Laval théologique et philosophique

Wisdom Christology in Q

John S. Kloppenborg

Volume 34, Number 2, 1978

URI: https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/705665ar
DOI: https://doi.org/10.7202/705665ar

See table of contents

Publisher(s)

Faculté de philosophie, Université Laval

ISSN

0023-9054 (print)
1703-8804 (digital)

Explore this journal

Cite this article

Kloppenborg, J. S. (1978). Wisdom Christology in Q. *Laval théologique et philosophique*, *34*(2), 129–147. https://doi.org/10.7202/705665ar

WISDOM CHRISTOLOGY IN Q

John S. KLOPPENBORG

To the memory of Dieter Mueller (1935-1977)

For Christianity, as a child of its age, it was virtually inevitable that at some stage it would encounter and absorb some elements of the Wisdom tradition, and more particularly, of Wisdom-speculations which were so characteristic not only of late Judaism, but also of gnosticism and of Hellenistic thought in general. Indeed Jesus himself probably employed sapiential devices in his preaching and the earliest tradition characterized him (in part) as a "Wisdom Teacher."[1] Some strata of Christianity, however, went far beyond this in identifying Jesus as the incarnation of Wisdom (Sophia). But the mere fact that Jesus was portrayed as a teacher of Wisdom cannot adequately account for this new development. Rather, the identification followed as a consequence of what the church had come to believe, namely, that God had spoken and acted in a definitive manner through Jesus, and that in some way, salvation hinged on acceptance or rejection of him. In Israel the personified Wisdom—which had adopted much of the mythic dress of the Egyptian Isis and Maat[2]—was utilized to make a similar theological affirmation: to know and obey the created and hypostasized Wisdom of God was to know and obey God who was separated from man. In other words, it was not simply a matter of appropriating a foreign myth for its own sake, but rather of "mytho-logy" or reflective mythology:[3] the use of mythic language, motifs and configurations to articulate a theological insight.[4] It was the mytho-logical use of the Jewish Wisdom traditions

1. R. BULTMANN, *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*, 4. Aufl. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1970) 73-113; J.M. ROBINSON, "ΛΟΓΟΙ ΣΟΦΩΝ : Zur Gattung der Spruchquelle Q," *Zeit und Geschichte* [Bultmann Festschrift] ed. E. Dinkler (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1964) 77-96.

2. See H. CONZELMANN, "Die Mutter der Weisheit," *Zeit und Geschichte*, 225-234; C. KAYATZ, *Studien zu Proverbien 1-9* (Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1966) 86-119; J. MARBÖCH, *Weisheit im Wandel: Untersuchungen zur Weisheitstheologie bei Ben Sira* (Bonn: Henstein, 1971) 49-54; J. M. REESE, *Hellenistic Influences on the Book of Wisdom and its Consequences* (Rome: Biblical Institute, 1970) 42-50; M. HENGEL, *Judaism and Hellenism*, trans. J. Bowden (London: SCM, 1974) I, 158f.; B. L. MACK, *Logos und Sophia* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1973) 34-62.

3. See CONZELMANN, "Mutter," 227, 234.

4. See especially B. L. MACK, "Wisdom Myth and Mytho-logy," *Interpretation* 24 (1970) 46-60. Mack argues that "wisdom mytho-logy is an early form of Jewish theology" which responded to the problem of theodicy. The mythic language of the Isis-Maat myth was borrowed, "wisdom was objectified, personified and distanced from man by protraying it as a mythic person whom man must now seek, but who is difficult to find in this world." (p. 59) See also E. Schüssler FIORENZA, "Wisdom Mythology and the Christological Hymns of the New Testament," *Aspects of Wisdom in Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. R. L. Wilken (Notre Dame: Univ. of Notre Dame, 1975) 17-41.

which enabled early Christianity to express its convictions that Jesus, like the Wisdom of God in Prov 8 and Sir 24, was the mediator between God and man and that to follow him was to become "a friend of God." The identification of Jesus with Sophia was in all probability grounded in the first place in a soteriological concern—Jesus' relation to man's salvation. But the language and mythic configurations of Wisdom once utilized created the possibility of cosmological and ontological speculations about Jesus. It was these speculations taken to extremes in gnosticism, which led in the directions of docetism and a complete disregard for the humanity of Jesus.

If, as has long been recognized, a Wisdom Christology appears in Pauline,[5] Johannine[6] and the hymnic materials used by John and Paul, then it is also possible that it was present, at least seminally, in other streams of early Christian tradition. Q, as it can be reconstructed, contains both sapiential forms and motifs and references to Sophia. The question remains whether Q made the step to identify Jesus with the heavenly Sophia. In Mt 11, 19b/Lk 7, 35 Jesus and John are represented as the "children of Sophia"[7] by whom Wisdom is vindicated in the face of an unbelieving generation. Indeed Jesus is given the title "Son of Man" in Mt 11, 19a/Lk 7,34 and as such is unquestionably superior to John; but as "children of Wisdom" the roles of Jesus and John are comparable: they stand in a long line—probably as the culmination—of the messengers of Sophia to the world.[8] A saying of Wisdom[9] is also found in Q on the lips of Jesus (Mt 23,34f./Lk 11,49):

> Therefore the Wisdom of God said (εἶπεν):
> I will send (ἀποστελῶ) to them prophets and apostles
> and some of them they will kill and persecute . . .

5. For a bibliography, see G. FOHRER and U. WILCKENS, σοφία, *TDNT* VII 465-467; H. CONZELMANN, "Paulus und Weisheit," *NTS* 12 (1965/1966) 234-244; D. GEORGI, "Der vorpaulinische Hymnus Phil 2,6-11," *Zeit und Geschichte* 263-293; R. G. HAMMERTON-KELLY, *Pre-existence, Wisdom and the Son of Man* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973); J. T. SANDERS, *The New Testament Christological Hymns* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971); E. SCHWEIZER, "Aufnahme und Korrektur Jüdischer Sophia-theologie im Neuen Testament," *Neotestamentica: Deutsche und Englische Aufsätze 1951-1963* (Zürich: Zwingli, 1963) 110-121.

6. See H. MOELLER, "Wisdom Motifs and John's Gospel," *Bulletin of the Evangelical Theological Society* 6 (1963) 92-100; F.-M. BRAUN, "Saint Jean, La Sagesse et l'Histoire," *Neotestamentica et Patristica* [Cullmann Festschrift] (Leiden: Brill, 1962) 123-33; R. E. BROWN, *The Gospel According to John I-XII* (New York: Doubleday, 1966) cxxii-cxxv; A. FEUILLET, *Johannine Studies*, trans. T. E. Crane (Staten Island: Alba, 1964) 76-101; SCHULZ, *Komposition und Herkunft der johanneischen Reden* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1960) 32-34; C. H. DODD, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1954) 274-5; R. BULTMANN, "Der religionsgeschichtliche Hintergrund des Prologs zum Johannesevangelium," *Eucharisterion: Festschrift für H. Gunkel*, ed. K. L. Schmidt (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1923) 3-26.

7. The Matthaean version, "wisdom is justified by her works," is best explained as an alteration of Q's reading, "children." In Matthew, "works" forms an inclusion with 11,2 and both point to the miracles which precede the question about the Baptist.

8. Cf. the book of Wisdom which attributes to Sophia the work of guiding the course of salvation history (chs. 10-11), including "working through the holy prophet" (11,1) and "passing into holy souls making them friends of God and prophets" (7,27). For a discussion of later developments of the "trajectory" see J. M. ROBINSON, "Jesus as Sophos and Sophia," *Aspects of Wisdom*, 1-16 [see above note 4].

9. It is easier to explain the Matthaean version, which attributes the saying directly to Jesus (and therefore puts the verb in the present), as an alteration of Q (=Lk) than to suppose that Luke transferred the saying from Jesus to Wisdom.

Here the pre-existent Wisdom speaks from her extramundane vantage point, prophesying the sending and rejection of the prophets. In a tradition-critically related—though form-critically and contextually independent[10]—logion (Lk 13,34f./Mt 23,37-39), a divine figure (probably Wisdom[11]) again speaks, this time lamenting Jerusalem's rejection of the prophets. Yet in none of these instances is Jesus explicitly identified with Sophia herself.[12]

The *locus classicus* for Wisdom-Christology in Q has been Mt 11, 25-27/Lk 10,21f. Since D. F. Strauss, the affinity of Mt 11,25-30 with sapiential hymns, especially Sir 51, has been recognized and the question of Jesus' relation to Sophia has been raised.[13] The passage was thoroughly investigated by Eduard Norden[14] and T. Arvedson[15] who argued that in this Q passage, Jesus spoke as Sophia. Yet this judgement rested, at least in part, on the assumption that 11,28-30—which is closely paralleled by the appeal of Sophia to men in Sir 51,23-37—belonged to Q, an assumption which has been repeatedly called into question. More recently, the question of Wisdom Christology has been raised in the context of the discussion of the theology of Q, but no consensus reached.[16] It would seem profitable, then, to examine the pericope.[17]

10. Though some (A. HARNACK, *Sprüche und Reden Jesu* [Leipzing: J. C. Hinrichs 1907] 119; BULTMANN, *Tradition*, 120f.; Robinson, "ΛΟΓΟΙ ΣΟΦΩΝ," 78; D. LÜHRMANN, *Die Redaktion der Logienquelle* [Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969] 44) have argued for an original association (in Q) of Lk 11,49f. and 13,34f., the heavily redactional character of Mt 23 (in which the two are associated) seriously weakens this hypothesis. See on this E. HAENCHEN, "Matthäus 23," *ZThK* 48 (1951) 52-57; P. HOFFMANN, *Studien zur Theologie der Logienquelle* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1972); O. H. STECK, *Israel und das gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten* (Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1967) 47f.

11. The speaker of Lk 13,34f. is not identified. A number of possibilities present themselves: (1) Jesus (so W. G. KÜMMEL, *Promise and Fulfilment*, trans. D. M. Barton London: SCM 1957 80f.; HOFFMANN, *Studien*, 173). But STECK (*Geschick*, 54) has rightly argues that "Da wir in der Verkündigung Jesu nicht den geringsten Anhalt dafür haben, daß er sich schon in alttestamentlicher Zeit, etwa in der Sendung der Propheten, wirksam verstand, kann er nicht das "Ich" des Jerusalemwortes sein." (2) God. However Steck has again shown that since in v. 35a, the passive circumlocution (ἀφίεται) refers to God (or the Shekinah), the "I" of 35b cannot refer to God. (3) The most probable speaker is Sophia whose abode is in Jerusalem (Sir 24,11), who, as in Lk 11,49, is connected with the sending of the prophets and apostles, and who withdraws from men (Prov 1,24ff.; I Enoch 42; II Baruch 48,36). For a full discussion cf. STECK, *Geschick*, 230-232; S. SCHULZ, *Q Spruchquelle der Evangelisten* (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1972) 349 n. 194.

12. F. CHRIST (*Jesus Sophia: Die Sophia-Christologie bei den Synoptikern* [Zurich: Zwingli, 1970] 62, 66, 130 etc.) asserts that in these cases, Jesus is aligned and identified with Wisdom, ignoring apparently the fact that in Lk 7,35, he is only a child of Wisdom, and in 11,49, he is quoting an oracle of Sophia. See the review of Christ by R. G. HAMMERTON-KELLY (*JBL* 90 [1971] 239f.): "Christ's arguments depend too much on interpretational ideas introduced by him into the text . . ."

13. D. F. STRAUSS, "Jesu Weheruf über Jerusalem und die σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ. Matth. 23,34-39, Luk 11,49-51. 13,34f. Ein Beitrag zur johanneischen Frage," *ZWT* 6 (1863) 84ff.

14. E. NORDEN, *Agnostos Theos* (Leipzig/Berlin: Teubner, 1913) 277-308, 394-6.

15. T. ARVEDSON, *Das Mysterium Christi* (Uppsala/Leipzig: Lundequistsks bokhandeln/A. Lorentz, 1937) esp. 211.

16. Against the identification of Jesus with Sophia in Q: M. J. SUGGS, *Wisdom, Christology and Law in Matthew's Gospel* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard, 1970) 19, 28, 96; LÜHRMANN, *Redaktion*, 99; HOFFMANN, *Studien*, 137; HAMMERTON-KELLY, *Pre-existence*, 36; apparently SCHULZ, *Spruchquelle*, 352 + note 208; supporting the identification: U. WILCKENS, *Weisheit und Torheit*

1. *Reconstruction of the Q text*

As the synoptic comparison shows, the two logia, Mt 11,25f.27/Lk 10,21.22 belonged to Q and were already connected with each other. That Q began with a short temporal introduction is suggested by Mt's ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ and by Lk's ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ . But the formulation ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ is used redactionally by Mt in 12,1 and 14,1 and hence is suspect here. On the other hand, ἐν αὐτῇ (ἐκείνῃ) τῇ ὥρᾳ is due to Lucan redaction in 7,21 and 20,19 and appears three times in Sondergut.[18] Since no other Q passage begins with such an introduction, and since both Mt and Lk may have tampered with the opening, all that can be said is that a temporal reference was probably present in Q.[19] The Lucan phrase ἠγαλλιάσατο (ἐν) τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ is probably also redactional. While ἀγαλλιάομαι is not a favourite Lucan word,[20] the intimate connection of Jesus with the Holy Spirit is clearly part of Lucan theology.[21] Furthermore, I can see no reason for Matthew to omit the reference. Although a few Q pericopae explicitly mention Jesus,[22] Mt displays a strong tendency to add ὁ Ἰησοῦς , especially at the beginning of pericopae.[23] The construction ἀποκριθεὶς... εἶπεν is found only once in Q (Mt 11,4/Lk 7, 22) but is a favourite Matthaean

---

(Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1959) 198f.; idem, σοφία , *TDNT* VII 516; CHRIST, *Jesus Sophia*, 93; A. FEUILLET, "Jésus et la Sagesse divine d'après les évangiles synoptiques", *RB* 62 (1955) 161-196; FIORENZA, "Christological Hymns," 17. J.M. Robinson ("Basic Shifts in German Theology," *Interpretation* 16 [1962] 83-5) stated that "Jesus is explicitly called Sophia in Q" in Mt 11,19; in his English revision of "ΛΟΓΟΙ ΣΟΦΩΝ" (*Zeit und Geschichte*), Robinson ("LOGOI SOPHON: On the Gattung of Q," *Trajectories through Early Christianity* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971] 112f) modified his view slightly, stating that in Q, John and Jesus "seem to function as bearers of or spokesmen for Wisdom" and quoting Suggs apparently with approval. In a later article ("Jesus as Sophos and Sophia," 6-10) his position becomes clearer: in Q one cannot speak of a Sophia-Christology in the sense of incarnation. But in Lk 10,22/Mt 11,27, "Jesus is not simply cast in the role of one of Sophia's spokesmen, even the culminating one, but rather is described with predications that are reserved for Sophia herself" (p. 9). At least in the final stage of Q, the "exclusivity of Sophia is attributed to the Son" (p. 10).

17. For a discussion of the textual problems cf. SUGGS, *Wisdom*, 71-7. Suggs, in my view, persuasively argues against P. Winter ("Matthew XI 27 and Luke X 22 from the First to the Fifth Century," *NovTest* I [1956] 112-148) who urges that Mt 11,27b is not original on the strength of some patristic witnesses.

18. Lk 2,38; 13,31; 24,33; also Acts 16,18.33; 22,13. Only once is this phrase clearly traditional: Mt 10,19/Mt 13,11.

19. So LÜHRMANN, *Redaktion*, 64; J. SCHMID, *Matthäus und Lukas*, Biblische Studien 23,2-4 (Freiburg. 1930) 289; E. KLOSTERMANN, *Das Matthäusevangelium* HNT 4 (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, ²1927) 102.

20. Ἀγαλλιάομαι : Mt 1x/ Mk -/LK, 1, 47 (trad); 10,21/ Acts 2x. It is frequent in the LXX (69x), especially in thanksgiving psalms. Schulz (*Spruchquelle*, 213) plausibly suggests that Lk is here introducing Septuagintal language.

21. The Holy Spirit appears in connection with various figures in Lk. Cf. 1,15.41.67.80; 2,25.27; 4,1.14. "Holy Spirit" is redactional in 3,22; 4,11 and 11,13, and appears 42x in Acts. See H. CONZELMANN, *The Theology of Saint Luke*, trans. G. Busswell (London: Faber, 1960) 180 + n.1; E. SCHWEIZER, πνεῦμα , *TDNT* VI 404-406.

22. Cf. Mt 4,1.7.10; 8,10.20 / Lk 4,1.8.12; 7,9; 9,58.

23. Ὁ Ἰησοῦς: redactional in Mt at least 69x; at the beginning of pericopae in Mt 7,28; 8,14; 9,9.27.35; 12,1; 13,1 etc.

redactional element.[24] Hence the only element which with any certainty can be ascribed to Q is εἶπεν (Mt=Lk) and a temporal introduction is probable.

In the logia themselves, there are minor disagreements between Mt and Lk. Mt's ἔκρυψας is probably original; Lk displays a preference for compound verbs[25] and has perhaps used ἀποκρύπτω in order to stregthen the parallel with ἀποκαλύπτω of the second line.[26] It is more difficult to determine whether ἐπιγινώσκει (Mt) or γινώσκει (Lk) is original.[27] On one hand, Lk twice changes ἐπιγινώσκει in Mk to γινώσκει (Lk 8,46; 9,11); on the other, he uses it redactionally once (7,37), in Sondergut five times, and preserves it from Mk once (5,22). There are no clear cases of ἐπιγινώσκει in Q[28] whereas γινώσκει is found four times (Mt 10,26; 12,33; 24, 43.40 parr.) It may therefore be preferable to use γινώσκει in the reconstruction since that word is already clearly part of Q vocabulary. In the Matthaean version, an accusative object, τὸν υἱόν, follows the verb, while Luke has an indirect question, τίς ἐστιν ὁ υἱός. R.P. Casey[29] holds that the Matthaean version represents "more advanced theology" emphasizing the "mystical union" of the Father and Son. However the use of an indirect question represents better Greek and other Lucan passages betray an interest on the part of the redactor in the question "who is Jesus?"[30] It seems probable, then, that the Matthaean version is primary. The same can be said regarding the absence of τίς ἐπιγινώσκει in Lk; Lk tends to avoid unclassical repetition of a verb.[31] In reconstructing the Q text, Matthew is to be preferred to Lk, except in the introduction where the precise wording is uncertain, and in the use of γινώσκει where Lk is to be given preference.

The position of our logion in Q can be determined with some certainty. Since it is preceded in both Mt and Lk by the Woes against the Galilean cities (Mt 11,20-4/Lk10,13-5), it is probable that this was the order in Q. The logion may have been immediately preceded by another Q logion, "whoever hears me hears you . . ." (Lk 10,16/Mt 10,40); the present Matthaean setting is clearly secondary,

---

24. Ἀποκριθεὶς...εἶπεν: in Mt redactional at least 18x.

25. Luke changes a Marcan simple verb into a compound at least 15x and there are at least 10 Q passages where a similar phenomenon is observed. See H. J. CADBURY, *The Style and Literary Method of Luke*, Harvard Theological Studies VI (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard, 1929) 166f.

26. So LÜHRMANN, *Redaktion*, 64 n. 8; SCHULZ, *Spruchquelle*. 214 n. 263; HOFFMANN, *Studien*, 105; J. M. ROBINSON, "Die Hodajot-Formel in Gebet und Hymnus des Frühchristentums," *Apophoreta: Festschrift Ernst Haenchen* BZNW 30 (Berlin: Töpelmann, 1964) 227f.

27. Ἐπιγινώσκει: Mt 5x/ Mk 4x/ Lk 7x/ Acts 13x; γινώσκει: Mt 20x/Mk 12x/ Lk 28x/Acts 16x.

28. In 3 Q passages (Mt 7, 16.20; 11,27) Mt has ἐπιγινώσκει while Lk has γινώσκει. Both in the LXX and in the NT the two are used completely interchangeably.

29. R. P. CASEY, "Gnosis, Gnosticism and the New Testament," In: *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology* [Fs. C. H. Dodd] ed. W. D. Davies and D. Daube (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ., 1956) 63.

30. Cf. Lk 5,21; 7,49; 9,9; 19,3. HOFFMANN, *Studien*, 105: "Lukas geht es um eine inhaltliche Aussage über Jesus, um die Erkenntnis, 'wer' er ist, wie auch seine Bearbeitung von Lk 9,9 . . . oder Apg 2,36; 8,30ff; 17,19f beweisen."

31. Cf. Mk 2,18; 3,14.16; 9,38; 10,23f; 12,41.43; 13,8 and Lucan parallels. For the omission of repetitious elements in general cf. CADBURY, *Style*, 83ff.

as V. Taylor has shown.[32] Regarding the conclusion of the logion, E. Norden and M. Dibelius[33] both held that Mt 11,28-30 originally belonged to Q but was omitted by Lk. Norden found in 11,25-30 the same schema as that of the thanksgiving psalm of ben Sirah (ch. 51) including (1) a prayer of thanksgiving, (2) an assertion regarding the conferral of gnosis and (3) and appeal to men. Norden did not claim that Mt derived from Sirach; rather both were dependent upon a "discourse-type" whose origin was to be found in oriental mystical literature.[34] This basic schema, according to Norden, could also be found in Sir 24, Odes Sol. 33, Poimandres and Rom 11, 25f. (although the most convincing parallel remained Sir 51). And since 11, 28-30 clearly belonged to this basic schema, its original connection with vv. 25-7 could be affirmed unconditionally.[35] A number of factors, howerver, tell against the original unity of 11,25-30. (1) Vv. 28-30 find no parallel in Lk, who concluded the pericope with a Q-beatitude, "blessed are the eyes which see what you see . . ." Matthew's association of this logion in the parable discourse is clearly secondary,[36] based on *Stichwortkomposition*.[37] That Mt's setting is secondary, is, of course, no proof that Lk's position followed the order of Q.[38] Lk's introduction of 10,23, στραφεὶς πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς κατ' ἰδίαν εἶπεν, is clearly redactional[39] but from the point of content, Lk 10, 23f. is entirely appropriate to the Q context.[40] On the other hand, neither Dibelius' explanation for Lk's omission of 28-30 (namely, because it was inappropriate to the context of the return of the seventy) nor Feuillet's ("because of its Jewish tone")[41] is convincing. (2) From the Gospel of Thomas (logion 90) it is now known that the logion behind 11,28-30 did circulate independently of 11,25-27. (3) Finally, the main support for Norden's thesis of a three-strophe liturgical schema evident in Sir 51 and 11,25-30 has been put into question with the discovery of 11QPs[a] Sirach which shows, as Bultmann and Klostermann had already suspected, that Sir 51 was not an original unity.[42] 11QPs[a] contains an independent version of the hymn, Sir 51,13-19.30, in the form of an alphabetic acrostic, which suggests that the presence of the hymn in ch. 51 must be

32. V. TAYLOR, "The Original Order of Q," *New Testament Essays* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972) 106.

33. NORDEN, *Agnostos Theos*, 277-308; M. DIBELIUS, *From Tradition to Gospel*, trans. B.L. Woolf (New York: Scribner, 1954) 79 n. 2; also ARVEDSON, *Mysterium*, 229; WILCKENS, *Weisheit*, 199 n. 1; A. M. HUNTER, "Crux Criticorum—Matt XI. 25-30—A Reappraisal," *NTS* 8 (1962) 247 n. 2.

34. NORDEN, *Agnostos Theos*, 303.

35. NORDEN, *Agnostos Theos*, 301.

36. So SUGGS, *Wisdom*, 79; HOFFMANN, *Studien*, 105; J. GNILKA, *Die Verstockung Israels*, StANT 3 (München: Kösel, 1961) 93 + n. 18; G. STRECKER, *Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit*, FRLANT 82 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, ³1971) 197.

37. Cf. "οφθαλμος: 13,15 (*bis*).16; βλέπω: vv. 13.14.16; ἀκούω: vv.13.14. 15.16; ὅτα: vv. 15.16.

38. So HOFFMANN, *Studien*, 105; LÜHRMANN, *Redaktion*, 61.

39. Cf. similar Lucan transitions in 7,9.44; 9,55; 14,25; 22,61; 23,28.

40. So SUGGS, *Wisdom*, 79; H. C. KEE, *Jesus in History* (New York: Harcourt Brace and World, 1970) 90.

41. FEUILLET, *Johannine Studies*, 99.

42. For the text of 11QPs[a] see J. A. SANDERS, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11*, DJDJ 4 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1965) 80. That Sir 51 is not an original unity is also shown by the fact that a prayer was interpolated between 51,12 and 51,13 in the Hebrew text (Ms. B).

explained in a literary way rather than by dependence on a mystical-discourse schema.[43]

If the evidence against the original unity of 11,25-30 is convincing, the possibility remains that Lk 10,23f. was the original ending of our Q logion. The redactional clasp, Lk 10,23a, need not speak against this since Lk sometimes inserts this phrase into the middle of pericopae (Lk 7,9; 22, 61) as well as using it to connect originally independent passages (7,44; 14, 25). For the purpose of form- and tradition- critical investigations Lk 10,23f. can be set aside; nevertheless, its original connection with our logion (in Q) cannot be excluded.

2. *Form and tradition-critical Observations*

Since there may have been a short introduction to the Q unit, the designation "apophthegm" might be appropriate.[44] However, form-critically it is a matter of two distinct logia (11,25f.27) which have been joined secondarily. Norden's proposal that the Q passage was in the form of a three-strophe mystical discourse has been rejected for lack of evidence that 11,28-30 belonged to Q.[45] Nevertheless, Norden's designation of the first strophe as a *Dankgebet*[46] and his suggestion of a liturgical setting are worthy of consideration in light of the recent study of J.M. Robinson on the "Hodajot Formula in early Christian prayer and hymn."[47] Robinson noticed the similarity between the introductory words of Mt 11,25 (ἐξομολογοῦμαι σοι, πάτερ, κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς) and the introductory formulae of a number of late Jewish and early Christian prayers, including the Qumran Hodayoth (beginning with "I give thanks to you O Lord")[48], the Eucharistic prayer of the Didache (10,2) and Apoc Jn 11,17ff. This suggests that the setting of Mt 11,25f. might be liturgical, perhaps Eucharistic as in the Didache. Yet the precise *Sitz* of the Hodayoth is unknown and thus one should not insist too strongly upon a liturgical setting for the formula.

Moreover, Robinson has also pointed out that the formula was part of non-liturgical language and has strongly influenced Pauline epistolary thanksgiving (e.g., 1 Cor 4,5; Rom 1,8; 1 Thes 2,13; 2 Thes 1,2f; 2.13). Indeed, Dibelius' comment that 11,25ff. is only in the form of a prayer of thanks, "but in reality is a sermon

43. See SUGGS (*Wisdom*, 77-81) for an excellent presentation of the arguments against the original unity of 11,25-30 (upon which I am partially dependent).

44. So SCHULZ, *Spruchquelle*, 214.

45. The proposal of M. Rist ("Is Matt 11:25-30 a Primitive Baptismal Hymn?" *JR* 15 [1935] 63-77) that the *Sitz im Leben* was a baptismal liturgy, and that of Arvedson (*Mysterium*, 229) that 11,25-30 represents a mystery liturgy for the ceremony of the enthronement of Christ both require that 11,25-30 be considered a single unit, and consequently fail.

46. NORDEN, *Agnostos Theos*, 294; also SCHULZ, *Spruchquelle*, 215.

47. J. M. ROBINSON, "Die Hodajot-Formel in Gebet und Hymnus des Frühchristentums," *Apophoreta: Festschrift Ernst Haenchen*, BZNW 30 (Berlin: Töpelmann, 1964) 194-235.

48. See M. MANSOOR, *The Thanksgiving Hymns*, STJD 3 (Leiden: Brill, 1961) 33, 107. 8. A number of the Hodayoth begin with the formula *ʾwdkh ʾdwny . . .ky*, "I praise you O Lord." E.g., 1QH 2,20.31; 3,19.37; 4,5; 6,7.26.34.

on the true receivers of revelation" is well taken.[49] The statement, "you have hidden these things from the wise and prudent and revealed them to the simple" has some formal similarities to the "revelations-schema" identified by N. Dahl in Pauline material.[50] This schema speaks of the mystery which was formerly hidden but has now been revealed (e.g., 1 Cor 2,6ff; Col 1, 26; Eph 3,4f. 9f.; Rom 16,25f.) While Mt 11,25f lacks the term μυστήριον and the explicit temporal distinction characteristic of some of the Pauline passages, there is an implicit temporal distinction inasmuch as the ταῦτα/αὐτά of 11,25 must refer to the eschatological events which are now experienced by the church (but which were formerly not in evidence).[51] In this respect, 11,25f is not unlike the Q logion which may have followed it, Lk 10,23f, which distinguishes between the disciples (or Church) who have seen the eschatological signs, and the prophets and kings of the past who wished to see them but could not. Yet the emphasis in the Q "revelations-schema" in 11,25 is not upon the temporal aspect but rather on the two groups: the church, made up of the νηπίοι, who receive revelation, and the "wise men" who do not. Lührmann has shown that the Pauline revelation-schema had its setting in preaching;[52] this may also be the setting in life of our logion although a liturgical *Sitz* is equally plausible. It is noteworthy that there is nothing specifically Christological about the revelation-schema as 1 Cor 2,6ff. shows.[53] F. Christ surely goes beyond the evidence in his assertion that " 'Dies', identisch mit dem Mysterium des Reiches Gottes . . ., erscheint . . . als identisch mit der *Weisheit*, welche wiederum mit Jesus identisch ist" (Christ's italics).[54]

Mt 11,27, however, cannot be considered simply a continuation of the Hodayoth or the "revelation-schema" forms. V. 27 is no longer in the form of an

---

49. Dibelius, *Gospel*, 281.

50. N. Dahl, "Formgeschichtliche Beobachtungen zur Christusverkündigung," *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann*, ed. W. Eltester; BZNW 21 (Berlin: Töpelmann, 1954) 3-9; now in "Form-critical observations on Early Christian Preaching," *Jesus in the Memory of the Early Church* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1976) 31-36, esp. 32f. See also D. Lührmann, *Das Offenbarungsverständnis bei Paulus und in paulinischen Gemeinden*, WMANT 16 (Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1965) 124-33; H. Conzelmann, "Paulus und die Weisheit," *NTS* 12 (1965/1966) 231-44.

51. That ταῦτα/αὐτά refer to the eschatological events of Jesus' ministry is suggested by Schulz (*Spruchquelle*, 217), Hoffmann (*Studien*, 110), H. Braun (*Spätjüdisch-häretischer und frühchristlicher Radikalismus*, BHTh 24; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1969, II 18 n. 3), W.D. Davies ("Knowledge in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Matthew 11:25-30," *HThR* 46 1953 137). Lührmann (*Redaktion*, 65) thinks that "es generalisierend gemeint ist," while Bultmann (*Tradition*, 172) unnecessarily assumes that it refers to a "lost Jewish writing." Luke apparently relates the ταῦτα specifically to the success of the seventy in their mission (Lk 10,17ff). But this association is undoubtedly secondary. Matthew perhaps understands it as "the works of Christ" (Mt 11,2ff.) It is noteworthy, however, that both evangelists relate "these things" to eschatological events.

52. Lührmann (*Offenbarungsverständis*, 125): "Im Kontext des Schemas tauchen die Begriffe λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ (Kol 1,25); καταγγέλειν, διδάσκειν (Kol 1,28); εὐαγγελίζεσθαι (Eph 3,8); εὐαγγέλιον, κήρυγμα (Röm 16,25) u.a. auf. Das deutet auf die Predigt als den 'Sitz im Leben' des Revelations-schemas." So Dahl, "Early Christian Preaching," 32f.

53. Dahl, "Early Christian Preaching," 32. Lührmann, *Offenbarungsverständnis*, 131f: "Nicht Christus ist das μυστήριον, sondern seit Christus (νῦν!) ist Offenbarung (=Verkündigung) des μυστήριον als der Heilsbedeutung des Christusgeschehens möglich."

54. Christ, *Jesus Sophia*, 82.

address to God, nor does it deal with the recipients of revelation; it is rather a self-recommendation of the revealer and deals with the mediation of revelation.[55] Also absent from 27 is the distinction between the two groups; instead, the emphasis falls upon the exclusive character of the Son's revelation. It is possible that the two logia, 25f. and 27 circulated independently. But the contacts between the two suggest that 27 was connected with 25f. as its interpretation on the basis of catch-word composition. Both logial use πατήρ and ἀποκαλύπτω, the lordship of the Father corresponds roughly to the authority of the Son in 27a, and the εὐδοκία (v. 26) of the Father is parallel to the Son's will to reveal in 27d.[56] Thus, the "these things" of 25, while perhaps originally referring to the events of Jesus' ministry, in light of v. 27 now referred to the revelation which was mediated to the church by the Son. It is surely incorrect to speak of a Sophia-Christology—at least on formal grounds—in vv. 25f; but for v. 27—which form-critically is a self-recommendation of a revealer, and which appears to be an interpretation and development of the notion of revelation found in 25f.—the possibility of Wisdom Christology is left open.

There are a number of *traditions-* and *religionsgeschichtliche* indications of the provenance of the two logia.

Vv. 25f. As stated above, vv. 25f. are introduced by the Hodayoth formula which is well attested at Qumran, but also in both Jewish and Hellenistic Christianity. Ἐξομολογοῦμαι does not appear in Hellenistic Greek in such contexts, but is frequent in the LXX.[57] Jeremias has argued that underlying πάτερ in v. 25 and ὁ πατήρ in v. 26 is the Aramaic *abba* characteristic of Jesus' vocabulary.[58] But the simple πάτερ was common in the diaspora, as Jeremias admits, and in the Greek world.[59] Ὁ πατήρ used vocatively is probably due to Semitic influence[60] though this form never appears in the LXX.[61] The address κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς, hitherto paralleled only in Tobit 7,17, has now turned up at Qumran: *mrʾh šmyʾ wʾrʿ* (1Q Gen apoc. 22,16.21).[62] The phrase, οὕτως εὐδοκία ἐγένετο

55. So NORDEN, *Agnostos Theos*, 304; DIBELIUS, *Gospel*, 280f.; HOFFMANN, *Studien*, 118; SCHULZ, *Spruchquelle*, 215.

56. So HOFFMANN, *Studien*, 109; SCHULZ, *Spruchquelle*, 215.

57. Cf. O MICHEL, ὁμολογέω, *TDNT* V 200-204; ROBINSON, "Hodajot-Formel," 198-201; 201-5. Ἐξομολογέω : in Pss, 59x; Sir 5x.

58. J. JEREMIAS, *The Prayers of Jesus*, trans. J. Bowden et al.; SBT second series 6 (London: SCM, 1967) 55-7, 108f.

59. Cf. 2 Macc 6,3,8; Apoc. Ezek. apud Clement of Alexandria, *Paed.* I 91,2; Wis 14,3; Sir 24,1.4; see also G. SCHRENK, πατήρ, *TDNT* V 952, 981.

60. See BLASS-DEBRUNNER-FUNK, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago, 1961) § 147(3); in Ptolemaic papyri, only a few uncertain passages are found with this construction. Cf. E. MAYSER, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1926) II/1§ 12 p. 55.

61. The closest to the vocative use of ὁ πατήρ is found in 1 Chr 29,10: κύριε ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραηλ, ὁ πατὴρ ἡμῶν where the liturgical *ʾabînû* stands in the background.

62. Cf. J. A. FITZMYER, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1*, Bib. et Orient. 18A (Rome: Biblical Institue, ²1971) 177. The Qumran parallels are much superior to those proposed by Billerbeck (I 607), *ribbônû šel ʿôlam*.

ἐμπροσθέν σου corresponds to the rabbinic phrase, *yhy rswn mlpnyk*.[63] On the other hand, ναί is relatively rare in the LXX (7x) but common in Hellenistic Greek. It may, however, have been used in Q as an equivalent for "amen;" it is found twice and perhaps four times (Lk 7,26; 11,21.51[?]; 12,5)[64] — each time before a solemn pronouncement which in Aramaic may have been introduced by "amen."

In respect to the *traditionsgeschichtliche* background of 25f., Bultmann's judgment that this was originally an Aramaic saying seems justified in view of the number of Semitic elements (some of which are not Septuagintal).[65] From the standpoint of history of religions, 11,25f. has contacts with apocalyptic, Qumran and sapiential traditions. The notion of the hiddenness of certain divine secrets from men in general but their disclosure to specific "chosen" persons is attested in all three traditions. In apocalyptic literature, mysteries of cosmological and eschatological character are withheld from the masses but revealed to certain wise and righteous men of antiquity (e.g., the Patriarchs, Enoch etc.) The community of Qumran regarded itself as the recipient of special revelation regarding the proper interpretation of the Law and the events of the immanent close of the age (e.g., 1QpHab 7,1-5).[66] Not only was the reception of revelation a means by which the covenanters might know about the eschaton; it was also a sign of divine election:

> To these whom God has chosen he has given [wisdom]
> as an eternal inheritance, and has given them
> to share the destiny of the saints
> and has associated their assembly with the sons of heaven . . .
> (1QS 11,7f.)

In the Wisdom tradition, too, there was a strong emphasis on the hiddenness of wisdom from the masses and particularly from the evil, but its disclosure to the σοφοί and the δίκαιοι.[67] In late Judaism, the streams of wisdom and apocalyptic converged, producing the notion that the conferral of wisdom was reserved especially for the eschaton, or the time immediately preceding it.[68] This "apocalyptic wisdom"[69] is certainly one of the ideas operative at Qumran (cf. 1QpHab 7,1ff.)

The notion of revelation in Mt 11,25f. has affinities with these late Jewish concepts. But there is no reason to suppose that the content of the revelation was

63. Billerbeck I 607; G. Schrenk, εὐδοκία, *TDNT* II 745.

64. "Amen" never occurs in Q but is found in Mt 31x, Mk 13x and Lk 6x. Ναί is probably original in Lk 11,51 but perhaps secondary in Lk 12,5.

65. Bultmann, *Tradition*, 172; so Hoffmann, *Studien*, 110; F. Hahn, *Christologische Hoheitstitel*, FRLANT 83; 4th. ed. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1974) 322; against this, Schulz (*Spruchquelle*, 217) argues that despite the clearly "semitische Fassung von Vv 25f" its origin is just as, if not more, probably in the Jewish Hellenistic church. He offers no justification.

66. See O. Betz, *Offenbarung und Schriftforschung in der Qumransekte*, WUNT 6 (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1960) 82-88; Braun, *Radikalismus*, II 18; Hoffmann, *Studien*, 112.

67. Wisdom is hidden from the world: Job 28,12-28; Prov 1,20-33; 8,36; Sir 1,3.6; 15,7-8; 24,28; Wis 2,22; 11QPs[a] XVIII,15. Wisdom reveals herself and her secrets to the wise: Prov. 8,17.21; Sir 1,10b-20; 4,18; Wis 6,22; 11QPs[a] XVIII, 5-7. Cf. Wilckens, σοφία, *TDNT* VII 498-500.

68. Cf. I Enoch 91,10; 99,10; II Bar 51,3; 54,4f; IV Ezra 8,52; Wisdom is hidden from the masses prior to the end: I Enoch 93,8; II Bar 48,36; IV Ezra 5,10.

69. On the idea of "apocalyptic wisdom" cf. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, I 202-10.

cosmological or even the elaborate historical-eschatological secrets of the times and signs of the end or, still less, "gnostic" secrets.[70] Rather, the content of the revelation—particularly if the logion is authentic[71]—was that the eschatological events were already happening to the church. Here there is no question of a "Wisdom Christology" simply because the focus is not christological in the least. But in Q—that is, with the association of 11,27—the emphasis shifted towards christology. The language of vv. 25f. presupposes both apocalyptic and sapiential traditions. For the Q community the idea of revelation was clearly constitutive: its members stood in the line of the children of Sophia (cf. Lk 7,35) and despite their name, the simple, they were in actual fact the wise—those who had received God's revelation and by that very fact were shown to be God's elect.[72] It may have been the presence of sapiential language in 25f. which prompted an editor to further develop this logion in the direction of a Wisdom Christology by the addition of v. 27. From a sociological point of view, it was precisely because the community considered itself as the "true σοφοί"—as opposed to the "official wise men" of Israel—that the road lay open for Jesus to be regarded as not only the σοφός *par excellence*, but as the very source of the community's revelation, i.e., as the divine Wisdom.

---

70. There is no hint of characteristic gnostic ideas and motifs. For gnostic mysteries cf. Hippolytus, *Ref.*, V 10,2 [Naassene Hymn]; CH I,16 [secrets about the primal man]. There are, however, similarities in terminology between gnostic and Christian statements. CH I,16: τοῦτο ἔστι τὸ κεκρυμμένον μυστήριον μεχρὶ τῆσδε τῆς ἡμέρας.

71. Bultmann (*Tradition*, 172) himself saw no reason to deny the authenticity of the saying. Formally, there is nothing in the Hodayoth formula or the revelation-schema which would exclude attribution to Jesus—especially if the schema is not explicitly Christological—and the vocative use of ὁ πατήρ may derive from Jesus' *abba*. But although an exact parallel to 11,25 is wanting in Jewish Wisdom literature, one cannot argue from the criterion of dissimilarity since manifestly, the Q community regarded itself as the πτωχοί (Mt 5,3 par) and the νήπιοι—designations which might have been used by Jesus and reinterpreted by the church, but which equally could have been self-designations of the church—perhaps pejorative terms used by its opponents but turned into titles of pride.

72. "Sophos" is used in both the apocalyptic tradition for the recipient of special insight into eschatological mysteries (Dan 2,12-25: IV Ezra 12,38; 14,26) and in the wisdom tradition as the followers of Sophia (so frequently in Prov, Wis. Sir etc.) Νήπιος in the wisdom tradition is used in both a positive way (those who will receive instruction: Wis 10,21; Sir 3,19) and in a censorious manner (those who reject Wisdom's instruction: Prov 1,32; Wis 12,24; 15,24). Nowhere in wisdom literature is found a statement such as Mt 11,25—denying revelation to the "wise" in favour of the simple. (Cf. I Enoch 5,8: "Wisdom will be given to the elect . . . but those who are wise shall become humble.") Another possible background for νήπιοι is found at Qumran. 1QpHab 12,2-10 describes the ill-treatment of the poor (*ʾebyônîm*), the Council of the Community and the simple ones of Judah (*pʿtaʾê-yʿhûdah*) "who practice the Law" by the Wicked Priest. 1QpMicah (14) 7 speaks of the "Spouter of Lies" [who led the] simple [astray]." In 1QH, God is said to help the poor and needy (2,32.34), to protect them (5,13.18.20-22) and to bring them good tidings (18,14). 11QPs[a] XVIII 6-7 speaks to Wisdom's revelation to the simple (*pwtʾym*) and the senseless (*ḫsry-lbb*). It is plausible that Jesus and/or the Q community was influenced by the positive evaluation of the "poor" and "simple" at Qumran.

Jesus may have been reacting against the very negative opinion of the *ʿam haʾares* in rabbinic circles (cf. HILLEL, Aboth 2,5). The "wise" of Mt 11,25 may have originally referred to the opponents of Jesus—those who thought themselves wise—though in the Q community (which apparently understood itself as the "Simple"), the "wise" may have been the name for all of Israel (so Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 65) or perhaps a more restricted group of opponents within Israel. See HOFFMANN, *Studien*, 113-8; SCHULZ, *Spruchquelle*, 219f; F. MUSSNER, "Wege zum Selbtbewusstsein Jesu," *BZ* NF 12 (1968) 167-9.

V.27 This logion can be divided into four lines, with the first more or less separable from lines b-d and with 27d serving as a qualification of b-c. The *traditions*- and *religionsgeschichtliche* background of this logion is somewhat more complex than that of 25f.

Jeremias has assigned 27 to a Semitic-speaking milieu on the basis of a number of criteria:[73]

(1) Οὐδεύς...εἰ μή is typically Aramaic[74] (corresponding to *lêt . . . ʾellāʿ*),

(2) ʾαποκαλύπτω is not found regularly in Hellenistic Greek as a *terminus technicus* for revelation,[75]

(3) asyndetic construction at the beginning of 27,

(4) the un-classical repetition of the verb ἐπιγινώσκω,

(5) synthetic parallelism of the second and third logia, and

(6) "both four line stanzas [11,25f.27] mention the theme first in line I, then elaborate it with two parallel clauses in the second and third lines, the second being subordinate to the third . . . and end in the fourth line with an emphatic last clause" (p. 46).

One suspects that Jeremias has pushed the parallels between 25f. and 27 too far; in my opinion the "theme" of the first "stanza" in not 25a but 25c: the revelation to the simple. In any case, the parallelism, if it does exist hardly proves a Semitic *Vorlage*, but at best that 27 was a carefully constructed interpretative verse for 25f. Οὐδεύς (οὐδέν) . . . εἰ μή , while perhaps a Semitism, is not an indication of "translation Greek;" it appears also in the LXX (Wis 7,29; 17,11), frequently in the NT[76] (including passages where a Semitic *Vorlage* is excluded) and in Ptolemaic papyri.[77] ʾΑποκαλύπτω is indeed rare (though not entirely absent[78]) as a technical term for revelation in Hellenistic Greek, but is frequent in the LXX. Jeremias' remaining criteria only indicate that the author of 11,27 may have been influenced by biblical style; they do not prove a Semitic *Vorlage*. On the other hand, the use of ὑπό after παρεδόθη does not correspond to Semitic style (as Jeremias concedes) and rather points to a Hellenistic linguistic setting. The provenance of 11,27, it seems to me, cannot be decided on philological-grammatical grounds alone; an investigation of its leading ideas and motifs is necessary.

V. 27a: Πάντα μοι παρεδόθη ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός μου . Two problems emerge at once: (1) to what does the πάντα refer, and (2) what are its Christological implications? Jeremias interprets παρεδόθη in the sense of the Rabbinic term, "to pass on

73. JEREMIAS, *Prayers*, 45f.

74. Cf. K. BEYER, *Semitische Syntax im Neuen Testament. Bd. I: Satzlehre Teil 1*; SUNT 1; 2 ed. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1928) 105f.

75. See esp. A. OEPKE, καλύπτω, *TDNT* III 570f.

76. E.g., Mk 5,7; 6,8; 9,8.29; 10,18; Mt 11,27; Jn 3,13; 6,46; 17,12; 1 Cor 2,11b; 8,4; 2 Cor 12,5 (P^{46}) Apoc Jn 2,17; 13,17.

77. MAYSER, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri*, I/3 p. 205.

78. See CH XIII,1 where ἀποκαλύπτω may be used as a technical term.

teaching."[79] But where παραδίδωμι appears as a technical term (e.g., 1 Cor 11,23; 15,3) it refers to teachings from the past; this interpretation is excluded by ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός μου .[80] Others have urged that πάντα refers to gnostic secrets.[81] But parallels from apocalyptic, early Christianity and Hellenism show that πάντα is best interpreted as "authority:"

Dan 7,13: καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ (υἱῷ ἀνθρώπου) ἐξουσία.

Enoch 69,27: And the sum of judgment was given to the Son of Man.

Mt 28,18; ἐδόθη μου πᾶσα ἐξουσία ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς

John 3,35: ὁ πατὴρ ἀγαπᾷ τὸν υἱόν, καὶ πάντα δέδωκεν ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ.

John 13,3: πάντα ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ ὁ πατὴρ εἰς τὰς χεῖρας.

John 17,2: καθὼς ἔδωκας αὐτῷ ἐξουσίαν πάσης σαρκός.

CH I:32: ὁ σὸς ἄνθρωπος συναγιάζειν σοι βούλεται, καθὼς παρέδωκας αὐτῷ τὴν πᾶσαν ἐξουσίαν.

V. 27a, with its notion of the conferral of authority, has contacts not only with late-Jewish-apocalyptic Son of Man traditions, but also with the broader religious context of which the Johannine Son and the Hermetic Anthropos were parts. F. Christ states: "Als Empfänger von 'allem' erscheinst also hier Jesus als die Weisheit."[82] But against this, it must be said that nowhere in the Wisdom tradition is it stated that Sophia *received* either knowledge or power from God. Sophia indeed has knowledge of all things (Wis 7,18-21; 8,8) and ἐξουσία in Jerusalem (Sir 24,11b) but these derive from the fact that she was present with God at the creation, and the instrument of creation.[83] Christ's argument seems to rely heavily upon an unproven hypothesis that Wisdom and the Son of Man were closely associated if not identified in pre-Christian Judaism.[84] Others have argued on the strength of the parallel with Dan 7,14 that 27a refers to Jesus as the Son of Man.[85] This is indeed more cogent than Christ's proposal, although caution should be exercised since of the seven parallels adduced above, only two refer explicitly to the Son of Man. It may be safer to assert that while the roots of 27a may be found in the apocalyptic Son of Man concept,[86] the saying has already passed through

79. *Prayers*, 49; T.W. MANSON, *The Sayings of Jesus* (London: SCM, 1949) 79.

80. So F. BÜSCHEL, δίδωμι, *TDNT* II 171; A. FEUILLET, "Jésus et la Sagesse divine d'après les Évangiles synoptiques," *RB* 62 (1955) 188.

81. NORDEN, *Agnostos Theos*, 288ff.; DIBELIUS, *Gospel*, 280f.

82. CHRIST, *Jesus Sophia*, 87.

83. The Anthropos of Poimandres (CH 1, 12ff), although a heavenly being and emanation of the Father of the All, is not comparable to the Jewish Sophia. The Anthropos is a collective soul, who is conjoined to matter and entirely distinct from the demiurge or the Logos.

84. See CHRIST, *Jesus Sophia*, 69 n. 236; J. MUILENBERG, "The Son of Man in Daniel and the Ethiopic Apocalypse of Enoch," *JBL* 79 (1960) 197-209; A. FEUILLET, "Le Fils de l'homme et la tradition biblique," *RB* 60 (1953) 170-203; 321-46; and above all the careful discussion of the matter by C. COLPE, υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, *TDNT* VIII 411f. 415, 467.

85. HOFFMANN, *Studien*, 121; SCHULZ, *Spruchquelle*, 222.

86. So BULTMANN, *Tradition*, 172.

another milieu where it could come into contact with pre-Johannine[87] and pre-Gnostic ideas.[88]

V. 27b-d: Καὶ οὐδεὶς (ἐπι)γινώσκει τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ, οὐδὲ τὸν πατέρα τις (ἐπι)γινώσκει εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς καὶ ᾧ ἐὰν βούληται ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψαι.

a. The Concept of Knowledge

Since Norden and Bousset, 11,27 was thought to derive from the realm of Hellenistic gnosticism, as evidenced by its concept of knowledge and by the use of the absolute "son" title.[89] Hermetic and magical parallels were adduced:

> P. Lond. 122,50: οἶδα σε, Ἑρμῆ, καὶ σὺ ἐμέ. ἐγώ εἰ⟨μι⟩ σὺ καὶ σὺ ἐγώ.[90]
>
> CH X, 15: Οὐ γὰρ ἀγνοεῖ τὸν ἄνθρωπον ὁ θεός, ἀλλὰ καὶ πάνυ γνωρίζει καὶ θέλει γνωρίζεσθαι τοῦτο μόνον σωτήριον ἀνθρώπῳ ἐστίν, ἡ γνῶσις τοῦ θεοῦ.
>
> CH I, 31: ἅγιος ὁ θεός, ὃς γνωσθῆναι βούλεται καὶ γινώσκεται τοῖς ἰδιοῖς.

The usefullness of these parallels may be questioned. In the magical text (P. Lond. 122), it is a matter of an incantation to secure power and benefits, not a self-predication of a mediator of revelation. The element of exclusivity of the revelation given through the revealer is also missing in the Hermetic texts. Moreover, there are many nuances in the Hellenistic notion of γνῶσις which are entirely foreign to Q. A.-J. Festugière has summarized the idea of γνῶσις in Hellenistic mysticism:[91]

> C'est une connaissance :
>
> I. de Dieu, particulièrement sous son aspect de Sauveur (γν. θεοῦ);
>
> II. de soi, en tant qu'issu de Dieu et susceptible de retourner à Dieu (γν. ἑαυτοῦ);

---

87. But see E. Schweizer (υἱός, *TDNT* VIII 374) who argues that in Jn 3,35; 5,19-23(26) "one may still detect the apocalyptic origin of the abs. ὁ υἱός." Also S. Schulz, *Untersuchungen zur Menschensohn-Christologie* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1957) 125-35.

88. Lührmann (*Redaktion*, 65) opposes the attempt to find a Son of Man Christology in the background. "Vielmehr findet sich hier die Relation Vater/Sohn: als der Sohn, vom Vater eingesetzt (Lk 10,22a:Mt 11,27a) ist Jesus *der* Offenbarer" (Lührmann's emphasis). See also G. Bornkamm, "Der Auferstandene und der Irdische," *Überlieferung und Auslegung im Matthäusevangelium*, WMANT 1; 4. ed. (Neukirchen, 1965) 292 n. 3; A. Vögtle, "Das christologische und ekkesiologische Anliegen von Mt 28,18-20," *Studia Evangelica II*, TU Bd. 87 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag 1964) 269, 283.

89. Norden, *Agnostos Theos*, 287-93; W. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, trans. J. Steely (New York: Abingdon, 1970) 85-9.

90. Text available in K. Preisendanz, *Papyri Graecae Magicae* (Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1928-30) No. VIII,50.

91. A.-J. Festugière, "Cadre de la mystique hellénistique," *Aux Sources de la Tradition Chrétienne : Mélanges offerts à M. Maurice Goguel* (Neuchâtel et Paris: Delchaux et Nestlé, 1950) 78.

III. des moyens de remonter à Dieu et du mode de cette remontée (γν. ὁδοῦ).

The idea of knowledge in Q is by no means this developed, nor is there any hint of the hypostases-speculations, the anti-cosmic dualism and the notion of the "divine spark" imprisoned in man, all of which were characteristic of gnosticism. In Q, the emphasis falls not upon *what* is known, but rather *to whom* and *through whom* it is known.

Jeremias attempted to understand the logion from a wholly Jewish context, arguing that it reads like a simple metaphor:[92]

> Just as only a father really knows his son,
> so only a son really knows his father.

But the final clause (27d) militates against such an interpretation of father/son; 27d emphasizes the exclusivity of the Son's mediation of revelation and implies that "Son" is intended as a title. Moreover, "reveal" is hardly appropriate for the passing of knowledge about one's earthly father.

Davies and Hoffmann have argued that the concept of knowledge in 11,27 is best understood against the background of Jewish apocalyptic and especially Qumran beliefs, though both admit foreign influences on the Qumran community.[93] "To know God" in the OT as well as in late Judaism signified recognizing his sovereignty and obeying His Law; in apocalyptic, knowledge took on the added dimension of insight into eschatological mysteries—a development especially evident at Qumran.[94] Admitting however, that the emphasis on knowledge of God at Qumran is worthy of consideration for the background of 11,27, we also see that it cannot explain it completely. 11,27 emphasizes the uniqueness of the Son's knowledge and revelation of the Father. Indeed the Teacher of Righteousness, if he is the speaker in the Hodayoth, has some of the attributes of a mediator of revelation:[95]

> And through me Thou hast illuminated the faces of many
> and Thou hast become mighty infinitely;
> for Thou hast made known to me thy wondrous mysteries
> and by The wondrous secret Thou hast worked mightily in me
> and Thou hast worked wonders in the presence of many
> for the sake of Thy glory. (1QH 4,27-28)

Yet statements corresponding to "no one knows the Father except the Son" and "to whom the Son wishes to reveal" are missing at Qumran. That is, while the Teacher is a mediator of truth to the community, he makes no claims to exclusivity. Yet at Qumran, another hint is provided for the background of 11,27 (11QPs[a] XVIII 5-7):[96]

---

92. JEREMIAS, *Prayers*, 50.

93. DAVIES, "Knowledge in the Dead Sea Scrolls," 113-139; HOFFMANN, *Studien*, 127-31.

94. E.g., 1QpHab 7, 1ff; 1QS 4, 18ff; see DAVIES, "Knowledge in the Dead Sea Scrolls," 122-125; HOFFMANN, *Studien*, 128f; BETZ, *Offenbarung*, 83-7.

95. See BETZ, *Offenbarung*, 54f; for more examples of texts about knowledge in the DSS cf. MANSOOR, *Thanksgiving Hymns*, 67-74; DAVIES, "Knowledge in the Dead Sea Scrolls," 126-9.

96. For the text see SANDERS, *Psalms Scroll*, 64-70.

For to make known the glory of the Lord
is Wisdom (*ḥkmh*) given,
And for recounting his many deeds
she is revealed (*nwdʿh*) to man
To make known to simple folk (*lpwtʾym*) his might
and to explain to the senseless (*lḥsry-lbb*) his greatness.

This Wisdom text, and the presence of a fragment of Sirach (51,13-20.30 = 11QPs[a] XXI 11-17) at Qumran shows that they too had been influenced by the language of Wisdom and its notion of a semi-divine mediator of revelation and salvation. The mention of the simple (*pwtʾym* = νήπιου ?) as the recipients of Wisdom's revelation indeed deserves notice in connection with 11,25. But 11QPs[a] XVIII also suggests that it is precisely in the sapiential tradition that we may find the history of religions background to the idea of knowledge and revelation in 11,27.

The language used to describe the Son is closely paralleled by the description of Wisdom. Wisdom is hidden from man but known to God,[97] conversely, she also has perfect insight into God and has working,[98] and finally, she is the one who reveals God and his secrets to men.[99] It is the sapiential background of 11,27 which perhaps best explains the statement, "no one knows the *Son* except the Father," which apparently seemed unnatural or illogical to some of the Patristic writers and scribes. Against a wisdom background this becomes perfectly comprehensible: the identity of the Son, like that of Wisdom, is only known to God and to whom special revelation is given.

b. The title "Son"

A second indicator of provenance is the absolute "son" title. Perhaps the closest NT parallels are found in Johannine literature. Yet the origin, and therefore the significance of the absolute Son title is a matter of serious dispute. On one hand, some regard it as related to "the son of God" and therefore of Hellenistic origin.[100] Care should be exercised in this regard, however, in view of the findings of W. von Martitz and M. Hengel that the title θεοῦ υἱός was *not* common in the Hellenistic world.[101] Hahn, who insists on separate origins for "Son" and "Son of God,"

97. Job 28,12f; Sir 1,6; Bar 3,31; Job 28,23; Sir 1,9; Bar 3,32.

98. Wis 7,25f; 8,4.

99. Wis 9,17; 7,21; Sir 4,18.

100. SCHULZ, *Spruchquelle*, 223f; LÜHRMANN, *Redaktion*, 66. Schulz (*Menschensohn*, 141f) holds that the roots of the Johannine Son are to be found in the apocalyptic Son of Man, but that this has received a new interpretation in pre-Johannine tradition, where the hellenistic-gnostic idea of the Son of God was introduced.

101. W. VON MARTITZ (υἱός, *TDNT* VIII 334-40): "Apart from Greek stories of gods and heroes, the express claim that a mortal is a son of god occurs only in limited circles: 1. in connection with doctors at a relatively early period, where the phrase is functional and denotes membership of the profession by reference to the basic deity, Aesculapius; 2. in the ruler cult whose terminology suggests oriental roots; 3. in the Gnostics combatted by Christian apologetics; 4. less explicitly in the biographies of philosophers in Neo-Pythagorean and Neo-Platonic circles.
θεοῦ υἱός appears as a translation of *divi filius*, "son of the divinized," as a title of Augustus

derives the former chiefly from the *abba* that was characteristic of Jesus,[102] but the apocalyptic contexts of not only 11,27a but also Mk 1,32 and Jn 3,35; 5,19-23.26 suggest that the Son of Man concept may stand in the background[103] and that this may have received a new interpretation by association with the Son of God title.[104] But one does not have to (and according to Hengel, cannot) look to the Hellenistic world for the Son of God title. In Jewish apocalyptic there was a hesitancy to use the title;[105] nevertheless at Qumran, Nathan's oracle (II Sam 7,14) was applied to the "shoot of David" (4QFlor 1,11f) and 1QSa 2,11f. speaks of the birth of the Messiah as God's work. The titles *brh dy'l* (Son of God) and *br'lywn* (Son of the Most High) do emerge in 4QpsDan A^a [=4Q 243], but it is not certain to whom these titles should apply.[106]

In Wisdom literature, the wise man is described as the son of God or as the son of Wisdom (e.g., Wis 2,13.18; Sir 4,11), while in the Hellenistic Jewish romance *Joseph and Asenath*, Joseph is called "son of God" in virtue of his wisdom (6,2-6; 13,10; 21,3). In *Test. Abraham* (12), Abel is described as ὅμοιος υἱῷ θεοῦ and in *Test. Levi* 4,2, Levi is promised that he will be a son, helper and servant to God. Yet these examples, while instructive, do not provide the essential religious background to Mt 11,27, in which the "Son" must be a supra-human being who has *unique* knowledge of the Father and who alone is able to reveal God to man. In this, Jesus is distinguished from the σόφος of the Wisdom tradition and the righteous man of late Judaism.[107]

In the area of Hellenistic-Jewish Wisdom speculation, however, there are examples of semi-divine beings who stand in a filial relationship to God. In the

---

(cf. P. TEBT. II 382,21; IG 12,3 No. 174,2). Ptolemaic rulers did not use the designation but preserved the Old Egyptian titulary, "Son of Re" (e.g., UPZ II 10, 11-22 [Satrap Stele]) or "Son of Helios" (SEG VIII No. 467, 504 [Raphia Decree]; UPZ II 166-98 [Rosetta Stone]). See P. BURETH, *Les Titulaires impériales dans les papyrus, les ostraca et les inscriptiones d'Egypte*, Papyrologica Bruxellensia 2 (Bruxelles 1964) 24, 28. See now also the study of M. HENGEL, *The Son of God*, trans. J. Bowden (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976) esp. 23-41.

102. HAHN, *Hoheitstitel*, 329.

103. So SCHWEIZER, υἱός, *TDNT* VIII 370-6.

104. Cf. SCHULZ, *Menschensohn*, 142; SCHWEIZER, υἱός, 370-3.

105. SCHWEIZER, υἱός, 356; E. LOHSE, υἱός, *TDNT* VIII 360f; JEREMIAS, *Prayers*, 37.

106. Published by J. A. FITZMYER, "The Contribution of Qumran Aramaic to the Study of the New Testament," *NTS* 20 (1974) 391-4. Fitzmyer reconstructs the text as follows:

[But your son] shall be great upon the earth. [O King! all (men) shall] make [peace] and all shall serve [him. He shall be called the son of] the [G]reat [God] and by his name shall he be named. He shall be hailed (as) Son of God and that shall call him Son of the Most High. As comets (flash) to the sight, so shall be their kingdom . . .

J. T. Milik (as reported by Fitzmyer, 392) suggests that the titles refer to the Seleucid king Alexander Balas (150-145 B.C.); Fitzmyer thinks it refers to an heir to the Davidic throne, while Hengel (*Son of God*, 45) suggests a collective interpretation (the Jewish people).

107. Against SUGGS, *Wisdom*, 92ff. Suggs, in a review of Robinson's article on "Jesus as Sophos and Sophia" argued that in Wis 2,10-5, the wise man as "son of God" is not recognized by the ungodly and that (presumably) this is a better parallel to 11,27 that Robinson (or the present author) thinks. Yet the "hiddenness' of the wise man (which is by no means obvious in Wis 2,10-18) is surely of a different order than that of Sophia or of Jesus as the 'son.' (see *Interpretation* 31 [1977] 206-7.)

Prayer of Joseph,[108] which has many contacts with sapiential and Philonic ideas,[109] Jacob-Israel appears as a pre-existent angelic being, a man seeing God, the first-born of all living things (πρωτόγονος παντὸς ζώου),[110] and the chief of the sons of God, who like Sophia, descends to earth. This description is remarkably similar to that of the Philonic Logos in Conf. Ling. 146. In Philo, the Logos is called αὐτοῦ λόγος καὶ πρωτόγονος υἱός (Agr. 51f.) while Wisdom is designated as the "daughter of God" and the "firstborn mother of all things" (Fug. 50ff; Quaest. in Gen 4,97), who is the "chiefest of all other things" (Fug. 51). Though it would be fruitless and indeed illegitimate to attempt a reconstruction of a single Jewish-Hellenistic "Revealer/Mediator" myth—of which Sophia and the Logos/Son of God were variants—one can see a Wisdom "trajectory" extending between OT Wisdom literature and Philo with numerous mythical configurations, which viewed Sophia as God's cohabitant (Wis 8,3f; 9,4), as his image (Wis 7,26; Conf. Ling. 147), later in the rabbis and Philo as "the daughter of God"[111] and alongside this, a corresponding masculine figure, with similar configurations, variously called "the Logos" and "the First-born Son of God." Within this "trajectory" was not only the titles, Son/Daughter of God, but also the notion of a divine figure who alone knows God and who alone reveals Him to man.

Although the apocalyptic Son of Man title may stand in the background of 11,27a, the υἱός-title of 27-b-d is best understood beside the Jewish-Hellenistic "Son of God" who, like the Jewish Sophia, has intimate knowledge of God and reveals it to men.[112] Thus in both the concept of knowledge/revelation and the title "Son," 11,27 has important contacts with the sapiential traditions of Hellenistic Judaism. What are the Christological implications of this?

3. *Wisdom Christology in Q*

We return to the initial question of whether Q contains a Wisdom Christology. Mt 11,25f. points to a community which prided itself in being the νήπιοι, who, paradoxically, were the recipients of revelation and by that very fact, the true "wise men" of Israel. Likewise, the Q community perceived itself as the πτωχοί (Mt 5,3 par)—to whom the Kingdom belonged—and probably as the children and messengers of Sophia (Lk 7,35), that is, the prophets (Lk 11,49) who stood in opposition to "this generation." Yet in Mt 11,25f. a Wisdom Christology—and indeed a Christology at all—is excluded both on formal and material grounds, though wisdom motifs appear there. Regarding 11,27, the decision is much more difficult. On one hand, Jesus appears in much the same role as Sophia: as the one unknown to man

108. Preserved in Origen, *Comm. in Joh.* II,31.

109. See J. Z. SMITH, "The Prayer of Joseph," *Religions in Antiquity*, ed. J. Neusner (Leiden: Brill, 1968) 253-94.

110. Cf. Ex 4,22 where Jacob is called υἱὸς πρωτογονός μου Ἰσραήλ.

111. Cf. BILLERBECK II 355f; III, 129ff.

112. I am not prepared to exclude entirely the possibility of purely Hellenistic influence in the absolute 'son' title. "Son of God" does appear as a name for the Logos in Poimandres (CH I,6). Nevertheless, a Jewish Hellenistic backgroung appears to account better for the title.

but known to the Father and as the one through whom God is known to man. The exclusivity of the Son's mediation of revelation distinguishes Jesus from a mere "wise man" or "son of God/righteous man" of the Wisdom tradition. On the other hand, 11,27 lacks perhaps the two most distinctive features of the Jewish Sophia/Logos: pre-existence[113] and the function of mediator of creation, while 27a implies the *transferral* of authority to Jesus—which is reminiscent of Son of Man traditions, but inconsequent with Wisdom traditions. But Jesus is clearly more than a τέκνον σοφίας, i.e., as a messenger of Wisdom, even the most important of her children. But it would be illegitimate to speak of an *identification* of Jesus and Wisdom since the word σοφία and the most distinctive attributes of Sophia do not appear in 11,27. What we have in 11,27 is neither an explicit Sophia-Christology nor a "messenger of Sophia" nor "wise man" Christology; rather, we are in the realm of "reflective mythology."

It is undoubtedly impossible to reconstruct a single "Wisdom myth" which collects and harmonizes the multitude of statements made of Sophia, as it is futile to seek a single *Sitz im Leben* for Jewish Wisdom. It was precisely what made it possible to speak of Wisdom so elusively and allusively that allowed Christian writers to appropriate sapiential language, shape it, and apply it to Jesus, all in the service of theology. V. 27 expresses in perhaps a more effective way than in earlier formulations that to know and follow Jesus is to know and obey God precisely because Jesus occupies the place of sole mediator of revelation. At the same time, the sapiential language and thought did not entirely displace other Christological traditions, for example, the Son of Man tradition, the remains of which are still visible in 11,27a. The appropriation of the mythic language of Wisdom—perhaps suggested by the sapiential motifs of 11,25f. and other Q passages—did not as such constitute an identification of Jesus with Sophia, but it allowed the development of an authentic Sophia Christology in later Christian tradition, in which Jesus appeared as pre-existent and as the creating Logos (Jn 1,1-18) and as the "image" and "first-born of all creation" (Col 1,15). The Christological reflection in Q—which takes its theological materials from the trajectory of reflective mythology associated with late Jewish Wisdom—was not so much a matter of reflection on the historical Jesus as on the present situation of the community: that it regarded itself as the true σοφοί, and that it believed itself to be, as the followers of Jesus, the true possessor of the revelation of God which leads to salvation. In this context, it was natural to speak of Jesus in terms of Divine Wisdom itself.[114]

113. Christ (*Jesus Sophia*, 91) states that although the notion of pre-existence is not explicitly mentioned in 11,27, "aber darin enthalten, dass der Sohn als die göttliche Weisheit in Person erscheint." Christ here as elsewhere too readily assumes an identification of Jesus with Sophia (e.g., in 11,26!) Consequently, his argumentation is often circular: if Jesus is Sophia, then pre-existence must be implicit in 11,27.

114. The author would like to express his thanks to Prof. Dr. Heinz Guenther and Prof. Dr. Joseph Plevnik for their criticisms and comments which have aided greatly in the revision of this paper.