), pp. 189–210
- Yadin, Yigael, 'A Crucial Passage in the Dead Sea Scrolls: 1Q Sa ii. 11–17', *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 78 (1959), pp. 238–41
- Yamauchi, Edwin Masao, *Pre-Christian Gnosticism: A Survey of the Proposed Evidences* (London, 1973)
- Young, Frances, 'A Cloud of Witnesses', in *The Myth of God Incarnate*, ed. by John Hick (London, 1977), pp. 13–47
- , 'Notes on the Corinthian Correspondence', in *Studia Evangelica, Volume VII*, ed. by Elizabeth A. Livingstone, Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, 126 (Berlin, 1982), pp. 563–66
- Zeitlin, Irving Mordecai, *Ancient Judaism: Biblical Criticism from Max Weber to the present [sic]* (Cambridge, 1984)
- Zeitlin, Solomon, 'The Liturgy of the First Night of Passover', *Jewish Quarterly Review*, new series, 38 (1947–48), pp. 431–60
- Zeller, Eduard, *Outlines of the History of Greek Philosophy*, trans. by L.R. Palmer from the thirteenth edition revised by Wilhelm Nestle, International Library of Psychology (London, 1931)
- , *Die Philosophie der Griechen in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung*, ed. by Wilhelm Nestle and others, various editions, 3 vols in 6 (Leipzig, 1882–1963)
- Ziener, Georg, *Die theologische Begriffssprache im Buche der Weisheit*, Bonner biblische Beiträge, 11 (Bonn, 1956)
- Ziesler, John A., *The Jesus Question* (Guildford/London, 1980)
- , *Pauline Christianity*, Oxford Bible Series (Oxford/New York, 1983)
- Zimmerli, Walther, 'Biblical Theology', *Horizons in Biblical Theology*, 4 (1982), pp. 95–130

—, *Old Testament Theology in Outline*, trans. by D.E. Green (Edinburgh, 1978)

Zuntz, Günther, *The Text of the Epistles: A Disquisition upon the Corpus Paulinum*, Schweich Lectures, British Academy, 1946 (London, 1953)

Notes

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28
- 29
- 30
- 31
- 32
- 33
- 34
- 35
- 36
- 37
- 38
- 39
- 40
- 41
- 42

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6

7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

"

"

"

"

"

"

—

"

"

"

"

"

"

"

"

"

"

"

3

3

3

3

3

3

3

3

3

3

3

3

3

3

3

3

3

3

3

3

3

3

3

3

3

3

3

3

TT

en

.3

29

24

66

66

.6

26

.6

TT

.8

28

29

24

82

65

26

22

22

TT

25

7

27

21

67

61

.6

2.
—
c
T
T
T
T
T
T
T
—
—
T
f
v
x
e
e
s
x
c
T
c
y
y
y
e

•

•

•

•

•

•

•

•

•

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

30

31

32

33

34

35

—

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

x

o

o

o

o

o

o

o

o

o

o

o

o

o

o

o

o

o

o

o

o

x

o

o

o

o

o

o

.

—

.

.

1

2

3

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27