

On the Source and Rewriting of 1 Corinthians 2.9 in Christian, Jewish, and  
Islamic Traditions

(1 Clem 34.8; GosJud 47.10-13; a *ḥadīth qudsī*)<sup>1</sup>

**PRE-PROOF VERSION, ACCEPTED FOR PUBLICATION**

The article reopens the dossier of the sources, parallels and rewritings of 1 Cor 2.9, a saying that Paul attributes to a written source, when other sources put it into Jesus' mouth (e.g. *GosThom* 17). The state of research shows that the hypothesis of an oral source is generally preferred but an accurate study of 1 Clem 34.8, a parallel too often neglected, supports the presence of a written source that existed before 1 Cor 2.9. *GosJud*. 47.10-13 will help to understand the attribution of the saying to Jesus. Finally, the article takes into account the well-known parallel in Islamic tradition, a *ḥadīth qudsī*.

**Keywords:** agraphon, 1 Corinthians, 1 Clement, Gospel of Judas, *ḥadīth*

1. Introduction

There are some questions in New Testament studies that are particularly humbling for researchers. Amongst these questions is the issue of the sources, parallels and rewritings of 1 Cor 2.9, a passage which Paul attributes to a written source as yet unidentified: 'But, as it is

---

<sup>1</sup>Sections 1-4 of the article are based on a French 2010 paper: C. Clivaz, '1 Co 2,9, ses sources et ses réécritures : trois nouveaux éléments pour un dossier sans fin (1 Clem 34,8 ; EvJud 47,10-13 ; un *ḥadīth qudsī*)', *IIIe colloque international de l'AELAC. Strasbourg 2010* (ed. R. Gounelle et al.; Prangins: Ed. Zèbre, forthcoming). The translation of this part is published with the agreement of the editor Rémi Gounelle. Section 5 develops researches of the Swiss National Science Foundation project no. 143810 (2013-2016), lead by Claire Clivaz, co-lead by David Bouvier, with Sara Schulthess as PhD student (University of Lausanne), co-direction with Herman Teule (Radboud University Nijmegen).

written, “What no eye has seen, nor ear heard, nor human heart conceived, what God has prepared for those who love him”<sup>2</sup>. As Jean-Daniel Dubois said: ‘The search for possible parallels to the biblical saying quoted by the apostle Paul can create a certain sensation of dizziness’.<sup>3</sup> With regard to the source from which 1 Cor 2.9 could have come, Jean-Marie Sévrin stresses that ‘The number of hypotheses highlights the fact that none of them is conclusive, and the distance between Isa [6]4.4 and 1 Cor 2.9 is such that it cannot be said that Paul alleges the authority of the Isaiah text as it stands’.<sup>4</sup> For a list of the possible parallels and rewritings, the article by Klaus Berger (1978) remains the most exhaustive study, citing several dozen attestations.<sup>5</sup> Jean-Daniel Dubois indicates that the *Encomium on John the Baptist* 142.31–34 should be added to that list,<sup>6</sup> as well as the Islamic traditions regarding this saying, as mentioned in an article by Alfred-Louis de Prémare.<sup>7</sup> We also noted that Berger mentioned only one ‘Turfan Fragment’,<sup>8</sup> whereas Jean-Marie Sévrin mentions

---

<sup>2</sup>NRSV. For the Greek text, Nestle-Aland<sup>28</sup> proposes the following: ἀλλὰ καθὼς γέγραπται· ἃ ὀφθαλμοῦς οὐκ εἶδεν καὶ οὐκ ἤκουσεν καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἀνέβη, ἃ ἠτοίμασεν ὁ θεὸς τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν.

<sup>3</sup>J.-D. Dubois, ‘L’utilisation gnostique du centon biblique cité en 1 Corinthiens 2,9’, *KATA TOYΣ O’; selon les Septante. Trente études sur la Bible grecque des Septante. En hommage à Marguerite Harl* (ed. G. Dorival and O. Munnich; Paris: Cerf, 1995) 371–9, here 374 (our translation).

<sup>4</sup>J.-M. Sévrin, “‘Ce que l’œil n’a pas vu ...’. 1 Co 2,9 comme parole de Jésus’, *Lectures et relectures de la Bible. Festschrift P.-M. Bogaert* (ed. J.-M. Auwers and A. Wénin; BETL 144; Leuven: University Press, 1999) 307–24, here 307, n. 1 (our translation).

<sup>5</sup>Cf. K. Berger, ‘Zur Diskussion über die Herkunft von I Kor. ii. 9’, *New Testament Studies* (1978) 270–283.

<sup>6</sup>Cf. Dubois, ‘L’utilisation gnostique’, 374–375, n. 12. He was told of this reference by Anne Boud’hors who has since published the text in A. Boud’hors, ‘Éloge de Jean-Baptiste’, *Écrits apocryphes chrétiens I* (ed. F. Bovon and P. Geoltrain; Pléiade 442; Paris: Gallimard, 1997) 1553-78.

<sup>7</sup>Cf. Dubois, ‘L’utilisation gnostique’, 375, n. 12: A.-L. de Prémare, “‘Comme il est écrit’. L’histoire d’un texte’, *Studia Islamica* (1989) 27–56. Mention of this reference dates back to at least 1957 and an article by L. Gardet, ‘Les fins dernières selon la théologie musulmane’, *Revue Thomiste* (1957/1) 246–300, here 290. Cf. n. 12 below for further references.

<sup>8</sup>Cf. Berger, ‘Zur Diskussion’, 276, 278, 280. He mentions a ‘Turfan-Fragment’ without giving any further

two of them.<sup>9</sup> Yet more surprising is his omission of the attestation of *1 Clem* 34.8, although he does mention *2 Clement* 11.7 and 14.15.<sup>10</sup> In view of the present lack of any exhaustive survey of the parallels and rewritings of 1 Cor 2.9, this article proposes to contribute to the overall study of the question by examining three elements that are either new or not usually taken into account, namely: *1 Clem* 34.8; *Gospel of Judas* 47.10–13; a *ḥadīth qudsī*.

In Section 2 of this article, we will begin by presenting an examination of the present state of research<sup>11</sup> on the question of the source on which 1 Cor 2.9 draws, highlighting that the hypothesis of an oral source is generally preferred, whether explicitly or implicitly. Section 3 will demonstrate that *1 Clem* 34.8 – a parallel too often neglected – serves to confirm the presence of a source that existed before 1 Cor 2.9. Section 4 will revisit the list of parallels that attribute the saying cited in 1 Cor 2.9 to Jesus, adding to it the parallel found in *GosJud.* 47.10–13. In Section 5 the complex question of a *ḥadīth* (plural *aḥādīth*), from the Islamic tradition that contains the saying of 1 Cor 2.9, will be examined. The *ḥadīth* is not usually included in the study of the sources, parallels and rewritings of Paul’s verse.<sup>12</sup> In a mirrored

---

details about it.

<sup>9</sup>Cf. Sévrin, “Ce que l’œil n’a pas vu”, 308, n. 7: ‘Fragments de Turfan, M554 et M589, qui ne diffèrent guère entre eux. Édition: F.W.K. Müller, *Handschriften – Reste in Estrangelo – Schrift aus Turfan 2*, in *Pr. Ak. Wiss. Berlin, Phil.-Hist. Kl.* (1907), Abhang II, pp. 67-68’.

<sup>10</sup>Cf. Berger, ‘Zur Diskussion’, 278.

<sup>11</sup>For a more detailed state of research: Clivaz, ‘1 Co 2,9’.

<sup>12</sup>Jean-Daniel Dubois is one of the rare scholars to point out its existence in a study of 1 Cor 2.9, see Dubois, ‘L’utilisation gnostique’, 375, n. 12. The discussion in this article is primarily based on M. S. Seale, ‘A Biblical Proof Text in Al-Ghazali’, *The Muslim World* (1964/3) 156–9; de Prémare, “Comme il est écrit”; id., ‘*Des Alexandries I. Du livre au texte*’ (ed. L. Giard and C. Jacob; Paris: BNF, 2001) 179–96, here 182; D. Tacchini, ‘Paul the Forgerer. Classical and Modern Radical Muslim Views of the Apostle of Tarsus’, *Islamochristiana* 34 (2008), 129–47, here 131–132. The following authors also associate this *ḥadīth* with 1 Cor 2.9: L. Gardet, ‘Les fins dernières’, 290; D. Masson, *Le Coran et la révélation judéo-chrétienne: études comparées*, vol. 2 (Paris:

sense, this cultural shift will give a better understanding of the presence, in a canonized text, of an ‘apocryphal scripture’ or even an ‘*agraphon* scripture’, to adopt a paradoxical phrase. The fact that Paul can cite as scripture a text that apparently does not belong to the Hebrew Bible influences how this saying was perceived and interpreted. It is a saying that has often disturbed New Testament commentators, a point we shall come back to at the end of our study.

## 2. The State of Research on the Sources of 1 Cor 2.9: Written or Oral?

The only source prior to 1 Cor 2.9 that offers a parallel to the saying and on which there is currently any consensus<sup>13</sup> is *The Book of Biblical Antiquities* 26.13 of Pseudo-Philo (*L.A.B.*), where God says to Cenez<sup>14</sup> as he speaks of the time ‘when the sins of my people are filled up’:

And then I will take [these stones] and many others even better, from that place which no eye has seen nor ear heard neither has it never come up into the heart of man, until the like will come to pass unto the world and the just shall have no need for the light of the sun nor of the shining of the moon, for the light of these precious

---

Librairie d’Amérique et d’Orient, 1958) 760; id., *Monothéisme coranique et monothéisme biblique: doctrines comparées* (Paris: Desclée De Brouwer, 1976) 745; id., *L’eau, le feu, la lumière: d’après la Bible, le Coran et les traditions monothéistes* (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1985) 165. Albert-Marie Denis and Jean-Claude Haelewyck cite the references of Masson and of de Prémare in their *Introduction à la littérature religieuse judéo-hellénistique. Pseudépigraphes de l’Ancien Testament* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2000) 612–3, n. 16.

<sup>13</sup>See, e.g. C. M. Tuckett, ‘Paul and Jesus Tradition: The Evidence of 1 Corinthians 2:9 and Gospel of Thomas 17’, *Paul and the Corinthians. Studies on a Community in Conflict. Essays in Honour of Margaret Thrall* (ed. T. J. Burke, J. K. Elliott; N.T.S 109; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2003) 55–73, here 63: ‘At least one version of the saying is agreed as providing independent attestation, viz. PsPhilo 26:13’.

<sup>14</sup>Cf. Josh 15.17; Judg 1.3.

stones shall be their light.<sup>15</sup>

It should be noted from the outset that in this version of the saying it is God who speaks, and that ‘which no eye has seen nor ear heard neither has it never come up into the heart of man’ refers to a *place*: we will return to these aspects later. Among the other hypotheses concerning independent sources and/or ones prior to 1 Cor 2.9, those relating to the *Testament of Jacob* have been abandoned.<sup>16</sup> The idea that it is a simple re-writing or an oral tradition to do with Isa 64.3 – which goes back to Jerome<sup>17</sup> – does not stand up to scrutiny, because of the differences in content and vocabulary between the saying of 1 Cor 2.9 and the text of Isaiah, whether in Hebrew or Greek.<sup>18</sup> Finally, the suggestions that the saying depends on *Gospel of Thomas* 17 or an ‘Elijah apocryphon’ have recently been rejected by

---

<sup>15</sup>M. R. James, trans., *The Biblical Antiquities of Philo* (London: SPCK, 1917), 157 (our adaptation into modern English).

<sup>16</sup>Hofius showed in 1975 that the *Testament of Jacob* could not be a source of 1 Cor 2.9, *contra* Nordheim (cf. E. von Nordheim, ‘Das Zitat des Paulus in I Kor. 2,9, und seine Beziehung zum koptischen Testament Jakobs’, *ZNW* 65 (1974), 112–20; O. Hofius, ‘Das Zitat I Kor 2,9 und das koptische Testament des Jakob’, *ZNW* 66 (1975) 140–2). But as Klaus Berger rightly points out in considering Hofius, the Christian influences present in the *Testament of Jacob* do not make it dependent on New Testament sources (Berger, ‘Zur Diskussion’, 270–1, n. 1).

<sup>17</sup>Cf. Jerome, *Pachomius* 57.9 (see A. Veilleux, ed. and trans., *Instructions, Letters and Other Writings of Saint Pachomius and His Disciples* (Pachomian Koinonia 3; Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 1982).

<sup>18</sup>See J. Verheyden, ‘Origen and the Origin of 1 Cor 2,9’, *The Corinthian Correspondence* (ed. R. Bieringer; BETL 125; Leuven: Peeters, 1996) 491–511, here 493. In n. 8 on the same page, Verheyden presents the state of research on this point. See also Sévrin, “‘Ce que l’œil n’a pas vu’”, 307. As for Berger, he proposes Isa 6.10 and 30.20 as the basis of his reconstruction of the history of the tradition, which confirms that there is no need to look to Isa 64.3 (Berger, ‘Zur Diskussion’, 277). But some scholars are still defending an implicit quotation. See e.g. H.-J. Inkelhaar, *Conflict over Wisdom. The Theme of 1 Corinthians 1-4 Rooted in Scripture* (CBET 63; Leuven: Peeters, 2011) 231–69. H. H. D. Williams, *The Wisdom of the Wise. The Presence and Function of Scripture within 1 Cor. 1:18-3:23* (AJECAGJU 49; Leiden: Brill, 2001) 157–208.

Christopher Tuckett and Joseph Verheyden.

In *GosThom* 17, the saying, only available in Coptic, is ascribed to Jesus: ‘Jesus said “I shall give you what no eye has seen and what no ear has heard, and what no hand has touched and what has never occurred to the human mind”’.<sup>19</sup> In 2003, Christopher Tuckett<sup>20</sup> showed that the hypothesis of a dependence on *GosThom* was unsustainable.<sup>21</sup> Amongst other arguments, Tuckett first underlines the fact that Paul does not link the saying to a ‘word of the Lord’ but to a ‘scripture’, which poses the difficulty of explaining why Paul would have removed from the mouth of Jesus a *logion* that would have formerly been attributed to him.<sup>22</sup> Tuckett concludes that ‘the saying in 1 Cor. 2:9 may have been known and used by the Corinthians. But there is nothing to suggest that Paul knew the saying in the form of a saying of Jesus’.<sup>23</sup> We would reinforce Tuckett’s arguments by underlining that it is striking to note that Origen, in the two passages of his *Commentary on Matthew* where he mentions 1 Cor 2.9,<sup>24</sup> makes

---

<sup>19</sup>B. Layton, ed., *Nag Hammadi Codex II,2-7 together with XIII,2*, *Brit. Lib. 4926(1) and P. Oxy. I, 654, 655* (NHS 20; Leiden: Brill, 1989) 61.

<sup>20</sup>See Tuckett, ‘Paul and Jesus Tradition’.

<sup>21</sup>A hypothesis repeatedly posited by Helmut Koester, then James Robinson and Stephen Patterson. See H. Koester, *Trajectories Through Early Christianity* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1971) 158–204; J. M. Robinson, ‘The Study of the Historical Jesus after Nag Hammadi’, *Semeia* 44 (1988), 45–55; S. J. Patterson, ‘Paul and the Jesus Tradition: It is Time for Another Look’, *HTR* 84 (1991), 23–41. About a possible dependence of *GosThom* on Paul, see: S. Gathercole, ‘The Influence of Paul on the *Gospel of Thomas* (§§ 53.3 and 17)’, *Das Thomasevangelium. Entstehung – Rezeption – Theologie* (ed. J. Frey, E. E. Popkes, J. Schröter; BZNW 157; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008) 72–94; C. W. Skinner, ‘The *Gospel of Thomas*’s Rejection of Paul’s Theological Ideas’, *Paul and the Gospels. Christologies, Conflicts and Convergences* (ed. M. F. Bird, J. Willitts, Joel; LNTS 411; London/New York: T&T Clark, 2011) 220–41.

<sup>22</sup>Cf. Tuckett, ‘Paul and Jesus Tradition’, 64 and 71.

<sup>23</sup>Tuckett, ‘Paul and Jesus Tradition’, 72.

<sup>24</sup>Origen, *CommSer* 28 (Mt 23.37–39) and 117 (Mt 27.9–10); see E. Klostermann, ed., *Origenes Werke*. XI.

absolutely no mention of the *GosThom*, even though he knew it.<sup>25</sup> There is also nothing to indicate that Origen knew the *logion* of *GosThom* 17, but even if he did know it, he does not mention a source that would have attributed the saying to Jesus. These observations confirm Tuckett's demonstration: Paul does not take up the saying from a source that he attributes to Jesus.<sup>26</sup> In consequence, an investigation still remains to be made, for Tuckett does not say when or why the saying became a *logion* attributed to Jesus. We will examine this point in Section 4.

Turning to Origen's proposed hypothesis of an 'Elijah apocryphon' as the source of the saying, Joseph Verheyden has clearly demonstrated that it cannot be sustained.<sup>27</sup> Drawing first on the work of David Frankfurter, he reiterates that there is no attestation of an 'Elijah apocryphon' before Origen.<sup>28</sup> The saying in question is not found in what today is known as *The Apocalypse of Elijah* and it cannot be a fragment of a lost text nor of any other 'Elijah apocryphon'.<sup>29</sup> He then goes back to the two passages in Origen's *Commentary on Matthew*

---

*Origenes Matthäuserklärung. II. Die lateinische Übersetzung der Commentariorum Series* (GCS 38; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1933) 40–50 and 249–50.

<sup>25</sup>Origen, *Hom. Lc* 1.2; see J. T. Lienhard, trans., *Origen. Homilies on Luke* (The Fathers of the Church 94; Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1996), 6; Sévrin, “Ce que l’œil n’a pas vu”, 313.

<sup>26</sup>Tuckett's article opens up the debate on the supposed age of certain *logia* of the *GosThom*. *GosThom* 17 preceding 1 Cor 2.9 has played a not insignificant role in this respect, especially in the writings of Helmut Koester. See Tuckett, 'Paul and Jesus Tradition', 57.

<sup>27</sup>Verheyden, 'Origen'.

<sup>28</sup>D. Frankfurter, *Elijah in Upper Egypt. The Apocalypse of Elijah and Early Egyptian Christianity*, Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1993) 47; cited by Verheyden, 'Origen', 498.

<sup>29</sup>Verheyden, 'Origen', 500: 'There is no such quotation in the extant text of the *Apocalypse of Elijah*. Attempts to locate the passage in the parts that are lacking, in an hypothetical longer *Vorlage*, or at the end of the text (as its conclusion), all have proven to be unsuccessful. There is no evidence in the manuscripts that the end is missing.'

and highlights the theologian's hesitation as well as the speculative aspect of his reasoning.<sup>30</sup> Above all, Verheyden draws attention to a passage in the *Panarion* of Epiphanius where there is evidence in the manuscript tradition of confusion between 'Elijah' and 'Isaiah', one that could easily have arisen because of the similarity in the Greek between ΗΑΕΙΑΣ and ΗΣΑΙΑΣ.<sup>31</sup> Verheyden backs up his 'suspicion' with information from Jerome's *Commentary on Isaiah*. Jerome places the *Ascension of Isaiah*, where a parallel to 1 Cor 2.9 is found in *AscIs* 11.34, side by side with the *ApocEl* to explain the source of the saying of 1 Cor 2.9:<sup>32</sup> 'the addition of "Ascensio Isaiae" could be a tacit correction of what he had read in Origen'.<sup>33</sup> Verheyden thus supports Kretschmar's hypothesis:<sup>34</sup> it is very likely that Origen had access to the *AscIs*, especially if the hypothesis of Enrico Norelli regarding the composition and circulation of this text (one work written in two stages), is taken into account.<sup>35</sup> But Verheyden categorically asserts that "there can be no doubt that [*AscIs*] 11,34 was taken from 1 Cor 2,9"<sup>36</sup>, while leaving open the question of the sources of 1 Cor 2.9.

However, by rejecting the possibility of an 'Elijah apocryphon' and by leaving Paul's

---

<sup>30</sup>Verheyden, 'Origen', 506.

<sup>31</sup>Epiphanius, *Panarion* 42.12,3 (ed. K. Holl; GCS 31; Leipzig/Berlin: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung/Akademie-Verl., 1980) 179–80; to explain the confusion, Verheyden refers to T. Zahn, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*, vol. II/2 (Erlangen/Leipzig: A. Deichert, 1892) 804, n. 2 (Verheyden, 'Origen', 507, n. 61).

<sup>32</sup>Cf. Jerome, *Comm. Is.* 64.3: see M. Adriaen, ed., *S. Hieronymi Presbyteri. Opera exegetica* (CC 73A; Turnout: Brepols, 1963) 735.

<sup>33</sup>Verheyden, 'Origen', 509.

<sup>34</sup>Verheyden, 'Origen', 510; cf. G. Kretschmar, *Studien zur frühchristlichen Trinitätstheologie* (BHT 21; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1956) 71–4, here 72.

<sup>35</sup>Verheyden, 'Origen', 511. Cf. E. Norelli, *Ascensio Isaiae. I. Textus; II. Commentarius* (CC SerAp 7–8; Turnhout: Brepols, 1995).

<sup>36</sup>Verheyden, 'Origen', 510.

reference to a written source without any explanation, Verheyden's article implicitly lessens the probability of a written source for 1 Cor 2.9 and opens the door to the hypothesis of an oral source.<sup>37</sup> This hypothesis comes up against some serious objections: first, Paul says that he is quoting a scripture in 1 Cor 2.9, which cannot simply be Isa 64.3 as Verheyden recognizes. Secondly, *L.A.B.* 26.13 represents an independent Jewish source existing prior to 1 Cor. 2.9; *AscIs* 11.34 as a second attestation of an independent source is still a possibility to be discussed, according to Enrico Norelli.<sup>38</sup> Thirdly, there were other attestations that could confirm the existence of an independent source to 1 Cor. 2.9: We believe that *1 Clem* 34.8 does just that, as we will see in Section 3. Little account has been taken of this occurrence in examining 1 Cor 2.9 and it may be noted that the scholars who do not consider it are also those who explicitly or implicitly favour an oral source for 1 Cor 2.9.

This is seen especially in the work of Klaus Berger who has conducted the most exhaustive study of the parallels to 1 Cor 2.9 but nevertheless omitted *1 Clem* 34.8. For Berger, 1 Cor 2.9 does not attest to a literary source but to an 'apokalyptische Schultradition'.<sup>39</sup> He stresses that, '[a]part from the *Gospel of Thomas*, the Turfan fragment and the letter of Pseudo-Titus, which consider this tradition to be the word of the earthly Jesus, this passage is viewed as a

---

<sup>37</sup>As suggested by Prigent, Koch and Barbaglio, who advanced the Jewish synagogal liturgy as milieu from which the saying of 1 Cor 2.9 could have come. See P. Prigent, 'Ce que l'œil n'a pas vu, 1 Cor. 2,9. Histoire et préhistoire d'une citation', *TZ* 14 (1958), 416–29, here 426–9; D.-A Koch, *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums. Untersuchungen zur Verwendung und zum Verständnis der Schrift bei Paulus* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1986) 62; G. Barbaglio, 'L'uso della scrittura nel Proto-Paolo', *La Bibbia nell'antichità cristiana. I. Da Gesù a Origene* (ed. E. Norelli, Bologna: Dehoniane, 1993) 65–85, here 73: 'La soluzione più probabile è che anche qui Paolo dipenda dalla tradizione orale, a sua volta influenzata dalla corrente apocalittica'.

<sup>38</sup>E. Norelli, *Ascensio Isaiae. I. Textus; II. Commentarius* (CC SerAp 7–8; Turnhout: Brepols, 1995) ; here vol II, 590–2.

<sup>39</sup>Berger, 'Zur Diskussion', 280.

quotation by Paul alone. In all the other texts named here [...], the tradition is fully integrated into the context'.<sup>40</sup> Berger is so concerned with bringing his discussion to a close by reducing the importance of the sources that present the saying as words of Jesus, that he forgets to mention other occurrences cited in his own article, namely the Arabic *Apocryphal Gospel of John* 37.56<sup>41</sup> and the *Apocalypse of Peter* (Ethiopic and Karshuni versions)<sup>42</sup> where this saying is attributed to Jesus. Besides, there are further occurrences not mentioned by Berger where the saying is placed on the lips of Jesus or attributed to him in indirect speech: *Acts of Peter* 39 (Latin) or *Martyrdom of Peter* 9 (Greek); *Enc. on John the Baptist* 142.31–34; *GosJud* 47.10–13; and finally the *Festal Letter* 39.9 of Athanasius.<sup>43</sup>

So it can be seen that attributing the saying of 1 Cor 2.9 to Jesus, whether in direct or indirect speech, is far from anecdotal, as Berger, followed by Sévrin, claimed.<sup>44</sup> Furthermore,

---

<sup>40</sup>Berger, 'Zur Diskussion', 280 (our translation).

<sup>41</sup>Cf. Berger, 'Zur Diskussion', 275.

<sup>42</sup>See Berger, 'Zur Diskussion', 274. Berger gives as a reference for these two passages A. Mingana, *The Apocalypse of Peter* (Woodbrooke Studies 3.2; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1931) 224; S. Grébaud, 'Littérature éthiopienne pseudo-clémentine', *R.O.C.* VIII (1913), 69–78, here 71. These references are cited in Berger, 'Zur Diskussion', 274, nn. 1–2.

<sup>43</sup>Jean-François Cottier points out that in *AcThom* 36.3 the saying is also placed in the mouth of Jesus, see J.F. Cottier, 'L'épître du Pseudo-Tite', *Écrits apocryphes chrétiens* II (ed. P. Geoltrain, J.-D. Kaestli; Pléiade 516; Paris: Gallimard, 2005) 1131–71, here 1139 (note on 1.1). Actually, it is the apostle Judas Thomas who utters it, cf. J. K. Elliott, ed., *The Apocryphal New Testament. A Collection of Apocryphal Christian Literature in an English Translation* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993) 439–511. About the *Festal Letter* 39.9 of Athanasius, see Clivaz, '1 Co 2,9'. Cf. the edition of G. Aragione, 'La lettre festale 39 d'Athanase. Présentation et traduction de la version copte et de l'extrait grec', *Le canon du Nouveau Testament. Regards nouveaux sur l'histoire de sa formation* (ed. G. Aragione, E. Junod, E. Norelli; MdB 54; Geneva: Labor et Fides, 2005) 197–219.

<sup>44</sup>Sévrin, "'Ce que l'œil n'a pas vu'", 312: 'Except the *Gospel of Thomas*, only the Turfan fragments, *Martyrdom of Peter* and the letter of Pseudo-Titus can be considered as witnesses for a tradition of this sentence as parable of Jesus' (our translation).

Berger's main affirmation – that only Paul makes this saying into a quotation – is unsustainable in the light of *1 Clem* 34.8, which will now be discussed.

### 3. *1 Clem* 34.8: A Neglected Attestation of an Independent Written Source of 1 Cor 2.9

In *1 Clem* 34.8, the saying is as follows: ‘For he said: “no eye has seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which he has prepared for them that wait for him”’.<sup>45</sup> Without claiming to have examined the secondary literature exhaustively, it can be observed that the attestation of *1 Clem* 34.8, even though it is the oldest after 1 Cor 2.9, is generally not mentioned<sup>46</sup> or else it is mentioned only in passing.<sup>47</sup> Tuckett has observed in a note Wolfgang Schrage's suggestion that there was an independent tradition in *1 Clem* 34.8, taken up in *2 Clem* 11.7, but neither Schrage nor Tuckett investigate the matter any further.<sup>48</sup>

---

<sup>45</sup>λέγει γάρ· ὀφθαλμος οὐκ εἶδεν καὶ οὐκ ἤκουσεν καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἀνέβη, ὅσα ἠτοίμασεν τοῖς ὑπομένουσιν αὐτόν. Edition of Annie Jaubert (éd.), *Clément de Rome. Épître aux Corinthiens* (SC 167), Paris, Cerf, 1971, 156. In the English edition, the passage is translated as follows: ‘For [the Scriptures] saith, “Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which He hath prepared for them that wait for him”’. A. Roberts, J. Donaldson, eds., *The Ante-Nicene Fathers. Translations of the Writings of the Fathers down to A.D. 325*. Vol. 1, *Apostolic Fathers, Justin Martyr, Irenæus* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1993<sup>2</sup>), 14.

<sup>46</sup>This is seen in e.g. Berger, Barbaglio, Dubois and Verheyden.

<sup>47</sup>Tuckett, ‘Paul and Jesus Tradition’, 63, n. 50; Sévrin, “Ce que l’œil n’a pas vu”, 311, n. 17. Denis and Haelwyck mention it as a quotation of 1 Cor 2.9 and as free use of Isa 64.3 or 65.16-25: Denis, Haelwyck, *Introduction*, 612 and 614. Andrew Gregory see it as a ‘common place’: A. F. Gregory, C. M. Tuckett, ‘2 Clement and the Writings That Later Formed the New Testament’, *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* (ed. A. F. Gregory, C. M. Tuckett; Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 2005) 251–92, here 285.

<sup>48</sup>Tuckett, ‘Paul and Jesus Tradition’, 63, n. 50; he refers to W. Schrage, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther* (EKKNT 7/1; Zurich: Benzinger, 1991) 246, n. 139.

There is only a single author who has devoted some attention to an analysis of this parallel: Johannes B. Bauer,<sup>49</sup> in his article from 1957.

Bauer is of the opinion that *1 Clem* 34.8 is much closer to Isa 64.3 than 1 Cor 2.9 is: he thinks that the passage in *1 Clem* cites a collection of *testimonia* on Isa 64.3 or an apocryphon that develops from the verse.<sup>50</sup> Drawing on the analysis of rabbinic sources of Strack and Billerbeck,<sup>51</sup> he observes that ‘the earliest explicit exegesis of Isa 64.3 is given by R. Schimeon b. Chalaphata (around 190), in the *Midr. Qoh. 1.8*’.<sup>52</sup> These are pointers to a Jewish milieu, just like *L.A.B. 26.13*, even if it is precarious to base a chronology on a midrashic tradition. Two important facts stand out in Bauer’s analysis: *1 Clem* 34.8 presents another version of the saying of 1 Cor 2.9 which is closer to Isa 64.3; and he understands *1 Clem* 34.8 as referring to a written source. This second point is fully supported by an analysis of the whole of *1 Clement*.

Indeed, *1 Clem* contains no less than thirty occurrences of introductory formulas with λέγει,<sup>53</sup> such as the expression λέγει γάρ that introduces *1 Clem* 34.8. They all introduce quotations that come from sources considered as ‘scriptures’. My first observation is that the expressions with λέγει introduce unknown texts a total of six times.<sup>54</sup> The analysis of the occurrences of

---

<sup>49</sup>See J. B. Bauer, ‘ΤΟΙΣ ΑΓΑΠΙΩΣΙΝ ΤΟΝ ΘΕΟΝ... Rm 8,28 (1 Cor 2,9, 1 Cor 8,3)’, *ZNW* 50 (1959), 106–12, esp. 108–11, mentioned by Sévrin, “Ce que l’œil n’a pas vu”, 311, n. 17.

<sup>50</sup>Bauer, ‘ΤΟΙΣ ΑΓΑΠΙΩΣΙΝ ΤΟΝ ΘΕΟΝ’, 109.

<sup>51</sup>Cf. H. L. Strack, P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, vol. III (München: C.H. Beck, 1926) 328.

<sup>52</sup>Bauer, ‘ΤΟΙΣ ΑΓΑΠΙΩΣΙΝ ΤΟΝ ΘΕΟΝ’, 109.

<sup>53</sup>Cf. *1 Clem* 8.2,3; 8.4,1; 8.4,6; 10.2,4; 10.6,1; 13.1,3; 14.5,2; 15.2,1; 15.4,1; 15.6,2; 17.2,2; 17.6,1; 18.2,2; 21.2,1; 23.3,1; 26.2,1; 26.3,1; 28.2,3; 29.3,1; 30.4,1; 34.3,1; 34.6,1; 34.8,1; 36.5,2; 37.5,2; 42.5,3; 46.3,2; 52.3,1; 56.6,1; 57.3,1.

λέγει shows that *1 Clem* quotes at the end of the first century CE the ‘canonical’<sup>55</sup> Jewish Scriptures in exactly the same way as the apocryphal ones. It is all the more comprehensible that Paul should do the same forty years earlier in 1 Cor 2.9. Secondly, the saying presented in 34.8 is spoken by someone<sup>56</sup> whose identify is left unspecified; in 34.7, the singular subject immediately preceding is God,<sup>57</sup> which leads us back to the saying of *L.A.B.* 26.13, where it is precisely God who pronounces this saying,<sup>58</sup> but where ‘what eye has not seen’ describes a *place* and not promises (*1 Clem* 34.8). A last point which is particularly striking is that *1 Clem* knows 1 Corinthians perfectly well and explicitly quotes this letter of Paul’s,<sup>59</sup> but without relating the saying cited at *1 Clem* 34.8 either to Paul or to 1 Cor 2.9.

These observations confirm that the passage refers to an earlier written, independent source of 1 Cor 2.9. In this source, the saying appears as reported speech, apparently attributed to God, with an eschatological note and in a form different from that of 1 Cor 2.9. The plausibility of a written source that preceded *1 Clem*, no longer extant, is supported by the fact that *1 Clem* otherwise attests to a wide circulation of texts among the early Christian

---

<sup>54</sup>Cf. *1 Clem* 17.6,1; 23.3,1; 26.2,1; 29.3,1; 34.3,1; 34.8,1.

<sup>55</sup>We use the term here with care for it does not have the same sense at the end of the first century CE that will be given to it later, whether for the Hebrew Bible or the Christian Scriptures.

<sup>56</sup>We do not agree with Jaubert, who translated λέγει by ‘il est dit’ (it is said) (Jaubert, *Clément de Rome*, 157). Roberts and Donaldson added in square brackets ‘the Scripture’ as subject but meant here 1 Cor 2.9 (cf. n. 45).

<sup>57</sup>Cf. *1 Clem* 34.7-8: ‘Crions vers lui avec instance comme d’une seule bouche, afin d’avoir part à ses grandes et magnifiques promesses. Car il dit: “L’œil n’a pas vu et l’oreille n’a pas entendu, et cela n’est pas monté au cœur de l’homme, tout ce qu’il a préparé pour ceux qui l’attendent.”’ (Jaubert, *Clément de Rome*, 157). We have changed ‘il est dit’ (it is said) to ‘il dit’ (‘he says’).

<sup>58</sup>*Acts of Thomas* 36.3 also understands that this saying refers to ‘what God has prepared in advance for those who love him’; cf. Poirier, Tissot, ‘Les Actes de Thomas’, 1363. In *AscIs* 11.34, it is the angel of the Holy Spirit who speaks.

<sup>59</sup>Cf. *1 Clem* 47.1–4.

communities.<sup>60</sup> The long passage from an unknown text quoted in *1 Clem* 23.3–4 confirms that the author had access to texts that we no longer have today. In concluding Section 3, we will therefore assert that two texts attest to the existence of an independent source for the saying quoted at 1 Cor. 2.9: *L.A.B.* 26.13 and *1 Clem* 34.8. There is ambiguity concerning *AscIs* 11.34 in the present state of research.<sup>61</sup>

#### 4. When Was This Saying Placed in the Mouth of Jesus?

If the oldest attestations of this saying place it in the mouth of God, when and why was it put into the mouth of Jesus, as shown by the witnesses mentioned in Section 2? No doubt the list is not exhaustive: *GosThom* 17; two Turfan fragments, M554 and M589;<sup>62</sup> *Epistle of Pseudo-Titus* 1.1; the Arabic *Apocr. GosJohn* 37.56;<sup>63</sup> *Apocalypse of Peter* (Ethiopic and Karshuni versions);<sup>64</sup> *Acts of Peter* 39 (Latin); *Martyrdom of Peter* 9 (Greek); *Encon. on John the Baptist* 142.31–34; *GosJud* 47.10–13; and Athanasius' *Festal Letter* 39.9. Of these texts, one that is worth highlighting is *GosJud* 47.10–13, a new passage to add to the list of parallels of 1 Cor 2.9.

It is still impossible to say whether Paul was the first to have given a Christological interpretation to the saying but, whatever the case, the way he sets it in the context of 1 Cor

---

<sup>60</sup>See on this topic: C. Clivaz, 'Heb 5.7, Jesus' Prayer on the Mount of Olives and Jewish Christianity: Hearing Early Christian Voices in Canonical and Apocryphal Texts', *A Cloud of Witnesses. The Theology of Hebrews in its Ancient Context* (ed. R. Bauckham, D. Driver, T. Hart et al.; LNTS 387; London: T&T Clark, 2008) 187–209, here 207.

<sup>61</sup>Cf. Norelli, *Ascensio Isaiae. II. Commentarius*, 590–2.

<sup>62</sup>Cf. Sévrin, "'Ce que l'œil n'a pas vu'", 308, n. 7.

<sup>63</sup>See Section 5.

<sup>64</sup>Cf. n. 42 above.

2.6–16, playing with the traditions of his addressees,<sup>65</sup> marks a significant step in the history of its interpretation. After Paul, the Christological focus is widespread but in general the eschatological perspective is maintained. The fact that *1 Clem* 34.8 has no trace of a Christological reading of the saying, highlights the probability to a greater extent that this is an echo of a source independent of 1 Cor 2.9.<sup>66</sup> In the traditions following Paul, the Christological focus is clearly seen both in the fact that the saying becomes a *logion* of Jesus (right up to Athanasius' *Festal Letter* 39.9) and by the interpretation of the mention of 'what eye has not seen' as a reference to Jesus.

Jean-Daniel Dubois noted 'the vitality of this biblical saying in the debates among Gnostics and non-Gnostics', a vitality that needs to be taken into account of in order to establish the history of the tradition.<sup>67</sup> For Dubois, the *Prayer of the Apostle Paul* develops the Christological aspect of the saying, so much so that he suggests translating *PrPaul* A 27 as 'grant *who* no angel eye will see', instead of 'grant *what* no angel eye will see'<sup>68</sup> It can be seen here that the Christological reading of the saying is secondary and that it will be increasingly understood as the original saying. The ambiguity of the description 'things that

---

<sup>65</sup>Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn rightly points out that the earliest literary attestation of the contrast πνευματικός – ψυχικός is found in 1 Cor 2; he highlights how Paul mixes his ideas with the vocabulary of his addressees; see H. W. Kuhn, 'The Wisdom Passage in 1 Corinthians 2:6-16 between Qumran and Proto-Gnosticism', *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran. Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies Oslo 1998. Published in Memory of Maurice Baillet* (ed. D. K. Falk, F. G. Martínez, E. M. Schuller; StTDJ 35; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2000) 240–53, esp. 245, 247.

<sup>66</sup>This argument could also be used in favour of the independence of the tradition mentioned in *AscIs* 11.34.

<sup>67</sup>Dubois, 'L'utilisation gnostique', 379.

<sup>68</sup>See the traduction of *PrPaul* A, 27: J.-D. Dubois, trans., 'La prière de l'apôtre Paul', *Écrits gnostiques. La bibliothèque copte de Nag Hammadi* (ed. J.-P. Mahé, P.-H. Poirier; *Pléiade* 538; Paris: Gallimard, 2007) 1–24, here 9, and id., 'L'utilisation gnostique', 377. See his argument in Dubois, 'L'utilisation gnostique', 372; he follows the suggestion of Gérard Roquet. See our opinion: Clivaz, '1 Co 2,9'.

the eye has not seen' is also found in the attestation of *GosJud* 47.10–13:

Jesus said, '[Come], that I may teach you about the [(things)...] that [no (?)] human will (ever) see. For there exists a great and boundless aeon, whose extent no generation of angels could (?) see, [in] which is the great invisible Spirit, *which no eye of an [angel] has ever seen, no thought of the heart has ever comprehended, and it was never called by any name.*'<sup>69</sup>

As can be seen from the number of uncertain words in brackets, the manuscript has many lacunae.<sup>70</sup> Despite this, it can be seen that: 1) it is Jesus who pronounces the saying; 2) this version is close to that of the *PrPaul* A, 27 with the mention of an 'eye of an angel'; 3) the saying refers to either the 'great invisible Spirit' or the 'great and boundless realm' with which the great Spirit is associated: it is impossible to decide given the current state of the Coptic text, which the two standard English translations also render.<sup>71</sup> If one follows the second interpretation, then there would be a description of a place in this passage, the 'great realm', just as in *L.A.B.* 26.13. In fact, other parallels relate the saying of 1 Cor 2.9 to a place, namely Paradise, as in the *ḥadīth qudsī* of the Islamic tradition, commenting on the *Surat as-Sajda* 32.17–20.

## 5. The Saying 'What Eye Has Not Seen': An 'Apocryphal Scripture' in Christianity and Islam

Alfred-Louis de Prémare summarizes the situation thus:

---

<sup>69</sup>*GosJud* 47.2-13: see R. Kasser, G. Wurst, M. Meyer et al., ed., *The Gospel of Judas together with the Letter of Peter to Philip, James, and a Book of Allogenes from Codex Tchacos. Critical Edition* (Washington: National Geographic, 2007) 246.

<sup>70</sup>For the Coptic text, see Kasser, Wurst, Meyer, *The Gospel of Judas*, 213.

<sup>71</sup>R. Kasser, G. Wurst, M. Meyer et al., trans., *The Gospel of Judas. Second Edition* (Washington: National Geographic, 2008) 42.

The canonical corpus of the *Ḥadīṭ* reproduces the following text, which is attributed to the prophet Muhammad by the links of transmission that go back to one or other of his companions: ‘God said, “I have prepared for my holy servants what eye has not seen, nor ear heard, and what has not entered into the heart of man”’. The context is, very generally, that of a description of the Paradise promised to faithful believers, linked to the explanation or illustration of a verse of the Quran, *Surah* 32.17-20.<sup>72</sup>

This text entered Islamic tradition at a very early date and later became popular. We find it in the earliest general collections of the *Ḥadīṭ*: those of al- Buḥārī, Muslim, al- Tirmidī, Ibn Māḡa, Ibn Ḥanbal.<sup>73</sup>

In most cases, this *ḥadīth* is found in the mouth of God, through his apostle, which makes it a *ḥadīth qudsī* (sacred narrative). In some instances, the *ḥadīth* is associated with the Torah, according to the lines of transmission, but it is never linked with the apostle Paul.<sup>74</sup> Denise Masson simply supposes that Bukhārī ‘quotes Saint Paul without giving his name’,<sup>75</sup> but there is nothing to say that 1 Corinthians was the channel of transmission and we cannot exclude another source.

The saying as found in the *aḥādīth* is particularly interesting: it is pronounced by God (as in *I Clem* 34.8), addressed to his ‘servants’ and is describing a place, namely Paradise. We see that the saying transmitted by the Islamic traditions has features in common with *L.A.B.* 26.13. In the introduction of his study, Prémare evokes the *Isrā’īliyyāt*, a broad notion in the Islamic tradition, described as follows by *Encyclopaedia of Islam*:

An Arabic term covering three kinds of narratives, which are found in the commentators on the *Ḳur’an*, the

---

<sup>72</sup>de Prémare, “Comme il est écrit”, 27 (our translation).

<sup>73</sup>de Prémare, “Comme il est écrit”, 49 (our translation).

<sup>74</sup>Cf. de Prémare, “Comme il est écrit”, 40–2.

<sup>75</sup>‘Cit[e] Saint Paul sans donner son nom’: Masson, *Le Coran*, vol. 2, 760; id., *Monothéisme coranique*, 745.

This opinion is repeated in Denis, Haelewyck, *Introduction*, 613, n. 16.

mystics, the compilers of edifying histories and writers on various levels. 1. Narratives regarded as historical, which served to complement the often summary information provided by the revealed Book in respect of the personages in the Bible (Tawrāt and Indjīl), particularly the prophets. 2. Edifying narratives placed within the chronological (but entirely undefined) framework of ‘the period of the (ancient) Israelites’. 3. Fables belonging to folklore, allegedly (but sometimes actually) borrowed from Jewish sources. The line of demarcation between this class and the preceding one is difficult to establish.<sup>76</sup>

Thus, it would not be surprising to find in a *ḥadīth* a Jewish (or Christian) extracanonical tradition. This raises the question: can we exclude the New Testament channel? It would not be the only time that the *aḥādīth* show influences from the New Testament. The parallels are mostly not very close as in our case, but Tacchini mentions two others influences from the letters of Paul in the *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* (Eph 2.20–22; 1 Cor 12.12 and 25–26).<sup>77</sup> Cook distinguished three other cases of Pauline influence.<sup>78</sup> All these sayings have transmission chains but are never related to Paul, contrary to *aḥādīth* with Gospels influence, which often refer to Jesus.<sup>79</sup>

---

<sup>76</sup>G. Vajda, ‘Isrā’līyyāt’, *Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition. Volume 4* (ed. E. van Donzel, B. Lewis, Ch. Pellat; Leiden: Brill 1978) 221–2. Translation Brill Online: [http://www.encyislam.brill.nl/subscriber/entry?entry=islam\\_SIM-3670](http://www.encyislam.brill.nl/subscriber/entry?entry=islam_SIM-3670), 16 May 2014.

<sup>77</sup>Tacchini, ‘Paul the Forgerer’ 131–2. To find Pauline traditions in Islamic texts is rather unexpected: ‘these Pauline influences in the *Saḥīḥ* of Bukhari allow us to affirm that even the despised Paul contributed to the construction of Islam’, Tacchini, ‘Paul the Forgerer’ 132.

<sup>78</sup>1 Cor 3.13; 1 Cor 4.10; 2 Thess 3.10, cf. D. Cook, ‘New Testament Citations in the Hadith Literature and the Question of Early Gospel Translations into Arabic’, *The Encounter of Eastern Christianity and Early Islam* (ed. E. Grypeou, M. N. Swanson, D. Thomas; Leiden: Brill, 2006) 184–223, here 217–8. But Cook should problematize his use of the notion ‘citations’; in many cases the intertextuality is far from evident.

<sup>79</sup>For example this reuse of Matt 5.19: ‘The Messiah Jesus son of Mary said: Whoever learns, teaches and acts, that person shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven’, c.f. Ibn ‘Asākir, *Ta’rikh madīnat Dimashq* (Beirut, 1995-2001) vol. XLVII, 456, cited by Cook, ‘New Testament Citations’, 207.

Traits of the New Testament in early Islamic literature lead to the question of the early translations of the New Testament into Arabic. In his reference article,<sup>80</sup> Sydney Griffith demonstrated that the Gospels were first translated during the first Abbasid century (750-850).<sup>81</sup> After this period appeared the six great *ḥadīth* collections (*kutub as-sittah*) of Bukhārī (d. 870), Muslim (d. 875), Abū Da'ud (d. 888), Tirmidhī (d. 892), al-Nasā'ī (d. 915) and Ibn Māja (d. 886),<sup>82</sup> collecting materials allegedly going back to the time of the Prophet. Can we then avoid the comparison between the text of the *ḥadīth* and the Arabic versions of the verse? The *ḥadīth* in the different collections is uniform: 'Allah said, "I have prepared for My righteous slaves what as no eye has ever seen, nor an ear has ever heard nor a human heart can ever think of."'”<sup>83</sup> We have chosen to compare it to three of the oldest manuscripts of

---

<sup>80</sup>S. H. Griffith, 'The Gospel in Arabic: An Inquiry Into its Appearance in the First Abbasid Century', *Oriens Christianus* 67 (1983), 126–67.

<sup>81</sup>Unfortunately, the great majority of studies on the New Testament Arabic versions focus on the Gospels, neglecting the Pauline letters. But in view of the manuscript tradition, we maintain that the Pauline letters were translated at the same time as the Gospels.

<sup>82</sup>J. Robson, 'Ḥadīth', *Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition. Volume 3* (ed. B. Lewis, V. L. Ménage, C. Pellat, J. Schacht; Leiden, Brill: 1971) 24–30.

<sup>83</sup>قَالَ اللَّهُ عَزَّ وَجَلَّ أَعَدَدْتُ لِعِبَادِي الصَّالِحِينَ مَا لَا عَيْنٌ رَأَتْ وَلَا أُذُنٌ سَمِعَتْ وَلَا خَطَرَ عَلَى قَلْبِ بَشَرٍ

In the English translation of the *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* of Muhsin Kahn (Al Saadawi Publications and Dar-us-Salam, 1984(?) <http://www.usc.edu/org/cmje/religious-texts/hadith/bukhari/>), the *ḥadīth* is referenced as follow: Vol. 9, Book 93, Hadīth 589, but with no reference to Arabic edition; this numeration is popular (e.g. Tacchini uses it). The question of the references of the *ḥadīth* collections is particularly complicated and can not be discussed here, but computer tools available on Internet are a great help to find the Arabic text in the different collections: <http://sunnah.com>. For more information about the website: <http://sunnah.com/about>. Here the reference of the *ḥadīth* in another collection: Ibn-Šaraf An-Nawawī (Abū-Zakariyah Yahyā), *Riyāḍ as-ṣāliḥīn* (Beirut: Mu'assasat ar-risālah, 1980) 304, no. 1881.

the Pauline letters: Vat. Ar. 13 (ninth-tenth century),<sup>84</sup> Sin. Ar. 151 (year 867),<sup>85</sup> Sin. Ar. 155 (ninth century).<sup>86</sup> It is interesting to see that the three manuscripts have a very similar text.

Except for the difference between ‘those who love him’ (للذين يحبونه) and ‘my righteous servants’ (لعبادي الصالحين), the formulations are very close between the verse in Arabic and the *ḥadīth*.<sup>87</sup> Can we conclude that there is some literary dependance, in one way or the other? A particular detail retained our attention: in both traditions the verb *خطر* (*khaṭara*) is used to express ‘what has not come up into the heart of man’. *خطر* [*khaṭara*] does not mean ‘to come up’ but means primarily ‘to move’, ‘to agitate’ (for instance as a camel does with its tail or a man with his sword or spear).<sup>88</sup> Associated with *على قلب* [*alá qalb*] or *على بال* [*alá bāl*] it has the secondary meaning of ‘to occur to somebody’s mind’. This verb is not used in the Quran,<sup>89</sup> and does not seem to appear in other *aḥādīth*<sup>90</sup> (as the first or second meaning). It could even be possible that the meaning ‘to occur to somebody’s mind’ was developed during this period in association with the saying, either from the *ḥadīth*, from the Arabic versions or

---

<sup>84</sup>ولاكن كما انه مكتوب ان التي لم تراه العيون والاذان لم تسمع وعلى قلب انسان لم يخطر [...] للذين يحبونه

Early Christian Arabic manuscripts are unvocalized. There is as yet no edition of the Vat. Ar. 13. We are currently working on the edition of 1 Corinthians in Vat. Ar. 13.

<sup>85</sup>بل كما هو مكتوب ان العين لم تر و الاذن لم تسمع و لم تخطر على قلب الانسان ما اعد الله للذين يحبونه

H. Staal, *Mt. Sinai Arabic Codex 151 I: The Pauline Epistles* (CSCO 452 and 453; Louvain, 1983).

<sup>86</sup>و لاكن كما هو مكتوب ما لم ترى عين و لم تسمع اذن و لم يخطر على قلب انسان ما قد اعد الله للذين يحبونه

M. D. Gibson, *An Arabic Version of the Epistles of St Paul to the Romans, Corinthians, Galatians with Part of the Epistles to the Ephesians* (Studia Sinaitica II; London: Cambridge University Press, 1894).

<sup>87</sup>Here the few differences: the *ḥadīth* uses the negation لا, the New Testament manuscripts have the negation لم; the *ḥadīth* uses for the ‘heart of man’ قلب بشر [*qalb bašar*], the manuscripts have قلب انسان [*qalb insān*].

<sup>88</sup>W. Lane, *Arabic-English Lexicon* (London: Willams & Norgate, 1863) 764–5; A. de Biberstein Kazimirski, *Dictionnaire Arabe-Français, Tome 1* (Paris: Maisonneuve, 1860) 593.

<sup>89</sup>H. E. Kassis, *A Concordance of the Qu’ran* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983).

<sup>90</sup>We used the research tools of <http://sunnah.com/>. See n. 83.

from another source. Yet, how can we then explain that this expression which is not the direct translation of ‘to come up’, appears both in the *ḥadīth* and the three Arabic versions?<sup>91</sup>

Here we also have to underline the intriguing uniformity of 1 Cor 2.9 in the three manuscripts. In fact, Sin. Ar. 151 was translated from Syriac,<sup>92</sup> Sin. Ar. 155 from Greek<sup>93</sup> and Vat. Ar. 13 shows influences from both Greek and Syriac.<sup>94</sup> Consequently, the manuscripts have often very different texts; in 1 Cor 2.9, it is interesting to see that the manuscripts have a very similar verse. Did the *ḥadīth* know one Arabic version to have the similar vocabulary? Or on the contrary did the translators of the Pauline letters know the *ḥadīth* tradition to have a uniform verse? Both are unlikely, but not impossible. Should we then suppose that the *ḥadīth* and the Arabic versions know another source or that they were both influenced by a popular saying?

Furthermore, we should also consider the Arabic *Apocr. GosJohn* 37.56, where we found: ‘what eye has not seen, nor ear heard, and what has not entered into the heart of man, I have prepared for those who believe in me before the ages’.<sup>95</sup> The eschatological promises in the apocryphal text and in the *ḥadīth* are very close. In both cases, we have an ‘I-formulation’,

---

<sup>91</sup>Furthermore, other versions of the New Testament such as the Vulgate, the Peshitta, the Harklean version, the Sahidic and Bohairic versions, have all translated ἀνέβη by ‘to come up’. Only the Ethiopic version has the verb ‘to think’ (Thanks to Charlotte Touati for this hint).

<sup>92</sup>Staal, *Mt. Sinai Arabic Codex* (CSCO 453), V–VII.

<sup>93</sup>Gibson, *An Arabic Version*, 7.

<sup>94</sup>See n. 84.

<sup>95</sup>و لم تبصره عين و لم يسمع به اذن و لا خطر على قلب بشر فاني اعددت ذلك للمؤمنيني قبل الدهور.

Edition of the Ambrosiana manuscript by I. Galbiati, *Iohannis evangelium apocryphum arabice* (Mediolani: In aedibus Mondadorianis, 1957), 159. See also L. Moraldi, *Vangelo Arabo apocrifo dell’Apostolo Giovanni da un Manoscritto della Biblioteca Ambrosiana* (Milan: Editoriale Jaca Book, 1991) 142.

but in the case of *Apocr. GosJohn* as a part of an eschatological discourse of Jesus. *Apocr. GosJohn* 37.56 also used the expression خطر على قلب بشر [*khaṭara ‘alá qalb bašar*]. The text is preserved in Arabic in two manuscripts from the twelfth and the fourteenth century but the researchers agree on an early translation from the Syriac, going back to the beginning of the ninth century.<sup>96</sup>

With the *ḥadīṭ* and *Apocr. GosJohn* 37.56, we face the same ‘bulk of communications between early Islam and Jewish and Christian traditions [that occurs] via the medium of Arabic as a language used by all three parties’<sup>97</sup> as for narratives about Mary’s life and Jesus’ childhood in Quranic material or Christian apocryphal texts. As for the *Isrā’īliyyāt*, the potential interactions between New Testament apocrypha and early Islamic literature were also underlined by De Prémare: ‘The text “What the eye has not seen” could equally have been used by the *ḥadīṭ* from a Christian pseudepigraph’.<sup>98</sup>

In short, we have textual similarities between three different Arabic versions of Paul, an Arabic Christian apocryphal text and a popular Islamic tradition, something that still has to be explained. Besides, the *ḥadīṭh* itself shares common features with *L.A.B.* 26.13 by describing a place, and also with *1 Clem* 34.8, as an eschatological promise pronounced by God and not by Jesus (Jesus’ sayings not being rare in the *aḥādīṭh*, see n. 78). Do we find here the trace of the independent written source?

## 6. Conclusion

---

<sup>96</sup>C. Horn, ‘Syriac and Arabic Perspectives on the Structural and Motif Parallels Regarding Jesus’ Childhood in Christian Apocrypha and Early Islamic Literature: The “Book of Mary”, the Arabic Apocryphal Gospel of John, and the Qur’an’, *Apocrypha* 19 (2008), 267–91, here 288

<sup>97</sup>Horn, ‘Syriac and Arabic Perspectives’, 291

<sup>98</sup>de Prémare, “Comme il est écrit”, 34 (our translation).

We have here some clues and many gaps to be filled with a certain amount of historical imagination. Yet even so, taking into the Islamic traditions regarding the saying of 1 Cor 2.9 does help to widen the debate and offers interesting attestations of the saying transmitted without any reference to a Christological context, placed in the mouth of God, describing a place, that is, Paradise. For research on the Christian apocrypha and Islamic scholarship on the *ḥadīth* to be mutually beneficial, a number of steps still need to be taken for the two disciplines to adapt to one another. Fikret Karcic, who takes note of the methodological differences between the Western academic approach and Islamic studies, sees one thing clearly: electronic means of research can only be of service in charting the innumerable versions of the *ḥadīth*.<sup>99</sup> Given the use of the expression ‘the apocryphal continent’,<sup>100</sup> it would be fitting to speak of an ‘ocean’ of *aḥādīth* as a corollary. The path taken by the *ḥadīth* that speaks of Paradise, which ‘eye has not seen’, as *ḥadīth qudsī* of a very respectable age, presents an interesting mirror image of the ‘apocryphal scripture’ to which 1 Cor 2.9 alludes.

In working through this question, it is a constant surprise to find that not only Paul, but also *I Clem* makes no distinction between the canonical Hebrew Scriptures and those that were not canonical.<sup>101</sup> In the third century CE, Origen apparently does not yet have any difficulty in

---

<sup>99</sup>See Karcic, ‘Textual Analysis in Islamic Studies: A Short Historical and Comparative Survey’, *Islamic Studies* 45 (2006/2), 191–220, 219; cf. his conclusion, Karcic, ‘Textual Analysis’, 220: ‘Textual analysis in Islamic studies may be improved by the development of language-related disciplines, the formulation of a general theory of interpretation of the revealed texts, and the adoption of adequate computer tools of analysis’. See our remarks n. 80.

<sup>100</sup>See J.-C. Picard, *Le Continent apocryphe: Essai sur les littératures apocryphes juive et chrétienne* (Instrumenta Patristica 36; Turnhout: Brepols, 1999).

<sup>101</sup>See Section 3 above and the analysis of the expressions using λέγει in *I Clement*.

thinking that Paul cited an unknown apocryphon,<sup>102</sup> whereas a century later Jerome<sup>103</sup> and Athanasius will no longer accept it. This quotation by Paul of an ‘apocryphal scripture’ has sometimes posed a difficulty for contemporary New Testament exegetes. This is illustrated, for example, by William Walker who uses textual criticism in an unconvincing way to attempt to view 1 Cor 2.6–9 as an interpolation.<sup>104</sup> Another example is Judith Kovacs who feels obliged to show in every way possible that 1 Cor 2.6–16 is in absolute conformity with Pauline thought.<sup>105</sup> It is most likely this concern that is expressed in the repeated tendency to opt for the hypothesis of an oral source behind the saying of 1 Cor 2.9.<sup>106</sup> Hopefully, by seriously underlining the fact that Paul states that he is quoting a scripture in 1 Cor 2.9 and by a careful consideration of *1 Clem*, the text cited in *1 Clem* 34.8 can be included alongside *L.A.B.* 26.13 among the independent written sources of the saying of 1 Cor 2.9. Similarly, considering the Islamic tradition reinforces the hypothesis of a written source, in the light of the *ḥadīth* that provides the saying. Meanwhile, a broad approach of the diverse attestations including *GosJud* 47.10–13, serves to underline that the Christological interpretation of the saying is not found before 1 Cor 2.9 but from then on is increasingly accentuated, either by the transformation of the saying into a *logion* of Jesus or by making the description of the saying apply to the person of Jesus. Therefore, against Paul’s interpretation, eschatology continues to prevail in the interpretative history of the saying: the description of ‘what eye has not seen’ is left in suspense as a future expectation. In conclusion, we can only be pleased

---

<sup>102</sup>See Verheyden, ‘Origen’, 498.

<sup>103</sup>See Verheyden, ‘Origen’, 491.

<sup>104</sup>See W. O. J. Walker, ‘1 Corinthians 2.6-16: A Non-Pauline Interpolation’, *JSNT* 47 (1992), 75-94; W. O. J. Walker, *Interpolations in the Pauline Letters* (JSNT.S 213; London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001).

<sup>105</sup>See J. L. Kovacs, ‘The Archons, the Spirit and the Death of Christ: Do We Need the Hypothesis of Gnostic Opponents to Explain 1 Corinthians 2.6-16?’, *Apocalyptic and the New Testament. Essays in Honor of J. Louis Martyn* (ed. J. Marcus, M. L. Soards; JSNT.S 24; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989) 217–36.

<sup>106</sup>Cf. the discussion in Section 2 above.

about the fact that Paul read *other* texts, and that Muhammad and his followers were interested in the ‘tales of the ancients’.<sup>107</sup> Without their curiosity, the saying ‘what eye has not seen’ would perhaps not have left its trace in 1 Cor 2.9 and in the *ḥadīth*.

---

<sup>107</sup>He is reproached for this (cf. Surah 25.4–5).