

Boston College
The School of Theology and Ministry

AN EXAMINATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP
BETWEEN PERSONIFIED WISDOM IN PROVERBS AND JESUS IN THE GOSPELS:
FOCUSING ON THEIR IMAGES AND ACTIVITIES

By REV. JEONG MUN HEO

A Research Project submitted
To the Centre of Christian Jewish Learning at Boston College
Director of the Research Project:
Richard J. Clifford, S.J.
Visiting Professor of Old Testament
STM, Boston College
Email: richard.clifford.1@bc.edu, Office Phone: 617-552-6529

CHESTNUT HILL, MA

MAY 2015

© Copyright by JEONG MUN HEO

2015

CONTENTS

Table

Abbreviation

Abstract

Introduction

Chapter 1: Personified Wisdom in Proverbs and Jesus in the Gospels

- (1) Personified Wisdom in Proverbs
- (2) Traditions regarding the links between Personified Wisdom and Jesus
 - a) Torah, the Foundation of Personified Wisdom and Jesus
 - b) Greek Logos-Centered Traditions in the Fourth Gospel
 - c) Jewish Wisdom-Centered Traditions in the Synoptics

Chapter 2: Comparative Analysis of the Images and Activities of Personified Wisdom and Jesus

- (1) On the Images and activities of Creator or Son of God
- (2) On the Images and Activities of Sage or Teacher
- (3) On their Images and Activities of Master or Lord in Banquet

Chapter 3: Critical Findings and Their Implications

- (1) Critical Findings regarding the Relationship of Personified Wisdom and Jesus
- (2) Implications for the Relationship of Personified Wisdom and Jesus

Conclusion

Bibliography

TABLES

Table.1. Evidence of Personified Wisdom in Proverbs

Table.2. Intertextual allusions between Genesis and Proverbs

Table.3. Intertextual evidence of Torah in the MT and LXX

Table.4. Intertextual Relationship of Personified Wisdom and Torah

Table.5. Philo's Explanation in relation to the Logos (Gen 1:26-27, 2:7) in *Opif.* Creation

Table.6. Chiastic Structure of the Johannine Prologue

Table.7. Step Parallelism in John 1:1-5

Table.8. Intertextual Allusions to Personified Wisdom in the Logos in the Johannine Prologue

Table.9. Parallelism between Woman Wisdom and Wisdom Folly

Table.10. Intertextual and Compositional Relationship between Prov 1 and 9 on the Personified Wisdom

Table.11. Intertextual and Compositional Relationship between Prov 8 and 9

ABBREVIATIONS

1. Primary Sources: Bible Texts, and Ancient Texts

Gen	Genesis	John	John
Exod	Exodus	Heb	Hebrews
Num	Numbers	Cor	Corinthians
Deut	Deuteronomy	Col	Colossians
2 Kings	2 kgs	Gos. Tr.	The Gospel of Truth
1 Chronicles	1 Chr	Gos. Thom.	The Gospel of Thomas
Ps	Psalms	<i>M. 'Abot</i>	Mishnah Avot
Jer	Jeremiah	<i>Gen. Rab.</i>	Genesis Rabbah
Esth	Esther	<i>Lev. Rab.</i>	Leviticus Rabbah
Mic	Micah	<i>Ber. Rab.,</i>	Bereshit Rabbah
1 Macc	1 Maccabees	<i>Pesiq. Rab</i>	Pesiqta Rabbati
Prov	Proverbs	<i>4Q525,</i>	4Q Beat Beatitudes
Sir	Sirach	<i>11QPs^a</i>	11Q5 Psalms Scroll ^a
Wis	Wisdom of Solomon	<i>Tg. Onq.</i>	Targum Onqelos Targum
Bar	Baruch	<i>Tg. Ps.- J.</i>	Pseudo-Jonathan
Matt	Matthew	<i>Tg. Neof.</i>	Targum Neofiti
Luke	Luke	<i>Frg. Tg.</i>	Frgamentary Targum

Philo: Opif. Creation.
Alleg. Interp.3

De Opificio Mundi: On the Creation of the World
Legum Allegoriarum Libri iii: Allegorical Interpretation 3

2. Secondary Sources: Journals, References Works, Series

CBQ	Catholic Biblical Quarterly
HTR	Harvard Theological Review
JANESCU	Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society of Columbia University
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature
JECS	Journal of Early Christian Studies
JJS	Journal of Jewish Studies
JQR	Jewish Quarterly Review
JSOT	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament
JTS	Journal of Theological Studies.
NTS	New Testament Studies
ResQ	Restoration Quarterly
SBL	Society of Biblical Literature
SUNT	Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments
VT	Vertus Testamentum
TWNT	Theologisches Wörterbuch Zum Neuen Testament

Abstract

This study examines the intertextual and theological relationship between personified Wisdom in Proverbs and Jesus in the Gospels. This subject is the object of constant and energetic discussion even within contemporary Judaism and Christianity. I attempt to explain the backgrounds of the relationship between personified Wisdom and Jesus by categorizing them as two supposed traditions: Greek Logos-centered tradition and Jewish Wisdom-centered tradition. In the first place, I examine the origins of the Johannine Logos in order to discover the significant impacts of Greek influences including Torah, Word and Philo's Logos, along with the gradual influences of Jewish Wisdom traditions on the Johannine Logos. In the second place, I examine the direct influences of Jewish Wisdom traditions on the Jesus tradition in the Gospels. Next, I try to discover their images and activities between personified Wisdom and Jesus. On the basis of these examinations, I not only explain the relationships between them, but also the profound meanings of the personification of Wisdom. The conclusions elucidate the critical aspects of Jewish exegetical practices and theological intentions for the relationships between them. However, the examinations suggest the necessity of close reexamination for the developmental process and its various exegetical, theological and philosophical influences. This study underlines the importance of reconsidering the profound relationships between them. However, the outcome of this research is not to make a compromise between the Jewish and Christian perspectives. Consequently, I expect to promote the theological and philosophical dialogues of Judeo-Christian relations by developing a methodology for the relationship between personified Wisdom and Jesus.

Introduction

The research is designed to compare the images and activities of personified Wisdom in Proverbs including the Wisdom materials with Jesus in the Gospels. The objective of this study is to discover the relationships and the intertextual, exegetical and theological allusions between personified Wisdom in Proverbs including the Wisdom materials and Jesus in the Gospels.¹ In Chapter I of this research, I first examine various characteristics of the images and activities of personified Wisdom in Proverbs by examining the Jewish wisdom literature such as Hebrew Bible texts, such as Proverbs, Genesis, Numbers, and Deuteronomy; deuterocanonical books, such as Wisdom of Ben Sira, Wisdom of Solomon; the Qumran wisdom texts; the rabbinic sources, such as rabbinic midrash and the Targums. Next, I look at the characteristics of Torah in relation to personified Wisdom in the Jewish wisdom literature as an exegetical and theological foundation. On the basis of this examination, I try to categorize and develop the relationship as two supposed traditions: Greek Logos-centered tradition in the Fourth Gospel and Jewish Wisdom-centered tradition in the Synoptics. In the first place, I trace the developmental process of the concept of personified Wisdom, and of the relationship between personified Wisdom and the Johannine Logos, further, Incarnate Jesus. I particularly deal with the contemporaneous Jewish hypostatic notions: Torah, Word, Memra in the Targums, and Philo's Logos, as well as the Johannine Logos in addition to evaluating their gradual and interactive influences on Incarnate Jesus. Here I also discuss in detail Jewish hypostatic notions and their exegetical practices. In the second place, I trace the process of personified Wisdom's concept to the images and activities of Jesus in the Gospels in terms of the Jewish exegetical and compositional practices within Wisdom materials.

¹ Gérard Genette, *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation* (NY: Cambridge University Press, 1997), xviii. Genette defines the intertextuality, in "an undoubtedly restrictive manner," as "a relation of co-presence between two or more texts, that is to say, eidetically and most often, by the literal presence of one text within another." Intertextuality implies that the meaning of a text can be reformulated by the features of other texts, such as allusion, quotation, translation, pastiche and parody and so on. In addition, as the instances of intertextuality, an author transforms a prior text, or a reader references a prior text in reading other text.

In Chapter II, I conduct a comparative analysis about the relationship between personified Wisdom and Jesus in respect to their images and activities as three categories: 1) Creator or Son of God; 2) Sage or Teacher; 3) Master or Lord of a banquet. In this examination, through integrating intertextual, exegetical, semantic and theological methods and dimensions, I trace the developmental or shifting process from the personified Wisdom's concepts to the Johannine Logos, Jesus in addition to examining the related texts: Proverbs including Wisdom materials and the Gospels. In Chapter III, regarding the critical findings from the examination in Chapter II, I attempt to discover the significant allusions, and to elucidate the critical implications concerning the relationship between them. I reexamine the features of the usages of theological and philosophical languages, and their exegetical practices and compositional expressions in reference to the relationship. Afterward, I reconsider the theological and philosophical debates regarding the developmental or shifting process from personified Wisdom to Jesus within early Jewish Christianity and early Palestinian Judaism.

Consequently, I discuss various aspects and angles concerning the backgrounds and influences on the relationships between personified Wisdom and Jesus. I also reevaluate the relationship between them through the integrative approach of interpretative methodologies of intertextual dimension, and exegetical, semantic and theological dimensions. Furthermore, I reexamine the similarities and connections between their activities and images in order to reorganize a sound direction and its methodology of a theological discourse for the reconstruction of Judeo-Christian relations in respect of discovering a convergent point between Judaism and Christianity. Rather than making a compromise between two religions, and their theological positions, the study is intended to converse their theological and philosophical methodologies with each other, and then to formulate the convergent positions in respect of understanding each different religious, theological, and philosophical perspective in a deeper and broader level.

Chapter 1: Personified Wisdom in Proverbs and Jesus in the Gospels

(1) Personified Wisdom in Proverbs

According to Richard J. Clifford, “The book of Proverbs consists of several collections of instructions, speeches, and two-line sayings.”² Clifford explains, “Proverbs is an anthology of collections and appendixes, which were composed and collected from the earliest days of the monarchy (ca. 1000 B.C.E) to the end of the sixth century B.C.E., or to the Babylonian Exile and thereafter in the opinions of many scholars.”³ According to the descriptions of the independent collections of Proverbs (Prov 1:1, 10:1; 25:1), the primary author of the Book of Proverbs is King Solomon (mid tenth century B.C.E.).⁴ The author of Proverbs, however, presents chronological evidence that “the men of King Hezekiah collected” in Prov 25:1. James L. Crenshaw classifies “the actual dates of the various literary complexes that make up the wisdom corpus in the Proverbs” as follows: some canonical proverbs, which may have preceded the monarchy; others, which flourished during the exilic period; and Proverbs 1-9 as the latest collection, since the post-exilic period.⁵ The majority of scholars insist that the bulk of the sayings of Proverbs in Biblical Hebrew are of the pre-exilic or exilic period, and most of the instructions and speeches in Chapters 1-9, as well as the final editing in late Biblical Hebrew are the post-exilic period.⁶ However, it is difficult to determine the date of the book of Proverbs by only the linguistic criteria, since the Book contains different linguistic characteristics, such as Aramaisms, and Grecisms.⁷ Alice M. Sinnott assumes that the book of Proverbs might have been formulated from the beginning of exilic period until the post-exilic period, due to the mythological, and even Greek, Hellenistic evidence that perceive personified Wisdom as a

² Richard J. Clifford, *The Wisdom Literature* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1998), 1.

³ Clifford, *Wisdom Literature*, 42.

⁴ James L. Crenshaw, *Old Testament Wisdom: An Introduction*. 3rd ed. (Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press, 2010), 5. Crenshaw suggests that Proverbs in large part, Ecclesiastes, and Wisdom of Solomon are attributed to King Solomon.

⁵ Crenshaw, *Old Testament Wisdom*, 52.

⁶ Richard J. Clifford, *Proverbs: A commentary* 1st ed. (Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press, 1999), 4, 28. Clifford explains, “the origin Hebrew manuscripts of Proverbs have not survived, but we have two fragments from Cave Four at Qumran: 4QProv^a (=4Q102) written in an early Herodian formal script (ca. 30- 1 B.C.E), contains 1:27-2:1; 4QProv^b (=4Q103), written in a late Herodian formal script (ca. 50 C.E.), preserves vestiges of two columns: 13:6-9; 14:5-10, 12-13; 14:31-15:8; 15:20-31,” “A different Hebrew recension of Proverbs was evidently the basis for the Greek translation of the second century B.C.E., which is known as the Septuagint. The translations of Proverbs were expanded to Syriac and Targum, and Latin.”

⁷ Clifford, *Proverbs*, 4-5.

feminine form in Prov 1, 7, 8, and 9.⁸ Crenshaw even implies, “the book of Proverbs may not have been complete until Hellenistic times (339-198), although containing much older literature.”⁹

Regarding the chronological order of Prov 1-9, most scholars generally agree that the date of Prov 2-7 is the exilic or early post-exilic period, especially the Persian period. Michael V. Fox criticizes: “the simplistic periodization is contradicted at every step by the complaints of the pre-exilic prophetic and Deuteronomic authors.”¹⁰ In this regard, it seems to be reasonable to accept that there were several authors who wrote and edited the collections of Proverbs in the early Second Temple period, which includes from the Persian period, the sixth and fifth century B.C.E. to early Hellenistic period, i.e., the fourth centuries B.C.E.¹¹

The purpose of Proverbs is explained in Prov 1:2-4.¹² It also shows that the compositions of Proverbs had a long developmental process including both the pre-exilic and post-exilic.¹³ The religious and moral instructions in Proverbs show that wisdom is not only an important compositional and theological source, but is also a Jewish hypostatic notion in relation to the expression of God.¹⁴ The wisdom of Proverbs in Jewish wisdom traditions is of two distinctive kinds, didactic or practical wisdom, and speculative or personified Wisdom.¹⁵ On the one hand, practical wisdom is found

⁸ Alice M. Sinnott, *The Personification of Wisdom* (England: Ashgate Pub., 2005), 6-7.

⁹ Crenshaw, *Old Testament Wisdom*, 5.

¹⁰ Michael V. Fox, *Proverbs 1-9: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, 1st ed. (New York: Doubleday, 2000), 343.

¹¹ Clifford, *Proverbs*, 5-6; PHEME PERKINS, April, 2014, email message to author. In an email conversation with author on April, 2014, she mentions that it is first necessary to clarify exactly the provenance and category of the book of Proverbs. Since I assume that the date of its final editing of the book of Proverbs is included until the post-exilic, i.e., later Persian, and even early Hellenistic period. I regard it as one of “early” Jewish sources.

¹² “That men may appreciate wisdom and discipline, may understand words of intelligence; 3 May receive training in wise conduct, in what is right, just and honest; That resourcefulness may be imparted to the simple, to the young man knowledge and discretion.”(NAB)

¹³ Samuel L. Adams, *Proverbs, Book of*, in *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism*, ed. William B. Eerdmans (Grand Rapids, Mich., 2010), 1103.

¹⁴ Wisdom in Hebrew is Hokma (חכמה) and Sophia (Σοφία) in Greek; Erwin Fahlbusch, and Geoffrey William Bromiley, *The Encyclopedia of Christianity* vol. 5 (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Leiden, Netherlands: Wm. B. Eerdmans; Brill, 1999), 542-3. Hypostasis basically means a substantial reality of spiritual and physical beings. Neoplatonism, which is regarded as the origin of hypostasis by Plotinus, divides the hypostasis as the Soul, Spirit and the One. In Christian theology, a hypostasis means “one *ousia*” of the “three *hypostaseis*, Father, Son, and Spirit.”

¹⁵ Daniel J. Harrington, *Wisdom texts from Qumran Source* (Routledge, London: New York, 1996), 8. Harrington implies that Proverbs provides significant understandings and vocabularies to other wisdom literature, such as Qumran texts, Qoheleth, and Sirach as well as the Wisdom of Solomon and so on. Richard Clifford, *Proverbs*, 31, Proverbs seems to have given an influence on “the rabbinic sources, such as *Pirqe. Abot*, *the Saying of the Father's*, a collection of sayings from the men of the Great Assembly between fifth to the third

throughout all the chapters of Proverbs. Prov 1-7 appear to have remarkable evidence of Torah-centered tradition influenced by Deuteronomistic Laws¹⁶ On the other hand, personified Wisdom is described in Prov 1:20; 7:4; 8:1, 12; 9:1. The personification of wisdom in Prov 1, 8-9 is particularly a controversial issue. Clifford summarizes the scholarly research of personified Wisdom as four theories in view of the processes of adaptation of ancient Near Eastern literature: “(1) Wisdom is a hypostasis of Yahweh; (2) Wisdom as a Syro-Palestinian or Egyptian goddess such as the Goddess Ma'at, Isis and Canaanite Goddess and so on;¹⁷ (3) Wisdom as the Mesopotamian divine or semi-divine *ummānu* in terms of a mythology; (4) Wisdom as a pure literary personification.”¹⁸ However, Sinnott approaches the provenance and development of personified Wisdom differently; they reflect a theological response to a critical event and dramatic change, such as the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple, and the Babylonian Exile, and even the invasion of Alexander the Great in early Hellenistic period.¹⁹

On the basis of this background, I look at the examples of personified Wisdom in Proverbs, which is an ongoing polemic issue.²⁰ The personification of Wisdom appears exclusively in Prov 1, 8, and 9. In Prov 7:4, *בִּינָה* and *הִכְמָה* are personified and used differently from the same words in Prov 3, and 6. The use of *בִּינָה* and *הִכְמָה* seems to move from a negative motif to a positive motif (cf. Prov 3:5-7; Jer 9:22-23). It appears to allude to a theological change from the didactic and Deuteronomic Law or Torah centered tradition to personified Wisdom. In comparison between Prov 3, 6, and Prov 7, 8, there

century B.C.E., to the commentary in *Abot de Rabbi Nathan* in the Mishnah, and the descendants of Rabbi Judah the Prince in the third century C.E.”

¹⁶ Interestingly, in Prov 6, Torah sometimes seems to be identical with wisdom in a hidden and mixed form.

¹⁷ Fox, *Proverbs 1-9*, 331. Fox suggests an example of an extended allegorical personification of an abstract virtue such as the Late Egyptian tale, “Truth and Falsehood” which are meant as “Two Brothers in Egyptian literature. (Pap, Chester Beatty II; AEL 2.211-14).” However, in this tale, the personification does not indicate hypostatization in itself. In this sense, Fox mentions that they can be some of the literary, mythological, and real-life background images that entered into the portrayal of Woman Wisdom, but not to be equated with personified Woman Wisdom.

¹⁸ Clifford, *Proverbs*, 23. It is important to notice the formative and developmental process of personified Wisdom in Proverbs in conjunction with wisdom literature in the ancient Near East.; Michael Fox, *Proverbs 1-9*, 331-32. Fox mentions, “The literary development of the figure such as the trope of personification is frequent and significant in the Hebrew Bible (Ps 85:11, Isa 59:14).” Fox also explains the figure of personified Wisdom by dividing an inchoate stage and full-fledged stage in the personification of wisdom in the book of Proverbs in terms of a literary development.

¹⁹ Sinnott, *The Personification of Wisdom*, 3-5, 171-2. It seems to allude to a significant theological and socio-political nexus with Sirach and the Wisdom of Solomon in relation to personified Wisdom.

²⁰ Adams et al., “Proverbs, Book of,” in *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism*, 1103. Even if there is a fundamental difference between biblical texts and other ancient Near Eastern texts, we can see that a number of books of most remarkably in Egypt exemplify similar structures.

is the explicit move from the didactic Torah to personified Wisdom.²¹

Table.1. Evidence of Personified Wisdom in Proverbs²²

חכמות, בחוץ תרצה; ברחבות, תתן קולך	Prov 1:20
אמר לחכמה, אחתי את; ומדע, לבונה תקרא	Prov 7:4
א הלא-חכמה תקרא; ותבונה, תתן קולך יב אני-חכמה, שכנתי ערמה; ודעת מזמות אמצא	Prov 8:1,12 ²³
חכמות, בנתה ביתה; הצצה עמודיה שבעה	Prov 9:1

This feature appears to be the close relationship between God and personified Wisdom in Prov 8. Personified Wisdom in Prov 7 appears to play a role as a window in introducing her in Prov 8, 9.²⁴ In this sense, the Torah gives a critical allusion and insight into the personification of Wisdom in the Proverbs. The most important feature of personified Wisdom in Prov 8:22-31 is that she derives her vitality from her close association with God, containing allusions to the creation account of Gen 1:1.²⁵ Here is evidence alluding to the intertextual nexus between two texts in relation to personified Wisdom in creation.²⁶

Table.2. Intertextual Allusions between Genesis and Proverbs

כב והנה--קנני, ראשית דרכו: קדם מפעליו מאז. כג מעולם, נסכתי מראש-- משדמי-ארץ. כד באיון-תהמות חוללתי; באיון מעצנות, נכבדי-מים. כו בהקיניו שמים, ושם אני; בתקו חוג, על-פני תהום ל ואתה אצלו, אמון; ואתה שעשועים, יום יום	Prov 8: 22-24, 27 30
א בראשית, ברא אלהים, את השמים, ואת הארץ ב והארץ, היתה תהו ובהו, וחשך, על-פני תהום; ורוח אלהים, מרחפת על-פני המים	Gen 1:1-2

²¹ Bernd U. Schipper, “When Wisdom Is Not Enough! The Discourse on Wisdom and Torah and the Composition of the Book of Proverbs” in *Wisdom and Torah: The Reception of 'Torah' in the Wisdom Literature of the Second Temple Period*, edited by Bernd U Schipper, D Andrew Teeter, (MA: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2013), 75-76. Schipper observes that there is “a reception of Deuteronomy in Proverbs 1-9,” which alludes to “a didactic concept where wisdom can serve as a hermeneutic of Torah, transmitting the divine word from one generation to the other.” It implies in the process of the final composition, and editing of the book of Proverbs, the concept of wisdom was reduced, whereas the level of the Deuteronomic and written Torah was increased. It alludes to a theological conflict, or debate, which was existed between Torah and Wisdom. Schipper argues that the main strategy of the author of Prov 31 which is generally considered as the final redaction’s chapter is to reduce intentionally the theological position in relation to wisdom in the heavenly level, i.e., personified Wisdom, to the ground level, such as practical wisdom. It implies that personified Wisdom was one of the metaphorical expressions in scribal and exegetical practices by the theological changes in the authors’ intentions in relation to historical situations.

²² I make yellow marks to highlight the important analyses in the tables below.

²³ Reinhard Adler, *Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft*, <http://www.bibelwissenschaft.de/online-bibeln/ueber-die-online-bibeln/> (accessed April 5, 2014). I cited most of Masoretic texts and Septuagint texts with vowels in this paper from this site.

²⁴ Fox, *Proverbs 1-9*, 343.

²⁵ The remainder of Prov 8 also supports the fact of Wisdom's presence with God during the creation.

²⁶ In Proverbs, the concept of Torah is mainly “instruction” of parents, and God in terms of didactic wisdom. In this sense, it is necessary to remember, Torah is implicitly appeared in the background of personified Wisdom. Regarding the relationship between Torah and personified Wisdom, I examine this part in detail in Chapter 2.

They first have a clear similarity in the terminological expressions, such as *בְּרֵאשִׁית*, and *עַל-פְּנֵי* *תְהוֹמוֹת*. In addition, *אֱלֹהִים* for *יְהוָה*, and *בְּרָא* for *קִנְיִי* appear to be substituted by the authors' phraseologies about the pre-canonical texts.²⁷ The translation of *אֶמוּן* is important for the argumentation of the personification of Wisdom. In the Mishnah *Gen. Rab.*, and Midrash *Ber. Rab.*, as well as the Midrash on Proverbs, the Rabbis consider the Torah in relation to the translation of *אֶמוּן*.²⁸ They explain the Torah not only as an identical being with the Wisdom in Proverbs, but also as a “blueprint” or “instrument” for the creation of the world, seemingly, in spite of an inner conflict within the doctrine of revelation of Rabbinic Judaism.²⁹ The rabbinic interpretation also appears to have a similarity with Philo's methodological exegesis for the Reason, the Intellect as an “instrument” in creation.³⁰ It alludes to a theological change regarding Wisdom in relation to the Torah. These examinations concerning the personification of Wisdom in regard to Torah allude to a particular change in the authors' exegetical practices and their theological intentions in relation to personified Wisdom and Torah in accord with their socio-historical backgrounds shaped by the exilic or post-exilic period. I will discuss in detail this issue in Chapter 2.

(2) Traditions regarding the links between Personified Wisdom and Jesus

a) Torah, the Foundation of personified Wisdom and Jesus

The relationship between Torah and personified Wisdom in Proverbs and Torah-centered statements in Jewish wisdom traditions offer an inner exegetical allusion to the connectivity between personified Wisdom and Johannine Logos. The relationship also alludes to the situation of ancient

²⁷ In fact, the chronological order between Genesis and Proverbs is not easy to delineate in terms of literary, exegetical, and compositional dimensions. In terms of the Documentary Hypothesis, it could be hypothetically said that *אֱלֹהִים* and *בְּרָא* in Genesis, belongs to Elohist source (E) written around 850 B.C.E., and *יְהוָה* and *קִנְיִי* in Proverbs, belongs to Yahwist sources (J) written around 950 B.C.E. (cf. Sir 24:9). However, it seems actually not a proper chronological calculation. In fact, it seems that Proverbs 8:22-31 was particularly written in the background of Genesis 1, because the author's intention of Prov 8:22-31 appears to emphasize the superiority of Wisdom by employing *קִנְיִי* instead of *בְּרָא* in Genesis.

²⁸ See Table.8.

²⁹ Ephraim E. Urbach, *Sages*, 287. Jacob Neusner, *Genesis Rabbah: The Judaic Commentary to the Book of Genesis: A New American Translation*. (Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1985), 1-2; Burton L. Visotzky, *The Midrash on Proverbs* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992), 45-47.

³⁰ The interpretation of intellect as “instrument” of rabbinic Judaism appears to have a relationship with that of Philo's Logos in relation the preexistence of Wisdom.

Judaism in regard to the critical impacts of Torah within Palestinian Judaism, including even Rabbinic Judaism around the first century C.E.³¹ The term ‘Torah’ was used in two different connotations in the traditions of the Oral Law of the preserved Mishnah.³² In *M. ’Abot* i, 1, ‘Be deliberate in judging, and raise up many disciples, and make a fence for the Torah,’ Torah implies teachers and judges of the people.³³ *M. Sanhedrin* xi, 2, Torah signifies the teaching of precepts and *Halakhot* itself.³⁴ In this regard, Torah can be defined within the threefold division: Torah, Prophets, and *Hagiographa*, around the first second centuries C.E. Due to the terminological similarity between Torah and Law, the Law (νόμος) oftentimes appears “in Greek-speaking Jewish texts in Hebrew or Aramaic.”³⁵ The term תורה usually appears as the meaning of “Law” in various usages in the Bible.³⁶ Torah is also given various names with a similar meaning, such as “the Book of the Law of Moses,”³⁷ and λόγῳ "word" (Wis 9:1), νόμον “law” (Wis 6:4), παιδείας “instruction” (Wis 6:17), מוסר “instruction” (Prov 1:2, 8) in the MT, and the LXX.³⁸ These texts demonstrate a critical relationship with Torah as a central feature in Jewish wisdom traditions. The personification of Wisdom alludes to a specific nexus with the observance of the Torah in these texts. It also implies to some extent the intertextual and theological relationships between personified Wisdom and Torah in early Jewish sources.

Here are the instances of a predecessor or prototype of חכמה and תורה in Table.3. These texts allude to a strong and explicit textual strategy using simultaneously חכמה and תורה (sometimes

³¹ Scholars, who attempt to interpret the meanings of logos within Jewish Midrash, believe the Greek translates either דבר, word or חכמה, wisdom in Jewish wisdom traditions into the Logos. They assume that the Prologue can be a kind of homily or midrash, which means a retelling of a biblical story through the exegetical Jewish wisdom tradition on a passage such as Gen.1:1.

³² Ephraim E. Urbach, *Sages*, 289. The concept and meaning of Torah can be extended in terms of including the reproaches regarding the observance of the precepts, the reprimands and promises of the prophecies and the ethics of the Wisdom books, as well as the history of Israel, etc.

³³ *Ibid.*, 286.

³⁴ *Ibid.* Simon the Just declared in *M. ’Avot* i, 2, “Upon three things the world is based: upon the Torah, upon Temple service, and upon deeds of loving-kindness.” It implies not only that the use of the term Torah was not confined in the Mosaic Torah, but also that the Torah has an expansive and symbolic meaning for a personified being. Simon the Just referred that the Temple service and deeds of loving-kindness are included in the study of Torah since the Torah alone is the covenant between God and His people. It implies that the study of Torah itself is one of the supports of the world, and the presence of God among His people who relies on the implementation of the study of Torah.

³⁵ Boaz Cohen, *Jewish and Roman Law: A Comparative Study*, 2 vols. (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1966), 28-29.

³⁶ Abraham Evan-Shoshan, *A New Concordance*, Printed in Israel, by “Kiryat-Sefer” (Ltd. Jerusalem, 1989), 1225.

³⁷ Refer to Josh 8:31–32; 1 Kings 2:3; 2 Kings 14:6; Ezra 6:18; Neh 8:8, 13:1.

³⁸ The meaning between מוסר and תורה is, in many cases, exchangeable in Proverbs.

substituted as חוק (מוסר) within one paragraph.

Table.3. Intertextual Evidence of Torah in the MT and LXX

תורה צוה לנו משה: מורשה קהלת יעקב	Deut 33:4
ב לדעת חכמה ומוסר; להבין, אמרי בינה.	Prov 1:2, 8 ³⁹
ח שמע בני, מוסר אביך; ואל-תשש, תורת אמן.	
כג כל אלה בספר ברית יי כתובים תורה צוה לנו משה מורשה קהלת יעקב	Sir 24:23
ב על-עזבנו התורה יוכיחנו, ודרכנו דרך חטאים יקרא	16:2
ה יען כי-כלאו בניך, אשר על-ידם תינתן התורה לאות עולם	18:6
ταῦτα πάντα βίβλος διαθήκης Θεοῦ Ὑψίστου, νόμον ὃν ἐνετείλατο ἡμῖν Μωσῆς κληρονομία συναγωγῆς Ἰακώβ.	Sir 24:23 ⁴⁰
יב יחדיו שיחתם בתורת עליון אמריהמה להודיע עזו	Ps154:12
ΘΕΕ πατέρων και Κύριε του ἑλέους ὁ ποιήσας τὰ πάντα ἐν λόγῳ σου	Sir Wis 9:1
א אנא ה' אלוהי אבותי, אל החסד והרחמים, אשר בדברך הכל כוננת	
οὐδὲ ἐφυλάξατε νόμον, οὐδὲ κατὰ τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐπορεύθητε.	Sir Wis 6:4
ד ומחוקקי אוון כולכם, ואת-חוקי אלוהים לא נצרתם	
ἀρχὴ γὰρ αὐτῆς ἡ ἀληθεστάτη παιδείας ἐπιθυμία, φροντίς δὲ παιδείας ἀγάπη,	Sir Wis 6:17(18)
פרק ו יח ראשית חכמה אהבת מוסר, ותוצאות מוסר חסד	

The textual combination of חכמה and תורת also contributes to the developmental process of the personified Wisdom within these texts.

Table.4. Intertextual Relationship of Personified Wisdom and Torah

ה ראה למדתי אתכם, חקים ומשפטים, כפאשר צונו יהנה אלהי: לעשות פן--בקרב הארץ, אשר אתם באים שמה לרשתה	Deut 4:5-8
ו ושמרתם, ועשיתם--כי הוא חכמתכם ובינתכם, לעיני העמים: אשר ישמעו, את כל-החקים האלה, ואמרו רק עם-חכם ונבון, הגוי הגדול הזה	
ז כי מי-גוי גדול, אשר-לו אלהים קרבים אליו, פיהנה אלהינו, בקל-קראנו אליו	
ח ומי גוי גדול, אשר-לו חקים ומשפטים צדיקים, ככל התורה הזאת, אשר אנכי נתן לפניכם היום	
א החכמה תהלל נפשה ובקרב עם אלהים תתפאר	Sir 24:1,23-26 ⁴¹
כג כל אלה בספר ברית יי כתובים	
תורה צוה לנו משה מורשה קהלת יעקב	
כה מלאה חכמה כפישון וכנהר חדקל בימי האביב	
כו לא גמרי קדמונים החכמה ואחרונים לא ישגוה	
1 ΠΟΛΛΩΝ και μεγάλων ἡμῖν διὰ τοῦ νόμου και τῶν προφητῶν και τῶν ἄλλων τῶν κατ' αὐτοὺς ἠκολουθηκότων δεδομένων, ὑπερ ὧν δεῖον ἐστὶν ἐπαινεῖν τὸν Ἰσραὴλ παιδείας και σοφίας	Sir 1:1
ראשית חכמה אהבת מוסר, ותוצאות מוסר חסד	Wis 6:17
ג לכול פותאים כי להודיע כבוד יהוה נתנה, חוכמה ולספל	Ps 154. 3, 10-13
י צדיקים מפתחי צדיקים נשמע קולה ומקהל חסידים	
יא זמרתה על אוכלם בשבע נאמרה ועל שתותמה בחבר	
יב יחדיו שיחתם בתורת עליון אמריהמה להודיע עזו	
יג כמה רחקה מרשעים אמרה מכול זדים לדעתה הנה	

The equivalence of Wisdom and Torah in Sir 24 is impressive. These texts in Table.3 and 4 illustrate well that personified Wisdom is identified with the Torah.⁴² It is worthwhile to notice that in

³⁹ 2 To know wisdom and instruction; to understand the words of understanding; 8 Hear, my son, the discipline of thy father, and forsake not the teaching of thy mother.

⁴⁰ "All this is true of the book of the Most High's covenant, the law which Moses commanded us as an inheritance for the community of Jacob."(NAB)

⁴¹ Patrick William Skehan, "Structures in Poems on Wisdom: Proverbs 8 and Sirach 24." *CBQ* 41 (3) (1979): 374. This text is a modern reconstruction in Hebrew.

⁴² The similar demonstrations of a combination between Wisdom and Torah are also appeared in Bar 3:9-4:4, and Ps 1 and 119. However, the Wisdom in the stories of Exodus in Wis 11-19 does not seem to be directly connected to the Torah in covenantal and sapiential traditions in Sirach.

John 1:17 the Law credited to Moses alludes to the Torah in a similar manner. In John 1:18, the one, who is in the bosom of the Father, i.e., the Logos has a similar motif with personified Wisdom in creation in Prov 8 in relation to Torah. It triggers a question of how Torah corresponds to personified Wisdom in the Jewish wisdom traditions, and Logos in early Christian traditions. W.D Davies asserts, “the finally definitive move for the Rabbis was to transfer all Logos and Sophia talk to the Torah alone.”⁴³ For this, Ephraim Urbach also states that Judaism ultimately identifies divine Wisdom with Torah.⁴⁴ Tannaitic literature, which is dated in the first second centuries C.E., also contains the identifications and depictions of personified Wisdom in Prov 8 with Torah in rabbinic texts.⁴⁵ W.D Davies and Dale C. Allison assume that early Jewish Christians might have expected a new or a renewal of Torah, or the abolition of the old Torah in the messianic time.⁴⁶ Helmer Ringgren emphasizes, “personified Torah replaces personified Wisdom in rabbinic tradition.”⁴⁷ In a similar vein, M. J. Edwards concludes that Torah can be referred to the Logos as “an earlier midrash” form of the Prologue in the Gospel of John in terms of Christological perspective.⁴⁸ However, due to the strong influences of Hellenism, and Hellenized Palestinian Judaism within early Judaism, the personification of Torah might not have been a widespread phenomenon or exegetic practice in comparison with the personification of Logos (or Wisdom) at the time of the Johannine community. In this controversial debate, there is an undeniable consensus that the significance and use of Torah was gradually increased in rabbinic tradition, and personified Torah has a significant interaction with personified

⁴³ W.D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology*, 2d ed., 1995, reprint, (London: Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, 1965), 170-72; Ephraim, E. Urbach, *Sage*, 287. Urbach mentions “The remnants of the Wisdom myth referring to Wisdom’s preexistence and its presence at the creation of the world, found in Proverbs (viii 22 ff), were transferred to the Torah, and it was said that it existed before the creation of the world, while R. Eliezer b. R. Zadok and R. Akiba spoke of the Torah as ‘an instrument wherewith the world was created, although this myth militates against the doctrine of Revelation.’”

⁴⁴ Ephraim E. Urbach, *Sages*, 1:198-99, 287; Daniel Boyarin, *Border Lines: The Partition of Judeo-Christianity*, (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania, 2004), 129. Daniel Boyarin also interestingly remarks, “For the Rabbis, Torah supersedes Logos, just as for John, Logos supersedes Torah.”

⁴⁵ Eldon Jay Epp, “Wisdom, Torah, Word: The Johannine Prologue and the Purpose of the Fourth Gospel,” in *Current Issues in Biblical and Patristic Interpretation: Studies in Honor of Merrill C. Tenney* Presented by His Former Students, ed. Gerald F Hawthorne (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975), 133-36. Tannaitic and Amoraic literature contains considerable examples of the identifications between personified Wisdom in Prov 8 and the Torah (e.g. *Gen. Rab.* 17:5; 31:5; 44:17; *Lev. Rab.* 11:3; *Pesiq. Rab.* 20:1)

⁴⁶ Dale C. Allison, Jr. *The New Moses: A Matthean Typology* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 323.

W.D. Davies, “Reflections on the Spirit in the Mekilta: A Suggestion,” *JANESCU* 5 (1973): 72.

⁴⁷ Helmer Ringgren, *Word and Wisdom Studies in the Hypostatization of Divine Qualities and Functions in the Ancient Near East* (Lund: H. Ohlssons boktr. 1947), 123.

⁴⁸ M. J. Edwards, “Justin’s Logos and the Word of God,” *JECS* 3, no. 3 (09/01, 1995): 262.

Wisdom in Jewish wisdom traditions, and even Incarnate Logos in the Johannine context and the images and activities of Jesus in the Synoptics.

b) Greek Logos-Centered Tradition in the Fourth Gospel

On the basis of the afore-examination of the relationship between Torah and Personified Wisdom, I try to discover the Greek Logos-centered tradition in relation to personified Wisdom and its critical influences on the images and activities of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel. I first examine Philo's Logos for the effective approach and explanation. Philo wrote in Greek, and in his biblical exegesis combined both Jewish exegesis and Greek philosophy. Philo's work is earlier than the Gospel of John, and closer than early Jewish sources in terms of the use of the term *logos* in discussing Genesis. It is meaningful to examine the Hellenistic influences on the Johannine Prologue, which seems to contain a blend of similar theological and philosophical languages such as λόγος "word," φως "light" and σκότος "darkness," as well as ἀλήθεια "truth" and so on.⁴⁹ I analyze Philo's Logos, which was created by his own exegetical methodology from Hellenistic philosophy and Jewish biblical traditions on Genesis in *De Opificio Mundi: On the Creation of the World (Opif. Creation)*. Philo's works comprise three independent sets of commentaries on the Pentateuch, and extensive treatment of Genesis.⁵⁰ In *Opif. Creation*, he comments on the "image of God" in Gen 1:26-27, and Gen 2:7 with the Logos.⁵¹ Philo's exegetical comments reflect an eclectic mix of philosophical traditions with

⁴⁹ Philo, *On the Creation* 31 (vol.1), 25. Even if those are not much within the limit of some philosophical languages, there are shared vocabularies between the Gospel of John and Philo's works such as λόγος "word," φως "light," and σκότος "darkness"; Philo, *On the Creation* 33 (vol.1), 25, τὸ δὲ ἀόρατον νοητὸν φῶς ἐκεῖνο θεοῦ λόγου γέγονεν "Now that invisible light perceptible only by mind had come into being as an image of the Divine Word,"; μετὰ δὲ τὴν τοῦ νοητοῦ φωτός ανάλαμψιν, ὃ πρὸ ἡλίου γέγονεν, ὑπεχώρει τὸ ἀντίπαλον σκότος "After the kindling of the intelligible light, which preceded the sun's creation, darkness its adversary withdraw" in; Philo, *On Dreams* 75 (vol.5), I., 335-336, ὁ θεὸς φῶς ἐστὶ, "God is light.,"; PHEME PERKINS, April, 2014, email message to author. She points out that even if it is evident that the evangelist uses some philosophical language, John's Greek actually seems to show that he would be actually unable to either listen or grasp the subtleties of a Greek drama or speech by a rhetorician, and he is certainly unable to write at the level of a serious philosopher in comparison with Philo's Greek.

⁵⁰ Gregory E. Sterling, "When the Beginning Is the End: The Place of Genesis in the Commentaries of Philo," in C. Evans, J. Lohr & D.L. Petersen eds. *The Book of Genesis. Composition, Reception and Interpretation*, (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2012), 428-38. Three sets are as follows: *The Questions and Answers on Genesis and Exodus, The Allegorical Commentary, Exposition of the Law*.

⁵¹ Philo, et al., *Philo: On the Creation*, 1 vol. (1929; repr., Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2004), 53-54, 106-7. Philo describes God as the only Creator. Philo relates the philosophy with regard to the Law of Moses. He emphasizes that Moses made the foundation of the Law of God in the creation of the world

particular emphasis on Platonic and Stoic traditions.⁵² He makes a nexus between the “image” in Plato’s *Timaeus* and the “image” in Gen 1:27. Philo emphasizes that the being in Gen 1:26-27 was κατ’ εικόνα θεοῦ “in the image of God,” while distinguishing with καθ’ ὁμοίωσιν, which means “just as his likeness or resemblance⁵³, i.e., as an image of the image of God,” which is supposed to be a human being.⁵⁴ In addition, καὶ ἔπλασεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον in Gen 2:7, the human being was “formed” or “fashioned.”⁵⁵

Table.5. Philo’s Explanation in relation to the Logos (Gen 1:26-27, 2:7) in *Opif. Creation*

τὸν ἄνθρωπον φησι γεγενῆσθαι κατ’ εικόνα θεοῦ καὶ καθ’ ὁμοίωσιν. וְיִבְרָא אֱלֹהִים תְּצַלְמוּ אֶת-תְּבִלְתוֹ	Gen 1:26 ⁵⁶
καὶ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον, κατ’ εικόνα θεοῦ ἐποίησεν αὐτόν, ἄρσεν καὶ θήλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς וַיִּבְרָא אֱלֹהִים אֱדָמָה, וַיִּצְבְּרָהּ אֱדָמָה-תָּא, וַיִּבְרָא אֱלֹהִים אֱדָמָה-תָּא, וַיִּצְבְּרָהּ אֱדָמָה-תָּא	Gen 1:27 ⁵⁷
καὶ ἔπλασεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον χοῦν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς καὶ ἐνεφύσησεν εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ πνοὴν ζωῆς, καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἄνθρωπος εἰς ψυχὴν ζώσαν. וַיִּצַּר יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים אֱדָמָה-תָּא, עֶפְרָר מִן-הָאָדָמָה, וַיִּפְּאֵר אֱדָמָה-תָּא; וַיִּבְרָא אֱלֹהִים אֱדָמָה-תָּא, וַיִּצְבְּרָהּ אֱדָמָה-תָּא	Gen 2:7

Philo also makes a distinction between γεγενῆσθαι “came into existence” in Gen 1:26-27 and ἔπλασεν “formed” in Gen 2:7. Philo explains that the former, human beings were created according to the Image of God, while emphasizing that “nothing earth-born is more like God than man.”⁵⁸ In *Allegorical Interpretation* 3, 94-96, Philo mentions Βεσελεῖλλ, which means “in the shadow of God,”

under the assumption that the law corresponds to the world, and the world to the law.

⁵² The influence of the Middle Platonic readings of Plato’s *Timaeus* emphasizes an intermediary role of the “image” as a second principle, which is called “the Idea”, “the heavenly Mind,” “the demiurge God,” and “the Logos.” It alludes to an influence of Middle Platonism on Philo’s Logos as divine mediator.

⁵³ William F. Arndt, et al., *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, 487.

⁵⁴ Gregory E. Sterling, “Different Traditions or Emphases? The Image of God in Philo’s *De Opificio Mundi*,” in *New Approaches to the Study of Biblical Interpretation in Judaism of the Second Temple Period and in Early Christianity: Proceedings of the Eleventh International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and associated literature*, jointly sponsored by the Hebrew University Center for the Study of Christianity, 9-11 January, 2007, eds. Gary Alan Anderson; Ruth A Clements; David Satran; Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature (Jerusalem). International Symposium: (Studies on the texts of the Desert of Judah, 106.), (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2013), 44.

⁵⁵ Philo, et al., *Opif. Creation*: 133-136, 106-7, However, the identification between the image of the Image of God and the human mind cannot be clarified. Philo’s comments on Gen 1:26-27 in *Opif. Creation*, 69-71, and 133-136, appear to contain two different understandings: one is that the human beings’ most complete resemblance to God is “in the image of God” and likeness, whereas the other is that it is impossible to think of God in the corporeal terms of an anti-anthropomorphic interpretation.

⁵⁶ Philo, *Philo: On the Creation*, 53-54.

⁵⁷ Ibid.

⁵⁸ Philo, et al., *Opif. Creation*: 68-71, 52-55; *Opif. Creation*: 133-136, 107. Philo explains the threefold scope of the ontological and hierarchic order: God, the Logos, and humanity in a sense of hierarchical ideas through the philosophical interpretation of Scripture. Gregory E. Sterling, “Different Traditions or Emphases?”, 45, 48, 50. Just as God is the model for the Image, which has been called a shadow, the Image is the model for other things because God made the human being to represent the Image.

and indicates the “chief craftsperson of the Tabernacle” as an example of an individual who was endowed with various gifts by God.⁵⁹ It implies that the Logos is an “instrument,” which God used for the creation of the cosmos. For Philo, the entire sense-perceptible cosmos- a copy of a divine Image and intelligible cosmos - is equal to the Logos as the model, the archetypal seal, as well as the Logos of God.⁶⁰ Philo, furthermore, points out, “The human being became a likeness and copy of the Logos when [the spirit] was breathed into his face.”⁶¹ In this logic that God made the Logos, which is the Image, the location of the ideas before “the sense-perceptible world,” Philo identifies the Logos with the human mind, and the idea of humankind, while attempting to make a connection between the Logos and rational thought.⁶² Philo develops a further thematic link of the Logos, which is Reason, and Human beings, who are created in the image of Reason. In this nexus, Philo produces a way of providing a relationship between God and the Logos, i.e., the Word of God.⁶³ In the larger system of the thought of Philo, the Logos serves as the representative of God, i.e., “the intelligible cosmos,” which is posited between God and the perceptible cosmos including human beings.⁶⁴ The Logos of God (ὁ θεοῦ λόγος) was not only an agent comparable to the Demiurge in Plato’s *Timaeus* through which God created in the world, but is also associated with a revelation.⁶⁵ Philo explicates that the Logos, i.e. the Word of God, which is even superior, is connected to the first man who “created, as I think, in body and soul, surpassing all the men that now are and all that have been before us.”⁶⁶ It also means that the ideal first man to “the divine Logos,” i.e., the Logos of God, which is “superior to all

⁵⁹ Philo et al., *Philo: Alleg. Interp.* 3., 365-67. Philo establishes a link between the popular etymology of בְּצִלְעָל and the metaphor of Plato’s cave.

⁶⁰ Gregory E. Sterling, “Different Traditions or Emphases?,” 55. On the basis of this logic, Philo concludes that the cosmos is a copy of the intelligible cosmos, and namely, of God.

⁶¹ Ibid.

⁶² Ibid., 44, 55.

⁶³ Ibid., 5-9, 48.

⁶⁴ Ibid. Philo establishes that “the intelligible cosmos” is “the Logos of God” in the act of creating the cosmos by explaining that the “intelligible city” is the reasoning capacity of the architect who is in the process of thinking through the founding of the “intelligible city.” It is based on the assumption identifying the image of God with the Logos under the influence and development of the Platonic tradition.

⁶⁵ Philo’s Logos is not the same as the Stoic or Platonic Logos, and is also not identical with the several usages of “Word” in the Hebrew Bible. For Philo, the Word is associated with the “mind of God” which contains the forms or the plan of all that is created. This can offer an opportunity to use the concept for the theology of its incarnation in Christian theology, e.g. Trinity.

⁶⁶ Philo, et al., *Opif. Creation: 139-141*, 111; David T. Runia, ed. *On the Creation of the Cosmos According to Moses* (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2001), 344-45.

rational natures.”⁶⁷ Through this reasoning, “the divine Logos” is eventually connected to a “second God,” therefore is with God.⁶⁸ Philo’s conclusion implies not only the relationship with personified Wisdom in Prov 8:22-31, but also the significant nexus with the Johannine Logos.

Despite the terminological, semantic, and even theological connectivity between them, as many scholar think, the association between Philo’s writings and the Fourth Gospel is still dubious due to the absence of philosophical vocabulary and its allegorical methodologies in the Fourth Gospel.⁶⁹ Goodenough does not even support the idea that the concept of Logos and other variants as a mediator figure was expressed as the site of God's presence in the world, as well as a very widespread image in the philosophical system of first-century and even second-century Judaism.⁷⁰ Craig S. Keener, on the contrary, supports the view that Philo’s Logos combines logically divine Wisdom and universal Law [or Torah].⁷¹ Thomas H. Tobin’s conclusion is noticeable, “the parallels do show that both the author of the hymn and Philo of Alexandria were part of the larger tradition of Hellenistic Jewish biblical interpretation and speculation.”⁷² In this debate, it is evident that the personification of Wisdom existed in Jewish wisdom traditions even before Hellenization,⁷³ and Philo’s Logos had a significant

⁶⁷ Ibid., 337, 344-345.

⁶⁸ Ibid. In this sense, it can be said that the divine Logos is a separate being from God, but a part of God.

⁶⁹ Brown, *The Gospel of John*, LVII-LVIII. Brown observes the methodological similarity in between Philo and John, i.e., a method inducing the concept of the logos from the Wisdom literature of the OT. In addition, the use of term logos triggered a strong curiosity that Philo’s Logos can be the basis of the Johannine Logos ; James A. T. Robinson, "The Relationship of the Prologue to the Gospel of St. John," *NTS* 9, (1962): 128. James A. T. Robinson tries to prove that the Prologue has a close connection with first-century Palestinian *realia*. Bultmann attempted to prove that the Johannine Logos came from sources in Palestinian Judaism or outside of Judaism such as "Mandaean writings" or some version of Gnosticism, which is based on mythology.

⁷⁰ Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough, *The Theology of Justin Martyr: An Investigation into the Conceptions of Early Christian Literature and Its Hellenistic and Judaistic Influences* (Amsterdam: Philo, 1968) 140-41. Bultmann attempted to discover the early impact of eastern gnostic speculations upon early Christianity, and especially on the Johannine Prologue, while insisting that the concept of Johannine Logos does not have its origin in the philosophical tradition of Hellenism, but in mythology.

⁷¹ Craig S. Keener, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* (vol.1), (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2010), 345; R. D. Middleton, "Logos and Shekinah in the Fourth Gospel," *JQR* 29, no. 2 (Oct., 1938): 101-3. R.D Middleton argues that the shift from Philo’s Logos to Torah is consistent with the overall rabbinic insistence that personified Wisdom in Prov 8 is Torah. Middleton insists that there is a significant role of Philo's Logos between “Greek Philosophy and rabbinic traditions.

⁷² Thomas H. Tobin, "The Prologue of John and Hellenistic Jewish Speculation." *CBQ* 52, no. 2 (04/01, 1990): 268. Tobin mentions, “this assimilation in Hellenistic Judaism of the *logos* to the figure of the heavenly man may have served as an important step in the kind of reflection that led to the identification of the *logos* with a particular human being, Jesus of Nazareth in the hymn in the Prologue of John.”

⁷³ Albright, William Foxwell. “The Supposed Babylonian Derivation of the Logos,” *JBL* 39 (1920): 143-51. Albright also mentions, “In the Proverbs of Ahiqar (about the sixth century), the text of Prov., chs. 8 and 9 must go back to a Canaanite original of about the seventh century with roots in still earlier Canaanite lore.” In this

influence from various Jewish hypostatic notions such as personified Wisdom, Torah and Memra.⁷⁴ Philo's exegetical use of Logos also reinforced the conceptual combination of Greek philosophy and the Torah, but also influenced the Jewish exegetical practices personifying Wisdom.⁷⁵ As a result, Philo's Logos permits personified Wisdom to be the Logos of God in creation through a theological and philosophical synthesis between the Law/Word/Logos and Wisdom of God. Therefore, in spite of Philo's Logos as a metaphysical intermediate being, we can infer that Philo's Logos offers a significant insight into Johannine Logos and eventually the Incarnation of the Logos, i.e., Jesus of Nazareth. It is not an exaggeration to say that Philo's Logos offers a theological framework for the personification and incarnation of the Johannine Logos. The central "middle Platonic" theological notions were also significant influences upon first-century Judaism.⁷⁶ In light of the centrality of mediation on the Logos in Philo's theology, Philo's Logos was influenced by Middle Platonism regarding Greek philosophy and Hellenistic contexts. As aforementioned, Philo's Logos offers a possibility that the divine Logos can be both the first human being and a second God. It is noticeable that Philo connects the Jewish hypostatic notions, e.g. the Word (of God) to a Greek philosophical concept, while making allusion to a new way of interpreting personified Wisdom of Proverbs.⁷⁷ Furthermore, Philo's Logos can also offer a likelihood of discovering the important evidence not only in the developmental process of Jewish hypostatic notions, but also in the reconstructive process of the hypostatization and personification of Wisdom in Jewish wisdom traditions. It becomes clear that the Logos theology originated in the world of Philo under these Hellenistic and Palestinian Jewish

sense, he mentions that personified Wisdom is not essentially related to Hellenistic origin, but more significantly to the origin of Canaanite-Aramean paganism. However, it is evident that Greek influences strengthened the developmental process of personified Wisdom in the Jewish traditions.

⁷⁴ Harry Austryn Wolfson, *Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*. 2vols. 4th rev. ed. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968), 1:255. Ibid., 42. Wilhelm Bousset supports Philo's use of Jewish exegetical traditions in addition to the existence of an Alexandrian school.

⁷⁵ Sterling, "Different Traditions or Emphases?," 43-44. The closeness of Philo's Logos to Torah and Jewish homiletic and midrashic practices, e.g., descriptions of the cosmology in the opening verses of Genesis, proves the comprehensive metaphoric and linguistic uses as an interpretative tool.

⁷⁶ These middle Platonic theological notions were regarded as a part of the development of Plato's philosophy on Philo's philosophical works on the Logos. In this regard, it can be inferred that Philo's Logos was a shared theological notion and form of Judaism and Christianity under Middle Platonism's influence in which the Logos as divine mediator is the defining characteristic.

⁷⁷ In fact, it can be inferred that the Jewish hypostatic notions were condensed and consolidated in Philo's Logos. This point of Philo's Logos is very important to understand the Johannine Logos and the theology of its Incarnation of divine Logos, i.e. Jesus Christ in terms of Christology.

Traditions, while providing a substantial impact on the Johannine Logos, and even early Logos Christology.⁷⁸

Philo's Logos eventually implies the relevance of the nexus between personified Wisdom and the Johannine Logos.⁷⁹ Philo's Logos is, however, only a prerequisite for the Johannine Logos, but not an omnipotent key for the Johannine Logos. On the one hand, on the basis of Philo's Logos, the mutual interactions between Jewish Logos and Christian Logos involved the particular theological development of the Johannine Logos as a second God, and on the other hand, on the basis of Jewish exegetical practices, the personification of Wisdom in relation to Torah, Word, and Memra influenced the notion of the Johannine Logos as an Incarnate Logos.⁸⁰ It then can be inferred that the conceptual development of the hypostatic notions: Torah, Word, Memra, and Philo's Logos in connection to personified Wisdom appear to have their direct and indirect influences on the Johannine Logos, and to offer an insight for how the Johannine Logos was involved with their developmental processes. Furthermore, the consequences of these examinations allude to a necessity of the uniqueness of the Johannine Logos, i.e., the creative and inspired concept, which is combined from the related concepts, which the evangelist would have considered. As concluding remarks, we can say that the Johannine Logos is a combined and crystalized product by the idiosyncratic Johannine Logos theology under the Greek and Hellenistic philosophical influences, and the Jewish wisdom traditions within Palestinian Judaism including Rabbinic Judaism and Hellenized Judaism. The unique Johannine Logos also was in a gradual process from the pre-existent Logos to the Incarnation of the Logos in the Messiah, Jesus of Nazareth, called the Christ, i.e., a shifting form from a Hellenistic and Jewish Logos [or Wisdom] theology to the particularism of Christology.

⁷⁸ It can also be assumed that there were phases in religious and cultural influences from the Greco-Roman environment upon the formative process of the Christian Logos theology. In particular, we can infer that Jewish Palestinian culture was gradually integrated and deeply influenced by the Hellenistic ways of life, thought and expressions for the last three centuries B.C.E. In this vein, we can infer that the Johannine Logos was derived from the influences within Hellenistic Judaism influenced by Middle Platonism through Philo.

⁷⁹ Philo's Logos provides significant characteristics and meanings in terms of theological and philosophical dimensions when comparing and analyzing the notions of the Logos between early Judaism and Christianity.

⁸⁰ In terms of a sematic dimension, Torah, Word, Memra, and Philo's Logos, which we have examined above, have similar or almost identical concepts with the Word of God in the Biblical context, even if their usages and meanings were totally different in accordance with their different theological and philosophical contexts. In this sense, it is crucial to understand the historical and ideological backgrounds of the Jewish hypostatic notions in relation to personified Wisdom.

c) Jewish Wisdom-Centered Tradition in the Synoptics

The presence of personified Wisdom in the Wisdom literature and New Testament (NT) within the period of thousand years between around 900 B.C. and A.D. 100 is clearly apparent, but needs thorough explanations.⁸¹ Among the many ideas and topics in the sapiential materials in regard to biblical wisdom traditions, the idea of personified Wisdom is unique and particular. In this sense, it is necessary to examine closely the related texts in the Wisdom literature and the N.T, since this study is about personified Wisdom's journey moving to Jesus, which we have intertextually, exegetically and theologically examined. From the point that the scopes and impacts of the sapiential materials are extensive unto the NT, Dieter Georgi explains, "Jewish Apologists took the practical consequences of the universal aspects of Jewish wisdom [using the same] dialectic between universalism and particularity as the Hellenistic culture around them."⁸² It implies that there was a theologically and philosophically combinational process between Judaism and Hellenism within Wisdom literature such as Sirach, the Wisdom of Solomon, and Philo. It also seems evident that early Jewish Christianity was not only part of the Jewish Wisdom movement, but also maintained the Christological uniqueness.⁸³ The sapiential materials in the NT particularly reflect that a universalistic Jewish Wisdom movement existed and gave a huge impact on the Jesus tradition in the NT under the Hellenistic influences.⁸⁴ In evaluation of the characters of the late Jewish Wisdom materials, one cannot deny that there were great changes and influences in replacing the locus of Wisdom as Torah in Rabbinic Judaism or Jesus in early Jewish Christianity, and that the Jesus tradition was sufficiently influenced to some extent under the Hellenization of early Judaism. Furthermore, it becomes clear that both the late Jewish sapiential materials and the NT were written during a contemporary period of time (i.e., before and even after the age of Jesus), reflecting cross-fertilization in a variety of permutations and combinations within various Jewish Wisdom traditions.⁸⁵

⁸¹ Ben Witherington, *Jesus the Sage: The Pilgrimage of Wisdom* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994), 381.

⁸² *Ibid.*, 382.

⁸³ *Ibid.*

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 381; Dieter Georgi, *The Opponents of Paul in Second Corinthians* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986), 337ff. Those influences reached out to Gentiles as well as Jews throughout the Mediterranean crescent.

⁸⁵ It also alludes to the fact that the late sapiential materials had been influenced by an eschatological and apocalyptic character which mirrors a social and political problem like persecution at that time. For instance, in

On the basis of this analysis, Ben Witherington summarizes the striking resemblance between personified Wisdom and Jesus in the Fourth Gospel.⁸⁶ In considering the chronology of the origins of the materials, it is generally accepted that the origin of the Synoptics is prior to that of the Fourth Gospel.⁸⁷ This fact alludes to a comprehensive feature of the Fourth Gospel in respect of embracing the characteristics of the similarities between personified Wisdom and Jesus in the Synoptics. However, we can also discover a unique evidence of the sapiential materials' impacts on the Gospels in the NT, which appears to more straightforwardly influence the Jesus tradition in the Synoptics, in comparison to the Fourth Gospel. In the beginning and early Jewish Christianity and in its forming process, it appears to have been different Wisdom traditions in accordance with the different influences: Hellenism and Judaism, i.e., Greek and Hellenistic tradition, and Jewish and Hebraic tradition. From these notions, we can infer that within a particular Jewish Wisdom tradition, there was an exegetical and literary practice to make a direct connection between personified Wisdom and Jesus while excluding or avoiding the Hellenistic influences. This assumed process and its consequences can offer an insight into a critical influence on forming literary, exegetical and compositional practices as well as theological intentions in relation to a direct relationship between them in the Synoptics.

More remarkably, there are explicit differences of the Synoptics from the Fourth Gospel in regard to the features of the connection between personified Wisdom and Jesus. The earlier sapiential materials such as Proverbs appear to some degree a more direct and valuable counter-order with the

addition to a prophetic and eschatological dimension, the Jesus tradition and the late sapiential materials such as Sirach and Wisdom of Solomon contain prominently a dualistic discussion of two levels: physical and spiritual, sight and insight, and light and darkness, as well as death and eternal life. However, it cannot be ignored that the speeches of Wisdom in the early Wisdom materials and its characterization particularly appear to have influenced the Wisdom materials such as Sirach and Wisdom of Solomon.

⁸⁶ Witherington, *Jesus the Sage*, 374. Witherington summarizes as follows, "(1) the Logos hymn, (2) 'I am' saying and discourses, (3) the use of Father-language, and teacher- learner language, (4) various aspects of Christology, soteriology, and pneumatology"

⁸⁷ Warren J. Moulton, "The Dating of the Synoptic Gospels," *JBL* 37, no. 1/2 (1918): 8. Moulton summarizes, "During the remaining years of the century one can trace a growing unanimity in these conclusions, as well as in the belief that all three Synoptic Gospels were written during the last thirty years of the first century, although a few scholars still continued to keep the first decade of the second open for Matthew and Luke." Rudolf Bultmann, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1971), 12. Bultmann mentions, "we should define the period for the composition and redactional edition of the Gospel as about 80-120 A.D."; Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1966), LXXXII-LXXXVI. Brown mentions, "at its outermost limits, A.D. 75 to 110, but the convergence of probabilities points strongly to a date between 90-110." Brown pinpoints, "the positive arguments point to 100-110 as the latest plausible date for the writing of the Gospel" while considering the discovery of "several early 2nd-century papyri texts of John."

Synoptics in terms of the Jesus tradition in relation to Jewish Wisdom traditions.⁸⁸ The particular counter-order between personified Wisdom and Jesus concerning the images and activities, and their words, deeds, and parables and aphorisms appears in the Synoptics.⁸⁹ Both the Synoptics explicitly and the Fourth Gospel implicitly, present Jesus as God’s Wisdom and God’s Word. Jesus himself is strikingly and publicly saying as personified Wisdom (Luke 24:44). In this point, Witherington observes that Matthew present Wisdom as “the public teaching of Jesus,” “for Christian teachers to use with outsiders or *new converts*”; John presents Wisdom as the private teaching of Jesus,” “for those who need *further* instruction in the school of Christ.”⁹⁰ The most important characteristic of teaching methods of Jesus in the Gospels is “parable.” The parable is translated as *παραβολή* in Greek in the New Testament, and is interestingly translated as *mashal*, *משל* in Hebrew. The parables in both the Jesus tradition and early Jewish traditions are supposed to construct a *mashal*, as an ordinary phenomenon, derived from human communications. The personified Wisdom form can be particularly considered as a premier and highest form of *mashal*, i.e., a metaphorical and figurative Wisdom speech.⁹¹ The analysis reveals a possibility of the advance from a *mashal* to personified Wisdom. The Jesus material and its tradition appear to emphasize the components of Wisdom in Jesus’s teachings.⁹² In this vein, the Jesus material’s appreciation to Jewish Wisdom traditions is generally natural since the mainstream authentic Jesus material, and early Jewish Wisdom sources echo a popular form of aphorisms and parables, i.e., narrative *meshalim* (*משלים*).⁹³ Narrative *meshalim* in relation to the parables of Jesus still seems to be a significant issue since Jesus’ sayings and Wisdom’s sayings have many common sources.

In this regard, it is necessary to reexamine more closely the various aspects of theories and their interpretative methodologies about Jesus’s parables in relation to early Jewish parables. Jesus’s

⁸⁸ Witherington, 384.

⁸⁹ Ibid., 161-183.

⁹⁰ Ibid., 338.

⁹¹ Ibid., 205.

⁹² Ibid., 155-156. Witherington mentions, “By even a conservative estimate at least 70 % of the Jesus tradition is in the form of some sort of Wisdom utterance such as an aphorism, riddle, or parable”; Rainer Riesner, *Jesus Als Lehrer: Eine Untersuchung Zum Ursprung Der Evangelien-Überlieferung* (Tübingen: Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1981), 392-394. Rainer Riesner counts 247 *meshalim* in the Synoptic Gospels.

⁹³ Ibid., 382.

parables and aphorisms appear to describe well that Jesus purposefully presented himself as a sage or teacher of all believers and audiences, even identifying himself with personified Wisdom in Proverbs.⁹⁴ Gerhardsson has shown that narrative *meshalim* in a similar allusion to Jesus's parables and aphorisms in the Synoptics can be found in the Hebrew Scriptures and in extra-canonical materials, especially in relation to the Wisdom materials.⁹⁵ The most controversial proposal in this allusion was that Jesus presented himself as Wisdom.⁹⁶ In Matt 11:19b; 12:42, and in Luke 11:31,⁹⁷ there is explicit evidence of the Jesus's attempt to identify Jesus himself with Wisdom embodied with flesh and of the interpretation of Jesus's mission in light of the earlier Wisdom traditions.⁹⁸ It is noticeable that this feature concerning the personification of wisdom appears to develop into a particularism, identifying Jesus himself as a particular historical person.⁹⁹ It alludes to a difference between a metaphor and an identity's statement, i.e., between a personification and a person. The nexus between God's personified Wisdom and Jesus is unprecedented in respect to a historical and individual dimension. The particular practices of the personification or hypostatization of Wisdom is also apparent more in the pre-Christian Wisdom material than in Proverbs including the NT. The majority of the Gospel traditions indicate that Jesus presented himself as a Jewish prophetic sage in a sapiential form (e.g. aphorism, parable) in relation to the earlier Jewish sapiential traditions like Sirach and Wisdom of Solomon.¹⁰⁰

⁹⁴ Witherington, 191.

⁹⁵ B. Gerhardsson, *The Narrative Meshalim in the Synoptic Gospels: A Comparison with the Narrative Meshalim in the Old Testament*, (NTS, Vol. 34(3), 1988), 339-63.

⁹⁶ Luke's author seems to conclude that Jesus was a teacher of wisdom who was tremendously marked by the possession and employment of wisdom, and Wisdom itself.

⁹⁷ Matt 12:42; Luke 11:31, ὅτι ἦλθεν ἐκ τῶν περάτων τῆς γῆς ἀκοῦσαι τὴν σοφίαν Σολομῶνος, καὶ ἰδοὺ πλεῖον Σολομῶνος ὧδε. "for she came from the ends of the earth to listen to Solomon's wisdom, and now one greater than Solomon is here."; Matt. 11:19b, καὶ ἐδικαιώθη ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων αὐτῆς. "But wisdom is proved right by her actions."

⁹⁸ It appears to be clear that Jesus saw himself as Wisdom and interpreted his mission in the light of the earlier Wisdom poem/hymns (cf. Sir 24:7ff.)

⁹⁹ Witherington, 384.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., 159. For instance, Wis10:9-10 σοφία δὲ τοὺς θεραπεύοντας αὐτὴν ἐκ πόνων ἐρρύσατο. 10 αὕτη φυγάδα ὀργῆς ἀδελφοῦ δίκαιον ὠδήγησεν ἐν τρίβοις εὐθείαις· ἔδειξεν αὐτῷ βασιλείαν θεοῦ καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ γνῶσιν ἁγίων· εὐπόρησεν αὐτὸν ἐν μόχθοις καὶ ἐπλήθυνεν τοὺς πόνους αὐτοῦ· "10 Wisdom rescued from troubles those who served her 11 When a righteous man fled from his brother's wrath, she guided him on straight paths; she showed him the kingdom of God, and gave him knowledge of angels [holy things]; she prospered him in his labors, and increased the fruit of his toil."(RSV) It illustrates that the role of Jesus is very similar to the role of Wisdom.

Several passages in the Gospels such as Matt 11:28-30 illuminate accurately the sage-disciple relationship and especially the image of Jesus as a Sage in a personified embodiment of Wisdom.¹⁰¹ As personified Wisdom appears to relate the revelation of the hidden meanings of Wisdom as a sage and prophet, Jesus as being a *mashal* himself reinterpret God's message to God's people for the Kingdom of God in respect to a prophetic and eschatological dimension.¹⁰² In view of Wisdom Christology, many scholars attempt to focus on Jesus as personified Wisdom as a female form, or as a personified quality of God in God's images by explaining that early Jewish Christians who created the sapiential Christological hymns declared Jesus as Wisdom in a mere metaphorical form in the Gospels. However, Jesus's parables appear to not only be a different dimension from an allegorical interpretation disregarding the historical orientation of the parables, but also allude to a profound nexus with the prophetic features of personified Wisdom to reveal the truth and aspects about the character of God.¹⁰³

Jesus's approach to public audiences particularly appears to involve a prophetic speech, which is very similar to Wisdom as a sage's approach.¹⁰⁴ Wilder defines a parable or *mashal* as "a prophetic or unveiling of the secrets of the eschatological future. In intertestamental Judaism there was a tendency for the old categories to be merged- law and wisdom, but also wisdom and prophecy or apocalyptic vision."¹⁰⁵ PHEME PERKINS also mentions, "Jesus uses proverbs [*meshalim*] in defense of his vision of the Reign of God."¹⁰⁶ It implies that Jesus' narrative *mashalim* is "a prophetic adaptation of a Wisdom form."¹⁰⁷ Despite the connectivity of Jesus's parables and narrative *meshalim*, there is a decisive difference between Proverbs and the Jesus tradition as Jesus' sayings had a distinctive and

¹⁰¹ Wis10:9-10 "Wisdom rescued from troubles those who served her... she guided him on straight paths; she showed him the Kingdom of God, and gave him knowledge of holy things." It illustrates that the role of Jesus is very similar to the role of Wisdom.

¹⁰² Witherington, 202.

¹⁰³ Ibid., 159-160.

¹⁰⁴ Claus Westermann, *The Parables of Jesus in the Light of the Old Testament* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990), Westermann points out, "They are an extended form of another sort of figurative comparison, namely the simile in the light of "a timeless and unhistorical linguistic phenomenon called 'metaphor.'"

¹⁰⁵ James Breech, and Wilder Amos N, *Jesus' Parables and the War of Myths: Essays on Imagination in the Scripture* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982), 79.

¹⁰⁶ PHEME PERKINS, *Jesus as Teacher* (New York; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 44.

¹⁰⁷ Witherington, 201.

particular voice with patterns, styles, themes, and an idiosyncratic ideology.¹⁰⁸ For instance, early Jewish parables are different from Jesus's narrative *meshalim* in that "Jesus never or almost never uses *meshalim* as a means of interpreting or illuminating Scripture... Halachic questions do not arise at all in the narrative *meshalim*." as B. Gerhardsson pointed out.¹⁰⁹ Rather, Jesus's direct use of narrative *meshalim* appears in his explanations of *mashalim* to the disciples. It is also noticeable that rabbinic parables were interpretations or illustrations and applications of some Torah-centered Scriptural texts; whereas Jesus's *mashalim* are prophetic, but not Torah-centered like other early Jewish parables. Jesus' eschatological conviction seems to make a Wisdom that entailed a counter-order in narrative *meshalim*. Despite these differences between them, they do not compromise a critical nexus between them in discovering the significant meanings of narrative *meshalim* in the parables of Jesus. Therefore, it is notable that the idea of understanding Jesus through the lens of Jewish Wisdom material was not only developed in conjunction with Jesus's own appropriation, but also formed through the "cross-fertilization" between the various forms of Wisdom speech expressing prophetic or apocalyptic ideas.¹¹⁰

In summary of Chapter 1, there were the two traditions regarding the personification of Wisdom: Greek Logos-centered tradition and Jewish Wisdom-centered tradition. Greek Logos-centered tradition was that the Jewish hypostatic notions in relation to personified Wisdom were extant before and after the period of the evident emergence of the Johannine Logos, and they had a critical impact on the formative process of the tradition between personified Wisdom and Jesus.¹¹¹ Unlike the

¹⁰⁸ Bernard Brandon Scott, "Jesus as Sage: An Innovating Voice in Common Wisdom," In *Winona Lake*, (Ind: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 407. One may also be surprised to discover the absence of major themes of proverbial Wisdom from the Jesus tradition; Ben Witherington, 161. There are no proverbs urging the seeking of Wisdom, or suggesting that the acquiring of it is difficult or urging that the fear of God is the beginning of Wisdom. In this sense, there is actually a great difference between them; David Aune, "Oral Tradition and the Aphorisms of Jesus," in *Sheffield* (England: JSOT Press, 1991), 241. Aune stresses that "the tenacity with which aphorisms cling to their attribution to Jesus is an important theological and sociological feature of early Christianity, suggestive not only of the role played by the historical Jesus, but also of the role which later Christianity wished to have Jesus play."

¹⁰⁹ B. Gerhardsson, "If We Do not Cut the Parables out of their Frames," 329-32.

¹¹⁰ Witherington, 201, 384-385.

¹¹¹ The Jewish hypostatic notions, such as Wisdom, Torah, Word, and Memra, as well as Logos allude to the necessity of the terms' uses as a theological and philosophical response in the historical situations. In this sense, it is necessary to examine closely the usages, and their intended meanings of the Jewish hypostatic notions, in addition to the historical backgrounds.

prominent aspects of the complex and developmental process of the personified Wisdom in regard to the Johannine Logos in the Fourth Gospel, Jewish Wisdom-centered tradition was that the approaches and uses of the images and activities of personified Wisdom in the Synoptics appear to apply directly to those of Jesus as a strong Jewish exegetical and literary practice. Even if the related texts that allude to the relationship between them are not sufficient, it is meaningful to examine a direct nexus between personified Wisdom and Jesus, and examine closely the related texts which allude to the relationship between them in regard to exegetical, semantic and theological dimensions.

Rediscovering the sapiential materials' influences on the Synoptics and their implications can also offer the critical evidence of the connectivity between personified Wisdom and Jesus in relation to their images and activities. Consequently, a profound connection between Jesus in the Gospels and personified Wisdom in the Proverbs from the critical findings could be found in the thorough and close reexamination for the two traditions aforementioned. The implications from the results of the examinations and analyses eventually also could widen and deepen the ways of reconsidering and discussing the various theories supposed between them.

Chapter 2: Comparative Analysis on the Images and Activities of Personified Wisdom and Jesus

On the basis of these afore-examinations, I intensively examine and analyze the critical texts in relation to the images and activities of personified Wisdom and Jesus within three categories: on the images and activities of a Creator or Son of God, on the images and activities of a Sage or Teacher, and their images and activities of a Master in Banquet.

(1) On the Images and activities of Creator or Son of God

The images and activities of personified Wisdom as Creator or Son of God was very controversial throughout the history of Christianity regarding the Trinity doctrine which considers Jesus as a personal and divine being in God. During the Christological disputes of the early church, there were particularly a number of disagreeable interpretations around the passages regarding personified Wisdom in creation. Moreover, personified Wisdom's application to Jesus from the Trinitarian

position is an ongoing controversial issue, which is continuing as intertextual, intertestamental and theological debates within Christianity and Judaism. The critical point was profoundly related to the preexistence of Wisdom in connection to the preexistence of Jesus in creation. The very controversial arguments in the point are whether or not the point that the Johannine Logos and Jesus can be related to the personified Wisdom figure, and whether or not there are authentically the similarities from the images and activities of personified Wisdom and Jesus in relation to the features of Creator and Son of God as an actual and divine agent of creation.

To begin with this debate, I analyze the two texts in the Johannine Prologue (John 1:1-18), and Prov 8:22-31, which have been disputed for a long time throughout the history of biblical interpretation. Regarding the provenance and basic structure of the Johannine Prologue (John 1:1-18), most scholars generally place the origin of the Gospel of John between 90 and 110 C.E.; whereas Rudolf Bultmann presumes its origin to be after the first century C.E.¹¹² The Johannine Prologue contains two kinds of genres: a poetic or hymnic form, mixed with prose passages.¹¹³ Like the origin of the Johannine Logos, the provenance of an “original hymn” of the Prologue is debated.¹¹⁴ The supposed origins and their influences on the Johannine Prologue can be classified as three: Gnosticism, Palestinian Judaism, and Hellenism.¹¹⁵ For the background of the Johannine Prologue, Brown analyzes Bultmann’s reconstruction of the Gnosticism as the “redeemer myth,” which

¹¹² Rudolf Bultmann, *The Gospel of John*, 12; Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, LXXXII-LXXXVI.

¹¹³ The Prologue is different from the other chapters with their narratives and theological reflections in the form of drama-rhetoric oriented approaches in the Gospel of John. In particular, the rabbinic perspectives prefer to see it as a prosaic form similar to the Proverbs 8.

¹¹⁴ Bultmann insists that the Prologue is a revised Logos hymn that derived from the Gnostic community. Brown, however, says that the Prologue has considerable evidence to be a unique exegetic production within the Johannine community influenced by Palestinian Judaism.

¹¹⁵ Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, LIII-LXV; Gail R. O’Day, “The Gospel of John: Introduction, Commentary and Reflections,” in *New Interpreters Bible: A Commentary in Twelve Volumes*, Vol. 9, ed. Neil Alexander (Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon Press, 1995), 515; Gail R. O’Day sees that the Prologue has the similarities with other Christological hymns in the New Testament, such as those in Phil 2:6-11; Col 1:15-20 and Heb 1:2-4. In addition to Brown’s classification, I included the theory of the Johannine community by John Ashton. See John Ashton, *Understanding the Fourth Gospel*, 22-23, 61, 115. NT scholars consider that the Johannine Prologue is not familiar with rabbinic sources, and its exegesis. However, even if many scholars tend to assume that the dating of rabbinic sources is much later than the date of the Johannine Prologue, the significance of the rabbinic sources on the Johannine Logos does not appear to be reduced due to the chronological diversity of the rabbinic sources, and the ambiguousness of their final editing, as well as the agreed assumption of later date of the final compositional editing of the Johannine Prologue in the Gospel of John. In this respect, it is still meaningful to examine whether or not there was a connection between the Gospel of John and rabbinic traditions in relation to the concept of Torah.

“supposes the existence of an *Urmensch*, an Original Man.”¹¹⁶ Bultmann attempts to prove that the Johannine Logos came from sources in Palestinian Judaism or outside of Judaism, such as "Mandaean writings" or some version of Gnosticism, which is based on mythology.¹¹⁷ James A. T. Robinson, in a different angle, tries to prove that the Prologue has a close connection with first-century Palestinian *realia*.¹¹⁸ It is essentially notable that in Palestinian Judaism, there were two strong influences: Hellenistic writings, Rabbinic Judaism.¹¹⁹ It then cannot be ignored that there is a Greek and Hellenistic influence on the Johannine Prologue in relation to personified Wisdom.¹²⁰ The dualistic features in the Prologue such as light and darkness appear to reflect a critical influence of Greek and Hellenistic philosophies, such as Aristotelianism, middle-Platonism and Stoicism.¹²¹ The Hellenistic

¹¹⁶ Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, LIV. Brown mentions, “In the Revelatory Discourse Source, this redeemer was the pre-existent (John 1:1) who became flesh (1:14).” He also claims, “other evidence of this pre-Christian Gnosticism in *the Odes of Solomon* and particularly in the writings of Mandaeans, which was a baptizing sect still extant in Mesopotamia.”; Rudolf Bultmann, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*, 9. Bultmann insists, “John is directly dependent on Gnostic traditions, and he uses these traditions in far greater measure than Philo the other late Jewish writers.” In addition, Bultmann attempted to discover the early impact of eastern gnostic speculations upon early Christianity, and especially on the Johannine Prologue, while insisting that the concept of the Johannine Logos does not have its origin in the philosophical tradition of Hellenism, but in mythology.

¹¹⁷ Rudolf Bultmann, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*, 8. In fact, we can see that Christian Gnostic works such as *the Gospel of Truth*, and *the Gospel of Thomas* seem to be comparable to the Gospel of John, which are based on ontological dualism. However, the allusion of ontological dualism such as light/darkness division is at issue. PHEME PERKINS, April, 2014, email message to author. Perkins mentions that *Gos. Tr.* may have an intertextual reception of the Johannine material, but there is no evidence for a “source” of the John’s Gospel, in addition, *Gos. Thom.* shows only partial parallel to the Johannine material.

¹¹⁸ James A. T. Robinson, “The Relationship of the Prologue to the Gospel of St. John,” *NTS* 9, (1962): 128. However, this theory is unlikely to be accepted by many scholars, due to the lack of clarity in the nature and even existence of synagogical schools in either Palestine or Alexandria, moreover, the unfittingness to the anti-Jewish characters of the evangelist in Jn.9:22, 12:42 and 16:2, etc.

¹¹⁹ Daniel Boyarin, *Border Lines: The Partition of Judeo-Christianity*, (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania, 2004), 129. Daniel Boyarin insists that the background of the Johannine Logos is based on a homiletic mirash in the rabbinic traditions, and Jewish Logos/Memra theology, which was later developed to Logos Christology; John F. McHugh, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on John 1-4*, ed. Graham Stanton (London; New York: T & T Clark, 2009), 95; McHugh also mentions “Even if these Targums do not predate the Fourth Gospel, they are the best guide we possess to the Aramaic tradition in which John’s Gospel was first formed,” while accepting the evidence that “in calling Jesus the Word made flesh, the evangelist was equating him with the Memra, and thus with everything that term implies” However, the Targums and the rabbinic sources do not appear to be appropriate evidence in relation to the Johannine Prologue due to the ambiguousness of the date of their sources. Nonetheless, it is necessary to remark that there were allusions from the Targums in relation to personified Wisdom and Torah, as we have examined in Chapter 1. (5) In this sense, even if the Targums and rabbinic sources do not predate the Jewish wisdom literature and even the Gospel of John around the first second centuries C.E, I do not exclude the Targums and rabbinic sources in the Aramaic traditions in relation to personified Wisdom reflected in the Johannine Logos.

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*, LVI; James D.G. Dunn, *Christology in the Making: A New Testament Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation* 2nd ed. (1989), 213-250.

¹²¹ These philosophical connections seem to be appeared in deuterocanonical books like Sirach and Wisdom of Solomon.

influences of the Johannine vocabularies within Palestinian Judaism were a natural consequence in a continuous combinative process of Greek philosophy, Stoic thought, Philo, and the *Hermetica*, which are Egyptian-Greek wisdom texts from second century C.E.¹²²

In a different direction from these two influences, there is a point of view of the development of the Johannine community as correlated with its unique emphasis on a “high” Christology.¹²³ This perspective considers a unique Johannine theological development as an idiosyncratic Christology. It examines further linguistic and theological parallels between the Qumran texts, other NT sources such as Paul and the Synoptic Gospels, and patristic period theology in relation to the Johannine Prologue.¹²⁴ Brown argues that the Johannine Prologue was composed directly by the evangelist in the Johannine community.¹²⁵ On this point, John Ashton also elaborates a hypothetical reconstruction, which supports the singular theology and its aspects of the Johannine community, in addition to

¹²² Ibid.

¹²³ PHEME PERKINS, April, 2014, email message to author. Perkins mentions that due to explicit identification of Incarnate, human Jesus as God and the consequent expulsion from the synagogue, ‘high’ Christology is one of the provenances of the Gospel of John within Palestinian Judaism. In this sense, assuming the unique theological tendency and the existence of Johannine community surrounding or within Hellenistic Judaism cannot simply be ignored.

¹²⁴ DUNN, *Christology in the Making*, 214-230. Dunn concludes, beyond the dependence to these influences of the pre-NT materials, “The Logos of God is God in his self-revelation.”; FRANCIS J. MOLONEY, *The Gospel of John: Text and Context* (Boston: Brill, 2005), 9-22. Moloney presumes that the narrative and theological messages of the Prologue itself should be considered as a mirror or window introducing Jesus as Incarnate Logos between “the implied author and implied reader.”; HERMAN N. RIDDERBOS, *The Gospel According to John: A Theological Commentary* (Grand Rapids; Mich.: Eerdmans; W.B. Eerdmans Pub, 1997), 17. Ridderbos asserts that the intention of the Prologue is “to describe the background against which Jesus’s historical self-disclosure must be understood.”; ANDREW T. LINCOLN, *The Gospel According to Saint John* (Peabody, MA: London; New York: Hendrickson Publishers; Continuum, 2005), 109. Lincoln comments, “The prologue’s profound theological implications emerge from a radical reshaping of Israel’s story. Israel’s God, its Scriptures and its symbols are now reconfigured around the one who is the subject of the Gospel’s own story. Genesis 1, Torah, Moses, Exodus 33 and 34, Wisdom, God’s Word, glory, the identity of the people of God, covenantal grace and truth, all help to interpret the distinctive significance of Jesus, but in the process are themselves reinterpreted in the light of what is believed to be the decisive revelation that has taken place in him.”; D. M. SMITH, *The Theology of the Gospel of John* (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 56. Smith mentions, “In discussing the background of the theology of the Gospel of John, it has seemed appropriate to refer to Paul and the Synoptic Gospels.”

¹²⁵ It implies that a Jewish Christian in a Jewish Christian community wrote this hymn as a result of a conflict with Jewish authorities. PHEME PERKINS, April, 2014, email message to author. Perkins mentions that the hymn is not an immediate result of the conflict, but a consequence of the debates, such as the incarnation from “no one has seen God,” and the separation of the “grace and truth” of Jesus from the Torah of Moses.; BROWN, LIX-LXI; PEDER BORG, “Philo of Alexandria as Exegete,” in *The Ancient Period: A History of Biblical Interpretation*, edited by Alan J. Hauser and Duane F. Watson, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 126-29. Peder Borgen gives an example that a similarity with the exegeses of the writings of Philo of Alexandria and *Gen. Rab.*, reflects that the evangelist attended a synagogical school with a curriculum of exegetical questions and answers.; FRANCIS J. MOLONEY, *The Gospel of John: Text and Context* (Boston: Brill, 2005), 52. The Prologue seems to have been composed as a final section, after the Gospel of John had undertaken a considerable compositional development within the Johannine community.

excluding the view that the provenance and composition of the Gospel of John can be simply reconstructed from the Hellenistic and Rabbinic Judaism.¹²⁶ In considering these theories, it is noticeable, “there is a growing consensus that the prologue must be read within the context of a Jewish speculative theology,” as Jo-Ann A. Brent mentions.¹²⁷ In addition, it still seems to be important to consider not only the influences of including Hellenistic and Rabbinic Judaism within Palestinian Judaism in relation to Torah, Memra, and Word, but also the Greek philosophical influences such as Philo’s Logos on personified Wisdom.¹²⁸

On the basis of the analysis, here I provide an exegetical overview of the Prologue in order to discover the explicit evidence of the nexus between personified Wisdom and Jesus through the Johannine Logos. To begin, there is a particular chiastic structure of the Johannine Prologue.¹²⁹

Table.6. Chiastic Structure of the Johannine Prologue

A The Origin and emergence of Logos in relation to God (1:1-5)
B Witness of John the Baptist about the light (1:6-8)
C Emergence of the light (1:9-11)
D The purpose of emergence of the light: transition from the light to Logos (1:12-13)
C’ Incarnation of the Logos (1:14)
B’ Witness of John the Baptist about Jesus Christ (1:15)
A’ The Origin of Incarnate Logos/Jesus Christ in relation to Moses and God (1:16-18a)

This particular chiastic structure of the Johannine Prologue illustrates that the evangelist elaborated the idea of Logos and personified Wisdom in addition to motivating the audiences to

¹²⁶ Ashton, *Understanding the Fourth Gospel*, 22-23, 61, 115.

¹²⁷ Jo-Ann A. Brant, *John* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic, 2011), 26. PHEME PERKINS, April, 2014, email message to author. In an email conversation with author on April, 2014, Perkins points out that even if the Johannine Prologue is a rhetorical prose piece, it cannot be seen as a formal encomium. It does not praise a human subject, but addresses an abstract entity, and it moves from the "pre-creation, Genesis" mode to the quasi-narrative mode, which with the John the Baptist insertions, orients the reader to the narrative which follows in the Johannine Prologue.

¹²⁸ The relationship between the Jewish hypostatic notions such as Philo’s Logos in relation to personified Wisdom contributes to discovering the major evidence of the relationship between personified Wisdom in early Jewish sources and the Johannine Logos.

¹²⁹ Brant, *John*, 23-27. Brant mentions that it should be careful to reconstruct the Prologue in a rigid chiastic structure. I represent the appropriate chiastic juxtaposition, while referring to other analytic structures of the Johannine Prologue.; John F. McHugh, *John 1-4*, 78-79. There are various structures suggested, which are “discerned from the way in which the major editions of the Greek NT divide it.” McHugh mentions, “By far the most popular description (and in the present writer’s view, rightly so) is that which sees vv.1-5 as speaking of the primordial existence of the Logos, and of the role in creation and history, of vv. 6-13 as outlining the historical advent of the Logos into the world, and of vv.14-18 as celebrating the Incarnation of the Logos.”; Brown, 1-2, 22. I follow Brown’s classification as the four strophes in the Prologue. Brown asserts, that there is an “original hymn,” first (1-2) strophe, second (3-5) strophe, insertion (6-8), insertion (9-10), third strophe (10-12b) fourth strophe (14,16), explanatory- expansions (17-18) including additional materials pertaining to John the Baptist (vss. 6-9, vss. 15 R). He mentions, “Perhaps originally the opening verses of the Gospel, displaced when the Prologue was prefaced to the Gospel by the final redactor.”

understand his particular theological intentions in terms of the Incarnation of the Logos: Jesus. The descriptions of A', B', C', supplement the descriptions of A, B, C in an articulated form. A' makes clear the origin and its meanings of Logos in A by connecting directly to the origin of Jesus Christ. In B, John the Baptist witnesses the light whereas in B', John explicitly witnesses Jesus Christ. C alludes to the emergence of the light in regard to the Logos, while C' directly refers to the emergence of the Logos in relation to Jesus. D has a significant role in bridging between A, B, C and A', B', C', the paralleled statements in this chiasmic structure. In addition, through the abrupt transition from the light to Logos in D, the purpose of emergence of the light, i.e., the Incarnate Logos appears to be dramatically emphasized in the middle of the Prologue. If we observe closely the structure of vv.1-5, we can discover a unique chiasmic formula in John 1:1-5 (See the Table.16 below). In the first (vv.1-2) and second (vv.3-5) strophe of the Prologue, a poetic structure and metaphorical language appear to be used through an explicit step parallelism as below.

Table.7. Step Parallelism in John 1:1-5¹³⁰

1	Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος, καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, καὶ Θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος. Οὗτος ἦν ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν.	1 In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was by (in company with ¹³¹) God, and God was the Word. 2 He (the Word) was by (in company with) God in the beginning .
3	πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἓν ὃ γέγονεν.	3 all came into being through him ; without him nothing came into being
4	ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἦν, καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ἦν τὸ φῶς τῶν ἀνθρώπων.	4 In him was life , and that life was the light of men.
5	καὶ τὸ φῶς ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ φαίνει, καὶ ἡ σκοτία αὐτὸ οὐ κατέλαβεν.	5 The light shines in the darkness, but the darkness has not understood it.

In the first strophe (vv.1-2), ἐν ἀρχῇ in the opening phrase of the Prologue have an analogous sense with the translation of תְּחִלָּתָא in Gen 1:1.¹³² Ἐν ἀρχῇ is particularly paralleled in v. 1 and v. 2. The role of ἦν is to confirm that the Logos was already before the existence of the physical world created.¹³³ McHugh classifies the term λόγος as having possible five basic meanings, (1) a self-subsistent Form or idea in the Platonist sense, (2) internal concept or the external expression in the Stoic sense, (3) Mind (Νοῦς) for Plotinus and the Neoplatonists, (4) the Word of God in the Hebrew

¹³⁰ JoAnn A. Brant, *John*, 28.

¹³¹ William F. Arndt, et al., *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press), 875.

¹³² PHEME PERKINS emailed a message to author on April 2014. In an email conversation with author on April 2014, Perkins points out that even if there is an intention to at least echo part of Gen 1 in the opening of the Fourth Gospel, it does not guarantee that the evangelist exegetes directly the Genesis texts.

¹³³ McHugh, *John 1-4*, 6.

OT (5) the Aramaic term Memra in the Targums, “meaning literally the *utterance* or the *Word* of God.”¹³⁴ McHugh concludes that the Word of God in the OT can be identified with “divine Wisdom,” as an external expression.¹³⁵ He also says, “The sense of John 1:1a is therefore: ‘In the beginning, before the material world was created, there existed the Word of God, the Compassionate, the All-merciful’.”¹³⁶ In particular, πρὸς τὸν θεόν may be appropriately translated as “near God, or by God, or in company with God,” according to the lexicological usages.¹³⁷ The Logos then gives a sense of “a companion of God.”¹³⁸ The Logos also has an exalted status in relation to God regardless of many terminological interpretations and theological speculations about it. This status of the Logos indicates a significant connection to the status and role of personified Wisdom in relation to God in creation’s context in Prov 8:22-31. The most striking and debatable sentence in the first strophe is θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος, “The Word too was God.”¹³⁹ James F. McGrath suggests that the Prologue expresses the dignified and “exalted status” of Jesus by adopting and associating the imagery of Logos in regard to the personification of Wisdom as a reaction to Jewish oppositions to Jesus.¹⁴⁰ Verse 3 appears to use empathetically a poetic antithesis between πάντα “all” and οὐδὲ ἐν ᾧ γέγονεν “nothing that has come into being,” and between δι’ αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο “through him” and χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο “without him.” In vv. 3-5, the terms of light and darkness have a significant connection with the context of creation. In vv. 6-9, as an insertion, which is not part of the original hymn, the witness of John the Baptist is mentioned.¹⁴¹ Verses 9-10 illustrate a transferring process from cosmic Logos to Incarnate Logos.

¹³⁴ McHugh, 8.

¹³⁵ Ibid.

¹³⁶ Ibid. McHugh mentions, “The Logos, the Memra, is ‘He Who is There.’” He does not restrain the possibility of the classical interpretation that the evangelist intended to include in his usage whatever the OT meant by the term Logos, and the Logos-Memra interpretation, which refers to the Deity revealed in the phrase ‘I AM WHAT I AM’ in Exod 3:14.

¹³⁷ William F. Arndt, et al., *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature*, 875.

¹³⁸ Brown, *The Gospel of John*, 21. McHugh (9) introduces fourth interpretation (1) the accusative, the dative to denote παρα “with” (2) “devoted to, and in converse with” (3) the accusative to denote “proximity” (4) the accusative to denote “orientation towards.” McHugh mentions, “Perhaps the difference between these interpretations should not be pressed too hard.... it must have been in some relationship to God,”

¹³⁹ Nigel Turner, and James Hope Moulton, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1906), 183. The absence of article before Θεός implies that ὁ λόγος is the “subject,” and θεός is the “predicate.”

¹⁴⁰ James F. McGrath, *John's Apologetic Christology: Legitimation and Development in Johannine Christology* (Cambridge, U.K.; New York; Cambridge University Press, 2001), 137-142., Herman N. Ridderbos, *The Gospel According to John: A Theological Commentary*, 17.

¹⁴¹ Brown, *The Gospel of John*, 22.

The move from the light to Jesus also infers a transitional point from Logos (Wisdom) to the Incarnation of Jesus. In the third strophe (vv. 11-13), the ultimate goal of the Incarnation of Logos is to give the gift and power of being children of God for those who believe in Jesus. The terms, light and life are used for the expression of salvation of humankind. The light comes and remains unknown or unaccepted to the Jews for Jesus as Son of God. The dualistic contrast between φῶς “light” and σκοτία “darkness” (vv. 4-5) also alludes to a similar dualistic concept at the Qumran community, i.e., sons of light and sons of darkness.¹⁴² In vv. 9-12, the term “light” conveys a similar sense of separation of Jewish sectarians at Qumran from the main Jewish community.¹⁴³ Through the antithesis, the evangelist asserts the purposeful emergence of the light towards the significance of ζωὴ “life” in vv.10-13 by emphasizing the roles of Logos as a life-giver and life-sustainer. In particular, ὁ κόσμος in v.10 is not merely the whole Universe, but δι’ αὐτοῦ, through the Logos, the world, where had come into being, and people lived with sin (John 1:19).¹⁴⁴ The aim of the emergence of the light, i.e., Logos is that τοῖς πιστεύουσιν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα “those who believe in his name” can have the ἐξουσίαν “the authority,” ἐκνα Θεοῦ γενέσθαι “to become the children of God.”¹⁴⁵ Through the parallel between vv. 4-5, and vv. 10-13, the evangelist seems to attempt the intersectional change between the light and the Logos (Word), and the shift from the light to Jesus via the Logos. In this vein, Brant states that in the Prologue, the narrative of “the origin of the Logos and its indwelling” is analogous to portrayals of personified Wisdom in early Jewish sources such as Sirach, Wisdom of Solomon, while emphasizing the role of Philo who provides an example of a *logos* informed by God’s wisdom as a heavenly agent.¹⁴⁶ The testimony of John the Baptist in vv. 6-8, 15, which are insertions, authenticates the Johannine narrative and messages, when considering the existence of considerable followers and comprehensive acknowledgement of John the Baptist around the age of Jesus. John the

¹⁴² Smith, *The Theology of the Gospel of John*, 16-17. Smith mentions that in *Community Rule* (col.3 and 4) in the Qumran scrolls, there are dualistic theological vocabularies of Gnosticism and the Gospel of John, such as *world, life, the spirit of truth, falsehood, light, darkness, unending light*.

¹⁴³ Smith, 16-17, 53-55.

¹⁴⁴ McHugh, *John 1-4*, 40-41.

¹⁴⁵ Philo, *The Confusion of Tongues* (vol.4), 144-46, 88-89. Philo explains the Logos (Word) as God’s First-born. Philo implies that “a Son of God is the Word, and “those who live in the knowledge of the One are rightly called ‘Sons [or children] of God’ (Deut. xiv 1).”

¹⁴⁶ Brant, *John*, 26. In this sense, we can infer that Philo of Alexandria offers an allusion to the theological use of Logos of the evangelist within Jewish wisdom traditions.

Baptist's witness underlines Jesus Christ as the Son of God, the Messiah. In the fourth strophe (vv.14-16), v.14a, "The Logos became flesh," refers directly to the Incarnation of Jesus. In particular, ὁ λόγος σαρξ ἐγένετο "Word became flesh" in v.14, and ὁ μονογενῆς υἱὸς ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς "the only begotten [only one of his kind] Son, who is in the bosom of the Father," provides significant theological references: the theological relationship between the Johannine Logos and personified Wisdom and God's communicative means with humankind through the Incarnation of Jesus in terms of the revelation of salvation by God. The rhetorical method of "flesh" appears to be directly related to the ultimate purpose of the revelation of God's salvation.¹⁴⁷ In this manner, the Incarnation in the flesh and blood of Jesus is an indispensable option regarding the revelation of God's salvation. The term σαρξ "flesh" as a counterpart of Logos alludes to a theological significance. Brown, in this sense, connects the Incarnate Logos (Word) with the ministry of Jesus in the world.¹⁴⁸ In v.17, ὁ νόμος is credited to Moses, while ἡ χάρις καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια "grace and truth" is credited to Jesus Christ.¹⁴⁹ In John 17:5, Jesus directly mentions that he existed in God's presence with the glory before the beginning of the world in his prayer. This expression alludes to an image of personified Wisdom dwelling in a whole place (τὴν οἰκουμένην συντελέσας) as a home, and within the sons of man (ἐν υἱοῖς ἀνθρώπων) in the world in Prov 8:31 (cf. Sir 24, Bar 3: 29, 37; Wis 9:10, 16-17). It is connected to the depiction about Incarnate Jesus as the Son of Man dwelling within humans (ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν) in the world in John 1:14 (cf. John 3:13, 31; 6:38; 16:28). On the basis of this textual analysis, I try to

¹⁴⁷ Through John 1-6, the speeches of Jesus are deeply related to His passion, death, and resurrection. In particular, in the "Bread of Life" discourse in John 6:41-58, the evangelist asserts the flesh and blood of Jesus is the true, real food and drink, which assures union with the Son and Father as the source of eternal life in the Prologue. Matt 11:19, 22:1-14, etc., seem to convey a significant sense of eating the bread as Jesus' body and drinking as Jesus' blood., "The Son of Man came eating and drinking, and they say, 'Here is a glutton and a drunkard, a friend of tax collectors and sinners.' But wisdom is proved right by her actions."

¹⁴⁸ Brown, *The Gospel of John*, 29. Brown, however, explains, "the presence of the incarnate Word in the world is rejected for the world does not recognize the Word (10c), although, Jesus said that he has come into the world (3:19, 7:46) that he is in the world.(4:5)"

¹⁴⁹ McHugh, *John 1-4*, 67, Friedrich, Gerhard Kittel, et al., *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (vol. 4) (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1964), 1033. "The essential nature of the Greek concept of νόμος has something in common with the Greek gods"; In the LXX, תורה is the "vast majority of cases translated νόμος (some 200 times out of 220)," Kittel, 1046; In the Rabbinic Judaism, the Law is denoted by the term תורה; Kittel, 1082-83. In the the Johannine Prologue, νόμος can usually be denoted as תורה, which means the whole teachings in the Law like the OT. However, the point is that in the Johannine Prologue, νόμος has not "a possibility for regulating human or even Christian action" and it is shown as "the first instance as revelation, in this sense it is set in confrontation with Jesus." This antithetic allusion between Law and Jesus also seems to indicate a tension between a rabbinic or synagogical group and the Johannine community.

expressions and descriptions of personified Wisdom in Prov 8:22-31. Friedrich Vinzenz Reiterer explains regarding the nexus between Wisdom and Torah in Sirach.¹⁵⁵ Afore-examined, there was preexistent evidence of the relationships between Wisdom and Torah in the biblical tradition through the explicit verbal expressions in Deut 4:5-8. In respect to considering the Incarnation of the Logos, the verb, ἐγένετο is used in ἐγένετο ὁ ἄνθρωπος εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν “the man became a living being” in Gen 2:7 in the LXX, and in ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο “The Word became flesh” in John 1:14. In addition, there are terminological and phraseological similarities within these texts in relation to creation, such as the contrast between light and darkness, and similar usage such as “in the beginning,” and so on.¹⁵⁶ In Prov 8:33, ἐν ἀρχῇ in the LXX appears to translate בְּרֵאשִׁית in Genesis 1:1.¹⁵⁷ According to *Gen. Rab.*, the word for “beginning” in Prov 8:22 refers only to the Torah.¹⁵⁸ R. Oshaia commences with the translation of Prov 8:30-31 as follows: “Then I was beside him like a little child, and I was daily his delight [rejoicing before him always, rejoicing in his inhabited world, and delighting in the sons of men.]”¹⁵⁹ In the interpretations of Genesis 1:1 in the Targums, there is interestingly a particular parallel alluding to the pre-existence of personified Wisdom in creation. Gary A. Anderson observes that “*Tg. Onq., Tg. Ps.-J.*, which exclude כִּמְהָ from Gen 1:1, also exclude the term שְׂכֵל, whereas in

¹⁵⁵ Friedrich Vinzenz Reiterer, “The Interpretation of the Wisdom Tradition of the Torah within Ben Sira,” in *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: Studies on Tradition, Redaction, and Theology*. (eds.) Passaro, Angelo and Giuseppe Bellia, *Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature*, 1, (Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2008), 224-8. Friedrich Vinzenz Reiterer offers a summary for an internal order with “a deep view of the activity of God”: wisdom, creation, and law for human being. Thus he presents the theological, soteriological, and practical functions of the Torah.

¹⁵⁶ McHugh, *John 1-4*, 6. McHugh states that the Johannine Logos is not a “created” being unlike Wisdom in Prov 8:22ff, and Sir 34:9, while emphasizing the terminological differences between these texts and the Johannine Logos. However, the interpretations of בְּרֵאשִׁית in the MT and ἔκτισέν με in the LXX Prov 8:22 ff are still debated. Sidnie White Crawford, “Lady Wisdom and Dame Folly at Qumran,” Faculty Publications: *Classics and Religious Studies Department*, (Brill NV. Leiden, 1998), 357; Jane S. Webster, “Sophia: Engendering Wisdom in Proverbs, Ben Sira and the Wisdom of Solomon,” *JSOT*, no. 78 (06/01, 1998):69. Ben Sira also claims the figure of women as a personified Wisdom reflecting the teaching of the wisdom tradition of patriarchal teachers

¹⁵⁷ Philo, *The Confusion of Tongues* 146 (vol. 4), 88-89. γὰρ ἀρχὴ καὶ ὄνομα θεοῦ καὶ λόγος καὶ ὁ κατ’ εἰκόνα ἄνθρωπος καὶ ὁ ὄρων, Ἰσραὴλ, προσαγορεύεται. “for he is called, “the Beginning,” and the Name of God, and His Word, and the Man after His image, and “he that sees” that is Israel.” Interestingly, Philo connects ἐν ἀρχῇ τολόγος. In addition, in Sir 24:9 instead of ἐν ἀρχῇ, ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς “from the beginning” is used.

¹⁵⁸ Neusner, *Genesis Rabbah*, 2.

¹⁵⁹ Neusner, *Genesis Rabbah*, 1.; Solomon Shechter, ed., *Aboth de Rabbi Nathan* (1887; reprint, New York: Philipp Feldheim, 1967), 91; Judah Goldin, trans., *The Fathers According to Rabbi Nathan, Yale Judaica Series* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1955), 126-27. Rabbi Eliezer, the son of Rabbi Yose, the Galilean also says: “Nine hundred and seventy generations before the world was created, the Torah was written and lying in the bosom of the Holy Blessed One and singing song with the serving angels, as it says: ‘I was daily his delight, playing before him at all times.’” (Prov 8:30)

Tg. Neof., and *Frg. Tg.*, which include חכמה, also include שכליל.¹⁶⁰ The uses of חכמה allude to a particular compositional and exegetic strategy for a midrashic thought, which reflects an intertextual intersection between these texts.¹⁶¹ One interesting fact is that the midrashic interpretation in Gen 1:1 to 2:1 places Wisdom in the entire creative process, and inserts Wisdom into the beginning of creation.¹⁶² On the basis of this interpretation of Prov 8:22-31, we can see that the Johannine Logos has an analogous conception with personified Wisdom in Prov 8:22-31, Gen 1:1, 2:1. In addition, depending how one translates יהוה קנני ראשית in Prov 8:22, קנני “created” or “possessed or [acquired],” as afore-examined, we can infer that the author’s theological intention of the whole passage in Prov 8:22-31 is significantly affected regarding the preexistence and identity of Wisdom.

However, due to the difficulty of determining the precise interpretation by a linguistic and grammatical approach, it is still necessary to examine closely this text in respect to the contextual and syntactic dimensions. In this context, these controversial interpretations of אָמוֹן in Prov 8:30 can give a critical insight into the relationship between personified Wisdom and Jesus and the preexistence of personified Wisdom in creation. In addition, Sir 24:9-10 and Wis 9:4 have an allusion to אָמוֹן in Prov 8:30 translated as ἀρμόζουσα (lit. “to join, to accommodate, bring into harmony,” or “suing, and fitting”) as an infinitive absolute form in the LXX. עבדתי, נבראתי in Sir 24:9-10 appear to allude to both the active role and passive status of personified Wisdom in creation. In addition, אָמוֹן can be translated in an adverbial or adjective form such as “faithful,” “faithfully.” However, in terms of the terminological and grammatical structure, the term אָמוֹן does not seem to be merely a adverbial or adjective form or even an absolute infinite form, but אָמוֹן is best seen as a noun representing the state

¹⁶⁰ Gary A. Anderson, “The Interpretation of Genesis 1:1 in the Targums,” *CBQ* I 52, (1990), 24. In the biblical texts, such as Jer 10:12; 51:15; Ps 104:24, we can see God’s use of W/wisdom in creating the world. The observation is mentioned as a part of argument of Anderson. The argumentative point is a problem of the translations within the Targums in relation to temporality, then, resulting in two very different positions in the Targums, which has חכמה “wisdom” or not. The argumentative point is a problem of the translations within the Targums in relation to temporality, then, resulting in two very different positions in the Targums, which has חכמה “wisdom” or not.

¹⁶¹ Martin McNamara, *Targum Neofiti I, Genesis* (Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1992), 52, In the English translation of Gen 1:1 in *Tg. Neof.*, “From the beginning “with wisdom” the Memra of the Lord created and perfected the heavens and the earth.” “For creation of the world by/in wisdom, (cf. Prov 8:22, 3:19; Wis 9:9; Ps 104:24) Rabbinic tradition, identifying wisdom and the Torah, speaks of God creating the world by the Torah; “beginning=t Torah”, Gen. R, 1:4.”

¹⁶² *Ibid.* Wisdom in the Targums particularly means “instrument” or “artisan,” as well as “Torah” by rabbinic interpretation. It alludes to a similar relationship with the role of personified Wisdom in Prov 8:22-31.

of subject(s). In particular, חָמָד in Prov 8:30 appears to be translated as “craftsman or architect” in *Gen. Rab.* 1:1. The descriptions of τεχνίτης “artisan” in the Wisdom of Solomon 7:21 also refer to the role and status of חָמָד as a preexistent and independent being in creation in relation to personified Wisdom. More importantly, when considering the rhetorical features of personified Wisdom in Prov 8:30-31, the meaning of חָמָד appears to be herself or her state in creation. On the one hand, in a combined way with these traditional Jewish interpretations, Michael Fox attempts to interpret this as a “child” or “nursling” who was growing up in God as His delight.¹⁶³ It can be inferred that the meaning of חָמָד can be semantically combined with a *qal* passive participle meaning “being raised” or “growing up,” as “an adverbial complement to the main verb.”¹⁶⁴ It then references the image of a child “nestling in and being embraced” in the arms of parents, which alludes to an intimate relationship with God. In this manner, the חָמָד can also be connected to the meanings of “begotten or acquired” in respect to both birth and creation.¹⁶⁵ On the other hand, Clifford attempts to interpret, in a different sense, the meaning of the term חָמָד as “a sage or teacher.” He derives the meaning from Akaddian *ummānu*, which is attested to Mesopotamian mythology and known to Levantine scribes, and which is vocalized as 'omman in Hebrew and means “sage,” which has a close meaning with “teacher.”¹⁶⁶ In this regard, he concludes that חָמָד is a heavenly figure symbolizing wisdom, derived

¹⁶³ Michael V. Fox, “Amon again,” *JBL* 115, no. 4 (Winter, 1996): 699-702. cf. 1 Kgs 10:1, 5; Esth 2:7; Num 11:12; Isa 49:23; Fox, *Proverbs 1-9*, 285-88. The literary contextual meaning in Num 11:12, represents Moses' relationship with the people of Israel. However, חָמָד in Num.11:12, is actually translated as a nursing father, and חָמָד was translated as “a child being nursed.”¹⁶³ In this regard, Prov 8:30-32 appear to have a similar motif in the depiction concerning being nursed and carried by the nurse or parent in Num 11:12, in respect to personified Wisdom and God in creation. Accordingly, this motif appears to have a significant connection with חָמָד in Prov 8:30.

¹⁶⁴ Fox, *Proverbs 1-9* 285-88. Fox explains a connection with חָמָד meaning “bringing up” in Esth 2:20b, and חָמָד meaning “with” as a preposition of proximity. However, the point is that חָמָד seems to have a relation with חָמָד. Summarizing these characteristics, Fox concludes that even if the image of wisdom in v. 31a is an image of a child or nursling figure, the image of wisdom in vv. 31b, 32 speaks of “a different stage in a sense of parents and teacher, addresses mankind as “sons” and takes on the persona of an owner of a house where people gather as supplicants or disciples.”

¹⁶⁵ Kenneth T. Aitken, “Proverbs,” *The Daily Study Bible Series* (Louisville, KY.: Westminster John Knox Press, 1986), 82. Kenneth Aitken mentions, “In the Old Testament, birth can happily be described as an act of creation (Ps. 139:13; cf. Deut. 32:6), and an act of creation just as happily as a birth (Ps. 90:2).” In this sense, the meanings of both birth and creation can be described as means of acquisition in respect to the implications of Proverbs 8. The Masoretic Text keeps the interpretation as “possessed or [acquired]” including the meaning “begotten,” while κύριος ἔκτισέν με ἀρχὴν in the LXX, ἔκτισέν is translated into “created.”

¹⁶⁶ Clifford, *Proverbs*, 99-101. In this sense, the translation of Num 11:12 might be “as teacher [or sage] carries the suckling child.” The image of sage can be also related to that of “craftsman or architect” in *Gen. Rab.* 1:1, as we have examined in the Table.2.

from the Mesopotamian *umānnu*.¹⁶⁷ It also appears to offer a significant implication for the nexus of Torah and חָכְמוֹת in which the image of sage also conveys a feature of a matured heavenly figure with profound wisdom, and of an authoritative figure in regard to the Torah in Judaism. These examinations also offer a critical insight into the image of חָכְמוֹת, which demonstrates an authority of personified Wisdom in the creation, which is granted by God, and shared with God. In sum, the meanings of חָכְמוֹת appear to convey not only a linguistic connection within these texts, but also a comprehensive semantic connection appropriately applied in exegetical approaches. Consequently, in my opinion, in terms of an integrative interpretation summarizing the meanings and definitions of חָכְמוֹת through the examinations of various interpretations, the image of חָכְמוֹת can be, on each different level, referred to as both “a child [or son] nursing or growing up with God” and “a sage with wisdom and authority who grew up with God” as a divine being existing and working with God in creation.¹⁶⁸ On this basis of this assumed position I propose, the Johannine Logos appears to, intertextually and theologically, be connected to the image of חָכְמוֹת, which indicates personified Wisdom herself. Personified Wisdom in Proverbs also alludes to a priority and superiority in the context of creation in the relationship with God like Jesus does. Subsequently, it also becomes persuasive that חָכְמוֹת alludes to an image of the Johannine Logos, i.e., Jesus “begotten” as a child or son in the bosom of God the Father in John 1:18 in regard to the image of the Son of God.¹⁶⁹ Moreover, it is noticeable that the images, activities and sayings of Jesus as the Son of God in the Fourth Gospel are profoundly connected to the salvific implications giving “eternal life”, e.g., John 5:21-40. Through this logic, it

¹⁶⁷ Richard Clifford, May, 2015, email message to author.

¹⁶⁸ I will discuss the images and activities of Jesus as “a sage with wisdom and authority who grew up with God” in creation” in Chapter 2. (2); Daniel Boyarin, “The Gospel of the Memra: Jewish Binitarianism and the Prologue to John.” *Harvard Theological Review* 94, no. 3 (07/01, 2001): 282. However, it is noticeable that the antithesis of Jesus and Moses in the Fourth Gospel does not support simply that Jesus is a sage (rabbi) or teacher or prophet in terms of an individual dimension.

¹⁶⁹ R.L Roberts, “The Rendering ‘Only Begotten’ in John 3:16,” *ResQ* 16 (1973): 4; Everett F. Harrison, “A Study of John 1:14,” 23-36 in *Unity and Diversity in NT Theology: Essays in Honor of G.E. Ladd.*, edited by Robert A. Guelish (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), 32. They think the verse can be paralleled to the “only one of his kind,” but not Jesus being “begotten,” The verse can be related to יָחִיד, which is used for Abraham's “only” son, in Gen 22:2. In this reasons, the title “only” son came to mean particularly “beloved” son, in Jewish texts. In addition, they imply that in μονογενής (1:14, 18), γεωγής is derives from a meaning “one of a kind” in a etymological and semantic dimension, even though many patristic writers read the term as “only begotten,” but this may imply more about second-century Christology. It probably corresponds to “the Hebrew יָחִיד, which it translates at times in the LXX.” Consequently, it seems to be reasonable to translate ὁ μονογενής υἱὸς ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς,” as “the only begotten [only one of his kind] Son, which is in the bosom of the Father.”

strengthens a possibility of explaining the use of “begotten” in reference to Wisdom as the Trinitarian position that Jesus is “begotten” of God, but not created.

In the Synoptics, there are indirect references about Jesus as the Son of God.¹⁷⁰ In Luke 7:31-35, Jesus declares the identification of himself and John as Wisdom’s children. In Matt 11:16-20; 25-30, in relation to a revelation of God’s purpose, the revealed knowledge appears to refer to an intimate relation of the Son and Father in Wisdom’s context.¹⁷¹ In addition, Jesus is literally the “firstborn” (πρωτότοκος) of the Virgin Mary (cf. Matt 1:25; Luke 2:7). The concept of firstborn is profoundly related to the “firstborn” in the O.T.¹⁷² The firstborn’s concept is intertextually connected to the firstborn, David, and “the highest of the kings” promised by God in Psalm 89:27, and can be eventually linked to a Messianic hint that Jesus was the Son of God and preexistent.¹⁷³ Despite these witnesses, the relationship between them on the Son of God still seems to be ambiguous and suspicious in the Gospels since the title “Son of God” is limitedly used as an idea of Messiah and its context in regard to the Kingdom of God in the Synoptics.¹⁷⁴ However, Paul, in the Epistles, supports strongly the direct connection between them as the image of the Son of God, Messiah. Paul attempts to explain the *יהושע* in Hebrew, *τεχνητός* in Greek as the Son of God, in addition to explaining the roles of Jesus in creation in connection to the roles of personified Wisdom in creation, which are derived and drawn from Proverbs (Prov 3:19-20; 8:22-31) and other Wisdom materials.¹⁷⁵ In Col 1:15-17:15,

¹⁷⁰ In the NT, there are some examples of Jesus as the Son of God in terms of Jesus’ self-witness, miracles, and so on. However, most descriptions of Jesus as the Son of God are difficult to directly connect to the images and activities of personified Wisdom. In comparison to the Synoptics, in the Epistles, there are direct explanations about the images and activities of Jesus as a Son of God or Creator in relation to personified Wisdom.

¹⁷¹ Suggs, 90-94. Wis 3:1-3 “The souls of the righteous are in the hand of God, and no torment will ever touch them. They seemed, in the eyes of the foolish, they seemed to have died.... But they are at peace.” It cannot be sure that the Son of our hymn-like the Son of the Wisdom of Solomon “functions primarily as the mediator of revelation.”

¹⁷² In light of Old Testament, Jesus can be a symbolic and figurative firstborn like Isaac’s Abraham’s son in Gen 22 instead Ishmael, and Jacob, Isaac’s son in Gen 25, 27 instead of Essau who possesses spiritually certain rights and privileges concerning the covenant of God.

¹⁷³ In Heb 1:3b, Jesus “sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high (cf. Luke 22:69) after he had provided purification for sins (cf. Mark 16:19).

¹⁷⁴ L. M. White, *Scripting Jesus: The Gospels in Rewrite*. 1st ed. (New York: HarperOne, 2010), 317. White points out, “The Jesus of the Gospel of Matthew is understood as the apocalyptic Messiah from the line of David.” The title “Son of God” seems to function a peculiar relation between the Messiah and God in traditional Jewish ways in the Mathew and John; whereas the title “Son of God” seems not dramatically function in Mark.

¹⁷⁵ Even if we cannot prove the authenticity of Paul’s theological understanding and reinterpretation for personified Wisdom, we cannot easily ignore them in the relationship between personified Wisdom and Jesus.

Jesus is “the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of all creation,” which is greater than all things created by God.¹⁷⁶ In Heb 1:3a,¹⁷⁷ the images and actions of Jesus are directly related to the images and actions of God. More importantly, the divinity of Jesus as a Creator is emphasized in 1 Cor 8:6.¹⁷⁸ These passages appear to imply the superiority and divinity of Jesus as the Son of God, in comparison with the roles of personified Wisdom in Prov 1, 8, and 9. Through this examination, Jesus and God appear to convey the same position as the Creator who is the one through whom all things came (cf. Prov 3:14, 19). In summary, we can say that the Johannine Logos encompasses an intertextual and theological allusion to personified Wisdom not only as a heavenly figure as an agent of God or as a God, but also a Son growing up in the arms of God the Father under the assumption that the image of the Johannine Logos conveys the image of a child or son “begotten” in the bosom of God the Father in John 1:18. Consequently, it can be inferred that the interpretation of *ἡμῶν* in Prov 8 is linked to not only an image of a divine agent for God’s works, but also a salvific images of the Son of God as a Messiah giving life, wisdom and salvation from the audiences’ contexts.

(2) On the Images and Activities of Sage or Teacher

The more we examine personified Wisdom in the Jewish Wisdom materials, the more the nexus between personified Wisdom and Torah becomes explicitly evident. It is then meaningful to examine more this nexus, since the relationship offers a connection to the images and activities of personified Wisdom as a Sage or Teacher with wisdom for Torah in relation to Jesus. As aforementioned, the preexistent feature of personified Wisdom in Prov 8:22-31 coincides with Gen 1:1, Sir 24:1-11, and

¹⁷⁶ Col 1:15-17:15 ὃς ἐστὶν εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου, πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως, 16 ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, τὰ ὄρατα καὶ τὰ ἀόρατα, εἴτε θρόνοι εἴτε κυριότητες εἴτε ἀρχαὶ εἴτε ἐξουσίαι· τὰ πάντα δι’ αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν ἔκτισται 17 καὶ αὐτός ἐστιν πρὸ πάντων καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκεν, “15 He is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of all creation. 16 For by him all things were created, in heaven and on earth, visible and invisible, whether thrones or dominions or rulers or authorities all things were created through him and for him. 17 And he is before all things, and in him all things hold together.”

¹⁷⁷ Heb 1:3a ὃς ὢν ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτήρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ, φέρων τε τὰ πάντα τῷ ῥήματι τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ “He is the radiance of the glory of God and the exact imprint of his nature,” (cf. 2 Cor 4:4) and “he upholds the universe by the word of his power” (ESV; cf. Heb 9:14).

¹⁷⁸ 1 Cor 8:6 ἀλλ’ ἡμῖν εἷς θεὸς ὁ πατὴρ ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτόν, καὶ εἷς κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς δι’ οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς δι’ αὐτοῦ. “yet for us there is one God (cf. Eph 4:6), the Father, from whom are all things and for whom we exist (cf. Rom 11:36), and the Lord, Jesus Christ (cf. Eph 4:5, John 13:13), through whom are all things and through whom we exist (ESV)” (cf. John 1:3, Col 1:16).

Wis 7-8. Ben Sira's works also seem to be utilized as a significant basis of the later works such as the wisdom literature reworked in the Qumran texts, and even the rabbinic texts. We also have examined the intertextual and theological allusions step by step in accordance with the related main issues: the authors' theological and compositional intentions, and intertextual and compositional implications. In arranging the chronological order of Jewish Wisdom materials as afore-examined above, the allusions of an explicit layer of intertextuality clarify the dates and provenances of the sources, and each author's theological, ideological and compositional intention in respect to personified Wisdom. Even if it is difficult to extract the accurate first and foremost layer, and the exact relationship existing between scriptural predecessor and rewritten work, we can infer the clear developmental process of the personification of Wisdom in relation to Torah. In addition, we can infer to some extent the reasons why the authors developed the personification of Wisdom from the preexistent scriptural sources. Such proven intertextuality gives a foundation to examine the ways in which the authors teach their audiences who were faced with actual social and historical situations, i.e., in the Hellenistic world.¹⁷⁹

On the basis of the background of the early Jewish sources regarding personified Wisdom, here I reexamine the interpretations of $\eta\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma$, which we already have examined in Chapter 2.(1); since it is crucial to understand the relationship between personified Wisdom and the Johannine Logos in respect to their images and activities of Jesus as a Sage or Teacher. In respect to the preexistence of personified Wisdom, which we have seen in Chapter 1.1), Torah signifies God's teachings in relation to the Law ($\nu\omicron\mu\omicron\varsigma$) of God. As afore-examined, personified Wisdom in Prov 8 is meaningfully identified with the Torah, and Torah corresponds to personified Wisdom in the Jewish wisdom traditions and Logos in early Christian traditions, and even in rabbinic traditions. There was also a clear reference to the connection between the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel and Prov 8. In John 1:17-

¹⁷⁹ A. Klostergaard Petersen, "Rewritten Bible as a Borderline Phenomenon—Genre, Textual Strategy, or Canonical Anachronism?" in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez*. Edited by A. Hilhorst, et al. (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2007), 305-306. Therefore, to discover the more layers in relation to intertextual allusions, it is necessary to examine the *etic* levels in terms of given cultures by outside observers, and *emic* levels of the culture itself, as A. Klostergaard Petersen explains. In fact, the terms, *emic* and *etic*, are used in the social and behavioral sciences. While *emic* refers to a consideration about how the local people, who lived at a place in a period, thought, *etic* refers to a consideration about how contemporary scholars interpret and categorize and explain the local observations.

18, the Logos has a similar motif with personified Wisdom in creation in Prov 8 in regard to Torah. The conclusion was that Torah can be referred to the Logos of the Johannine Prologue in terms of Christological perspective, and Torah can be eventually paralleled with Incarnate Jesus as a Sage with great wisdom and knowledge of Torah. The teachings of Jesus also make reference to the new interpretations of Torah by Jesus. Moreover, we can discover many instances regarding the characteristics of the images and activities of Jesus as a Sage in the Gospels and personified Wisdom in the Wisdom materials in terms of semantic, theological dimensions.

Personified Wisdom says, teaches and answers to humans' questions regarding life, wisdoms and God's divine will and teachings in a long discourse in Prov 1:21-30 and 8:17 (cf. Job 11:6-7; Wis 6:4, 17-18, 22; Wis 9:9-10, 18). The images and activities of personified Wisdom are explicitly paralleled with those of Jesus who says, teaches and answers to humans' questions in a long discourse in the Gospels e.g., *Sermon on the Mount* in Matt 5. In their speeches and discourses, there are significant similarities in terms of exegetical, semantic and theological dimensions. "I am" sayings of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel have a very similar characterization with the "I am" sayings of personified Wisdom in Proverbs including several Wisdom materials.¹⁸⁰ Wisdom first call (κηρύξεις, κηρύσσεται and παρεδρεύει) her people in Prov 1:20-21 and 8:1-4 (cf. Wis 6:16). In a similar manner, Jesus lets his disciples and his people follow, come and see (ἤκουσαν, λέγει, and Ἔρχεσθε καὶ ὄψεσθε) what Jesus does in John 1:35-51; 9:35 (cf. Matt 4:18-20; Mark 1:14-20, Luke 5:1-11). These imply that Jesus also

¹⁸⁰ There is a significant allusion that "I am" sayings of Jesus are indebted to "I am" discourse of Wisdom in Wisdom materials. The "I am" discourse is a critical characterization of the speeches of Wisdom. For instances, In Prov 8:12 **אֲנִי הָאֵלֹהִים** (BHS), **ἐγὼ ἡ σοφία** (LXX) "I am Wisdom"; In Sir 24:17 **ἐγὼ ὡς ἄμπελος** ἐβλάστησα χάριν "I am like a vine putting out graceful shoots," The evidence directly relates to the influence of sapiential material on the Fourth Gospel. cf. Wis 7:26, ἀπαύγασμα γάρ ἐστιν φωτὸς αἰδίου καὶ ἔσοπτρον ἀκηλίδωτον τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ ἐνεργείας καὶ εἰκὼν τῆς ἀγαθότητος αὐτοῦ. "She is a reflection of eternal light, untarnished mirror of God's active power, image of his goodness."). In the Fourth Gospel, the "I am" (*ego eimi*) sayings of Jesus are characterized variously as living bread, light, the gate, life, and the true vine and so on. Refer to these instances as follows.

Jn 6:35 Ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος τῆς ζωῆς "I am the bread of life."; 51 ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ζῶν "I am the living bread"
 8:12 Ἐγὼ εἰμι τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου "I am the light of the world."
 10:7 ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ θύρα τῶν προβάτων "I am the gate for the sheep." ;9 ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ θύρα "I am the gate";
 11,14 Ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλὸς "I am the good shepherd.";
 11:25 Ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ ἀνάστασις καὶ ἡ ζωὴ "I am the resurrection and the life."
 12:46 ἐγὼ φῶς εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἐλήλυθα, "[I am a light comes into the world]"
 14:6 Ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ ὁδὸς καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια καὶ ἡ ζωὴ "I am the way and the truth and the life."
 15:1 Ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ ἄμπελος ἡ ἀληθινὴ "I am the true vine"; 5 ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ ἄμπελος "I am the vine" (NIV)

calls his people. As Wisdom raise her voice and cries out (θαρροῦσα λέγει, and ὑμνεῖται) in public places in Prov 1:20-21 and 8:1-4, Jesus also cries out (ἔκραξεν) in a public place in John 7:28, 37 and 12:44 (cf. Matt 21:46). Wisdom calls the audience her children (υἱοῖς ἀνθρώπων and υἱέ) in Prov 8:31-32 (cf. Sir 4:11; 6:18) like Jesus who seems to acknowledge his disciples as children (τέκνα θεοῦ and τεκνία) in John 1:12 and 13:33. Their attitudes to the audiences allude to an intimate relationship much like a father-children relation. This also justifies the personality and divinity of Jesus in the relationship between Jesus as Wisdom and God. Wisdom gives a warning for the coming future in Prov 1:15-19, and Prov 8:36; 9:12,18,¹⁸¹ and asks them for repentance, as Jesus asks them for repentance in Matt 3:2; Mark 6:12; Luke 5:32; 15:7) or the dwelling or return to the loving word of God in John 15:4-10. Personified Wisdom tests and cleans her people or disciples until they love her in Prov 8:17 as Jesus sanctifies his children with his word, love and truth in John 13:3-17; 15:1-17; 16:27; 17:17.¹⁸² Eventually, because of her speeches about truth, Wisdom is rejected in Prov 1:24-25, as Jesus is also rejected in John 8:46, 59; 10:25 (cf. Matt 13:53-58; Mark 6:3; Luke 14:34, 4:24 29).¹⁸³

¹⁸¹ Jesus even prophesies the apocalyptic events in details in Matt 24, Mark 13 and Luke 21.

¹⁸² Susan Cady, Marian Ronan, and Hal Taussig, *Wisdom's Feast: Sophia in Study and Celebration* (New ed. Kansas City, Mo.: Sheed & Ward, 1996), 207. We can see the evident allusions in Proverbs, and the late sapiential materials: Prov 8:17 ἐγὼ τοὺς ἐμὲ φιλοῦντας ἀγαπῶ, οἱ δὲ ἐμὲ ζητοῦντες εὐρήσουσιν “I love those who love me, and those who seek me find me”; Sir 4:12 ὁ ἀγαπῶν αὐτὴν ἀγαπᾷ ζωὴν, καὶ οἱ ὀρθρίζοντες πρὸς αὐτὴν ἐμπλησθήσονται εὐφροσύνης “Whoever loves her loves life”; Susan Cady, 2008., Sir 6:20-22, 20 ὡς τραχεῖά ἐστιν σφόδρα τοῖς ἀπαιδεύτοις, καὶ οὐκ ἐμμενεῖ ἐν αὐτῇ ἀκάρδιος· 21 ὡς λίθος δοκιμασίας ἰσχυρὸς ἔσται ἐπ’ αὐτῷ, καὶ οὐ χρονιεῖ ἀπορρῖναι αὐτὴν 22 σοφία γὰρ κατὰ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῆς ἔστιν καὶ οὐ πολλοῖς ἔστιν φανερά. “How very harsh she is to the undisciplined! The senseless man does not stay with her for long: 21 she will weigh on him like a heavy stone, and he will lose no time in throwing her off; 22 for discipline is true to her name.”; Susan Cady, 202., Wis 6:17 ἀρχὴ γὰρ αὐτῆς ἡ ἀληθεστάτη παιδείας ἐπιθυμία, φροντίς δὲ παιδείας ἀγάπη, 18 ἀγάπη δὲ τήρησις νόμων αὐτῆς, προσοχὴ δὲ νόμων βεβαίωσις ἀφθαρσίας “Of her the most sure beginning is the desire for discipline, care for discipline means loving her.”; Susan Cady, 202., Wis 7:14 ἀνεκλιπῆς γὰρ θησαυρὸς ἔστιν ἀνθρώποις, ὃν οἱ κτησάμενοι πρὸς θεὸν ἐστεῖλαντο φιλίαν διὰ τὰς ἐκ παιδείας δωρεάς συσταθέντες “For she is an inexhaustible treasure to men, and those who acquire it win God’s friendship, commended as they are to him by the benefits of her teaching.” In the Fourth Gospel, John 15:15 οὐκέτι λέγω ὑμᾶς δούλους, ὅτι ὁ δούλος οὐκ οἶδεν τί ποιεῖ αὐτοῦ ὁ κύριος· ὑμᾶς δὲ εἵρηκα φίλους, ὅτι πάντα ἃ ἤκουσα παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς μου ἐγνώρισα ὑμῖν “No longer do I call you servants, for the servant does not know what his master is doing; but I have called you friends, for all that I have heard from my Father I have made known to you”; John 16:27 αὐτὸς γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ φιλεῖ ὑμᾶς, ὅτι ὑμεῖς ἐμὲ πεφιλήκατε καὶ πεπιστεύκατε ὅτι ἐγὼ παρὰ [τοῦ] θεοῦ ἐξῆλθον “for the Father himself loves you, because you have loved me and have believed that I came from God.”

¹⁸³ Prov 1:24 ἐπειδὴ ἐκάλουν καὶ οὐχ ὑπηκούσατε καὶ ἐξέτεινον λόγους καὶ οὐ προσείχετε, 25 ἀλλὰ ἀκύρους ἐποιεῖτε ἐμὰς βουλὰς, τοῖς δὲ ἐμοῖς ἐλέγχοις ἠπειθήσατε, “Because I have called and you refused to listen, have stretched out my hand and no one has heeded.”; John 8:46 τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν ἐλέγχει με περὶ ἁμαρτίας; εἰ ἀλήθειαν λέγω, διὰ τί ὑμεῖς οὐ πιστεύετε μοι; “Which one of you convicts me of sin? If I tell the truth, why do you not believe me?”; John 10:25 ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Εἶπον ὑμῖν καὶ οὐ πιστεύετε· τὰ ἔργα ἃ ἐγὼ ποιῶ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ πατρὸς μου ταῦτα μαρτυρεῖ περὶ ἐμοῦ. “Jesus answered them, “I told you, and you do not believe. The works that I do in my Father’s name bear witness about me.”

It then becomes evident that certain features of personified Wisdom in regard to Torah have influenced the images, activities and sayings of Jesus. Consequently, in terms of Jewish exegetical strategy and compositional practices, the images and activities of Jesus have considerable allusions to personified Wisdom in regard to Torah, and that those of Jesus in the Gospels are holistically connected to the images and activities of a Sage or Teacher.

(3) On their Images and Activities of Master or Lord in Banquets

Here I examine the personified Wisdom figure in a banquet in Prov 9 in order to substantiate the connectivity between the personified Wisdom figure in Proverbs and Jesus in the Gospels. I first translate the text of Prov 9, and examine Prov 9 through literary and exegetical analysis. The position of Prov 9 is significant not only within Prov 1-9, but also in comparison with other texts in Proverbs, and Sirach, as well as the Gospels in respect to the compositional and exegetical dimensions. In this regard, I try to discover not only intertextual and theological relationships between these texts, but also the shifting processes of the authors' theological intentions, and compositional characteristics. The majority of scholars follow this classification of Prov 9: "Woman Wisdom's invitation to her banquet (vv. 1-6), and a Woman Folly's counter-invitation (vv. 13-18), as well as an interlude (vv. 7-12)."¹⁸⁴ There is particular antithesis between Woman Wisdom (vv. 1-11), and Woman Folly (vv. 13-18).¹⁸⁵ The speeches of Woman Wisdom and Woman Folly also demonstrate a parallelism in the structure of Prov 9.¹⁸⁶ This paralleled antithesis illustrates a similar textual construct in regard to the unfolding process and its styles of the speech styles.

¹⁸⁴ Clifford, *Proverbs: A commentary* 103. Generally, Prov 9 holds a significant position as the final edition within Prov 1-9.

¹⁸⁵ Fox, *Proverbs 1-9*, 296, 339. Michael Fox remarkably argues, "one reason Wisdom must be female (as opposed to personifying a masculine gender word such as *sekel* [שֵׁקֶל]) is the need for an erotic counterweight to the "explicitly sexual pull" of the Strange Woman or female Folly." Richard Clifford, *Proverbs*, 102. Clifford mentions, "The chapter contains Women Wisdom's invitation to her banquet (vv.1-6, +11), a counter-invitation by Women Folly (vv.13-18) and five independent sayings.(vv.7-10,12)"; Daniel J. Harrington, *Wisdom texts from Qumran* (Routledge, London: New York, 1996), 34. Harrington summarizes that Woman Folly Prov.9 is personified as a street prostitute, whereas Woman Wisdom is personified as a symbolic warning for young male students against Woman Folly's attractions in Prov 8, and invites young people to her house in Prov 9; Michael Fox, *Proverbs*, 339. Michael Fox remarkably argues, "one reason Wisdom must be female (as opposed to personifying a masculine gender word such as *sekel* [שֵׁקֶל]) is the need for an erotic counterweight to the "explicitly sexual pull" of the Strange Woman or female Folly."

¹⁸⁶ Parallelism and antitheses are literary and exegetical features of Jewish wisdom literature.

Table.9. Parallelism between Woman Wisdom and Wisdom Folly

Woman Folly	Woman Wisdom
יג אִשֶׁת פְּסִילוֹת, הַמִּיָּה; פְּתִיּוֹת, וּבַל-יָדְעָה מָה.	א תְּכֵמוֹת, בְּנִתָּה בֵּיתָה; חֲצֹבָה עֲמוּדֶיהָ שִׁבְעָה.
יד וְיִשְׁכַּח, לְפִתַּח בֵּיתָה-- עַל-כֶּסֶף, מְרַמֵּי קֶרֶת.	ב טְבַחָה טְבַחָה, מְסַכָּה יַיִנָּה; אֶרֶץ עֲרֻכָה שְׁלֵחָנָה
טו לְקֹרָא לְעִבְרֵי-דָרָה; הַמִּיִּשְׁרִים, אֲרַחֲוֹתָם.	ג שְׁלֵחָה נְעֻרְתֶּיהָ תִקְרָא-- עַל-גִּפִּי, מְרַמֵּי קֶרֶת.
טז מִי-פְתִי, יָסַר הַנְּהָ; וְחֶסֶר-לֵב, וְאַמְרָה לֹו.	ד מִי-פְתִי, יָסַר הַנְּהָ; חֶסֶר-לֵב, אֲמָרָה לֹו.
יז מִיִּם-גְּנוּבִים וּמְתַקֵּי; וְלֶחֶם סֹתְרִים יִנָּעַם.	ה לְכוּ, לַחֲמוּ בְלֶחֶמִי; וּשְׁתוּ, בַּיַּיִן מְסַכְתִּי.
יח וְלֹא-יָדַע, כִּי-רַפְּאִים אֲשֶׁם; בְּעַמְקֵי שְׂאוֹל קִרְאַיָּה ֹ	ו עֲזָבוּ פְתָאִים וְחַיִּי; וְאֲשָׁרוּ, בְּדָרָה בֵּינָה.

In addition, there appears to be a literary attempt to personify wisdom in order to offer the strong impacts of the authors' theological intentions on God to audience through the literary device and its practices with vivid and effective expressions such as Woman Wisdom and Woman Folly as two different paths of wisdom and folly.¹⁸⁷ In Prov 9, her speeches are accentuated in a metaphorical separation with Woman Folly.¹⁸⁸ Personified Wisdom in Prov 8-9 urges mankind as “sons” to listen to her teaching, and to seek wisdom, while inviting them to her house as disciples.¹⁸⁹ In the beginning of the speeches of the two Women, there are the similar designations for the subjects in the first sentences, תְּכֵמוֹת (v. 1) and אִשֶׁת פְּסִילוֹת (v. 13), and there are the detailed descriptions of two Woman figures. Woman Wisdom (תְּכֵמוֹת) makes a house בֵּיתָה with seven pillars,¹⁹⁰ which were hewn out by her,¹⁹¹ for her special feast (vv. 1-3). The depiction of the personified Woman Wisdom figure in vv. 1-3 has a sequential process: building, slaughtering, invitation, and feast.¹⁹² Her banquet is very well-organized and well-prepared in the table (שְׁלֵחָנָה עֲרֻכָה), with lavish meals with meat and well-mingled wine (טְבַחָה טְבַחָה, מְסַכָּה יַיִנָּה).” She also seems “deliberate, and confident,” and to be capable of preparing and inviting her quests. In v. 3, She sends her maidens to invite her guests for her feast

¹⁸⁷ The author seems to have a critical intention to encourage the audience to choose the right ways of wisdom. Similarly, Jesus as Wisdom itself encourages audience to choose and follow the way that Jesus instructs. Paul also teaches and encourages his audience to choose Jesus who is the wisdom of God in addition to comparing wisdom and folly (e.g. 1 Cor 2:6-8).

¹⁸⁸ Most scholars use Lady, and Dame, etc. But, we can see that personified Wisdom in a feminine form is sometimes described as a woman who is a marriageable female as Richard Clifford implied.

¹⁸⁹ Fox, *Proverbs 1-9*, 289. In comparison with Women Wisdom in Prov.8, the wisdom in Prov 5, 7, and 9 seems a literary personification without a mythological background.

¹⁹⁰ Bruce K. Waltke, *The Book of Proverbs: Chapters 1-15* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: W.B. Eerdmans Pub. Co, 2004), 124. Waltke summarizes the characteristics of Wisdom's house, and its seven pillars as three dimensions: cultic, cosmological, and literary.

¹⁹¹ Fox, *Proverb 1-9*, 297. Fox comments, “Perhaps the notion of wisdom’s house predates Prov 9:1, but if so, it has been appropriated and demythologized.” It has not only a geographical and archeological relevance, but also a mythological and cultic character in ancient Near East. חֲצֹבָה עֲמוּדֶיהָ שִׁבְעָה seems to represent a specific type of craftsmanship, and means a particular style to hew stones out of the rocks.

¹⁹² Waltke, *The Book of Proverbs*, 1:432. Waltke mentions, “the scene depicted in 9:1-3 is particularly close to the dedication of Baal’s palace in Ugaritic texts.”

על-גפי) (שְׁלֵחָה נְעוּרֹתֶיהָ), and she cries out to her quests (or her maidens) on the highest places of the city (מִי-פְתֵי יָסָר (מִי-פְתֵי יָסָר) and the one who lacks understanding (לֹא-יָדָע) to her.¹⁹³ She also urges the one who lacks understanding and is gullible to come, and eat of her bread, and drink of her wine (v. 5). Furthermore, she speaks to the one in the imperative mood, “forget all thoughtlessness, and live!” (פָּתְאִים וְחַיִּי; עֲזְבוּ) and gives commands in a strong manner, “and walk in the way of understanding!” (וְאָשְׁרוּ, בְּדַרְךְ בִּינָה)

In the similar structure of the speech of Woman Wisdom, Woman Folly (אִשְׁתַּת כְּסִילוּת) also appears to prepare for a kind of her own banquet in her house.¹⁹⁴ In the parallel between the banquet of Wisdom (vv. 1-6) and that of Folly (vv. 13-18), there is an explicit contrast between the contents of them. Unlike Woman Wisdom, Woman Folly, who is riotous (הִמְיָה) and totally gullible (פְּתִייוֹת),¹⁹⁵ is just sitting near the door of her house (יֹשְׁבָה, לְפֶתַח בַּיְתָהּ), and on a seat in the high places of the city (עַל-),¹⁹⁶ and waiting for her guests, who are thoughtless like her, to invite to her banquet. She also calls out the passersby who are going right on their ways (אֲרַחֲוֹתָם, לְעֵבְרֵי-דָרֶךְ הַמְיֻשְׁרִים),¹⁹⁷ “one who is thoughtless, let him return to here,” with the same expressions with Woman Wisdom (vv.4, 16). Woman Folly with an evil intention, unlike Woman Wisdom, also entices the one who lacks understanding to drink “stolen waters,”¹⁹⁷ which will be sweet (מֵי-גְנוּבִים יִמְתְּקוּ), and to eat “bread which will be pleasant in secret (לֶחֶם סְתָרִים יִנְעַם).” The author of Prov 9 concludes the narrative of the Woman Folly figure by mentioning the deadly end of the her way, “he does not know that the dead are there;”¹⁹⁸ that her guests are in the valley of the grave (*sheol*) (וְלֹא-יָדָע, כִּי-רַפְּאִים שָׁם; בְּעֵמְקֵי שְׂאוֹל קְרָאֶיהָ)

¹⁹³ Robert C. Stallman, “Divinity Hospitality and Wisdom's Banquet in Proverbs 9:1-6” In *The Way of Wisdom: Essays in Honor of Bruce K. Waltke*, eds. Waltke, Bruce K., (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Zondervan, 2000), 126.

¹⁹⁴ The Woman Folly figure seems to be deciphered as a more concrete figure of the "loose woman" in Prov 2, 5, 6, and 7.

¹⁹⁵ Waltke, 1:443. It means that she “lacks any will or resolves to leave her ignorance and complacency to do what is right.”

¹⁹⁶ Ibid. It intensifies that the way of life of the gullible did not originally intend to go the way of death with the immoral conduct. However, the “seduction” intends to testify the resolve of the gullible, and dissuade the resolve “in a skillful manner from his preconceived way.”

¹⁹⁷ Ibid., 445. Waltke explains that water instead of wine is “an incomplete metaphor for sexual pleasure” so that “no contrast with Wisdom’ offer of wine is intended.”

¹⁹⁸ Waltke, 1:146. It refers to the corpses in her “festive” house. Waltke interprets those who invited (call out

In particular, there is an interlude (vv.7-12) between the contrasting descriptions of two Woman figures. It seems an extraordinary shift. The statements appear to be spoken by a third person, (i.e. the author of Prov 9). In v.7, the narrator insists on the necessity of the careful admonishment to a wicked man or scorner, who can take revenge on the admonisher with shame (קָלוֹן) and blot (מוֹמוֹ). In v.8-9, he advises, “do not reprove a scorner, lest he hates you; do reprove a wise man, then he will love you!” (אַל-תּוֹכַח לְזָר, פֶּן-יִשְׁנָאֶנּוּ; הוֹכַח לְחָכָם, וַיֵּאֱהָבֶנּוּ) and “Give to a wise man, then he will be wiser; teach a righteous man, he will add learning!” (תֵּן לְחָכָם, וַיִּחְכְּמוּ-עוֹד; הוֹדַע לְצַדִּיק, וַיֹּסֶף לְקַח) In this interlude, there is a chiasmic structure in the narrative between the scoffer and the wise.¹⁹⁹ In vv. 10-12, there is a concluding statement, the fear of God is the beginning of wisdom, and understanding is the knowledge of the Holy one (תְּהִלַּת הַקְּדוֹשׁ, יְרֵאת יְהוָה; וְדַעַת קְדוֹשִׁים בִּינָה). In addition, “your days will be multiplied, and the years of your life will be added to you if (or because) you are in the God (the fear of God)” (כִּי-בִי, יִרְבוּ יָמֶיךָ; וַיֹּסִיפוּ לְךָ, שָׁנוֹת חַיִּים) Furthermore, “if you are wise, the wisdom is for you,²⁰⁰ and if you scorn, you alone will suffer” (אִם-תְּכַמְתָּ, תְּכַמְתָּ לְךָ; וְלֹצְתָהּ, לְבַדָּךָ תִּשָּׂא).

There are different directions and theories concerning the contrastive parallel between Woman Wisdom and Woman Folly. Clifford suggests a Ugaritic parallel as a possible background of the Wisdom figure in Prov 9, which supports the pre-exilic dating in active polemics against Canaanite religion.²⁰¹ Sinnott attempts to understand the provenance and development of personified Wisdom, which reflect a theological response to a critical event and dramatic change, such as the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple, and the Babylonian Exile, and even the invasion of Alexander the Great in early Hellenistic period.²⁰² Bernd Schipper, in a different sense, tries to see the personified Wisdom figure as a literary and exegetical feature of a certain prophetic group during the exilic or post-exilic

in v. 3) refers to the apostates who followed her siren invitation (v. 18).

¹⁹⁹ Ibid., The Holy One, the plural קְדוֹשִׁים usually refers to holy or saintly persons or to heavenly beings or angels. Most commentators take it to be an epithet of God.

²⁰⁰ Ibid., The LXX extends the benefits of righteousness to one's neighbor as well, while the benefits will be granted to the gainer of wisdom. However, the consequences of sin are limited to oneself.

²⁰¹ Richard J. Clifford, "Proverbs 9: A Suggested Ugaritic Parallel." *Vetus Testamentum* 25, (05/01, 1975): 299. Clifford mentions, "The Aqht legend is preserved in three broken tablets found at Ugarit in the French excavations of 1930 and 1931. The scene in column vi, (CTCA 17 = UT 2 Aqht) is clearly a banquet of the gods. The stereotyped language is used elsewhere of divine banquets. Anat is probably the hostess since she plays a central role in the story from this point on."

²⁰² Alice Sinnott, *The Personification of Wisdom*, 3-5, 171-2. It seems to allude to a significant theological and socio-political nexus with Sirach and the Wisdom of Solomon in relation to personified Wisdom.

period, which had a theological intention in regard to the authority of the Deuteronomic written Torah.²⁰³ On this controversial issue, it seems to be difficult to determine exactly one origin of the personified Wisdom figure. In considering these different positions and approaches concerning the provenance of the personified Wisdom figure and her banquet, it is necessary to reconsider a broader perspective for discovering the important implications in the developmental process of the personified Wisdom figure in respect of diachronic and synchronic examinations.

In Prov 1-9, there are the explicit textual and linguistic features and meanings of the personified Wisdom figure. For instance, *אָמַר לְחֵכְמָה, אֶהְיֶה אִתָּךְ; וּמִדָּע, לְבִינָה תִקְרָא* in Prov 7:4, *בִּינָה* and *חֵכְמָה* illustrate a different usage in comparison with the usages of Prov 3 and 6. The different meanings and uses of *בִּינָה* and *חֵכְמָה* between Prov 3, 6, and Prov 7, 8 imply a shift or transitory stage of theological change from the didactic and Deuteronomic Torah to personified Wisdom.²⁰⁴ These indicate that Wisdom figure reflects a literary and exegetical feature. Prov 1-9 contains an important presentation of the personification of wisdom, and of a figurative imagery for the way of wisdom. Prov 9 has particularly a complicated poetic and compositional expression through imagery in terms of a literary and symbolic approach: the ways of Wisdom, and the personified Woman figures.²⁰⁵ The

²⁰³ Bernd U. Schipper, "When Wisdom Is Not Enough! The Discourse on Wisdom and Torah and the Composition of the Booke of Proverbs" in *Wisdom and Torah: The Reception of 'Torah' in the Wisdom Literature of the Second Temple Period*, eds. Bernd U Schipper, D Andrew Teeter, (MA: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2013), 75-76. Schipper concludes, "the shift is related to a theological discourse on the status of Torah in post-exilic times and to the question whether the deuteronomistic concept of Torah as a kind of sapiential instruction can lead to a life according to the will of God." He also observes that there is "a reception of Deuteronomy in Proverbs 1-9," which alludes to "a didactic concept where wisdom can serve as a hermeneutic of Torah, transmitting the divine word from one generation to the other." It implies in the process of the final composition, and editing of the book of Proverbs, the concept of wisdom was reduced, whereas the level of the Deuteronomic and written Torah was increased.

²⁰⁴ Fox, *Proverbs 1-9*, 343. The personification of Wisdom in Prov 8 in comparison with that of Prov 3, 6, 7, seems to become weaker gradually in the degree of the distinction between *בִּינָה* and *חֵכְמָה*. This feature alludes to a close relationship between God and personified Wisdom. (cf. Jer 9:22-23). In particular, personified Wisdom in Prov 7 seems to play a critical role in introducing her in Prov 8 and 9; Richard Clifford, May, 2015, email message to author. Clifford mentions that Torah in Prov 1-9 is somewhat undefined, and is also unclear if Torah is referred to "law" in the Pentateuch.

²⁰⁵ Stuart Weeks, *Instruction and Imagery in Proverbs 1-9*. (New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 127, 135-138. The features and functions of the personified Wisdom figure in Prov 9 are amplified by the contrast with the Woman Folly through the way imagery. For example, the expression of "the highest places of the city" (v.3) and "on a seat in the high places of the city" (v.14) seems to allude to a motif of the way imagery. Woman Folly, on the middle of the way to go up to the highest places of the city, entices the simple, who were invited by Woman Wisdom to a joyous banquet. It evokes an imaginative power about the way to gain wisdom. In other words, Wisdom's students should overcome Woman Folly's seduction to get to Woman Wisdom's house and her banquet as a destination for those who seek wisdom and the fear of God; Harold C. Washington, "The

images of personified Wisdom can be related to the woman's roles in a literary and socio-historical context. The woman imagery of Sirach also reflects a particular socio-historical situation in the early second century Jerusalem influenced by Hellenism.²⁰⁶ In this point, it is worthwhile to examine more closely the imagery of the personified Wisdom figure in respect to the authors' theological intentions, and exegetical practices their socio-historical and religious situation.²⁰⁷

On the foundation of the textual analysis and conceptual backdrops of the personified Woman figures, I examine the features of personified Wisdom as a Master in a banquet in Prov 9 in comparison with other texts in Proverbs, Sirach, and especially the Gospels. Woman Wisdom in Prov 9 is a builder and confident hostess.²⁰⁸ In light of the OT, God is depicted as a divine host, e.g., in Exodus 17:1-16.²⁰⁹ The author of Prov 9 appears to have a shared similar and collective conventions and memories with Prov 1-8 in terms of the exegetical and compositional practices. In this sense, we can infer that the unity of vv. 1-6, 13-18 was derived from earlier materials engaged with Prov 1-8. First, we can see the intertextual and compositional relationship between Prov 1 and 9. Wisdom in Prov 1 calls out outside (בַּחוּץ), whereas Wisdom in Prov 9 invites guest inside house (בְּיָתֵהָ). There, however, seems to offer an allusion to a chronological order between them. For example, in Prov 9, אֶל-תּוֹכַח לֵץ alludes to a prior composition to תּוֹכַחְתִּי in Prov 1. In addition, my spirit (רִיחִי) and my words (דְּבָרִי) in Prov 1 allude to a symbolic expression to my bread (בֶּלֶחֶמִי) and my mixed wine (בְּיַיִן מְסֻכָּתִי) in Prov 9.

Strange Woman of Proverbs 1-9 and Post-Exilic Judean Society', in *Second Temple Studies, vol.2: Temple Community in the Persian Period*, eds. T.C. Eskenazi and K. H. Richards (JSOTS 175; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994), 217-42; Joseph Blenkinsopp and Harold Washington argue that the woman must be understood within the context of the post-exilic campaign against marriage to foreign women.

²⁰⁶ Benjamin G. Wright III, "Ben Sira, Book of," In *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism*, eds. John J. Collins and Daniel C Harlow (William B. Eerdmans; Grand Rapids, Mich., 2010), 437. Like the woman of strength in Prov 31, Ben Sira attempts to change the authority shown to Woman Wisdom in Proverbs into one's wife's beauty and power of the practical and productive life (Sir 25:8; 26:1-16; 28:15; 36:24-27; 40:23). However, in the Jewish life of Jerusalem during the shifting period of authority from Ptolemaic to Seleucid period around 200 B.C.E, the idealized female Wisdom figure did not seem to support the social equality of women, and there was a manifestation of a conservative Jewish perspective about woman, which overtly resisted the pressures of Hellenization. Ben Sira seems to use the tradition of personified Woman Wisdom as one of the exegetical skills for the emphasis of the authority of the Torah.

²⁰⁷ She is a teacher of wisdom and kindness (v.26), and a woman with economic activities (vv. 14, 16, 24).

²⁰⁸ Robert Stallman, "Divine Hospitality," 121. Wisdom in Prov 9 prepares meats for a lavish banquet. It seems to be comparable to an abundant banquet of meat and wine by the generosity of God in Isa 25:6.

²⁰⁹ Ibid. God provides plentiful water from the rock, and manna and quails through Moses. It also implies the personified Wisdom figure in Prov. 9:1-6 has an image of God as a host.

Table.10. Intertextual and Compositional Relationship between Prov 1 and 9 on the Personified Wisdom

Prov 1	Prov 9
כ חכמות, פחיון תרונה; ברחבות, תתן קולך.	א חכמות, בנתה ביתה; הצבה עמודיה שבועה
כא בראש המיות, תקרא; בפתחי שערים בעיר--אמר	ב טבחה טבחה, מסכה יינה; אף, ערכה שלחנה
כב עד-מתי, פתים-- תאהבו-פתי, תאמר	ג שלחה בערמיה תקרא-- על-גפי, מרמי קרת
כג תשובו--לצון, חמדו להם; ובסילים, ישנאו-דעת.	ד מי-פתי, יסר הנה; חסר-לב, אמרה לו
אתכם	ה לכו, לתמו בלחמי; ושתו, ביון מסכתי
כד יען קראתי, ותמאנו; נטיתי נדי, ואין מקושיב.	ו עזבו פתאים ותי; ואשרו, בדרך בינה
כה ותפרעו כל-עצתי; ותוכחתי, לא אביתם..	ז יסר, לץ--לקח לו קלון; ומוכיח לרשע מומו.
כט תחת, פי-שנאו דעת; וראת יהוה, לא בקרו	ח אל-תוכח לץ, פן-ישנאה; הוכח לתכם, ונאהבך
ל לא-אבו לעצתי; נאצו, כל-תוכחתי.	ט תו לתכם, ונחכם-עוד; הודע לצדיק, ויוסף לקח
לא ויאכלו, מפרי דרךם; ומעצתיים ישבעו	י תחלת חכמה, וראת יהוה; ודעת קדשים בינה
לב פי משובת פתים תהרגם; ושלוח פסילים תאבדם.	יא אם-חכמת, חכמת לך; ולצתי, לבדך תשא
לג ושמע לי, ישכון-בטח; וישאנו, מפחד רעה.	יג אשת פסילות, המיה; פתיות, ובל-ידעה מה

The authors of Prov 1 and 9, in a similar nuance of the speeches, warn of the seriousness of the judgment of God, and encourage the audiences to choose the fear of God, and the way of wisdom by making a sharp distinction between the ways of the foolish and wise. The speeches of the two Wisdom figures have a similar poetic and metaphorical expression in terms of terminological and phraseological dimensions, but there seems also a difference of theological intentions, and historical situations. Prov 8 and 9 contain the most similar vocabularies, speech styles, and the unfolding processes and the images and activities of personified Wisdom as the rewritten and paraphrased evidence. One of the common ideas of Prov 8 and 9 is the fear of God. However, in Prov 9:10, the beginning of wisdom is the fear of God, whereas in Prov 8, wisdom is first emphasized (v.11), and the fear of God which, is to hate evil (v.12), is later emphasized. In Prov 8, the personified Wisdom figure directly introduces herself as Wisdom (v.12) in a different sense with the figure of Prov 9.

Table.11. Intertextual and Compositional Relationship between Prov 8 and 9

Prov 8	Prov 9
א הלא-חכמה תקרא; ותבונה, תתן קולך.	א חכמות, בנתה ביתה; הצבה עמודיה שבועה
ב בראש-מרמים עלי-דרך; בית נתיבות נצבה.	ב טבחה טבחה, מסכה יינה; אף, ערכה שלחנה
ג ליד-שערים לפי-קרת; מבוא פתחים תרנה.	ג שלחה בערמיה תקרא-- על-גפי, מרמי קרת
ד אליכם אישים אקרא; וקולי, אל-בני אדם.	ד מי-פתי, יסר הנה; חסר-לב, אמרה לו
ה הבינו פתאים ערמה; ובסילים, הבינו לב.	ה לכו, לתמו בלחמי; ושתו, ביון מסכתי
ו שמעו, פי-נגידים אדבר; ומפתח שפתי, מישרים.	ו עזבו פתאים ותי; ואשרו, בדרך בינה
ז פי-אמת, והגה חפי; ותועבת שפתי רשע	ז יסר, לץ--לקח לו קלון; ומוכיח לרשע מומו
ח בצדק כל-אמרו-פי; אין בהם, נפתל ועקש.	ח אל-תוכח לץ, פן-ישנאה; הוכח לתכם, ונאהבך
ט בלם נכחים, למביו; וישרים, למצאי דעת.	ט תו לתכם, ונחכם-עוד; הודע לצדיק, ויוסף לקח
י קחו-מוסרי ואל-בסר; ודעת, מהרוץ נבחר.	י תחלת חכמה, וראת יהוה; ודעת קדשים בינה
יא פי-טובה חכמה, מפנינים, וכל-תפצאים, לא ישוו-בה.	יא פי-בי, ירבו ימיה; ויוסיפו לך, שנות חיים
יב אני-חכמה, שכנתי ערמה; ודעת מזמות אמצא.	
יג וראת יהוה, שנאת-רע	

In addition, Wisdom in Prov 9 has a quite different sense in comparison with personified Wisdom in the context of creation. Wisdom in Prov 8 speaks in an equal or close position with God, whereas in

Prov 9, there is a fundamental distance between Wisdom and God.²¹⁰ Furthermore, there are intertextual allusions from Prov 2, 3, 5, 7 and 31 illustrate the evidence of a rewritten compositional and exegetical practice in Prov 9.²¹¹ The woman of strength in Prov 31:10-31 appears to have relevance with the images of Wisdom of Prov 9 in the point which the woman figure as a mistress holds a household, and a number of maidens or daughters.²¹² The image of Wisdom figure in Prov 9, who gives meats for food and mingled wine for drink in a banquet, particularly offers a similar allusion on Sir 15:3, 24:21 Sir 32; 37:27-31; 31:22-27.²¹³ Ben Sira emphasizes a moderate manner in a banquet consuming food (31:19-24) and drink (31:25-31). Ben Sira, however, transforms the image of the Wisdom's banquet of Prov 9 from the mysterious and metaphorical expressions to the ordinary

²¹⁰ In Prov 8, Wisdom has a role of subject, whereas in Prov 9, God has a role of subject. It also means that there is diversity, such as a hypostasis or literary figure in the personification of wisdom.

²¹¹ There are intertextual allusions between Prov 9 and 2, 3, 5, 7, and 31 in Proverbs.

Prov 2, 3, 5, 7, and 31	Prov 9
1:1 לדעת חכמה ומוסר; לקביו, אמרי בינה העונות, אלוף נעוריה; ואת-ברית אלהיה ששקה. 2:17	א חכמות, בנתה ביתה; חצבה עמודיה שבעה ו עזבו פתאים וחי; ואשרו, בדרך בינה ח אל-תוכח לז, פן-ישנאך; הוכח לחכם, ויאחזקך
1:7 ראת יהנה, ראשית דעת; חכמה ומוסר, אילים בון	ט תן לחכם, ונתחכם-עוד; הודע לצדיק, ויוסף לקח
1:5 ישמע חכם, ויוסף לקח	י תחלת חכמה, נראת יהנה; ודעת קדשים בינה
3:7 אל-תהי חכם בעיניך; נרא את-יהנה, וסור מרע	יא כי-בי, ורבו ימיה; ויוסיפו לך, שנות חיים
3:16 ארץ ימים, בימינה; בשמאולה, עשר וכבוד	יג אשת כסילות, המנה; פתיית, ובל-נדעה מה
27 כבוד, חכמים יתלו; וקסילים, מרים קלון	יד ולא-נדע, כי-רפאים שם; בעמקי שאול קראיה
5:1 בני, לחכמתי תקשיבה; לתבונתי, הט-אזנה	
2:18 כי שקה אל-מנת ביתה; ואל-רפאים, מעגלתיה	
7:27 דרכי שאול ביתה; ירדות, אל-תדרי-מנות	
31:10 אשת-חיל, מי ימצא; ורחק מפנינים מכרה	
31:26 פיה, פתחה בחכמה; ותורת חסד, על-לשונה	

In particular, in Prov 9, the fear of God is a prerequisite for the life of wisdom, whereas in Prov 8, the fear of God is a consequence and its explanation, which is derived from personified Wisdom. Torah does not appear in Prov 8 and 9, but seem to be implicitly mentioned; תבונה, בדרך, אמרי-כל בדרך, תבונה, in the teaching of wisdom and Torah in vv. 8-10.

²¹² The two features of the Wisdom figure are, however, different: in Prov 9 she has still an afterimage of the strong personified Wisdom from Prov 8, but the woman of strength in Prov 31:10 is an ordinary figure with wisdom. The woman of strength in Prov 31:10 basically appears as an ordinary figure (cf. אשת חיל in Ruth 3:11). The woman of strength is seen as a professional woman, merchant, and business woman who works in international trades (v.24). The woman is also one who seems to have many households and great farms (vv. 27, 14, 16). This surface level in Prov 31 also represents an important aspect of the concepts of practical wisdom.

²¹³ Skehan, 374. This is a modern reconstruction in Hebrew.

Sir 31:22-27, שמע בני וקח מוסרי ואל תלעיג עלי ובאחרית תמצא דברי טוב על לחם תברך שפה עדות פובו נאמנה וגמ על היין אל תתגבר כי רבים חכשיל תירוש רע על לחם ירגו בשער דעת רועו נאמנה למי היין חיים לאנוש אמ ישתנו במת] לתו כור בוחן מעשה לוטש כן היין למצות לצים

"Instruction for bread and wine together (31:22-27) 22 my son, hear my instruction. Do not challenge me, and in the end you will find out my words. 23 You will bless the word that bread is good. Their testimony to his excellence is trustworthy. 24 He will complain in the gate that bread is bad. Their testimony to his niggardliness is accurate. 25 Do not be valiant over wine, for wine has fall down many people. 26 Fire and water control the temper of steel, so wine tests hearts in the strife of the proud. 27 whom wine is life to men, if you drink it in moderation."

and practical expressions in Ben Sira's descriptions for the banquet. It alludes to a possibility that Ben Sira might have tried to rephrase and rewrite Prov 9 through the shift of an exegetical practice in a different theological lens in addition to changing a metaphorical meaning as a practical meaning.

On the basis of this examination, as to the connectivity of the images and activities of personified Wisdom in banquet between Proverbs and Sirach, we can further discover the similitudes in the banquet's contexts between the images and activities of personified Wisdom and Jesus in the Gospels. It is still difficult to discover precisely the intertextual allusions between them; whereas the discussion about personified Wisdom in Proverbs 8:22-31 and 9 are supportive of a direct relationship in relation to exegetical and semantic dimensions. The image of Wisdom building a house in Prov 9:1 can be interestingly connected to the image of Jesus promising a temple, which means a body of his resurrection and Himself as the Son of God, instead of the Temple built by Herod the King (John 2:19). The activity of building a house also conveys a significant meaning and connection with the purpose of building activities of personified Wisdom. The main purpose regarding the activities of personified Wisdom and Jesus is deeply connected to sharing a banquet or festival in the house. The banquet in the house needs guests who enjoy the joyful and glorious banquet eating (meat or bread) and drinking (wine or water). Woman Wisdom offers a lavish banquet with meat and wine; whereas Woman Folly offers a poor banquet with bread and water.²¹⁴ Woman Wisdom actively invites and welcomes guests by sending maidens to bring them to her banquet as Jesus gives a parable of the Kingdom of God in regard to a wedding banquet which a king sent his servants to invite his people (Matt 22:1-14). Wisdom invites people to eat meat and drink wine in her banquet in Prov 9 as Jesus invites his disciples to eat bread as his body and to drink wine as his blood in the Last Supper (Matt 26:26-28; Luke 22:7-38; Mark 14:12-26).²¹⁵ In comparison with the Synoptics, the texts related to

²¹⁴ However, Woman Folly sitting on the sidewalk lures foolish pedestrians with false by giving a bread and water, and attracting them to fall into a deadly sin.

²¹⁵ There are significant allusions of his body and blood as a bread and wine as follows.

Matt 26:26-28	26 λαβὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἄρτον, Λάβετε φάγετε, τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου. 27 λαβὼν ποτήριον καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν 28 τὸ αἷμά μου, ἁμαρτιῶν.
Mark 14: 22-24	22 λαβὼν ἄρτον, Λάβετε, τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου. 23 λαβὼν ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς, 24 τὸ αἷμά μου
Luke 22:19-20	19 λαβὼν ἄρτον Τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου 20 αἵματί μου

Jesus's Last Supper (John 13:1-32) in the Fourth Gospel, overtly do not mention the Eucharistic contents regarding the remembrance of Jesus' body and blood. However, in John 6:41-58, Jesus explicitly asserts his "flesh and blood" as the true food and drink.²¹⁶ The rhetorical expression of "food and drink" in personified Wisdom also appears to have a critical allusion to a parallel with that of "flesh and blood" in Incarnate Logos, who is Jesus, the Son of God.²¹⁷ Remarkably, as aforementioned, like personified Wisdom's invitation in Prov 9, Jesus also invites his disciples and people to his Last Supper.²¹⁸ Wisdom appears to have a similar symbolic connection with "food and drink," as Jesus symbolizes himself as bread (e.g., John 6:35) and water (e.g., John 4:13-14) in regard to giving life and salvation.²¹⁹ The metaphors of eating bread and drinking wine converge in Jesus' body and blood on the cross for salvation and life. In other words, Jesus' sayings about his body and blood as bread and wine in the Last Supper allude to a structural similarity to personified Wisdom's sayings about giving food and drink while giving a message of life to her guests. It is noticeable that personified Wisdom explicitly alludes to the images and activities of Jesus in relation to the banquet with bread and meat for food, and water and wine for drink through metaphorical expressions. In particular, meat and wine in Wisdom's banquet seem to be, directly and theologically, related to Jesus' sayings in the Last Supper, which symbolizes bread as his body (flesh) and wine as his blood. Even if Jesus did not provide meat as Wisdom did, Jesus mentions that the bread (cf. *לֶחֶם* in Ex 12:15) is his

²¹⁶ The rhetorical analogy of "food and drink" and "flesh and blood" also appears to have a terminological, phraseological and theological development in the Gospel of John, and even early Jewish sources, e.g., Prov 9, Sir 1:1-4; 15:3; 24:8, 19-21; 32:1-13, as well as Wis 9:1-2, 4. These passages in Sirach and Wisdom of Solomon are related to a concept of eating and drinking in relation to personified Wisdom which provides the righteous with *ἄρτον συνέσεως* "bread of understanding" and *ὔδωρ σοφίας* "water of wisdom." in a banquet. In this sense, the character of banquet is also linked to an imagery of eating and drinking. A motif of eating and drinking in relation to activities in the ministry of Jesus as the personified Logos in the Prologue, seem to provide the significant evidence of personified Wisdom.

²¹⁷ Clifford, *Proverbs*, 32. Clifford observes, "Jesus speaks in long discourses", "Jesus recruits disciples" and "gives the bread [and wine] of life" in a similar form with Women Wisdom; Brown, *The Gospel of John*, 32.

²¹⁸ Craig Keener, 1:682. Jesus however promises, "never thirst again"; personified Wisdom in Sir 4:19-21 alludes to the repetition of their thirsts.

²¹⁹ John 6:35 εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, **Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος τῆς ζωῆς**. ὁ ἐρχόμενος πρὸς ἐμὲ οὐ μὴ πεινάσῃ, καὶ ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ οὐ μὴ διψήσῃ πώποτε "Then Jesus declared, **"I am the bread of life**. He who comes to me will never go hungry, and he who believes in me will never be thirsty." (cf. Sir 24:19 προσέλθετε πρὸς με "come to me" Prov 9:4 ἐκκλινάτω πρὸς με "let him turn in here [or to me]" (ESV); a water of life: Jn 4:13-14, 13 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῇ, Πᾶς ὁ πίνων ἐκ **τοῦ ὕδατος** τούτου διψήσῃ πάλιν 14 ὃς δ' ἂν πῖνῃ ἐκ **τοῦ ὕδατος** οὐ ἐγὼ δώσω αὐτῷ, οὐ μὴ διψήσῃ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, ἀλλὰ τὸ ὕδωρ ὃ δώσω αὐτῷ γενήσεται ἐν αὐτῷ πηγὴ **ὑδατος ἀλλομένου εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον**. Jesus answered, "Everyone who drinks this water will be thirsty again, but whoever drinks the water I give him will never thirst. Indeed, the water I give him will become in him a spring of water welling **up to eternal life**."(NIV)

flesh. It also reminds us of the regulations about “the unleavened bread” and “the blood of the lambs” in Passover in Ex 12:6-15.²²⁰ Jesus is the “Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world” (John 1:29). The symbolization as bread and wine appears to be enough to remember and remind the audience of Jesus’s sacrifice as his flesh and blood for his people’s sins. The profound and symbolized connotations vis-à-vis meat and wine of personified Wisdom are vividly associated not only with Jesus’s sacrifice and suffering of his flesh and blood on the cross, but also with what Jesus gave his guests and people through his sacrifice: life, truth and wisdom. Through the sacrifice of Jesus giving his body (flesh) and blood as bread and wine, Jesus is revealed as an image of Lord and the Savior giving wisdom and life.

In Luke 11:49, Jesus speaks of ἡ σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ “the Wisdom of God,” as he says, “For this reason also the wisdom of God said, ‘I will send to them prophets and apostles, and some of them they will kill and some they will persecute.’” In Luke 7:35, Jesus also refers directly to Wisdom: καὶ ἐδικαιώθη ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς “Yet Wisdom is vindicated by all her children.” In Matt 11:19b “Wisdom is justified by her deeds.” M. Jack Suggs explains regarding the parable of the children playing in the market place; the “men of this generation” are like spoiled children, and Jesus and John are Wisdom’s children.²²¹ In Matt 23:34, Jesus also alludes to the images and activities of Wisdom who sent prophets and apostles, while implying the self-recognition that he himself was the Wisdom of God.²²² The personification of Wisdom more effectively seems to strengthen the sense of the identification of the Wisdom of God and Jesus himself.²²³ These passages also appear to be critical to understand the core messages and contexts of Prov 9. By making the contrastive parallel between Woman Wisdom and Woman Folly, Wisdom’s ultimate purpose is to invite the gullible and

²²⁰ אֶת־הַכֶּמֶחַ לִיהֲרֹגָהּ in Ex 12:11 it is the LORD's Passover. וְגִתְכֶם וְגַתְכֶם מִן־הַדָּם in Ex 12:7 “put it on the sides and tops of the doorframes of the houses where they eat the lambs.” הָאֶמְלֶלֶת מִצֹּדֶת מִיָּמִים שִׁבְעַת in Ex 12:15 “seven days you are to eat bread made without yeast”

²²¹ M. Jack Suggs, *Wisdom, Christology, and Law in Matthew's Gospel* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970), 35.

²²² Suggs, *Wisdom*, 39. Suggs tries to connect it to the context in Wis 7:27 “in every generation she passes into holy souls and makes them friends of God, and prophets,” while explaining “the idea of Wisdom’s persistent quest for men by means of her envoys.”

²²³ The images of personified Wisdom in Proverbs also gives a critical insight into recognizing that Jesus is the Messiah with wisdom is greater than Solomon’s wisdom (Matthew 12:42), Wisdom itself, Logos itself, and Truth itself on a deeper level.

foolish to her banquet, and to give them wisdom and life. The ultimate aim of their banquets is to give life itself and instruct the way of life in comparison with Woman Folly's way of death. In Luke 7:34, the images and activities of personified Wisdom who tries to invite the gullible and foolish to her banquet appear to be parallel with Jesus who invites not only his disciples but also guests, the gullible such as the "gluttonous man and a drunkard, a friend of tax collectors and sinners."²²⁴ In relation to Wisdom's hidden efforts and wise activities for leading people to the way of light, truth and life, the expression in Luke 7:35 alludes to a similar motif with Jesus's wise activities and hidden efforts. These allusions offer an insight into the activities of Jesus who behaves in a free manner with them and even tries to convert, save, and eventually invite them to the Kingdom of God. In this vein, it infers that his guests who finally will become his children will also vindicate Jesus's activities and accomplishments.

Furthermore, there is a particular exegetical and semantic reference, and their similitudes between Prov 9:3 and Luke 14:15-21 in the Master's images and activities of sending servants (or maidens) to invite people.²²⁵ The master warns of the foolish responses and decisions to their invitations and callings through temptations of Woman Folly (Prov 9:17-18) or their own willingness (Luke 14:19-21). The banquet of personified Wisdom and Jesus seems to refer to the Kingdom of God. In other words, the descriptions concerning these images and activities of Jesus as a Lord in a banquet can be similarly found in several passages in the NT such as Matt 22:1-14. It then becomes evident that Jesus as a Lord or Master often uses the image of banquet or wedding feast as an emblem of the Kingdom of God.²²⁶ Consequently, the images and activities of Jesus as a Master (or Lord) in banquet in relation to personified Wisdom is an ultimate destination of Wisdom's journey in addition to embracing the critical roles as a Creator (or Son of God) and as a Sage (or Teacher).

²²⁴ Luke 7:34, ἐλήλυθεν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐσθίων καὶ πίνων, καὶ λέγετε, Ἴδου ἄνθρωπος φάγος καὶ οἰνοπότης, φίλος τελωνῶν καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν. "The Son of Man came eating and drinking, and you say, 'Here is a glutton and a drunkard, a friend of tax collectors and "sinners.""

²²⁵ ἀπέστειλεν τοὺς ἐαυτῆς δούλους in Prov 9:3 "She has sent out her maids" (NIV); ἀπέστειλεν τὸν δούλον αὐτοῦ τῇ ᾠρᾷ τοῦ δεῖπνου εἰπεῖν τοῖς κεκλημένοις in Luke 14:17 "he sent his servant to tell those who had been invited (NIV); Prov 9:5 φάγετε τῶν ἐμῶν ἄρτων "Come, eat my food.." (NIV); Μακάριος ὅστις φάγεται ἄρτον ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ in Luke 14:15 "Blessed is everyone who will eat bread in the kingdom of God!" (ESV)

²²⁶ Matt 22:1-4 "Again he sent out other slaves saying, 'Tell those who have been invited, "Behold, I have prepared my dinner; my oxen and my fattened livestock are all butchered and everything is ready; come to the wedding feast."'"

Chapter 3: Critical Findings and Allusions, and their Implications

(1) Critical Findings regarding the Relationship of Personified Wisdom and Jesus

Through the examinations and analyses in Chapter 1 and 2, we have seen that there are the authors' theological intentions and particular exegetical practices about the personification of Wisdom in relation to Jesus. However, there are still the general but suspicious position that Jesus is a created being and not an eternal member of the Trinity. Some scholars then argue that there is no evidence of an explicit shift from personified Wisdom to the Johannine Logos in relation to creation. They have noted a number of discontinuities between the Johannine Logos and the personified Wisdom figure in Proverbs. Waltke points out that a historical critical exegesis of Prov 8:22-31 does not offer a basis for patristic exegesis which identifies personified Wisdom with Jesus in "their preexistence and their assumed roles as agents in the creation."²²⁷ He also mentions that the ancient versions of Proverbs and Jewish wisdom literature do not offer a consistent ground for the Christology of the NT.²²⁸ Moreover, Karen Jobes also argues that the absence of the Greek word *sophia* in John's gospel, or in the Johannine Epistles, presents a discontinuity between "Wisdom-Sophia in Hellenistic Jewish writings and the Christology of John's Gospel."²²⁹ She points out the difference in which personified Wisdom in Proverbs is just a creature created by God and a witness for the creation; whereas, John's Logos is the Creator and God. However, these scholars' arguments do not appear to sufficiently offer a holistic interpretation textually, intertextually and theologically regarding them.

In this context, here I summarize the critical findings from the examinations concerning the exegetical, semantic and theological relationships between personified Wisdom and Jesus. As the foundation of this examination, we first have examined the relationship between personified Wisdom and Torah, which supports not only the considerations about the Greek Logos-centered tradition, but also a direct relationship between personified Wisdom and Jesus. In addition, we have discovered the intertextual and theological allusions helping to discover a disconnected link between personified

²²⁷ Bruce K. Waltke, *The Book of Proverbs*, 127-128., cf. Prov 3:19-20; 8:22-27; cf. John 1:3; 1 Cor 8:6; Col 1:15-16; Heb 1:3

²²⁸ Ibid.

²²⁹ Karen H. Jobes, "Sophia Christology: The Way of Wisdom?" In *The Way of Wisdom: Essays in Honor of Bruce K. Waltke*. Edited by James I. Packer and Sven Soderlund, (Grand Rapids, Mich: Zondervan, 2000), 239.

Wisdom and the Jesus from; 1) the developmental process between personified Wisdom and the Johannine Logos; and 2) the shifting process between personified Wisdom and Jesus in the Synoptics. In the first place, the portraits of Jesus have been influenced by the Greek Logos-centered tradition which had also influenced the Jewish hypostatic notions such as Wisdom, Torah, and Logos. In respect to discovering the profound relationships with Jesus, the Jewish hypostatic notions were to some extent influenced by particular Jewish exegetical practices within the Jewish wisdom traditions. In addition, there was a possibility of connecting these through a set of associations in some sources between personified Wisdom, Word, Torah, Memra, and the Logos. Through a historical and contextual consideration, we have examined that there were the exegetical, theological interrelationships of personified Wisdom and Jesus between Palestinian Judaism and the Johannine community in early Christianity.²³⁰ In particular, we have analyzed that the image of personified Wisdom is paralleled with Jesus's image as the "begotten" Son of God through the allusions of personified Wisdom's context in the Johannine Prologue in the Fourth Gospel.²³¹ In the second place, in terms of the Jewish Wisdom-centered tradition, the direct relationship between personified Wisdom and Jesus implies the identification between them, and their preexistence in creation on the basis of the relationship with Torah.²³² In terms of exegetical, semantic and theological allusions, there was a clear and direct link that personified Wisdom has a mature Sage's role in working together with God in creation context in Proverbs and in the Fourth Gospel, and a Sage with profound wisdom in the Synoptics. In addition, we have seen a profound relationship between them on the images and activities of a Master in banquet's context. The nexus in a symbolic and contextual motive is continued as the resemblance between them in relation to a particular Jewish literary and exegetical

²³⁰ Burton L. Mack, "Wisdom Makes a Difference: Alternatives to "Messianic" Configurations," in *Judaisms and their messiahs at the turn of the Christian era* (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press., 1987), 44-47.

²³¹ Refer to the examination of חֵכֶם in relation to the image of Son of God in 2. (1). Within the images and activities of personified Wisdom in Proverbs 8:22-31, especially in the interpretations of חֵכֶם, there were two significant roles: Son of God as a begotten firstborn (child or son) being in creation and a Sage with great and profound wisdom.

²³² Richard M. Frank, *The Wisdom of Jesus Ben Sirach*, 33-34. The Torah is directly related to Deuteronomistic Laws and the aforementioned theology in Deut 4:6. This examination presents evidence for the pre-existence of personified Wisdom in Proverbs with God during the creation of the universe.

practice.²³³ The nexus also eventually supports this argument that the nature and identity of Jesus cannot be only identical with the Johannine Logos and personified Wisdom, but is also one of divine and eternal members of the Trinity begotten from God. These two supposed traditions explicate exclusively and holistically critical connections of the relationship between their images and activities as a Creator or Son of God, as a Sage or Teacher in the creation context, as well as a Master in banquet's context. The images and activities of a Creator or Son of God, and a Sage or Teacher eventually appear to be convergent to the images and activities of a Master in banquet. Through images of a Master in banquet, the authors appear to emphasize the critical role of personified Wisdom in reference to Jesus and the Kingdom of God in terms of a prophetic and eschatological dimension. More significantly, the images and activities of personified Wisdom were profoundly related to the eschatological purposes regarding the Kingdom of God through Jesus's sacrificial activities giving food and drink as a symbol of body and blood, which means giving life and wisdom²³⁴ These similarities between them elucidate the reasons why the authors tried to use the personification of Wisdom and the meanings why the authors tried to exercise the particular exegetical practices as to the relationship between personified Wisdom and Incarnate Jesus, and their significant roles.

(2) Implications for the relationship of Personified Wisdom and Jesus

Through the examinations of both the supposed traditions in regard to the relationship between personified Wisdom and Jesus, we have seen that there was a complicated process of exegetical, intertextual, and theological interactions between their sources, ideas, and theologies. On the one hand, regarding the problematic passages in Prov 8:22-31, some scholars try to make a direct connection between personified Wisdom and the Johannine Logos (John 1:1-18) in terms of Jewish exegetical practices; they want to extend their theories to emphasize the identification of Jesus as personified

²³³ Bruce K. Waltke, *The Book of Proverbs*, 130. Waltke observes the connectivity: the existence with God before the creation, teaching wisdom, and "blessings in the symbols of food and drink."

²³⁴ This is a highlight among personified Wisdom's sayings in Proverbs, as the purpose of Jesus' Incarnation is also focused on the giving of his life and wisdom to his people.

Wisdom and the Johannine Logos, and even further to a preexistent Messiah, Jesus since the earliest days of Christianity. On the other hand, many scholars reject the opinion that personified Wisdom in Proverbs contains a straight reference to Jesus due to the slight ambiguousness and shortages of intertextual evidences and the exaggerated theological presuppositions of Christian scholars. In order to disentangle these problematic issues as a reference to the relationship between them, it was important that the literary and exegetical practices of personified Wisdom within early Jewish Wisdom traditions offer the significant allusions to the Hellenistic and Rabbinic influences on the Johannine Logos in respect to the intertextual and theological nexuses.

In the first place, in terms of a Greek Logos-centered tradition, we have traced the process that the personification of Jewish hypostatic notions, such as Wisdom, Torah, Word and Memra, and even Philo's Logos in Palestinian Judaism appears to be important in examining the nexuses between personified Wisdom and the Johannine Logos eventually in relation to Incarnate Jesus. These relationships between Jewish hypostatic notions offer a motivation to reexamine the influences of Greek and Hellenistic philosophies on the relationship between them in reference to the exegetical and theological mainstreams of Palestinian Judaism including Hellenistic and Rabbinic Judaism.²³⁵ This analysis also reveals that the evangelist uses significant keywords, which convey a literary interplay and exegetical practice, reflecting his theological and philosophical concepts. The exegetical and theological allusions also imply that the evangelist elaborated the unique idea of the Johannine Logos as the core point of the Johannine Christology. The Johannine Logos eventually could have been integrated into the Incarnation of Jesus, the Son of God on the side of Christianity and especially of Wisdom Christology. In addition, the Johannine Logos has a similar allusion to personified

²³⁵ James H. Charlesworth, "The Fourth Evangelist and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Assessing Trends over Nearly Sixty Years," in John, Qumran, and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Sixty Years of Discovery and Debate, ed. Tom Thatcher, (Atlanta: SBL, 2011), 161-163. Some scholars, after the recovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, have first attempted to discover linguistic and theological parallels between the Gospel of John and the Qumran texts, while excluding external influences, such as Hellenistic and Rabbinic Judaism within the influences of Palestinian Judaism on the Johannine Logos. Even if the examinations grant an insightful and original direction to the study of the Johannine community, the examined evidence still does not seem to elucidate entirely the backgrounds of the Johannine Logos. In this context, I think that it is first desirable to closely reexamine the theological and philosophical backgrounds, and the compositional and exegetical intention of the author of the Johannine Prologue in the Johannine community in addition to the provenance of Palestinian Judaism of the Johannine context.

Wisdom in terms of terminological, phraseological, and phenomenological dimensions.²³⁶

Nevertheless, due to these limitations of terminological and intertextual approaches, it is still necessary to correct and supplement inadequate premises and assumptions regarding the relationship between them.

In the second place, in terms of Jewish Wisdom centered tradition, there was a direct and critical relationship of Wisdom passages and the Gospels in regard to the development of early Christology, in comparison with the indirect attempts of the Greek Logos-centered tradition to connect personified Wisdom and Jesus. It becomes evident that the Gospels and Epistles explicitly offer obvious evidence about Jesus as the Wisdom of God including Wisdom itself (e.g., Matt 11:19, Col 1:15-17; 2:3); whereas personified Wisdom is implicitly connected to the Johannine Logos, and Proverbs itself does not provide a direct link to Jesus as an ontological wisdom, i.e., Wisdom itself. In general, the personification of Wisdom in Prov 8:22–31 was considered as a representative example which alludes to the significance of the understanding of literary genre including the direction of the interpretations and its principles.²³⁷ The literary genres of poetry, prophecy, narrative, and so on, unquestionably influence the interpretations and guides their directions.²³⁸ The personification is linked to the embodiment of an abstract quality or attribute of a person.²³⁹ In this regard, many scholars might identify the personification of Wisdom as a literary device reflecting a characteristic or attribute of God that humans could possess. However, the early disputes in regard to the nature and identity of Jesus were profoundly involved with these texts and their various reinterpretations, and the

²³⁶ It also alludes to the significant nexus between personified Wisdom, Torah, Word, and Memra as well as Logos in terms of a semantic dimension. They also seem to have a hypostatic or personified characteristic in all these texts.

²³⁷ There are several verses in relation to Prov 8:22-31; Col 1:15 which calls Jesus “the first-born of all creation.”; 1 Cor 8:6, “There is one God, the Father, from whom are all things, . . . and one Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom are all things.”; Revelation 3:14, Jesus Christ as “the beginning of God’s creation.”

²³⁸ It is noticeable that the Jesus tradition implies that Jesus presented himself as a Jewish prophetic sage in a sapiential form (e.g. aphorism, parable) in relation to the earlier Jewish sapiential traditions like Sirach and Wisdom of Solomon.

²³⁹ This was the case with some who mistakenly identified the man Simon as “the power of God” (Acts 8:9-10). Jesus, who has “all the treasures of [the attribute] wisdom” within him (Col. 2:3), so fully possesses and displays this to be identified as Wisdom. The poet’s usage of personification usually refers to an attempt, which attributes human qualities, to an abstract and inanimate being. In terms of a common literary device, we can prove that anthropomorphizing impersonal beings with an abstract attribute is historically and traditionally common. In the early Jewish writings, personification was generally used as the most vivid way of expressing for the impersonal. Because of this, many misunderstand wisdom as only an attribute, being personified as a literary device. However, it is noticeable that this case is different from the identification of Jesus as Wisdom.

applications of personified Wisdom to Jesus.²⁴⁰ The historical and theological debates surrounding the divinity of Jesus in the Trinity make us to be cautious when simplifying authors' attempts and intentions as a poetic expression used for the personification of non-human beings. However, personified Wisdom's appearance in the OT and NT seems to be not a mere attribute of God in terms of a literary device, but as a personal and divine being.²⁴¹ The uniqueness of the personification of Wisdom in Prov 1-9 is explicitly different from a mere poetic approach; the personified Wisdom's explanations and expressions within the contexts of the creation are very different from a personified being's expressions as human qualities. More importantly, in Prov 1-9, the following does not have clear evidence: why wisdom literally became a woman who speaks about herself or why wisdom is described as an abstract personality or attribute of God or of the soul of the speaker. Rather, one special aspect we have noticed was that wisdom's personification appears well in the context of the creation of the world (e.g. Prov 3:19; Prov 8:22-31). In this regard, it is necessary to analyze closely the particular literary and exegetical principles and their contexts in reference to the relationship between personification of wisdom and creation. Without a theological and doctrinal preposition, through thorough exegetical, intertextual and theological examinations, the interpretations and understandings of the personification of wisdom should be reconsidered in the complex senses and aspects of intertextual and historical contexts. In particular, through the case of narrative *meshalim* as a popular form of aphorisms and parables in the Gospels as afore-examined, we can see that the sophisticated and symbolic portrayal of personified Wisdom can be explained as one feature of Jewish exegetical and compositional practices, reflecting authors' theological intentions and tendencies in a specific historical context.²⁴² In this sense, it becomes critical to discover the authors' authentic

²⁴⁰ Although most NT scholars in the early churches during the patristic period had tried to connect personified Wisdom in the OT as Jesus in the NT, there were different approaches. Some of the NT authors have applied the languages of personified Wisdom to Jesus in both biblical and apocryphal texts. The other, however, rejected the literary device and its applications to the personification of Wisdom in relation to Jesus, since the subject of the divinity of Jesus as one person in the Trinity was historically and theologically related to the controversial issues, i.e., the ancient heresies such as Arianism.

²⁴¹ In fact, it is difficult to determine whether personified Wisdom in Proverbs conveys a mere literary or figurative or other sense in regard to the author's intention attempting the personification of Wisdom.

²⁴² Another critical question in these interpretative approaches is about whether the authors, particularly and uniquely, created personified Wisdom in Proverbs or personified Wisdom was variously derived from other sources such as ancient Near Eastern sources in relation to Wisdom material.

intentions in reference to not only a literary and exegetical practice, but also a theological tendency and position. Nevertheless, there is still a difficulty in affirming completely the intertextual nexuses in respect to each intention of personified Wisdom between these texts. It offers a necessity of understanding different theological perspectives and interpretative approaches of different authors, which they approached with different socio-historical backgrounds.

In summary, it is primarily reasonable to see that the personification of Wisdom was not only a particular literary and exegetical method of expressing a personal and divine being in relationship with God, but also one of the dominant compositional strategies within hermeneutical interactions between Jewish Wisdom traditions and Hellenistic influences. Furthermore, it is remarkable that the authors' ultimate intentions towards the personification of Wisdom in their unique ways are connected to the salvific recovery of their relationship with God through the reinterpretation, combination and integration between the earlier Jewish biblical traditions and the Hellenistic contexts. However, it is necessary to rediscover, continuously and thoroughly, the author's authentic intentions for the personification of Wisdom appeared and reflected on their literary and exegetical practices in various angles and aspects.

Conclusion

Through the study, in the first place, regarding the Greek Logos-centered tradition, we have seen the literary and exegetical practices concerning the personification of Wisdom in Jewish hypostatic notions: Torah, Word, Memra and Philo's Logos.²⁴³ It becomes certain that the intertextual and theological nexuses between the Jewish hypostatic notions were the significant seeds sown for the unique birth of not only the Johannine Logos. They elucidate the authors' theological and philosophical intentions, which combined the direct or indirect influences within Palestinian Judaism

²⁴³ It is noticeable that Philo's Logos, as one of the main Hellenistic influences, particularly offers a theological and philosophical nexus between personified Wisdom and the Johannine Logos.

including Hellenism and Rabbinic Judaism. The Wisdom's journey to the Johannine Logos and directly to Jesus, however, should not be restricted by these external influences since these influences cannot explain holistically the unique characteristics of Jesus as the Johannine Logos and personified Wisdom. The evangelist's unique genius, in relation to the inspired and unique Incarnate Logos: Jesus, can also be considered within the process of forming the Johannine Logos from the personification of wisdom. Regardless of either way of these approaches, the Incarnation event of Jesus might have been, in a sense, an eventual and necessary result in the process of becoming personified Wisdom.

In the second place, regarding the Jewish Wisdom-centered tradition, we have seen that Jewish Wisdom traditions had a direct influence on the Jesus tradition in relation to their images and activities between them in terms of a critical exegetical, semantic allusion, and theological orientation. It implies that the authors attempted to connect directly Jesus to personified Wisdom in the Synoptics through particular literary and exegetical practices such as Jesus's parables, i.e., narrative *meshalim*. Through the particular textual and theological understandings in collaboration with an inspiration, the authors might have attempted to express creatively the Incarnation of Jesus by connecting it to the images and activities of Jesus, and by reformulating a new image as a Creator or Son of God and a Sage or Teacher, and a Master in banquet. In this sense, it is reasonable to summarize that the unique theology and connectivity of personified Wisdom and Jesus were profoundly formulated from the author's particular exegetical practices reflecting a theological intention but also from the complex operations fused these various elements and interactive influences.

Despite these comprehensive and sharable conclusions, there are still dichotomized perspectives between Jewish and Christian Wisdom traditions. On the side of Jewish Wisdom traditions, the Incarnation of Jesus can be just one of the Jewish exegetical practices and biblical interpretations. In addition, it is just one of heretical influences or one of two combinational results from other Jewish Wisdom traditions and Jewish Hellenistic traditions on the topic of the personification of Wisdom. In relation to an inner-biblical and intra-textual principle and its rules, they only might emphasize the original intentions of the writings of Proverbs concerning personified Wisdom under an assumption that the authors of Proverbs had never considered the existence of Jesus in relation to personified

Wisdom. On the side of Christian Wisdom traditions, it also appears to be clear that the authors of the Gospels might have been influenced by Jewish exegetical traditions on the subject of the personification of Wisdom in regard to the Incarnation of Jesus. On the side of Christian exegetical and biblical interpretations, Jesus' identification as personified Wisdom involves the personification and embodiment of wisdom which is theologically related to a feature as one of divine persons of the Trinity in Christianity. They might conclude that the holistic examination also reveals not only that there is a critical link between Wisdom and Jesus, which exists throughout the NT, but also that the images and activities which personified Wisdom in Proverbs involves a direct and clear reference to those of Jesus.

In this conflicting debate, it is first necessary to acknowledge that the attempt for the personification of Wisdom is profoundly related to the authors' theological intentions and their exegetical and scribal practices in regard to the historical, social and theological contexts. On the basis of thorough reexamination of the authors' exegetical and theological intentions, it is also important to comprehend and preserve sound hermeneutic principles regarding the interpretations of the sapiential materials in the early Jewish and Christian sources. One critical point is that the direction in the interpretative methods should not be limited and become misleading by a subjective and one-sided interpretation. While according to the principles of the sound biblical and exegetical interpretations, the texts first should voice and express of itself, by itself, and for itself. In other words, a theological presupposition and its approach such as a redemptive-historical interpretation from the N.T should be restricted before completing the interpretations of the text itself, and before discovering and interpreting the original textual meanings of the passages. The intertestamental interpretations and attempts about the identification of Jesus to personified Wisdom should be sufficiently based on literary, exegetical, semantic and theological examinations within Wisdom literature. Nevertheless, the advancing processes in respect to textual and intertextual interpretations should not be blocked by only the completion of textual and intratextual interpretations in the OT including early Jewish sources. When discussing the theological implications from O.T to N.T, it is necessary not only to acknowledge the limitations of the literary and exegetical approaches, and the arguments in the past

such as the patristic exegeses, but also to recognize that various interpretative attempts are still an ongoing controversial progress. Furthermore, the interpretations and understandings of the Wisdom passages should not be limited within only one framework such as a historical-grammatical or critical exegesis and biblical exegesis, but should be more extensive on a deeper level. Rather, they need to be developed to the comparisons and applications to the NT including early Christian sources, and their extensions in terms of intertextual, semantic and even intertestamental dimensions, while maintaining the valuable interpretations from the OT itself, and discovering the legitimate connections between the texts. This authentic and holistic study can offer an insight into a sound interpretive direction of the OT and NT. It can also provide us with not only how we can approach and interpret the passages which allude to the relationship between them, but also how we can deal with the authority of the OT and NT. These thorough examinations could offer profound and incessant insights into a sound interpretative direction of intertestamental studies in relation to a connected purpose, historically and metaphorically, representing the relationship between them.

Consequently, this study suggests a necessity of the thorough reexamination and continuous reevaluation of the relationship between them. In order to solve effectively the dilemmas and puzzles of the relationships between them, I suggest some additional examinations: 1) to clarify thoroughly textual interpretations and intertextual allusions on a controversial issue, such as the interpretations of $\eta\mu\lambda\omicron\varsigma$, through linguistic similarities and semantic continuities in relation to their images and activities; and 2) to analyze more systematically the literary and exegetical practices and their theological intentions; and 3) to reexamine more closely the contemporary literary, scribal and compositional traditions in order to discover the historical and theological backgrounds reflect the significance and implications of the metaphorical expressions and special exegetical practices; and 4) to study more early Christian sources and later Jewish and rabbinic sources not only for discovering the critical influences in regard to the movement from Jewish Wisdom-Logos theology to Christology, but also for tracing the trajectory of the ideas of both religions: the personification of Wisdom in Jewish wisdom literature, and the Incarnation of Jesus in Christian wisdom literature.

These additional examinations could give a holistic understanding of the developmental process and its sophisticated combination of various intertextual, exegetical and theological influences. The relationships between their images and activities can be more clarified by referring and examining the further external and internal sources. They also could offer critical understandings for the historical backgrounds and the hermeneutic and theological interactions between early Christianity and Judaism. Furthermore, the further studies could help us redefine and conceptualize the profound relationship between them, in addition to clarifying more the theological formative process of Wisdom-Logos theology in early Judaism and Christianity, in respect of reconsidering the split history between these two religions.

Bibliography

- Adams, Samuel L. "Proverbs, Book of." In *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism*, edited by John J. Collins and Daniel C Harlow, William B. Eerdmans; Grand Rapids, Mich., 2010.
- Adler, Reinhard. *Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft*, <http://www.bibelwissenschaft.de/online-bibeln/ueber-die-online-bibeln/>. (accessed April 5, 2014).
- Aitken, Kenneth T. "Proverbs." In *The Daily Study Bible Series*. Louisville, KY.: Westminster John Knox Press, 1986.
- Albright, William Foxwell. "The Supposed Babylonian Derivation of the Logos," *JBL* 39 (1920):143-51.
- Allison, Dale C., Jr. *The New Moses: A Matthean Typology*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.
- Anderson, Gary A. "The Interpretation of Genesis 1:1 in the Targums," *CBQ* 52, no. 1 (01/01, 1990): 219.
- Arndt, William. F., W. Gingrich, Frederick W. Danker, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979.
- Ashton, John. *Understanding the Fourth Gospel*. 2nd ed. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Aune, David E. "Oral Tradition and the Aphorisms of Jesus." In *Sheffield*, England: JSOT Press, 1991., 211-265.
- Borgen, Peder. "Philo of Alexandria as Exegete." In *The Ancient Period: A History of Biblical Interpretation*, edited by Alan J. Hauser and Duane F. Watson, 114-43. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.
- Boyarin, Daniel. *Border Lines: The Partition of Judeo-Christianity*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania, 2004.
- . "The Gospel of the Memra: Jewish Binitarianism and the Prologue to John," *Harvard Theological Review* 94, no. 3 (07/01, 2001): 243-84.
- Brant, Jo-Ann A., *John*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic, 2011.

- Breech, James, and Amos N., Wilder. *Jesus' Parables and the War of Myths: Essays on Imagination in the Scripture*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982.
- Brown, Raymond E. *The Gospel According to John*. 1st ed. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1966.
- Bultmann, Rudolf, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1971.
- Charlesworth, James H. "The Fourth Evangelist and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Assessing Trends over Nearly Sixty Years." In *John, Qumran, and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Sixty Years of Discovery and Debate*, edited by Tom Thatcher, 161-182, Atlanta: SBL, 2011.
- Chesnutt, Randall D. "Solomon, Wisdom of." In *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism*, edited by John J. Collins and Daniel C Harlow, William B. Eerdmans; Grand Rapids, Mich., 2010.
- Chilton, Bruce. *Judaic Approaches to the Gospels* (University of South Florida International Studies in Formative Christianity and Judaism 2) Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994.
- Clarke, Ernest G. *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Deuteronomy*. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1998.
- Clifford, Richard J. *Proverbs: A commentary*. 1st ed. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press, 1999.
- . *The Wisdom Literature*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1998.
- Cohen, Boaz. *Jewish and Roman Law: A Comparative Study*. 2 vols. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1966.
- Collins, John J. "Wisdom Literature" and "Wisdom Literature at Qumran." In *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism*, edited by John J. Collins and Daniel C Harlow, William B. Eerdmans; Grand Rapids, Mich., 2010.
- Crawford, Sidnie White. "Lady Wisdom and Dame Folly at Qumran," *Faculty Publications, Classics and Religious Studies Department*, Brill NV: Leiden, 1998.
- Crenshaw, James L. *Old Testament Wisdom: An Introduction*. 3rd ed. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press, 2010.
- Davies, W.D. "Reflections on the Spirit in the Mekilta: A Suggestion," *JANESCU* 5, 1973.
- . *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology*, 2d ed., 1995,

- reprint, London: Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, 1965.
- Dunn, James D. G. *Christology in the Making: A New Testament Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids, Mich.: W.B. Eerdmans Pub Co, 1996.
- Edwards, M. J. "Justin's Logos and the Word of God" *J ECS* 3, no.3, 09/01, 1995.
- Epp, Eldon Jay. "Wisdom, Torah, Word: The Johannine Prologue and the Purpose of the Fourth Gospel." In *Current Issues in Biblical and Patristic Interpretation: Studies in Honor of Merrill C. Tenney Presented by His Former Students*, edited by Gerald F Hawthorne, 128-46. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975.
- Evan-Shoshan, Abraham. *A New Concordance*. printed in Israel, by "Kiryat-Sefer" Ltd., Jerusalem. 1989.
- Fahlbusch, Erwin, and Geoffrey William Bromiley. *The Encyclopedia of Christianity*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Leiden, Netherlands: Wm. B. Eerdmans; Brill, 1999.
- Fox, Michael V. *Proverbs 1-9: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, Doubleday, New York, 2000.
- . "Amon again," *JBL* 115, no. 4 (Winter, 1996): 699-702.
- Frank, Richard M. *The Wisdom of Jesus Ben Sirach* (Sinai Ar. 155. IXth-Xth Cent.). Louvain: Corpus SCO, 1974.
- Friedrich, Gerhard. eds. Gerhard Kittel, and trans. Geoffrey William Bromiley, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1964.
- Georgi, Dieter. *The Opponents of Paul in Second Corinthians*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986.
- Genette, Gerard, and Richard Macksey, and Jane E. Lewin. *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*. NY; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Gerhardsson, Birger. "If we do Not Cut the Parables Out of their Frames," *NTS*, Vol. 37(3), 1991.
- Gerhardsson, Birger. *The Narrative Meshalim in the Synoptic Gospels: A Comparison with the Narrative Meshalim in the Old Testament*. *NTS*. Vol. 34(3), 1988.
- Goodenough, Erwin R. *The Theology of Justin Martyr: An Investigation into the Conceptions of Early Christian Literature and Its Hellenistic and Judaistic Influences*. Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1968.

- Harrington, Daniel J. *Wisdom texts from Qumran*. Routledge, London: New York, 1996.
- Harrison, Everett F. "A Study of John 1:14." In *Unity and Diversity in NT Theology: Essays in Honor of G.E. Ladd*, edited by Robert A. Guelish, 23-36. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978.
- Jo-Ann A. Brant, *John*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic, 2011.
- Jobes, Karen H. "Sophia Christology: The Way of Wisdom?" In *The Way of Wisdom: Essays in Honor of Bruce K. Waltke*, edited by James I. Packer and Sven Soderlund, 226-250. Grand Rapids, Mich: Zondervan, 2000.
- Keener, Craig S. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2010.
- Kittel, Rudolf, Karl Elliger, Wilhelm Rudolph, Hans Peter Rüger, G. E. (Gé Weil, and Hans Bardtke). [*Torah, Nevi'im u-Khetuvim*]= *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. Editio secunda emendata opera W. Rudolph et H. P. Rüger. ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1984.
- Klostergaard Petersen, A. "Rewritten Bible as a Borderline Phenomenon - Genre, Textual Strategy, or Canonical Anachronism?" In *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino Garc ía Martínez*, edited by A. Hilhorst, et al., 285-306. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2007.
- Knox, Wilfred L. "The Divine Wisdom," *JTS* 38, 1937.
- Lincoln, Andrew T. *The Gospel According to Saint John*. Hendrickson Publishers, Inc. ed. Peabody, MA; London; New York: Hendrickson Publishers; Continuum, 2005.
- Mack, Burton L. "Wisdom Makes a Difference: Alternatives to 'Messianic' Configurations." In *Judaisms and Their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era*, Mack, Burton L., *Logos und Sophia: Untersuchungen zur Weisheitstheologie im Hellenistischen Judentum*, *SUNT* 10, 15-48. Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973.
- McHugh, John F. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on John 1-4*, edited by Graham Stanton, London; New York: T & T Clark, 2009.
- McGrath, James F. *John's Apologetic Christology: Legitimation and Development in Johannine Christology*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- McNamara, Martin. *Targum and Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972.

- . *Targum Neofiti I, Genesis*. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1992.
- . *Targum Neofiti I: Deuteronomy*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1997.
- Middleton, R. D. "Logos and Shekinah in the Fourth Gospel." *JQR* 29, no. 2 (Oct., 1938): 101-133.
- Moloney, Francis J. *The Gospel of John: Text and Context*. Boston: Brill, 2005.
- Moulton, Warren J. "The Dating of the Synoptic Gospels," *JBL* 37, no. 1/2 (1918): 1-19.
- Neusner, Jacob. *Genesis Rabbah: The Judaic Commentary to the Book of Genesis: A New American Translation*. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1985.
- O'Day, Gail R. "The Gospel of John: Introduction, Commentary and Reflections." In *New Interpreters Bible: A Commentary in Twelve Volumes*, vol. 9, edited by Neil Alexander, Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon Press, 1995.
- Petersen, Anders Klostergaard. "Rewritten Bible as a Borderline Phenomenon -- Genre, Textual Strategy, or Canonical Anachronism?" In *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez*, edited by A. Hilhorst, et al. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2007.
- Perkins, Pheme. *Jesus as Teacher*. New York; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Philo of Alexandria. *Philo*, edited by Ralph Marcus, and F. H. Colson, and G. H. Whitaker. 10 vols. 1929. Reprint, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2004.
- Ridderbos, Herman N. *The Gospel According to John: A Theological Commentary*. Grand Rapids; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans; W.B. Eerdmans Pub, 1997.
- Ringgren, Helmer. *Word and Wisdom Studies in the Hypostatization of Divine Qualities and Functions in the Ancient Near East*. Lund: H. Ohlssons boktr, 1947.
- Roberts, R. L. "The Rendering "Only Begotten" in John 3:16," *ResQ* 16, no. 1 (01/01, 1973): 2-22.
- Robinson, James T. "The Relationship of the Prologue to the Gospel of St. John," *NTS* 9, no. 2., (1963): 120-129.
- Ronning, John L. *The Jewish Targums and John's Logos Theology*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, 2010.
- Runia, David T. and Philo of Alexandria. *On the Creation of the Cosmos According to Moses*. Leiden;

- Boston: Brill, 2001.
- Ronan, Marian, Hal Taussig, and Susan Cole. *Wisdom's Feast: Sophia in Study and Celebration*. New ed. Kansas City, Mo.: Sheed & Ward, 1996.
- Schipper, Bernd U. "When Wisdom Is Not Enough! The Discourse on Wisdom and Torah and the Composition of the Booke of Proverbs." In *Wisdom and Torah: The Reception of 'Torah' in the Wisdom Literature of the Second Temple Period*, edited by Bernd U Schipper, D Andrew Teeter, 233-272. (Supplements to JSJ: Volume 163), MA: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2013.
- Scott, Martin. *Sophia and the Johannine Jesus*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992.
- Scott, Bernard Brandon. "Jesus as Sage: An Innovating Voice in Common Wisdom." In *Winona Lake*, Ind: Eisenbrauns, 1990., 399-415.
- Scott, R. B. Y. "Wisdom in Creation: The 'Āmôn of Proverbs VIII 30." *VT* 10, no. 2 (Apr., 1960): 213-223.
- Shechter, Solomon. ed., *Aboth de Rabbi Nathan* (1887; reprint, New York: Philipp Feldheim, 1967), 91. Judah Goldin, trans., *The Fathers According to Rabbi Nathan*, Yale Judaica Series, New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1955.
- Sinnott, Alice M. *The Personification of Wisdom*. Aldershot, Hants, England: Ashgate Pub., 2005.
- Skehan, Patrick William. "Structures in Poems on Wisdom: Proverbs 8 and Sirach 24." *CBQ* 41 (3) (1979): 365-79.
- Smith, Dwight. M. *The Theology of the Gospel of John*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Sterling, Gregory E. "Different Traditions or Emphases? The Image of God in Philo's *De Opificio Mundi*" in *New Approaches to the Study of Biblical Interpretation in Judaism of the Second Temple Period and in Early Christianity: Proceedings of the Eleventh International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and associated literature*, jointly sponsored by the Hebrew University Center for the Study of Christianity, 9-11 January, 2007. Edited by Gary Alan Anderson; Ruth A Clements; David Satran; Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature (Jerusalem). International Symposium: (Studies

- on the texts of the Desert of Judah, 106.), Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2013.
- . “When the Beginning Is the End: The Place of Genesis in the Commentaries of Philo,” in C. Evans, J. Lohr & D.L. Petersen eds. *The Book of Genesis. Composition, Reception and Interpretation*. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2012, 427-45.
- Suggs, M. Jack. *Wisdom, Christology, and Law in Matthew's Gospel*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970.
- Teeter, D. A. “Torah, Wisdom, and the Composition of Rewritten Scripture: Jubilees and 11QPs^a in Comparative Perspective.” In *Wisdom and Torah: The Reception of 'Torah' in the Wisdom Literature of the Second Temple Period*. edited by Bernd U Schipper, D Andrew Teeter, 233-272. (Supplements to *JSJ*: Volume 163), MA: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2013.
- Tobin, Thomas H. "The Prologue of John and Hellenistic Jewish Speculation." *CBQ* 52, no. 2 (04/01, 1990): 252-269.
- Turner, Nigel, and James Hope Moulton 1863-1917. *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1906.
- Urbach, Ephraim E. *The Sages, Their Concepts and Beliefs*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1987.
- Vinzenz Reiterer, Friedrich. “The Interpretation of the Wisdom Tradition of the Torah within Ben Sira.” In *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: Studies on Tradition, Redaction, and Theology*, edited by Angelo Passaro, and Giuseppe Bellia, *Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature*, 1, 209–231. Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2008.
- Visotzky, Burton L. (trans.) *The Midrash on Proverbs*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.
- Waltke, Bruce K. *The Book of Proverbs*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: W.B. Eerdmans Pub. Co, 2004.
- Webster, Jane S. "Sophia: Engendering Wisdom in Proverbs, Ben Sira and the Wisdom of Solomon," *JSOT*, no. 78 06/01, 1998.
- Westermann, Claus. *The Parables of Jesus in the Light of the Old Testament*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990.
- White, L. Michael. *Scripting Jesus: The Gospels in Rewrite*. 1st ed. New York: HarperOne, 2010.

Witherington, Ben. *Jesus the Sage: The Pilgrimage of Wisdom*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994.

Wolfson, Harry Austryn. *Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*. 2vols. 4th rev. ed. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968.