



No Wisdom, No Trinity: Why (the Biblical Figure of) Wisdom Matters for Interpreting and Confessing the Trinity

LOIS MALCOLM

The doctrine of the Trinity often confuses people. Is it about two men and a bird, as is often depicted in Christian art? Is it a nonsensical mathematical equation about three being equal to one? And yet the Trinity is at the heart of baptismal confession, when believers profess faith in Christ Jesus and renounce all the forces that defy God, including sin, death, and demonic powers.¹

But what does it mean to confess faith in the triune God? And what does it mean to do so in an age when, on the one hand, faith in God is either nonexistent or connected only with vague moral or spiritual intuitions² or, on the other hand, aligned with beliefs and practices that often explicitly link the “Christian

¹ See “Holy Baptism,” in *Evangelical Lutheran Worship* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2006), 229.

² See Charles Taylor, *A Secular Age* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2018). For a discussion of moral therapeutic deism, see Christian Smith and Melinda Lundquist Denton, *Soul Searching: The Religious and Spiritual Lives of American Teenagers* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011).

The biblical wisdom tradition is often seen as an incidental or even marginal addition to biblical theology, at best a sort of alternative voice in the conversation. But when considering the development and implementation of the Christian doctrine of the Trinity, it seems that the wisdom tradition plays a central role in forging and understanding this doctrine.

God” with the supremacy of one group of human beings over others (based, e.g., on gender, race or ethnicity, class, etc.)?³ In this essay, I address these questions by spotlighting a theme often neglected in modern accounts of Trinitarian theology—the biblical figure of Wisdom. I contend that this figure provides a profoundly faithful and generative resource for interpreting and confessing the triune God in our time.⁴

I make this case in three parts. First, I examine Wisdom’s role in the formation of Trinitarian and christological dogmas. Then, I discuss how these creedal formulations might be deepened and expanded by relating them to their roots in biblical wisdom literature. I conclude by addressing, in light of these reflections, what the confession of the triune God might mean for our lives today and for our relation to the world around us.

WISDOM IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF TRINITARIAN DOCTRINE

The Apostles’ and Nicene Creeds are two of the oldest and most widely accepted creeds within Christianity.⁵ In a comparison of these creeds, Oskar Skarsaune points out that the Apostles’ Creed centers on the proclamation that Jesus is the Messiah: it highlights his birth, which confirms that he is from the house of David (being born of Mary), and his death, where the references to his resurrection, and to his ascension and heavenly enthronement at the right hand of the Father, serve to tell the story of his being enthroned as Messiah.⁶

By contrast, the Nicene Creed speaks of Jesus as the Wisdom of God in order to accentuate that, on the one hand, he is the one through whom God created the world and that, on the other, he was incarnate and became truly human. In doing so, the Nicene Creed draws not on biblical messianic imagery, but on New Testament texts that identify Jesus with the biblical figure of Wisdom.⁷

Skarsaune demonstrates the Nicene Creed’s reliance on wisdom imagery by providing an analysis of biblical allusions in a similar but earlier creed:⁸

³ For discussions of Christianity and race, see Robert P. Jones, *White Too Long: The Legacy of White Supremacy in American Christianity* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2020); and Michael Luo, “American Christianity’s White-Supremacy Problem,” *The New Yorker* (September 2, 2020): <https://tinyurl.com/anzr9twp>. For a discussion of Christianity and gender, see Sophia Bjork-James, “White Sexual Politics: The Patriarchal Family in White Nationalism and the Religious Right,” *Transforming Anthropology* 28, no. 1, 58–73.

⁴ For an earlier, and very different, version of this argument, see Lois Malcolm, “On Not Three Male Gods: Retrieving Wisdom in Trinitarian Discourse,” *Dialog: A Journal of Theology* 49, no. 3 (2010): 238–247.

⁵ See the classic monograph on the formation of the creeds, John N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds* (London: Longman, 1972).

⁶ See Oskar Skarsaune, “From the Jewish Messiah to the Creeds of the Church,” *Evangelical Review of Theology* 32, no. 3 (2008), 224–237.

⁷ Skarsaune, “From the Jewish Messiah,” 230–237.

⁸ According to Skarsaune, this creed was used during the baptism of Eusebius of Caesarea, probably in the 260s or 270s; Skarsaune, “From the Jewish Messiah,” 230. As noted above, the chief sources for this creed include New Testament texts with allusions to the figure of Wisdom (John 1:1–18; 1 Cor 8:6; Col 1:15–20; Heb 1:3; John 1:1–18); the personified figure of Wisdom is depicted in Prov 8:22–31; Sir 24:1–37; and Wis 7:22–30.

And [we believe] in one Lord, Jesus Christ (1 Cor 8:6),
the Logos of God,
God from God,
light from God, life from life (John 1:1–4; on light, see Wis 7:26; on life,
see John 5:21–26),
Son only begotten (John 1:14, 18; 3:16, 18),
first-begotten before all creation (Col 1:15; Prov 8:22),
begotten before all ages from the Father (Prov 8:23 LXX),
through whom all things came into being (1 Cor 8:6; John 1:3; Col 1:16;
Heb 1:2; Gen 1:1; Prov 8:22–30; Wis 7:22),
who because of our salvation was incarnate (John 1:14; Sir 24:8),
and dwelt among humans (Bar 3:38),
and suffered,
and rose again on the third day,
and ascended to the Father,
and will come again in glory to judge the living and the dead.

This link between Jesus and Wisdom was not without precedent.⁹ Already in Second Temple Judaism, the figure of Wisdom was identified with God’s Word (in Philo) and with the Torah (in Sirach and the Rabbis). Moreover, based on an analogy between the Hebrew *reshit* (“beginning”) in Genesis 1:1 and in Proverbs 8:22, the Torah was interpreted to be a preexistent tool or plan through which the world was created. Given these associations, it is not surprising that Jews who trusted in Jesus as the Messiah would identify him as God’s Wisdom—and God’s Word and Torah—the one through whom the world was created and who became flesh and dwelled among us.¹⁰

*Given these associations, it is not surprising that Jews
who trusted in Jesus as the Messiah would identify him
as God’s Wisdom—and God’s Word and Torah—the one
through whom the world was created and who became
flesh and dwelled among us.*

The Council of Nicaea (325) adopted a creed similar to this one. However, it added the phrase “of the same substance” (Greek: *homoousios*) in order to emphasize that the Son is “of the same stuff” as the Father (since, as Athanasius would argue, only as divine could the Son save and divinize human beings). As Skarsaune observes, this term was added only to clarify the nature of the Father-and-Son relationship within the Trinity.¹¹ As described in treatises by Tertullian and Athanasius, among others, although this relationship was analogous

⁹ Skarsaune, “From the Jewish Messiah,” 234–235.

¹⁰ See John 1:1–18 and Sir 24:1–37.

¹¹ See Skarsaune, “From the Jewish Messiah,” 230.

to human relationships between fathers and sons, it was also radically distinct from these creaturely relationships; thus, it could also be portrayed by way of metaphors depicting God's relationship to the figure of Wisdom.¹² A primary metaphor for this was the mental production of a word, or wisdom coming forth from the mind.¹³ Yet another was the way an image (or impress or seal) reflects its prototype.¹⁴ Finally, three related images were commonly used to portray Wisdom's coming from and going out of God: light from light, tree from root, and river from source.¹⁵

These metaphors for depicting Trinitarian relations were commonplace in the ancient church. With a few notable exceptions (the main one being Irenaeus, who associated Christ with the Word and the Holy Spirit with Wisdom), the majority of early church theologians associated Christ with Wisdom (including not only Justin Tertullian, Origen, Athanasius, but also the Cappadocians, and Augustine), frequently speaking of him as the Father's "Word and Wisdom."¹⁶ Indeed, a major point of controversy at the Council of Nicaea was whether Christ was "begotten" or "created," an issue that, because it had to do with the Septuagint translation of Proverbs 8:22, only exemplifies the importance of that Wisdom text for interpreting Christ's identity.¹⁷

The Council of Constantinople (381) reaffirmed the creed of 325, but with two additional emphases. It highlighted Christ's full humanity (since only by fully assuming human experience, body and soul, could Christ redeem it) and in so doing also highlighted the Holy Spirit's divinity (since only as divine could the Spirit give life and raise the dead; Jesus's human spirit could not do this). Thus, in a fashion analogous to the argument given at Nicaea for Christ's needing to be divine, the case was made at Constantinople that the Holy Spirit could not be inferior to God. In this way, the Council of Constantinople, which led to the "Nicene Creed," laid the groundwork for what would be affirmed as Trinitarian dogma.

However, it also made two christological claims, which as we have seen have their roots in the appropriation of Wisdom themes, in order to accentuate (1) that Jesus is the one through whom God created the world and (2) that he was incarnate and became truly human.¹⁸ The Council of Chalcedon (451) would flesh out these two themes more fully, asserting that Christ is fully divine ("of one substance with the Father as regards his Godhead") and fully human ("one substance with

¹² See Skarsaune, "From the Jewish Messiah," 230. For a discussion of the three types of wisdom metaphors, see Kathryn Tanner, "Gender," in Mark Chapman, Sathianathan Clarke, Ian Douglas, and Martyn Percy, eds., *Oxford Handbook of Anglican Studies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), www.oxfordhandbooks.com, p. 7.

¹³ See Sir 24:3; see also Prov 8:22–31.

¹⁴ See Wis 7:26.

¹⁵ All three metaphors are present in Sir 24:1–37, but see also for light from light, Wis 7:26; for tree from root, Prov 3:18; from river and source, Bar 3:12.

¹⁶ See Malcolm, "On Not Three Male Gods," for references to the primary literature.

¹⁷ See Athanasius, *Against the Arians* 2:18–82.

¹⁸ Compare John 1:1–18 and Sir 1:1–37.

us as regards his humanness”)—as “one person” in “two natures,” which are to be neither confused nor separated.¹⁹

WISDOM AS A BIBLICAL RESOURCE FOR TRINITARIAN THEOLOGY

If the figure of Wisdom played a role in the biblical exegesis leading to the formation of the creeds, then it also provides a means for addressing whether or not the creeds—and the ancient church’s Logos-theology that they presupposed—necessarily sever the Christian faith from its biblical roots, turning Jesus into a divine savior for individual gentile souls rather than Israel’s Messiah.²⁰ It is true, of course, that as Christianity spread among gentiles, early Christian understandings of Jesus as the Logos were often interpreted in relation to a middle Platonic sense of the Logos as the divine principle of reason linking the human mind to the mind of God and cosmic order.²¹ However, as biblical scholars have long recognized, the term *logos* in the prologue to the Gospel of John presupposes the personification of Wisdom found in the Septuagint.²² In a similar fashion, other New Testament hymns drew on Wisdom imagery to speak about Christ’s cosmic significance.²³

*However, as biblical scholars have long recognized, the term *logos* in the prologue to the Gospel of John presupposes the personification of Wisdom found in the Septuagint. In a similar fashion, other New Testament hymns drew on Wisdom imagery to speak about Christ’s cosmic significance.*

Thus, we can locate the interpretive framework for understanding Trinitarian and christological dogmas—and the Logos theology they presupposed—within the context of biblical wisdom literature. Doing so enables us to address three difficulties that often arise when we compare the creeds with biblical traditions.²⁴ The first difficulty is that the ancient church’s Logos-theology makes no reference to, as Jürgen Moltmann has put it, “Christology’s prehistory in the Old

¹⁹ Richard A. Norris, *The Christological Controversy* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980), 1–31.

²⁰ See Skarsaune, “From the Jewish Messiah,” 224–226.

²¹ See Paul Foster, “Logos,” in Ian A. McFarland, David A. S. Fergusson, Karen Kilby, and Iain R. Torrance, eds., *The Cambridge Dictionary of Christian Theology* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 285–287.

²² See John 1:1–18; cf. Prov 8:22–31 and Sir 24:1–37.

²³ New Testament christological hymns include Phil 2:6–11; Col 1:15–20; Eph 2:14–16; and John 1:1–18; see Jack T. Sanders, *The New Testament Christological Hymns: Their Historical Religious Background* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971). Pauline texts that have links with personified Wisdom include, e.g., 1 Cor 1:18–30; 2:6–8; 8:6; 10:1–4; 2 Cor 3:18; 4:4; Rom 10:6–10; Phil 2:6–11.

²⁴ Jürgen Moltmann lists these difficulties in *The Way of Jesus Christ* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995), 69–70.

Testament history of promise.²⁵ However, if we interpret the early church's Logos-theology in light of Jewish wisdom literature—for example, the books of Sirach and the Wisdom of Solomon (found in the Jewish Apocrypha)—we find resources that already relate sapiential themes to biblical narrative and law. In a related vein, as Daniel Boyarin has pointed out, biblical and other Jewish sources can help us interpret early Christian creedal formulations. These include traditions that link the Messiah with the Wisdom of God, that speak about a Messiah who suffers, and that name God in ways that allow for differentiation within God's life even as they also maintain God's unity and oneness.²⁶

A second difficulty is that early church dogmas do not mention the proclamation and ministry of Jesus between his birth and death.²⁷ This difficulty, however, is also rooted in differences within the New Testament texts themselves. And here again, wisdom motifs provide us with a means for relating these seemingly diverse biblical pictures of Jesus's identity. Not only do they enable us to understand Jesus as the Wisdom through whom God creates and sustains the world (as in Johannine and Pauline literature), but they also provide us with the means for understanding him as the righteous sufferer in whom wisdom is embodied, in spite of the injustice he suffers (as in the Synoptic Gospels).

A final difficulty is that the ancient church, with its emphasis on Christ as the risen Lord glorified as *pantocrator*, tended to lose the eschatological edge found in much of the New Testament, which expected Christ's *parousia*, his coming again, to be imminent.²⁸ Of course, within the New Testament itself there exists a tension between the "eschatological proviso" found in Paul's undisputed letters and the "realized eschatology" of Ephesians and Colossians, and these viewpoints are not easily harmonized.²⁹ However, both sets of letters forge a link between creation and resurrection, defining the risen Christ in relation to the Wisdom that created all things and brings them into cohesion and harmony.³⁰ Moreover, they both accord cosmic and universal significance to Christ's death, which brings reconciliation to the entire cosmos through the sufferings of Jesus the Messiah, the one who died for all so that all might live.³¹ These themes, which are at the heart of Paul's proclamation of the crucified Messiah as the "Wisdom of God," provide resources for a contemporary reconstruction of creedal dogmas in view of their biblical sources.³² We turn to this task in the next section.

²⁵ Moltmann, *Way of Jesus Christ*, 70.

²⁶ See Daniel Boyarin, *The Jewish Gospels: The Story of the Jewish Christ* (New York: New Press, 2012).

²⁷ Moltmann, *Way of Jesus Christ*, 70.

²⁸ Moltmann, *Way of Jesus Christ*, 70.

²⁹ Moltmann, *Way of Jesus Christ*, 285–86.

³⁰ See Rom 4:17.

³¹ 2 Cor 5:14–6:10.

³² 1 Cor 1:30.

CONFESSING THE TRINITY

So far, I have argued that the biblical figure of Wisdom is indispensable not only for understanding the evolution of Trinitarian and christological dogmas, but also for helping us relate these later creedal traditions to their biblical roots. However, the Christian Trinity is first and foremost a baptismal confession.³³ When one confesses the Trinity, one renounces sin, death, and demonic powers and embraces trust and hope in, as Paul puts it, in an early formula, “the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Spirit.”³⁴ So, what does it mean to make such a confession, especially in an age when faith in God is, at one extreme, often either questioned or linked with vague intuitions, and at another extreme, frequently associated with beliefs and practices that warrant the supremacy of one group over another in terms of the identity of the Christian God?

In the first place, by defining Jesus’s identity in relation to the figure of Wisdom, we are saying with the Nicene Creed that there is no middle ground where Jesus as the Messiah is less than God but more than a creature.³⁵ This understanding of Jesus’s identity, however, assumes that God is not another being or agent alongside others but the one in whom we live and move and have our being.³⁶ Thus, when we affirm with the Chalcedonian Creed that Jesus is fully divine, we are affirming that he is the one through whom God creates and sustains us and the entire cosmos. With the same creed, however, we affirm that Jesus as God’s Wisdom became fully incarnate and dwelt among us, completely sharing in our humanity. In affirming Jesus’s full divinity and his full humanity, we affirm that he is one person, even as his divine and human natures can neither be “separated” nor “confused.” Thus, we might say, following Rowan Williams, that in Jesus God’s relationship to creatures is “non-dual” (i.e., not separated from us), even as it is also “non-identical” (i.e., not fused with us in ways that would negate the ontological difference that holds between God and creatures).³⁷

In view of such claims, patristic theologians understood the Trinity in relation to the Greek concept of *perichoresis*, which they defined as an “inseparable mutual indwelling” that has no creaturely analogy.³⁸ Such *perichoresis* precludes any “subordinationism” in which there might be hierarchy within the Trinity since divine life is such that all Persons share equally in it. Likewise, it precludes any “tritheism” in which the Trinitarian Persons are related to one another as separate subjectivities, analogous to the way human persons are related to one another. Thus, early church theologians emphasized such things as God’s simplicity and incomprehensibility, and a nuanced understanding of how all our speech about

³³ Matt 28:19.

³⁴ 2 Cor 13:13.

³⁵ See Rowan Williams, *Christ the Heart of Creation* (London: Bloomsbury Continuum, 2018), xi–xvi.

³⁶ Acts 17:28.

³⁷ Williams, *Christ the Heart*, xiv.

³⁸ See Ian A. McFarland, *The Word Made Flesh: A Theology of the Incarnation* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2019), 34–37.

God must in some way be analogical.³⁹ In line with both Jewish and Greek critiques of idolatry, they eschewed any attempt to identify some aspect of creaturely experience as being somehow either farther from or closer to God than others, even though they acknowledged that God manifests the divine presence among us with varying degrees of intensity and clarity.

Thus, when we affirm with the Chalcedonian Creed that Jesus is fully divine, we are affirming that he is the one through whom God creates and sustains us and the entire cosmos. With the same creed, however, we affirm that Jesus as God's Wisdom became fully incarnate and dwelt among us, completely sharing in our humanity.

In more practical terms, these formulations should cause us to question the near exclusive privilege often given to father and son language in much classical and contemporary Trinitarian theology—a privileging often connected with a re-mythologizing of the Christian confession and problematic identity statements that, explicitly or implicitly, seek to assert the superiority of one group over others (e.g., based on gender).⁴⁰ As the patristic fathers would have maintained, God has no gender. Likewise, the father-son relationship used to depict the Trinitarian relations is analogous to, but also radically different from, human parent-child relationships. Most significantly, the plethora of wisdom-related terms and images used in tandem with father-son language to depict these relations within the Trinity point us in the direction of a kind of “baffling of gender literalism.”⁴¹ The Father gives birth to a Son; Jesus is both a messianic king and the feminine personification of God’s Sophia; and the Spirit is both a masculine-like figure in the conception of Jesus in Mary’s womb, and a feminine-like figure who “groans” like a mother giving birth, amid creation’s and our own sighs and groans.⁴²

At the same time, God’s Word and Wisdom speak in and as a human being who is not only subject to the vulnerability of mortal life, but also at the mercy of the most blatant and haughty forms of human violence and injustice.⁴³ Early on, Paul proclaimed that it was precisely as a crucified Messiah that Jesus is the Wisdom of God, one “[whose] foolishness is wiser than human wisdom, and [whose] weakness is stronger than human strength”—bringing to naught our wish for “signs”

³⁹ See Lewis Ayres, *Nicaea and Its Legacy: An Approach to Fourth-Century Trinitarian Theology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 273–301.

⁴⁰ Tanner, “Gender”; see also her *Christ the Key* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 207–46, and Williams, *Christ the Heart*.

⁴¹ Janet Martin Soskice, “Trinity and Feminism,” in Susan Frank Parsons, ed., *Cambridge Companion to Feminist Theology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 146.

⁴² Rom 8:19–26.

⁴³ Williams, *Christ the Heart*, 253.

of a miraculous power that would triumph over our enemies, and our desire for a “wisdom” that would secure us in the face of contingency and impermanence.⁴⁴

Through his death, Jesus reconciles all things in the cosmos. In turn, his being raised from the dead confirms not only that he is the personification of God’s Word and Wisdom through whom all things are created out of nothing and are sustained, but also that his life-giving presence is now manifest universally and in a definitive way precisely as the incarnate and crucified one or, as Martin Luther put it, “according to his humanity.”⁴⁵ Thus, as Elizabeth Johnson has pointed out, what is at issue in Jesus’s being fully embodied as a human being is not his gender, class, race and ethnicity, or any other particularity of his, but the completeness of his being fully human, even to the point of suffering and experiencing death so that all could be redeemed.⁴⁶

What this means is that the Messiah is now embodied everywhere and anywhere—“in the living and nonliving, in the animate and the inanimate, wherever pain and death are at stake and the resurrection is a promise, a new creation.”⁴⁷ In other words, Christ is there whenever and wherever we encounter “the body of creation, suffering human bodies, Jewish bodies, the ecclesial body (indwelt by the Holy Spirit), the ‘body’ of world religions, and the historical ‘body’ of humanity.”⁴⁸ As the one who, in the words of Chalcedon, is “one in being with us as to his humanity,” his presence is mediated here and now in an infinite variety of ways and with varying degrees of intensity and clarity—until the consummation of all things in his eschatological body.⁴⁹

In this time between his resurrection and his coming again, we affirm that Jesus of Nazareth is God’s Word and Wisdom, the unique embodiment of an agency that holds the diversity of creation in unified tension.⁵⁰ As we trust and hope in him, we are incorporated into his messianic identity; we become a member of his “body,” a new community defined not by the tribal god of a particular race, ethnicity, class, gender, or such, but by sharing in Jesus’s life and its mercy, righteousness, and justice. And yet, even as it is centered in the Messiah’s identity, this new community is characterized not by a stultifying uniformity, but by the pluriform variety of gifts and experiences that shape each member’s individuality and distinctive contribution to the shared vocation of being the Messiah’s emissaries in the world.⁵¹

⁴⁴ 1 Cor 1:18–25.

⁴⁵ Vitor Westhelle, *Transfiguring Luther: The Planetary Promise of Luther’s Theology* (Eugene: Cascade, 2016), 246, with a footnote to Martin Luther, *Luther’s Works*, 37:218.

⁴⁶ Elizabeth Johnson, “Redeeming the Name of Christ,” in *Freeing Theology*, ed. Catherine Lacugna (New York: Harper & Row, 1993), 115–137.

⁴⁷ Westhelle, *Transfiguring Luther*, 246–247.

⁴⁸ Gerald O’Collins, *Christology: A Biblical, Historical, and Systematic Study of Jesus Christ* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 318.

⁴⁹ O’Collins, *Christology*, 318.

⁵⁰ Williams, *Christ the Heart*.

⁵¹ My reflection on these matters has been informed by my work on a committee at Luther Seminary dealing with the ABIDE document (including Kenneth Reynhout, Leon Rodriguez, Mark Tranvik, and Matthew Skinner, committee chair).

Baptized into the Messiah's death and life, we each now share in the same intimacy that Jesus had with his Father—crying “Abba, Father!” as he did through the Spirit's bearing witness with our spirit that we too are God's children.⁵² Grounded in the intimacy Jesus had with God as a parent, we also share in Jesus's saving mission of proclaiming and embodying God's reign of justice and mercy. In so doing, we fully represent the Messiah, being ourselves in the Spirit “Messiahs” (or “Christs”) to one another.⁵³ And as we do so, we become a community defined not by master-slave relations, but by the Messiah's work of bringing about reconciliation and righteousness among us amid conflict and injustice, and equity amid the inequalities of some enjoying the surplus of abundance and others suffering in need.⁵⁴

As such a community, the *ekklesia*—the public assembly or church that is Christ's body—exists not as another sectarian group seeking to secure its status in a secularizing and multireligious age. Our missionary call centers not on entering “a competitive religious struggle” with others, but rather on being “a peace-giving and unifying community” that bears witness to the reconciliation that is the “eschatological horizon of the cosmos” in Christ.⁵⁵ In this task, we can echo the biblical and creedal naming of Jesus as the Wisdom of God, which secures faith firmly in the mystery of the Trinity while also providing a thread from creation through the incarnation, the ministry of Jesus, his crucifixion and resurrection, and his inauguration of a universal eschaton in which God will be all in all.⁵⁶ If the Old Testament describes the Wisdom of God as the life of creation, then we can, with the New Testament, speak of how Jesus as the crucified Messiah, in whom the whole fullness of the Godhead dwells bodily, not only reconciles us through his death, but also gathers us and all creation up through his raised life in which all acts of violence and injustice end, replaced instead by a community of peace and justice in which created beings exist with, for, and in one another through their participation in the *perichoretic* triune life of God.⁵⁷ ⊕

LOIS MALCOLM is the Olin and Amanda Fjelstad Reigstad Chair of Systematic Theology. She is currently completing two forthcoming books: *A Theological Commentary on Second Corinthians for the Belief series (Westminster John Knox)* and *Sophia Cries Out in the Street: Wisdom in Christian Theology (Fortress)*.

⁵² Rom 8:15–17.

⁵³ Johnson, “Redeeming the Name,” 131.

⁵⁴ 2 Cor 5:14–6:10; 2 Cor 8:1–9:15.

⁵⁵ Moltmann, *Way of Jesus Christ*, 284.

⁵⁶ 1 Cor 15; Collins, *Christology*, 315–318.

⁵⁷ Moltmann, *Way of Jesus Christ*, 255.