

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

## Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

---

Bachelor of Divinity

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

---

6-1-1945

### The Personal Wisdom in Proverbs Eight

Rudolph E. Honsey

*Concordia Seminary, St. Louis*, [ir\\_honseyr@csl.edu](mailto:ir_honseyr@csl.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv>



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Honsey, Rudolph E., "The Personal Wisdom in Proverbs Eight" (1945). *Bachelor of Divinity*. 149.  
<https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv/149>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Bachelor of Divinity by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact [seitzw@csl.edu](mailto:seitzw@csl.edu).

**THE PERSONAL WISDOM  
IN PROVERBS EIGHT**

---

**A Thesis Presented to  
The Faculty of Concordia Seminary  
Department of Old Testament Theology**

---

**In Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Bachelor of Divinity**

---

**by  
Rudolph E. Honsey**

**June, 1945**

**Approved by:**

*Th. Luetck*  
*George P. Schick*

## THE PERSONAL WISDOM IN PROVERBS EIGHT

**Introduction:** There are many opinions concerning חֵכְמָה,  
**Wisdom:**

1. Some scholars say that it is an attribute of God.
2. Others assert that it is merely wisdom personified.
3. We maintain that it is Jesus Christ, the Eternal Son of God. This is the view of the majority of scholars in the early Christian Church.

**I. Reasons why Wisdom, particularly in Proverbs 8, 22-31, refers to the Son of God. We base our reasons on words in our text.**

- A. יָרַד, "possessed me," "brought me forth." Here we have the eternal generation of the Son from the Father.
- B. יָלַד, "gave birth to me." This term likewise refers to the eternal generation, but has a different etymology.
- C. תָּקַם, "established me." The Son was established in His office. Literally, "I was established."
- D. יָסַד, "beside Him." The Son is co-equal with the Father, yet there is a distinction between the Persons.
- E. עָמַל, "workmaster," "Master Workman." He took an active part in the work of creation. Cf. the *Λόγος* of John 1. Also, like the Word and the Angel of the Lord, the expression Wisdom designates the Son of God as the One who reveals the will of God to us.
- F. שִׂמְחָה, literally, "Delights." Wisdom delighted in the creation of man as well as in the redemption of the sinful human race. His delights are with the children of men.

**II. The Appropriateness of the Term Wisdom as Ascribed to Christ.**

A. The Meaning of חֵכְמָה and a Few of Its Synonyms.

1. חֵכְמָה
2. בִּינָה
3. טְבוּנָה
4. דַּעַח
5. מוֹסֵר
6. מְצַחֵחַ
7. גְּבוּרָה
8. עֲקָרְמָה
9. עֲצָה
10. חֵקְשׁוּת

B. New Testament Passages in Which the Term *σοφία*, Wisdom, is Associated With Christ.

C. Jesus Christ, the Personal Wisdom, Our Comfort in Life and in Death.

## THE PERSONAL WISDOM IN PROVERBS EIGHT

### Introduction

In one of our familiar hymns<sup>1)</sup> we sing: "O Word of God Incarnate, O Wisdom from on high." Proof for the first phrase is found in the opening verses of the Gospel According to St. John. Since the Gospel of John is one of the most widely read books in the Bible, the fact that the Word, the  $\Lambda \acute{\omicron} \gamma \omicron \varsigma$ , is to be identified with the Son of God is well known to many, including the young children in the Sunday schools. On the other hand, fewer people would be able to indicate the source of the second phrase. The Book of Proverbs definitely merits much more attention than has been given to it. Obviously this lack of familiarity with the Book of Proverbs accounts for the fact that a more limited number of people realize that there is a section in Proverbs which points to the Pre-incarnate Christ, the  $\Lambda \acute{\omicron} \gamma \omicron \varsigma \acute{\alpha} \sigma \alpha \rho \kappa \omicron \varsigma$ .

It will be the burden of this treatise to establish the fact that in the eighth chapter of the Book of Proverbs we have a direct reference to Jesus Christ, the Son of God. This we shall do on the basis of six Hebrew expressions which occur in verses 22 to 31. Then we shall consider the appropriateness of the term  $\Pi \nu \nu \nu$ , as well as related terms, as ascribed to the Son of God. Finally, we shall consider the Personal Wisdom as our comfort in life and in death.

---

1. The Lutheran Hymnal, No. 294. The author is W. W. How.

The Book of Proverbs is a part of the Old Testament Wisdom Literature. Included also are Job and Ecclesiastes of the canonical books, and the Wisdom of Solomon and the Wisdom of Jesus the Son of Sirach, or Ecclesiasticus, of the Apocrypha. All except the Wisdom of Solomon were originally written in Hebrew. However, the Wisdom of Jesus the Son of Sirach was translated into Greek, and only fragments of the Hebrew text have been discovered.<sup>1</sup> Both of these apocryphal books were written at a later period than the canonical books.

From the outset we wish to state our conviction that Solomon is the author of this section, as well as of at least the greater part of the entire Book of Proverbs. We know from 1 Kings 3,12 that Solomon was a man of a  $\square \text{ז} \eta \text{כ} \text{ז}$ , wise heart. His great wisdom and understanding was evidenced by the fact that he spoke 3000 proverbs and composed or sang 1005 songs.

T. K. Cheyne objects to the Solomonic authorship of the Book of Proverbs on account of the ethical and religious content. In his book he opposes the view of Keil, who upholds the Solomonic authorship. Cheyne remarks:

The ethical and religious character even of the earliest proverbial collection stands too far removed from that of the historical Solomon. It is indeed a pure hypothesis that any Solomonic element survives in the Book of Proverbs....It would appear from 1 Kings 4,33 that the wisdom of the historical Solomon expressed itself in spoken fables or moralisations about animals and trees.<sup>2</sup>

However, it is arbitrary, to say the least, for a person to put Solomon into a strait-jacket and expect him to

---

1. Cf. Dr. L. Ruerbringer, Introduction to the Old Testament, p. 115.

2. T. K. Cheyne, Job and Solomon, p. 165.

conform to a particular type of content or style which an individual may fancy. We must remember that Solomon was the wisest of all men, excepting, of course, Christ, the God-Man. According to the very verse which Cheyne cites, 1 Kings 4,33, Solomon was a man of remarkably wide learning. Who, then, is to sit as judge and deny that Solomon is the author?

Of course, it may be that the Proverbs, or at least a number of them, were not written by the hand of Solomon. Perhaps they were written by others under his direction. It may be that they were penned down soon after his death. One thing, however, is certain: They were in existence by the time of Hezekiah<sup>1</sup>, who lived about three centuries later. Solomon's authorship stands, and it is probable that this first section, chapters 1-9, was written during his lifetime.

It was this famous, influential, wealthy king of Israel, a man wiser than the wisest of all other nations, it was this remarkably gifted man, who wrote concerning  $\aleph \eta \zeta \aleph$ , wisdom. And ought he not to have been qualified to hand down his sage advice to posterity? Christ Himself refers to Solomon's wisdom and glory.<sup>2</sup>

In this section we shall, as stated above, try to establish <sup>the fact that</sup> the word  $\aleph \eta \zeta \aleph$ , particularly in the eighth chapter and also in a number of other passages in Proverbs, refers to the Second Person of the Trinity, the Son of God, our Lord Jesus Christ. Of course, frequently it refers to the attribute wisdom. However, <sup>as we shall see,</sup> here it refers to Divine Wisdom, and not the mere attribute, but the Son of God Himself. Dr. L. Fuerbringer remarks: "Darin stimmen alle Ausleger überein, dass hier die

1. Cf. Prov. 25,1.

2. Cf. Matt. 6,29 and Luke 12,27; Matt. 12,42 and Luke 11,31.

Weisheit Gottes redend eingeführt, also personifiziert wird. Aber die meisten neueren Ausleger beschränken dies auf eine dichterische Personification einer Eigenschaft Gottes."<sup>1</sup>

We shall now briefly state the three chief interpretations which are proposed for the word  $\pi\eta\gamma\omega\gamma\eta$  in this section, Prov. 8,22-31.

1. The view is held that this is an attribute of God. It is true that wisdom is an attribute of the Triune God. In Job 12,13 we read: "With Him is wisdom ( $\pi\eta\gamma\omega\gamma\eta$ ) and strength; He hath counsel and understanding."<sup>2</sup> However, that  $\pi\eta\gamma\omega\gamma\eta$  is merely an attribute here cannot be maintained, as we shall demonstrate later.

2. There are several who will go so far as to say that wisdom is here actually personified, but not a Person. Among other things they draw our attention to the fact that  $\pi\eta\gamma\omega\gamma\eta$  is a noun in the feminine gender. We shall discuss also this view later.

3. The view that  $\pi\eta\gamma\omega\gamma\eta$  is the Second Person of the Godhead has been held by very many. A large number of Church fathers held this view, including Irenaeus, Tertullian, Cyprian, Athanasius, Gregory of Nyssa, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Hilary, Eusebius, Epiphanius, Jerome, and Augustine<sup>3</sup>, as well as Luther and later commentators including Hengstenberg and Matthew Henry. This has been the view of conservative Lutherans up to the present day, and this is the view which we also hold. After this brief presentation of the various interpretations, we shall now consider in detail the meaning of  $\pi\eta\gamma\omega\gamma\eta$  as it appears in Prov. 8,22-31, where it is the speaker.

---

1. L. Ruerbringer, *Die Persönliche Weisheit Gottes*, CTM IV, 243.  
2. Cf. Job 28,20-27; Ps. 104,24; Is. 40,13; Eph. 1,7f; Rom. 11,33.  
3. Ruerbringer, *op. cit.*, p. 244.

I. REASONS WHY THE TERM WISDOM, PARTICULARLY AS GIVEN  
IN PROVERBS 8,22-31, REFERS TO THE SON OF GOD

Although we shall study the word  $\text{חָכְמָה}$ , as well as its various synonyms, in another part of this treatise, it is necessary also at this point to determine the meaning of the word.

The word  $\text{חָכְמָה}$  is a noun derived from the verb  $\text{חָכַם}$ , which, according to Gesenius, means "to be or become wise," "to act wisely." The adjective  $\text{חָכֵם}$  is synonymous with the Greek words σοφός and φρόνιμος. One is  $\text{חָכֵם}$  who is skilled in the arts, or knowing, skilful in any way. In most instances

$\text{חָכֵם}$  means "wise," "intelligent," "sagacious," "shrewd."

$\text{חָכְמָה}$  denotes "skill" or "dexterity," but in most cases "wisdom." This word may be applied to God, to His angels (2 Sam. 14,20), and to human beings. The word  $\text{חָכְמָה}$  is a wide, general term which includes all the specific aspects of knowledge and wisdom which are designated by the narrower terms

$\text{בִּינָה}$  and  $\text{דַּעַת}$ , as well as others. Therefore, it includes "insight," "knowledge," and, among other attributes, "piety."

In this connection we wish to quote from the Pulpit

Commentary:

The Hebrew  $\text{חָכְמָה}$  and the Greek σοφία so far agree as philosophical terms in that the end of each is the same, viz., the striving after objective wisdom, the moral fitness of things; but the character of the former differs from that of the latter in being distinctly religious. The beginning and the end of the  $\text{חָכְמָה}$ , Wisdom, is God (Prov. 1,7). Wisdom, then, is not the merely scientific knowledge, or moral philosophy, but knowledge *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, i.e. religious knowledge or piety towards God, i.e. an appreciation of what God requires of us and what we conversely owe to God. Wisdom will carry with it the notions of knowledge and insight.<sup>1</sup>

1. The Pulpit Commentary, Vol. XX, p.2.

That which we quoted refers to human wisdom, which is a gift of God. Only believers possess that wisdom, for "the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom."<sup>1</sup> However, we can see that not human wisdom, although it comes from God, is spoken of in this passage, Prov. 8,22-31. Even a superficial reading will convince us that not human wisdom, but something much higher is meant, and a closer study will establish the fact that this wisdom spoken of here is Divine Wisdom. Moreover, this is not merely wisdom as an attribute of God, nor wisdom personified, but the Personal Wisdom, the Second Person of the Godhead, Jesus Christ.

In reading through this section, we find a few key words which will form a basis for our position. These words are:

'וְיָרַד , 'חֲזִקוּ , 'חֲזַקוּ , יִצְחָק , יִמְנָן ,  
and וְיָרַד . We shall divide this material into six sections according to the chief thought contained in these words as they are used in this section.

A. 'וְיָרַד

Verse 22 begins our section with the words: "The Lord possessed me in the beginning of His way, before His works of old." The key word is 'וְיָרַד , and on the correct understanding of that term much depends. This word, according to Gesenius in his lexicon, has the etymological significance of "setting upright," "erecting," "founding," "forming." However, it seems that the root meaning has almost disappeared. The chief idea in every instance in which it is used is that of obtaining something, and as a result possessing it. As a verb in its various forms it occurs 80 times in the

---

1. Prov. 9,10.

Old Testament.<sup>1</sup> It is found a number of times in the book of Genesis, where it is clear from the context that it means "to obtain by purchase," "to buy for a price."<sup>2</sup> In Exodus 15,16 the meaning is different. There it refers to God: "O Lord, till the people pass over, which thou hast purchased,  $\text{חָרַדְתָּ}$ . Luther's translation is a fine interpretation: "Bis dein Volk, Herr, hindurch komme...das du erworben hast." That  $\text{חָרַדְתָּ}$  can mean possidere also Mandelkern admits.

In the book of Leviticus Moses used the word  $\text{חָרַדְתָּ}$  with reference to the buying of land which was to return to its former owner in the year of jubilee. It is also used in this sense in the other historical books of the Old Testament. In the book of Ruth it also has this significance.

In Jer. 13,1 it need not mean "buy." There the Lord commands Jeremiah to obtain for himself a linen girdle. So also in Jer. 19,1, where the prophet is told to obtain (whether by purchase or any other means is not mentioned) a potter's earthen bottle. In Is. 11,11, which is a Messianic section, the prophet remarks: "The Lord shall set His hand again the second time to recover (  $\text{חָרַדְתָּ} \text{ } \text{?}$  ) the remnant of His people." Obviously this means to "obtain," "get back again," and consequently "possess for one's self."

Likewise, in Gen. 14,19.22 Melchizedek, in blessing Abram, calls Jehovah the Most High God, Possessor (  $\text{חָרַדְתָּ}$  ) of heaven and earth." There are several other instances also where  $\text{חָרַדְתָּ}$  means "to possess," including Is. 1,3, where the participle is rendered "owner." However, we cannot enumerate them now.

---

1. Solomon Mandelkern, Veteris Testamenti Concordantiae Hebraicae Atque Chaldaicae.

2. Cf. Gen. 25,10; 47,22; 49,30; 50,13.

Nevertheless, there is one most important passage which must be taken into consideration, namely, Gen. 4,1. Eve had received the promise, in Gen. 3,15, that the Seed of the woman would be born, and that this Seed would bruise the head of the serpent. In her joy she thought that her first child was the promised Seed. In this she was mistaken--not about the promise, but in the person. Thinking that her first child, Cain, whose name means "possession," was that Seed, she exclaimed: **וְהָיָה לְיָדָי** **וְהָיָה לְיָדָי** **וְהָיָה לְיָדָי** **וְהָיָה לְיָדָי** . There **וְהָיָה לְיָדָי** can have but one meaning: "obtain," "come into possession of," "receive." And how did she obtain him? Through birth, of course. That is the only possibility, because the verbs **וְהָיָה לְיָדָי** (in a euphemistic sense) , **וְהָיָה לְיָדָי** , and **וְהָיָה לְיָדָי** are employed in the first half of the verse.

We know, therefore, that **וְהָיָה לְיָדָי** means to "acquire," and, as a result, "possess." Mandelkern lists several possible meanings for the word: fundare, creare, parare, acquirere, emerere, redimere, and possidere. However, in each instance the result is possession. "Ganz richtig bemerkt Calov, dass **וְהָיָה לְיָדָי** auf einen Besitz gehe entweder per modum creationis, Gen. 14,19, oder per modum adoptionis, Ps. 74,2, oder per modum generationis, Gen. 4,1. (Biblia Illustrata, I, 1150)."<sup>1</sup>

The Septuagint renders the word **וְהָיָה לְיָדָי** by **ἐκτίσει** . Targums and the Peshito, as well as most of the modern commentators, follow the Septuagint in this respect. Zöckler and Strack also give this as the meaning. However, neither the Septuagint nor the other versions nor the commentaries are

1. Fuerbringer, Op. cit., p. 323.

inspired.  $\pi\lambda\rho$  can mean possidere per modum generationis, as well as per modum creationis and per modum adoptionis. Of course, the question is: What does it mean here? Zöckler, who translates "Jehovah created me as the beginning of His course," raises the following objections to the translation  $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\tau\eta\sigma\alpha\tau\omicron$  (Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotian), possedit (Jerome), "gehabt," "possessed."

1. The fact that the verb  $\pi\lambda\rho$  does not signify simply "to possess," but "to attain to the possession," "to acquire," which latter signification would find here a poor application.
2. The fact that the adjunct of the verb ( $\text{יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי} \text{ ) agrees better with the idea of creating than that of possessing.}$
3. That the double mention of Wisdom's "being born" in verses 24,25, and not less the expression in verse 23, "I was set up" (or "wrought out"), corresponds better with the idea of a creation than with that of possessing or having.
4. That the parallel passages, Ecclesiasticus 1,4.9; 24,8, which are evidently formed on the model of that before us, also employ the verb  $\kappa\tau\iota\zeta\epsilon\iota\nu$  (create) and not some such as  $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\iota\nu$  or  $\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\tau\eta\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  (have or possess)."<sup>1</sup>

We shall answer these arguments in order:

1. It is true that the significance of  $\pi\lambda\rho$  is that of possession through acquisition. However, that acquisition need not be limited to an act of creation, which, as we know, is impossible in this instance, for the last part of the verse reads:  $\text{וְיָצַדְתִּי בְּחָכְמָתְךָ} \text{ . As we shall see below, several have regarded } \text{יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי} \text{ as an adjunct of the verb, which is our key word, } \text{ } \pi\lambda\rho \text{ . This they have done instead of taking it to be an adverbial accusative expressing time. For } \text{יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי} \text{ the Septuagint has } \acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\eta\nu \tau\omega\nu \acute{\omicron}\delta\omega\nu \acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omega\upsilon \text{ .}$

---

1. E.g. P. Lange and Philip Schaff, A Commentary on the Holy Scriptures. Vol. X by Otto Zöckler.

Evidently the Septuagint's peculiar rendering, εἰς ἔργα αὐτοῦ, is explained by the probability that the translators did not understand the phrase יָנַח יְצַעֲבֵן בְּקִדְרָה. On the other hand, the Vulgate correctly reads antequam.

Franz Delitzsch makes יָנַח יְצַעֲבֵן בְּקִדְרָה an adjunct parallel to יְצַעֲבֵן בְּקִדְרָה, which he also maintains to be an adjunct. He holds that the first "Bestimmung des Wann" occurs in יָנַח, although he apparently admits the possibility of taking בְּקִדְרָה as temporal when he remarks: "בְּקִדְרָה räumliches und dann zeitliches Vornsein be eutet," and proceeds to quote Sirach 1,4: προτέραν τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ. 1

Dr. Fuerbringer, on the other hand, remarks: "Alle Präpositionen im Hebräischen ursprünglich Substantiva sind," and defines בְּקִדְרָה as: "1. Was vorn ist. 2. Osten. 3. Vorzeit."<sup>2</sup>

It surely follows from the context that here this word בְּקִדְרָה, in its use as a preposition, has a temporal, not a local meaning. It is a parallel to יְצַעֲבֵן בְּקִדְרָה, which we shall discuss in the next point. Now, if He had not at this time done any "works," if He had not created any objects, how could this בְּקִדְרָה refer to creation? "He created me before He did any creating" is nonsensical. On the other hand, the meaning possidere per modum generationis makes good sense in this connection. From eternity, long before time began, in fact uninfluenced by time, He possessed by generation, or begetting, בְּרִשְׁתּוֹ, the Son. This is the deepest of all mysteries, for we can only think in terms of limited measures such as time and space.

---

1. Carl F. Keil und Franz Delitzsch, Biblischer Kommentar über Das Alte Testament. Die Poetischen Bücher Des Alten Testaments von Franz Delitzsch. Das Salomonische Spruchbuch. p.142.  
2. Fuerbringer, op. cit., p. 325.

2. Zöckler's second argument (see above) is based on his assumption that  $\text{הַשְׁמַרְתָּ} \text{לְעוֹלָם}$  is an adjunct. The grammarian König holds that  $\text{הַשְׁמַרְתָּ}$  is equivalent to  $\text{הַשְׁמַרְתָּ} \text{בְּ}$  here.<sup>1</sup> Dr. Fuerbringer correctly remarks that it means more than an accusative of time,<sup>2</sup> for it is the absolute beginning, long before time was created.<sup>3</sup> Surely this also supports the fact that  $\text{בָּרָא}$  here means beget rather than create.

3. His third argument (see above) does not hold. Indeed, rather than weakening our position, it strengthens it. Is not  $\text{בָּרָא}$  to be considered a parallel of  $\text{בָּרָא}$  in the sense in which this passage employs the word?

4. At first this argument (see above) might seem quite cogent. However, we must remember that Ecclesiasticus (Jesus the Son of Sirach) is an apocryphal book, and hence not inspired. It was of a later date than Proverbs, and may have been written with a prejudiced notion of the identity of Wisdom. Then, too, it is not definite that the Wisdom of which Jesus the Son of Sirach speaks is the same as the Personal Wisdom in our chapter. Moreover, there is a real parallel between the Wisdom in Proverbs 8 and the creation account in Genesis 1, as well as the Logos in John 1. Since we have such striking and convincing parallels in our canonical Scriptures, why turn to the Apocrypha to draw parallels? The parallels in the two books of Wisdom contained in the Apocrypha are indeed useful. However, we dare not make the meaning of the verb  $\text{בָּרָא}$  depend on the  $\text{κτίσις}$ , or related words which we find in Ecclesiasticus.

---

1. Fr. Eduard König, Historisch-Comparative Syntax Der Hebräischen Sprache, p. 385.

2. Fuerbringer, op. cit., p. 324.

3. Cf. Gen. 1,1; John 1,1.

Franz Delitzsch closely approaches our view, but he stops short of definitely identifying the  $\pi\tau\theta\zeta\pi$  with the Son of God. Since this is such a vital point, we shall list his objections to the meaning "possessed," i. e., by generation, as we render the word  $\pi\tau\theta\zeta$ .<sup>1</sup> He goes into the matter rather at length, and it is difficult to determine exactly where he stands. At times his position seems to approximate ours, but at other times it is far removed from our view. His objections are:

1. Die Weisheit ist nicht selber Gott, sondern Gottes; sie hat der neutestamentliche Offenbarung zufolge im Logos persönliches Dasein, aber ist nicht der Logos selbst; sie ist die Weltidee, welche, einmal entworfen, Gotte gegenständlich ist, nicht als tottes Schemen, sondern als lebendiges Geistesbild; sie ist das Urbild der Welt, welches aus Gott entstanden vor Gott steht, die Welt der Idee, welche das Medium zwischen der Gottheit und der Welt der Wirklichkeit bildet, die bei der Entstehung und Vollendung der Welt, so wie Gott diese haben will, betheiligte geistige Macht. Diese Weisheit personificirt hier der Dichter, er redet nicht vom persönlichen Logos, aber der weitere Offenbarungsverlauf weist ihre faktische Personification im Logos nach.

2. Indem ihr der Dichter der Weltentstehung vorausgegangenes Dasein zuspricht, erklärt er sie, indem für vorweltlich und also vorzeitlich, ebendamit für ewig. Denn wenn er sie an die Spitze der Creaturen als deren erste stellt so will er sie damit doch nicht selber zu einer weltlichen zeitanfänglichen Creatur machen; er rückt ihre Entstehung mit der Entstehung der Creatur nur deshalb zusammen, weil jene von vornherein auf diese bezogen ist und abzweckt; die Macht, welche wurde ehe Himmel und Erde wurden und bei der Entstehung der Erd- und Himmelswelt mitgewirkt hat, kann doch nicht selber unter die Kategorie der Creaturen um und über uns fallen.

Ebenderum hat 3. die Übersetzung mit  $\epsilon\kappa\tau\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\upsilon$  nichts gegen sich, es ist aber ein von der  $\kappa\tau\iota\sigma\iota\varsigma$  Himmels und der Erde verschiedenes, weil zu dem Zwecke dieser  $\kappa\tau\iota\sigma\iota\varsigma$  geschehenes,  $\kappa\tau\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\upsilon$  gemeint, und sicher

---

1. For the sake of reproducing Delitzsch's very words, we are quoting from the original German, not from the English translation by Dr. M. G. Easton, from which we shall quote later on in this paper.

hat der Dichter mit Absicht nicht 'J N 7 7, sondern 'J J P geschrieben.<sup>1</sup>

Delitzsch then proceeds to point out the difference between the verbs N 7 7 and 7 J P as follows:

An 7 J P haftet nicht in gleicher Weise das Merkmal der Zeitanfänglichkeit wie an N 7 7, welches immer göttliches Hervorbringen von bisher noch nicht Gewesenem ausdrückt. Das verbum 7 J P vereinigt die Bedeutungen schaffen und sich etwas schaffen, bereiten parare (z. B. Ps. 139,13) und sich etwas bereiten comparare. . . . In dem 'J J P liegt also beides: dass Gott die Weisheit hervorgebracht und dass er sie sich zu eigen gemacht, freilich nicht so wie ein Mensch sich Weisheit von Aussen her zu eigen macht.<sup>2</sup>

He goes on to say:

Wenn aber Gott die Weisheit zum Erstling seines Weges d. i. seiner Schöpferthätigkeit gemacht hat (vgl. Apok. 3,14 und Col. 1,15), so ist das Machen nicht als Erwerbung, sondern als ein diese Schöpferthätigkeit Gottes eröffnendes, auf sie abzielendes Hervorbringen zu denken, und dies wird auch durch das folg. 'h 3 7 7 (genita sum, vgl. Gen. 4,1 'h' J P genui) bestätigt.<sup>3</sup>

Although Delitzsch goes very far on the way of identifying 7 J P in this passage with Christ, he stops all of a sudden, as it were. It is true that he speaks of a "Hervorbringen," yet it is not the aeterna generatio of the Son by the Father which Delitzsch has in mind. He does not identify it with the eternal Λόγος, although, as we shall see, the parallels are striking, to say the least. To him, 7 J P is merely Wisdom personified. [He goes no further than the ancient Greeks, who spoke of various virtues personified.]

In this long philosophical discussion Delitzsch speculates concerning God and Wisdom. We dare not speculate about God or try to make Him conform to our limited reason. The only statements which we make concerning Him must be based on His own revelation to us, which is Holy Scripture.

1. Delitzsch, op. cit., p. 141f.

2. Ibid., p. 142.

3. Ibid..



But, we ask, do the passages (Rev. 3,14 and Col. 1,15) teach that Jesus Christ is a creature of God? Let us examine them.

In Rev. 3,14 it is clear that Christ is the speaker. He is called *ὁ ἀμὴν, ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστὸς καὶ ἀληθινός, ἡ ἀρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ*. Christ is appropriately designated *ὁ ἀμὴν*, because He is firm, reliable, unchangeable. Likewise, He is the faithful, trustworthy One, as the word *πιστός* indicates. Not only that, but He is also *ἀληθινός*: true, actual, genuine.<sup>1</sup> The following words further describe Him: *ἡ ἀρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ*. The Arians and their kind hold that Christ is here designated the first of the creation of God, *i. e.*, a created being. However, that interpretation is impossible, for it clearly contradicts all those passages of the Bible in which Christ is set forth as true God from eternity. Furthermore, we shall presently show that the word *ἀρχή* can be used in such a way that no Arianism need be implied in this passage. Dr. James Moffatt remarks: "He is the first in the sense that he is neither creator (a prerogative of God in the Apocalypse), nor created, but creative."<sup>2</sup> He makes Christ merely an active principle, and will not admit that the Son, with the Father, is creator. However, since "I and my Father are one,"<sup>3</sup> and since we are expressly told that "all things were made by Him,"<sup>4</sup> we dare not deny that Jesus is Creator also, and not merely a creative principle. By the same token we must disagree with Dūsterdieck: "The wording in itself allows only two conceptions:

---

1. According to Thayer, Dūsterdieck, and others, *ἀληθινός* is to be distinguished from *ἀληθής*, in that the former means "real," "genuine," whereas the latter means "truthful."

2. *The Expositor's Greek Testament*, Vol. V, p. 370.

3. John 10,30.

4. John 1,3.

either Christ is designated 'the beginning of the creation of God,' i. e., as the first creature of God, . . . or the Lord is regarded as the active principle of the creation."<sup>1</sup> Dusterdieck's position is wrong because at best he will admit that Christ is merely a power or means of creation, and hence not to be identified with the Father. That would result in subordinationism, which is something entirely different from the distinction of persons which does exist in the Godhead.

Let us briefly study the meaning of the word ἀρχή in this connection. We shall list the meanings which two lexicographers give for the word. Thayer gives the following meanings:

1. Beginning, origin.
2. The person or thing that commences, the first person or thing in a series, the leader.
3. That by which anything begins to be, the origin, active cause. Rev. 3,14.
4. The extremity of a thing.
5. The first place, principality, rule, magistracy.<sup>2</sup>

In the lexicon of Preuschen and Bauer we find the following meanings listed:

1. Anfang. a) Zipfel. b) Der Beginn. c) Der Anfang, Urbeginn. d) Der Anfänger.
2. Die erste Ursache, der Urgrund, das Princip. Apok. 3,14; doch ist auch die Deutung Anfang = Erstlingswerk möglich; siehe oben lb.
3. Die Behörde.
4. Das Amt. Judas 6.<sup>3</sup>

In both lexicons this passage, Rev. 3,14, is listed under the meaning "origin," "active cause." If this is understood in the sense that Christ, the  $\pi\tau\epsilon\rho\varsigma$ , was

---

1. H. A. W. Meyer, Commentary on the New Testament, Vol. XI, p. 177.

2. J. H. Thayer, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, pp. 76f. He gives a rather lengthy discussion.

3. Erwin Preuschen und Walter Bauer, Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments.

actively engaged, with the Father and the Spirit, as true Creator of this world, then this meaning would be acceptable. However, that is not the sense in which Dusterdieck understands this word. Another possible interpretation would be one which is listed by lexicographers before the one which we have discussed, and that is, according to Thayer, "the person or thing that commences," "the first person or thing in a series." Under this meaning, "der Anfänger," Preuschen-Bauer lists Col. 1,18 as well as Rev. 21,6 and 22,13. The two last passages seem somewhat doubtful in this sense. Our passage, Rev. 3,14, would fit better if given the meaning "der Anfänger." The Colossians passage evidently has this meaning, however.

In regard to Rev. 3,14, therefore, it may be said that we have a choice of two interpretations of the word ἀρχή :

1. The active cause of the creation, in the sense that John uses it in 1,3: "All things were made by Him."
2. The One who began creation, "der Anfänger." Obviously He was not a part of the creation, for He was Creator.

The other passage to which Delitzsch refers, Col. 1,15, speaks of Christ as follows: ὅς ἐστιν εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου, πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως. Christ was the "image of God" in that in Him God was, and is, revealed. In His state of humiliation our Savior did not always make full use of His divine glory. Now He does. He is the εἰκὼν, the very image of God, because they are one. Here the glorified Jesus is meant.

In Heb. 3,3 we are told: ὅς ἦν ἀπαύρασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτῆρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ. Christ is always,

( ὤν , present participle), the effulgence of the glory of God. That identifies Him with God the Father according to essence, for are not the rays of the sun the very sun itself? He is the very impress of God. The absence of the article brings out the qualitative idea. Now such a One who is true God is called ΠΡΩΤΟΤΟΚΟΣ ΠΑΨΗΣ ΚΤΙΨΕΩΣ. The Arians falsely based their teaching on the assumption that ΠΑΨΗΣ ΚΤΙΨΕΩΣ is a partitive genitive, "out of all creation," as though Christ were a creature.<sup>1</sup>

Meyer correctly holds that the genitive is a genitive of comparison. The genitive ΠΑΨΗΣ ΚΤΙΨΕΩΣ is not the partitive genitive, because the anarthrous ΠΑΨΑ ΚΤΙΨΙΣ does not mean the whole creation, as Meyer affirms. We shall quote him:

The anarthrous ΠΑΨΑ ΚΤΙΨΙΣ does not mean the whole creation, or everything which is created. . . , and consequently cannot affirm the category or collective whole to which Christ belongs as its first-born individual (it means: every creature. . . ); but it is the genitive of comparison, corresponding to the superlative expression: "the first-born in comparison with every creature," that is, born earlier than every creature.<sup>2</sup>

Dr. Fuerbringer quotes Luther and Bengel in support of our position. Luther: "Der Erstgeborne vor allen Kreaturen." Bengel: "Das ΠΡΟ in ΠΡΩΤΟΤΟΚΟΣ heisst 'vor den Kreaturen.'"<sup>3</sup>

In the notes to Meyer's Commentary, Timothy Dwight remarks:

That the primary idea of ΠΡΩΤΟΤΟΚΟΣ , as here used, is that of priority of time--born before every creature, as Meyer says--is clearly indicated by the

---

1. Cf. The Pulpit Commentary on Colossians, p. 8. He condemns the Arian view.

2. Meyer, Commentary on the New Testament, Vol. VIII, p. 225.

3. Fuerbringer, op. cit., p. 324.

original sense of the adjective; by the fact that the following  $\delta\tau\iota$  with its clause seems to suggest this meaning; and by  $\eta\rho\theta\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omega\nu$  of verse 17.<sup>1</sup>

This passage does not weaken, but rather strengthens the teaching that Jesus Christ is the pre-existent Son of God. Although begotten of God, He is very God Himself. For this reason every Christian can confess, in the words of the Nicene Creed:

And (I believe) in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, begotten of the Father before all worlds, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father; by whom all things were made.<sup>2</sup>

We entered upon this rather lengthy discussion of these two passages in order to show that these very passages to which Delitzsch refers teach the pre-existence of Christ, with whom Delitzsch refuses to identify the  $\pi\ \rho\ \theta\ \eta$  of Proverbs Eight. Why he goes so far as he does in granting the striking parallelism between the  $\pi\ \rho\ \theta\ \eta$  here and the  $\Lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omega\varsigma$  in John 1,1ff, and yet will not admit that both directly refer to Christ, seems strange indeed. Of course, we hold that the two expressions are to be identified with Christ. In his discussion of this subject A. G. Hoelemann remarks:

Nec diversas duas hypostases in Verbo illo divino et in hac Sapientia divina, creatione et gubernatione . . . mundi occupatis, sed unam eandemque hypostasim utroque in nomine . . . agnoscimus. Id quod certò quidem aliunde, simul vero etiam inde possit.<sup>3</sup>

Indeed, the  $\pi\ \rho\ \theta\ \eta$  is the  $\Lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omega\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\rho\kappa\omega\varsigma$ , the Pre-incarnate Christ.

---

1. Meyer, *op. cit.*, Vol. VIII, p. 270.

2. *Concordia Triglotta*, p. 31.

3. A. G. Hoelemann, *De Evangelii Joannei Introitu*, p. 30.

There are those who appeal to the fact that the feminine form,  $\text{חָכְמָה}$ , is used, and not a masculine form. Among them is Cheyne. His view is similar to that of Delitzsch. Cheyne declares:

She (for Wisdom, *khokma*, is a feminine word) has indeed been mentioned before (1,20; 3,13-20; 4,5-9), but from 8,1 to 9,6 the poet is absorbed in his grand personification. Wisdom is now presented to us in the familiar dialect of poetry, as the first-born Child of the Creator. There is but one Wisdom; though her forms are many, in her origin she is one. The Wisdom who presided over the "birth" of nature is the same who by her messengers (the "wise men") calls mankind to turn away from evil (9,3).<sup>1</sup>

The specious argument which Cheyne and others advance, namely, that the feminine form,  $\text{חָכְמָה}$ , is used, might seem cogent at first glance, but it is a weak, unconvincing, and even erroneous one. Let us produce a few examples. Since there is no neuter in Hebrew, all nouns must be either masculine or feminine. Now it so happens that the feminine gender is usually employed for things without life, abstract ideas, countries, towns, parts of the body, and powers of nature. The fact that the word which describes them is in the feminine gender surely does not prove that these objects are feminine. Even the word  $\text{אָב}$ , "father," has a feminine plural,  $\text{אִבּוֹת}$ .<sup>2</sup> Now who would be so foolish as to insist that the fathers are of feminine gender because the form of the noun is feminine?

Another example would be the word  $\text{רוּחַ}$ , which is of the feminine gender. In the many passages where it is used of the Holy Ghost, we would not think of appealing to its

---

1. Cheyne, *op. cit.*, p. 159.

2. Benj. Davies and Edward C. Mitchell, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, pp. 270ff. There are several paragraphs on this subject. We cannot go into detail on this matter.

gender in order to attempt to prove that not the true God is meant. The same applies to its counterpart in the New Testament, the noun τὸ πνεῦμα. There the neuter gender is used. However, that a definite person of the Godhead is meant can readily be determined from the numerous benedictions in which it is used in a construction parallel with ὁ πατήρ or ὁ υἱός or both, as well as from the other passages in which attributes and works are ascribed to the Holy Ghost, so that it must be a definite person.<sup>1</sup> As we shall mention later, the word ἰσοϋς, verse 30, is a masculine noun, yet the Personal Wisdom, σοφία, was ἰσοϋς.

Thus far it has been our object to prove that the verb ἰσοϋμαι, which in itself has the meaning "to possess as a result of acquiring," in this connection means "to possess through generation." Consequently σοφία can truly say: "Jehovah possessed me (generated me) in the beginning of His way." We shall now proceed to the second of our six key words which form the basis for this first part of our paper.

B. ἰσοϋμαι

The verb ἰσοϋμαι is a synonym of ἰσοϋμαι, and it occurs in the form ἰσοϋμαι twice in this section, verses 22-31. ἰσοϋμαι has a side form, ἰσοϋμαι. According to Gesenius the etymological meaning is "to be twisted, turned, turned round." Depending on the connection, the verb has various

---

1. Cf. Matt. 12, 31f., and in particular John 14, 17, 18, 26; 15, 26; 16, 8, 13. Note that the neuter form τὸ πνεῦμα must be understood as a personal Being, for the masculine ὁ παράκλητος, ἐκεῖνος, etc., are used to define Him further.

meanings in the qal conjugation: "dance;" "be twisted;" "twist oneself," "writhe," "be in pain;" "bring forth;" "tremble;" "be strong," "be firm;" "wait," "stay," "delay." In the pulal it means "to be born," "to be brought forth."<sup>1</sup> The word זָרָא , "strength," is related to it.

Besides the two instances in our section, this verb is found in the pulal conjugation also in Job 15,7, where Eliphaz asks Job: הֲזֵרָא חַיִּים וְיָבִיא בְּעֵינָיו זָרָא וְיִשְׁוֶן עֵינָיו וְיִשְׁוֶן עֵינָיו . That in this passage from Job it means "to be born" is clear from the context, and particularly so because of the parallel word, זָרָא , which is the niph'al of זָרָא , "bring forth." Another instance of the word זָרָא in the pulal conjugation is found in Ps. 51,7. In that remarkable penitential Psalm David confesses: אֶפְשָׁר לִי זָרָא וְיִשְׁוֶן עֵינָיו וְיִשְׁוֶן עֵינָיו . Again the parallel word, this time זָרָא , in the pi'el, which means "be warm," "have sexual desire," "conceive," establishes the meaning "be born" as the only possible one for זָרָא .

Let us also consult Deut. 32,18. In this beautiful song of Moses we read: הֲזֵרָא חַיִּים וְיָבִיא בְּעֵינָיו זָרָא וְיִשְׁוֶן עֵינָיו וְיִשְׁוֶן עֵינָיו . As in all Hebrew poetry, here we have parallelism. In each member there are three words. It is a form of chiasmus: The verb is last in the first member, but first in the last one.

יְהוָה and אֱלֹהֵינוּ are synonymous. In poetry אֱלֹהֵינוּ often stands for God. It has the same significance as the name זָרָא : a God of power and might. Again we have זָרָא as a parallel to זָרָא , which here appears in the active (pi'el) form.

---

1. Gesenius, Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon, pp. 264f.

Let us again turn to our chapter, verses 24 and 25. It has been established that **יְהוָה יָלַד** here means "born," "brought forth." What kind of bringing forth is expressed in this word as it is used with reference to wisdom? We know that **הַחַיָּה** is not a creature; nevertheless this unique Person is spoken of as being born. It is not a birth here in time, but in eternity. It is the generatio aeterna of the Son of God by the Father. Several expressions in our text convey the idea of eternity. We shall mention them:

1. **לֹא שֵׁחַ דָּרְכָיו** 2. **מִכְּעֶלְיוֹן** 3. **מִנְּעוֹן** 4. **מִעוֹלָם**
5. **מִרְאֵי מַעְיָנוֹחַ** 6. **מִפְּתֵי-אֵי-אֵלֹהִים** 7. **בְּאֵי-תַחַת-הַמַּוֹחַ** 8. **בְּאֵי-מַעְיָנוֹחַ**
9. **בְּפְתָרֵם הַרְיִים** 10. **לְפָנַי גְּבוּעוֹחַ** (Literally "to the face of," a local meaning. However, because of the parallelism it receives a temporal force: "to the face of" the hills, i. e., even before they were formed.)

There are other expressions also, but we shall not enumerate them. However, in verse 30, we have the imperfect, **יְהִי־הוּא**, given twice. It is the very word by which God designated Himself in His appearance to Moses in the burning bush. In Exod. 3,14 He said: **יְהִי־הוּא וְאֵין־הוּא**. The imperfect form, **יְהִי־הוּא**, from **הָיָה**, "to be," denotes a continuous state of condition without termination or mutation. God is eternal and immutable. So is **הַחַיָּה**, who is characterized as **יְהִי־הוּא**, continuously being<sup>1</sup> at His side, **יְשָׁרֵף**. We shall discuss this word **יְשָׁרֵף** later.

It is interesting to note that in verse 23 Solomon uses three synonyms for eternity. Dr. Fuerbringer explains them as follows:

---

1. Note that **יְהִי־הוּא** means being, not becoming. "Ich war," not "ich ward."

דָּלִיָּוָה, von Ewigkeit her, weist zurück in die unabsehbare Ferne der Ewigkeit. דָּלִיָּו ist ja etymologische das Verborgene, Verhüllte, das man wegen seiner weiten Entfernung nicht erkennen kann. . . .  
 וְאֵתֵּן, von Anfang her, a principio, wie Geier übersetzt, weist dazu in die Zeit des Weltanfangs. . . . Das Wort וְאֵתֵּן bezeichnet ja zunächst den Kopf, dann den Anfang. Und וְאֵתֵּן--בְּרֵאשִׁיתֵי הָאָרֶץ heisst wörtlich: "von den Vorderseiten, den Anfängen, der Erde her." Das könnte nun die ältesten Zeiten der Erde sein, die Urzeit; aber es kann auch die Zeiten bezeichnen, die der Erde vorangehen. . . . Diese letztere Fassung wird durch den Kontext nahegelegt und durch Micha 5,1 . . . "welches Ausgang von Anfang und von Ewigkeit her gewesen ist," bestätigt, דָּלִיָּו יְהוָה בְּרֵאשִׁיתֵי הָאָרֶץ. Aber selbst wenn man die Worte von den ältesten Zeiten der Erde verstehen wollte, so zeigt doch der nachfolgende Kontext, dass der Ursprung der Weisheit nicht mit der Grundlegung der Welt zusammenfällt, sondern damals schon die Weisheit existierte.<sup>1</sup>

All of these expressions join to give eloquent testimony to the eternity of **וְאֵתֵּן**. The eternal generation of the Son is taught here. In parallel passages we have the same thought stated. In the well-known verse, Ps. 2,7, God the Father addresses the Son: **וְאֵתֵּן יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ יְהוָה**. The Father is addressing the Son, so two persons of the Godhead are involved. The begetting took place in eternity.

**וְאֵתֵּן** in this instance means "eternity." With God, a thousand years are like a day, and vice versa.<sup>2</sup> He is not governed or influenced by time. In the gal, the verb means either "bring forth," "bear," (of a woman) or "beget," (of a man). In the hiphil it means only "beget."

Indeed, we know that God, who is a Spirit, does not beget or bring forth children as an earthly father or mother does. However, these expressions are ascribed to Him. In this Psalm (2,7) we have the word **וְאֵתֵּן**, which here

1. Fuerbringer, op. cit., pp. 325f.  
 2. Cf. Ps. 90,4 and 2 Pet. 3,8.

definitely means "beget," for the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews quotes it as follows: υἱός μου εἶ σύ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γενένηκά σε . Here, in Heb. 1,5a, γεννάω can mean only "beget," as it does always. However, is it not interesting to note that the same Person, Almighty God the Father, also gave birth to His Son? In verses 24 and 25 of Proverbs 8, הַיְיָיִן is used. The Son, who is the אֵלֹהִים, speaks of Himself when He says הַיְיָיִן. This eternal generation is so far above and beyond our meager reasoning power that we must not pry into this great mystery which concerns the Almighty God. However, where Scripture speaks we have not only the privilege, but also the duty to acknowledge and teach it.<sup>1</sup>

Since אֵלֹהִים is born, it must be a Person, not a mere attribute, or even a personification of the attribute. One false view may here be mentioned: " הַיְיָיִן indicates in this place the energizing of Wisdom, her conception in the Divine Mind, and her putting forth in operation."<sup>2</sup> We have already stated reasons why this position is untenable. This argument is similar to that of Delitzsch given above.<sup>3</sup>

In Prov. 30,4, Agur describes God's great works, and says: "What is His name, and what is His Son's name, if thou canst tell?"<sup>4</sup> We take this to refer to God the Father and God the Son. The Hebrew text is: מַה-שְּׁמוֹ וּמַה-שֵּׁם-בְנוֹ כִּי תֵדָע. The Authorized Version renders כִּי תֵדָע by "if thou canst tell." It would be better to take the כִּי as causal.

1. Cf. 1 Pet. 4,11; 1 Tim. 6,3.

2. The Pulpit Commentary, Vol. XX, p. 166.

3. See pp. 12f.

4. The capital letters are our own. The Authorized Version does not capitalize these words.

Although the word may mean "when," and hence "if," the more usual meaning is "because," "since," for the causal idea seems to be more prominent. Furthermore, the series of questions would warrant our interpreting it in a causal sense. Alex R. Gordon, in the Chicago translation of the Old Testament, correctly renders it: "For surely you know!"<sup>1</sup> Likewise, the Norwegian translation: "Du ved det jo."<sup>2</sup> In this section, then, it is taken for granted that, if we know God's name, which is His own revelation of Himself, we know His Son's name also. Obviously the word son's in the Authorized Version ought to be capitalized.

There are many other Old Testament passages which give convincing proof of Christ's divine Sonship, but space will not permit us to consider all of them. We have, however, presented a number of passages which are parallel to Prov. 8,22-31. That Wisdom is the Son of God is surely very forcefully brought out by these close parallels also. In the New Testament, the Prologue of John's Gospel testifies of the Logos as the Eternal God, Creator, Light, Life, Savior, and Mediator, who, although He came to save all mankind, was rejected by both the majority of the Jews and a large number of the Gentiles. In 1 Cor. 1, that marvelously rich chapter, Christ is expressly designated Wisdom.<sup>3</sup> Indeed, Christ is the true Wisdom from above.

---

1. The Old Testament, An American Translation. Edited by J. M. Powis Smith.

2. Bibelen, Eller Den Hellige Skrift.

3. Cf. verse 24: "But to them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God." Also verse 30: "But of Him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption."

c. הָצַבְתִּי

After the lengthy sections in which we particularly considered the meanings of the two verbs, נָתַתְּ and שָׂתַתְּ, we shall now discuss more briefly the fact that Wisdom was set up, established. The verb הָצַבְתִּי in its form הָצַבְתִּי, in verse 23, will be the center of this study.

Our first task will be to establish the text, since there are variant readings. The best-attested reading is the one given in the Masoretic text: הָצַבְתִּי, which is the 1 sing. perf. niph'al of הָצַבְתִּי. According to Gesenius the word means "to make libation," "to cast," "to found;" "to anoint."<sup>1</sup> Dr. Fuerbringer does not favor the meaning "anoint." He remarks:

" הָצַבְתִּי ," "ich bin eingesetzt," wie in Ps. 2,6 das Kal. Die Grundbedeutung des Wortes ist hingiesen, vom Opfer oder vom Geist gebraucht; dann synekdochisch verallgemeinert: festsetzen, einsetzen, nicht "salben." . . . Abzuweisen ist die Bedeutung "ich bin gegossen, gestaltet, gebildet worden," die Zöckler und König annehmen.<sup>2</sup>

One variant reading has been presented in which the consonants remain unchanged. It has been suggested that the word be pointed הָצַבְתִּי. That would be the niph'al perfect of הָצַבְתִּי, "anoint." However, the niph'al of this verb does not occur in the entire Old Testament. Furthermore, we know that the Masoretic vowel points are generally authentic, since they reproduce the pronunciation of the words as they were handed down by oral tradition among the Hebrews, who were scrupulously careful in the matter of such details.

1. Gesenius, Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon. Whenever Gesenius is mentioned in the remainder of this dissertation, it is his lexicon to which reference is made, unless otherwise indicated.

2. Fuerbringer, op. cit., p. 325<sup>4</sup>.

Another suggested reading involves the change of consonants in the text. This seems to be a rather arbitrary measure adopted by various critics for the sake of reconciling the Hebrew text with a number of versions, including the Septuagint, the Syriac Version, Targums, the Vulgate, and Aquila. The reading which they adopt is 'הַטֹּבֵי, or plene written 'הַטֹּבֵיִי, the niph'al perfect of טֹבַי. In the qal this verb means "to place," "set," "found;" "ordain," "appoint;" "constitute," "establish." This word, it is true, would fit well here. Neither is there any doubt that, in the niph'al, in which it would be found here, it would be very appropriate, for in the niph'al it means "to be founded," "settle;" "support oneself," "lean;" "take counsel together." Doubtless, this word is synonymous with the Septuagint translation ἔθεμελίωσέ με and the Vulgate version ordinata sum. Nevertheless, what need is there of changing the *Masoretic* text in order to force it to agree with the translations?

Another suggestion has been offered by Frankenberg.

He states:

'הַטֹּבֵי vers 23 hat mit טֹבֵי oder טֹבֵי nichts zu thun, sondern ist niph'al von טֹבַי = טֹבַי Job 10,11, "durchweben, wirken" und bezeichnet das geheimnisvolle Werden im Mutterleibe.

However, there is no indication that this verb is used in the niph'al in the Old Testament. Neither does the meaning "be woven," "protected," "covered" fit the context as well as the meaning "be established," "set up."

---

1. D. W. Nowack, Handkommentar zum Alten Testament.  
Die Sprüche, von L. W. Frankenberg. p. 58.



Father from eternity, we are relating what our Savior has done for our salvation. For the sake of convenience and clarity our catechism speaks of a three-fold office of Christ, that of Prophet, High Priest, and King.

This very  $\pi\eta\gamma\omega\tau\eta$ , like the  $\Lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$  of John 1, is Jesus Christ, so it would not be amiss to apply what the Bible tells us of the office of Christ to the term  $\pi\eta\gamma\omega\tau\eta$ . The  $\pi\eta\gamma\omega\tau\eta$  of Prov. 8 was Christ as He was before His incarnation, but we do know that the decrees of creation, redemption, and predestination are from eternity, as is also the establishment of His holy office as Savior of all mankind.

It would be well at this time to quote Schwan's Catechism as we briefly consider the three-fold office of Christ:

Q. 140. Wherein does the prophetic office of Christ consist?

In this, that He by word and deed revealed Himself, and by the preaching of the Gospel still reveals Himself, as the Son of God and the Redeemer of the world. Deut. 18,15; Matt. 17,5; John 1,18; Luke 10,16.

Q. 141. Wherein does the priestly office of Christ consist?

In this, that He in our stead perfectly fulfilled the Law, and sacrificed Himself for us, and still intercedes for us with His heavenly Father. Heb. 7,26f; Gal. 4,4f; 1 Pet. 2,24; 1 John 2,1f.

Q. 142. Wherein does the kingly office of Christ consist?

In this, that He mightily rules over all creatures, and especially governs and protects His Church, and finally leads it to glory. Matt. 28,18; John 18,37; Matt. 21,5; 2 Tim. 4,18.<sup>1</sup>

Under the last question we distinguish between the kingdoms of power, grace, and glory, the first applying to all creatures, the second to all believers, and the third to the

---

1. H. C. Schwan, A Short Exposition of Dr. Martin Luther's Small Catechism. The Interleaf Edition of 1912. pp. 83ff.

believers glorified in heaven, as well as to the angels.

Jesus Christ, the true Wisdom, is "worthy to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing."<sup>1</sup> As true God He receives that from His Father, whose equal He is, for they are One Being, or Essence. In that grand Messianic Psalm, Ps. 110, we are told, verse 1: "The Lord said unto my Lord (יְיָ יָשָׁבַד לַיהוָה), sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool." Jesus clearly applies this to Himself in the Gospel accounts.<sup>2</sup> In Acts 2,34f., Luke applies it to Christ. Peter is the speaker. This statement is also applied to Him in that remarkable Christological section of Hebrews, in the first chapter, verse 13.

In the fourth verse of the same Psalm, Ps. 110, David speaks concerning Christ: "The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek." This verse is very thoroughly expounded by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews in chapters 5-7, where he frequently quotes it and applies it to Christ.

That our Savior is worthy of the highest honor and glory is stated, among other places, in John 5,23 and in Heb. 1,6. The latter passage has a definite bearing on our text, Prov. 8,22-31, so it would be in place to make a few remarks concerning it. For grammatical reasons we shall quote the original Greek: ὅταν δὲ πάλιν εἰσαγάγῃ τὸν πρωτότοκον εἰς τὴν οἰκουμένην, λέγει· καὶ προσκυνησάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι θεοῦ.

The πάλιν can hardly be considered as merely

---

1. Rev. 5,12.

2. Matt. 22,41-46; Mark 12,35-37; Luke 20,41-44.

introducing a new quotation, as is the case in the preceding verse. Its position makes it necessary for us to construe it with εἰσαγάγη, the aorist subjunctive referring to a future time. Here the word πρῶτότοκον is used absolutely, and is equivalent to μονογενής. In other passages, e. g., Rom. 8,29 and Rev. 1,5, it is not used absolutely, for there the believers are included also, although Jesus is the "First-born." However, here He is the First-born, the only of His kind. The introduction spoken of cannot be the incarnation, nor is it likely that it is the resurrection, nor an imagined introduction of the Son at some past period.<sup>1</sup> Rather it refers to Christ's last advent, when He will appear in glory. Then everyone, including the angels, will worship Him. The quotation is from the Septuagint version of Deut. 32,43.

It is not found <sup>IN THIS EXACT FORM</sup> in the Hebrew text of the Old Testament, <sup>BUT Cp</sup>

Also this last advent and judgment has been established <sup>Ps. 97:7.</sup> in eternity. Throughout all eternity, therefore, the Father has established, and we may say, is establishing<sup>2</sup> the Son, who is the true Wisdom indeed.

D. ἰσχυρ

Up to this point we have shown that ἡ ἰσχυρ, the Son of God, has been begotten (ἰσχυρ), born (ἰσχυρ), and established (ἰσχυρ) by God the Father. Let us now point out the fact that, although there is one God, these two, the Father and the Son, are two different persons. Our text

1. See The Expositor's Greek Testament, Vol. IV, p. 254.  
 2. Not as though the establishing were incomplete, but because of the eternity of God, with whom there is neither beginning nor end. This transcends our powers of comprehension.



The distinction is here brought out in several ways. First of all,  $\text{יְיָ יְיָ}$  is distinguished from  $\text{יְיָ יְיָ}$ , my Lord, namely Jesus. Secondly, God the Father is addressing God the Son, telling Him to sit at "my right hand." Thirdly, the Father promises the Son that "I will make Thine enemies Thy footstool."

There is also the well-known passage, Matt. 3,17: "This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased." Here the Father and the Son are distinguished. In fact, they are also distinguished from the Holy Ghost, who, as verse 16 relates, assumed the visible form <sup>A</sup> ~~of~~ <sup>LIKE</sup> a dove. The three Persons are also clearly distinguished in the various apostolic benedictions.

We have another clear instance of the Personal distinction in Ps. 45,6f, where the Holy Ghost through David is addressing the Messiah: "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: the sceptre of thy kingdom is a right sceptre. Thou lovest righteousness and hatest wickedness: therefore God, thy God (rather: O God, thy God), hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows." The words  $\text{יְיָ יְיָ יְיָ}$  are best rendered "O God, Thy God," since the Spirit is addressing the Son, and we would expect the vocative, which is employed in the preceding verse. It would, furthermore, be a rather clumsy and unusual construction to say: "God, Thy God." If it were meant for repetition, the identical form would rather be used. Cf. Ps. 22,2 (thus in the Hebrew text) and note that the same form is repeated:  $\text{יְיָ יְיָ}$ . Cf. also Prov. 30,1, which is probably to be

LESSER

pointed thus:  $\aleph \aleph \aleph \aleph \aleph \aleph \aleph \aleph$ . This passage, Ps. 45,6f (vv. 7f in the Hebrew text) is specifically applied to Christ in Heb. 1,8f. The word  $\aleph \aleph \aleph \aleph$  is rendered by  $\acute{\omicron} \theta \epsilon \acute{\omicron} \varsigma$  in both verses. That  $\acute{\omicron} \theta \epsilon \acute{\omicron} \varsigma$  can be vocative, and often is used instead of  $\theta \epsilon \acute{\epsilon}$ , is seen, for example, in Mark 15,34, where  $\aleph \aleph \aleph \aleph$  is rendered by  $\acute{\omicron} \theta \epsilon \acute{\omicron} \varsigma \mu \omicron \upsilon, \acute{\omicron} \theta \epsilon \acute{\omicron} \varsigma \mu \omicron \upsilon$ . Consequently, in this passage also the distinction between the Persons in the Godhead is taught.

Let us consider one more passage with regard to the significance of  $\aleph \aleph \aleph \aleph$ . It is perhaps the closest parallel we have to the expression  $\aleph \aleph \aleph \aleph$ . It is found in the section of John 1, which we know to be the New Testament counterpart of the  $\aleph \aleph \aleph \aleph$  discussion in Prov. 8.

John opens his marvelous gospel with the words:  $\epsilon \nu \alpha \rho \chi \eta \eta \nu \acute{\omicron} \lambda \omicron \gamma \omicron \varsigma, \kappa \alpha \iota \acute{\omicron} \lambda \omicron \gamma \omicron \varsigma \eta \nu \pi \rho \acute{\omicron} \varsigma \tau \omicron \nu \theta \epsilon \acute{\omicron} \nu, \kappa \alpha \iota \theta \epsilon \acute{\omicron} \varsigma \eta \nu \acute{\omicron} \lambda \omicron \gamma \omicron \varsigma$ .

The expression  $\pi \rho \acute{\omicron} \varsigma \tau \omicron \nu \theta \epsilon \acute{\omicron} \nu$  reveals the same thought as  $\aleph \aleph \aleph \aleph$ .

Meyer acknowledges these two passages to be parallel.<sup>1</sup>

Dods remarks concerning  $\pi \rho \acute{\omicron} \varsigma \tau \omicron \nu \theta \epsilon \acute{\omicron} \nu$ : "

$\pi \rho \acute{\omicron} \varsigma$  implies not merely existence alongside of but personal intercourse. It means more than  $\mu \epsilon \tau \acute{\alpha}$  or  $\pi \alpha \rho \acute{\alpha}$ , and is regularly employed in expressing the presence of one person with another. . . . This preposition implies intercourse and therefore separate personality.<sup>2</sup>

Another commentator asserts:

"With" is the expression used to denote not only the general relationship, but more particularly the personal and the inward fellowship in His devotion and association with the Father. He was with God as a separate entity, apart from Him as to person

1. Meyer, op. cit., Vol. III, p. 48.

2. The Expositor's Greek Testament, Vol. I, p. 684.

as I am from you, and yet in the innermost unity of being. The evangelist does not state that the Logos was in God, just as we speak of a word or an expression existing in us. He was not an attribute reposing in God nor yet any force emanating from Him. Brenz writes: "Even as the stream is never separated from its source, nor the light from the sun, so is the Son of God never separated from the Father."<sup>1</sup>

This intimate union with the Father is possible only because the Son is true God, One with the Father,<sup>2</sup> Although they are different Persons, they are of the same Essence.

Dr. Franz Pieper correctly states:

Wenn die Schrift Christum θεός (Joh. 1,1) und ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ (Matt. 16,16) nennt, so gebauht sie diese Ausdrücke nicht im uneigentlichen Sinne, wie auch Kreaturen wegen göttlicher Functionen Gott genannt werden (Joh. 10,35), sondern im eigentlichen, das heisst, im wesentlichen oder metaphysischen Sinne des Wortes. Dies geht unwidersprechlich daraus hervor, dass die Schrift dem Sohne im Verhältnis zum Vater dasselbe göttliche Wesen und dieselben göttlichen Wirkungen der Zahl nach (eandem numero essentiam et eadem numero operationes ad extra) und überhaupt die ganze Reihe der göttlichen Attribute zuschreibt.<sup>3</sup>

On this account  $\text{I} \text{H} \text{C} \text{H}$ , who is the Λόγος ἄσαρκος, Jesus Christ, can truly say:  $\text{I} \text{B} \text{Y} \text{N} \text{I} \text{H} \text{C} \text{H}$ . As is the case in John 1, so also here it is not merely an attribute, but the Son of God Himself who speaks. We repeat:  $\text{I} \text{B} \text{Y} \text{N}$  cannot mean in. With reference to verses 29b and 30a,

Dr. Theo. Laetsch aptly remarks:

Note here that He does not merely say, "in" Him, in His heart and mind, as a person has wisdom within himself, as an attribute or quality. No, the Hebrew word translated "by" means "at the side of." Never does it mean "within;" always, next to one's side, as an object or person separate or distinct from the object or person at whose side one is.<sup>4</sup>

- 
1. Johannes Yltisaker, The Gospels, p. 42.
  2. Franz Pieper, Christliche Dogmatik, Vol. II, p. 62.
  3. John 10,30.
  4. Theo. Laetsch, Divine Wisdom From the Book of Proverbs. An essay in the Proceedings of the 20th Convention of the Southern Wisconsin District of the Mo. Synod. p. 27.

Now there can be one God and yet three distinct Persons in the Godhead is far above and beyond our meager human comprehension. We must confess with awe: "Great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh,"<sup>1</sup> and declare with Paul: "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and the knowledge of God!"<sup>2</sup>

E. יִדְּוֹן

We shall now make the word יִדְּוֹן the basis for our study. In verse 30 יִדְּוֹן relates: יִדְּוֹן לְיָדְוֹן יִדְּוֹן. Due to the translations of a number of the early versions, there are three variant readings for the word יִדְּוֹן. They are: יִדְּוֹן, יִדְּוֹן, and יִדְּוֹן. However, the Masoretic reading is most reliable of all; therefore we shall abide by it.

The word יִדְּוֹן has been variously translated and interpreted. The Septuagint understands it to be an infinitive absolute or the like, deriving it from יִדְּוֹן and translating: ἀρροζοῦσα. Likewise Kúrrelmeyer: "ordnend."<sup>3</sup> Similarly, the Vulgate has cuncta componens. This interpretation is similar to the one which we hold. However, we do not take it as an infinitive absolute, which is usually employed in any of four instances:

1. When it is governed by a transitive verb, and stands in fact as an accusative.
2. When it is in the accusative and used adverbially.
3. When it stands in immediate connection with the corresponding finite verb (either before or after, and derived from the same verb).

---

1. 1 Tim. 3,16.  
 2. Rom. 11,33.  
 3. Kúrrelmeyer, Die Erste Deutsche Bibel.

4. When it stands in place of the finite verb.<sup>1</sup>

Since the word  $\text{יִדְוֹן}$  is preceded by the words  $\text{וְיִדְוֹן}$   $\text{יְבֹרָךְ}$  ( $\text{וְיִדְוֹן}$  is not a transitive verb), since  $\text{יִדְוֹן}$  is not in the accusative case, since it is not used in a cognate construction, nor used in place of a finite verb, we must reject the theory that  $\text{יִדְוֹן}$  is an infinitive absolute, although in form it appears to be one.

Another interpretation offers the translation "ward,"<sup>2</sup> and the Authorized Version has "one brought up with Him," the last two words in italics. The proponents of this theory assume that  $\text{יִדְוֹן}$  is a passive form of the verb  $\text{יָדָן}$ . However, then it would be pointed  $\text{יִדְוֹן}$  instead. They appeal to John 1,18:  $\text{ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς}$ . We cannot agree with them, for even if it were pointed  $\text{יִדְוֹן}$  the context prohibits us from translating it alumnus, "ward." Throughout the preceding context the activity of  $\text{וַיִּבְרָא}$  in the creation of the world is stressed.

Another view is that of Ehrlich, who remarks: "Das Nomen scheint 'vertrauter Freund' oder 'beständiger Gast' zu bedeuten."<sup>3</sup> This interpretation is entirely too weak. It does not express the real nature of Christ's work in the creation as our interpretation does.

Our view is that  $\text{יִדְוֹן}$  is a noun related to the verb  $\text{יָדָן}$ , "be firm." An  $\text{יִדְוֹן}$ , therefore, is one who is firm, sure, skilled in his art. With Luther, Delitzsch, and several others we agree that it is best rendered by "Werkmeister,"

1. Davies and Mitchell, Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, pp. 321ff.

2. Alexander R. Gordon in The Old Testament, An American Translation.

3. A. B. Ehrlich, Randglossen Zur Hebräischen Bibel, p.42.

"Master Workman," opifex. In the Wisdom of Solomon, 7,21, we read: ἡ γὰρ πάντων τεχνίτις ἐδίδαξέ με σοφία.

Delitzsch correctly remarks:

Der Werkmeister heisst ἰδοῦ . . . wol nicht als der den man etwas betraut, auf den man sich in seiner Arbeit verlässt oder verlassen kann . . ., sondern von ἰδοῦ, fest sein, als der in seiner Kunst fest ist, wie vielleicht auch die rechte Hand den Namen ἰδοῦ als der Artifex unter den Gliedern hat.<sup>1</sup>

Another point in favor of our interpretation is the fact that the form is in the masculine gender. That throws overboard the argument of the critics who make so much of the feminine form ἰδοῦ. Some of the critics reply that there is no feminine form of the word ἰδοῦ, or that the position of the Master-Workman warrants the use of a masculine form even if the feminine gender is meant. Let us hear what Dr. Fuerbringer says on this point:

Zu beachten ist noch, dass das Wort ein Maskulinum ist, was gerade zu der kirchlichen Erklärung passt, dass die Weisheit der Sohn Gottes ist. Wenn man dagegen einwendet, dass es eben keine Femininform gebe (Strack) oder dass das Handwerk Männersache ist, nicht Frauensache (Delitzsch), so ist zu sagen, dass eine Femininform amona sich sehr leicht hätte bilden lassen.<sup>2</sup>

Therefore we translate ἰδοῦ "Werkmeister," or "Künstler," not "Künstlerin."<sup>3</sup> König takes the word to mean "Künstlerin," and offers the following explanation: "ἰδοῦ wurde Prov. 8,30 die Chokh'ma genannt, weil der Sprachgebrauch kein Wort für 'Künstlerin' ausgeprägt hatte."<sup>4</sup> However, that argument has already been answered in the previous paragraph.

1. Delitzsch, op. cit., p. 147.

2. Fuerbringer, op. cit., p. 405.

3. It is translated "Künstlerin" in the German Parallel-Bibel.

4. König, op. cit., paragraph 246c, p. 154.

Delitzsch's peculiar view concerning the  $\eta\eta\zeta\eta$ , namely that it was a more or less subjective thing in the mind of God, something "nicht Gott aber Gottes," a type of  $\delta\eta\mu\iota\omicron\upsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ , appears also in his long exegesis on this verse. We shall quote a few sentences from him:

Diese Selbstbezeichnung dieser Weisheit tritt hier wolvermittelt auf, denn nachdem sie gesagt hat, dass sie aus Gott geboren worden ist, ehe die Welt ward, und dass sie zugegen war, als diese wurde: beantwortet nun dieses  $\eta\eta\zeta\eta$  die Frage, worauf Gott sein Absehen hatte, als er der Weisheit ihr sonderliches Dasein gab, und in welcher Eigenschaft sie der Welt-schöpfung assistierte: sie war es, welche die in Gottes Schöpferwillen urstündenden und durch sein Schöpfergeheiss in Bewegung gesetzten Schöpfungsgedanken aus ihrer idealen Wirklichkeit in reale umsetzte und gleichsam die Entwürfe der einzelnen Creaturen künstlerisch ausführte; sie war die Mittelursache, war die demiurgische Macht, deren sich die göttliche Schöpferthätigkeit bediente, wie 3,19 gesagt wird: Jahve hat  $\eta\eta\zeta\eta$  die Erde gegründet, usw.<sup>1</sup>

We cannot agree with Delitzsch that  $\eta\eta\zeta\eta$  is a force so subjective and idealistic as that. There is no warrant for his position that  $\eta\eta\zeta\eta$  was a force created by Jehovah in order that she might assist Him in the creation. Again Delitzsch begins to speculate when he pictures Wisdom as something idealistic "whereby the creative thoughts originating in God's creative will and set into motion by His creative command were transformed from this ideal reality into actual reality." There is no Word of God to prove his point. In the final analysis, he refuses to associate  $\eta\eta\zeta\eta$ , the  $\eta\eta\zeta\eta$ , directly with the  $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\phi\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ .

On the other hand, we have already seen, and shall see further, that the only suitable interpretation is the one

---

1. Delitzsch, op. cit., p. 147.

held by the ancient church, and which we hold, that it is the Personal Wisdom which speaks to us in this section of Proverbs 8, and probably also in the context.

Throughout these ten verses, 22-31,  $\pi\tau\tau\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\alpha\iota$  speaks of His part in the work of creation.  $\pi\tau\tau\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\alpha\iota$  stresses the fact that He was in existence before any of the acts of creation took place, even those of the earliest days. He was there, not as a passive being with no influence whatsoever, but as an active agent in the creation, as one who contributed both toward the designing and toward the execution of the plans into the great miracle which we know as creation.

We know from Scripture that God, and God alone, created the world. However, here and in John 1, as well as in other places,  $\pi\tau\tau\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\alpha\iota$ ,  $\acute{\omicron}\ \Lambda\acute{\omicron}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ , and other terms are used to designate one who created. What stronger proof could we desire for the deity of the  $\pi\tau\tau\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\alpha\iota$  and the  $\Lambda\acute{\omicron}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ , who is Christ? It is true that usually creation is ascribed to the Father, as it is in 1 Cor. 8,6 and, as everyone knows, in the First Article of the Creed. However, it is an opus ad extra. In the words of Dr. John Theodore Mueller this fact is brought out:

Creation, as an opus ad extra, is the work of the triune God. Hence it is ascribed to the Father (1 Cor. 8,6), to the Son (Heb. 1,10; John 1,3; Col. 1,16), and to the Holy Ghost (Gen. 1,2; Ps. 33,6). Yet, though the three persons of the Trinity concurred in this work, the creative power, or omnipotence, to which the universe owes its existence, is numerically one (una numero potentia), so that we must not speak of three Creators, but of only one, John 5,17. "Creation is an action of the one God. . . . It is likewise an action of God alone, which neither ought to be, nor can be, ascribed to any creature." (Chemnitz.)<sup>1</sup>

---

1. John Theodore Mueller, Christian Dogmatics, p. 187.

In this detailed account of His activity in the creation of the heavens, the land, and the water,  $\eta\eta\zeta\eta$  impresses upon us His pre-existence. He uses several expressions to indicate His eternity. We have already enumerated and explained a number of them. According to the Authorized Version, verse 25 reads: "Before the mountains were settled, before the hills was I brought forth." It translates both  $\eta\eta\zeta\eta$  and  $\eta\eta\zeta\eta$  with the word "before." However, the first expression is temporal, and the second local.

Dr. Fuerbringer explains the word  $\eta\eta\zeta\eta$  as follows:

$\eta\eta\zeta\eta$  --abgeschnittensein vom Vorhandensein; als Adverbium bedeutet es "noch," "noch nicht," als Konjunktion "bevor," "ehe," und so steht es hier mit  $\eta$ , wie oft, verbunden.<sup>1</sup>

Another strong negative expression employed by the author to designate eternity is  $\eta\eta\zeta\eta$ , literally "toward not," which can be rendered "when not yet."

Solomon truly goes into detail. He uses a rich supply of synonyms. In speaking of the clouds and heavens he employs the terms  $\eta\eta\zeta\eta$ , "clouds," (although Symmachus, the Vulgate, and Delitzsch take it to be "ether") and

$\eta\eta\zeta\eta$ , "heavens." He uses numerous words, differing in details but all generally synonymous, when he describes the land. First of all there is the general term  $\eta\eta\zeta\eta$ , "land," "earth." He uses the word  $\eta\eta\zeta\eta$  to describe the uninhabited land, which lies "outside" of the inhabited land. The Septuagint has  $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\kappa\acute{\eta}\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ . Besides, there is the word  $\eta\eta\zeta\eta$ , "dust," which in the plural can also mean "masses of dust," or "clods." For the inhabited land

---

1. Fuerbringer, op. cit., p. 327.

he employs the term  $\text{הַיָּבֵל}$ , which is equivalent to  $\text{οἰκουμένη}$ , and is frequently translated "world." He also refers to the  $\text{מְנַחֵם הָאָרֶץ}$ , the "foundations of the earth." He mentions specifically the  $\text{רָמֵי הַר}$ , "mountains," "high hills" and the  $\text{הַגְּבֻעֹת}$ , "hills." There are also several words used for the waters. The  $\text{מַיֵּי הַחַיִּים}$  are the surging, untamed waters, the depths of the original flood waters, or, in the words of Dr. Fuerbringer, "die brausenden, ungebädigten Wasser, die Tiefen der Urflut."<sup>1</sup> Other expressions for the general term "water" are:  $\text{מַיֵּי הַמַּיִם}$ , "fountains," related to the word  $\text{מַיִם}$ ;  $\text{מַיִם}$ , the usual word for "water;" and  $\text{יָם}$ , meaning "sea." In all this  $\text{הַחָכְמָה}$  was active and instrumental.

This, of course, immediately reminds us of Genesis 1. It is a commentary particularly upon the work of God on the second and third days of creation. Identical terms appear:  $\text{מַיֵּי הַמַּיִם}$ ,  $\text{מְנַחֵם}$ ,  $\text{רָמֵי הַר}$ ,  $\text{מַיִם}$ , etc.  $\text{הַחָכְמָה}$  is described as  $\text{מְנַחֵם}$ , "Master Workman," and hence not merely an instrument of the Creator, but Creator Himself.

There are parallels also in Job, particularly in chapters 26, 28, and 38. However, it is rather doubtful that the  $\text{הַחָכְמָה}$  in those chapters is the Personal Wisdom. Nevertheless, we do know that the Son of God participates in the opera ad extra, such as creation, and that to Him also, as true God from eternity, those marvelous miracles in nature can be attributed. The very simlilarity between those chapters and our chapter, Prov. 8, strengthens our position that Solomon was the author of that poetical

---

1. Ibid.

masterpiece, the Book of Job.

There are two expressions in the Bible which are closely parallel to the designation  $\text{מַלְאָכִים}$ . These are the  $\text{מַלְאָכִים}$   $\text{מִן־שָׁמַיִם}$  of the Old Testament and the  $\text{Λόγος}$  of the New Testament. We shall not attempt to make an exhaustive study of these terms. That would be impossible in this paper, for each expression would require a thesis itself if it were to be exhausted. However, we shall refer to a few passages in which those terms occur, and link these passages with the verses of our chapter, which treats of the  $\text{מַלְאָכִים}$ .

The  $\text{מַלְאָכִים}$   $\text{מִן־שָׁמַיִם}$  is not an ordinary angel, not even Michael or Gabriel. We hold that it is none other than the Angel of the Lord  $\text{κατ' ἐξοχήν}$ , which is Christ, the Great Messenger.

The first passage in which the term is employed is Gen. 16, 7ff, which treats of Hagar's flight. That the Angel of the Lord is not a mere angel we know from the fact that in verse 13 we are told: "And she called the name of the Lord that spake unto her, Thou God seest me."

In Gen. 22 also the Angel of the Lord is spoken of. He it was who kept Abraham from sacrificing his only son to God, verse 11. In verse 15 and following we have a repetition of the Messianic promise spoken in chapter 12. In chapter 12 the speaker is the Lord,  $\text{מַלְאָכִים}$ , whereas here He is designated  $\text{מַלְאָכִים}$   $\text{מִן־שָׁמַיִם}$ . Surely that identifies them, for both are true God.<sup>1</sup> Furthermore, the

1. There are several commentators who hold the view that whenever the name  $\text{מַלְאָכִים}$  is used it refers in particular to the Second Person. They link it with  $\text{Κύριος}$  in the New Testament.

P. 44-47 do not belong to this section  
 Truly,  $\text{מַלְאָכִים}$

מַלְאָכִי אֱלֹהִים of verse 15 and the מַלְאָכִי of verse 16 are closely related: "And the Angel of the Lord called unto Abraham out of heaven the second time, and said, By myself have I sworn, saith the Lord, for because thou hast done this thing, etc."

Another passage in which the term is used is of special interest to us. It is the narrative of Moses and the burning bush. We are informed in verse two: "And the Angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a flame of fire out of the midst of a bush." Verse four reads: "And when the Lord saw that he turned aside to see, God called unto him." Verse six tells us: "Moreover he said, I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. And Moses hid his face; for he was afraid to look upon God." Does not this passage clearly identify the Angel of the Lord with God Jehovah Himself?

The Angel of the Lord is directly identified with Jehovah also in Judg. 6, 11ff, in which He is speaking to Gideon. The two terms are used synonymously and interchangeably.

There are several other references to the Angel of the Lord, but we shall let this suffice. From these passages we learn that the office of the מַלְאָכִי אֱלֹהִים is to reveal the will of God to mankind.

Although we have mentioned the *Λόγος* already in this paper, there are a few things which remain to be said concerning the word. It is derived from *λέγω*, "to collect." Thayer explains its meaning as follows:

*λόγος*, prop. a collecting, collection (see *λέγω*)

--and that, as well of those things which are put together in thought, as of those which, having been thought i. e., gathered together in the mind, are expressed in words. Accordingly, a twofold use of the term is to be distinguished: one which relates to speaking, and one which relates to thinking.<sup>1</sup>

Λόγος, therefore, is to be distinguished from *ῥῆμα* or *ἔπος* in that the latter may mean merely a word or vocable without implying that there is any reflection or cogitation on the part of one who uses the word, whereas *λόγος* means a word spoken with meaning, conveying a definite idea.

Usually the word *λόγος* means "word," "saying," "discourse," "doctrine," or "reason," "account," etc. However, John sometimes uses it in a special sense, as in John 1,1.14; 1 John 1,1; Rev. 19,13. In these passages it is described as a Person, and attributes of God are ascribed to it. Not only is the *Λόγος* divine, eternal, and almighty, but also the source of all life, physical (since He is Creator), spiritual, and eternal. His incarnation, rejection by the masses, and acceptance by believers is also stated. His message is not the Law, but the Gospel.

Someone may ask: How can all three, *πνεῦμα*, *ῥῆμα*, and *ὁ Λόγος* refer to Christ, as we maintain they do? We must remember that Christ is Wisdom, that in Him "are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge,"<sup>2</sup> Only from and through Him can any true wisdom proceed. The greatest wisdom which we can show is to accept Jesus

1. Thayer, op. cit., p. 380.

2. Col. 2,3.

as our Redeemer. The height of folly is to reject our Savior. The most horrible fate a person can meet is to die in his sins, for that means eternal damnation. How true are His words to the unbelieving Jews: "If ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins."<sup>1</sup>

Jesus reveals to us the way of salvation which God has prepared for us. He is the Angel of the Lord, announcing to mankind this way of salvation.<sup>2</sup> He is the Word of God, which is found in Holy Scripture. Since this Scripture, or Word, is true wisdom, so also the Λόγος who announces it and is the Mediator of our covenant is true Wisdom, ΠΝΩΠ. All three expressions undoubtedly refer to our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.

In this section, which we have based on the word  $\text{I} \text{N} \text{N}$ , we have shown that  $\text{Π} \text{N} \text{O} \text{P}$ , the Son of God, was active in the creation of all things, and is also now active in the preservation of the world, and, in particular, in the salvation of His own believers. The Son alone is able to reveal the Father to us.

F. ד'גףשגש

Under the general heading: REASONS WHY THE TERM WISDOM, PARTICULARLY IN PROVERBS 8,22-31, REFERS TO THE SON OF GOD, we have shown that Wisdom was eternally generated from the Father, He was established in His office, He was beside the Father as a distinct individual, and, as Master Workman, He had an active part in the creation. Let us now proceed

1. John 8,24.

2. It is significant that nearly always the  $\text{N} \text{N} \text{N} \text{N} \text{N}$  is a Messenger of grace, hope, and promise, not of justice and punishment.

to the last part of this first section, which is the longer one of the two.

The word which chiefly concerns us here is the term  $\text{דְּלִיטָה}$ , "delight." It occurs plene written in verse 30. It assumes a defective form with the first person singular suffix,  $\text{לִיטָה}$ , in verse 31. We shall quote these two verses: Verse 30b: "And I was daily his delight, rejoicing always before him;" Verse 31: "Rejoicing in the habitable part of his earth; and my delights were with the sons of men." We quoted the Authorized Version.

According to Gesenius, the word  $\text{דְּלִיטָה}$ , which is a plural, is derived from the verb  $\text{לִיט}$ . Its etymological meaning is "to stroke," "overspread," "smear." Then, used of the eye, "to be smeared over," "to be blinded," as in Is. 29,9. In the hiphil it occurs in that well-known passage in which God commands Isaiah to reveal His judgment of obduracy to the unbelieving Jews, Is. 6,10. There it means "to blind." In the pilpel it takes the meaning "to delight," "delight oneself." The pupal, of course, is passive, meaning "be caressed." The hithpalpel means "delight oneself." Consequently  $\text{דְּלִיטָה}$  means "delight," "pleasure."

Let us examine two other passages in which the word occurs: Ps. 119,24 and Jer. 31,20. In Ps. 119,24 the Psalmist joyfully confesses: "Thy testimonies also are my delight ( $\text{לִיטָה}$ ) and my counsellors." The entire Psalm, the longest in the Psalter, speaks of the great joy which a believer derives from meditation on the Word of God.

Surely, then, this word must not be restricted to its etymological meaning, that of carnal delight and joy, but it has a much deeper spiritual significance, as this passage, Ps. 119,24, clearly indicates.

Jer. 31,20 reads: "Is Ephraim my dear son? is he a pleasant child? for since I spake against him, I do earnestly remember him still; therefore my bowels are troubled for him; I will surely have mercy upon him, saith the Lord." The word "dear" is רִפְיָה, which is derived from רָפִי, literally "be heavy," and then, "be precious," "be dear." The word "pleasant" is our word רִצְוֵנוּ. Here, too, we must not limit the meaning of the word to the root idea of carnal delight, but, since the context speaks of conversion, we regard Ephraim to be a "dear" and "precious" as well as "pleasant" child because the souls of the tribe are immortal, hence it is the true delight of God that they be saved, for Jehovah is also a God of mercy and grace.

The plural form רִצְוֵנוּ, following the singular verb רִצְוֵנוּ, has caused several to alter the text. They want it to read רִצְוֵנוּ. The Septuagint, following this procedure, translates it ἐν τῷ ἤνευ ἧ προσέχαιρεν. The Syriac version also has a similar translation.

There have been two chief theories concerning the interpretation of this word רִצְוֵנוּ.

1. That God took pleasure in the Wisdom which displayed this workmanship, saw that it was very good (Gen. 1,4 etc.), looked with delight on the beloved Son in whom he was well pleased (Matt. 3,17).
2. That Wisdom herself rejoiced in her power and her work, rejoiced in giving effect to the Creator's idea, and so "founding the earth."<sup>1</sup>

---

1. The Pulpit Commentary, Vol. XX, p. 167.

For several reasons we prefer the second theory.

Faussett remarks:

The image is from children, which, when playing in the sight of their nurses, are their delight. The truth meant is, "I was by Him as the closest and the supreme object of the Father's delight."<sup>1</sup>

He offers Matt. 3,17 and Col. 1,13 (in the margin the Authorized Version has "the Son of his love.) as parallel passages. As we shall presently see, these are not parallels.

There is no warrant for changing  $\square^{\prime} \dot{\gamma} \dot{\omega} \dot{\omega} \dot{\omega} \dot{\omega}$  to  $\dot{\gamma} \dot{\omega} \dot{\omega} \dot{\omega} \dot{\omega}$ , as Frankenberg, Ehrlich, Faussett, and the Authorized Version do.<sup>2</sup> It is true that  $\dot{\eta} \dot{\eta} \dot{\gamma} \dot{\eta}$ , the Son of God, was and is the delight of His Father. However, that is not what the text says. It brings out the joy which  $\dot{\eta} \dot{\eta} \dot{\gamma} \dot{\eta}$  experienced in both the process and the result of His creative activity.

Furthermore, the plural form of the noun need not disturb us, for the plural can be used to denote a continuous or constantly-recurring state of condition. Such is the delight of  $\dot{\eta} \dot{\eta} \dot{\gamma} \dot{\eta}$ . We agree with Delitzsch's statement:

Sodann hütete man sich,  $\square^{\prime} \dot{\gamma} \dot{\omega} \dot{\omega} \dot{\omega} \dot{\omega}$  mit LXX Syr. im Sinne von  $\dot{\gamma} \dot{\omega} \dot{\omega} \dot{\omega} \dot{\omega}$  zu fassen . . . denn nicht was die Weisheit für Jahve, sondern was sie in sich selbst ward, wird hier gesagt. . . . Der Ausdruck will nach Ps. 109,4 (vgl. Gen. 12,2) beurteilt sein, wo Hitzig richtig übersetzt, "ich bin ganz Gebet." . . . Es ist das Ergötzen gemeint, welches ihr diese mittlere Betheiligung an Gottes Schöpferwerk gewährte, die Freude am Schaffen, in der sie aufging.<sup>3</sup>

That in verse 30 the word  $\square^{\prime} \dot{\gamma} \dot{\omega} \dot{\omega} \dot{\omega} \dot{\omega}$  means Wisdom's own delight is, moreover, proved from verse 31, where He speaks

1. Jamieson, Faussett, and Brown, A Commentary on the Old and New Testaments. Vol III, Job-Isaiah, p. 440.  
2. The Authorized Version supplies his.  
3. Delitzsch, op. cit., p. 148.

of "my delights." According to a rule of interpretation, a word, when used repeatedly in a context, retains the same meaning, unless, of course, there is a clear indication that in one or more cases a different meaning must be adopted.<sup>1</sup>

Wisdom delighted in the process of creation. "That immense work (of creation) was play for Him. Verily, He spake, and it was done. He commanded, and it stood fast."<sup>2</sup> "Es soll hier und v. 31 besagen, dass die ganze Tätigkeit der Weisheit leicht und mühelos war, keine Anstrengung kostete, sondern lauter Vergnügung war."<sup>3</sup>

Not only did  $\pi\eta\delta\omega\pi$  rejoice in the process or act of creation, but He also rejoiced in the result or finished product of His creative activity. This, according to verse 31, consists of the world and mankind.

He who created the world and everything that is in it said that it was very good. That declaration is repeatedly stated in the creation account. How great was the joy of the triune God when He beheld this marvelous result of His creation as it was then, before it became afflicted through the ravages of sin! It was a satisfaction which was justifiable indeed.

Now if He was so well pleased with the world and the plants and animals in it, how much greater must have been his delight in mankind, in the sons of men! The expression "sons of men" obviously does not apply to our first parents, although He had delight in them too, as we know. In fact,

---

1. Cf. Fuerbringer, Theological Hermeneutics, pp. 25f.

2. Laetsch, op. cit., p. 30.

3. Fuerbringer, Die Persönliche Weisheit Gottes, p. 406.

the triune God took special counsel and gave our first parents a blessing (Gen. 1,26-28), for it was for their sake that the world had been created. The expression "sons of men" refers to all of Adam's and Eve's descendants. Now, all men after Adam and Eve, excepting Christ, have been born in sin. At the time of creation, Jesus foresaw that we would be born in due time, and His delight was with us.

According to Dr. Fuerbringer, "Die ganze Aussage geht nach dem Zusammenhang auf die Zeit der Schöpfung, nicht schon auf die spätere Zeit."<sup>1</sup> However, it is correct to state that at that time He was already concerned about our eternal welfare, for Christ is omniscient, and He is not restricted by time or space.

We may, therefore, assert that  $\pi\eta\sigma\tau\eta$ , true God, who decreed to create us, to redeem us, and to predestinate us to eternal life, has already created us and also redeemed us with His holy, precious blood on Calvary's hill. Through the Holy Spirit He has brought us to faith and is preserving us in this our faith unto salvation.<sup>2</sup> Truly the Personal Wisdom, Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is the Wisdom who speaks in Proverbs Eight.

---

1. Ibid.

2. 2 Thess. 2,13.

II. THE APPROPRIATENESS OF THE TERM WISDOM  
AS ASCRIBED TO CHRIST

In the first and longer section of this treatise we have shown why we identify the Wisdom in Proverbs Eight with the Son of God. We shall now consider the appropriateness of the term Wisdom as ascribed to Christ. This will entail, first of all, a careful word study of the term חָכְמָה and other synonyms used in chapter eight of the Book of Proverbs. In this study it will be necessary to consult the immediate as well as the more remote context of Prov. 8,22-31. Furthermore, we shall give due attention to the usage of New Testament terms such as σοφία with reference to Christ. Finally, from the practical point of view, we shall regard חָכְמָה, our Savior Jesus Christ, as our comfort in life and in death.

A. The Meaning of חָכְמָה and a Few of Its Synonyms.

We have already entered upon this study to some extent in the case of the word חָכְמָה. The reason is obvious. However, we can take up a few details at this time which we have not mentioned previously. We shall also study the words בִּינָה, חִבְנָה, דַּעַח, מוֹסֵר, חִוְשֵׁה, גְּבוּרָה, עֲלִמָּה, עֲצָה, and חִוְשֵׁה.

1. חָכְמָה

This important word is derived from the verb חָכַם, which means "to be wise," "to become wise." According to Gesenius it is related to an Arabic word meaning "to judge,"

"to rule." He takes the primary power of the word to be that of judging. He gives the adjective  $\Pi\zeta\eta$  first the meaning "skilful,"  $\sigma\omicron\phi\acute{o}\varsigma$ , and then, more frequently, the meaning "wise," with various connotations such as "intelligent", "sagacious or shrewd," "subtle or crafty." Gesenius lists the following meanings for  $\Pi\zeta\eta$ : "skill," "dexterity," "wisdom," "various learning," "piety."

The Pulpit Commentary lists two possible derivations for the word  $\Pi\zeta\eta$ , either, with Gesenius from the Arabic word "to judge," or, with Zöckler, from another Arabic word signifying "to fasten," or "compactness," "to be firm or closed."<sup>1</sup>

The word  $\Pi\zeta\eta$  has been variously defined. The Pulpit Commentary lists three definitions:

1. Insight into that upright dealing which pleases God--a knowledge of the right way which is to be followed before God, and the wrong way which is to be shunned. (Zöckler).
2. Piety towards God, as in Job 28,28. (Gesenius).
3. The knowledge of things in their being and in the reality of their existence. (Delitzsch).<sup>2</sup>

It is true that in several passages in Proverbs the word  $\Pi\zeta\eta$  refers to the abstract quality or attribute in man<sup>3</sup> and probably in God, although it seems that when Wisdom, particularly in the first nine chapters, is associated with God, the Son of God best fits the description. This is possible, and even probable, throughout the entire section, and it becomes very clear in the eighth chapter, particularly in our ten verses, 22-31, as well as also in the first twelve verses of the ninth chapter.

1. The Pulpit Commentary, Vol. XX, p. 2.

2. Ibid.

3. Prov. 10,13.23.31, etc.

The word  $\text{חָכְמָה}$  occurs 149 times in the Old Testament,<sup>1</sup> more often than any of its synonyms which are used in our chapter. That it is a favorite of Solomon, who himself was  $\text{חָכֵם}$ , "wise," is evident from the fact that he employs it 85 times: 40 times in Proverbs, 27 times in Ecclesiastes, and 18 times in Job.<sup>2</sup> In the book of Ecclesiastes there is no indication that he identifies  $\text{חָכְמָה}$  with Christ. He rather uses it in the sense of "prudence," or wisdom in contrast to folly. However, the term appears to have a reference to Christ in a few sections of the book of Job, particularly chapters 26, 28, and 38, which are parallels to the creation account in Gen. 1 and the description of the work of  $\text{חָכְמָה}$  in the creation of the world in our section, Prov. 8,22-31. However, it would be difficult to prove that the  $\text{חָכְמָה}$  in Job is Christ, although, of course, all true wisdom comes from Him, who is the fount of wisdom, and in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge.

Indeed, the word  $\text{חָכְמָה}$  very fittingly describes Christ. It is the most general and all-embracing term of all these synonymous words which we are now in the process of studying. It includes all the various aspects of knowledge which each of the other nouns particularly brings out. The Pulpit Commentary regards Wisdom as an attribute, but we shall nevertheless hear what it has to say in regard to the word:

The  
The beginning and end of the  $\text{חָכְמָה}$ , Wisdom, is God (v. 7). Wisdom, then, is not the merely

---

1. Mandelkern, *op. cit.*, sub  $\text{חָכְמָה}$ .

2. We assume that Solomon was the author of all three books.

scientific knowledge, or moral philosophy, but knowledge *κατ' ἐξοχῆν*, i. e., religious knowledge or piety towards God, i. e., an appreciation of what God requires of us and what we conversely owe to God. Wisdom will carry with it the notions of knowledge and insight.<sup>1</sup>

That is indeed true of human wisdom, and this also applies to Christ, much more than to any frail mortal. He, the only sinless and perfect man since Adam's fall, is infinitely wiser and holier than anyone of mankind, however high the standards of morality be which men try to set. And yet Christ, the *הַמְּדַבֵּר*, condescends to call to us, Prov. 8,1, and asks us to hearken to Him, verse 32. Oh, wonder of wonders, how marvelous are the ways of Wisdom!

2. הַיָּדָבָר

This term is usually translated "understanding." It is derived from the verb *יָדָבָר*, which, as Gesenius sees it, means "to distinguish," "to separate;" then, "to consider," "to understand." One can discern or perceive with the eyes, which is "to see;" with the ears, "to hear;" or with the touch, "to feel." Then, it carries the idea of turning the mind to something, hence, "to understand," "to know."

The word *יָדָבָר*, which occurs in its construct form *יָדָבָר*, "between," is derived from this verb *יָדָבָר*. The etymological concept is that of an "interval," which naturally is "between" the things spoken of when the word is employed. The word which interests us is, of course, *הַיָּדָבָר*.

---

1. The Pulpit Commentary, Vol. XX, p. 2.

Gesenius lists the meanings "understanding," "insight," "intelligence," and "skill." The Pulpit Commentary, in its fine discussion of the terms for knowledge and wisdom, describes  $\text{חָכְמָה}$  as "the capability of discerning the true from the false, good from bad, etc. Enabled to know what to do in any circumstances, and what not to do. LXX *φρόνησις*, Vulgate prudentia."<sup>1</sup>

This word occurs 37 times in the Old Testament. Solomon uses it 23 times, 14 times in Proverbs. The concept of "insight" is the etymological one, and it is always in evidence in this word. It is to be distinguished from  $\text{דַּעַת}$ , which stresses the idea of knowledge as acquired through the senses.  $\text{חָכְמָה}$  is rather the ability of discerning or distinguishing that which is already at one's disposal. The Greek verb *κρίνω* expresses about the same thought as the verb  $\text{יָדַע}$ .

In Prov. 8,14  $\text{אֲנִי חָכְמָה}$  remarks: "I am understanding." As we shall see later, this part of chapter eight also very likely refers to the Son of God. However, we shall not be able to enter upon a thorough study of the first part of this chapter, for that in itself would be a lengthy thesis. Nevertheless, this section most probably refers to the Son of God, and the understanding or insight which this verse speaks of is not merely human understanding or insight. Just as  $\text{אֲנִי חָכְמָה}$  is an essential attribute of God, and in this instance is the very Son of God Himself, so also  $\text{חָכְמָה}$ , which is an attribute of God in that it

---

1. Ibid., p. 3.

describes His perfect insight into everything, is the Son of God Himself. He, the eternal, infinite, immutable One is, in the final analysis, the only One who can say: "I am Understanding." Compared to His understanding<sup>OUTS</sup> is nil.

He is understanding. He can distinguish at once between right and wrong, wisdom and folly, essentials and negligibles; things advantageous and things harmful, undertakings effectual and plans impractical.<sup>1</sup>

His remarkable understanding and insight are evident from both revelation and nature. This marvelous world of ours, which fills us with awe as we gaze at it, is indeed an eloquent testimony to the amazing insight of our triune God who, according to Scripture, created it within a period of six days. Everything was "good" and "very good," as we are told in the first chapters of Genesis. Even after creation has been cursed because of man's sin, the world is a marvelous product of the  $\text{יְהוָה}$ , the Master Workman. How much more so before sin entered into it, and the ground was cursed on account of man's sin! How truly  $\text{אֲנִי הוֹדֵא}$  can say: "I am  $\text{אֲנִי הוֹדֵא}$ ."

3.  $\text{הוֹדֵא}$

This word also is translated "understanding." It is derived from the same root as  $\text{אֲנִי הוֹדֵא}$ , and is therefore closely related to it. Much of the discussion under  $\text{אֲנִי הוֹדֵא}$  will apply here, too. Delitzsch makes the following distinction:

With  $\text{אֲנִי הוֹדֵא}$  are interchanged  $\text{אֲנִי הוֹדֵא}$ , which properly means that which is distinguished or

---

1. Laatsch, op. cit., p. 28.

separated, and  $\text{הַבְּיָבוּחַ}$ , which means the distinguishing, separating, appellations of the capacity of distinguishing in definite cases and in general; but it does not represent this as a faculty of the soul; but as a divine power which communicates itself as the gift of God (charisma).<sup>1</sup>

Although Delitzsch identifies neither  $\text{הַמְּדַבֵּר}$  nor  $\text{הַבְּיָבוּחַ}$  and  $\text{הַבְּיָבוּחַ}$  with the Son of God, He does admit that, as attributes, these capacities are not faculties of the soul, but are a gift of God. That is true, but here it is evident that He who calls Himself  $\text{הַמְּדַבֵּר}$  also designates Himself  $\text{הַבְּיָבוּחַ}$  and  $\text{הַבְּיָבוּחַ}$ . This word is not to be taken as a mere attribute, but is Christ. He is Understanding.

The word  $\text{הַבְּיָבוּחַ}$  is used 41 times in the Old Testament. In the Book of Proverbs we find it 18 times. In Job it occurs in only four places. The word can be translated "intelligence," "understanding," or "insight." It expresses somewhat the same thought as  $\sigma\upsilon\nu\nu\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$ . How well this word, also, fits our Lord!

#### 4. הַיָּדַעַת

We have mentioned the word  $\text{הַיָּדַעַת}$  before, in comparison with  $\text{הַבְּיָבוּחַ}$ . The derivation of  $\text{הַיָּדַעַת}$  is obvious: it is derived from  $\text{יָדַעַת}$ , one of the more common verbs in the Old Testament. The verb  $\text{יָדַעַת}$  obviously corresponds to the Greek verbs  $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\delta\omicron\nu$  and  $\delta\tilde{\iota}\delta\alpha$ , and to the Latin verb video. According to Gesenius it means "to perceive," "to acquire knowledge," "to know," "to be acquainted." It includes knowing both as commencing and as completed.

---

1. Delitzsch (Translation by M. A. Easton), Biblical Commentary on the Proverbs of Solomon, Vol. I, p. 76.

It is synonymous with both *οἶδα* and *γινώσκω*, the two most common New Testament verbs expressing the idea "to know." The words are frequently used interchangeably,<sup>1</sup> but if a distinction is to be made, it probably consists in this that *οἶδα* means "to know innately," whereas *γινώσκω* means "to know from experience."<sup>2</sup>

The verb  $\gamma\tau\tau$  means to observe, perceive, take note of a thing, by the eye, the ear, the senses, to receive into one's soul life, intellect, emotion, will; hence in its full sense it denotes not merely an intellectual knowing, but a knowledge affecting both emotion and will, a nosse cum affectu et effectu, a knowledge that is mindful of, provides for, cares for, is devoted to, will do all in its power to promote the welfare of its object.<sup>3</sup>

This verb  $\gamma\tau\tau$  is used very frequently in the Old Testament. From it is derived our word  $הַיָּדָע$ , which occurs 89 times in the Old Testament. Solomon employs the word 57 times. In Proverbs it is used 39 times, in Ecclesiastes eight times, and in Job ten times. In Prov. 8 it is found three times. The Septuagint renders it, in all three instances<sup>4</sup> in which it appears, by the word  $\gamma\nu\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma$ . In several other passages it is rendered by  $\alpha\iota\sigma\theta\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$ . Mandelkern gives the following meanings: scientia, cognitio alicuius rei, intelligentia, sapientia. According to Gesenius it means "knowledge," "knowing," "understanding," "insight," "intelligence." Delitzsch aptly suggests "experimental knowledge."

In verse 10  $\eta\eta\tau\tau$  pleads with us: "Receive my instruction, and not silver: and knowledge rather than

---

2. Cf. Thayer, op. cit., p. 118.  
 3. Cf. Kohn 21, 15-57.  
 4. Laetsch, Notes on הַיָּדָע.  
 4. Verses 9, 10, and 12.

choice gold." He is the fount of all knowledge. Whatever knowledge of God and things divine we have comes from Christ our Savior. As true God, He has from eternity known us with a loving knowledge, a nosse cum affectu et effectu, as is so marvelously depicted in Rom. 8,29, where the verb  $\pi\rho\sigma\epsilon\gamma\gamma\omega$  has precisely that meaning, as the following verbs in that great panorama of salvation indicate. Since Christ, true God, has known all things from eternity according to His omniscience, and in a special sense has known His believers and predestinated them to eternal life, He can rightly be designated  $חַכְמָה$ , "knowledge." Not only does He possess knowledge, but He is knowledge. Therefore, for us to know Knowledge is knowledge indeed. He does not in so many words declare "I am  $חַכְמָה$ ", as He says, in verse 12, "I  $אֶחְוָה$  dwell with  $אֶחְוָה$ ," or in verse 14, "I am  $אֶחְוָה$ ." Nevertheless, just as He is  $אֶחְוָה$  and  $אֶחְוָה$ , so He is also  $חַכְמָה$ .

5. מִנְחָה

The noun  $מִנְחָה$  is derived from the verb  $מָנַח$ . Gesenius gives, as the primary meaning of  $מָנַח$ , "to correct by blows or stripes," "to chastise." It is so used in Deut. 22,18; 1 Kings 12,11.14; Prov. 19,18; 29,17; Ps. 6,2; etc. As the derived meaning he gives "to correct by words," "to admonish," "to exhort," Prov. 9,7; Job 4,3; "to instruct," "to teach," Is. 28,26; Prov. 31,1. The Greek synonym is  $\piαιδεύω$ .

The noun  $מִנְחָה$  occurs 48 times in the Old Testament.

It is Solomon, who, for obvious reasons, uses this word most frequently. It is employed no less than 30 times in Proverbs, twice in our chapter. In Job it appears only four times.

It means "correction," "admonition," "discipline," "instruction," "doctrine." The two latter meanings are the result of the first three meanings, which indicate the process. With The Pulpit Commentary, we may state that it is "wisdom on its practical side."<sup>1</sup>

In Prov. 3,11  $\text{רָדַף}$  clearly means "chastisement," "discipline." The following verse has the verb form  $\text{רָדַף}$ . The two verses are quoted in Heb. 12,5.6, where the noun in the form  $\text{παιδείας}$  and the verb  $\text{παιδεύει}$  are found. Also in Prov. 8 the word  $\text{רָדַף}$  is rendered by  $\text{παιδεία}$  in the Septuagint. In both instances the term is associated with  $\text{יְהוָה}$ , the Son of God. In verse 10 we are told: "Receive my  $\text{רָדַף}$ , and not silver." The exhortation is given in verse 33 to "hear  $\text{רָדַף}$ , and be wise, and refuse it not." That  $\text{רָדַף}$  and  $\text{יְהוָה}$  are closely related is evident from verse 32, in which Wisdom is the Speaker: "Now therefore hearken unto me, O ye children, for blessed are they that keep my ways."

All instruction comes from God. Since  $\text{יְהוָה}$  is true God, we are to hear Him, learn of Him. He is the One who bids us: "Learn of me."<sup>2</sup>

Christ is the perfect Teacher, who not only, as true God, is able to teach us, both in the matter of our eternal

---

1. The Pulpit Commentary, Vol. XX, p. 3.  
2. Matt. 11,29.

salvation and in other matters, but also, as true man, can sympathize with us. "For we have not a high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin."<sup>1</sup>

6. חִמְצָה

This word occurs chiefly in the plural. The singular, חִמְצָה, is found only eight times in the Old Testament.

It is derived from the verb חִמְצָה, an onomatopoeic word which means "to murmur," "mutter," "meditate," "have in mind." It denotes mental or intellectual concentration, as also Delitzsch states. Gesenius takes it to mean, properly, "to tie" or "bind." Hence tropically: 1. "To lie in wait," "to plot," "to purpose or meditate evil." It is so used in Prov. 30,32 and in Ps. 31,14. Here, then, it is in the evil sense. 2. It means "to meditate something," "to propose to oneself." In this instance it has a favorable connotation. It is used in this sense in Gen. 11,6; Prov. 31,16; Zech. 1,6; etc.

The word חִמְצָה occurs 19 times in the Old Testament. It is found eight times in Proverbs and twice in Job. In Proverbs it appears in the singular in 1,4; 2,11; and 3,21. It is used in a favorable sense all three times, and translated in the Authorized Version by "discretion." It is found in the plural in Prov. 5,2; 8,12; 12,8; 14,17; and 24,8. In the last three instances it is used to designate "wicked devices."

---

1. Heb. 4,15.



of His activity.

Such discretion is the characteristic of the Personal Wisdom, the Son of God, who, Prov. 8,12, states, "I Wisdom dwell with prudence, and find out knowledge of witty inventions." Wisdom is constantly finding out, never at a loss of knowledge of carefully considered and well weighed plans and resolutions, "witty inventions" of the mind, "witty" being used in the original sense of "knowing, wise, resourceful."<sup>1</sup>

7. הַבְּרִיָּה

This word, הַבְּרִיָּה, appears in Prov. 8,14, as well as in 61 other places in the Old Testament. It is derived from the verb בָּרַךְ, "to be strong," "to be strengthened." Its primary significance is that of "binding," or "making firm." Gesenius lists as its first meaning "strength;" then, "fortitude," "military virtue," "power," and also "victory." The last meaning is given for the word in Ex. 32,18, which in the Authorized Version is rendered "mastery."

הַבְּרִיָּה is related to the noun בְּרָךְ and the adjective בָּרוּךְ, the latter being attributed to the Messiah in Is. 9,5, where He is called אֵל גִּבּוֹר. The name "Gabriel" means "strong man of God."

Although the word occurs five times in Job and twice in Ecclesiastes, הַבְּרִיָּה is found only once in Proverbs, in 8,14, where חָכְמָה remarks: לִי גִבּוֹרָה, "Mine is strength." Strength is, therefore, another attribute of the Personal Wisdom.

In this connection it is interesting to compare Eccles. 9,16, where the author comes to the conclusion

1. Laetsch, Notes on חָכְמָה.

that Wisdom is better than strength. The words are: טוֹבָה חֵכְמָה מִגְּבוּרָה. In this Ecclesiastes passage, evidently the two human attributes are meant. The author desires to convey the idea that wisdom, the practical knowledge which embraces a large number of desirable qualities, is better than strength, which is restricted in its scope, and can very easily be conducted into unworthy or even destructive channels. The point he wishes to make is that wisdom is more useful and valuable than strength.

As we return to our verse, Prov. 8,14, we see that the Personal Wisdom also has strength. That is a part of חֵכְמָהּ, just as חֵכְמָהּ, חֵכְמָהּ, and the other similar expressions are. The Son of God asserts: "Strength is mine." In fact, He is the only one who can truthfully make that unqualified statement. Was not He the אֱלֹהֵי גִבּוֹר, the Mighty God? Did He not, with His unlimited strength, frame the heavens and lay the foundations of the world? Did He not establish the fountains of the deep and set bounds to the waters, so that they would not submerge the entire face of the earth? And was not He the One who, after His incarnation, worked miracles and wonders during His visible sojourn among His people? Most assuredly so. As He could say, "I am Wisdom," "I am Understanding," so He could also say, "I am Strength." Just as we receive whatever wisdom is ours from Jesus Christ, the true Wisdom, so also we obtain strength from Him who said, "Strength is Mine."

8. מְרִיץ

We have already mentioned this word. Its derivation is, of course, from מְרִץ. Gesenius gives the etymological meaning "make naked," "uncover." The idea of smoothness, slipperiness is emphasized. Its derived meaning is "to be crafty." In the hiphil it can mean "to make crafty," as in Ps. 83,4. It can also mean "to act craftily," 1 Sam. 23,22, or, in a good sense, "to act prudently," as in Prov. 15,5 and 19,25.

The word מְרִיץ is found only six times in the Old Testament: Exod. 21,14; Josh. 9,4; Job 5,13; Prov. 1,4; 8,5,12. In the Exodus passage it has an evil connotation, as it also evidently has in the verse from Joshua, and probably also in Job. On the other hand, it is used in a favorable sense in the three passages in Proverbs.

In its evil sense מְרִיץ, as has been stated, means "craftiness." The adjective מְרִיץ is ascribed to the Serpent in Gen. 3,1. The Septuagint has φρονιμώτατος πάντων for the peculiar Hebrew construction לְכַפֵּץ מְרִיץ. However, in the New Testament reference, 2 Cor. 11,3, we are told: ὁ ὄφις ἐξηπάτησεν ἑἑαυτὸν ἐν τῇ πανουργίᾳ αὐτοῦ. The word πανουργία seems to fit the evil connotation particularly well, although it, too, can be used in a good sense.

In the passage Prov. 1,4, מְרִיץ is rendered "subtily." There it clearly is ascribed to human beings. The lack of מְרִיץ makes a person simple, foolish, devoid of wisdom and prudence. The Septuagint has πανουργία.

In chapter 8 we read in the fifth verse: "O ye simple, understand wisdom; and, ye fools, be ye of an understanding heart." In this verse the word translated "wisdom" is not  $\pi\tau\tau\tau$ , the usual word, but  $\pi\tau\tau\psi$ , which is a synonym, but not as all-embracing as  $\pi\tau\tau\tau$ . We note again that  $\pi\tau\tau\psi$  is used as an antonym for the quality of simplicity or foolishness. Here, also, the word  $\pi\alpha\nu\omicron\rho\upsilon\gamma\iota\alpha$  is used in the Septuagint.

The passage of chief interest to us is, however, the twelfth verse, which we have already quoted in previous paragraphs: "I wisdom dwell with prudence, and find out knowledge of witty inventions." The word "prudence" is, in the original,  $\pi\tau\tau\psi$ . We may well define  $\pi\tau\tau\psi$  as "practical cunning."

It is interesting to note that, whereas the Septuagint employed the noun  $\pi\alpha\nu\omicron\rho\upsilon\gamma\iota\alpha$  in both 1,4 and 3,5, it has  $\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\acute{\eta}$  here:  $\text{Ἐγὼ ἡ σοφία κατεσκήνωσα βουλήν.}$  Usually  $\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\acute{\eta}$  is the Septuagint translation of the word  $\pi\tau\tau\psi$ , "counsel," which we shall presently discuss in this word study of the synonyms of  $\pi\tau\tau\tau$ . The word  $\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\acute{\eta}$ , in the New Testament, may have an evil connotation in a few instances, but in Luke 7,30; Acts 2,23; 4,28; 20,27; Heb. 6,17; and Eph. 1,11 it refers to God, and, of course, is used in a good sense.

The fact that the Septuagint has  $\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\acute{\eta}$ , though not absolutely conclusive, does carry considerable weight in establishing the fact that  $\pi\tau\tau\psi$  in this instance has a favorable connotation. Even if that fact could not be

established, it would be clear from the context, and to adopt the other meaning, "craftiness" in an evil sense, would be strictly unwarranted.

In ascribing  $\pi\eta\gamma\gamma$  to Jesus, we mean, of course, the attribute "sagacity," "prudence." This also is a characteristic of Jesus. In fact, He is the prudent One  $\kappa\alpha\tau' \epsilon\acute{\iota}\sigma\omicron\chi\eta\gamma$ . According to Umbreit,  $\pi\eta\gamma\gamma$  can be "the capacity for escaping from the wiles of others." It would not be straining the sense of the term to apply this to the Temptation of Jesus in the wilderness. Satan, who is wily,  $\pi\eta\gamma\gamma$  in the wicked sense, and by his wicked  $\pi\eta\gamma\gamma$  caused Adam and Eve to yield to his temptation, was not able successfully to tempt our Savior, for He is  $\pi\eta\gamma\gamma$  in the good sense of the word: prudent, and therefore unyielding. He cannot sin, for He is the Holy One of God.

9.  $\pi\lambda\gamma$

This word is derived from the root  $\lambda\gamma$ , "to consult," according to Gesenius. It is related to the verb  $\lambda\gamma$ , which Gesenius believes probably has the primary meaning "to command." It means: "to give counsel," "to take counsel," "to consult for any one," or "provide for." The participle  $\lambda\gamma$  is ascribed to the Messiah in that classical prophecy, Is. 9,5.

$\pi\lambda\gamma$  is found frequently in the Old Testament: 88 times. However, it is not very common in Proverbs; it

---

1. Quoted in The Pulpit Commentary, Vol. XI, p. 4.

occurs there only ten times, once more than in Job. Its primary meaning is, of course, "counsel." Such counsel may be that which one gives, that which one receives, or that which one forms. It is clear, however, that occasionally not the counsel in concreto, so to speak, is meant, but the faculty of forming plans, i. e., "prudence," "wisdom," is meant. Gesenius rightly lists this as another meaning. In this sense it is a synonym of  $\pi\eta\gamma\omega\gamma$  and the other words which we have studied.

The word  $\pi\eta\gamma\omega\gamma$  is used once in our chapter, in Prov. 8,14, where it is connected with  $\pi\eta\gamma\omega\gamma$ , which will be the last synonym in our discussion. The first part of the verse reads:  $\pi\eta\gamma\omega\gamma\ ? \pi\eta\gamma\omega\gamma \ ?$ . Counsel is an essential part in the essence of  $\pi\eta\gamma\omega\gamma$ .

We know that this applies to Christ. "Counsel is His. He always knows just what to do and how to proceed; He is never at a loss."<sup>1</sup> This applies to Him in every respect. Meager indeed would be our comfort if it were applicable to His counsel, His wisdom only in the realm of nature, in the kingdom of power. No, it is not restricted to that. Jesus also has revealed His wisdom and counsel in the kingdom of grace. He it is who guards and keeps us in body and soul, who watches over our spiritual welfare. Whatever of counsel we ever attain to in this life is a result of our mystical union with Him, who is also Counsel. How truly He can be called "Wonderful, Counsellor, the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of peace!"<sup>2</sup>

---

1. Laetsch, Divine Wisdom From the Book of Proverbs, p.28.  
 2. Is. 9,6. (Verse 5 in the Hebrew Bible.)

10. נִשְׁׁוֹן

This word will bring to a close our study of these synonyms. In regard to the derivation of the word נִשְׁׁוֹן, the scholars are not agreed. Gesenius asserts that it is derived from נִשְׁׁוֹן, a root unused in Hebrew, but found very widely spread through the ancient languages. From נִשְׁׁוֹן also נִשְׁׁוֹן, "being," is derived. According to him the meaning of נִשְׁׁוֹן would be: "to stand," "to stand out," "to stand upright," "to be."

On the other hand, Delitzsch offers a different derivation. He discusses the term in connection with his remarks on Prov. 2,7. His view is as follows:

The Chokma-word . . . נִשְׁׁוֹן is a Hiphil formation (with the passing over of ô into û, as in נִשְׁׁוֹן) from נִשְׁׁוֹן (whence the pr. names נִשְׁׁוֹן and נִשְׁׁוֹן) = (Arab.) wasy and asy, to reestablish, to advance, Hiph. of נִשְׁׁוֹן = נִשְׁׁוֹן, to stand, and thus means furtherance, i. e., the power or the gift to further, and concretely that which furthers and profits, particularly true wisdom and true fortune.<sup>1</sup> (I was formerly in error in regarding the word as a Hophal formation, and in assigning to it the primary significance of being in a state of realized existence, of reality, in contradistinction to appearance only. The objection of J. D. Michaelis, Supplem. p. 1167, Non placent in lingua ejusmodi styma metaphysica, etc., does not apply here, since the word is a new one coined by the Chokma, but all the shades of meaning are naturally derived from the fundamental signification "furtherance" (cf. Seneca, Deus stator stabilitorque est). נִשְׁׁוֹן, from Arab. asy and wasy, to further by word and deed, to assist by counsel and act, to render help, whence the meanings auxilium, salus, and prudens consilium, sapientia, easily follow. . . .) The derivation from נִשְׁׁוֹן (8,21) is to be rejected, because "the formation would be wholly without analogy, so much the more because the . . . of this word does not represent the place of the ן, . . . and the derivation of נִשְׁׁוֹן = נִשְׁׁוֹן, to be smooth (Hitzig), passes over without any difficulty into another system of roots. In the passage under consideration נִשְׁׁוֹן signifies advancement in the sense of true prosperity.<sup>2</sup>

1. A pertinent note by Delitzsch follows. This footnote by Delitzsch will be placed in parentheses.

2. Delitzsch, op. cit., pp. 77f.

Although Delitzsch's derivation is indeed different from that which Gesenius and many others have held, and in particular seems to differ from the translation of several of the versions in various passages where the word occurs, we do feel that his arguments are quite convincing, and that his careful and exhaustive study of the word merits consideration, to say the least. Furthermore, as we shall presently see, the versions, including the Septuagint, betray a definite unclearness and lack of understanding in regard to the meaning and significance of the word

נִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה.

The noun נִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה is found only twelve times in the Old Testament. Job uses the word six times, and it appears in Proverbs four times.

It is more difficult to determine the precise meaning of נִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה than of any of the other synonyms which express the idea of knowledge or wisdom. Apparently the translators who composed the Septuagint did not catch the meaning, for there are twelve different renderings for the word, a different one for each passage in which the word occurs.

In Job 5,12 the Septuagint has ἀληθείς. The Vulgate is puzzling here. It has quod cooperant. In Job 6,13 we find βοήθεια. In Job 11,6 the words נִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה לְ אֲדֹנָי אֱלֹהֵי אֲדָמָה are rendered ὅτι διπλοῦς ἔσται τῶν κατὰ σέ, which seems enigmatic, to say the least. Job 12,16 has ἰσχύς. In Job 26,3 the word נִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה is translated ἢ τίμι ἐπακρολουθήσεις. In Job 30,22 the words נִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה נְיָגְנִי אֲנִי are rendered καὶ ἀπέριψάς με ἀπὸ

σωτηρίας. The Chethib reading is  $\pi\tau\psi\eta$ , and the Gere reading is  $\pi\tau\psi\eta$ . With the Gere reading Gesenius translates the two words: "Thou hast dissolved my welfare." According to the Chethib reading he would render it, "Thou hast dissolved me (and) terrified (me)." However, the Septuagint is difficult to understand here, also.

In Isaiah 28,29  $\pi\tau\psi\eta$  is translated μάταιαν παράκλησιν. Micah 6,9 makes it a verb, σώσει. We see that in these passages the Septuagint helps very little in establishing the meaning of the word  $\pi\tau\psi\eta$ . One thing is certain, however, and that is the fact that the exact meaning of the word was rather obscure.

Nor is the matter much simpler in Proverbs. In the four passages in that book we also have divergent meanings as indicated by the Greek words. In Prov. 2,7 we have σωτηρίαν; in 3,21, βουλήν; in 8,14, ἀσφάλεια; and in 18,1, καιρῷ. Safety, counsel, security, and proper time--these are the English equivalents, and we see a relation only between σωτηρίαν and ἀσφάλεια.

We have mentioned briefly Gesenius' derivation of the word. At this point we shall give his view a little more in detail. Gesenius derives the word  $\pi\tau\psi\eta$  from  $\pi\psi$ , as previously stated, and gives its proper meaning to be "a lifting up," "that which is erect." The first meaning, according to him, is "aid," (for comforting is properly to lift up). He then cites Job 6,13; Prov. 2,7; Micah 6,9; and Job 30,22. His second meaning is "counsel," (the raising of anything, that which one

wishes to raise or set up). He lists Job 5,12; Here the Septuagint has  $\alpha\lambda\eta\theta\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma$ . The third meaning which he proposes is "counsel," i. e., "wisdom." The passages under this meaning are Job 11,6; 12,16; 23,6; Prov. 3,21; 8,14; 18,1; Is. 28,29.

We have presented the views of Gesenius and Delitzsch. They propose different etymologies. However, it is difficult to determine which one is the correct one, although we have expressed our preference for the theory of Delitzsch on this word. How can we, then, determine which meaning of the numerous ones listed in the various versions is closest to the original? The Authorized Version has several translations in Job, including "enterprise," "wisdom," "that which is," and "substance," and it has "working" in Isaiah 28,29, and "wisdom" (in the margin: "that which is") in Micah.

However, in the four Proverbs passages the Authorized Version restricts itself to "sound wisdom" and "wisdom." We are inclined to agree with that translation for a number of reasons: 1. The general tone of the book is that of the praise of wisdom. 2. The context speaks, not of safety, nor of substance, nor of enterprise, but of wisdom and understanding. 3. The parallelism within the verse demands that we take it to be "sound wisdom," "counsel," or the like, which is also in keeping with the etymology of the word, both according to Gesenius and according to Delitzsch. We conclude, therefore, that the meaning "wisdom" or "sound wisdom" is more satisfactory than any other in this passage.

Jesus Christ, the Wisdom of God, is also  $\pi\rho\omega\tau\eta$  κατ' ἑξοχὴν. He is that in every sense, whether we understand it to mean "wisdom," or "help" (βοήθεια), or "salvation." How truly He can say: "Counsel is mine, and sound wisdom." Indeed,  $\pi\rho\omega\tau\eta$  is also an appropriate term for the Personal Wisdom.

In considering the appropriateness of the term  $\pi\rho\omega\tau\eta$ , as well as its synonyms, as a designation for the Son of God, we have completed our word study, and we shall now, in a brief section, discuss those passages in the New Testament which associate the concept of wisdom with Christ.

### B. Christ as Wisdom in the New Testament.

In this study we shall not include John 1, for we already touched upon that matter when we identified  $\pi\rho\omega\tau\eta$  with the *Λόγος ἄσαρκος*. Furthermore, the *Λόγος* subject is a study in itself. We shall, in the last section, refer to it again in connection with Prov. 8, 32-36, which forms the basis for the practical, hortatory section of Proverbs 8, and is continued in the first verses of the following chapter also, which is an application of the truths set forth in Prov. 8, 22-31.

It would be unthinkable in a study of this type to neglect the common New Testament word which is a synonym of the word  $\pi\rho\omega\tau\eta$ . The New Testament word is σοφία. Of course, it has synonyms like γνῶσις, σύνεσις, φρόνησις, ἐπίγνωσις, etc., but we cannot

discuss them here now, due to lack of space. Only insofar as they have direct reference to and bearing upon σοφία will they be mentioned.

According to Thayer, σοφία means "wisdom," "broad and full intelligence." One who is σοφός is "skilled," "expert;" then, "wise," "learned;" finally, in a practical sense, "governed in action by piety and integrity." Like πᾶσι, σοφία is the widest and most all-embracing term for knowledge. For that reason the context must determine the precise meaning of the word in a given passage. Of course, it is often used of men. However, we shall not concern ourselves with that usage at this time. We shall limit this brief study to those passages which associate or identify σοφία with Christ.

The most striking passages are two verses in the first chapter of 1 Corinthians: verses 24 and 30. In the entire context, both preceding and following, the great Apostle praises and extols the wonderful wisdom of God, thus drawing a marked contrast between that and the paltry, insignificant wisdom of men.<sup>1</sup>

The concept of wisdom is introduced in chapter 1, verse 17, and continues through the second chapter. The word σοφία occurs 15 times, and σοφός 5 times in this section. From verse 17 and on, the idea of wisdom, which begins as an abstract quality, gradually, in climactic fashion, assumes the force of the Personal Wisdom, which is identified with Christ, until in verse 24 it is definitely stated that Christ is the power of God, and

---

1. We must bear in mind that Corinth was a wealthy city which, though wicked, took pride in its wisdom.

the wisdom of God.

In 1 Cor. 1 it is difficult to draw the line exactly where the Personal Wisdom begins and the attribute wisdom ends. This is difficult because here we are dealing with the loftiest as well as the deepest of all theology. We are in the realm of theology proper. We must ever remember that Christ is the highest, most exalted being, since He is true God, infinite and incomprehensible. We cannot begin to fathom Him, to understand His essence and working. He is far beyond our limited Knowledge. Christ is the true Wisdom of God. He was instrumental in the creation of the world. Now, the greatest of all wisdom consists in this, that He came to redeem the lost and condemned world. But, sad to say, the blind unbelievers never would see, and they persistently continue not to want to see, this wisdom of God revealed in the Gospel, which tells of Christ's redemption. To them a Crucified Christ is sheer foolishness and a stumbling block. They wanted miracles, and still are eager to see them. They search only for human wisdom, which is similar to a bucket with the bottom knocked out. Human wisdom has absolutely nothing to offer in answer to the question: "What must I do to be saved?"

According to 1 Cor. 1,29, we are told that we cannot glory in God's presence. Then, in verse 30, Paul adds: "But of Him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption." Our Savior is everything that we need.

He is σοφία, as our verse tells us. That is the all-inclusive knowledge or wisdom. From Him we also receive whatever spiritual wisdom we have. That which is to the unbelievers the greatest folly is to us the highest wisdom: Christ Crucified, of whom Paul testified so eloquently: "For I determined not to know any thing among you, save Jesus Christ, and Him crucified." From such faith in Him may nothing deter us.

An entire library could be written on 1 Cor. 1 and 2, about the wisdom of God, of which Paul speaks in 1 Cor. 2,7: "But we speak the wisdom of God in a mystery, even the hidden wisdom, which God ordained before the world unto our glory." However, space does not permit that we even attempt anything like an exhaustive study of it. We have mentioned that Christ is designated Wisdom in two verses, and that there is an inherent connection between those verses and the context. Whenever the word "wisdom" designates spiritual knowledge, we think of Christ, who is vitally associated with it, even if, according to our human manner of distinguishing concepts, the attribute "wisdom" is meant, or seems to be meant, at any rate.

Another marvelous Pauline section, a section especially rich in Christological doctrine, is Colossians 2. It follows that grand rhetorical chapter which opens the Epistle to the Colossians, and which is similar to the first chapter of Ephesians.

The verse which shall engage our attention is Col. 2,3: "In whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge." σοφία and γνῶσις are the words which are used, as frequently they are.

On the distinction between these two words, Thayer, sub γνῶσις, remarks: "Where γνῶσις and σοφία are used together the former seems to be knowledge regarded by itself, the latter wisdom as exhibited in action." Thayer quotes Lightfoot: " γνῶσις is simply intuitive, σοφία is ratiocinative also; γνῶσις applies chiefly to the apprehension of truths, σοφία superadds the power of reasoning about them and tracing their relations." We might add that σοφία and ΠΙΣΤΗ are practically equivalent, as are γνῶσις and ἡΨΥ.

Christ, in whom all the fulness of the Godhead dwells bodily, is also the treasury of all wisdom and knowledge. As we examine the context, we learn that this great Christological statement is inserted into a hortatory section. The Colossians were admonished to search for these attributes. However, there was but one place where they could profitably look. Peake is correct in saying:

All, not merely some of, the treasures of wisdom and knowledge are contained in Christ, therefore the search for them outside of Him is doomed to failure. But not only are they in Christ, but they are contained in a hidden way. Therefore they do not lie on the surface, but must be sought for earnestly, as men seek for hidden treasure. They are not matters of external observances, such as the false teachers enjoined, but to be apprehended by deep and serious meditation.<sup>1</sup>

Of course, we would say "by faith and meditation."

---

1. The Expositor's Greek Testament, Vol. III, p. 519.

A remarkable passage indeed is Luke 11,49: "Therefore also said the wisdom ( ἡ σοφία ) of God, I will send them prophets and apostles, and some of them they shall slay and persecute." In itself, this is not so remarkable, but if we examine the parallel, it truly is. The parallel passage is Matt. 23,34. Jesus is the One who speaks: "Wherefore, behold, I send unto you prophets, and wise men, and scribes: and some of them ye shall kill and crucify: and some of them ye shall scourge in your synagogues, and persecute them from city to city."

In the context, of course, Jesus had been denouncing the Pharisees vehemently for their hypocrisy. Now in this passage Jesus is identified with ἡ σοφία of the Luke passage. Both are introduced as saying the same thing.

In reference to these two passages, Meyer remarks:

It is supposed that Jesus is here quoting one of His own earlier utterances (observe the past tense *εἶπεν* ), so that He represents the wisdom of God (Wisd. 7,27; Matt. 11,19; Luke 7,35) as having spoken through Him. Allied to this is the idea of the *λόγος* . . . . According to this, however, the original form of the passage is not to be found in Luke (Olshausen, Eisek); for while Matthew gives this remarkable utterance in a directly present form, Luke's method of recording it transfers to the mouth of Jesus what rather was a later mode of citing it, and gives it in the shape of a result of reflective theology akin to the doctrine of the Logos.<sup>1</sup>

Meyer seems to complicate matters by entering upon the question of whether Luke's expression or Matthew's expression is the original one. The chief point is this: Christ and ἡ σοφία are here identified. It is not

---

1. Meyer, op. cit., Vol. II, p. 408.

sufficient to say, with Meyer, "that He represents the wisdom of God . . . as having spoken through Him."

Christ is Wisdom. Therefore also the same can be attributed to the one as to the other.

In Matt. 11,19b and Luke 7,35 we are told that "wisdom is justified of (all) her children." Luke includes the word "all." It would be well at this point to give the preceding context. According to the Authorized Version we quote Matt. 11,16-19a: We have also the same context in Luke. In Matthew we read:

But whereunto shall I liken this generation? It is like unto children sitting in the markets, and calling unto their fellows, and saying, We have piped unto you, and ye have not danced; we have mourned unto you, and ye have not lamented. For John came neither eating nor drinking, and they say, He hath a devil. The Son of man came eating and drinking, and they say, Behold a man gluttonous, and a wine-bibber, a friend of publicans and sinners.

Immediately our Savior adds:

But wisdom is justified of her children.<sup>1</sup>

In regard to the question: Who spoke these words?

Meyer correctly states that these words are

. . . not a continuation of the words of the Jews, in which case  $\epsilon\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\lambda\omega\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha$  would have to be taken ironically . . ., but the closing observation of Jesus in reference to the perverse manner in which His own claim and those of John had been treated by the Jews.<sup>2</sup>

We can hardly accept the interpretation that

. . . "the wisdom manifested in Jesus has nothing to answer for with regard to the Jews" (Chrysostom, Theophylact, and Castilio), a view to which

---

1. There is a variant reading:  $\epsilon\pi\gamma\omega\upsilon$  for  $\tau\epsilon\kappa\upsilon\omega\upsilon$ . Nestle prefers the reading  $\epsilon\pi\gamma\omega\upsilon$  in Matthew, although the reading  $\tau\epsilon\kappa\upsilon\omega\upsilon$  seems better attested. In Luke, the reading  $\tau\epsilon\kappa\upsilon\omega\upsilon$  is much better attested. The latter seems to be the genuine one in Luke. We prefer  $\tau\epsilon\kappa\upsilon\omega\upsilon$ .

2. Meyer, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 227.

it may be objected--first, that *δικαιοδοσις ἀπό τινος* cannot be taken in the sense of to be free from the guilt of any one . . .; and secondly, that the Jews . . . cannot straightway be spoken of as the children of wisdom.<sup>1</sup>

Other interpretations have been offered, but we cannot go into detail here, so we shall be satisfied to quote what seems to be the most satisfactory interpretation of the passage. This interpretation of the passage identifies Wisdom and Christ, and yet makes the *σοφία* applicable to John the Baptist, who is also described in this passage. We quote Dr. P. E. Kretzmann:

The wisdom of God, present in the preaching of John, and embodied in the person of Jesus, was justified, acknowledged, given its right by the children of wisdom, who accepted its teachings. Thus the heavenly Wisdom always finds some disciples and children that receive Him gladly and are, in turn, instructed in the way of salvation by grace.<sup>2</sup>

From these New Testament passages occurring in 1 Cor. 1 and 2, Col. 2, Matt. 11 and 23, and Luke 7 and 11, we have learned that the term *σοφία* is very closely associated with, and even identified with, Christ. There is little if any doubt that all of these passages refer back to Prov. 8, where the Personal Wisdom is most clearly and fully taught.

C. Jesus Christ, the Personal Wisdom,  
Our Comfort in Life and in Death.

In Prov. 9,10 the statement is made: *הַחֵלֶּבֶת הַחַיִּים*. In Prov. 1,7 we read: *יִרְאֵהוּ יְהוָה רִאשׁוֹן דָּעַח*.

1. Ibid., p. 228.  
2. P. E. Kretzmann, A Popular Commentary of the Bible, New Testament, Vol. I, p. 64.

Although two different words are used for "beginning," and instead of  $\text{הַתְּחִלָּה}$  we find  $\text{הַיְחָדָשׁ}$  in 1,7, nevertheless, the meaning is the same. True wisdom or knowledge, and how we can acquire it, is meant.

The terms  $\text{יִרְאָה}$  and  $\text{יִרְאָה}$  are very significant. Instead of "fear" in the sense of "terror" or "dread," which is included in the expressions  $\text{יִרְאָה}$ ,  $\text{יִרְאָה}$ , and  $\text{יִרְאָה}$ , all of which also occur in Proverbs, we have the word  $\text{יִרְאָה}$  ( $\text{יִרְאָה}$  in the construct state), which means "fear" in the sense of "reverence." It is that kind of fear which God wants us to have for Him: a fear intimately connected with love, the fruit or effect of love, as love is the fruit of faith. Of His Christians God expects filial fear, not slavish fear.

Furthermore, God is designated, not as  $\text{יְהוָה}$ ,  $\text{יְהוָה}$ ,  $\text{יְהוָה}$ ,  $\text{יְהוָה}$ , or  $\text{יְהוָה}$ , all of which to a greater or lesser degree emphasize the sovereignty and omnipotence of God, but as  $\text{יְהוָה}$ , the immutable covenant God, who keeps His promises to His believers.

To all men as they are by nature, God is a stern Judge, and if they fear Him, they fear Him slavishly, not through love and reverence for Him. However, in Christ Jesus, the true Personal Wisdom, we have been redeemed, and are reconciled to God. To us believers God is, therefore, a gracious and merciful God who loves us. We, in return, show Him love and reverence. This kind of fear is the beginning of wisdom.

We note, however, that the author says: "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom. Throughout life we are always in the process of obtaining this wisdom, but it is a very slow process, frequently interrupted on account of our manifold sins and weaknesses, our general imperfection. However, there can be no true wisdom without "the fear of the Lord," which is possible only through faith in Wisdom, the Author of our salvation.

We would naturally be led to think that  $\pi\eta\zeta\eta$ , the sinless Son of God, would have nothing to do with sinful human beings. At least, it would seem that the wretched sinner, in need of a Savior, would be the one who would plead to be received by Jesus. But, wonder of wonders, the opposite is true. In Prov. 1,20-23 Solomon tells us concerning Wisdom:

Wisdom crieth without; she uttereth her voice in the streets: she crieth in the chief place of concourse, in the opening of the gates: in the city she uttereth her words, saying, How long, ye simple ones, will ye love simplicity? and the scorers delight in their scorning, and fools hate knowledge? Turn you at my reproof: behold, I will pour out my spirit unto you, I will make known my words unto you.

The word for "Wisdom" in this place is  $\eta\lambda\eta\zeta\eta$ .

We quote Delitzsch:

After that Dietrich, in his Abhandl. 1846, has shown that the origin of the plural proceeds not from separate calculation, but from comprehension, and that particularly also names denoting intellectual strength are frequently plural, which multiply the conception not externally but internally, there is no longer any justifiable doubt that  $\eta\lambda\eta\zeta\eta$  signifies the all-comprehending, absolute, or, as Böttcher, paragraph 689, expresses it, the full personal wisdom.<sup>1</sup>

---

1. Delitzsch, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 68.

Furthermore, it is difficult to understand how the attribute wisdom, or even wisdom personified, could call to the simple, as is expressed in these verses.

Is it not strange that wisdom should be able to stand and speak, to cry at the city gates and lift up her voice at the crossroads and the high places so all may hear? Is this to be regarded as mere figurative language?<sup>1</sup>

On the other hand, these words are very appropriate when applied to Christ. Is He not the One who said: "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy-laden, and I will give you rest"?<sup>2</sup> He it was also who graciously invited the Jews on the great day of the feast, saying, "If any man thirst, let him come unto me, and drink."<sup>3</sup> The invitations which He extended are too numerous to mention here. In fact, the essence of the entire Gospel is not "go, do," but "come, receive."

This invitation is extended by  $\pi\eta\gamma\eta$  in Prov. 8, 32-36. These verses, as we know, follow the ten verses which form the core of this paper. We shall quote the verses at this point, and briefly discuss them.

Now therefore hearken unto me, O ye children: for blessed are they that keep my ways. Hear instruction, and be wise, and refuse it not. Blessed is the man that heareth me, watching daily at my gates, waiting at the posts of my doors. For whoso findeth me findeth life, and shall obtain favour of the Lord. But he that sinneth against me wrongeth his own soul: all they that hate me love death.

Immediately this passage reminds us of Christ's invitations to follow Him, who is the Way, the Truth, and the Life.<sup>4</sup> Verse 35 in particular is a parallel

---

1. Laetsch, *op. cit.*, p. 25.

2. Matt. 11, 28.

3. John 7, 37.

4. Cf. John 14, 6.

of John 1,4: "In Him was life; and the life was the light of men." As Jesus repeatedly stated in John 6, He is the Bread of Life. We need light, bread, and water if we expect to sustain our physical life here on earth. How much more important that we receive spiritual light! Else we would be groping in darkness, and be completely lost. How we need bread and water! Without it we would famish, so that our body and life would waste away. All this our Savior, the Wisdom from on High, gives us, supplying all our needs plentifully.

He pronounces the man blessed who hears Him and watches at His gates and doorposts. These expressions are, of course, figurative, indicating constant, attentive watchfulness. This pronouncement reminds us of the matchless Beatitudes which Jesus spoke in the Sermon on the Mount. True blessedness consists in hearing the Word of God and keeping it, or, to put it in the words of Solomon, it consists in hearing Jesus and doing His will. How the Christian should overflow with joy to do the will of his dear Savior!

The other side of the picture enters in also. Verse 36 describes the fate of those who disregard and hate  $\eta\chi\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\sigma\alpha\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\sigma\alpha\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\sigma\alpha$ . Wisdom states:  $\eta\chi\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\sigma\alpha\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\sigma\alpha\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\sigma\alpha$ . The Authorized Version translates the first half of this verse as follows: "But he that sinneth against me wrongeth his own soul." That statement is absolutely true in itself. However, in this passage it would be better to understand  $\eta\chi\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha$  in its original sense, as Delitzsch does. We quote him:

'N<sup>o</sup>7 may, it is true, mean "my sinning one—who sins against me . . .;" but the contrast of 'N<sup>o</sup>7 places it beyond a doubt that N<sup>o</sup>7 stands here in its oldest signification: to miss something after which one runs (19,2), seeks (Job 5,24), at which one shoots (Hiphil, Judges 20,16) etc. . . . Just because it is the idea of missing, which, ethically applied, passes over into that of sin and guilt (of fault, mistake, false step, Fehls, Fehler, Fehltritt), N<sup>o</sup>7 can stand not only with the accusative of the subject in regard to which one errs, Lev. 5,16, but also with the accusative of the subject which one forfeits, i. e. misses and loses, 20,2, cf. Hab. 2,10.<sup>1</sup>

That a great number of people have despised and hated Jesus is a deplorable fact which is recorded throughout Scripture, and which, of course, the slightest contact with the world will prove to us. We cannot enumerate all of the passages, or even a number of them. We shall restrict ourselves to what Solomon states in regard to this rejection of the Personal Wisdom. In Prov. 1,24-26 Wisdom tells the unbelievers:

Because I have called, and ye refused; I have stretched out my hand, and no man regarded; But ye have set at naught all my counsel, and would none of my reproof: I also will laugh at your calamity; I will mock when your fear cometh.

We know, of course, that this applies to Jesus. It was He, the Logos, of whom it is said, in John 1,10f:

He was in the world, and the world was made by Him, and the world knew Him not. He came unto His own, and His own received Him not.

Indeed, rejection of the Personal Wisdom is foolishness, for without the Personal Wisdom an individual cannot receive any true wisdom himself, but only falls more deeply into his folly. This folly is described throughout the first nine chapters of Proverbs. Although

---

1. Delitzsch, op. cit., p. 195.

it involves falling into all kinds of sins, it is noteworthy that the sin of unchastity and unbridled lust is most prominently depicted. Folly is personified as a harlot, a promiscuous woman. Whoever yields to her subtle enticements is described as a simple one, void of understanding.<sup>1</sup> Such an individual cannot escape evil consequences and ultimate ruin.<sup>2</sup> Folly is pictured in Prov. 9,13-18 as a foolish woman inviting men who pass by, enticing them to enter her house of ill fame.

What a contrast between her and חֵן וְיָדָה ;<sup>3</sup> In the same chapter, Prov. 9, verses 1-12, חֵן וְיָדָה is described. Wisdom is inviting us to a feast. This is the Gospel invitation of the Son of God. We are invited to come unto Him. We are reminded of the parables of The Great Supper<sup>4</sup> and The Marriage of the King's Son.<sup>5</sup>

What great wisdom there is in the One who has invited us to His feast! How appropriate is the designation "Wisdom" when applied to Him!

The Son of God clearly understood the obstacles that lay in the way and that had to be removed before a reconciliation between God and man could be effected. There had to be a fulfillment complete enough to comprise all mankind. There had to be a complete satisfaction for the sin and transgressions of all the world. There had to be a full payment of all the penalties incurred by all the children of men.<sup>6</sup>

All this the Savior did, as the whole Bible clearly and repeatedly testifies. The reconciliation has been

1. Cf. Prov. 7,7.

2. Cf. Prov. 6,27f.

3. חֵן וְיָדָה is the intensive plural of חֵן וְיָדָה .  
The same person is meant.

4. Luke 14,15-24.

5. Matt. 22,1-14.

6. Lastsch, op. cit., p. 35.

effected, and the whole world stands justified before God.

Now we see the righteousness of God giving up not the least jot or tittle of its demands, yet no longer protesting against the reception of sinners into the loving arms of God, for our Counselor and Strength has fulfilled all demands of God's righteousness for His brethren, the sons of men. We see the justice of God yielding not an iota of its right to exact and execute punishment for every sin committed by man, and yet reconciled to the fact that the heart and home of God are opened to sinners, because the Son of God, wisdom incarnate, drained the cup of God's wrath to its very last and bitterest dregs.<sup>1</sup>

What sweet comfort for us to be assured of the fact that we have a pacified, reconciled God! What great wisdom He has! And great indeed is the wisdom of the Son of God, who is  $\pi\eta\gamma\epsilon\gamma\eta$  and  $\sigma\omicron\phi\iota\alpha$ , the Personal Wisdom. Since He is Wisdom, we also have God's promise that, by believing in Him, we also shall receive wisdom. This wisdom, limited in our life here on earth, will be increased to perfection in the life to come, where we shall see the Personal Wisdom, our dear Savior, face to face.<sup>2</sup>

---

1. Ibid., p. 36.

2. Cf. 1 Cor. 13, 10, 12.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- THE GREEK NEW TESTAMENT, Nestle's Sixteenth Edition.
- THE HEBREW BIBLE. 1889.
- BIBLIA HEBRAICA, Rud. Kittel and P. Kahle. Third Edition revised by A. Alt and O. Eissfeldt. Stuttgart, Priv. Württ. Bibelanstalt, 1937.
- THE SEPTUAGINT, Rahlf's Edition.
- THE LATIN VULGATE.
- DIE BIBEL, ODER DIE GANZE HEILIGE SCHRIFT, Martin Luther's Translation.
- DIE ERSTE DEUTSCHE BIEEL, Kurrelmeyer.
- PARALLEL BIBEL, Luther's and another German Translation.
- BIBELN, ELLER DEN HEILIGE SKRIFT, Andet Oplag, Christiania, Det Norske Bibelselskabs Forlag, 1891.
- THE THOMPSON CHAIN REFERENCE BIBLE, Authorized Version, Third Edition, Indianapolis, B. B. Kirkbride Bible Company, 1929.
- THE ENGLISH REVISED VERSION OF THE HOLY BIBLE, Old Testament 1885, New Testament 1881.
- THE OLD TESTAMENT, AN AMERICAN TRANSLATION, Edited by J. M. Powis Smith, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1927.

Other Sources

- APOCRYPHA: Ecclesiasticus and The Wisdom of Solomon.
- CHEYNE, T. K., Job and Solomon, or The Wisdom of the Old Testament, New York, Thomas Whittaker, 2 and 3 Bible House, 1887.
- CONCORDIA TRIGLOTTA, St. Louis, Concordia Publishing House, 1921.
- EHRLICH, ARNOLD G., Randglossen zur Hebraischen Bibel, Textkritisches, Sprachliches und Sachliches, Band I und VI, Leipzig, J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1908, 1913.

- FUERBRINGER, L., Die Persönliche Weisheit Gottes, Spr. 8,22-31, In the Concordia Theological Monthly, Vol. IV, Nos. 4,5,6, St. Louis, Concordia Publishing House, 1933.
- FUERBRINGER, L., Introduction to the Old Testament, St. Louis, Concordia Publishing House, 1925.
- FUERBRINGER, L., Theological Hermeneutics, St. Louis, Concordia Publishing House, 1924.
- GESENIUS, WILLIAM, Student's Hebrew Grammar, Translated by Benj. Davies, Revised and enlarged by Edward C. Mitchell, London, Asher & Co., 13, Bedford Street, Covent Garden, W. C., 1903.
- GESENIUS, WILLIAM, Hebrew Grammar, The Kautsch Edition, Translated by A. E. Cowley, Oxford, The Clarendon Press, 1910.
- GESENIUS, WILLIAM, Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament Scriptures, Translated by Samuel Prideaux Tregelles, New York and London, John Wiley & Sons and Samuel Bagster & Sons, 1883.
- HOELEMANN, ARMINIUS GUSTAVUS, De Evangelii Joannei Introitu, Lipsiae, Doerffling & Franke, 1885.
- JAMIESON, ROBT., FAUSSETT, A. R., and BROWN, DAVID, A Commentary, Critical, Experimental, and Practical, on the Old and New Testaments, Vol. III, Job-Isaiah, by Ar R. Faussett, Philadelphia, J. B. Lippincott & Co., 1866.
- KEIL, CARL FRIEDRICH und DELITZSCH, FRANZ, Biblischer Kommentar Über das Alte Testament, Die Poetischen Bücher des Alten Testaments von Franz Delitzsch, Dritter Band: Das Salomonische Spruchbuch, Mit Beiträgen von Prof. Dr. Fleischer und Consul Dr. Welstem, Leipzig, Dörffling und Franke, 1873.
- KEIL, CARL FRIEDRICH and DELITZSCH, FRANZ, Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament, The Proverbs of Solomon by Franz Delitzsch, Translated from the German by M. G. Easton, Vol. I, Prov. 1-17, Edinburgh, T. & T., Clark, 38, George Street, 1874.
- KOENIG, FR. EDUARD, Historisch-Comparative Syntax der Hebräischen Sprache, Schlusstheil des Historisch-Kritischen Lehrgebäudes des Hebräischen, Leipzig, J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1897.
- KRETZMANN, PAUL E., Popular Commentary of the Bible, New Testament Vol. I, St. Louis, Concordia Publishing House, 1923.

LAETSCH, THEO., Divine Wisdom From the Book of Proverbs, An essay from the Proceedings of the Twentieth Convention of the South Wisconsin District of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, & Other States, St. Louis, Concordia Publishing House, 1943.

LAETSCH, THEO., Notes on Hebrew Words for "Wisdom," "Understanding," "Knowledge," and "Witty Inventions."

LANGF, JOHN PETER and SCHAFF, PHILIP, A Commentary on the Holy Scriptures: Critical, Doctrinal, and Homiletical, Vol. X, The Proverbs of Solomon, Theologically and Homiletically Expounded by Otto Zöckler. Translated and Edited by Charles A. Alken, New York, Charles Scribner & Co., 654 Broadway, 1870.

MANDELKERN, SOLOMON, Veteris Testamenti Concordantiae, Hebraicae Atque Chaldaicae, Lipsiae, Veit et Comp., 1896.

MEYER, H. A. W., Commentary on the New Testament, Translated by several into English, American Edition, New York and London, Funk and Wagnalls, 1883, 1884, 1885, 1887, 1889.

MUELLER, JOHN THEODORE, Christian Dogmatics, St. Louis, Concordia Publishing House, 1934.

NICOLL, W. ROBERTSON, Editor, The Expositor's Greek Testament, Grand Rapids, Michigan, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

NOWACK, D. W., Handkommentar zum Alten Testament, II Abtheilung, Die Poetischen Bücher, 3 Band, 1 Theil, Die Sprüche von Liv. W. Frankenberg, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1898.

PIEPER, FRANZ, Christliche Dogmatik, St. Louis, Concordia Publishing House, Vol. I in 1924, Vol. II in 1917, and Vol. III in 1920.

PREUSCHEN, ERWIN und BAUER, WALTER, Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments, Giessen, Alfred Töpelmann, 1928.

SCHWAN, H. C., A Short Exposition of Dr. Martin Luther's Small Catechism, St. Louis, Concordia Publishing House, 1912. (The Inter-leaf Edition.)

SPENCE, CANON H. D. M., and EXELL, JOSEPH S., The Editors, The Pulpit Commentary, New York and London, Anson D. F. Randolph & Company, and Kegan Paul, Trench & Company.

THAYER, JOSEPH HENRY, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, Being Grimm's Wilke's Clavss Novæ Testamenti Translated Revised and Enlarged, Corrected Edition, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago, American Book Company, 1886.

YLVISAKER, JOHANNES, The Gospels, A Synoptic Presentation of the Text in Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John with Explanatory Notes, Published originally in the Norwegian Language 1905 and 1907, Minneapolis, Augsburg Publishing House, 1932.

YOUNG, ROBERT, Analytical Concordance to the Bible, New York, Funk & Wagnalls Company.