

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-05377-8 - The Book of Wisdom: With Introduction and Notes

Edited by A.T.S. Goodrick

Excerpt

[More information](#)

INTRODUCTION

§ 1. Wisdom and the Hebrew Canon.

THE study of the non-canonical books of the Old Testament should be at the present day of peculiar interest. The progress of Biblical criticism, with the introduction of sounder methods of interpretation, has inclined us to reconsider the subject of inspiration, and the question may well be raised whether there are not books outside the Canon which are more deserving of inclusion than some of those which have gained admission.^a

Of such outside works the book of Wisdom stands out foremost with its noble statement of the doctrine of the Immortality of the Soul, its indignant denunciation of idolatry at a time when such denunciation may have been dangerous, and its firm stand against the Epicureanism which was sapping the very foundations of Jewish morality and belief. So exalted indeed are the sentiments of the writer that he has been, as we shall see, claimed as one of the foremost teachers of the early Christian Church. On what ground his book was never admitted to the Canon we do not know. Possibly he was after all too late; possibly his unfortunate parade of Greek learning disgusted the Jewish doctors.

^a Ryle, *Canon of O. T.*, 171. Cheyne, *Job and Solomon*, 280, states that 'when after the destruction of Jerusalem Jewish learning reorganised itself at Jamnia (4½ leagues south of Jaffa), the view that the Song and Koheleth "defile the hands," i.e. are holy Scriptures, was brought forward in a synod held about A.D. 90, and finally sanctioned in a second synod held A.D. 118. The arguments urged on both sides were such as belong to an uncritical age. No attempt was made to penetrate into the spirit and object of Koheleth, but test-passages were singled out. The heretically sounding words in 11^{9a} were at first held by some to be decisive against the claim of canonicity; but, we are told, when the "wise men" took the close of the verse into consideration ("but know that for all this God will bring thee into the judgment") they exclaimed, "Solomon has spoken appropriately.'" Dr. Cheyne adds (281) that 'there was even as late as A.D. 90 a chance for any struggling book (e.g. *Sirach*) to find its

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-05377-8 - The Book of Wisdom: With Introduction and Notes

Edited by A.T.S. Goodrick

Excerpt

[More information](#)

It is, moreover, high time that the value of the so-called Apocryphal books (we shall use the term 'apocryphic' as not implying the idea of falsification or forgery which attaches to the other word) should be recognised, not merely on the ground of their intrinsic merit, but also because they represent a transition stage between the doctrines of the Old and New Testaments. The more the nature of the gap between these has been recognised, and the more clearly the distinct points of view which the Old and the New Dispensations afford have been set forth, the more men's attention has been directed to the Apocrypha. Under this name we include not only the books recognised as deuterо-canonical by Jerome and the Fathers, but also the rich stores of kindred literature which modern research has unearthed or recalled to notice. Among the former 'Wisdom' easily holds the first place. Valued by the early Christians for the beauty of its diction and of its ideas, it now occupies a higher place as introducing us to the mind of a man who stood at the very turning-point of belief; a Jew so advanced in his opinions that inconsiderate critics have even called him Christian.

Of this intermediate literature we recognise three distinct classes or currents, answering to the local conditions of the dispersed Jews. We have first the purely Palestinian school, represented by Siracides, 1 Maccabees, Judith, and the book of Jubilees. They keep to the old ways; their one concern is with the observance of the Law and the respect due to the Temple. They exhibit no ideas with regard to a future state, and they cling to the old doctrine of retribution meted out by God to the righteous and to the wicked in this life. In the

way into the Canon. But Budde (*Althebr. Lit.*, p. 2) goes further. As late as 125 A. D., he says, there was a dispute as to the admission of the Song and Ecclesiastes. It is true that we find no mention of the rejected candidature of any book; but the Rabbis seem to have proceeded on two principles—(1) that books which claimed an authorship older than Moses (*e.g.* Enoch) were not genuine; (2) that Apocalyptic works must be excluded. For this latter there was a reason; Christian writers had already begun to employ such books for their own ends. See also Bertholet in the same volume, p. 338, on the use of the Jewish Apocalypses by Christian writers, and F. C. Porter in *Hast. D. B.*, i. 114a. So Corn. à Lapidé says that the Jews rejected Wisdom because the death of Christ was there predicted. For the views of the Western Fathers on the Canon, see the full and clear account in Salmon's Introduction to the Speaker's *Apocrypha*, vol. i. pp. xxv-xxviii, and Bissell, *Introd.* 51 *sqq.*, cf. Aug. *de Doctr. Chr.*, ii. 8, who practically maintains the absolute right of the Church to say what is canonical and what is not; and he is speaking of O.T. as well as N.T.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-05377-8 - The Book of Wisdom: With Introduction and Notes

Edited by A.T.S. Goodrick

Excerpt

[More information](#)

WISDOM AND THE HEBREW CANON

3

book of Judith in particular we have the old idea of Yahwe as the national God, protecting his own at the expense of other nations, and even countenancing the base assassination of Holofernes as he had countenanced that of Sisera. To the second class belong those works which, though chiefly of Palestinian origin, are deeply affected by views imbibed during the captivity from the followers of Zoroaster. These are 2 Maccabees, Baruch, the additions to Daniel, and, most of all, on the score of local origin as well as of content, Tobit. In these books we find the Resurrection of the Just plainly set forth, coupled with elements which had but little influence in the ancient Jewish theology. We have a doctrine of angels approaching to that of mediæval times, accompanied by a similar development of belief as to demonic interference; we have hints of miraculous interference in the most trifling affairs of domestic life; and we have the efficacy of prayer for the dead plainly stated. We have, in short, signs of intermediate opinion; a distinct variation from Old Testament doctrine; a distinct approximation to that of the New.

But most important of all is the Jewish-Alexandrian class, which represents not merely the growth of Jewish opinion, unfertile in itself and yet capable of development when assisted from without, but also the assimilation of Hellenic elements. To this class we may assign without hesitation 1 Esdras, the Prayer of Manasses, and Wisdom.

On the merits and value of our book the most diverse opinions have been held and expressed. The storm of controversy which began with the decision of the Bible Society to exclude the Apocrypha from their editions in 1827 involved 'Wisdom' in the general denunciation of books as widely different from it as 'Bel and the Dragon.'^a We can here only refer to the great dispute over the retention of the Apocrypha which raged in Germany in the early fifties of the last century. Conservative Lutherans like Stier and Hengstenberg, as well as liberal theologians like Bleek, were rightly in favour of the toleration of the books on precisely the grounds laid down in our own Articles. But the great value of the discussion was that it suggested a deeper study of the Apocrypha than had hitherto been known. The work of its opponents, like Keerl, is most important. With regard to English scholars of the time, one can only suppose that their knowledge of 'Wisdom' in particular was most superficial. Brucker's *History of Philosophy* was their text-book, and when Brucker insisted on dis-

^a For specimens of the unmeasured language used with regard to the Apocrypha in general, cf. Fairweather in *Hast. D. B.*, v. 273.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-05377-8 - The Book of Wisdom: With Introduction and Notes

Edited by A.T.S. Goodrick

Excerpt

[More information](#)

covering Platonism, Stoicism, the *anima mundi*, and what not, in every chapter of 'Wisdom,' they blindly followed him. Burton's *Bampton Lectures* are a good example of such criticism, and Payne-Smith's words (*Bamp. Lect.*, p. 368) are worth quoting: 'It is in the book of Wisdom that we find the open expression of those philosophical opinions which finally ruined the Alexandrian school. . . . Nothing can be more unsound than its philosophy, and it did introduce into the Church principles contrary to the teaching of the New Testament.' He cites three points: (1) the eternity of matter, (2) the pre-existence of souls, (3) the inherent badness of matter and of the body. But the extremest views naturally were those of the Evangelical school in the Church. We may cite one specimen from Gurney's *Dictionary of the Bible* (1828): 'Sundry phrases of it seem taken out of the prophets and even the New Testament. Some will have Philo the Jew to be the author of it, but he seems rather to have been a fraudulent Christian. He talks as if souls were lodged in bodies according to their former merits; makes the murder of Abel the cause of the flood; represents the Egyptians as plagued by their own idols, though it is certain they never worshipped frogs or locusts; and calls the divine Logos or second person of the Trinity a *vapour* and *stream*.' On the other hand, appreciation at the present day goes too far, as when André (*Les Apocryphes de l'Ancien Test.*, Florence, 1903, p. 312) says that 'Wisdom' contains the first attempt at a systematic Jewish philosophy. Theocratic Monotheism has no place for philosophy; and Pseudo-Solomon is nothing if not unsystematic.

Nevertheless, the book has been repeatedly used in the Christian Church as of evidential value. It was employed in the Trinitarian controversies, in which the attributes of Wisdom were connected sometimes with the person of the Son, sometimes with that of the Holy Ghost. Methodius used Chap. 4 in pleading for the monastic and conventual life. Chap. 2 was quoted against the Jews to support the view of a suffering and not a triumphant Messiah. Chap. 3 is an encouragement for martyrdom. St. Augustine used the words as to the inherited guilt of the Canaanites in his argument against the Pelagian heresy; and the 'idolatry' chapters were naturally quoted in the Iconoclastic disputes (*Church Quart. Rev.*, Apr. 1879). Lastly, the pseudo-Dionysius in the treatise *De divinis nominibus* uses the passage in 8² *ἐραστιῆς ἐγενόμην τοῦ κάλλους αὐτῆς* as a justification of the erotic or passionate form of devotion, of which enough is said in the notes on the text. The book was continually used by the Christian

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-05377-8 - The Book of Wisdom: With Introduction and Notes

Edited by A.T.S. Goodrick

Excerpt

[More information](#)

DATE OF COMPOSITION

5

Fathers for centuries, during which, according to Freudenthal,^a it remained unrecognised by the Jews.

§ 2 Date of Composition.

The question of date is in the case of the book of Wisdom of great importance, and that for two reasons: the first concerning its position in the development of Jewish Eschatology; the other affecting the question of the purpose which the author had in view in composing it. We may here summarise briefly what will be more fully treated of hereafter. (1) If the date of the writing be pushed as far back as the earliest period assigned to it by any reasonable critics—say 200 B.C.—then it represents a most remarkable step forward in the doctrine of the Resurrection and of a future life. If, on the other hand, we accept the opinion, now more and more advocated, that the book was composed in the reign of Caligula (37-41 A.D.),^b then it contains little more than the formulation of a belief already current among a large section of the Jewish people; ^c a belief in the Resurrection of the Dead and the Life Everlasting. (2) Again, if we accept the earlier date, the persecutions indicated must almost certainly be those alleged to have taken place under the Egyptian Ptolemies. No authoritative writer considers that the oppression of the Jews by the kings of Syria can be referred to. But if Egyptian persecution be in question, then the purpose of the book is little more than an exhortation to hold fast by God and his Providence, and to resist the temptations of idolatry. If, however, we adopt the latter date, there is much ground for accepting the theory that ‘Wisdom’ has, to begin with, a distinct and definite aim: that it is directed against those renegade Jews who, embracing heathenism, had risen high in imperial favour and held great offices

^a *J. Q. R.*, iii. (1891) 722 *sqq.*

^b Bousset, *Theolog. Rundschau*, 1902, p. 185.

^c The whole question of the differences of the opposing sects of Pharisees and Sadducees, and in particular of their antagonistic views on the subject of the Resurrection, is involved in obscurity. Cf. Grätz, *Geschichte der Juden*, iii, 647 *sqq.*, who thinks that the Sadducees admitted a life after death in some form, but not future rewards and punishments. There can be little doubt that Josephus is a bad authority on the subject; he is too much concerned with the laudation of the Essenes. Yet not only Christian authority (Mk. 12¹², Acts 23⁸) ascribes to the Sadducees denial of the Resurrection, but at least one Talmudic tract (*Sanhedrin*, 16⁴, quoted by Grätz) testifies to the same effect.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-05377-8 - The Book of Wisdom: With Introduction and Notes

Edited by A.T.S. Goodrick

Excerpt

[More information](#)

under the Roman government. They are regarded as oppressors^a (chap. 1), as epicureans (chap. 2), and as idolaters: and certainly, if this view be accepted, the purport of the book becomes clear and its violent rhetoric more justified.

We turn our attention, therefore, in the first place, to this question of date. And we may at once accept the common decision that the book was written later than the 'Septuagint' and earlier than those New Testament books in which it is quoted or referred to. The writer's acquaintance with the Greek Old Testament is plain enough, 6⁷ οὐ γὰρ ὑποστελείται πρόσωπον ὁ πάντων δεσπότης is from Deut. 1¹⁷, οὐ μὴ ὑποστείλῃ πρόσωπον ἀνθρώπου. So also 11⁴ ἐδόθη αὐτοῖς ἐκ πέτρας ἀκροτόμου ὕδωρ from Deut. 8¹⁶, τοῦ ἐξαγαγόντος σοι ἐκ πέτρας ἀκροτόμου πηγὴν ὕδατος; and though the allusion in 12⁸ to the 'hornets' of Ex. 23²⁸, etc., shows no verbal identity, πῦρ φλεγόμενον ἐν τῇ χαλάζῃ 16²² is Ex. 9²⁴ with the single change of φλεγόμενον for φλογίζον. But the question is set at rest by two passages. In 15¹⁰ Wisdom has σποδὸς ἢ καρδία αὐτοῦ directly from Isa. 44²⁰, where the present Hebrew text reads 'he feedeth on ashes'; and again in 3¹² ἐνεδρεύσωμεν τὸν δίκαιον ὅτι δύσχρηστος ἡμῖν ἐστι is from Isa. 3¹⁰ δῆσωμεν τὸν δίκαιον ὅτι δύσχρηστος ἡμῖν ἐστι which is the Greek translation of the Hebrew, 'say ye to the righteous that it shall be well with him.'

These are decisive proofs that the writer knows the Septuagint;

^a In the passage of Philo generally quoted as condemnatory of the apostates (*De Confus. Ling.*, § 2), it is noteworthy that their fault is stated rather as intellectual than moral. They deride the law. οἱ μὲν δυσχεραίνοντες τῇ πατρίῳ πολιτείᾳ (which seems to fix the charge on renegade Jews) ψόγον καὶ κατηγορίαν ἀεὶ τῶν νόμων μελετώντες, τούτοις καὶ τοῖς παραπλησίοις, ὡς ἀν' ἐπιβάθραις τῆς ἀθεότητος αὐτῶν, οἱ δυσσεβεῖς, χρωῖνται, φάσκοντες, εἶτι νῦν σεμνηγορεῖτε περὶ τῶν διατεταγμένων ὡς τοὺς ἀληθείας κανόνας αὐτῆς περιεχόντων, κτλ. Philo did not see that it was his own explaining away of the historical facts which encouraged such apostasy. In *De Migr. Abr.*, § 16 (the whole section), he protests against the idea that the law can be neglected on account of its spiritual signification. For an example of such ideas (the spiritual observance of the law) cf. Aristeas, 234. The highest glory is 'to honour God, not with gifts and sacrifices, but by purity of soul and pious belief.' We see here plainly the decay of belief in the purely ceremonial ordinances.

For an instance of the fidelity of the apostates to their Egyptian lords, cf. the case of Dositheus (3 Macc. 1³), who saved the life of Ptolemy Philopator. Edersheim (*Hist. of the Jewish Nation*, 71) makes out a good case for Tiberius Alexander in his suppression of the tumults at Alexandria. The Jews had actually attempted to set fire to the amphitheatre and destroy the multitudes therein assembled.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-05377-8 - The Book of Wisdom: With Introduction and Notes

Edited by A.T.S. Goodrick

Excerpt

[More information](#)

DATE OF COMPOSITION

7

but they do not justify Farrar (420*b*) in saying that he 'could not have known Hebrew.' St. Paul is represented in the Acts (13^{34,31}) as quoting not only the Septuagint but its peculiar translations. Yet no one argues that he did not know the original.

We have, therefore, the date of the Septuagint^a as fixing the earliest time at which our book could have been written. But this date is almost no date at all. The idea of the simultaneous or even contemporary translation of the books of the Old Testament has long ago been given up, and it is recognised that the narrowest time-limit which can be assigned to the compilation of the Greek Old Testament is that of 283-205 B.C. (the reigns of Ptolemy Philadelphus, Euergetes, and Philopator). No book of which the author can be proved to have known the Septuagint can be dated earlier than 210 B.C.

On the other hand, a date, not much more definite, is fixed as the latest at which the book can have been composed, by the quotation of it by New Testament writers. The question of such quotation becomes, therefore, of considerable importance.

Before entering upon it, we may dismiss in a few words the matter of the relation or want of relation between 'Wisdom' and Philo. Philo's lifetime may be roughly put between 20 B.C. and 45 A.D., and if there were the slightest reference in him to Wisdom or in Wisdom to him, we should have some vague indication of date. But no such allusions can be traced, and we are left to the *à priori* conjectures of scholars. Schürer (*Jewish People*, Eng. tr., II. iii. 234) argues that, as the Pseudo-Solomon's standpoint is a preliminary step to Philo's, he must precede Philo. Farrar, on the contrary (421*b*), thinks that he must be later; for, 'if he had preceded Philo, some traces of the powerful style and individuality and phraseology of the Pseudo-Solomon must surely have been observable in the voluminous pages of the Jewish Theosophist.' The argument is not without force; but the conflicting views

^a It is noteworthy, though it militates against the theory of the late origin of 'Wisdom,' that the books especially quoted by Pseudo-Solomon were precisely those which are supposed to have been first translated.

For a clear and succinct account of the probable origin of the Septuagint, see besides Swete, *Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, Salmon's *Introduction to the Apocrypha* (*Speaker's Com.*), § 22. For its date cf. Schürer, *Jewish People in the Time of Christ* (Eng. tr.), Div. II. vol. iii. 161, 201. The earliest writer who quotes it seems to be a certain Demetrius, about 210 B.C., but even then it is possible that some books remained untranslated. Grätz (*Gesch. der Juden*, III. 623) puts Demetrius much later, and indeed refers the whole Septuagint to a date not earlier than 150 B.C. Cf. Swete, *Introduction*, p. 17.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-05377-8 - The Book of Wisdom: With Introduction and Notes

Edited by A.T.S. Goodrick

Excerpt

[More information](#)

are almost reconciled if we suppose, as we shall find reason to do, that the two writers are nearly contemporary. In that case Farrar's further position, that we have here an author who was familiar with the speculations of Philo, but who regarded them from a completely independent point of view, may be fully justified.

In dealing with quotations by New Testament writers it is hardly necessary to premise that great care is necessary in eliminating all apparent correspondences which may proceed from a source common to both authors; of this striking instances will be found in the additional note on St. Paul's supposed references to Wisdom; and, indeed, we can hardly ever be sure that such a common source does not exist in any given case. Nevertheless the resemblances of language and of ideas are here too striking to be neglected.

1. The coincidence—to call it nothing more—of the language of the Epistle to the Hebrews with that of Wisdom is remarkable, and indeed gave rise to somewhat extravagant theories, hereafter to be mentioned. A few instances will suffice. In Heb. 1³ the unusual phrase *ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ* corresponds to Wisd. 7²⁶ *ἀπαύγασμα φωτὸς αἰδίου*, where it is applied to *σοφία*. Again, the words *τόπος μετανόιας* in Wisd. 12¹⁰ are repeated in Heb. 12¹⁷. Here, indeed, the verbal resemblances cease, except for *παιδεία* in the sense of disciplinary suffering, used repeatedly in Heb. 12⁶⁻¹¹ and also in Wisd. 3⁵ (*παιδευθέντες*); *ἔκβασις* for the result and end of life in Heb. 13⁷ and Wisd. 2¹⁷, and *θεράπων* used of Moses as the 'servant' of the Lord in Heb. 3⁶ and Wisd. 17²¹, the word not occurring elsewhere in the New Testament. But besides these there seem to be genuine resemblances of thought in Heb. 4^{12,13}, Wisd. 7²⁴ (cf. also 1⁶), where the word ^a of God in the first case and his wisdom in the latter is spoken of as 'quick to discern the thoughts and intents of the heart'; and again the description of 'the true tabernacle which the Lord pitched, not man' in Heb. 8² is compared with that in Wisd. 9⁸, 'the holy tabernacle which thou hast prepared from the beginning.' Other supposed correspondences quoted by Plumptre (*Expositor*, Series i. i. 333-9) are too vague to be of value.

* Any attempt to argue (as Drummond, *Philo Judæus*, i. 137, seems inclined to do) that the Septuagint held a 'Logos theory' from their occasional translation by יהוה by ברך *לגוֹס* is hopeless. They constantly render the same phrase by *λόγος θεοῦ* (cf. Exod. 10²⁰, 1 Sam. 3¹, etc.), and as Freudenthal (*J. Q. R.*, iii. 723) remarks, they were wretched translators with no knowledge of Greek philosophy. Drummond is compelled to say (139) that the 'word of the Lord to some extent stands in opposition to the later idea of the Logos.' As a matter of fact, has it any connection with it at all?

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-05377-8 - The Book of Wisdom: With Introduction and Notes

Edited by A.T.S. Goodrick

Excerpt

[More information](#)

DATE OF COMPOSITION

9

We turn as of course to the sententious and practical Epistle of St. James for references to the 'sapiential' literature current in his time, and we are not disappointed. But naturally he makes most use of the wise maxims of the son of Sirach, from whom he seems at times to quote directly: *e.g.* 1¹³, 'Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God,' compared with Ecclus. 15¹¹, 'Say not thou, It is through the Lord that I fell away,' etc. There are no such close correspondences with the book of Wisdom; but Dr. Mayor, in his edition of the Epistle (pp. lxxv-vi), has collected some ten instances which certainly seem to show that the writer knew the work of the Pseudo-Solomon and was imbued with his views. The oppression of the just man, the value of suffering as a means of education, the strong condemnation of slander and backbiting, are ideas common to both; but the verbal resemblances are few indeed, except perhaps *καταλαλεῖν* and *καταλαλία* in Jas. 4¹¹ and Wisd. 1¹¹, while in one instance (Jas. 4 compared with Wisd. 2⁴) the New Testament writer seems to adopt the very view which Pseudo-Solomon condemns: the likeness between chap. 4¹⁴ and Wisd. 2⁴ is very close indeed. But St. James uses the very phraseology of Wisdom's epicureans to rebuke the far-reaching schemes of avaricious men. He refers to Wisdom, and that in terms which might well have been used by the Pseudo-Solomon (3¹⁷); and there is even a hint of a personification, but none of a separate entity.

But the most remarkable verbal correspondence with Wisdom to be found in the New Testament, apart from those passages of St. Paul where the similarity is explained by derivation from a common source, is undoubtedly to be found in 1 Pet. 1^{6,7}, compared with Wisd. 3^{6,6}. A parallel arrangement will make this clear.

1 Peter.

ἐν ᾧ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε ὀλίγον ἄρτι εἰ
δέον λυπηθέντες ἐν ποικίλοις
πειρασμοῖς, ἵνα τὸ δοκίμιον ὑμῶν
τῆς πίστεως πολυτιμότερον χρυσίου
τοῦ ἀπολλυμένου διὰ πυρὸς δέ
δοκιμαζομένου εὐρέθη εἰς ἔπαινον
κτλ.

Wisdom.

καὶ ὀλίγα παιδευθέντες μέγала
εὐεργετηθήσονται ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ἐπείρασεν
αὐτοὺς καὶ εὗρεν αὐτοὺς ἀξίως ἑαυτοῦ·
ὡς χρυσὸν ἐν χωνευτηρίῳ ἐδοκίμασεν
αὐτοὺς καὶ ὡς ὀλοκάρπωμα θυσίας
προσεδέξατο αὐτούς.

* Here, however, the resemblance in phraseology to Wisdom is as nothing compared to the exact similarity between Jas. 3 and Ecclus. 28. The two should be read side by side to appreciate the likeness.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-05377-8 - The Book of Wisdom: With Introduction and Notes

Edited by A.T.S. Goodrick

Excerpt

[More information](#)

Compared with this, the verbal similarity of 1 Pet. 2¹² ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐπισκοπῆς and Wisd. 3⁷ ἐν καιρῷ ἐπισκοπῆς αὐτῶν is unimportant, and indeed both phrases are probably reminiscences of Jer. 6¹⁵ ἐν καιρῷ ἐπισκοπῆς αὐτῶν ἀπολοῦνται.

Of the relation of the prologue of the Fourth Gospel to the book of Wisdom various views will be taken, according as the indebtedness of the Evangelist to the Alexandrine doctrine of the Logos is affirmed or denied, but one strong verbal similarity may be noted. In Joh. 1¹ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν may be compared with the phrase used of Σοφία in Wisd. 8³, συμβίωσιν θεοῦ ἔχουσα, and again Joh. 1³ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο with Wisd. 9¹ ὁ ποιήσας τὰ πάντα ἐν λόγῳ σου; but other supposed correspondences are either references to the same subject, as Joh. 3¹⁴ and Wisd. 16⁵ (the brazen serpent), or mere coincidences of phrase, like Joh. 3¹² and Wisd. 9¹⁶. Mere identity of words like σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα in Joh. 4⁴⁸ and in Wisd. 8⁸, 10¹⁶ proves little more than the use of the words 'signs and wonders,' by, say, two Elizabethan writers would do; and the same may be said of χάρις καὶ ἔλεος in 1 Tim. 1² and in Wisd. 3⁹, 4¹⁶.

The quotations of Wisdom in an Apostolic Father, Clement of Rome, can have little weight in determining our estimate of the date of 'Pseudo-Solomon,' but they are of interest for other reasons, and may be dealt with here. The first and most generally quoted is from Clement's First Epistle to the Corinthians, chap. 17, τίς ἐρεῖ αὐτῷ τί ἐποίησας; ἢ τίς ἀντιστήσεται τῷ κράτει τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ; This may certainly come direct from Wisd. 12¹², τίς γὰρ ἐρεῖ τί ἐποίησας; ἢ τίς ἀντιστήσεται τῷ κρίματί σου; but it may also be a reminiscence of Job 11¹² and Rom. 9²⁰, or possibly of Daniel 4³², οὐκ ἔστιν ὃς ἀντιποιήσεται τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐρεῖ αὐτῷ Τί ἐποίησας. Still, the connection with Wisdom is exceedingly likely, and still more in the passage of Clement 1 Cor. 3, ζῆλον ἀδικῶν . . . δι' οὗ καὶ θάνατος εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον compared with Wisd. 2²⁴, φθόνῳ δὲ διαβόλου θάνατος εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον. Yet even here there is a considerable likeness to Rom. 4¹² δι' ἐνὸς ἀνθρώπου ἡ ἁμαρτία εἰς τὸν κόσμον εἰσῆλθεν καὶ διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ὁ θάνατος.

Of all these references, the most important and yet the least satisfactory are to be found in the Epistle of St. James: if actual quotation from the book of Wisdom by the writer of that Epistle could be proved, there would be at least some reason for not dating the Pseudo-Solomon later than the first decade after the death of Christ. But to that decade other and internal evidences point. Those evidences are now to be examined.