

Abilene Christian University

**Digital Commons @ ACU**

---

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

---

10-1965

## **A Study of the Resurrection Errors in I Corinthians 15 and II Timothy 2**

Kenneth John Wilkey

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.acu.edu/etd>

---



ACU LIBRARY



0 3064 0033 6724

A STUDY OF THE RESURRECTION ERRORS IN  
I CORINTHIANS 15 AND II TIMOTHY 2



BY  
KENNETH JOHN WILKEY



A STUDY OF THE RESURRECTION ERRORS IN  
I CORINTHIANS 15 AND II TIMOTHY 2

---

An Abstract of  
a Thesis Presented to  
the Faculty of the Department of Bible  
Abilene Christian College

---

In Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Master of Arts

---

by  
Kenneth John Wilkey  
October 1965

119560  
LIBRARY  
ABILENE CHRISTIAN COLLEGE  
ABILENE, TEXAS

The Problem. This thesis seeks to identify the errorists Paul noted in I Corinthians 15 and in II Timothy 2 who held to a "spiritual" or "realized" resurrection. The heated controversy the Church Fathers had with the Gnostics on the question of the resurrection in the second century directs attention to incipient Gnosticism as a possible source for this error. Newly published Gnostic documents which deal with their view of the resurrection make this study appropriate at this time. Did the errorists spiritualize the resurrection because of Gnostic presuppositions? In other words, were the errorists Paul wrote of in the Pastoral and Corinthian correspondence early Gnostics? This thesis seeks to identify them as such.

Method and Procedure. A survey of contemporary beliefs in the resurrection as held in New Testament days is given which reveals that in Judaism and Mithraism are found beliefs in the resurrection of the dead similar to the New Testament doctrine. The Gnostics spoke of a resurrection, but they meant a resurrection in a spiritual sense.

A consideration of the New Testament doctrine of the resurrection shows that this was a cardinal doctrine. An eager expectancy concerning the Lord's return led some into error, as at Thessalonica. Improper emphasis given to the realized aspects of future life which Christians now have could have easily led to an error such as that noted in Corinth and at Ephesus and Crete.



When one considers the Pastoral and Corinthian Epistles the errors Paul faced show common elements. Gnostic documents such as the Epistle to Rheginus and the Gospel of Philip preserve a view similar to that combatted in these epistles. The immediate reason for the error is seen to be an "over-realized eschatology" that came to force because of underlying presuppositions from an early Gnosticism.

Following the conclusion and summary of the thesis a bibliography of helpful material is given. Two appendices are attached dealing with Gnostic sources and tenets.

Conclusions. The errors noted in I Corinthian 15 and II Timothy 2 which spiritualized the resurrection came from an "over-realized eschatology." The heretics held to Gnostic presuppositions which despised the body and this caused them to reject a bodily resurrection. The source of the error at Corinth and in Ephesus and Crete was the same. Early Gnostic documents and historical evidence combined with evidence from the New Testament show the heretics may well have been early Gnostics.





This thesis, directed and approved by the candidate's committee, has been accepted by the Graduate Council of Abilene Christian College in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Fred J. Barton  
Dean

10-21-65  
Date

Thesis Committee

J. W. Roberts  
Chairman

A. J. Mathews

Le Moin S. Lewis

A STUDY OF THE RESURRECTION ERRORS IN  
I CORINTHIANS 15 AND II TIMOTHY 2

---

A Thesis  
Presented to  
the Faculty of the Department of Bible  
Abilene Christian College

---

In Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Master of Arts

THESIS  
2368  
WILKEY  
c2

---

by  
Kenneth John Wilkey  
October 1965



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Purpose of the Study . . . . .	1
Limitation of the Study . . . . .	2
Definitions: Gnosticism and Gnosis . . . . .	2
Methodology . . . . .	3
II. CONTEMPORARY VIEWS OF THE RESURRECTION IN NEW TESTAMENT DAYS . . . . .	4
Old Testament Doctrine . . . . .	4
The Teaching in Jewish Apocryphal and Apocalyptic Literature . . . . .	6
Greek and Roman Views of Future Life . . . . .	11
Homeric . . . . .	11
Mysteries . . . . .	12
The Philosopher's Doctrine of Future Life. . . . .	14
Philo . . . . .	17
Sects Existing in New Testament Days . . . . .	18
Pharisees and Sadducees . . . . .	18
Essenes . . . . .	20
Samaritans . . . . .	22
Gnostic Views of the Resurrection . . . . .	22
III. NEW TESTAMENT DOCTRINE OF THE RESURRECTION . . . . .	31
The Resurrection of Jesus . . . . .	31
A Cardinal Doctrine . . . . .	31

## CHAPTER

## PAGE

A Predicted Event . . . . .	31
A Proved Fact . . . . .	32
Teaching of Jesus on the Resurrection . . . . .	33
Pauline Doctrine of the Resurrection . . . . .	35
To Thessalonica . . . . .	35
To Corinth . . . . .	38
IV. ABERRATIONS CONCERNING THE RESURRECTION . . . . .	44
The Pastoral Heresy . . . . .	44
Nature of the Pastoral Heresy . . . . .	46
Source of the Pastoral Heresy . . . . .	49
Characteristics Peculiar to Gnosticism in the	
Pastoral Heresy . . . . .	50
Creation . . . . .	51
Man . . . . .	52
Gnosis . . . . .	52
The Incarnation . . . . .	53
Asceticism . . . . .	54
Libertinism . . . . .	57
Myths and Genealogies . . . . .	64
The Resurrection . . . . .	66
The Corinthian Heresy . . . . .	71
Background of the Error . . . . .	73
Textual Evidence of the Heresy . . . . .	75
I Corinthians 15 . . . . .	87



CHAPTER	PAGE
Relationship Between the Heresies in the Pastoral and Corinthian Epistles . . . . .	94
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	95
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	102
APPENDIX A. Review of Gnostic Sources . . . . .	113
APPENDIX B. The Nature of Gnosticism . . . . .	140

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

Purpose of the Study. The purpose of this thesis is to investigate two New Testament passages which record aberrations concerning the Christian doctrine of the resurrection of the dead in order to determine the possible sources from which these deviations sprang. The first passage is I Corinthians 15: 12 where "some" denied the resurrection of the dead. The second passage is II Timothy 2: 17, 18, where two false teachers named Hymenaeus and Philetus are named as members of a party which said, "The resurrection is past already."

Such teaching is reminiscent of the second century Gnostic "spiritual resurrection" refuted by the Church Fathers. Incipient Gnosticism similar to that faced at Colossae<sup>1</sup> will receive special attention as a possible source for these deviations in doctrine. Recently published original Gnostic works which deal with the resurrection now make such a study possible.

---

<sup>1</sup>E.g., Col. 1: 26-27; 2: 2, esoteric teaching; 1: 13-20; 2: 15, denial of Christ's place in the creative process; 1: 16; 2: 8-20, angels worshipped; 2: 11, 12; 3: 1-3, 10, asceticism and liturgical practices. Cf. George Johnston, "Colossians," The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible (New York: Abingdon Press, 1962,) I. 650.

Limitation of the Study. This thesis does not try to deal with the many eschatological problems as found in the New Testament, but only seeks to examine the passages in question so as to determine, as far as possible, the underlying reason for spiritualizing or denying the resurrection.

Definitions: Gnosticism and Gnosis. In dealing with Gnostic material, the warning of Abraham J. Maiherbe has been heeded. "A claim to be able to define Gnosticism and to give an account of its origin would be highly presumptuous at this stage of scholarly investigation."<sup>2</sup> Thus a "working" definition of Gnosticism must be sought. Two elements at least must be present for a system to be considered Gnostic; (1) Dualism of a cosmological (matter-spirit) type, and (2) a special knowledge available only to certain initiates.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup>Abraham J. Maiherbe, "Gnosis and Primitive Christianity: A Survey (I)," Restoration Quarterly, III (1959), 99.

<sup>3</sup>W. S. LaSor, Amazing Dead Sea Scrolls and the Christian Faith (Chicago: Moody Press, 1956), p. 141. Others also who attempt to define Gnosticism stress these same two elements as all conclusive. R. M. Grant says, "There is one element which binds all the various systems together. This is the doctrine, to a considerable extent shared by Jewish apocalyptic writers of the period, that the world is bad; it is under the control of evil or ignorance, or nothingness. It cannot be redeemed. . . . It is saved when by divine grace, it comes to know itself, its origin and its destiny." Gnosticism (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1961), p. 15. Hans Jonas would emphasize ". . . the feeling of an absolute rift between man and that in which he finds himself lodged, the world" and the character of God who is "unknown" or "wholly other" and of man's spirit which is akin to this God and is "totally transcendent." "Gnosticism and Modern Nihilism," Social Researches, XIX (1952), 431, as quoted in Interpretation, XVI (October, 1962), 388. See also Appendix B above.

Gnosis is that special knowledge which the Gnostic claims for himself. Upon reception "gnosis" brings enlightenment which is at once redemption and revelation.<sup>4</sup>

#### Methodology

The following pages contain a presentation of the contemporary views of the resurrection in New Testament days as well as the New Testament doctrine of the resurrection. The heresy in the Pastoral Epistles and the Corinthian Epistles are investigated in depth, and a conclusion as to the identity of the heretics and the source of their error is presented. Two appendices are attached concerning Gnostic sources and tenets which will be helpful in understanding Gnosticism in a larger sense than touched on in the text of this thesis.

---

<sup>4</sup>W. R. Schoedel, "The Rediscovery of Gnosis," Interpretation, XVI (October, 1962), 388.

## CHAPTER II

### CONTEMPORARY VIEWS OF THE RESURRECTION IN NEW TESTAMENT DAYS

#### Old Testament Doctrine

Special emphasis was not given the resurrection in the Old Testament. The dead went to the tomb and there were thought of as also abiding in Sheol. This place for the dead was in the depth of the earth and was the common abode of all men.<sup>1</sup> Sheol was of course more than just the grave; it is pictured as a place with an insatiable appetite. In Proverbs 27: 20, the author said: "Sheol and Abaddon are never satisfied; . . ." The wicked have a place apart in Sheol, located in the lowest part of the earth and thus called "lowest Sheol" (Deut. 32:22; Ps. 63: 9; 86: 13), that took on the characteristic of "hell" in later concepts.<sup>2</sup> When Sheol is used in a local sense referring to the righteous dead, it always meant the grave and had no reference to a punishment.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>George Foot Moore, Judaism (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1950), II, 289.

<sup>2</sup>J. Barton Payne, The Theology of the Older Testament (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1962), p. 447.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.



The Hebrews went further in their thinking than a "Hadean" concept of after-life though. Several Old Testament passages without dispute are concerned with a personal resurrection. For example:

Thy dead shall live; my dead bodies shall arise.  
Awake and sing, ye that dwell in the dust; for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and earth shall cast forth the dead.<sup>4</sup>

Again:

And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt.<sup>5</sup>

Other references are not so clear with reference to after-life. Taken by themselves, certain passages have led some to believe that some Old Testament writers did not believe in a life after death at all.<sup>6</sup> Taken alone, the agnosticism expressed in Ecclesiastes 3: 21 might be so considered.

Who knoweth the spirit of man, whether it goeth upward, and the spirit of the beast, whether it goeth downward to the earth?

The author's whole concept must be considered though, for in chapter 12: 7 he said:

And the dust returneth to the earth as it was, and the spirit returneth unto God who gave it.

Perhaps he did not hold with a resurrection, but at least the soul is given the quality of immortality.

---

<sup>4</sup>Isaiah 26: 19.

<sup>5</sup>Daniel 12: 2.

<sup>6</sup>Moore, op. cit., II, 292.

A very early example of faith in a personal resurrection is to be found in Abraham. When ascending the mount where he was to offer Isaac, he told the servant who had accompanied them:

Abide here with the ass, and I and the lad will go yonder; and we will worship, and come again to you.<sup>7</sup>

The Hebrew Epistle interpreted Abraham's action as that of one who believed in a resurrection. It said:

By faith Abraham, being tried, offered up Isaac: . . . accounting that God is able to raise up, even from the dead; . . .<sup>8</sup>

Other examples might be discussed, such as the faith that some express in a restoration, or resurrection, of the Israelite nation. These concepts are interesting in themselves but not expressly relevant to this thesis. What is clear, and of importance, is that citizens of God's nation in Old Testament time believed in a physical resurrection. They knew that their bodies would not be left in Sheol (Psalms 16: 10).

#### The Teaching in Jewish Apocryphal and Apocalyptic Literature

In Jewish thought of more or less heterodox nature there are several concepts concerning the resurrection. An early source would be the Book of Enoch. Enoch contains

---

<sup>7</sup>Genesis 22: 5.

<sup>8</sup>Hebrews 11: 17-19.

several writings by different authors which span almost a century, and "revivification of the righteous dead" is mentioned in several places in the work showing the currency of that idea.<sup>9</sup> The third section, which is dated between 134-95 B. C., speaks of the judgment of the righteous and the wicked:

After the final judgment the righteous will be raised as spirits and enter into the portals of the new heaven where they will become companions of the heavenly hosts and shine as the stars forevermore. The wicked, on the other hand, are doomed to eternal punishment in the Sheol of fire and darkness.<sup>10</sup>

Here then is a "spiritual resurrection."

In the apocryphal book II Maccabees, composed sometime between 100 B. C. and 44 A. D.,<sup>11</sup> two passages speak of faith in a resurrection. In chapter 7, three of the sons being martyred speak their faith concerning the resurrection. As the second son died he addressed the king saying:

Thou cursed miscreant! Thou dost dispatch us from this life, but the King of the world shall raise us up, who have died for his laws, and revive us to life everlasting.<sup>12</sup>

The third martyr died saying of his body:

These I had from heaven; for His name's sake I count them naught; from Him I hope to get them back again.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup>Ibid., II. 306, 307.

<sup>10</sup>H. T. Andrews, An Introduction to the Apocryphal Books of the Old and New Testament (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1964), p. 54.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid., p. 23.      <sup>12</sup>II Maccabees 7: 9, 10.

<sup>13</sup>II Maccabees 7: 11, 12.

At his death, the fourth son said:

Tis meet for those who perish at men's hands to cherish hope divine that they shall be raised up by God again; but thou--thou shalt have no resurrection to life.<sup>14</sup>

Chapter 12 of II Maccabees speaks of Judas Maccabeus, who when he found that a number of his dead soldiers had died from wearing amulets of the "idol of Jamnia" into battle, collected two thousand drachma of silver to make a sin offering on their behalf. The author said:

In this he acted quite rightly and properly, bearing in mind the resurrection--for if he had not expected the fallen to rise again, it would have been superfluous and silly to pray for the dead--. . . .<sup>15</sup>

From these passages it is clear that the Judaism of this period believed in a physical resurrection of the righteous, where they would return to receive the same physical faculties, but the wicked would have no such resurrection to life.

The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs is:

A pseudepigraphic work which probably reached its present form in the second or third century A. D., though it includes material which seems to have been put into writing as early as the beginning of the second century B. C.<sup>16</sup>

This work goes further than II Maccabees in its teaching. In it, ". . . the resurrection is extended to the dead of remote

---

<sup>14</sup>II Maccabees 7: 14.

<sup>15</sup>II Maccabees 12: 43, 44.

<sup>16</sup>M. Smith, "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible (New York: Abingdon Press, c. 1962), IV. 576.

generations back to the beginnings of the people."<sup>17</sup> Another document affirming the resurrection of the body is the Apocalypse of Baruch (c. A. D. 50-100).<sup>18</sup> The passage in part is:

- 49:2. In what shape will those live who live in Thy day?  
Or how will the splendor of those  
Who (are) after the time continue?  
3. Will they then resume this form of the present,  
And put on these entrammeling members. . . ?

The answer given is:

- 50:2. For the earth shall then restore the dead,  
.....  
It shall make no change in their form.<sup>19</sup> . . .

A bodily resurrection is by no means the only view held by the writers of apocryphal and apocalyptic literature. A different view is found in the Book of Wisdom which is dated variously from 145 B. C. to A. D. 40. Oesterley's comment is:

Turning to the Book of Wisdom we note that there is no resurrection of the body taught here; this follows naturally from the writer's doctrine of the inherent evil of matter. The only immortality is that of the soul, and this is gained through "kinship into wisdom": . . . so that immortality begins on this earth.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup>Moore, op. cit., II, 307.

<sup>18</sup>Andrews, op. cit., p. 59.

<sup>19</sup>R. H. Charles, The Apocalypse of Baruch (London: The Macmillan Company, 1918), p. 67ff.

<sup>20</sup>W. O. E. Oesterley, The Books of the Apocrypha (London: Robert Scott, 1914), p. 298.



S. W. Baron finds this the "focal point" of the difference between the Judaism of Palestine and that of Egypt; that is, eschatology. Of these writings he said:

No matter who the authors are, none of them, not even such pious preachers as the authors of Wisdom and the Fourth Book of Maccabees, profess the belief in the bodily resurrection.<sup>21</sup>

Jesus ben Sira in Ecclesiasticus rejected the bodily resurrection and took the view which came to be held by the Sadducees of the New Testament.<sup>22</sup> As noted in Charles:

The only sense in which according to Ben-Sira, a man can be said to "live" after death was by means of his wisdom which he had acquired in his lifetime:

His understanding many do praise  
And never shall his name be blotted out:  
His memory shall not cease,  
And his name shall live from generation to generation.  
(xxxix. 9)<sup>23</sup>

Both the Book of Jubilees which was composed between 135 and 115 B. C.,<sup>24</sup> and the Assumption of Moses, which was written during the Lord's earthly life, rejected a physical resurrection in favor of a spiritual.<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup>Salo Wittmayer Baron, A Social and Religious History of the Jews (New York: Columbia University Press, 1937), I, 207.

<sup>22</sup>Oesterley, op. cit., p. 337.

<sup>23</sup>R. H. Charles, The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament, Vol. I (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913), p. 313.

<sup>24</sup>Andrews, op. cit., p. 65.

<sup>25</sup>Ibid., p. 61.

Jewish apocryphal and apocalyptic literature then taught more than one view of the resurrection. A very literal, physical revivification was held by some, while others believed in a spiritual resurrection of one sort or another.

### Greek and Roman Views of Future Life

There is little in the teachings of Greece and Rome which deals with a resurrection. Concepts of a future life are found, and these are briefly surveyed below.

Homeric. In Homer's poems death was not viewed as the end of man, for something survived. When Odysseus visited the realm of the dead, his mother Anticleia told him:

. . . but this is only what happens to mortals when one of us dies. As soon as the spirit leaves the white bones, the sinews no longer hold flesh and bones together-- the blazing fire consumes them all; but the soul flits away fluttering like a dream.<sup>26</sup>

Should a body be unburied, as that of Patroclus had been, it could not enter Hades, the unseen realm of the dead, thus it was that Patroclus approached his friend Achilles in a dream. When Achilles awoke he cried:

So there now! So there is still something in the house of Hades, a soul and a phantom but no real life in it all! For all night long the soul of unhappy Patroclus has been by my side, sorrowing and lamenting and telling me what to do. And it was mightily like himself!<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup>W. H. D. Rouse (trans.), Homer: The Odyssey (New York: The New American Library, 1963), p. 128.

<sup>27</sup>W. H. D. Rouse (trans.), Homer: The Iliad (New York: The New American Library, 1964), p. 267.

Although Odysseus could recognize the dead, he found them greatly changed. When he met King Agamemnon he found him one who had ". . . no strength or power left in him such as there used to be in that body full of life."<sup>28</sup>

The Homeric man would not find the Hadean existence something to long for. Achilles' words to Odysseus were:

Don't bepraise death to me Odysseus. I would rather be plowman to a yeoman farmer on a small holding than lord Paramount in the kingdom of the dead.<sup>29</sup>

The Hadean world was the abode of the shades of men. Man did not leave it, and they did not desire to descend to it. The gloomy concept did not die but was still held by men when Virgil the Roman poet wrote the Aeneid. Aeneas also visited the Hadean world, which is pictured as a "joyless, sunless abode" where men exist in a "vague, vexed region."<sup>30</sup>

If the state religions of Rome and Greece held to a future life, it would be along the lines of that which was taught in Homer and Virgil.

Mysteries. The Homeric view of man's future left much to desire, as did the worship of the state religions. The mystery cults arose to fill that void. Hope for the individual was ushered in with these salvationist sects. Of the

---

<sup>28</sup>Rouse, Odyssey, p. 132.

<sup>29</sup>Ibid., p. 134.

<sup>30</sup>C. Day Lewis (trans.), The Aeneid of Virgil (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, 1953), p. 145.

cults G. F. Moore wrote:

The mysteries . . . were solely concerned with the salvation of the individual after death, each in its own particular way, of which they offered to their initiates the earnest and assurance.<sup>31</sup>

There were many of these cults, but a cursory examination of two will suffice for this survey. The two to be considered are ancient Orphism and Mithraism, which was an opponent of Christianity in the first century. Nock defines Orphism by saying:

By Orphism we mean a theology and a way of living which claimed to be based on a sacred literature passed under the names of Orpheus and Musaeus, singers of the mythical past. In the fifth century B. C. we hear of the Orphic Life (abstinence from eating animal flesh and wearing woolen clothes, and contact with birth and death, respect for holy writings, contempt for the body as the soul's tomb, and a general preoccupation with the expectation of a future life in which the soul will enjoy happiness thanks to discipline and initiation on earth).<sup>32</sup>

Orphism had a continuing influence, affecting other mystery sects and some Greek philosophers. The Greeks did not adopt Orphism as their religion, but from it adopted certain tenets; ". . . the idea of the soul as a unity, the same in life and after life, fundamentally different from the body, and perhaps immortal, the hope of a hereafter. . . ;"<sup>33</sup> Immortality was thus a common belief, but not a resurrection.

---

<sup>31</sup>G. F. Moore, op. cit., II, 320.

<sup>32</sup>A. D. Nock, Conversion (Oxford: University Press, 1963), p. 26.

<sup>33</sup>Ibid., pp. 31, 32.

Mithraism, on the other hand, did have a belief in a resurrection to give to its followers. The origin of Mithraism and date of that origin are hard to place.<sup>34</sup> The remains of Mithraism tie it back to some degree to Parseeism.<sup>35</sup> It seems the worship of Mithra was quite popular with the Roman soldiers, who naturally felt a need for the assurance it could offer him as he lived out his precarious profession. That hope? Interestingly enough, a physical resurrection. "To the devout Mithraist death did not end all, in a blank wall of ignorance and night. He was offered a sure hope of resurrection."<sup>36</sup>

The Philosophers' Doctrine of Future Life. The learned in the Graeco-Roman world also felt a need for something beyond the worship of the state religions, and they found this in the speculation of the philosophers. Their speculation did not lead them to respect the material world, nor to a view of resurrection for the body.

Pythagoras, whose activities fell in the second half of the sixth century B. C.,<sup>37</sup> established a foundation from

---

<sup>34</sup>A. S. Geden, Select Passages Illustrating Mithraism (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1925), p. 5.

<sup>35</sup>Franz Cumont, The Mysteries of Mithra (New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1956), p. 143.

<sup>36</sup>Geden, op. cit., p. 3.

<sup>37</sup>John Burnet, "Pythagorus and Pythagoreanism," Hasting's Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1922), p. 521.



which many later philosophers drew. The society he formed lasted for some three centuries in Greece,<sup>38</sup> and later philosophers, such as Plato, seem to have adopted his view of the soul. Pythagoras taught that the soul is of three parts; feeling, intuition, and reason.

. . . Reason belongs to man alone and is immortal. After death the soul undergoes a period of purgation in Hades; then it returns to earth and enters a new body by a chain of transmigration that can be ended only by a completely virtuous life.<sup>39</sup>

The height of philosophic thinking on the soul in Greek thought was reached in Plato, and ". . . all subsequent writers who deal with the future life followed in his footsteps."<sup>40</sup> Plato taught that man possessed both a rational and an irrational soul, the former being that which is immortal, incorruptible and ungenerated.<sup>41</sup> It is doubtful that he held that each man's soul individually was immortal, but more likely it was considered to receive its immortality through its unity with the universal soul to which it was to return at death.<sup>42</sup> The philosophical soul would return above, to dwell in the heavenly abode with the "angelic" host.<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>38</sup>Will Durant, The Story of Civilization: II, The Life of Greece (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1939), p. 166.

<sup>39</sup>Ibid., p. 165.

<sup>40</sup>Staudt, op. cit., p. 15.      <sup>41</sup>Ibid.

<sup>42</sup>Harry A. Wolfson, Philo (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962), p. 396.

<sup>43</sup>Ibid.

Although Plato taught that all souls would return above, that did not mean at death for everyone. The fact of a soul's involvement with sin might cause it to be re-incarnated in a lower beast, and then much later it might return above. Plato gave assurance that ". . . each soul returns to the place whence it came in ten thousand years," although it might undergo a period of purgation first.<sup>44</sup>

With the philosophy of life that Plato and the others who followed held, one could approach death with tranquillity. To these men death was not an enemy, but the friend who came to liberate man from the confining prison of the body.<sup>45</sup> Resurrection of the material body was impossible in such a system of thought, but immortality of the soul well expressed their hope.

At Athens Paul met certain "of the Epicurean and Stoic philosophers,"<sup>46</sup> who were a part of the group on the Areopagus which mocked his message concerning a risen Christ.<sup>47</sup>

Epicureanism taught men how to live with mortality, but not that they were immortal, or might ever be. De Witt has well noted:

Epicureanism presented two fronts to the world, the one repellent, the other attractive. . . . It was chiefly

<sup>44</sup>Ibid., pp. 406, 407.

<sup>45</sup>Cf. Oscar Cullmann, Immortality of the Soul or Resurrection of the Dead? (London: The Epworth Press, 1958), p. 1ff.

<sup>46</sup>Acts 17: 18.

<sup>47</sup>Acts 17: 32.

appealed. Philo represents such a part of Judaism. Just as the Sadducees rejected a "revivification of the dead", Philo found it unacceptable to his philosophy.<sup>51</sup> Philo held to a faith in immortality of the soul, and those references in literature which he considered sacred which mentioned the resurrection were understood by him as being ". . . only a figurative way of referring to immortality."<sup>52</sup>

Philo agreed with Plato on many points, but unlike Plato he saw individual souls as immortal entities and denied the existence of a universal soul.<sup>53</sup> He was Hellenized to the point where he did not accept the resurrection of the body.

#### Sects Existing in New Testament Days

Pharisees and Sadducees. Luke records that when Paul appeared before Ananias the priest, and the council, he cried: "Brethren, I am a Pharisee, a son of Pharisees: touching the hope and resurrection of the dead I am called in question."<sup>54</sup> This cry divided the council into two hostile groups, and the writer's explanation was: "For the Sadducees say that there is no resurrection, neither angel, nor spirit; but the Pharisees confess both."<sup>55</sup> The doctrine of the resurrection was no moot point between these groups, for the Pharisees felt more akin

---

<sup>51</sup>G. F. Moore, op. cit., II, 295.

<sup>52</sup>Wolfson, op. cit., p. 404.      <sup>53</sup>Ibid., p. 396.

<sup>54</sup>Acts 23: 1-6.      <sup>55</sup>Acts 23: 8.

to Paul than the Sadducees at the hearing of these words. They spoke of him saying: "We find no evil in this man: and what if a spirit hath spoken to him, or an angel?"<sup>56</sup> Josephus also left a record substantially the same as this picture from the New Testament concerning the Pharisees and Sadducees.<sup>57</sup> Hippolytus wrote of the Sadducees saying:

The soul they consider nothing but mere vitality, and that it is on account of this that man has been created. However, (they maintain) that the notion of the resurrection has been fully realized by the single circumstance, that we close our days after having left children upon earth.<sup>58</sup>

The majority of the people seemed to have shared the hope of a resurrection with the Pharisees. The Pharisees defined the object of their hope in a twofold form; life hereafter, and a reigning Messiah.<sup>59</sup> This "life hereafter" would begin on a great day when a resurrection would take place which would re-unite body and soul as before.<sup>60</sup> Although this resurrection life was superior to the present life, yet it was bodily and mundane in form.<sup>61</sup>

---

<sup>56</sup>Acts 23: 9.

<sup>57</sup>Josephus, Antiquities, XVIII. 1. 3, 4; Wars, II. 8, 14.

<sup>58</sup>Hippolytus, Refutation of All Heresies, IX. xxiv, (Vol. V of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, editors Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmann Publishing Company, 1951), p. 137.

<sup>59</sup>Robert Travers Herford, The Pharisees (Boston: Beacon Press, 1924), p. 169.

<sup>60</sup>Ibid., p. 170. <sup>61</sup>G. F. Moore, op. cit., p. 315.

The Sadducees naturally did not hold with such teaching, rejecting a future life. It might be noted that neither of these sects of Judaism would say that "the resurrection is past," although a Sadducee would say, "there is no resurrection."

Essenes. Although not mentioned in the New Testament, this retiring group of ascetics are known to have existed in those days, and their view of the resurrection aids in giving an overall picture of this concept in that day. Of the Essenes Hippolytus wrote: "And they renounce matrimony, but they take the boys of others, and thus have an offspring begotten for them."<sup>62</sup> Hippolytus also noted that these men ". . . in no way whatsoever have they confidence in women."<sup>63</sup> Not all Essenes rejected marriage, feeling that to do so was wrong in that it cut off succession and that if everyone practiced continency the race might cease.<sup>64</sup>

The Essenes did accept the resurrection of the body. Hippolytus noted:

Now the doctrine of the resurrection has also derived support among these; for they acknowledge both that the

---

<sup>62</sup>Hippolytus, Refutation, IX, xiii., Roberts, V. 134.

<sup>63</sup>Ibid.

<sup>64</sup>Josephus, Jewish Wars, II. 1, 13 (Matthew Black, The Scrolls and Christian Origins, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1961), p. 179.



flesh will rise again, and that it will be immortal, in the same manner as the soul is already imperishable.<sup>65</sup>

The Qumran sectionaries are identified as Essenes by Kurt Schubert, and he noted that they held to a resurrection.

The Qumran Essenes envisaged both reward and punishment in extremely anthropomorphic images. They therefore believed in a continuance of physical existence after death or a new bodily existence at the last judgment. This conception presupposes at least a rudimentary belief in a resurrection of the dead.<sup>66</sup>

Rabin has pointed to three passages from the Thanksgiving Scroll which

. . . definitely speak of the rising of the dead: 'and then the sword of God shall hasten in the epoch of judgement, and all the sons of His truth shall awake for [ ] wickedness, and all sons of guilt shall be no more' (DST vi. 29-30); "and they that lie in the dust shall raise a mast, and the worm of the dead ones shall lift up (plural) a standard' (ibid. 34); 'to raise from the dust the worm of the dead ones for a council of [ ]' (ibid. xi. 12).<sup>67</sup>

The common man of Judaism would endorse the view of the Pharisee or the Essene as to the resurrection. A hint as to the commonly held concept in Palestine is shown in Martha's words to Jesus when she said of her brother Lazarus: "I know that he shall rise again in the resurrection at the last day."<sup>68</sup> Perhaps had she been an Alexandrian Jewess she

---

<sup>65</sup>Hippolytus, Refutation, IX. xxii., Roberts, V. 136.

<sup>66</sup>Kurt Schubert, The Dead Sea Community (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1959), p. 108.

<sup>67</sup>Chaim Rabin, Qumran Studies (Oxford: University Press, 1957), p. 73. Brackets indicate lacunae.

<sup>68</sup>John 11: 24.

might have said, "I know his spirit continues immortal."<sup>69</sup>

Samaritans. The Samaritans were divided on the matter of a resurrection of the dead as were the Jews. A sect called after one Dositheus had some members which believed in a resurrection.<sup>70</sup> Of the Samaritans in general Origen, in commenting on Matthew 22: 23f., said that they did not believe in a resurrection at all.<sup>71</sup>

It is interesting to note the basis that the Samaritans had for officially accepting a resurrection. Their hope came from Genesis 3: 19. Macdonald's explanation is:

The warrant is the Samaritan reading of part of Gen. 3: 19, where the Masoretic text is translated:

"You are dust, and to dust you shall return."

The Samaritan Pentateuch text reads:

"You are dust, and to your dust you shall return," a difference of one Hebrew letter only.<sup>72</sup>

### Gnostic Views of the Resurrection

Tertullian felt constrained to warn his readers against accepting the words of the Gnostics about the resurrection.

He reports:

---

<sup>69</sup>Cf. Wolfson, op. cit., p. 396, on different views of after life in Palestine and Alexandria.

<sup>70</sup>John Macdonald, The Theology of the Samaritans (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1964), p. 35.

<sup>71</sup>Ibid., p. 376, n. 1.

<sup>72</sup>Ibid., pp. 374, 375.

Woe, say they, to him who has not risen in the present body; for they fear that they might alarm their hearers if they at once denied the resurrection. Secretly, however, in their minds they think this: Woe betide the simpleton who during his present life fails to discover the mysteries of heresy; since this, in their view, is the resurrection.<sup>73</sup>

The Gnostic view that matter was evil as a creation of the inferior Creator-God's angels made it impossible for him to conceive of a physical resurrection. The "docetic" view of Christ is one other indication of their problem, for they denied that Christ had a body of qualities such as would permit a resurrection as conceived by the Christians. For example: Valentinus taught that the flesh of Christ had qualities peculiar to itself,<sup>74</sup> and Basilides taught that His flesh possessed no reality.<sup>75</sup> In examining Gnostic views of resurrection, variations may be noted, but all rejected any view of a physical resurrection in favour of one that was spiritual in nature.

Today it is clear that the Gnostic view of the resurrection is more complex than their belief that the body of flesh is a structure of evil matter, and therefore there can

---

<sup>73</sup>Tertullian, The Resurrection of the Flesh, XIX (Vol III of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, editors Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1951), p. 559.

<sup>74</sup>Tertullian, Adversus Valentinus, 26; Irenaeus, Adversus Haereses, I, III. 2.

<sup>75</sup>Cf. Tertullian, The Resurrection of the Flesh, 2; Irenaeus, Adversus Haereses, I, xxiv. 4, 5.

be no resurrection of the body. Yet for practical purposes this might be considered true.

In both the Epistle to Rheginus and the Gospel of Philip a resurrection of the flesh seems to be taught. The Epistle to Rheginus (47: 4-10) reads:

5 For if thou wert not  
in (the) flesh, thou didst take on flesh when  
thou didst come into this world. Wherefore  
shouldst thou not take on the flesh when thou  
goest up into the aeon?  
That which is better than the flesh is  
10 for it the cause of life. [Greek words omitted]

A change is expected with the "spiritual resurrection" though (45.28-46.2), which resurrection takes place at death (45. 34, 35). In this resurrection the Gnostics, such as Rheginus and his teacher were, would lose both the "psychic" and the fleshly elements (45.39-46.2). In the passage under consideration (47.4-10), a special meaning must be assigned to "flesh". On the possibility of the redemption of the present body (47. 30-36) the author wrote:

Let

none be doubtful concerning this.  
. . . the members which are  
visible (but) dead will  
48. not be saved for it is (only)  
the living (members) that are within  
them which were to rise again. What  
then is the resurrection?  
It is the revelation  
5 at every moment of  
those who have arisen.  
(47.36-48.6)

That only a changed "flesh" is to arise is clear from 48.38-49.5:

- For incorruptibility  
 49. descends upon the  
 corruption, and the light flows  
 down upon the darkness, to  
 swallow it up, and the Pleroma  
 5 makes perfect the deficiency.

In the Gospel of Philip, Logion 23 seems to teach a conflicting doctrine. In 104.26-34, the doctrine of the resurrection is attacked and in 105.9ff., the same doctrine is defended.<sup>76</sup> Logion 23 reads:

- 104.26 (23) Some  
 are afraid lest they rise naked.  
 Because of this they wish to rise  
 in the flesh, and they do not know that those who  
 30 bear the flesh [it is they who are] naked;  
 those who. . . . themselves to unclothe  
 themselves it is they who are not naked. "Flesh  
 [and blood shall] not inherit the kingdom  
 [of God]" . What is this which will  
 105 not inherit? This which we have. But what is  
 this which will inherit? That which belongs to Jesus  
 with his blood. Because of this he said:  
 He who shall not eat my flesh and drink  
 5 my blood has not life in him. What is it?  
 His flesh is the logos, and his blood  
 is the Holy Spirit. He who has received these  
 has food and drink and clothing.  
 For myself, I find fault with the others who say  
 10 that it will not rise. Then both of these  
 are at fault. Thou sayest  
 that the flesh will not rise; but tell me  
 what will rise, that we may  
 honour thee. Thou sayest the spirit in the flesh,  
 15 and it is also this light in the flesh. But  
 this too is a logos which is in the flesh, for whatever  
 thou shalt say thou sayest outside the flesh.  
 It is necessary to rise in this flesh, in which  
 everything exists.<sup>77</sup>

---

<sup>76</sup>R. McL. Wilson, The Gospel of Philip (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1962), pp. 87, 88.

<sup>77</sup>Ibid., p. 87.

Wilson's solution of the apparent contradiction here was:

The idea may be that the Gnostic must rise in the flesh in order to be stripped of the garment of flesh and clothed in his heavenly robe; in which case 104.26-34 may be an attack on those who maintain a resurrection of the flesh and no more, who are thus bound to the things of this world; and 105.9ff. may be directed against the "Greek" view that only the soul (or the spirit) is immortal. Both are wrong (105.10f.).<sup>78</sup>

Since Jesus only possesses "true flesh", what man has must then be something else.<sup>79</sup> That a distinction between "flesh" and "true flesh" was made is clear from certain passages in the Gospel of Philip (114.13ff, 116.34ff., 125.2ff). The Gnostic only possessed an "image" of the true flesh which only Christ had.<sup>80</sup> In the words of "Philip", "For this one is no longer a Christian but a Christ."<sup>81</sup>

That which rose had for its goal the upward rising into the Pleroma. Men on earth had three possible realms of abode open to them, determined by their nature. These realms and the Gnostic's desire are found in Logion 63, of the Gospel of Philip:

- 114.7 (63) Either will he be in this world or in the resurrection or in the places of the midst. God forbid that I be found in them.
- 10 In this world there is good and evil. Its good is not good, and its evil not evil. But there is evil after this world, which is truly evil,
- 15 namely what they call the Midst. This

<sup>78</sup> Ibid., p. 89.

<sup>79</sup> Ibid., p. 13.

<sup>80</sup> Ibid., p. 136.

<sup>81</sup> 115.26,27.



is death. While we are in this world  
 it is fitting for us to acquire for ourselves  
 the resurrection, in order that when we strip off the  
 flesh

we may be found in Rest and not walk  
 20 in the Midst. For many go  
 astray on the way. For it is good to come forth  
 from the world before man yet  
 sinned.

The hylic man, in his ignorance and blindness, would remain  
 in this world to be destroyed. The Midst, which is the realm  
 above this present universe, will be vacated by Sophia-  
 Archamothe at the consummation, and the Demiurge and psychic  
 men will arise to dwell there.<sup>82</sup> Only one place of abode  
 appeals to the Gnostic. This is the "rest", or the Pleroma of  
 the Father. Only one saved, or raised by his saving knowledge  
 had hope of avoiding the "evil" of walking in the Midst:  
 which actually meant only men who became Gnostics would reach  
 the realm of bliss.<sup>83</sup>

The "rest" mentioned above, may mean the perfect rest  
 of residence with the Father in the Pleroma, but in Gnostic  
 literature it seems to have had a dual meaning. It was both  
 "realized" and "eschatological". Rest is of course obtained  
 by having the redemptive self-knowledge of the Gnostics.<sup>84</sup>  
 This acquired "rest" of course extended on to the final  
 consummation. An example of one who believed he had acquired  
 such "rest" is the author of the Gospel of Truth, who said

---

<sup>82</sup>Ibid., p. 124.

<sup>83</sup>Ibid.

<sup>84</sup>R. M. Grant, Gnosticism and Early Christianity  
 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1959), p. 198.

in the closing lines of his gospel:

42:40 May the rest (of men) understand  
therefore, in their places that  
it beseems me not,  
having been in the place of rest,  
to say any more.<sup>85</sup>

His words indicate that to a Gnostic, "rest" did not apply exclusively to the heavenly bliss after death.<sup>86</sup> Gärtner has the following observation on the dual nature of the term meaning both enlightenment and perfected rest with the Father:

Occasionally one may detect a duality in expression, when the term may refer to both these aspects, since salvation here and now is a condition which "continues" after death. Indeed, the Gnostic is said not to "see death," which means that he has already reached the "quality" which governs the heavenly world.<sup>87</sup>

Not only might the Gnostic "rest" be spoken of in two senses, but their idea of the resurrection might also be explained in several ways. Marcion, is reported by Tertullian to have held to immortality of the soul only.<sup>88</sup> In this he was in sympathy with Alexandrian Judaism (as in Philo) and the Hellenistic thought of his day.

The Resurrection was considered more than immortality by other Gnostics. Some taught that "enlightenment"=resurrection.

---

<sup>85</sup>Kendrick Grobel, The Gospel of Truth (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1960), p. 198.

<sup>86</sup>Ibid., p. 201.

<sup>87</sup>Bertil Gärtner, The Theology of the Gospel of Thomas (London: Collins, 1961), p. 266.

<sup>88</sup>Tertullian, Against Marcion, V. x, Roberts, III, 450.

Menander was one such teacher who provided instant resurrection for his converts. Tertullian criticized him saying:

He pretends to have received such a commission from the secret power of One above, that all who partake of his baptism become immortal, incorruptible, and instantaneously invested with resurrection life.<sup>89</sup>

Plotinus had criticism for Gnostics who taught a similar doctrine of immediate release from the body in Enneads II.

9. 18. There he said:

But perhaps they will maintain that their teaching makes men escape right away from the body in their hatred of it, but ours holds the soul down to it. This is like two people living in the same fine house, one of whom criticizes the building and architect but stays there all the same; the other does not criticize, but says the architect has built it with utmost skill, and waits for the time when he will go away and not need a house any longer.<sup>90</sup>

Another aspect of the Gnostic's belief in the resurrection was that which held that the resurrection had to do with escaping from the body at death.<sup>91</sup> This view was called the "spiritual resurrection" in the Epistle to Rheginus.

There the author taught:

But if we  
are made manifest in  
30 this world wearing  
him, we are his beams  
and we are

---

<sup>89</sup>Tertullian, Treatise on the Soul, L. Roberts, III, 227; cf., The Resurrection of the Flesh, XIX. ii. 4.

<sup>90</sup>A. H. Armstrong, Plotinus (London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1953), p. 145.

<sup>91</sup>Tertullian, The Resurrection of the Flesh, XIX, Roberts, III, 559.

NOTE

encompassed by him  
 until our setting, which is  
 35 our death in this life.  
 We are drawn upward  
 by him like the beams  
 by the sun, without being held back  
 by anything. This is  
 40 the spiritual resurrection  
 46. which swallows up the psychic  
 alike with the fleshly.  
 (45.28-46.2) [Greek words omitted]

Of course the perfection of the Gnostic's hope lay in  
 the final consummation when all the divine elements, or sparks,  
 in the world would ascent back to the Father above, leaving  
 all material and psychic elements behind.<sup>92</sup> This final event  
 is the apocatastasis (ἀποκατάστασις) when the Gnostic and his  
 heavenly counterpart from the Midst will ascend into the  
 Pleroma.<sup>93</sup> In the Epistle to Rheginus it is Jesus as the Son  
 of Man who provides the "restoration (ἀποκατάστασις) into the  
 Pleroma" (44.30-32).

In all their concepts of "rest" and restoration, or  
 resurrection, the Gnostics consistently reject a bodily  
 resurrection as held by the Christians. In their minds the  
 resurrection was for them a realized event; a resurrection  
 which could be said "to be past already."

---

<sup>92</sup>Gärtner, op. cit., p. 181, n. 3.

<sup>93</sup>Wilson, op. cit., p. 129.

## CHAPTER III

### NEW TESTAMENT DOCTRINE OF THE RESURRECTION

#### The Resurrection of Jesus

A Cardinal Doctrine. In Paul's words this was a central theme of Christianity. "For I delivered to you as of first importance what I also received, that Christ. . . was raised on the third day in accordance with the scriptures."<sup>1</sup> The truth of this doctrine is very important as can be seen by the results of denying it. Paul said, ". . . if Christ has not been raised, then our preaching is in vain and your faith is in vain."<sup>2</sup> "If Christ has not been raised, your faith is futile and you are still in your sins. Then those who have died in Christ have perished."<sup>3</sup>

A Predicted Event. Frequently Jesus spoke of his impending death. He said, "The Son of man must suffer many things, and be rejected by the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and on the third day be raised."<sup>4</sup> At another time he said, "'Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up.' . . . he spoke of the temple of his body."<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>1 Cor. 15: 3, 4.                   <sup>2</sup>1 Cor. 15: 14.

<sup>3</sup>1 Cor. 15: 17-18.

<sup>4</sup>Luke 9: 22; cf. Matt. 16: 21ff.; Mk. 8: 31ff.

<sup>5</sup>John 2: 19-21.

Because his enemies understood that Jesus taught that he would rise from the grave on the third day, they requested his tomb to be sealed and guarded to prevent any deception of the people.<sup>6</sup> With their guarding of the corporeal remains it is clear that a bodily resurrection was expected.

A Proved Fact. On the third day after the Lord's death the women who had gone to the tomb to anoint his body amazed the disciples by revealing that they ". . .did not find his body; and they came back saying they had even seen a vision of angels, who said he was alive."<sup>7</sup> It was hard for the early disciples to accept the resurrection, but the Lord rebuked their doubting and said: "See my hands and my feet, that it is I myself; handle me, and see; for a spirit has not flesh and bones as you see that I have."<sup>8</sup> When Jesus ate with them they could not deny that he was risen in bodily form.<sup>9</sup> In his record Paul made reference to six witnessing groups and individuals, including himself, who had seen the risen Lord.<sup>10</sup>

As William Hordern considered I Corinthians 15: 17 he wrote:

---

<sup>6</sup>Matt. 27: 62-66.

<sup>7</sup>Luke 24: 22ff.

<sup>8</sup>Luke 24: 36ff.

<sup>9</sup>Luke 24: 41-43.

<sup>10</sup>I Cor. 15: 5-8.



If you read this passage, you will see that he [Paul] is not trying to persuade his fellow Christians that Christ arose; rather he is referring to the one point where there can be no difference between himself and his readers in order that he may go on to prove another point. The Resurrection was the one thing the early Christian could not deny and still consider himself a Christian.<sup>11</sup>

### Teaching of Jesus on the Resurrection

In the Lord's words recorded in John, death and resurrection are conceived of in two ways. Death in one sense referred to men lost in sin, thus spiritually dead. Such was his meaning when the disciple who, prior to following Christ, wished to bury his dead father. Jesus said to him: "Follow me, and leave the dead to bury their own dead."<sup>12</sup> To this class reference was made when Jesus said, "Truly, truly, I say to you, the hour is coming, and now is, when the dead will hear the voice of the Son of God, and those who hear will live."<sup>13</sup> Jesus taught that a man might be physically alive and spiritually dead as well as the opposite, that is, he might be physically dead while spiritually alive.<sup>14</sup> The Lord did not teach that either of these states was the eternal state of man, but he taught that at a general resurrection of all men a new existence would come for them.

---

<sup>11</sup>William Hordern, A Layman's Guide to Protestant Theology (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1961), pp. 10, 11.

<sup>12</sup>Matt. 8: 22.

<sup>13</sup>Jn. 5: 25; cf. Eph. 2: 1-6; I Tim. 5: 6.

<sup>14</sup>Luke 16: 19 ff.; Luke 23: 43.

This is the second sense in which death and resurrection might be understood. On resurrection, he said, ". . . the hour is coming when all who are in the tombs will hear his voice and come forth, those who have done good, to the resurrection of life, and those who have done evil, to the resurrection of judgment."<sup>15</sup> Those who experience the latter resurrection are also destined for the "second death."<sup>16</sup>

Considering the raising, one can see that it is God who will raise the ones in the tombs, just as it was he who raised Jesus from the dead.<sup>17</sup> The raising at the last day will include the whole man.<sup>18</sup> In an exhortation to martyrdom, Jesus said, "And do not fear those who kill the body but cannot kill the soul; rather fear him who can destroy both soul and body in hell."<sup>19</sup>

Man's fate was a controversial matter in Jerusalem in the days of Christ. As Jesus faced the Sadducees who denied the resurrection he revealed that: (1) the Old Testament taught the resurrection of the dead,<sup>20</sup> (2) God's power, of which the Sadducees were ignorant, as the source of the resurrection, and (3) that the resurrection life was one

---

<sup>15</sup>Jn. 5: 28.

<sup>16</sup>Rev. 20: 14.

<sup>17</sup>Acts 2: 24, 32; I Thess. 1: 10.

<sup>18</sup>Jn. 6: 39, 40, 41, 54.

<sup>19</sup>Matt. 10: 28.

<sup>20</sup>Exodus 3: 6.

of changed existence for man, as shown in the matter of marriage.<sup>21</sup>

### Pauline Doctrine of the Resurrection

Paul's teaching covered the same materials mentioned by the Lord and agreed with that which was preached in the early church, that is, ". . . in Jesus the resurrection from the dead."<sup>22</sup> In the history recorded in Acts of Apostles Paul is seen before a council of Judaism which was divided over ". . . the hope of the resurrection of the dead. . . ." <sup>23</sup> With a majority of his nation Paul shared a hope in God ". . . that there will be a resurrection of both the just and the unjust."<sup>24</sup> As Paul preached to those outside of Judaism his message of a risen Christ was hard for them to accept.<sup>25</sup> Misunderstandings arose, and it was necessary to write to several groups about the resurrection.

To Thessalonica. In what well may be Paul's earliest epistles he wrote at some length concerning the resurrection. After its establishment the church at Thessalonica had grown and withstood persecution<sup>26</sup> but their hope for Christ's speedy return ". . . was still exercising a disturbing influence

---

<sup>21</sup>Matt. 22: 23-33 and parallels.

<sup>22</sup>Acts 4: 2.      <sup>23</sup>Acts 23: 1-6.      <sup>24</sup>Acts 24: 15.

<sup>25</sup>Acts 17: 31ff.      <sup>26</sup>Cf. 2 Thess. 1: 3.

over the Thessalonians' daily conduct."<sup>27</sup>

In the First Epistle Paul wrote of the order of the gathering of the Lord's people at the last day. When Christ returns the dead shall rise first, then the living will join them and the Lord for eternity.<sup>28</sup> Paul did not reveal "when" this event would occur, but "how" it will come is said to be unexpectedly.<sup>29</sup>

The Christians at Thessalonica were grieving over loss of their dead companions. Vos said they grieved for:

In I Thess. iv. 13 the cause for the "sorrowing" which Paul deprecates does not lie in their regarding the state of death as an evil in itself, but in their apprehension of it as an interminable state.<sup>30</sup>

Because some Christians had died and Christ had not yet returned it was necessary for Paul to write, do not grieve ". . . as do the rest who have no hope."<sup>31</sup> His answer implies a misconception of the future hope on their part. Davies explained their grief by saying:

The Thessalonian Christians had quite clearly been taught the transformation of those "in Christ" into the resurrection mode of existence would soon take place and that without the experience of death. Not only so, but,

---

<sup>27</sup>George Milligan, St. Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, c. 1908), p. xxxviii.

<sup>28</sup>I Thess. 1: 16-18.      <sup>29</sup>I Thess. 5: 1ff.

<sup>30</sup>Geerhardus Vos, The Pauline Eschatology (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1953), p. 146.

<sup>31</sup>I Thess. 4: 13.

as such passages as Rom. 6. 1-14 show, the solidarity of Christians with their Lord was such that they had died but also risen with Christ to life; a second death was unthinkable; they had already passed from death to life.<sup>32</sup>

There is no certainty to Davies' assertion that the Thessalonians had been taught to believe they would not experience death, but they might easily have come to believe this due to a misunderstanding of Paul's teachings. Particularly we have Paul's specific teaching in II Thess. 2: 1ff. that those who had understood him to teach the immediate coming of the Lord were mistaken. There is much difference between the stress that the coming is imminent (liable to happen at any moment) and that the coming will occur within a given immediate time period.

Second Thessalonians also deals with eschatological questions. Paul first spoke of the fate of the wicked who persecuted the Christians. He said that when Christ returned ". . . these will pay the penalty of eternal destruction away from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power."<sup>33</sup> The fate of the Christian would be the opposite. Paul also prayed for the salvation of the Christians at Christ's return. He sought their total being's salvation; "spirit and soul and body."<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup>W. D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism (London: S.P.C.K., 1948), p. 291.

<sup>33</sup>II Thess. 1: 9, NASV.

<sup>34</sup>I Thess. 5: 23.

A real danger faced the Thessalonians in that someone might seek to mislead them concerning this return. Paul warned them to consider carefully any message they received by ". . . spirit or by word, or by letter purporting to be from us, to the effect that the day of the Lord has come."<sup>35</sup>

To Corinth. Some were denying the resurrection of the dead among the converts at Corinth. In correcting this false teaching Paul revealed much of what is known of the New Testament doctrine of the resurrection.

Christ's resurrection is the heart of the Christian's hope, for what Jesus has shall be shared by those that are his. As W. C. Robinson said:

The New Testament thought moves from the resurrection of Jesus to that of his people, that is, from history (Geschichte) to hope, or from what God has done in Jesus the Messiah to what he will do in those that are Christ's.<sup>36</sup>

When God raised his Son he stopped the mouths of those who said, "Cursed is every one who hangs on a tree."<sup>37</sup> But the raising of Jesus from the dead was the event which proved him to be the "son of God."<sup>38</sup> When Jesus died and rose again, it was for the justification of men, for what God had done was to ". . . make Him who knew no sin to be sin on our behalf,

---

<sup>35</sup> II Thess. 2: 3 ff.

<sup>36</sup> W. Childs Robinson, "The Resurrection," Interpretation, XVI (April, 1962), 177.

<sup>37</sup> Deut. 21: 23.

<sup>38</sup> Rom. 1: 4.



that we might become the righteousness of God in Him."<sup>39</sup>

Christ identified himself with men so as to redeem them.

As the Hebrew Epistle notes:

Since then the children share in flesh and blood, He Himself likewise also partook of the same, that through death He might render powerless him who had the power of death, that is, the devil; and might deliver those who through fear of death were subject to slavery all their lives.<sup>40</sup>

Awareness of Christ's identity with the Christian logically made it impossible to deny the resurrection of Christians.

Perhaps the Corinthian Christians were in error in that they considered Christ risen, but they could not think others needed a resurrection. Paul's line of reasoning is that Christ is a precursor of others. "But now Christ has been raised from the dead, the first fruits of those who are asleep."<sup>41</sup> Christ as the "first-born from the dead"<sup>42</sup> is both the proof and earnest of the future raising of others. This, to Hering, is why Paul spoke in this way for ". . . the word 'aparche'='first-fruits' being almost synonymous with 'arrabon'='earnest', because the resurrection of others is still in the future."<sup>43</sup>

The giving of the Holy Spirit is at times spoken of as an "earnest" or "guarantee" of the future redemption of the body.

---

<sup>39</sup>II Cor. 5: 21, NASV.      <sup>40</sup>Heb. 2: 14, 15.

<sup>41</sup>I Cor. 15: 20.      <sup>42</sup>Col. 1: 18; Rev. 1: 5.

<sup>43</sup>Jean Hering, The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians (London: The Epworth Press, 1962), pp. 164, 165.

In one text Paul said that the Holy Spirit is ". . . given as a pledge of our inheritance, with a view to the redemption of God's own possession, . . ."44 Again he said:

But if the Spirit of Him who raised Jesus from the dead dwells in you, He who raised Christ Jesus from the dead will also give life to your mortal bodies through His Spirit who indwells you.45

What the Christian looked forward to Paul revealed when he wrote, ". . . even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting eagerly for our adoption as sons, the redemption of our body."46 The Spirit gives assurance of future life, but His work is not done there. As Vos noted:

On the one hand the Spirit is the resurrection-source, on the other He appears as the sub-stratum of the resurrection-life, the element, as it were, in which, as in its circumambient atmosphere the life of the coming aeon shall be lived.47

In I Corinthians 15 Paul contrasts two totalities; "in Adam," and "in Christ."48 In explanation of this symbolism Hering wrote:

So we are in the presence of two humanities, each one having an "Adam" as its founder and head. "Pantes" should therefore be taken cum grano salis as "all who depend on Christ." Naturally Christians belong to the old humanity through their earthly birth. That is why some Christians have already died before the Lord's return (15<sup>18</sup>). But they too share in the resurrection through belonging to Christ.49

44Eph. 1: 14. 45Rom. 8: 11. 46Rom. 8: 23.

47Vos, op. cit., p. 163. 481 Cor. 15: 22, 45ff.

49Hering, op. cit., p. 165.

The qualities of the two bodies of these totalities are contrasted by Paul with the Spiritual yet to be revealed. What is sown may be contrasted with what shall be raised as follows:

"Sown"	"raised"
perishable	imperishable
dishonor	glory
weakness	power
a natural body	a spiritual body. <sup>50</sup>

Of course the error must be avoided of thinking there is no identity between the present body which will be "sown" at death with the future state of that body when it is resurrected.

Paul wrote the Philippians saying:

But our commonwealth is in heaven, and from it we await a Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ, who will change our lowly body to be like his glorious body, by the power which enables him even to subject all things to himself.<sup>51</sup>

What kind of body is this? If the answer is "a spiritual body," care must be exercised so that the idea of ghostly or ephemeral content is not given to the word "spiritual." Whiteley's comment is of value in this matter:

St. Paul continues in I Cor. xv. 44, "Sown as an animal (psuchikon) body, it is raised as a spiritual (pneumatikon) body." Adjectives ending with the suffix--ikos mean "like," whereas those ending in--inos mean "made of." Accordingly, we may follow Arndt and Gingrich when they render Pneumatikos "belonging to the supernatural order"; it does not mean "made of spiritual matter," . . .<sup>52</sup>

---

<sup>50</sup> I Cor. 15: 42-44.

<sup>51</sup> Phil. 3: 20-21.

<sup>52</sup> D. E. H. Whiteley, The Theology of St. Paul (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964), p. 252.

W. C. Robinson makes a similar observation by saying:

I Corinthians 15 teaches that the present body is sown a psychical (natural, psychological, soulish, animate) body and will be raised a spiritual body. In both cases the contrasting adjective describes not the composition but the control of the body. As the present body is dominated by our fallen, sinful, Adamic psychology, so will the final one be resurrected and motivated by the Spirit of the risen Christ.<sup>53</sup>

Paul gave much emphasis to the future realization of what the Christian has now in promise, but he also had much to say as to the "now" of this union with the risen Lord. Paul's unity with Christ was shown in his "fellowship of his sufferings."<sup>54</sup> When one is baptized into Christ, he is also raised to "walk in newness of life."<sup>55</sup>

How far might one go with this concept? Paul could say, "I have been crucified with Christ; it is no longer I who live, but Christ who lives in me; . . ."<sup>56</sup> Paul would urge morality upon the Christians at Corinth because ". . . your bodies are members of Christ."<sup>57</sup> Numerous other statements illustrate that being a part of the totality of the Second Adam means a new way of life now, for Christians have a very real relationship with the risen Christ at the present time.

Such thought might completely obscure the future aspect of a resurrected life. It would seem that it did both at

---

<sup>53</sup>W. C. Robinson, op. cit., p. 180.

<sup>54</sup>Phil. 3: 10.

<sup>55</sup>Rom. 6: 4.

<sup>56</sup>Gal. 2: 20.

<sup>57</sup>1 Cor. 6: 15.

Corinth and where Timothy and Titus preached; for in one place the Christians denied a future resurrection and at the other said they already were raised.

## CHAPTER IV

### ABERRATIONS CONCERNING THE RESURRECTION

The identity of the errorists concerning the resurrection as noted in the Pastoral and Corinthian Epistles must ultimately be determined by evidence found in these letters. This chapter treats such evidence and seeks to determine if Paul answered one or more heresies in his correspondence.

#### The Pastoral Heresy

The New Testament records little about the Cretans except Paul's uncomplimentary description of them as "always liars, evil beasts, lazy gluttons."<sup>1</sup> A number of Jews are known to have lived on Crete in those days<sup>2</sup> and this fact makes the references to Judaism in the Pastoral heresy lucid.

The situation at Ephesus is better known from the New Testament. Some of the first members of the church in Ephesus practiced "magical arts,"<sup>3</sup> and those from Judaism may have once been part of a somewhat heterodox form of Judaism. The latter may be inferred from the fact that the sons of

---

<sup>1</sup>Titus 1: 12, 13.

<sup>2</sup>"There is evidence (Josephus, Antiq. xvii. 327; Bell. Iud. ii. 103; Philo, Leg. ad Gaium 282) that Jews were numerous in Crete."; John Norman Kelly, Early Christian Doctrines (New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1960), p. 234.

<sup>3</sup>Acts 19: 19.



Sceva, who were "itinerant Jewish exorcists," are pictured as plying their trade at Ephesus and using the name of Jesus whom they did not believe in or know.<sup>4</sup> Failure on the part of these charlatans caused a great deal of fear among the magicians in the church so that they burned their magical formulae and confessed their deeds.<sup>5</sup> It also may be inferred that if Apollos, a Christian minister who originally came from Alexandria, was at Ephesus, others from that city where the thoughts of Philo were known might well have visited the Ephesian synagogue as well.<sup>6</sup>

Ephesus was located in a place where heresy might be encountered. When Paul wrote to those "who are at Ephesus and faithful" he gave a warning as well to: "Let no one deceive you with empty words."<sup>7</sup> When he spoke with the elders of the Ephesian church Paul could already see the possibility of apostacy. He placed them on their guard by saying:

I know that after my departure fierce wolves will come in among you, not sparing the flock; and from among your own number will arise men speaking perverse things, to draw away the disciples after them.<sup>8</sup>

By the time John received the Revelation from the Lord the church at Ephesus had already resisted "false apostles" and fought the hateful "works of the Nicolaitans."<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup>Acts 19: 13ff.

<sup>5</sup>Acts 19: 18ff.

<sup>6</sup>Acts 18: 24.

<sup>7</sup>Eph. 1: 1 (RSV marg.); 5: 6.

<sup>8</sup>Acts 20: 29, 30.

<sup>9</sup>Rev. 2: 2, 6.

Of course Ephesus was not the only congregation plagued by heresy in Asia Minor. Colossae also faced heretics of the same general characteristics as those at Ephesus and Crete. This will become clear when the nature of the heresy of the Pastoral Epistles is explored.

Nature of the Pastoral Heresy. Speculation in matters contrary to the sound doctrine delivered to the Christians by the apostles was a major part of the Pastoral heresy. Numerous references in all three Epistles refer to this speculation which involved: "myths and endless genealogies,"<sup>10</sup> "godless chatter,"<sup>11</sup> "stupid controversies, genealogies, dissensions, and quarrels over the law."<sup>12</sup> Paul saw that such activity would ruin the hearers<sup>13</sup> since it developed in some a "morbid craving for controversy and for disputes about words which produce envy, dissension, slander, base suspicions, and wrangling among men."<sup>14</sup> Gealey has well said:

The author opposed the heretics and their different doctrine on two grounds:

(a) It promotes "speculations," "vain discussion," "cravings for controversy and for disputes about words," "godless chatter."

---

<sup>10</sup>I Tim. 1: 4.      <sup>11</sup>II Tim. 2: 16; 6: 20.

<sup>12</sup>Titus 3: 9.      <sup>13</sup>II Tim. 2: 14.

<sup>14</sup>I Tim. 6: 3-5.

(b) All such wranglings destroy conscience, sincere faith, and replace the Christian virtues with conceit and quarrelsomeness.<sup>15</sup>

These speculations had a definite Jewish tinge, as shown by the facts that the heretics sought to be "teachers of the law"<sup>16</sup> and had their followers giving heed to "Jewish myths."<sup>17</sup> This is only one strand of the teaching though, as Guthrie noted on Titus 1: 14:

The other strand termed commandments of men, that turn from the truth, is strongly reminiscent of the ascetic tendencies in the Colossian heresy which are also described as "commandments of men" (Col. ii. 21, 22).<sup>18</sup>

E. F. Scott had earlier expressed Guthrie's view, saying

From the verses which follow we can gather that the man-made "commandments" were of the nature indicated in I Tim. iv. 3-6--prohibitions imposed on marriage and on certain meats and drinks.<sup>19</sup>

The passage Scott had in mind was that which indicated that the errorists believed "nothing is pure."<sup>20</sup>

Two of the heretics were named in the Second Epistle to Timothy, that is Hymenaeus and Philetus.<sup>21</sup> This Hymenaeus was linked with one Alexander in the First Epistle,<sup>22</sup> and

---

<sup>15</sup>Fred D. Gealey, The First and Second Epistles to Timothy and the Epistle to Titus, The Interpreter's Bible (New York: Abingdon Press, c. 1955), XI, 351.

<sup>16</sup>I Tim. 1: 7.      <sup>17</sup>Titus 1: 14; cf. Titus 1: 10; 3: 9.

<sup>18</sup>Donald Guthrie, The Pastoral Epistles (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1957), p. 189.

<sup>19</sup>E. F. Scott, The Pastoral Epistles (New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1947), p. 161.

<sup>20</sup>Titus 1: 15.      <sup>21</sup>II Tim. 2: 16-19.      <sup>22</sup>I Tim. 1: 20.

Hymenaeus is later mentioned as one of the teachers whose "cancerous doctrine"<sup>23</sup> maintained that "the resurrection is past already."<sup>24</sup>

Compounded within this strife-producing heresy were doctrines which produced both asceticism and libertinism. The latter practices were contrary to the Law, or rather the sound teaching given by the Apostle.<sup>25</sup> Since these men were already active as Paul wrote the Epistles, Timothy was to use care to avoid such men.<sup>26</sup> His opponents sought to be "teachers of the law,"<sup>27</sup> but they themselves were guilty of lawlessness. Paul said that the precepts of the law condemned "profligate" lives,<sup>28</sup> and these heretics lived lawlessly.<sup>29</sup> They taught out of a greed for "base gain."<sup>30</sup> Not only did they count that "godliness is a means of gain"<sup>31</sup> but they also used foolish women.<sup>32</sup> As they professed to know God, their lives proved that they neither knew or served him.<sup>33</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup>II Tim. 4: 17 (NASV margin).

<sup>24</sup>II Tim. 4: 18.

<sup>25</sup>Cf. I Tim 1: 9ff.; 6: 3; II Tim. 1: 13; 4: 3; Titus 1: 9, 13; 2: 1, 2.

<sup>26</sup>II Tim. 3: 1-7; cf. I Tim. 6: 3ff.; Titus 3: 9ff.

<sup>27</sup>I Tim. 1: 3.      <sup>28</sup>I Tim. 1: 9, 10.      <sup>29</sup>II Tim. 3: 1.

<sup>30</sup>Titus 1: 11.      <sup>31</sup>I Tim. 6: 5.      <sup>32</sup>II Tim. 3: 6ff.

<sup>33</sup>Titus 1: 16; cf. II Tim. 3: 5.

This brief survey has shown that the heresy was of a nature to oppose "sound doctrine" in the following ways:

(1) Participation in destructive controversy, speculations over such matters as "myths" and genealogies" which led to the destruction of the hearers; (2) a past or "realized" resurrection was believed; (3) and both asceticism and libertinism were promoted. Attention now must be given to discover the group which held to these tenets.

Source of the Pastoral Heresy. The Essenes held with a doctrine similar in some ways to that outlined above. Even with their food regulations and observation of celibacy they are unlikely subjects as the men faced by Paul. This is true because they are known to have accepted a future resurrection and not one that was realized. Lenski also gives a telling argument against their identification with the heretics when he said:

To point to the Essenes, a small sect of Judaism that never amounted to much, is little help. Josephus, Ant. 13, 5, 9, speaks of them as early as 166 B. C. . . . All but one group of them never married. Since they had been in existence for over two centuries, Paul could not be thinking of them here when he is speaking of devilish doctrines that are soon to arise in the Christian Church.<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>34</sup>R. C. H. Lenski, The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians, to the Thessalonians, to Timothy, To Titus and to Philemon (Columbus, Ohio: Wartburg Press, 1937), p. 622.

There is no evidence that shows any libertine tendencies among these people, in fact, the opposite seems to be true. At first sight the Essenes seem a possible source for the heresy Paul faced, but for these considerations they must be rejected.

A more likely source for the heresy is to be found in an early form of Gnosticism. One must say an early form of Gnosticism because of the legitimate objection that second century Gnosticism was too late to be the heresy. The possibility of a combination of Jewish and Gnostic ingredients in an early heresy certainly existed, and this seems to be the best way to conceive of the error.<sup>35</sup>

#### Characteristics Peculiar to Gnosticism in the Pastoral Heresy.

Material within the Pastoral Epistles points to an incipient Gnosticism as the source of the heresy which said that the resurrection is past already. The underlying assumptions of the errorists become apparent when Paul's answer to them is considered.

---

<sup>35</sup>Commentators generally agree that the heresy was of Gnostic and Jewish origin. For examples: ". . . the background out of which the heretics attacked in the Pastorals emerged was at the same time Jewish and gnostic." C. K. Barrett, The Pastoral Epistles in the New English Bible (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963), p. 14. Walter Lock saw the heresy as either one which combined these elements, or two sets of error. W. Lock, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles in the International Critical Commentary (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1924), p. xvii. Kelly characterized it as ". . . a Gnosticizing form of Jewish Christianity." J. N. D. Kelly, A Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1963), p. 12. To Scott it was "A mixture of Jewish with gnostic speculation, similar in

Creation. Evidently these men rejected the creative activity of God, for Paul answers their prohibitions concerning the eating of foods by referring to God's creative activity. Paul spoke of things that God had "created"<sup>36</sup> and maintained that "everything created by God is good."<sup>37</sup> In another place Paul said that it is God who gives "life to all things."<sup>38</sup>

Paul also gave emphasis to there being "one God and one mediator between God and men,"<sup>39</sup> as well as speaking of "the only God."<sup>40</sup> These references would refute the Gnostic idea of an inferior Creator-God who was responsible for the existence of material things. Reference to "one" Mediator naturally excludes many mediators between a Father-God, who was wholly transcendent, and the created world.

Gnostics might have accepted Christ as God, but if so, they would have relegated him to the inferior place of the

---

character to that condemned in the Epistle to the Colossians." Scott, op. cit., p. 43. Roberts emphasized the necessity of error being considered "incipient" by commenting:

Most of the doctrinal features of the full-fledged Gnostic sects are lacking in these epistles. The existence of an incipient form of Gnosticism in the decade of 60-70 A. D. in the churches of Asia Minor is witnessed by the books of Ephesians and Colossians. The second-century Gnosticism beginning with Marcion (cir. 140. A. D.) was strongly anti-Jewish, while that of the epistles which we are studying was definitely Jewish in its nature (Titus 1: 10; I Tim. 1: 7ff.)."

J. W. Roberts, Letters to Timothy (Austin, Texas: Sweet Publishing Company, 1961), p. 3.

<sup>36</sup>I Tim. 4: 3.      <sup>37</sup>I Tim. 4: 4.      <sup>38</sup>I Tim. 6: 13.

<sup>39</sup>I Tim. 2: 5.      <sup>40</sup>I Tim. 1: 17.



creator deity. The emphasis given to the saving work of God the Father and Christ the Son guards against any such idea. As Gealey has noted:

There are not two gods, a lower creator God and a higher Saviour God. With almost equal frequency in the Pastorals God and Christ are both described as Saviour.<sup>41</sup>

Man. The Gnostics of later times emphasized the division of men into different groups; the "hylic" class, or lowest category, was destined to perish.<sup>42</sup> Paul emphasized that God did not just want the "Pneumatic" class of mankind to be saved, but that God is ". . . the Savior of all men, especially of those who believe."<sup>43</sup> Paul also spoke of "God our Savior, who desires all men to be saved," and of the grace of God which ". . . has appeared for the salvation of all men."<sup>44</sup>

Gnosis. Paul gives emphasis to the fact that salvation is for those who believe, not for those who know, for he

---

<sup>41</sup>Gealey, op. cit., p. 357.; cf. Appendix B--Gnostic Theology. God is mentioned as Saviour in I Tim. 2: 3; 4: 10; Titus 1: 3; 2: 10; 3: 4; as compared with Christ called Saviour in I Tim. 1: 15; 2: 5; II Tim. 1: 10; Titus 1: 4; 2: 13; 3: 6.

<sup>42</sup>See Appendix B--Gnostic Anthropology.

<sup>43</sup>I Tim. 4: 10.

<sup>44</sup>I Tim. 2: 4; Titus 2: 11.

stressed the need for faith throughout the Pastorals.<sup>45</sup> Knowledge is not the basis for salvation in fact, the one reference to "knowledge" (gnosis) is adverse. Paul wrote: "O Timothy, guard what has been entrusted to you. Avoid the godless chatter and contradictions of what is falsely called knowledge, . . ."<sup>46</sup> This knowledge coupled with "godless chatter" recalls the error of Hymenaeus and Philetus who spiritualized the resurrection.<sup>47</sup> Of this reference to "gnosis" Scott wrote:

Here perhaps, we have the clearest indication given us in the Epistles that the false teaching was of a gnostic type. Its exponents laid claim to a "gnosis" or higher knowledge, although, in the writer's view, they were misusing a good word.<sup>48</sup>

The Incarnation. The view of the Lord Jesus Christ in the Pastorals is one which would refute any doceticism; that is, one could not read these letters and think of an earthly Jesus and a heavenly Christ. In four cases the titles are both used of the Lord: "Christ Jesus came into the world,"<sup>49</sup>

---

<sup>45</sup>Cf. "mystery of the faith", I Tim. 3: 9; "believed on in the world", I Tim. 3: 16; "believe and know the truth", I Tim. 4: 3; "especially those who believe", I Tim. 4: 10; "aim at . . . faith", I Tim. 6: 11 and II Tim. 2: 22; "you have learned and have firmly believed", II Tim. 3: 14, and "who have believed in God", Titus 3: 8.

<sup>46</sup>I Tim. 6: 20.      <sup>47</sup>II Tim. 2: 15.

<sup>48</sup>Scott, op. cit., p. 83; C. K. Barrett sees the gnosis here as an indication of ". . . some kind of primitive Christian gnosticism.", op. cit., p. 89; Lock also referred the gnosis to an early stage of Gnosticism, op. cit., p. 76.

<sup>49</sup>I Tim. 1: 15.

"the man Christ Jesus,"<sup>50</sup> "the appearing of our Savior Christ Jesus,"<sup>51</sup> and "Remember Jesus Christ, risen from the dead, descended from David."<sup>52</sup> Another reference to the Lord's true manhood was "He was manifested in the flesh. . . received up in glory."<sup>53</sup> Paul needed to give this emphasis because of a view held by his opponents--the Gnostic idea of Jesus would make such an emphasis necessary.

Asceticism. Marriage and foods were a problem to the heretics of the Pastorals, just as they were to later Gnostics. Paul gives great emphasis to the honorable estate of marriage in his writing to Timothy and Titus. Elders and deacons are to be married,<sup>54</sup> and it is best for younger widows to remarry and have children.<sup>55</sup> The bearing and raising of children, Paul said, is a woman's duty: "Yet woman will be saved through bearing children, . . ."<sup>56</sup> Kelly's comment on this passage is:

Paul is aiming a shaft at the false teachers, who had disparaging views about sex (I Tim. iv. 3), and whose later Gnostic successors, according to Irenaeus (Haer. 1.24.2) declared that "marriage and the begetting of children are of Satan."<sup>57</sup>

Paul's remarks show that it is not by marrying and begetting children that men are led by Satan, but he said that those

---

<sup>50</sup>I Tim. 2: 5.      <sup>51</sup>III Tim. 1: 10.      <sup>52</sup>II Tim. 2: 8.

<sup>53</sup>I Tim. 3: 16.      <sup>54</sup>I Tim. 3: 2, 12; Titus 1: 6.

<sup>55</sup>I Tim. 5: 4, 9, 14.      <sup>56</sup>I Tim. 2: 15.

<sup>57</sup>Kelly, op. cit., p. 70.; See Appendix B, for teaching of Marcion, Saturninus, etc.

who forbid marriage are the ones who ". . . depart from the faith by giving heed to deceitful spirits and doctrines of demons."<sup>58</sup>

Another prohibition taught by the heretics concerned eating certain foods.<sup>59</sup> Wine appears on their list of prohibited foods, as is shown by Paul's advice to Timothy to "No longer drink only water, but use a little wine for the sake of your stomach and your frequent ailments."<sup>60</sup> Of this verse Kelly said:

The advice will have even more point if we are justified in supposing (iv. 3 seems to support this) that the errorists erected total abstinence into a principle, thereby making nonsense of the theological truth that all God's gifts are good in themselves and remain so providing they are used in moderation and with an act of thanksgiving.<sup>61</sup>

What Paul had said was that certain ones ". . . enjoin abstinence from foods which God created to be received with thanksgiving by those who believe and know the truth."<sup>62</sup> The "thanksgiving" Paul is referring to is ". . . not gratitude in general, but gratitude as expressed in grace at meals: cf., e.g., I Cor. x. 30."<sup>63</sup>

Craig has noted three attitudes toward food and other material things in the ancient world. First was that of the Graeco-Roman culture which opposed certain dualities of

---

<sup>58</sup> I Tim. 4: 1, 2.

<sup>59</sup> I Tim. 4: 3.

<sup>60</sup> I Tim. 5: 23.

<sup>61</sup> Kelly, op. cit., p. 129.

<sup>62</sup> I Tim. 4: 3.

<sup>63</sup> Kelly, op. cit., p. 96.

"mind-matter," "soul-body" and "spirit-flesh." In each of these antitheses the first element was thought a higher principle of the good god, and the latter a part of the work of the lower, inferior, creator god. Certain Gnostics held with this type thinking including Saturninus,<sup>64</sup> and they felt it necessary to refrain from connections with this material world as much as possible by rejecting marriage and foods (especially wine and flesh).<sup>65</sup>

Another view, as was found in the Corinthian error, was that the use of the natural world is a matter of indifference, and man can do as he wills with material things without affecting the "inner man," who really is not a part of this world.<sup>66</sup> A libertine Gnostic reasoned in this manner.

Finally there is the Christian view which permits the use of foods and marriage with thanksgiving. To this view men should use these gifts from God in a wise way, with moderation and thankfulness.<sup>67</sup>

Of 1 Timothy 5: 23 Craig said:

. . . we interpret the passage as a qualification of vs. 22c, prompted by the author's concern to repudiate Gnostic asceticism at every opportunity. Purity, he will

---

<sup>64</sup>See Appendix B. p. 157.

<sup>65</sup>C. T. Craig, The First Epistle to the Corinthians in The Interpreter's Bible (New York: Abingdon Press, 1953), X, 423.

<sup>66</sup>Ibid., pp. 425, 426.

<sup>67</sup>Ibid., pp. 426, 427.

say, neither requires nor warrants ascetic abstinence from wine.<sup>68</sup>

Paul treated "purity" in another text where he wrote:

To the pure all things are pure, but to the corrupt and unbelieving nothing is pure; their very minds and conscience are corrupt.<sup>69</sup>

On this passage Craig remarked:

In the present passage the writer brandishes the familiar saying in his own defence to justify Christian practice of marriage and enjoyment of foods (see I Tim. 4: 3; 5: 23): to the spiritually pure all (an over-statement) things are (ritually) pure.<sup>70</sup>

In these passages Paul seems to be striving for the Christian principle of a wise, moderate and thankful use of material things. Just as Kelly noted:

. . . Paul seems to imply that the Ephesian prohibitions I Tim. 4: 3 were based on a more explicit dualism which stigmatized matter as evil.<sup>71</sup>

Libertinism. As well as the asceticism which was seen in the prohibitions of marriage and foods, there was in the Pastorals a certain libertine element as well. Those, who sought to be "teachers of the law"<sup>72</sup> which corrected "those who are lawless and rebellious,"<sup>73</sup> were themselves "lawless."<sup>74</sup> They taught for "base gain"<sup>75</sup> as men who were depraved in mind thinking that "godliness is a means of gain."<sup>76</sup> Their claim

---

<sup>68</sup>Ibid., p. 445.      <sup>69</sup>Titus 1: 15.

<sup>70</sup>Craig, op. cit., p. 532.

<sup>71</sup>Kelly, op. cit., p. 95.      <sup>72</sup>I Tim. 1: 3ff.

<sup>73</sup>I Tim. 1: 9.      <sup>74</sup>II Tim. 3: 1-9.      <sup>75</sup>Titus 1: 11.

<sup>76</sup>I Tim. 6: 5.

to "godliness" was made only on a "form" which had no real "power".<sup>77</sup> Paul described them by saying: "They profess to know God, but they deny him by their deeds; they are detestable, disobedient, unfit for any good deed."<sup>78</sup>

The clearest reference to their "profligate" lives is shown in their method of proselyting followers. Of these "lawless" teachers Paul said, they ". . . enter into households and captivate weak women weighed down with sins, . . ."<sup>79</sup> Irenaeus took notice of men of this same type character, libertine Gnostics of his day, when he wrote:

Some of them, moreover, are in the habit of defiling those women to whom they have taught the above doctrine [ i.e. "carnal things for the carnal nature, spiritual things for the spirit" ], as has frequently been confessed by those women who have been led astray by certain of them, on their returning to the Church of God, and acknowledging this along with the rest of their errors.<sup>80</sup>

Irenaeus brought this same charge against Marcus and his followers, who ". . . have deceived many silly women, and defiled them."<sup>81</sup>

In another place Paul charged these heretics with leading "profligate" lives.<sup>82</sup> This same charge was made by Irenaeus against Simon and his followers when he wrote:

---

<sup>77</sup>II Tim. 3: 5.      <sup>78</sup>Titus 1: 16.      <sup>79</sup>II Tim. 3: 6.

<sup>80</sup>Irenaeus, Adversus Haereses, I, vi. 3. (Vol. I The Ante-Nicene Fathers, editors, Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1951), p. 324. Hereafter referred to as Roberts.

<sup>81</sup>Ibid., I. xiii. 6, p. 335.      <sup>82</sup>II Tim. 3: 3.



"Thus, then, the mystic priests belonging to this sect lead profligate lives and practice magical arts, each one to the extent of his ability."<sup>83</sup>

Teaching for fees and practicing magic were also ways the errorists sought to take advantage of those who came within their control. According to Paul these men were teaching out of a desire for "base gain."<sup>84</sup> They lived lives full of controversy and imagined that "godliness" was another "means of gain."<sup>85</sup> What "godliness" or "religion" these wicked fellows displayed was only pretense, for they were only ". . . holding the form of religion but denying the power of it."<sup>86</sup> The verses which follow I Timothy 6: 5 show that ". . . the heretical teachers are concerned with fees, perhaps for their instruction, to a much greater extent than our writer regards as justifiable."<sup>87</sup>

The pretended piety could have been used as a lever for advancement within the church, or it may have been that the advantage sought was through the fees charged. Kelly favours the latter idea, that is, fees for "the esoteric religious instruction."<sup>88</sup> The context favours this view<sup>89</sup> and the idea

---

<sup>83</sup>Irenaeus, Adversus Haeresies, I. 23. 4, Roberts. p. 348.

<sup>84</sup>Titus 1: 7, 11.    <sup>85</sup>I Tim. 6: 5.    <sup>86</sup>II Tim. 3: 5.

<sup>87</sup>Craig, op. cit., p. 450.

<sup>88</sup>Kelly, op. cit., p. 135.

<sup>89</sup>Cf. I Tim. 6: 6-10.

is paralleled in Titus which notes that "they are upsetting whole families by teaching for base gain what they have no right to teach."<sup>90</sup> It is doubtful if Christianity at that time was materially rewarding to the extent that men would pretend of piety to gain advantage.<sup>91</sup>

Irenaeus spoke of magicians in his day who deceived, just as Paul spoke of "evil men and imposters"<sup>92</sup> of which the latter are probably involved in the practice of magic in some way. The title "imposter" means ". . . in our lit. more in the sense swindler, cheat."<sup>93</sup> Gerhard Delling wrote of this word (i. e., goes):

In Eur. Ba., 234 Dionysus is called a *ρόης*, obviously in the sense of one who entices to impious action by apparently pious words, and this is the meaning in 2 Tim. 3: 13. The *ρόητες* are here identical with those described in v. 6f. There is no contrast here between magic and revelation.<sup>94</sup>

When Paul spoke of young widows he said they are ". . . not merely idle, but also gossips and busybodies, . . ."<sup>95</sup> Kelly said of this passage:

---

<sup>90</sup>Titus 1: 11.      <sup>91</sup>Kelly, loc. cit.      <sup>92</sup>II Tim. 3: 13.

<sup>93</sup>W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, c. 1957), p. 164.

<sup>94</sup>Gerhard Delling, "*ρόης*," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, Gerhard Kittel, editor, and G. W. Bromiley, trans. and ed. VI. 1. (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. G. Eerdmans Publishing Company, c. 1964), p. 738.

<sup>95</sup>I Tim. 5: 13.

The word translated busybodies is periergoi (lit. "overcareful", "taking needless trouble"), the neuter plural of which (perierga) is used in Acts xix. 19 and certain magical papyri as a euphemism for "spells" or "magical arts." He may therefore be expressing, in discreetly veiled language, the fear that irresponsible young widows, if encouraged to undertake house-to-house visiting, will resort to charms, incantations, and magical formulae in dealing, e.g., with sick people.<sup>96</sup>

As to Titus 1: 11 Kelly said, "This cryptic phrase recalls I Tim. v. 13 ("saying things they ought not"), where . . . scholars have suspected a veiled reference to magical arts."<sup>97</sup>

Irenaeus would identify early Gnostics as those who practiced magic. Of Menander, the successor to Simon and also a Samaritan, Irenaeus said, and ". . . he, too, was a perfect adept in the practice of magic."<sup>98</sup> Basilides also is mentioned, of whom Irenaeus said:

He attaches no importance to [the question regarding] [sic] meats offered in sacrifice to idols, thinks them of no consequence, and makes use of them without any hesitation; he holds also the use of other things, and practices of every kind of lust, a matter of perfect indifference. These men, moreover, practice magic, and use images, incantations, invocations, and every other kind of curious arts.<sup>99</sup>

The Carpocratians also are said to have practiced magical arts and lived licentious lives.<sup>100</sup> They did this so as to avoid a re-incarnation in transmigration, for if they could engage

---

<sup>96</sup>Kelly, op. cit., p. 118.      <sup>97</sup>Ibid., p. 234.

<sup>98</sup>Irenaeus, Adversus Haereses, I. 23. 5, Roberts, p. 348.

<sup>99</sup>Ibid., I. 24. 5, p. 350.

<sup>100</sup>Ibid., I. 25. 4, p. 357.

in everything in this life, then they would not face another existence in sinful flesh.<sup>101</sup>

This libertinism is not so clear in the Gnostic treatises found at Chenoboskion. Doresse has written:

Nothing in the documents leads us to suppose that the Gnostics in question were addicted to licentious rites: one finds oneself almost disappointed at this, so freely had the heresiologists given us to understand that mysteries of that description were common practice in the principal sects!<sup>102</sup>

The difference between what the Church Fathers wrote and the Gnostics taught in their documents is difficult to understand.

It is possible that the Church Fathers used some who were not true to their doctrine of asceticism as examples and thus warned the Christians away from the heretics; but it is doubtful that these men would have misrepresented their opponents, especially since they are not the only ones who report the libertinism among the Gnostics. Plotinus, in Enneads 2. ix. 15 wrote:

We should, however, observe the effect produced in the souls of those who listen to the speeches of these men and who are persuaded to have contempt for the world and what it contains. . . . It [their doctrine] refuses respect to the laws established here below and the virtues which has been honored by all centuries. It ridicules rational self-control. . . , it destroys temperance and

---

<sup>101</sup> Ibid., See above on this same idea in this section.

<sup>102</sup> Jean Doresse, Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics (New York: Viking Press, 1960), p. 251.

debt to any of the angelic powers of the world. If one does render his due to every angelic power, he is free to return above.<sup>106</sup> There were then two motives possible for a Gnostic to be immoral; one was to defy the inferior Creator-God and the other was to give their due to each of the "world-creating" angels so no debt to them might hold one in this world below.

Myths and Genealogies. Not all commentators see Gnosticism as the only heresy that Paul faced. Some feel that there are two ingredients in one sect, or perhaps two heresies to be faced. This view comes about because of the distinct references to Jewish elements in the error. Scott felt that the reference to "teachers of the Law"<sup>107</sup> implied that the heretics at Ephesus were seeking to re-establish the Jewish law.<sup>108</sup> On the other hand Scott notes that the "myths and genealogies"<sup>109</sup> are considered by some to refer to the Gnostic systems ". . . with their fantastic theories of a disturbance in the heavenly world and consequent fall of spirit into matter."<sup>110</sup> It is of course conceivable that one heresy might combine both Gnostic and Jewish elements. In another place Scott has commented:

In the earlier phases of Christian gnosticism there was doubtless a tendency to combine Jewish practices

---

<sup>106</sup>Ibid.      <sup>107</sup>1 Tim. 1: 7.

<sup>108</sup>Scott, op. cit., p. 10.      <sup>109</sup>1 Tim. 1: 4.

<sup>110</sup>Scott, op. cit., p. 8.

and beliefs with borrowings from paganism, and this mingled type of doctrine would exist under many forms.<sup>111</sup>

References to "fables and genealogies" were seen by some to refer to the Valentinian system of aeons of the second century.<sup>112</sup> Tertullian adapted the words of I Timothy 1: 4 to the errors of the developed system of his day. He wrote:

When again he mentions "endless genealogies" one also recognizes Valentinus, in whose system a certain Aeon, whosoever he be, of a new name, and that not one only generates of his own grace Sense and Truth; and these in like manner produce of themselves Word and Life, while these again afterwards beget Man and the Church. From these primary eight ten other Aeons after them spring, and then the twelve others arise with their wonderful name to complete the mere story of the thirty Aeons.<sup>113</sup>

Of course the error Tertullian faced was similar, but he was facing an error too late to have been the very one Paul was refuting even though it were similar or perhaps a developed form of the same.

Concerning the heresy in the Pastorals Barrett has well said:

Colossians already bears witness to a combination of Judaism and gnosticism in a Christian heresy, and the writings of the Christian gnostics of a somewhat later time are full of fanciful interpretation of the Old Testament (the Law). Even the lists of emanations often reveal striking contacts with Old Testament terms.<sup>114</sup>

---

<sup>111</sup>Ibid.    <sup>112</sup>Kelley, op. cit., p. 11.

<sup>113</sup>Tertullian, de Praescriptone Haereticorum, XXXIII, (Vol. III of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, editors, Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1951), p. 259.

<sup>114</sup>Barrett, op. cit., pp. 40, 41.

Because of the tendency to synthesize religions in the ancient world, there is no real reason for seeking to find two distinct heresies in Crete and Ephesus.

Easton made a strong case for making the "endless genealogies" of 1 Timothy 1: 4 out as Gnostic. He said that the references to the heresy as Gnostic by Irenaeus ". . . in the first sentence of his Heresies. . ." should have removed all doubt as to their nature.<sup>115</sup> Easton also noted that the genealogies of Judaism did not ". . . endanger the Church's general harmony. . .", nor were they immoral.<sup>116</sup> "On the other hand gnosticism fulfills all the conditions absolutely."<sup>117</sup>

The Resurrection. The linking of the genealogies with Judaism within the Pastorals themselves makes a heresy with both Gnostic and Jewish elements a necessary conclusion. From all indications the heresy was a form of incipient Gnosticism which had Jewish undertones. With this conclusion the facts of the historical survey of contemporary beliefs in the resurrection agree. Within this heresy was a denial of the resurrection, for Paul told Timothy:

But avoid worldly and empty chatter, for it will lead to further ungodliness, and their talk will spread like gangrene, among whom are Hymenaeus and Philetus, men who

---

<sup>115</sup>Burton Scott Easton, The Pastoral Epistles (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1947), p. 112.

<sup>116</sup>Ibid.

<sup>117</sup>Ibid.



have gone astray from the truth saying that the resurrection has already taken place, and thus they upset the faith of some.<sup>118</sup>

To its cause attention is now directed.

There are several possible reasons that the resurrection was denied. One generally held view is illustrated by Lock's paraphrase of II Timothy 2: 17, 18. He wrote:

To that class [irreligious hairsplitters] belong Hymenaeus and Philetus, for they have entirely missed their aim about the truth, explaining away the literal resurrection and saying that Resurrection is only our past resurrection with Christ in Baptism, and thereby they are upsetting the faith of some.<sup>119</sup>

In this view their error consisted in viewing the resurrection ". . . not in an eschatological but in a moral or spiritual sense."<sup>120</sup>

Another idea of a "realized resurrection" was put forward by Menander. Irenaeus wrote of him:

He gives, too, as he affirms, by means of that magic which he teaches, knowledge to this effect, that one may overcome those very angels that made the world; for his disciples obtain the resurrection by being baptized into him, and can die no more, but remain in the possession of immortal youth.<sup>121</sup>

This shows that an early Gnostic system held with a "realized resurrection."<sup>122</sup>

---

<sup>118</sup>II Tim. 2: 16-18, NASV.      <sup>119</sup>Lock, op. cit., p. 97.

<sup>120</sup>C. K. Staudt, The Idea of the Resurrection in the Ante-Nicene Period (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1909), p. 47.

<sup>121</sup>Irenaeus, Adversus Haeresies, I. 23. 5, Roberts, p.348.

<sup>122</sup>Cf. Chapter II.

In an apocryphal New Testament book, Acts of Paul and Thecla another view is expressed:

And Demas and Hermogenes said: bring him before Castellius the governor as one that persuadeth the multitude with the new doctrine of the Christians; and so will he destroy him and thou shalt have thy wife Thecla. And we will teach thee of that resurrection which he asserteth, that it is already come to pass in the children which we have, and we rise again when we have come to the knowledge of the true God.<sup>123</sup>

Here are contained two distinct ways of viewing the resurrection; one like that of the Sadducees<sup>124</sup> and the other of the Gnostics who believed in resurrection at the time of being enlightened.<sup>125</sup> In a heresy with Gnostic and Jewish characteristics such a view is tempting as the one to be considered as the background for this error. Yet there is still another which better fits the Pastoral situation.

W. L. Lane points to a more likely source for the error in that the heretics seem to have held to an "over-realized eschatology." On I Timothy 4: 1-3 he wrote:

There is second-century evidence for other aberrations concerning resurrection which throw doubt on the validity of identifying earlier teaching by reference to one facet of later doctrine. What is needed is an interpretation of the passage which takes account of its immediate context and specifically of Paul's statement in

---

<sup>123</sup>M. R. James, (trans.) The Apocryphal New Testament (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924), p. 275.

<sup>124</sup>See Chapter II, p. 18.

<sup>125</sup>See Chapter II, p. 28.

iv. 8, distinguishing between the present age and the Age to come.<sup>126</sup>

To Lane, the source of their error lay in not distinguishing as Paul did between the present age and the future age. Their error lay in their belief that because of the resurrection of Christ ". . . the Christian community had been projected into the age to come, and that the conditions of life in that age were now in force."<sup>127</sup> The forbidding of marriage is logical on this basis, for the Lord did say: "For in the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are like angels in heaven."<sup>128</sup> Abstaining from foods as much as possible may have come from teaching such as Paul's words: "Food is for the stomach, and the stomach is for food; but God will do away with both of them"<sup>129</sup> Yet in this latter case it must be noted that the Gnostics did not succeed. Clement of Alexandria pointed to the Gnostics' inconsistency by saying:

If, as they say, they have already attained the state of resurrection, and on this account reject marriage let them neither eat nor drink. For the apostle says that in the resurrection the belly and food shall be destroyed. Why then do they hunger and thirst and suffer the weaknesses of the flesh and all the other needs which will

---

<sup>126</sup>W. L. Lane, "I Tim. iv. 1-3. An Early Instance of Over-Realized Eschatology?" New Testament Studies, II (January, 1965), 165.

<sup>127</sup>Ibid., pp. 165, 166.

<sup>128</sup>Matt. 22: 30.

<sup>129</sup>I Cor. 6: 13.

not affect the man who through Christ has attained to the hoped for resurrection?<sup>130</sup>

No doubt this was a telling argument in later times, but as Paul wrote the error was only developing.

Lane summarized this understanding of the underlying cause for the proscription of foods and marriage in the Pastoral Epistles by saying:

In short, it was not a failure to distinguish the spiritual resurrection experienced at baptism from the resurrection of the body which the apostle castigates in the context of I Tim. iv. 1-3, but rather the failure to distinguish the present times of refreshing, which the resurrection of Jesus had initiated, from the consummation to be inaugurated by the yet future resurrection. This failure accounts for their doctrine and provides an early instance of over-realized eschatology within the early church.<sup>131</sup>

The Epistle to Rheginus endorses the conclusion that the Gnostics held to a realized eschatology, for in a passage similar to II Timothy 2: 11ff. the author wrote:

But then as the Apostle  
said, we suffered  
with him, and we arose  
with him, and we went to heaven  
with him.<sup>132</sup>

Bultmann has noted the general reasoning which the Gnostics might have used which is substantially what has occurred in the situation to which the Pastorals were written.

---

<sup>130</sup>Clement of Alexandria, Stromateis, III. 30 in Alexandrian Christianity, Vol. II of the Library of Christian Classics (London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1954), p. 62.

<sup>131</sup>Lane, op. cit., p. 166.

<sup>132</sup>p. 45. 24-28.

For believers the cosmic triumph of Christ means emancipation from the demonic world-rulers, from sin, and especially from death; hence the declaration that "the resurrection has already occurred" (II Tim. 2: 18; . . .) is comprehensible. In this connection the Gnostic idea is frequently utilized that the Redeemer by his ascent has prepared the way through the spheres of the spirit powers into the heavenly world.<sup>133</sup>

### The Corinthian Heresy

Several passages in the First Corinthian Epistle reveal the purpose Paul had in writing the letter. He said: "For it has been reported to me by Chloe's people that there is quarreling among you, my brethren."<sup>134</sup> Later Paul wrote: "It is actually reported that there is immorality among you, and of a kind that is not found even among pagans; for a man is living with his father's wife."<sup>135</sup> Another purpose besides correcting the abuses he had heard of from others was to answer certain questions that the Corinthian Christians had asked: "Now concerning the matters about which you wrote"<sup>136</sup> precedes a section where Paul gives answers to certain questions.

Problems at Corinth. As the First Epistle is examined a number of problems are noticable. Here were divisions or schisms among brethren,<sup>137</sup> evidently due to the fact that the Corinthians were following teachers and priding themselves

---

<sup>133</sup>Rudolf Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, Vol. I (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951), p. 177.

<sup>134</sup>I Cor. 1: 11.      <sup>135</sup>I Cor. 5: 1.

<sup>136</sup>I Cor. 7: 1.      <sup>137</sup>I Cor. 1: 10.

in being of superior knowledge. Grave matters of moral deviations were noted<sup>138</sup> as well as a public display of division through the lawsuits among brethren.<sup>139</sup> An error also existed because of ascetic tendencies which implied the necessity of rejecting marriage.<sup>140</sup> The eating of foods offered to idols aroused questions.<sup>141</sup> Paul's authority was questioned by some.<sup>142</sup> The Corinthians were mistaken about how to conduct themselves in public worship<sup>143</sup> and seem not to have known how to use the blessings conferred upon them by God as was shown by their division over charismatic gifts.<sup>144</sup> Paul left the error concerning the resurrection until last; for certain ones at Corinth were saying "there is no resurrection."<sup>145</sup>

As chapter fifteen is considered, one sees that the resurrection of Christ was not denied, only that of the dead in general. Those who "had believed", i.e., Christians, were the ones guilty of this denial.<sup>146</sup> A key to what they denied is found in Paul's reasoning in chapter fifteen and what he understood of the effect of Christ's death as taught elsewhere.

---

<sup>138</sup>I Cor. 5: 1.      <sup>139</sup>I Cor. 6: 1.      <sup>140</sup>I Cor. 7.

<sup>141</sup>I Cor. 8 and 10.      <sup>142</sup>I Cor. 9.

<sup>143</sup>I Cor. 11-14.      <sup>144</sup>Especially I Cor. 12 and 14.

<sup>145</sup>I Cor. 15.      <sup>146</sup>I Cor. 15: 11.

Paul wrote Timothy saying that it is ". . . our Saviour Christ Jesus, who abolished death and brought life and immortality to light through the gospel."<sup>147</sup> Paul meant that ". . . Christ has revealed to men the nature of the risen life which can now be theirs."<sup>148</sup> Immortality characterizes this life, but immortality (Greek aptharsia) ". . . is regularly employed by Paul of the resurrection body (1 Cor. xv. 42; 50; 53; 54); it denotes for him something which God alone can give (Rom. ii. 7)."<sup>149</sup> What men, who accepted Christ's resurrection as found in the gospel preached to them, denied could not be the resurrection of the Lord but the resurrection of dead bodies.

Background of the Error. What background was responsible for this wrong thinking on the Corinthians' part? If the error was from Judaism, the most likely sect would be that of the Sadducees.<sup>150</sup> A large number of converts from Sadduceanism in Corinth seems unlikely because Corinth was far from Jerusalem where most of the Sadducees would live, and even where the Sadducees were numerous (as Judea) no large segment would likely have been converted. Josephus relates that ". . . the Sadducees are able to persuade none

---

<sup>147</sup> 1 Tim. 1: 10.

<sup>148</sup> Kelly, op. cit., p. 164.      <sup>149</sup> Ibid.

<sup>150</sup> The Pharisees and Essenes would find any denial of the resurrection repugnant. Cf. chapter II.



but the rich, and have not the populace obsequious to them, . . ."<sup>151</sup> Guignebert said of the Sadducees: "They were drawn from the Jerusalem aristocracy, the wealthy, and the priests and officers of the Temple, people of rank and importance."<sup>152</sup> It is unlikely that such would have lived in number far from Jerusalem and that of this number enough would have been converted to cause the concern Paul evidently felt because of the denial of the resurrection.

To some "popular"<sup>153</sup> or "decadent"<sup>154</sup> Epicureanism was the source of the heresy. It is true that the "dauntless Epicureans" sought, not after future life, but only ". . . to liberate man from the fear of death and to reconcile him to mortality."<sup>155</sup> Paul's use of "bad company corrupts good morals,"<sup>156</sup> a quotation from the Epicurean Menander's

---

<sup>151</sup>Josephus, Antiquities XIII. 10. 6. In The Life and Works of Flavius Josephus, William Whiston, Trans. (Philadelphia: The John C. Winston Co., 1957 ed.), p. 397.

<sup>152</sup>Charles Guignebert, The Jewish World in the Time of Jesus, S. H. Hooke, trans. (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubnes and Co., Ltd., 1939), p. 163.

<sup>153</sup>A. Robertson and A. Plummer, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1925), p. 347.

<sup>154</sup>Alford, Edwards, and Findlay are cited by M. E. Dahl, The Resurrection of the Body (Naperville, Illinois: Alec R. Allerson, Inc., 1962), p. 12 n. 4.

<sup>155</sup>Norman Wentworth Dewitt, St. Paul and Epicurus (Toronto: The Ryerson Press, 1954), p. 120.

<sup>156</sup>I Cor. 15: 33.

Thäls,<sup>157</sup> has added weight to the plausibility of this view. Of the possible Epicurean element in the passage Meyer has observed:

Nor is it more probable that the opponents had been Epicureans [than Sadducees] , for it is plain from vv. 32-34 that the Epicurean turn which they had taken was not the ground but the consequence of their denial of the resurrection; as, indeed, Epicureanism in general is such an antichristian element that, supposing it had been the source of the denial, Paul would certainly have entered upon a discussion of its principles, is so far as they were opposed to the faith in the resurrection.<sup>158</sup>

Evidence within the Corinthian correspondence points to incipient Gnosticism as a more likely source for the denial of the resurrection. In the section which follows such evidence will be presented both from First and Second Corinthians. The relationship of this heresy to that already treated in the Pastorals will be left for a later section.

Textual Evidence of the Heresy. The First Corinthian Epistle begins with reference to "eloquent wisdom" for which Paul had no use.<sup>159</sup> Paul was disturbed at the Corinthians' loyalty to preachers, and the importance they attached to the one who baptized them seems to imply that they had a high regard for the sacramental. As Hering observed:

---

<sup>157</sup>Jean Hering, The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians (London: Epworth Press, 1962), p. 172.

<sup>158</sup>H. A. W. Meyer, Critical and Exegetical Hand-book to the Corinthians (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, c. 1884), pp. 338, 339.

<sup>159</sup>I Cor. 1: 17; 2: 1, 5.

The argument of 1<sup>14</sup>-17 implies that many of the Corinthians believed there was a kind of mystical relationship between the baptizer and the baptized. Such a belief is not surprising because in many of the mystery religions the initiating individual was called the father of the initiate.<sup>160</sup>

This misconception could easily have existed among early Gnostics as it did in the system of Menander who taught that baptism provided his adherents an immediate resurrection.<sup>161</sup>

The phraseology of Paul in the second chapter is similar to that of the Gnostics when he speaks of "mature" men and those who are "spiritual" and "natural" men. In the use of "teleios", "psuchikos", and "pneumatikos" Paul may be alluding to terminology used by the Gnostics, but he does not use these terms in the same sense here. It is true that ". . . according to the gnostics, only one who had become a 'teleios' was saved."<sup>162</sup> Care must be exercised in argument from language similarities, but with other indications of incipient Gnosticism present, such notice adds weight to the consideration that the heretics were indeed Gnostic. Other indications do exist. On "teleios" as found in Philippians 3: 12-15 Koester remarked, that it was more than achievement of moral qualities, he said:

However, it is also insufficiently understood, if taken only as a non-moral religious quality. It is both, but it is more: the word designates the possession of

---

<sup>160</sup>Hering, op. cit., p. 7.

<sup>161</sup>Cf. below Chapter II, p. 28.

<sup>162</sup>Ibid., p. 26.

the qualities of salvation in their entirety, the arrival of heaven itself.<sup>163</sup>

Paul said: "Yet among the mature we do impart wisdom, although it is not a wisdom of this age or of the rulers of this age, who are doomed to pass away."<sup>164</sup> It could easily have been the case that his opponents claimed to have "knowledge" or "wisdom" which made them "mature" in the sense defined by Koester, and Paul was here refuting that claim.

An important passage in defining the nature of the heresy at Corinth occurs in chapter four.<sup>165</sup> A reference is made to "things which are written" which implies that these men held the Old Testament writings in respect and thus may have been from a background of Judaism.<sup>166</sup> In that same passage another word occurs which well describes these heretics, this word being translated "puffed up"<sup>167</sup> or "arrogant".<sup>168</sup> Of the term, which described those who were judging the Apostle Paul, Hering wrote:

The term "phusiousthe" ("phusioumai"="be puffed up") taken up later perhaps alludes already to arrogant gnostics who scorn other Christians, and against the false wisdom of whom true wisdom has already been ranged.<sup>169</sup>

---

<sup>163</sup>Helmut Koester, "The Purpose of the Polemic of a Pauline Fragment," New Testament Studies, 8 (July, 1962) 322.

<sup>164</sup>I Cor. 2: 6.

<sup>165</sup>I Cor. 4: 6.

<sup>166</sup>I Cor. 4: 6.

<sup>167</sup>R. S. V.

<sup>168</sup>N. A. S. V. and R. S. V.

<sup>169</sup>Hering, op. cit., p. 28.

Their desperate circumstance is shown by their attitude of arrogance even when faced with such shame as the evil of a son living with his step-mother.<sup>170</sup> Paul located the source of their sinful attitude when he wrote, "'Knowledge' puffs up, but love builds up."<sup>171</sup> From Paul's challenge in the close of chapter four it appears that their vaunted "knowledge" made them think they were superior to the Apostle.<sup>172</sup>

Paul began his answer to them by asking, "for who regards you as superior?"<sup>173</sup> They were boasting over a gift, and Paul ridiculed them with scathing irony for their pride. He said, "Already you are filled! Already you have become rich! Without us you have become kings! And would that you did reign, so that we might share the rule with you!"<sup>174</sup> Their claim was to already having attained what the Apostles and others still sought. First Paul said ". . . ironically . . . you already have all you would wish i.e., you think you already have all the spiritual food you need I Cor. 4: 8. . . ." <sup>175</sup> The Apostle's bitter irony is brought out even more by the last part of his statement, with his wishful statement, "And would that you did reign, so we might share the rule with you." Sunbasileuo means:

---

<sup>170</sup>I Cor. 5: 2.      <sup>171</sup>I Cor. 8: 1.      <sup>172</sup>I Cor. 4: 18, 19.

<sup>173</sup>v. 7, N.A. S. V.      <sup>174</sup>I Cor. 4: 8.

<sup>175</sup>W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, c. 1957), p. 445.

. . . rule (as king) with someone fig. of the eschatological situation when the Christians are to share the kingship w. their royal Lord 2 Ti 2: 12; Pol 5: 2. Paul ironically states that the Corinthians have achieved kingship; he wishes they had achieved it because then he would be reigning with them; actually he was still leading a miserable life (cf. vs. 9) I Cor. 4: 8.<sup>176</sup>

In a contrast of three vigorous antitheses Paul makes the ridiculous situation clear:

The Apostles

"fools"  
"weak"  
"despised"

The Arrogant Ones

"wise"  
"strong"  
"honored"<sup>177</sup>

Hering aptly observed: "What gives these their pungency is the fact that the first term of each . . . expresses a cruel truth, while the second term . . . only expresses an illusion."<sup>178</sup> Glen noted the Apostle's integrity of ministry and the opposite quality in his opponents and then sought to define the cause:

In contrast to such integrity it would seem that the corruption of spiritual success which, according to Paul's satire (Ch. 4: 8), motivated the Corinthian church, or a significant portion of its membership, derived from a certain absolutizing of the present. For this reason it would be inconsistent with the eschatological outlook that characterized his ministry. [His opponents] . . . had arrived at the goal of destiny, so to speak. They had found in the present a substitute for what Paul and his fellow apostles had anticipated only at the end, in the resurrection of the dead.<sup>179</sup>

<sup>176</sup> Ibid., p. 785.      <sup>177</sup> I Cor. 4: 10.

<sup>178</sup> Hering, op. cit., p. 30.

<sup>179</sup> J. Stanley Glen, Pastoral Problems in First Corinthians (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1964), pp. 70, 71.

R. M. Grant also sees the cause of the problem as arising from a concept of "realized eschatology." He wrote:

But why do they believe that they have reached the exalted status which they were claiming to have attained? The answer seems to be hinted at in what Paul says of their claims. . . . The idea of being filled and of receiving a kingdom is expressed in the Sermon on the Mount, while that of being rich is implied in various parts of the teaching of Jesus. It would appear that the Corinthians had misunderstood the Christian eschatological message (cf. II Thess. 2.2; II Tim. 2: 17), believing that the eschatology had been "realized". The kingdom had already arrived.<sup>180</sup>

Grant also noted that these errorists misunderstood the Lord and the suffering of the Apostles. He said: "In other words, for them Jesus was a redeemer-revealer who made them aware of their own nature as 'spiritual'."<sup>181</sup> Grant called these heretics Gnostics because he saw a similarity between their system and a later ". . . real Gnostic system in which notions like theirs are found."<sup>182</sup> The system he refers to is that mentioned in Clement of Alexandria's Stromateis. Clement gave a description of ". . . the doctrines of the adherents of Prodicus, who falsely entitle themselves gnostics, asserting that they are by nature sons of the first God."<sup>183</sup> He gave a further description which makes his opponents similar to those met by Paul in Corinth. "To a king, they say,

---

<sup>180</sup>R. M. Grant, A Historical Introduction to the New Testament (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1963), p. 204.

<sup>181</sup>Ibid.      <sup>182</sup>Ibid., p. 205.

<sup>183</sup>Clement of Alexandria, op. cit., p. 54.



there is no law prescribed. . . . And even what they can do, they do not like kings, but like cringing slaves."<sup>184</sup> Clement has reference to their immoral tendencies which they claimed they had a right to practice. Of this Grant said:

Clearly their eschatology was "realized", for they called promiscuous intercourse a "mystical union" and claimed that it "lifts them up into the kingdom of God."<sup>185</sup>

Paul turned to matters of morality in chapters five through seven of First Corinthians. Their insensitivity to shame has already been mentioned in the case of the man who had his father's wife. Chapter six shows that sexual license was taken by some outside marriage, and chapter seven shows that some also were rejecting marriage. These apparently conflicting attitudes and actions can be understood if the basis for their practices lay in a "realized eschatology" such as that to which the heretics of the Pastorals held. Projection into the future age freed them from the need to marry, and it also gave the "spiritual" license to practice immorality.

In chapter six certain ones at Corinth are revealed as those who were using the formula "all things are lawful for me" in an unlawful way.<sup>186</sup> Paul had made foods a matter of indifference because God will destroy both the stomach and food. Craig said that Paul did not introduce the subject of

---

<sup>184</sup>Ibid.

<sup>185</sup>Grant, loc. cit.

<sup>186</sup>I Cor. 6: 12.

food--

. . . because Jewish dietary regulations were the subject of controversy. Rather, Gnostic libertines had used the agreement of the fact that food did not raise a moral issue to support their contention that sexual conduct also had no moral significance.<sup>187</sup>

Concerning this point Glen said:

The decisive consideration for Paul is the eschatological destiny of the personal. Since sex is intimately bound up with the personal, sex and eschatology are bound up together. This, in effect, is what the Corinthian libertines and their modern counterparts deny by their equation of sex with hunger.<sup>188</sup>

Hering would note Paul's emphasis of the ". . . Christian view of the Eucharist."<sup>189</sup> As Cullmann spoke of the immorality Paul mentioned in I Corinthians 6, he wrote:

It is impossible at the same time to be one body with a harlot and with Christ. The two unions are mutually exclusive.

This is solely because Paul conceives of membership of the Church as a physical relationship.<sup>190</sup>

With a temple of Aphrodite at Corinth the Christians there might well be tempted by the temple prostitutes, especially if they had the arrogant air mentioned earlier.<sup>191</sup> When they thus erred it was a double fall, for they not only

---

<sup>187</sup>C. T. Craig, The First Epistle to the Corinthians in the Interpreter's Bible (New York: Abingdon Press, 1953), X, 73.

<sup>188</sup>Glen, op. cit., p. 89.      <sup>189</sup>Hering, op. cit., p. 44.

<sup>190</sup>Oscar Cullmann, "The Proleptic Deliverance of the Body According to the New Testament," The Early Church (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1956), p. 172.

<sup>191</sup>Glen, op. cit., p. 86.

committed immorality but also engaged in what was at Corinth an act of worship to Aphrodite. Whiteley pointed out: "A temple prostitute, for example one attached to the temple of Venus at Corinth, was supposed to put her 'client' into touch with the goddess."<sup>192</sup>

It may not at first be clear how these heretics could indulge in immorality on one hand and forbid marriage on the other. Evidently there were two groups with views at variance concerning the Gnostic's use of the world. As Hering has noted:

One objection may even so have been raised, on this occasion by ascetic gnostics. If fleshly communion with a "porne"="harlot" breaks the union with Christ, why is the same not true of the fleshly communion in marriage? The reply will be given by implication in Chapter 7.<sup>193</sup>

Thus it was that the ascetic Gnostic would reject marriage for either one of two reasons; his world view of matter as being evil and the other possibility, that he was already raised. The libertine Gnostic saw sexual matters as indifferent to him, but would have rejected marriage as a part of the aeon which he had just left in his "spiritual resurrection."

Paul again returned to the matter of foods in I Corinthians 8: 1-6. In this case the foods in question have been offered to idols. On Paul's reasoning in this text

---

<sup>192</sup>D. E. H. Whiteley, The Theology of St. Paul (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964), p.215.

<sup>193</sup>Hering, op. cit., p. 45.

Hering wrote:

But why does the thought of the Apostle, instead of reaching out at once to the question of "eidolothuta", occupy itself with a digression about gnosis? Apparently because those who were "strong" at Corinth, "the gnostics" we have already encountered in 52, boasted that they had a superior knowledge which dispensed them from all scruples in this matter. The Apostle takes up their catch-phrase ["All of us have knowledge," v. 1] in order to let them understand, first of all, that they are not the only ones to "have knowledge." "We also ourselves have it."<sup>194</sup>

Here again their vaunted liberty--"All things are lawful for me"--due to superior knowledge caused the error. Hering's further comment on this passage shows the Gnostic bent of Paul's opponents.

To return to 82, commentators have not sufficiently attended to the deliberate opposition between the perfect "egnokenai" and the aorist "egno." This aorist is inceptive (or ingressive): "You who claim to be already in possession of complete gnosis" [this is the force of the perfect "egnokenai"] [sic], you are not even at the beginning of true knowledge.<sup>195</sup>

C. K. Barrett analyzed Paul's use of "gnosis" and gave this summary:

Paul uses the word gnosis far more frequently than any other New Testament writer: twenty-one times (including once in Colossians), against eight times in the rest of the New Testament (including once in Ephesians, once in the Pastorals, and three times in II Peter). Of Paul's use of gnosis sixteen fall in I and II Corinthians, and of these five are in I Cor. viii. If figures can prove anything, these figures show that primarily in the Corinthian situation the idea of gnosis developed, and that the gnosis was much, though not exclusively, concerned with the problem of eidolothuta. The word gnosis does not recur in I Cor. x. but the idea makes a veiled

---

<sup>194</sup> Ibid., p. 67.

<sup>195</sup> Ibid.

appearance in x.15 where Paul appeals to the phronimoi. The word occurs again at I Cor. iv. 10; II Cor. xi.19, and I have little doubt that it refers to the Corinthian gnostics.<sup>196</sup>

Barrett and Hering rightly give emphasis to Paul's use of "gnosis" in these passages, and that usage implies that his opponents were indeed Gnostics.

In I Corinthians 10: 1-12 Paul's use of the baptism and communion in eating and drinking of ancient Israel implies that his opponents held these sacraments in high respect. Paul expected his warning from that people's fall to have an effect upon his auditors, and he tried to show that their participation in these rites did not free them from the duty of being moral. He expected his reasoning to have effect, and such reasoning would have effect only if a great respect were given to the sacraments by these persons of "knowledge." As Glen said: "As indicated in chapter 10: 1-12, their conception of freedom was complicated by a sacramentalism they probably considered supplementary to their religious experience (knowledge)."<sup>197</sup>

When Paul pointed these men to the proper observance of the Lord's Supper, he said he was addressing them as "wise men."<sup>198</sup> He had no new group in mind for he returned

---

<sup>196</sup>C. K. Barrett, "Things Sacrificed to Idols," New Testament Studies, 11 (January, 1965), 150, 151. (Greek words Anglicized. KJW)

<sup>197</sup>Glen, op. cit., p. 112.      <sup>198</sup>I Cor. 10: 15.

to the formula "All things are lawful" which they evidently echoed.<sup>199</sup>

Chapter twelve deals with spiritual gifts. A terrible error is recorded here, for some, evidently while claiming to be inspired by the Holy Spirit, cried, "Jesus is accursed" (Anathema).<sup>200</sup> This is not what a Jew might say from the part of the Law which said one hung on a tree was accursed. (epikartartos)<sup>201</sup> The ones saying this are not relying on knowledge of the Old Testament, but they are supposedly getting their message by a revelation of the Spirit. Again it must be noted that to say "anathema Iesus" is different from epikartartos Jesus.<sup>202</sup> These two facts seem to show that other than Jews were those in error. Another fact to note is that the name Jesus is used. A docetic Gnostic might say this, for he considered the earthly Jesus lost and the heavenly Christ saved.<sup>203</sup>

In chapter thirteen Paul again wrote about "knowledge." Bultmann's comment was: "Gnostic piety is surpassed by Christian love and eschatological faith; gnosis is not full

---

<sup>199</sup>I Cor. 10: 23.      <sup>200</sup>I Cor. 12: 3.

<sup>201</sup>Deut. 21: 23; Gal. 3: 13.

<sup>202</sup>Cf. Greek of I Cor. 12: 3; Gal. 3: 10, 13.

<sup>203</sup>The Gnostic view of a sarchic Jesus and an indwelling heavenly Christ is presented in Bertil Gärtner, The Theology of the Gospel of Thomas (London: Collins, 1961), pp. 142, 143.; On Cerinthus' view see Irenaeus, Adversus Haereses, I. 26, I., Roberts, I. 352.

intimacy with God; that must wait until we have passed beyond earthly life."<sup>204</sup>

I Corinthians 15. These heretics at Corinth faced difficulty when they considered the possibility of a body rising from the dead. Bultmann thought Paul was facing Gnostics here, and he wrote:

I Cor. 15, early as that is, is already a great polemic against the gnosticizing party in Corinth which declares, "there is no resurrection of the dead." Paul one must admit, misunderstands his opponents in attributing to them the view that with death everything is over (I Cor. 15: 19, 32). That, of course, was not their view, as the custom of vicarious baptism (15: 29) by itself suffices to show; they were only contending against the realistic teaching of the resurrection as contained in the Jewish and primitive-Christian tradition. This view could also take the form of saying: "the resurrection has already occurred", i.e. the resurrection doctrine could be spiritualized (II Tim. 2: 18; but cf. also Jn. 5: 24f. and Eph 5: 14).<sup>205</sup>

No doubt Bultmann is correct in seeing the problem as one which concerns the heretics attitude toward a future bodily resurrection, but it is doubtful that Paul can be shown to have misunderstood his adversaries. J. M. Robinson saw a similar reason for the denial of the resurrection in I Corinthians 15. He wrote:

Julius Schniewind showed that those who deny the resurrection in I Corinthians are not rationalists who

---

<sup>204</sup>Rudolf Bultmann, "Gnosis," Kittel's Bible Key Words, II (New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1958), p. 43.

<sup>205</sup>Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, I, 169.



cannot believe in bodily resurrection on the grounds that their spiritual ascension has already been effected at baptism; that is, I Corinthians 15: 12, "there is no resurrection of the dead," is to be understood as an inference from the position attacked in II Timothy 2: 18, where some heretics maintain "the resurrection has already taken place."<sup>206</sup>

Perhaps the Corinthians believed as the Pastoral heretics did, not especially that their baptism projected them into the future, but that Christ's resurrection has projected them into the future aeon. H. W. Bartsch's comments on I Corinthians 15: 3-11 are reviewed by J. J. Collins when he said:

Apparently the Corinthians believed that with the appearance of the risen Lord a new physical existence had become actual for His followers. There was among many a belief that the parousia began with Easter. Against this view Paul cites the whole of tradition. It is not the apparitions of a heavenly being that have inaugurated the new existence. It is the rising of one who died and was buried that has given the hope for the new existence which commences with the parousia. . . . But the emphasis here [v. 6a] is, not on the fact that some are still living, but that some are already dead.<sup>207</sup>

He further noted:

Thus Paul by showing that even some of the witnesses to the Resurrection are in their graves, removes the foundation of the Corinthians' belief that the faithful through Christ's rising from the dead have obtained immortality.<sup>208</sup>

---

<sup>206</sup>J. M. Robinson, "Basic Shifts in German Theology," Interpretation, XVI (January, 1962), p. 81

<sup>207</sup>J. J. Collins, review of H. W. Bartsch, "Die Argumentation des Paulus in I Cor 15: 3-11," Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, 55 (3-4, 1964), 261-274, in New Testament Abstracts, 9 (Spring, 1965), pp. 366, 367.

<sup>208</sup>Ibid., p. 367.

The fifteenth chapter of I Corinthians also contains an allusion to "knowledge" which may be an indirect reference to Gnostics. In Hering's words:

If our interpretation be correct, the point once again concerns a group with immoral tendencies within the Church, probably the predecessors of the Gnostic libertines, well known to the heresiographers; and this supposition seems to be confirmed by the word "agnosia"="the opposite of knowledge," in 15<sup>34</sup> which might well be satirizing some false Gnostics.<sup>209</sup>

As Paul closed his dissertation on the resurrection he made reference to a new fact which was that all would not die, but that all Christians would be changed at the last trumpet.<sup>210</sup> He gives emphasis to the "coming of Christ" as the moment of this change and not that death brought the change.<sup>211</sup> Jeremias has ably shown that the expression "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God"<sup>212</sup> has reference to the changing of the living when they are clothed upon with immortality.<sup>213</sup>

A passage in Second Corinthians that deals with material that hints at Gnostic opponents is found in chapters

---

<sup>209</sup>Hering, op. cit., p. 173.

<sup>210</sup>I Cor. 15: 51.; cf. I Thess. 4: 13-18.

<sup>211</sup>That this occurs at the resurrection is shown by I Cor. 15: 54ff.; Rev. 20: 13-14.

<sup>212</sup>I Cor. 15: 50.

<sup>213</sup>J. Jeremias, "'Flesh and Blood Cannot Inherit the Kingdom of God', (I Cor. xv. 50)," New Testament Studies, II (1955-1956), 159.

four and five.<sup>214</sup> Chapter four makes reference to the suffering of the Apostles who have the precious gospel message in "earthen vessels."<sup>215</sup> Although the Apostle is abased, his converts claim to be exalted. Paul wrote, "So death is at work in us, but life in you."<sup>216</sup> This statement is reminiscent of the irony he addressed them with in First Corinthians.<sup>217</sup> Paul assured the Corinthians that they would not enjoy bliss without their teachers, for ". . . he who raised the Lord Jesus will bring us with you into his presence."<sup>218</sup>

Paul said he did not wish to be found "naked"<sup>219</sup> and meant something quite different from the idea of nakedness of the soul as a common idea in philosophy and Gnosticism. As Hughes notes:

The Pythagorean doctrine, that the body is the prison-house of the soul from which the soul of the wise longs to be liberated so that without restraint may soar upwards to be reunited to the supreme soul of the world, was characteristic not only of Platonism and of the contemporary Philonism but also of Gnosticism which, in its various forms, presented so serious a threat to the early church.<sup>220</sup>

Bultmann's view of this passage is that Paul is not concerned with a "somatic" existence but:

---

<sup>214</sup> II Cor. 4: 7-5: 10.      <sup>215</sup> II Cor. 4: 7.

<sup>216</sup> II Cor. 4: 12.      <sup>217</sup> Cf. I Cor. 4: 7ff.

<sup>218</sup> II Cor. 4: 14.      <sup>219</sup> II Cor. 5: 3.

<sup>220</sup> P. E. Hughes, Paul's Second Epistle to the Corinthians (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1962), p. 170.

Rather, the arguments of 5: 1ff. contain indirect polemic against a Gnosticism which teaches that the naked self soars aloft free of any body. The Christian does not desire, like such Gnostics, to be "uncloathed" . . . ; he yearns for the heavenly garment, "for we will not be found naked when we have divested ourselves (of our present physical body)" . . . .<sup>221</sup>

Logion 21a of the Gospel of Thomas is one good example of this Gnostic teaching:

Mary said to Jesus:

"Who are your disciples like?"

He said:

"They are like little children, living in a field which is not theirs.

When the owners of the field come, they say,

'Leave our field to us.'

They strip themselves before them

That they might leave it to them and give them back their field."<sup>222</sup>

Gartner understands this logion to refer to the death of the "spiritual ones" or Gnostics.<sup>223</sup> The "owners" of the "field" are the powers in the world, and at death, the Gnostics strip themselves of their bodies, which actually belong to these powers.<sup>224</sup> "According to a common Gnostic idea the soul of man," Gartner said, "is naked after death, and must tread the difficult path up to the heavenly world in constant exposure to the attacks of the evil powers."<sup>225</sup>

In II Corinthians 5: 4, Paul is not dealing with "nakedness" in death. Nakedness is here, as in Judaism, an image

<sup>221</sup>Bultmann, op. cit., p. 202.

<sup>222</sup>Bertil Gärtner, The Theology of the Gospel of Thomas (London: Collins, 1961), p. 176.

<sup>223</sup>Ibid., p. 184.

<sup>224</sup>Ibid., p. 185.

<sup>225</sup>Ibid.

expressing the condition in the resurrection of the dead man's soul who has been unfaithful.<sup>226</sup> The Lord's parousia is in Paul's mind, for he has a concept somewhat as that expressed by: "Lo, I am coming like a thief! Blessed is he who is awake, keeping his garments that he may not go naked and be seen exposed!"<sup>227</sup>

Paul's concept, according to Ellis,

. . . cannot be understood in terms of gnostic or other anthropological dualism; for Paul posits neither a division of the self nor an escape from materiality and death but a "changed" . . . psychosomatic organism which envelops and pervades the whole personality and finds its fulfillment in the deliverance of the whole man at the resurrection.<sup>228</sup>

Ellis further observed, and correctly so, on Paul's usage of "naked,"

Although Paul (it is thought) derived the expression and the dualism, from the Greek world, he has modified it in the light of his Hebrew background; from Plato and Philo the "nakedness" of disembodiment was the goal of life; for Paul it is patently undesirable, and his use of the term actually was a polemic against Gnostics in Corinth who depreciated material existence. [emphasis mine, KJW] <sup>229</sup>

When might one be found naked? Ellis answers:

It is not at death but at the parousia that those without the wedding garment (Matt. xxii.11), the spiritual body (I Cor. xv. 44, 53f.), the heavenly house (II Cor. v.1f.)

---

<sup>226</sup> Ibid.      <sup>227</sup> Rev. 16: 15.

<sup>228</sup> E. E. Ellis, "II Corinthians V. 1-10 in Pauline Eschatology," New Testament Studies, 6 (April, 1960), 218, 219.

<sup>229</sup> Ibid., p. 219.

to put on will be discovered stripped and naked (II Cor. v. 3f.).<sup>230</sup>

Paul's statement that "we have this treasure in earthen vessels"<sup>231</sup> is quite similar to the thought expressed by the Gnostics that such a precious thing as the soul would be found in a despised body.<sup>232</sup> In the Gospel of Truth the figure of "jars" or "vessels" representing men occurs. One text reads:

26:5 . . . when came into the midst  
the Word who is  
in the heart of those who speak it--  
it was not a mere sound, but  
it became a soma--a great  
26:10 disturbance occurred within  
the jars, because some were  
emptied, others were filled,  
because < > some were supplied,  
others were overturned,  
26:15 some were purified, some also  
were divided (into pieces). . . .<sup>233</sup>

When the error of Hymenaeus and Philetus had been discussed Paul used the imagery of "vessels" to explain that one might purge himself of sin and become a vessel of honor unto God.<sup>234</sup> In those passages where Paul uses this word (i.e., vessel) in correcting errorists<sup>235</sup> he may have been adapting his language

---

<sup>230</sup> Ibid., p. 221.      <sup>231</sup> II Cor. 4: 7.

<sup>232</sup> Gospel of Philip, Logion 22.

<sup>233</sup> Gospel of Truth, 26:4-26:15, in Kendrick Grobel, The Gospel of Truth (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1960), pp. 102, 104.

<sup>234</sup> II Tim. 2: 20ff.

<sup>235</sup> II Cor. 4: 7; II Tim. 2: 20ff.

to theirs. In doing so it seems likely that such usage had a polemical basis.

Relationship Between the Heresies in the Pastoral and Corinthian Epistles.

Consideration of the characteristics of the heresies as seen in both the Pastoral and Corinthian Epistles indicate that there were a number of likenesses between them. A superior "knowledge" is involved in both which does not build up as does love. Questions concerning foods and marriage are characteristics of both. Each heresy has a Jewish element in it. Both heresies err concerning the resurrection, and evidently they err for the same reason. The two errors are actually one when the resurrection is considered, for both groups have a misconception as to when they are resurrected. The Pastoral heretics say they are already resurrected, while the Corinthian heretics say no dead bodies are raised since they already have the only resurrection which can be experienced.

Evidence points to the two heresies being one in source as they clearly are in results. Incipient Gnosticism with its world view oriented in cosmic dualism caused these men to over-emphasize Paul's eschatological teachings so as to exclude any future aspects such as a resurrection of the flesh at the coming of Christ. Their revulsion to the body of flesh made them inclined to reject a bodily resurrection.



## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This thesis has been written to seek the identity of the sect or heretical group to which errorists concerning the resurrection of the dead at Corinth and noted in the Pastoral Epistles belonged. The views expressed as recorded in I Corinthians 15: 12 and II Timothy 2: 17, 18, are very similar to what would be expected from heretics who "spiritualized the resurrection." The second century controversy between the Church Fathers and Gnostic heretics focuses attention upon Gnosticism as a possible source for the error. Newly published original documents of the Gnostics make this study appropriate for this time. Were the heretics Gnostic? This is the question this thesis seeks to answer.

In a survey of beliefs concerning the life of man after death it was found that in Judaism as pictured in the Old Testament a belief in a resurrection of the dead existed. Heterodox Judaism of a later period reveals in its literature that it was divided over the question of man being resurrected or if he only possessed immortality of the soul.

Ancient views of future life of the Greeks and Romans as recorded in Homer and Virgil see man existing after death in a "Hadean" world similar to the "Sheol" of the Old Testament.

The mystery religions ushered in a hope of survival for Rome and Greece, and one mystery, that of Mithra, offered its initiates a resurrection in the future. Greek philosophers would have nothing to do with ideas of resurrection although some of them held with a future existence for man. The body was considered a burden or a prison to be escaped from.

Philo of Alexandria followed Plato to a degree, and he spiritualized certain Biblical passages so as to teach only an immortality in place of a Resurrection.

The Pharisees and Essenes believed in a future resurrection of the body, but the Sadducees and some of the Samaritans rejected any resurrection.

Gnostic doctrine speaks of a resurrection, but this does not mean a resurrection of the body as held by certain of the Jews and the Christians. The Gnostic view of material creation made a bodily resurrection repulsive to him. Even the resurrection of Jesus was rejected. Yet the Gnostic did speak of a resurrection.

The New Testament doctrine of the resurrection is centered upon the fact of the raising of the Lord Jesus Christ from the grave. All men, good or evil will someday arise from the "tombs." This event will be unexpected. Paul wrote Thessalonica so those Christians would not err in their view of Christ's return. At Corinth Paul answered the denial of the resurrection in detail. God raised his

Son, one innocent of sin, who became the source of eternal life for all believers. Christians become a part of the new humanity as found in union with Christ, and they are assured of their salvation and future resurrection by the indwelling Holy Spirit who is an "earnest" to them of the future glory. The resurrected life is to be one in a body spiritually controlled. Certain aspects of the future life are already realized in the life of a Christian.

The Pastoral heresy involved speculation concerning "myths and genealogies" which led men into error. A Jewish tinge was seen in the heresy similar to that in the heresy at Colossae. Proscriptions on marriage and foods co-existed with libertine tendencies toward immorality as seen in the heretical teachers' action with "silly women." The heresy also held that the "resurrection was past already."

The source of this error is clearly an early form of Gnosticism as can be seen in the above doctrines and in the emphasis Paul gives certain facts. The things which Paul emphasizes which would be answers to Gnostic errors are: God's creative activity and the Unity of the Godhead; the seeking of God to save all men and not just one class of predestined "pneumatics." The emphasis that salvation rests on faith and the one reference in an adverse way to "so-called knowledge." The Lord's essential manhood is given due emphasis. All these factors combined make the error most logically Gnostic, especially when the group best fitted

to this error as seen in the historical survey of chapter II is the Gnostic.

The Pastoral heresy seems to be one heresy with both Jewish and Gnostic ingredients. This heresy is the underlying cause for the "over-realized" eschatology. A Gnostic might speak of resurrection, but his cosmological dualism of good-spirit and evil-matter would cause him to see only a spiritual resurrection possible. Christ's resurrection was evidently seen as projecting all those "in Him" into the aeon to come, and this theory makes the proscriptions logical. Paul's reference in I Timothy 4: 8 to "this age and the Age to come" are understandable in this light, for there he objects to their theory. Finally it is observed that the Epistle to Rheginus contains a passage much like a part of the Pastorals which considers the resurrection as realized.

At Corinth Paul faced a number of questions which had been asked him and had to correct a number of malpractices among the Christians there. A survey of the errors in the letter, and the view expressed toward the resurrection, seems to best fit Gnosticism according to the facts learned in the historical survey of contemporary views of the resurrection as noticed in Chapter II. Here at Corinth many of the same errors existed as were noticed in the Pastoral Epistles as well. Divisions were seen because of bigoted teachers, or

at least teachers who were "puffed" up claiming to be mature and wise. Immorality also existed alongside asceticism. The Corinthians did not conduct themselves properly in public worship services. Many of the errors noted may be traced to a lack of concern by men proud of their knowledge. The resurrection of the dead was flatly denied here.

Paul's references as he answered this problem draws a picture of heresy which seems best fitted by an incipient Gnosticism similar to that found in the Pastorals. Here were persons who viewed the sacramental aspects of Christianity highly and had little love for their brethren. Menander's followers would have also regarded baptism highly. The language Paul uses indicates that his opponents are Gnostics, for he speaks of "natural" and "spiritual" men. He gives emphasis to "mature" men, and Paul addresses "wise" men.

Notice is taken of arrogant claims among his converts, those who claim to "Already" being kings, rich and full, while Paul and the other teachers are suffering. Clement of Alexandria took notice of proud Gnostics who claimed to already have the Christian's kingdom. Their claims to a realized eschatology was ridiculed by Paul in both I and II Corinthians.

In the matter of morals there was asceticism as to marriage and indulgence in immorality and idolatry. In chapter eight the ones in error concerning foods proudly claimed to having attained to "knowledge." Emphasis is

119560  
LIBRARY

ABILENE CHRISTIAN COLLEGE  
ABILENE, TEXAS

given to "knowledge" in this correspondence. Two formulas stand out: "All things are lawful for me," and "All of us have knowledge." Paul refutes this independent, heartless arrogance through knowledge by a reference to the better way of Christian love.

Even while influenced by God the Spirit, peace could not reign among these "babes". Some actually said, "Jesus be cursed." This may well have been an expression of doceticism.

Throughout the epistles Paul reverts to a future eschatology as the basis for correcting their actions and sought to present them an example of suffering with Christ.

In chapter fifteen of the first letter Paul gave special emphasis to the future aspect of the rising, just as he did in the second letter, chapter five.

Second Corinthians has language which is similar to that of Gnosticism, especially as seen in Paul's use of "vessels" and "naked". In the Gospel of Thomas is one example of the concept of the "naked" rising of the spirit, and the Gospel of Truth makes reference to "jars" or "vessels." The latter word is found in the context where Hymenaeus and Philetus are mentioned in II Timothy, and thus to some degree ties the two heresies together with Gnosticism.

Do all these facts add up to Gnosticism at Corinth? It can hardly be denied that the errors could well rest upon an early form of Gnosticism. Language used and doctrines

noted fit the pattern. The relationship between this error and the one in the Pastorals is clear.

Both errors have a Jewish element. They also both have a conflicting morality with a prohibition of marriage. Both heresies emphasize knowledge and promote divisions. Both have elements which can be paralleled by Gnostic sources of later date. Both err concerning the resurrection, and apparently for the same reason.

The best conclusion concerning the heresies concerning the resurrection as noted in I Corinthian 15 and II Timothy 2 seems to be that they arise from an "over-realized eschatology" which has come about because of gnostic presuppositions held by the heretics. The incipient Gnosticism seen in both passages are very alike if not from the same source. The historical survey endorses this view as well as the evidence of the documents themselves and related material of a later period.



BIBLIOGRAPHY

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### A. PRIMARY SOURCES

- Charles, R. H. The Apocalypse of Baruch. New York: Macmillan Company, 1918.
- Clement of Alexandria. The Stromata. Vol. II of the Ante-Nicene Fathers. Edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. 12 vols. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1951.
- Hippolytus. Refutation of All Heresies. Vol. V. of the Ante-Nicene Fathers. Edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. 12 vols. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1951.
- Irenaeus. Adversus Haereses. Vol. I of the Ante-Nicene Fathers. Edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. 12 Vols. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1951.
- James, M. R. (trans.). The Apocryphal New Testament. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1924.
- Lewis, C. Day (trans.). The Aeneid of Virgil. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, 1953.
- Malinine, Michel, et al. De Resurrectione. Zurich: Rascher Verlag, 1963.
- Mead, G. R. S. Pistis Sophia. London: John M. Watkins, 1947.
- Rouse, W. H. D. (trans.). Homer: The Iliad. New York: New American Library of World Literature Inc., 1964.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Homer: The Odyssey. New York: New American Library of World Literature, Inc., 1963.
- Tertullian. Against Marcion. Vol. III of the Ante-Nicene Fathers. Edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. 12 vols. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1951.

- \_\_\_\_\_. Against Valentinus. Vol. III of the Ante-Nicene Fathers. Edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. 12 vols. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1951.
- \_\_\_\_\_. de Praescriptone Haereticorum. Vol. III of the Ante-Nicene Fathers. Edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. 12 vols. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1951.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Flesh of Christ. Vol. III of the Ante-Nicene Fathers. Edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. 12 Vols. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1951.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Treatise on the Soul. Vol. III of the Ante-Nicene Fathers. Edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. 12 vols. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1951.
- Whiston, William (trans.). The Life and Works of Flavius Josephus. Philadelphia: The John C. Winston Company, 1957 edition.

## B. SECONDARY SOURCES

### 1. BOOKS

- Albright, W. F. "Recent Discoveries in Palestine and the Gospel of St. John," The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology. Edited by W. D. Davies and D. Dauge. Cambridge: University Press, 1956.
- Andrews, H. T. An Introduction to the Apocryphal Books of the Old and New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1964.
- Armstrong, A. H. Plotinus. London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd, 1953.
- Arnold, Edward Vernon. Roman Stoicism. New York: The Humanities Press, 1958.
- Baab, Otto J. The Theology of the Old Testament, New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1949.
- Bailey, Cyril. Phases in the Religion of Ancient Rome. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1932.

- Bacon, Salo Wittmayer. A Social and Religious History of the Jews. 8 vols. New York: Columbia University Press, 1937.
- Bultmann Rudolf. Theology of the New Testament. 3 vols. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951.
- Burkitt, F. C. Church and Gnosis. Cambridge: University Press, 1932.
- Burrows, Millar. An Outline of Biblical Theology. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1946.
- Chafer, Lewis Sperry. Systematic Theology. 8 vols. Dallas, Texas: Dallas Seminary Press, 1947.
- Charles, R. H. The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913.
- Cross, F. L. (trans. and ed.). The Jung Codex. London: A. R. Mowbray and Co. Limited, 1955.
- Cullmann, Oscar. Immortality of the Soul or Resurrection of the Dead? London: The Epworth Press, 1958.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Early Church. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1956.
- Cumont, Franz. The Mysteries of Mithra. New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1956.
- Dahl, Murdoch E. The Resurrection of the Body. Naperville, Illinois: Alex R. Allerson, Inc., 1962.
- Davies, W. D. Paul and Rabbinic Judaism. London: S.P.C.K., 1948.
- De Witt, Morman Wentworth. Epicurus and His Philosophy. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1954.
- \_\_\_\_\_. St. Paul and Epicurus. Toronto: The Ryerson Press, 1954.
- Doresse, Jean. The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics. New York: Viking Press, 1960.
- Durant, Will. The Life of Greece. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1939.
- Findlay, A. F. Byways in Early Christian Literature. Edinburg: T. & T. Clark, 1923.

- Geden, A. S. Select Passages Illustrating Mithraism. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1925.
- Goodspeed, Edgar J. A History of Early Christian Literature. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942.
- Grant, Robert M. A Historical Introduction to the New Testament. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1963.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Gnosticism. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1961.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Gnosticism and Early Christianity. New York: Columbia University Press, 1959.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Secret Sayings of Jesus. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1960.
- Grobel, Kendrick. The Gospel of Truth. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1960.
- Guignebert, Charles. The Jewish World in the Time of Jesus. S. S. Hooke, (trans.). London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubnes and Company, Ltd., 1939.
- Guthrie, Donald. New Testament Introduction. Chicago: Inter-Varsity Press, 1961.
- Harnack, Adolph. History of Dogma. 7 vols. Trans. Neil Buchanan. London: Williams and Norgate, 1894.
- Hennecke, Edgar. New Testament Apocrypha, Volume I: Gospels and Related Writings. Edited by W. Schneemelcher and R. McL. Wilson. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1963.
- Hordern, William. A Layman's Guide to Protestant Theology. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1961.
- Jaspers, Karl and Rudolf Bultmann. Myth and Christianity. New York: The Noonday Press, 1958.
- Jonas, Hans. The Gnostic Religion. Boston: Beacon Press, 1958.
- Katz, Joseph. The Philosophy of Plotinus. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1950.
- Kelley, J. N. D. Early Christian Doctrines. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1960.
- Kennedy, Harry A. A. St. Paul's Conceptions of the Last Things. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1904.

- La Sor, William S. Amazing Dead Sea Scrolls and the Christian Faith. Chicago: The Moody Press, c. 1956.
- Legge, F. Forerunners and Rivals of Christianity. New York: Peter Smith, 1950.
- Macdonald, John. The Theology of the Samaritans. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1964.
- Moore, Clifford Herschel. Ancient Beliefs in the Immortality of the Soul. New York: Cooper Square Publishers, Inc., 1963.
- Moore, George Foot. Judaism. 3 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1950.
- Nock, Arthur Darby. Conversion. Oxford: University Press, 1963.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Early Gentile Christianity and Its Hellenistic Background. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1964.
- Oesterley, W. O. E. The Books of the Apocrypha. London: Robert Scott, 1914.
- Oulton, John Ernest and Henry Chadwick. Alexandrian Christianity. Vol II of the Library of Christian Classics. London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1954.
- Payne, J. Barton. The Theology of the Older Testament. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1962.
- Pistorius, Philippus Villiers. Plotinus and Neoplatonism. Cambridge: Bowes and Bowes, 1952.
- Puech, H. C. "The Jung Codex and Other Gnostic Documents from Nag Hammadi," The Jung Codex. F. L. Cross. (editor). London: A. R. Mowbray and Co., Limited, 1955.
- Quispel, Gillis. "The Jung Codex and Its Significance," The Jung Codex. F. L. Cross (editor). London: A. R. Mowbray and Co., Limited, 1955.
- Rabin, Chaim. Qumran Studies. Oxford: University Press, 1957.
- Robinson, John A. T. The Body. Chicago: Alex R. Allenson, Inc., 1952.
- Schep, J. A. The Nature of the Resurrection Body. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964.

- Schubert, Kurt. The Dead Sea Community. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1958.
- Simon, Uirick. Heaven in the Christian Tradition. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958.
- Staudt, Calvin Klopp. The Idea of the Resurrection in the Ante-Nicene Period. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1909.
- Vos, Geerhardus. The Pauline Eschatology. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1953.
- Whiteley, D. E. H. The Theology of St. Paul. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964.
- Whittaker, Thomas. The Neo-Platonists. Cambridge: University Press, 1928.
- Wilson, Robert McL. The Gnostic Problem. London: A. R. Mowbray and Co., Limited, 1958.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Gospel of Philip. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1962.
- Wolfson, Harry Austryn. Philo. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962.

## 2. COMMENTARIES

- Barclay, William. The Letters to the Philippians, Colossians and Thessalonians. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1959.
- Barrett, Charles Kingsley. The Gospel According to St. John. London: S.P.C.K., 1960.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Pastoral Epistles in the New English Bible. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963.
- Craig, C. T. and John Short. The First Epistle to the Corinthians. Vol. X of The Interpreter's Bible. 12 vols. New York: Abingdon Press, 1953.
- Easton, Burton Scott. The Pastoral Epistles. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1947.



- Gealey, Fred D. The First and Second Epistles to Timothy and the Epistle to Titus. Vol. XI of The Interpreter's Bible. 12 vols. New York: Abingdon Press, c. 1955.
- Glen, J. Stanley, Pastoral Problems in First Corinthians. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1964.
- Grosheide, F. W. Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1957.
- Guthrie, Donald. The Pastoral Epistles. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1957.
- Hendriksen, William. New Testament Commentary, Exposition of the Pastoral Epistles. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1957.
- Hering, Jean. The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians. London: The Epworth Press, 1962.
- Hughes, P. E. Paul's Second Epistle to the Corinthians. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1962.
- Kelley, J. N. D. A Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1963.
- Leaney, Alfred R. C. The Epistles to Timothy, Titus and Philemon. London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1960.
- Lenski, Richard C. H. The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians, to the Thessalonians, to Timothy, to Titus and to Philemon. Columbus, Ohio: Wartburg Press, 1937.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Interpretation of St. Paul's First and Second Epistle to the Corinthians. Columbus, Ohio: Wartburg Press, c. 1937.
- Lock, Walter. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles. International Critical Commentary. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1924.
- Meyer, H. A. W. Critical and Exegetical Hand-book to the Epistle to the Corinthians. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, c. 1884.
- Milligan, George. St. Paul's Epistle to the Thessalonians. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1953.

- Moffatt, James. The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, n. d.
- Morgan, G. Campbell. The Corinthian Letters of Paul. Westwood, New Jersey: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1946.
- Morris, Leon. The First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1959.
- Roberts, J. W. Letters to Timothy. Austin, Texas: R. B. Sweet Co., Inc., 1961.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Titus, Philemon and James. Austin, Texas: R. B. Sweet Co., Inc., 1963.
- Robertson, Archibald, and Alfred Plummer. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians, International Critical Commentary. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1911.
- Scott, E. F. The Pastoral Epistles. Vol. XIII of the Moffatt New Testament Commentary. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1947.

#### e. PERIODICALS

- Barrett, C. K. "Things Sacrificed to Idols," New Testament Studies, 11 (January, 1965), 138-153.
- Bartsch, H. -W. "Die Argumentation des Paulus in I Cor 15: 3-11." Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, 55 (3-4, 1964), 261-275. In review by J. J. Collins. New Testament Abstracts, 9 (Spring, 1965), 366-367.
- Chadwick, Henry. "Origen, Celsus, and the Resurrection of the Dead," The Harvard Theological Review, XLI (April, 1948), 83-102.
- de Catanzaro, C. J. "The Gospel According to Philip," The Journal of Theological Studies, XIII (April, 1962), 37-71.
- Ellis, E. Earle. "II Corinthians V. 1-10 in Pauline Eschatology," New Testament Studies, 6 (April, 1960), 211-224.
- Filson, Floyd V. "The Gnostic 'Gospel of Truth'," Biblical Archaeologist, XX (September, 1957), 76-78.

- Gold, V. R. "The Gnostic Library of Chenoboskion," The Biblical Archaeologist, XV (December, 1952), 70-88.
- Grant, Robert M. "The Mystery of Marriage in the Gospel of Philip," Vigiliae Christianae, XV (September, 1961), 129-140.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Resurrection of the Body," The Journal of Religion, XXVIII (April, 1948), 120-130; XXVIII (July 1948), 188-208.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Two Gnostic Gospels," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXIX (March, 1960), 1-11.
- Heller, James J. "The Resurrection of Man," Theology Today, XV (July, 1958), 217-229.
- Jeremias, Joachim. "'Flesh and Blood Cannot Inherit the Kingdom of God,' (1 Cor. XV. 50)," New Testament Studies, II (1955-1956), 151-159.
- Koester, Helmut. "The Purpose of the Polemic of a Pauline Fragment," New Testament Studies, 8 (July, 1962), 371-332.
- Lane, William L. "1 Tim. IV. 1-3. An Early Instance of Over-realized Eschatology?" New Testament Studies, II (January, 1965), 164-167.
- Malherbe, Abraham J. "Gnosis and Primitive Christianity: A Survey (I)," Restoration Quarterly, III (1959), 99-107.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Gnosis and Primitive Christianity: A Survey (II)," Restoration Quarterly, IV (1960), 16-29.
- Quispel, Gillis. "The Original Doctrine of Valentinus," Vigiliae Christianae, I (1947), 43-73.
- Reicke, Bo. "Traces of Gnosticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls," New Testament Studies, I (1954-1955), 137-141.
- Robinson, James M. "Basic Shifts in German Theology," Interpretation, XVI (April, 1962), 76-97.
- Robinson, William Childs. "The Resurrection," Interpretation, XVI (April, 1962), 177-180.
- Schoedel, W. R. "The Rediscovery of Gnosis," Interpretation, XVI (October, 1962), 387-401.
- Thiele, Gilbert A. "I Believe in the Resurrection," Concordia Theological Monthly, XXXIII (February, 1962), 91-95.

Van Unnik, W. C. "The Newly Discovered Gnostic 'Epistle to Theginos' on the Resurrection: I and II," The Journal of Ecclesiastical History, XV (October, 1964), 141-166.

Wilson, R. McL. "Gnostic Origins," Vigiliae Christianae, IX (1955), 193-211.

#### 4. DICTIONARIES, ENCYCLOPAEDIAS, LEXICONS AND WORD BOOKS

Arndt, W. F. and F. W. Gingrich, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, c. 1957.

Bultmann, Rudolf. "Gnosis," Gerhard Kittel's Bible Key Words, Vol. II. Edited by J. R. Coates. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1958.

Burnet, John. "Pythagorus and Pythagoreanism," Hastings's Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, X, 520-530. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1922.

Easton, B. S. "Resurrection," International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia, IV, 2562-2565. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1946.

Enslin, M. S. "Pistis Sophia," The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, III, 820. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962.

Johnson, George. Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, I, 650. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962.

Kittel, Gerhard (editor). Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. G. W. Bromley (trans.). Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, c. 1964.

Robertson, J. A. T. "Resurrection in the New Testament," The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, IV, 43-53. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962.

Smith, M. "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, The," The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, IV, 575-579. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962.

Zahn, T. "Irenaeus," The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, VI, 29. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1910.

## 5. UNPUBLISHED MATERIAL

Kramer, Paul Stevens. "The Sources of Primitive Gnosticism and Its Place in the History of Christian Thought." Unpublished dissertation, the University of Chicago, August, 1933.

## 6. TRANSLATIONS

New American Standard Version, New Testament. Washington, D. C.: Christianity Today, c. 1960.

Revised Standard Version. New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, c. 1952.

## APPENDIX A

### REVIEW OF Gnostic SOURCES

#### I. MATERIAL KNOWN PRIOR TO THE CHENOBOSKION DISCOVERY

The small number of original Gnostic texts extant prior to the Chenoboskion find testify to the success of the Church in its efforts at suppressing this system. A. F. Findlay has well said:

The Church took care, when she gained her hard-won victory over Gnosticism, that the obnoxious writings were destroyed. When she had beaten the enemy, she burned his camp.<sup>1</sup>

So well did the Church eliminate the writings of the heretics that besides a few fragmentary works, the chief source for the study of Gnosticism was the writings of the Church Fathers who opposed the Gnostic teachers. Three main codices and several fragments were all that remained prior to Chenoboskion.

Codex Askewianus. This manuscript is in codex form, having 178 leaves which are divided into 356 pages of quarto (8 3/4" by 6 1/2"). The heirs of D. A. Askew brought the manuscript to the British Museum in 1785.<sup>2</sup> "Of the five texts it contains, written in a Theban dialect of Coptic--in Sahidic--

---

<sup>1</sup>A. F. Findlay, Byways in Early Christian Literature (Edinburg: T. & T. Clark, 1923), pp. 117, 118.

<sup>2</sup>G. R. S. Mead, Pistis Sophia (London: John M. Watkins, 1947), p. xxi.

a first translation was published in 1851."<sup>3</sup> Underlying this 5th century Coptic text is an original Greek composition.<sup>4</sup> Of the four sections of Pistis Sophia, as this work is generally known, H. C. Puech observes:

The first three sections correspond to the three books of one and the same work, probably composed between 250 and 300: . . . On the other hand the fourth section (232:1-254:8), which has no title is in reality a distinct work, composed in the first half of the 3rd century and thus older than those which precede it.<sup>5</sup>

Although various dates have been assigned the manuscript, "All critics agree in regarding Egypt as the land of origin of the two writings of the Codex Askewianus."<sup>6</sup> Unanimity does not exist either concerning the author or his sect, but M. S. Enslin feels,

The author of this writing was apparently a Valentinian or Barbleo Gnostic of the Sethian type, of the sort evidenced by the MSS discovered in 1946 at Chenoboskion in Upper Egypt. . . .<sup>7</sup>

H. C. Puech supplies another possibility in the view that Schmidt supposed for a time, that the author was of the Severians.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup>Jean Doresse, The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics (New York: The Viking Press, 1960), p. 65.

<sup>4</sup>H. C. Puech, "Gnostic Gospels and Related Documents," New Testament Apocrypha, Edgar Hennecke, Wilhelm Schneemelcher, and R. McL. Wilson, editors (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1963), I, 252.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., pp. 250, 251.      <sup>6</sup>Ibid., p. 252.

<sup>7</sup>M. S. Enslin, "Pistis Sophia," The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible (New York: Abingdon Press, 1962), III, 820.

<sup>8</sup>Puech, loc. cit.



R. M. Grant's view is that Pistis Sophia sheds a good deal of light on Gnostic thought in decline.<sup>9</sup> Here is a picture ". . . of the vagaries of Gnostic speculation that was rife in the second century onward."<sup>10</sup> The work tells how Jesus dwelt among his disciples for eleven or twelve years after his resurrection and answered the questions that they asked him. Mary Magdalene takes a large part in the questioning, for "It has been reckoned that of the 46 questions here put to Jesus 39 fall to the lot of Mary Magdalene."<sup>11</sup> During the discourse material is covered which is found in other early writings. Enslin notes:

The writing contains five of the Odes of Solomon and many references to the two books of Jeu, which latter have been identified by Carl Schmidt with the Mystery of the Great Logos (λόγος κατὰ μυστήριον), now included in the fifth-century Oxford Codex Bezae Cantabrigiae.<sup>12</sup>

An interesting feature of the faith of these Gnostics was that they were "transmigrationists; transcorporation formed an integral part of their system."<sup>13</sup> The souls of both the good and evil might be reincarnated. The last section of the Pistis Sophia (Chapter 144ff.) recalls to mind Dante's Inferno, for certain sinful souls are given punishments described as to

---

<sup>9</sup>R. M. Grant, Gnosticism and Early Christianity (New York: Columbia University Press, 1959), p. 4.

<sup>10</sup>Edgar J. Goodspeed, A History of Early Christian Literature (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942), p. 59.

<sup>11</sup>Puech, op. cit., p. 257.

<sup>12</sup>Enslin, loc. cit.

<sup>13</sup>Mead, op. cit., p. xlv.

length and type. Some of these souls are given to drink the "cup of forgetfulness" and then are reincarnated. That the good soul might also be reincarnated is shown by the example of Elias' soul being given to John the Baptizer (Chapter 7).

Evidently these Gnostics found no problem in this matter of "transmigration" of souls because they looked for a "consummation of the Aeon" when those that had received certain mysteries would reach their final state in the regions to which they had attained a right by the mysteries undertaken here. They had hope of reaching the highest region, the Realm of Light, through the mysteries undertaken and the gnosis held (See Chapter 86). This was their hope.

Codex Berolensis 8502. The Codex Berolensis 8502 is a fifth century Coptic codex acquired by Dr. Rheinhardt in Cairo and announced to the scholarly world on July 16, 1896, by Carl Schmidt.<sup>14</sup> Contained in this codex are three Gnostic works; a Gospel of Mary, a Secret Book of John, and a work called The Wisdom of Jesus, as well as some Acts of Peter which are not Gnostic.<sup>15</sup>

Three other copies of the Apocryphon of John were found at Chenoboskion which shows that it evidently was a fundamental

---

<sup>14</sup>Mead, op. cit., p. xxxvi.

<sup>15</sup>Doresse, op. cit., pp. 86, 87.

treatise of the Gnostics.<sup>16</sup> The copy of the Apocryphon from Cairo is later than those from Chenoboskion, and the Greek original underlying the Apocryphon is still earlier.<sup>17</sup> Even prior to the finding of the Berlin Codex this treatise was known due to the use made of it by Irenaeus as a source concerning the Barbelo-Gnostics (Adv. Haer. I. 29), and his use gives the Apocryphon of John a terminus ad quam for its original of ca. A. D. 180.<sup>18</sup> Schmidt's attempts at publishing the Berlin Codex were unsuccessful, and it was not until an edition by Walter Till appeared in 1955 that the Text of the Apocryphon appeared.<sup>19</sup> Till used one of the copies from Chenoboskion for notation of variant readings.

There is ample proof for believing that a Greek original underlies the Coptic version of the works in the Berlin Codex. the Gospel of Mary exactly repeats part of a Greek papyrus attributed to the third century (Ryland Papyrus 463).<sup>20</sup> Of the Wisdom of Jesus, H. C. Puech wrote, ". . . of which I have recovered in another Oxyrhynchus papyrus (No. 1081) two pages in the original Greek; . . ."21

---

<sup>16</sup>H. C. Puech, "The Jung Codex and the Other Gnostic Documents from Nag Hammadi," The Jung Codex, F. L. Cross, editor (London: A. R. Mowbray & Co. Limited, 1955), p. 22.

<sup>17</sup>Ibid.      <sup>18</sup>Doresse, op. cit., p. 87.      <sup>19</sup>Ibid.

<sup>20</sup>Ibid.

<sup>21</sup>Puech, The Jung Codex, loc. cit.

Just as Mary Magdalene played an important part in the Pistis Sophia, she again does in the Gospel of Mary, and as Puech said, this ". . . is almost the rule in Gnostic literature."<sup>22</sup>

The Sophia or Wisdom of Jesus is now known from the Chenoboskion find, and is very like the Epistle of Eugnostos which precedes it in one of the codices.<sup>23</sup> The Sophia dates from the second half of the second century or the third century at latest, but its author's sect is not now determinable.<sup>24</sup>

It may be that the Codex Berolensis appeared just to pass away again, for it has disappeared since the Second World War.<sup>25</sup>

Codex Bruceanus. This codex derives its name from the great Scottish explorer and traveller in Abyssinia,<sup>26</sup> Bruce, who purchased it at Thebes, Egypt, in 1769.<sup>27</sup> Doresse sees much in common between the Codex Askewianus and the Codex Bruceanus, for he said:

It is a question--the two manuscripts having come to light about the same time whether the Codex Askewianus may not have come from the same Theban source: by their contents alone the two collections present a family likeness that suggests this hypothesis.<sup>28</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup>Puech, New Testament Apocrypha, p. 342.

<sup>23</sup>Ibid., p. 248.      <sup>24</sup>Ibid.

<sup>25</sup>Doresse, op. cit., p. 86.

<sup>26</sup>F. Legge, Forerunners and Rivals of Christianity (New York: Peter Smith, 1950), II, 189.

<sup>27</sup>Doresse, op. cit., p. 76.      <sup>28</sup>Ibid.

The codices also have the same Sahidic dialect of the Coptic.<sup>29</sup>

The Bruce Codex consists of seventy-eight papyrus pages written by several different scribes,<sup>30</sup> and contains two works: The Book of the Great Logos According to the Mystery and a lofty apocalypse without a title. The former contains two books and may be dated in the fifth century while the latter untitled work may go back to the end of the fourth century.<sup>31</sup> Both works present a Gnosticism of fully developed form.

Other Sources. In 1938, C. H. Roberts published a fragment of a manuscript known as Ryland's Papyrus 463, consisting of a leaf of the Gospel According to Mary, in Greek, which was known in a Coptic form in the Berlin Codex.<sup>32</sup> This fragment can hardly be later than A. D. 200, and it was probably current in Irenaeus' day.<sup>33</sup>

Among the many papyrus fragments recovered at Oxyrhynchus, four are now known to be of importance to the study of Gnosticism (1, 654, 655, and 1081). Oxyrhynchus Papyrus I is from the third century of our era and was found in 1897.<sup>34</sup> Papyri Nos. 654 and 655 were discovered in 1903.<sup>35</sup> Grant noted that it ". . . was Puech who discovered that all three Oxyrhynchus

---

<sup>29</sup>Legge, loc. cit.      <sup>30</sup>Doresse, loc. cit.

<sup>31</sup>Ibid.      <sup>32</sup>Goodspeed, op. cit., p. 96.      <sup>33</sup>Ibid.

<sup>34</sup>Robert M. Grant, The Secret Sayings of Jesus (Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1960), p. 47.

<sup>35</sup>Ibid., p. 49.

fragments (1, 654, and 655) came from the Gospel of Thomas."<sup>36</sup> Fragment number 1081, as noted above,<sup>37</sup> preserves a portion of the Sophia of Jesus and is from the third or fourth century.<sup>38</sup> Finally should be noted Puech's recognition of another Oxyrhynchus fragment quoting from the Gospel of Thomas preserved ". . . on a strip of linen, part of a shroud, . . ." <sup>39</sup>

Doresse notes two other sources; one fragment of a parchment codex from Deir-Bala'izah, in Sahidic Coptic of the fourth century, and another the funerary epitaph of a Gnostic lady of Rome, Flavia Sophe, who died in A. D. 300.<sup>40</sup>

A few monuments, paintings and gems might be added, but on the main these are the important sources prior to Chenoboskion. At Chenoboskion a wealth of information appeared to be added to this information of "The Gnosis according to its Friends".<sup>41</sup>

## II. THE CHENOBOSKION FIND

In brief this was how the Gnostic library found at Chenoboskion came to light. Not later than 1946, a jar containing some forty-eight Gnostic works was discovered in a tomb of the early Christian period (probably of the fourth

---

<sup>36</sup>Ibid., p. 52.      <sup>37</sup>See p. 117.

<sup>38</sup>Grant, op. cit., p. 60 n. 12.

<sup>39</sup>Doresse, op. cit., p. 338.      <sup>40</sup>Ibid., pp. 88, 89.

<sup>41</sup>Mead, op. cit., p. xxxix.

century) at the site of the ancient town of Chenoboskion.<sup>42</sup> The site of the discovery is some thirty to fifty miles up the Nile from Luxor, and the finders were peasants of the villages of Debbah and Hamra-Doum. These labourers attached little importance to the codices, as was shown by the fact that they sold them for three pounds.<sup>43</sup> Soon after being found the codices became separated, but finally reached Cairo in three different groups.

The codex now known as the Jung Codex was purchased by a second-hand dealer in 1946 and later sold to the Jung Institute in May of 1952. The other twelve codices, in two groups, were obtained by the Cairo Museum by purchase in 1952.<sup>44</sup>

These manuscripts are very important for the study of Gnosticism. W. R. Schoedel feels,

The value of these finds is that for the first time we have a significant body of material in which gnostic heresiarchs speak for themselves without being filtered through the hostile mind of the orthodox church.<sup>45</sup>

The paucity of original material for a study of Gnosticism prior to the manuscripts noted above is clearly shown in the words of C. K. Staudt who wrote in 1909 saying:

---

<sup>42</sup>Kendrick Grobel, The Gospel of Truth (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1960), pp. 7, 8.

<sup>43</sup>Ibid.      <sup>44</sup>Puech, The Jung Codex, pp. 13-15.

<sup>45</sup>W. R. Schoedel, "The Rediscovery of Gnosis," Interpretation, XVI (October, 1962), 396.



In an effort to restate Gnosticism, we are at once confronted with a serious difficulty. The writings of the Gnostics have perished, and we know of their tenets only through their opponents, who may often have misunderstood them and given undue emphasis to certain minor statements.<sup>46</sup>

How greatly this picture has been changed was noted by Abraham J. Malherbe in 1960 when he wrote, "When all these works are published, we will know more about Gnosticism than the contemporaries of the Gnostics did."<sup>47</sup>

Here in 48 codices are preserved 794 pages out of a possible 1,000.<sup>48</sup> Eleven of the thirteen codices still retain their original bindings, which were of supple leather, decorated with various designs, formed so as to resemble modern portfolios.<sup>49</sup> Three of the writings are preserved in double or triple recensions, and in all, only two of these works were previously known and edited.<sup>50</sup> The papyrus leaves average about twenty-five cm. high by fifteen cm. broad, and the script on the whole is good.<sup>51</sup>

The language of composition was originally Greek, but the copies found at Chenoboskion are all translations in the

---

<sup>46</sup>Calvin Klopp Staudt, The Idea of the Resurrection in the Ante-Nicene Period (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1909), p. 47.

<sup>47</sup>Abraham J. Malherbe, "Gnosis and Primitive Christianity: A Survey (II)," Restoration Quarterly, IV (1960), 28.

<sup>48</sup>V. R. Gold, "The Gnostic Library of Chenoboskion," The Biblical Archaeologist, XV (December, 1952), 72.

<sup>49</sup>Ibid., p. 73.   <sup>50</sup>Puech, The Jung Codex, p. 16.

<sup>51</sup>Ibid.

Coptic language, the majority being in the Upper Egyptian Sahidic dialect.<sup>52</sup> This language has been one of the factors delaying publication, as Van Unnik notes:

Various causes have contributed to the delay in the publication of these treasures, in particular the fact that these books are preserved not in the original Greek, but in Coptic translations and the extremely difficult character of their contents.<sup>53</sup>

R. M. Grant lists the few works published so far from the wealth of the discovery at Chenoboskion. He wrote in 1959,

At the present time only three volumes of the Nag-Hammadi writings have been published, though more are promised in the near future. These are (1) the edition of the Gnostic writings contained in the Berlin Coptic papyrus, in which, as we have said, Till included variant readings from a Nag-Hammadi version of the Apocryphon of John; (2) the Gospel of Truth; and (3) reproductions of the first volume, which includes the Discourse on the Resurrection, [sic] the Apocryphon of John, the gospels of Thomas and Philip, and the Hypostasis of the Archons.<sup>54</sup>

A variety of ancient material has been preserved in the Chenoboskion library. Here remains Gnostic apocalyptic literature, Gnostic commentaries and abstract treatises, along with previously unknown Hermetic works and pseudo-Christian apocryphal works. Among the unpublished works are a number of apocalypses, the greater part of which are

---

<sup>52</sup>Ibid.

<sup>53</sup>W. C. Van Unnik, "The Newly Discovered Gnostic 'Epistle to Rheginos' on the Resurrection: I," The Journal of Ecclesiastical History, (October, 1964), p. 141; See also Dorresse, op. cit., Chapter III, for a history of the problems which have hindered publication.

<sup>54</sup>R. M. Grant, Gnosticism and Early Christianity, pp. 5, 6.

connected in some way with the "Great Seth".

Three apocalyptic works were mentioned by Porphyry in his biography of Plotinus; these being the Apocalypse of Allogenes, Apocalypse of Zostrianus (or Zoraster), and the Apocalypse of Messos.<sup>55</sup> Gold feels, "The composition of all three antedates 240 A. D. and comes from the same Sethian circle."<sup>56</sup>

The Gospel of the Egyptians, or the Book of the Great Invisible Spirit, preserved in two forms, is also related to Seth.<sup>57</sup> A fragment of a Gospel of the Egyptians was known in Patristic writings, but according to Schneemelcher, "The Greek Gospel of the Egyptians is not identical with the 'Gospel of the Egyptians' recently found at Nag-Hammadi;. . ." <sup>58</sup> The date of composition was "probably the first third" of the second century.<sup>59</sup>

Another work related to the Great Seth is the Paraphrase of Shem, which has another title at its close; the Second Treatise of the Great Seth, which was referred to by Hippolytus as the Paraphrase of Seth.<sup>60</sup> Of it Hippolytus said,

---

<sup>55</sup>Gold, op. cit., p. 75.      <sup>56</sup>Ibid., p. 76.

<sup>57</sup>Puech, The Jung Codex, p. 20.

<sup>58</sup>Wilhelm Schneemelcher, "The Gospel of the Egyptians," New Testament Apocrypha, Edgar Henneke, Wilhelm Schneemelcher, and R. McL. Wilson, editors (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1963), I, 252.

<sup>59</sup>Ibid., p. 178.      <sup>60</sup>Puech, The Jung Codex, p. 21.

If, however, anyone is desirous of learning the entire doctrine according to them Sethians, let him read a book inscribed Paraphrase of Seth; for all their secret tenets he will find deposited there.<sup>61</sup>

Two pseudo-Biblical apocrypha: a Revelation of Adam to His Son Seth, and the Book of Noria, also fit into the Sethian group. The latter work also is called the Hypostasis of the Archons.

The Three Pillars (or Tables, or Steles) of Seth, also called the Apocalypse of Dositheus belongs in the "Sethian" category of these works. Evidently this work is not related to Dosithee, an early leader of a Samaritan sect, except in name, and perhaps the desire to give it authenticity prompted the title.<sup>62</sup>

Another work, existing in part, is entitled The Triple Discourse of the Triple Protennoia, qualified as a book written by the Great Seth, i.e. a Sacred Book written by the Father.<sup>63</sup>

Besides these, there are several un-titled works that little has been written about as yet.

Five works might be termed Gnostic commentaries or abstract treatises. There are two copies of the Sethian cosmological work The Epistle of Eugnostos the Blessed.<sup>64</sup> This treatise precedes the Wisdom of Jesus in its codex,

---

<sup>61</sup>Refutatio, V. xvii, Roberts.

<sup>62</sup>Gold, op. cit., p. 77.

<sup>63</sup>Ibid., p. 78.      <sup>64</sup>Puech, The Jung Codex, p. 23.

and seems to have been a source for that work.<sup>65</sup> Of the other works little is known.

Five Hermetic works were found at Chenoboskion, four previously unknown. This group contains the Authentic Discourse of Hermes to Thoth, Meditation on the Supreme Power, a portion of Asclepius, and two untitled works.<sup>66</sup>

A series of Christian-Gnostic works exist in this group of codices. Several "Petrine" works exist, one being The Apocalypse of Peter which has nothing in common with the work of the same name that enjoyed a degree of acceptance by the church near the end of the second century, except in being attributed to Peter.<sup>67</sup> Complete copies of the latter work have been preserved in Ethiopic and in fragmentary form in both Greek and Arabic. Still another "Petrine" work which has no known affinities with previous works of the same, or nearly identical titles, is the Acts of Peter and the Twelve Apostles. The Chenoboskion copy is quite short and "romantic" in nature.<sup>68</sup> The final work of the Jung Codex is also concerned with the Apostle Peter.

There are three apocalypses, all different, attributed to James among the texts from Chenoboskion. The one found in the Jung Codex is in a different dialect than the other two.

---

<sup>65</sup> Puech, New Testament Apocrypha, p. 248.

<sup>66</sup> Gold, op. cit., pp. 78, 79.

<sup>67</sup> Ibid., p. 80.      <sup>68</sup> Puech, The Jung Codex, p. 22.

It is now known that the Chenoboskion Apocalypse of James is different from the previously published Coptic work of the same name which was known to Hippolytus and was used by the Naassenes.<sup>69</sup> The Apocalypse of the Jung Codex is attributed to a Valentinian Gnostic author due to the companion works of that Codex.<sup>70</sup> The author feels that Christians were called upon to suffer according to God's plan, that prophecy ended with John the Baptist, and it speaks of faith, works and love, but reasons that one receives the Kingdom of Heaven only by Gnosis.<sup>71</sup>

The Apocalypse of Paul from Chenoboskion is similar to the Ascension of Paul used by the later Gnostics and the Cainites.<sup>72</sup> Just as with the Christian apocryphal work of the same title, this work is concerned with revealing the words Paul could not utter in II Corinthians 12: 2-4.<sup>73</sup>

The Wisdom of Jesus mentioned before<sup>74</sup> consists of a discourse between the resurrection Saviour and his twelve disciples and seven holy women.<sup>75</sup> The Dialogue of the Saviour

---

<sup>69</sup>Gold, op. cit., p. 82.

<sup>70</sup>G. Quispel, "Contents of the Jung Codex," The Jung Codex, F. L. Cross, editor (London: A. R. Mowbray & Co., Limited, 1955), p. 46.

<sup>71</sup>Ibid.      <sup>72</sup>Puech, The Jung Codex, loc. cit.

<sup>73</sup>Gold, op. cit., p. 77.      <sup>74</sup>See below, pp. 117.

<sup>75</sup>Puech, New Testament Apocrypha, p. 247.



is in the same literary form, but it is not so well preserved as the Wisdom of Jesus is.<sup>76</sup>

Several of the pseudo-epigraphical works are attributed to Thomas. One is the Gospel of Thomas, a work quite different from the Christian apocryphal work of the same name. Still another work attributed to Thomas is the Book of Thomas: Secret Words Spoken by the Saviour to Jude Thomas, and Recorded by Matthew. Perhaps this is the Basilidean Gnostics work called The Traditions of Matthias,<sup>77</sup> or perhaps it is the Gospel According to Matthias which was referred to by Origen and Eusebius.<sup>78</sup>

The Gospel of Thomas is among the published texts of those found at Chenoboskion (in Codex III, Puech's classification). The work which immediately precedes it in its codex is the Apocryphon of John, which has been known for some time but was not published until 1955.<sup>79</sup>

Today scholars are inclined to "admit or suggest" that the Apocryphon of John represents a form of Gnosticism earlier than Valentinus.<sup>80</sup> Bertil Gärtner would place the Apocryphon among the "... the most ancient of Gnostic scriptures, dating

<sup>76</sup>Gold, loc. cit.

<sup>77</sup>Puech, The Jung Codex, loc. cit.      <sup>78</sup>Ibid.

<sup>79</sup>See below, pp. 116.

<sup>80</sup>Puech, New Testament Apocrypha, p. 331.



The Gospel of Thomas is quite different from any of the canonical gospels. "It recounts no episode from the life of Jesus, and contains scarcely any narrative; it is in no respect a gospel of narrative character."<sup>89</sup> The contents are for those initiated and are meant to be secret, for a knowledge of them ensures eternal life. The opening words are:

These are the secret words which the living Jesus spake, and Didymus Judas Thomas wrote them down.

(1) And he said: He who shall find the interpretation of these words shall not taste of death.<sup>90</sup>

The Gospel of Thomas ". . . is no other and no less than a collection of 114 logia, the most extensive collection of sayings of Jesus or sayings attributed to Jesus, that has come down to us independently of the New Testament tradition."<sup>91</sup> Among these many sayings are some dealing with the Gnostic view of salvation and the resurrection.

The Gospel of Philip immediately follows the Gospel of Thomas in Codex III and precedes a "dogmatic tractate", the Hypostasis of the Archons.<sup>92</sup> Until recently only a citation from the Gospel of Philip was known from Epiphanius Panarion (26. 13. 2-3), but that citation does not occur in the Gospel

---

<sup>89</sup>Puech, op. cit., p. 283.

<sup>90</sup>R. McL. Wilson, "Appendix I, The Gospel of Thomas," New Testament Apocrypha, Edgar Henneke, Wilhelm Schneemelcher, and R. McL. Wilson, editors (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1963), I, 511.

<sup>91</sup>Puech, op. cit., pp. 284, 285.

<sup>92</sup>Ibid., p. 276.

of Philip from Chenoboskion.<sup>93</sup>

As to date, Wilson wrote:

The Coptic manuscript is probably to be dated about A. D. 400, but the document itself is older. In Puech's view the Vorlage, originally in Greek, might be dated to the second century A. D., or at latest to the beginning or middle of the third.<sup>94</sup>

Wilson gives four reasons for a second century dating. (1)

"In the first place there is the agreement with the Valentinian system as described by Irenaeus and in the Excerpta ex Theodoto [sic]."<sup>95</sup> (2) "Secondly, there are the parallels with such writings as the Apostolic Fathers."<sup>96</sup> (3) "In the third place, there is the state of the Canon reflected in the New Testament echoes and allusions."<sup>97</sup> (4) "Finally, the general atmosphere seems to be rather that of the second century than of the third."<sup>98</sup>

The Gospel of Philip treats various themes, one being the resurrection. Wilson makes note of these references saying:

Of the references to the Resurrection, two (21,90) present the view condemned in the Pastoral Epistles, that for the believer it is already a thing of the past. Another admittedly. . . is an accurate reflection of the Pauline doctrine (23), but admits of interpretation in a

---

<sup>93</sup>Ibid., pp. 273, 277.

<sup>94</sup>R. McL. Wilson, The Gospel of Philip (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1962), p. 3

<sup>95</sup>Ibid.    <sup>96</sup>Ibid., p. 4.    <sup>97</sup>Ibid.

<sup>98</sup>Ibid., p. 14.

Gnostic sense. Of the others, 67 contains no more than a passing allusion, while 63 treats the resurrection as one of the possibilities open to man: he may find himself either in this world or in the resurrection or in "the place of the Midst."<sup>99</sup>

Next to the Epistle to Rheginus, the Gospel of Philip is of most importance in investigating the Gnostic views of the resurrection.

The Gospel of Truth attracted much attention when it was published, being from the Jung Codex, and one of the first treatises to appear from Chenoboskion. The language of this work is the Subakhmimic dialect of the Coptic.<sup>100</sup> After some study of the Gospel of Truth, W. C. Van Unnik put forth this thesis:

The Gospel of Truth, which has been recovered in the Jung Codex, was written by Valentinus at Rome round about 140-145, before the development of typically Gnostic dogmas.<sup>101</sup>

Prior to its being found at Chenoboskion, Irenaeus (Adv. Haer. III, XI. 9), and possibly Tertullian (de Praes. Haer. Ch. 25) mentioned the Gospel of Truth.<sup>102</sup> Van Unnik believes that Irenaeus referred to the same Gospel as that found at Chenoboskion, since ". . . the name, origin, and plan of the work are in full accord with the account of Irenaeus."<sup>103</sup>

---

<sup>99</sup>Ibid., p. 14.      <sup>100</sup>Quispel, op. cit., p. 51.

<sup>101</sup>W. C. Van Unnik, "The 'Gospel of Truth' and the New Testament," The Jung Codex, F. L. Cross, editor (London: A. R. Mowbray and Co., Limited, 1955), p. 104.

<sup>102</sup>Quispel, op. cit., p. 49.      <sup>103</sup>Van Unnik, op. cit., p. 96.

Puech, in considering the contents of the Gospel of Truth, endorsed its Valentinian origin. He wrote:

In my opinion we have to do rather with a homily [not a gospel] which might be reckoned among the pieces of the same kind which, according to Clement of Alexandria (Strom. IV. 13, 89. 1-3; VI. 6, 52, 3-4), belonged to the literary work of Valentinus.<sup>104</sup>

Concerning this homily he noted, "It contains no account of the life or works of Jesus, nor any mention of the words or sayings of the Lord."<sup>105</sup> According to Floyd V. Filson, the Gospel of Truth:

. . . does not tell the gospel story we know. It is a story of the way of salvation, and that way is not the one the New Testament describes. In this Gospel of Truth sin plays no real role. The dilemma of man comes from his ignorance or forgetting of God. He must gain or recover this knowledge (Gnosis) of God.<sup>106</sup>

Puech notes that what is really commended here is not a "gospel", but "gnosis", and feels that ". . . the whole work could be regarded as a kind of hymn to Knowledge. . ."<sup>107</sup>

Immediately following the Gospel of Truth in the Jung Codex is a treatise concerning the resurrection, now known as the Epistle to Rheginus.<sup>108</sup> The text mentions "the Apostle"

<sup>104</sup>Puech, New Testament Apocrypha, p. 240.

<sup>105</sup>Ibid., p. 236.

<sup>106</sup>Floyd V. Filson, "The Gnostic 'Gospel of Truth'", Biblical Archaeologist, XX (1957), 78.

<sup>107</sup>Puech, op. cit., p. 239.

<sup>108</sup>Michel Malinine, De Resurrectione, Michel Malinine, Henri-Charles Puech, Gilles Quispel, and Walter Till, editors (Zurich: Rascher Verlag, 1963), p. vii.

who said "we suffered with him, and we arose with him, and we went to heaven with him" (45), so the author lived after the Apostle Paul. This means ". . . one can be practically sure that he lived in the second century, the very age in which the question concerning the resurrection was a burning one. . . ."109 Puech and Quispel felt,

The Letter to Rheginus comes either from a teacher belonging to the eastern branch of Valentinianism--or from Valentinus himself. As to the choice between the two possibilities, we would decide for ourselves, with all due reservations, in favour of the latter.<sup>110</sup>

This choice was made for several reasons. Quispel noted:

There are some peculiarities of language that our letter shares with the fragments of Valentinus. And we may suppose, with even more confidence than in the case of the Gospel of Truth, that it is by Valentinus himself. For this writing in many of its traits recalls the spirit and personal manner of the heresiarch.<sup>111</sup>

The Epistle to Rheginus consists of seven pages of text in the Subakhmimic dialect of Coptic,<sup>112</sup> and it retains many Greek words from its original text.<sup>113</sup> It immediately follows the Gospel of Truth and immediately precedes a work, the Treatise on the Three Natures.<sup>114</sup>

---

<sup>109</sup>Van Unnik, Journal of Ecclesiastical History, p. 144.

<sup>110</sup>Grobel, op. cit., p. 17.

<sup>111</sup>Quispel, op. cit., p. 56.

<sup>112</sup>Malinine, op. cit., p. vii.

<sup>113</sup>Ibid., p. x.

<sup>114</sup>Ibid., p. vii.

The contents of the Epistle to Rheginus concern the Gnostic view of the resurrection. Here a Gnostic teacher is writing to his disciple Rheginus to answer certain questions. Others are involved in questionings, but they do not have the answers or take their stand on the truth. The teacher and Rheginus have received their "rest" through the Saviour, the Lord Christ, when they came to know the truth. The teacher tells Rheginus that the resurrection "is necessary". Many do not believe this or find it.

The work of the Lord while he was in the flesh is noted. He revealed himself as Son of God and Son of Man so as to be able to vanquish death and bring about a restoration into the Pleroma. Before the creation of this "structure" in which many "lordships and deities" exist, the Lord was a "seed of the truth". This teaching is difficult, but there is nothing hard in the "word of truth". The solution has come forth to explain all, the revelation of the elect and the dissolution of the evil.

The Savior swallowed up death, laid aside this world and changed himself into an incorruptible aeon. With the swallowing up of the visible by the invisible he provided the way of immortality. When the Gnostics are manifested in the world wearing Christ, they are his beams and will be "encompassed" by him until their setting at physical death. The going up like a sun-beam at death is the spiritual resurrection.

This teaching is a matter of faith, not logic or of the philosophers. The Gnostic came to know the Son of man, believed he arose from death, and he became their "great one" who destroyed death. Believers are immortal. A holder of this truth is elect unto salvation and redemption, and this uncreated truth of the Pleroma cannot be lost.

The teacher urged Rheginus not to doubt the resurrection. Since he had flesh in coming into the world, he would also have flesh on entering the aeon. What he has is his, so what does he lack? The flesh has an after-birth in old age, so the disciple should desire the putting away of this corrupt body. Some are concerned about the salvation of this body, but the dead visible members will not be saved.

The fact that the fleshly members of this life are not saved should not trouble the disciple. The resurrection is reality as shown by Elias and Moses at the Transfiguration. If anything is an illusion, it is this world. The firm is the transformation of things, the transition into a new existence and the revelation of what is.

In closing the teacher urges Rheginus not to be divided. If he notes that a man knows he will die, and does; he can also note that he has the resurrection and in time he is brought to it. The disciple needs to exercise himself so as not to go astray. This message was awaited by others, and they are not to be jealous of each other. The close is with a salutation to those who love Rheginus in fraternal love.



## III. SECONDARY OR INDIRECT SOURCES

The most important indirect sources concerning the Gnostics are the writings of opponents, mainly the Church Fathers. Some gave only passing notice of the heretics, but others wrote books directed against the Gnostics.

Several Fathers preceding Irenaeus gave passing notice to the Gnostics; four of these being Clement of Rome (A. D. 30-100, Ignatius (30-107), Polycarp (69/70-155/156) and Justin Martyr (114-165). Irenaeus stands out as the great adversary of the Gnostics, and,

his principal work is the "Refutation and Subversion of knowledge Falsely so Called," generally referred to as "Against Heresies." It consists of five books, and is preserved in its entirety only in a Latin version,  
 . . .<sup>115</sup>

Irenaeus (120-202) provided "The oldest continuous account of various gnostic systems. . . ."<sup>116</sup>

Another important voice is that of Tertullian (145-220) who wrote against Marcion, Hermogenes and Valentinus. Tertullian also wrote extensively concerning the resurrection (cf. De Carne Christi and De resurrectione Carnis).

Some of these writers preserved portions of the heretics' writings. One such was Clement of Alexandria

---

<sup>115</sup>T. Zahn, "Irenaeus," The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1910), VI. 29.

<sup>116</sup>R. M. Grant, Gnosticism (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1961), p. 21.

(150-215) who preserved certain excerpts from the writings of the Valentinian Theodotus (cf. Stromateis). Some time later Epiphanius (315-403) included Ptolemaeus' Letter to Flora in his writings (cf. Pan haer. xxxiii. 3-7).

Not all the opponents of Gnosticism were Christian. Plotinus (205/206-270) was an outstanding example of a non-Christian adversary as is seen by the ninth book of his Enneads. Porphyry (234-301/305), also a Neoplatonist, was his master's biographer, and he deserves credit for most of the extant work of Plotinus.<sup>117</sup> Porphyry rejected the Gnostic Apocalypse of Zoraster.<sup>118</sup> Unfortunately much of the work of both of these writers has perished.

---

<sup>117</sup> Thomas Whittaker, The Neo-Platonists (Cambridge: University Press, 1928), p. 26ff.

<sup>118</sup> Ibid., p. 109.

## APPENDIX B

### THE NATURE OF GNOSTICISM

#### Definitions

R. McL. Wilson's remarks concerning the language used in the study of the origin of Gnosticism well might be applied to the study of Gnosticism as a whole. Wilson wrote:

The problem is complicated by laxity in the use of terms, since some scholars speak of Gnosis in a wide and vaguely-defined sense, as distinct from Gnosticism, while others treat the words almost as synonymous. To add to the possibility of confusion, the same adjective "gnostic" has to do duty in both senses.<sup>1</sup>

In speaking further on the use of language, Doctor Wilson suggested that the subject of Gnosticism be divided in the interest of clarity and precision. He would thus divide the field into three areas:

1. . . . The precursors of Gnosticism (in the narrower sense) in Philo and, it would seem in Jewish groups of more or less heterodox character, including possibly the Essenes of the Dead Sea Scrolls.

2. At the other extreme we would have such systems as Manicheism and Mandaeism, in which "Gnostic" influences seem definitely to be present but which are probably to be regarded as more or less distinct.

3. Between these two extremes we have the Gnosticism opposed by Irenaeus and Hippolytus, which came into full flourish in the second century A. D., and also the pagan "Gnosticism" in the Hermetica.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>R. McL. Wilson, The Gospel of Philip (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1962), p. 16.

<sup>2</sup>R. McL. Wilson, "Gnostic Origins," Vigiliae Christianae, IX (1955), 196.

It is in the latter sense that Gnosticism is treated in this thesis.

Even with the field narrowed, a diversity of systems are found in that era. These many systems are called by a number of different names; historically appearing bearing names of people, places, nationality of adherents, activities practiced, peculiar dogmas, individuals honored by them, and objects of worship.<sup>3</sup> Paul S. Kramer would class the major systems as follows:

Samaritan and Syrian Gnostics: Simon, Menander, Saturninus, Tatian, Bardesanes, the Elkesaites.  
 Egyptian Gnostics: Basilides, Valentinus, Heracleon, Ptolemaeus, Marcus.  
 Asiatic Gnostics: Marcion and the Marcionites and Apelles.  
 In addition to these, the more important Gnostics are Cerinthus, Carpocrates, Epiphanes and Cerdo.<sup>4</sup>

Certain elements were common to each system to give it the title Gnostics. LaSor limits these elements to two:

1. Dualism of a cosmological (matter-spirit) type.
2. Special knowledge available only to the initiated.

Without one or the other he would not accept a system as Gnostic.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup>Clement of Alexandria, The Stromata, VII 17, (Vol. II of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, editors Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1951), p. 555. Hereafter cited as Roberts.

<sup>4</sup>Paul S. Kramer, "The Sources of Primitive Gnosticism and Its Place in the History of Christian Thought," (unpublished thesis, University of Chicago, 1933), p. 5.

<sup>5</sup>William Sanford LaSor, Amazing Dead Sea Scrolls and the Christian Faith (Chicago: Moody Press, 1956), p. 141.

Gnosis. To the Gnostic, "Gnosis" was ". . . essentially self-knowledge, recognition of the divine element which constitutes the true self."<sup>6</sup> Thus:

. . . by knowing himself the Gnostic transcended all the limitations of human existence. He recognized his "inner man" (identified with the kingdom of the Father) and hated the world with its ties of family, sex, marriage, and--for that matter--religion (fasting, prayer, and almsgiving).<sup>7</sup>

"Gnosis" then was both "revelation and redemption."<sup>8</sup> What the Gnostic was really seeking was a knowledge of God, for as Jonas noted, the

. . . event [of Gnosis] in the soul transforms the knower himself by making him a partaker in the divine existence (which means more than assimilating him to the divine essence). Thus in the more radical systems like the Valentinian the "knowledge" is not only an instrument of salvation but itself the very form in which the goal of salvation, i.e., ultimate perfection, is possessed.<sup>9</sup>

### Origin of Gnosticism

Currently the origin of Gnosticism is an open question. One of three views or schools as to Gnosticism's origin is usually held: an Oriental origin, a Greek origin, or a Judaeo-Christian origin.

---

<sup>6</sup>R. M. Grant, Gnosticism and Early Christianity, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1959), p. 10.

<sup>7</sup>R. M. Grant, "Two Gnostic Gospels," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXIX (March, 1960), 4.

<sup>8</sup>W. R. Schoedel, "The Rediscovery of Gnosis," Interpretation, XVI (October, 1962), 388.

<sup>9</sup>Hans Jonas, The Gnostic Religion (Boston: Beacon Press, 1958), p. 35.

Oriental origin. The Oriental origin theory sees Gnosticism as being pre-Christian and non-heretical in nature. Hans Jonas explained one of the reasons this view emerged:

. . . Somehow the division of the quantity that is Gnosticism by these known factors [Greek and Judaeo-Christian] leaves too large a remainder, and from the early nineteenth century the "Hellenic" school was confronted by an "oriental" one which argued that Gnosticism derived from an older "oriental philosophy."<sup>10</sup>

The first great proponent of the Oriental view was W. Bousset, ". . . the real father of the religionsgeschichtliche method of the study of ancient religion."<sup>11</sup> The "history of religions" method ". . . approaches the study of a particular religion by studying it in its setting within surrounding religions and with the Phenomena of religion as the guiding principle."<sup>12</sup> The best known exponent of this method today is Rudolf Bultmann. In Bultmann's theory of Gnosticism, he ". . . joins all the elements of different Gnostic systems together and constructs a pan-Gnostic system, which", according to Malherbe, "certainly did not exist."<sup>13</sup>

It is often charged that Gnosticism is largely "syncretistic." One almost suspects that to those who hold the Oriental theory, what qualifies a system to be called "Gnostic" is

---

<sup>10</sup>Ibid., p. xv.

<sup>11</sup>Abraham J. Malherbe, "Primitive Christianity and Gnosis: a Survey (I)," Restoration Quarterly, III (1959), 103.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid., p. 104.

for it to be syncretistic. The view expressed of the contents of Gnosticism by Hans Jonas is an example, for in his view:

. . . The gnostic systems compounded everything--oriental mythologies, astrological doctrines, Iranian theology, elements of Jewish tradition, whether Biblical, rabbinical, or occult, Christian salvation-eschatology, Platonic terms and concepts.<sup>14</sup>

R. McL. Wilson pointed out a problem faced by this school:

The weakness of their theory [Reitzenstein and Bousset's] lies in the inferences which they draw from the material they collected, and their disregard for chronology. For example, there can be no doubt that Gnosticism is in some way related to Manicheism and Mandaeism but, in the first place, Mani lived in the third century A. D., while our evidence does not seem to permit of our placing the Mandaens before 400 A. D.; and in the second place, the Mandaens seem to have been indebted to Mani for some of the ideas which they hold in common.<sup>15</sup>

This theory is not only embarrassed by faulty methodology, but also lacks documents to substantiate its inferences.<sup>16</sup>

Greek origin. The champion of the Greek theory of origin for Gnosticism was Adolf von Harnack. In Harnack's view, ". . . the Gnostic systems represent the acute secularising or hellenising of Christianity. . . ." <sup>17</sup> It was

---

<sup>14</sup>Jonas, op. cit., p. 25.

<sup>15</sup>R. McL. Wilson, The Gnostic Problem (London: A. R. Mowbray and Company, Limited, 1958), p. 66.

<sup>16</sup>Malherbe, loc. cit.

<sup>17</sup>Adolph Harnack, History of Dogmas, trans. Neil Buchanan (London: Williams and Norgate, 1894), I, 226.



Harnack's opinion that the Gnostics were "essentially Christian philosophers."<sup>18</sup>

The Church Fathers also linked Gnostics with philosophy, seeing them as heretics who were adulterating the faith with Hellenic philosophy. Tertullian for example wrote:

Indeed heresies are themselves instigated by philosophy. From this source came the Aeons, and I know not what infinite forms, and the trinity of man in the system of Valentinus, who was of Plato's school.<sup>19</sup>

Plotinus the Neoplatonist also linked the Gnostics with Greek philosophy, charging that they wrongly interpreted Plato.<sup>20</sup> A. H. Armstrong observed:

Plotinus has left us in no doubt about his opinion on . . . Gnosticism. He attacks it vigorously in the ninth treatise of the Second Ennead as untraditional, departing from the true teaching of Plato, irrational and inconsistent, insanely arrogant, and immoral in its tendencies.<sup>21</sup>

To this view most of the Church Fathers would have added a hearty "Amen".

---

<sup>18</sup>Malherbe, op. cit., p. 105.

<sup>19</sup>Tertullian, de Praescriptone Haereticorum, VII, (Vol. III of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, editors, Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmann Publishing Company, 1951), p. 246.

<sup>20</sup>Philippus Villiers Pistorius, Plotinus and Neoplatonism (Cambridge: Bowes and Bowes, 1952), p. 73.

<sup>21</sup>A. H. Armstrong, Plotinus (London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1953), p. 25.

Judaean-Christian origin. F. C. Burkitt anticipated this view a quarter of a century ago, writing: "I have said that the Gnostics come before us historically as Christians."<sup>22</sup> Burkitt's basis for this belief lay in his view of the nature of Gnosticism. "To him," observed Malherbe, "Gnosticism was a Christian product, an attempt to fill the void left by the failure of apocalypticism and the eschatological hope."<sup>23</sup> R. M. Grant is now an influential exponent of this view. Gnosticism, to Grant, arose to fill a void left by the failure of an older system, as in Judaism. Of the man who might become a Gnostic, Grant wrote:

Faith was shaken in God, his covenant, his law, and his promises.

Out of such shaking, we should claim, came the impetus toward Gnostic ways of thinking, doubtless not for the first time with the fall of Jerusalem but reinforced by this catastrophe.<sup>24</sup>

Heterodox Judaism is seen by Quispel and Van Unnik as a possible origin for Gnosticism.<sup>25</sup> Schoedel noted this trend when he wrote:

One of the most striking features of recent gnostic studies, however, is the tendency to see in Judaism the source, or at least the main channel, through which Gnosis entered the Graeco-Roman world.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup>F. C. Burkitt, Church and Gnosis (Cambridge: University Press, 1932), p. 9.

<sup>23</sup>Malherbe, op. cit., p. 106.

<sup>24</sup>R. M. Grant, Gnosticism and Early Christianity, p. 34.

<sup>25</sup>Malherbe, op. cit., p. 107.      <sup>26</sup>Schoedel, op. cit., p. 393.

Fortunately one need not be able to answer the "whence," "when," or "why" of Gnosticism before it may be considered as a possible source for heretical teachings mentioned in the New Testament. Whether the one theory of origin or the other be correct will not affect the study of the Gnostic view of a spiritual resurrection as the possible doctrine faced by Paul. The point may remain an open question without hampering this study.

What is known is that in the age that the New Testament books were written ideas were current, of Gnostic nature, which Paul might have faced. As R. McL. Wilson considered the New Testament, he wrote:

The evidence of the New Testament justifies the provisional dating of the origins of Christian Gnosticism in the middle of the first century, in the contact of Christianity with "the higher paganism."<sup>27</sup>

An early date for the rise of the Barbelo-Gnostics also seems to justify the view that Paul could have faced an incipient Gnosticism, especially when the Johannine Epistles are considered. W. F. Albright was convinced by the reasoning of Gillis Quispel that:

. . . Gnosticism had already developed some of its most pronounced sects well before the Fall of Jerusalem, and there is no reason to date the emergence of the Sethians and Barbelo-Gnostics after the end of the first

---

<sup>27</sup>Wilson, Vigiliae Christianae, p. 201.

century A. D.<sup>28</sup>

An early date of origin then seems possible, and thus Gnosticism may be considered as one possible source of the heresies concerning the resurrection which Paul faced.

### Gnostic tenets

The Gnostic view of theology, cosmology, anthropology and morality will be treated below. The important question of eschatology, although touched upon in this section is found in the chapter on other ancient beliefs in the resurrection.

Theology. God to a Gnostic was wholly transcendent, as would naturally follow from his concept of cosmological dualism.<sup>29</sup> The Supreme God could not create matter which was evil, therefore, between him and the world were a series of intermediaries.

The attributes of this God were given in the Apocryphon of John. The Revealer who is "Father, Mother and Son" said:

The Spirit [?] [sic] is a Unity, over which no one rules. It is the God of Truth, the Father of the All, the Holy Spirit, the invisible one, the one who is over the All, the one who exists in his Imperishability, the

---

<sup>28</sup>W. F. Albright, "Recent Discoveries in Palestine and the Gospel of St. John," The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology, W. D. Davies and D. Dauge, editors (Cambridge: University Press, 1956), p. 163.

<sup>29</sup>Wilson, The Gnostic Problem, p. 183.

one who exists in pure light into which no sight can look.<sup>30</sup>

The Spirit is further revealed to be eternal, perfect, light, illimitable, undifferentiated, immeasurable, invisible, indescribable, and un-nameable.<sup>31</sup>

In the Valentinian system there is a god of the world, who was the workmanship of the last Aeon emanated by the Supreme God of the Pleroma. Man and all things material were made by this Creator-God, known also as Demiurge and Ialdabaoth. Unlike the Supreme God who loves the spiritual men, this Creator-God is the enemy of man, keeping him in ignorance, imprisoned in this world. This concept of a creator, or Demiurge, was shared by the Gnostics with Plato.<sup>32</sup> Plotinus, the defender of Plato, was not prepared to accept the idea that ". . . the Creator of the Universe is evil and that the strife and contradictions in the visible universe are to be explained by that cause."<sup>33</sup> A view shared with him by Christians past and present.

---

<sup>30</sup> R. M. Grant, Gnosticism (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1961), p. 70.

<sup>31</sup> Ibid., pp. 70, 71.

<sup>32</sup> S. Vernon McCasland, "New Testament Times," The Interpreter's Bible (New York: Abingdon Press, 1951), VII, 85.

<sup>33</sup> Pistorius, op. cit., p. 72.

From the Logia already noted it is evident that the Gnostic's inner man originated in another realm. The Gospel of Thomas (Logion 49) teaches this:

Jesus said:  
Blessed are the solitary and elect,  
For you shall find the kingdom.  
For from it do you come  
(And) to it shall you return.<sup>48</sup>

This spirit from the kingdom above has one awaiting his return, the "angelic image" of his soul. Valentinus taught that the Gnostics were formed as images of angels and will finally in the consummation be united with their angels.<sup>49</sup> The Saviour prays in the Gospel of Philip saying:

106 10 . . . He said on that day  
in the thanksgiving . . . : Thou who hast joined  
the perfect, the light, with the Holy Spirit,  
unite the angels with us also,  
the images.<sup>50</sup>

The Gnostic was a dual personality, "despised body" and light image from the Pleroma. To other men who questioned him he said: "We have come from the light: that place where the light came into existence of itself. . . . We are his children . . . the elect of the living Father."<sup>51</sup>

Morality. The Gnostic felt, since he did not belong to the material world, he might conduct himself differently

---

<sup>48</sup>Gärtner, op. cit., p. 198.

<sup>49</sup>Wilson, op. cit., p. 92.

<sup>50</sup>Ibid., p. 91.

<sup>51</sup>Gärtner, op. cit., p. 200.



from men of lower nature. The Gnostic taught that the Christian was obligated to do good works; "But as to themselves, they hold that they shall be entirely and undoubtedly saved, not by means of conduct, but because they are spiritual by nature."<sup>52</sup> Being conscious that his "Gnosis" freed him, two courses were open to him in showing this freedom: asceticism or libertinism, "or even a peculiar combination of both."<sup>53</sup> Of the libertine Gnostic, Irenaeus' indignant comments were:

For, just as it is impossible that material substance should partake of salvation (since, indeed, they maintain that it is incapable of receiving it), so again it is impossible that spiritual substance (by which they mean themselves) should ever come under the power of corruption, whatever the sort of actions in which they indulged. For even as gold, when submersed in filth, loses not on that account its beauty, but retains its own native qualities, the filth having no power to injure the gold, so they affirm that they cannot in any measure suffer hurt, or lose their spiritual substance, whatever the material actions in which they may be involved.<sup>54</sup>

With such freedom open to him many Gnostics did "submerge" themselves in filth, but others were ascetic. Their view of the Creator-God caused them to withdraw from his world. As Gärtner observed:

This world, as well as the human body, is the work of the inferior Creator-God, and is nothing but a stumbling-block to the enlightened man. Man is therefore exhorted to live in as little contact as possible with the created world.<sup>55</sup>

---

<sup>52</sup>Irenaeus, Adv. Haer., I. v. 2., Roberts, p. 324.

<sup>53</sup>Rudolf Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, Vol. I. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951), p. 166.

<sup>54</sup>Irenaeus, Adv. Haer., I. vi. 2., Roberts, p. 324.

<sup>55</sup>Gärtner, op. cit., p. 229.



Interestingly enough the form that the Gnostic asceticism took was that of the error condemned in Paul's First Epistle to Timothy: the "forbidding to marry and commanding to abstain from meats" (4: 3). Of these words of Paul Tertullian wrote, "Such also as 'forbid to marry' he reproaches in his instructions to Timothy. Now, this is the teaching of Marcion and his follower Apelles."<sup>56</sup>

Marcion's practice was to forbid baptism to a person;

. . . unless it be in virginity, widowhood, or celibacy, or has purchased by divorce a title to baptism, as if even generative impotents did not all receive the flesh from nuptial union. Now, such a scheme as this must no doubt involve the proscription of marriage.<sup>57</sup>

Marcion would also bar a married couple from the Lord's Supper unless they ". . . should agree together to repudiate the fruit of their marriage, . . ."<sup>58</sup> The reason he

had such a view of marriage and the sexual life was that:

. . . Marcion considered them to be degrading and undesirable, and forbade the faithful to enter the state of matrimony. He considered it essential to use all possible means to limit the Creator-God's sphere of influence, and thus to avoid bringing children into the world. In this way it was possible to demonstrate that one did not owe allegiance to the Demiurge, by protesting against flesh and matter.<sup>59</sup>

marriage was nothing else than corruption and fornication.<sup>63</sup>

<sup>56</sup>Tertullian, de Praesc. Haer., I, xxxiii.; Roberts, III, 259.

<sup>57</sup>Tertullian, Adv. Marcion, I, xxix.; Roberts, III, 293.

<sup>58</sup>Ibid., IV, xxxiv.; Roberts, III, 405.

<sup>59</sup>Gärtner, op. cit., p. 249.

<sup>62</sup>Irenaeus, Adv. Haer. I, xiv, 2.; Roberts, I, 34.

<sup>63</sup>Ibid., I, xxviii, 1.; Roberts, I, 31.

Simon Peter said to them:  
 "Let Mary depart from us,  
 For women are not worthy of life."  
 Jesus said:  
 "See, I shall lead her,  
 So that I make her a man,  
 That she too may become a living spirit,  
 Who is like you men.  
 For every woman who makes herself a man  
 Shall enter the kingdom of heaven."<sup>67</sup>

This woman becoming male must have been conceived as possible,  
 for Mary speaks as if she attained it with the others in the  
Gospel of Mary.

Then Mary stood up and greeted all of them and said  
 to her brethren, "Do not mourn or grieve or be irresolute,  
 for his grace will be with you all and will defend you.  
 Let us rather praise his greatness, for he prepared us  
 and made us into men."<sup>68</sup>

Mary's words here endorse the view expressed by Gärtner that  
 ". . . the words about man and woman in Logion 114 should  
 apply not so much to distinction between the two sexes as  
 metaphorically to the cosmological aspect."<sup>69</sup> There was a  
 train of thought of the Valentinians as found in the Excerpt  
from Theodotus of there being two elements in the world.  
 One from the Savior, "the male seed", and the other from the  
 fallen Aeon Sophia, carried to man through Eve, "the female  
 seed". The "male seed" is the possession of the Savior, the  
 angels and the higher world, and within enlightened men is

---

<sup>67</sup>Gärtner, op. cit., p. 253.

<sup>68</sup>Grant, Gnosticism, p. 66.

<sup>69</sup>Gärtner, op. cit., p. 255.

the "female seed" which can be saved. "Only if the female is 'led' to union with the male (with the angels) in the higher world, so that they become 'one', can salvation be brought about."<sup>70</sup>

The ascetic Gnostic could find still another reason to reject marriage. In refuting them, Clement of Alexandria wrote: "If, as they say, they have already attained the state of resurrection, and on this account reject marriage let them neither eat nor drink."<sup>71</sup> He goes on to state that they reject marriage but not food, but the resurrected being would have no need of one if he rejected the other. A Gnostic might have thought himself consistent in his reasoning though, for he claimed to have experienced the resurrection already. If he were already resurrected, marriage was not for him; for had not the Lord said: "For in the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as angels in heaven." (Matthew 22: 30)? This then was another reason for rejecting marriage. From the words of the author of the Epistle to Rheginos, it seems freedom from marriage was one of the "bonds" to shun in having a part in the resurrection:

So do not  
think in part, O Rheginus

---

<sup>70</sup> Ibid., pp. 254, 255.

<sup>71</sup> John Ernest Culton and Henry Chadwick, Alexandrian Christianity (Vol. II of the Library of Christian Classics; London: S.C.M. Press, Ltd., 1954), p. 62.

neither conduct thyself  
according to this flesh for the sake of  
unity, but come away  
from the divisions and the  
bonds, and already thou hast  
the resurrection.

(p. 49, 11. 9-16).<sup>72</sup>

---

<sup>72</sup>Malinine, op. cit., p. 66. Greek words omitted from  
the above text.