

DIE GOTTESSCHAU IN DEN HYMNEN SYMEONS, DES NEUEN THEOLOGEN (949-1022)

Von

Dr. phil. DEMETRIOS L. STATHOPOULOS

II

b) Gott — die Schau (θεωρία) — der Mensch.

Nicht nur der Mensch verlangt danach, Gott zu schauen, sondern auch Gott selbst wünscht geschaut zu werden. «Der Herr lehnt es nicht ab, sich den Menschen durch seine göttliche Gnade zu offenbaren..., sondern freut sich darüber»¹¹⁹. Der Wunsch Gottes, geschaut zu werden, ist klar geworden durch seine Fleischwerdung. «Βλέπεις, sagt Gott, πόσον πόθον ἔχω / τοῦ ὁρᾶσθαι παρ' ἀνθρώπων ὡς καὶ ἄνθρωπον γενέσθαι / θελῆσαι καὶ ὁραθῆναι»¹²⁰, und ferner: «εἰ γὰρ μὴ ὁραθῆναι θέλω / τί καὶ ἐν σαρκὶ ἐφάνην, τί δὲ καὶ κατήλθον ὅλος / τί δὲ καὶ ὠράθην πᾶσι;»¹²¹.

Gerade für die gefallen Menschen, die durch das Verlieren ihrer Augen geistig blind geworden waren, ist er erschienen. Nachher wurde er nur von denen gesehen, die ihn lieben und die er darum wiederliebt¹²², wie und soviel es ihm gefällt¹²³. Sich zu zeigen, ist für Gott selbst nicht notwendig, sondern er tut es aus seiner gütigen und menschenfreundlichen Natur heraus. Die Antwort Gottes auf die Liebe des Menschen zu ihm ist von Symeon ausgezeichnet beschrieben worden: «...Wieder wird er dich erleuchten; wieder wird er dir den unerschöpflichen Reichtum und die unvergängliche Herrlichkeit seines väterlichen Antlitzes zeigen, und du wirst mit sehr grosser Freude erfüllt sein»¹²⁴.

Alle Güter im Leben des Menschen haben ihre Quelle in der Vorsehung Gottes¹²⁵, und der Mensch kann nichts Gutes ohne Gottes Hilfe

119. 34,187-189 (76B); vgl. die Einleitung, die Pontanus als ersten Hymnus übersetzt hat (Migne PG, 120, 509C): «Nunquam tu ab ullo te abscondisti, verum nos semper nosmet a te abscondimus, dum ad te venire nolumus».

120. cod. Par. fol. 240r

121. cod. Par. fol. 239r.

122. 8,203-206 (21B)

123. 22,103-104 (48B) und 39,223-225 (89B)

124. 11,108-111

125. 51,10 (120B)

vollbringen¹²⁶. Gott wirkt und sorgt für sein Geschöpf. Sein Blick ist immer auf es gerichtet, und gerade diesen Blick kann der Mensch sehen, wenn er durch den Geist Gottes dazu befähigt wird¹²⁷. «Ὡςπερ τὸ πρὶν δέδωκας ἰδεῖν τὸν κόσμον / καὶ τὸν ἥλιον καὶ τὸ φῶς τῆς ἡμέρας / οὕτω καὶ νῦν... φωτὶ ἐλλάμψαί σε τῷ τρισηλίῳ, / ὃ εἰ θεάσῃ, τότε γινώσκεις ἃ λέγω»¹²⁸.

1. Christus und die Schau. Die Mystik Symeons ist, wie gesagt, christozentrisch. Christus ist der Mittelpunkt bei der Schau Gottes. Die Fleischwerdung Christi ist die wirkliche Ercheinung Gottes auf Erden. Gott nimmt Leid an, und wir nehmen seine Gottheit an¹²⁹. Ohne das Erscheinen des Sohnes Gottes wäre die Gottesvorstellung Symeons eine völlig andere. Christus hat Gott in der Geschichte geöffnet: «Gott», sagt Symeon, «ist Mensch geworden und hat sich mit den Menschen vereinigt. Er nahm an der Menschheit teil und teilte allen, die an ihn glauben und den Glauben mit Werken verbinden, seine Gottheit mit»¹³⁰. Durch Adam ist der Tod in die Menschheit gekommen, so dass die Menschen bis Christi Erscheinen sterbliche Söhne Adams waren. Durch den zweiten Adam, Christus, sind die Menschen nicht mehr nur aus Erde geboren, sondern vom Himmel her unsterbliche «Söhne Christi». Die Ergebnisse der Teilnahme Gottes an der menschlichen Natur sind von entscheidender Bedeutung. Gott wurde dem Menschen gleich, jetzt soll der Mensch Gott gleich werden. Dieses Gott-ähnlich-werden ist eine *conditio sine qua non* der Schau. Ferner drückt Symeon die Bedeutung der Fleischwerdung Christi so aus: «ἐπέφανε τὸ μέγα φῶς τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος / ἡ βασιλεία οὐρανοῦ ἐπὶ γῆς κατήλθεν /, μᾶλλον δὲ ὁ Παμβασιλεὺς τῶν ἄνω, καὶ τῶν κάτω / ἐλήλυθεν. ἠθέλησεν ἡμῖν ὁμοιωθῆναι, / ἵν' ἐξ αὐτοῦ ὡς ἐκ φωτὸς πάντες μεταλαβόντες / φῶτα δεῖχθῶμεν δεύτερα, ὅμοιά γε τοῦ πρώτου, / καὶ βασιλείας οὐρανῶν κοινωνοὶ καὶ τῆς δόξης / συμμετοχοὶ ὑπάρξωμεν ὁμοῦ καὶ κληρονόμοι / τῶν αἰώνιων ἀγαθῶν»¹³¹. Auf dieselbe Weise, wie Gott Christus geboren hat, werden wir durch Christus geboren, werden gleichzeitig Söhne und Brüder Christi und können somit wie Christus Gott, den Vater, sehen¹³².

Wenn Christus Grund und Mittelpunkt für die Gottesschau ist, dann ist das sich wiederholende Abendmahl ihre Fortsetzung und Voll-

126. 47,199-200 (113A) — cod. Par. Hymus 54m Vv. 61-62

127. vgl. 14,120-125 (33A)

128. cod. Par. fol. 96v

129. 46,187-188 (108B)

130. 14,137-140 (32A)

131. 14,187-195 (34A)

132. cod. Par. 53,20-23

endung. Der sakramentale Charakter des Abendmahls ist dabei wesentlich. Die Augen des Menschen sollen vom Leib und Blut Christi genährt werden, d.h. um Gott zu sehen, muss man mit Gott selbst genährt werden¹³³. Dem Menschen wird durch das Abendmahl die Gottheit gänzlich und immerwährend vermittelt. Wenn er bewusst Leib und Blut Christi zu sich nimmt, nimmt er an dem Leben, bzw. der Inkarnation¹³⁴, der Heiligkeit, dem Leiden und der Auferstehung teil¹³⁵. Ohne diese persönliche und bewusste Teilnahme kann man Gott nie sehen. Zusammenfassend betont Symeon, dass der Mensch durch das Abendmahl folgendes erreicht¹³⁶.

1. Teilnahme an der Unsterblichkeit und Reinheit des Logos Gottes;
2. Reinheit von allen Lastern;
3. Loslösung von der Finsternis der Sünde;
4. Reinigung des Herzens;
5. Eingang in das Licht;
6. Gotteskindschaft;
7. Einigung mit der Gottheit;
8. das Erbe des Königreiches Gottes;
9. ewige Schau Gottes und
10. Vergöttlichung.

Einige der schönsten Teile in der mystischen Literatur sind wohl die folgenden Verse Symeons, in denen er die unaussprechliche Gotteinigung des Menschen in der Eucharistie zusammenfasst: «Σῶμα γὰρ τὸ σὸν τὸ ἄχραντον καὶ θεῖον / ἀσπράπτει ὅλον πυρὶ θεότητός σου / ἀναφύρα-
θὲν καὶ συμμιγὲν ἀρρήτως / τοῦτο οὖν κάμοι ἐδωρήσω Θεέ μου / τὸ γὰρ ῥυ-
παρόν, καὶ φθαρτὸν τοῦτο σκῆνος / τῷ παναχράντῳ ἐνωθὲν σῶματί σου /
καὶ μιγὲν τῷ αἵμά μου τῷ αἵματί σου / ἠνώθην οἶδα καὶ τῇ θεότητί σου / καὶ
γέγονα σὸν καθαρώτατον σῶμα / μέλος ἐκλάμπον, μέλος ἄγιον ὄντως»¹³⁷.
Durch den fortwährenden Kontakt mit Christus wächst der Mensch als Glied Christi, bis er vergöttlicht ist¹³⁸. Die Einverleibung des Menschen in Christus bedeutet, dass Christus in ihm Gestalt gewonnen

133. 36,9-16 (78A)

134. vgl. Holl, a.a.O.S.71: «Τὸ γοῦν μυστήριον τοῦτο (ἡ σάρκωσις) οὐ μόνον τῷ ῥηθέντι τρόπῳ γέγονεν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς Χριστοῦ ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐφ' ἐνὶ ἐκάστῳ τῶν πάσαι ἀγίων ἐγένετο καὶ μέχρι νῦν αἰεὶ γίνεται».

135. 15,59-60 (35B) und 13,74-78 (30B); vgl. auch Chap. 3,81

136. 39,22-29 (87A) und 49,25-36 (115B)

137. 28,7-16 (60B)

138. vgl. 15, 152-157 (bei Maas, S. 336)

hat¹³⁹, wodurch der Mensch zu absoluter Freiheit gelangt¹⁴⁰. Wenn man so frei geworden ist, muss man jedoch diese Freiheit zu bewahren suchen durch fortwährende Verbindung mit Christus¹⁴¹. Christi Leib ist der Weg zur Einigung mit Gott. Symeon preist Christus mit den schönsten Worten der Verehrung und Anbetung¹⁴². Der Geist des Menschen soll eine «Wohnstätte Christi» sein¹⁴³, und somit wird der Mensch zum «Hausgenossen Christi» und sein Tischgenosse. Der in uns wohnende Sohn Gottes, Christus, befähigt uns, mit ihm zusammen im Hause seines und unseres Vaters zu wohnen. Wer Christus empfängt, empfängt gleichzeitig alle drei Personen der Trinität, da in Christus der Vater und der Geist sind. Das endgültige «συμβασιλεύσαν» («Mit-König-Sein») des Menschen mit Christus¹⁴⁴ bedeutet die ewige und selige Teilnahme am Herrlichkeitmahl, d.h. am Leben der hl. Trinität¹⁴⁵.

2. Erscheinungen Gottes. Wenn der Mensch die vorher genannten Voraussetzungen erfüllt hat, wird Gott ihm allmählich erlauben, «ihn zu sehen»¹⁴⁶. «Καὶ καθαρθεῖσαν (τὴν ψυχὴν) τέλειον τοῦ φωτὸς τῇ ἐλλάμψει, ὅλος αὐτὸς ἐλεύσεται»¹⁴⁷. Die Dauer der Schau ist kurz, aber das Verlangen nach ihrer Wiederkehr ist jetzt heftiger geworden, und der Mensch wartet beharrlich darauf. «Μὴ εἴπῃς πῶς δύναμαι κοπιᾶν μέχρι τέλους, / καὶ κατοκνήσης, ὦ ψυχὴ, ἐκζητῶν τὸν Δεσπότην... / Κἂν μυριάκις ἄφαντος, τοσαυτάκις φανεῖς σοι γένηται... ἕως ἐμπνέεις ὅλως»¹⁴⁸. Wenn man durch die sich wiederholenden Erscheinungen des Lichtes bereit geworden ist, erscheint schliesslich Gott selbst¹⁴⁹.

Ein anderes Mal erscheint Gott nur dem Nous, «dem geistigen Sinn». So hört der Mensch zuerst die Stimme Gottes als Blitz, der zuletzt als «Feuerwolke» auf sein Haupt herniedersteigt¹⁵⁰.

Niemand unter den Menschen und Engeln hat je die Natur Gottes

139. 27,486 (59B); Gal 4,19

140. 14,209-210 (34A)

141. 20,112-118 (42A-B)

142. vgl. das Gebet zu Christus 50,1-23 (116A) und 3,1ff; 23,1ff; 27,123-140

143. vgl. 20,1-38 (40A-B)

144. 26,141 (80A)

145. 14,194f (34A). Über die Lehre Symeons vom hl. Geiste könnte man eine ganze Studie füllen. Vgl. besonders die Hymnen 23 u. 34

146. 11,101 (27B)

147. 11,139-140 (28A)

148. 11,124-125, 132, 134 (27B-28A)

149. 11,140 (28A)

150. vgl. 3,83-86 (13A)

gesehen¹⁵¹. «Aber es ist für den Menschen nicht zulässig, sie zu sehen»¹⁵², weil das Geschöpf dem Schöpfer nicht gleich ist. Die aber Gott lieben, sehen soviel, wie genug ist, ihn zu erkennen. Durch einen Strahl Gottes kann man so die ganze Gottheit sehen¹⁵³.

In Parallele zur Vision des hl. Stephanus¹⁵⁴ berichtet Symeon die folgende Vision: »In dieser Nacht und diesem Dunkel sehe ich Christus den Himmel öffnen und sich zu mir neigen, zusammen mit dem Vater und dem Geiste«¹⁵⁵. Und jedesmal entströmen Symeons Augen Tränen, weil er sich seiner Unreinheit bewusst wird¹⁵⁶.

Als er sich einmal in Dunkelheit befand, sagte er wiederholend zu Gott: «Erbarme dich meiner». Seine Stimme wird von Gott gehört, und die Zelle erfüllt sich mit dem Lichte. Der Mystiker zittert und sieht das Antlitz Gottes, dessen Schönheit ihn zum Staunen bringt. Er versucht, sein eigenes Gesicht zu verbergen, aber Gott nimmt ihn in seine Arme und küsst ihn vielmals¹⁵⁷.

Auch über eine Vision der Trinität berichtet Symeon im 32. Hymnus¹⁵⁸. Von ferne sieht er die «unsichtbare» Schönheit der Trinität.

In Einzelheiten berichtet er über eine Erscheinung der Hand Gottes¹⁵⁹. Einmal liegt der Mystiker auf dem Boden in grosser Sehnsucht nach der Schau Gottes. Da berührt Gott ihn mit seiner Hand. Der Mystiker öffnet seine bis dahin geschlossenen Augen und sieht diese Hand erstaunt vor sich, die heller als die Sonne strahlt. Er erhebt sich schnell, um die Hand zu ergreifen, die aber sofort verschwindet, worauf der Mystiker in tiefe Trauer versinkt. Er wälzt sich mit seinem Gesicht auf dem Boden. Er verlangt so sehr danach, die Hand Gottes wieder zu ergreifen. Gott streckt seine Hand wieder nach ihm aus, ihre Gegenwart ist jetzt noch herrlicher als vorher. Der Mystiker presst seine Lippen auf sie, und während er Gott für dieses unsagbare Geschenk dankt, entfernt sich die Hand zum zweiten Mal. Aber auch über diese Probe verzweifelt der Mystiker nicht. Das Warten auf das Wiedererscheinen der

151. 16,24-25 (36A); 42,62 (98B); 40,51 (90B)

152. 16,38 (36B)

153. vgl. 16,27-38 (36B)

154. Apg. 7,55-56

155. vgl. 32,34-38 (67B)

156. 23,29-39 (50B)

157. vgl. 8,212-271 (21B-22A)

158. Vv. 34-63 (67B-68A)

159. vgl. 46,87-150 (170B-108A)

Hand Gottes ist jetzt sein einziger Gedanke. Charakteristisch sind seine jetzigen Entscheidungen. Er verschliesst alle seine Sinne und fühlt sich der äusseren Welt gegenüber gestorben. Und so fühlt er, dass die Hand Gottes ihn führt und sich um ihn sorgt. Sie führt ihn empor, und, obwohl er ganz in Ruhe und Frieden verweilt, ist er tief in die Welt Gottes eingedrungen, und da er jetzt auf Gott orientiert ist, lässt ihn die Hand Gottes. Während der Erscheinung hat die Hand sich manchmal in eine Siegeskrone verwandelt, manchmal in eine Brust, die ihn mit der Milch der Ewigkeit ernährt, und einmal in ein Glas, aus dem ihm ewiger Trank zufliesst.

3. Nach der Schau. Wer Gott gesehen hat, erfährt eine Umgestaltung. Er hat neue Sinne und weitere Fähigkeiten über die natürlichen hinaus gewonnen¹⁶⁰. Der Nous des Menschen ist Nous Gottes geworden.

Betrachten wir jetzt die Situation des Menschen nach jeder Erscheinung Gottes. In Gestalt einer Feuerwolke, die sich auf sein Haupt senkt, bringt Gott ihn zu Bewunderung und Zufriedenheit. Diese Gestalt hat Vorbereitungscharakter; sie verbrennt alle Leidenschaften. Die Erscheinung Christi¹⁶¹ öffnet das blinde Auge des menschlichen Nous, so dass es befähigt wird, die Trinität im Lichte zu sehen. Der Mystiker fürchtet jetzt, von der brennenden Gottheit wie eine Kerze eingeschmolzen zu werden. Gleichzeitig möchte er die Schau nicht aus seinen Augen verlieren. Der Gegenstand der Schau ist jedoch nicht oben, wohin er sieht, sondern in seinem Herzen. Wenn er den Gegenstand seiner Liebe nirgendwo mehr sieht, zieht er vor zu sterben und fühlt sich schon im Grabe.

Christus erscheint zu Anfang als Stern, und wenn dann der Nous als Sonne, die ihn umgibt und bedeckt, erweitert ist, findet er seine Befreiung und Freiheit. «...καὶ κατεπίπλαμαι χαρᾶς, ἀφ'αυτοῦ θυμηδίας /... καὶ πάντων τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ὅλως ἀλλοτριῶμαι»¹⁶². Nachher lobpreist er Gott. Aus der Welt der Traurigkeit, Bitterkeit und der Gegensätze ist er jetzt dort, wo er weder «Kummer» noch «Schmerz» empfindet.

Von den vielen Tränen reingewaschen, erscheint ihm Gott. Der Mystiker lebt in vollkommener Harmonie, die sich jedoch auflöst, wenn er in den Kosmos zurückkehrt. Den aus der Schau gewonnenen Reichtum kann man durch nichts Irdisches ersetzen¹⁶³.

160. 12,33-45 (29A)

161. 32,64-94 (68A-B)

162. 23,45-51 (50B)

163. vgl. 11,109-166 (27B-28B)

Die Erscheinung Gottes als Hand wird als «unaussprechliches Geschenk und grosse Gnade Gottes» bezeichnet. Der Mystiker ergreift die Hand und folgt ihr mit Bereitwilligkeit und grosser Freude. Die Nahrung, die er durch diese Hand empfängt, ist «Leib» und «Blut» Gottes, die ihn unsterblich machen durch die Kommunion seiner Gottheit¹⁶⁴.

Das Hinabsteigen Gottes macht die Dunkelheit vergehen und schenkt den Wunden des Menschen Heilung. «Ich bin», sagt der Mystiker, «entzückt von deiner Schönheit und Liebe». Wenn er sich im Bewusstsein seiner Schwachheit verbergen will, nimmt Gott ihn in seine Arme und küsst ihn. Symeon ruft aus: « $\tau\omega$ ἀνάβασις, ὃ θέωσις, ὃ πλοῦτος, ὃ λαμπρότης ἀφραστός!...»¹⁶⁵.

Die «πανάγαθος θέα» Gottes ist die Quelle «aller Güter», die unmittelbar mit ihr verbunden sind¹⁶⁶. Die Schau ist das Ende und die Erfüllung «aller Herrlichkeit», weil sie den Menschen nicht nur den Engeln gleichmacht, sondern vielleicht grösser als sie¹⁶⁷.

Durch die Schau wird der Mensch aus der Welt herausgeführt, wo er «einsam angesichts des Einsamen» steht. «Τὰ δὲ ἐν αὐτῇ (τῇ θεωρίᾳ) σιωπάσθω, / ἀμυδρῶς καὶ γὰρ ὁρῶνται καὶ ποσῶς κατανοοῦνται»¹⁶⁸. Die einzige und vollkommene Freude im ganzen Leben des Mystikers ist gerade diese Schau, die ihn direkt zur Erkenntnis Gottes führt.

Der Mystiker kann sich das Wie der Erscheinung nicht erklären¹⁶⁹. Die Schau liegt jenseits aller sprachlichen Mittel und des Verstandes. Im Augenblick der Schau befindet sich der Mystiker «τοῦ κόσμου ἔξωθεν»¹⁷⁰. Es ist unmöglich zu bestimmen, woher Gott kommt¹⁷¹, da er nicht räumlich beschränkt ist. Ebenso ist ungewiss «...ποῦ ὑπάρχει, πόσος ἔστι, ποταπὸς δε»¹⁷². Er ist zugleich innerhalb und ausserhalb des Alls¹⁷³. Das geistige Auge des Menschen trifft das Auge Gottes auf geheimnisvolle Weise, die man nicht mit zeitlichen und räumlichen Vorstellungen definieren kann. Die Form der Schau an sich ist unerklärlich. Sie

164. 46,87-154 (107B-108A)

165. 8,265-266 (22A)

166. 27,160-163 (59A)

167. 49,23-24 (115B); vgl. auch 8,207-208; cod. Par. 21,17-19

168. 41,211-212 (96A-B)

169. vgl. 1,120-212 (4A); 24,80 (53B): οὐτε κατανοήσασθαι τὸν θεωρίας τρόπον, τὸ πῶς... ὁρᾶται». Chap. 2,11-13.

170. vgl. 24,84-85 (53B)

171. vgl. 22,68-69 (47B)

172. 1,208-209 (4A)

173. vgl. cod. Par. 59r.

ist eine innere erlebnisvolle Wirklichkeit. Symeon sagt: «ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ μου βλέπω»¹⁷⁴ und «ἐντός μου ὅλον καθορῶ τὸν ποιητὴν τοῦ κόσμου»¹⁷⁵. Wer Gott sieht, verspürt in sich die Sicherheit, dass er gleichzeitig auch von ihm gesehen wird. Die Schau ist nie einseitig, d.h. die Blicke Gottes und des Menschen begegnen einander. Gott wird nicht als etwas Lebloses verstanden, wie z. B. der «αἰσθητὸς ἥλιος», den man zwar sieht, von dem man selbst aber unmöglich gesehen wird¹⁷⁶. Gott selbst lenkt die Augen des würdigen Menschen auf sich, da er sich zuerst dem Menschen zuneigt. Für den erfahrenen Mystiker ist die Schau etwas Konkretes: «Sie ist nichts Illusorisches oder eine blosser Vorstellung des Nous und kein Trugbild des menschlichen Geistes, sondern eine wahre Wirklichkeit, ein göttliches und furchteinflössendes Geschehen, in Erfüllung des Planes Gottes. Durch die Schau wird die Entfernung zwischen Gott und Mensch aufgehoben»¹⁷⁷. «Τὰ τελούμενα ὁ νοῦς ὁρᾷ, οὐχ ἐρμηνεύει. / Βλέπει καὶ βούλεται εἰπεῖν, καὶ λόγον οὐχ εὐρίσκει. / Ἄδρατα γὰρ καθορᾷ, ἀνείδεα εἰς ἅπαν, / ἀπλᾶ πάντα ἄσύνθετα, ἅπειρα τῷ μεγέθει, / οὔτε ἀρχὴν γὰρ καθορᾷ, οὐ τέλος ὅλως βλέπει. / Μέσσην δὲ πάντῃ ἀγνοεῖ, καὶ πῶς εἶπη τί βλέπει; Ἀνακεφαλαιούμενον ὅλον δοκῶ, ὁρᾶται / οὐ τῇ οὐσίᾳ πάντως δέ, ἀλλὰ τῇ μετουσίᾳ»¹⁷⁸.

Dass die Schau auch im diesseitigen Leben stattfindet, wird von Symeon vielfach betont: «οὐ μόνον ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι... / ἀλλὰ καὶ νῦν ἐν σώματι τοὺς ὄντας σου ἀξίους, / ἡγουν καθάραντας αὐτοὺς διὰ τῆς μετανοίας / ὁρᾷς, ὁρᾷν σε δὲ τρανῶς κἀκείνους ἐμπαρέχεις»¹⁷⁹.

Die Lage des Menschen als Geschöpf dem Schöpfer — Gott gegenüber wird von Symeon mit den folgenden vier Versen ausdrücklich bezeichnet: «ἐθαύμασα, ἐξέστην, ἐφοβήθην, ἐχάρην»¹⁸⁰. Soviel der Mensch sich auch immer vorbereitet und reinigt, ist er dennoch von der absoluten Heiligkeit und Reinheit Gottes weit entfernt, und so schliesst er manchmal seine Augen: »βλέπειν οὐκ ἰσχύω σε, καὶ μὴ βλέπειν οὐ φέρω»¹⁸¹. Angesichts der Schau beurteilt er sich selbst und wird gerichtet. Auf diese Weise kommt er zur Erkenntnis der menschlichen Natur und erkennt klar, dass alles, was er tut, von der Schau erfasst ist¹⁸². Der

174. 39,39 (87A)

175. 6,77 (18A) vgl. cod. Par. fol. 58v.

176. Chap. 2,24-25

177. 3,22-26 (12B)

178. 27,22-29 (57A-B)

179. 3,18-21 (12B)

180. 1,206 (4A)

181. 14,75 (32A)

182. vgl. cod. Par. fol. 57v-58r

schwache Mensch erstarkt und findet die Rechtfertigung seiner Existenz durch die Schau. Ferner bekräftigt die Schau das Bewusstsein des in jedem Menschen wohnenden Gottes¹⁸³.

c) Die Ergebnisse der Schau: 1) Die Erkenntnis Gottes.

Geht der Erkenntnis Gottes die Liebe voraus oder ist es umgekehrt?¹⁸⁴ Bei Symeon ist beides der Fall. Einmal gehen Schau und Erkenntnis der Liebe voraus, ein andermal folgen Schau und Erkenntnis auf die Liebe. Die Gottesliebe macht Gott dem liebenden Menschen »ὁπτικόν«¹⁸⁵. In dem Augenblick, in dem der Mensch Gott liebt, ist es notwendig für ihn zu wissen, dass er von Gott erkannt wird. Die Antwort auf diese Frage jedoch erhält er durch Gottes Erscheinung. «'Αλλ' οὐχὶ πάντας, οὓς ὁρᾷς καὶ γινώσκεις, Θεέ μου, / ἀλλὰ τοὺς ἀγαπῶντάς σε μόνους φιλῶν γινώσκεις, / καὶ κατ' ἐξαίρετον αὐτοῖς σεαυτὸν ἐμφανίζεις»¹⁸⁶.

Wir würden eher sagen, dass die Liebe zu Gott der Erkenntnis vorausgeht: sie beendet ihre Rolle aber nicht mit der Schau, sondern sie besteht weiter, ist jetzt vollendet. In der Mitte der Liebe zu Gott steht die Erkenntnis. Im folgenden Vers gehen Schau und Erkenntnis seiner Liebe voraus: «οἱ δὲ τῆς θεᾶς τῆς αὐτοῦ καὶ φωτὸς μετασχόντες / γνωσθέντες καὶ γνωρίσαντες αὐτὸν πῶς μὴ ποθῶσιν;»¹⁸⁷. Derselbe Gedanke wiederholt sich auch im folgenden Vers: «τὸν δὲ τὸν πάντων ποιητὴν, τὸν ἀθάνατον μόνον, / τὸν πάντα πᾶσι δυνατόν, τίς ἰδὼν οὐ ποθήσει;»¹⁸⁸. Wenn Schau und Erkenntnis mit der Liebe verbunden sind, kann der Mensch jenseits von Glaube und Hoffnung¹⁸⁹ sein.

Die Schau führt den Menschen zur Erkenntnis Gottes. Aus dem Zustand der *ἀγνοσία* der als Blindheit und Gottesferne bezeichnet wird, tritt der Mensch nun in die Sphäre der Erleuchtung (*φωτισμός*) und Herrlichkeit (*δόξα*). Der Mensch hat nach seinem Fall die Fähigkeit der Schau Gottes und infolgedessen seiner Erkenntnis verloren. Vor dem Fall, sagt Gott «ἐβλεπε θεότητός μου / δόξαν ὁ Ἀδὰμ καὶ ἔζη / παραβάς ἀπετυφλώθη / καὶ εὐθὺς ἀπενεκρώθη»¹⁹⁰. Und ferner: «τοῦτο γὰρ

183. cod. Par. fol. 58v.

184. Chap. 1,33

185. 2,172 (8A)

186. 4,3-5 (15A)

187. 4,83-84 (16A)

188. 4,79-80 (16A)

189. 53,36 (124A)

190. cod. Par. 53,93-94.

ζωή τὸ σὲ γινώσκειν μόνον»¹⁹¹. Der Nichterkennende steht mit den Tieren auf gleicher Stufe und ist sogar noch niedriger als sie. Durch die Fleischwerdung Gottes findet der Mensch seine verlorenen Augen wieder. Die ganze Menschheit hat durch diese Gnade Gottes die Fähigkeit, Gott zu sehen und ihn zu erkennen, wiedergewonnen. «Πάντως δ' οὐ πάντες», sagt Symeon, «ἐπέγνωμεν τὴν χάριν, / οὐ τὴν ἔλλαμψιν, οὐ μέθεξιν, οὐδ' ὅτι / οὕτως ἐγεννήθημεν, μόλις δὲ τοῦτο / τῶν χιλίων εἷς, εἴτε καὶ τῶν μυρίων / ἐν τῇ μυστικῇ ἐπέγνω θεωρίᾳ»¹⁹². Die anderen sind einem Toten zu vergleichen, dem es gleichgültig ist, ins Wasser oder ins Feuer geworfen zu werden¹⁹³.

«Τίς γὰρ τὸν κτίστην γνώσεται πρὶν ἢ τὸν κτίστην ἴδοι;»¹⁹⁴. Durch das Wunder der Schau ist es dem Menschen möglich, zur Erkenntnis Gottes zu kommen. Die innere Erleuchtung des Menschen kommt unmittelbar vom Antlitz Gottes¹⁹⁵. Wie weit kann man nach Symeons Lehre Gott erkennen? Die Erkenntnis des Schöpfers durch das Geschöpf würde es über den Schöpfer stellen¹⁹⁶. Die menschliche Natur ist beschränkt. Sie kann nur das, was ihr erlaubt ist, ertragen. Es sind ihr bestimmte Grenzen gesetzt. Symeon sagt, dass letztlich nur Gott sich selbst kennt, ebenso sein Sohn und sein Geist, da sie wesensgleich sind¹⁹⁷. Was der Mystiker von Gott weiss, ist wegen der sprachlichen Unzulänglichkeiten nicht mitteilbar. Die Sprache kann nie vermitteln, was in persönlicher Erfahrung gewonnen wurde¹⁹⁸. Meistens sind die Worte Schauen und Sehen von dem Wort Erkennen begleitet. «Ich sah ihn und habe ihn wirklich erkannt»¹⁹⁹. Weiter teilt er nichts mit.

2) Die Gotteinigung.

Die Bedeutung der Schau im Diesseits für das Jenseits ist entscheidend für seine Auffassung der Gotteinigung und Vergöttlichung des Menschen. Wenn der Mensch «blind» aus dem diesseitigen Leben geht, tritt er auch so in die Finsternis ein und bleibt für immer von dem Lichte Gottes getrennt. Diese ewige Trennung wird als «furcht-

191. 28,77 (61A)

192. 46,155-159 (108A)

193. 46,162-163 (108A)

194. vgl. 51,42 (121A)

195. 51,11-15 (120B)

196. cod. Par. 21,114-118

197. 22,94-95 (48A)

198. 22,115-123 (48B)

199. 21,37 (43B)

bare und unerträgliche Traurigkeit» bezeichnet²⁰⁰. Mit Gott auf ewig vereint sein werden nur die, die ihm auf Erden gleich geworden sind²⁰¹. Die Schau Gottes im Jenseits ist eine selbstverständliche Fortsetzung der Schau Gottes im Diesseits²⁰². Im Jenseits kann man nicht mehr die Voraussetzungen für die Schau Gottes erfüllen; der Tod jedes Menschen ist ein Abschluss, nach dem man nichts mehr tun kann, weder Böses noch Gutes²⁰³. Der hl. Symeon betont, dass wir vor dem Tode uns durch die Schau Gottes mit ihm vereinigen sollen. «Σπουδάσωμεν οὖν ἀδελφοί, σπουδάσωμεν πρὸ τέλους, / προσκολληθῆναι τῷ Θεῷ»²⁰⁴, «πᾶς τόπος ἀνέσεως ὁ Θεός ἐστι μόνος»²⁰⁵. Symeon legt die folgenden Worte in den Mund Christi: «πρὸ τοῦ χωρισθῆναι ἐκ τοῦ σώματος σοὶ λέγω / βλέπε τὰς εὐεργεσίας, βλέπε τὴν οἰκονομίαν / μάνθανε τὰς δωρεάς μου, ἐφάνέρωσα τῷ κόσμῳ / ἐμαυτὸν καὶ τὸν πατέρα»²⁰⁶. So wird der Mensch den Herrn in Herrlichkeit kommen sehen²⁰⁷, wird auf ewig mit ihm vereint sein und ihn schauen.

Hier können wir wohl folgendes über den Begriff der Theologie nach der Lehre Symeons und ihre Beziehung zur Gottesschau bemerken: Nur der θεωρὸς (contemplator) kann Gottaussager, d.h. Theologe sein, weil er erleuchtet (ἐλλαφθεῖς, φωτισθεῖς)²⁰⁸ ist; und er allein ist würdig, den Namen «Theologe» oder «μύστης τῶν ἀρρήτων»²⁰⁹ zu tragen. Der Schauende erlangt durch die Schau das Charisma, «Diener, Priester und Myste des Leibes Christi»²¹⁰ zu sein. Das Wesen der Theologie ist ein ständiger Dialog der einander Liebenden, des Menschen und Gottes, im Bereich der Schau. Wer an diesem Dialog wirklich teilnimmt, heisst echter Theologe. In den Hymnen Symeons bilden die drei Begriffe: Theoria, Heiligkeit, Theologia eine Einheit, die das Wesen des christlichen Lebens ist.

Der Triumph der Liebe zu Gott und das erfolgreiche Ende aller Bestrebungen des Mystikers auf Erden besteht in seinem Miteingeschlossenensein im ewigen Leben Gottes. Diese seine Teilnahme an Gott

200. vgl. 27,75-92 (58A) und Vv. 160-163 (130A)

201. 20,90-92 (42A) und 34,193-195

202. 52,54-57 (123A)

203. 27,75-77 (58A)

204. 14,177-178 (33B)

205. 14,171 (33B)

206. cod. Par. 53,151-154.

207. 14,127 (33A)

208. vgl. 42,99-100 (99A); Chap. 2,1

209. vgl. 47,86-94 (111B); Chap. 2,6

210. 39,62 (87B) und 175f (89Af)

ist die Verklärung des Menschen; der Mensch ist durch Adoption und Gnade («θέσει καὶ χάριτι») ²¹¹ Gott geworden. Die Vereinigung und Vergöttlichung des Menschen ist Aufgehen, keine Auflösung der Persönlichkeit ²¹² in der Gottheit — jeder wird wie ein Licht gleich dem Ersten leuchten ²¹³ —, sondern sie ist real, persönlich und immer durch Christus verwirklicht. Der Gotteinigung geht die Gottähnlichkeit voraus: «εἰ γὰρ μὴ τοιοῦτοι ὦμεν (οἷοι καὶ ἐκεῖνος) / ὅμοιοι ἐν ἀκριβείᾳ, πῶς ἐσόμεθα ἐκεῖνω / ἡνωμένοι;...» ²¹⁴. Die Gotteinigung wird als innerlich, vollständig, reichlich, allgemein, tief und persönlich verstanden ²¹⁵. In einem anderen Vers ist sie durch diese vier Adjektive «αἰσθητῶς καὶ νοερώς, οὐσιωδῶς καὶ πνευματικῶς» ²¹⁶ ausgedrückt. Aus dieser Unio ergibt sich für den Gottliebenden folgendes:

1. Er wird der Gemeinschaft der Heiligen und Gerechten zugezählt ²¹⁷.
2. Er nimmt an der Unsterblichkeit ²¹⁸ und am Herrlichkeitsmahl teil.
3. Er wird ein strahlendes Glied des göttlichen Leibes ²¹⁹.
4. Wie Christus die menschliche Natur annahm, so hat er jetzt die göttliche gewonnen ²²⁰, d.h. «Ende aller Übel» und «Finden aller Güter» ²²¹.
5. Seine Liebe zu Gott ist jetzt unbegrenzt, während sein Glaube an ihn und seine Hoffnung auf ihn ihre Rolle beendet haben. Er ist somit für die Auferstehung bereit ²²².
6. Vergöttlichung: «Θεὸς καὶ γὰρ γίνομαι τε τῇ ἐνώσει τῇ ἀφράστῳ» ²²³.

211. vlg. Chap. 1,65.

212. 1,214 (4A-B)

213. 17,105 (38B)

214. 34,193-195 (76B)

215. vgl. 7,24-28 (18B); 22,24 (47B)

216. 1,234 (4B). Das Wort «αἰσθητῶς» bezieht sich auf die Sakramente der Kirche; vgl. 1,236: «αἰσθητὴν δὲ (ἐνώσειν) τὴν τῶν μυστηρίων λέγω».

217. 20,9-12 (40B-41A); Chap. 3,4

218. 17,50-55 (37B)

219. 28,1f (60B)

220. 44,144-148 (33A)

221. 14,205-206 (34A)

222. vgl. Hymnus 17 (37A-38B)

223. 1,239 (4B)

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE TERM "SON OF GOD, IN ST. PAUL, THE OLD TESTAMENT, THE HELLENISTIC WORLD AND IN PHILO.

2. THE SON OF GOD IN THE O. TESTAMENT AND IN ST. PAUL

BY

BASIL TSAKONAS, Doctor of Philosophy

The idea of the «Son of God» outside Paul and the Gospels also occurs in the Old Testament and the Hellenistic world. There are also some references to this idea in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament. Among these areas we have to look for any possible connection with St. Paul. It is necessary to examine the application of the religious ideas of the «Son of God» first in the Old Testament and the Apocrypha and secondly, in the Hellenistic world and try to draw the line of connection between St. Paul and these two areas respectively. The necessity of this comparison is obvious. Did Paul use the term as it was used in the Old Testament or in the Hellenistic world? Did he give the title the same meaning which it had in the above-mentioned religious spheres? If not, what is Paul's contribution to this conception and how far did he go from the Old Testament and Hellenistic usage of the term? In this chapter we shall compare Paul and the Old Testament; the next chapter will be left for the study of Paul's usage of the title «Son of God» and that of the Hellenistic world.

In the Old Testament, the title «Son of God» is used in three main ways¹. It denotes the People of Israel as the People of the Covenant. In Ex. 4:22, Israel is called the first-born Son¹. The term occurs most in Isaiah and Jeremiah. In Isaiah 4:2, the usage of the title indicates the relationship which exists between God and His chosen people. This relationship is brought forth by God who has given birth and has exalted the people of Israel, but the people have violated God. «Υἱοὺς ἐγέννησα καὶ ὑψώσα, αὐτοὶ δὲ με ἠθέτησαν» (cf. 30:1 «τέκνα ἀποστάται»).

The language used here is figurative; it refers to the event of the Covenant between God and Israel. The picture is symbolic. The verb γεννῶ in the Greek language is used of man, never of woman; the verb τίττειν is used of woman. (Matt. 1:21; 23,25; Luke 1:31,57; 2:6,7,11; John 16:21; Gal. 4:27.) The verb is also used in a spiritual sense espe-

1. cf. Assumption of Moses 1:12, where the תּוֹרָה is the first-born. For the Messiah, see Ps. 89:27-28. In Philo the Logos (word) is called πρωτόγονος-πρεσβυτάτος. (De Conf. ling. 63, 146; De Agric. 51; De Somniis 215). Ps. of Solomon 18:4.

cially in Paul and John. (I Cor. 4:15; John 1:13; 3:3,3,4,5,6,7,8; I John 2:29; 3:9) It is also used of Christ's proceeding from the Father (I John 5:1); the act of God separating the chosen people from all the other nations is denoted by the verb ὑψῶ — to raise, to lift, to separate. (cf. Luke 1:52; Phil. 2:9). The verb is also used in the meaning of glorifying, exalting (δοξάζειν)¹, or both ὑψῶ (הָרַף) and δοξάζειν (כָּבַד) together². The break of the Covenant between God and His people is stressed by the usage of the verb ἀθετῶ. The verb is a compound one: ἀ — θέτω (τίθημι plus the negative particle). Its specific usage in connection with the Covenant is obvious even in the New Testament, in which not only the verb but also the noun is used (ἀθέτησις)³. In its classical usage, the verb has a legal meaning: to set at naught a treaty, a promise, to deny, to disprove⁴. In the Old Testament the word is used in both meanings—classical and religious⁵. So the idea of Sonship is here based on the concept of the Covenant made between God and His people. It is a relationship of the people's dependence on and obedience to God. On that ground, the prosperity of the people is based⁶. In Isaiah also the idea of the Sonship of Israel depends on the fact that God knows His people well, and that God's name is with the people from the beginning⁷.

The idea of the creation of Israel by God also determines the fatherhood-sonship (Is. 45:11). In Jeremiah, Ephraim is called υἱὸς ἀγαπητὸς to God.—The idea here is established on the fact that Ephraim is obedient to God and keeps His words⁸. The ἀγαπητὸς emphasized the concept of Sonship. The word itself is found many times in the Old Testament¹ and occurs also in the New Testament, especially in the Synoptics, as an appellation for Christ¹⁰, and in Paul by whom it is attributed to Christians¹¹. In another form the word ἀγαπημένος¹² occurs once

1. Acts 5:31, «Τοῦτον ὁ Θεὸς ἀρχηγὸν καὶ σωτῆρα ὑψώσεν τῇ δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ». (cf. 2:33, 36; 7:32).

2. Is. 4:2.

3. Luke 10:16; Gal. 3:15; I Thess. 4:8; Hebr. 7:18.

4. Mostly in Polybius 8:36.5; 9:36.10.

5. Ps. 131:11; cf. Jer. 3:10; 15:16; Ezek. 22:26; Dan. (LXX) 3:28 (15).

6. Ps. 131:12.

7. 63:16.

8. 31:20.

9. Gen. 22:2,12; Ps. 83:1. Is. 5:1.

10. Matt. 3:17; 17:5; Mark 4:11; Luke 3:22; cf. II Peter 1:17.

11. Rom. 1:7; 12:19; I Cor. 4:14; 10:14; II Cor 7:11; Eph. 5:1; Phil. 4:1; I Tim.

6:2.

12. cf. Ps. 28:6. The word occurs in the Apostolic Fathers more than once of our Lord. Ignat. Smyrn. inscr., Clem. of Rom: 5:9; Epistle Barn. 3.

in Paul, referring to Christ (Eph. 1:6) expressing the uniqueness in Jesus' Son—relationship analogue to that of ἀγαπητός in the Synoptics¹. 'Αγαπητός also is very closely related to the μονογενής (Julius Pollux the Lexicographer, second century A. D.; Onomasticon: 111:2: «Καλοῖτο ἂν υἱὸς ἀγαπητός ὁ μόνος ὢν πατρὶ ἢ μητρί· ὥσπερ καὶ ἀγαπητὴ θυγάτηρ καὶ μονογενὴς καθ' Ἡσίοδον»²).

Outside the Gospels the words ἀγαπητός and μονογενής are found in the Pseudepigrapha. In the Ascension of Isaiah, a book written about the second century or the latter part of the first century A. D., and being in its present form of Christian origin³, both terms occur in the sense of the «only son» or «only begotten» (in the metaphysical meaning of the world)⁴. The word ἀγαπητός is found in a Trinitarian form given in the text (2:4, «τὴν τε πατρικὴν δόξαν καὶ τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ πνεύματος.» (cf. 3:13.) Plato attributes both appellations (μονογενής — ἀγαπητός) to the universe: «Πλάτων αὐτῷ δεῖ φησι δοκεῖν ἓνα τοῦτον (τὸν κόσμον) εἶναι μονογενῇ τῷ Θεῷ καὶ ἀγαπητῷ»⁵. In the Jewish wisdom literature μονογενής is the main characteristic of the Divine wisdom. «ἔστιν ἐν αὐτῇ πνεῦμα νοερὸν, ἅγιον, μονογενές». (Wisdom of Sol. 7:22) In the Hermetic writings (56) the attribute μονογενής is ascribed to the Logos. «Ὁρκίζω σε, οὐρανέ, Θεοῦ μεγάλου σοφοῦ ἔργον, ὀρκίζω σε, φωνὴν πατρός, ἣν ἐφθέγξατο πρώτην ἡνίκα τὸν πάντα κόσμον ἐστηρίξατο, ὀρκίζω σε κατὰ τοῦ μονογενοῦς αὐτοῦ λόγου».

1. G. Schrenk, εὐδοκέω-a, Kittel, op. cit., II 738; F. R. Fuller, The Mission and Achievement of Jesus, in Studies in Biblical Theology, XII (1954), 87; Arndt and Gingrich, op. cit., sub. ἀγαπητός; Cullmann, op. cit., 294; W. Zimmerli and J. Jeremias «The Servant of God» in Studies in Biblical Theology, XX (1957), 95.

2. Homer Od. 2:365, «μόνος ὢν ἀγαπητός»; cf. Judith (LXX) 11:34, «Αὕτη μονογενὴς αὐτῷ ἀγαπητή» Philo.; Ebr. «μόνος καὶ ἀγαπητός υἱός»; «ταῦτόν ἐστι τὸ μονογενές καὶ ἀγαπητόν» (Athanasius).

3. J. Hastings Dictionary of the Bible, ed. F. C. Grant and H. H. Rowley (New York: Scribner's, 1963), p. 822.

4. A. Harnack, in his Das Apostolische Glaubensbekenntnis (Berlin: A. Haack 1892), pp. 20-22, contends that when Christ is called «the Son» or «the only Begotten Son» it does not claim for Him a pre-existent sonship but limits its view to His incarnate life and that after Nicaea these words came to be unanimously believed by the Church to refer to the pre-historic and eternal sonship of Christ. But this is not correct because even the Valentinians recognized in the Monogenes (μονογενής) of the forth Gospel a pre-historic Being. 2) It is equally certain that when the Church began to use the word in reference to our Lord, she used it in this sense.

5. Tim. 31B. Critias 113b.

The Father-Son relationship is also pre-eminent in the book of Malachias (1:6: «υἱὸς δοξάσει πατέρα καὶ δοῦλος Κύριον αὐτοῦ· καὶ εἰ Πατὴρ εἰμὶ ἐγώ, ποῦ ἔστιν ἡ δόξα μου»;

The idea of the Sonship derives from the relation which exists between God and Israel. God is the creator (2:10: «Οὐχὶ Θεὸς ὃς ἔκτισεν ὑμᾶς»);). As creator, He is the father of all things (2:10: «Οὐχὶ πατὴρ εἷς πάντων ὑμῶν»);), and the ruler over all (3:6: «Ἐγὼ Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς ἡμῶν καὶ οὐκ ἡλλοίωμαι»).

In the writings of the same prophet, the idea of covenant on which the Father-Son relationship is based prevails (3:7, 16, 17). Finally, the relationship between God and Israel in its father-son relationship is established on a moral and social basis. Israel is the son of God not only because it is created and chosen by Him, but also because it expresses and fulfills in its everyday life the divine attributes of justice (δικαιοσύνη) or charity (φιλανθρωπία) or love (ἀγάπη). (cf. Ecclesiast. 4:10: «Καὶ ἔσῃ ὡς υἱὸς ὑψίστου καὶ ἀγαπήσει σε μᾶλλον ἢ ἡ μήτηρ σου»). (cf. Ps. 81:6; cf. Luke 6:36: «Γίνεσθε οὖν οἰκτίρμονες καθὼς καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἡμῶν οἰκτίρμων ἐστίν»). So Israel is called the Son of God because it is created by Him, chosen by Him to become the elect people, and destined to become like God in all the divine attributes which are attainable by it. Also he is called «Son of God» because of the absolute obedience which he owes to Him¹.

2. The King of Israel is also called «Son of God». In II Sam. 7:14; Ps. 2:7; 89:25, this name is given to him. The King is the Son of God, «υἱὸς Θεοῦ», because (a) God has chosen him (Ps. 2:7): «Ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά Σε»; v. 6: «Ἐγὼ κατεστάθην βασιλεὺς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ» cf. 89:28). b) The King represents God on earth (Ps. 2:8-9). c) The King, as the People of Israel, keeps and preserves the Covenant and proclaims the commandments of God (Ps. 2:7: «Διαγγέλλων τὸ πρόσταγμα Κυρίου» cf. Ps. 89:29: «Εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα φυλάξω αὐτῷ τὸ ἔλεός μου καὶ διαθήκη μου πιστὴ αὐτῷ»). d) He owes absolute obedience to God; he has to trust God and to accept Him as his own Savior (Ps. 89:28: «Αὐτὸς ἐπικαλέσεται με: Πατὴρ μου εἰ Σὺ, Θεὸς μου καὶ ἀντιλήπτωρ τῆς σωτηρίας μου» cf. Ps. 20:1-3; 19:10). e) The power, the authority, and the success of the king are derived from God (Ps. 2:8: «αἶτησαι παρ' ἐμοῦ καὶ δώσω σοι ἔθνη τὴν κληρονομίαν σου καὶ τὴν κατάσχεσίν σου τὰ πέρας τῆς γῆς»). f) As Son, the King is the first-born of God (Ps. 89:27-28: «Κἀγὼ πρωτότοκον θῆ-

1. Cullmann, Christology of the New Testament, p. 273.

σομαι αὐτὸν ὑψηλὸν παρὰ τοῖς βασιλεῦσι...»). The meaning of πρωτότοκος here is not that of *primus inter pares*, but that of the chosen one and beloved by God¹, and distinguished among the kings of the earth (Ps. 89:28: «ὑψηλὸν παρὰ τοῖς βασιλεῦσι τῆς γῆς»).

Lastly, the «Son of God» is used of persons with special commission from God, especially the angels and perhaps also the Messiah (Gen. 6:2; Job. 1:6; 2:1; 38:7)². They are called «Sons of God» (בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים) because they participate in the divine nature as spiritual beings, are messengers of God (מַלְאָכִים cf. Hebr. 1:14: «Οὐχὶ πάντες εἰσὶ λειτουργικὰ πνεύματα εἰς διακονίαν ἀποστελλόμενα»;) and speak in the name of Yahweh (Hebr. 2:2: «εἰ γὰρ ὁ δι' ἀγγέλων λαληθεὶς λόγος»). As to the name of the Messiah as the «Son of God», the problem becomes more complicated since no known ancient text definitely calls the Messiah the «Son of God». One exceptional place where the Messiah is called «Son of God» is the Ethiopic Enoch (105:2), but many critics regard it as a later interpolation³. Also, we have another reference to the Messiah as the «Son of God» in IV Ezra 6:28,29⁴. The first passages speak of the revelation of the Messiah and of His death: «ἀποκαλυφθήσεται γὰρ ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ Χριστὸς σὺν τοῖς μετ' αὐτοῦ καὶ εὐφρανεῖ τοὺς περιλειπομένους ἐν τῇ τετρακόσια καὶ ἔσται μετὰ τὰ ἔτη ταῦτα καὶ ἀποθανεῖται ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ Χριστὸς καὶ πάντες οἱ ἔμπνοοι». (cf. Apocalypse of Baruch 3). This passage and the next one speak of a condition of pre-existence or of preservation of the Messiah in Heaven and of His advent (cf. 13:52)⁵. In the same book, 14:9, we read: «Σὺ γὰρ ἀναληφθήσῃ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ συναναστραφήσῃ τὸ λοιπὸν μετὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ μου καὶ μετὰ τῶν ὁμοίων σοι, ἕως ἄν...». The meaning of the «Son of God» used of the Messiah points rather to the

1. Kittel, *op. cit.*, VI, 874-875.

2. F. Stier, *Gott und Seine Angel in A. T. (Altestamentliche Abhandlungen)* (Münster: 1934), XII, 2, *passim*.

3. G. Dalman, *op. cit.*, 268-272; G. H. Box, *Ezra - Apocalypse* (London: S.P.C.K., 1917), p. CVL; Bousset, *op. cit.*, p. 53: cf. E. Huntress, «Son of God» in *Jewish Writings Prior to the Christian Era*, in *Jewish Biblical Literature*, LIV (1935), 117. R. H. Charles interprets the passage in its moral sense. The Messiah, he says, is called «Son of God» for the same reason for which the righteous are called «Sons of God». He related this verse with IV Ezra 7:28,29; 14:9; cf. Enoch 62:14; John 14:13. *The Book of Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1896), pp. 262-263.

4. Various readings: *My Messiah* (Ethiopic); *The Messiah of God* (Armen.); *Filius Meus Jesus* (Latin); Ambrose, *M. P. L.*, XV 1536c.

5. Cf. IV Ezra 12:32; 13:26,52. Box, *op. cit.*, p. 309; Charles, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

servant of God (δοῦλος Κυρίου יְהוָה עֶבֶד) and does not refer directly to sonship. It depends mostly on the early Messianic interpretation of the Psalm 2¹. This becomes evident if we take into consideration the date of the composition of the book of IV Ezra, which, according to many scholars, is placed in the beginning of the second century A.D.²

In what we have said above, we have tried to trace the various meanings which the tern «Son of God», (υἱὸς Θεοῦ) has outside of the New Testament. We saw that it was applied to different persons in the Old Testament (people of Israel, kings, and Angels) and that we have not strong grounds for its application to the Messiah, unless we accept the connection of the title with that of the Messiah of Psalm 2. This connection is obvious in the epistle to the Hebrews (1:5; cf. Ps. 2:7; Acts 13:33; II Sam. 7:14). But for the author of this epistle, the Son of God is more than a Messianic figure (cf. Hebr. 1:7,8,9-13; 4:5,6; 9:14; 13:8). To Him divine attributes have been given, and even an equality to God. But to return to our point, does Paul use the title «Son of God» in the sense in which it was used in the Old Testament? A comparison of these two areas (Old Testament and Paul) can convince us that the usage of the υἱὸς Θεοῦ in Paul is utterly removed from that of the Old Testament or the Apocalyptic thought³. There is a specific meaning in the Pauline designation of Christ as «Son of God» which is truly new⁴.

1. B. Violet, *Die Apocalypsen des Ezra und des Baruch in Deutschen Gestalt*, G. C. S., 1924; Box, *op. cit.*, p. 309; Zimmerli and Jeremias, «The Servant of God» *Studies in Biblical Theology* vol. (XX Naperville, Ill. A. R. Allenson Inc. 1957) p. 49. n. 196.

2. Grant and Rowley, *op. cit.*, p. 40; Box *op. cit.*, p. XXXIII.

3. M. Werner *The Foundations of Christian Dogma* (New York: Herper, 1957), pp. 122-123. The author asserts that Paul, in naming Christ the «Son of God», did not exceed the late Jewish doctrine of angels. (cf. Enoch 6:2, where the angels are designated as «Sons of Heaven»). The author also proclaims that the exaltation of Christ to cosmic significance in Paul was clearly related to that late Jewish speculation which increasingly assigned divine functions to mediators of a celestial kind.

4. W. Michaelis, *Zur Engel-christologie im Urchristentum*, in *Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments* (Basel: H. Major, 1912), I, 48-53; Stevens, *op. cit.*, p. 396; Beyerlag, *op. cit.*, II, 68; J. Weiss, *Primitive Christianity*, II, 476-495; Morgan, W. *The Religion and Theology of Paul*. (Edinburgh T. and T. Clark, 1923) p. 57; Cullmann, *op. cit.*, p. 270; Bousset *op. cit.*, p. 82; J. Jeremias, «Abba», *Th. L. Z.*, LXXIX (1954), col. 213; G. Schrenk, εὐδοχέω-a. *op. cit.* II, p. 738, n. 7; K. Leivestad, *Christ the Conqueror, Ideas of Conflict and Victory in the New Testament* (London: S. P. C. K., 1954), p. 92, n.3.

The «Son of God» in St. Paul does not express an outward relationship nor an adoption which took place in the course of Christ's life-time or after the resurrection. The divine sonship of Christ is a unique and special one. It points to Christ's coming from the Father and His Deity. The expression «υἱὸς Θεοῦ» presents Christ as a super-worldly being, standing in the closest relation metaphysically to God¹. This close relationship existing between God and Christ appears nowhere in the Old Testament. On the contrary, the relationship between God and the king is understood only in the sense of adoption and not of begetting. The begetting of the king (Ps. 2:7,9: «υἱὸς μου εἰ Σὺ ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά Σε» here is only figurative (cf. II Sam. 7:14; Ps. 89:26). The King is always subordinated to Jahweh; he is the channel of the divine blessings. He has some extraordinary power: for instance, the power of healing is ascribed to Him as to a God. (II Kings 5:7). His knowledge is like that of one of God's angels-supernatural. (II Sam. 14:17.) He is the people's shield (Ps. 84:10; cf. 84:12; 47:10; 89:19). where the same title is simultaneously applied to God and to the King. But at the same time, the Old Testament observes and always stresses very strongly the limits which separate the King from God. The true King and the true throne are to be found in heaven, from which Yahweh directs the history of the world (Ps. 33:13; 89:10; 103:19)².

According to Psalm 2, the dominion of the king is extended only on earth. His kingdom is in this world (v. 8). But to Christ, as the «Son of God» is ascribed not only power of this world, but also dominion *ὑπεράνω πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας καὶ δυνάμεως καὶ κυριότητος*. (Eph. 1:21; cf. I Cor. 15:28; Phil. 2:9; Col. 1:3,16; 2:10,15). God is the king's Savior, and in the name of God the King will be glorified (Ps. 89:25). It does not happen with Christ. He, as the only Son, is the Savior of His people (Eph. 5:23; Phil. 3:20; I Tim. 1:1,2,3; 4:10; II Tim. 1:10; Tit. 1:3,4; 2:10; 3:4,6; cf. Luke 2:11; John 4:42; Acta 5:31; 13:23). His name is exalted above *παντὸς ὀνόματος ὀνομαζομένου οὐ μόνον ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰῶνι ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι*. (Eph. 1:21; cf. Phil. 2:9; Hebr. 1:4). His name is evoked in prayers and in His name miracles are performed (Rom. 10:15; I Cor. 1:2; 5:4,6,11; II Thess. 3:6; Phil. 2:10; Col. 3:17; Hebr. 13:15; cf. Acts 3:6; 16:18; 4:10; 8:16; 9:28).

1. Bousset, *op. cit.*, p. 182; H. Lietzmann, *Kommentar on Rom. Handbuck zum Neuen Testament* (Tübingen: 1933), VIII, connects Rom. 1:4 with 8:3. and regards «υἱὸς Θεοῦ» as a title for the pre-existent Christ.

2. Jacob, *op. cit.*, pp. 239-241.

The sonship of the King is a temporal one, beginning on the occasion of his enthronement (I Sam. 7:14: «Ἐγὼ ἔσομαι αὐτῷ εἰς πατέρα». cf. Ps. 2:7). But Christ is the Son of God from the beginning; He, who was sent by God (Rom. 8:3-4,32; Gal. 4:6). He is the image of the invisible God (Col. 1:15; cf. II Cor. 4:4). It is He through whom God created the world (Col. 1:16; Eph. 1:10,21) and, according to an advanced statement, He himself is the creator of the universe and the judge of the world (Hebr. 1:10). As such, He is the heir of the Father and God's only revealer and representative¹. In the Apostolic language, Christ is confessed as Lord (Κύριος), prayers are offered to Him and finally he becomes the subject of faith (Gal. 2:20). But prayers on behalf of the king by his subjects are indispensable to Him (Ps. 72:15). The offering of prayers characterizes the divine nature of the receiver. But in Israel's religion «the king never became a God, but it was God who was king»².

As to the angels, their sonship is determined on the one hand by their nature—which is divine to some extent—and on the other hand, by the nature of their functions. They minister unto God and pray before Him (Job 1:6; 2:1; 38:7). But there is no possibility of comparison between Christ—as the Son of God—and the angels as the **בְּנֵי יְהוָה**. Christ, as the Son, is above all the Spiritual and material world, above *πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας* (Eph. 1:21; Col. 1:3; Rom. 8:38). No angel is called υἱός in the unique sense in which Christ is so called (Hebr. 1:5). Christ is worshipped by the angels (Hebr. 1:6; *Καὶ προσκυνησάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι Θεοῦ*). This idea of Christ's being worshipped by the angels is used on a large scale in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old and New Testaments. So in the Ascension of Isaiah, the author describes the superiority of Christ over the angelic world in terms of worship (cf. II: 2-25) «Μὴ προσκυνήσης μήτε ἀγγέλους, μήτε ἀρχαγγέλους μήτε κυριότητας, μήτε θρόνους... ὁ δὲ ἐπιτρέπειν Σοι ἀναβαίνειν ἐστὶν ὁ Κύριος τῆς δόξης, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος, ὃν καὶ ἰδέσθαι ἔχεις κατερχόμενον ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν ἐν τῇ γῇ κατὰ τὰς ἡμέρας ἐκείνας τοῦτον τοῖνυν προσκύνησον καὶ ὑμνησον καὶ δόξασον». The attempt of Werner to define the theology of the first Christianity, and especially of Paul in terms of Angelology (Angel-Christology), is without strong grounds³.

1. Lövestam, *op. cit.*, p. 92, n. 3.

2. Herni Berri in the preface to the work of A. Lods, «Les prophètes d'Israël», 1936, p. XX.

3. Werner, *op. cit.*, pp. 120-130, 155.

(since he does not mention specific passages which can bear evidence to this point). The passage which he quotes as support are not decisive nor of particular importance to his theory: 1) The Enoch 6:2 undoubtedly calls the angels «Lord of heavens», but the passage does not contain anything else but a simple designation. 2) The language here is figurative and the angels named are of an imperfect nature, which cannot be compared to the nature of Christ, which was sinless (Rom. 8:3-4; cf. I Peter 2:22). 3) In Enoch, angels are appointed to some function over the world or people (1:9, 9:1; 20:1-7; 21:5,9; 22:3; 81:5; 90:21,11), but nowhere in this book or elsewhere are ascribed any participation in the creation of the world or other creative functions belonging to them (cf. 81:1, 10,3). No angels are called the «Lord of the glory» — an attribute given to God, and constantly ascribed to Christ in the New Testament (I Cor. 2:8; II Cor. 3:18; 8:23; Tit. 2:13). Nowhere in the Bible can be found any kind of faith toward the angels. They never became the subject of preaching or of a religious understanding like the «Son of God» (Gal. 2:20; Eph. 4:13). To the contrary, to believe in angels constitutes a kind of heresy, repeatedly condemned by St. Paul (Col. 2:18 *θησαυρίζεσθε ἀγγέλων*).

To Christ is ascribed not only superiority over the angels, but also it is He who makes His angels *πύρρος φλόγα* and winds. The angels serve and minister unto Him, as they do unto God. They are his *λειτουργοί* (*קְשָׁרִי*)¹. The meaning of the Hebrew root is to minister, to serve, to perform the service of the sanctuary. In Ezekiel it has the meaning of worship (cf. 20:32) (*מִשְׁרַת עֵץ וְאֶבֶן*). In the New Testament, the verb means to pray, to perform the worship (Acts 13:2). Also, to contribute to something, to cooperate (Rom. 15:27). The adjective *λειτουργός* is used of the officials (Rom. 13:6: *Λειτουργοὶ γὰρ Θεοῦ εἰσι*), of the Apostle himself (Rom. 16:16), of Christ (Hebr. 8:2: *τῶν ἁγίων λειτουργός*. cf. Philo; De Leg. Alleg. III:135: «*τοιούτος δὲ ὁ θεραπευτὴς καὶ λειτουργὸς τῶν ἁγίων...*»). To minister unto and to worship God is one of the functions of the angels in the Old Testament, and in the late Jewish literature². This ministry and worship is given to Christ as God

1. For the meaning of *λειτουργέω* - *ō* in the Greek language cf. Liddell and Scott, *o. p. cit.*, II 1036-1037; *λήτος-ἔργον*=public function, particularly a sacred office. *λειτουργεῖν* means (a) to serve public offices at one's own cost; b) generally to perform public duties (Isocrates 8:13; Xen. Men. 2:7,6; Arist. Pol. 1291a34). c) to serve a master: Arist. Pol. 1278a12: «*οἱ ἐνὶ λειτουργοῦντες τὰ τοιαῦτα δοῦλοι εἰσι*».

2. Dan. 7:10; Testament of XII Patriarchs (Levi 3:5; cf. Philo: Virt. 74; I Clem. 34:5-6; Ps. 102:21).

by them. It happens not only because Christ is exalted over everything in heaven and on earth, but also because it is He in whom all things have been created (Col. 1:16: «ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα, τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, τὰ ὁρατὰ καὶ τὰ ἀόρατα, εἴτε θρόνοι, εἴτε κυριότητες, εἴτε ἀρχαί, εἴτε ἐξουσίαι· τὰ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν ἔκτισται»). cf. Eph. 1:10,21; cf. John. 1:3.10). So Christ is the «Son of God» in a unique and metaphysical sense, and the term «υἱὸς Θεοῦ» reflects a religious and theological interest¹. The Gal. 4:6 expresses, in the highest religious sense, this relationship of Father and Son². The expression «τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ» is one of the hapax legomena in the New Testament (cf. Phil. 1:19: τὸ πνεῦμα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ· Rom. 8:9c: πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ. cf. also II Cor. 3:17; Acts 16:7; I Peter 1:11; Hebr. 9:14; Rev. 19:10). It does not refer to the incarnation of the Son, but rather to the sending of the Spirit of the Son to the world, which Spirit is the Spirit of God³. By the effect of the Spirit of the Son, Christians become «Sons of God» and «heir of God». (cf. Rom. 8:14-15: «Ὅσοι γὰρ πνεύματι Θεοῦ ἄγονται οὗτοι υἱοὶ εἰσὶ Θεοῦ... ἀλλ' ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα υἱοθεσίας ἐν ᾧ κρᾶζομεν Ἀββᾶ ὁ πατήρ. cf. verses 16,17).

We can summarize by quoting the words of Ménègoz. He says, «Pour Paul, le Fils de Dieu est un être unique, exceptionnel, né de Dieu, antérieur au monde, supérieur à tout l'univers qui a été créé par son intermédiaire et qui subsiste en lui. De l'existence d'un tel être, il n'y a seule trace dans l'Ancien Testament»⁴.

The Son of God in Paul, in Philo, and the Hellenistic World.

The term «Son of God» is not unfamiliar to the Hellenistic world⁵.

1. G. S. Duncan, The epistle of Paul to the Galatians, in Moffat's New Testament Commentary, IX, 4:6; Morgan, op. cit., p. 57.

2. Jeremias, op. cit., col. 213. The author insists on the point that «...to name God «My Father» with the use of the word 'Abba', a diminutive form originating in children's language, is without analogy in Judaism and indicates Jesus' unique Son relationship to God. (cf. Cullmann, op. cit., 300, n. 1. (German edition) «Nur weil Jesus ganz anders als wir der Sohn ist, kann er uns zu Söhnen machen»).

3. cf. II Clem. 9:5, «Χριστὸς ὃν τὸ μὲν πρῶτον πνεῦμα ἐγένετο σὰρξ. II Cor. 3:17, «Ὁ Κύριος τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστιν». cf. Lebreton, op. cit., I 412, n. 1.

4. E. Ménègoz, Le pèche et la redemption d'après St. Paul (Paris: G. Fishbacher, 1882), p. 158.

5. G. P. Wetter, Der Sohn Gottes. Eine Untersuchung über des Cha-

It was a widespread designation having its origin in the ancient oriental religions in which, above all things, kings were thought to be begotten of Gods. This belief was especially common in Egypt. The rulers or Pharaohs were all considered to be sons of the sun-god Re¹. The term was extended to anyone who was believed to possess some kind of divine power².

An estimate of the popularity of the term is offered by Origen in his work against Celsus. From the relevant part, we can see the development brought to the idea of the divine sonship in the hellenistic world and its religious implications. The text runs as follows: «Πρόχειρον δ' ἐκάστω καὶ σύνηθες εἰπεῖν· ἐγὼ ὁ Θεὸς εἰμὶ ἢ Θεοῦ παῖς ἢ πνεῦμα θεῶν· ἡκω δέ· ἡδὴ γὰρ ὁ κόσμος ἀπόλλυται καὶ ἡμεῖς, ὧς ἄνθρωποι, διὰ τὰς ἀδικίας οὔχεσθε· ἐγὼ δὲ σῶσαι θέλω· καὶ ὅψεσθέ με αἰθῆρι μετ' οὐρανόφωτος δυνάμεως ἐπανιόντα· μακάριος ὁ νῦν μὲν θρησκεύσας, τοῖς δὲ ἄλλοις πῦρ αἰώνιον ἐπιβαλὼν καὶ πόλεις καὶ χώρας· καὶ ἄνθρωποι, οἳ μὴ τὰς ἑαυτῶν ποινὰς ἴσασιν, μεταγνώσκονται μάτην καὶ στενάζουσι· τοὺς δὲ μοι πεισθέντας...»³. The basic meaning, according to the passage, of the «Son of God» in its hellenistic application, is that of a divine being, a god, a supernatural being an equivalent of θεῖος ἄνθρωπος or of θεὸς ἐπιφανής⁴. The designation here has a soteriological meaning (ἐγὼ σῶσαι θέλω)⁵ and an eschatological one (καὶ ὅψεσθέ με αἰθῆρι μὲν ἐπουρανόφωτος δυνάμεως ἐπανιόντα). Philo in Flacc. 74, definitely describes Augustus as εὐεργέτης. The worshipping elements of the sons of God in the hellenistic world are an inseparable part of their divine nature. In the designation of Christ as

rakter und die Tengeniz des Johannes-evangeliums (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Rubrecht, 1916). This is an excellent source of the relevant material. See also W. Grundmann, *Die Gotteskindschaft in der Geschichte Jesu und Ihre religionsgeschichtlichen Voraussetzungen* (1948) passim.

1. C. J. Gadd, *Ideas of Divine Rule in the Ancient East* (London: Oxford University Press, 1948).

2. W. Bauer, *Das Johannesevangelium* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1933), p. 37.

3. Origen *Contra Celsum* VII:9; cf. Robinson, *op. cit.*, p. 70.

4. A. D. Nock, «Studies in the Graeco-Roman Beliefs of the Empire, *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, XLV, 84; W. L. Knox, *Some Hellenistic elements in Primitive Christianity* (London: Published for the British Academy by H. Milford, 1944), pp. 37-40; Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, I, 121-133.

5. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, I, 130, relates the savior, Son of God of the Hellenistic world with the redeemer (Σωτήρ) of the Gnostic myth.

the «υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ» we have seen that these elements of a soteriological (Rom. 5:10; 8:3,4; Gal. 4:4; Col. 1:13) and of an eschatological figure (I Thess. 1:10) can be found. Also faith to Him has been ascribed by Paul (Eph. 4:13; Gal. 2:20) and worship has been rendered to Him accordingly (Phil. 2:5-11; Rom 10:9; I Cor. 12:3).

On the basis of what has been established above, can we trace any relationship between Paul and the hellenistic world in the use of the term the «Son of God»? Did Paul derive his concept of Christ as the «Son of God» from the hellenistic religious and philosophical strata, and if so, in what sense? Bultmann favors the idea of a borrowing of this by St. Paul. In his *Theology of the New Testament*, he gives a full statement in explaining Paul's dependence upon his contemporary world¹. We quote his words.

The Hellenistic period knows a whole series of «Divine men» (θεῖοι ἄνδρες), who claimed to be sons of a God or who were regarded such and some of whom were also cultically worshipped. In their case there is no emphasis or almost none, on the paradoxicality of the divine appearing in human form. Moreover, this was no problem at all to Greek thinking in general, for which every man's soul is a divine entity. Hence, here the interest lies not in the paradoxical fact of the divine Son's humanity but in the content of his life (βίος) marked by miracles and the other divinely conferred phenomena.

Another variation was the conception of divine sonship which was common in oriental hellenism as an inheritance from old oriental mythology. The idea is of son-divinities, upon whom cultic worship was bestowed and who were regarded as saviors (Σωτῆρες). About such divinities, worshipped in «mysteries», their myths related that they had suffered the human fate of death but had risen subsequently from death. But according to the belief of their worshippers, the fate of these divinities establishes a salvation which is imparted to those who experience with the deity his death and resurrection in the rites of the mysteries. Further on he continues.

But still a third type of the son of God figure must be recognized. The son-divinity of Gnosticism often possesses not only soteriological but also cosmological significance. Indeed, this was probably its primary meaning, and it was independently develo-

1. Ibid., pp. 130-132.

ped in mythologies and in religious—philosophical speculations like those of Philo, whose cosmic Logos is the son of God and a similar development is found in the Hermetic writings. A parallel phenomenon is the Cosmic figure of Wisdom which had already crept into the Wisdom literature of the Old Testament, and had become an object of speculation in Judaism, especially in hellenistic Judaism.

So, according to Bultmann's explanation, there are three types of divine sonship: α) those who became sons of God by miraculous performances; b) the well known «saviors» (soteriological significance) and «cultically worshipped»; and, c) the sons of God as «cosmic figures» and «saviors» together. From all these types of divine sonship early Christianity derived the various elements which make up Christ as the «Son of God», comparable to these similar conceptions. As for the first type of the son-divinities, we can say that no relationship is to be found between Paul and the hellenistic concept of the «Son of God». α) For Paul, Jesus is not He who proved that He was the «Son of God» by miraculous phenomena, but His miraculous acts were the expression of His divine nature (Rom. 1:3; Gal. 4:4,6; Col. 1:13). b) These «sons of God» of the hellenistic world were exalted to the dignity of Gods not by the piety of faith, not even by the strength of the community's faith, but were declared to be Gods by some imperial decree or by their own claim¹. But Christ proved to be the Son of God ἐν δυνάμει κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγίωσύνης. (Rom. 1:3). c) In the hellenistic son-divinities we have a complete transformation of human into divine so that nothing is left of the original human but the outward appearance. In Paul, on the other hand, Christ's human existence is emphasized and defended against any docetic misconceptions (Rom. 1:3; I Cor. 15:3-4; Gal. 4:4; Rom. 8:3-4,32; I Tim. 3:16; 2:5-6; II Cor. 5:15; Tit. 2:14)².

The second type of the Sons of God stresses their soteriological significance for their believers. Later, we will make a comparison between these saviors and Christ, as Savior, when we deal with the soteriological significance of Christ as God. What is left here for a more detailed examination is the relationship which Bultmann finds between the

1. Rawlinson: A.E.J. The New Testament Doctrine of Christ, London 1926; Longmans, Green and Co. pp. 70-72.

2. E. Stauffer, New Testament Theology, trans. J. Marsh (New York: Macmillan, 1956), pp. 106-107.

cosmic character of the Sons of God and Christ. For the main sources for information about these son-divinities, Bultmann has gone to the religious-philosophical speculations of Philo and the Hermetic writings¹.

In Philo, the idea of Logos occupies a great part of his philosophical and religious thinking. The Logos is called υἱὸς Θεοῦ as coming from God². He is also called the dwelling place of God³, the oldest of the ideas⁴, the closest to God⁵, the beginning (ἀρχή)⁶, the image of God (εἰκὼν Θεοῦ)⁷. As the image of God, the Logos manifests the divine perfections, in which he participates: omnipotence (παντοδυναμία), omniscience (παντογνωσία), goodness (ἀγαθότης), holiness (ἀγιότητα). The Logos is called the second God and the God of the imperfect⁸. The Logos reveals God, par excellence; He is the instrument of God in the creation of the world⁹. He preserves the world and connects its various parts¹⁰. He is the ruler of the universe¹¹ and the character of the seal of God¹².

Also in Philo, the Logos is the eternal law (αἰδώς Νόμος) identical with the natural law. He is the soul of the world, the universal spirit, and the law of the moral order. He is a spiritual law, or the universal reason, in which all the phenomena and events in world history find their cause¹³. He is also the angel of God¹⁴. In his relationship to God, the Logos is described as God's Son, as incorruptible¹⁵ since he is born of God, who is invisible¹⁶, incomprehensible¹⁷, creator¹⁸ unbegotten¹⁹,

1. Bultmann, *op. cit.*, I, 129, 132, 178; II, 13, 146.

2. *de Agricult.* 51.

3. *De Migr. Abr.* I:7.

4. *De Somn.* I:230.

5. *De Fuga et invent.* 101.

6. *Conf. Ling.* 146.

7. *De Special. Legibus* I:81; cf. *de Somn.* 1:240; *De fuga et invent.* 101.

8. *Leg. All.* II:86; cf. *Quest. in Gen.* II:62.

9. *Leg. All.* III:96; cf. *De opif. mundi.* 36; *Quod Deus Immut.* 1:128.

10. *De fuga* 110, 112.

11. *De Cherub.* 36.

12. *De Plant.* 18.

13. *Quod Deus Immut.* 50, 120, 134, 176.

14. *De Conf. Ling.* 146.

15. *De Conf. Ling.* 41.

16. *De Somniis* I:72.

17. *De Mutat. Nom.* 7.

18. *Ibid.*, 18.

19. *Ibid.*, 22.

unchangeable¹, transcendent², everlasting³ and the head and source of all riches and of all things⁴. God is the only source of Logos (Quod det. Pot. Insist. 82: «ὁ Θεὸς ἡ τοῦ πρεσβυτάτου λόγου πηγὴ» cf. de Poster. Caini 69). The logos is God's work (De sacr. Ab. et Cain 65: «ὁ Λόγος ἔργον ἦν αὐτοῦ»). His function is to stay between God and the world (μεθόριος)⁵. The Philonic Logos in his creative and moral character is found to be closely related to the Stoic Logos. For the Stoics, Logos is the creative principle (τὸ ποιοῦν)⁶. He moves the material and shapes it. The Pythagoreans also called λόγους the causes of all beings: «ἀριθμοὺς μὲν οἱ Πυθαγόρειοι καὶ λόγους ἐν τῇ ὅλῃ ὠνόμαζον τὰ αἷτια ταῦτα τῶν ὄντων ἢ ὄντα»⁷. In Stoicism, the Logos also is identical with fate; he is described as a corporeal spirit (πνεῦμα σωματικόν) in his communication with men;⁸ and finally, he is identified with God⁹. and eventually he is God¹⁰. His moral character is obvious in Stoicism. He functions as a moral principle in men, encouraging them to good actions, and prohibiting them to take part in bad acts¹¹. He also contains natural qualities, being the disposer of the natural things and the architect of the universe (Z. 1.42; 24,26. Arnim: «rerum naturae dispositor atque artifex universitatis Logos.... quem et fatum et necessitatem rerum et deum et animum Jovis nuncupat»). The usage of the

1. Ibid., 28.

2. Ibid., 13.

3. De Plant. 8.

4. De fuga 198.

5. Quis Rer. Div. Heres. 42. cf. Cleanthes-II:168:26; κοινωνία ὑπάρχει ἀνθρώποις καὶ θεοῖς διὰ τοῦ λόγου μετέχειν. cf. R. Bultmann, Primitive Christianity in its contemporary setting, trans. R. H. Fuller (London: Thames and Hudson, 1956), p. 97.

6. Zen. 1:24,7; Cleanthes. 110, 27; Arnim, op. cit., II:111; 10; cf. E. Zeller, Die Philosophie der Griechen (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1881), V, 385: «Dass aber nichtsdestoweniger der Stoische Logoslehre die nächste quelle der philonischen gewesen-Bedeutung bis dahin nur bei den Stoikern vorkommt, sondern auch aus dem ganzen Begriff desselben». Heinze, Die lehre vom Logos, p. 238, «Die Gleichmässigkeit in ganzen zwischen dem Stoischen und dem philonischen Logos fällt deutlich ins Auge».

7. Kittel. op. cit., IV, 78; cf. Plot. Enn. V; 1:5.

8. Arnim II:264:18;

9. Ibid., II:310:24.

10. Ibid., 315:3.

11. Ibid., III:79:40.

term Logos to denote the rational faculty and hence as the equivalent of νοῦς (mind) occurs in both, the Stoics and Philo¹. In Aristotle it has the meaning of mind (νοῦς), too².

Taking into consideration what has already been said about Philo's doctrine of Logos as the Son of God, we proceed now to a comparison between him and St. Paul in order to see the possible connections between these two spheres of religious and philosophical speculation, or their independence of thinking and their different evaluation of the term υἱὸς Θεοῦ. Philo was primarily a philosopher and his main concern was to color by his philosophical principles the re-writing of Biblical history, since most of his works are either parts of a running commentary on the Pentateuch, or essays of selected subjects on the same³.

In Philo the Logos is called son of God, (υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ) not because there is any relationship of love between God and the Logos, but because the Logos is the Son of God as having come from Him. At the same time the incorporeal man is called the son of God: «Τοῦτον τὸν ἀσώματον ἄνθρωπον μὲν γὰρ πρεσβύτατον υἱὸν ὁ τῶν ὅλων ἀνέτειλε πατήρ, ὃν ἐτέρωθι πρωτόγονον ὠνόμασεν»⁴.

The idea is derived from the basic assumption of Philo's thought that there are basically three kinds of life: «Ζωῆς δὲ τριττὸν γένος: τὸ μὲν πρὸς Θεόν, τὸ δὲ πρὸς γένεσιν, τὸ δὲ μεθόριον μικτὸν ἀμφοῖν· τὸ μὲν οὖν πρὸς Θεὸν οὐ κατέβη πρὸς ἡμᾶς οὐδὲ ἦλθεν εἰς τὰς σῶματος ἀνάγκας: τὸ δὲ πρὸς γένεσιν οὐδ' ὅλως ἀνέβη οὐδὲ ἐζήτησεν ἀναβῆναι, φωλεῦον δὲ ἐν μυχοῖς "Αἰδοῦ τῷ ἄβῳτῳ βίῳ χαίρει· τὸ δὲ μικτὸν ἐστίν, ὃ πολλάκις μὲν ὑπὸ τῆς ἀμείνωνος ἀγόμενον τάξεως θειάζει καὶ θεοφορεῖται, πολλάκις δὲ ὑπὸ τῆς χείρονος ἀντισπώμενον ἐπιτρέπει· τοῦθ' ὅταν ὥσπερ πλάστιγγος ἢ τῆς κρείττονος ζωῆς μοῖρα τοῖς ὅλοις βρίσῃ συνεπιπασθὲν τὸ τῆς ἐναντίας ζωῆς βάρος...»⁵.

Among the sons of God, this world is also included. «Ὁ μὲν γὰρ

4. H. A. Wolfson, *Philo, Foundations of the Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam* (2 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1947), I, 230-233.

2. The term in Plato is correlated with the knowledge (γνώσις, ἐπιστήμη) and thought (διάνοια) and is ascribed to God as a characterization of the Intelligence with which He created time, the sun, the moon, and the five other stars and by which the creative processes in nature in both animal and plant life and even in the formation of lifeless substances are continued. cf. *Timaeus* 38c.

3. R. H. Pfeiffer, *History of the New Testament times with an Introduction to the Apocrypha* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949), pp. 206-207.

4. *Conf. Ling.* 63.

5. *Quis rer. div. her.* 45-46.

κόσμος οὗτος νεώτερος υἱὸς Θεοῦ ἅτε αἰσθητὸς ὢν»¹. The idea is highly characteristic. This υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ is described by Philo in another passage as the only son and beloved one of God². The meaning of μόνος is made clear by the word *visibilis* of the previous passage. The adjective νεώτερος introduces us to the basic concept of Philo about a double creation: the creation of the νοητοῦ κόσμου (the world of the ideas) and of the visible world (αἰσθητοῦ κόσμου). This second world is characterized by Philo as visible God (ὁ κόσμος ἐστὶν ὁρατὸς Θεός)³. This world is an antitype of the world of the ideas made in, the image of Logos and by the Logos⁴. The Logos also is God but a second God. The δεύτερος includes the cardinal order among two or more things or beings. It becomes obvious from two points: (1) Philo repeatedly stresses the monotheism of the Old Testament; this is a basic presupposition for Philo. There is one God creator (Δημιουργός)⁵, incomprehensible and the only source of everything, even of the Logos⁶. So He is unique in rank. The Logos as His Son is something between Him and the world⁷.

2) Philo ranks the Logos among the angels, regarding him as the oldest of them⁸. He is the ἀρχάγγελος and πολυώνυμος and θεῖος ἄγγελος ποδηγετῶν⁹. Turning now to Paul, we can say that the Sonship of Christ is defined not in a Philonic pattern (relationship of cause and effect) but in a natural and unique way. Christ is the only Son of God, the Son of His love, the first-born (πρωτότοκος)¹⁰. All the others are sons of God either by the grace of Christ or the Holy Spirit or by adoption (Rom. 8:14; 9:26; II Cor. 6:18; Gal. 3:26; 4:6; I Thess. 5:5; Hebr. 2:10; 12:5,7). Christ, as the Son of God, is an independent personality from eternity to eternity (Phil. 2:6: ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχων). But in Philo the Logos is not an independent being. As long as he is an inner Logos (ἐνδιάθετος), he is an integral part of God., i. e., has not proceeded from Him, and as such, he cannot be regarded as the Son of God¹¹. The

1. Quod Deus Immutab. 31, Opif. Mundi. 4:16; cf. Plato Tim. 34c.

2. De Ebriet. 30; cf. De Speci. Legib. 1,41,96; cf. James 1:18.

3. De aeternitate mundi 4,16.

4. Leg. All. 1,43.

5. De Mut. Nom. 18.

6. De fuga 198.

7. Quod rer. div. her. 205,206.

8. Conf. Ling. 146; Leg. Alleg. III:177.

9. Quod Deus Immut. 182.

10. Nowhere in Philo does the word πρωτότοκος appear as an appellation for the Logos. Instead of it, we have the word «πρωτόγονος».

11. De Migr. Abrah. For an opposite opinion, cf. B. Jowett, Epistles of

«Son of God» in Paul is placed above all the angels who serve Him. He sits at God's right hand and participates in the divine substance being the ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης and χαρακτήρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ (God). (Hebr. 1:3, 4,5-7; Eph. 1:21; Phil. 2:9)¹. For Philo, the idea of an incarnated «Son of God» is inconceivable. There is a sharp distinction maintained between the intelligible and the visible worlds; no visible appearance is possible for him. (De fuga 101: «Ὁ δ' ὑπεράνω τούτων λόγος θεῶς εἰς ὁρατὴν οὐκ ἦλθεν ιδεάν, ἅτε μηδενὶ τῶν κατ' αἴσθησιν ἐμπερὴς ὢν, ἀλλ' αὐτὸς εἰκὼν ὑπάρχων Θεοῦ τῶν νοητῶν ἅπαξ ἀπάντων πρεσβύτατος»). He communicates only with the soul of man, which itself is regarded as being a part of the intelligible invisible world. He calls the soul to perfection (τελειότης), offers salvation, makes the virtues desirable, leads man's soul to the seeking of the truth and helps them to become virtuous². No incarnation, much less passion of the Logos can be found in Philo. But in Paul the «Son of God» is sent to the world, becomes a man (Rom. 1:3-4; 8:3;4; 32; Gal. 4:4,6). The Christ, as υἱὸς Θεοῦ, voluntarily delivers himself to suffer, and through his passion saved man from the sword of evil and death (Gal. 2:20; cf. Rom. 8:32).

The cosmological significance of Logos in Philo is also entirely different from that of the Son of God in Paul. The cosmic Logos plays a secondary role in the creation of the whole world. God is the creator of the world: «Ὁ δὲ Θεὸς πατὴρ καὶ τεχνίτης καὶ ἐπίτροπος τῶν ἐν οὐρανῷ τε καὶ κόσμῳ πρὸς ἀλήθειαν ἐστι... δημιουργὸς δὲ καὶ χρόνου ὁ Θεός...»³.

The Logos is not the creator himself: He is the instrument of God in the creation: He is the seal of God: «εὐρήσεις... ὄργανον λόγον Θεοῦ δι' οὗ κατεσκευάσθη (ὁ κόσμος)»⁴. There is a decisive difference between the cause and the instrument (or agent) of creation for Philo: He contrasts them. For him God is the cause, the only cause (ἡ μόνη αἰτία), and as such, He is not the instrument (ὄργανον): «Ὁ Θεὸς αἷτιον οὐκ ὄργανον, τὸ

St. Paul to the Thessalonians, Galatians, and Romans (2 vols., London: J. Murray, 1859), I,510. The author appears to find in Philo «the complete personification of the Logos», although he admits that Philo's idea of the Logos leaves us in doubt at last whether it is not a quality only, or mode of operation in the Divine Being.

1. cf. Test. of Dan. 3:6.

2. De Spec. Leg. 11 275; De Somn. 1:651, 633, 449; De Post. Calm. 1:249-250; Quis Rer. div. her. 1:479; De nom. mut. 1:596; De migr. Abrah. 1:455; De Ebriet. 1:362; Quod Deus Immut. 1:292.

3. Quod Deus Immut. 30:3.

4. De Cherub. 35.

δὲ γινόμενον δι' ὀργάνου μὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ αἰτίου πάντως γίνεται¹. Philo distinguishes four factors in the act of creation: α) τὸ ὑφ' οὗ β) τὸ ἐξ οὗ γ) τὸ δι' οὗ and δ) τὸ δι' ὅ². In Paul, the role of the Son of God in the creation is far more advanced than in Philo. Paul never calls the Son of God an instrument (ὄργανον) nor does he draw a contrast between the Father and the Son in the act of the creation. The creative act of God is described in Paul many times (Rom. 11:36; II Cor. 8:6; Eph. 4:5). The same words are used to describe the creative action of Christ. (I Cor. 8:6; Col. 1:16-20; Hebr. 1:3; 2:10). In Hebrews, the identity of Christ's role in the creation in comparison with that of God is recognized by the author in ascribing to Christ the same words which are used of God (1:10-13). Thus, the role of Christ is more than instrumental. In interpreting the relevant passages of Paul's epistle to the Colossians about the creative role of Christ, Lightfoot concludes that «this mediatorial function has entirely changed its character. To the Alexandrian Jew it was the work of a passive tool or instrument; but to the christian Apostle it represented a cooperative agent»³. So the «Son of God» in Philo is an ideal conception, a cosmic principle; but the «Son of God» in Paul is a living person who is in immediate relationship to God, the Father, no lower than God, and incomparably higher than the angels. In order to have a clear idea about the eminent place which Jesus, as the Son of God, occupies in St. Paul's letters and to understand the religious depths of the title as denoting Christ's relationship to the Father, we quote Weinell's words:

It strikes us as remarkable that the Apostle uses the title Son of God in the most solemn passages of the epistles and in the most sublime utterances about Jesus Christ. When he wishes to give prominence to the infinite love of the Father and to immeasurable humility and condescension of Jesus, which is involved in the incarnation (Rom. 1:1-3; 8:3), when he wishes to prove triumphantly the sublimity and blessing of the Gospel of Jesus (Rom. 1:9; II Cor. 1:19), when he desires to extol in jubilant strains the certainty and divine blessedness of reconciliation and redemption

1. De Cherub. 125.

2. Ibid., 125-126. cf. Wis. of Sol. 9:1; Ecclesiasticus 43:26. cf. Plato's Timaeus, passim. For Plato there are five causes: the material, the agent, the make-up, the model, and the end in view.

3. J. B. Lightfoot, St. Paul's epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon (revised text, 8th ed., New York: Macmillan, 1886), p. 155.

through Jesus Christ (Rom. 5:10; 8:1; Gal. 4:6), when he wishes to reveal overwhelmingly the whole might and grandeur of the Savior Jesus Christ (Rom. 1:4; Phil. 2:9; Hebr. 1:2), when he summons his readers to faith in Jesus Christ (Gal. 2:16,20) and to his invocation everywhere (I Cor. 1:1-9); at the commencement and the conclusion of his epistles, where he calls down upon the believers the grace and peace of God, in all these instances Paul calls Jesus Christ preferably the «Son of God». And correspondingly he calls also God in the most solemn moments and formulas of confession, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ¹.

What remains to be examined is the supposed relationship that is, as Bultmann asserts², to be found between the concepts of the «Son of God» as they were held by St. Paul and the Hermetic writings. These writings reflect a doctrine of the ancient times. But in present form they may have been influenced by the christian literature³. It becomes obvious a) from the last chapters of these writings at which points the religious and devotional language of the New Testament writings and of the Early Church Fathers prevails;⁴ b) from the fact that all the Hermetic writings are later than the New Testament period; c) all these writings are admittedly influenced by Judaism; and d) at least the latest stratum in the Hermetic writings has passed through the christian sphere. But regardless of their direct or indirect relationship with the christian world, we must take a close inspection of their concepts concerning the «son of God» as a cosmic principle and his relationship to the Supreme God. The concept of the son of God in the Hermetic writings is not entirely irrelevant to that of Philo, although the former presents a religious orientation entirely different from the monotheistic orientation of Philo. The Hermetic writings are full of a pantheistic system, in which God and the world are mixed up together⁵.

1. Weinel, op. cit., p. 324.

2. Bultmann *Theology of the New Testament*, op. cit., I, 132.

3. C. F. G. Heinrici, *Die Hermes-Mystik und das Neue Testament* (1916); Windisch, *Urchristentum und Hermes*. The latter thinks that Christianity first received from oriental religions the fundamental ideas and then gave back to oriental religion as represented by Hermes certain forms of expressions in which those ideas had been clothed.

4. cf. Postscript.

5. XI:5 (edition: W. Scott, *Hermetica* (4 vols., New York: Oxford University Press, 1924-36).

The son of God here, as in Philo, is God's Logos who is an instrument of the Father in the creation of the world. He is the image of God (εἰκὼν Θεοῦ) in a cosmological sense¹. The Father - son relationship is defined in terms of the proceeding. The Logos is the Son of God as having proceeded from Him². But this Logos is not an independent person. He is confused with a principle which exists in man, and to which sensible attributes are ascribed³. This Logos is of the same substance (οὐσία) with the νοῦς (mind). He comes from the lower elements of the divine substance and was united with the creative mind (νοῦς) as being of the same substance⁴. In other passages the νοῦς (mind) is placed in a higher level than the Logos, elsewhere is identified with God himself⁵. In the Hermetic writings, as in Philo, not only the Logos as the creative instrument of God is called the son, but also the world (visible) is named the son of God⁶. This kind of sonship can be defined only as, so to say, all-inclusive. The world is the son of God only because it is regarded as being a property of God. The same analogy is to be found between man and the world. Man in the son of the world only as being an offspring of it and as being contained in it. «Καὶ τρία τοίνυν ταῦτα, ὁ Θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ καὶ τὸ ἀγαθόν, καὶ ὁ κόσμος καὶ ὁ ἄνθρωπος· καὶ τὸν μὲν κόσμον ὁ Θεὸς ἔχει, τὸν δὲ ἄνθρωπον ὁ κόσμος· καὶ γίνε-ται ὁ μὲν κόσμος τοῦ Θεοῦ υἱός, ὁ δὲ ἄνθρωπος τοῦ κόσμου ὥσπερ ἐγγονος»⁷.

In the Hermetic writings, creative power is not only attributed to the Logos but also to the fire (πῦρ), which is the instrument of God in the creation. Here, no less than in Philo, the superiority of the One God, even in a polytheistic or pantheistic way, is emphasized. God is one (εἷς), the supreme power, and superior to whatever exists, even to Logos. «Πάντων γὰρ κρείττων οὗτος (ὁ Θεὸς) καὶ πάντα αὐτοῦ ἐλάττονα· ὁ δὲ Θεὸς ὑπὲρ πάντα καὶ περὶ πάντας»⁸. He is the beginning and the head of everything⁹. He is eternal and creator of everything¹⁰ and consequently, the father of all¹¹. Creativity is the very nature of God¹². The very

1. I: 34.

2. I: 3.

3. I: 6.

4. I: 10.

5. I: 6.

6. IX: 8.

7. X: 14.

8. X: 22.

9. XI: 3.

10. VIII: 2; X: 18; XV: 3.

11. IX: 8; X: 2, 14; XV: 18.

12. XI: 17.

substance and nature of God are identical with the Good¹. Elsewhere He is characterized as pure energy and power². His nature is also light and life³. But the polytheistic and naturalistic orientations of the writings lead the author to extend divine attributes to things or phenomena that play a great part in the course of time or in human life. The greatness of universe and the harmony that exists in it forces the author to call it the great God (μέγας Θεός), the image of God as reflecting the divine attributes of order and harmony⁴, and son of God (υἱὸς Θεοῦ) and fullness of life⁵.

Creative power is also given to the sun. The sun is the creator (δημιουργός)⁶ or the savior (Σωτήρ) in a naturalistic way⁷, and is regarded as being the second God⁸.

As in Philo, so also here we can trace the notion of a double creation. But unlike Philo, whose God is the creator of everything, the author of the Hermetic writings seems to imply that there are two creators. The first, who is the Lord of all, is mentioned as the creator of the eternal (αἰδίων) things which need no providence nor any care⁹. The second creator is corporeal and his creation continues throughout the course of time. His creation includes beings corruptible and mortal¹⁰. This double side of existence introduces a Dualism, which is widespread in the writings. There can be no communication between God and the material¹¹, or between heavenly and earthly things¹². A consequence of the whole thought of the Hermetic system is the fact that no complete revelation of God is possible as long as man lives on earth¹³. So the Hermetic writings cannot, at least in the form in which they have been preserved, have any affiliation with Paul's concept of the «Son of God». In the last chapter of the writings, especially in the fragments, is found a more developed form of the doctrine of the Logos and of his cosmo-

1. VI: 4.

2. X: 1.

3. I: 6.

4. XII: 21.

5. XII: 15.

6. XV: 5.

7. XV: 12.

8. Frag. II: A: 14.

9. Frag. II:1-2.

10. Frag. II:3-4.

11. XI: 22.

12. X:25.

13. Frag. VI:19; Frag. WXI: 18-27.

logical significance. But in these parts the Logos is identified with the providence¹. The Logos here is described as coming from God, being perfect and fruitful and creator not as a person but rather as a divine word (דְּבַר), as a creative energy that penetrates the material and the water². This Logos as «Son of God» takes a place subordinate to that of his Father. The terms in which his nature is described are rather a mixture of religious and philosophical vocabularies³. The nature of the Logos is creative, eternal, unchangeable, incorruptible, stable, and life-giving⁴. But all these terms, although they are repeatedly used by Christian literature, do not indicate the close relationship of God and the Son in the creation, as, in contradistinction, it is to be found in Paul. They reflect the later development of the Christian theology about Christ, but do not interpret the concepts of Paul. Their motives are based on a naturalistic or philosophical foundation concerning God and do not render the religious language which comes out of the Pauline writings.—For the author of these writings, the great sin is ignorance of God, which ignorance can be removed by the knowledge of God (γνῶσις)⁵. The Son of God in Paul has a salvatory mission which has as its goal not only the knowledge and the revelation of God, but also the suffering of the «Son of God» for the expiation of the sin, which sin presupposes a rebellion against God by man. The meaning of the «Son of God» in Paul in its revelatory sense is the suffering and not only the revelation of God; the suffering was an exclusive part of God's plan for the salvation of mankind. (Rom. 8:3; 32; Hebr. 5:8; 2:18; 9:26; cf. I Peter 2:21; 4:1;)

1. XIII:1.

2. Frag. 27.

3. Frag. 28.

4. Frag. 30.

5. X: 15.