Master of Sacred Theology Thesis   Concordia Seminary Scholarship

5-1-1966

ΤΕΛΕΙΟΣ in Paul and Hebrews

Robert Rickus
Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, bobkathirickus@gmail.com

ΤΕΛΕΙΟΣ IN PAUL AND HEBREWS

————————

A Thesis Presented to the Faculty
of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,
Department of Exegetical Theology
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Sacred Theology

————————

by

Robert Lawrence Rickus

May 1966

Approved by: _Frederick W. Danker_
Advisor

Victor Bartling
Reader

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This study is intended to analyze and explain the use of τέλειος and cognates primarily in the thirteen Pauline Epistles and Hebrews, with specific reference to the problem of semantic uniformity in these epistles. Although much has been written about individual occurrences of τέλειος , the question of the over-all role of τέλειος terminology has received less attention than it deserves, and where treated, has too often been considered under the category of "perfection," which is not always an appropriate category for understanding individual passages, or recurring themes associated with τέλειος . The findings of this study will be used to determine the appropriateness of the English adjective "perfect" in translating τέλειος . This investigation is confined to the Pauline Epistles and Hebrews in order to include the largest concentrations of both the verb and the adjective under the fewest number of authors. Pauline authorship is assumed for all the passages cited in Chapter III.

Chapter II is an investigation of the background of τέλειος and τελειόω . The methodological presupposition behind the selection of extra-biblical usages is that the use of τέλειος prior to the writing of the New Testament provides commonly accepted understandings of τέλειος in various contexts. Although it is helpful to investigate the usage of τέλειος in post-New Testament writings, and in New Testament writings out-side of Paul's Epistles and Hebrews, the influence of such usage on the epistles under consideration cannot be determined. Where possible, the extra-biblical usages of Chapter II are taken from written sources which

either antedate or are contemporaneous with Paul's writings. An exception

is made in the case of gnostic and mystery usages, where many written

sources are late. The importance of determining the influence of the

mysteries on τέλειος , and the scarcity of pre-Pauline writings justi-

fies the examination of later writings.

Chapters III and IV deal with Paul and Hebrews respectively. The

former deals primarily with τέλειος , the latter primarily with τελειόω .

The only use of τέλειος in Hebrews is treated at the end of Chapter IV,

and compared with Paul's usage. Chapter V states the conclusions.

THE MEANING OF ΤΕΛΕΙΟΣ AND ΤΕΛΕΙΟΩ

Overview of τέλος

A complete study of τέλος is not the purpose of this investigation, however an overview is necessary since τέλος affects τέλειος both etymologically and in usage. Τέλος is formed from the verb τέλλω ("to accomplish, to perform"), and is used to describe either goal or end. The latter bears two possible connotations: termination or completion. Of these, "completion" is the more frequent. Among the various meanings of τέλος are: power of deciding, office, decision, task, offering, dues, expenditure, military station, goal, and full realization. The wide variety of meanings stems from the various perspectives from which τέλος may be viewed. Where performance itself is foremost, τέλος can assume any number of activities. Where the goal of performance or the completion of activity is foremost, the meanings narrow to include primarily aim and attainment.[1]

Classical Usage

The following references to τέλειος are not intended to be exhaustive. They have been chosen among many either because they are unusually

_____

[1]Du Plessis summarizes the essential character of τέλος as follows: "1. As nomen actionis (coming to pass), it expresses decreed activity; 2. wherein the notion of turning is evident; 3. proclaiming, therefore, the suggestive idea of a turning point as opposed to ultimate finality; 4. nevertheless underscoring the idea of completion, in that attainment of this point marks the consummation of a particular period, stage, achievement,

4

clear or fairly representative. The various nuances of τέλεος may be seen within its wide area of application.

As used of animals it denotes cultic purity, as in Homer's Iliad 1,66, where it refers to unblemished goats. It also denotes full growth, as in Democritus 59.60, and Herodotus I,183.

Of men and women it is used to denote maturity and adulthood. The Cyropaedia of Xenophon (I 2.4) clearly divides men into three groups: παῖδες, τέλεοι ἄνδρες, and γεραίτεροι. Plato, likewise calls adults the τέλεοι (Laws 929 c). There are some indications that τέλεος also denotes being married. The clearest passage, however, refers to a goddess rather than a human. In Pausanius VIII.22,2, Hera is called τελεία when married to Zeus. It may be, as Bayfield suggests, that τελεία was originally just the counterpart of τέλεος, a title well known for Zeus.[2] But since Hera was also the goddess of marriage, her title may have been associated with the τέλος, or rite, of marriage. Another passage which loosely associates τέλεος with marriage is Agamemnon 973, where the master of the house is called ἀνὴρ τέλεος. Since maturity and marriage are usually related, τέλεος easily covers either or both aspects.

As τέλεος applies to humans it can also designate skill and completeness. Plato refers to the skill of Pericles as an orator by calling him

event or process, but admitting the suggestion of a new beginning; 5. finally, denoting totality, of something which extends from ἀρχή to τέλος." Paul Johannes du Plessis, Teleios. The Idea of Perfection in the New Testament (Kampen: J. H. Kok N. V., 1959), p. 45.

[2]M. A. Bayfield, "On Some Derivatives of τέλος," The Classical Review, XV (1901), 446.

the most perfect speaker (Phaedrus 269e). In Laws 687b Plato refers to
skill in either virtue or vice. Sometimes τέλειος means "complete,"
as in Isocrates 12,32, where a man is τέλειος and educated when he has .
all the virtues. Similarly, Plato says a man can become perfect in an
area by overcoming a deficiency, and thus become complete (Laws 647d).

As applied to things, it denotes completeness, totality, and realiza-
tion. Plato speaks of the complete year in Timaeus 39d, a year in which
all the planets return to their starting points. Aristotle, in Nicomachean
Ethics (I,6,p.1098a,18) speaks of a complete lifetime. In his Physics
(III⁶,207a,9,13) τέλειος is used synonymously with ὅλος to denote that
from which nothing is absent. Plato uses it in Laws XI,931b, to describe
the realization of an argument.

The word applied to things can also signify finality and insupera-
bility. In Aeschylus' Suppliants 739, the fateful decision of the gods is
called the τελεία ψῆφος , which is the final, authoritative, inescapa-
ble decision. In Seven Against Thebes, 832, Aeschylus speaks of the dark
and prevailing ill over Oedipus' line as μέλαινα and τελεία . His
fate is unrelenting. A related notion, that of insuperability, is seen
in the Critias of Plato (106b), where knowledge is said to be the most per-
fect medicine. Aristotle in his Nicomachean Ethics (V,3,p.1129b,30), says
that righteousness is the most perfect virtue because it is the practice
of perfect virtue.

As applied to gods, τέλειος is a title of pre-eminence. Examples
of such application are: Zeus (Agamemnon 973); Hera (Eumenides 214); the
gods (Seven Against Thebes 167). The title stresses the perfection of the
gods, especially denoting their power and effectiveness.

Aristotle's definition in <u>Metaphysics</u> V,16,p.1021b,12-31, although it does not cover every use of the word, is a useful summary of the association of τέλος with τέλειος .

> <u>Teleios</u> is that which constitutes an aggregate from which no component part is absent, e.g. the time of something is only then <u>teleios</u> when no intrinsic element of this can be identified extrinsically; and again: that which is insuperable in respect of virtue and excellence. A physician, for example, is <u>teleios</u> and a flutist is <u>teleios</u> when in consistency with the requisite aptitudes of their respective crafts, they are lacking in nothing. In metaphorical sense, we also speak of sycophants and thieves as perfect by calling such depreciative qualities good. And virtue is a certain perfection, and each thing is then perfect when in accordance with the species of its proper excellence of virtue no part of the natural magnitude is deficient. Moreover, <u>teleios</u> is also an appellation of that which has successfully reached its <u>telos</u>, and a beneficial and meritorious <u>telos</u> at that; for by the attainment of its contemplated end, something is <u>teleios</u>. However, as <u>telos</u> is culminant, we also speak of utter destruction and complete depravity where deficiency is absolute and where it culminates in disaster. Thus also, metaphorically, death is a <u>telos</u> because both are extremes. Likewise <u>telos</u> and the final cause are ultimates.

Greek Religious Usage

The mystery religions and gnosticism are a fruitful field of investigation for the study of τέλειος . Of chief interest is the application of τέλειος to persons. The major problem is whether or not τέλειος is a technical term for "initiate." In order to meet this problem it is necessary to consult some post-New Testament literature, and this alone makes the conclusions tentative as far as the New Testament period is concerned. The scarcity of definite pre-Pauline religious usages of τέλειος also makes findings less than positive.

The evidence for equating τέλειος with "initiated" is very limited. The passages usually cited are: <u>Hermetic</u> <u>Writings</u> 4:4; Plato, <u>Phaedrus</u> 249c, Philo, <u>De</u> <u>Somniis</u> 2,234; Philodemus, περὶ θεῶν I,24,11; and Hippolytus,

Refutation of Heresies V,3,9,29. Of these, one of the strongest is the first: ὅσοι μὲν οὖν ἐβαπτίσαντο τοῦ νοός οὗτοι μετέσχον τῆς γνώσεως καὶ τέλεοι ἐγίνοντο ἄνθρωποι τὸν νοῦν δεξάμενοι.

Reitzenstein relied heavily on this passage. He says:

> Wenn τέλεος hier einerseits 'vollkommen' bedeutet ('volle Menschen'), so andrerseits doch offenbar zugleich 'in der Taufe vollkommen geworden'. 'Vollkommen', d.h. geweiht, ist ein fester Begriff in den meisten orientalischen Religionen und der ganzen Gnosis.[3]

Even this piece of evidence, however, is not conclusive. It is one thing to say that τέλεος is used in mystery contexts, but quite another to say that it is a technical term. Of this Hermetic passage Walter Scott says:

> The word τέλεος sometimes carried with it religious associations connected with τελετή and τέλος in the sense of "initiation". But in this sentence, the common and popular meaning of τέλεος gives a satisfactory sense, and there is no need to look for any other.[4]

It is possible that τέλεος is a technical term in Hermetic Writings 4:4, but it need not be taken so, and certainly makes good sense without such a meaning.

Similarly, the passage in Plato (Phaedrus 249c) seems to connect τέλεος and "initiate":

> And therefore it is just that the mind of the philosopher only has wings, for he is always, so far as he is able, in communion through memory with those things the communion with which causes God to be divine. Now a man who employs such memories rightly is always initi-

---

[3] Richard Reitzenstein, Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen (Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft, 1956), p. 338.

[4] Walter Scott, Hermetica, edited and translated by Walter Scott (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924), II, 143.

ated into perfect mysteries and he alone becomes truly perfect
(τέλεους ἀεὶ τελετὰς τελούμενος, τέλεος ὄντως μόνος γίγνεται).

Here Plato employs mystery language to describe the philosopher. The
two occurrences of τέλεος are employed differently. The first modifies
τελετάς and does not apply to the problem at hand. The second describes
the result of initiation. The same question arises as before: is τέλεος
a technical term? Again, it need not be. Τέλεος makes good sense in its
usual meaning, "perfect" or "complete." The same may be said for the
passages in Philodemus, Philo, and Hippolytus. In none of these instances
does τέλεος demand a technical meaning.

Evidence against the equation of τέλεος with "initiate" rests partly
on the possible normal sense of the previous passages, but mostly on the
use of other terms for "initiate" (μυουμενοί, μύστης, τελεσθείς,
τετελεσμένος, ἐπόπτης) and the extreme scarcity of passages which
may even hint at any use of τέλεος as a technical term. It is tempting
to assume that τέλεος is a mystery word because τέλος and τελέω are.
Yet Delling seems to do justice to the actual evidence when he says:

> Aus der gesamten Wortgruppe werden nur τέλος u bes τελέω deutlich
> auf Mysterien bezogen. Weiter ist der Sprachgebrauch ausser in
> Anspielungen jedenfalls in vorchr u nt.licher Zeit offenbar nicht
> ausgedehnt worden.[5]

Du Plessis' summary likewise points both to the direction of the evidence
and to the tentative nature of a conclusion based on limited writings:

> In conclusion we may say that teleios meaning "initiate" is not to
> be excluded from its category of meanings. In so far as telos is
> also the mystic rite of initiation, teleios may be "one who has been
> initiated". The few passages at our disposal as far as the mysteries

---

[5] G. Delling, " τέλεος ," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament,
begründet von Gerhard Kittel (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1965), VIII,
70.

are concerned do not prove the point beyond doubt. The basic notion is rather more the perfection of being, attained by such a cultic act.[6]

The use of τέλειος in gnostic circles may have been similar to that of the mysteries, that is, denoting a special level of attainment. Irenaeus and Hippolytus both refer to τέλειος in reference to gnostics,[7] but again the term may be descriptive of special knowledge, without any reference to initiation. One distinct use, however, is that of τέλειος ἄνθρωπος, as Hippolytus describes him in Refutation of Heresies V. 1-3. Here the Perfect Man descends and becomes enslaved in matter; is reborn, ascends, and imparts knowledge by which those who know may become Perfect Men.

Another gnostic use of τέλειος is the combination τέλειος λόγος in Hermetic literature. It stands at 9:1 and at the head of the Asclepius. Walter Scott says the title means "a discourse in which the teaching is brought to completion."[8] He goes on to refute Reitzenstein's opinion that τέλειος has to do with initiation by noting that the Asclepius has nothing to do with initiation. "Moreover, the proper word for 'concerned with initiation' is not τέλειος, but τελεστικός."[9]

The value of studying τέλειος in gnostic circles may be debated in a work which seeks to enlighten New Testament usage. It cannot be proved that any gnostic use of τέλειος has any effect on the New Testament. At

---

[6]du Plessis, p. 85.

[7]Irenaeus, I 6:4; 13:6. Hippolytus, V 3:9, 29.

[8]Scott, III, 1.

[9]Ibid., p. 2.

this point the gnostic usage has been considered for the sake of complete-
ness in dealing with all possible influences on the New Testament.

LXX Usage

In the twenty occurrences of τέλειος in the LXX,[10] two Hebrew words,
תָּמִים and שָׁלֵם , and their cognates are represented in every case
except one. The LXX uses τέλειος for תָּמִים in Genesis 6:9, Exodus
12:5, Deuteronomy 18:13, II Kingdoms 22:26, II Esdra 2:63, Canticum 6:2,
6:9, Judges 20:26 (B), and I Kingdoms 17:40 (B). Considering that תָּמִים
occurs approximately eighty-four times in the Old Testament, it is clear
that תָּמִים covers more linguistic area than τέλειος .

The fundamental meaning of תָּמִים is wholeness, completeness,
soundness. It can refer to sacrificial animals (Exodus 12:5), time (Joshua
10:13), knowledge (Job 36:4), among others. It also is applied to men;
to Noah (Genesis 6:9), Abraham (Genesis 17:1), Israelites (Deuteronomy 18:13),
the psalmist (Psalm 7:24). It does not describe God Himself, but does
describe His way (Psalm 7:31), work (Deuteronomy 32:4), and law (Psalm 18:8).
It is often used of man's way (Psalm 100:2; 118:1; 7:33; Ezekiel 28:15;
Proverbs 11:20; 28:18; II Kingdoms 22:23).

Whenever תָּמִים is used in its predominately cultic and non-personal
sense, τέλειος is not used by the LXX. To render the cultic meaning of
תָּמִים the LXX translators have chosen ἄμωμος , except in Exodus 12:5,
where τέλειος is used. The connection between the cultic use of תָּמִים

---

[10]The passages of the LXX are cited according to Alfred Rahlfs,
Septuaginta, edited by Alfred Rahlfs (Editio Sexta; Stuttgart: Privilegierte
Würtembergische Bibelanstalt, 1959), 2 vols.

and its rendering as ἄμωμος is so close that even considering the whole
LXX (not just the priestly sections) ἄμωμος renders תָּמִים over fifty
times while τέλειος renders it only seven times. Such statistical evi-
dence, however, does not do justice to the whole picture. Considering
just the non-cultic occurrences of תָּמִים , neither τέλειος nor
ἄμωμος predominates. In fact other Greek terms assist in rendering תָּמִים
(or תָּם), such as ἄμεμπτος (Genesis 17:1), ἄπλαστος (Genesis 25:27),
and ἀληθινός (Job 1:1).

This evidence indicates that τέλειος is not as wide a term as תָּמִים .
The LXX translators apparently thought that it did not express cultic spot-
lessness as well as ἄμωμος , nor personal integrity in every instance.
Yet it does serve to translate each aspect occasionally. The cultic aspect
in Exodus 12:5 has already been noted. The personal aspect is most clearly
seen in Genesis 6:9, where τέλειος translates תָּמִים , and is found in
conjunction with δίκαιος. Another important occurrence is in Deuteronomy
18:13, where the Israelites are charged to be τέλειοι , or undivided, †
before Yahweh. II Kingdoms 22:26 also applies the term to persons. Wher-
ever τέλειος is used of men it means more than "blameless." It is a term
describing the relationship between God and man. The meaning of תָּמִים
includes such other key concepts as holy, upright, righteous, and faithful.
Τέλειος alone does not normally carry these meanings, but it can be made
to carry them. The LXX influences τέλειος by filling it with the relational
element between God and man. A man can be τέλειος and yet sinful because †
God makes covenants with sinful men and calls them to walk with Him accord-
ing to His commands. The resultant integrity and right relationship quali-
fies a man as תָּמִים and τέλειος .

$\overset{\prime}{\tau}\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\cos$ translates תָּמִים in two other senses, somewhat unrelated
to the former. In Canticum 5:2 and 6:8 it translates תַּם as an adjec-
tive of endearment, which in Greek may simply mean "wife." In I Paralipomenon
25:8 it is used in the phrase $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\omega\nu$ $\kappa\grave{\alpha}\iota$ $\mu\alpha\vartheta\alpha\nu\acute{o}\nu\tau\omega\nu$, for teacher
and pupil.

The only occurrence of $\overset{\prime}{\tau}\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\cos$ in Wisdom of Solomon deserves atten-
tion for its combination of the Greek meaning of the word $\overset{\prime}{\tau}\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\cos$ with
the Jewish meaning of the concept. "For even if someone among the sons
of men is perfect, lacking your wisdom it will be accounted for nothing,"
(9:6). Here $\overset{\prime}{\tau}\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\cos$ denotes completion, but the missing element is not
a human accomplishment; it is a gift of God. Outside of the polemical value
of this verse, it serves as an example of $\overset{\prime}{\tau}\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\cos$ as understood by Jewish
faith.

The second main Hebrew word rendered by $\overset{\prime}{\tau}\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\cos$ is שָׁלֵם .
The verb שָׁלֵם means "to be intact, in harmony with and complete."
In the hiphil it means "to make peace with." The noun שֶׁלֶם is a
"peace offering." שָׁלוֹם carries the notion of an intact and unviolated
state of peace. $\overset{\prime}{\tau}\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\cos$ translates these forms in Judges 20:26; III Kingdoms
8:61; 11:4; 15:3,14; I Paralipomenon 28:9 and Jeremiah 13:19. Except for
Jeremiah 13:19 and Judges 20:26, all these passages employ the adjective
שָׁלֵם and לֵב to express wholehearted allegiance to the Lord. As
in the case of תָּמִים the LXX is not exclusive in translating the idea
of a perfect heart with $\overset{\prime}{\tau}\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\cos$. Other Greek terms share in the descrip-
tion: $\grave{\epsilon}\nu$ $\pi\lambda\acute{\eta}\rho\epsilon\iota$ $\kappa\alpha\rho\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha$ (IV Kingdoms 20:3; I Paralipomenon 29:9;
II Paralipomenon 15:17; 16:9; 19:9; 25:2), and $\grave{\epsilon}\nu$ $\kappa\alpha\rho\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha$ $\grave{\alpha}\lambda\eta\vartheta\iota\nu\acute{\eta}$
(Isaiah 38:3). The exceptions to the consistent use of $\overset{\prime}{\tau}\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\cos$ for שָׁלֵם

are Judges 20:26 (B; compare 21:4), where it means "peace offering," and Jeremiah 13:19 where it is used adverbially to denote totality.

There is one other Hebrew root behind τέλεcος , a form of כָּלָה in Psalm 138:22. This is a very interesting Hebrew choice of words since תָּמִים is too positive a word to express "perfect hatred." However, the classical usage of τέλεcος readily expresses both positive and negative perfection, and the LXX translators employ the word in a genuine classical usage.

To summarize the importance of the LXX on τέλεcος : the LXX employs the word in a sense not common in the Greek world (to denote God-relatedness), but does not use it often enough to recast it to any large degree. Both of the major corresponding Hebrew roots are used more widely than τέλεcος . Thus τέλεcος does not interpret them so much as they enrich τέλεcος . This is especially true where τέλεcος is used of persons.

Qumran

In the Qumran writings תָּמִים is sometimes used in constructions which resemble those of the Old Testament. The Manual of Discipline, in particular, uses the phrase "to walk blamelessly" to describe the life of the members. A similar phrase occurs in Psalms and Proverbs.[11] It is further described as a walking תָּמִים "in all their ways," which reflects the Old Testament emphasis on total response. In The War of the Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness תָּמִים is used to denote the unblemished quality of the warriors in the great battle (7:5). They are to be "unimpaired" in spirit and body.

_____

[11]Psalm 83:12; 100:2,6; 118:1; 14:2. Proverbs 11:20; 28:18.

14

While the foregoing examples resemble the Old Testament, much of the use of תמים belongs specifically to Qumran life.[12] Even the phrase "to walk blamelessly" has a specific Qumran application. It is synonymous with membership (1:8), and is the exact opposite of the path taken by those outside the community, who have cast their lot with Belial (2:5), and who walk in stubbornness of heart (2:14). All who join are תמים. In fact, the community itself is called the house of perfection (or integrity) and truth (8:9). In 3:3 תמים alone designates membership.

Even though all were תמים, not all were equal in knowledge or conduct. The council of the community, composed of twelve laymen and three priests, was to have a perfect knowledge of all the revelations of the sect, and was to behave in absolute blamelessness. Penalties for misconduct among them were more harsh than for the rest. In 5:24 there is mention of an annual review of each in his rank. Each was promoted according to his understanding and perfection of conduct, or demoted according to his faults.

At Qumran moral and intellectual perfection were closely related. The novice entered the community to have his mind purified by the truth of God's precepts (1:12). The result, however, affected his conduct, which is characterized by walking neither to the right nor left of these precepts (1:15). In 3:6 the wickedness of those outside the community is attributed to their lack of spiritual understanding, which is only available within the community. In 4:22 the "blameless of the way" are the ones who eventually receive full knowledge. It is explicitly stated in 9:16-19 that

[12]The Manual of Discipline contains the most important occurrences of תמים and all of the remaining references are taken from that source.

knowledge belongs only to members, and that their discussions of God's truth are to yield not only greater insight into the mysteries of God, but also blamelessness of conduct. The <u>Hymn of the Initiants</u> likewise connects knowledge and perfection of conduct:

> For to God belongs by justification,
> and the perfection of my way,
> and the uprightness of my heart
> are in His hand:
> by His righteousness are my rebellions blotted out.
> For He has poured forth from the fount of His Knowledge
> the light that enlightens me . . . (11:2-3).[13]

A parallel thought is in 11:17:

> For without Thee no way is perfect,
> and without Thy will nothing is done.
> It is Thou who hast taught all Knowledge,
> and all that is brought into being exists by Thy will.[14]

The knowledge that directs Qumran life is revealed knowledge (8:1), which is an exposition of the Torah, but not as it is seen by those outside the community.

While the concept of תָּמִים in Qumran shares some emphases with the Old Testament (total response; life according to revealed Law; integrity before God), it is narrowed by its limitation to those of the community. Since the community is so legal-minded, it tends to narrow the meaning of תָּמִים to "blameless." One becomes תָּמִים by keeping the rules, and remains תָּמִים by continued obedience. It is possible, however, that modern readers of Qumran material are misled by focusing on the <u>Manual of Discipline</u>, which by its very nature is more likely to interpret תָּמִים

---

[13] A. Dupont-Sommer, <u>The Essene Writings from Qumran</u>, translated by G. Vermes (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1961), p. 101.

[14] <u>Ibid</u>., p. 103.

in terms of blamelessness before the law rather than integrity before God.
One piece of evidence bears this out: at the close of the Manual, the
Hymn of the Initiants (10-11) employs ⊓ ' ⋂ ⊤ less legalistically
(11:2; 11:10-11; 11:17). Here one is ⊓ ' ⋂ ⊓ before God, not before men
or the law. Thus both aspects are present: blamelessness and integrity.
The emphasis lies on blamelessness as it is acquired through membership
and obedience.

Philo

One indication of the importance of τέλειος in Philo is the fact
that it occurs approximately 403 times. The verb occurs forty-five times;
τελειότης thirty-four times; and τελείωσις, twenty-seven times. Τέλειος
is used most often in reference to the "good," to God, and to men.

The perfect good is variously described as ὁσιότης (Sacr. A. C. 10);
θεοσέβεια (Congr. 130); θεοῦ μνήμη (Spec. Leg. II. 171); καλόν
(Poster C. 95); ἐγκράτεια (Spec. Leg. I. 149); ἀφθαρσία (Agric. 100);
πίστις (Migr. Abr. 43).

Philo claims that God alone is perfect (Rer. Div. Her. 121). He is
both τὸ πρῶτον ἀγαθόν and τὸ τελειότατον, and as such the
fountain of wisdom, justice, and every virtue (Spec. Leg. I. 277). His
nature is most perfect, and he is the goal of happiness (Cher. 86).

Philo most frequently employs τέλειος in reference to men. The per-
fect man is distinct from ordinary men. He is distinguished from the
νήπιοι, who cannot take solid soul nourishment, but can only receive
γάλα (Agric. 9). The νήπιοι are childish in both the moral and intel-
lectual sphere, and therefore need schooling and ἄσκησις. The τέλειος

is also to be distinguished from the προκόπτων . Those who are advanc-
ing still have θυμός and πάθος in the soul, and must wage war
against them. The perfect man rids his soul of passion and reacts to
every demand cheerfully and peacefully both in word and deed (Leg. All.
III. 140-144). The advancer acts under orders while the perfect man acts
of himself. Philo divides those who progress toward perfection into three
groups: ὁ ἀρχόμενος , ὁ προκόπτων and ὁ τέλειος (Leg. All.
III. 159). In another place he describes them differently: ὁ ἐλπίζων ,
who is still defective; ὁ μετατεθειμένος , who has been transferred
from vice to virtue; and ὁ τέλειος , who is complete from the beginning
(Abr. 47). It is only the perfect who possess real wealth, the perfect
virtues (Sacr. A. C. 43). The most distinguishing statement about the per-
fect is that they are on the borderline between God and man, between the
uncreated and the perishing form of being (Som. II. 234).

Perfection involves several aspects. Völker includes the following:

Vollkommenheit (τελειότης) bedeutet für Philo nichts anderes
als den Lebensgipfel, wo mit der Höhe des Tugendlebens die Schau
Gottes verbunden ist, wo das ganze Dasein als ein Dienst Gottes
und ein Dienst an den Brüdern aufgefasst, wo alles als ein Geschenk
Gottes empfunden und als μίμησις θεοῦ gestaltet wird.[15]

There are two paths to perfection, moral with the goal of ἀρετή , and
intellectual with the goal of σοφία .[16] These two are not rigidly inde-
pendent, but represent the two basic strands in most Philonic thought:
Judaism and Hellenism. Philo combines the lover of God and the lover of

---

[15]Walther Völker, Fortschritt und Vollendung bei Philon von Alexandrien
(Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs Verlag, 1938), p. 263.

[16]du Plessis, pp. 67-68. Here du Plessis summarizes the position of
Völker.

virtue. Perfection cannot be a purely human achievement. No man is per-
fect without God's gift and blessing. As Delling states it: "Wird hier
schon sichtbar, wie die Wertlehre Philos von seinem religiosen Denken her
bestimmt ist, so vollends dort, wo er von dem 'vollkommene' Gut im
strengen Sinn redet."[17] Not only is the perfect good usually God-related,
but it finds its value in practice and its fruitfulness in God's blessing
(Det. Pot. Ins. 60). Repeatedly Philo describes perfection in terms of
"word and deed" (Vit. Mos. 150; Abr. 36; Leg. All. III. 140-144). This
emphasis on a total and harmonious response not only is in line with as-
pects of harmony in Stoic thought, but Jewish motifs as well. The total
response stems from the total sovereignty of God. As Philo says: "'I am
the Lord' does not only mean 'I am $\tau\grave{o}$ $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\iota o\nu$ and $\overset{\flat}{\alpha}\varphi\vartheta\alpha\varrho\tau\acute{o}\nu$ and
$\pi\varrho\grave{o}s$ $\overset{\flat}{\alpha}\lambda\acute{\eta}\vartheta\epsilon\iota\alpha\nu$ $\overset{\flat}{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\vartheta\acute{o}\nu$,' but also means 'I am the sovereign king and
master,'" (Gig. 45).

Philo's combination of Jewish and Greek thought raises a difficulty
with regard to $\varphi\acute{u}\sigma\iota s$. Must one have a perfect nature before he is per-
fect? According to Philo, some men are naturally perfect and need no
development. Moses was naturally perfect (Leg. All. III. 140-144). Both
$\sigma o\varphi\acute{o}s$ and $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\iota o s$, he was in control of himself (had $\sigma\omega\varphi\varrho o\sigma\acute{u}\nu\eta$) and
was $\vartheta\epsilon o\varphi\iota\lambda o\~u s$ (Leg. All. II. 81). The best that $\varphi\acute{u}\sigma\iota s$ can give
is to be called well-pleasing to God (Abr. 35). To be well-pleasing to
God is the consummation of virtues and the definition of true happiness
(Deus. Imm. 118). According to Philo a perfect $\varphi\acute{u}\sigma\iota s$ is the same as
perfection (Ebr. 135), and this $\varphi\acute{u}\sigma\iota s$ comes from God (Leg. All. III. 219).

---

[17]Delling, p. 71.

19

While Noah is called perfect (Genesis 6:9), his perfection is only by contrast with his generation and does not measure up to Moses' natural perfection.

The admission that a man can be perfect and yet be in need of further perfection is a significant clue to Philo's thought. He is extremely wary of admitting full perfection among mankind. Most men need to progress toward perfection, and for this they need repentance, which holds second place only to perfection itself. "The unbroken perfection of virtues stands nearest to divine powers, but improvement in the course of time is the peculiar treasure of a soul gifted by nature. It does not stay in childish thoughts, but by manly thoughts seeks to gain a condition of serenity and pursues the vision of the excellent." (Abr. 26). As a man progresses a teacher can assist, but only God completes the process (Fug. 172). An example of such divine completion is Jacob (Ebr. 82-83). Prior to receiving the name Israel he was the man of ἄσκησις . But in the struggle he exchanged hearing for eyesight, words for deeds, προκοπάς for τελειότης . The name Jacob stands for learning and progressing, while Israel is the name for perfection, for it expresses the vision of God.

Even the perfect man still needs ἄσκησις . According to Agr. 160, the perfect are to strengthen themselves by practice and exercise. They are likened to a house being finished, not one which is completed. While Philo praises the achievement of perfection without toil (Leg. All. III. 135), he likewise praises the exercise of virtue (Mut. 40), and describes Noah's perfection not only in terms of his possession of virtues, but in his exercise of them. The perfect man most naturally exercises his virtues

in studying (Leg. All. III. 131), and teaching (Spec. Leg. IV. 140). He is not to engage in struggles against evil men, but is to live a quiet and harmonious life. In warning all men against verbal battles with the sophists, Philo cautions the perfect men to abstain, because even though they are perfect they are necessarily unconscious of it. The arrival at the goal cannot include its apprehension, and so even the perfect are ignorant (with an ignorance that is close to knowledge). Thus even those who have just attained perfection, are to some extent unconscious of it (Agr. 160-165).

While Philo highly regards the possession and exercise of virtue, he maintains an emphasis on God as the giver of perfection. Then, granted that some receive the gift and exercise it, their perfection is still not equal to His. For Philo there are degrees of perfection, but the ultimate goal is the same: the vision of God (Ebr. 83). Prior to that, however, the Τέλειοι are to lead a studious and harmonious life of service to God.

Τελειόω

The fundamental meaning of Τελειόω is "to make Τέλεος ," which means "to bring to completion or maturity." A secondary meaning is simply "to do." Sometimes Τελειόω and Τελέω overlap, which is understandable since Τέλος is common to both. In most cases, however, Τελέω reflects Τέλος as its root, while Τελειόω reflects Τέλεος . In Greek usage Τελέω is used especially for the execution of religious ceremonies.

Since Τελειόω reflects Τέλεος , many of the nuances of the adjective find their way into the verb. The notion of totality and completeness predominates in Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics X,3,p.1174a,15-20.

Thorough accomplishment is the sense of τελειόω in Herodotus 120,2.
Philo expresses realization in Abr. 62. In Cong. Ling. 155, it means "to
finish." The verb is often used to express maturity: of animals (Aristotle,
Genesis of Animals III,2,p.752b,21); and of men (Plato, Republic VI,487a).

The LXX employs the verb approximately twenty-five times, and most
of the usage is similar to Classical usage. It is synonymous with the
verb "complete," or "finish" in I Kingdoms 7:10 (A); 14:10; II Paralipomenon
8:16; II Esdra 16:3,16; Sirach 50:19; and Judith 10:8. Elsewhere it
carries various notions of perfection, such as Ezekiel 27:11, where the
verb denotes the perfecting of the beauty of Tyre. In the passive of
Sirach 31:10 it represents "being found perfect," which in conjunction
with ἄμωμος (verse 8) and the rest of the context favors the meaning of
moral blamelessness. The verb is used with God as subject in II Kingdoms.
22:26, where it says: μετὰ ἀνδρὸς τελείου τελειωθήσῃ. The
verb acquires its meaning from the adjective in this verse. The hithpael
of תָּמַם means that Yahweh will cause Himself to be תָּמִים
toward him who is תָּמִים.

Two apocryphal references demonstrate a slightly different aspect of
the verb. Wisdom of Solomon 4:13 and IV Maccabees 7:15 use the verb in
connection with the death of the righteous man. The latter passage speaks
of the perfecting of the faithful life by the seal of death. The former
paradoxically equates "being perfected in a little while" with "fulfilling
long years." Here τελειόω denotes completion and death, but both pass-
ages employ the verb in a victorious sense to denote the blessed goal of
the martyr.

While all the foregoing passages demonstrate an agreement with Classical usage, in several passages the LXX does employ τελειόω in a unique way. It occurs as an almost technical phrase for priestly consecration, τελειοῦν τὰς χεῖρας , in Exodus 29:9,29,33,35; Leviticus 4:5 (added to the Hebrew text); 8:33; 16:32; and Numbers 3:3. In Leviticus 21:10 the whole phrase does not occur, but τετελειωμένον carries the same notion. The Hebrew phrase also occurs outside the Pentateuch (Judges 17:5, 12; III Kingdoms 13:33; II Paralipomenon 13:9; 29:31), but is translated in the LXX by πληροῦν . The similar phrase, πίμπλημι τὰς χεῖρας (Leviticus 9:17; 16:12), does not relate to consecration.

The precise meaning of the phrase is debated, but the general notion is that of consecration. The phrase in Exodus 29:33 is joined with ἁγιάζω , which adds the idea of holiness and separation. The precise meaning of the Hebrew phrase depends on how literally the "hands" are to be taken. Aelred Cody, following P. Dhorme, says that the expression has its origin in the Akkadian in the sense of entrusting something or someone into someone's care. "The priest is not 'consecrated with respect to the hands,' rather the priestly functions are entrusted to him to care for with his hands."[18] Similarly Delling maintains that the phrase does not express an accusative of respect, but concludes: "Dass die Hände jemandes makellos gemacht wurden bzw dass er makellos gemacht wurde, bedeutete schliesslich das der Betreffende zur Ausübung des Kultus fähig wurde."[19] While one cannot say exactly why the LXX translators chose τελειόω in these passages,

_____

[18]Aelred Cody, Heavenly Sanctuary and Liturgy in the Epistle to the Hebrews (St. Meinard, Indiana: Grail Publications, 1960), p. 101.

[19]Delling, p. 81.

it is possible that they desired a word which would do justice to the literal meaning of the phrase ("fill"), and to the resultant perfection or integrity of the priest. If this is true, then the LXX is a semi-paraphrase of the Hebrew idiom. No matter what the reason is, τελειόω found a place in the cultic language of the LXX. Yet in no instance is there any hint of mysteries or initiation. Although sometimes τελειόω occurs without the rest of the phrase, its meaning belongs to the Hebrew idiom, which remains the basis of the LXX translation.

CHAPTER III

ΤΕΛΕΙΟΣ IN PAUL

Non-Personal Usage

Romans 12:2

Romans 12:2 is the only passage in which $\tau \acute{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \iota o \varsigma$ occurs in this
letter, and it is the only instance in the entire New Testament where
$\tau \acute{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \iota o \varsigma$ is used of God's will. Any difficulty caused by the uniqueness
of this usage is offset somewhat, however, by the inclusion of two other
descriptive terms, "the good," and "acceptable." All three terms stand
in a relationship to "will" and may be either attributive or substantive.
Since they stand in a group, and since "the good" appears elsewhere in
Romans as an independent substantive (2:10; 12:9,21; 13:4), it seems best
to translate this passage with the modifiers in a substantive position.
The comma in the Nestle text stands (against Weiss).

The opinions vary widely as to why Paul employs these particular terms.
Some see a hellenistic background: "Wir haben in dieser Aufzählung der
drei Adjectiva mit übernommenen hellenistischen Formeln zu tun."[1] There
can be no doubt that these terms are important in the Greek world, especially
in Greek ethics and in Stoicism. Two or more of these terms can be found
together in Clement of Alexandria (quoting Cleanthes),[2] Johannes Stobaeus,[3]

---

[1] Otto Michel, Der Brief an die Römer, in Kritisch=exegetischer Kommentar
über das Neue Testament, begründet von H. A. W. Meyer (10. Auflage; Göttingen:
Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1955), p. 262.

[2] Protrepticus, VI 72,2.

[3] Ecloge, II 99,6; 100,7.

and Philo.[4]   Yet the judgment of Delling is noteworthy: "Dass Paulus den

griechischen Wertbegriff des $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\iota o\nu$ verbunden mit dem des $\mathring{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\theta\acute{o}\nu$

. . . aufgreift, ist nicht naheliegend."[5]   None of these terms is foreign

to a Jewish or Old Testament background.   In fact, the combination of

"perfect" and "acceptable" already occurs in Genesis 6:9 and 17:1.   The

context of Romans 12:2 reflects Old Testament sacrifice, and already em-

ploys "acceptable" in verse one in reference to living sacrifice.

Since all three terms belong to both Jewish and Greek thought (not

always neatly distinct), it is possible that Paul has either or both in

mind.   In any case he places the emphasis of the sentence on "God's will."

Whatever Jews or Greeks might consider good or acceptable or perfect,

Paul identifies that entity as God's will.   The good is a single entity,

not one among several.   At the same time it is perfect.   In contrasting

Paul and Plutarch, Helge Almqvist says:

> das Gute ist das Vollkommene, die Vollkommenheit vollzieht sich
> im Guten.   Bei Plut. ist aber das Vollkommene $\tau\grave{o}$ $\mathring{\alpha}\kappa\rho o\nu$ $\mathring{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\theta\acute{o}\nu$;
> es sind Stufen im Guten.   Bei Paulus ist $\tau\grave{o}$ $\mathring{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\theta\acute{o}\nu$ ohne weiter
> $\tau\grave{o}$ $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\iota o\nu$: Gottes Wille.[6]

The good, acceptable, and perfect is not a humanly generated product, as

$\mathring{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\theta\acute{o}\varsigma$ was in much Greek philosophy,[7] but it is God's desire and intention.

---

[4]Deus. Imm. 118.

[5]G. Delling, "$\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\iota o\varsigma$," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament,
begründet von Gerhard Kittel (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1965), VIII,
77.

[6]Helge Almqvist, Plutarch und das Neue Testament (Uppsala: Appelbergs
Boktryckeri, 1946), p. 89.

[7]Walter Grundmann, "$\mathring{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\theta\acute{o}\varsigma$," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen
Testament. Begründet von Gerhard Kittel. (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag,
1933), I, 10-16.

Men have access to it only by Christian renewal of the mind; it is revealed, but remains the object of scrutiny. In part this is an intellectual scrutiny because it stems from a renewal of νοῦς and results in a process of proving.

It is not surprising to hear Paul use these adjectives for God's will. What is surprising is his following exposition of proving God's will. Assuming that 12:1-2 forms an introduction and that the γάρ of 12:3 really relates the two sections, it is clear that Paul has stripped "the good, acceptable, and perfect" of any otherworldly idealism and contemplation, and immersed them into the mainstream of ordinary life. A man proves God's will by his communal thinking; and his communal thinking concerns communal action. The word φρονέω occurs in four forms in 12:3, and these reflect the δοκιμάζω of 12:2. While 12:1-2 could be misconstrued to involve only God and believer (the sacrifice is to God) in an intellectual search, the following verses show that sacrifice to God involves sacrifice to brother in both thought and action. The close of chapter 12 carries the notion of self-sacrifice to the extreme: love of enemy. As a Christian overcomes evil with good in this way, he ceases to be conformed to this aeon. The same thoughts are in Matthew 5:43-48, where the command to be τέλεος is explained by love of enemy, an action which goes against the norm of this aeon. The combined thought of the two texts is: God is τέλεος ; His will is τέλεος ; and He calls for a τέλεος people. While Romans 12:2 only refers to God's will with the term τέλεος , the related notions are present. For a similar emphasis on testing what is good see Philippians 1:10; Ephesians 5:9; I Thessalonians 5:21; and Philippians 2.

While Paul brings the perfect will of God into the mainstream of life, this in no way dilutes its demand. What is demanded, however, is not the keeping of laws. The rabbinic saying that "the good simply means the Torah"[8] occasionally obscured God Himself. Paul does not let God's will obscure God. He follows the Old Testament teaching that obedience to God is wholeheartedly walking with God (compare Micah 6:8). The ability or possibility to be perfect depends on God's initiative and guidance. The human responsibility remains (to prove God's will), but it is based on God's prior mercy (12:1). Paul exhorts Christians to respond to God wholeheartedly by the sacrifice of self. He qualifies the sacrifice as a living sacrifice, which involves the realization of God's perfect will in the community. The working out of God's will produces the fruits by which it is described.

I Corinthians 13:10

The substantive use of $\tau\grave{o}$ $\tau\acute{e}\lambda\epsilon\iota ov$ here differs from the previous use. It is clearly a future designation which stands absolutely, without any referent. Its meaning is largely determined by its opposition to $\tau\grave{o}$ $\acute{e}\kappa$ $\mu\acute{e}\rho ovs$. Following this clue the New English Bible translates with "wholeness." In English, "wholeness" sounds somewhat weak, and "the perfect" remains a preferable translation. It refers to the future reality whose completeness consists in face to face sight and full knowing. Thus verse 12b explains verse 10. (While the weakly attested $\tau\acute{o}\tau\epsilon$ in verse 10 is rejected, its sense remains, and is echoed in the $\tau\acute{o}\tau\epsilon$ of 12b.)

---

[8] Pirke Aboth 6,3.

The use of $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\rho\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ in reference to $\tau\grave{o}$ $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa$ $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho o\upsilon\varsigma$ shows that the coming of the "perfect" means an abandonment of the partial, and no progression or carry-over is possible, except for love, which remains. Verse 12b does not allow for a carry-over of knowledge, as if our imperfect knowledge is to be merely completed or filled out. Verse 8 has already stated the future abandonment of knowledge. In verse 12, the verb $\gamma\iota\nu\acute{\omega}\sigma\kappa\omega$ is used in a wider, fuller sense,[9] and does not contradict verse 8.

While $\tau\grave{o}$ $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\iota o\nu$ stands without much description, the context fills in the nuance of completeness. Two parallel thoughts are used: immaturity versus maturity; and direct vision versus indirect vision.

$T\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\iota o\varsigma$ as a Present Designation of Persons

I Corinthians 2:6

Of the many difficulties which arise in dealing with the first three chapters of I Corinthians, some submit to fairly certain explanation on the basis of the text, while others require some theorizing about the situation to which Paul is speaking. In view of the divergent opinions on several different questions, it seems best to state those findings which are most secure first, and then approach the most elusive, and (for this study) important question, the use of $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\iota o\iota$ in 2:6.

The first question deals with the possibility of two messages within Christian teaching. The evidence for this contention rests on the two statements in 2:1-5 and 2:6-9 in which Paul seems to say that he preached

---

[9]Delling, p. 76, n. 45.

without wisdom earlier to the Corinthians, but that among the τέλειοι

he did indeed preach wisdom. Then, in 3:1-3 he further distinguishes be-

tween γάλα and βρῶμα as he characterizes the food for which they are

ready. This view has been espoused most recently by Héring and Grundmann.

The latter concludes: "Er unterscheidet zwischen dem Wort vom Kreuz als

der die Gemeinde gründenden Predigt und der 'Weisheit Gottes unter den

Vollkommenen,' eine Weisheit 'im Geheimnis.'"[10] The difficulty with this

view is that it does not take into account the paradoxical nature of these

chapters. To seize on 2:6 and 3:1 without considering the paradoxes of

chapter 1 is to misinterpret Paul. He has already stated that the word

of the cross is the power and wisdom of God (1:24). He has praised the

foolishness and weakness of God as being truly wise and strong.

> Accordingly, there is no question here of Paul's saying anything
> essentially new as far as content goes, but at the most a speak-
> ing in such a way as to impart a deeper insight into the "secret"
> (cf. 2,7) of God's salvific design . . . the difference between
> "milk" and "solid food" in 3,2 cannot be very great, either in
> content or in manner of speaking. The metaphor contrasts rather
> with something else--with the ability and readiness of the
> Corinthians to accept what he tells them in this letter.[11]

Similarly Baird writes:

> Thus when he seems to speak of a special sort of wisdom in verse 6,
> in truth, he is referring to the proclamation of the crucified
> Christ. To the spiritually immature this seems like a simple message
> --to these babes in Christ it is mere "milk." To the mature it is
> "solid food" indeed--it is the hidden wisdom of God foreordained

---

[10]Walter Grundmann, "Die Νήπιοι in der urchristlichen Paränese," New Testament Studies, V (1959), 191.

[11]Rudolf Schnackenburg, "Christian Adulthood According to the Apostle Paul," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XXV (1963), 356-357.

before the ages and revealed through the Spirit to those who have
the mind of Chrst. The distinction is not in wisdom, but in its
recipients.[12]

Those who maintain that Paul teaches two kinds of wisdom often point

to particularly profound sections of his letters and claim that these are

examples of deeper wisdom. Grundmann, for example, lists Romans 5:12-21;

8:10-30; 9-11; I Corinthians 13 and 15.[13] They include such themes as

the total plan of God, the Parousia, and the indwelling Christ. It is

conceded that these topics are profound, but how does one account for their

presence in a letter which claims to be "milk"? To some degree every pro-

found thought of Paul finds a place in I Corinthians, and none of these

thoughts are far removed from the "milk" of the emphasis on the Crucified

One. If Paul had a secret message it was certainly a well-kept secret.

Since he states his policy of open reception of common tradition (15:1),

the burden of evidence heavily favors a unified $\varepsilon\dot{\upsilon}\alpha\gamma\gamma\acute{\varepsilon}\lambda\iota o\nu$ which at

its most simple core (the word of the cross) is the very deepest wisdom

of God.

A second question which is closely related is whether or not Paul is

borrowing theology from the mystery religions. It is possible that he is

employing mystery vocabulary. Baird succinctly presents the evidence for

both sides and concludes that every supposed mystery allusion may reasonably

be explained without any references to the mysteries.[14] The relevant terms

---

[12]William Baird, "Among the Mature," Interpretation, XIII (1959), 431.

[13]Walter Grundmann, "Die $N\acute{\eta}\pi\iota o\iota$ in der urchristlichen Paränese,"
New Testament Studies, V (1959), 191.

[14]Baird, p. 429.

are λαλέω , μυστήριον , ἀποκαλύπτω , and τέλεcοc . It is impossi-
ble to say with certainty whether Paul is using the imagery of the mysteries.
What can be said is that even if he is employing the terminology, he is
not employing the accompanying thought. If one claims that Paul employs
mystery theology, he must account for the fact that the imparting of wisdom
in 2:6 is not the cause of one's being τέλεcοc , but that one is τέλεcος
prior to the reception of wisdom. Another difficulty is that Paul widens
the circle of the τέλεcοc by allowing all the Corinthians to have access
to the wisdom which he says he speaks among the τέλεcοc (1:30). Further,
Paul claims that salvation is available to all Christians, not just to a
select few. These fundamental differences militate against detecting
mystery thought in Paul. In view of the findings in chapter II, the evi-
dence is not weighty for seeing τέλεcος as a mystery designation at all.

If Paul has a single teaching, and if he is writing for the avowed
purpose of destroying factions, why does he introduce the τέλεcοc ? The
explanation by du Plessis provides a good starting point.[15] Du Plessis
guards against a hierarchy of the prudent and the wise within the Church
by maintaining that at 2:6 Paul is not yet speaking about "intramural cate-
gories" in the Church, but that he is contrasting the whole Church with the
outside world. The later contrast between the νήπιοι and πνευματικοί
does not relate to the question of the τέλεcοc . Following Weiss[16] he
notes that a reader is not prepared to contrast τέλεcοc with νήπιοι

_____

[15]Paul Johannes du Plessis, Teleios. The Idea of Perfection in the
New Testament (Kampen: J. H. Kok N. V., 1959), pp. 178-185.

[16]Johannes Weiss, Der Erste Korintherbrief in Kritisch=exegetischer Kommentar
über das Neue Testament, begründet von H. A. W. Meyer (Göttingen: Vanden-
hoeck und Ruprecht, 1910), p. 74.

since the latter does not occur until ten verses later. So he concludes

that "the perfection of the teleioi is their being in Christ. . . . In

this connection teleios is a general term for Christians as such."[17] He

goes on to describe the specific meaning as that of "the plentitude of

salvation . . . and the consummate bounty of redemptive gifts bestowed on

those who believe in Him.[18] His final statement is that "teleios in this

particular connection expresses the state of redemption."[19]

The weakest point in this explanation is the disregard of 3:1. Even

du Plessis agrees that "the $\tau \acute{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \iota o \iota$ are correlative with the $\pi \nu \epsilon \upsilon$ -

$\mu \alpha \tau \iota \kappa o \acute{\iota}$."[20] In 3:1 Paul says that he cannot speak to them as $\pi \nu \epsilon \upsilon$ -

$\mu \alpha \tau \iota \kappa o \acute{\iota}$, but as $\sigma \alpha \rho \kappa \iota \nu o \tilde{\iota} \varsigma$, $\nu \acute{\eta} \pi \iota o \iota \varsigma$ in Christ. Paul thereby seems

to be denying that the Corinthians are $\tau \acute{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \iota o \iota$. Du Plessis avoids this

shift by focusing only on the previous context. Weiss is certainly correct

in saying that the $\tau \acute{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \iota o \iota / \nu \acute{\eta} \pi \iota o \iota$ contrast is not evident at 2:6.

But when the reader passes 3:1 it is certainly likely that $\nu \acute{\eta} \pi \iota o \iota$ has

a retrogressive influence on $\tau \acute{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \iota o \iota$, especially since $\lambda \alpha \lambda \acute{\epsilon} \omega$ occurs

in both constructions. In view of the harsh, critical treatment in 3:1,

it is contradictory to assume that Paul is employing $\tau \acute{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \iota o \iota$ in a

thoroughly complimentary manner.

Du Plessis bases his complimentary meaning on the rich praise of the

Corinthians in 1:4-9 and 1:26-31. That which makes them $\tau \acute{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \iota o \iota$, according

---

[17]du Plessis, p. 184.

[18]Ibid.

[19]Ibid.

[20]Ibid., p. 180.

33

to this view, is their fulness of gifts and complete status in Christ.
The following points, however, show that a Christian can be the recipient
of gifts and be in Christ, and yet not be τέλειος . First, according
to 3:3 the Corinthians are called σαρκικοί, but are still νήπιοι "in
Christ." Even conceding for the moment that Paul could be dealing with
intramural and extramural categories, it remains that being "in Christ"
does not guarantee full maturity or full blessing. Second, it is not simply
the reception of gifts that makes one τέλειος , but it is the proper
understanding and use of them. It is by the Holy Spirit that Christians
know God's gifts (2:12). In 4:8, which appears to be a commentary on what
the Corinthians thought τέλειος to be, Paul portrays the Corinthians as
poor receivers of gifts, and he ridicules their premature "arrival" by
emphasizing their misuse of gifts.

These comments help show that although Paul praises the Corinthians,
he never loses sight of his corrective purpose. In other words, to main-
tain that Paul's thinking falls into intra- and extramural categories, is
to dissect his train of thought unnecessarily. It is more likely that Paul
lets the phrase about the τέλειοι just drop, to be picked up later. Its
position in 2:6 is definitely subordinate to σοφία , a fact which the
Revised Standard Version obscures. It is possible that he is employing a
Corinthians self-designation, but even if he is not, no doubt the appella-
tion would please them. As Schnackenburg says:

> It is quite possible that the section 2, 6-16 contains certain
> concepts, formulations, and ideas of the arrogant Corinthian
> "pneumatics"; it is precisely this assumption which gives force
> to our interpretation: You demand "wisdom" and call yourselves

34

teleioi--well then, we speak wisdom among the perfect. If you
only understood it, if only you were really perfect!21

The strength of this view, which sees a certain amount of irony in

Paul's use of τέλειοι , is that it accounts for the paradoxical nature

of chapters 1-3. It seems that Paul is purposely unwilling to elaborate

on τέλειοι when he uses the phrase. He is granting that he speaks among

the τέλειοι , but he does not identify them. The immediate contrast to

τέλειοι in 2:6 is ἀρχόντων . These failed to understand God's wisdom,

the same wisdom which Paul claims to grasp through the Spirit (2:10). The

Spirit, then, is the difference between the rulers and the τέλειοι .

Paul never says that the Corinthians do not have the Spirit. But he says

he cannot speak to them as pneumatics.

> That is the paradox of his remarks, a paradox we are not allowed
> to resolve: they are pneumatics and yet they are not; they can
> and ought to recognize God's wisdom and yet they grasp it not,
> for the precise reason that they fancy themselves in possession
> of wisdom and boast of it.22

Paul is employing and reinterpreting a term which is not a common one for

him. He grants the idea of some being τέλειοι but he denies the same

reality to the very ones who claim it (or would like to claim it).

> It is this combination of denunciation with winning talk, this
> acceptance and rejection of current notions in Corinth, and the
> implication that he makes a personal claim to be a true pneumatic
> while turning back all the false claims of others (cf. v. 15),
> that make the Apostle truly great.23

It remains to determine the sense of τέλεος which is acceptable to

Paul. The foregoing discussion indicates that Paul is probably not employing

---

21Schnackenburg, p. 358.

22Ibid.

23Ibid.

τέλειοι as a general positive designation of Christians. The term is
rare as a name for Christians, it is not explained here, and he does not
pick up the term later in chapter 3. Yet it does occur here, and Paul
must have had some meaning for it, even if that meaning did not correspond
with that of certain Corinthians. In view of the introduction of νήπιοι
in 3:1, it is likely that Paul is employing τέλειος as a term of maturity.
The type of maturity which Paul proceeds to describe is the maturity of a
Christian being led by the Spirit. For the Corinthians this means putting
a stop to strife and envy, and abandoning the wisdom of this aeon. The
distinguishing characteristic about the τέλειοι would be their applica-
tion of wisdom to Church life. These would be the ones who not only have
the Spirit, but live by the Spirit; who know their gifts and use them
properly. It is unnecessary to say that the τέλειοι possess deeper
knowledge than the rest. Paul does not criticize them for superficial
knowledge (1:5), but for contradictions between what they know and what
they do. In effect, what Paul does is to briefly accept τέλειος as a
Christian designation, but to recast it by the word πνευματικός,
which adds the dimension of divine guidance and includes the total Christian
life within the larger community, God's holy temple (3:16).

I Corinthians 14:20

The meaning of τέλειος in this passage is much clearer than in the
previous passage. Paul contrasts maturity with immaturity, and encourages
maturity in thinking, but not in malice. While the formal contrast is
between τέλειοι and παιδία , the use of νηπιάζετε brings in the
notion of νήπιοι and recalls 3:1. The key to understanding τέλειος

here is the use of $\tau\alpha\tilde{\iota}\varsigma \ \varphi\rho\epsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\nu$. Unfortunately it does not occur else-
where in the New Testament. The word originally meant "diaphragm," but
also came to mean both mind and heart. It is related to $\nu o\tilde{\upsilon}\varsigma$, but need
not be merely cognitive. The English word "thinking" is fairly close be-
cause it can include feeling and disposition. The LXX employs the term
almost exclusively in Proverbs (8 times), usually with $\dot{\epsilon}\nu\delta\epsilon\acute{\eta}\varsigma$. The
Hebrew in these cases is $\daleth\dot{\bar{\zeth}}$.

The Nestle text places verse 20 at the beginning of a new thought.
Paul's use of $\dot{\alpha}\delta\epsilon\lambda\varphi o\acute{\iota}$ usually does begin a new thought. In this case
the new thought does not constitute a radical break in the context, but
merely another point in the same line of thought. While Paul proposes
maturity in thinking and immaturity in malice, his first and final state-
ments speak of maturity and are obviously the main emphases.

The use of $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\iota o\varsigma$ in this passage is definitely related to its
meaning in 2:6. In 14:20 it is no title, but the addition of $\varphi\rho\epsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\nu$
shows that Paul is still characterizing the $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\iota o\iota$ in the same way.
The issue is still the proper use of gifts. The Corinthians have childishly
emphasized the least edifying gifts, and Paul encourages them to exercise
what they know in a more profitable way. Since the beginning of chapter 12
he has been encouraging them to use their gifts for the common good. The
choice between tongues and prophecy is to be made on the basis of which
is the greater gift (12:31). Since love and edification are the outcome
of prophecy, the Corinthians can demonstrate their mature thinking by
properly emphasizing the better gifts.

It probably is no accident that Paul's only use of $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\iota o\varsigma$ in Romans
occurs in a parallel context. There too, $\varphi\rho o\nu\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ is used to describe

the sober thought which allows a man to evalutate his own position in the
Church and act accordingly.

Philippians 3:15

Philippians 3:12-15 contains the only Pauline use of the verb $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\acute{o}\omega$,
and the only other application of $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\iota o\varsigma$ as a title outside of I Corin-
thians 2:6. The combination of the perfect passive form of the verb and
the adjective has caused no small discussion among readers. Some maintain
that Paul is talking about two different kinds of perfection because in
one case he says he is not perfect, and in another he includes himself
among those who are perfect. Paying close attention to Paul's actual words,
it is clear that in verse 12 Paul is referring to a future action upon
man, his "being perfected." Verse 15 employs the adjective as a title for
certain Christians in the present time. If these two verses are to stand
without contradiction, any translation of them must reflect the verb form
in verse 12. It will then become clear that Paul does not equate being
a $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\iota o\varsigma$ with being perfected.

The context of verse 12 makes fairly plain what "being perfected" means.
It is the death and resurrection with Christ. Here Paul is using the verb
much the same as it is used in IV Maccabees 7:15 and Wisdom of Solomon 4:13.
The precise reason for the double $\acute{\eta}\delta\eta$ and the change in tense between
the parallel verbs is debated. It is possible that Paul wishes to guard
against the notion that the resurrection is somehow his work ($\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\alpha\beta ov$),
and so he inserts a passive form of $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\acute{o}\omega$. The twin use of $\acute{\eta}\delta\eta$
reinforces the "not yet" character of Paul's present life. This thought
occurs again in verse 13 with the word $o\acute{v}\pi\omega$. Paul is intent on maintaining

that he has not yet reached the goal, and that therefore more effort is needed; and yet the tense of his verbs indicate that human effort alone is no guarantee of success (verse 9: $εὑρεθῶ$; verse 10: $συμμορφιζ$ $όμενος$; verse 12: $κατελήμφθην$). Thus Paul's addition of $ἤδη$ $τετελείωμαι$ serves the purpose of repeating the $ἤδη$ and adding the passive note.

The use of $τέλειος$ in verse 15 is more difficult. Its presence, following a statement about not yet being perfected, is hard to explain if Paul is simply using it to refer to all Christians, as du Plessis maintains.[24] Two issues are involved: first, whether $τέλειος$ refers to all Christians, and second, whether the term is used ironically. The former question depends on the sense of $ὅσοι$ in verse 15. Du Plessis says that it means "all," and translates "We all, being perfect, let us . . . ." He lists several New Testament examples of $ὅσοι$ meaning "all" (Romans 6:3; 8:14; II Corinthians 1:20; Galatians 3:27). These do not prove his case. Only II Corinthians 1:20 is really parallel in construction, and this passage still allows either "whatever" or "all." More pertinent is the multiple use of the neuter $ὅσα$ in Philippians 4:8, where it definitely means "whatever." Whether $ὅσοι$ means "all" or "whatever" is not the only issue. The point is whether or not Paul means to say that all Christians are $τέλειοι$, that is, whether $ὅσοι$ $οὖν$ $τέλειοι$ is a declarative statement that all <u>are</u> $τέλειοι$. Of Paul's total use of $ὅσος$, no clause which lacks a verb is used declaratively. In both II Corinthians 1:20 and Philippians 4:8 the sense is not "all are . . . ," but "all who

---

[24]du Plessis, p. 196.

are . . . ." Even if the verb εἶναι were included (as in I Timothy 6:1),
the sense is still not "all are under . . . ," but "whoever is under . . . ."
Paul is not identifying these people, nor is he implying that all his readers
are among the group. He seems to allow the reader to place himself in
this group, if he wishes to do so.

If Paul is not necessarily referring to all Christians, and if he has
corrective advice to give to those who are supposedly mature, it is possi-
ble that he is employing the word somewhat ironically, as in I Corinthians
2:6. Helmut Koester explains the use of ὅσοι οὖν τέλεσοι as a captatio
benevolentiae in which Paul addresses those who claim to be perfect.[25]
The likelihood that Paul is either using a term currently in use or describ-
ing a prevailing attitude (rather than introducing the term on his own)
is supported by his previous statement that he is not yet perfected. He
is telling the τέλεσοι not to take their title seriously. Using himself
as an example, he has shown that he still can call himself τέλεσος if
he wants to, but that this does not exempt him from further striving,
suffering, and future death. As in I Corinthians 2:6 he is radically revis-
ing this title.

Paul encourages the Philippians to think the way he is thinking. Koester
suspects that φρονεῖν is a slogan of Paul's opponents.[26] While the case
cannot be proved, it nevertheless is clear that Paul is correcting and
cautioning the type of φρόνησις that characterized some of his readers.

_____

[25]Helmut Koester, "The Purpose of the Polemic of a Pauline Fragment,"
New Testament Studies VIII (1961), 332, n. 1.

[26]Ibid., p. 328.

The correction lies in his own type of thinking, especially in verses 13-14, but also including the whole chapter. The caution lies in the possibility that even the τέλεcοι have an incomplete revelation. Paul does not say that their thinking ἑτέρως is wrong, but incomplete. Among those who pride themselves on being spiritually mature and knowledgeable, the suggestion that their thinking is incomplete would not be disregarded.

It is not necessary to assume that a group of τέλεcοι existed in Philippi and called themselves by that name. It is probable, however, that the title τέλεcοι would have been a pleasing one to certain Philippians. It is also probable that Paul redefines this term to divest it of its overtones of self-sufficiency, omniscience, and premature consummation.

Τέλεcος as a Designation of Anticipated Personal Development

Ephesians 4:13

Although there are parallels between this passage and Colossians 1:28, the occurrence of ἀνὴρ τέλεcος is unique, and deserves attention within its own setting. It has not always received such attention. The attempts to see gnostic redeemer-myths in this verse have not proved cogent or enlightening. Schlier, for example, equates the ἀνὴρ τέλεcος with Christ as the Heavenly Man.

> Der ἀνὴρ τέλεcος ist niemand anders als der Christus, der Anthropos selbst, der als höchste Spitze seines eigenen Pleroma gedacht ist, oder wie wir vorausgreifend sagen können, als seines σῶμα.[27]

---

[27]Heinrich Schlier, Christus und die Kirche im Epheserbrief (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1930), p. 28.

This interpretation not only rests on questionable parallels (Manichaean and Naasene texts), but it disregards the context, which emphasizes the growth of Christians. The phrase ἀνὴρ τέλειος is set in the middle of three parallel phrases introduced with εἰς . No matter whether the first or last phrase is the "standard,"[28] both influence the middle one. The combined thought of all three passages is: unity and knowledge; maturity; and developed fulness. The latter two appear to belong close together, as if μέτρον ἡλικίας describes ἄνδρα τέλειον . Whether ἡλικία means "age" or "stature," it still expresses maturity. In fact, both ἡλικία and ἀνήρ are terms denoting maturity. Further support for the idea of maturity may be found in verse 14, which contrasts the condition of νήπιοι . Thus, "mature man" is a better translation than "perfect man."

The singular form of this phrase has caused much comment. Most probably the singular form emphasizes the corporate aspect of Christian growth. The phrase οἱ πάντες expresses the totality of the group more emphatically than πάντες alone. If ἀνὴρ τέλειος is to express corporate growth, this interpretation must rest on a metaphorical understanding of the phrase, which

> should be understood as a designation of the whole church, symboli-
> cally pictured as an individual who has attained the end or purpose
> of his existence, one complete or perfect, and should not be under-
> stood as a designation of the perfect individual believer. Though
> it is true that each individual member of the church is also to
> attain to perfection, the emphasis in this particular verse is upon
> the final goal of the whole church . . . .[29]

---

[28]Edwin Roels, God's Mission (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1962), p. 204. Roels, following C. F. D. Moule, considers the third phrase to be the standard for interpreting the first two.

[29]Ibid., p. 205.

Percy sees more of an individual emphasis in this phrase:

> Die Gemeinde ist erst dann vollkommen und schliesst erst dann die
> ganze Fülle Christi in sich, wenn alle ihre einzelnen Mitglieder
> die vollkommene Erkenntnis von Christus erreicht haben . . . .[30]

This view does not do justice to the singular form of ἀνὴρ τέλειος .
It reflects the thoughts of the Colossian parallel more than this text it-
self. The fact that νήπιος is in the plural form makes the singular
form of ἀνήρ even more striking. It may be true, as Robinson suggests,
that the text purposely associates individualism with immaturity, and
unity with maturity.[31] Thus while both the individual and the body are
involved, the emphasis here lies on the body. By no means is the indi-
vidual to be isolated within his own scope of personal development. "Die
Reife des Einzelnen und die Einheit der Gemeinde sind miteinander verbunden."[32]

Although ἀνὴρ τέλειος appears parallel to καινὸς ἄνθρωπος
(2:15; 4:24), it is not exactly synonymous.

> For, though both phrases are designations of the same object, the
> "new man" represents the church from a soteriological, the "full-
> grown man" from an eschatological perspective . . . the "full-grown
> man" represents the eschatological maturity of that salvation entity
> designated already as the "new man."[33]

To summarize: ἀνὴρ τέλειος is a metaphor for the whole Church. It
describes the anticipated maturity of the entire group, in contrast to the
immaturity of the present time. This maturity is a growing up into Christ,
the Head of the body.

---

[30]Ernst Percy, Die Probleme der Kolosser - und Epheserbriefe (Lund:
C. W. K. Gleerup, 1946), p. 322.

[31]J. Armitage Robinson, St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians (London:
James Clarke and Co., Ltd., n.d.), p. 183.

[32]Walter Grundmann, "Die Νήπιοι in der urchristlichen Paränese,"
New Testament Studies, V (1959), 195.

[33]Roels, p. 205.

Colossians 1:28

The text of Colossians 1:28 is to be read as in the Nestle text, re-
jecting the omission of "every man" because it is not included in Vaticanus,
Alexandrinus, or Sinaiticus. Its omission in Claromontanus, Boernerianus,
Sangermanens, Augiensis, 33, Old Latin, and Clement may have been the re-
sult of a failure to copy the thrice-repeated phrase. Even if the phrase
were omitted, the sense would not be altered. The addition of "Jesus" at
the end of the verse is too weakly attested to be accepted.

The presentation of every man mature in Christ is portrayed here as
an anticipated development. The aorist subjunctive of the verb, while
not necessarily pointing to a specific future event (such as the Parousia),
nevertheless indicates that the presenting is still anticipated. The
proclamation and teaching are still going on. Paul is still exerting him-
self to that end. The anticipated character of Paul's presenting has
already been mentioned by him in 1:22. There the same verb is used, but
Paul is not the subject. Whether Christ or God is interpreted as subject,
it is still true that the presenting of Christians as holy and blameless
before God assumes their continued firmness in the faith. Thus, even here
where it first appears that the presenting may have already been accomplished,
the grammar allows a future connotation, and the context favors an antici-
pated presenting.

It is not necessary to assume that Paul has the Parousia in mind.
While it is true that he uses the same verb in reference to the Last Judg-
ment (Romans 14:10; I Corinthians 8:8; II Corinthians 4:14), he also uses
it in a sacrificial setting (Romans 12:1), and in a marital setting

(II Corinthians 11:2; Ephesians 5:27). Finally, the verb can also mean simply "render."[34] In view of the diverse meanings of παριστάνω, it cannot be said that Paul is using a technical term for an eschatological presenting. Since Paul is speaking about his own presenting, it is likely that he is referring to the outcome of his own ministry. When he speaks of Christians as τέλειοι in Christ he is not necessarily speaking of heavenly existence. The context indicates that the characteristics which Paul is teaching are definitely for the present life. He does not say when it is that a man becomes τέλειος . If Paul "probably has the Parousia in mind,"[35] he does not show it. He is interested in the present renewal, and the replacement of the old man by the new (3:9). Maturity in Christ is anticipated for the very reason that the renewal is still going on. The moment of absolute realization is not Paul's interest. In fact, there is no evidence that Paul is thinking about an absolute realization of maturity at all. When Bruce connects this passage with the τὸ τέλειον of I Corinthians 13:10,[36] he assumes that τέλειος is always a radically future designation. The context of Colossians 1:28, as will be shown later, indicates that although the development of maturity is anticipated, it is not put off until the Parousia.

_____

[34] Walter Bauer, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, translated and adapted from the German by W. Arndt and F. Gingrich (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957), p. 663.

[35] E. K. Simpson and F. F. Bruce, Commentary on the Epistles to the Ephesians and the Colossians (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1957), p. 220.

[36] Ibid.

The anticipated development is also personal. The threefold repetition of "every man" makes it clear that there is no exclusive group which alone shares in the instruction in total wisdom. But it is not only the present Christians who are to be τέλειοι ; the context points to the Gentiles (verse 27) as the locale for the revelation of the mystery. "The recurrent 'every man' should not be restricted to a Christian universality."[37]

In considering τέλειος as a description of an anticipated personal development, it remains to document the fact that Paul is thinking of a development or growth. Du Plessis rejects any notion of growth:

> The idea of spiritual growth within the converted community is a theme not patently clear in the context and in terms of the preceding, improbable . . . . What is bestowed in Christ is quite perfect and needs no supplementation whatsoever. Perfection is the absolute redemption which is in Christ.[38]

There is evidence in Colossians for the rejection of any idea of growth. A passage already noted (1:23) indicates that what is needed is simple perseverance, not necessarily growth. In 2:9 Paul says "you are πεπλη - ρωμένοι in him." In 3:3 he says, "your life is hid with Christ in God."

While these emphases on Christian fulness are present, the epistle also abounds in parenetic material which calls for increasing in knowledge (1:10), good works (1:9), love (2:2), thanksgiving (2:7), forgiveness (3:13), and obedience (3:20). Since Paul emphasizes both present endowment and future growth, the issue boils down to the question: does "τέλειον" equal "in Christ," or does it add something? The context shows quite plainly that Paul is talking about more than just converting the Gentiles. He is

_____

[37]du Plessis, p. 198.

[38]Ibid., p. 199.

46

speaking of the on-going pastoral process of building up Christian converts.

He qualifies καταγγέλομεν with νουθετοῦντες and διδάσκοντες.

This activity of his does not stop when his converts become church members.

Paul continues to toil for them that their hearts might be encouraged as

they are knit together in love (2:2). Verses 6 and 7 sum up his will for

them: that they walk in Him; being rooted and built up, established in

the faith, abounding in thanksgiving. The rest of the chapter expands on

the implications of a well-grounded faith. A mature Christian can guard

against enemies and deceivers. The context which follows 1:28 is the best

commentary on what it means to be mature in Christ. Verbal correspondences

between 1:28 and 2:6-7 bear this out. At 2:6 the "in Christ" is picked up

again; at 2:7 ἐδιδάχθητε echoes διδάσκοντες of 1:28; and the con-

tent of Paul's warnings in 2:8-23 correspond with νουθετοῦντες of 1:28.

Paul is describing the development of strong Christians who grow "with a

growth that is from God" (2:19). Τέλειος in 1:28 means "mature, stable

in the faith."

Another passage which interprets 1:28 is 3:16, which speaks of the

Colossians themselves teaching and admonishing each other in all wisdom.

Here the Colossians are encouraged to do for each other just what Paul had

done for them: speak the word, teach, and admonish. This activity is the

activity of those who are mature and knowledgeable, who really are being

renewed (3:10). In a similar vein, Paul writes in Romans: "I myself am

satisfied about you, my brethren, that you yourselves are full of goodness,

filled with all knowledge, and able to instruct one another" (15:14). The

means by which Paul hopes to present every man mature in Christ, are the

same by which those who are mature in Christ exercise their maturity among

others.

Colossians 4:12

The two textual variants are read in agreement with the Nestle text. In reference to the first, du Plessis says:

> This rather uncommon use [σταθῆτε] has in its favour that it is quite explicable that a copyist should substitute the simple form for the complex one, as in the case of Matt. 2.9 and 27.11 for instance, whilst the origin of the latter, if secondary, is difficult to imagine. The difference in meaning is not very great. The passive form is intransitive and implies that the initiative for their maintenance stems from God.[39]

The attestation for σταθῆτε is superior, with Vaticanus, Sinaiticus, and P46, among others. The second textual decision is based on the considerably stronger witness for πεπληροφορημένοι . The other reading, πεπληρωμένοι , is supported by Koine and P46. Abbott conjectures that the shorter form "probably slipped in as the more familiar and simpler word."[40]

The verse, which represents Epaphras' prayer for the Colossians, is obviously parallel to the desire of Paul as stated in the last passage considered (1:28). The parallels are striking: prayer (1:9); the use of τέλειος (1:28); ἀγωνιζόμενος (1:29, in exactly the same form); the noun form of πεπληροφορημένοι (2:2); and reference to God's will (1:9). Granted these similarities, it is still necessary to determine the precise sense of τέλειος within its context.

---

[39]Ibid., p. 204.

[40]T. K. Abbott, Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Colossians in International Critical Commentary (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1956), p. 302.

The word order suggests that τέλειοι goes with σταθῆτε as a parallel to πεπληροφορημένοι, which is qualified by the subsequent phrase, "in the total will of God." The distance of this final phrase from σταθῆτε would not forbid their being connected, but since 1:9 connects πληρωθῆτε with θελήματος, there is precedent for maintaining that the similar thoughts in 4:12 may likewise stand together.

The parallel in 1:9 also recalls the flexibility of the verb πληρο-φορέω. It can mean either "fill," "fulfill" (II Timothy 4:5,17), or "convince" (Romans 4:21; 14:5). Its meaning in Colossians 4:12 is probably "fully convinced, or assured." This interpretation is based on the parallel between 4:12 and 2:2, where πληροφορία occurs. In 2:2-4 there is a contrast between full knowledge and the danger of being deluded by beguiling words. This contrast supports the meaning of πληροφορία which stresses conviction, certainty, and steadfastness. Yet the notion of fulness is not to be totally excluded. The verb πληροφορέω recalls πλήρωμα, an important word in Colossians (1:19; 2:9). The parallel between 1:9 and 4:12 was noted above in another connection. In 1:9 Paul prays that they may be filled with the knowledge of God's will (πληρόω and θέλημα). The use of πληροφορέω in 4:12 retains and intensifies the important Colossian emphasis on "fulness."

The combination of σταθῆτε and τέλειοι likewise stresses mature durability. Even without τέλειος, the verb σταθῆτε connotes resolute perseverance (I Corinthians 15:1; 16:13; Romans 11:20; II Corinthians 1:24). The double occurrence of the verb in Ephesians 6:13-14 bears out the notion of firm defense. These same characteristics are those which Paul portrays after announcing his desire to present every man mature in Christ (Colossians 2).

The meaning of τέλειος in 4:12 is congruous with that of 1:28. The notion of defense is more explicit, while the more cognitive elements are taken over by the parallel term, πεπληροφορημένοι. "Mature" is the best translation. This passage illuminates 1:28 in one important respect. It describes the state of being τέλειος as a thing desirable in the present. From Epaphras' point of view it is anticipated, but his prayers call for a nearby realization of maturity.

Τελειότης in Colossians 3:14

The rarity of the noun Τελειότης in the New Testament is matched by its rarity in most Classical Greek literature. Aristotle uses it twice to denote completeness.[41] Philo's use, noted above, is more frequent and diverse. Its most usual sense is that of the highest level of human attainment. The LXX employs the term six times. In Judges 9:16,19 it is used parallel with ἀληθεία in reference to the agreement between Jotham and the Shechemites. Here it renders םיִמָּת and denotes integrity. It means the same thing in Proverbs 11:3, where it renders תָּמֻּה. In Wisdom of Solomon 6:15 and 12:17 it follows φρονήσεως and δυνάμεως respectively. In both it means completeness and totality. In Jeremiah 2:2 (א) it translates כְּלוּלוֹתָיִךְ, "betrothal time," which in A and B is rendered by τελείωσις.

The text of Colossians 3:14 is to be read as in the Nestle text. The phrase ὅ ἐστιν is better attested than ὅς and ἥτις , and may be understood as a "formularic phrase without reference to the gender of the

_____

[41]Metaphysics III,6,p.207a,21; p.261a,36.

word explained or to that of the word which explains . . . .[42] The second

variant, $\text{ΕΝΌΤΗΤΟ}\varsigma$, is likewise rejected for its weaker witness, but

its importance as a possible equivalent for $\text{ΤΕλΕΙΌΤΗ}\varsigma$ is significant.

The most important extra-biblical parallels for the general sense of

3:14 are: (1) the saying of Simplicius in Epictetus 208a that the

Pythagoreans gave the highest honor to $\varphi\iota\lambda\acute{\iota}\alpha$ and called it the $\text{ΓΎΝδΕΓΜΟ}\varsigma$

of all the virtues; (2) the use of $\text{ΓΎΝδΕΓΜΟ}\varsigma$ in Plato, Politicus 310a

to describe that which holds together diverse parts of virtue.[43]

The biblical parallel most often cited is Ephesians 4:3. The over-

all parallels between Colossians 3:12-15 and Ephesians 4:2-4 are rather

extensive. Percy assembles the evidence at some length.[44] The phrase

$\text{ΓΎΝδΕΓΜΟ}\varsigma$ $\text{τῆ}\varsigma$ $\text{ΕἰΡΉΝΗ}\varsigma$ echoes the thoughts of Colossians 3:14, but

not the exact choice of words. The syntax of the phrase appears to be an

epexegetic genitive[45] ("the bond which is peace").

These parallels do not explain the meaning of Colossians 3:14. They

do, however, offer at least two general directions toward solution. After

noting that in Ephesians 4:3 the bond is peace itself, Percy continues:

Dagegen sind die Meinungen geteilt betreffs des Sinns des $\text{ΓΎΝδΕΓΜΟ}\varsigma$
$\text{τῆ}\varsigma$ $\text{ΤΕλΕΙΌΤΗΤΟ}\varsigma$ in Kol 3,14, ob die Liebe hier ebenso wie der

---

[42]F. Blass and A. Debrunner, A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, translated from the German by R. Funk (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961), §132,2.

[43]For other references see H. Chadwick, "All Things to All Men," New Testament Studies, I (1954-55), 273.

[44]Percy, p. 406.

[45]Bauer, p. 793.

Friede in Eph 4,3 als das Band gedacht ist, das die einzelnen
Gläubigen zu einer Einheit zusammenschliesst, oder ob sie als
ein Band, das die verschiedenen in V. 12 aufgezählten Tugenden
zu einer Einheit verbindet und dadurch die Vollkommenheit bewirkt,
gedacht ist. Der Gedanke sollte im letzteren Falle mit dem in
Röm 13,9 identisch sein, wenn es dort heisst, dass alle Gebote
des Dekalogs im Liebesgebot zusammengefasst sind (vgl. Gal 5,14).
Als Stütze für die letzerwähnte Interpretation hat man auf die
Aussage bei Simplicius . . . verwiesen.[46]

To equate the "bond of perfection" with "the power which unites and

holds together all those graces and virtues which together make up per-

fection,"[47] is to assume that Paul views $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\acute{o}\tau\eta\varsigma$ as the totality of

virtues. Delling implies that this is a legitimate possibility: "Dass

durch die Liebe die christlichen ,Tugenden' zur Ganzheit verbunden werden,

wäre eine wohl im Neuen Testament sachlich mögliche Aussage."[48] Percy

thinks otherwise: "Dagegen ist die $\alpha\gamma\acute{a}\pi\eta$ nach Paulus die eine Grund-

tugend des christlichen Lebens; die andere Tugenden sind dabei nichts als

verschiedene Ausserungen der $\alpha\gamma\acute{a}\pi\eta$."[49] He concludes, then, that the

Pythagorean parallel is not relevant.

The other direction of thought, that the parallel in Ephesians helps

explain Colossians 3:14, has also been suggested. The problem here is

that there is no precise parallel. Whereas love is the bond in Colossians,

in Ephesians the bond is peace. The Colossian construction is more complex,

and the nature of the genitive construction of $\tau\hat{\eta}\varsigma \ \tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\acute{o}\tau\eta\tau o\varsigma$ is more

---

[46]Percy, p. 406.

[47]J. B. Lightfoot, St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon
(London: Macmillan and Co., 1879), p. 222.

[48]G. Delling, "$\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota o\varsigma$," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament,
begründet von Gerhard Kittel (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1965), VIII,
80.

[49]Percy, p. 407.

crucial than the genitive construction in Ephesians. "In view of the
property of σύνδεσμος as a unifying force, the genitive is most suitably
rendered as objective and not subjective, because it is the cause and not
the result of τελεσότης."[50] Likewise, Blass-Debrunner lists Colossians
3:14 as objective genitive[51] ("the bond which produces perfection"). It
is not impossible to interpret this phrase as a descriptive or qualitative
genitive, but the noun, with the definite article, seems to deserve more
attention than that of a simple modifier.

Even deciding that τελεσότης is effected by ἀγάπη, the σύνδεσμος,
it is still necessary to define τελεσότης. Some suggest that the term
has philosophical or cosmic overtones by virtue of its association with
σύνδεσμος. Fitzer notes the cosmic background behind σύνδεσμος in both
Ephesians and Colossians:

> In beiden Stellen liegt eine formale Ähnlichkeit mit dem platonischen
> Gebrauch des Wortes . . . vor; es geht um eine Zweiheit, die durch
> den σύνδεσμος zur Einheit gebracht und überwunden wird. Aber
> es geht hier nicht um einen kosmologischen, sondern eher um einen
> soteriologischen Bereich, genauer um die Gemeinde in der Welt.[52]

Even though the constructions of Ephesians 4:3 and Colossians 3:14 are not
verbally parallel, these passage do reflect an interest in congregational
unity. The Ephesian passage provides a parallel in which σύνδεσμος is
applied to interpersonal relations.

Although this parallel is valuable, the exact meaning of τελεσότης
in Colossians ultimately rests on its own use and setting. The clothing

---

[50]du Plessis, p. 201.

[51]Blass-Debrunner, §163.

[52]Gottfried Fitzer, "σύνδεσμος," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen
Testament, begründet von G. Kittel (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1964),
VII, 857.

imagery, which begins in verse 9, is the background of verse 14. To say
that τελειότης refers to the totality of "virtues" in verses 12 and
13, as Lightfoot does, is certainly possible. The passage in Epictetus
supports this interpretation. The "virtues" in this case would be those
qualities listed in verses 12-13. Love ties them together, and enables
people to be τέλειος. Although verse 17 does not use the term τέλειος,
it describes the one who shares in τελειότης as one who does everything
in the name of the Lord Jesus, whether in word or deed.[53] Interpreted in
this way, τελειότης is the totality of virtues, which is equivalent to
the condition of being τέλειος.

Another possibility is to take the phrase "Christ is all and in all,"
in verse 11 as the antecedent to τελειότης. The justification for this
connection lies in the οὖν (verse 12), which immediately follows this
phrase, and which includes verse 14. The main difference between this
interpretation and the former is that here the bond does not unify virtues;
it unifies persons, and expresses the condition where Christ is all and
in all. By putting on love a Christian brings to realization the totality
and unity of the one body. Paul has already expressed a similar thought
in 2:2, and especially 2:19, where σύνδεσμος appears more biologically
oriented, but expressive of the same idea. According to this interpreta-
tion the primary notion of τελειότης is totality, the totality of God's
love shared among the elect in every activity. Τελειότης thus stands for
a congregational condition in which Christ is all and in all.

_____

[53]Philo repeatedly characterizes the τέλειος person as one who re-
sponds in "word and deed." Supra, p. 18.

It is hazardous to impose severe limits on what Paul may have intended

with the term τελειότης. Whether it means the totality of virtues, or

the condition of Christ's love active in the Church, the result is the

same: the peace of Christ rules in the hearts of his people, and his word

dwells among them; the chosen people live the forgiving and worshiping life

in the one body into which they have been called.

CHAPTER IV

ΤΕΛΕΙΟΣ AND COGNATES IN HEBREWS

Τελειόω Used Negatively

Three of the nine occurrences[1] of the verb Τελειόω are used nega-
tively, to denote the ineffectiveness of the law or old covenant. These
three are roughly parallel, but do not form an independent category within
Hebrews. They must be seen against the background of Τελειόω as applied
to Jesus and mankind. Still, these three occurrences provide a starting
point, and offer a setting in which to place the use of Τελειόω .

Hebrews 7:19 substantiates the weakness and uselessness of the former
commandment by parenthetically noting that the law perfected nothing.
The former commandment is set aside for a better hope, "through which we
draw near to God." Hebrews 9:9 notes that under the old arrangement (the
earthly sanctuary) gifts and sacrifices are offered, but that these cannot
perfect the conscience of the worshiper. They deal only with outward
things. Hebrews 10:1 also refers to the inability of the law (by means
of yearly sacrifices) to perfect those who draw near. The passage goes
on to demonstrate that under the old sacrificial arrangement there was no
effective cleansing from sin.

It is clear that all these passages are located in a sacrificial,
cultic setting. In view of a similar cultic setting for Τελειόω in the
LXX Pentateuch, a likely background for understanding Τελειόω in Hebrews

---

[1]Hebrews 2:10; 5:9; 7:19,28; 9:9; 10:1,14; 11:40; 12:23.

is the LXX, especially the Pentateuch, as G. Delling observes. "An eine

spezielle Bedeutung von τελειόω in der Septuaginta . . . knüpft über-

wiegend die Verwendung des Verbs im Hebräerbrief an."[2] However, not all

scholars are in agreement. Sidney Sowers comments:

> By now it is obvious that the author is working with a much larger
> concept of perfection than he started with in the Pentateuch
> passages which spoke of the consecrated, or perfected high priest
> and the τελείωσις of the offerings.[3]

Sowers is substantially following J. Kögel, who maintains that τελειόω

is a formal concept which derives its meaning from the context.

> Wenn wir diesen wechselnden Gebrauch beobachten, so können wir
> daraus schon eine Folgerung ziehen, nämlich die, dass τελειόω
> ein Allgemeinbegriff ist, ohne einen bestimmten Inhalt. Es
> ist ein rein formaler Ausdruck . . . auf das Objekt und auf
> den Kontext kommt es demnach vor allem an, wollen wir den Sinn
> erfassen . . . .[4]

Applying this principle to Hebrews 7:19, Kögel paraphrases, "Nichts wurde

an das ihm gesetzte Ziel geführt."[5] Sowers sees a similar meaning for

τελειόω wherever it applies to the theology of the two covenants. "So

applied perfection means, the bringing to completion in the new covenant

of that which was anticipated in the old."[6]

While Kögel throughout views τελειόω as a formal concept, Sowers

abandons the LXX Pentateuch content of τελειόω because its use in Hebrews

is simply too far-reaching to be explained within the category of priestly

---

[2]G. Delling, "τελειόω," _Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament_, begründent von Gerhard Kittel (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1965), VIII, 83.

[3]Sidney Sowers, _The Hermeneutics of Philo and Hebrews_ (Zürich: EVZ-Verlag, 1955), p. 113.

[4]Julius Kögel, "Der Begriff τελειοῦν im Hebräerbrief," _Theologische Studien Martin Kähler dargebracht_ (Leipzig: n.p., 1905), p. 39.

[5]_Ibid._, p. 60.   [6]Sowers, p. 113.

consecration. Similarly, A. Cody, in speaking of the old and new priest-hood, notes that from an Alexandrian point of view perfection is an aspect of that which is heavenly.[7] If Hebrews is dealing in a Philonic-type dualism, then τελειόω may be rooted as much in a philosophical background as biblical.

The three passages which are under consideration all resemble LXX cultic usage, but the resemblance is not complete. In Hebrews 7:19 and 10:1, "heisst τελειόω τινά jemanden in den Zustand versetzen, in dem er vor Gott treten bzw vor Gott bestehen kann . . . ."[8] Here the object of the verb is not the priest, or his hands, but the worshiper. The sub-ject of the verb is the "law." In 10:1 the object is "conscience," and the subject is "gifts and sacrifices." Yet the contexts of all three passages suggest that τελειόω is nearly synonymous with ἐγγίζω (7:19), καθαρίζω (9:14; 10:2), and ἁγιάζω (10:10), terms which are related to the cultic meaning of τελειόω . The Septuagintal origin is reinforced in 7:11, where the writer describes the unattainability of τελείωσις under the Levitical priesthood and law. Τελείωσις occurs in the LXX sixteen times, twelve of which are in Exodus 29 and Leviticus 7-8, where they translate מִלֻּאִים, the sacrifice which accompanies priestly consecration.

> Die gesamte Weise der Verwendung von Τελείωσις an diesen St zeigt, dass in LXX darunter eine Handlung verstanden wird, die mit der Einsetzung der Priester in ihren Dienst zusammenhängt.[9]

---

[7]Aelred Cody, Heavenly Sanctuary and Liturgy in the Epistle to the Hebrews (St. Meinrad, Indiana: Grail Publications, 1960), p. 101.

[8]Delling, p. 83.   [9]Ibid., p. 86.

Hebrews 7 is demonstrating the absence of an effective and lasting ordina-

tion under the Levitical priesthood. Thus the οὐδέν of 7:19 refers both

to the consecration of priests and to effectiveness of the work on behalf

of the people. To translate τελειόω formally in this verse may yield

an understandable sense, but does not do justice to the cultic background.

The sense of 7:19 is not

> "das Gesetz hat ja nichts zur Vollendung geführt" (Windisch, ähnlich
> Michel), sondern muss dem ἐτελείωσεν seine volle Bedeutung geben:
> "es hat ja keine vollendende Weihe gebracht."[10]

In all three passages it is possible to understand τελειόω as "to fully

consecrate." The only shift in meaning from the LXX is that in Hebrews

the people, not just the priests, are the object of τελειόω . This shift

is not difficult. Already in the Old Testament the priest worked on behalf

of the people. His capacity to stand before God was symbolic of theirs.

Thus, applying τελειόω to the people does not change its priestly mean-

ing. If τελειόω may also be understood according to its formal meaning,

or under the influence of Alexandrian philosophy, these meanings are sub-

ordinate to the clear cultic meaning suggested by the context.

The combined sense of the three passages where τελειόω is used nega-

tively is: the old dispensation (law, priesthood, sacrificial system) did

not lastingly consecrate priests or people. It did not thoroughly cleanse

the people from sin, nor sanctify them inwardly. As a result it did not

effectively succeed in enabling people to stand before God.

---

[10]Martin Dibelius, "Der himmlische Kultus nach dem Hebräerbrief,"
Botschaft und Geschichte, Gesammelte Aufsätze von Martin Dibelius. Heraus-
gegeben von Günther Bornkamm (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1956),
II, 168.

$T\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\acute{o}\omega$ As Applied to Jesus

Hebrews 2:10

This passage is one of the most explicit in describing the consecra-
tion of Jesus. The context indicates that the emphasis of the verse lies
on the means of consecration, which is suffering ($\delta\iota\grave{\alpha}\ \pi\alpha\theta\eta\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\nu$).
Yet it is not the suffering alone which brings about Jesus' consecration.
God is the subject and He consecrates Jesus through suffering. This means
that the suffering is not accidental, but planned by the Father "for whom
and by whom all things exist." The use of $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\rho\epsilon\pi\epsilon\nu$ ("to be fitting")
speaks to the appropriateness of having the $\alpha\rho\chi\eta\gamma\acute{o}\varsigma$ consecrated by
means of suffering, which is the identification with mankind in origin,
necessity for obedience, temptation, and finally death.

The word $\alpha\gamma\alpha\gamma\acute{o}\nu\tau\alpha$ is capable of being taken with either $\alpha\dot{\upsilon}\tau\tilde{\omega}$ or
$\alpha\rho\chi\eta\gamma\acute{o}\nu$. If taken with $\alpha\dot{\upsilon}\tau\tilde{\omega}$, God is the one who leads the many sons.
If taken with $\alpha\rho\chi\eta\gamma\acute{o}\nu$, it can either describe His mediatorial capacity,
or serve as an "agent-noun,"[11] which stresses vocation in much the same way
that $\acute{o}\ \beta\alpha\pi\tau\iota\zeta\omega\nu$ of Mark 6:14,24 acts as a title. It would then read:
"It was meet that God should perfect the Conductor and Author of our salva-
tion by suffering." Even though the mediatorial function of leading is
usually ascribed to Jesus, the sense of the sentence seems to favor associat-
ing $\alpha\gamma\alpha\gamma\acute{o}\nu\tau\alpha$ with $\alpha\dot{\upsilon}\tau\tilde{\omega}$. This choice is perfectly in line with the
emphasis on divine initiative expressed in the verse. It also maintains

---

[11] Paul Johannes du Plessis, _Teleios. The Idea of Perfection in the New Testament_ (Kampen: J. H. Kok N. V., 1959), p. 219.

the direct interest that God has in the sons which is evident from the first verse of the epistle. The time and sequence of this aorist participle cannot be historically pinpointed. "The element of past time is absent from the aorist participle especially if its action is identical with that of an aorist finite verb."[12] Used in this absolute sense, the relationship between ἀγαγόντα and τελειῶσαι has no reference to time or sequence. There seems to be no sure basis, therefore, for interpreting ἀγαγόντα as an ingressive aorist as Michel does.

The occurrence of ἀρχηγός in this passage deserves additional consideration. Rendered variously in the translations, (Authorized Version, "Captain;" Revised Standard Version, "Pioneer;" New English Bible, "Leader"), the term carries several different notions even in antiquity.[13] The founder of a Greek city was often called its ἀρχηγός, or hero, such as Athene for Athens. Included in that position was the function of guardianship. This usage provides the additional nuance of "originator," and "author." A subsidiary sense is that of "captain." Simpson maintains that "this vocable hovers between the two senses of Chieftain and Founder, according as the main stress is laid on the first or the second syllable respectively. . . . When followed by the possessive case the notion of prime agent or factor prevails."[14] Significant for its usage in Hebrews

---

[12]F. Blass and A. Debrunner, A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, translated from the German by R. Funk (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961), §339,1.

[13]Gerhard Delling, "ἀρχηγός," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, herausgegeben von Gerhard Kittel (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1933), I, 485-486.

[14]E. K. Simpson, "The Vocabulary of the Epistle to the Hebrews," Evangelical Quarterly, XVIII (1946), 35.

is the fact that ἀρχηγός is occasionally used in conjunction with ἀίτιος, as in Plato[15] or Philo.[16] The ruling power and the cause are understandably associated with each other. Philo uses the term ἀρχηγέτης for the patriarchs, and even applies it to God on one occasion. In the LXX ἀρχηγός usually means a political or military leader, or the head of a clan. In Micah 1:13 and I Maccabees 9:61 it is used figuratively in reference to sin and evil. In the New Testament the word is used four times (Hebrews 2:10; 12:2; Acts 3:15; and Acts 5:31). In Acts 3:15 it refers to Christ as ἀρχηγὸν τῆς ζωῆς, and in Acts 5:31 as ἀρχηγὸν καὶ σωτῆρα in the context of exaltation. The former conveys the idea of Author, the latter possibly Leader, but even that is somewhat weak. In Hebrews the translation "Pioneer" fits well within context, but is weak in designating power and influence.

If the exact meaning of τελειόω is debated in negative usage, it is even more debated as it applies to Jesus. Much of the discussion revolves around an issue not specifically discussed in the letter, namely, the question of whether Christ was perfected morally or only in respect to his office. This question will be considered later, but for the present our purpose is to determine what τελειόω meant as applied to Jesus.

As in the last section, the context points to priestly consecration. Even though the verses prior to 2:10 do not refer to a High Priest, the verses following are saturated with priestly content. Verse 17, particularly,

[15]Cratylus 401.

[16]Vit. Mos. 3, 28.

echoes 2:10, and provides an illuminating parallel. Using the Septuagintal background and the priestly context, one could reasonably conclude that τελεοώ means "consecrate as priest." Yet few stop with this simple meaning.

> the consummation of Christ is of greater profundity than consecratory associations allow. To a far greater extent the text radiates a personal qualitative sense, firstly as far as vocational aptitude is concerned and secondly in relation to moral and spiritual capacity.[17]

While some commentators begin with the LXX background, others bypass it altogether. As a result, the possible synonyms for τελεοώ have experienced a confusing proliferation which includes: initiate, consummate, perfect, fulfill, complete, elevate, glorify, enable, qualify, cause to enter, and realize. Many of these meanings dovetail, and require that an interpreter provide his translation and its background. Michel is one of the few who does this. He says:

> die LXX wohl bis zu einem gewissen Grade die Voraussetzung für den Sprachgebrauch des Hb liefert . . . aber die LXX allein ihn nicht erklärt.[18]

The reason why this starting point is so important is that it facilitates distinguishing between primary and secondary senses of τελεοώ . It also safeguards against subjective interpretation. One wonders how interpreters arrive at their synonyms for τελεοώ . Most translations make sense from various perspectives, but few of them have the support of common usage or clear substantiation from the text. Most interpretations of τελεοώ

---

[17]du Plessis, p. 218.

[18]Otto Michel, Der Brief an die Hebräer, in Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament, begründet von H. A. W. Meyer, (10. Auflage; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1957), pp. 137-138.

63

are applications of Kögel's "formal" concept. The foremost difficulty

with the application of this concept is that it empties the verb of its

own specific meaning acquired in usage. Granted that it is a word variously

used, and is often used formally,

> the term and its derivatives have acquired by elastic adaptability
> various stable associations from religious, profane and colloquial
> usage. To wield it as a materially neutral concept is an unjustifia-
> ble abstraction.[19]

Given the LXX background and the priestly context of 2:10, τελειόω

very likely means "consecrated." From this starting point it may be that

some of the formal characteristics of τελειόω are also intended. The

most obvious hint that the context is more than priestly is the use of

ἀρχηγός as the object of the verb. The basic point of 2:10-18 goes be-

yond mere consecration. The thought is that the ἀρχηγός is fully equipped

to serve as priest because he has experienced the human plight of suffering

and temptation. He is a brother; he is of the same origin. His priestly

effectiveness rests on his humanity. With the application of τελειόω

to Jesus as ἀρχηγός, it is possible to see more in τελειόω than consecra-

tion. The "formal" sense of τελειόω is "to make τέλειος." The sense

of the text is that the ἀρχηγός is made τέλειος as High Priest; he is

made complete, and equipped to function as a High Priest.

Thus, although it is likely that τελειόω is used as in the Pentateuch

of the LXX, its use in 2:10 allows in addition formal nuances. What the

writer to the Hebrews may be doing is employing cultic terminology in such

a way that it encourages other associations. In the case of this passage

τελειόω could mean: "die," as in Wisdom of Solomon 4:13; or "consummate

---

[19]du Plessis, p. 212.

and glorify" (compare 2:9); or "fully equip." The modern reader may be
ignorant of some of these allusions. The context suggests, however, that
the intended sense of the verb is "consecrate," with possible allusions
to equipping and glorifying. In any case, the result is clear: God made
Jesus High Priest, and as such Jesus is complete and able to function on
behalf of men.

Hebrews 5:9

Although Hebrews 5:5-10 offers many issues for discussion, the present
investigation is primarily interested in the sense and meaning of
Τελεcωθεiς . The context suggests that it is related to 2:10 since
both speak of the priesthood, of suffering, and of the activity of God
behind it all. Unlike the verb in 2:10, Τελεcωθεiς is passive. If
Τελεcωθεiς and προσαγορευθεiς correspond, it is possible to under-
stand ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ behind Τελεcωθεiς also. Whether or not these
verbs actually do correspond (see below), it is still true that verses 4
and 5 emphatically attest to God's activity in calling Christ as high priest.
Thus 2:10 and 5:9 appear related, although 5:9 contains some new features.

While both 2:10 and 5:9 speak of suffering, 5:9 states that Jesus
"learned obedience through what he suffered."[20] Cullmann maintains that
this passage contains "the most important confirmation of Hebrews' concept
of Jesus' full humanity . . . . This expression presupposes an inner human

_____

[20]Aeschylus also speaks of learning through suffering when he notes
in Agamemnon 175, that Zeus has ordered that suffering be educational
(πάθει μάθος).

development."[21]   It is legitimate to ask in what sense Christ could learn.

The danger is always present to divide the natures, as Montefiore seems

to do when he says of this verse: "Our author is, of course, speaking here

of the Son not as eternally divine but as fully and completely incarnate."[22]

This sort of explanation does not do justice to Hebrews or to the Incarna-

tion itself. More helpful is the approach which understands learning and

obedience not in terms of their opposites (error and disobedience), but

in terms of their absence in experience. Vos calls this learning

> the experiential knowledge of obedience . . . . "Learning simply
> means to bring out of the conscious experience of action, that
> which is present as an avowed principle antecedent to the action.[23]

Thus without dividing the natures, or positing un-biblical attributes to

Christ, it is possible to understand Christ's learning as that of a man

who opened Himself up to experiences which were new and strange. His

learning was the result of being incarnate, not the overcoming of moral

or intellectual error.[24]

Vital for understanding $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\omega\theta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ is its relationship to the events

in the context. Verses 8 and 9 note the following events: learning obedi-

ence, being consecrated, becoming the Source of eternal salvation, and

being designated high priest by God. Westcott relates $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\omega\theta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ with

---

[21]Oscar Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament, translated
from the German by Shirley Guthrie and Charles Hall (Second edition; Phila-
delphia: Westminster Press, 1963), p. 97.

[22]Hugh Montefiore, A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews (London:
Adam and Charles Black, 1964), p. 99.

[23]Geerhardus Vos, "The Priesthood of Christ in Hebrews," Princeton
Theological Review, V (1957), 584.

[24]For more detail, see Charles D. Froehlich, "He Learned Obedience,
Hebrews 5:8" (Unpublished STM Thesis, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, 1958).

all that goes before (5:7-8) by contrasting "in the days of his flesh" with $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \iota \omega \theta \epsilon \iota \varsigma$. He describes the two periods as the "period of preparation for the fulness of His priestly work, and the period of His accomplishment of it after His 'consummation.'"[25] Windisch describes $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \iota \omega \theta \epsilon \iota \varsigma$ as "den Abschluss des $\mu \alpha \theta \epsilon \hat{\iota} \nu \; \dot{\upsilon} \pi \alpha \kappa o \eta \nu$."[26] The text suggests that $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \iota \omega \theta \epsilon \iota \varsigma$ marks a break in the life of Jesus. The learning, suffering, and obeying are events prior to his priestly consecration. The functions of Source and High Priest flow out of consecration. Since $\pi \rho o \sigma \alpha \gamma o \rho \epsilon \upsilon \theta \epsilon \iota \varsigma$ syntactically may fall under the $\kappa \alpha \iota$ which precedes $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \iota \omega \theta \epsilon \iota \varsigma$, it is possible to interpret them as parallel and corresponding. They express the same thing: the consecration or designation of Christ as High Priest.

The priestly function is here described by the phrase $\alpha \iota \tau \iota o \varsigma \; \sigma \omega \tau \eta \rho \iota \alpha \varsigma$. The phrase is not peculiar to Hebrews; it occurs in other Greek literature, especially in Philo.[27] The phrase $\sigma \omega \tau \eta \rho \iota \alpha \varsigma \; \alpha \iota \omega \nu \iota o \upsilon$ is also located in Isaiah 45:17. The emphasis on eternity is stressed in the next passage to be considered, Hebrews 7:28.

As in 2:10 the verb $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \iota \acute{o} \omega$ admits formal interpretation as well as cultic. If Jesus was made $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \iota o \varsigma$ following his learning, his completeness could be his heavenly return, his glorification, or his last step toward being High Priest. Du Plessis says:

---

[25] Brooke Foss Westcott, _The Epistle to the Hebrews_ (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1950), p. 125.

[26] Hans Windisch, _Der Hebräerbrief_, Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, herausgegeben von Hans Lietzmann. (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1913), p. 44.

[27] In Philo: _Agric._ 96; _Spec. Leg._ I. 252; _Virt._ 202. In Josephus: _Ant._ XIV. 8,2; _Bell._ IV. 5,2.

it is a consummation, not by a single act of obedience, but one
evinced in a complexive development, comprising all experiences
characteristic to human nature, of which suffering and distress
are the most prominent. By this realization He achieved the
purpose of His ordination, which was to become the Source of
eternal salvation for all who obey Him.[28]

Further evidence that τελεωθείς may include notions of consummation

and exaltation is 5:5, which states that Christ did not glorify himself

to be made High Priest. The verses in which 5:9 is set are a demonstra-

tion of this non-glorification. These verses make two related points:

Christ's own actions were not a grasp at glory; and it was God, not Christ,

who did the eventual glorifying. Both these points may be seen in

τελεωθείς . Jesus himself did not strive to be consummated. His

learning was no upward climb to glory. His learning was in the realm of

obedience and suffering with the goal of death rather than glory. When

he had done his part, he was dead. The consecration and consummation came

from outside of himself, from the Father.

Hebrews 7:28

The text of 7:28 is to be read αρχιερεις , not ἱερεις , which

is the reading of Claromontanus and Freer. Moffatt suggests that ἱερεις

was the original, conforming with ἱερεύς of 7:1. This may not be true

since αρχιερεις occurs in verse 27. In any case, "Once the category is

levitical, the interchange of αρχιερεύς and ἱερεύς becomes natural."[29]

_____

[28]du Plessis, p. 221.

[29]James Moffatt, _The Epistle to the Hebrews_, _International Critical
Commentary_ (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1924), p. 101.

Of the three passages being considered, 7:28 is the clearest. It suggests most clearly what $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\acute{o}\omega$ means, and provides solid clues toward establishing secondary senses. The passage contrasts Levitical priests with the Son who has been consecrated eternally. Specifically, the contrast is between $\alpha\rho\chi\iota\epsilon\rho\epsilon\hat{\iota}\varsigma$ $\check{\epsilon}\chi o\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ $\alpha\sigma\theta\epsilon\nu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu$ and $\tau\epsilon\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\omega\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu o\nu$. The Levitical priests are many, are weak, and are appointed by the law. The Son is unique, holy, and appointed by the word of an oath. The superiority of oath over law was established in 6:13-7:22. The weakness of Levitical priests is not only their dying (7:23), but their own sins (7:27). It is the total condition of limitation both personally and by virtue of the human condition. This weakness and dying accounts for the plurality of priests.

In contrast, the Son has been consecrated eternally. While the perfect tense of $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\acute{o}\omega$ is new, the thought is in line with 2:10 and 5:9. The presence of $\kappa\alpha\theta\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\eta\mu\iota$ does not replace $\tau\epsilon\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\omega\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu o\nu$ as a term of consecration. Both terms are related. $\tau\epsilon\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\omega\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu o\nu$ speaks of the consecration which follows appointment. The context suggests what this consecration involves: being exalted above the heavens (7:26); being seated at the right hand of the throne (8:1); being a minister in the true tent (8:2). As in the previous passages, these "formal" nuances grow out of the consecratory meaning. They are expressions of a $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota o\varsigma$ consecration. In this passage there is some evidence that eternal consecration does refer to the "Endzustand seiner himmlischen Erhöhung."[30]

---

[30]Franz Joseph Schierse, Verheissung und Heilsvollendung (München: Karl Zink Verlag, 1955), p. 155.

The Question of Moral Perfection

The basic difference between the present investigation and most dis-
cussions of $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\acute{o}\omega$ is that here moral perfection is of secondary impor-
tance. In fact, "perfection" has hardly been mentioned, owing to the
conclusion that in Hebrews $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\acute{o}\omega$ basically reflects cultic terminology
("to consecrate"), not moral terminology ("to perfect"), and that the
question of Jesus' moral development forms too small a part of consecration
to warrant attention as a prime factor in his becoming High Priest. The
use of $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\acute{o}\omega$, insofar as it denotes a change in Jesus' life, does
touch on all aspects of his development. But to limit the interpretation
of $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\acute{o}\omega$ to "moral" or "formal" is to posit too few possibilities.
Hebrews uses $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\acute{o}\omega$ neither exclusively formally nor morally. The
cultic meaning includes and subsumes both of these. On this point Cullmann
says:

> the cultic interpretation alone is too narrow and represents an
> abridgement of the statement. Just as the High Priest concept
> applied to Jesus is so fulfilled that the purely cultic in general
> must be raised to a higher level, so must the purely cultic con-
> cept $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota o\tilde{u}\nu$ applied to him necessarily include also the sense
> of making morally perfect.[31]

This statement seems to say that the cultic meaning is too narrow. It con-
cludes, however, by subsuming the moral meaning under the cultic. The
present investigation has sought to demonstrate that the cultic meaning of
$\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\acute{o}\omega$ is so rich that it covers far more area than moral categories
suggest.

---

[31]Cullmann, pp. 92-93.

The discussion of moral perfection has often resulted in strained solutions. These include interpretations which maintain that "the subject of τελείωσις is always the priest, never the man."[32] Similarly, the essay by Kögel, which stresses the perfection of Christ's "Heilsmittler-qualität," was directed specifically against the moral view of perfection. Hebrews itself is silent on these distinctions. Most of the desire to posit or discredit moral perfection stems from the use of the word "perfection." The present investigation has suggested that notions of perfecting are legitimate secondary nuances, but that it is misleading to translate τελειόω as "to perfect." The English verb "perfect" does not contain enough cultic flavor to reflect the sense of τελειόω. In addition, it carries a strong moralistic flavor of its own. Consequently, "consecrate" is a better translation. If need be, τελειόω may be rendered "consummate," "fully equip," or "glorify," since these verbs can express the uniqueness and heavenly nature of Christ's consecration. At least "consecrate" restores the cultic tone which "perfect" misses, and it guards against unnecessary sidetracks into the question of Jesus' moral development. That Hebrews discusses Jesus' development cannot be debated, but τελειόω does not express this development. The consecration or consummation comes from outside, from the Father. It has far wider meaning than moral perfection because consecration embraces not only the status and development of Christ, but his function on behalf of men.

---

[32]Vos, p. 589.

Τελειόω as Applied to Men

Hebrews 10:14

The text is to be read according to the Nestle text. Bengel's conjecture, based on the silence of the iota subscript, is without known manuscript evidence, and the replacement of ἁγιαζομένους by ἀναεωγομένους in P46 is probably a copying error.

The occurrence of Τελειόω in verse 14 marks the second time Τελειόω is used in chapter 10. In 10:1 it is used negatively to denote the inability of the law (by repeated sacrifices) to consecrate those who draw near. In other words the old system did not enable men to stand before God in their sinful condition. With Christ's ἐφάπαξ sacrifice, he has done what the law and sacrifices could not do, namely, consecrate men. With one offering he has consecrated those who are sanctified.

While sanctification and consecration are both cultic and closely related, they are not identical. Michel distinguishes them in the following way:

> Τελειοῦν bedeutet, dass das Opfer in kultischer Hinsicht ein neues Verhältnis zu Gott schafft. Was einmaliges Ereignis ist (ΤΕΤΕλείωκεν), vollzieht sich in einem fortwirkenden Prozess (ἁγιαζομένους).[33]

Even though ἁγιάζω is used to express the purpose of Christ's atoning work (10:10; 13:12), Τελειόω seems to be a more inclusive term. Just as Christ was consecrated in order to sanctify (2:10), so those who are sanctified undergo a consecration which enables them to come before God.

---

[33]Michel, p. 227.

72

> Durch sein hohepriesterliches Handeln . . . vor Gott hat Christus
> die, denen dieses Handeln gilt, ein für allemal fähig gemacht,
> als Entsühnte unmittelbar vor Gott zu treten . . . in himmlischen
> Heiligtum.[34]

If consecration represents an "advance" over sanctification, it is simply
to show that under the new covenant even the people are granted priestly
privileges by virtue of their High Priest. Verse 18 mentions the forgive-
ness of sins; the next verse mentions more: the confidence to enter the
sanctuary. The second privilege falls under the category of $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\acute{o}\omega$,
and represents an immediacy of relationship, which although not absent
from $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\omega$, is more vivid when seen from the perspective of priestly
privilege.

Hebrews 11:40

The text is to be read without accepting the P46 variant of $\pi\rho\sigma\epsilon\text{-}$
$\beta\lambda\epsilon\psi\alpha\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\sigma\nu$ for $\pi\rho\sigma\beta\lambda\epsilon\psi\alpha\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\sigma\nu$. No other manuscripts contain
this reading. The variant may have arisen in an effort to emphasize "pro-
vide" rather than "foresee," both of which are present in $\pi\rho\sigma\beta\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\pi\omega$.

Although $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\acute{o}\omega$ in 11:40 applies to men as in 10:14, and is not
far removed from the context of 10:44, it has significant features which
are new. First, it is not located in a cultic setting. Second, the verb
is passive, and does not specifically mention that Christ is the power
behind it. These points raise a question about the applicability of cultic
categories in this passage. Delling notes the setting of chapter 11 and
states: "Anders ist $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\acute{o}\omega$ in Hb 11f gebraucht . . . ."[35]

---

[34] G. Delling, "$\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\acute{o}\omega$," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament,
begründet von Gerhard Kittel (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1965), VIII, 84.

[35] Ibid.

73

The context of 11:40 provides clues toward understanding $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\acute{o}\omega$ in this passage. What the faithful Israelites did not receive was a $\pi\alpha\tau\rho\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ (11:14), a heavenly $\pi\acute{o}\lambda\iota\varsigma$ (11:10,16). In other words they did not come into God's very presence, into "the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem" (12:22). Kögel calls this goal "die Gemeinschaft mit dem Vater . . ."[36] which is the "rest" of 4:1. One of the passages already considered, 2:10, noted that the consecration of Jesus was part of a plan by which God was bringing many sons to glory. These clues indicate that $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\acute{o}\omega$ signifies the consummation of the believer's life, the achievement of the goal, the vision of God (compare 12:14).

> Die „Vollendung" ($\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota o\hat{v}\sigma\Theta\alpha\iota$) ist offenbar auch hier eschatologisches Ereignis. Jeder einzelne Christ muss sie erwerben, aber er empfängt diese Gabe im Zusammenhang mit der ganzen Gemeinde.[37]

The meaning of $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\acute{o}\omega$ in 11:40 comes close to its meaning in Wisdom of Solomon 4:13, where the notion of rest and final achievement is evident. The nuances of finality and completeness both stem from a formal interpretation of $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\acute{o}\omega$, depending on whether $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda o\varsigma$ or $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\iota o\varsigma$ is understood as the basic root. Both thoughts are present in 11:40, where $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\acute{o}\omega$ connotes both goal and consummation. This is not to say that 11:40 is not related to the other passages where $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\acute{o}\omega$ is used. In 10:14, where the cultic setting is obvious, $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\acute{o}\omega$ describes the consecration which enables the sanctified ones to draw near to God with priestly privilege. $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\acute{o}\omega$ in 11:40 describes the same nearness, but without overt cultic associations. Although it is possible that $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\acute{o}\omega$ is still

---

[36] Kögel, p. 56.

[37] Michel, p. 284, n. 1.

being used as a technical cultic term, the context suggests some of its other legitimate meanings. Thus in this passage the more formal nuances which have been secondary are now primary. Yet in view of the former cultic emphasis of $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\acute{o}\omega$, it is likely that the verb still retains a cultic flavor. The over-all notion is the same: that of bringing men near to God.

The phrase $\mu\grave{\eta}\ \chi\omega\rho\grave{\iota}\varsigma\ \acute{\eta}\mu\hat{\omega}\nu$ is stronger than "not before us." As Michel mentions, it means "not without us."[38] Sowers notes that the Jewish teaching on the relationship between generations was just the opposite of the teaching in 11:40.[39] For example, Philo, following Jewish tradition, makes the welfare of the present generation dependent on the intercession of the patriarchs.[40] In Hebrews the consummation of the former saints is linked with the present saints. Michel notes that a similar thought occurs in Revelation 6:11. He also quotes W. Vischer's helpful analogy of a relay race, in which individual runners finish at different times, but only obtain victory when the last man finishes.[41]

Hebrews 12:23

The text of 12:23 is to be read in the Nestle text. Claromontanus and its Latin version read $\pi\nu\epsilon\acute{u}\mu\alpha\tau\iota$ and $\tau\epsilon\theta\epsilon\mu\epsilon\lambda\iota\omega\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\sigma\nu$ for $\pi\nu\epsilon\acute{u}\mu\alpha\sigma\iota$ and $\tau\epsilon\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\omega\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega\nu$. Hilary also supports the latter variant. Neither variant is well supported. If $\pi\nu\epsilon\acute{u}\mu\alpha\tau\iota$ were genuine, it would

---

[38] Ibid.

[39] Sowers, p. 114.

[40] Praem. Poen. 166.

[41] Michel, p. 284, n. 2.

introduce a possible mention of the Holy Spirit, but nowhere else is the Holy Spirit designated as the "Spirit of just men." Both variants are understandable scribal errors.

Although the setting of τελειόω does contain some cultic references (12:24), the emphasis of 12:18-24 lies on a comparison between the events at Mount Zion, and the events in the present generation. The Levitical cult is not under consideration in this passage. Thus τελειόω again, as in 11:40, may be loosely connected with cultic meanings.

Michel discusses the possibility that δικαίων τετελειωμένων is equivalent to the rabbinic expression אֲדִיקִים גְּמוּרִים, the "wholly righteous."

> dann würden "Gerechte" gemeint sein, über die das Urteil Gottes schon gefällt ist . ... würden dann die Frommen sein, die das Zeugnis erlangt haben, gerecht zu sein.[42]

The difficulty with this interpretation, as Michel notes, is that the passive verb form is used, not the adjective.

Given the verb form, it is more likely that τελειόω has the same meaning in 12:23 that it has in 11:40. It means "consummated" or "having died victoriously."

> Der Ausdruck ist ebenso zu verstehen, wie wir von den Verstorbenen als den Vollendeten reden. Das sind diejenigen, welche mit dem Kampf des irdischen Lebens und dem damit verbunden Leiden, von dem ja Hebräerbrief auch in so ergreifenden Tönen zu reden weiss (10, 32 ff.; 12, 4 ff.), abgeschlossen haben und die am Ziel ihrer Wallfahrt angelangt sind.[43]

---

[42] Michel, p. 319.

[43] Kögel, p. 56.

Again the passages in Wisdom of Solomon are closely parallel. In 3:14 the verb denotes victorious death, and in 3:1 there is mention of the souls of the righteous being in the hand of God.

If the verb in 12:23 is used with the same meaning as in 11:40, then an apparent contradiction ensues. In 11:40 the faithful were not to be consummated apart from us. In 12:23 it appears that just the opposite has already occurred. Westcott explains the problem in this way:

> the thought is no longer, as in the former clauses, of the complete glory of the divine commonwealth, but of spiritual relations only; not of the assembly in its august array, but of the several members of it in their essential being.[44]

This explanation does not do justice to the content of 12:18-24, which emphasizes the august array in the heavenly Jerusalem. A more likely explanation is that the scene in 12:23 is viewed proleptically for parenetic purposes. In order to make his point that the new encounter with God is a heavenly encounter, the writer envisions the entire heavenly scene in advance. This proleptic view has the effect of encouraging the readers to listen to God. While 11:40 provides comfort and satisfaction, 12:23 goads the reader to strive and persevere. These two passages do not contradict each other; they view the same scene from different perspectives.

As in 11:40, the cultic significance of τελεόω is present even though τελεόω most probably has a more formal sense. This cultic significance is that the believer is present before God. Dibelius, who interprets τετελειωμένον cultically, speaks of the souls "derer, die jene Weihe schon empfangen haben und in das himmlische Heiligtum eingegangen sind."[45]

----

44 Westcott, p. 416.

45 Dibelius, p. 168.

Whether τελιcόω is viewed formally or cultically, the effect is the same: men are brought into the presence of God.

The Relationship between the Consecration
of Jesus and the Consecration of Men

Three of the τελιcόω-passages explicitly connect Jesus' consecration and mankind's (2:10; 5:9; 10:14). The same idea is also implicit in 7:28. Although the consecration which men experience is not identical with that of Jesus, it is nevertheless inherent in the consecration which Jesus experienced. Kögel relates them in the following way:

> In der Tat, der Heerführerberuf Jesu wurde dadurch an sein Ziel
> gebracht, dass die Söhne zu δόϸα gelangten und ihm so eine
> Schar treuer Anhänger gewonnen wurde. Beides ist miteinander
> gegeben und beides is voneinander abhängig.[46]

In answering the question "Wie wird die Behauptung möglich dass Jesus nicht nur 'Vollender,' sondern selbst 'Vollendeter' ist?,"[47] Käsemann explains Hebrews in terms of the Urmensch myth of the "erlöste Erlöser."[48]

> Als Führer ist Christus zugleich Vollender seiner Gemeinde:
> Er führt sie zur himmlischen Vollendung als seinem und ihrem
> Ziel. Seit seiner eigenen Vollendung liegt ihnen dieses Ziel
> aber nicht mehr fern und transzendent verborgen. In der Darbring-
> ung seines Leibes und Blutes hat er ihnen schon auf Erden in
> gewisser Weise Anteil an seiner Vollendung verschafft und sich
> als Vollender bewährt.[49]

---

[46]Kögel, p. 62.

[47]Ernst Käsemann, Das Wandernde Gottesvolk (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1939), p. 83.

[48]Ibid., p. 90.

[49]Ibid., p. 89.

The difficulty with Käsemann's interpretation is that the written sources for the gnostic redeemer myths are late, and their influence on Hebrews cannot be proved. Besides, the terms in which Hebrews presents the relationship between "consecrated and consecrating" are primarily cultic, and therefore find their home most naturally in the Old Testament.

The title of High Priest is the most descriptive and recurring designation for understanding the relationship between Jesus' being consecrated and his consecrating. This mediatorial title encompasses Jesus' work of offering himself, sanctifying and consecrating those who draw near, and interceding before the Father. It is an understatement to say that the consecration of Jesus makes possible the consecration of mankind. As High Priest on behalf of men Jesus has already secured the consecration (or access to God) of mankind. The consecration of men is inherent in his consecration (10:14). This close connection is not expressed in terms of imitation.

> it is just the idea of Ἐφάπαξ which this book so strongly empha-
> sizes which shows that an imitation of Christ is possible only
> when we are first of all aware of the fact that we are not able
> to imitate him. He is sinless; we are not. He offers the sacri-
> fice of atoning death; we cannot. It is precisely the decisive
> act of obedience which effects our perfection which we cannot
> imitate.[50]

The other mediatorial titles, ἀρχηγός (12:2), αἴτιος (5:9), ἁγιάζων (2:10), τελειωτής (12:2), μεσίτης (9:15), and πρόδρομος (6:20), all designate functions on behalf of men. From the perspective of this investigation the mediatorial function of τελειωτής deserves further attention.

---

[50]Cullmann, p. 100.

erscheint in 12,2 Jesus als der, an dem diese Schar schlechthin urbildlich sichtbar wird (ἀρχηγός), und der das Glauben zur Vollendung gebracht . . . hat, dh ihm den vollkommenen Grund gegeben hat durch sein hohepriesterliches Werk.[51]

Later Delling notes that τελειωτής may designate "den . . . das vollendete Glauben übt."[52] This interpretation takes its cue from chapter 11, and focuses on Jesus' own faith. Similarly du Plessis reflects both possibilities when he says:

> The fact that τῆς πίστεως is construed without amplifying phrases, makes it clear that it is to be interpreted absolutely and not as the subjective act of Christ in the individual, as if He is confessed as the Generator of personal faith. Consequently the AV and RSV (a.o.) are erroneous in translating "Pioneer and Perfecter of our faith". On the other hand, there is no reason why the absolute usage should not contain an allusion to the personal belief of Jesus.[53]

The parenetic setting of 12:2 lends support to the view that Christ the τελειωτής is an example for imitation (compare 12:3). Yet such an interpretation does not exhaust the possibilities for understanding the effects of Jesus' faith. The other titles he bears testify to the qualitative difference between him and all other believers. The saints of chapter 11 displayed faith, but none received the title of τελειωτής.

> As ἀρχηγός καὶ τελειωτής He constitutes the new ground, content and possibility of true realization of faith in God. By His work He created a new dimension and channel for the fusion of obedience, confidence, hope, and fidelity, because He pioneered this road.[54]

---

[51]G. Delling, "τελειωτής," _Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament_, begründet von Gerhard Kittel (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1965), VIII, 87.

[52]_Ibid._, p. 88.

[53]du Plessis, p. 225.

[54]_Ibid._

The pioneering and perfecting aspect of Jesus' work falls within the priestly category, which is the dominant way of expressing the connection between the consecration of Jesus and mankind. As High Priest Jesus makes faith possible as the human responsibility within the consecrated relationship (10:19-22). Because Jesus has been consecrated, he consecrates; that is, just as he was consecrated to act as High Priest, so now he enables others to draw near to God through himself and his work.

Τέλειος in Hebrews

Hebrews 9:11

The text of 9:11 is to be read γενομένων, not μελλόντων, even though the latter has the support of Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus, Freer, Harclean Syriac (in a marginal reading), and Vulgate. The attestation for γενομένων is Vaticanus, Claromontanus, P46, plus the Old Latin and Syriac. Thus the oldest Greek, Latin, and Syriac texts all attest γενομένων. The variant may have been introduced under the influence of μελλόντων in 10:1.

The impersonal use of τέλειος in 9:11 refers to the heavenly σκηνή, which is described in several ways.

> Das himmlische Heiligtum erhält zwei Attribute der Überbietung (μείγων, τελεότερα) und eines der Absolutheit (οὐ χειροποίητος), das durch eine Erklärung (οὐ ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως) verstärkt wird.[55]

This tent is the outer division of the heavenly sanctuary, and corresponds to the Holies of the earthly tent. Cody deals extensively with the earthly

---

[55]Michel, p. 202.

and heavenly sanctuaries, and notes that "the division of the celestial

sanctuary into two parts has its role to play only in 9:11."[56] According

to Hebrews Christ goes through this tent into the celestial Holy of Holies.

The identity of the outer tent is debated. Some say it is the Church

(Westcott), or the humanity of Christ (early Greek fathers), or the upper

heavens. It is possible that the expression does not call for an exact

equivalent. Cody allows for a more relaxed figurative interpretation when

he says:

> Thus the σκηνή of Heb. 9.11 is not exactly to be equated with
> the body of Christ or humanity of Christ, but it is a figure pri-
> marily of the humanity of Christ as an instrument in the work of
> salvation (διά instrumental) and secondarily of the entire span
> of Christ's saving passage through the earthly plane (διά local)
> and on to heaven.[57]

Even this interpretation sees more meaning in σκηνή than is necessary

or helpful. The greater and more perfect tent is the heavenly sanctuary,

as in 8:2, where it is called the σκηνῆς τῆς ἀληθινῆς . After demon-

strating that σκηνή in 9:11 is not the humanity of Christ, or the heavenly

region, Michaelis concludes:

> Vielmehr wird gemeint sein, dass auch das himmlische Heiligtum
> einen vorderen Teil enthält, der, verglichen mit der Stiftshütte,
> ebenfalls "grosser und vollkommener", aber von dem eigentlichen
> Heiligtum, dem Allerheiligsten, zu unterscheiden ist.[58]

---

[56] Cody, p. 150.

[57] Ibid., pp. 164-165.

[58] Wilhelm Michaelis, "σκηνή ," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen
Testament, begründet von Gerhard Kittel (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag,
1933), I, 251.

82

The parallel between 9:11 and 8:2 helps explain $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\acute{o}\tau\epsilon\rho o\varsigma$. The word $\mathring{\alpha}\lambda\eta\theta\iota\nu\acute{o}\varsigma$ describes the tent as eternal and heavenly.[59] When 9:11 says that the heavenly tent is greater and more perfect, these adjectives further describe the superiority of the heavenly over the earthly. The greatness of the tent is not a spatial superiority.

> Gemeint ist aber wohl, dass im himmlischen Kultort jene Wirklich-
> keit erschlossen ist, die alles Irdische wesenhaft überbietet
> . . . . Der Unterschied ist wieder qualitativ, nicht quantitativ.
> Das himmlische Heiligtum heisst deshalb "vollendeter", "vollkommener",
> weil in ihm das, wo von die Stiftshütte nur schattenhaftes Abbild
> ist, zu seiner wahre Wirklichkeit kommt.[60]

If Hebrews is influenced by Alexandrian dualism and two-world theories, then the "greater and more perfect" aspect of the heavenly tent is its ultimate "reality." In that case, $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\acute{o}\tau\epsilon\rho o\varsigma$ and $o\mathring{v}\ \chi\epsilon\iota\rho o\pi o\acute{\iota}\eta\tau o\varsigma$ are tautological. It may be, however, that Hebrews is using hellenistic philosophic forms without necessarily accepting all the content. If so, $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\acute{o}\tau\epsilon\rho o\varsigma$ may express some aspect of the heavenly tent. "es ist vollkommener als das irdische in seiner Vorläufigkeit, in dem keine völlige Reinigung von Sünden bewirkt wurde."[61] Michel suggests a related aspect of superiority when he equates "greater and more perfect" with "besser geeignet zum himmlischen Dienst."[62] Whether $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\acute{o}\tau\epsilon\rho o\varsigma$ is automatically

---

[59]"Im Hellenismus aber bedeutet $\mathring{\alpha}\lambda\eta\theta\iota\nu\acute{o}\varsigma$ echt nicht mehr nur im allgemeinen Sinne, sondern meint, als Attribut der göttlichen Dinge, das einzig wirklich Seiende, das Ewinge . . . ." Rudolf Bultmann, "$\mathring{\alpha}\lambda\eta\theta\iota\nu\acute{o}\varsigma$," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, begründet von Gerhard Kittel (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1933), I, 251.

[60]Schierse, p. 50.

[61]G. Delling, "$\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\iota o\varsigma$," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, begründet von Gerhard Kittel (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1965), VIII, 78.

[62]Michel, p. 203.

83

synonymous with "heavenly," or whether it describes some aspect of that which is heavenly, it reinforces the recurring emphasis that the work of Jesus is superior to the work of Old Testament priests.

Τέλεςος in Hebrews 5:14-6:1

Hebrews 5:14 is the only passage in Hebrews where τέλεςος is used as a personal designation. It is contrasted with νήπιος, and carries notions of maturity similar to τέλεςος in I Corinthians. The mention of two types of nourishment likewise recalls I Corinthians, except that στερεὰ τροφή replaces βρῶμα. The food for the νήπιος is milk in both cases. In Hebrews, however, there is an added pedagogical dimension to the meaning of τέλεςος. The writer is chiding the readers for their need of teaching when they themselves ought to be διδάσκαλοι. "Τέλιοι corresponds manifestly with διδάσκαλοι (5:12) without being wholly identical."[63] The use of pedagogical language (διδάσκω, στοιχεῖα, αἰσθητήρια, γυμνάζω, διάκρισις) prepares the reader to interpret νήπιος and τέλεςος in terms of maturity in the learning process. Verse 14b pinpoints one aspect of maturity: the ability to distinguish between good and evil.

H. P. Owen has illuminated the stages in 5:11-6:3 by a close reading of the text, and comparisons with Stoic and Philonic parallels. He sees three stages: the νήπιος, fit only for milk (the ABC's); the τέλεςος, who has his faculties trained to distinguish between good and evil; and the τέλεςος, who, having been trained (γεγυμνασμένα), is able

---

[63] du Plessis, pp. 207-208.

to receive στερεὰ τροφή . Owen translates λόγος δικαιοσύνης as "a

principle of righteousness,"[64] which is the moral standard built up during

the practice of making moral choices. This threefold division of stages

(infantile, ethical-practical, religious-theoretical) is paralleled in

Philo. Epictetus has a partial parallel, understandably omitting the third

stage. What is remarkable about Hebrews 6:1 is the intention of bypassing

the first two stages for the moment, and proceeding immediately to στερεὰ

τροφή . The force of διὸ in 6:1 cannot be made concessive.

> Yet logic seems to dictate the opposite. Pupils who are uncertain
> of the opening stages of their subject are normally required to
> revise and master these before they go any further. One must assume
> that the author's mind is working according to different principles.[65]

Owen suggests that the author may be omitting the θεμέλιος because its

content is such an "arid propaedeutic,"[66] that it would not counteract the

apathy and sluggishness of the readers. It may be that stage two (moral

practice) is omitted in eschatological urgency.

> This is a bold venture and an inevitable one. The disease cannot
> be healed in any other way. The only method of curing such
> lethargy is by an appeal to the imagination . . . . Yet it would
> be misleading to say that the author intends the third stage to
> act as a substitute for the previous two, as if their claims were
> simply ignored. Rather he hopes that the third stage will subsume
> all the properties of the previous two in its own superior mode.[67]

---

[64] Walter Grundmann, "Die Νήπιοι in der urchristlichen Paränese," New
Testament Studies, V (1959), p. 192, understands λόγος δικαιοσύνης to
be the doctrine of righteousness, while Michel, Der Brief an die Hebräer
(Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1957), p. 143, considers the genitive
to be one of quality, and therefore translates "richtiger Rede." Owen's
translation of λόγος has parallel in the Stoic ὀρθὸς λόγος , and fits
the context best.

[65] H. P. Owen, "The 'Stages of Ascent' in Hebrews V, 11 - VI, 3," New
Testament Studies, III (1956-57), 248.

[66] Ibid., p. 249.   [67] Ibid.

The meaning of τελειότης in 6:1 is debated. Delling says "τελειότης ist in Hb 6,1 lexikalisch nicht wie τέλειος in 5,14 gebraucht."[68] Similarly du Plessis avoids associations of maturity in τελειότης. "There is simply no example available where the word expresses maturity."[69] On the other hand, since the νήπιοι are presented in a pedagogical setting, it may be that τελειότης expresses pedagogical advancement in contrast to pedagogical immaturity. The use of ἀρχή in both 5:12 and 6:1 reinforces the view that τελειότης represents an advanced learning level. "Im Unterschied zu ἀρχή . . . ist τελειότης die höchste Stufe der christlichen Lehre."[70] Käsemann calls this teaching a λόγος τέλειος.

> Die prägnante Ausdruck τελειότης Hebr. 6,1 dürfte anzeigen, dass unser Brief mit seinen Ausführungen von Kap. 7 ab einen solchen λόγος τέλειος darzubieten gedenkt.[71]

Although Hebrews may not reflect such gnostic terminology, the idea of advanced teaching is present in 6:1. Sowers calls the mature doctrine "a Christological exegesis of the 'oracles of God' (5:12), i.e., the Old Testament."[72] The best translation for τελειότης is not "perfection" (either as a moral attainment or as a subject for discussion), but "maturity" (in terms of mature teaching). Thus τελειότης gathers its meaning not only in opposition to νήπιοι, but to ἀρχή.

---

[68] G. Delling, "τελειότης," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, begründet von Gerhard Kittel (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1965), VIII, 80, n. 12.

[69] du Plessis, p. 209.

[70] Delling, p. 80.

[71] Käsemann, p. 122.

[72] Sowers, p. 79.

The use of τέλειος in Hebrews resembles τέλειος in Paul, especially in I Corinthians 2:6-3:1. Both use the term to denote maturity. Both speak to situations in which the readers are unprepared to advance with the writer. Both associate the ability of discernment with being τέλειος (compare I Corinthians 14:20; Philippians 3:15). Both associate τέλειος with teaching ability (Colossians 1:28; 3:16).

The use of τέλειος in Hebrews also varies in some respects from Paul. The writer to the Hebrews does not let the immaturity of the readers stop him from proceeding. The διό of Hebrews 6:1 is just the opposite of οὐκ ἠδυνήθην in I Corinthians 3:1. It may be, however, that this difference is not radical. Paul's οὐκ ἠδυνήθην in I Corinthians 3:1 was probably not carried out. The approaches of Paul and the writer to the Hebrews are opposite, but attempt the same purpose: to make the reader grow up spiritually. Owen notes another difference between the two writers. "The author's message is δυσερμήνευτος (v. 11) not because it is intrinsically remote (as is the στερεὰ τροφή of Philo and Paul) but because the community is dull of hearing."[73] In the present study it was noted earlier that in Corinth the difficulty lay in the readers, not in Paul's message. His readers lacked the leadership of the Spirit, and were not in a position to hear Paul's message. There is no essential difference between the two writers on this point. The main difference is one of emphasis. Hebrews emphasizes the pedagogical side of τέλειος, while Paul, in attempting to refute false notions of what it means to be τέλειος, interprets it in terms of spiritual maturity in the community. Paul recasts τέλειος, while Hebrews employs it with a more positive, permanent meaning.

_____

[73]Owen, p. 251.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

The object of this investigation has been to determine the meaning of τέλειος and τελειόω in Paul and Hebrews. Although the limited scope of the subject might have suggested that this task was elementary, it has become evident that these terms are not employed with a uniform meaning. Chapter II sought to show the background of τέλειος in order to identify the various meanings of the word in its diverse settings. In view of the diverse usage of τέλειος , the New Testament portion of the investigation rested heavily on the New Testament contexts. In some cases the context was very helpful in determining what τέλειος meant. In other passages the context allowed for various suggestions. The combination of diverse pre-Pauline usage of τέλειος and diverse New Testament settings made the object of this study a limited, and yet fundamental one: to translate, and demonstrate the sense of τέλειος .

The investigation of τέλειος in Paul suggests the following conclusions. The word itself is not used frequently. It does not appear to have been a favorite term of St. Paul, nor does he use it as a standard designation for Christians. In fact, there is evidence that the term is not his own, but belongs to those who used the name presumptuously. In I Corinthians 2:6-3:1, for example, Paul drops the term in favor of πνευματικός . In Philippians 3:12-15 he also redefines what it means to be τέλειος . It should be noted, however, that on occasion Paul does use τέλειος positively in reference to Christians (I Corinthians 14:20; Colossians 1:28; 4:12).

A further question dealt with the appropriateness of translating τέλειος with the English adjective, "perfect." The present study has generally avoided the term, except in non-personal usage. As applied to men, τέλειος denotes maturity more than perfection. The English word, "perfection," suggests moralistic emphases which are not foremost in τέλειος . To speak of the doctrine of perfection in Paul (on the basis of τέλειος) is somewhat misleading. In the first place, Paul avoids the noun form almost entirely. The only occurrence of τελειότης (Colossians 3:14) is one of the most disputed forms of τέλειος in the whole Pauline corpus. It is granted that it is not necessary for Paul to use a noun form in order to speak of a concept, but it is noteworthy that he avoids abstracting τέλειος into a form which is equivalent to "perfection" in English. When commentators begin speaking of perfection as soon as they see τέλειος , they are making a switch in categories which is sometimes misleading. For example, R. Newton Flew, in speaking of perfection in St. Paul, comes to the conclusion that "he distinguished between absolute perfection, which was reserved for the future . . . , and a relative perfection which he regarded as realizable by himself and his converts."[1] Six of seven passages cited as evidence are those in which τέλειος occurs. This split view of perfection does not do justice to the word "perfection" or to Paul. The term "relative perfection" attempts to render Paul's description of spiritual maturity. It fails because "relative perfection" is a contradiction in terms, and is open to serious misunderstanding. The truth is that English notions of perfection carry too much metaphysical

---

[1]R. Newton Flew, The Idea of Perfection in Christian Theology (London: Oxford University Press, 1934), p. 52.

and moral weight to render adequately the more simple Pauline notions of maturity. Nor is "perfection" able to capture the God-related character of τέλειος , which is evident as far back as Genesis 6:9. On the contrary, "perfection" usually denotes individual, solitary achievement.

A related difficulty with "perfection" terminology is that it is closely linked with the pursuit of the ideal. Here again, such terminology parts ways with Paul. Although Paul encourages growth and striving, his message contains no achievement of perfection by gradual steps. Christian striving flows from the assurance of the goal. This goal is no Ideal, but a person, God Himself.

Paul may teach what has been understood as perfection, but the τέλειος-terminology should not bear the entire weight of such teaching. Paul's teaching on sanctification, the Holy Spirit, and eschatology show his views more clearly. It is best to reflect his own terminology, which if done, would place Paul's τέλειος references under the larger category of growth and sanctification in the Spirit.

The conclusions suggested by the study of Hebrews are the following. The verb τελειόω is capable of several meanings, and Hebrews may well be employing the term in such a way that more than one meaning is intended. However, in view of the cultic setting of most of the τελειόω -passages, there is a basis, both in the LXX and in the context of Hebrews, for trans-lating τελειόω as "to consecrate." Possible secondary nuances were noted in each case. As with τέλειος in Paul, this study has avoided the expression "perfection" as an interpretation of the word τελειόω. It is admitted, however, that finding a substitute for the verb "to perfect" is more difficult than finding a replacement for the adjective. The verb

"to consecrate" does not capture all the notions of consummation in τελειόω, but it does reflect the cultic orientation. The purpose of this study has not been merely to translate, but to reveal meaning. The conclusion of this study is that "to consecrate" is a slightly more meaningful and less misleading term than "to perfect."

Further investigation of τέλειος and cognates should include the rest of the New Testament. Of particular interest would be the relationship between τελειόω in Hebrews and the Gospel of John.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbott, T. K. Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Colossians. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1956.

Almqvist, Helge. Plutarch und das Neue Testament. Uppsala: Appelbergs Boktryckeri, 1946.

Baird, William. "Among the Mature," Interpretation, XIII (1959), 425-432.

Bauer, Walter. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Translated and adapted from the German by W. Arndt and F. Gingrich. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957.

Bayfield, M. A. "On Some Derivatives of τέλος ," The Classical Review, XV (1901), 446-448.

Beardslee, W. A. Human Achievement and Divine Vocation in the Message of Paul. Naperville, Illinois: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1961.

Blass, F. and A. Debrunner. A Greek Grammar of the New Testament. Translated from the German by Robert W. Funk. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Bonhöffer, Adolf. Die Ethik des stoikers Epictet. Stuttgart: Verlag von Ferdinand Enke, 1894.

Bornkamm, Günther, Gerhard Barth and Heinz Joachim Held. Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew. Translated from the German by Percy Scott. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1963.

Bousset, Wilhelm. Kyrios Christus. Zweite Auflage. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1921.

Brown, Raymond E. "The Semitic Background of the New Testament Mysterion," Biblica XXXIX (1958), 426-448; Biblica XL (1959), 70-87.

Bultmann, Rudolf. "ἀληθινός ," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. I. Begründet von Gerhard Kittel. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1933. Pp. 249-251.

Chadwick, H. "All Things to All Men," New Testament Studies, I (1954-55), 261-275.

Clemen, Carl. Religionsgeschichtliche Erklärung des Neuen Testaments. Zweite Auflage. Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann-Verlag, 1924.

Cody, Aelred. Heavenly Sanctuary and Liturgy in the Epistle to the Hebrews. St. Meinard, Indiana: Grail Publications, 1960.

Cohn, Leopold, and Paul Wendland, editors. <u>Philonis Alexandrini Opera Quae Supersunt</u>. 7 vols. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter and Co., 1962.

Cremer, Ernst. "Christliche Vollkommenheit," <u>Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie</u>. Dritter Jahrgang, Zweites Heft. Herausgegeben von A. Schlatter und H. Cremer. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1899. Pp. 1-41.

Cremer, Hermann. <u>Biblico-Theological Lexicon of New Testament Greek</u>. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1954.

Cullmann, Oscar. <u>The Christology of the New Testament</u>. Translated from the German by Shirley Guthrie and Charles Hall. Second Edition. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963.

de Boer, W. P. <u>The Imitation of Paul</u>. Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1962.

Deissner, Kurt. <u>Paulus und die Mystik Seiner Zeit</u>. Erlangen: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1921.

Delling, Gerhard. "$\dot{\alpha}\rho\chi\eta\gamma\acute{o}s$," <u>Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament</u>. I. Begründet von Gerhard Kittel. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1933. Pp. 485-486.

-----. "$\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\iota os$," <u>Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament</u>. VIII. Begründet von Gerhard Kittel. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1965. Pp. 68-88.

Dibelius, Martin. "Der himmlische Kultus nach dem Hebräerbrief," <u>Botschaft und Geschichte</u>, <u>Gesammelte Aufsätze von Martin Dibelius</u>. II. Herausgegeben von Günther Bornkamm. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1956.

du Plessis, Paul Johannes. <u>Teleios. The Idea of Perfection in the New Testament</u>. Kampen: J. H. Kok N. V., 1959.

Dupont-Sommer, A. <u>The Essene Writings from Qumran</u>. Translated from the French by G. Vermes. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1961.

Fitzer, Gottfried. "$\sigma\acute{v}v\delta\epsilon\sigma\mu os$," <u>Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament</u>. VII. Begründet von G. Kittel. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1964. Pp. 854-857.

Flew, R. N. <u>The Idea of Perfection in Christian Theology</u>. London: Oxford University Press, 1934.

Forestell, J. B. "Christian Perfection and Gnosis in Phil. 3:7-16," <u>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</u>, XVIII (1956), 123-136.

Friedrich, Gerhard. "Das Lied vom Hohenpriester im Zusammenhang von Hebr. 4,14-5,10," <u>Theologische Zeitschrift</u>, XVIII (1962), 95-115.

Froehlich, Charles D. "He Learned Obedience, Hebrews 5:8." Unpublished STM Thesis, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, 1958.

Fuchs, Ernst. "Die Vollkommene Gewissheit," Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann. Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1954. Pp. 130-136.

Godet, F. Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians. Translated from the French by A. Cusin. Vol. I. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House, 1957.

Goodenough, E. R. By Light, Light: The Mystic Gospel of Hellenistic Judaism. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1935.

Grundmann, Walter. "Die Νηπιοι in der urchristlichen Paränese," New Testament Studies, V (1959), 188-205.

-----. "αγαθος," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. I. Begründet von Gerhard Kittel. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1933. Pp. 10-16.

Hanson, Stig. The Unity of the Church in the New Testament. Lexington, Kentucky: The Keystone Printery, Inc., 1963.

Hatch, Edwin, and Henry A. Redpath, editors. A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament. Unveränderte Nachdruck der 1897 in Oxford, Clarendon Press erschienenen Ausgabe. Graz, Austria: Akademische Druck - u. Verlagsanstalt, 1954.

Heinrici, Georg. Ersten Brief an die Korinther. Kritisch=exegetisches Kommentar über das Neue Testament. Siebente verbesserte Auflage. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht's Verlag, 1888.

Héring, Jean. The Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians. Translated from the French by A. W. Heathcote and P. J. Allcock. London: The Epworth Press, 1962.

Jeremias, Joachim. "Hbr 5,7-10," Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XLIV (1952), 107-111.

Käsemann, Ernst. Das Wandernde Gottesvolk. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1939.

Kennedy, H. A. A. Philo's Contribution to Religion. New York: Hodder and Stoughton, 1919.

-----. St. Paul and the Mystery Religions. New York: Hodder and Stoughton, 1913.

Kittel, Rudolf, editor. Biblia Hebraica. Stuttgart: Privilegierte Würtembergische Bibelanstalt, c.1937.

Kögel, Julius. "Der Begriff τελεсοῦν im Hebräerbrief," Theologische Studien Martin Kähler zum 6. Januar dargebracht. Leipzig: n.p., 1905. Pp. 35-68.

Koester, Helmut. "The Purpose of the Polemic of a Pauline Fragment," New Testament Studies, VIII (1961), 317-332.

Lidell, Henry George, and Robert Scott, compilers. A Greek-English Lexicon. A new (ninth) edition revised and augmented by Henry Stuart Jones. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958.

Lightfoot, J. B. Notes on the Epistles of St. Paul. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House, 1957.

-----. Saint Paul's Epistle to the Philippians. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1953.

Lütgert, W. "Freiheitspredigt und Schwarmgeister in Korinth," Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie. Zwölfter Jahrgang, Drittes Heft. Herausgegeben von A. Schlatter und W. Lütgert. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1908. Pp. 123-279.

-----. "Die Vollkommenen im Philipperbrief und Die Enthusiasten in Thessa-lonich," Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie. Dreizehnter Jahrgang, Sechstes Heft. Herausgegeben von A. Schlatter und W. Lütgert. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1909. Pp. 548-654.

MacNeill, H. L. The Christology of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1914.

Michaelis, Wilhelm. "σκηνή," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. VII. Begründet von Gerhard Kittel. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1964. Pp. 369-383.

Michel, Otto. Der Brief an die Hebräer. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1957.

-----. Der Brief an die Römer. Kritisch=exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament. Begründet von H. A. W. Meyer. 10. Auflage. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1955.

Moffatt, James. The Epistle to the Hebrews. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1924.

-----. "Expository Notes on the Epistle to the Philippians," The Expositor, Series 8, XII (1916), 339-353.

Montague, G. T. Growth in Christ. Kirkwood, Missouri: Maryhurst Press, 1961.

Montefiore, Hugh. A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1964.

Moulton, W. F., and A. S. Geden, editors. A Concordance to the Greek Testament. Fourth revised edition. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1963.

Nestle, Eberhard, editor. Novum Testamentum Graece. 24th edition with the assistance of Erwin Nestle and Kurt Aland. Stuttgart: Würtembergische Bibelanstalt, 1960.

Nock, A. D. Early Gentile Christianity and its Hellenistic Background. New York: Harper and Row, 1964.

Nötscher, F. Vom Alten zum Neuen Testament. Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlag, 1962.

Owen, H. P. "Stages of Ascent in Hebrews 5:11-6:3," New Testament Studies, III (1956-57), 243-253.

Percy, Ernst. Die Probleme der Kolosser und Epheserbriefe. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1946.

Perkins, Harold W. The Doctrine of Christian or Evangelical Perfection. London: Epworth Press, 1927.

Pohlenz, Max. Die Stoa. Vol. I. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1948.

Prat, Fernand. The Theology of Saint Paul. Translated from the French by John L. Stoddard. London: Burns Oates and Washbourne Ltd., 1957.

Preisker, Herbert. Das Ethos des Urchristentums. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1949.

Prümm, Karl. "Das neutestamentliche Sprach- und Begriffs-problem der Vollkommenheit," Biblica, XLIV (1963), 76-92.

Rahlfs, Alfred, editor. Septuaginta. 2 vols. Editio Sexta. Stuttgart: Privilegierte Würtembergische Bibelanstalt, 1959.

Reitzenstein, Richard. Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligion. Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft, 1956.

Rissi, Mathis. "Die Menschlichkeit Jesu nach Hebr. 5, 7-8," Theologische Zeitschrift, XI (1955), 28-45.

Robinson, J. Armitage. St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians. London: James Clarke and Co., Ltd., 1928.

Roels, Edwin. God's Mission. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1962.

Roscher, Wilhelm H. Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie. Vol. V. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1965.

Scharlemann, Martin H. Qumran and Corinth. New York: Bookman Associates, 1962.

Schierse, Franz Joseph. Verheissung und Heilsvollendung. München: Karl Zink Verlag, 1955.

Schlier, H. Der Brief an die Epheser. 4. Auflage. Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1963.

-----. Christus und die Kirche in Epheserbrief. Tübingen: Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1930.

Schmithals, Walter. Die Gnosis in Korinth. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1956.

-----. "Die Irrlehrer des Philipperbriefes," Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche, LIV (1957), 297-341.

Schnackenburg, Rudolf. "Christian Adulthood According to the Apostle Paul," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XXV (1963), 354-370.

Schrage, Wolfgang. Die konkreten Einzelgebote in der paulinischen Paränese. Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1961.

Scott, Walter, editor and translator. Hermetica. 4 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924.

Sevenster, J. N. Paul and Seneca. Vol. IV of Supplements to Novum Testamentum. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1961.

Simpson, E. K. "The Vocabulary of the Epistle to the Hebrews," Evangelical Quarterly, XVIII (1946), 187-190.

-----, and F. F. Bruce. Commentary on the Epistles to the Ephesians and the Colossians. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1957.

Sowers, Sidney G. The Hermeneutics of Philo and Hebrews. Zürich: EVZ-Verlag, 1965.

Stacey, W. David. The Pauline View of Man. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1956.

Stählin, Gustav. "Fortschritt und Wachstum," Glaube und Geschichte, Festgabe für Joseph Lortz. Baden-Baden: Bruno Grimm, 1957.

Stalder, Kurt. Das Werk des Geistes in der Heiligung bei Paulus. Zürich: EVZ-Verlag, 1962.

Völker, Walther. Fortschritt und Vollendung bei Philon von Alexandrien. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs Verlag, 1938.

Vos, Geerhardus. "The Priesthood of Christ in Hebrews," Princeton Theological Review, V (1907), 423-447; 579-604.

Warfield, Benjamin B. Perfectionism. Vol. I. New York: Oxford University Press, 1931.

Weiss, Johannes. Der Erste Korintherbrief. Kritisch=exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament. Begründet von H. A. W. Meyer. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1910.

Westcott, Brooke Foss. The Epistle to the Hebrews. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1950.

Wikenhauser, Alfred. Pauline Mysticism. Translated from the German by Joseph Cunningham. Freiburg: Herder and Herder, 1960.

Wikgren, Allen. "Patterns of Perfection in the Epistle to the Hebrews," New Testament Studies, VI (1959-60), 159-167.

Wilckens, Ulrich. Weisheit und Torheit. Tubingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1959.

Windisch, Hans. Der Hebräerbrief. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament. Herausgegeben von Hans Lietzmann. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1913.