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ABSTRACT

PRIMEVAL HISTORY ACCORDING TO PAUL:
“IN ADAM” AND “IN CHRIST” IN ROMANS

Timothy A. Gabrielson, B.S., B.S., M.A.
Marquette University, 2016

Paul's comparison of Adam and Christ in Rom 5:12–21 is among the most influential doctrines in the Bible and Christian theology. Often it has been used to summarize God’s purposes in creation and redemption, from humanity’s “fall” in Adam to its restoration in Christ. In the past several decades, however, it has increasingly been seen as provisional and functional because the Jewish writings used to support it have now been dated after the apostle's lifetime. This study retrieves the traditional position, but does so by appeal to different corpora of Jewish texts, those that are prior or contemporary to Paul.

After considering the most prominent interpretations of Rom 5 over the past century, and the increasing questions surrounding it, I argue that it is hard to explain Paul’s interest in the comparison and the rhetoric of Romans without the presence of underlying Adamic traditions. Turning to Greco-Roman Jewish thought about primeval history, I organize the traditions into a fivefold taxonomy: Adam as (1) the head of humanity, a (2) paradigmatic pattern and (3) moral warning, as well as a (4) bearer of disaster and (5) glorious figure. Of these, the first, fourth, and fifth are relevant for Rom 5. To combine these three, I propose a construct called “participatory domains” wherein a single figure, a heavenly or earthly patron, rules over a people and their destinies are intertwined. I then apply this construct to Romans, particularly the Adam-Christ typology, to demonstrate that it solves longstanding riddles within the text and provides a cohesive account of the letter as a whole. Insofar as the proposal is satisfactory, it holds a number of consequences for Christian theology and Pauline studies.
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“O happy fault,
that earned so great, so glorious a Redeemer!”
— Exsultet of the Easter Vigil
INTRODUCTION — A FERTILE STORY: THE DIVERSE READINGS OF GENESIS
1–3

“. . . but now I will tell you the whole truth. The fact is, I — corrupted them all!”
– Dostoevsky, “The Dream of a Ridiculous Man”

The Diverse Readings of Genesis 1–3

The narrative of the garden of Eden is fertile, and with its fecundity comes a great
 diversity of meaning. At times the diversity is obscured. Ask a class of intelligent, at
 least moderately religious undergraduates to relay the plot of Gen 2–3, and you
 receive a version along these lines: Adam and Eve are created immortal and live in
 perfect world, naked and tending a garden. God tells them not to partake of the tree
 of good and evil, but Satan enters and tempts Eve to eat the apple. She does and
 then gives it to Adam, who also eats. This is “original sin,” at which God becomes
 angry, curses them with labor pains, toil, and mortality, and sends them out of
 paradise. And so evil and death become part of the world.

---

1 The version I quote is Fyodor Dostoevsky, “The Dream of a Ridiculous Man: A Fantastic
Story,” in The Best Short Stories of Fyodor Dostoevsky, trans. David Magarshack (New York: Modern
Library, 2001), 280.
The tale is eminently familiar. Whatever their opinion of the story, they have little doubt that they know it well enough. But if you prompt them to ask questions about it, an assortment of possible meanings begins to appear: “Why is God against knowledge?” “Why didn’t he kill Adam and Eve ‘on the same day’ they ate?” “If humans committed the first sin, why is there already a crafty tempter in the garden, and why did God let him in?” “Wait — the snake once walked on legs?” With even a second, closer reading, a number of oddities emerge, and more accrue if you ask students to demonstrate certain aspects of the text: the identity of the fruit, the presence of Satan, the concept of original sin. It does not take long to realize that primeval history could be taken to imply a wide variety of things.

The fertility of the story is evident in high art and pop culture as well. The snake and apple are instantly recognizable as symbols of sin and seduction, whether in advertisements, television, or movies. In literature, Eden is a popular topic. Famous in this regard is John Milton’s epic *Paradise Lost*, and much of the English-

---

2 To give an example from advertising, Katie B. Edwards (*Admen and Eve: The Bible in Contemporary Advertizing*, BMW 48 [Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2012]) argues that the figure of Eve in contemporary marketing portrays women as irresistibly alluring, but in reality men still control the money and power.
speaking world is profoundly influenced by the blind poet’s imagination. In American letters, *East of Eden*, which John Steinbeck considered his greatest novel, layers the stories of primeval history onto an inter-generational tale of early twentieth-century northern California. Dostoevsky’s short story, “The Dream of a Ridiculous Man,” presents a despairing character who falls asleep contemplating suicide, and in his nighttime vision he is transported to another world, unsullied by corruption. He becomes their Adam, their original sin: “like the germ of the plague infecting whole kingdoms, so did I infect with myself all that happy earth that knew no sin before me.” And yet he loves the world more after its fall, however much he pities its inhabitants, and he wakes from his dream able to see beauty and truth amidst the pain on this earth. Examples such as these abound, and that abundance bespeaks the potency of the original narrative.

---

3 Just as he himself was formed by the traditions that came before him. Although it is now a bit dated, J. M. Evans (Paradise Lost and the Genesis Tradition [Oxford: Clarendon, 1968], 7–104) seeks to ground Milton’s poem in part in the foregoing exegetical tradition.

4 Dostoevsky, “Ridiculous Man,” 280.
There is the telling of Adam and Eve in Gen 1–3, and then there are its many and varied retellings ever since. Disentangling the manifold versions is difficult, since each new version builds on previous iterations, altering certain points and adopting others, at times doing so unawares. In recent years there have been many attempts in scholarship to return to the original tale in its ancient Near Eastern setting and discover its intent apart from later interpreters, to reread it for modern times or with newer critical methods, to examine it in dialogue with science, to locate its reception in a particular time and place, and to chart its influence over the millennia — or to do some combination of the above.

5 Incidentally, among the most influential works of literary theory in the twentieth century was concerned with this process of “mimesis,” compared with realistic literature that takes non-repeatable events and individuals as serious concerns of high art. I speak, of course, of Erich Auerbach, Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature, trans. Willard R. Trask (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1968). Among his interests are Adam and Eve in the High Middle Ages (pp. 143–73).

One of the most influential efforts to elucidate the logic of Gen 1–3 on its own terms, un.behelden to later interpretations, is James Barr’s *The Garden of Eden* und zur relativ-chronologischen Einordnung von Gen 1–3, FRLANT 256 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2014).


and the Hope of Immortality. It is not the case, he says, that Gen 2–3 presents perfect and everlasting life once secured and then lost, but rather two ordinary individuals, imperfect from the start but still created “good.” Immortality was, for a time, within their grasp, but they let it slip away. As told, though, the story does not lament death as an unnatural force, but like the rest of the HB and much of post-biblical Jewish tradition it accepts mortality as an inevitable part of human history, tragic only when a life is cut short. People are made, after all, from dust, and to dust they return. Ultimately, Genesis envisions the soul’s immortality, and that is later complemented by the doctrine of physical resurrection.

My own intent is not to champion a return to Genesis as if with a tabula rasa, although there is much to be gained by the endeavors of Barr and his confrères. My goal is, in fact, much the opposite. I am interested in establishing why, among all the

---


8 Ibid., 1–20. Barr notes figures like Enoch and Elijah in the HB, and Moses in various apocryphal stories, who do achieve immortality. Adam and Eve could have been like these but squandered their chance.

9 Ibid., 21–56. Barr also maintains, contra a significant stream of OT scholarship, that the ancient Hebrews did believe in a soul distinct from the body, and that the soul would live on after death. This is not simply “Greek” thought, as some portray it to be.

10 Ibid., 94–116. In the intervening two chapters Barr considers the place of knowledge and sexuality in the story (pp. 57–73) and the story as it progresses through the flood (pp. 74–93).
possible ways of reading Gen 1–3, Christians have come to interpret it within a narrow band of meaning, as a story about the entrance of sin and death, of profound loss, of alienation from God, and of the rending of humanity from the rest of creation. For Barr there is no question who is responsible for reading it as a “fall” narrative: “This understanding derives essentially from St. Paul.” While Barr might be characterized as wanting to free Christianity from unnecessary shackles, not only from the way we read one particular text but from the theological weight of original sin, I am interested in the one who bound Christianity to its darker reading of primeval history, and why he did so.

Nonetheless, I am in basic agreement with Barr. The account of Adam and Eve in Genesis is open to a great diversity of possible interpretations. Jewish tradition in the Persian, Greek, and Roman eras provides ample support, in that there are myriad ways primeval history stimulates theological reflection, is parsed in

[11] Ibid., 4–5. Barr explains himself further, “It is important to perceive that this analogy is very much Paul’s own property. So widely established did it become in Christian thought and tradition that one does not easily become aware of its narrow basis within the New Testament itself. The typology of Adam and Christ is absent from the teaching of Jesus, from the Gospels in general, from the other Johannine literature, from Hebrews, Peter and James, from everything. Jesus himself, though he noted some features of the early Genesis story in other respects, shows no interest in Adam or Eve as the persons who brought sin and death into the world. Apart from Paul, Adam is mentioned little in the entire New Testament and only incidentally . . . . Clearly, the emphasis on the sin of Eve and Adam as the means by which death came into the world was not considered a universal necessity in New Testament Christianity.” See also p. ix.
debates, and is retold in other narratives. Paul was heir to a number of assumptions and interpretations, and, creative thinker that he was, he contributed his own inventive reading of the tale, one that takes the Messiah to be the counterpart of Adam. The darkness of his interpretation sets in brighter relief the glory of Christ, yet without negating a real commensurability between Adam and Jesus.\footnote{I will use “commensurate” or “commensurable,” as well as synonymous terms, a number of times to describe the relation of Adam and Christ. My intent is not to say that Adam, even before the fall, is equal to the stature of Christ in Paul’s mind. Jesus is an absolutely unique individual for the apostle. My goal, rather, is to say that there is a proportionality between Adam and Christ that is replicated in no other human being, save perhaps Eve. For Paul, the prelapsarian Adam establishes a better measure for the glorified Messiah than any other human, including the greats like Abraham, Moses, and David, and Adam’s “fall” is the fastest way for Paul to illustrate Jesus’s elevation.}

**The Project: Intent, Limits, Methodology, and Criteria**

The intent of the following work is to analyze the Pauline juxtaposition of Adam and Christ, especially as it appears in Rom 5:12–21, and compare it to other understandings of primeval history found among Greco-Romans Jews. In general the Adam-Christ typology has received less and less attention as the twentieth century
has flowed into the twenty-first, with the result that scholars often dispute that original sin is to be found in the passage. That, many say, is a later development.\(^\text{13}\)

Even more considerable has been the conclusion that Adam plays no role in Paul’s Christology. The similarity, on this view, is functional and provisional.

Although I allow that certain qualifications are in order, I disagree with both conclusions. On the basis of the extant literature of the Greco-Roman period, there is good reason to think that Paul articulated something like original sin and advocated a certain ontological likeness between Adam and Christ. In arguing for these points I propose a construct of “participatory domains” to explicate the way in which Adam’s sin and Christ’s death can affect humanity.

Delimiting the writings to be considered is an uncertain task, not least because many works of the time prove difficult to date and, even when there are chronological indicators within them, contain later glosses and antecedent traditions. In principle, every existing Jewish writing prior to and near the time of Paul should be considered. I have attempted to do so. I have collected, so far as I know, every reasonably likely echo of Gen 1–3 in the OT (both the HB and the Greek versions, including the Apocrypha), the NT, the OT Pseudepigrapha, and the

\(^{13}\) Mostly the credit (or blame, as the intent may be) is laid at the feet of Augustine.
DSS, as well as Josephus and Philo.¹⁴ Within these corpora, many if not all the writings were completed by the end of the first century, and those that were composed later nonetheless are thought to contain earlier traditions.¹⁵

I have not, however, given my attention to early (post-NT) Christian writings, rabbinic works, or Gnostic sources, nor to a more recently published collection of later OT Pseudepigrapha.¹⁶ Occasionally I will mention these writings, but there has been no systematic treatment of them. The partition is somewhat artificial. Later works in Charlesworth’s *OTP*, such as 3 Enoch (5th / 6th c. CE), are less pertinent

---


¹⁵ The OT Pseudepigrapha present a special case. As James R. Davila (*The Provenance of the Pseudepigrapha: Jewish, Christian, or Other?*, JSJSup 105 [Leiden: Brill, 2005]) in particular argues, many of the works have a Jewish core that predates the emergence of Christianity, but they have come down to us nearly exclusively by the pens of Christian scribes — and often those pens were also employed to add glosses, explanations, and new material that Christianized the whole of the work. This presents methodological difficulties. In my reconstruction I have tried to be attentive to these, but in many cases it is not possible to establish what is the pre-Christian core and later edition. My proposal, if persuasive, must persuade through the breadth of examples, particularly with recourse to more secure texts (e.g., the DSS).

¹⁶ Richard Bauckham, James R. Davila, and Alexander Panayotov, eds., *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: More Noncanonical Scriptures*, vol. 1 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013). The second volume has not yet been published. For the most part the writings fall after Charlesworth’s *OTP* and before the rise of Islam, and only two specifically Adamic works are included, one of which is the Coptic fragments of the LAE, which will receive a good deal of focus in Chapter 2, and the other is the Adamic Octipartite / Septipartie traditions, which are present in 2 Enoch. There is little if any loss by excluding the *More OTP*, vol. 1. The subsequent volume promises to have more Adamic works.
than Tannaitic material (2nd / 3rd c. CE) or 1 Clement (end of 1st c. CE). But in the cases of Patristic, rabbinic, and Gnostic documents, even the earliest writings are post-Pauline. The chosen corpora remain the best approximation for the ideas present in Paul’s lifetime.

I approach the Adamic traditions primarily as folklore. I do not mean to describe a genre thereby, although some of the pseudepigrapha are folkloristic. Nor do I assume that the shape primeval history took among Second Temple Jews was something inevitable, without the fingerprints of individual tradents. Particularly in the case of Philo (and Paul!), it is obvious that an active mind is molding the received traditions. However, these points notwithstanding, it is evident that certain concepts are slowly attached to the story of Gen 1–3. It occurs along recognizable patterns, yet these patterns do not accord with individual authors or even social groups within Judaism. The same Adamic legend might be found in the historian Josephus, the sapiential Wisdom of Solomon, and the apocalyptic Greek Life of Adam and Eve. It is hard to account for these similarities among disparate communities with no clear lines of influence unless the populace itself is producing

---

17 This is at least true of Gnosticism as fully developed systems, although its origins may be pre-Christian. In any case, some proto-gnostic works are included in the *OTP.*
much of the tradition. The legends about Adam and Eve, it seems, developed	piecemeal, in a synagogue homily or at a family meal, region by region, from one
generation to the next.

For this reason I offer in Chapter 2 a fivefold taxonomy of Adamic traditions
in Greco-Roman Judaism, each culled from a range of sources. The taxonomy derives
from my direct study of the corpora mentioned above, the results of which I
organized into general categories that cover the data exhaustively. I then refined my
approach via secondary literature. I may add that this is a taxonomy, not a typology.
That is, I did not fix beforehand the categories I expected, nor did I chart out an
abstract graph of possible options. The individual writings have conceptual
precedence, and the organization is subsequent. Constructing a taxonomy, though,
does entail a threat of reading noncontextually. To minimize this risk, I have selected
individual works within each category to illustrate it. I hope by this hybrid approach
to reap the benefits of a taxonomy while reducing its attendant liabilities.

I have written Chapter 3 analogously. In it I propose a construct I call
“participatory domains.” As with the Adamic traditions in Chapter 2, it emerged
from direct study of the writings. It bears a family resemblance to other scholarly
views about heavenly mediators and social groups, but the particular framing of the concept is my own. In it a singular figure rules a corporate group and determines its destiny, at least in part. The concept revolves around authority ("domains") and the interpenetration of influence between the one and the many ("participatory"). The usefulness of participatory domains will be clearer after analyzing primeval history, but the methodology of Chapter 3 is similar to that of Chapter 2.

Perhaps the prime difficulty for demonstrating the proposal that I develop is that it concerns the substructure of Paul’s thought, and so there can be no direct test of whether it is satisfactory. However, three criteria must be fulfilled if it is to be adopted. The first is availability: is it likely that Paul and his audience knew the apropos traditions? If the apostle shows direct knowledge of a writing that contains the tradition, then we can be sure that he knows it and that his audience probably does. By the nature of the evidence, though, this is not always possible, especially for primeval history, which only becomes prominent in the Hellenistic age. When there is no evidence for direct knowledge the two substitutes are that the concept is prior to Paul or widespread enough that its roots probably precede Paul. If it is both prior to Paul and widespread, so much the better.
The second criterion is productivity: what “work” does the concept do in explaining the apostle’s thought? The Pauline letters are apt to confuse, and a theory that provides organization and clarity to what was previously obscure deserves consideration. Although this measure may be subjective, locating difficult passages is not a subjective venture, and if a single idea is able to offer coherent solution to several, it stands a good chance of being secure.

Third, we can look for “outcrops”: are there places where the implicit logic becomes momentarily explicit? The contours of Romans are identifiable, and all commentators agree that several verses represent turning points in the logic. Yet in between those junctures, other passages have tended to cause confusion. For example, no one doubts that Rom 1:18 sets in motion the first wave of Paul’s argument that ends at Rom 3:20. These verses are structural outcrops. But in Rom 2 it is harder to discern the underlying logic. The theory I propose gains credence if it is evident in an outcrop. By these three criteria we are able to judge whether the sources adduced in Chapters 2 and 3 are germane to Paul’s letter to the Romans.18

---

18 The attentive reader will no doubt have noticed a similarity to the sevenfold list in Richard B. Hays (Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989], 29–32): availability, volume, recurrence, thematic coherence, historical plausibility, history of interpretation, and satisfaction.
The concept of participatory domains raises its own methodological challenge. It might be objected that I am imposing a foreign idea onto the texts. It is true that the terminology itself does not occur in any source from antiquity. In that sense it is an etic definition. However, that does not invalidate its heuristic utility. The fair test is whether ancient Mediterranean Jews, hearing a participatory domain described, would recognize the conceptuality as native to their thought. By way of comparison, E. P. Sanders has suggested “covenantal nomism” as an umbrella term for the “pattern of religion” practiced by Greco-Roman Jews. A significant percentage of the guild of Pauline studies — indeed, of NT and Second Temple Jewish studies — has found the terminology useful, even though it was coined by Sanders himself. Other theories have likewise rearranged the known data on a topic so that the same writings appear to hold new meaning. A construct is useful insofar as it organizes the data clearly, succinctly, and accurately. That, I seek to show, participatory domains do.

---


20 E.g., in the days when “corporate personality” was a popular concept, it was used to explain passages throughout the Bible, and the reversal within Pauline studies of “solution to plight,” rather than “plight to solution,” inclines the exegete to a considerably different understanding of Paul’s acceptance of Jesus as the Messiah. In these three cases, the construct works as a lens that alters one’s vision, bringing new items into focus.
Genesis 1–3 is, in and of itself, a fertile story, and its most influential interpreter is the apostle Paul. In his hands a simple tale is transformed into a summary of God’s work in the world, from creation, through pain and death, to its restoration in Christ.

What follows is principally a retrieval. I argue that there remains much to commend the understanding of the apostle’s Adam-Christ typology that is found in the official doctrines of most Christian churches, as well as in the positions of commentators several decades ago. There is a genuine commensurability between the two men, and significant Adamic traditions predated Paul that gave him the material for the juxtaposition. The increasing movement toward seeing the comparison of the two figures as provisional and functional is unwarranted. Since I am drawing from the past, I leave until the Conclusion a direct statement about the relation of my proposal to the New Perspective on Paul, but implicitly that debate informs my exegesis throughout.

My retrieval is a retrieval of results rather than means. That is, the positive critique leveled by the last generation of scholarship against the particular writings
adduced (mostly rabbinic and Gnostic) is sound. To substantiate my claim I will turn to other texts, ones that have a better historical pedigree. With the exchange of corpora comes a new way of conceptualizing how Adam and Christ are counterparts. So although the end results are the same, I offer at the same time another way to look at Rom 5.

The new construct also gives a comprehensive way to read Romans. To be sure, it is not altogether novel. I am regularly in agreement with a number of other Pauline exegetes. However, the same reading of the Adam-Christ comparison not only removes several difficulties in Rom 5:12–21, but it underpins the logic of Rom 1 and Rom 7–8 and applies throughout Rom 1–11. Further, it removes several longstanding difficulties in Rom 2 and Rom 7. For these three reasons — as a retrieval of earlier scholarship on Rom 5, as a new conception of the Adam-Christ juxtaposition, and as a cohesive way to read Romans — I deem my proposal worthy of consideration.

It is to Paul’s retelling of primeval history that we now turn.
“The high Injunction not to taste that Fruit, 
Whoever tempted; which they not obeying, 
Incurr’d, what could they less, the penalty, 
And manifold in sin, deserv’d to fall.”
– Milton, Paradise Lost 10.13–16

**Adam’s Ambivalent Legacy**

This is Adam’s résumé, according to Paul: “sin came into the world through one 
man, and death came through sin” (Rom 5:12); “the many died through the one 
man’s trespass” (v. 15); “the judgment following one trespass brought 
condemnation” (v. 16); “because of the one man’s trespass, death exercised 
dominion through that one” (v. 17); “one man’s trespass led to condemnation for all” 
(v. 18); “by the one man’s disobedience the many were made sinners” (v. 19). As 
presented in Rom 5, Paul’s appraisal of Adam is bleak. It is, in fact, hard to imagine 
an assessment much worse than the one given. All that we might call evil — sin, 
death, and guilt — is pinned on one man, one action at the dawn of creation. Paul’s 
view is no more optimistic in 1 Cor 15, the only other time the apostle refers to 
Adam by name in the undisputed epistles. He says simply, “all die in Adam” (v. 22).
As opposed to the man from heaven, the “first man was from the earth, a man of
dust” (v. 47) who was merely “a living being” rather than “a life-giving spirit” (v. 45).

This surge of blame is what scholars normally point out when commenting
on the role of Adam in Rom 5:12–21, and so for this reason 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch are
the Jewish parallels that receive the most attention. In the former, Ezra sums up his
complaint to the angel Uriel in words quite reminiscent of Paul: “O Adam, what have
you done? For though it was you who sinned, the fall was not yours alone, but ours
also who are your descendants” (4 Ezra 7:48[118]). A similarly desolate cry comes in
2 Baruch: “O Adam, what did you do to all who were born after you? And what will
be said of the first Eve who obeyed the serpent, so that this whole multitude is going
to corruption?” (2 Bar. 48:42). Charles H. Talbert’s list of Jewish sources extends
beyond these works, and he divides his list according to who is primarily held
responsible for sin and death: the serpent (Wis 2:24); equally Adam, Eve, and the
serpent (Jub. 3:17–31); Eve (Sir 25:24; Lat. LAE 3; 10:4; 1 Tim 2:8–15); or Adam (4
Ezra 3:7, 21; 4:30; 7:48[118]; 2 Bar. 23:4; 54:15, 19; Sifre Deut. 138b [sec. 323] on
Deut 32:32). Thomas H. Tobin considers many of the same works but classifies

---

21 Talbert, Romans, SHBC 24 (Macon, Ga.: Smyth & Helwys, 2002), 147–48. Note that the
Lat. LAE is also known as the Vita. As Talbert points out, there is disagreement in ancient works
Jewish thought about Adam into works that use him to speak of human nature (Sir and Wis), to moralize (Josephus and Philo), and to explain the existence of sin and death (Sib. Or. 1, Jub., 4 Ezra, 2 Bar., LAE, and Ps.-Philo, LAB). He finds Paul to be closest to the last group, particularly to Ps.-Philo’s LAB. From a brief review of Paul’s words, several Jewish parallels, and modern commentators, it would appear the apostle has nothing positive to say about the first man.

The lingering question not answered by this discussion, however, is how Adam wields such power. After all, Paul’s juxtaposition works only because there is an element of similarity between the two men, not only dissimilarity. The actions of both affect all people, and in Paul’s writings no other figures leave such outsized footprints. Abraham may be the exemplar of faith (Rom 4:12), and those who believe may be his offspring (Gal 3:29; cf. 3:16); Moses’s covenant may play fading glory to Christ’s transcendent light (2 Cor 3); but Paul falls short of attributing to either the power to determine the destiny of all others. Only Christ and Adam are given that

regarding what exactly the effect of the primal sin was. Some works (e.g., Rom 5, 4 Ezra) see it introducing both sin and death into the world, whereas others (e.g., 2 Baruch, Sifre Deut.) allow that death came from eating the fruit but make each of us our own Adam, with the choice to sin or to refrain.

distinction. Indeed, undergirding Rom 5:12–21 is the relation of the one to the many. Despite everything, Adam and no one else remains “a type of the one who was to come,” that is, of the Messiah. The negative elements of the first man are in the foreground, but for the comparison to make sense, in the background there has to be some genuine continuity between Adam and Christ.

With age the comparison of the two has assumed a certain self-evidence. Salvation history commences with Adam and old creation, and its climax is Christ and new creation. The pivot away from God and into sin comes by the hand of the first, and the pivot back to God and into redemption by the hand of the second. This construction, however, has not always been taken for granted. After Gen 5:5 Adam’s role in the Hebrew Scriptures is vanishingly small. There is an increase of interest in Adam in the Persian period and more still in the Hellenistic era. Nonetheless, in the NT outside the Pauline corpus (see also 1 Tim 2:13–14) Adam is only mentioned in the genealogy of Luke (3:38) and to locate Enoch chronologically (‘seventh from

---

23 So Stephen Westerholm, *Perspectives Old and New on Paul: The “Lutheran” Paul and His Critics* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 393. “the turning point in human history came, not with Abraham or Moses, but with Christ. The only rival who approximates his importance — though in a negative way — was Adam.”

24 The phrase is generally taken to indicate the Messiah, but that position is not universal. See the third “riddle,” near the end of the chapter.
Adam”) in Jude 14. If not for Paul, there is no guarantee that Adam and Eve would have achieved common coinage in Christian theological discourse. This in turn raises the issue of what precedents, if any, the apostle had in seizing on Adam as the counterpart of the Messiah.

What, then, is that commonality? What accounts for the massive impact of both the first man and the Messiah? According to Paul, how are we to explain Adam’s ambivalent legacy in light of Jesus? History is littered with answers to these questions, and as we will see, scholarship over the past century has proposed divergent solutions. The emerging consensus is that Paul asserts Adam’s significance without providing his reasons for doing so. This is a noticeable departure from traditional formulations, however, and one that I argue is not necessitated by the evidence.

Further, the juxtaposition of Adam and Christ is of no mean importance for Christian theology, touching as it does on matters of our common humanity, the person and work of Jesus Christ, the makeup of the church, the characteristics of salvation, and the trajectory of history. For innumerable generations Adam’s fall and Christ’s restoration have provided fodder for theological debate, liturgical reflection,
and private devotion. Indeed, although Adam could be removed from the HB with little loss to its overall message, he cannot be so removed from Christian thought without great violence to its governing structures and recurrent motifs. More than anyone else, we have Paul to thank for that.

The comparison of Adam and Christ is thus a topic that warrants further investigation.

**Proposed Solutions, in Brief Review**

*Official Teachings.* As early as the evidence will allow, early Christians who reflected on Rom 5 read Adam’s deed to consign all humans to a state of sinfulness and death, but it is Augustine who is commonly cited as developing Paul’s suggestive comments into a systematic doctrine of “original sin.” In *City of God,* for example, he writes,
“In the first man, therefore, there existed the whole human nature,” and that nature “was in his person vitiated and altered.” Thus “what he himself had become by sin and punishment, such he generated those whom he begot; that is to say, subject to sin and death” (Civ. 13.3). This has been the official position for Western Christianity ever since.

For example, the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* states, “Following St. Paul, the Church has always taught that the overwhelming misery which oppresses men and their inclination toward evil and death cannot be understood apart from their connection with Adam’s sin and the fact that he has transmitted to us a sin with which we are all born afflicted, a sin which is the ‘death of the soul’ ” (§ 403).

The Lutheran *Augsburg Confession* speaks similarly: “since the fall of Adam all men

removed somewhat from the controversies of the Latin West and buried before the Pelagian Controversy broke out, affirms a view of Adamic sin as a power or infection that comes to all, yet he also affirms individual moral choice (see esp. Hom. Rom. 10). Origen and Chrysostom are representative of most orthodox Christian viewpoints from the late second to the early fifth century.

26 This represents Augustine’s later, anti-Pelagian formulation. Earlier he reasoned that all people sin in some sense as a result of the primeval misdeed, but he had not settled on a particular means of transmission. The ones he considers depend on how the soul enters the body at the beginning of life. See, e.g., Lib. 3.180–202.

27 The Orthodox tradition, uninfluenced by Augustine, dissents in particular from the idea of a traducian account of sin. Nonetheless, Adamic sin is something all humans share from conception, and only by God’s work is it removed. See, e.g., Symeon the New Theologian (949–1022), Hom. 37, “The Ancestral Sin and Our Regeneration.”
begotten in the natural way are born with sin, that is, without the fear of God, without trust in God, and with concupiscence; and that this disease, or vice of origin, is truly sin, even now condemning and bringing eternal death upon those not born again through Baptism and the Holy Ghost” (Art. 2). To the question, “[W]here does this corrupt human nature come from?” the Reformed Heidelberg Catechism answers, “The fall of our first parents, Adam and Eve, in Paradise. This fall has so poisoned our nature that we are all conceived and born in a sinful condition” (Ques. 5). Particulars of the definition differ from denomination to denomination, and strict traducianism may or may not be present, but in all cases a defect in human nature is passed from one generation to the next, entailing a long genealogy of sin and death.

Despite the pedigree of the doctrine of original sin, most contemporary commentators agree that Rom 5 does not quite say that. They do not agree about what it does say, however.

*Corporate Personality.* In the early and middle part of the last century one of most prominent proposals for explaining Adam’s effect was “corporate personality,”
a concept pioneered by H. Wheeler Robinson. His argument derives primarily from OT texts in which the penalty for sin is extended to whole families or clans (e.g., Josh 7), and from this Robinson weaves his system: the ancient Israelites, he argues, did not finely distinguish between an individual and community, and thus the actions of any one member implicated the rest. He specifies four aspects of this construct:

1. the unity of its [i.e., the group’s] extension both into the past and into the future;
2. the characteristic “realism” of the conception, which distinguishes it from “personification,” and makes the group a real entity actualized in its members;
3. the fluidity of reference, facilitating rapid and unmarked transitions from the one to the many, and from the many to the one;
4. the maintenance of the corporate idea even after the development of a new individualistic emphasis within it.

According to Robinson, this relative preference for society over the individual explains how certain famous leaders could stand in for the whole community. “The most familiar of all examples of this representative value,” he comments, “is seen in the thoroughly Hebraic contrast of Adam and Christ made by the Apostle Paul, which draws its cogency from the conception of corporate personality.”

---


29 Ibid., 27.

30 Ibid., 37. Robinson is specifically citing 1 Cor 15:22 at this point, but it readily applies to Rom 5:12–21.
this was a fashionable way to understand the impact of Adam’s sin, since it was thought to be native to a Jewish understanding of the world.\textsuperscript{31} Integral to the construct of corporate personality is the sociology of Émile Durkheim and Lucien Lévy-Bruhl, who theorized that primitive peoples could not conceive of the individual as separate from the group.\textsuperscript{32}

It is on this point that the most forceful challenge to Robinson has come. John W. Rogerson distinguished shared legal responsibility from “psychic unity” between individuals, and argued that OT texts only bore out the former.\textsuperscript{33} Thus one cannot extrapolate from Achan’s sin and his family’s punishment to corporate personality as elaborated by Robinson. At most, the OT supports corporate responsibility. The theory of corporate personality has, for this reason, seen steady decline since the 1970s.

\textsuperscript{31} So, e.g., J. de Fraine, \textit{Adam et son lignage: Études sur la notion de «personnalité corporative» dans la Bible}, ML (Brussels: Desclée de Brouwer, 1959), esp. 127–34; William Barclay, “Great Themes of the New Testament III: Romans v. 12–21,” \textit{ExpTim} 70 (1959): 132–35, 172–75. Barclay does not go as far as Fraine, and never identifies with Robinson or “corporate personality” by name. According to him Paul holds that in some “realistic” sense all people sinned in Adam, which is at least not far from Robinson’s view. See also “corporate solidarity” below.

\textsuperscript{32} Robinson (\textit{Corporate Personality}, 31–32) explicitly invokes their work.

**Adam as Everyman.** It is often suggested that Gen 2–3 represents “the man” (הָאָדָם) as a generic individual, and Paul might have adopted this meaning as well. This is Karl Barth’s position in his influential revised *Der Römerbrief*: “the old man [Adam] also is mankind, humanity, and the world of men.” 34 It is not the physical Adam who matters (“Adam has no existence on the plane of history and of psychological analysis”), for Adam’s sin like Christ’s redemption is “timeless and transcendental.” 35 Adam is only a stand-in for us all, the first in a long line of sinners. 36

In his commentary Barth portrays Adam as a lesser Christ, the “shadow” to Christ’s “light.” 37 Later, after Barth’s theology shifts from dialectic to analogical, it is this aspect that is emphasized. In *Christ and Adam* the theme of Rom 5:12–21 is

---

34 Barth, *The Epistle to the Romans*, trans. Edwyn Clement Hoskyns (London: Oxford University Press, 1933), 164. Barth’s emphasis. This is an ET of the sixth edition of *Der Römerbrief* (1928), but the text of the commentary itself stays the same after the second edition (1922). The following editions only add further prefaces. There is a major change between the first edition (1919), written while Barth was still a pastor in Safenwil, and the second, written while teaching at University of Göttingen.

35 Ibid., 171.

36 “By the first Adam we mean the natural, earthly, historical man; and it is this man who must be overcome” (ibid., 172).

37 Ibid., 171. Barth takes “Much more!” to be the theme of vv. 15–17, and stresses that Adam and Christ are related dialectically rather than ontologically (ibid., 176–80).
“how much more?” and the “essential disparity” between Adam and Christ.\textsuperscript{38} Christ is the “original” and every person, Adam included, a “copy.”\textsuperscript{39} He summarizes: “Jesus Christ is the secret truth about the essential nature of man, and even sinful man is still essentially related to Him. That is what we have learned from Rom. 5:12–21.”\textsuperscript{40}

However, what differs from his \textit{Romans} commentary is that Barth no longer emphasizes Adam the individual as a “timeless” being, man in the abstract. Rather, Adam is an individual, “the responsible representative of humanity.”\textsuperscript{41} “Adam,” Barth adds, “as the one, can represent the many; he can represent humanity — but only as one among others . . . . Adam has no essential priority of status over other men. He cannot be their lord and head; he cannot determine their life and their destiny.”\textsuperscript{42}

This openness to a historical Adam as human representative is also seen in \textit{Church


\textsuperscript{39} Ibid., 26.

\textsuperscript{40} Ibid., 86. In the original the whole sentence is italicized as the summary of the section.

\textsuperscript{41} Ibid., 90.

\textsuperscript{42} Ibid., 93.
Dogmatics IV / 1, ch. xiv § 60: “The Pride and Fall of Man.” Here Barth asks, “What is the obviously outstanding feature of world-history?” He answers,

the really outstanding thing . . . is the all-conquering monotony — the monotony of the pride in which man has obviously always lived to his own detriment and to that of his neighbour, from hoary antiquity and through the ebb and flow of his later progress . . . , the pride in which he still lives to his own and his neighbour’s detriment and will most certainly continue to do so till the end of time. . . . The Bible gives to this history and to all men in this sense the general title of Adam.\(^\text{43}\)

For Barth, Adam is a snapshot of humanity at its worst and in no meaningful sense an equal of Christ.\(^\text{44}\)

\textit{Adam as Gnostic Urmensch.} To Barth’s interpretation of Rom 5 Rudolf Bultmann curtly replies, “How one can read that out of Romans 5 is incomprehensible to me.”\(^\text{45}\) Bultmann contends that Barth has found in the Adam-Christ typology a particular set of theological interests that are not present in Romans itself. Rather, the section answers the question, “Is then life a present

\(^{43}\) I quote from Barth, \textit{Church Dogmatics IV/1: The Doctrine of Reconciliation}, trans. G. W. Bromiley (London: T&T Clark, 1956), 507. The ET came three years after the German original.

\(^{44}\) Barth’s \textit{Shorter Commentary on Romans}, published in 1959 from a series of lectures given in 1940–1941, mostly accords with his views in \textit{Christ and Adam}, but is far briefer. In both works the main point is the disparity between the two figures, how much greater Christ is than Adam.

reality?” occasioned by the declaration of justification in Rom 3:21–4:25. In 5:1–11 Paul says that eschatological life is present in hope, but in 5:12–21 he is able to go further and show that life is present now, albeit hidden. The sharp dispute between Barth and Bultmann is the relative primacy of Adam in the order of understanding.

Responding to Barth’s view that Adam is to be interpreted by Christ, Bultmann retorts, “Paul knows nothing of that, but, in designating Adam in verse 14 as ‘the prototype of the coming (Adam),’ he asserts the contrary.” More precisely, Bultmann argues that Paul adapts a Gnostic *Urmensch* tradition in vv. 12–21. The apostle “reaches for the gnostic myth of the original man,” but changes it (1) by affirming that “all sinned” (v. 12) is part of the cause of the present deadly situation, and (2) by mapping the cosmological story onto the plane of salvation history. In other words, as Bultmann views it, the spiritual life Gnostics expected to reside in

---

46 Ibid., 144.


48 Bultmann agrees with Barth that Christ is much greater than Adam in terms of his deed and rank: v. 14 “expresses the magnificence of the figure of Christ and his gift and his superiority over Adam” (ibid., 155).

49 Ibid., 163.

50 Ibid., 154.
reunification with the original cosmic ἄνθρωπος is now found in Christ for those who believe.⁵¹

In many ways Bultmann’s reliance on Gnostic mythology to explain Rom 5 is minimal. He assumes that it underlies the apostle’s thought, but it is clear that Bultmann sees it merely as a useful metaphor for Paul, just as Jewish cultic imagery informs vv. 1–11.⁵² Paul’s point is not determined by Gnosticism, and the “primal man” story takes on a significantly different shape once Paul has finished with it.⁵³ Others went much further than this. Today this explanation for the passage has been almost wholly abandoned since Gnosticism, as a cohesive system of belief, is increasingly seen as a second- and third-century phenomenon.⁵⁴

---

⁵¹ This is one of several places where Paul’s antithesis is not “precisely formulated” (ibid., 155), per Bultmann. For Adam’s sin was given to all, but Christ’s grace must be accepted: “While Adam, then, brought death to all men after him without a possibility of escape, Christ brought for all the possibility (of life)” (p. 158).

⁵² Ibid., 150–51.


⁵⁴ To be sure, elements of the later Gnostic systems can be found in Iranian religion, Platonic philosophy, and apocalyptic Judaism, so a loose “proto-gnosticism” may well be present in NT times. However, the aspects important for Rom 5, such as the primal man / redeemer myth, are no longer generally granted.
Adam as Jewish Redeemer. While many sought primal man traditions in Gnostic literature, others discovered a similar concept in Jewish texts, whether mystical, rabbinic, or philosophical. Some among this party envisioned the Danielic “Son of Man” as a counterpart to the first man and postulated that Jews had a concept of two Adams, one primeval and the other eschatological. Very often the research turned to either Philo or rabbinic sources for substantiation.

W. D. Davies combines the corpora, as well as an assortment of other Jewish and Christian writings, in his chapter, “The Old and New Humanity: The First and Second Adam,” in Paul and Rabbinic Judaism. In his reconstruction, Hellenistic Judaism came up with a concept of a heavenly and earthly Adam (as in Philo), whereas Palestinian Judaism believed in only one Adam, a glorious one who lost his

---

55 E.g., Oscar Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament, trans. Shirley C. Guthrie and Charles A. M. Hall (London: SCM, 1959), 137–92, esp. 166–81. Cullmann’s German original is from 1957. This solution had the added benefit of explaining why Jesus’s favorite title for himself in the Gospels is entirely absent from the Pauline corpus: on this view, Paul substitutes “last Adam” or its equivalents for “Son of Man.” The thesis has been revived recently by Yongbom Lee (The Son of Man as the Last Adam: The Early Church Tradition as a Source of Paul’s Adam Christology [Eugene, Ore.: Pickwick, 2012]).

56 Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology, 4th ed. (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980), 36–57. The fourth edition is from 1980, but aside from new introductions and appended material, the content of the book did not change after the first edition of 1948. Writings besides Philo and those in the rabbinic corpus include 4 Ezra, 2 Baruch, 2 Enoch, Sib. Or. 3, and the Ps.-Clementine Homilies, in addition to OT texts about a “new creation” and several possibly Adamic NT passages.
status at the fall (as in the rabbinic sages). Although he sees Paul correcting the
duality of the Hellenistic conception and the naïve physicality of the Palestinian one,
his focus is on the speculations about Adam’s greatness and how this set a precedent
for Paul’s conception of the Messiah and the messianic age. To be sure, Davies
agrees that Gen 3 provides an etiology of sin, but it is not front and center.  

Of particular note, he postulates that Paul inherits the concept of the church
as the “body of Christ” from the rabbinic conception of Adam’s immense body as it
existed before the fall, and all humans stemming from it. Although Paul and
Rabbinic Judaism was arguably the most prominent effort in the mid-twentieth
century to place Paul within his Jewish heritage, its influence waned as rabbinic
writings, and the traditions within them, were dated to a later age, that is, to the
second century and beyond.  

__________________________________________

57 He considers the role of Adam in bringing about sin on ibid., 38.

58 Ibid., 54–57. The analogy of a “body politic” does not seem odd to us, but only one or two
examples can be found in Greek before Paul, and further, Paul’s conception does not seem to be
purely metaphorical.

59 Skepticism about a pre-Pauline doctrine of two Adams only increased as rabbinic writings
were dated later, but even at the end of the nineteenth century George Foot Moore (“‘The Last Adam’:
Alleged Jewish Parallels,” JBL 16 [1897]: 158–61) registered a sharp challenge to the idea. But the idea
is not entirely dead. Recently Stephen J. Hultgren (“The Origin of Paul’s Doctrine of the Two Adams
Adam as Bearer of Destiny. Bultmann’s protégé Ernst Käsemann penned among the most significant commentaries on Romans in the latter half of the twentieth century. More than anyone since Albert Schweitzer, Käsemann revived the importance of apocalypticism for understanding Paul, and this is reflected in his characterization of Adam and Christ in Rom 5.\(^\text{60}\) He calls them “inaugurators of their different worlds” whose “spheres” are “alternative, exclusive, and ultimate,” with one “power,” “dominion,” or “reign” warring against the other.\(^\text{61}\)

His favorite term for the pair is “bearers of destiny,” and he bases his argument on the concept of types. “Typology strictly adhered to is clearly indicated by the use of the word ‘type’ in v. 14,” which has “apocalyptic rootage” but also “fundamentally presupposes history.”\(^\text{62}\) One sees the influence of Leonhard Goppelt, who distinguished typology from allegory because types recur throughout history in 1 Corinthians 15.45–49,” *JSNT* 25 [2003]: 343–70 has argued for the relevancy of rabbinic writings, over against Philo and Gnosticism, at least for 1 Cor 15.

\(^{60}\) And early Christianity in general; hence his famous aphorism, “Apocalyptic was the mother of all Christian theology” (Käsemann, New Testament Questions of Today, trans. W. J. Montague [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969], 102. Originally published in German in 1960.)


\(^{62}\) Ibid., 142.
rather than being illustrations drawn from myth or folklore.\textsuperscript{63} Käsemann rejects the idea that Adam is an “ancestor who potentially decides the fate of his descendants,” à la Augustine, in part because “the western theory of original sin and death . . . is much too rationalistic,” particularly when it specifies sex as the means of transmission.\textsuperscript{64} Adam and Christ are instead opposing apocalyptic powers, and humanity is divided between their camps.\textsuperscript{65}

Käsemann’s apocalyptic view of Pauline soteriology has been sustained in the intervening decades by scholars like J. Christaan Beker, J. Louis Martyn, Martinus C. de Boer, and Douglas A. Campbell, but in reformulated packages. The advent of the New Perspective in the late 1970s has marked a watershed in Pauline studies, altering the scholarly understanding of justification, works of the law, and Jewish-


\textsuperscript{64} Käsemann, \textit{Romans}, 142, 147.

\textsuperscript{65} Harder to classify is C. K. Barrett, \textit{From First Adam to Last: A Study in Pauline Theology} (New York: Scribner’s Sons, 1962), 1–21, 68–119. In part he is to be placed with Käsemann, at least insofar as he thinks Paul’s view of Adam is “cosmological (or apocalyptic-mythical)” (p. 21). Similar to Barth, he also sees Adam as an everyman: “It is clear that Paul believed that everything that could be said about Adam as a (supposed) historical figure could be said also about mankind as a whole; he took his Hebrew (‘\textit{ādām} — man) seriously” (p. 19). Further, Barrett does not think either negates an existential interpretation akin to Bultmann’s.
gentile relations. Romans 5 is still read by some as an apocalyptic text, but shorn of
to earlier Lutheran trappings.\(^\text{66}\)

\textit{Adam as Ruling an Epoch.} With James D. G. Dunn, one of the standard-
bearers of the New Perspective, we come to positions adopted in today's academy in
something near their original form. Dunn agrees with Barth and Bultmann that
Adam can be viewed as mythical. It is not the case, he says, “that Paul’s theological
point here depends on Adam being a ‘historical’ individual or on his disobedience
being a historical event as such.” Paul’s goal “is not so much to historicize the
individual Adam as to bring out the more than individual significance of the historic
Christ.”\(^\text{67}\)

But instead of Adam as everyman or as primal man, Adam stands for an
epoch of humanity: both Jew and gentile under sin, the human race \textit{in toto} before

\(^{66}\) To pick two of these scholars as examples, de Boer (\textit{The Defeat of Death: Apocalyptic
Eschatology in 1 Corinthians 15 and Romans 5}, JSNTSup 22 [Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988], esp. 84–
91), nearer the time of Käsemann and before the New Perspective had won wide acceptance, sets up
two “tracks” of Jewish eschatology, either the forensic or the cosmological. (On pp. 149–53 he walks
a middle line between the forensic interpretation of \textit{δικαιοσύνη} in Bultmann and the cosmological
interpretation in Käsemann, although favoring the latter, and ultimately concludes that Rom 5:12–21
“marks a shift” between the two). Campbell (\textit{The Quest for Paul's Gospel: A Suggested Strategy},
JSNTSup 274 [London: T&T Clark, 2005], esp. 17–55 and \textit{The Deliverance of God: An Apocalyptic
Rereading of Justification in Paul} [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009], esp. 931–36) goes far further. He
has set as his scholarly agenda the destruction of a justification model of salvation, preferring his
“pneumatologically participatory martyrological eschatology” or “PPME” model.

Christ. Much as death and sin are personified in this passage, Adam takes on an outsized role, as an “‘epochal figure’ — that is, as the one who initiated the first major phase of human history and thereby determined the character of that phase for those belonging to it.”

Thus for Dunn there need not be some real Adam who precipitated all our distress at some real point in history; “Adam” is simply the name Paul gives to human history before Christ. Luke Timothy Johnson proposes a similar idea inasmuch as he reads in Rom 5 Paul’s “new creation” theme (2 Cor 5:17), which parallels Christ as the resurrection and life (Rom 4:17; 1 Cor 15:45–50). Johnson also speaks of “humans as inevitably ‘subject’ or ‘obedient’ to some power above.”

With resonances in both Käsemann and Dunn, Johnson presents humanity as tied up with one of two opposing worlds.

_Dual Causality_. Increasingly, a number of commentators allow two means of sinfulness in v. 12 to stand side-by-side, often unresolved. After all, Paul may have been a bright and penetrating thinker, but he was no analytic philosopher. The fine

---

68 Ibid., 1:289.

69 Johnson, _Reading Romans_, ReadNT (New York: Crossroad, 1997), 87.

70 Ibid., 89.
parsing of categories was not his style.71 In the words of Joseph A. Fitzmyer, “Paul ascribes the mortal condition to a dual causality, to Adam and to the sins of individual human beings.”72 In his comments on this passage, Fitzmyer tentatively considers various positions from church history, speaking of Adam as the “head” in a sense not unlike federal headship (see below), and of Rom 5 as being “seminal and open to later dogmatic development” along the lines of hereditary sin.73 But Fitzmyer does not find Paul to have settled on the exact way our sins follow from Adam’s except to say that there is a “ratification of his [Adam’s] sin in the sins of all individuals.”74 Adam sinned, we sinned, and there is some connection, yet “Paul is aware that not all human sinfulness is owing to Adam alone.”75

Käsemann also subscribes to this position: “there is in this verse [v. 12] an ambivalence between destiny and individual guilt,” so much so that “Paul’s concern

71 One need not agree with the overall thrust of Heikki Räisänen, Paul and the Law, 2nd ed., WUNT 29 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1987) — viz., that Paul’s views on the law are intractably contradictory — to take as a lesson from his monograph that Paul’s terms change and his arguments vary. In terms of style, Paul has more kinship with Nietzsche than Spinoza.


73 Ibid., 407–8. Fitzmyer rejects other views, such as Adam as Urmensch and “everyman.”

74 Ibid., 416.

75 Ibid., 407.
unites what seems to us to be a logical contradiction.”76 We remain responsible for
our own sins, even if Adam is their source.

_Adam as Federal Head._ A perspective common among the Reformers was that
Adam was the “federal head” or “representative” of humanity, and thus God justly
imputed his sin to all those associated with him. The whole mass of humanity until
the coming of Christ was, at a bite of forbidden fruit, condemned. This view is
distinguishable from a traducian view in that the explanation is couched in terms of
human relations, not biology. It is a political understanding.

A modern exegete who follows this paradigm is Talbert.77 He gives the
analogy of country A’s leader declaring war on country B. The citizens of country A,
despite not making the decision themselves, are nonetheless implicated in the
president’s actions. They are officially at war with country B and likely take the war
personally. In this sense they “participate” in the leader's action. In fact, as Talbert
points out, this is true of children born after the declaration of war. They who not
only did not make the decision but also were not alive for it, are nevertheless born
into a state of war. So it is with Adam as federal head: he made us “enemies” of God

---

76 Käsemann, _Romans_, 149–50.

77 Talbert, _Romans_, 157–58.
(Rom 5:10), and unless we exchange our citizenship for that of Christ, we remain at war with the divine. This, Talbert says, is the best theory, but it is still insufficient:

“Perhaps one must ultimately rest content with Paul’s own tactic: to affirm that fallenness is a fact . . . without being able to explain exactly how it is so.”

Corporate Solidarity. As noted above, corporate personality is not much mentioned in Pauline studies any longer, except on rare occasion — in 2004 Ben Witherington wrote that “there is a dimension of corporate personality or, better said, incorporative personality to Paul’s argument.” Given that Witherington later speaks of the “relational and personal” effect of Adam’s action that alters both one’s position and character, he does not seem to invoke the whole meaning of corporate personality. Specifically, psychic unity is absent. Rather, he implies corporate responsibility, which was the strongest support for Robinson’s theory.

---

78 Ibid., 158.

79 Witherington, Paul’s Letter to the Romans: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 143. Witherington allows that “federal headship . . . does get at some of the dimensions of Paul’s argument” (p. 143), but he prefers “incorporative personality” because he deems federal headship insufficient to express the real effects Christ’s and Adam’s deeds have on those associated with them (pp. 143–44).

80 Ibid., 150.
This is also the position taken by Douglas J. Moo. He does so tentatively because Paul himself does not resolve the question of how our sin (v. 12) and Adam’s sin (vv. 18–19) intertwine, but it sometimes behooves the exegete to attempt “reasonable harmonizations” of unclear texts. Comparing v. 12 and vv. 18–19, Moo contends that there is sufficient warrant to see all people sinning “in and with Adam,” and the reason given to tip the scales in favor of this is “the popularity of conceptions of corporate solidarity in the Jewish world of Paul’s day.” Adam and Christ are both representative of classes of humans: “For Paul, Adam, like Christ, was a corporate figure, whose sin could be regarded at the same time as the sin of all his descendants.” It is the legal aspect of corporate responsibility that is prominent in Moo’s commentary.

Morna D. Hooker might be added here as well. Although she devotes more time to establishing the presence of Adamic allusions in Rom 1, when she speaks of Rom 5:12–21 it is in the sense of an “interchange” in Christ: “Christ became what we

---


82 Ibid., 325.

83 Ibid., 327. Moo explicitly differentiates himself from corporate personality (p. 327 n. 60).

84 Ibid., 328. In a long footnote, Moo (p. 328 n. 61) writes that corporate solidarity could align with a “realist” view, tradicianism, or a “federal” view.
are — ‘adam — in order that we might share in what he is — namely the true image of God.”\textsuperscript{85} Christ has established solidarity between himself and humanity.

\textit{Social Sin.} Robert Jewett agrees that “the main theme of vv. 12–21 is the ‘unity of the many in the one’ both in Adam and in Christ,”\textsuperscript{86} but he hints at his own interpretation of what this implies. It is all too obvious that children pick up the manners, habits, and bearing of their parents, as if by osmosis, whether for good or ill. In the case of Adamic sin, it is possible that he transmits it to his descendants not by genetic material but by interpersonal influence. Jewett writes, “A social theory of sin appears to be implied here in which the actions of forebears determine those of their descendants.”\textsuperscript{87}

This does not, for Jewett, minimize the impact of the deed. He does not follow a Pelagian line of thinking, that Adam is merely a bad example: “However one

\textsuperscript{85} Hooker, “Interchange in Christ,” in \textit{From Adam to Christ: Essays on Paul} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 19. Mention should also be made of her “Introduction” in the same volume (pp. 1–10), where she summarizes her mature view of Paul’s theology. Prominent in it is the idea that the glory lost “in Adam” is being restored “in Christ.”


\textsuperscript{87} Ibid., 375.
explains the background of his thought, it remains clear that Paul depicts Adam’s act as decisively determining the behavior of his descendants.\textsuperscript{88} Indeed, “the social poison of sin” so determines the actions of all humans “that choices of evil deeds remain inevitable.”\textsuperscript{89} This is also the position of Craig S. Keener, who states that “for Paul, it is apparently behavior or choices, more than genetics, that identifies one’s solidarity” with either Adam or Christ.\textsuperscript{90} Paul deploys the figure of Adam to undercut any ethnic claims to superiority. Adam is the father of all — even Paul’s fellow Jews.

\textit{Adam’s Indeterminate Effect.} Paul’s style in Rom 5 is terse and elliptical, and at many points we may wish he had expanded where he did not do so. For this reason many, perhaps most, modern scholars have chosen to leave Paul’s reasoning indeterminate. How Paul thought Adam passed on sin to his progeny is unknown, but we can affirm that he did so. An early voice in this chorus is Robin Scroggs, who states that in Rom 5:12 “no explanation is attempted of the physical or historical

\textsuperscript{88} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{89} Ibid., 376. In this respect Johnson (\textit{Reading Romans}, 89) is similar: Adamic sin is “a pervasive and systemic disease of the human spirit.”

\textsuperscript{90} Keener, \textit{Romans}, NCCS 6 (Eugene, Ore.: Cascade, 2009), 74.
relations between Adam’s sin and those who followed and ‘became sinners.’” Larry Kreitzer describes the comparison as “a useful tool” but “by no means a rigidly
defined structure.” Stanley K. Stowers claims that Paul’s “main concern consists in
showing how the actions of one person can affect many,” but the passage “nearly
assaults the reader in stressing that the analogy between Adam and Christ is limited,
underlining the dissimilarity of the two with loud qualifications in 15–17.” Despite
the “endless room for speculation,” Paul’s point is simply to offer Adam as a general
analogy for an action with broad consequences. Paul “never explains how Adam’s
sin makes all sinners,” Frank J. Matera writes, but nonetheless “he suggests that
Adam’s transgression had a baleful effect on his descendants.”

91 Scroggs, *The Last Adam: A Study in Pauline Anthropology* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1966), 78. Per Scroggs, Paul agrees with “the usual Jewish doctrine of the universality of sin,” including that “Adam was the first sinner and the originator of sin,” and on the next page is the most specific: “Adam is the necessary but not sufficient cause for the sin of other men” (p. 78). Throughout his consideration of Rom 5:12–21 (pp. 76–82), Scroggs disputes both that the passage is about original sin and that Adam and Christ are meaningful parallels, saying, “Paul nowhere gives any indication that he wants to show any positive relation between Adam and Christ” (p. 80).


94 Ibid.

95 Matera, *Romans*, Paideia (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010), 140.
agrees: “Precisely how the legacy of sin was passed on from Adam to his descendants Paul does not explain,” and he adds parenthetically that the “precision brought by subsequent Christian theological and dogmatic explanations has no real basis in the text.” Stephen Westerholm seems to fall in this camp, as well. Moreover, several of those who do offer specific answers allow that the text admits of various possibilities. 

*Adam as Afterthought.* Perhaps Adam is not merely indeterminate, but even expendable. Though many commentators warn that research into Adam and original sin might throw us off the scent of Paul’s overriding point — salvation in Christ — in recent decades none has voiced this concern as loudly as Pheme Perkins. From her perspective, “the Adam-Christ analogy functions like a utility player on a

---


97 Westerholm, *Perspectives*, 393–95; idem, *Understanding Paul: The Early Christian Worldview of the Letter to the Romans*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004), 102–4. In the former, he begins with Adam initiating sin, whence come death and condemnation. “So much is clear,” he says: “to be more specific is to invite controversy” (p. 393). In the end he seems to place himself with those who see Adam bringing a state of sinfulness to human nature, not unlike the traditional Western view.


baseball team who can be employed at several positions or sent to pinch hit at a
critical point. Paul has not framed his theology in response to earlier speculation
about Genesis 1–3 about the cause of sinfulness or about the anthropology of the
‘image’ and the breathing in of God’s Spirit.”\(^{100}\) The Eden story provides nothing
fundamental to Paul’s theology, which is instead centered on the nation of Israel.

Perkins rejects the pertinence of most of the Jewish and Christian speculation
surrounding the role of Adam in salvation history: “Paul has no interest in
grounding the enslavement of humanity to sin and death in a philosophical
anthropology” — here drawing sharp contrast with Philo.\(^ {101}\) Rather, “Romans 5:12–
21 employs only the sin, disobedience and death items in the Adam story.”\(^ {102}\) At
most, Paul “may have adopted” themes similar to 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch, but only as “a
contributing factor.”\(^ {103}\) Adam, Perkins suggests, is a bench player who happens to
get a handful of appearances in Paul’s corpus.

\(^{100}\) Ibid., 147.

\(^{101}\) Ibid., 145.

\(^{102}\) Ibid.

\(^{103}\) Ibid.
This is far from the definition of original sin with which we started. The historical review of Adam’s transgression, as understood in Pauline studies, ends not with a bang but a whimper.

An Apology for Revisiting Romans 5

What is clear from this review is the very cloudiness of the debate. It is as if we are looking “through a glass, darkly,” to borrow a phrase from another Pauline epistle (1 Cor 13:12 KJV). No side has prevailed and many positions overlap. There are a cluster of recurrent suggestions — genetics or headship, legal theory or apocalypticism, social influence or political relations, concrete historicity or reified human nature. The general trend is to do no more than affirm that, somehow, for Paul Adam’s sin affects all, without getting into the details. In contrast with the specific definitions of the past, recent scholars have appeared to lose confidence by the decade in finding anything beyond an ad hoc meaning of Adam in Paul’s letters.

Now, it might be foolish to rush in where apostles, it would seem, fear to tread. Paul’s reticence might bid us to be still. Yet it is Paul himself who calls Adam a “type” of the coming one, Christ, and these are the only two “ones” who affect the
“many.” It is the apostle, in fact, who prompts us to consider some commensurability between the two men.

The rub is moving from “some” conception to a specific idea. This requires tracing the thought outward from Paul to his circle to the church at Rome. To begin with Paul himself, whatever his brief description in Romans, the apostle must have had some thought in his mind of how Adam’s deed spread through humanity and history. The transmission of sin and death from Adam to all others is not an isolated or offhand comment, but the organizing principle of these paragraphs. In fact, there is a sense in which Rom 5:12–21 is Paul’s whole soteriology in miniature, since here he trades in universal categories.\(^\text{104}\) Further, the juxtaposition of the Messiah and the first man is also a concept that had been on his mind for three years or more.\(^\text{105}\) It is possible that Paul came up with the comparison extemporaneously in 1 Cor 15, but this cannot be the case in Rom 5. Even after further reflection and in a new situation,

---

\(^{104}\) Despite the doubts registered above, over generations of scholarship Rom 5 has been considered an epitome of Paul’s soteriology. E.g., Moo, *Romans*, 314: “In a passage that rivals 3:21–26 for theological importance, Paul paints with broad brush strokes a ‘bird’s-eye’ picture of the history of redemption. His canvas is human history, and the scope is universal.”

\(^{105}\) Assuming the traditional dating of 1 Corinthians (ca. 52–55) and Romans (ca. 57–58). Rainer Riesner (“Pauline Chronology,” in *The Blackwell Companion to Paul*, ed. Stephen Westerholm, BCRel [Chichester, England: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011], 17–25) offers a chronology of his own (1 Corinthians in 54, Romans in 57), but lists other major chronologies as well.
Paul still found the juxtaposition of Adam and Christ profitable. It would be surprising, then, if Paul did not have his own theory of Adam’s woeful impact and the corresponding redemption found in Jesus.

So, then, Paul must have had some specific conception of Adam’s sin, but it is possible that he did not elucidate it. Another explanation for the lack of detail in Rom 5:12–21 is that Paul deliberately kept his theory tacit and simply asserted its result. Something dissuades the modern exegete from adopting that position, however: the apostle is writing to a new audience. Were he writing to Corinth or Thessalonica, to the churches he founded and to which he sent emissaries, we might reasonably take unstated matters to be shorthand reminders of teaching already entrusted to his converts. For example, 1 Cor 11:2–16 concerns the proper decorum for women as they prophesy in the church, and both its specific injunctions and its explanations appear cryptic to modern eyes. Although the passage “abounds in obscurity” for us, Nigel Watson comments, “Since Paul’s addressees were fully acquainted with the manner in which worship was being conducted in Corinth, he is content to allude to certain practices with a brevity that modern readers find
tantalizing.” Paul had left the Corinthians with a certain custom (συνήθεια, 11:16) in place, so less explanation was required of him. We are not privy to it, but his readers were. Similarly, 1 Thess 5:1 refers to eschatological teaching about “the times and the seasons” that Paul feels no need to reiterate, presumably because he had covered it already in person. With Romans, however, we do not have recourse to this possibility. As a letter of introduction (Rom 1:8–15; 15:22–33), it would hardly do for Paul to neglect the requisite details that make his comparison work.

It might be objected instead that Paul left out those details accidentally. Granted, this is not impossible. Paul’s thought often seems to run ahead of his words, and his rhetoric can be confusing. Indeed, among his earliest legacies was that of confounding his readership (2 Pet 3:15–16). In Rom 5 itself, there seems to


107 If 2 Thessalonians is genuinely Pauline, it provides the best example. A whole host of questions are raised in our minds when we read the “man of lawlessness” section (2:1–12), but they had been explained in person to the audience: “Do you not remember that I told you these things when I was still with you?” (v. 5).

108 One that, according to Dunn (The Theology of Paul the Apostle [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998], 25), “was clearly intended to set out and defend his own mature understanding of the gospel.”
be a long digression (vv. 13–17) that interrupts his leading sentence (v. 12), which Paul only resumes at v. 18. 109

Still, if not impossible, it is unlikely that specific information was left out by chance. In antiquity writing a letter was a long, arduous, and communal process. 110 According to estimates from E. Randolph Richards, given the writing speed of an average scribe, for every draft it would have taken Paul over eleven hours to dictate his letter to Tertius, his scribe (Rom 16:22). 111 No doubt this would have been spread over several days, as nearly twelve straight hours is too much to ask of Paul’s concentration — to say nothing of Tertius’s hand. Paul and Tertius would have cycled through several drafts, with Tertius copying notes onto wax tablets or

109 Occasionally scholars have disputed that it constitutes an anacoluthon. E.g., John T. Kirby (“The Syntax of Romans 5.12: A Rhetorical Approach,” *NTS* 33 [1987]: 283–86) contends that it presents a syllogism: (a) If sin entered the world through one man, and (b) if death entered through sin, then (c) death spread to all people through one man. If so, this would strengthen the present point in that Paul’s argument would be all the tighter.


111 Richards, *Paul and First-Century Letter Writing: Secretaries, Composition and Collection* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 2004), 161–65. Richards bases his estimates on standards drawn from literary works, of which there is some information about production, and which seem to have been common practice for private letters as well, such as the number of syllables (sixteen) per line (στίχος), the mixing of ink and scoring of the papyrus, and so forth.
writable papyrus notebooks and writing out sentences later, Paul checking the draft
and making necessary alterations, Tertius taking new notes, and so on until Paul was
happy with a final version, which would then be prepared on fine papyrus with a
better pen. Paul also probably retained a copy for his own records. This process
likely took weeks, if not months, and prevents us, as Richards pictures it, “from
suggesting that Paul easily dashed off a letter over the weekend.”112

Further, in our day of electronic communication, rarely does it cost anything
to send an email, except the sunk costs of computers and internet service. In the first
century, writing a letter the length of Romans — preposterously long by
contemporary standards — is estimated to have cost the equivalent of two thousand
dollars.113 This figure, of course, cannot be fixed precisely, but there is as good a

112 Ibid., 164–65. Given the theological complexity of Romans, David Aune (“Romans as a Logos Protreptikos,” in Karl P. Donfried, ed., The Romans Debate, rev. ed. [Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1991], 290) estimates that “Paul had worked and reworked this material over a period of several years,” a point that he thinks is “seldom appreciated.”

113 Richards, Letter Writing, 165–69. The specific figure Richards calculates is $2275, based on several conservative estimates for the cost of the scribe and papyrus. An edict from Diocletian in 301 set a specific price a scribe could charge per στιχος, and this roughly matches evidence given in the Oxyrhynchus papyrus from the third century, although different types of script receive different rates, the length of a line was not perfectly standard, and the value of the currency fluctuated over the centuries. There are a number of variables that make the estimate rough, but in general Richards sides with caution. It is also possible that Tertius provided his services pro bono, so Paul or his benefactor (Phoebe?) may not have paid this amount. (Jewett [Romans, 22–23] conjectures that Tertius was Phoebe’s personal scribe, and that together they not only produced the letter but
chance that it is too low as too high. A letter the length of Romans was a significant investment, not lightly dispatched. It obliged Paul to get every word right.

Although Paul lists no co-sender (Rom 1:1–7), several associates were around Paul at the time of writing who had at least enough influence in shaping the epistle to have their names added to the final greetings (Rom 16:21–23). Among them was Timothy, who is listed among the authors of over half of Paul’s undisputed letters (2 Cor 1:1; Phil 1:1; 1 Thess 1:1; Phlm 1) as well as two disputed ones (Col 1:1; 2 Thess 1:1), so we should hardly be surprised if his hand was involved. And since he greets the Romans “in the Lord,” Tertius was apparently not merely a professional scrivener but a fellow believer; he could well have influenced not just the wording but also the rhetoric and argumentation of Romans.

All of this is to say that letter writing was an exacting process and one involving a community of minds. Presumably Paul, with the help of his associates, had considered the details carefully. This cannot rule out that it slipped Paul’s mind delivered it to Rome for Paul.) Even so, the costs of materials would not have been incidental: Romans runs to 7114 words, or 979 στίχοι, whereas the average letter was about 200 words, and Seneca’s longest was 4134. The apostle would not have wanted to squander the generous volunteer work of his scribe.
to add additional explanation of Adam’s role and that no one in the letter’s production noticed the deficiency, but it makes it improbable.\(^{114}\)

So we may safely conclude that Paul and his circle considered Rom 5:12–21 sufficient to convey a specific conception of the first man. The next consideration is the audience, whether they could have been expected to detect subtle allusions to Adamic lore. The operative word here is expected: since my goal is to discern Paul’s view of Adam, whether the Roman Christians did in reality understand his logic is not the precise question. The question, rather, is whether the apostle and his associates had justifiable reason to think that the allusions would be understood without further elaboration than is provided.

To determine this requires an investigation of the audience’s composition. Most likely the Roman Christians to whom Paul wrote were predominately gentile, but with an appreciable minority of Jews.\(^{115}\) To rehearse briefly the commonly cited

\(^{114}\) I have assumed in the foregoing paragraphs the integrity of Rom 16 within the letter, a point that has been disputed but, according to Jewett (\textit{Romans}, 8–9), has been the growing consensus since the late 1970s. But if Rom 1–15 existed independently, we would lose specific information about the scribe involved in writing the letter, the other associates around Paul, and the length of Romans would be reduced somewhat. Still, in the main, the above points would hold: the letter was prepared with diligence and at no mean expense of time and money.

\(^{115}\) There is a strong consensus on the point: so Dunn, \textit{Romans}, 1:xliv–liv; Fitzmyer, \textit{Romans}, 25–39; Moo, \textit{Romans}, 9–13; Jewett, \textit{Romans}, 55–74, esp. 70–72; Keener, \textit{Romans}, 9–17. There are
evidence for this position, Romans addresses both gentiles (1:5–6, 13; 11:13–32; 15:15–16) and Jews (2:17–29; 4:1; 7:1–6?). Although in a number of cases those uses might be merely rhetorical (especially so with the Jewish addressee in the diatribe of 2:17–29), Jewish-gentile relations is a dominating topic in the letter — apparent in the so-called thesis of 1:16–17, prominent in chs. 9–11, and the probable background for the “weak” and the “strong” in 14:1–15:13. Thus, if we assume that Paul has at least a passing knowledge of the condition of the churches in Rome, this indicates the presence of both Jews and gentiles among Paul’s readership. It also seems to indicate certain tensions between those parties.

This accords with a plausible reconstruction of the historical situation:

Around 49 CE a segment of Rome’s sizeable Jewish population was expelled from the city for a dispute, possibly over Jesus’s messianic credentials (Suetonius Claud. 25.4; Acts 18:2), and upon Claudius’s death in 54 CE the edict would have lapsed, allowing exiled Jews to return. This caused divisive issues among the Roman

___

also five chapters in the revised edition of Donfried, Romans Debate on the historical and sociological situation of the audience of Romans, and all of them (F. F. Bruce, A. J. M. Wedderburn, Francis Watson, Peter Lampe, and Peter Stuhlmacher) agree that both Jews and gentiles are present in the Christian community in Rome and on Paul’s mind as he writes.
churches, whose leadership and membership were altered both by the removal of
Christian Jews and by their eventual return, producing strain along ethnic lines.\footnote{So Dunn, Romans, 1:xlvi–liii; Fitzmyer, Romans, 30–36; Jewett, Romans, 18–20, 58–62. They all make allowances for some doubt about the historical context but find this situation to be the most probable: In the mid-first century Rome’s Jewish community is estimated to have numbered in the tens of thousands, with certain gentiles also attracted to the community. It is not feasible that Claudius’s order could have removed all Jews from Rome, but it did seem to encompass many. In Suetonius’s account, the act was a reprisal for a volatile upheaval in the Jewish community over a certain “Chrestus,” possibly a garbled reference to Christ, in which case we might have evidence of a dispute among Roman Jews about whether Jesus is the Messiah. No matter who “Chrestus” indicates, the expulsion of Jews would have included Christian Jews like Priscilla and Aquila (per Acts 18:2), who seem then to have returned to Rome and began, or resumed, hosting a church (Rom 16:3–5, assuming the originality of the chapter). The complexion of the Christian community would have changed in the process. Having originated in Rome’s synagogues, the churches would have become significantly more gentile when many Jews were expelled from the city, but would then have faced an influx of returning Jews. Such a situation was almost bound to cause annoyances, if not significant problems. By the time of the fire in Rome in 64 CE, Christianity itself had a significant number of adherents, even into the thousands, being visible enough in Roman society that Nero could use them as scapegoats and kill “large numbers” of them, per Tacitus’s second-century account (Ann. 15.44).}

If the Christian congregation in Rome was dominated by gentiles, however, it
might weaken the case I am making. Paul could not then expect his audience to
know extrabiblical traditions about Adam current among Jews, someone might
demur. No doubt a number of those who first heard Paul’s words did misunderstand
what he was saying. There is reason to suppose, though, that many gentiles were
knowledgeable enough to understand. To join the Christian movement was to
become enmeshed in the Jewish heritage, including its scripture and stories. This
would have been particularly true in Rome, since Christianity there seems to have
emerged from the Jewish synagogues, not from direct gentile conversion.\textsuperscript{117} Even among those less acquainted with Jewish ways, Paul regularly treats his gentile congregations to detailed interpretations of books that they only recently received.

Galatians 3 serves well as an example. Paul’s argument not only involves detailed analysis of several parts of the Abraham cycle (Gen 12:3; 15:6; 18:18), which are compared to Mosaic law (Lev 18:5; Deut 21:23; 27:26) and a prophetic promise (Hab 2:4), he even narrows his focus down to the grammatical number of a single word in Gen 13:15 (namely, σπέρμα, “offspring”). More than that, in Gal 3:19 the apostle relies on a noncanonical tradition about angels entrusting the law to Moses on Mount Sinai. Perhaps Paul was wrong to expect so much of his non-Jewish audiences, but there is no reason to think that, out of fear of incomprehension, he would have shied away from the minutiae of Israel’s scriptures, nor later traditions

\textsuperscript{117} This is, again, the consensus: so Dunn, \textit{Romans}, 1:xlvi–l; Fitzmyer, \textit{Romans}, 32–35; Jewett, \textit{Romans}, 55, 58–61. Fitzmyer (\textit{Romans}, 34) draws this implication: “In writing to the Christians of Rome, Paul assumes that they are familiar with the OT, building, as he does, large parts of his argument on the Greek OT . . . . [E]ven a predominantly Gentile Christian community was certainly familiar with the LXX as well as with other Jewish tenets and practices: the Decalogue, Jewish prayers used in synagogues, messianic expectations, dietary regulations, and details of the Mosaic law affecting daily life.” I am suggesting knowledge more in depth than this, but we can say that the Roman churches seem to have been well anchored in Jewish traditions.
about them, in Rom 5. It fits his *modus operandi* elsewhere, and there is evidence of
deeper knowledge of Judaism in Rome than in most of Paul’s own churches.118

The most likely scenario, then, is that Paul and his circle believed that the two hundred fifty or so words of Rom 5:12–21 sufficed to communicate to the Roman Christians the implicit conception of Adam that undergirds the Adam-Christ comparison, as well as the comparison itself. Seeing palm trees in the desert, Paul trusted his audience to deduce the presence of a spring. Since the extra information had not come by Pauline communiqué, it must have been public and well known in the Jewish symbolic universe of the first century. Obviously the core story derives from the first book of Moses: the name “Adam,” the disobedience of Adam and Eve (Gen 3), sin as a personified power (Gen 4:7), and the entry of death into the world (as promised in Gen 2:17 and unhappily accomplished in Gen 4:8).

Nonetheless, like Gal 3, Rom 5 is witness to developments beyond the OT, not least the gravity of the consequences extending to all and the antithetical

118 I might add that other early Christian authors expect as much of their non-Jewish audiences. Many of the books in the NT that address gentiles predominantly or exclusively are also among those with the densest reference to the OT, not least 1 Peter. Paul was by no means alone in his high expectations.
correspondence of the Messiah and Adam. These developments must have been well established if Paul relies on them without comment. They must also have been widespread if Paul, Tertius, Timothy, and others know them and assume the Roman Christians will as well. The only sort of traditions that could reasonably explain Paul’s brevity in Rom 5 are those that have worked themselves into the texture of Second Temple Jewish thought, so commonplace that the slightest spark would kindle illumination in the reader’s mind.

What might these traditions be? This brings us back to an observation made at the outset, that commentators on Rom 5 almost exclusively mention the gloomy portraits of Adam, as in 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch, when they cite parallels to Paul. To be sure, these shed light on Adam as initiator of sin and death, but those are the points most easily extrapolated from Genesis. They are not particularly surprising. More revolutionary is the juxtaposition of the Messiah and first man. Few note that there is an entirely alternate stream of Adamic lore, the “glorious Adam” stream, where Adam and Eve are great, even glorious beings, the apex of human history. Matera is among a handful of scholars who have taken cognizance of these traditions, but he

---

119 As noted in the Introduction, the Eden story is flexible, and Paul has both received additional traditions and contributes a good share of his own to how the tale is now widely understood.
dismisses their importance here: unlike some Jews, Paul “does not present Adam as a
royal or angelic figure filled with all wisdom.” It is rarely explored what these texts
might contribute to the discussion of Rom 5.

Hidden in them, I argue, are the unarticulated glories that explain how Adam
and Christ can affect all people through all time, and further, tell us something
about Paul’s Christology and his view of the nations.

The Riddles of Romans 5

Adam’s place in Jewish literature roughly contemporaneous with Paul, and its
importance for Rom 5, is the topic of the following chapter. At present it is prudent
to give a sense of the chapter and three exegetical riddles within it that remain
disputed. This will give us more specific textual points to consider as we seek to
untangle the overarching question of the Adam-Christ typology in Rom 5. These are
the details that must be arranged if the general theory is to be judged satisfactory.

---

120 Matera (Romans, 127–29; quotation on p. 129) specifically mentions Sir 49:16 and 2 En.
30:11–12 as examples of a high view of Adam. Johnson (Reading Romans, 87–88) gives Philo and
rabbinic works on Adam’s cosmic importance as background to Paul, and Keener (Romans, 74–75)
devotes a paragraph to the topic; his position is that Jesus constitutes the recovery of Adam’s glory
and the ultimate step back to paradise.
Overview. Romans 5:12–21 falls in the central theological section of the epistle (chs. 5–8), after an account of God giving his righteous to those who believe apart from works of the law (chs. 1–4). In the following sections, Paul considers the relation of “Israel according to the flesh” with the gentiles who are now included in the promises (chs. 9–11) and gives the ethical consequences of belief (chs. 12–15). The partitions at Rom 9:1 and 12:1 are manifest. Less so is the dividing line between the initial section on justification and the middle chapters on life either in Christ or the flesh. Sometimes Rom 5:1–11 is linked with chs. 1–4, and sometimes it is joined to Rom 5:12–8:39. Occasionally Rom 5:12–21 is kept with the earlier chapters, and it is ch. 6 that begins the new material. This question relates to the first riddle, to which we will come soon.

In the passage itself, Paul’s primary contrast is clear enough, but there is more nuance to the text than may first appear, and the fluctuating terminology is apt to confuse. Paul is giving not only a comparison between two figures, but the essence of salvation history. The disobedient act itself is not mentioned, so the apostle’s chronology commences the moment after Adam and Eve eat the fruit. Sin (ἁμαρτία) and its consequence, death (θάνατος), enter the world (v. 12), coming to
the many (πολλοί) (vv. 15, 19), that is, to all (πάντες) (vv. 12, 18).\textsuperscript{121} Since the law (νόμος) has not yet appeared, instances of sin after this first one are not calculated (οὐκ ἐλλογέω), but sin is nonetheless present (v. 13) and all are sinners (v. 19). All also die (v. 15) because death reigns (βασιλεύω) over all (vv. 14a, 17) — or, alternatively, because sin reigns (βασιλεύω) in death (v. 21). In fact, it is not only that sin and death are present, all also share the “condemnation” (κατάκριμα; vv. 16, 18) that followed Adam’s “judgment” (χρίμα; v. 16). In this schema, the murder Lamech committed was an example of “sin” and shows how the antediluvian age was contrary to divine design, but it was also one done unawares, perhaps not much different from a lion hunting a gazelle. Nevertheless, despite not knowingly violating God’s principles, death came upon these ancients.

Not all sins are made equal, though. The above paragraph describes the state of all peoples and all ages, but what Adam did was worse. His deed was a “sin” (ἀμαρτία; v. 16), but more than that, it was a “transgression” (παράβασις; v. 14), a “trespass” (παράπτωμα; vv. 15 [bis], 16, 17, 18), and “disobedience” (παρακοή; v. 19). Adam was given a specific commandment from God and deliberately flouted it. With

\textsuperscript{121} Occasionally scholars will try to take “many” to mean something other than “all,” but the parallels in vv. 18–19 cannot be ignored. Paul uses the two terms synonymously in Rom 5:12–21.
the Mosaic legislation, Israel comes to stand in a position analogous to Adam, and is
captured in the same failure: “But law came in, with the result that the trespass
multiplied (ἵνα πλεονάσῃ τὸ παράπτωμα)” (v. 20). This is why sins in the epoch
between Adam and Moses “were not like the transgression (παράβασις) of Adam”
(Rom 5:14b). Intention makes Adamic and Israelite sin fundamentally different
from pre-Mosaic and, it would seem, gentile sin. Solomon’s decision to marry
foreign women might not be as evil as Lamech’s deed in its effect, but its flagrance
exceeds the murder since wise Solomon knew better. Torah, prized possession of
God’s chosen people, had in practice only exacerbated sin.

Only one could undo this situation, and it was God’s Messiah. Standing
exactly opposite Adam’s trespass is Christ’s “free gift” (χάρις, vv. 15, 16; δωρεά, vv.
15, 17; δώρημα, v. 16) and “grace” (χάρις, vv. 15, 17), his “act of righteousness”
(δικαίωμα, v. 18) and “obedience” (ὑπακοή, v. 19). The logic of the passage demands
that these terms be largely synonymous, describing Christ’s freely willed decision to

---

122 The NRSV takes ἵνα with the subjunctive as result in this case, but usually it is purpose:
the law was designed to increase the trespass. Either way, Paul is convinced that the law’s effect was
anything but checking acts of disobedience. Cf. Rom 4:15: “For the law brings wrath; but where there
is no law (νόμος), neither is there violation (παράβασις).” I return to the point in Chapter 4.

123 A number of textual witnesses to this verse drop the μή, apparently not realizing that Paul
distinguishes two types of sins.
follow God’s directives in saving humanity, although sometimes the “free gift” and “grace” bleed into the results of Christ’s actions (as in v. 17). The result is that justification (δικαίωμα, v. 16; δικαιοσύνη, v. 17; δικαίωσις, v. 18; δικαίοι katapesaθήσονται, v. 19) defeats sin, and life (ζωή, v. 17) defeats death — sometimes Paul combines the terms for effect (δικαίωσις ζωῆς, v. 18; δικαιοσύνη eis ζωήν αἰώνιον, v. 21) — for those who receive (οἱ λαμβάνοντες) it, or the “all” (v. 18), the “many” (v. 19). Paul also opposes grace (χάρις) to the general category of sin (ἁμαρτία) at the climax of the section (vv. 20–21), thus including history outside Israel’s.

Although the parallels throughout bid us to contemplate the ways in which Christ’s actions are equal and opposite Adam’s, Paul hastens to add that his actions accomplish “much more” than Adam’s (vv. 15, 17, 20). The reason for the surpassing greatness of Christ could indicate several things. Perhaps it is that Christ himself is a greater figure than Adam, although the context indicates that the effect of their actions rather than their ontological status is covered by the repeated “how much more.” It could be that the act to lead humanity astray was far easier than the act to

---

124 So Käsemann (Romans, 153): “The connection between action and result is emphasized.”

125 Technically, it is not “life” that reigns (βασιλεύω) in v. 17, but instead believers do “in life” (ἐν ζωῇ). Paul’s parallel is in this sense inexact, but since sin acts as a personified power, it is perhaps intentional.
put it right, so Christ’s work is therefore celebrated as the greater of the two.

Alternatively, it could be that Jesus’s “free gift” is a state even greater than the paradise Adam lost for us. What does not seem to be in mind is the scope of the effect. Almost all indications in the passage are that both cover the same mass of humanity, the “all” or “many”: indeed, to the degree this passage itself might put any limits on who is covered by their actions, it is Christ’s side that would be smaller.  

Riddle 1: Fit in Romans. As already noted, there is debate how Rom 5 fits within the unfolding logic of Rom 1–8. Most often “therefore” (οὖν) in the first verse of Rom 5 is thought to be the signal that Paul is summing up his earlier argument and applying justification apart from works to the present life of the Christians, making Rom 5–8 a unit. On another reading justification dominates the letter up to and including Rom 5:1–11, and in Rom 5:12–21 life becomes main concern. Or the partition could come after Rom 5:21. Dunn, for example, argues that Rom 5

126 That is, in v. 17 it speaks of “those who receive” rather than the typical “all” or “many.” The following verses pick up the more common terminology, so it is not evident that Paul is trying to limit the group, however. Of course, this raises a wider exegetical and theological question of universalism, but for the moment I limit myself to the passage on its own.

127 So Moo, Romans, 292–95. He notes the language common to Rom 5:1–11 and 8:18–39 (“love,” “justify,” “glory,” “peace,” “hope,” “tribulation,” “save,” and “endurance”) and draws the inference that Rom 5–8 is a “ring composition” about the current experience of salvation in Christ.

128 So Keener, Romans, 73.
coheres and that the Adam-Christ comparison is a way to epitomize all Paul has said about salvation thus far.  

Enmeshed in this discussion is what the τὸῦτο of διὰ τοῦτο (lit.: “on account of this”) in Rom 5:12 looks back on: v. 11 or vv. 1–11 (favored by those who combine Rom 5–8), or possibly all of 1:18–5:11 (favored by those who combine Rom 1–5). Those who see a break at 5:12, by contrast, generally take the prepositional phrase to be dispensable, without much force.  

Not surprisingly, some scholars resist the impulse to give Romans a strict outline, contending that the transition between topics is gradual.

This diversity notwithstanding, the range of views mentioned above agrees that the topic in Rom 6–8 is not, on the whole, that of Rom 1–4.  

Without doubt, the vocabulary and topics shift considerably, albeit not entirely, from justification,

---

129 Dunn, Romans, 1:271.

130 In the words of Bultmann (“Adam and Christ,” 153), it is “no more than a transitional expression,” although he does connect vv. 12–21 with vv. 1–11.

131 This is well illustrated by a chart in de Boer (Defeat of Death, 148). He collects the vocabulary typical of Rom 1–4 (πίστις, ἔργον, δικαιοσύνη, κρία, etc.) and Rom 6–8 (ζωή, ἁμαρτία, πνεῦμα, σάρξ, ἔλπις, etc.), and then compares their frequency in the other chapters. The first group is found 83 times in Rom 1–4 while only 11 times in Rom 6–8, whereas the second group occurs only 16 times in Rom 1–4 but 125 times in Rom 6–8. (Interestingly, the verb ἁμαρτάνω is relatively more frequent in Rom 1–4, yet the noun ἁμαρτία is far more common in Rom 6–8.) Many of these words are found in Rom 5, as it pivots from faith and forensic words to hope and the dualities of life / death and Spirit / flesh.
faith, and works of the law to life, baptism, and hope, and from entry into God’s grace and people to the present and future experience in Christ. Most stark in this regard is that Paul abruptly drops ethnic language in favor of universal categories. While Paul’s various ethnic terms occur with frequency in Rom 1–4, as well as Rom 9–11 and Rom 12–16, they do not occur in Rom 5–8. There is not a single instance of “Jew” or “gentile,” “circumcision” or “uncircumcision,” or their equivalents.

It is a strange void. Krister Stendahl, playing forerunner to the New Perspective, characterized Rom 1–8 as “so to say, a preface” to Rom 9–11, since justification in his mind was centrally about the unification of Jew and gentile in a single church. The last quarter century and more has been favorable to this proposal, inasmuch as Rom 9–11 is now given far more weight in reconstructing the meaning of the epistle. But if this is the case, the absence of all ethnic words in Rom

---


5–8 prepares poorly for the deliberation about Israel that follows. There can be no
denying that in the central chapters of Romans Paul, as it were, steps back to take in
the entire canvass of human history, yet it remains unsettling that the figures that
elsewhere occupy the foreground (Israel and the nations) slip from sight.

_Riddle 2: Means of Transfer._ Another major question that has bedeviled
commentators is how exactly Adam’s sin and Christ’s grace are transferred from the
one to the many. In general this debate has been covered above, but the decision as
to the most plausible interpretation must be made on particular textual matters in
concert with wider-ranging theories. A detective solving a crime must consider not
only broad questions of motive and character but also particulars: the location of
fingerprints, the angle of entry, and the timeline of events.\footnote{134} So also here. The
likelihood of various interpretations depends in part on explaining lexical and
grammatical details.

The first thing to note in Rom 5:12–21 is the fivefold recurrence of “reigning”
(βασιλεύω): death (vv. 14, 17), and sin through death (v. 21), rule over humanity, but

\footnote{\textsuperscript{134} The same analogy is made by J. L. Houlden (A Commentary on the Johannine Epistles, BNTC [London: Black, 1974], 1–2) to introduce the difficulties of reconstructing the situation of the Johannine Christian community.} grace (v. 21) and those receiving Christ’s gift (v. 17) rule in life. These rival domains
are at the heart of the passage.\textsuperscript{135} The default preposition for expressing the flow of this influence is διά ("through"), indicating a spatial or causal sense.\textsuperscript{136} The simple dative (vv. 15, 17) and the ἐν phrases ("in," "by"; vv. 15, 17, 21) might imply instrumentality, but they could also indicate sphere, a sense that is evident in vv. 12–14: "sin came (εἰσῆλϑεν) into (ἐν) the world"; "death spread (διῆλϑεν) to (ἐν) all"; "sin was indeed in (ἐν) the world"; and "death exercised dominion . . . even over (ἐπί) those whose sins were not like the transgression of Adam."\textsuperscript{137} Paul expresses a battle, with a personified sin over one kingdom, opposed by grace and its kingdom.\textsuperscript{138}

\textsuperscript{135} So, e.g., Käsemann (\textit{Romans}, 145): "In all circumstances [the interpretation of the Adam-Christ typology] has to keep in view the central motif of Christ's dominion." Likewise Jewett (\textit{Romans}, 370): "The comparison between the realms of Adam and Christ dominates the passage and is expressed in various ways no less [sic] than eight times. The verb 'rule over' is therefore a key to the passage."

\textsuperscript{136} The LSJ (s.v., "διά") gives three meanings for διά with the genitive: spatial, temporal, or causal. Time, specifically duration ("during"), will not do. If place, Adam and Christ are the portals through which sin and grace enter. If causal, they could be either the agent or the instrument.

\textsuperscript{137} See also v. 20: "But law came in (παρεισῆλϑεν), with the result that the trespass multiplied; but where (οὗ) sin increased, grace abounded all the more." In fact, although διά is the most common preposition, εἰς ("into," "toward," "for") occurs often (vv. 12, 15, 16, 18, 21), and ἐκ ("from," "on the basis of") is used twice in v. 16. Prepositions are often used metaphorically, of course, but a spacial sense seems to be implied.

\textsuperscript{138} Particularly germane is Käsemann's (\textit{Romans}, 147) imagery: "The spheres of Adam and Christ, of death and life, are separated as alternative, exclusive, and ultimate." His favorite term, "bearers of destiny," always has this cosmological sense.
Instead of images of location, many commentators speak in temporal terms, of Adam and Christ as ruling “epochs.” There are indeed several chronological markers in the section (“before the law,” v. 13; “from Adam to Moses,” “the one who was to come,” v. 14), and the turning points, though few, are significant. The apostle begins with Adam’s misdeed, from which comes — apparently instantaneously — sin, death, and condemnation to all. Next comes Mosaic law, which only manages to increase the trespass. Finally Christ appears, reversing Adam’s dolorous effects. The difficulty to consider in this case is whether history plays a role beyond dividing humankind into those under the law and those apart from it. On Paul’s accounting would Plato, for instance, be in the same position as Japheth? If so, then the temporal aspect may be a means to another end, the role of Torah.

I began with a word from the cognitive domain of power, βασιλεύω, but this passage is not free of the Pauline vocabulary of justification and grace, law and sin so common in the debates between the New Perspective and traditional Reformed understandings of Paul. Some important terms of that discussion are absent (ἔργα and πίστις, for example), but this passage cannot be extricated entirely from either the forensic or “boundary marker” meanings, as one prefers. That said, Paul’s mind

---

139 E.g., Dunn, *Romans*, 269–300 passim.
is particularly attuned to the singular actions of Adam disobeying and Christ obeying, and the resulting consequences of those two actions, rather than to the way they are appropriated (or not) by humans. Throughout this passage at least, the “all” and “many” are passive masses, with the possible exception of λαμβάνοντες (“those receiving”) in v. 17. For this reason βασιλεύω should be given precedence in this passage, and our gaze must be directed at the two leading characters.

The means of transfer, then, have to do with two opposing realms of power, but the exact ways history and justification are incorporated into Rom 5:12–21 is yet unclear. An added consideration is that, as normally translated, vv. 15–16 contrast the results of Adam and Christ: “But the free gift is not like the trespass (Ἀλλ᾿ οὐ χ ὡς τὸ παράπτωμα, σῶς καὶ τὸ χάρισμα). . . . And the free gift is not like the effect of the one man’s sin (καὶ ως δι’ ἕνος ἁμαρτήσαντος τὸ δώρημα).” Chrys C. Caragounis disputes this rendering of Paul’s thought, since the context indicates symmetry of outcome. He proposes that it is better to read the two as rhetorical questions, in which case οὐ would not negate the sentences but expect a positive answer. He translates, “But does not the free gift operate just like the trespass did? (Yes, it does!)
... And is not the free gift transmitted in the same way as sin was transmitted by
the one who sinned? (Yes, it is!)

There is much to commend this interpretation, and it does account well for
the conclusion (ἀρα οὖν) drawn in v. 18, that both the trespass and the righteous
deed are transmitted from the one to all. In a larger sense, however, it does not
fundamentally alter the point of the passage; it only rearranges how it works.
Whether vv. 15–16 are taken as statements or questions, Christ and Adam similarly
affect the many but do so with opposite results. Caragounis’s interpretation would
tilt the balance of the passage toward similarity, but opposition would remain.

Historically, the most consequential detail in the discussion comes at the very
end of v. 12. After saying that sin came into the world by Adam, and death through
sin, Paul ends, “and so death spread to all, ἐϕ´ ᾧ all sinned.” The three letters that
comprise this brief prepositional phrase conceal manifold potential interpretations.

Ἐπί can mean a variety of things with the dative, and ᾧ as a masculine relative

140 Caragounis, “Romans 5.15–16 in the Context of 5.12–21: Contrast or Comparison?” NTS

141 Ibid., 143–44. One reason Caragounis advocates this reading is that ἀρα ᾧν indicates a
conclusion from the preceding argument. Had Paul gone straight from v. 14 to v. 18, he would merely
be asserting the similar results between the Adam and Christ, but if vv. 15–16 are making a rhetorical
argument that the results of the trespass and grace are communicated in the same way, then Paul’s
“therefore” in v. 18 is justified.
pronoun might reasonably claim a variety of antecedents from earlier in the sentence (e.g., εἷς ἄνϑρωπος, κόσμος, or θάνατος).\textsuperscript{142} If instead ᾧ is neuter, ἐϕ᾿ ᾧ can be taken as a conjunction, adding another array of options.

Augustine’s Latin translation reads \textit{in quo} (“in him” or “in which”), whence his eventual position that we all sinned “in Adam.” For more than a millennium this was the inherited interpretation in the West, but in the academy that is no longer the case. The consensus among commentators and translations for most of the twentieth century has been that ἐϕ᾿ ᾧ is an idiom meaning “because.”\textsuperscript{143} If this is the case, the tie that binds human sin to Adam’s is weakened, and the dual-causality interpretation is given further support.

Some scholars disagree. Fitzmyer objects: “The trouble with this interpretation is that there are almost no certain instances in early Greek literature wherein \textit{eph’ hō} is used as the equivalent of causal \textit{dioti},” and it “seem[s] to make

\textsuperscript{142} Or possibly it refers to an implicit antecedent. For example, Frederick W. Danker, (“Romans V. 12: Sin under Law,” \textit{NTS} 14 [1968]: 424–39) argues that νέμος is assumed from the context, thus the sense is “on the basis of what (law) they sinned.”

\textsuperscript{143} Fitzmyer (\textit{Romans}, 415) gives an impressive list of adherents to a causal construction (“since,” “because,” or “inasmuch as”): Achtemeier, Barrett, Bruce, Bultmann, Byrne, Cranfield, Dibelius, Dodd, Dunn, Käsemann, Moule, and Moo, among a number of others. Several other times Paul uses ἐϕ’ ὅ (2 Cor 5:4; Phil 3:12; 4:10) and ἐϕ’ ὃς (Rom 6:21), but their meanings are also not entirely clear. The only other NT example, in Acts 7:33, ἐϕ’ ὃ means “upon which.”
Paul say in 5:12d something contradictory to what he says in 5:12abc.”\textsuperscript{144} Therefore, Fitzmyer, bolstered by several parallels in Greek literature, prefers “with the result that.” The passages envisions “the ratification of [Adam’s] sin in the sins of all individuals.”\textsuperscript{145} Jewett, in turn, disputes the passages adduced by Fitzmyer that give a consecutive sense, and instead commends κόσμος as the antecedent of ὃ since it appears in v. 12 and v. 13. In this case, Adam let sin into the world, and it is upon that same earth that all human sin occurs.\textsuperscript{146} Given that two of the major recent commentators on Romans have raised anew issues that for a stretch of the twentieth century seemed settled, the determination of ἐφ᾿ ὃ in Rom 5:12 is once again in flux.

What seems clear about the means of transfer is that it concerns the reigns of two powers that vie with each other, and Adam and Christ are instruments by which sin and death, grace and life rule over humanity. There is also a distinct cosmic or

\textsuperscript{144} Ibid., 415–16. In disputing “because,” Fitzmyer reinterprets the most commonly listed parallels, Phil 3:12; 4:10; and 2 Cor 5:4 among them.

\textsuperscript{145} Ibid., 413–17. Quotation on p. 416. Fitzmyer adds that “primary causality” for humanity’s sinfulness is ascribed to Adam, “secondary causality” to individuals after him.

\textsuperscript{146} Jewett, \textit{Romans}, 375–76. Although he does not choose “because,” Jewett is near the dual-causality view here. He writes that Paul is “advancing a paradoxical combination of fateful influence from Adam and individual responsibility for sins.” Again, “each person in v. 12d replicates Adam’s fall because of his or her own free will. In the light of v. 12a–c, however, each is sufficiently determined by the social poison of sin that choices of evil deeds remain inevitable.”
spatial aspect, indicated by ἐν, εἰς, and ἐπί. It is not clear to what degree the transfer has a historical aspect, nor is the place of justification in the development certain.

Two of the verses (vv. 15–16) may be questions that emphasize the similarity of Adam and Christ rather than statements that emphasize their dissimilarity, and ἐϕ᾿ ᾧ might indicate “because,” “with the result that,” “upon the world,” or something else. These specific textual matters must be resolved in conjunction with the larger issues of Adam and the Messiah in Second Temple Judaism.

*Riddle 3: Adam as “Type.”* I began this chapter with Adam’s bleak résumé, but I saved one important element. According to v. 14, Adam is “a type of the one who was to come” (τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος), which, in the midst of a bevy of negative statements, appears to give the first man a reprieve, bestowing on him a high title, one that likens him to the coming Christ. However, the apparently straightforward association between the two figures is attended by its own set of difficulties.

First, the link might not be between Adam and Christ. A minority of voices have seen the “coming one” as Moses, since the law-giver appeared earlier in the same verse and, from Adam’s perspective, would be coming later.147 While not

---

impossible, the juxtaposition throughout sets Adam beside Christ, and it is more natural to read “coming one” as an eschatological title for the Messiah. Further, in 1 Cor 10 the events of the wilderness generation are “examples” (τύποι, v. 6), and serve “as an example” (τυπικῶς), for current believers, “on whom the ends of the ages (τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰώνων) have come” (v. 11). There is, at least in the Corinthian passage, an eschatological cast to typology: the fullest meaning of “type” obtains in the messianic age. Most importantly, calling Adam a “type” of the Messiah would not be far off from 1 Cor 15:45, wherein Jesus is described as “the last Adam.” Both phrases indicate a deep correspondence between the two figures.

Second, there are two possible axes on which to plot the typology, depending in part on the proper background for the image. One axis is time. It has already been assumed in the paragraph above that this is in Paul’s mind. It is certainly true of 1 Cor 10:11, in which the ancient Israelites become an example for those who live in “the ends of the ages.” Chronology is likewise evident in Rom 5. Paul describes or intimates four distinct eras, each with its own characteristics: before the fall (assumed in v. 12), from Adam to Moses (vv. 13–14), from Moses to Christ (v. 20),

---

148 Most commentators dismiss the idea with little ado. Jewett (Romans, 378), for example, calls the debate “minor” and the suggestion that Moses is in view “unlikely.”
and after the Christ event (vv. 15–21). Paul may have chosen ὁ μέλλων, “the one who is coming” (in the future), rather than ὁ ἐρχόμενος, “the one who is coming” (from elsewhere) — the latter of which occurs as a messianic title in Matt 11:3 (par. Luke 7:19–20) — for this very reason.\footnote{So Käsemann, \textit{Romans}, 151–52; Dunn, \textit{Romans}, 1:277. The use of μέλλω in Rom 5 cannot be explained by the verbal preferences of the apostle, since Paul uses ἔρχομαι when describing Jesus’s return in 1 Cor 4:5 (“before the Lord comes [ἔλϑῃ”) and 1 Cor 11:26 (“you proclaim the Lord’s death until he comes [ἐλθῇ”). He seems to have chosen μέλλω deliberately in Rom 5:14.} Indeed, it is possible that τοῦ μέλλοντος is not meant absolutely as a messianic title (“the Coming One”) but rather is elliptical for “the coming (Adam),” akin to Paul’s description of Jesus in 1 Cor 15:45. A temporal typology would fit an apocalyptic background for the passage, since apocalypses contain a rich history of correspondence between protology and eschatology.\footnote{For a number of instances, see the section “Restoration of Paradise” in the “Glorious Adam Traditions” in Chapter 2. A particularly concise example that is commonly cited (e.g., Leonard Goppelt, “τύπος, ἀντίτυπος, κτλ.,” \textit{TDNT} 8:259), albeit one that post-dates Paul, is Barn. 6:13, in which the Lord declares, “Behold, I make the last things as the first (τὰ ἐσχάτα ὡς τὰ πρῶτα).” In the immediate context, OT stories, including ones concerning Adam (v. 9) and the creation of humanity in God’s image (vv. 12, 18), each constitute a “parable” (παραβολή) foretelling Jesus (v. 10), and Christians, who have been renewed by the forgiveness of sins, are a people of “another type” (ἄλλος τύπος), “as if he [the Lord] were creating us all over again” (v. 11). In this section of Baruch it is evident that typology is taken to be chronological recurrence, with the OT pointing to the eschatological future that begins in Christ. The translation and Greek text used here are those found in Michael W. Holmes, ed., \textit{The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations}, 3rd ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 398–99.}
The second potential axis is cosmological. In the LXX τῦπος is rare, but it generally has the sense of “pattern” or “form.”\(^\text{151}\) In Exod 25:40 it indicates the heavenly blueprint for the earthly tabernacle. Speaking in particular of cultic utensils that have just been described, God commands Moses, “And see to it that you make them according to the pattern [κατὰ τὸν τύπον] for them, which is being shown you on the mountain.” Especially in sapiential circles, this lead to speculation about God’s temple in the heavens, which transcends its earthly counterpart.\(^\text{152}\) Philo distinguishes three separate categories: the heavenly ἀρχέτυπος (“archetype”) or ἰδέα (“form” or “idea”), the τῦπος (“type”) or παράδειγμα (“model”) that Moses is shown, and the earthly μίμημα (“copy”) or σκιά (“shadow”) (Leg. 3.102; Mos. 2.74ff., 141; Somn. 1.206; he speaks of creation with similar language in Opif. 16, 19, 29, 36, 36).

\(^{151}\) See Goppelt, *TDNT* 8:248. Three of the four instances indicate, in turn, idols (Amos 5:26: “You shall take up Sakkuth your king, and Kaiwan your star-god, your images [τοὺς τύπους αὐτῶν], which you made for yourselves”), the form of a letter (3 Macc 3:30 [NETS]: “The original of the letter [ὁ . . . ἐπιστολῆς τύπος] was written in this manner”), and a moral example to avoid (4 Macc 6:19 [NETS]: if the elderly were to turn from the law by threat of torture, they would “become a model of impiety [ἀσεβείας τύπος] for the young so that we should set a precedent for eating defiled food”). Far more common in the LXX is the verbal form, τύπτω (“to strike”), which indicates “smiting” another with the fist or a weapon; metaphorically, it is used of grief or regret “stabbing” the soul. See Gustav Stählin, “τύπτω,” *TDNT* 8:261–62. The verb has the same meanings in the NT as well (ibid., 263–69).

\(^{152}\) In the NT, both Acts 7:44 and Heb 8:5 reference Exod 25:40 to this effect, with τῦπος indicating the heavenly original. In Heb 9:24, ἀντίτυπον is the earthly copy of the true temple. (Cf. 1 Pet 3:21, in which baptism is an “antitype of” or “corresponds to” the waters of the flood — the syntax is hard, but ἀντίτυπον seems to indicate the later, fuller reality of salvation in Christ.) Hebrews 8–10 is particularly close to Philo’s terminology and viewpoint.
So in the first century we can certainly find parallels for investing τύπος with an otherworldly significance. Although the cosmological tenor of τύπος is not as clear in Rom 5 as it is in Philo or Hebrews, there is reason to think Paul has this axis in mind alongside the temporal one. To begin with, we can remove the objection that they are unlikely to have been combined. They are united, for example, in Heb 8: the Jerusalem temple is not only “a sketch and shadow of the heavenly one” (v. 5), but also the covenant associated with it is “obsolete and growing old” (v. 13). Nearer at hand, the τύποι the apostle recalls in 1 Cor 10:6 are not simply historical; Moses’s day and Paul’s own interpenetrate, so that the parting of the Sea of Reeds becomes a kind of baptism (vv. 2–3), and the Rock from which the Israelites drank was Christ (v. 4).

---

153 So Goppelt, *TDNT* 8:257–59. (I am listing the references as he gives them; *Mos.* 2.74ff. seems to indicate *Mos.* 2.74–77.) He is comparing Philo with Hebrews in particular at this point, but he does not think Hebrews is dependent on Philo, and he also registers the differences in their wording (e.g., Hebrews does not have an ἀρχέτυπος). He speaks of “vertical” and “horizontal” typology, rather than cosmological and temporal typology, as I have done.

154 Here I differ from Goppelt (*TDNT* 8:258–59), for whom the truest sense of typology, as found in Paul, is “consummation in salvation history,” over against merely “cyclic” or “cosmic mythical” views of typology. I see no reason why Christ cannot be at once the second Adam and a heavenly archetype of the first man.

155 The OT “types” here are more than just examples from the distant past, but in some way become present to the young Corinthian church. That does not necessarily mean the connection is
More than that, there is positive evidence for a union of temporal and cosmological senses here. When Paul speaks of Adam and Christ in 1 Cor 15, his language concerns not just the present world and the coming one, it is also about the physical and the spiritual, the earthly and the heavenly (vv. 42–29). Further, the vast majority of commentators approach Rom 5:12–21 as passage filled with cosmic imagery. “Sin” and “Death” are often capitalized as personified forces rather than mere abstractions, and the effects of two decisive actions by two men are universal in scope. Romans 5 is about salvation history, to be sure, but it also about the heavenly realm’s impact on humanity.

Assuming, then, that Adam is an eschatological and heavenly type of the coming Messiah, v. 14 is the most direct hint we have of Paul’s otherwise unstated logic of their commensurability. Even so, Paul’s intent remains elusive. The third problem is identifying the precise meaning of “type.” Etymology and other Pauline parallels give limited help. Τύπος — originally a “blow” (from τύπτω, “to strike”), as cosmological, but the point is that Paul does not seem to limit τύπος to a strictly historical sense in 1 Cor 10:6, which is the passage closest to τύπος in Rom 5:14.

This passage introduces an apparent difficulty into my argument, in that it seems only Christ, not Adam, is to be associated with the heavenly or spiritual realm. In Chapter 4 I will return to 1 Cor 15 with more depth, and there I will argue that Paul is viewing Adam’s creation retrospectively, through the lens of the fall, so that Adam was not merely of the dust at his creation.
in John 20:25 — derives from the realm of metalworking, with the sense of “impression” or “stamp” (as on a coin), and it came to be used of molds as well. By the first century τύπος could indicate the original “model” or the “copy” made from it, as well as a preliminary “sketch” and “form” generally. In Paul’s usage the τύπος designates a person or event chronologically earlier, as of moral examples in his own day, but without archetypal priority being a necessary consequence — and in 1 Cor 10 and Rom 5, the fulfillment of the typology is greater than the original. Adam as a “type” of Christ indicates that, on some level, they bear a common imprint.

The word τύπος involves us in a further consideration of typological hermeneutics, which would become common patristic practice. In an earlier generation of scholarship, when Goppelt’s specific definition of typology as correspondence across history (as opposed to allegory) still held sway in NT studies,

---


158 Most instances of τύπος in Pauline literature have the sense of moral “example,” of one Christian or church for another (Phil 3:17; 1 Thess 1:7; 2 Thess 3:9; 1 Tim 4:12; Tit 2:7; similarly ὑποτύπωσις in 1 Tim 1:16). It also occurs in Rom 6:17, meaning the “form” or “norm” of teaching received (similarly ὑποτύπωσις in 2 Tim 1:13). The word group, then, means “example” or “form,” at times with deeper significance.

this instance appeared odd to some, given the opposite results of the two figures.\textsuperscript{160}

Writes Heinrich Müller,

In Rom. 5:14, the typos-concept produces a tension which basically breaks through the typological method . . . . [S]ince, on the one hand, Adam cannot really count as a faithful prefiguration of Christ, and on the other there is no other known occurrence of typos meaning a contrasting picture, Paul is here quite possibly employing the concept with the precise polemical intention of rejecting a traditional Adam-messiah typology. It is a matter of the radical abrogation of the old by the new; the new only becomes actual, when the old is overcome.\textsuperscript{161}

Käsemann sees it as a valid typology, but limits the extent of the association. As noted already, for him the presence of τύπος in v. 14 indicates strict typology, but it implies that Adam and Christ are “commensurable, not in terms of nature, but solely in terms of function; the world is changed by both.”\textsuperscript{162} Goppelt himself argues that Adam is “an advance presentation” of Christ as an “antithetical correspondence.”\textsuperscript{163} All three, in different ways, reject τύπος as a term of honor for Adam. They accede only that he is a negative counterpart to Christ.

\textsuperscript{160} See Goppelt, \textit{Typos}, 17–19. In these pages Goppelt defines typology and contrasts it with other ancient exegetical strategies, such as allegory.

\textsuperscript{161} Müller, \textit{NIDNTT} 3:906. Although he seems influenced by Goppelt’s definition here, Müller adds later, “Typology in Paul has obviously not yet hardened into a methodology simply requiring appropriate technical application to any situation.”

\textsuperscript{162} Käsemann, \textit{Romans}, 142, 144.

\textsuperscript{163} Goppelt, \textit{TDNT} 8:252; see also idem, \textit{Typos}, 129–30.
Recently scholars have downplayed the precision of the word, arguing that in primitive Christianity it remained flexible, and there is no indication that it held specific, methodological import for Paul. Less stock is put in the specific word now, but overall the positions taken today as to what Paul intends with τύπος at the end of Rom 5:14 have not greatly changed since Müller, Käsemann, and Goppelt. It is generally said that the comparison is limited and antithetical, indicating only the functional results they accomplish for all of humanity.

If Adam as a “type” of Christ were to signify any ontological similarity to the Messiah, this lone word in Rom 5:14 is too unsteady a foundation, by itself, to suggest an Adamic Christology. There must be parallels to substantiate the identification. This brings us to a fifth concern, one that comes by way of the religionsgeschichtliche Schule. Is there any precedent before Paul’s time for a

---

164 Indeed, Paul’s “typologies” in Rom 5 and 1 Cor 10 do not seem to be, to his thinking, different from his “allegory” in Gal 4. (The passive participle of ἀλληγορέω occurs in Gal 4:24.)

165 Exemplary of the changing tides is John Muddiman, “‘Adam, the Type of the One to Come,’ ” Theology 87 (1984): 106. He stresses that “type of the One to Come” has a “strictly limited scope” (emphasis his). Paul’s premise of universal condemnation in Adam, adopted “for the sake of argument,” “enables him to score a debating point”; further, Paul “can be splendidly equivocal over such questions as whether man is responsible for his own moral acts or is the helpless victim of the power of sin, whether he is free and therefore culpable or in bondage and therefore merely pitiable, or whether the Law was there from the beginning or only added later.” His view of the Adam-Christ typology is much like that of Pheme Perkins, mentioned above.
Messiah-Adam comparison? As mentioned above, two of the major theories in the twentieth century have now been largely discredited as only arriving on scene too late. Gnosticism no longer seems to be a pre-Christian phenomenon, so there is no clear “primal man” tradition on which Paul could draw. Similarly, the latter half of the last century generally questioned the date and cogency of purported pre-Pauline Jewish parallels to a “second Adam.” If there is any significant support left, it is found in Philo’s oeuvre, when he speaks of both a heavenly and earthly Adam, but even here no line of influence can be traced to the apostle. At most, what can be demonstrated is that a conception of an archetypal human was possible among first-century Hellenistic Jews.

Indeed, the quest for a historical precedent of the Adam-Christ typology has been largely abandoned. According to Käsemann, writing in 1980, “In spite of strenuous efforts no adequate explanation in the history of religions has been found for the rise of Adam-Christ typology.” Notwithstanding this proviso near the outset of his comments on Rom 5:12–21, Käsemann tries his hand at identifying the background and arrives at a plausible solution. In a series of intricate steps, he (1) fixes on the “main religio-historical problem” as whether Adam and the Messiah can

166 Käsemann, *Romans*, 142.
be subsumed under the common denominator ἄνθρωπος, (2) eliminates as historically unhelpful the Gnostic “redeemed redeemer” myth and Jewish “Son of Man” traditions, (3) presents Hellenistic Jewish σοφία / λόγος speculation as a more likely alternative for associating the primeval and eschatological ἄνθρωποι, and finally (4) adds the apocalyptic conception of two ages to explain how Adam and Christ became opposing ἄνθρωποι ruling two worlds. At the end of the same decade in which the final edition of Käsemann’s commentary appeared, Dunn was less convinced that the juxtaposition pre-dated Paul. He speaks of research into the matter as something that “still lingers on” and dismisses several efforts to recover first-century Adamic traditions as, in turn, “a wild goose chase,” “highly suspect,” and an idea with “no real ground.” However, he cautions, “we should not go to the opposite extreme and attribute the whole of Paul’s Adam Christology to Paul

167 Ibid., 142–46.

168 Dunn, Romans, 1:277–79. “Wild goose chase”: Gnostic primal ἄνθρωπος; “highly suspect”: Philonic heavenly and earthly ἄνθρωποι, in conjunction with 1 Cor 15; “no real ground”: an earlier Son of Man Christology that has blended with Adamic themes. He also disagrees with a theory set forth by N. T. Wright, that Israel was the Last Adam in apocalyptic Judaism, because it appears too late.
himself,” positing that Ps 110:1 was joined to Ps 8 to form an Adamic Christology in primitive Christianity.\footnote{Ibid., 1:279. Dunn cites Mark 12:36 par.; 1 Cor 15:25–27; Eph 1:20–22; Heb 1:13–2:8; and 1 Pet 3:22.}

Skip forward to 2007, and Jewett, in his 1200-page commentary, devotes but a single paragraph to the issue. “The historical-religious background remains problematic,” he states, concluding that “there is no credible evidence that Jewish thinkers ever viewed the Messiah as a kind of second Adam.”\footnote{Jewett, Romans, 378–79.} The proto-gnostic option of an redeeming primal man fares a little better in his evaluation, and 1 Cor 15 gives it some credence, but in Rom 5 “no trace of polemic against an original spiritual Adam is visible.”\footnote{Ibid., 379.}

Stymied by a dearth of historically provable antecedents to Paul’s Adam-Christ typology, scholarly appetite for isolating the cultural background of the comparison has grown faint. Additionally, there is no definitive significance we might assign τῦπος, and a few even dispute whether Adam is a type of Christ or a type of Moses. Although I have argued that τῦπος should be read as entailing both

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item \footnotetext{Ibid., 1:279. Dunn cites Mark 12:36 par.; 1 Cor 15:25–27; Eph 1:20–22; Heb 1:13–2:8; and 1 Pet 3:22.}
\item \footnotetext{Jewett, Romans, 378–79.}
\item \footnotetext{Ibid., 379.}
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
history and cosmic reality, the point is contested, and it is not clear whether an
apocalyptic or sapiential background is most likely. Together these factors make a
riddle of Paul’s statement that Adam is a “type of the coming one,” and combine
with the riddles involving, first, the place of Rom 5:12–21 in the wider letter to the
Romans, and second, the means of transfer of Adamic sin and messianic redemption
to the masses, to render the Adam-Christ comparison a nettlesome topic. The
viewpoint that Paul’s contrast is provisional and limited has steadily gained
ascendancy, and in light of the foregoing, it is little wonder why. Of late Beverly
Roberts Gaventa has noted “something of a shift in scholarly interest away from
chapters 5–8” of Romans, and the remark certainly obtains for Rom 5:12–21.172

**Conclusion: A Riddled Passage**

It is well to take seriously the recent challenges to an Adam-Christ juxtaposition,
since many of the Gnostic and Jewish parallels have indeed proved to be post-
Pauline. That said, two points made already bear repeating. First, Paul’s comparison
of Adam and Christ is a juxtaposition he finds useful in two of his most memorable

---

chapters, and he employs it to summarize, in the briefest terms, his theology of
salvation history. It cannot be said that the typology is merely incidental.

Second, if Paul does not deliberately elaborate on how the two are alike, the
most reasonable hypothesis is that he relies on Jewish conceptions of Adam that the
Roman Christians knew. Yet despite a renaissance of research on the OT
Pseudepigrapha, the discovery and careful consideration of the DSS, and attention
given to other Greco-Roman Jewish writings, more work remains to be done on
understanding the picture of Adam among Second Temple Jews, particularly in
relation to Paul. Indeed, compared to the first half of the twentieth century, when
conviction in the Adam-Christ typology was strong, with many new resources at our
disposal we are in an enviable position to assess Adam’s place in first-century Jewish
thought compared to Paul’s — yet in our day the significance of the typology is at a
low ebb. We might therefore adopt the catchphrase of those earlier humanists: *ad
fontes!* By returning to Paul’s contemporaries, we shall see that Adam was not
simply a gloomy figure who introduced death into the world, but the father of all
nations — a glorious figure above all other created things, in addition to his
responsibility for death and sin.
A riddle operates on dual levels, and its solution comes by locating the metaphor: seeing beyond the superficial to a veiled meaning. In Classical literature, the most famous riddle comes from Sophocles, when Oedipus faces the Sphinx and her query, “What walks on four legs in the morning, on two legs at noon, and three legs in the evening?” The soon-to-be king of Thebes realizes that “morning,” “noon,” and “evening” indicate periods of life rather than of a day, and thus is able to supply the correct answer, “a human being.” In the Bible only Samson is associated with riddles in the proper sense, but in a looser sense many passages present themselves to us as riddles: truths half-apparent but still elusive. Prominent among these passages is Rom 5:12–21, which, despite much scholarly research, remains difficult to interpret. A new perspective is required. To find it, the best strategy is to consider the Adamic traditions current in Paul’s own day. This will allow us to give a reasonable answer to the Sphinx on this most riddled of passages.
"The God of peace will soon crush Satan under your feet.  
The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you.”  
– Rom 16:20

Introduction to Adamic Traditions

So ends Paul's final exhortation to the Roman Christians, seven verses from the conclusion of canonical Romans.\(^{173}\) This flourish, capping a warning against deceptive teachers, makes sly reference to the curse of the serpent in Gen 3:15 (Eve's offspring “will strike your head, and you will strike his heel”). The brevity of this line belies the complexity of its meaning. For one thing, Paul has identified the snake of the creation narrative with the chief demon, much as John the seer would later do in Rev 12:9. For another, the apostle has put the protological cursing in an eschatological context, envisioning the crushing of Satan to be the abolition of evil.

\(^{173}\) “Canonical” is important. Not only is the originality of ch. 16 as a whole contested, but this section within ch. 16 has raised additional questions. I will refer to the author is Paul, assuming the canonical shape of the letter is accurate, but little rides on it. Even if it were not written by Paul, whoever wrote this illustrates the multifaceted way in which Adamic traditions can be used among Second Temple Jews and early Christians, and as we will see in other parts of the undisputed epistles Paul trades in the lore similarly.
For a third, he places believers in his day into the role of the woman’s children.

Further, the image functions as a warning against deception by hearkening back to the principal act of treachery in biblical history. This is a quiet, creative allusion Paul has made, and it has received relatively little fanfare in scholarship.\(^{174}\)

---


Romans 16:20 in not an isolated text, but it suffices for the moment. Both its subtlety and its complexity are illustrative of how the apostle, and many other Jews in his time, employ primeval history in their writings. I have mentioned already that Paul, in the undisputed letters, speaks of Adam “by name” in only Rom 5 and 1 Cor 15, and “Eve” occurs but once, in 2 Cor 11:3 (both are also in 1 Tim 2). This is not, however, the same as saying that the apostle invokes the story of Adam and Eve only two or three times. Yet if we judge by direct citations, the apostle again demonstrates meager interest in Gen 1–3, quoting from it twice: Gen 2:7 (1 Cor 15:45) and 2:24 (1 Cor 6:16; also Eph 5:31). Neither of these metrics is representative. Primeval history works its way into his writings elsewhere, in muted but still unmistakable tones, none as unassuming as Rom 16:20. As we will see throughout this chapter, Paul regularly draws theology and morals from Gen 1–3, even though he names the figures rarely and quotes the text infrequently.

I have argued in Chapter 1 that Rom 5:12–21 presents several complicated riddles that remain unsolved. The broader question is why Paul, after repeatedly speaking of “Jews” and “Greeks” throughout Rom 1–4, apparently pivots away from Jewish-gentile relations in Rom 5 only to revive them, with gusto, in Rom 9. The two
narrower questions are, one, how sin and salvation are transmitted from the “one” to
the “many,” and, two, in what sense Adam is a “type” of Christ (Rom 5:14). The
solution to these riddles, I have also argued, is likely hiding in plain sight. If Paul has
returned to the Adam-Christ comparison several years after writing 1 Corinthians,
and if he expects an audience not yet acquainted with him to understand his logic,
then he most likely appeals to something taken as common knowledge among first-
century Christians. Our best approximation for that common stock of ideas comes
from the extant Jewish and Christian literature of the Greco-Roman period.

Methodological Challenges. Mapping out the ideas about primeval history
that were available to Paul and the Roman Christians, however, presents challenges.
The most obvious of these is that, aside from Genesis itself, Paul knows few of these
writings. Outside the initial chapters of Genesis, Adam is very nearly invisible in the
HB, a whisper floating lightly on the wind.\footnote{Aside from the location “Adam” (Josh 3:16; probably Hos 6:7), one could in fact read the
NRSV and not come upon Adam’s name again until the Apocrypha, except in the genealogy of 1
Chron 1:1. In the NIV the occurrences skip from Gen 5:5 to 1 Chron 1:1 to Luke 3:38. For most of
Israelite history, Adam is frankly dispensable. The Patriarchs founded the nation, David or Solomon
capture the image of a YHWH-appointed king, Moses stands as the preeminent leader, legislator, and
prophet of the people; Adam and Eve are of little significance. If there is anything of primeval history
in these early periods, it is the “tree of life” in sapiential works, or the paradisiacal garden and the
myth of fallen heavenly beings in certain prophetic writings, but the references surface in ways}
solidified, yet it is hard to discern the extent of Paul’s acquaintance with writings that come from after the Persian period. If one were to draw a Venn diagram of “works plausibly known to Paul” and “works showing interest in primeval history,” the intersection would be limited to the Septuagintal writings Tobit, Wisdom of Solomon, and Sirach, and perhaps several of the early pseudepigrapha, such as the Book of Watchers, Jubilees, and the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs. These give us some footing for Pauline comparisons, but much is still lacking. Breadth must be the compensation for this difficulty. For even if we cannot show that Paul knows a particular text in which a pertinent conception of Adam occurs, if it is found with frequency in multiple unrelated works around Paul’s time, there is sufficient warrant to hypothesize that the apostle could utilize the idea.  

This is, in a sense, an extrapolation of the independent attestation criterion from historical Jesus research.

The second challenge is that, not unlike Paul’s echo of the serpent’s curse in Gen 3, which contains none of the expected vocabulary of the Adamic tales, it is insufficient to search Second Temple literature for the name “Adam.” Many times impossible to pin definitively to Genesis itself. Only with exilic and postexilic works does firmer evidence come, but even then it is minimal.

Although I will give many references below, lest I weary the reader in the main text I will give only one illustrative example, leaving in the footnotes a full list of additional references.
primeval history is present with other symbols: Eve, the tree of life, a conniving
serpent, a fruit — usually the fig or grape when specified — that imparts sin, or, as
in this case, an oblique reference to one of the curses. Even when Adam is in mind,
sometimes he is given another title, such as the “first-formed man” or “our ancient
father.” For this reason I consider below a wide variety of images under the banner
of “Adamic traditions,” organized according to how they are cited by later Jews.

Third, references to primeval history are often suggestive but not definitive,
with images that could be drawn either from the early chapters of Genesis or from
everyday life, such as humanity coming from dust and returning to it, or working the
soil with toil and sweat. In these cases discerning a purposeful reference to Genesis
requires more than the verbal echo itself. There must be other evidence in the
context that indicates Adam, Eve, or the serpent is on the author’s mind. But often
the echo is indeed probable, as with Rom 16:20 (given Rom 5:12–21), and valuable
information can be found in these oblique references.

177 In this chapter I have generally picked indisputable allusions, when there can be no doubt
that these Second Temple Jews are referencing the Genesis narrative. Occasionally my secondary
examples are debatable, in which case I note the uncertainty. As developed in the Introduction, in
these cases I use criteria of (1) availability, which includes (a) Paul’s direct knowledge of a source, (b)
its chronological priority, and / or (c) its widespread existence near the time of Paul; (2) productivity,
i.e., how well it explains Paul’s logic; and (3) “outcrops,” i.e., whether it fits the main junctures in
Paul’s thought.
The fourth and most pressing challenge is that balance must be restored to our understanding of Adam and Eve in Jewish thought. The scholarly reticence to identify a more-than-surface comparison between Adam and Christ in Pauline literature is the result, at least in part, of isolating only one aspect of Adam’s legacy. Research on Paul in light of Adamic traditions is indeed common, but we are often eying selective points, particularly because the woeful Adam of 4 Ezra and the a-little-less-woeful Adam of 2 Baruch have played such an outsized role in our appreciation of Rom 5. We are misled not by the blindfold of a captor, but by the art of an illusionist: it is not that we see nothing but that we are distracted by the obvious facts and miss important details in the background. For most modern Christians, Gen 1–3 sets up the problem that the rest of the Bible seeks to solve; that is what we have been trained to observe. Paul’s contemporaries spoke regularly of this first pair, and in contrast to our day, they found much more in their story than a dour reflection on the entanglements of sin and the inevitability of death.\footnote{So also D. S. Russell, \textit{The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: Patriarchs and Prophets in Early Judaism} (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987), 21–23. After analyzing works that portray Adam’s sin as a catastrophe for future generations, he writes, “But although the role of Adam as a bearer of suffering, sin and death is fully recognized in these books, this is by no means the complete picture as presented by the writers of the pseudepigrapha” (p. 21). Rather, in these works he is also “a man of great honour and renown” (p. 23).}
For these reasons, I suggest that we turn afresh to Second Temple works, attending to the details and noticing the many ways primeval history is used in them. If Paul bids us to uncover his inner logic in Rom 5, it is necessary to ground our hypothesis in ideas that were in currency in the first century. What follows is my taxonomy of Adamic reflection in Jewish literature, from faint hints in the HB into the Greco-Roman era, with reference to the Pauline corpus where applicable.¹⁷⁹

**Taxonomy in Brief.** Five conceptions dominate Jewish writings, but the particular ideas present within any of these are diverse. (1) Adam and Eve are the heads of humanity, both of individuals and of nations, often as their genealogical source, but sometimes in other ways as well. The second and third categories are prescriptive. Adam and Eve set the pattern, positively or negatively, from which humans ought to learn: (2) primeval history can set an paradigmatic pattern to follow and (3) moral warnings to avoid. The fourth and fifth category are, by contrast, descriptive. (4) The “Adam as bearer of disaster” traditions assign one or

---

¹⁷⁹ My interest is Adam and Eve as they would have been understood by Second Temple Jews. Genesis 2–3 is the primary locus for these traditions, but the first man and woman also are interwoven into stories of their children Cain, Abel, and Seth, as well as Cain’s and Seth’s lines, usually to the time of the flood. Likewise, although I am only limitedly concerned with the creation account of Gen 1,.Adam is created male and female in the image of God and given dominion over creation, and there can be little doubt that Paul would have pictured the creation of the individuals Adam and Eve there.
more of the figures from Gen 3 blame for the difficulties of life at present, while (5)
the “Adam as glorious figure” traditions see in the first pair as among the greatest
beings conceivable, even in comparison to angels and gods, not to mention the likes
of Enoch and Moses. None of these categories are likely to surprise, but some of the
details in them might, and the relative volume of each is instructive for the overall
impression Adam and Eve made on readers of Genesis in the formative years of
Christianity.

My five categories are exhaustive, and the sub-categories given in the
footnotes, at least insofar as my survey of primeval history in the HB, Apocrypha,
OT Pseudepigrapha, DSS, Philo, Josephus, and the rest of the NT indicates. They
are not, by contrast, mutually exclusive. In many cases more than one category is in
play. To return to Rom 16:20, it assumes the “bearer of disaster” tradition since
humanity has an enemy seeking to lead us astray, but its optimism is born of a
“glorious Adam” conviction that Eve’s children will triumph over the devil, a victory

180 I have excluded some possible references where the echo cannot be proved. For works that
retell the Genesis story in one form or another (e.g., Josephus, Jewish Antiquities; Jubilees; or Ps.-
Philo, Liber antiquitatum biblicarum), my interest is only what differs from the original narrative, the
points that seem to be innovations, whether intentional or inherited accidentally. Rabbinic and early
Christian writings (outside those in the OT Pseudepigrapha) might also preserve traditions that date
back to the first century, and occasionally I mention examples that are especially germane, but mostly
I have not included them.
that, for Paul, comes through the Messiah Jesus. It is also an ethical warning, encouraging the believers in Rome to beware of false teachers. Reality rarely presents pure types, and I offer my five categories with full acknowledgment that many references fall into two or more places. Nor are the categories of equal weight. The paradigmatic pattern is relatively rare, while the “glorious Adam” is most common. Together, though, they give the five major faces of Adam in Jewish portraiture near the first century, insofar as we can reconstruct it. In the Pauline corpus all five are present, but it is the combination of the last three (Adamic headship, the “bearer of disaster” tradition, and the “glorious” tradition) that provide the interpretive key for Rom 5:12–21.

*Comparison to Other Methods.* The data could be organized otherwise. There are those who consider Jewish sources explicitly as background for Paul, many of which were noted in the previous chapter.181 Usually the organization of these works is either thematic or by corpora, with the other secondary. For example, Scroggs investigates the OT, the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, and the rabbinic corpus, looking for certain themes within each (e.g., the sin of Adam, Adam and the

181 See “Proposed Solutions, in Brief Review.”
eschaton) and then applying to Paul. De Boer gives precedence to themes, particularly death and apocalyptic eschatology, and then investigates individual writings under those topics before turning to Paul.

Among those who make the Adamic legends themselves the end of their study, some arrange their research by themes. Peter Thacher Lanfer gives his attention to the expulsion narrative, looking particular at its use of the tree of life and for wisdom, immortality, and the cult. He discerns allusions to primeval history much earlier than most, and he does so by decoupling the constituent parts into several motifs. In his analysis the discussion has been led astray by assuming one fixed, definitive story, an Urtext, and identifying it with Gen 1–3. Given this, allusions to primeval history are scant in the HB, and only come late. However, allusion to the elements of Gen 1–3 as component pieces occurs often. The volume

---

182 Scroggs, Last Adam.

183 de Boer, Defeat of Death.

184 Lanfer, Remembering Eden. The first chapter gives the method and background to the expulsion narrative, and then Chapters 2–5 considers the above ideas in light of the narrative.

185 Ibid., 3–32. This is my summary of Lanfer’s methodology. In his own conclusion he puts it this way, “The first goal of this project has been the more modest one of situating the interpretations and translations of Eden according to central themes and motifs, highlighting how these interpretations reflect the composite quality of the redacted narrative in Genesis. In compiling these
Paradise in Antiquity, a collection of papers from the British-Israeli conference at Hebrew University, narrows its scope to one image, paradise, discussed in various works from the Greco-Roman era. The subject matter of the volume extend from the Persian imagery of a walled garden to Augustine’s comparison of paradise in Virgil and the Bible.

Others organize by particular works or authors. This is John R. Levison’s strategy in Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism, in which he analyzes Sirach and Wisdom, Philo, Jubilees, and Josephus, 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch, with the Greek and Latin Life of Adam and Eve in an addendum of sorts. His positive reason for this interpretations of Eden, it is evident that the expulsion narrative is prominent in nearly all genres and collections of early Jewish and Christian literature. Although the marginality of Eden is perhaps apparent in a surface examination of the MT, motifs and themes derived from the Eden narrative are found throughout. Moreover, especially in the Hellenistic period, apocalyptic writings began to reinvigorate the use of creation myths, assigning the garden of Eden, Adam and Eve, guardian cherubim, and the Tree of Life thematic importance in the pursuit of wisdom and immortality."


Levison, Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism: From Sirach to 2 Baruch, JSPSup 1 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988). Bloomsbury republished the volume in 2015 in the Biblical Studies: Hebrew Bible series, but the text and pagination are the same. Levison divides works into categories, so Sirach and Wisdom are sapiential, Philo is given his own category, Jubilees is parnetic history and Josephus is rhetorical history, and then 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch are both apocalypses. He gives a conclusion on the unity and diversity of Adam in Second Temple Judaism, and then he adds the two Life of Adam of Eve books (under their older titles, the Apocalypse of Moses and Vita Adae et Evae). They are included because of their relevance but added later because of their uncertain origin, so as not to “contaminate” the earlier conclusions (p. 29).
book-by-book method is that “early Jewish interpretations of Adam are remarkably diversified because each author employs and adapts Adam according to his Tendenz,”\textsuperscript{188} and he also faults previous studies for only investigating Adam as a background for Paul.\textsuperscript{189} Ultimately his conclusion is that there is more diversity than unity to Jewish portraits of Adam, even if small clusters of similar ideas can be detected.\textsuperscript{190} In \textit{Primeval History} Helge S. Kvanvig casts a wider net, comparing Mesopotamian creation myths, the Genesis account, and the Book of Watchers, analyzed in terms of their common pattern: creation, the fall of semi-divine beings, ten generations of earliest humanity, and a flood story.\textsuperscript{191} He sees Babylonian texts (especially the Epic of Atrahasis) as the origin, to which both Genesis and the Watchers narrative respond as they also interact with each other.\textsuperscript{192}

\textsuperscript{188} Ibid., 14. Earlier he states his thesis negatively: “the ‘motifs’ of an ‘Adam speculation’ or ‘Adam myth’ which the last generation of scholars discerned in Early Judaism do not exist” (p. 13).

\textsuperscript{189} Ibid., 14–23.

\textsuperscript{190} Ibid., 143–61.


\textsuperscript{192} Ibid., esp. 517–29. The Babylonian primeval history is the foundational “master narrative,” and both biblical and Enochic primeval histories are “counter stories” to it, challenging significant parts of its meaning. He argues that P is the oldest material in Genesis, and dates the earliest parts of 1 Enoch (chs. 6–11) to before some of the non-P material in Gen 1–11, particularly Gen 6. Since “the
a shorter but still valuable survey, combines approaches, first considering the works that mention Adam and then discerning that Adam is portrayed as “fallen man” and “exalted man.”

My ultimate goal, like the first group of scholars, is to read Adamic traditions in light of Paul’s literature. However, in this chapter I have not privileged the apostle. I have included every tidbit, every crumb of Adamic lore in Greco-Roman Judaism, and created categories to articulate best what I have found. When relevant I introduce Pauline literature, but I did not determine my taxonomy based on him.

I have also decided, with the second group, to arrange by themes rather than works. Many of the same ideas can be found in desperate genres and social classes, and thus it is best approached as folklore. This is not to minimize that each author

directions of influence crisscross” between Genesis and the Book of Watchers (p. 520), and since their views sometimes complement each other and sometimes disagree, they are by turns counter stories to each other or “alternative stories” that supplement each other. In describing the Enochic tales, he also makes some use of other early accounts, such as Jubilees and some DSS, but the Book of Watchers is his focus.

193 Russell, Patriarchs and Prophets, 13–23. Russell’s work includes many other figures besides Adam.

194 My goal is similar to that of Lanfer (Remembering Eden, 23). Speaking of Adamic themes, he says, “I hope to establish in this analysis that Messianic and eschatological expectations crossed both sectarian and genre boundaries. Moreover, these expectations manifest in diverse ways in the pursuit of diverse interests. Communities do not restrict their interpretation to certain genres of literature; their ideology transcends the bounds of individual authors or text types.
interprets the traditions according to his or her own concerns. Rather, what motivates my methodology is the conviction that the images developed by one person — an exegetical solution to meet a current social need, say — quickly become common property of a wider public and are reused by others with new goals in mind. I am collecting the building blocks of Adamic traditions, not offering a tour of the various constructions they have been used to build.

**Head of Humanity**

The foundational position of Adam and Eve is as parents of humanity. All who come after them also come from them, and in this way their legacy redounds across the generations. This headship is apparent in several forms. In some cases the creation of Adam functions as a chronological marker, just as the birth of Jesus does in the traditional Gregorian calendar. In a similar manner, Adam can be a generational placeholder. Enoch is described as the “seventh from Adam” in both 1 En. 60:8

---

195 In Chapter 4, in fact, I seek Paul’s own interpretation of the legends.

196 Demetrius the Chronographer (late 3rd c. BCE) gives 3624 years from Adam to the entrance into Egypt (frag. 2:18 = Eusebius, *Preap. ev.* 9.21.18). Also Eupolemus (2nd c. BCE), frag. 5 (= Clement, *Strom.* 1.141.4); Jub. 50:4 (2nd c. BCE).
(early 1st c. CE?) and Jud 14 (1st / 2nd c. CE), and several sources trace a genealogy back to Adam, as in 1 Chron 1:1.\(^{197}\) The phrase בני אדם is common in the HB and later Hebrew literature, and in the vast majority of cases it is a pleonastic way to indicate humanity as a class (“humans”).\(^{198}\) However, on occasion it may envision the historical figure as the fountainhead of humanity (“sons of Adam”) — or, at any rate, that could be how the reference was read among Second Temple Jews.\(^{199}\)

Indicative of this is a rare use of “all the sons of Eve” ( NodeList) to designate humanity in 4QInstruction\(^d\) (4Q418 122 / 126 II.12).\(^{200}\)

---

\(^{197}\) This accounts for the one sure reference to Adam as an individual in the HB outside of Genesis and one of two in the LXX among books it shares with the HB (see below for the other). It is also one of two uses of the name in the NT outside the Pauline corpus, in Luke 3:23–38 (1st c. CE). Josephus (1st c. CE) combines approaches: Ant. 1.79 (genealogical), Ant. 1.82, 8.62, and 10.148 (chronological).


\(^{199}\) A few English Bibles follow this course. The KJV translates בני אדם as “sons of Adam” in Deut 32:8, and in quite a few Psalms the NABRE has “children of Adam” (Pss 11:4; 31:20; 33:13; 36:8; 53:3; 58:2; 66:5; 90:3; 107:8, 15, 21, 31; 115:16; 146:3). The LXX translates Deut 32:8 as υἱοὶ ἄδαμ, and Philo follows suit when he quotes the passage (Post. 89–91; Plant. 59–61; Congr. 58–62), although these “children of Adam” are taken symbolically (in Post. as virtues, but in Plant. and Congr. as vices, with only Israel representing virtue).

\(^{200}\) While אדם doubles in Hebrew as “Adam” and “man” or “human” in the abstract, חוה is a proper name and, limitedly, a way to designate a small town (“living place,” from חוה, “to live”), always associated with Jair: Num 32:41; Josh 13:30; 1 Kgs 4:13; 1 Chron 2:23. 4QInstruction\(^c\) also has the phrase “the sons of Seth” (בני שית), but its meaning is obscured by a lacuna beforehand (4Q417 2.I.15); it might only indicate the righteous.
More to the point for Rom 5, in several sources Adam becomes the patriarch of humanity in the same way that Abraham or Jacob is for Israel. Philo (1st c. BCE / CE) names Adam “the ancestor of our whole race” (ὁ παντὸς τοῦ γένους ἡμῶν ἀρχηγέντης) (Opif. 136). Although God’s purposes for his nation and its patriarchs feature more prominently in Jewish literature, Jews did reflect on the divine design for Adam and his offspring. For the second-century BCE Jewish sage Joshua Ben Sira, Adam provided the same raw material, even if the character varies greatly. Sirach 33:10 begins with commonality (“All human beings [ἄνθρωποι πάντες] come from the ground, and humankind [Heb: אדם; Gk.: άδαμ] was created out of the dust”), but only in potential are they equal. Under the influence of Jeremiah’s

---

201 There is a slim chance that Adam is the “one father” of Mal 2:10 (“Have we not all one father? Has not one God created us?”), especially since v. 15 might reference Gen 2:24 (see Paradigmatic Pattern below), but the context indicates an Israel-specific focus. The “one father” is probably God, Abraham, or Jacob.

202 Adam’s (and Eve’s) parentage of humanity is also evident in Opif. 79, 140–47; Leg. 2.15; QG 1.23, 1.52 (of Eve), 1.81, 2.17; Cher. 57 (of Eve); Mut. 64. This role matters little for Philo compared to allegory, but he does seem to think that all people derive from an original pair. He also occasionally dwells on genealogical descent from Adam (e.g., Post. 170–74).

203 The Greek translation of the Hebrew Sirach, accomplished by ben Sira’s own grandson ca. 117 BCE, gives further evidence of the last point (that references to אדם brought Adam to mind). The grandson took the creation of אדם from the dust in Sir 33:10 to be a reference not to the earthiness of human flesh in general but God’s act of creating Adam at the dawn of time. Given an allusion to Gen (here “created out of the dust”), אדם became “Adam” rather than simply “man.” The NRSV, by
potter-and-clay analogy (Jer 18–19). Ben Sira believes that, in effect, God has formed them into objects of varying worth:

In the fullness of his knowledge the Lord distinguished them and appointed their different ways. Some he blessed and exalted, and some he made holy and brought near to himself; but some he cursed and brought low, and turned them out of their place. Like clay in the hand of the potter, to be molded as he pleases, so all are in the hand of their Maker, to be given whatever he decides. (Sir 33:11–13; cf. Rom 9:19–24)

Human nature inherited from Adam provides a common material, but moral substance as given by God determines the finished product (see Sir 33:14–15). In Acts 17:26–27 (1st / 2nd c. CE) the common potential is belief in God, and the accent is on nations rather than individuals. Luke shows Paul before the Aeropagus,

contrast, takes the Heb to be “humankind” in the abstract. It is probable that both meanings are present, but outside Heb a single word cannot convey both.

Or possibly Isaiah’s. Although no passage in his work is as concentrated as Jeremiah’s is, the image of clay is repeated: Isa 29:16; 41:25; 64:7 [Eng.: 64:8]. In Isa 45:9 it prepares specifically for God’s creation of humanity (v. 12).

The association of Gen 2 and Jer 18–19 is probably suggested by humans’ creation “from the ground” (ἀπὸ ἐδάφους) and Adam’s “out of the dust” (ἐκ γῆς) in Sir 33:10. Although the word used for “clay” in Sir 33:13, namely πηλός, is neither of these, there is a conceptual similarity among the three words.

According to Patrick W. Skehan and Alexander A. Di Lella (The Wisdom of Ben Sira, AB 39 [New York: Doubleday, 1987], 399–401, Ben Sira places the prerogative on the mystery of God’s election, which separates Israel from the nations, and this makes the one righteous and the other wicked. Elsewhere the differentiation is a more explicitly an expression of Jewish uniqueness. In Ps.-Philo (1st c. BCE / CE) all humans descend from Adam (LAB 1–7), yet Israel is given a special place: the earth is enjoined to rejoice because “[n]ot unjustly did God take from you the rib of the first-formed, knowing that from his rib Israel would be born” (LAB 32:15). Humankind was made for the sake of Israel, or at least with Israel as its centerpiece.
proclaiming to its philosophers, “From one ancestor [God] made all nations
(ἐποίησέν τε ἐξ ἑνὸς πᾶν ἑθνὸς ἀνθρώπων) to inhabit the whole earth . . . so that they
would search for God and perhaps grope for him and find him.” This puts a
cosmopolitan touch on humanity’s lineage: though several in its races, humankind is
made by one God from “one,” from Adam, with the goal of reuniting under that
same God.207

More could be said about Adam and Eve as the figures who unite all
humanity. Indeed, it will often resurface in the coming categories, since their folly
and glory often become those of their descendants. For the moment the essential
lesson is that Adam is a symbol that unites all people, either as individuals or
nations.208

207 Adam is at least probably in view. The NRSV adds “ancestor,” and others have “man”
(ESV, NIV), preferring this interpretation. However, several old mss add αἷμα, “from one blood,”
which the KJV and NKJV follow. Similar to Acts 17 is T. Ab. 11:9–12; 13:5 (A); 8:12–16 (B), which
presents Adam as a father in heaven fretting over the eternal fate of all his offspring.

208 This is less of a tautology than it may first appear. There is no reason why Noah and his
wife, whose family alone survived God’s drastic pruning of the human race, could not also have
functioned this way. Following Gen 10, his three sons in combination do (e.g., 1QapGen ar XII–XVII;
Ps.-Philo, LAB 5), but Noah himself does not represent all peoples in the way Adam does, except
occasionally in Philo (QG 2.17; Vita Mos. 2.65), but even in these cases Noah is something of another
Adam. Alternatively, Adam could have been ignored. The HB barely mentions primeval history after
Gen 5, but it regularly mentions the goyim.
Paradigmatic Pattern

In Gen 1–3 the Adam (אָדָם) and Eve (וָהָ) are often called “the man” (אֱלֹהִים) and “the woman” (אָדָם). They are not simply two individual characters, but “woman” and “man” in the abstract. Many Second Temple Jews read the creation account this way, including the LXX and other Greek traditions, which seem to take their cues from the presence or absence of the article. In fact, in the LXX, Eve is called Ζωή, “Life,” in Gen 3:20 (but not 4:1), the better to match the etymology given in the verse. There is a sense in which the two, particularly as they live in Gen 1–2, set the pattern for human life thereafter.

One common application of this is to present Adam and Eve as the prototypical husband and wife, the picture of marriage as God desires it. This interpretation may date back as far as Mal 2:15 (5th c. BCE). According to one way of reconstructing its meaning, the prophet tells of God making husband and wife “one,” which could bespeak the influence of Gen 2:24’s “one flesh.” However, this is
not certain. We must wait until Tobit (3rd / 2nd c. BCE) for the first unambiguous witness to this line of thinking. After Tobit’s son Tobias has routed a demon by folk magic and thereby wedded young Sarah without dying, in the bridal chamber the couple prays,

Blessed are you, O God of our ancestors . . . . You made Adam, and for him you made his wife Eve as a helper (βοηϑός) and support (στήριγμα). From the two of them the human race has sprung. You said, “It is not good that the man should be alone; let us make a helper (βοηϑός) for him like himself.” I now am taking this kinswoman of mine, not because of lust, but with sincerity. Grant that she and I may find mercy and that we may grow old together. (Tob 8:5–7)

Lest the names themselves were not obvious enough, this passage quotes the Genesis account of creation (2:18; cf. 2:20), and the primarily lesson taken from the story is that woman is to function as a “helper” (Heb.: והילא דיתו; Gk.: βοηϑός) to man, Eve to Adam and Sarah to Tobias. Tobit adds the further shading of στήριγμα, “support,” which, like βοηϑός, probably assumes subordination, at least within the narrative of Tobit. Elements beyond the paradigmatic are also evident in Tob 8. For example,

---

210 The Heb of the verse reads: ולא־אחד עשה ושאר רוח לו. Among the difficulties is that “one” could instead describe God. So, e.g., the NABRE indicates Gen 2:24 by its wording (“Did he not make them one, with flesh and spirit?”; ESV similar), but far less so the NRSV (“Did not one God make her [= the wife]? Both flesh and spirit are his”; NIV similar). The Greek tradition offers another understanding, this one keeping לא־אחד adverbial. The first part of the verse reads, “And no one else did it . . .” (NETS).

211 Fitzmyer (Tobit, CEJL [Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003], 244–46), however, downplays this sense, warning that Sarah’s “amen” in v. 8 “is not meant to be a sign of her subservience to Tobiah.
Adam and Eve beget all of humanity (τὸ σπέρμα τῶν ἀνθρώπων), and there is a moralizing bent as Tobias and Sarah are untouched, even on their wedding night, by lust (πορνεία). These are comparatively minor points, however. The emphasis in this short section is that the ideal wife, following the pattern of the prelapsarian Eve, supports her husband.

In the Synoptic Gospels and DSS, Gen 2 is given as a reason to prohibit divorce and polygamy — a move that demonstrates primeval history’s gravitas, in that to do so they must relativize specific Mosaic legislation and the examples of OT

---

To read it thus is to introduce a modern misapprehension” (p. 246). For him the prayer signals only that the marriage union is blessed by God. Either way, Adam and Eve are nonetheless a pattern for the marriage of Tobias and Sarah.

Contemporary scholars generally favor the shorter recension of Tobit (Greek II, supported by Sinaiticus) as closer to the original, and I quote that. Greek I, supported by Vaticanus and Alexandrinus, have the equivalent, but more elegant, τὸ ἀνθρώπων σπέρμα. Although the wording differs in various ways, this particular scene in Tobit is largely the same in the two major mss traditions.

Other examples of subordination: (1) The logic of 1 Tim 2:8–15, in its common interpretation, is much the same as Tobit. The Paulinist gives two arguments why wives (or women) should be submissive to husbands (or men). The first comes from the original creation (v. 13: “Adam was formed first, then Eve”), and the second from the fall (v. 14: “… and Adam was not deceived, but the woman was deceived and became a transgressor”). Whether this conviction also describes the Paul of the undisputed epistles is a matter of debate. (2) 4QMeditation on Creation A (4Q303) is unfortunately fragmentary and short, but probably supports a similar concept. It speaks of Eve as a suitable helper (עזר) and wife, and the phrasing is repeatedly “for him” (ל), indicating subordination. The text draws principles from creation for the wise and understanding.
heroes such as Abraham and David.\textsuperscript{214} Josephus explains a number of realities in his world by using the story.\textsuperscript{215} The deeper meaning Philo finds in Gen 1–3 is multilayered (and not always consistent): the heavenly form of humanity, both male and female, is created in the image of God’s λόγος in Gen 1, and the earthly Adam, Eve, and serpent in Gen 2–3 are associated with mind (νοῦς), sense perception (αἴσϑησις), and desire (ἡδονή) respectively.\textsuperscript{216} Creation is often cited as the origin of

\textsuperscript{214} (1) In his debate with the Pharisees (Matt 19:3-9; Mark 10:2-12), Jesus reasons that Mosaic law permitting divorce is God’s accommodation to willful men, and that the divine design is better pictured in the opening chapters of Genesis: God made humanity male and female (Gen 1:27), and the two are joined together as one flesh (Gen 2:24). (2) The Damascus Document prohibits having multiple wives on the basis of “male and female” in Gen 1:27, in combination with “two by two” in Gen 7:9. Polygamous (or remarried?) preachers are castigated for being “caught twice in fornication: by taking two wives in their lives, even though the principle of creation (יסוד בריאה) is ‘male and female he created them,’ and the ones who went into the ark ‘went in two by two into the ark’ ” (CD-A IV20–V.1).

\textsuperscript{215} (1) Josephus explains “Adam” by reference to man’s origination in earth’s red soil and “Eve” by her life-giving power. He also bridges the primordial past and the first century, claiming that animals are still called by their Adam-given names and identifying the four rivers of paradise with the great rivers known to the Roman world, the Ganges, Tigris, Euphrates, and Nile (\textit{Ant.} 1.33-39). In most of these cases he follows cues in Gen or Gen combined with other passages (e.g., Sabbath from Gen 2:3 and Exod 20:11), but he also goes beyond the text, as with matching the Pishon with the Ganges. He also gives a continuity of divine action between creation, the Patriarchs, Noah, and the exodus (\textit{Ant.} 3.86-87).


This is an epitome of Philo’s conception of Adam and Eve, but it leaves out various minutiae. According to the standard reconstruction of Philo’s writings that James R. Royse (“The Works of
and others Jews deduce the purity regulations of Lev 12:2–5 from it.\(^{218}\) Paul warns against prostitution because intercourse unites man and woman as

---

217 In Jub. (2nd c. BCE), a work structured around divinely ordained seasons, the seven-day creation account serves as justification of the Sabbath. Indeed, ch. 2 reads as though the creation of humankind (vv. 13–16) is merely the last step before the climax, the Sabbath (vv. 17–33). So also Aristobulus (2nd c. BCE), as recorded in Eusebius, *Praep. ev.*, 13.12.9–16; Josephus, *Ant.* 1.33; *Hel. Syn. Pr.* 5:1–3, 19 (2nd / 3rd c. CE). See further Philo’s celebration of the number seven and the seventh day in *Opif.* 89–128; *Leg.* 1.1–30; *Post.* 64–65.

Philo,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Philo*, ed. Adam Kamesar [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009], 32–64) gives, he has three exegetical series: the “quaestiones” (of which *Questions and Answers in Genesis* is a part), the “allegorical commentary” (of which only the *Allegorical Interpretation* of Genesis remains), and the “exposition of the law” (which includes *On the Creation of the World*). In the three he achieves similar but not identical interpretations of Gen 1–3. Thomas H. Tobin (*The Creation of Man: Philo and the History of Interpretation*, CBQMS 14 [Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1983]), in fact, contends that Philo never synthesizes his two primary traditions about the first man into a coherent whole. Moreover, in certain cases ideas interpenetrate, as when the heavenly person is equated with the mind (e.g., *Opif.* 69), or when Gen 2:15 returns to the heavenly humanity (e.g., *Leg.* 1.53–55, 1.88–89). Philo allows himself long digressions within his telling of Gen 1–3, yet then the tales of primeval history return as supporting arguments when discussing other parts of scripture. These points notwithstanding, the main trends of Philo’s thought are clear enough, and my interest in his works is not his own view per se, but the Adamic lore which he attests.

Philo mines Gen 1–3 for more than Adam and Eve, of course. He speculates about subordinate powers alongside God as the “we” of Gen 1:26, removing God a step from the earthiness and vice of humanity (*Opif.* 2–76; *Conf.* 168–82; *Fug.* 65–70); uses the phrasing of LXX Gen 2:4–5 as proof that Platonic ideas precede earthly realities (*Opif.* 129–30; *QG* 1.2; similar *QG* 1.19); and sees the trees, streams, and other aspects of the garden as representative of virtues or wisdom (*Opif.* 153–56; *Leg.* 1.43–87, 95–99; *QG* 1.6–13; *Post.* 32, 124–29; throughout *Plant.* 32–138; *Migr.* 37; *Conf.* 60–63; *Fug.* 177–82; *Somn.* 2.237–44; in *Opif.* 131–33 it instead represents life) while Eden itself is the delight they bring (*Leg.* 1.43–55; *QG* 1.56), among other interpretations (*QG* 1.36, 1.44, 1.52–55, 1.57, 2.17; *Migr.* 1–6). Like Tobit, Philo draws inferences about the husband-wife relationship from Adam and Eve — they complement each other, but she is the domestic partner and is subordinate (*Leg.* 2.35–39; *QG* 1.23–29) — and, with similar reasoning, he judges Adam to be worthy of better things and less accountable for the first sin (*QG* 1.37, 1.43, 46).
“one flesh,” quoting Gen 2:24, whereas believers are to be devoted to Jesus (1 Cor 6:16). In terms of social roles, however, the apostle is surprisingly ambivalent about Adam and Eve serving as patterns. In 1 Cor 11:2–16 he speaks of woman coming from man and being created for him (probably with Gen 2 in mind), although he adds an egalitarian proviso “in the Lord” (vv. 11–12). In Gal 3:28 he intimates that in the new creation the “male and female” of Gen 1:27 will be abolished alongside racial and class designations. These are passages we will return to in the glorious Adam traditions, since both invoke the “image of God” language. However, in neither is Gen 1–2 a straightforward model his churches should adopt.

Second Temple Jews, then, show a concern for the original creation as an ideal archetype that their own world resembled, if only imperfectly, but Paul traded in this sense only in passing.

---

218 Jub. 3:8–14; similar: 4QMiscellaneous Rules (4Q265 7.II.11–17); Philo, QG 1.25. Adam is said to be created in the first week and Eve in the second, explaining why Lev requires double the length of cleansing after the birth of a girl than after that of a boy. There is nothing within Gen that encourages its connection to Lev 12, so presumably these works find support for purity laws in the creation story because it lends the regulations ontological backing: they are part of the fabric of reality.

219 This half-metaphorical sense, in which union with Jesus and with prostitutes is contrasted, is fully spiritualized in Eph 5:31–32, where the verse is applied to Christ and the church.
Moral Warning

If their original creation often functioned as a positive example for all to emulate, the fall of Adam and Eve proved to be a stern warning. In Western Christianity it is common to associate pride with the original sin of Adam and Eve, as well as that of Satan.\(^{220}\) That is not the main lesson found in antiquity, however.\(^{221}\) Rather, Gen 3 was an omen about the ruinous power of deception and desire.

---

\(^{220}\) Aquinas, for example, explicitly defends this proposition (\textit{Summa th.} II-II Q. 163 Art. 1), and hubris often headlines lists of the seven deadly sins. Milton's famous line, put on the lips of Satan, "Better to reign in Hell than serve in Heaven" (\textit{Paradise Lost}\ 1.260), abounds in arrogance. This suggestion reaches far back in time, probably to before the common era.

\(^{221}\) There are several possible examples, but none certain. (1) The woes oracles of Isa 14 (against the king of Babylon) and especially Ezek 28 (against the king of Tyre) mock these royals for their presumption (e.g., Isa 14:13–14; Ezek 28:1, 17), but they are patterned on an antecedent myth, probably of Canannite derivation, but probably already attached to the Eden story (e.g., Ezek 28:13), the fall either of Adam or Satan. (See further under the Glorious Adam traditions.) Hector M. Patmore (\textit{Adam, Satan, and the King of Tyre: The Interpretation of Ezekiel 28:11–19 in Late Antiquity}, JCP 20 [Leiden: Brill, 2012]) analyzes the ways in which Ezek 28 is employed in rabbinic and patristic interpretation, as well as implicitly in the LXX translation, the loose paraphrasing of the targumim, and the vocalization of the MT. He finds pride central to all accounts, but the rabbinic sages general think Adam is the once glorious figure, whereas the church fathers take it to be Satan. (2) Some have also taken Sir 10:12-13, "The beginning of human pride is to forsake the Lord" (\textit{Ἀρχὴ ὑπερηφανίας ἀνθρώπου ἀφισταθεὶ ἀπό κυρίου}) and "the beginning of pride is sin" (\textit{ἀρχὴ ὑπερηφανίας ἁμαρτία}), to affirm pride as the original sin. If correct, the sharp question of Sir 10:9, "How can dust and ashes (γῆ καὶ σποδός) be proud?" might recall Adam's creation from the dust (\textit{ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς}) in LXX Gen 2:7 (similar: Gen 3:19), although the phrase regularly designates mourning (Ezek 27:30), repentance (Job 42:6), or humiliation (Sir 40:3), not the creation of Adam. More importantly, however, Sir 10:12–13 actually seems to indicate the reverse: sin is the beginning of pride, not the other way around. Skehan and Di Lella (\textit{Ben Sira}, 225) nicely summarizes the theme as "the origin of pride, its roots and its fruits." (3) In the Geo. version of LAE [44]19:1 (not present in the other
Although it is not a source Paul could have known, a clear example comes in the History of the Rechabites (1st / 4th c. CE), formerly known as the Apocalypse of Zosimus. In this writing, a seer, identified as the hermit Zosimus, travels across far reaches of land and an expansive ocean to the island of the Blessed Ones, a paradise that includes death but in other ways is like the pre-fall Eden: no sin, no sickness, no strife, no toil (e.g., Hist. Rech. 14:1–2). The association with Gen 1–3 is explicit: “that place is like the Paradise of God and these Blessed Ones are like Adam and Eve before they sinned” (Hist. Rech. 7:2a). The inhabitants turn out to be translations), Satan indicates that Eve, after eating the fruit, might be proud of her knowledge compared to Adam’s, but pride itself does not seem to have been her motivation.

222 Like so many pseudepigrapha, there are several clear Christian interpolations in the text, none more conspicuous than Hist. Rech. 12:9a: “To us the holy angels of God announce (both) the incarnation of the Word of God, who (is) from the holy virgin, the mother of God, and all those things which (he) provides and perfects and endures for the sake of the salvation of mortals” (probably encompassing all of 12:9a–13:5c; also 16:1b–8 and the additional chs. 19–23 in the Greek mss). Other parts are also questionable, including the identification of the protagonist with Zosimus. The practices of the Blessed Ones are not typical of most Jews (e.g., rigorous fasts and general abstinence from sex even within marriage), but similar asceticism seems to have marked the Qumran community and Philo’s Therapeutae. The core of the story seems to stem from a non-Christian Jewish sect before being adopted by Christian scribes.

223 The millennial conditions resemble various portraits in Jewish prophetic-apocalyptic literature of a temporary earthly restoration, as in Isa 65; Ezek 40–48; Zech 14; 4 Ezra 7:26–30, 2 Bar. 40, 72–74; and Rev 20. However, Hist. Rech. is unique among Jewish works, except for Gen 3:24–25, for removing this paradise locally rather than temporally. Even works that speak of, say, a true temple existing elsewhere (e.g., Isa 6; 1 En. 14:8–25; Heb 9; and 2 Bar. 4) situate the perfect space in heaven, not elsewhere on earth. The trope does have ample precedent in Greco-Roman literature, however. Charlesworth (“History of the Rechabites,” in Charlesworth, ed., OTP 2:447) lists as examples
Rechabites, the faithful Judahites of Jer 35 whom, as this account goes, angels
spirited away from Jerusalem before its fall to the Babylonians (Hist. Rech. 8–10).

Their existence is glorious, like that of God’s heavenly ministers. Not only are they
called Blessed Ones, as well as the “elect” (e.g., Hist. Rech. 6:3a) and “holy” (e.g.,
Hist. Rech. 7:1a–b), one of them has “the face of an angel” (Hist. Rech. 5:4), and
they all “possess a shining appearance and dwell in light” (Hist. Rech. 11:5b). They
have unmediated access to supernatural beings (Hist. Rech. 6:6a; 10:5–8; 12:6–9a;
13:5b–c; 16:[3]8a–e) and are specially ushered from death into immortality by them
12:[2]3), they instead retain “a stole of glory (similar to that) which clothed Adam
and Eve before they sinned” (Hist. Rech. 12:3a). They dwell happily in a pleasant
land and have no need to fret about the exigencies of life and the aftereffects of sin
(e.g., Hist. Rech. 11:1–12:5).

What threatens this idyll is a fib or, more precisely, the threat of one. After
his arrival the Blessed Ones unceasingly inquire of Zosimus about the “world of
vanity” (Hist. Rech. 5:1–2; 7:4; 8:1; 16:8–9), to the point that he cannot slip away to

---

Hesiod, Op. 159–74 (800 BCE); Homer, Od. 4.560; Pindar, Ol. 2.69–71 (522–448 BCE); Herodotus,
Hist. 3.26 (485–25 BCE); Plato, Phaed. 111b (427–347 BCE); Vergil, Ecl. 4.18–25; 39f. (70–19 BCE);
and Lucian, Ver. hist. 2.6–13 (CE 125–200).
rest. Weary and distressed, he requests his attendant, one of the “Earthly Angels” (Hist. Rech. 7:11), to tell the others that he is elsewhere. The reaction to this whitest of lies is severe. The Blessed One laments,

O My Blessed Fathers, misfortune is counted to me on this day. Behold, I am almost like Adam in Paradise; for he through the advice of Eve transgressed the commandment. And this man through his evil advice, which he reveals (by) asking (something) that would cause me (to sin), said to me, “Lie, and say to your companions that I am not here.” (Hist. Rech. 7:8)

The reaction of the wider community is the same: “O man of sin, go, exit from among us. We do not know how you prepared yourself so that you were able to come among us; perhaps you wish to deceive us as the Evil One deceived our father Adam” (Hist. Rech. 7:10–10a). In time the Blessed Ones respond “with difficulty” to his petition for mercy (Hist. Rech. 7:11), the crisis is adverted, and Zosimus spends a week on the island to learn the people’s history (Hist. Rech. 8–10) and practices (Hist. Rech. 11–16) before he returns to his homeland (Hist. Rech. 17–18).

Nonetheless, the moral of the story is that Eden was destroyed by a lie, and even a minor deception threatens the integrity of a holy community.224

224 Several works admonish against deception using Gen 3: (1) Josephus (Ant. 1.49–50) uses the language of ἐξαπατάω (“to delude”) and παρακρούω (“to beguile”) in his retelling of the story, and, as he commends his own work as lessons in morality (Ant. 1.6, 14–15), there can be no doubt the reader is learn from their mistake; (2) Rev 12:9 equates “the Devil” and “Satan” with the “deceiver of the whole world”; and (3) Hel. Syn. Pr. 12:35–52 (2nd / 3rd c. CE) speaks, in an implicitly didactic way, of the “trickery of a serpent” that overcame Adam’s “rational discrimination.” Possibly in this
The other major warning Jews took from Gen 3 is against uncontrolled desire.

These two concerns are intertwined: deceit is a potent adversary because it plays on our appetites, trumping up the satisfaction we will receive and downplaying the risks incurred. We are deceived, in other words, because we want to be.\(^{225}\) When named, category are (4) Pss. Sol. 4:9 (2nd c. BCE / 1st c. CE) (note that Eden themes arise in 14:3); (5) T. Job 26:6 (1st c. BCE / CE) (Job, Sitis, and the devil might replay Gen 3); (6) 4 Mac 18:7–8 (1st c. CE) (note the use of “rib” and “serpent”); and (7) John 8:44, 55 (the devil is “a liar and the father of lies,” and “a murderer from the beginning”). In these four the wise serpent may be a stock character, like the crafty fox, or the devil a generally malevolent being, but there are some indications that they replay, positively or negatively, the primordial test. Of course, (8) Jesus’s temptation (Matt 4:1–11; Mark 1:12–13; Luke 4:1–13) could similarly be a triumph where Adam failed.

225 The admonitions are combined in Paul’s contemporary Philo, the exemplary philosophical moralist among Second Temple Jews. As noted above, in his allegory, Adam is mind, Eve is sense perception, and the serpent is pleasure. Thus the fall narrates the mind being deceived by its senses, which are induced by desire, when the mind should instead rule the senses and never make pleasure an end. This interpretation is given lengthy exposition in the third book of Allegorical Interpretation, but the moral surfaces in several places, e.g., Opif. 166: “In a word we must never lose sight of the fact that Pleasure (ἡδονή), being a courtesan and a wanton, eagerly desires to meet with a lover, and searches for panders, by whose means she shall get one on her hook. It is the senses (αἰσϑήσεις) that act as panders for her and procure the lover. When she has ensnared these she easily brings the Mind (νοῦς) under her control” (similar: Opif. 170; Leg. 2.14–18, 2.49–52, 2.71–108; QG 1.33, 1.41). Although he will occasionally specify a certain desire in particular, such as love (ἔρως) in Opif. 151–52, for Philo “pleasure” apparently stands for all non-rational urges. He thinks it is fitting that the serpent is cursed to crawl on its “breast” (στῆϑος) and “belly” (κοιλία) as those are the respective seats of the “high spirit” (Ďumučóν) and “desire” (ἐπιϑυκτικών) and the passions associated with both (Leg. 3.114–15, see further 3.114–61; also, Migr. 64–69). In another place he says that the mind alone is required for virtue, but vice uses ψυχή (“soul”), λόγος (“speech”), αἰσϑήσεις (“senses”), and σῶμα (“body”), although the main culprit is “the body and its cravings” (τὸ σῶμα καὶ αἱ ἐπιϑυκτικές) (Leg. 1.103–4). The deceptiveness of desire is not the only ethical principle Philo deduces from the story. He thinks Adam and Eve start as morally neutral (the “naked” and not ashamed of Gen 2:25) but ultimately tend toward the baser part of their nature (Leg. 2.53–70; QG 1.30; cf. QG 1.40, where their nakedness is instead being stripped of virtue). He thinks they neglected reverence toward God, the greatest of all virtues (ἡ μεγίστη τῶν ἄρετῶν θεοσεβία), symbolized by the tree of life, for “moral prudence, the virtue that occupies the middle position” (ϕρόνησις ἡ μέση), symbolized by the tree of knowledge (Opif. 153–
the particular urges might be for sex or drink. Most often, however, the problem is desire in general. Like their Greek counterparts, Jewish moralists were often mistrustful of ἐπιθυμία. Given this wariness, it is not difficult to read the sin of Gen 3 as the untoward triumph of matter, and its associated passions, over mind.

56; the idea that they chose an earthly or human good over God is also found in Leg. 3.28–48; QG 1.10–11; Cher. 53–66; Somn. 2.68–74). The tree of knowledge is, for Philo, suspicious from the start, for he locates it outside Eden (Leg. 1.100). He also takes Cain (as “possessiveness”) to be the result of the mind’s chasing after pleasure, and thus sees Cain and his line as symbols of various vices (see, e.g., Post. 9–10, 33–39, 83–99). Even these moral lessons, though, are cohesive with his main warning about the allure of pleasure: humanity begins neutral but often succumbs, against reason, to a pull toward lesser goods or vices.

Given the subject matter, I have limited myself to how Philo utilizes the Eden story to warn against desire, but it is an ever-present admonition in his works. The tenth commandment (“do not covet,” οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις in LXX Exod 20:17), e.g., is taken to be an absolute ban against desire. This is considered at length by Hans Svebakken (Philo of Alexandria’s Exposition on the Tenth Commandment, SPhiloM 6 [Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012]).

Sex: If 4 Macc 18:7–8 does allude to Gen 3, then the woman withstands the temptation to a pre-marital liaison. Also note Philo, Opif. 151–52. Drink: In 3 Bar.. 4:8, 16–17 (1st / 3rd c. CE), especially the Slavonic version, the grape vine is the “tree” of Gen 3, and “those who drink wine in excess do all evil.”

For example, in Plato’s (5th / 4th c. BCE) thought, the ψυχή (“soul”) is tripartite (Resp. 4.435c–441c, esp. 439d–441c; cf. Philo, Leg. 3.114–15). It is properly governed by the λογιστικόν (“reasoning”) faculty, via the θυμοειδές (“passionate”) faculty, whereby directing the naturally unruly ἐπιθυμητικόν (“appetitive”) faculty. Plato calls the appetitive part of the soul “irrational” (ἄλογος), and says that it chases after love (ἔρως), hunger (πείνα), and thirst (δίψα), among other desires (ἄλλαι ἐπιθυμίαι) (Resp. 4.439d). However, the fitting arrangement is easily and often upended, with the result that desires commandeer the soul, as in the example of Leontius (Resp. 4.439e–440a). Many other Greco-Roman ethical schools agreed with this evaluation. Friedrich Büchsel (“ϑυμός, κτλ..,” TDNT 3:169) summarizes, “In Greek philosophy ἐπιθυμία is the waywardness of man in conflict with his rationality.”

In the NT the word group sometimes indicates “lust” (e.g., Matt 5:28: “But I say to you that everyone who looks at a woman with lust [ὁ βλέπων γυναῖκα πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμήσαι αὐτήν] has already
Both uses of the name “Eve” (Εὔα) in NT constitute warnings against being misled. In 2 Cor 11:3, Paul expresses his consternation to a church vacillating between him and his opponents, saying, “But I am afraid that as the serpent deceived Eve by its cunning, your thoughts will be led astray from a sincere and pure devotion to Christ.” This is part of Paul’s “fool’s speech” (2 Cor 10–13), in which he mocks his rival teachers for brandishing their exploits too readily and defends his ministry by committed adultery with her in his heart”), sometimes “covetousness” (e.g., Acts 20:33: “I coveted no one’s silver or gold or clothing [ἀργυρίου . . . οὐδενὸς ἐπιθυμησαὶ”], even “hunger” (e.g., Luke 16:21: Lazarus “longed to satisfy his hunger [ἐπιθυμῶν χορτασθῆναι with what fell from the rich man’s table”), but it is properly a general word for desire, often desire gone awry (e.g., Jas 1:14–15: “one is tempted by one’s own desire [ὑπὸ τῆς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας], being lured and enticed by it; then, when that desire [ἡ ἐπιθυμία] has conceived, it gives birth to sin, and that sin . . . gives birth to death”).

229 In two works this assertion is stated outright. (1) In the Greek Life of Adam and Eve, also known as the Apocalypse of Moses (1st c. BCE / 2nd c. CE), Eve says, “When he [the serpent] had received the oath from me [to give the fig also to Adam], he went, climbed the tree, and sprinkled his evil poison on the fruit which he gave me to eat which is his ἐπιθυμία. For ἐπιθυμία is the origin of every sin [κεφαλὴ πάσης ἁμαρτίας]” (Gk. LAE 19:3; also in the Arm.. LAE). (2) In the Slavonic Apocalypse of Abraham (1st / 2nd c. CE), the ascended seer is given a vision of a tapestry on which biblical history plays out, and after a sexually suggestive portrait of Adam and Eve intertwined, biting into a cluster of grapes fed to them by the chief demon Azazel (Apoc. Ab. 23), the terrible aftermath of their decision quickly becomes evident. Abraham sees representative sins such as violence, fornication, theft (Apoc. Ab. 24:5–8), and then idolatry (Apoc. Ab. 25). However, the heart of the matter is again uncontrolled impulse. In words reminiscent of Gk. LAE 19:3, the Abrahamic apocalypse records, “And I saw there desire [Slav.: želanie], and in her hand (was) the head of every kind of lawlessness; and her torment and her dispersal destined to destruction” (Apoc. Ab. 24:9). R. Rubinkiewicz (OTP 1:701) notes that although želanie is neuter, the possessive pronouns following it are feminine, “surely reflecting mechanical translation of pronouns referring to Gk. epithymia.” Beyond these two, note also (3) Philo’s mistrust of all passions, those of both ἐπιθυμία and ᾧμός, as stated above (Leg. 3.114–61).

230 In Chapter 4 I will agree with those who see Adam present in Rom 7, and thus on my view Paul does adopt the ἐπιθυμία reading of Gen 3, too.
ironically donning the mantle of a buffoon and only obliquely citing his apostolic credentials. Although the immediate issue concerns Paul’s refusal of funds from Corinth, as in the Galatian controversy the apostle infuses what might seem a mundane topic with meaning far beyond this or that practice, one or another individual. Rather, it is a matter of the Corinthians’ spiritual life and death. Like a wayward spouse (2 Cor 11:2), the church is falling for “another Jesus,” a “different Spirit,” and a “different gospel” (2 Cor 11:4). They are being misled by “false apostles, deceitful workers” (2 Cor 11:13), ministers of Satan who “disguises himself as an angel of light” (2 Cor 11:14). The moral warning of the section is clear: the devil is active and crafty, enlisting an army of lackeys. Eve’s deception in the garden was but the first of his many tricks throughout history, and all God’s followers must be on guard against his wiles.231

Assuming the extant literature of Greco-Roman Judaism is representative, the moral warnings Eden supplied in the first century mostly revolved around deception and desire, with the two often intertwined. Considered only in ethical terms, the sin of Gen 3 might be overcome. Upon their decisive action and his quick repentance,

231 The point is similar in 1 Tim 2:14. Although v. 13, mentioned above, required women’s reticence in the congregation based on the pattern of creation in Gen 1, v. 14 cites Eve’s gullibility in Gen 3.
for example, the Rechabites avoid the corrupting influence of Zosimus’s lie, and even he is not expelled for tempting their rigorous honesty. Likewise, the Corinthian church has a chance to learn from Eve, discern the diabolical influence on them, and return to God. In the Adam-Christ juxtaposition in Romans, however, the effects of the first sin are not so easily undone.

**Adam as a Bearer of Disaster**

The previous two categories are relevant for other parts of the Pauline corpus, but Rom 5:12–21 does not utilize them. The Adam-Christ comparison is not paradigmatic, at least not in the sense that Adam and Eve give a picture of marriage or the ritual prescriptions of Torah. Nor is it admonition. It is diagnosis, not exhortation; description, not prescription. Romans 5 is about a world turned awry, disordered, in need of repair — the world downstream of Gen 3. It shares, as so many have recognized, a pessimistic view of Adamic influence. But we must not to rush ahead. Numerous Jews agree that humanity is united in the aftereffects of the primeval disobedience, yet the exact shape, scope, and manner of transmission are
debated. We might group the traditions that see Adam as a bearer of disaster into three “schools.”

*Minor Note.* The minimalist school mentions the sin of Adam and Eve but lets it recede into the background. The focus shifts to an angelic etiology of sin, with the human disobedience of Gen 3 becoming a mere prelude to the misdeeds of the deviant “sons of God” of Gen 6. In the Book of Watchers (= 1 En. 1–36; 3rd c. BCE), the sin of Adam and Eve is recorded (1 En. 32:6: “This very thing is the tree of wisdom from which your old father and aged mother . . . ate and came to know wisdom; and . . . they were expelled from the garden”), but this stray reference pales in comparison with the chapters detailing the sins of the demonic brood that seduced women and taught men illicit secrets (1 En. 6–16).232 Alternately, the effects of the first sin might be noted, but partially reversed. Jubilees (2nd c. BCE) records the fall, curses, and expulsion from Eden (Jub. 3:17–31), and the couple faces eventual death, although the Lord delays as long as possible.233 However, scattered

---

232 Similarly, in the Dream Visions (= 1 En. 83–90; 2nd c. BCE), the creation of Adam and Eve is recorded, but their sin goes unmentioned, skipping directly to Cain’s murder of Abel (1 En. 85:3–10) and then dwelling at length on the Watchers (1 En. 86:1–89:9). In these cases, sin and death are of demonic, more so than human, origin.

233 There are other embellishments as well: the animals lose their speech and go about naked, having previously been clothed and articulate beings. Adam and Eve retain their speech and, as in
throughout Jubilees are hints that the original state has been restored in limited ways, especially within the Jewish race. Another strategy is to uphold Adam and Eve as greater than other humans, despite their sin. In the first Sibylline Oracle (3rd c. BCE / 2nd c. CE), the fall is recorded at some length (Sib. Or. 1.38–64), but this “first race” still enjoyed “a lengthy day for a very lovely life” (l. 70), having been

Genesis, are clothed, but (as we learn later) they lose their original language, Hebrew, and the gentiles are said to live naked like animals in violation of Adamic precedent and heavenly law (Jub. 3:30–31). On Adam’s death Jub. 4:30 is an early witness to a exegetical solution known elsewhere. Adam’s age at death is 930, and the reasoning given is that “a thousand years are like a day” in God’s sight (Ps 90:4), and God promised that “on the day you eat it, you will die” (Gen 2:17). Thus Adam could not have lived to 1000 — but he did get ninety-three percent of the way there.

234 God entrusts to Abraham Hebrew, “the tongue of creation” (Jub. 12:25–27); Adam’s blessing is passed on to Noah, Abraham, and Jacob (Jub. 22:13); and in Joseph’s Egypt “there was no Satan and there was no evil” (Jub. 40:9), a foreshadowing of a future time when Israel will dwell in an Eden-like land (see Jub. 4:26) without “any Satan or any evil (one)” in it (Jub. 50:5). The Watchers and their gigantic offspring also wreak far more havoc on earth than did Adam’s sin: Jub. 4:21–22; 5:1–11; 7:21–27; 8:3–4; 10:1–14; etc. Here as in 1 Enoch, the sin in Eden was consequential but not irreversable, and in any case demonic influence better explains the ongoing human struggle with evil. Similar: (1) In Ant. 67–72, Josephus paints Seth’s descendants living for seven generations in a nearly idyllic world, with virtue, prosperity, and harmony, but eventually they go the way of Cain’s line, who, even “within Adam’s lifetime . . . went to the depths of depravity” (Ant. 1.66). As with the other works already mentioned, fault is shared with the angelic sin of Gen 6, which produces giants that sully humankind despite Noah’s best efforts to reason with them (Ant. 1.72–74). (2) In Ps.-Philo the fall is enough of an afterthought to be delayed until the Moses stories (LAB 13:8–9). From the sin “death was ordained for the generations of men,” but throughout the work paradise is given in parts to Moses or the Israelites, including in 13:8–9, which comes during Moses’s own vision of Eden. (3) The Apoc. Ab. presents Abraham himself being assumed to heaven and seeing Eden (12:10), and there he sees the garden populated by the righteous (21:6). These are probably those who have died and are in heaven, but Abraham at least experiences Eden before his death.
“loved” by God (l. 74). They are “great-hearted mortals” (l. 73) who, though sinning in various ways (ll. 74–84), retained “honor” as the first and greatest race of humans (ll. 85–86). For any of the above works, what Adam and Eve did was a sin, but one of lesser consequence than many other misdeeds throughout history.

There is a lightness to this type of “pessimism,” if we even call it that.

**Hard Truth.** Most Second Temple Jews approach Gen 2–3 more gravely. For a second school, primeval history is employed to explain human finitude, toil, and mortality, usually as indebted to Adam’s creation from clay as to his curse to return to dust at death. In the hellenized Wisdom of Solomon (1st c. BCE / CE; used by Paul?), for example, the fictional author, David’s son, reflecting on all wisdom has

---

235 The possible dates are this widespread in part because the original oracle, comprising both the first and second Sibyl, has been altered. There were once ten generations, but generations eight and nine are entirely lost. Also, there are several clear Christian insertions, but the majority of the text probably predates Christianity. So John J. Collins, “Sibylline Oracles,” in *OTP*, ed. Charlesworth, 1:330–34.

236 The second and subsequent generations are increasingly debased (ll. 87–283), until the sixth generation (following the flood) restores the glory of the first (ll. 284–306), beginning the descending cycle anew. Third Enoch, an admittedly late text (5th / 6th c. CE) but one that probably contains much earlier traditions, also fits here. Adam and Eve are expelled from Eden, but God does not remove his Šekinah from earth immediately (3 En. 5). Eden lingers, and the one who looks to the Šekinah is “not troubled by flies or gnats, by sickness or pain; malicious demons [are] not able to harm him, and even the angels [have] no power over him” (3 En. 5:4). They can even gaze directly upon God without harm (3 En. 5:5). This ends with Enosh, “the chief of all the idolaters in the world,” and his generation (3 En. 5:6–14). In both of these cases later generations are guilty of worse crimes than eating forbidden fruit.
accomplished, for him and in creation (Wis 6:22–10:21), acknowledges that he is cut from the same cloth as all humans (Wis 7:2–6) and shares a common fate: “I also am mortal (Σωτός), like everyone else, a descendant of the first-formed child of earth (γηγενός ἀπόγονος πρωτοπλάστου)” (Wis 7:1). Whether sovereign or peasant, all of Adam’s offspring are made, like him, of transitory earth. They also share the fallout of the first sin: “for God created man (ὁ ἄνθρωπος = Adam?) for incorruption (ἀφϑαρσία), and made him in the image (εἰκών) of his own eternity (ἀϊδιότητος), but through the devil’s envy death entered the world (Θάνατος εἰσῆλϑεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον), and those who belong to his party (οἱ τῆς ἐκείνου ἐχθρίδος ὄντες) experience it” (Wis 2:23–24 RSV).\(^{237}\) Genesis 2 and 3 jointly explain the ephemera that are human lives.

---

\(^{237}\) Levison (*Portraits of Adam*, 51–52) understands this verse differently. Διάβολος is not “devil” but “enemy,” and φόνος recalls not Gen 3, but Gen 4. So death entered the world because Cain, Abel’s enemy, was jealous of his brother. Levison also takes “death” to be spiritual death, which he says “differs markedly from that of Genesis 3, in which death is physical.” This second point counts against his first, since the “death” of Gen 3 is far more easily taken metaphorically than that of Gen 4, in which Abel dies. Even aside from that fact, the use of “the man” and “image” in the same sentence surely presses us toward Gen 1–3 over Gen 4. David Winston (*The Wisdom of Solomon*, AB 43 [Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1979], 121) deems the fall narrative “most likely” implied.
As many scholars have noted, the language of “death entering the world” is eerily similar to Rom 5, perhaps close enough to suggest dependence on Wisdom.\textsuperscript{238} For the latter what visits death on any human is, apparently, spiritual bondage, being counted among the devil’s μερίς, his “portion,” “lot,” or “division.”\textsuperscript{239} Unlike Paul, though, for this sapiential work the damage is relatively contained: “Wisdom protected the first-formed father of the world, when he alone had been created; she delivered him from his transgression (ἐκ παραπτώματος ἰδίου), and gave him strength to rule all things” (Wis 10:1–2).\textsuperscript{240} For Paul, in stark contrast, Adam’s “transgression” (παράπτωμα) doomed the “many” not only to face death (Rom 5:15), but to live under its dark dominion (Rom 5:17) and to receive condemnation (Rom 5:18). Death may enter the same way in both accounts, but in Wisdom humanity is left neither abject nor condemned. We are still guided by understanding and hold

\footnote{238} Cf. Rom 5:12: “Therefore, just as sin came into the world (ἡ ἁμαρτία εἰς τὸν κόσμον εἰσῆλθεν) through one man, and death (ὁ θάνατος) came through sin, and so death spread (ὁ θάνατος διῆλθεν) to all because all have sinned.”

\footnote{239} This seems to be the position of Winston (Wisdom, 121–23), who notes parallels to Zoroastrian legends of cosmic battle. The obverse of this is once found in Philo, when Adam, at his sin, was disinvested of his “lot” in heaven (QG 1.51). See more on Philo below.

\footnote{240} On the interpretation of Levison (Portraits of Adam, 57–61) wisdom gets Adam (and humanity) out of the bind of being required to rule but still subject to sin. Adam’s deed has its consequences for humanity, but not so disastrous that wisdom cannot heal.
sway over creation. Even if life ends, mortals have lost neither their stature nor their
divinely given grandeur.

If one could poll ancient Jews about the extent of Adam’s ill influence, the
evidence suggests that a decided majority would side with Wisdom. Two verses in
the HB, Job 31:33 and Hos 6:7, give present instances of sin, and possibly liken them
to Adam’s disobedience, but neither with the negativity of Rom 5. The
thanksgiving psalms of Qumran, 1QHodayot, similarly picture humanity as finite
and mortal, mostly due to Adam’s humble creation from dust, but nonetheless a
wondrous creation sitting atop God’s world. Sirach speaks of hard work,

241 (1) The KJV of Job 31:33 reads, “If I covered my transgressions as Adam, by hiding mine
iniquity in my bosom . . . ,” possibly with reference to Gen 3. Most translations and commentators
think it just refers to a person in general. (2) In the ESV of Hos 6:7, God complains, “But like Adam
(אדם) they transgressed the covenant; there they dealt faithlessly with me.” Most translations take
this instead as a place, “at Adam” (see Josh 3:16), and BHS in fact suggests בAdam rather than the MT’s
כAdam. Paul would likely have read this “like a person” (e.g., LXX: ὡς ἄνθρωπος), but possibly with
Adam as the everyman. E.g., 4QpHos b (4Q167.7–8) comments on Hos 6:7, seemingly with Adam as
they deserted God and followed the laws of [. . .] . . . Them in all [. . .].”

242 The sentiments are those of Ps 8 (vv. 4–5 [Eng.: vv. 3–4]: “When I look at thy heavens . . .
what is man [אנוש] that thou art mindful of him, and the son of man [בן-אדם] that thou dost care for
him?” [RSV]), but the background is also indebted to the humble creation of Adam from the earth.
Throughout people, the “sons of man / Adam” (בראשית: e.g., 1QH a IX.27) are called “dust” (עפר: e.g.,
1QH a V.21), “mud” (חמר: e.g., 1QH a XIX.3), “ashes” (אפר: e.g., 1QH a XVIII.5), and “clay” (טיט: e.g., 1QH a XXIII.10); from this material they are fashioned by God, and to it they will return. This is
the imagery of Gen 2–3, and in the case of עפר, its language as well. The influence of the creation
account is clearest in 1QH a XVIII.3–4: “What, then, is man (אדם)?” the sage asks: “He is nothing but
earth (אדמה). Blank. [From clay (חמר) he is fashioned and to dust (עפר) he will return (ishlist).” This
perplexity, vices, and the fear of death being the lot of all the “children of Adam” (Sir 40:1–11), knows the decree of death levied against Adam (14:17; see also 25:24; 41:1–4; 42:14?), but also marvels at humanity’s status in the cosmos (17:1–24). For Philo, the first humans before their sin were immortal in their soul (or mind) but mortal in their body; thus, preferring corporeal desire over spiritual union with God, they were reduced to their mortality, sent into exile from God and goodness, experienced the death of their souls, and became sinful, divided, and unstable — but not beyond repair.243

synthesizes the creation of “the man” (האדם) of “the dust of the ground” (עפר מן־האדמה) in Gen 2:7 with his curse in Gen 3:19: to “return (שוב) to the ground (אדמה), for out of it you were taken; you are dust (עפר), and to dust (עפר) you shall return (שוב).” Like Wis, humankind shares Adam’s finitude but also a position of authority over creation, and in contrast to Wis, death results primarily from humankind’s creation from the earth, not from a sin in days long past. Since mortality is bound up in the stuff humanity is composed of, these thanksgiving psalms need not even broach the question of sin’s transmission.

243 Pre-fall corporeal mortality / incorporeal immortality: Opif. 134–35 (cf. Somn. 2.68–74, of the post-fall state). Reduced to earthly mortality (and its pains and troubles): Opif. 156; QG 1.51 (cf. Gig. 60–67, where the “one flesh” of Gen 2:24 describes the Watchers choosing fleshly life over spiritual). Exile: Leg. 3.1–11; QG 1.45. Death of the soul: Leg. 1.105–8; QG 1.16. Sinful: QG 1.44. Divided: Leg. 1.101–4; QG 1.15. Unstable: QG 1.42; Somn. 1.189–92. In general, then, death as the advent of evil within the person came at the fall, but not death as the cessation of bodily life, which was present by nature (in Leg. 1.106 he even calls the death of the soul “practically the antithesis” of natural death, since the latter frees us of the downward influence of the body; but cf. the unclear reference to death in QG 1.33). None of these results is insurmountable for the first pair’s offspring: e.g., Philo encourages philosophy, for by it “man, mortal (ὢντις) though he be, is rendered immortal (ἀπαθανατίζεται)” (Opif. 77), and toil can still banished and plenty abound to anyone whose soul is not overrun with “irrational pleasures” (αἱ ἄλογοι ἡδοναί) (Opif. 79).
In writings of this moderate school, the scope is universal, but perhaps particularly fitting the wicked (e.g., T. Rue. 5; 3 Bar. 4 [Gk.]). The transmission is often attributed to the dust of which humans are made, although Wisdom pegs it to diabolic domination, 2 En. 31:7 (J) to sex, and 3 Bar. 4:16 (Gk.) to alcohol. For most Jews of Paul’s time, mortality is a hard truth, but one that can be faced with maturity and sober reflection. Further, as bitter as the truth might be, it is not the focal point of theology, nor does it become a looming, ever-present problem to solve: it is in the background, and other matters occupy the foreground.

Theological Knot. There is third school that, like Paul, paints scene in darker tones. The experience of corruption and sin is all too real, all too pressing. It is not the minor note of the Book of Watchers, nor even the hard truth of the Wisdom of Solomon. It defines reality as fallen, off the mark. This is the starting point of reflection. For them Gen 3 is a theological knot, and unraveling it forms the center of each of these writings. Given their proximity to Paul in language, concerns,

\footnote{Beyond the works mentioned in text, consider also: (1) Ps.-Phoc.. ll. 106–111, also l. 162? (1st c. BCE / CE); (2) 2 En. 30:17–32:2; 41–42 (J) (late 1st c. CE?); (3) T. Isaac 3:15–16 (2nd c. CE); (4) 3 Bar. 4:16 (Gk.) (1st/3rd c. CE). Possible also are (5) T. Iss. 5:4–5 and (6) T. Rue. 5:1–2 (both 2nd c. BCE), which seem to allude to the curses of Gen 3 and have other themes of primeval history in the context. In all cases death and sinfulness are in some sense attached to Adam and Eve, but in none does Adamic sin command center stage.}
emphasis, and (often) date, these writings are the ones most often given in
commentaries as parallels to Rom 5. How they unwind the skein is regularly
different from Paul, but at minimum they come with the same qualms and
misgivings about those things that mar God’s good creation.

The parade example is 4 Ezra (= 2 Esd 3–14; late 1st / early 2nd c. CE), and
indeed, its similarities with Paul are glaring. Written in response to the destruction
of the Jewish temple by the Romans, it tries to divine God’s purposes in light of the
catastrophe. Adamic traditions arise in the First and Third Visions of 4 Ezra (3:1–
5:20; 6:35–9:25), which are both dialogues between Ezra and either the angel Uriel
or God himself.245 The most poignant expression of 4 Ezra’s pessimism comes when
he summarizes his complaint to his angelic mediator during the Third Vision,

This is my first and last word: It would have been better if the earth had not produced Adam,
or else, when it had produced him, had restrained him from sinning. For what good is it to
all that they live in sorrow now and expect punishment after death? O Adam, what have you
done? For though it was you who sinned, the fall was not yours alone, but ours also who are
your descendants. For what good is it to us, if an eternal age has been promised to us, but we
have done deeds that bring death? . . . For while we lived and committed iniquity we did not
consider what we should suffer after death. (4 Ezra 7:46[116]–61[131])246

245 Traditionally, the seven major sections of 4 Ezra are all called “visions,” despite the fact
that the first three are really a series of dialogues. The Fourth Vision (4 Ezra 9:26–10:59) combines
dialogue and vision, the Fifth and Sixth Visions (chs. 11–14) are fully apocalyptic, and the Seventh
Vision (ch. 14) is a commissioning scene.

246 What intervenes in this quotation is a sequence of parallel questions, all asking what
usefulness a beatific eternity is if no one will achieve it, e.g., “Or that a paradise shall be revealed,
The heavenly response to these questions is that the righteous are few, but they do exist and will inherit paradise (4 Ezra 7:10–16, [127]–[131]; 8:46–62). Uriel, in fact, puts a sheen on the mass of humanity’s ultimate demise: like a rare jewel, that just makes the holy all the more precious (4 Ezra 7:[45]–[61]). Still, the Ezra of ch. 7 suggests that the impact of the “fall” (the now ubiquitous term was apparently coined in the above passage) extends to all people and mires humanity in an inescapable net of transgression.

Despite being the human voice within the pseudepigraphon, we should not dismiss it as of secondary importance. Ezra is, after all, a righteous figure, and his concerns are repeated several times over, even against divine assurances to the contrary. It is hard to doubt that the author genuinely explored the darkest interpretations of Adam’s influence on humanity, even while knowing that Israelite traditions (represented by Uriel and God) present a more hopeful picture. Outside whose fruit remains unspoiled and in which are abundance and healing, but we shall not enter it, because we have lived in unseemly places?” (vv. 53[123]–54[124]).

This is not the whole of 4 Ezra’s theodicy. It also asserts divine inscrutability (e.g., 4 Ezra 4:1–21; 5:31–40) and discusses the nearness of the end (e.g., 4 Ezra 4:26–5:13; 5:56–6:28).

In the HB Ezra’s role in 4 Ezra is most like Habakkuk or the poets who wrote Lamentations and the lament psalms. They all voice the people’s pain to God, often in light of (presently) unrealized divine promises. The perspective of the author is debated, however. On the one
the Pauline corpus one cannot find in Greco-Roman Judaism more utter dejection tied to the first man.

On Ezra’s accounting in the First Vision, sin is transmitted by an “evil heart” (*cor malignum*: 4 Ezra 3:20, 21, 27) that is shared by all. It is a “disease” that has become “permanent” (*permanens infirmitas*), and the law vied “with an evil root” (*cum malignitate radicis*) in the people’s heart (4 Ezra 3:22). Even Uriel, normally quick to assert the ability of the good to keep the law, allows that “a grain of evil seed (*granum seminis mali*) was sown in Adam’s heart from the beginning” (4 Ezra 4:30), producing untold godlessness throughout history. These parables, drawn from biology and botany, indicate a generational propagation of sin, although the means of transfer are not explicit. Fourth Ezra speaks of one *cor malignum* shared by Adam and his descendants, which might indicate a defect passed on within human

---

end of the spectrum, P. Richard Choi (“The Intra-Jewish Dialog in 4 Ezra 3:1–9:25,” *AUSS* 41 [2003]: 238–40) argues that Ezra’s voice in the work represents the talking points of Judaism, and Uriel is the author’s radical reorganization of it, a reorganization that is on par with Paul’s in its scope. On the other end, Michael E. Stone (“Reactions to the Destruction of the Second Temple: Theology, Perception and Conversion,” *JSJ* 12 [1981]: 201; ideam., *Fourth Ezra: A Commentary on the Book of Fourth Ezra*, Hermeneia [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990], 24–32) judges that Uriel’s words trite, while Ezra’s are penetrating. I follow Earl Breech (“These Fragments I Have Shored against My Ruins: The Form and Function of 4 Ezra,” *JBL* 92 [1973]: 269–74), who sees in Uriel the traditional Israelite promises and in Ezra the experience of the Jewish people. In the narrative the rift between those two is eventually healed. Note that Stone’s commentary puts him in significant agreement with Breech, more than his article seems to do.
nature. In one way or another, though, Adam’s inclination toward evil is, it seems, an inherited trait.

The foregoing is widely accepted in 4 Ezra scholarship, but another of Adam’s roles has received undue neglect, skewing appreciably the interpretations of the apocalypse. The fundamental question at the outset of the work, that which “troubled” Ezra as he lay in bed, concerns “the desolation of Zion and the wealth of those who live in Babylon” (4 Ezra 3:1–2), that is, the relation of Israel to the other nations. Adam in not given as an everyman or the father of all individuals, as commonly presented, but as progenitor of nations, of Jews and gentiles. After the

249 Unless it is a collective noun and indicates that all people have their own cor malignum.

250 Levison (Portraits of Adam, 114–19, 122–25) argues that 4 Ezra 3 indicates only correspondence in Adam’s act and those of his descendants, but then in 4 Ezra 7:116–31 hereditary sinfulness is in mind. Overall, though, on his reading the author is not consistent about the effects of sin and eventually human responsibility wins out, if only because it offers some hope for the future.

251 Here I depart in particular from the analysis of Sanders (Paul and Palestinian Judaism, 409–18): “in IV Ezra one sees how Judaism works when it actually does become a religion of individual self-righteousness” (p. 409). Sanders thinks that the heavenly voice (and not Ezra’s) represents the author’s, and that the final solution of the dialogues is that only the nearly perfect are saved. He denies that the visions are original to the work, for then, he says, “One would have to suppose that the author who so carefully constructed the dialogues and who dealt there with the most pressing questions of human existence . . . decided, with the final section, to dismiss those questions from mind and to depict a traditional (and comparatively naive) victory of Israel over the Gentiles” (p. 418). Thus, it is for him a rare “instance in which covenantal nomism has collapsed. All that is left is legalistic perfectionism” (p. 409), and, in fact, this “pessimistic view of the human plight . . . distinguishes the author from the rest of Judaism as it is revealed in the surviving literature” (p. 418). I am closer to Levison (Portraits of Adam, 119–21, 125–27), although the implication I draw is my
first man’s transgression, Ezra recounts in a prayer to God, “immediately you appointed death for him and for his descendants. From him there sprang nations (gentes) and tribes (tribus), peoples (populi) and clans (cognationes), without number. And every nation (gens) walked after its own will and did ungodly things before you and scorned you, and you did not hinder them” (4 Ezra 4:7–8). The fourfold use of ethnic designations orients us toward corporate groups rather than individuals, and retaining this perspective yields the best lens for Ezra’s retelling end of biblical history up to the exile (4 Ezra 3:12–36). The figures named are either nations (Egypt, Babylon, Israel / Zion) or individuals who represent nations (Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Esau, David). To his first speech, Ezra returns to the respective fates of Israel and Babylon: “When have the inhabitants of the earth not sinned in your sight? Or what nation (gens) has kept your commandments so well [as Israel]? You may indeed find individual men (hominæ) who have kept your commandments, but nations (gentes) you will not find” (4 Ezra 3:35–36). This last own. The work both begins and ends with Israel and the nations, and the place of peoples is never far from view throughout the work. Sinfulness is raised in the context of the respective fates of nations. There is ample warrant for an author who had recently survived the disastrous Jewish war to find Israel’s humiliation a pressing question and to find a coming Jewish triumph over “Babylon” (Rome) to be a sustaining hope.

Except for Babylon (standing in for Rome), Paul invokes all of these same figures and nations in Romans, particularly Rom 4 and Rom 9–11. Arguably they also have corporate significance.
sentence of Ezra’s initial complaint is a telling allowance. In his eyes, Adam’s sin
does not affect every last person. Rather, it infects all nations.\textsuperscript{253}

This clears up matters of the magnitude and transmission of original sin and
establishes a measure of agreement between Ezra and his heavenly interlocutors.

Adam’s sin extends to all peoples, not all people. Since certain exemplary individuals
manage to escape its baleful effects, inherited sinfulness is at most a propensity of
the human being toward evil, but one that can be overcome. At base 4 Ezra treats sin
as a social malady, and the author is most concerned with its effect on his people.

Ezra’s complaint in the dialogues (4 Ezra 3:1–9:25) is that Adam’s sin has taken root
in all nations, and that Israel, the least diseased, has received disproportionate
punishment. Ultimately he is not persuaded by his theological wrangling with Uriel
and God; he changes his view only with three visions of the climactic exaltation of
Israel over its rival nations (4 Ezra 9:26–13:58). What motivates the author

\textsuperscript{253} I have focused on the First Vision since it sets out the problem of the work, but the point
is also explicit in the Third Vision. There also Ezra seeks to learn why “the other nations (gentes)
which have descended from Adam,” which are “nothing,” “spittle,” and “a drop in the bucket,”
nonetheless “domineer over” and “devour” Israel (4 Ezra 6:55–59). Uriel agrees in part, stating that
the world was created for Israel, but he turns Ezra’s attention to the world to come as Israel’s
redemption, since “when Adam transgressed my statutes, what had been made was judged,” with the
result that all nations but Israel have gone off the path to eternity (4 Ezra 7:3–25, quoting v. 11).
throughout, then, is the relative sinfulness of Israel and the nations, and Adam is his preferred symbol to adjudicate the divine promise in light of human reality.\textsuperscript{254}

Without doubt, 4 Ezra — along with a small handful of other works that take Gen 3 as a starting point for theology (2 Baruch, the Life of Adam and Eve literature, and Testament of Abraham) — invites comparisons to Paul.\textsuperscript{255} This provides a

\textsuperscript{254} A network of Ezra-related literature grew under the influence of 4 Ezra. In two of these works, the same dynamic — a seer questioning God about the weakness of Adam and humanity’s resultant sinfulness and mortality — can be found: the Apocalypse of Sedrach (2nd / 5th c. CE; finalized around 1000), Byzantine with a likely Jewish core; the Greek Apocalypse of Ezra (2nd / 9th c. CE), Christian, possibly with Jewish sources. The Questions of Ezra (unknown date) also concerns the fate of humanity, but without reference to Adam.

\textsuperscript{255} (1) 4 Ezra is a closer companion to Rom 5, but 2 Bar. (early 2nd c. CE) is popular alongside it in Romans commentaries, and again it is for good reason. In the story Jeremiah’s scribe begins nearly as disconsolate as Ezra in 4 Ezra (2 Bar. 48:42–43: “O Adam, what did you do to all who were born after you? And what will be said of the first Eve who obeyed the serpent, so that this whole multitude is going to corruption?”; see further vv. 44–47; also 19:8), but the work veers further away from 4 Ezra and Paul by its ready acceptance of the divine reply. Baruch is assured by God that there is a plan (2 Bar. 23:4) and, more pointedly, roundly rejects anything like an inexorable Adamic influence on humanity: “Adam is, therefore, not the cause, except only for himself, but each of us has become our own Adam” (2 Bar. 54:19; also 54:15). All humans face temptation as if in Eden, in full control of their faculties and able to resist. The seer voices no protestations afterward. He is apparently satisfied that the many who are damned are justly punished for their own freely chosen fate, and for this reason some have seen 2 Bar. itself as a rebuke of 4 Ezra. Salvation, according to this work, is in the hand of the doer. (2) LAE (1st c. BCE / 2nd c. CE), covered further in the next section, is another example, since the protoplasts’ sin brings infection with ἐπιθυμία, loss of glory, pain and death, as well as disorder within creation. (3) A surprisingly humorous example comes in the T. Ab. (1st / 2nd c. CE). The plot of the work, in both its major recensions, is the crisis of individual death. God sends Michael to take Abraham’s soul (A: 1:1–7:12; B: 1:1–6:13), but the patriarch refuses (A: 7:12–8:12; B: 7:1–17) and then temporizes in the face of death, requesting a tour of earth and heaven (A: 9:1–14:15; B: 7:18–12:16) and still trying to elude his fate thereafter (A: 15:1–15). Finally, having refused Michael, God sends the angel Death (A: 16:1–6; B: 13:1–3). Abraham also refuses him and queries him to stall the inevitable (A: 16:7–20:7; B: 13:4–14:6), but Death eventually steals his soul by
desirable place to assess how Adamic traditions can help solve several difficulties in Rom 5 before moving to the final category. First, at the risk of reiterating a bromide, other Jews agree that sin and death are powerful foes that put in jeopardy God’s promises. Paul, though not in the majority, is also not isolated on the point. Second, the centrality of peoples in 4 Ezra yields an attractive solution to one of the lingering riddles in Paul: Adam as the common patriarch of all nations (also noticed in Acts 17, above) eases the apparent turn from Jewish-gentile relations in Rom 5, and to the degree that Adam factors in Rom 5–8 — I will argue he appears several times — there is increased continuity across Rom 1–11. Third, if we combine the greatly pessimistic works, like 4 Ezra, and the moderately so, like Wisdom of Solomon, the scope of Adam’s influence extends to all people, but sometimes there are partial exceptions, such as Israel, its heroes, or the righteous. Fourth, there is no uniform conviction about how Adam’s sin is passed along. In addition to options listed above (the frailty of flesh, diabolical dominion, sex, and alcohol), 4 Ezra adds the trickery (A: 20:8–15) or as in a dream (B: 14:7–9). Although light-hearted, death is the heart of the work, and it originates, at least in recension A, from the first couple: “Do you not know that all those who (spring) from Adam and Eve die? . . . All have died, all have departed into Hades, all have been gathered by the sickle of Death” (T. Ab. 8:8 [A]).
possibility of a social dimension, and 2 Baruch outright denies direct influence. That riddle remains incompletely answered.

At his worst, then, Adam casts a long shadow over humanity. Through him comes death, and to a certain extent ongoing evil, with aftereffects that ripple throughout creation.

**Adam as Glorious Figure**

The final category of Adamic reflection is, on the surface, the opposite of the last, a “glorious” Adam over against a “bearer of disaster.” In a deeper sense, however, the two are intrinsically linked. The fall is so grievous because of Adam’s potential, a potential not entirely lost. Adam, pre-fall, is the summit of human greatness. More than that, he edges past ordinary humanity into the realms of divinity and retains, post-fall, a glimmer of transcendence unique to him. Not only does Ben Sira, for example, speak of the toil, pain, and death that is the lot of all “children of Adam” (e.g. Sir 40:1–11), but near the conclusion of his famous *encomium* he also boasts,
“above every other created living being was Adam” (Sir 49:16).\textsuperscript{256} For 1QHodayot\textsuperscript{a} Adamic humanity is frail, but despite the lowly material from which we are made, those “fashioned out of dust” will dwell with the “congregation of the sons of heaven” (1QH\textsuperscript{a} XI.20–21), for God has worked “wonders with dust” (XIX.3).\textsuperscript{257} In recension A of the Testament of Abraham (late 1st / early 2nd c. CE), “the first-formed Adam,” despite bringing death on his progeny, is in heaven seated on a golden throne, with an appearance “terrifying, like the Master’s” (i.e., like God’s), striking the visionary as “a most wondrous man, who is adorned in such glory” (T.

\textsuperscript{256} This is in comparison with the best of the best: Enoch, Noah, the three patriarchs, Moses and Aaron, Phineas, Joshua and Caleb, the judges, Nathan, David, Solomon, Hezekiah, Josiah, and other kings, Elijah, Elisha, Isaiah, and other prophets — all rank below Adam. For the negative aspect of his character, see further the above footnote in “Finitude” subsection of the “Pessimistic Adam Traditions.” For Levison (Portraits of Adam, 44–45), “Not speculation about Adam but the glory of Israel leads Ben Sira to glorify Adam.” Perhaps it is meant to glorify Israel, but some minimal speculation is inherent in the assertion that Adam is above all created things.

\textsuperscript{257} In addition, “[a]ll the streams of Eden” (1QH\textsuperscript{a} XIV.16) and the “[t]rees of life” (XVI.5-6) appear.
Ab. 11:4, 8 [A]). \(^{258}\) If Adam’s shadow falls long over human history, it is only
because of his immeasurable stature.\(^{259}\)

There are a wealth of writings describing Adam as the ideal human, or an
angel or god, and they do so with a variety of images.\(^{260}\) Nowhere are they amassed
as densely as in the Life of Adam and Eve literature (1st c. BCE / 2nd c. CE).\(^{261}\)

---

\(^{258}\) The chapter presents Adam’s role in the judgment. Like a concerned father, he wails over
the damned and exults over the saved, an indication of the first category, Adam as genealogical head.
The actual threefold judgment follows Adam, proceeding from Abel, to the twelve tribes, to God (chs.
12–14). Recension B lacks the Adamic scene.

\(^{259}\) Size is, in fact, the exact metaphor the Apoc. Ab. (1st / 2nd c. CE) uses for their glory:
Adam and Eve appear “very great in height and terrible in breadth, incomparable in aspect” (23:5).
The chief demon Azazel, a dragon, is no larger than they. At the fall he stands in their midst, feeding
them grapes, as they indulge their desire rather than follow God (ch. 23). Similar: Philo, QG 1.32.

\(^{260}\) In what follows I will focus on traditions that make Adam more than human, or at least
more than what now constitutes human. However, some works prefer to see him as the perfect
realization of a finite being. (1) In the Dream Visions (= 1 En. 83–90; 2nd c. BCE), Adam is a snow-
white bovine, his whiteness indicates his innocence like the angels, but his basic form is animal (= human) rather than human (= angel). In (2) Sib. Or. 1.22–37 (1st c. BCE / 2nd c. CE), part of the
Jewish core, Adam is “beautiful, wonderful,” made in God’s image, and Eve, of the same form, is “a
wonderful maidenly spouse.” They dwell in “an ambrosial garden” and are “far removed from an evil
heart.” (3) Sometimes this is Philo’s point as well, although at other times he goes further. He defends
that being created last indicates honor (Opif. 77–88) and sees Adam as a microcosm (Opif. 82; see
also Her. 151–56) and world citizen (Opif. 142–44). Adam was, in fact, “most excellent in each part of
his being, in both soul and body, and greatly excelling those who came after him in the transcendent
qualities of both alike: for this man really was the one truly ‘beautiful and good’ ” (Opif. 136; see
with Adam as world citizen, microcosm, composed of the four elements, and endowed with a rational
soul and five senses.

\(^{261}\) There are five primary Adam books: the Gk. Apocalypse of Moses (a misnomer, since
Moses only appears in the title), the Lat. Vita Adae et Evae, the Slav. Life of Adam and Eve, the Geo.
known as the Primary Adam Books, this family of legends concerns the first pair’s postlapsarian life, including a repentance aborted by a second temptation of Eve, an unfulfilled quest for oil to heal the ailing Adam, and in time the deaths and funerals of Abel, Adam, and Eve. There are also recollections, variously from Satan, Adam, and Eve, of the angelic rebellion and human fall.²⁶² The works are interesting, however, not simply for the abundance of traditions they contain, but also because the story is set east of Eden. All the ideas presented, including the memories of paradise, are filtered through the fall. The despair is rivaled only by 4 Ezra and Rom 5.²⁶³ Yet Adam and Eve remain august. Like Sirach, 1QHodayot, and the Testament

²⁶² The basic plot is the same among all five, although the Slav. skips many events. Traditionally the Gk. and Lat. have been the most important, and I will focus on them, esp. the Gk. which is probably the earliest, noting when the other versions are parallel or offer a significantly different reading. Their order of events differ, and the Gk. includes Eve’s retelling of the events of Gen 1–3, much of which the Latin relates directly. The Latin also has a few events that the Gk. does not have. The Arm. and Geo. follow the Lat.’s sequence of events, but they also include Eve’s tale.

²⁶³ E.g., having wrongly eaten the fig, Adam and Eve are poisoned with ἐπιϑυκία, leading to all other sins (Gk. LAE 19:3 // Arm.); they have lost righteousness and glory (Gk. LAE 20:1–2 //
of Abraham, these writings combine the first couple’s greatness with the disastrous outcome of their sin. Like Acts 17 and 4 Ezra, the Life of Adam and Eve literature makes the first-formed humans the ancestors of all nations, not just all individuals.\textsuperscript{264} For these reasons the folkloristic \textit{bios} of Adam and Eve serves well as the showpiece of the “glorious Adam” traditions, with other works given ancillary display, as they add depth.\textsuperscript{265}

\textit{Knowledge.} Least of their glories, Adam and Eve are associated with knowledge. Sometimes it is practical (e.g., agriculture in Lat. LAE 22:2), sometimes cunning (e.g., outwitting Satan in Slav. LAE 30[32:3]–35[37:1]). Several times it is preternatural (e.g., a dream foretelling Abel’s death in Gk. LAE 2–3 // Arm., Geo., Arm.); creation has fallen into disorder (Gk. LAE 24:4 // Arm., Geo.); and the onset of illness and death drives the work.

\textsuperscript{264} So Michael D. Eldridge, \textit{Dying Adam with His Multiethnic Family: Understanding the Greek Life of Adam and Eve}, SVTP 16 (Leiden: Brill, 2001). In his summary of the work other dynamics of the narrative are more prominent, e.g., forgiveness, but it serves his theory that the work is a missionary document proclaiming the acceptance of all into God’s people (pp. 226–30). Ethnic identities are raised also in his introduction (pp. 1–11), when he considers the provenance of the work (i.e., Jewish or Christian) (pp. 233–64), and conclusion (pp. 275–81).

\textsuperscript{265} I mean \textit{bios} loosely. Generically, LAE bears only a passing resemblance to a Greek biography. It is more like folklore or other expansions of OT material, sometime called “rewritten Bible” (although that term is contested).
According to some manuscripts of Lat. LAE 29, Adam learns “future sacramental mysteries . . . by eating of the tree of knowledge” (v. 4), a curiously positive result of the first sin. Further, the Latin Life of Adam and Eve concludes with mysterious tablets of clay and stone (Lat. LAE 50), made to withstand two great cataclysms that Adam knows are coming, the primeval deluge and the eschatological conflagration (Lat. LAE 49:3). A later editor adds their discovery by Solomon, by which Israel’s great sage himself improves in knowledge (Lat. LAE 51).

Although Adam and Eve are not the leading pictures of wisdom in Second Temple Judaism, it

---

266 To be precise, while in the Gk. they are simply too late, in the Arm. and Geo., God sends an angel, either Michael or Gabriel, to prevent Adam from stopping the murder but promising the birth of Seth in return.

267 M. D. Johnson judges this to be an interpolation and translates it in a footnote (“Adam and Eve,” 2:268–70). Even granting this, the interpolation is itself ancient and reveals how certain early Christians perceived Adam. The context is a vision Adam recounts to Seth, which he had received soon after his expulsion from the garden, in which he was caught up to heaven by a fiery chariot (chs. 25–29). The theme of heavenly ascent is widespread in apocalyptic literature, but we may note the general similarity to 2 Cor 12.

268 These tablets, sometimes as books, are a recurrent symbol in Jewish literature. (1) In Jub. 8:1–4 (2nd c. BCE), shortly after the flood Noah’s grandson Canaan (spelled “Cainan”) discovers “a writing which the ancestors [= Adam? Seth?] engraved on stone” containing astrological lore taught by the Watchers, and Canaan sins by copying it and learning from it. (2) Josephus (Ant. 1.70–71; 1st c. CE) agrees that they reveal cosmic movements, but unlike Jubilees does not censure this information. Rather, for him Seth learns it because of his virtue, and puts his heavenly wisdom in stone and clay since Adam foretold the two cataclysms. (3) 2 En. 33:8–12 (late 1st c. CE) records a similar tradition. Having been given insight into the makeup of the universe, Enoch adds to writings by Adam and Seth, and God providentially ensures that these will outlive the flood and to “the final age.” Similar: (4) the Apoc. Adam (esp. 1:1–3, chs. 3, 5, and 8:14–17; 1st / 4th c. CE) and the (5) T. Adam (esp. ch. 3; 2nd / 5th c. CE), although neither mention of “tablets” or “books.”
is a distinct aspect of their heritage. Prophetic like Moses, astute like Solomon, they are placed among the great sages of the past.

General Imago Dei. The most multifaceted aspect of Adamic glory in Jewish literature is human creation in the “image” (צלם; εἰκών) and “likeness” (דמות; ὡμοίωσις) of God in Gen 1:26–27. The brevity of the account, combined with the

---

269 This is also true for Philo. Not only is Adam consistently a symbol of mind (as noted above), Philo credits him with philosophical ken (QG 1.32) and says that Adam's naming of the animals displays his wisdom, not because they were nameless as created by God but because Adam correctly discerns the animals' true, God-given natures (Opif. 148–50; Leg. 2.15; QG 1.20–22; Mut. 64). Despite this high evaluation of Adam (but not Eve: see, e.g., QG 1.33; Her. 52–53), Moses is Philo's most common exemplar of wisdom and the apex of an ascending ladder of sagacity, from Seth to Noah to Abraham, before arriving at the law-giver (Post. 173–75). At times, though, Philo does speak of Adam as the ideal of all human traits (e.g., Opif. 140–47), so it is possible that he remains, at least in principle, the preeminent wise man for Philo.

270 As far as I know, only thrice does their act significantly dim their enlightenment. (1) Ps.-Philo, LAB 26:6: “Blessed be God, who . . . made Adam as the first created one and showed him everything so that when Adam sinned thereby, then he might refuse him all these things (for if he showed them to the whole human race, they might have mastery over them).” The “everything” Adam knows seems to be magic particularly, and God removed it lest sinful humankind misuse it. (2) In 2 Bar. 4:3, Adam had been given sight of the heavenly Jerusalem, but he can longer look upon it after his sin. (3) In the Apoc. Adam 1, a gnostic work, Eve learns secret knowledge and shares it with Adam, and the evil creator god punishes them for it. In this case, however, it is not a sin, and their knowledge is restored partially by envoys from the highest God. By contrast, Philo, who probably speaks for most, Adam and Eve did not gain what was promised by the snake, knowledge like the gods', but nevertheless they were not deprived of their previous knowledge either (QG 1.36, 1.54). Levison (Portraits of Adam, 46–47) has Sir 24:28 (“The first man did not know wisdom fully, nor will the last one fathom her”) as an example of Adam's lack of knowledge. It does deprecate Adam somewhat, but the overall point is that humanity at large cannot plumb the depths of wisdom.

271 The language of “image” and “likeness” seem to have become fixed early, since all major Greek translations (LXX, Aq., Sym., Thd.) use these same two words, even though they translate the context differently.
exalted stature it implies, provided fertile ground for speculation. One facet of the image, in the Life of Adam and Eve and elsewhere, is that it replicates throughout humanity, another version of the first couple’s headship. Normally this is taken as a positive trait, but in the T. Isaac 4:26–38 (2nd c. CE) it actually seems that the first sin has attached itself to the image and is passed down generationally. The second facet prohibits murder: God’s image invests human life with sacredness, and wrongful death merits the severest of penalties. A third concerns the hope of

---

272 This follows the logic of Gen 5:1–3: Adam is again said to be made in the “likeness” (דמות) of God (v. 1), and then he begets Seth in his own “likeness” (דמות) and “image” (צלם) in v. 3. For this theme in the LAE, see Arm., Geo. LAE [23]3:2. One sure example: (1) In T. Naph. 2:4–5 (2nd c. BCE), the likeness passes not from parent to child, but is created directly for each person by God. Two other references are likely but not definitive, since the “image” could be understood literally: (2) In Ps.-Philo’s LAB (1st c. CE), Hannah hopes to have “my own image” before she dies (50:7), a wish fulfilled with the birth of Samuel. (3) The rule may be proved by an exception in the Sentences of Ps.-Phoc. (1st c. BCE / CE). In ll. 177–78, the moralist warns, “Do not prostitute your wife, defiling your children. For the adulterous bed brings not sons in (your) likeness.” The image is only passed along to legitimate offspring. (4) Philo, like Ps.-Phoc., seems to think that humans participate in the image to varying degrees, in his case depending on skill and virtue: e.g., later humans reflect Adam’s archetype to varying degrees (Opif. 141, 145), and the craftsman of the tabernacle, Bezalel, partakes in the imago in the act of building (Leg. 3.95–106). Most importantly, Philo notes that Seth, not Cain, is made in Adam’s “image” in Gen 5:3, since he alone is morally worthy to merit primogeniture (QG 1.81).

273 See esp. T. Isaac 4:32. Even in this work, however, there is a positive reference to the image in T. Isaac 6:34.

274 This follows the logic of Gen 9:6, the last reference to the imago in the HB: “Whoever sheds the blood of a human, by a human shall that person’s blood be shed; for in his own image (צלם) God made humankind.” In the expulsion narrative (Gk. LAE 29:7–13 // Arm., Geo., Lat., Slav.), Eve is distraught and begs that Adam kill her, so that he may reenter paradise. Adam refrains, but the
resurrection and requirements for proper burial.\textsuperscript{275} This theme is common in Second Temple literature, and it apparently understands the image literally: the human body itself bears God’s image and therefore will be renewed in eternity.\textsuperscript{276} For other Jews

\textsuperscript{275} Near the conclusion of the LAE, after Adam’s death but before his soul ascends to heaven and his body is buried, angels who have come to earth petition God for mercy because Adam is “your image, and the work of your (holy) hands” (Gk. LAE 33:5 // Geo.), a refrain that is echoed (in some mss, at least) by angels in heaven (Gk. LAE 35:2 // Geo.). This prayer is answered. God brings Adam’s soul to the third heaven and promises his body an eschatological restoration after the curse: “the LORD said to [Adam’s body], ‘I told you that you are dust and to dust you shall return. Now I promise to you the resurrection; I shall raise you on the last day in the resurrection with every man of your seed’ ” (Gk. LAE 41:2 // Arm., Geo.; see further Gk. LAE 37–42 // Arm., Geo., Lat., Slav.). Emphasis original, indicating the quotation from Gen 3:19.

\textsuperscript{276} Quite a few texts bring together some or all of the themes here — petitions for mercy, death and resurrection, and proper burial: (1) 4 Ezra 8:44 (late 1st c. / early 2nd c. CE) begs for mercy for humanity because “man . . has been formed by your hands and is called your own image because he is made like you, and for whose sake you have formed all things.” The context is eternal judgment, so the mercy is similar to that of LAE. (2) In T. Isaac 6:33–34 (2nd c. CE, with Coptic redactions), the namesake patriarch charges Jacob, “my beloved son, keep my injunction which I lay down today that you preserve my body. Do not profane the image of God by how you treat it; for the image of man was made like the image of God; and God will treat you accordingly at the time when you meet him and see him face to face.” (3) The Apoc. Sedr. (2nd / 5th c. CE), which knows and uses 4 Ezra, pleads on behalf of a hypothetical sinner who might repent of a lifetime of evil prior to death: “Have mercy, Lord, upon your image and be compassionate” (13:3). (4) In T. Adam 3:3 (2nd / 5th c. CE) God promises mercy for Adam “because you were created in my image,” and so he will not forever “waste away in Sheol.” Three verses later it records his death. Adam is buried by angels “because he had been created in the image of God,” and other apocalyptic signs mark the sad occasion (T. Adam 3:6). That God, or at least God’s “glory,” had a body in most rabbinic and Jewish-Christian thought has been noted for some time. See, e.g., Jarl Fossum, “Jewish-Christian Christology and Jewish Mysticism,” \textit{VC}
God’s imprint is found instead in the soul or spirit, but often there is nonetheless an expectation of bodily resurrection.\textsuperscript{277} Several facets can also be seen outside the Primary Adam Books. The \textit{imago} makes Adam and Eve the paragons of humanity,\textsuperscript{278} or it has an ethical sense, obliging people to refrain from slander or motivating them to aid the poor.\textsuperscript{279} Sometimes has an idiosyncratic (or unclear) sense, suggestive of how many-angled the interpretation of Gen 1:26–27 was around the first century.\textsuperscript{280}

\begin{itemize}
\item The logic comes from combining Gen 1:26–27 with Gen 2:7: “the Lord God formed man from the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and the man became a living being.” (1) This is Philo’s primary understanding of the \textit{imago Dei}. In most cases he portrays the heavenly “image” as the human mind patterned after the divine λόγος, which is communicated to the earthly person by the divine breath (\textit{Opif.} 139, 146; \textit{Plant.} 19–23; \textit{Her.} 230–36; \textit{Somn.} 1.30–36; but in \textit{Somn.} 1.72–76 the \textit{imago} seems to be directly of God, not the λόγος). In a secondary sense the body can reflect the divine image, too (\textit{Opif.} 146). The image, or divine breath, is the human soul’s life, while the blood is our fleshly, animal life (\textit{Det.} 79–86; \textit{Her.} 54–56; implicitly in \textit{Spec.} 4.122–25).
\item Another example: (2) Ps.-Phoc. (1st c. BCE / CE) writes, “For the spirit is a loan of God to mortals, and (his) image” (l. 106). This seems to equate the \textit{imago Dei} with the soul, taken to be eternal (ll. 105, 115), in contradistinction to the body, which is mortal (ll. 107–8). The ultimate hope, however, is resurrection, that “the remains of the departed will soon come to the light (again) out of the earth” (ll. 103–4), hence the justification of proper burial practices (ll. 99–102).
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{277} The logic comes from combining Gen 1:26–27 with Gen 2:7: “the Lord God formed man from the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and the man became a living being.” (1) This is Philo’s primary understanding of the \textit{imago Dei}. In most cases he portrays the heavenly “image” as the human mind patterned after the divine λόγος, which is communicated to the earthly person by the divine breath (\textit{Opif.} 139, 146; \textit{Plant.} 19–23; \textit{Her.} 230–36; \textit{Somn.} 1.30–36; but in \textit{Somn.} 1.72–76 the \textit{imago} seems to be directly of God, not the λόγος). In a secondary sense the body can reflect the divine image, too (\textit{Opif.} 146). The image, or divine breath, is the human soul’s life, while the blood is our fleshly, animal life (\textit{Det.} 79–86; \textit{Her.} 54–56; implicitly in \textit{Spec.} 4.122–25).

\textsuperscript{278} As in Sib. Or. 1, Philo, and the Hellenistic Synagogue Prayers. See the note at the start of the second paragraph of the “Glorious Adam Traditions” section above.

\textsuperscript{279} Slander: Jas 3:9, 2 En. 44:1–3, and Gen Rab 24:7 (on Gen 5:1); aid: Sib. Or. 8.402–8.

\textsuperscript{280} E.g., (1) In Wis 2:23 (1st c. BCE / CE) it implies the immortality intended for humanity (“God created us for incorruption, and made us in the image of his own eternity”), and this was lost at the fall (v. 24). Some mss do replace “eternity” with “nature,” but in any case “incorruption” occurs in v. 23a. (2) 1QWar Scroll speaks of God’s creation of “man’s image” (בְּנֵי אָדָם) in a litany of praise.
Messianic Imago Dei. The image of God is sometimes associated with the messiah and his community. This, the first of three particularly significant uses, is the only one not found in the Life of Adam and Eve, but it is important for Paul. In the Similitudes of Enoch (= 1 En. 37–71; early 1st c. CE?), the “Son of Man” figure is called, in manuscript A, “the prototype of the Before-Time” (1 En. 46:2), also being likened to angels (e.g., v. 1). If this reading is correct, it is quite important: in a slightly older contemporary of Paul, there is a confluence of Adamic, messianic, and angelic imagery coalescing in one superhuman figure, who bears the names “Son of Man,” “Elect One,” and “Messiah,” who is pre-existent, comes to earth to judge the evil and bring hope even to the righteous gentiles, and shares his identity with his community. 281 Manuscripts B and C, however, make the phrase adverbial (“with him extending from creation, to this “image,” on to generations, the confusion of tongues, the separation of nations, and more (1QM X.14). Although תבנית is not a typical word for the “image” of God, the matters of primeval history in the context at least makes an imago reference plausible. However, little can be gleaned of its meaning, since it comes as one item in a list. (3) The magical text T. Sol. (1st / 3rd c. CE) records, among other things, Solomon’s interview of thirty-six demonic στοιχεῖα (ch. 18), and the sixteenth says, “I am called Katrax. I inflict incurable fevers on men. If anyone wants to regain his health, let him pulverize coriander and rub it on his lips, saying, ‘I adjure you by Zeus, retreat from the image of God,’ and I retreat immediately” (v. 20). (4) In v. 63 of the Vis. Ezra (4th / 7th c. CE), God’s image differentiates humans from animals, apparently enabling moral judgment, and makes us culpable for sin, often facing eternal torture. Resonances with other traditions occur in these texts, but the prime application of the imago is unique to them.

281 These themes are spread throughout the Similitudes, but all are clustered in 1 En. 48 for a brief example. John J. Collins (“The Son of Man Who Has Righteousness,” SBLSem 17 [1979]: 1–13
who precedes time"), so the Adamic identification is in doubt. In any case not long after Paul, Christian sources do use the imago to this effect.

**Interlude: The Pauline *Imago Dei***

Aside from Jas 3:9, in the NT the language of image of God (εἰκών, ὁμοίωμα, or ὁμοίωσις θεοῦ) arises only in Pauline literature. Fourteen references are spread and George W. E. Nickelsburg and James C. VanderKam (*1 Enoch 2: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 37–82*, Hermeneia [Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012], 98–101) demonstrate systematically this relation between the community and its mediator.

See E. Isaac, "1 (Ethiopic Apocalypse Of) Enoch," in *OTP*, ed. Charlesworth, 1:34. Ms A, which contains the imago reference, is generally thought to be the best.

(1) This is, possibly, what the Odes Sol. 7 (late 1st c. / early 2nd c. CE) intends in celebrating Jesus’s incarnation: “He became like me, that I might receive him. In form he was considered like me, that I might put him on” (v. 4). Again, “Like my nature he became, that I might understand him. And like my form, that I might not turn away from him” (v. 6). Much in the context concerns creation, and Charlesworth notes on 7:6 that “[t]he Syr. nouns translated as ‘nature’ and ‘form’ also mean ‘natural disposition,’ ‘essence,’ and ‘image’” ("Odes of Solomon," in *OTP*, ed. Charlesworth, 2:740). Ode 7 seems to present the incarnation as Jesus taking on the *imago Dei*. In 17:4, the reverse may happen. The odist “received the face and form of a new person (πρόσωπον)” by walking in Christ and being saved. Here Christians receive Jesus's image. (2) The Christian section of Sib. Or. 8 (ll. 217–500; 2nd / 3rd c. CE) explicitly brings together the messiah and imago. In ll. 258–72, God and Jesus jointly make “the original man” and “mortal tribes” in their combined image. In coming to earth Jesus bears “a corresponding copy to the holy virgin.” In 8.458, 471, the incarnation is again the Word putting on “mortal form,” which, like Phil 2, is a possible reference to Gen 1. See also ll. 402, 437–55, dealt with above, on the imago.

When other NT authors use the typical words for “image” and “likeness,” they predominately indicate resemblance generally: the εἰκών of Caesar on a coin (Matt 22:20; Mark 12:16; Luke 20:24); the εἰκών of the beast on a human person (Rev 13:14, 15; 14:9, 11; 15:2; 16:2; 19:20;
throughout Romans, 1–2 Corinthians, Philippians, and Colossians; they seem disparate in content and are plausibly indebted to Gen 1 to varying degrees, from nearly certain to very doubtful. Further, the language of “form” (μορφή) comes up twice near one of the uses of δμοίωμα, in Phil 2, and many see here another reference to the imago.²⁸⁵ If so, the count rises to sixteen.

Sorting through these often debated possibilities is not as daunting as it may seem. We may dispatch quickly three extraneous instances that are usually taken as “resemblance” generally, two in Rom 1:23 and one in Rom 5:14.²⁸⁶ Then, if we adopt 1 Cor 15:49 as a provisional epitome of the apostle’s thought on the topic, we can make substantial headway. A simple classification emerges that neatly encompasses a majority of the instances. In the previously mentioned verse Paul writes, “Just as we

²⁸⁵ If we expand the search to μορφή, the only other NT use is in the longer ending of Mark, which speaks of the resurrected Jesus having an alternate μορφή from before. This is not likely to derive from Gen 1, and in any case is a later addition to the Gospel.

²⁸⁶ Even in these three there is some warrant for suggesting an echo of Gen 1, but they do not influence the following one way or another. In Rom 1:23 the pair refer to idolatry: “they exchanged the glory of the immortal God for δμοίωμα εικόνος of a mortal human being or birds or four-footed animals or reptiles.” I will return to this passage in the final chapter and give Morna D. Hooker’s argument for the imago’s relevance in it. In Rom 5:14 sins committed between Adam and Moses are not done in the δμοίωμα of Adam’s transgression. This is conceivably a subtle pun on Gen 1:26, since Adam is in the verse, but if so this tells us more about Paul’s humor than his theology.
have borne the εἰκών of the man of dust, we will also bear the εἰκών of the man of heaven.” The context is Paul’s other explicit Adam-Christ comparison, so it can hardly be doubted that Gen 1:26–27 is intended. Paul’s doctrine is that there are two εἰκόνες θεοῦ: Adam and the Messiah, with Jesus as the new and superior one (so also 2 Cor 4:4 [εἰκών τοῦ θεοῦ]; Phil 2:6 [μορφὴ θεοῦ]; Col 1:15 [εἰκών τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου]), and everyone shares in one of the two. For believers, it is the messianic image: they are molded at baptism into the ὁμοίωμα of his death and resurrection (Rom 6:5), “conformed to the εἰκών of [God’s] Son” (Rom 8:29), and “transformed into the same εἰκών [of the Lord] from one degree of glory to another” (2 Cor 3:18). Largely the same is Col 3:10, except that it speaks of the “image of God” rather than “of Christ.” The new “self” (ἄνθρωπος) “is being renewed in knowledge according to the εἰκών of its creator.” These nine instances of “image,” “likeness,” and “form”

---

287 More than that, it can also hardly be doubted that Paul builds on post-Genesis exegetical developments. Gregory E. Sterling (“‘Wisdom among the Perfect’: Creation Traditions in Alexandrian Judaism and Corinthian Christianity,” NovT 37 [1995]: 357–67) contends that this is one of three instances in which the Corinthians seem to know traditions also found in Philo, in this case of a heavenly and earthly Adam (influenced by Platonism) and of a spiritual and physical Adam (influenced by Stoicism). Paul himself opposes these viewpoints, making Adam in Gen 1 and Gen 2 both the earthly Adam, but if right, it indicates they are present outside of Alexandria. See further the excursus on 1 Cor 15 in Chapter 4.

288 Insofar as this fits the pattern of 1 Cor 15:49, the new ἄνθρωπος, usually translated “self,” seems to be Christ’s image as appropriated by an individual believer, since it is not likely that Christ’s
language all fit within a common pattern. It matters little if one discards several of the passages where the echo of Gen 1 is faint or those that come in the disputed Epistle of Colossians. The essential structure stands on the clearest texts (e.g., 1 Cor 15:49; 2 Cor 4:4), and less certain ones (e.g., Phil 2:6; Col 3:10) only add depth and repetition.

This permits us to draw preliminary conclusions about the Pauline *imago Dei*. Paul’s leading idea is that humans are conformed to either the Adamic or messianic image, the one broken and the other intact. This is most similar to manuscript A of the Similitudes, where another messiah is the “prototype” of God and his followers participate in his work and life. There is Pauline agreement with the Testament of Isaac, that sin has attached itself to the Adamic image; possibly also with a host of sources that see in the image hope of the resurrection, although for Paul this comes specifically with the messianic *imago*. And with Gen 5, the Life of Adam and Eve, and other texts, the image replicates throughout humanity. For Paul, the Adamic image may be inherited directly by a child from a parent, although

image itself needs further renewal. The context permits this interpretation, and shares a number of similarities with 1 Cor 15. In Col 3 there is an old and new ἄνθρωπος (vv. 9–10), the one associated with earth and vices (vv. 5–9), the other with heaven and virtues (vv. 1–4, 12–17), and believers “put off” the one in favor of the other (cf. Eph 5:22–24, which lacks any of the “image” words, but does include ὁ καινὸς ἄνθρωπος ὁ κατὰ Θεόν κτισθεὶς).
he never says so directly. Certainly the messianic image comes by other means, like belief and baptism (Rom 6:5), and it is accomplished in the providence of God (Rom 8:29). In these cases, Paul has taken a concept normally used by Jews to unify and glorify humankind, severed it in two, and left the glory with Christ alone.

Or so it seems, with twelve of the sixteen passages accounted for. Three uses of the word group may simply designate “likeness,” but could also allude to Gen 1. From the above we know that Paul thinks Adam’s image is lowly and defaced, so when he describes Jesus having been sent “in the ὁμοίωμα of sinful flesh” (Rom 8:3), or “taking the μορφή of a slave” and “being born in human ὁμοίωμα” (Phil 2:7), there is justification to speculate that Christ, at his incarnation, assumed Adam’s image. He did not, it seems, come bearing the new image already, but first deigned to assume the old.\footnote{The analogy is imperfect, but this is akin to Paul’s statement that Jesus was “born under the law, in order to redeem those who were under the law” (Gal 4:4–5), esp. if this is law as overtaken by sin. It is also near statements that Jesus became sin (2 Cor 5:21) and a curse (Gal 3:1) for us, or that he became poor (2 Cor 8:9) and a slave (Phil 2:7). Even if much of this terminology is legal, there is a consistent sense that Jesus entered the sphere of fallen creation in order to begin the new creation. In the case of the \textit{imago}, Jesus assuming Adam’s broken image would not indicate ontological loss on Christ’s part — and this is assuming that Paul has a notion of a pre-incarnate Messiah, which is disputed — but a willing acceptance of the frailty and mortality of the human self in a postlapsarian world. Also, as will be noted during the excursus on 1 Cor 15 in Chapter 4, most commentators see Christ receiving his exalted status in 1 Cor 15:42–49 (including the \textit{imago} statement in v. 49 which has served as the epitome of his idea here) at the resurrection.} If so, an important nuance arises. Christ’s \textit{imago} is not altogether
separate from Adam’s. Jesus inhabited the old image for a time, and repaired it, so
that the new image of God is in some sense a renewed Adamic image.\footnote{Col 3:10 is the closest the Pauline tradition gets to saying this directly, because individual Christians put off the old ἄνθρωπος (their appropriation of Adam?) and put on the new (their appropriation of Christ?), which is being renewed in the image of the Creator. Here there would be a sense of the image being repaired, rather than two static opposing images.} Although as a present reality the human world faces two opposing images, Paul may think that the earthly Jesus shared Adam’s image and, further, that his new image is the old restored.

The remaining passage, a clear reference to Gen 1:26–27, brings us back to Paul’s paradigmatic view of Adam and Eve. In his discussion of why women should remain veiled in the church but men should not, Paul says that man is “the image (εἰκὼν) and reflection (or ‘glory’: δόξα) of God,” while woman is the “reflection (or ‘glory’: δόξα) of man” (1 Cor 11:7). This reads like Tob 8 or 1 Tim 2: creation is the rationale for hierarchy. However, at first blush Paul’s reading of the Genesis account seems incorrect, in that he deliberately ignores the fact that “male and female” are created in the image of God (Gen 1:27). He continues pressing masculine authority through v. 10, speaking of women being made for men but not vice-versa (probably from Gen 2). But in vv. 11–12 he pivots: “Nevertheless, in the Lord woman is not...
independent of man or man independent of woman. For just as woman came from

man, so man comes through woman; but all things come from God.” This

qualification does not change his instructions; the rule for veils is still binding on

women, and he warns, “if anyone is disposed to be contentious — we have no such

custom, nor do the churches of God” (v. 16). Even so, the digression is more

important. In vv. 2–10 and 13–16, Paul’s ideas are rooted in nature (v. 14), the

original creation account (vv. 7–9), and “because of the angels” (v. 10). Only in vv.

11–12 does Paul consider life “in the Lord,” where women and men are

interdependent, and all things come from God. The question is what

accomplishment of Christ brings such interdependence.²⁹¹

The foregoing provides another consideration. Paul sees the Adamic image as
damaged but still exercising power in this world: we have borne the image of the

man from dust. It is as if the curses of Gen 3 have leached into the *imago* of Gen 1,

and Paul's instructions to the church account for life in the fallen world, where men

---

²⁹¹ According to Wayne A. Meeks (“The Image of the Androgyne: Some Uses of a Symbol in Earliest Christianity,” in *In Search of the Early Christians: Selected Essays*, ed. Allen R. Hilton and H. Gregory Snyder [New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002], 20–24; originally published under the same title in *HR* 13 [1974]: 165–208), however, what Paul prohibits women from doing in this passage, and in 1 Cor 14:33b–36, is not functional, but symbolic. Women can still prophesy, but they need to dress in certain ways. We will return to his view momentarily, but the argues that the church has again rushed ahead prematurely into the eschatological state.
rule women (Gen 3:16). But in the renewed image of Christ, Gen 1 untainted by Gen 3, mutuality will be restored.

This hypothesis cannot be proved, but it does have the benefit of explaining another reference to Gen 1:26–27 in Paul’s corpus (not using “image” language), one that also arose above. It is among Paul’s most famous statements: “There is no longer Jew or Greek, there is no longer slave or free, there is no longer male and female; for all of you are one in Christ Jesus” (Gal 3:28).\(^{292}\) The grammatically infelicitous switch from “or” (οὐδὲ) to “and” (καί), and from masculine nouns (Ἰουδαῖος, Ἕλλην, δοῦλος, ἐλεύθερος) to neuter (ἄρσεν, ὥμοι), together signal an allusion to Gen 1:27, especially since the terms for “male” and “female” match those of the Greek OT.\(^{293}\) Paul ostensibly declares the undoing of an aspect of God’s original creation. As with 1 Cor 11, on the face of it, this is strange. One would expect that Christ’s work would undo the curses of Gen 3, but instead it seems to

\(^{292}\) It is possibly an earlier creed that Paul is quoting, but even if so, he has made it his own. Not only does it fit the logic of Gal 3, Paul makes a parallel statement in 1 Cor 12:13 (and Col 3, if Pauline). Also, while older translations often “corrected” the verse to say, “neither male nor female” (e.g., KJV, RSV), most modern translations use “and” to signal the use of Gen 1:27 (e.g., NRSV, NABRE, NIV, ESV).

\(^{293}\) The LXX, Aq., Sym., Thd. of Gen 1:27 all use the same phrase as Gal 3:28: ἄρσεν καὶ ἥμαρσυ.
undo Gen 1. The interpretations given for 1 Cor 11 are also found here, but again, if the apostle thinks of the first image as damaged, then it is no longer bizarre that he would celebrate its end in Gal 3:28. Further support for this comes from the parallel statement in Col 3:11. Having encouraged the Colossians to put on the new ἄνθρωπος (the new Adam?) which is being renewed (ἀνακαινούμενος) in the image (εἰκών) of its Creator (Col 3:10), the author adds, “where (ὅπου) there is no

---

294 The most likely alternative to the view I express below is the myth of the androgyne, esp. as articulated in Meeks (“Image of Androgyne,” 3–54). In various segments of the Greco-Roman world, e.g., in Epicureanism and several mystery religions, the divide between male and female was reduced, negated, or even reversed, at least within certain cultic settings. The myth of a primal androgyne, shared by Plato and numerous other creation accounts, made its way into Philo, rabbinic writings, and various types of Gnosticism, and in Gnosticism it was the basis of various initiation rites. In this understanding of the creation story, the “Adam” of Gen 1, created male and female in the image of God, is still one, bisexual being. (Some Gk. mss the rabbis know have “him” rather than “them” in Gen 1:27.) Only in Gen 2 is the androgynous Adam divided in two to make a male Adam and a female Eve. Since there are pre-Pauline Greco-Roman sources of an original androgyne, and pockets of Judeo-Christianity in Paul’s day (Philø) and after (the Tannaim and Gnostics) applied it to Gen 1–2, it is possible that Gal 3:28 (and 1 Cor 12:13, Col 3:10–11) envisions the restoration of an androgynous imago. Perhaps this is a secondary idea in Paul’s mind; I doubt it is the main concept, however. Everything in the context is about salvation — not only baptism itself (cf. Rom 6) and the wider context of the law’s inability to save (cf. Rom 1–4), but the fact that the negation of “male and female” is equated with “sons of God” (Gal 3:26; cf. Rom 8:12–17), and is an antidote to being “imprisoned . . . under sin” (Gal 3:22; cf. Rom 11:32). The dividing of the original, bisexual Adam is not the result of sin, however, but simply another step of creation. If the androgyne is what Paul is in Paul’s mind in Gal 3:28, that only reverses Gen 2, not Gen 3. It should be added that, precisely speaking, the being is not always bisexual (an androgyne) but instead is without sex (“neither male nor female”), as in Philo and Gal 3:28 (see below).

295 If one grants Pauline authorship of Colossians, then the evidence is all the stronger, but at minimum the idea emerges from a Pauline school of the first century.
longer Greek and Jew, ... but Christ is all and in all!” (Col 3:11).²⁹⁶ The social leveling occurs specifically within the renewed image.²⁹⁷

Some may find the above solution too tidy or will dispute the proposed allusions to Gen 1–3. In any case, several important and indisputably Pauline texts do allude to Genesis’s “image of God,” enough to construct the idea that Jesus is a better iteration of the image than is Adam. We can also be confident that Paul has believers share in the imago Christi. Whether Christ has renewed Adam’s own image is debatable, as is whence comes his ambivalence about Gen 1–2 as an archetype for his churches. It is historically possible that he reverts, in 1 Cor 11, to a (mistaken)

²⁹⁶ This is a slight alteration of the NRSV, which breaks up Col 3:10 and 3:11 into two sentences and therefore does not directly translate ὅπου.

²⁹⁷ A comparison with Philo indicates that both the idea of a primal androgyny and a measure of equality between Adam and Eve were in circulation in the first century. Philo has many things to say about the imago Dei: one is that the heavenly ἄνθρωπος is the human genus, “neither male nor female” (οὔτε ἄρρεν οὔτε ἑδρα), while only on earth does sexual differentiation occur (Opif. 134–35; see also QG 1.25). On earth this divided unity is expressed in love as a buried longing of “divided halves” (διττὰ τῳδίῳ) to reunite as “a single living creature” (ἐν ἐσώμον) (Opif. 151–52), as well as the couple’s true companionship (QG 1.17) and Adam’s wonder at the creation of Eve (QG 1.28). To be sure, in explaining Gen 1–3 Philo indulges in patriarchy as much as any of his contemporaries (e.g., QG 1.25–27, 1.33, 1.43), but in a limited sense he could accord them equality: “Equality (ἰσότης) too divided the human being into man and woman, two sections unequal indeed in strength, but quite equal as regards what was nature’s urgent purpose, the reproduction of themselves in a third person. ‘God made man,’ he says, ‘made him after the image of God. Male and female He made’ — not now ‘him’ but ‘them’ (Gen. i. 27). He concludes with the plural, thus connecting with the genus mankind the species which had been divided, as I said, by equality” (Her. 164). Philo’s interpretation is not Paul’s, but the Alexandrian did see the imago as a place where the categories male and female ceased to be meaningful, something that is demonstrated in minor ways on earth.
reading of Gen 1:26–27 as a gender hierarchy to follow and yet proclaims its end in
Gal 3:28. But, if we combine these various passages, a consistent inner logic is
available: Paul longs for the renewing *imago* of Christ, which brings equality, while
permitting, and at times even enforcing, patriarchy, insofar as the defaced Adamic
image still has reach.

**Adam as Glorious Figure (Continued)**

Having considered Paul's use of a messianic *imago Dei*, we return to the taxonomy,
particularly to other uses of the “image of God.”

*Ruling Creation.* The second of the most important uses of the image of God
emerges from a synthetic reading of the first three stories in Genesis: first, humanity
made in God's image is given “dominion” over creation, Adam exercises it by
naming animals and tending the garden, but with the curses there is “enmity”
between at least one animal, the serpent, and humans (Gen 3:15), and the earth only
begrudgingly gives of its produce to people (Gen 3:17–19). The lesson learned,
according to many Second Temple Jews, is that nature and humanity thereafter have
existed in precarious relationship.
In the Life of Adam and Eve, this is most evident in the tale of Eve’s and Seth’s encounter with the beast (Gk. LAE 10:1–12:2 // Arm., Geo., Lat.). The two are going in search of oil from paradise that might heal the ill Adam, and on the way Seth is accosted by a beast (Lat. LAE 37:1 adds a gloss: “a serpent, a beast”). Eve calls out to the wild animal, “O you evil beast, do you not fear to attack the image of God? . . . How did you not remember your subjection, for you were once subjected to the image of God?” (Gk. LAE 10:3). To this the creature retorts that Eve should blame herself, “since the rule of the beasts has happened because of you. How is it that your mouth was opened to eat from the tree . . .? Through this also our nature was changed” (Gk. LAE 11:1–2). Creation’s order was shattered by the fall, with humans no longer holding the preeminent position unchallenged. However, the *imago* has not lost all its force. The story continues,

Seth said to the beast, “Shut your mouth and be silent [Arm. LAE (39)12:1 adds “O Satan”], and keep away from the image of God until the day of judgment.” Then the beast said to

---

298 The Slavonic lacks this particular story, but opens with a strong affirmation of Adam’s and Eve’s status over creation: “Before the trespass, Adam was in Paradise and had everything he wanted and everything happened according to his will: the wild animals and the domestic animals and all the feathered birds — all drew near, left and fled at his command. Apart from Adam’s command nothing was allowed to move around, or land, or eat anything before Adam permitted it. It was the same with Eve” (Slav. LAE 1:1–4).

299 Gk. LAE 24:4 supplements Adam’s curse in Gen 3 with this idea: “And the animals over which you ruled will rise up against you in disorder, because you did not keep my commandment.”
Seth, “See, I stand off, Seth, from the image of God.” Then the beast fled and left him wounded and went to its dwelling. (Gk. LAE 12:1–2)  

Elsewhere in Second Temple literature other imagery is used to suggest the same point, such as God’s spirit that was breathed into Adam, Adam’s composition from different materials (including earth and spirit), his association with the four quarters of the earth, a simple retelling some portion of Gen 1–2, or by some

---

300 In some mss of the Lat. LAE 39:3 (e.g., Synopsis but not OTP), Seth’s wound is healed at the conclusion of the story. Humanity’s remaining power over creation can be seen in another episode as well. When Adam stands in the Jordan as penance after his sin and expulsion, he enjoins the river, its fish, and animals nearby to join him in mourning, and they comply (Gk. LAE 29:13–14 // Arm., Geo., Lat.). As presented here, the imago Dei entitled humanity to rule creation. The fall brought chaos into nature. Humanity’s status over creation is not entirely erased, but now it is betrayed by disobedient nature. Other works that also link the imago Dei to humanity ruling creation: (1) This is probably true of 4QWords of the Luminaries, which gives a liturgy for the week. Although fragmentary, the prayer on the first day moves from “[. . . Adam,] our [fat]her, you fashioned in the image of [your] glory” to Adam’s “intelligence and knowledge,” to his work governing the garden of Eden (4Q504 8.1.4–8). (2) In a Christian portion of Sib. Or. 8 (2nd / 3rd c. CE), God and the Word create “man like in all respects to our form” (ll. 442–43) and give him breath, so that, “[t]hough he is mortal all the things of the world will serve him” (l. 444), including the sun and stars, mountains and sea currents, intellect and skill, as well as animals and birds (ll. 447–55).

301 E.g., 4QNon-Canonical Psalms B: “by his spirit he [= God] appointed them to rule over all these [= trees, etc.] on the earth and over all [. . .]” (4Q381 1.7). Here frag. 1 has a lacuna, but it mentions more produce, birds, and “[creep]ing things,” and ends with “to serve man and to wait on him and [. . .]” (4Q381 1.11).

302 E.g., Lat. LAE 55, where Adam is composed of eight materials. This is a later addendum. It is also used to explain humanity’s various abilities and flaws.

303 E.g., (1) Sib. Or. 3.24–26 (2nd c. BCE), although the rulership itself is only implicit (the imago is also mentioned in l. 8); (2) Lat. LAE 56–57, two later addenda that recount, first, Adam’s creation of dust from the four corners of the earth, from the four great rivers, and God’s breath, which is the imago, and second, his creation from the four directions. In both cases the identification
This theme is not too prominent in Paul, but he does speak of creation’s “groaning” alongside the human and Spirit’s groaning in Rom 8, and he clearly pictures renewal coming, in some sense, to this world.

with the four ends of the earth seems to indicate the extent of Adam’s reign. The idea derives not from Genesis, but from an anagram in Greek: ἀδαμ is the ἀνατολή (“rising,” i.e., east), δύσις (“setting,” i.e., west), ἀρκτος (“bear,” or where bears are found, viz., the north); and μεσημβρία (“midday,” or where the sun is at noon, viz., the south). In the Latin of LAE, these become the names of stars: Ancolim in the eastern sky, Disis (mistakenly) in the southern, Arthos in the northern, and Mencembrion (mistakenly) in the western.

E.g., (1) In the retelling of Jubilees (2nd c. BCE), humanity receives dominion as in Gen 1 (Jub. 2:13–16), and Adam names the animals and tills the soil as in Gen 2 (for seven years!) (Jub. 3:1–16). He also guards “the garden from the birds and the beasts and cattle” (Jub. 3:16), which suggests some disorder in creation before the fall. (2) Gen 1 might be assumed incidentally in 1 Esd 4:2: “. . . are not men strongest, who rule over land and sea and all that is in them?” (3) In Wis 10:1–2 wisdom gives strength to “the first-formed father of the world” to “rule all things.” (4) The central human figure of 4QPrayer of Enosh (?) is God’s “first-born son,” gloriously crowned with the heavens and the clouds, and apparently protected by angels, becomes “a prince and ruler in all /your/ [= God’s] inhabited world” (4Q369 1.II.7). Since the ms is tentatively identified with Enosh, and since Enoch and Mahalalel are mentioned, Adam is a likely guess. (5) 4QInstruction⁴, which speaks of Adam (not named) having authority over the garden to till and care for it. After a break in the text, we hear his curses, that the land will produce thorns and thistles instead of its produce (4Q423 2).

E.g., (1) in 4QWords of the Luminaries², God fashioned “[Adam,] our [father] . . . in the image of [your] glory,” and this is combined with the breath of life, intelligence, and governorship over Eden, at least insofar as the state of the ms allows it to be interpreted (4Q504 8 recto). Similarly, (2) the creation of the first person in 2 En. 30 (J) (late 1st c. CE?): he is made of seven materials, including reason coming “from the mobility of angels and from clouds” (v. 8); he gains from the imago understanding superior to other creatures (v. 10); his name is associated with four stars and the four directions (vv. 13–14), and that despite the fact that the anagram doesn’t work in Slavonic! He is assigned by God to be “a second angel, honored and great and glorious,” as well as “a king, to reign |on| the earth, |and| to have my wisdom. And there was nothing comparable to him on earth” (vv. 11–12). In addition, in 2 En. 58 (J and A), humanity is set over all the animals, and at the final judgment they will accuse Adam and his descendants of any wrongdoing toward them. (3) For Philo, humanity has royal authority over creation because our creation is the climax of creation and because God specifically invests us with our vice-regency (Opif. 83–86; QG 1.14, 1.20). It is revealed at the
Envy of Angels. So far the reflection about a glorious Adam has not exceeded points that might be said of any great sage or hero of Israel’s past, save that for a time he was without sin and could therefore be presented as the ideal human. A great prophet like Moses or Elijah, or Solomon in his wisdom, gets as much credit for knowledge as does Adam. His creation in the “image of God” and his rule over creation are traits shared by all of humanity. He is numbered among the greats, but not necessarily more so than any other patriarch. An important step further comes in this category.

The familiar tale of Satan’s fall from glory occurs in the Life of Adam and Eve. The myth originates much earlier; as noted above, it is probably assumed some centuries before by Isa 14 and Ezek 28, when the coming falls of the rulers of Babylon and Tyre are compared to that of the devil, called “Lucifer, son of the morning” (Isa 14:12 KJV) and “the signet of perfection, full of wisdom and perfect in beauty” (Ezek 28:12). In the third century BCE and later, it is expanded by the naming of the animals (Opif. 148–50), and originally the human-animal relationship included more companionship (QG 1.18, 1.32). Even after the fall people still hold authority in creation (Opif. 148). These points assume humankind’s creation in the imago Dei and the divine inbreathing Adam received, but ruling creation is not his main focus when discussing either. Philo also extrapolates from human creation of the four elements to human mastery over earth, sea, air, and heaven (Opif. 146–47).
Watchers tradition, and may be represented in the NT when Jesus says, “I watched Satan fall from heaven like a flash of lightning” (Luke 10:18), or when John the seer records the dragon’s expulsion from heaven by Michael (Rev 12). In the present work, the devil once had “glory . . . in the heavens in the midst of angels” (Lat. LAE 12:1 // Arm., Geo.), and he ruled over some unspecified segment of angels (Lat. LAE 15–16 // Arm., Geo.). Even after his fall, Satan is able to transfigure himself into “the brightness of angels” (Lat. LAE 9:1 // Arm., Geo., Gk., Slav.) — a tradition Paul also knows, since he warns, “Even Satan disguises himself as an angel of light” (2 Cor 11:14) shortly after speaking about the deception of Eve (v. 3). The devil once stood as a great angel, glorious and luminous, of created things, second to none.

But then Adam was made. The motive for Satan’s fall is the most telling illustration of the glorious Adam tradition. In a dialogue with the protoplasts, the

306 In neither text is the chronology of the event certain. In Luke 10 it is possible that Jesus is referring back to a primeval event, but the meaning may well be that Satan’s “fall” occurs as the disciples cast out demons. In the case of Rev 12, I will argue in the next chapter that this occurs at Jesus's death and resurrection. Despite the fact that neither of these likely present primeval history directly, like Isa 14 and Ezek 28, they seem to utilize a legend of Satan's protological fall as a way to explain the present.

307 The Arm. and Geo. are more specific about Satan's position than is the Lat.. In Arm. LAE 12:1 he has “the throne of the cherubs who, having spread out a shelter, used to enclose me.” And in Geo. LAE 12:1 he was given his “own throne. My wings were more numerous than those of the Cherubim, and I concealed myself under them.” Further, the Geo. specifies that Satan had six classes of angels under him (15:1).
devil exclaims, “O Adam, all my enmity and envy and sorrow concern you, since
because of you I am expelled and deprived of my glory” (Lat. LAE 12:1 // Arm.,
Geo.). They press him about the meaning of this, and he explains that when Adam
was formed, the Lord commanded all the angels, “Worship the image of the LORD
God” (Lat. LAE 14:1 // Geo.) or, in the Armenian, “bow down to the god I have
made” (Arm. LAE 14:1). Michael proceeds, but Satan balks. Adam, he rants, is
inferior and subsequent to him (Lat. LAE 14 // Arm., Geo.). Only in reaction to the
threatened anger of the Lord, and only in the Latin, does he lay claim to a throne
above the stars and have pretensions of equality with the Most High (Lat. LAE 15).

The root of Satan’s sin, as presented here, is not pride in general, nor jealousy of
God, but envy of Adam, who bears the likeness of God and receives praise alongside
God. Adam is angelomorphic, even divinized. He is no equal of God, but he is above
all else, from Michael to the smallest corner of earth.

The concept of Adam as a heavenly being second only to God is not isolated
to the Primary Adam Books, nor to the *imago Dei* imagery. That Satan’s act was
motivated by envy of Adam is early and widespread lore.\(^{308}\) In works that feature a

\(^{308}\) (1) Wis 2:23–24 (1st c. BCE / CE): “God created man for incorruption, and made him in
the image of his own eternity, but through the devil’s envy (φθόνος διαβόλου) death entered the world”
heavenly ascent, Adam is often in heaven as a glorious figure, resplendent in robes of glory, in appearance like an angel, and in status often above the angels or even a god. Of the works listed below, all date as early as the first or second century, but

309 (1) In the Christian additions to the Mart. Ascen. Isa. (2nd c. BCE / 4th c. CE; the Vision itself is prob. 2nd c. CE): in the seventh heaven with God (and above many angels) alongside Abel, Enoch and “all the righteous,” who are “stripped of (their) robes of the flesh” and “in their robes of above” “like the angels who stand there in great glory” (9:6–32, esp. vv. 7–9, 28) but awaiting the work of the Son for the receipt of their crowns and thrones. Note that Jesus (9:30) and the Spirit (9:33–36) are also angelomorphic. (2) There is an angelic Adam in 2 En. 30–32: Adam’s reason is the “mobility of angels” in 30:8 (J); he is “a second angel, honored and great and glorious” in 30:11 (J); God creates “for him an open heaven, so that he might look upon the angels” in 31:2 (J); he is restored to his place after death in 32:1 (J); also 42:5 (J) (cf. 41). See further 2 En. 22:8–10 (A and J), with heavenly clothes, “like one of his glorious ones, and there was no observable difference” (J and A), glowing like an angel’s in 37:1–2 (J; A less explicit, but of righteous in 65:11 A and 66:7 J) and then final theosis in ch. 67. (3) In T. Ab. 11 A (similar ch. 8 B): “the first-formed Adam” is glorious, seated on a golden throne, whose appearance was “terrifying, like the Master’s” (11:4 A), and he wails or celebrates over souls going to damnation or salvation. (4) 3 Bar. (1st / 3rd c. CE): after fall, Adam is “stripped of the glory of God” (3 Bar. 4:16 Gk.) and even seems possibly condemned eternally, along with other drunks (v. 17 Gk.), but eventually he is restored. (5) In the Hist. Rech. (1st / 4th c. CE):
it is hard to fix most of their dates precisely. Only Wisdom and Josephus are

demonstrably prior to Paul or near his time, and although they mention Satan’s

envy, they are the least specific about its meaning. The frequency with which Adam

is mentioned as a glorious figure in heaven or provoking jealousy from angels, and

the diversity of Jewish streams that witness these concepts, indicate that the

traditions pre-date Paul. Even if one were to doubt this, something not unlike these

views is indicated by the Qumran documents, which include a common refrain: “all

CE): the righteous Rechabites are “like Adam and Eve before they sinned” and live on an island “like

the Paradise of God” (7:2a); they appear to Zosimus to be naked, but retain the “stole of glory” that

Adam and Eve had (12:2[3]–3a; also ch. 4–5). They are consistently likened to angels (5:4; 7:10) and

even called “Earthly Angels” (7:11), and also communicate with angels (12:6–9a; 13:5b–5c; 14:2–

16:8g), who, incidentally, also have “shining stoles” (14:4). In the Gk. of ch. 23, Zosimus himself at

death shines “seven times brighter than the sun” (see Charlesworth, “Rechabites,” 2:461). It is a

perfect but still mortal existence, and at death angels guide souls to heaven, above various classes of

angels to God (chs. 11–16). (6) The gnostic Apoc. Adam (1st / 4th c. CE): Adam and Eve begin as

“great eternal angels, . . . loftier than the God who created us and the powers that were with him”

(1:3); although Adam and Eve are deprived of much of this glory by the creator god, the “seed” from

Seth onward retains it, and with the Illuminator, it will eventually achieve victory and a voice from

the highest God will find in their favor (see 8:1–15). (7) T. Adam (2nd / 5th c. CE): some glory is lost

at the fall (in 1:4, transgressing the law, he no longer hears the seraphim), but eventually is more than

restored: “He [Jesus] spoke to me about this in Paradise after I picked some of the fruit in which
death was hiding: ‘Adam, Adam do not fear. You wanted to be a god; I will make you a god, not right

now, but after a space of many years,’ ” but first must be death (T. Adam 3:2); again, Jesus: “ ‘And

after three days, while I am in the tomb, I will raise up the body I received from you. And I will set

you at the right hand of my divinity, and I will make you a god just like you wanted. And I will receive

favor from God, and I will restore to you and to your posterity that which is the justice of heaven”


things were revealed; death was trampled down, Hades was made captive, Adam was recalled (from
death), and through love one flock was made thereafter of angels and men. Through love Paradise has

been opened” (1:21–22). In the earlier, Jewish text, Adam was originally like the sun, and Eve better

than the moon (7:6–7); angels guard humanity, and God loves humans best of all creation (8:1–2).
the glory of Adam.” This, or a variant, is used as a way to describe eschatological salvation, purification, and restoration, often in the likeness of angels.\textsuperscript{310} For a number of Jews of Paul’s day, Adam’s resplendence before his sin was second only to one, to the Creator God.

Restoration of Paradise. Few figures in Second Temple Jewish thought are ever said to receive such glory as Adam and Eve. Sometimes Seth or Abel is added alongside their parents. Occasionally other heroes raise to similar heights: such as Isaiah (in Mart. Ascen. Isa.) or Abraham (in Apoc. Ab.). However, only the deathless Enoch, is associated with God’s messiah (in the Similitudes), and God’s chief angel or “the lesser YHWH” Metatron (in 3 Enoch), rivals the role Adam plays across many sources. There is a resplendent glory surrounding the first pair that is nearly

\textsuperscript{310} Examples come from some of the most famous scrolls, and the intent is to portray Adam and Eve as glorious, angelomorphic figures. See Alexander Golitzin, “Recovering the ‘Glory of Adam’: ‘Divine Light’ Traditions in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Christian Ascetical Literature of Fourth-Century Syro-Mesopotamia,” in The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity: Papers from an International Conference at St. Andrews in 2001, ed. James R. Davila, STDJ 46 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 275–308; Crispin H. T. Fletcher-Louis, All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls, STDJ 42 (Leiden: Brill, 2002). “All the glory of Adam” occurs in 1QRule of the Community (1QS IV.23); 1QHodayot\textsuperscript{3} (1QH\textsuperscript{2} IV.15); Damascus Document\textsuperscript{a} (CD-A III.20). Similar: 4QPsalms Pesher\textsuperscript{c}; “all the inheritance of Adam” (4Q171 III.1–2); 4QSongs of the Sage\textsuperscript{b}: God gives “to Adam and to [his] son[s . . . s]ource of purity, deposit of glory, great in just[ice]” (4Q511 52.2 [officially frags. 52, 54–55, 57–59 or frags. 44–62 col. III]). In several mss of 4QInstruction there is “an inheritance of glory” (4Q416 2.III.11–12; 4Q418 9.12), with Seth and Enosh fashioned by God “according to the pattern of the holy ones” (= angels?) (4Q417 2.I.15–17); this community among the “sons of Adam” is placed as a “holy of holies [over all] the earth, and among all the [g]o[ds] he has cast your lot” (4Q418 81.3–5), who will “inherit the earth” (81.14).
unique to them — or at least, there was. The crisis of the fall means, for many
works, that status has been lost or substantially reduced. But here it is important to
remember that Jews of the Greco-Roman era consistently expected paradise to be
restored, and Adam and Eve with it. Their glory, now dimmed, will shine brightly
once more.

As with human rule over creation, the *imago* is damaged but not lost.

Especially in the Greek version, Eve at times speaks of forfeiting the “righteousness”
or “glory with which we were clothed” (Gk. LAE 20:1–2 // Arm.) and of being
deprived of glory (Gk. LAE 21:2, 6).\(^{311}\) However, this is not final. At his death,
myriad angels, as well as the sun and moon, pay service to Adam’s body (Gk. LAE
33–36 // Geo., Lat., Slav.), and in preparation for the resurrection, God promises
him that, at the end of days, “I will establish you in your dominion on the throne of
your seducer” (Gk. LAE 39:2 // Arm., Geo., Lat.). Adam will at long last reign as he
was always meant to, assuming the seat vacated by Lucifer. The first man’s
restoration entails that of humanity and creation. This is why similar burial rites are
extended to Abel (Gk. LAE 40:3–7 // Arm., Geo., Lat.) and Eve (Gk. LAE 42:3–43:4

\(^{311}\) Contrariwise, in the Arm. LAE 10:1, even after Eve is deceived a second time and their
ongoing sinfulness is thereby ratified, “the form of her glory remained brilliant,” despite her withered
flesh.
as a sign of the general resurrection (e.g., Gk. LAE 43:2 // Arm., Lat., Slav.). It also accords with Michael’s promise to Seth and Eve earlier in the story as they stand near the garden, that the healing oil of paradise will be given to the holy at the end of days (Gk. LAE 13 // Arm., Geo., Lat.). The Georgian even stipulates that “all the wild beasts of the earth” are resurrected, readmitted to Eden, and given the oil ([42]13:5). Satan’s scheme to fleece humanity of its glory achieved only temporary success. In the end, Adam will regain his place next to God above all other created beings, and the proper harmony of the renewed creation will be realized.

The concept of eternity being a restored Eden is, of course, extremely common in the Judeo-Christian heritage. It is almost impossible to overestimate the influence of a verdant garden, the tree of life, and flowing rivers on the imagination of Second Temple Jews and the early Christians. It is, to be sure, often combined

---

312 But special honor is retained for Adam. Eve has to pray not to be separated from Adam’s body from which she was made, and she petitions God to “consider me worthy, even me, unworthy and sinful” (Gk. LAE 42:6), and Abel’s burial has to await Adam’s.

313 Probably also the Geo. (given, e.g., [42]13:5), but it only specifies the burial practices “until the death of all human beings” rather than “resurrection,” as the others have it.

314 The Arm., Geo., and some mss of the Lat. (which agree with the Lat. text of the G. Nic. 19) are explicitly christological at this point: Jesus raises Adam and his descendants from the dead. The Gk., however, is not, which indicates that the idea existed in a pre-Christian form.
with other images, such as a new Jerusalem or a perfected temple.\textsuperscript{315} There are a
great number of works where the protology of Gen 1–3 shapes the eschatology: it is
the explicit background or the echoes are so dense as to be undeniable.\textsuperscript{316} In many
other cases this is also possible, but the lush pictures might come instead from an
idealization of ordinary life.\textsuperscript{317} In not a few instances, the final age also enters this

\textsuperscript{315} Lanfer (Remembering Eden, esp. 33–65, 127–57) gives very good detail on the use of the Tree of Life and Eden-temple in the HB and later literature. This, particularly the “tree of life,” is one of the earliest datable images from primeval history, found in Psalms and Proverbs.

\textsuperscript{316} Alternatively, Gen 1–3 may be explicitly invoked elsewhere in the work, and this gives warrant for, say, seeing the “tree of life” as deriving from Genesis rather than Proverbs. Examples of explicit uses of a restored Eden: (1) Book of Watchers (1 En. 24–36: the trees of life and knowledge, as well as various verdant images, appear); (2) T. Levi 18:10–11 (“he shall open the gates of paradise . . . remove the sword that has threatened since Adam . . . grant to the saints to eat of the tree of life”); (3) T. Dan 5:12 (“the saints shall refresh themselves in Eden”); (4) 1QHodayot (the righteous are like a plant watered by “[a]ll the streams of Eden” in 1QH-a XIV.14–17; “[t]rees of life” in XVI.5–6); (5) 4QRenewed Earth (all the world will be like Eden” in 4Q475 5); (6) the Similitudes of Enoch (there is an eternal “garden of the righteous ones” in 1 En. 60:23 and “garden of life” in 1 En. 61:12; cf. “east of the garden of Eden” in 1 En. 60:8); (7) Ps.-Philo, LAB (tree of life in 11:15; visions, aromas, or manna of paradise in 13:8–9; 19:10; 32:8); (8) Rev 21–22 (garden, tree of life, rivers); (9) 2 En. 8, 42, 71–72 (paradise, tree of life, “Edem”); (10) 4 Ezra 8:52 (“Paradise is opened, the tree of life is planted, the age to come is prepared”); (11) 2 Bar. 4:1–7; 51:11; 59:8 (paradise lost and regained); (12) 3 Bar. 4:15 Gk. (“a calling and entrance into Paradise”); (13) 4 Bar 9:16–19 (in Christian ending the tree of life causes uncultivated trees to bear fruit but withers the cultivated ones to wither); (14) Apoc. Ab. 21:6 (“the garden of Eden and its fruits . . . the source and the river flowing from it, and its trees and their flowering”); (15) Hist. Rech. (blessed ones live in Edenic but mortal world awaiting eternal paradise); (16) Hel. Syn. Pr. 12:41(18)–52(21) (Adam is given a “paradise in Eden,” loses it, but to him and the righteous among his descendants God returns to glory and resurrects); (17) 5 Ezra 2:12, 18 (tree[s] of life); (18) Apoc. Elijah 5:5–6 (“eat from the tree of life” in an eschatological context).

\textsuperscript{317} Several OT references fit here: the “tree of life” in Proverbs, Ps 1; “Eden” in Isa 51:3; Joel 2:3 (where it is lost); Ezek 28:11–19; 31:9, 16, 18; 36:35; pictures of idyllic but still mortal life: Isa 65:17–25; Ezek 40–48; Zech 14; etc.. There are also a number of Second Temple works: (1) Sib. Or.
age, if imperfectly.\textsuperscript{318} It is common for works to state explicitly that Adam and Eve are restored after their sin.\textsuperscript{319} Importantly also, God’s elect share in some of this specifically Edenic or Adamic imagery. A couple of works speak of humans receiving the “garments of light” that once clothed Adam and Eve,\textsuperscript{320} and another couple might, like Rom 16, speak of salvation as escape from the serpent.\textsuperscript{321} The conviction that Adam would be restored to his glory, and we with him, is ubiquitous. Whatever was lost at the fall was not lost forever.

\textsuperscript{318} In NT studies the language of “already but not yet” has become standard, but this is not limited to Christians. Of the examples above, Ps.-Philo regularly pictures paradise helping the Israelites of Moses’s day, sweetening the waters of Marabah, or feeding them manna.

\textsuperscript{319} (1) 2 En. 42:5 (J); (2) T. Sim. 6:5–7 (in a ca. 2nd c. CE Christian interpolation); (3) Lad Jac 7:21 (in Christian ending); (4) Apoc. Sedr. 1:21–22 (in Christian preface); (5) Gk. Apoc. Ezra 7:2.

\textsuperscript{320} (1) 1QS IV.8 (“majestic raiment in eternal light”); (2) Odes Sol. 25:8 (“And I was covered with the covering of your spirit, and I removed from me my garments of skin”). Col 3 speaks of clothing oneself in the image of the creator, in the “new man,” and perhaps these same garments of light are implied.

\textsuperscript{321} (1) Liv. Pro. (1st c. CE) 12:3?: “And by means of them [angels?] the LORD will be recognized at the end, for they will illuminate those who are being pursued by the serpent in darkness as from the beginning”; (2) Odes Sol. 22:7?: “Your right hand destroyed the evil poison.”
Conclusion. As far as extant texts will allow us to speculate, Adam and Eve were everywhere considered the ideal humans before their sin. For many, though, they were more than that: to be human then was not to be finite and (potentially) mortal, but to be God’s highest angel incarnated in a luminous body, resembling God, supremely wise, ruler of the world, and, next to God, envy of all powers in heaven and on earth.

Paul and His Fellow Jews on Adam

There are four important lessons for Rom 5. First, the fact that the name “Adam” only occurs in two chapters of Paul’s undisputed writings is no argument against its prevalence in Paul’s thought. Some passages, such as Rom 16:20, 2 Cor 11:3, and Gal 3:28, are commonly agreed to allude to Gen 1–3. An even wider array of passages — including ones much pondered and debated throughout church history — are considered by many to have Adam, Eve, or the Garden as a backdrop. Primeval history is a basic category for Paul, and it influences much in his writings. The invocation of Adam in Rom 5 is no offhand comment, nor is his place in Paul’s thought dispensable.
Second, if Paul is appealing to a common knowledge about Adam in the first century, he could not have excluded the glorious traditions. They are too abundant to be ignored. For us, schooled in centuries of art that constantly reminds of Adam’s sin, if we are taken aback by Adamic traditions, it is by the glorious ones. We expect a man inclining his finger away from God from the start, not a shining and massive demigod seated next to the Most High, reigning above the angels. For the ancients it would have been almost precisely the opposite. For one work ruing Adam’s mistake, two would affirm his greatness, and three would remind of his ultimate restoration. Even if we can imagine Paul himself ignoring the glorious traditions, idiosyncratic thinker that he was, it would have been impossible for him to exclude those concepts from his readers minds — and he would have known that full well. His silence on the matter is the silence of assumption: we all know of Adam’s greatness, but remember also his sin.

Third, the glorious traditions are wont to describe Adam as like an angel. Of course, he was not an angel simply, not another Michael or Gabriel. Rather, he was almost another class of angel, one that was given flesh, but not always mortal flesh, a radiant, ever-strong body. When we consider in what way Adam was a “type” of the
coming Messiah for Paul, this combination of flesh and spirit, mortal and angel is probably our best guide. Indeed, Adam provided Paul with a unique way to articulate his Christology: no one other than Adam (except perhaps Enoch) combined “human” and “super-human” to the same degree.

Finally, insofar as we return to 4 Ezra to read Rom 5, we need to remember that his Adam is the father of nations. We do not have to suppose that Rom 5 is a departure from the question of Jews and gentiles, so prevalent in Rom 1–4. Adam combines in himself Jews, Greeks, Romans, and all the other ἔϑνη, and the apostle, having used the Jewish patriarch in Rom 4, now turns to the universal patriarch in Rom 5.
CHAPTER 3 — ON EARTH AS IT IS IN HEAVEN: THE CONSTRUCT OF PARTICIPATORY DOMAINS

“He appointed a ruler for every nation, but Israel is the Lord’s own portion.”
– Sir 17:17

Introduction

In the previous chapter I described five major ways in which Adam appears in Second Temple Jewish literature, but I have indicated that only three of them are relevant for Rom 5: Adam as genealogical head, as a bearer of disaster, and as a glorious being. Adam is a powerful, heavenly figure who influences a multitude of people, whether for good or ill. Often he is the father of nations. By Paul's logic these must also hold for Jesus and to a greater degree than they do for Adam even without the taint of sin, and his influence is exclusively salutary. Already, then, we have made some progress in discerning the Adam-Christ juxtaposition, but the precise contours remain blurry. The construct of “participatory domains” is the lens that brings the lines of the apostle's thought into focus.

With participatory domains we enter a world abounding in spiritual forces, and this is critical to remember for the construct I am proposing. It was true of
Classical Greek culture, even among the philosophers.\textsuperscript{322} One of the leading functions of the gods was to act as patrons, protectors of cities or advocates for activities and guilds.\textsuperscript{323} It was likewise true, though in a different sense, in Jewish culture. Despite a habitual tendency in some parts of NT studies to see first-century Jews as monotheists full stop, a group that removed itself from any polytheistic aspect of Hellenism, the variety of spirits and deities in the culture around them certainly impacted their theology, even if only in their rejection of idols.\textsuperscript{324} To be

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{322} To be sure, many of the educated read their myths euhemeristically or allegorically, but even Plato’s Socrates, rebutting Meletus’s charge that he is an atheist (ἁθεός) (\textit{Apol.} 26c), affirms his belief in divine spirits (δαίμονες), gods (θεοί), and heroes (ἥρωες) (\textit{Apol.} 28b).

\textsuperscript{323} To give an example of an admittedly different age before coming to sources more directly relevant for Paul, according to Robert Parker (\textit{Polytheism and Society at Athens} [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005], 387), in his study of Classical Athens, overseeing activities and cities are the two exceptions to his general rule that “Greek polytheism is indescribable,” a resigned conclusion he arrives at because the minutiae of Hellenic religion belie attempts to delimit exact roles and powers to this or that god. See his argument for gods as protecting realms (pp. 387–95), especially cities (pp. 395–415), and activities, such as agriculture, wealth, child-rearing, among others (pp. 416–51). He calls a deity that rules a city a “local special god,” and as his study is centered on Attica, Athena reigns supreme; he references Aeschylus, \textit{Pers.} 347; \textit{Eum.} 1045; Lycurgus of Athens, \textit{Leoc.} 26; Aristophanes, \textit{Thesm.} 1140; ibid. 318–19; \textit{Eq.} 763; \textit{Thesm.} 1142; Aeschylus, \textit{Eum.} 288; Aristophanes, \textit{Nub.} 601; Euripides, \textit{Heracl.} 770–2; \textit{Ion} 211. (p. 396; see all of pp. 397–409 for Athena’s role).

\textsuperscript{324} This is prevalent especially among those who stress the Jewish background of early Christianity over against Hellenism. The highpoint of contrasting Jewish and Hellenistic thought came with Thorleif Boman, \textit{Hebrew Thought Compared with Greek}, trans. Jules L. Moreau, LHD (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1960), an ET of \textit{Das hebräische Denken im Verleich mit dem Griechischen}, 2nd ed. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1954). Initially it was well received by many, but James Barr (\textit{The Semantics of Biblical Language} [London: Oxford University Press, 1961], 8–20) criticized the methodological essentialism and vagueness of posing the question in stark, exclusive terms. Barr’s approach has won increasing support over the last half century.
\end{footnotesize}
sure, few deny that the gods of peoples of the Roman Empire influenced the world of the NT, but it is easy to acknowledge this in theory and neglect it in practice. It does not appear particularly often in the pages of most commentaries and monographs. If we look for it, though, we can see evidence of it in the NT.325

**Definition of “Participatory Domains”**

I mention the polytheism of Greco-Roman antiquity, and the roles of gods and goddesses in protecting spheres of life, as an entrée into participatory domains, but

Further, even if Jews preferred terms like “angels” and “powers” rather than “gods,” the result was not entirely different. Good and bad spirits roamed the earth and dwelt in heaven, held individual roles and performed certain functions, were named and assembled in hierarchies, and had a meaningful impact on the life of the average Jew, whether residing in Galilee or Achaia. In fact, the relative congruence of Hellenism and Judaism in their view of the divine realm has led M. David Litwa (*Jesus Deus: The Early Christian Depiction of Jesus as a Mediterranean God* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 2014], 18–19) to make the case that Hellenism afforded Paul the categories for conceptualizing Jesus’s divinity. He does not argue that the Jewish background is unimportant, but rather, “In an effort to balance the one-sidedness of current scholarship on early christology, this book proposes that early Christians did in fact use and adapt widespread Hellenistic conceptions about divinity in order to understand and depict the divine status of Jesus” (pp. 18–19).

325 Acts 17, for example, pictures Paul in Athens, distressed that the city was “given to idolatry” (κατείδωλος, v. 16), so intent on worshiping every divinity that there was a catchall altar “to an unknown god” (Ἀγνώστῳ θεῷ, v. 23). Further, Paul’s audience mistakenly thinks he preaches Christ as another god of this order, one of the “foreign divinities” (ξένα δαιμόνια) (v. 18). Ephesus, meanwhile, was the “temple keeper” (νεωκόρος, Acts 19:35) of their patron goddess, and its inhabitants were so rabid in their dedication to her that a theater full of people are pictured chanting, “Great is Artemis of the Ephesians,” for two hours, even without quite knowing the blasphemy that dishonored her (Acts 19:29, 32).
we need not go so far afield. To be sure, the apostle to the gentiles was a hellenized Jew, and the greater part of his writing years was spent in close contact with Greeks and other *goyîm*. By his own admission he became “as one outside the law” in order to win “those outside the law” (1 Cor 9:21), so it is reasonable to consider the influence of Greek thought on his theology. Yet he was also “a Hebrew born of Hebrews” (Phil 3:5), and in bulk his quotations and allusions refer to the Jewish Scriptures. For this reason it is best to ground Paul’s thought, insofar as possible, in Jewish writings, especially ones of which he demonstrates firsthand knowledge.\(^\text{326}\)

There is, in the event, a concept within Israelite-Jewish tradition to explain Paul’s reasoning. It is particularly common in apocalyptic or mystical circles but can be found elsewhere, in wisdom literature and narrative.\(^\text{327}\) I call it “participatory domains,” but it is resonant with titular deities in ancient Near Eastern and Greco-

---

\(^\text{326}\) This is not to presume a Jewish-versus-Hellenistic divide; all of Judaism was hellenized to a degree. Rather, the point is that Paul’s literary references are almost always to works written by Jews or Israelites. His use of Greco-Roman works is minimal and debated. He displays his Hellenism in other ways, by his fondness for references to athletic contests, for example.

\(^\text{327}\) Definitions of “apocalyptic” and “mystical,” as well as related terms like “esoteric,” remain fraught with ambiguity in biblical studies. (In keeping with standard usage, I reserve “apocalypse” for the genre, “apocalypticism” for the social reality, and “apocalyptic eschatology” for a particular view of the end times, but the adjective “apocalyptic” remains difficult.) For my purpose I use them interchangeably, though “apocalyptic” will be most common. The words designate an openness to an otherworldly reality and a keen expectation of the dawning eschaton.
Roman thought. It is also in keeping with various scholarly reconstructions of ancient cosmologies and sociologies, across a wide swath of times and cultures. In biblical and Pauline studies in particular, “participatory domains,” especially in the heroic model, have some kinship with Robinson’s corporate personality (without postulating “psychic unity”) and its more recent cousin, corporate solidarity. However, they lack a supernatural component. Closer in this regard is Dunn’s concept of Adam and Christ ruling epochs, although with the extension in time, the corporate dimension is diminished. The most like my construct is Käsemann’s “bearer of destiny,” for he combines apocalyptic powers, a community, and an implicit or metaphorical territory — he speaks of “worlds” or “spheres.” The main difference, as I develop it, is that the relation of Adam and Christ is merely functional, whereas I see an ontological commensurability.\(^{328}\)

In participatory domains, reality is split in two levels. On earth there is a corporate group, a nation or smaller community, that is represented in heaven by an angel or god. The deity is not mere personification or projection. It is not a manner of speaking or pictorial rhetoric. It is conceived as a living spiritual entity, as real as

\(^{328}\) I treat Robinson, Dunn, and Käsemann, among others, in “Proposed Solutions, in Brief Review” (Chapter 1). Merely functional relation: Käsemann, Romans, 144.
physical matter and far more powerful. Although this will not be the main focus, it should be noted that in other texts an earthly ruler is at the apex of a corporate group and functions similarly. This parallel is not insignificant. We might postulate three types of corporate representation by an individual: the heroic (human over corporate group), supra-human (angel or other divine being over corporate group), and tripartite (an angel or divine being, human, and corporate group) participatory domains. They can be represented thus:

The heroic participatory domain puts a great human, such as a king or priest, atop a class, city, or people, and that group shares in the fortunes of its representative. In Greek thought, Thebes was freed from the Sphinx when Oedipus answered her riddle but then suffered a plague along with him because
(unknowingly) he had killed the previous king, his father Laius. Likewise, in the OT Israel thrives under David’s leadership, gaining land through conquests of the Jebusites, Philistines, Arameans, and other peoples (2 Sam 5–10), and he becomes the paradigmatic Israelite king. Yet the nation also shares the deadly punishment God metes out for David’s ill advised census (2 Sam 24), and David laments the collateral damage he has caused (v. 17).

The supra-human participatory domain functions similarly, but in this case the leader is supernatural, an angel, god, or δαιμόνιον. In the case of the tripartite participatory domain, the human and supra-human leaders may remain distinct individuals, but there is often an open boundary between the earthly ruler and heavenly patron, so that at death or assumption the hero-turned-god fulfills both roles for the community. This dual role is most common with messianic figures, but can be found elsewhere, too. Romulus, the purported founder of Rome, led the city to great military success and set up its foundational structures. According to Ovid,

329 The myth is found in several forms, but its classic expression is Sophocles’s Oedipus tyrannus (5th c. BCE).

330 A summary comes in 2 Sam 5:12, which follows the battle for Jerusalem and King Hiram of Tyre’s amicable gift: “David then perceived that the Lord had established him king over Israel, and that he had exalted his kingdom for the sake of his people Israel.”
the king is then divinized, becoming, at Mars’s behest, Quirinus, the heavenly
embodiment of the Roman people (Metam. 14.805–28; early 1st c. CE). In this case
Romulus is both earthly hero and heavenly patron over the Roman people.

For any instance of the heroic or supra-human participatory domain, it may
be that the tripartite model is assumed but one element is not mentioned. Therefore,
if anything, our search through Israelite and Jewish literature will run the risk of
under-representing the prevalence of tripartite participatory domains.\(^{331}\)

These two realms interact. What happens in heaven does not stay in heaven,
but has a direct impact on the affairs of earth. In certain aspects the influence is

---

\(^{331}\) A fourth iteration of the general concept is also possible but not pertinent to the question of corporate representation. This is the guardian angel who watches over an individual, where the associated community is, at minimum, not explicit, but might be implied. Two brief examples will suffice. First, not long before his death, Jacob blesses Joseph’s sons with these words: “The God before whom my ancestors Abraham and Isaac walked, the God who has been my shepherd all my life to this day, the angel who has redeemed me from all harm, bless the boys; and in them let my name be perpetuated, and the name of my ancestors Abraham and Isaac; and let them grow into a multitude on the earth” (Gen 48:15-16). Here an “angel,” probably the “angel of the Lord” who is equated by parallelism with God, has watched over the three Patriarchs individually, and Jacob requests that he also watch over Ephraim and Manasseh. It is likely that these statements have wider reference to the nation of Israel and the tribes that eponymously bear the names of Joseph’s sons.

Second, in Acts 12:1–19 the church is praying for Peter, who has been imprisoned by Herod Agrippa I. Upon his miraculous release, the church cannot believe that their prayers have been answered, and dismiss Rhoda’s excited announcement that Peter is at the door, replying, “It is his angel” (v. 15). The believers assume Peter has a guardian angel, and even one that can take his likeness. Since Peter is a leading member of the community, his angel might be overseeing him and his followers. In both cases, it is possible that the tripartite participatory domain is assumed, but all we have definitively is an angel over an individual.
unidirectional, from supernatural power to human community, with the latter’s fate dependent on what happens between angels in heaven. Many apocalyptic works, especially those that stem from an experience of persecution, encourage non-violent resistance because aid is to come from above, not below (e.g., Daniel, Testament of Moses, Revelation). More often, however, influence is bidirectional — earth can return the favor. Human prayers and sacrifices, obedience and martyrdom, as well as other acts of piety, encourage a heavenly response; God, in his sovereignty, is not constrained to act, but in his goodness he willingly responds to his creatures. The common assumption of all participatory domains is that reality is composed of two interacting tiers.

Since heaven and earth interact in participatory domains, its human and supra-human rulers are mediators. The last few decades have witnessed rich reflections on mediating figures in ancient Mediterranean Judaism, and in general scholars have organized their work in one of four ways. (1) Perhaps most common has been textual, looking at the ideal figures in a single document (e.g., Anders Hultgård, “The Ideal ‘Levite,’ the Davidic Messiah, and the Saviour Priest in the

---

332 In all these works, however, earth does have an effect on heaven in other ways — the prayers in Daniel and the martyrs in the Testament of Moses and Revelation all engage God — but the righteous on earth do not themselves indulge in war.
Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs”). (2) Another common strategy is to consider a persona as it is developed over several works (e.g., David Satran, “Daniel: Seer, Philosopher, Holy Man”). Both of these trends are represented in the influential work, *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms*, edited by John J. Collins and George W. E. Nickelsburg. In these two cases the goal is attention to the ancient sources on their own terms, attuned to their unique traits, like the patient excavation and observation of an archaeological relic.

Others seek to classify these artifacts, and this impulse accounts for the other two methods. (3) P. G. Davis organizes according to time: the legacy pattern (e.g., the commands and promises to Abraham still hold for his descendants), the intervention pattern (e.g., the institutional priesthood in Jerusalem and the roles of angels in protecting and guiding humans), and the consummation pattern (e.g.,

---


334 As Collins and Nickelsburg (“Introduction,” in *Ideal Figures*, 3–4) write, “[W]e have deemed it more useful to analyze individual figures and texts in some detail than to attempt a comprehensive survey or typology.” Even the articles in *Ideal Figures* that do offer something closer to mediators in the abstract (e.g., Susan Niditch, “The Visionary,” 153–79) are one-off examples, not the beginnings of a typology.
Elijah as the forerunner of the end). More often it is the roles themselves that are of interest. Larry W. Hurtado provides three basic types of mediators in Second Temple Judaism: the personification of divine attributes (e.g., Philo’s λόγος), exalted patriarchs (e.g., Enoch and Moses), and principal angels (e.g., Metatron). James R. Davila adds two more categories, the fourth being charismatic prophets and royal aspirants (e.g., the revolutionary Theudas, known from Josephus, *Ant.* 20.97–99 and Acts 5:36) and the fifth being ideal figures, those who perfectly fulfill a role imperfectly attested in Israelite history (e.g., the eschatological Davidic king, the Mosaic prophet, and the Aaronic High Priest). He also combines the typology of

---


figures from Hurtado with the typology of time from Davis to locate mediators along two axes.\(^{338}\)

Any great figure can thus be analyzed both according to the particular role and the timing of his (or her) influence. The Enoch-Metatron character tends toward the ideal type (his fifth category) but is as well an exalted patriarch (category two) and principal angel (category three), whose main role is eschatological, while Melchizedek can be present celestial priest or future eschatological warrior — both ideal types, but differing between intervention and consummation patterns.\(^{339}\) One matter all three of these scholars note is that few figures are restricted to one category, as the examples of Enoch and Melchizedek demonstrate. The benefit of typologies is giving broad descriptions by which to judge similarities and differences.\(^{340}\)

\(^{338}\) Ibid., 6–7.

\(^{339}\) He considers the Enoch-Metatron character in ibid., 7–18 and Melchizedek in Davila, “Melchizedek, the ‘Youth,’ and Jesus,” in The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity: Papers from an International Conference at St. Andrews in 2001, ed. James R. Davila, STDJ 46 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 248–74. Although the figures under consideration are new, his methodology remains the same in this article as in “Methodology.”

\(^{340}\) It is little coincidence that the three scholars who provide typologies do so in order to compare them to early Christology: Hurtado, One God, 98–128; Davis, “Divine Agents,” 488–91, 497–503; Davila, “Methodology,” 14–18; idem, “Melchizedek,” 267–74. By contrast, the methodology of
I offer my model of participatory domains as a recurring pattern of thought in Jewish literature, from some of the earliest sources well into Paul’s day. Insofar as it is a pattern, it shares similarities with the typologies above. Earthly rulers of participatory domains can be exalted patriarchs (category two), charismatic prophets and royal aspirants (category 4), or ideal figures (category five). The heavenly rulers, which receive more focus, may also be ideal figures, as well as principal angels (category three). Often they combine categories.

This is also true of their work in time. The typical picture of a participatory domain is of the current heavenly world and its effect on earth or the coming eschatological dénouement and its consequences for life today, but the legacy pattern can be found, too. Further, the tripartite domain offers a way of combining two mediators, earthly and heavenly, as well as explaining why the human Enoch would be identified with the angel Metatron: as with Romulus-Quirinus, the two are

---

Collins’s and Nickelsburg’s *Ideal Figures* avoids synthesizing and comparative work, tending “to emphasize the diversity of Judaism rather than its commonalities” (pp. 8-9) and preferring “to leave those figures as concrete images of Jewish ideals without attempting to bring them into a system” (p. 10) (Collins and Nickelsburg, “Introduction”).

341 According to Davila (“Methodology,” 5–6), rulers in category four are restricted to earthly influence; they are “historical figures,” no more. The other two, exalted patriarchs (“figures from Israel’s past who have been glorified to a super-human position”) and ideal figures (“mediatorial archetypes based on earlier biblical characters and offices”) may inhabit both earth and heaven.
united within a common participatory domain, so there is a natural bridge between heaven and earth.³⁴²

Although there are similarities to the foregoing research on Jewish mediators, the concept of participatory domains offers a unique perspective. In describing a type, however, I am mindful of the caution with which Collins and Nickelsburg end their introduction to *Ideal Figures:* “In short, while ‘systematic’ studies of ancient Judaism are valid and helpful, they must be carried on in tension with a sensitivity to the unique characteristics of the individual phenomena. Only then do we historians stand a chance of glimpsing the variegated and many-sided edifice of this ancient religion.”³⁴³ I argue that many works employ participatory domains, but I do not mean to tidy up all mediators under one rubric of participatory domains. The concept is widespread, but not ubiquitous.

To demonstrate the construct of participatory domains, I turn to one set of Jewish traditions in particular, those associated with the “sons of God,” which rely on principal angelic mediators. To indicate that participatory domains are prevalent

---

³⁴² The idea of dual mediators is itself common, but regularly it concerns roles, priestly and royal. I am concerned instead with a heavenly and earthly ruler over the same group.

elsewhere, I also mention briefly traditions associated with the “son of man,” which starts as a principal angel but then becomes an ideal figure, the messiah. Other examples could have been offered, but these are early and include passages Paul himself knew. Both presume a belief among many ancient Israelites and Second Temple Jews that YHWH held court with a variety of supernatural beings, but they picture the role of these figures in different ways.

Whereas in Chapter 2 my demonstration of the availability of the parallels aimed for breadth, here my work is diachronic. I trace the roots of the tradition as far back as possible and choose an illustrative example, and then sketch how it grows, twists and turns, leading to the first century and beyond. It is important that the ideas have illustrious pedigree. The arguments that follow do not depend on the reasoning that these ideas were merely “in the air” in Paul’s day. They were old ideas, and examples of participatory domains can be found in texts Paul himself knew and used. It is equally important that all three were living traditions, that they existed in Paul’s day in forms similar to their original formulation.344 The “sons of

---

344 By contrast, the promise of an everlasting Davidic line and temple cult is of considerable antiquity, even if its exact formulation in 2 Sam 7 betrays the fingerprints of later editing; otherwise, there would be no false hopes for Jeremiah to disabuse his contemporaries of (Jer 7:1–15), and there would be no divine riddle for Ethan the Ezrahite to solve (Ps 89:39–52 [Eng.: 89:38–51]). But the
God” (and “son of man”) were significant sinews attaching the Jewish culture of Paul’s day to among the earliest recoverable forms of ancient Israelite religion.

What follows covers a wide sweep of time and a considerable diversity of outlook. Despite that, my vision is targeted, focused on a particular formulations of participatory domains, and I focus on one text in particular. I am not attempting an exhaustive survey, but rather a selection of a clear, pre-Pauline example and a brief account of their legacy as they are passed down by tradents to the first century and a little beyond. These other writings are mentioned in order to demonstrate how common the concept was in Paul’s day, therefore increasing the likelihood that he knew and utilized the concept. In the following the argument is that, since there is strong evidence for participatory domains in varied traditions and numerous texts, stretching from Paul’s day back hundreds of years, including in writings he read and referenced, we can be confident that the idea was available to the apostle.

Lest I be misunderstood, I hasten to add that the “sons of God” provide an example of participatory domains that is structurally similar to the place of Adam and Christ in Rom 5. I am not proposing an identification. I am not saying that ancient promise, after the Babylonian exile and centuries of foreign rule with no new Davidide appearing, could not be taken literally in the first century. For faithful Jews the promise still stood, but its meaning had been transformed; it was not a living tradition, at least in its original form.
either Adam or the Messiah was conceived of as a “son of God” in the sense below, only that the patronage these beings have over nations is of the same type as Adamic and messianic influence.

The “Sons of God” Tradition in Brief

The enigmatic “sons of God” or “sons of the gods” are mentioned several times in the HB, but they take on other forms as well. Their significance is obscured for modern readers, coming as curiosities in strange-sounding stories, but their roots run deep and, like the gnarled and windswept bristlecone pines found in the White Mountains of California, these “sons of God” stand in the Bible as testaments to hoary antiquity amid much younger growth. In scattered references in Genesis, Deuteronomy, Job, the Psalter, and Daniel, the phrase denotes YHWH’s divine assembly tasked with watching over the nations.345 They are first conceived of as

---

345 This does not exhaust the possible meanings of “sons of God.” The phrase refers to the Israelites, as in Hos 2:1 [Eng.: 1:10]: “And in the place where it was said to them, ‘You are not my people,’ it shall be said to them, ‘Children [lit.: sons] of the living God.’ ” It can also denote David or the king as God’s adopted “son”; although the exact phrase is never used, the concept is present in 2 Sam 7:14 and Ps 2:7. These are the three categories given by Brendan Byrne (“Sons of God,” ABD 6 [1992]: 6:156) and are similar to those of Jan Bergman, Helmer Ringgren, and H. Haag (“בֵּן, bēn,” TDOT 2:155–59). The evidence is not strong enough, but it is at least tantalizing to note that the
lesser gods and then as angels.346 There is no evidence, even in the earliest texts of
the OT, that “sons” denotes divine patrimony, as it might with the Canaanite El.
Rather, it intends a class of beings, like the “sons of the prophets” (= seers; e.g., 2
Kgs 2:3, 5, 7, 15) or “sons of the exile” (= Judahites taken to Babylon; e.g., Ezra 4:1;
6:20; 8:35).347 The exact phrasing differs: בֵּן (ה)אֱלָהִים, “the sons of God / the gods”
(Gen 6:2, 4; Job 1:6; 2:1; 38:7; possibly Deut 32:8); בֵּן אֵל, “sons of El / God”
(another possible original of Deut 32:8); בֵּן אֵלֶּה, “sons of God / the gods” (Pss 29:1;
89:7 [Eng.: 89:6]); בֵּן עֶלְיוֹן, “the sons of the Most High” (Ps 82:6); as well as the
Aramaic בֵּרַאֲלָהִים, “a son of the gods” (Dan 3:25). In later works, as well as many
ancient Greek translations of the OT, these same beings seem to be in mind, but
they are given another name, such as “angel” or “watcher.” No matter: a son of God
by any other name would protect as well.

three possible meanings map onto the tripartite participatory domain model well: divine beings, royal
figures, and the community of Israel.

346 So, e.g., Day, From Creation to Babel, 77. The distinction between these two meanings
can easily be overstated, however.

347 These are two of many examples provided by Bergman, Ringgren, and Haag, TDNT
2:152–53. Although they do not directly address whether “sons of God” indicates divine patrimony,
they apparently take the phrase as a class, calling these figures “divine or heavenly beings” and noting
that בֵּן is never combined with the divine name YHWH (2:157–59).
The divine assembly, in numerous Jewish traditions, mirrors the earthly reality. YHWH, who oversees Israel, is the supreme God, just as Jacob’s seed is a unique people. The lesser deities surround the Most High just as lesser nations surround the people of Israel. The clearest, and likely earliest, evidence for this perspective is found in the closing chapters of the Pentateuch.

**The “Sons of God” in the Song of Moses**

Deuteronomy 32:1–43 (11th / 7th c. BCE; used by Paul), the “Song of Moses” or Shirat Ha’azinu, records an ancient and influential tradition, dating perhaps to the early days of the monarchy, that the Deuteronomist has incorporated as the climax of his book. It celebrates YHWH’s concern for Israel through the course of its

---

348 This passage is a favorite of Paul’s in Romans. He quotes from it three different times: Deut 32:21 (Rom 10:19); 32:35 (Rom 12:19); and 32:43 (Rom 15:10). There are other possible allusions in the Pauline corpus as well. David Lincicum (*Paul and the Early Jewish Encounter with Deuteronomy*, WUNT 2/284 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010], 117–68, esp. 158–67) suggests that Deuteronomy in general acts as an ethical authority, theological guide (particularly the Shema), and a lens for Israel’s history. Similarly, Richard H. Bell (*Provoked to Jealousy: The Origin and Purpose of the Jealousy Motif in Romans 9–11*, WUNT 2/63 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994], 200–285) contends that Deut 32 gives Paul a way to understand Israel being provoked to jealousy by the gentiles, which is a step in its election, fall, and salvation. Most uses of Deut 27–32 fall into the last category, although Deut 32:35 backs up an ethical principle in Rom 12:19.

349 The original Sitz im Leben of the Song is uncertain, as is the date of its inclusion in Deuteronomy. At latest it is composed in Josiah’s reign in archaizing Hebrew, but most scholars take
history and rebukes the nation for its faithlessness. The covenant between God and
his people undergirds the Song, and Moses gives it to the people as a “witness
against” them (v. 46) that “they may diligently observe all the words of this law” (v.
46). It is so important that it constitutes their “very life” and contains the lesson by
which they may live long in the land (v. 47) (likewise in Deut 31:28–30). The
importance accorded to this song within Deuteronomy was not lost on later readers,
past or present. Duane L. Christensen goes so far as to state, “No text within
Deuteronomy has received more attention through the years than the Song of
Moses,” offering as evidence (among other reasons) its special spacing in the DSS
and Masoretic manuscripts.350 Deuteronomy 32 functions as an epitome of the

the older Hebrew constructions at face value. Some will date the Song to the eleventh or tenth
centuries BCE, but even later dates are pre-exilic. It is often thought to be composed in the Northern
Kingdom, although that is disputed as well. Further, most researchers conclude that the
Deuteronomist himself adds the Song to the fifth book of the Torah, but occasionally it is also
suggested that it was an exilic or post-exilic redaction that inserted Deut 32 into its present canonical
location. Paul Sanders (The Provenance of Deuteronomy 32, OtSt 37 [Leiden: Brill, 1996], 1–98) gives
an overview of scholarship through the end of the twentieth century and favors a pre-exilic date
possibly as early as the settlement of Canaan, and Jack R. Lundbom (Deuteronomy: A Commentary
[Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013], 852–57) notes a trend in recent years to placing the Song early, as
an influence on Hosea, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel. In any case, the Song itself seems to be pre-
exilic and, by the first century, long thought to be a climactic statement within Deuteronomy.

Bell (Provoked to Jealousy, 209–84) gives a full review of the many ways Deut 32 was interpreted
through the Greco-Roman era. It among the most central texts of the HB.
Mosaic covenant, a recital of God’s ongoing gracious commitment to Israel despite its past infidelity, as well as a motivation to follow Torah. Given its prominence even peripheral ideas assumed by the Song take on added weight.

_Deuteronomy 32:8–9._ The periphery in this case is the status of other races in comparison with that of Israel. In the MT vv. 8–9 read, “When the Most High divided to the nations their inheritance, when he separated the sons of Adam (אדום, בני), he set the bounds of the people according to the number of the children of Israel (למספר בני ישראל). For the Lord’s portion is his people; Jacob is the lot of his inheritance” (KJV). The message of the verses, within the context of Deut 32, is that YHWH has chosen Israel from among the nations, and guided them to the promised land. As it stands in the MT, however, the phrase “according to the children of Israel” is obscure. In what sense are the land allotments of other peoples

---

351 Mark E. Biddle (*Deuteronomy*, SHBC 4 [Macon, Ga.: Smyth & Helwys, 2003], 471) speaks of it as “the panoramic message of Deuteronomy.”

352 Deuteronomy 32 is regularly thought to be either forensic or sapiential, either God’s case against his people or an encouragement to follow the instruction of Moses. My summary ties these together, in line with the suggestion of Steven Weitzman (“Lessons from the Dying: The Role of Deuteronomy 32 in Its Narrative Setting,” _HTR_ 87 [1994]: 377–93). He offers the testament as a genre that could combine both themes, comparing Deut 32 to Ahiqar, and a testament would be well tailored for the Song’s placement in Deut.

353 Similar: ASV, NKJV, NIV 1984, 2011, NASB, JPS, and NJPS.
tied to the number of Israelites? One possible answer is that the concern is spatial:

Israel’s land had to be large enough to support a people as numerous as the sand on
the shore.\textsuperscript{354} Another is that this pertains to the common number seventy in the

Table of Nations (MT Gen 10) and the descendants of Jacob who travel to Egypt
during the years of famine (Gen 46:27; Exod 1:5). This clever solution might be

presumed by the MT, but its attestation is late: the medieval Numbers Rabbah, for

example, finds Deut 32:8 and Exod 1:5 to be a confirmation of the seventy nations of

Gen 10 (Num. Rab. 9:14), and Rashi’s (1040–1105) commentary on Deut 32:8 is

similar.\textsuperscript{355} Whatever the original logic of the\textit{ בני יִשָּׂרָאֵל} reading, though, quite a few

ancient versions support it, including the Samaritan Pentateuch; the Aramaic
targumim Onqelos, Neofiti, and Yerušalmi II; the Syriac Peshitta; most Greek

manuscripts of Symmachus, Aquila, and Theodotion; and the Latin Vulgate, in

\textsuperscript{354} This is often the view of older commentators: e.g., S. R. Driver,\textit{ A Critical and Exegetical
considers the Septuagintal reading (below), but without the benefit of the discovery at Qumran and
its support of the LXX at this point, concludes that “there is no sufficient reason for preferring” it to
the MT. More recently, David E. Stevens (“Does Deuteronomy 32:8 Refer to ‘Sons of God’ or ‘Sons of
Israel’?”\textit{ BSac} 154 [1997]: 131–41) has supported this view as well.

\textsuperscript{355} The first part of Num. Rab. was probably completed in 12th c. Europe. The interpretation
pre-dates these medieval Jews, being found as early as Tg. P.-J. (2nd/3rd c. CE), which combines it
with the other major interpretation of Deut 32:8 (see below). Still, the explicit representations of this
view all post-date Paul.
addition to the MT. However, other ancient authorities differ. Most manuscripts of the LXX have κατὰ ἀριϑὸν ἀγγέλων, “according to the angels of God,” and equivalent phrases are found in the Old Latin and Targum Pseudo-Jonathan.\footnote{Also known as Targum Yerušalmi I (abbreviated Tg. Yer. I), not to be confused with Targum Yerušalmi II (abbreviated Tg. Yer. II) which contains the “sons of Israel” reading. The 1st ed. of the SBL Handbook of Style (1992) assigned a different roman numeral to the title compared to its abbreviation for these two writings. It had Targum Yerušalmi (Tg. Yer. I) and Targum Yerušalmi I (Tg. Yer. II) respectively. The 2nd ed. (2014) revised this so that the numbers match up, as above. To reduce confusion, I will refer to the two works as Targum Pseudo-Jonathan and Targum Yerušalmi II.} Most importantly, the very end of 4QDeut\footnote{While Rahlf\textsuperscript{s} LXX prefers ἀγγέλων ὑιῶν ἀγγέλων in light of the considerable mss support, the Göttingen LXX opts for υἱῶν ἀγγέλων on the basis of the DSS and several early Greek mss.} includes several words from vv. 7–8, and among them are בני אלוהים, “sons of God” (4Q37 XII). A few manuscripts in the LXX and Aquila families, likewise, have κατὰ ἀριϑὸν υἱῶν ὑιῶν ἀγγέλων.\footnote{While Rahlf\textsuperscript{s} LXX prefers ἀγγέλων ὑιῶν ἀγγέλων in light of the considerable mss support, the Göttingen LXX opts for υἱῶν ἀγγέλων on the basis of the DSS and several early Greek mss.} Many recent English translations run in this vein, including the RSV, ESV, NEB, and Jerusalem Bible (“sons of God”), as well as the NRSV (“gods”), NET (“heavenly assembly”), and NABRE (“divine beings”).

There is good reason to opt for “sons of God” as original, as a high proportion of commentators have done. The textual evidence itself is strong, the more so since the discovery of 4QDeut\footnote{Also known as Targum Yerušalmi I (abbreviated Tg. Yer. I), not to be confused with Targum Yerušalmi II (abbreviated Tg. Yer. II) which contains the “sons of Israel” reading. The 1st ed. of the SBL Handbook of Style (1992) assigned a different roman numeral to the title compared to its abbreviation for these two writings. It had Targum Yerušalmi (Tg. Yer. I) and Targum Yerušalmi I (Tg. Yer. II) respectively. The 2nd ed. (2014) revised this so that the numbers match up, as above. To reduce confusion, I will refer to the two works as Targum Pseudo-Jonathan and Targum Yerušalmi II.}\footnote{While Rahlf\textsuperscript{s} LXX prefers ἀγγέλων ὑιῶν ἀγγέλων in light of the considerable mss support, the Göttingen LXX opts for υἱῶν ἀγγέλων on the basis of the DSS and several early Greek mss.} but the principle of lectio difficilior is decisive. It is very hard to imagine “sons of Israel” being changed to “sons of God,”
as the centuries pass and both Judaism and Christianity stress strict monotheism more and more.\textsuperscript{358} By contrast, it is not difficult to see “sons of God” being altered to “sons of Israel” in Hebrew manuscripts (and any translation with Hebrew as its \textit{Vorlage}), nor to see “angels of God” offered as a translation of בני אל among Greek manuscripts. Concerning “sons of Israel,” a scribe, uncomfortable with the suggestion of alternate deities alongside YHWH, could edit the reference, making אלהים or יسرائيل (“God” / “gods”) into ישראל (“Israel”) by slipping in or altering a few letters.\textsuperscript{359} Concerning “angels of God,” there is ample precedent in Second Temple Judaism for understanding the “sons of God” as angels, and thus the gloss is a minimal change, softening the suggestion of alternate deities but still retaining the

\textsuperscript{358} Stevens (“‘Sons of God?’” 137–38) suggests accidental dropping of three letters by homoioteleuton. This is not impossible, but it is not as likely as the intentional addition of letters (see below). If there is an accidental change to the text, the suggestion of Jan Joosten (“A Note on the Text of Deuteronomy xxxii 8,” \textit{VTSJ} \textbf{57} [2007]: 548–55) is more probable. He suggests that the original text ran בני שׂר אל, “the sons of Bull El,” which could become “sons of Israel” by dittography (adding a second \textual{י}) and deleting a space. “Bull El” is a title known from Ugaritic sources and may have been the original reading of Hos 8:6, as well. If Joosten is correct, the meaning of the phrase is much the same, but the reason for the change in the MT is not theologically motivated.

\textsuperscript{359} This is the general view, but J. G. McConville (\textit{Deuteronomy}, ApOTC 5 [Leicester: Apollos, 2002], 454) contends that the change occurs because of the common number seventy in Gen 46:27 and the seventy nations in Gen 10, not disquiet with the apparent polytheism of the verse. He reasons that the concept of a divine court was sufficiently well known not to require editing. More likely, however, is the view of Jeffrey H. Tigay (\textit{Deuteronomy}, JPSTC 5 [Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1996], 517–18) that editorial activities such as these were unsystematic, individual decisions by scribes. Indeed, the common translation ἄγγελοι in many Greek texts is evidence of scribal discomfort with the idea of “sons of God.”
sense of supernatural powers. Elsewhere (in Job 1:6; 2:1; 38:7) the LXX renders the
בָּנֵי (ר)אָלָהִים as ἄγγελοι (θεοῦ). It is safe to conclude that “sons of God / the gods,”
either בָּנֵי אָלָהִים or בָּנֵי אֶל, is the likely original wording of Deut 32:8, as the editors of
*BHS* prefer.

*Deuteronomy 32:43.* Similar textual analysis applies to a discrepancy in v. 43,
the culminating verse of the Song. The MT, DSS, and LXX present three distinct
readings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT (also: Aq., Thd.)</th>
<th>4QDeut⁴ (4Q44)</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rejoice, O heavens,</td>
<td>Rejoice, O heavens,</td>
<td>Be glad, O skies,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>together with him</td>
<td>and bow down to him</td>
<td>with him,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and bow down to him</td>
<td>all you gods (אָלָהִים),</td>
<td>and let all the divine sons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(υἱοὶ ϑεοῦ) do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>obeisance to him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejoice, O ye nations,</td>
<td>Be glad, O nations,</td>
<td>Be glad, O nations,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with his people:</td>
<td>with his people,</td>
<td>with his people,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and let all the angels</td>
<td>and let all the angels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ἄγγελοι) of God</td>
<td>(ἄγγελοι) of God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>prevail for him.</td>
<td>prevail for him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for he will avenge the blood</td>
<td>for he will avenge the blood</td>
<td>For he will avenge the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of his servants,</td>
<td>of his sons,</td>
<td>blood of his sons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and will render vengeance</td>
<td>and will render vengeance</td>
<td>and take revenge and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to his adversaries,</td>
<td>to his enemies,</td>
<td>repay the enemies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and will recompense</td>
<td>with a sentence,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>those who hate him,</td>
<td>and he will repay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and will atone</td>
<td>those who hate,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for the land</td>
<td>and the Lord shall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of his people. (KJV)</td>
<td>cleanse the land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of his people. (DSS Bible)⁴⁶⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(NETS)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

³⁶⁰ There are italics in the text of the DSS Bible (= Martin Abegg, Peter Flint, and Eugene
Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible: The Oldest Known Bible Translated for the First Time into*
There is a common core of rejoicing, God avenging blood against foes, and God cleansing his people’s land. Aside from small differences in wording among the three versions, the MT and 4QDeut\textsuperscript{4} diverge in two ways: the MT has a “nations” clause instead of a “heavens” one and lacks “recompense those who hate.” The LXX includes nearly everything from both versions, with an extra colon as well (“and let all the angels . . .”). One logical explanation is that the LXX knows two Hebrew traditions and synthesizes them in its translation.\textsuperscript{361} If so, then both the MT and the DSS contain recensions of Deut 32:43 that pre-date the Roman era, and the question is which of those has precedence.

A crucial line is found in the Qumran manuscript and the LXX but not the MT: an invocation to “gods” (אלהים) or “sons of God” (υἱοὶ θεοῦ) to praise YHWH.\textsuperscript{362} Although on other points the verse may suffer expansion in the LXX or DSS (or their Vorlagen), in this case the change has probably come in the tradition seen in the


\textsuperscript{362} Most LXX mss contain both υἱοὶ θεοῦ and ἄγγελοι in these duplicated lines, but sometimes their positions are switched, so some mss contain ἄγγελοι here.
MT, where a scribe has expunged the text of reference to these deities, as in v. 8.363

The probability of this is bolstered by a second consideration. It is more fitting for
the heavens and their divine beings to rejoice at God’s deeds on behalf of Israel than
for the nations to do so, not least because YHWH is helping Israel at their expense,
at least insofar as they are antagonistic to Israel (“for he . . . will render vengeance to
his adversaries”). It is reasonable, therefore, to conclude that the earliest form of
Deut 32:43, like 32:8, included a reference to a divine assembly around God.

*The Song on the “Sons of God.”* Assuming the correctness of these two
textual arguments, the Song of Moses as first recorded in Deuteronomy envisioned
nations ruled by “sons of God,” lesser deities, while Israel was ruled by the chief
God, YHWH. Even on the off chance that the Leningrad Codex and its confrères are
true to the original language of Deut 32:8 and 43, however, the idea that nations
were paired with semi-divine beings nonetheless holds considerable antiquity. By the
early centuries CE it had worked its way into a host of ancient manuscripts of several

---

363 So most scholars, e.g., Tigay (*Deuteronomy*, 516–17), whose presentation of the data I
generally follow here. The change must come early, however, since the Aq., Thd., and other early
translations agree with the MT. The textual evidence for the verse is so complex, in fact, that the
Göttingen LXX requires thirty-seven and a half lines of small-font text to list the variants.
languages, provenances, and theological outlooks.\textsuperscript{364} That Paul would have consulted a scroll where the nations were apportioned to ἄγγελοι and where υἱοὶ θεοῦ praise God is probable. At minimum, when he quotes a line from Deut 32:43 in Rom 15:10 ("Rejoice, O Gentiles, with his people," Εὐφράνητε, ἔϑνη, μετὰ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ), the wording matches the LXX but not other Greek manuscripts.\textsuperscript{365}

Not only is "sons of God" likely on textual grounds, it is fitting within a synthetic reading of Deut 32. Having set out the leading themes of the Song in vv. 1–6, and reminding the Israelites of the testimony of their ancestors in v. 7, the subsequent verses (vv. 8–9) give the heavenly superstructure of national boundaries.

\textsuperscript{364} Although post-dating the first century, the Tg. Ps.-J. (3rd / 5th c.?) provides evidence of the perdurance and harmonization of both traditions. Its pleonastic rendering of Deut 32:8 combines the "sons of God" and "sons of Israel" meanings: "When the Most High made allotment of the world unto the nations which proceeded from the sons of Noach, in the separation of the writings and languages of the children of men at the time of the division, He cast the lot among the seventy angels, the princes of the nations with whom is the revelation to oversee the city, even at that time He established the limits of the nations according to the sum of the number of the seventy souls of Israel who went down into Mizraim." Translation by J. W. Etheridge, The Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan Ben Uziel on the Pentateuch, with the Fragments of the Jerusalem Targum from the Chaldee: Two Volumes in One (New York: Ktav, 1968), 2:662. Originally published in 1862–1865.

\textsuperscript{365} Although the sense of this particular line is similar in each, the particular vocabulary and construction differs. Cf. Aq.: αἰνοποιήσατε, ἔϑνη, λαὸς αὐτοῦ; Thd.: ἀγαλλιᾶσϑε, ἔϑνη, λαὸς αὐτοῦ. Further, it is possible but uncertain that Paul could have known it from Hebrew versions, even granting that he knew Hebrew. 4QDeut\textsuperscript{3}, as noted, lacks the phrase, and the MT (חרזת מים וטן) does not actually have "with" in the ms, despite the KJV translation. It may, however, be implied (as translations following the MT often take it to be: NKJV, NASB, NIV; cf. RSV: "Praise his people, O you nations"), or, after Paul's day, it may have dropped out by haplography: neglecting to add שֵׁם ("with") before שֵׁם ("people") in the unpointed ms.
The other nations are given by the Creator God to various semi-divine beings, the “sons of God,” but YHWH reserved for himself one people, Israel. YHWH was faithful to guide the people into their land, like an eagle nursing its young (vv. 10–14). No foreign god did this for them, but the Lord alone (v. 12). The travesty of Israel’s sin is that, having been adopted by the God of gods as his peculiar people, they sought out the inferior gods who ruled other nations (vv. 15–18), inviting the Lord’s punishment (vv. 19–27). Because of their sin, the Israelites are censured for their folly and called to learn from YHWH’s covenantal curses (vv. 28–43). It is the language of adultery: Israel “abandoned” (נתש, v. 15) God, making him “jealous” (קנה, v. 16) with “strange” gods (זרים, v. 16), a common term for sexual waywardness, especially in Proverbs (e.g., Prov 2:16; 5:20; 7:5).366 It is also familial: they are “children in whom there is no faithfulness” (v. 20). Like many of the later chapters of Deuteronomy, Moses’s Song presages the Israelites’ religious infidelity, and one of the images it gives is a people transgressing heavenly borders by leaving the domain ruled by YHWH and seeking out gods that are set over other nations.

366 As here, it is commonly extended to a religious sense: e.g., Ps 44:21 [Eng.: 44:20]; Isa 17:10; Jer 5:19; Ezek 16:32.
The complexity of Jewish “henotheism” is on full display in this passage.\(^{367}\)

On the one hand, Israel's idolatrous worship is direct at “what is no god” (לא אל) (v. 21) and YHWH asserts, “there is no god besides me” (אין אלים עמדי) (v. 39), making it sound as if these beings do not exist at all. On the other hand, some level of continuity is presumed by the common lithic imagery of v. 31: “Indeed their rock (צורם) is not like our Rock (צורנו).” In stating that no “foreign god” (אל נכר) led Israel, v. 12 presumes the reality of other deities even while denying their benefit to the Hebrew people. Two senses of (אל הים) must be operative in this passage, since the Song simultaneously affirms (vv. 12, 17) and denies (vv. 21, 39) the existence of other “gods.”

The specific terminology of vv. 16–17 yields the most precise picture. The “sons” are mocked as “strange” gods (זרמים), as well as “abhorrent” things (תועבות) in

\(^{367}\) In the following analysis I assume the substantial unity of Deut 32, for at minimum Paul would have read it that way, although particular phrases might differ here and there, in particular vv. 8–9 and v. 43. Near the end of his lengthy consideration of the Song, Sanders (Provenance, 429–31) concludes that Deut 32 is a unity, and one of his major arguments is that the apparent “monotheistic” and “polytheistic” elements of Deut 32 are compatible, properly understood (pp. 426–29). His definition of its “monotheism” is an exclusive veneration of YHWH by Israel, not an ontological statement about the nonexistence of other gods.
v. 16, both terms assigning them an alien status. In v. 17 they are slighted as being minor protective spirits (שדים) and, to use Jeffrey H. Tigay’s description, “deities-come-lately”. The Song portrays these “gods” as inferior but altogether real spiritual entities, a cue Paul follows in 1 Cor 10. Given this, when we come to v. 39 (“See now that I, even I, am he; there is no god besides me . . .”), we realize the accent falls on the second half of the verse (“. . . I kill and I make alive; I wound and I heal; and no one can deliver from my hand”). None of

368 The “gods” of “strange gods” is probably assumed, as in Vg.: in diis alienis. BHS in fact suggests reading the phrase as שדים ורסם מוכרים. The “strange” implies foreign; the common word for sojourning among a foreign people is the related verb תועבת. The primary meaning of תועבת, often associated with idolatry, is “an ethical or cultic taboo,” very often with the intent “to characterize it as chaotic and alien, and therefore dangerous within the cosmic and social order” — H.-D. Preuss, "סדה, תועבת, תונת, ת CONSTANT, 15:602.

369 Tigay, Deuteronomy, 306. More literally it is “gods . . . new ones recently arrived.” The root is complicated by its use as a divine name, which might come from any number of non-Hebrew roots, but in Deut 32:17, as well as Ps 106:37 (“They even sacrificed their sons and daughters to שדים”), it concerns spirits other than YHWH, deriving from the Akkadian loanword šēdu (so H. Niehr and G. Steins, „שד, šadday,“ TDOT, 14:422). Mathias Delcor (“Des Inscriptions de Deir ‘Alla aux traditions bibliques, à propos des šdyn, des šedim et de šadday,” in Die Väter Israels: Beiträge zur Theologie der Patriarchenüberlieferungen im Alten Testament, ed. Manfred Görg [Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1989], 36–39) cautions against taking this as “demons,” as many translations do (NRSV, NABRE, NKJV, ESV, etc.), because the Song still shows evidence of the Akkadian meaning protective spirits.

370 In 1 Cor 10 Paul understands this passage as referring to demons. As several scholars have noted, the wording of 1 Cor 10:20 (διὰ τῶν θεῶν, δαιμόνιοι καὶ οὐ θεός) is sufficiently close to LXX Deut 32:17 (˘ένωσιν δαιμόνιοι καὶ οὐ θεός) to suggest dependence, and both 1 Cor 10:22 and Deut 32:21 concern people provoking (παραζηλάω) God, which adds to the likelihood that Paul has the Song of Moses in mind. So Hays, Echoes, 93–94; Lincicum, Paul and Deuteronomy, 163–64. Hays additionally suggests that Paul’s identification of Christ as the “rock” in this passage owes to Deut 32 (MT, not LXX), which refers several times to YHWH as “rock.”
these deities can match the overriding power of Israel’s God. Similarly, the charge that the Israelites provoked God to jealousy by their idols (lit.: “their vanities,” הרליהם) and “what is no god” (לא-אל) in v. 21a is mirrored by the statement that YHWH would provoke them to jealousy by “what is no people” (לא-עם) and “a foolish nation” (גוי נבל) in v. 21b. The God of Israel is threatening to repay the nation in kind: if they preferred adopting other deities, their God is justified in adopting, or crafting, a new people. Verse 21 does not cast doubt on the existences of other gods any more than it casts doubt on the existence of other nations.

In summary, the Song of Moses pictures the absolute sovereign, YHWH, ruling his special people Israel, and the subordinate “sons of God” or “gods” ruling the other, inferior nations on earth. The cosmic order is in place so long as these boundaries are kept. Ultimately, however, they are not. It is Israel’s grave folly to prefer a cheap, foreign substitute to the Most High God.

*Paul and the Song.* This history is on Paul’s mind as he writes Romans, and it informs his perception of the gentile mission. Elsewhere in the letter the apostle...
has redefined “true circumcision” via Deut 29:1–30:10 (Rom 2:25–29) and inserted Christ into the near “word” of Deut 30:12–14, at the expense of Lev 18:5 (Rom 10:6–8). But it is the Song that gives Paul a framework to conceptualize Israel’s sin and gentile inclusion into God’s people. He sees Deut 32:21 being fulfilled in the wake of Christ’s advent — “Again I ask, did Israel not understand? First Moses says, ‘I will make you jealous of those who are not a nation; with a foolish nation I will make you angry’ ” (Rom 10:19) — before clinching his scriptural proof with Isa 65:1–2. Paul thinks that a new people is being created, that God is making Israel jealous with “those who are not a nation,” various gentiles being united across their native ethnic lines into a new society, a newly defined Israel, comprised of believing Jews and non-

372 So Lincicum, *Paul and Deuteronomy*, 147–58. Of course, the true circumcision and inward Jewishness that Paul speaks of also owes to prophetic oracles like Jer 31:31–34 and Ezek 36:25–29 that speak of God’s renewal of the covenant within his people, but Deut 30:6 (also Deut 10:16; Jer 4:4; 9:25) explicitly invokes a spiritual circumcision of the heart, and the wider context of Deut 29–30, as with Rom 2, concerns obedience and punishment for disobedience.

373 Lincicum (ibid., 166) argues that the passage is “foundational for Romans as a whole,” Bell (*Provoked to Jealousy*, 200–201) deems it the second most important passage for Paul after Gen 15; and Hays (*Echoes*, 164) makes bold to say, “Deuteronomy 32 contains Romans in nuce.”

374 There are two differences between the main mss of LXX Deut 32:21 and Rom 10:19, both likely alterations Paul made to fit into his discourse: the person is changed to increase the rhetorical immediacy of the passage (αὐτοί to ὑπερείς) and, since he is only using half the verse, he drops an embedded connective (κατηγορεῖ to ἐγώ).
Jews. This mixed people of God is what Rom 11 develops under the metaphor of
the olive tree, and when Paul returns to the topic in Rom 15 he again utilizes Moses’s
Song, alongside Psalms and Isaiah, to picture Jew and gentile together praising God:

“Rejoice, O Gentiles, with his people” (Rom 15:10, quoting Deut 32:43).

This four-act drama — God’s gracious election of Israel, their treachery,
God’s stirring of them to jealousy by the gentiles, and the ultimate fulfillment of
Jews and gentiles united under God — is the social aspect of Deut 32, and a number
of scholars have noted its usefulness for Paul. However, at least for Deuteronomy,

---

375 Jewett (Romans, 646) writes, “There is a consensus that οὐκ ἔθνος (‘no-people’) in this
citation refers to Gentiles, particularly in the light of the Hosea prophecy cited in 9:25–26 concerning
the Gentiles as ‘not my people.’ ” More specifically, Paul envisions gentiles who have believed in the
gospel as fulfilling Hosea’s prophecy (and the Deuteronomistic threat!) (see Rom 10:5–18), just as
Hosea’s “not my people” describes those God “has called, not from the Jews only but also from the
Gentiles” (Rom 9:24). Both quotations foreshadow the Israel-as-olive-tree analogy in Rom 11, which
through Jesus includes both Jews and gentiles in “the new people of God,” as Moo (Romans, 668)
terms it, or at least “the redefined Israel of God.”

376 It is interesting how often Paul quotes Deuteronomy in the near context of Isaiah and
Psalms. J. Ross Wagner (“Moses and Isaiah in Concert: Paul’s Reading of Isaiah and Deuteronomy in
the Letter to the Romans,” in “As Those Who Are Taught”: The Interpretation of Isaiah from the LXX
to the SBL, ed. Claire Matthews McGinnis and Patricia K. Tull, SymS 27 [Atlanta: Society of Biblical
Literature, 2006], 87–105) demonstrates that Deuteronomy and Isaiah mutually interpret each other
in three passages of Romans (Rom 10:19–21; 11:8; and 15:9–12), and the same could be extended to
Psalms and other passages in Romans. See also Hays’s view in next footnote.

377 A succinct and compelling presentation can be found in Hays, Echoes, 162–64. He notes
how often Paul quotes from four sources: Deuteronomy, the Abraham stories in Genesis,
messianically or gentile-themed Psalms, and Isaiah’s universalistic prophecies, concluding that the OT
there is the heavenly dimension to consider as well. The trouble on earth causes its
own disturbance in heaven. According to Deut 32 Israel’s chasing after foreign gods
led YHWH to seek “no people” or a “foolish nation” for himself, either disinheriting
a “son of God” of his people or, more likely, drawing individuals from various
nations into a new people. For most of the Song, from the time Israel strays until it
is provoked to jealousy and returns (vv. 15–42), YHWH and the “sons of God” are at
odds, presumably because they received Israelite worship. Yet in the likely original of
v. 43, the gods, with their nations, worship the Most High in the end. Since Paul’s
text of Deut 32 seems close to the LXX, and since he is keen to use passages from
the Song that refer to the other peoples, we can expect that he knows this plane of
the drama. Further, we can locate where Paul places himself in the drama: at the
time of Israel’s provocation, before its restoration and union with the gentiles.

functions primarily as a way for Paul to understand salvation history, particularly as it applies to
gentile inclusion into God’s people.

378 Hays (ibid., 70–73) is among those who argue that Paul, although inventive in his use of
Scripture, still knows the wider context of passages he quotes. This is pertinent for his use of Deut
32:43, since near the quoted portion is an explicit reference to these divine patrons. Hays shows that
Paul’s rhetoric in Rom 15:7–13 indicates that he cites his four passages not only because of the
common word ἔθνος, but for deeper reasons as well. For example, Paul cites Ps 18:50 [Eng. 18:49] in
Rom 15:9, but the next verse of the psalm speaks of God’s saving deeds (σωτηρίαι), his mercy (ἔλεος),
his anointed one (χριστός), and David and his seed (σπέρμα), all of which are common Pauline tropes.
If Paul implicitly invokes the context of Ps 18:50, then he likely assumes the wider context of Deut
Although Paul does not use the term “son of God” to mean this, it is my contention that Jesus functions for him as a new, superior “son of God” leading an eschatological people. God’s calling into existence this new people would, by the logic of Deut 32 at least, require a corresponding maneuver in heaven, and it would not be surprising to see it answered, in Paul’s theology, by Christ. However, this is to rush ahead. For the moment we are still in pre-exilic times, and Paul is heir to a long history of reflection on Deut 32 before his own day.

**Other Early “Sons of God” References and Related Traditions**

*Psalms and Job.* The Song of Moses serves as a focal point because of its prominence in the HB and the explicitness with which it affirms that foreign deities rule foreign nations. It is also quoted by Paul in Romans. There are clusters of references to “sons of God” in two sapiential books as well, in Job (6th / 5th c. BCE?) and the Psalter, and their descriptions, though brief, are congruous with the perspective of

---

32:43 as well. Bell (*Provoked to Jealousy*, 269–81, 284–85) argues the same point more narrowly, that at least for the Song in Romans Paul has the whole context in mind.
Deut 32.³⁷⁹ Of these, the oldest is Ps 29 (11th/10th c. BCE?; known by Paul).³⁸⁰ In v. 1 the “sons of God” (here spelled בני אלים) are subordinate divine beings.³⁸¹ They are called to “ascribe to the LORD glory and strength” because of the power of his voice over creation, likely a metaphor for YHWH as storm-God achieving victory for Israel in war — hence his enthronement (v. 10) and the request for him to strengthen his people (v. 11) at the end of the psalm.³⁸² Likewise, in Job 38:7 (known

³⁷⁹ The Psalter is obviously a composite document, but Job also presents many difficulties for dating. There is a lack of datable events within the work, and its canonical form is composite. The main segments are the prologue (chs. 1–2), the main dialogues (chs. 3–31), Elihu’s monologue (chs. 32–37), God’s monologue (38:1–42:6), and the epilogue (42:7–17). There is also a poem on wisdom in ch. 28 that sits oddly in its present location. There are indications that some of these parts were added to the original core, the dialogues between Job and his three friends, and all of it likely derives from an earlier tale of a righteous sufferer. The exilic prophet Ezekiel (14:14, 20) knows, at minimum, of a wise man by the name of Job, and in the Hellenistic and Roman eras his story is increasingly well circulated in something like its present form. Job as a hero of endurance is celebrated in Ben Sira (49:9; 2nd c. BCE), his eponymous testament (T. Job; 1st c. BCE/CE?), and James (5:11; 1st c. CE). Most importantly, there is a Targum of Job at Qumran (4Q157, 11Q10), and the ms from cave 11 includes texts from the most debated parts of Job, such as chs. 28, 32–37, and 42.

³⁸⁰ Paul obviously knows the book of Psalms in general, but his familiarity with this particular psalm cannot be proven. The “God of glory” language in Ps 29:3 may underlie “Father of glory” in Eph 1:17 as NA²⁸ suggests, but the echo is itself faint, and Eph is in any case among the most disputed Pauline works.

³⁸¹ The Greek mss have υἱοὶ ἔρωτος in Ps 28:1, but the LXX repeats the line with υἱοὺς κριῶν, “sons of rams” at the end, which has caused confusion among other Greek mss (e.g., being replaced by υἱοὺς ἰσχυρῶν, “sons of the mighty”).

³⁸² Given its similarities to the Song of the Sea (Exod 15:1–18) and the Song of Deborah (Jdg 5), Peter C. Craigie (Psalms 1–50, WBC 19 [Waco, Tex.: Word, 1983], 243–46) calls this a “victory hymn” and dates it to the early monarchic period. These early songs invoke other deities to demonstrate YHWH’s superiority to them (e.g., Exod 15:11; Jdg 5:8), and the same is implicit in Ps
by Paul),\textsuperscript{383} which occurs near the outset of the first divine speech, YHWH questions where Job was on the day he, God, created the earth, “when the morning stars (כוכבים) sang together, and all the heavenly beings (כל בני אלהים) shouted for joy” (38:7).\textsuperscript{384} The “sons” (NRSV translates it “heavenly beings”) are again shown to be lesser than YHWH, passive celebrants of his mighty acts of creation, but also immortals, having existed prior to the making of this world. They are equated with stars, a common designation for angels or gods in Jewish thought (e.g., Deut 4:19; Jdg 5:20; Isa 14:13; Dan 8:10; Amos 5:26).\textsuperscript{385}

\textsuperscript{383} There are a number of possible allusions to Job in Paul’s corpus, but he directly quotes from Job 5:13 in 1 Cor 3:19 (“He catches the wise in their craftiness”). Also, in Rom 11:35 (“Or who has given a gift to him, to receive a gift in return?”) he quotes an old Greek version of Job 41:3 (= Heb. 44:11), as argued by Berndt Schaller (“Zum Textcharakter der Hiobzitate im paulinischen Schrifttum,” ZNW 71 [1980]: 21–26).

\textsuperscript{384} Similar to Job 1–2, the LXX reads πάντες ἄγγελοι θεοῦ (“all the angels of God”), but Aq. and Thd. have ἡμα τοι θεοῦ (“the sons of God at once” [shouted for joy]).

\textsuperscript{385} Of these the occurrence in Deut 4:19 is most intriguing. In it other peoples are allotted to “the stars (הכוכבים), all the host of heaven (כל צבא השמים),” while Israel is to worship YHWH alone. If Job 38 retains a similar meaning of “stars,” then like the Song of Moses it too would picture the “sons of God” as ruling nations. The same word is also used of the messiah (Num 24:17) and the resurrected (Dan 12:3), both of which use angelic categories to speak of unique individuals.
These figures are subordinates, God’s councilors and the overseers of humanity, as becomes clear in Ps 89 (6th / 5th c. BCE; known by Paul) and Job 1–2 (known by Paul). The psalm, in its present form, laments the apparent annulment of the Davidic covenant. After a brief introduction to the major themes (vv. 2–5 [Eng.: vv. 1–4]), the psalmist acclaims the might of YHWH over all powers in heaven and on earth (vv. 6–15 [Eng.: vv. 5–14]). In a exemplary case of synonymous parallelism, the refrain “who is like YHWH?” or the call to “praise him” is repeated in several ways over the course of four verses (vv. 6–9 [Eng.: 5–8]), and in each case the God of Israel is compared favorably to other cosmic powers: to “the heavens”

---

386 NA suggests several possible allusions to Ps 89 in the Pauline corpus, but all are quite loose, and thus it is safer to categorize the passage as “known by Paul” rather than “used by Paul.” The evidence for Job 1–2 is closer but still insufficient. In 1 Thess 5:8 Paul tells his church to wait in the “hope of salvation” (ἐλπὶς σωτηρίας), and in LXX Job 2:9a (not in the MT) Job’s wife mocks him for retaining a “hope of deliverance” (ἡ ἐλπὶς τῆς σωτηρίας). The commonality of “hope” and “salvation / deliverance” in Jewish writings, as well as the differing contexts of Job and 1 Thess, makes an allusion unlikely. Similarly, 1 Tim 6:7 (“we brought nothing into the world, so that we can take nothing out of it”) might recall Job 1:21, but the wording is inexact, and it derives from the Pastoral Epistles.

387 It is this lament at the end (vv. 39–53 [Eng.: vv. 38–52]) that presumes an exilic or post-exilic setting. A few have reasoned that another historical event is in view, such as the split between Israel and Judah, but the strength of the wording (in the first two verses of lament God has “spurned' and “rejected” David and “renounced the covenant”) indicates a catastrophe only fitting the scale of Jerusalem’s fall. It is possible that the sudden turn of tone at the end indicates a later addition, in which case the praise of YHWH (vv. 2–3, 6–19 [Eng.: vv. 1–2, 5–18]) and the happy recollection of the Davidic covenant (vv. 4–5, 20–38 [Eng.: vv. 3–4, 19–37]) may reflect monarchical times. The reference to “sons of God” occurs in what would be the earliest section of the psalm, if indeed it was composed in stages.
“the assembly of the holy ones” (קהל קדשים), those “in the sky” (בשמים), the “heavenly beings” (lit.: “sons of God,” בני אלים), “the council of the holy ones” (סוד‑קדשים), “all that are around him [YHWH]” (כל‑סוביו), and the “hosts” (צבאות).

The parallelism of the lines indicates that these terms all denote similar, if not the exact same, class of supra-human beings, and so comparing the designations provides a small trove of valuable information about the “sons of God” (v. 7 [Eng.: v. 6]; υἱοὶ ὑιοῦ in LXX, Sym. Ps 88:7). The composite picture is a gathering of YHWH’s angelic advisers around his throne in heaven. In Job 1:6 and 2:1 the “sons of God” (בני האלהים) travel about the earth observing humankind and then reporting to God. In the early scenes of the prologue, God is located in heaven, Job on earth, and these “angels of God” (as most manuscripts of the LXX translate it) bridge the two realms. The picture is of provincial governors within an empire who report to the ruling king, or courtiers who travel the realm to do his bidding.

388 Among their number is “the accuser” (השטן) that incites YHWH and afflicts Job, but we should be careful about reading too much into this. This is not the “Satan” of later Jewish and Christian imagination, and although Job 1–2 displays some rift between God and at least one of these “sons of God,” it is well short of the dualism of God versus Satan, angels versus demons.

389 Other mss of the LXX read οἱ υἱοὶ (τοῦ) ϑεοῦ in Job 1:6; 2:1.
A final detail comes in Ps 82 (6th / 4th c. BCE; known by Paul), a concise plea that YHWH adjudicate justice for the vulnerable. As in the above texts, the “sons of the Most High” (v. 6, בני עליון) are called members of the “divine council” (NRSV) or, more literally, the “assembly of El” (v. 1, עדת אל), but in addition the psalmist twice gives them the name “gods” (vv. 1, 6, אלהים). However, this is no

390 This psalm is not referenced by Paul, and in fact is rarely referenced in the NT; the only certain reference is v. 6 in John 10:34. But it is probable that the apostle was acquainted with it.

391 The psalm provides no details that might serve as clues of its date. Most commentators put it in exilic or post-exilic times (6th / 4th c. BCE), but some have located it as early as the beginning of the monarchy (11th c. BCE).

392 That they are said to judge orphans and the poor (vv. 3–4), be darkened by ignorance (v. 5), and doomed to death “like mortals” (כ מאדם) and “like any prince” (v. 7, כ אחד השרים), has the chance of misleading, as if the poem addresses human judges, with “gods” (vv. 1, 6) a lofty title bestowed in bitter irony, not unlike the laments for the kings of Babylon and Tyre in Isa 14 and Ezek 28, respectively. Evidence of this interpretation can be dated at least to later Amoraic or Geonaic times (e.g., 6th / 8th c. CE Persia: b. Sanh. 6b–7a; 5th/9th c. CE Europe: Tg. Ket. on Ps 82), if not Second Temple times, depending on how John 10:34–35 and 11QMelch are understood. Targum Onqelos (as early as 1st/2nd c. CE, Palestine), which does not cover the Psalms, does translate as “gods” several uses of אלהים that it finds odd (e.g., Exod 21:6), which gives further credence to the possibility that first-century Jews read the “gods” of Ps 82 as humans. (So far as we are concerned with the original meaning of the psalm itself, of course, this translation is dubious despite showing up as the first entry in BDB, as argued some time ago by Cyrus H. Gordon “אלהים in Its Reputed Meaning of Rulers, Judges,” JBL 54 [1935]: 139–44). However, despite the antiquity of the “gods as judges” view, at least at the time of composition these were conceived to be semi-divine beings. Not only does the cumulative evidence of “sons of God” point in this direction, but the difference can be best illustrated by a comparison to Ezek 28:2. There the king of Tyre is mocked for claiming of himself, “I am a god” (אל אני who sits “in the seat of the gods” (אליהים מושב), to which God responds, “yet you are but a mortal (אדם), and no god (לא אל), though you compare your mind with the mind of a god (לא אל).” The words are similar to those of Ps 82, but the two passages assume opposite situations. Whereas the Ezekielian would-be god starts as mortal, claims divinity of himself, and is then revealed as a mere mortal by his violent death (Ezek 28:9), in Ps 82 the “sons of the Most High”
ordinary gathering: in the words of Matitiahu Tsevat, “what might normally be a routine assembly, where the gods report or participate in deliberations, has unexpectedly turned into a tribunal; God has stood up to judge the assembled.”

They have betrayed their role, and thus face a loss of their status as gods, immortality included.

---

are called “gods” at the outset (v. 1) and are proclaimed as such by YHWH himself (v. 6), only to be divested of immortality (v. 7) because of their malfeasance (vv. 2–5). The king of Tyre dies precisely because he is mortal (אדם), while they die only “like” mortals (כאדם). Further, there are several precedents in ancient Near Eastern literature of gods being punished with loss of status and even immortality, so there is nothing implausible about expecting the same of Ps 82. Marvin E. Tate (Psalms 51–100. WBC 20 [Dallas: Word, 1990], 338–40) gives as examples the Enuma Elish (1.119–28), Atrahasis (1.4.123–24), and the Epic of Gilgamesh (X.3:3–5). From Ugarit there is also the case of a man refusing proffered immortality (2 Aqht. 6.26–38), and a god that tries to depose and render mortal a rival god, although the attempt fails (CTA 16.6.45–54).

---


394 In v. 7 they are said to die כֶּחֶדֶם. The translation “like Adam” is tantalizing, and has been preferred by some scholars (e.g., E. Theodore Mullen, The Divine Council in Canaanite and Early Hebrew Literature, HSM 24 [Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1980], 243–44). This would indicate that Ps 82 assumes the tradition of an angelic or god-like Adam who became mortal by sin as these “sons of God” now experience, but the brevity of the account is too slight to assume a direct reference to Gen 2–3. In any case, all the Greek ms traditions have ὡς ἄνθρωποι, “like humans,” so there is no indication that Second Temple Jews saw primeval history in the background. Still, the two clearest references to the use of “gods” in Ps 82 during Second Temple times both question, in certain ways, the separation between humanity and divinity. The Fourth Gospel has, of course, the clearest picture of a divine Jesus in the NT (and not just in the prologue; also John 20:28), and in John 10:34–35 Jesus justifies his use of the title “son of God” by noting that those “to whom the word of God came” (probably the Israelites or their judges, but possibly the angels) were called “gods,” and thus it is all the more fitting on the lips of Jesus. 11QMelch (11Q13) also makes use of Ps 82. There a messianic Melchizedek figure, who is to initiate the eschatological jubilee and bring final judgment, is equated with either God himself or the gods of Ps 82:1. This figure is at least angelic, if not divine, so it
In the last verse of Ps 82 their position over nations can be deduced. The construction of the final colon is curious, but most translations take it to mean that God currently possesses (e.g., NABRE, NIV) or in the future will inherit (e.g., ESV, KJV) the nations. As the NRSV has it, “Rise up, O God, judge the earth; for all the nations belong to you (תנחל בכל־הגוים)!” (v. 8). Another translation for the second half of the verse, by contrast, sees God apportioning the nations to others — in context, to the אלהים or בן עליון: “... for you [God] allotted all the nations (to the gods)!” If the latter is preferred, Ps 82:8 presents the exact same event as Deut 32:8–9, as James S. Ackerman has argued. The נחל root concerns inheritance, but the ambiguity of the verb is that, even in the qal (so MT: תנחל), it can signify either receiving as an heir or, less often, allotting to an heir.

This is the primary reason for uncertainty, but there are subsidiary questions as well. Given different vowels, נחל could be read as a piel (תנחל, “to divide for a possession”) or hiphil (תנחל, defective spelling of תנחל, “to give as a possession”), indicates that Qumran read Ps 82 as picturing several semi-divine beings alongside YHWH. We may conclude that, in Roman times, some Jews still saw evidence in Ps 82 of supernatural powers alongside the Most High God.

395 Ackerman, “An Exegetical Study of Psalm 82” (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1966), 430–34.
both of which would settle the debate in favor of God giving the nations to others.

Additionally, the imperfect tense indicates ongoing action, but context dictates whether that action happens in the past, present, or future.\(^{396}\) In the midst of these uncertainties, it is easy to lose sight of the overall consistency of meaning. Whether the reference is to the past action of God handing the nations over to the “sons of God,” on the one hand, or to his present or future action of repossessing the nations, on the other, all interpretations assume a common sequence of events: having divested the “sons of the Most High” of their office (vv. 6–7) for perpetrating injustice (vv. 2–5), God as rightful judge over all (v. 1) takes up their vacated positions over the nations (at least v. 8a). The difference is whether the final picture (v. 8b) recalls the earlier allotment of the nations to the gods or looks to YHWH’s resumption of that authority over the peoples. All the major readings of this psalm take the “sons of the Most High” to be God’s heavenly counselors who, until they erred, ruled the peoples of the earth as judges.

\(^{396}\) Besides the questions surrounding the meaning, stem, and tense of יָנִח, there is the oddity that ב (“in,” “among”) follows it rather than a direct object, a construction that, while not unprecedented (e.g., Num 18:20; Deut 19:14; Josh 14:1; Jdg 11:2), is usual.
Genesis. By far the most famous text featuring errant “sons of God” is Gen 6:1–4 (10th / 6th c. BCE; known by Paul), which not only introduces the flood narrative in Genesis but is also generative of the “Watchers” tradition in Second Temple Judaism. In it we find the strange tale of “sons of God” (בני האלהים) taking as wives the “daughters of people” (בנות האדם) and having children by them, the redoubtable Nephilim (הנפליים). Given the typical meaning of “sons of God” as angels, this was an uncomfortable text for many. R. Akiba and those

397 NA suggests that Paul’s cryptic reason for why women should wear head coverings (1 Cor 11:10: “because of the angels”) might be a reference to the sexual misconduct of Gen 6:2. If so, then Paul directly uses this passage. More likely the idea is that Paul sees angels dwelling with his churches at their services, much as the Qumran community (so Joseph A. Fitzmyer, “A Feature of Qumrân Angelology and the Angels of 1 Cor. xi. 10,” NTS 4 [1957]: 48–58). Thus, I will side with caution and categorize the passage as “known by Paul.”

398 There remains significant debate over the various documentary hypotheses of the Pentateuch, including whether E and J represent distinct traditions and whether there was an overarching Pentateuchal narrative before the priestly editor. A good snapshot of the status quaestionis can be found in Thomas B. Dozeman and Konrad Schmid, eds., A Farewell to the Yahwist? The Composition of the Pentateuch in Recent European Interpretation, SymS 34 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), an outgrowth of a special session of the Pentateuch Section at the SBL annual meeting of 2004. If one does follow the traditional JEDP model, Gen 6:1–4 comes from J, generally thought to be the earliest Pentateuchal source, in the early monarchy. More recently scholars have placed J late, even to exilic times, although that is by no means universal, e.g., Richard M. Wright, Linguistic Evidence for the Pre-Exilic Date of the Yahwistic Source, LHBOTS 419 (London: T&T Clark, 2005).

399 The Greek versions had great trouble deciding how to translates these phrases, evidence of their confusion about the interpretation. בני האלהים is variously translated (οἱ) υἱοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ, “the sons of God” (most mss of LXX, Thd.); οἱ υἱοὶ τῶν θεῶν, “the sons of the gods” (Aq.); οἱ υἱοὶ τῶν δυναστευόντων, “the sons of the ruling ones” (Sym.); and οἱ ἄγγελοι τοῦ θεοῦ, “the angels of God” (some mss of LXX). The Nephilim are called οἱ γίγαντες, “the giants” (LXX, Thd.); οἱ ἐπιπίπτοντες, “the fallen ones” (Aq.); and οἱ βίαιοι, “the violent ones” (Sym.).
identified with him take the phrase to mean “sons of judges” (R. Simeon b. Yohai: בני דייניה) or “sons of the great ones” (Tg. Onq.: בני רברביא). Early Christians were split on the matter with some, like Ephrem and Augustine, preferring the “sons of God” to be “sons of Seth,” the godly line of humans, which united itself with the line of Cain (“the daughters of humans”). Others, like Clement of Alexandria and Ambrose did think the “sons of God” were angels. Among the Reformers the human interpretation is more common, though the angelic one is still known. At a popular level, the “sons of Seth” view is common to this day.

In the academy, however, the clear consensus is that these “sons of God” are divine beings, in keeping with the use of the term elsewhere. Nonetheless, scholars often seek to disentangle the text from its most curious consequences by acknowledging that mythology forms the background while denying the author’s

---


own subscription to it. It is true the author who affixed Gen 6:1–4 before the flood tale was horrified by the depravity it reflected, since in his mind it justified a worldwide cataclysm, but that depravity was not the existence of semi-divine beings. In Deuteronomy, Job, and Psalms, they are taken for granted as genuine figures in heaven. Rather, it was the violation of their duties and their intercourse with women. Their sin is flagrant because they were to be overseeing humanity and instead indulged in liaisons with their charges. Genesis 6:1–4 presents an offense against proper boundaries, not against monotheism.

The foregoing, from the Song of Moses to the flood narrative, assumes that there is an underlying unity to the “sons of God,” a class of heavenly beings who

---

403 E.g., Nahum M. Sarna (Genesis, JPSTC [Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1989], 45) argues that these verses are “surely the strangest of all the Genesis narratives.” After referencing other euhemeristic passages with mythological background (Isa 14:12; Job 4:18–19; Ezek 32:27), he continues, “In light of these and other biblical references, . . . it is quite likely that the main function of the present highly condensed version of the original story is to combat polytheistic mythology. The picture here presented of celestial beings intermarrying with women on earth may partake of the mythical, but it does not overstep the bounds of monotheism; there is only one God who passes judgment and makes decisions.” Similarly, E. A. Speiser (Genesis, AB 1 [Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1964], 45) comments, “The undisguised mythology of this isolated fragment makes it not only atypical of the Bible as a whole but also puzzling and controversial in the extreme.” He compares it to Greek, Phoenician, Hittite, and Hurrian mythology, and then concludes, “It is evident, moreover, from the tenor of the Hebrew account that its author was highly critical of the subject matter. It makes little difference whether J took the contents at face value or, as is more likely (cf. vs. 5), viewed the whole as the product of man’s morbid imagination. The mere popularity of the story would have been sufficient to fill him with horror at the depravity that it reflected” (p. 46). Sarna and Speiser are both attentive readers of Genesis and write profitably about it. However, in this case they impose a modern understanding of strict monotheism on the passage.
attend the Most High God. It is impossible to prove that this is so, but there is a basic continuity to their presentation in all the references. In two important cases their role over nations is explicit (Deut 32; Ps 82), in several others their guardianship is over people, without specifying whether individual or corporate (Job 1–2; Ps 89; prob. Gen 6), and in all instances they form a heavenly court around YHWH (including Job 38; Ps 29). They are also morally ambiguous figures: in Gen 6 they consort with women. In Ps 82 their corruption invites God’s wrath. In Job 1–2 an accuser among them incites God against the righteous Job. In Deut 32 they receive illicit worship from God’s people, although in the end they, with their nations, do give YHWH his proper place. The common substratum of meaning for the “sons of God” is semi-divine beings who oversee humanity, but are liable to be involved in human sin.

Related Traditions. As already noted, the concept is not limited to the particular phrase “sons of God.” The conviction that semi-divine beings govern other peoples is present in Jdg 11:12–27 (10th / 6th c. BCE; known by Paul). Jephthah

---

404 Presumably Paul knows of the book of Judges, as it is included in all major translations of the OT, but he never clearly references or alludes to it in his writings. The date of the work is unclear. Under the influence of Martin Noth (Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien: Die sammelnden und bearbeitenden Geschichtswerke im Alten Testament, 2nd ed. [Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1957]), for much
attempts, unsuccessfully, to avoid battle with the Ammonites over a piece of land in the transjordan. The Israelites’ God, he says, gave this region to them along with their land west of the Jordan. In vv. 23–24 we read, “So now the Lord, the God of Israel, has conquered the Amorites for the benefit of his people Israel. Do you intend to take their place? Should you not possess what your god Chemosh gives you to possess? And should we not be the ones to possess everything that the Lord our God has conquered for our benefit?” Jephthah states matter-of-factly that YHWH and Chemosh have allotted land to their respective nations, Israel and Ammon. While it is possible that Jephthah, with diplomatic finesse, deigns to appeal to the Ammonite king according to his own terms, more likely the words are an artless starting point for negotiation: that they each have a guardian deity is an assumption the

---

405 In this passage the author conflates Ammon and Moab, as elsewhere Chemosh is the god of Moab while Molech is the god of Ammon.

406 Jack M. Sasson (Judges 1–12, AB 6D [New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014], 429) mentions this as a possibility, while allowing that Jephthah may well think Chemosh is real.
judge of Israel and the king of Ammon hold in common. Jephthah does not question whether Chemosh exists but rather where his territory ends. There is no indication that the author of this story does not likewise assume that gods apportion land to their peoples.

Later in the Deuteronomistic History we are given the same picture. Even after Israel’s exile, YHWH displays special concern for the land of northern Palestine by sending lions to punish the new residents for worshiping him improperly (2 Kgs 17:24–41; 6th c. BCE?; known by Paul). YHWH’s ownership of the tract of land once ruled by Samaria is the assessment of the Assyrian court (vv. 26–27) and of the

407 So Daniel I. Block (Judges, Ruth, NAC 6 [Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1999], 361): “These arguments would have been understood by all ancient Near Easterners who accepted that each nation had a patron deity whose duty and passion was to care for his people, which included providing them a homeland.” This summarizes a theory he articulates in idem, The Gods of the Nations: Studies in Ancient Near Eastern National Theology, ETSMS 2 (Jackson, Miss.: Evangelical Theological Society, 1988) that there was a commonly recognized triad of deity, people, and land.

408 Although Paul never indisputably alludes to, much less quote, our 2 Kgs, he does quote from the story of Elijah in 1 Kings (19:10, 14, 18) in Rom 11:3-4, and he would have taken 1–2 Kgs to be a unified narrative. The LXX divides 1–2 Sam and 1–2 Kgs as 1–4 Βασιλείων, but if he is reading 1 Kgs he is almost certainly reading 2 Kgs as well. And, in Hebrew versions, the books were still unified. The MT keeps them as one book, and 6QpapKgs (6Q4) includes fragments from both books in what seems to have been one scroll. The date of the final version of 1–2 Kings has to be later than 562–560 BCE, the reign of Evil Merodach, as his liberation of Jehoiachin (2 Kgs 25:27–30) is the last datable event in the work. Often commentators have put 1–2 Kgs sometime in the early post-exilic era, but it is often thought that there were earlier editions during the late monarchy which were updated to bring the account of Judah’s kings to a conclusion. For example, Marvin A. Sweeney (I & II Kings: A Commentary, OTL [Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2007], 1–32) sees exilic, Josianic, and Hezekian editions of 1–2 Kgs. He also contends that they incorporate the dynastic histories of Jehu and Solomon.
narrator (vv. 25, 28). YHWH’s reign on earth is conceived concretely. Some texts expand the territory that the God of Israel’s controls (e.g., 1 Kgs 20:23–34 shows YHWH is not simply “a god of the hills”), yet without negating his particular care for the regions between the Jordan River and the Mediterranean Sea. The divine council around YHWH is well known in the OT, present in the divine “we” at creation (Gen 1:26; 6th / 5th c. BCE; used by Paul), in Micaiah’s prophecy to Ahab and Jehoshaphat (1 Kgs 22:19–22; 6th c. BCE; known by Paul), and in Isaiah’s mighty vision of God’s throne room (Isa 6:1–13; 8th c. BCE; known by Paul).

---

409 See previous footnote. Since 1–2 Kgs were a unity in Paul’s day, everything about 2 Kgs applies to 1 Kgs as well: Paul knows it, and in its final form is ca. 6th c. BCE.

410 Gen 1:26: the “image” language in the Pauline corpus (Rom 8:29; 1 Cor 11:7; 15:49; 2 Cor 3:18; 4:4; Phil 2:6; also Col 1:15; 3:10) is inescapably indebted to Gen 1:26–27. The date of Gen 1, like the rest of the material attributed to P, is hard to place. Suggestions vary from monarchic to post-exilic times, hence the wide range of dates given. 1 Kgs 22:19–22: See previous footnotes on classification and date of 1–2 Kgs. Isa 6:1–13: It is possible that Rom 11:8 derives in part from Isa 6:9–10, but other passages are closer in wording (including Isa 29:10). In any case, Paul quotes from Isaiah several times, so there can be no doubt he knows Isa 6. The date of Isa 6 is among the clearest, since v. 1 tells us that it occurs in the year King Uzziah died. Depending on the correct chronology of Judah’s kings, this is sometime in the 740s BCE.
“Sons of God” and Heavenly Patrons in Second Temple Works

So far all the works considered have been, at the latest, from the early post-exilic period, and all have been from the HB. The idea of heavenly powers ruling the nations does not disappear in the days of the Persians, Greeks, or Romans. Indeed, the references to patron deities over other nations in Deut 32 and elsewhere are comparatively brief. They tease the imagination. Much is left unsaid, entrusting, as it were, expansive treatment to future generations. Future generations did not disappoint.

_Early Enochic Works._ The theme of angelic overseers receives much attention in the early Enochic works, such as the Book of Watchers (= 1 En. 1–36; 4th / 3rd c. BCE; pre-Pauline).\(^{411}\) The tale found in Gen 6:1–4 is foretold to the antediluvian hero Enoch with considerable more detail than its canonical version. The fallen angels bring their technology, and lust, to earth, corrupting the mass of humanity

---

\(^{411}\) It may be that Paul knows the Book of Watchers, but since no allusion is decisive, I prefer to keep it as “pre-Pauline.” All parts of 1 Enoch have been found at Qumran except for the Similitudes (= 1 En. 37–71), and the Book of Watchers is among the earliest parts. Within the Book of Watchers, chs. 6–11, an account of the Watchers’ sin, is the oldest section, later added to, possibly in several stages. So George W. E. Nickelsburg, _1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1–36; 81–108_, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001), 132–34, 169–71, 230, 279, 293.
before the flood.\textsuperscript{412} In this early source, the “Watchers, children of heaven” (1 En. 14:3), like the OT “sons of God,” intermingle with humanity, but their domains are particularly tied to tasks: Azaz’el, various types of weaponry, metalworking, and decoration; Amasras, incantations and horticulture; Kokar’el, signs and astrology; and so forth (1 En. 8).\textsuperscript{413} Still, there are pronounced hints that their oversight includes humanity — God’s indictment of them begins, “It is meet (for you) that you intercede on behalf of man” (1 En. 15:2) — but only Michael is directly said to protect a nation, presumably Israel (1 En. 20:5).\textsuperscript{414}

\textsuperscript{412} Since the emphasis alternates throughout the Book of Watchers, it is often thought that there were originally two origin-of-sin tales, one concerning illicit knowledge and the other concerning illicit sex, and these were woven together to make 1 En. 6–16.

\textsuperscript{413} Their none-fallen counterparts, the archangels, also oversee particular tasks and realms, such as “the spirits of man,” vengeance, and the garden of Eden (1 En. 20).

\textsuperscript{414} The exact wording is uncertain, but all interpretations include a “people” being involved. Isaac ("1 Enoch," 1:24), who works from one ms of the Ethiopic in consultation with other witnesses, translates the phrase “over the people and the nations.” Matthew Black’s edition of the Greek text (\textit{Apocalypsis Henochi Graece}, PVTG [Leiden: Brill, 1970], 32) reads \(\delta\ \epsilon\pi\iota\ \tau\omicron\nu\omicron\ \lambda\alpha\omicron\omicron\ \alpha\gamma\zeta\omicron\omicron\ \tau\omicron\tau\alpha\gamma\mu\nu\omicron\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\pi\iota\ \tau\omicron\\chi\alpha\omega\) (“the one who has been set over the good ones of the people and over the chaos”), with a slight variant listed below. Nickelsburg (1 \textit{Enoch} 1, 294) argues that the original is “the good ones of the people,” taking \(\chi\alpha\omega\) (“chaos”) to be a paleographic mistake for \(\lambda\alpha\omega\) (“people”), and so the whole phrase \(\epsilon\pi\iota\ \tau\omicron\\chi\alpha\omega\) is a reduplication of the earlier phrase “over the good ones of the people.” In any case, Michael is set over God’s people; Nickelsburg (ibid., 295–96) calls him “the patron of Israel.”
In the Animal Apocalypse, which dominates the Maccabean-era Dream Visions (= 1 En. 83–90; 3rd / 2nd c. BCE; pre-Pauline), this theme comes into prominence. At 1 En. 89:59 sheep (representing Israelites) are turned over to seventy shepherds, grouped into four clusters (12 + 23 + 23 + 12). R. H. Charles called their identity “the most vexed question in Enoch.” In the past some maintained that the “shepherds” are human rulers, because that is the common referent of the image in the OT. However, thanks in no small part to Charles’s own research, there is a

---

415 Following Patrick A. Tiller (A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of I Enoch, EJL 4 [Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993], 61–79) and Nickelsburg (1 Enoch 1, 360–61) on the date. Tiller believes the whole work was composed during Maccabean times, esp. 165–160 BCE. Nickelsburg sees the final form as Maccabean, but other parts earlier. Nothing in the Pauline corpus suggests awareness of this section of 1 Enoch, but it does originate some two hundred years before him.


417 The Animal Apocalypse does seem to be the first to identify shepherds with angels. A possible, but doubtful, exception comes in Jer 49:19 and 50:44, verses that are nearly verbatim in wording. In woe oracles against Edom and Babylon, YHWH declares himself to be a lion who will chase these nations from their pasture. At the end of the verse, YHWH taunts, “For who is like me? Who can summon me? Who is the shepherd who can stand before me?” Most likely this is a simple metaphor, but it is not impossible that the would-be shepherds of Edom and Babylon are their angelic patrons, who are vastly inferior to Israel’s patron, YHWH. Outside of these two verses in Jeremiah, “shepherds” in Jewish writings are human rulers, YHWH, or the messiah. In Israelite history Joshua (Num 27:17) and David (2 Sam 5:2; Ps 78:71) qualify as shepherds, in addition to a number of unnamed rulers (2 Sam 7:7; Isa 56:11; 63:11; Mic 5:2, 5). Foreign nobles are “shepherds” (Nah 3:18), and the Persian king Cyrus acts a shepherd to exiled Israel (Isa 44:28). The pre-exilic Jeremiah, exilic Ezekiel, and post-exilic Zechariah capitalize on this imagery and follow a common pattern: the Jewish leaders cum shepherds are corrupt or negligent (Jer 10:21; 12:10; 22:22; 23:1–2; 25:34–36; 50:6; Ezek 34:1–10; Zech 10:2–3; 11:5, 8, 15–17), and YHWH will rebuke and dismiss them to husband the flock himself (Jer 31:10; Ezek 34:11–31). Sometimes the prophet is himself a shepherd (Jer 17:16; Zech
consensus today that they represent angels, the central support of this position being that the imagery of the Animal Apocalypse always uses human forms to depict angels and animal forms to depict humans. The harder question is what the number seventy signifies. Charles, Patrick A. Tiller, and Nickelsburg turn to the seventy years of exile (Jer 25:11–12; 29:10; Dan 9; Zech 1:12; 7:5) as the pattern invoked and conclude that it is a temporal sequence of angelic guardians over Israel. This sense is undeniable, because four groups of shepherds are dispatched.

11:4–14). In the future there is hope for better leaders (Jer 3:15; 23:4); in the case of Ezekiel it is a messianic figure who will mediate God's reign (“my servant David”: Ezek 34:23; also Ezek 37:24), and Jesus at least takes Zech 13:7–9 (“Strike the shepherd . . .”) messianically. Shepherding is a frequent image for YHWH's loving concern for Israel (Gen 49:24; Pss 28:9; 80:1; Ecc 12:11; Isa 40:11; Mic 7:14; Sir 18:13), immortalized in Ps 23 (“The Lord is my shepherd”). The NT, drawing on this imagery, pictures Jesus as a shepherd (Matt 2:6 [= Mic 5:2]; 18:12; 25:32; Matt 26:31 // Mark 14:27 [= Zech 13:7]; John 10:1–21; Heb 13:20; 1 Pet 2:25; 5:4; Rev 7:17), and sometimes adds Christian leaders, too (Acts 20:28; 1 Pet 5:1–3). The pictures painted by these varied passages are not always clear, but in general the shepherds seem to be human rulers, except for the instances in which the imagery is applied to God. Nowhere, except possibly in messianic contexts, are the shepherds supernatural beings other than YHWH. See further Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1, 391.


419 Charles, Book of Enoch, 199–201; Tiller, Animal Apocalypse, 53–60; Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch I, 387–401. Charles gives as the four eras the Assyrian exile of Israel to the return of Judah under Cyrus, then to the conquests of Alexander, to the Seleucid conquests of Palestine, and finally to the messianic kingdom. Tiller has the Babylonian, Persian, Ptolemaic, and Seleucid periods as his four,
over a stretch of time in 1 En. 89–90. However, this may not exhaust the meaning.

Seventy is also the number of nations in Gen 10 (MT), and thus these could be “the angelic patrons of the nations,” a way to speak of four eras during which the gentiles, considered *en masse*, dominate Israel. There are examples, albeit later, for using “seventy” itself as a way to equate angelic rulers with the nations, and in

and Nickelsburg argues that the first period precedes the exile, and then it runs from the return to Alexander, from Alexander to Maccabean times, and finally until the eschaton.

420 I quote Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 68–69. Like Tiller, he has the four eras as the Babylonian, Persian, Ptolemaic, and Seleucid empires. Charles (*Book of Enoch*, 200) allows that there “may be some distant connexion between the seventy angels here and the seventy guardian angels of the Gentile nations,” but he is certain about Jeremiah’s seventy years. Tiller (*Animal Apocalypse*, 53–54, 57–58) agrees with Charles’s assessment, but adds that their role “corresponds in some ways” to patron angels, and he lists the seventy angels as among seven traditions influencing the shepherd imagery. Nickelsburg (1 Enoch 1, 391–95), by contrast, explicitly rejects Gen 10 as the background, in part because his dating for the eras begins before the exile. He does so because he interprets the seventy shepherds to indicate 490 years, which, if the endpoint is ca. 163, the beginning point must be ca. 653, falling during Manasseh’s reign (687–642). So for him the first period of twelve shepherds (1 En. 89:65–72a) represents the slow slide into destruction from Manasseh’s reign to the exile. (Although Charles’s first time period is similar, his focus seems to be on the external oppression of God’s people rather than their internal dysfunction.) This is a plausible suggestion, but there are four difficulties I find with it. First, a number of apocalypses deriving from Daniel envision four heathen powers ruling Israel (however those four are identified), so given the groupings of four here, we expect that they should represent four foreign powers. Second, nothing about these shepherds differs from the fifty-eight who follow, as we would expect if they represent Israelite patrons. Third, even in the first verse of this section the Israelites (sheep) are handed over to foreigners (the lions), which would again minimize some of Judah’s greatest years, not least those of King Josiah. Fourth, his view gives no room for the exile proper, since 1 En. 89:72b (the start of the second period) commences with the rebuilding of the temple. It seems better to side with those who see an instance of exile beginning at 1 En. 89:59, which allows for the possibility that the seventy shepherds represent the seventy patrons of the nations.
any case the raw materials for the association are present.⁴²¹ Deuteronomy 32:8 states that the God apportioned the “number” of the nations according to that of the sons of God: a quick count of Gen 10 would yield seventy. Also, save for Nickelsburg, scholars agree that the rule of the shepherds coincides with gentile domination of Israel, so there is a prima facie reason to expect symbolism of other nations. Further, the shepherds of the apocalypse are agents. The imagery of seventy patron angels merged with the seventy years of exile accounts for this aspect of the pseudepigraphon better than the seventy years alone. In this case the Animal Apocalypse is an early witness to the combination of Gen 10 and Deut 32:8.⁴²² Even if only the seventy years are in view, though, the seventy angels would still be heavenly guardians over Israel, just without reference to Gen 10, Deut 32, and the angelic patrons of nations.⁴²³

⁴²¹ Mentioned elsewhere in this chapter: Tg. Ps.-J. on Deut 32:8 (above) and 3 Enoch (below).


⁴²³ Beyond these two possibilities, no other meaning of seventy is likely. The remaining common uses of the number are these: the family of Jacob that comes to Egypt during the days of Joseph (Gen 46:27; Exod 1:5; Deut 10:22), the eldership of Israel (Exod 24:1, 9; Num 11:16, 24–25; Ezek 8:11), and general pictures of fullness, both chronological (Gen 50:3) and verdant (Exod 15:27; Num 33:9).
If it is granted that Gen 10 and Deut 32 are implied, sheep being given over to seventy shepherds is a way to say that Judah has been handed over to the nations, with the shepherds playing the role of angelic patron to these peoples. Life might not be an unmitigated evil for the sheep under these shepherds (e.g., the temple is rebuilt in 1 En. 89:72), but in the main it is a time of destruction and death.\textsuperscript{424} The shepherds kill sheep by handing them over to unclean beasts (1 En. 89:65, 74), that is, the nations these shepherds rule (e.g., lions, leopards, and boars in 1 En. 89:66; various unclean birds in 1 En. 90:2).\textsuperscript{425} It is not so much that the angels are themselves destroying Jews; rather, they are complicit in the crimes their nations commit. Nonetheless, the God of Israel is in control, even while he bides his time. Other shepherds record the misdeeds of the wicked shepherds (1 En. 89:61-64), and one (Michael?) pleads repeatedly on Israel’s behalf (1 En. 89:76–77; 90:14, 17). In time God raises up a mighty ram on earth (i.e., Judas Maccabees, 1 En. 90:9–12) and destroys the treacherous angels in heaven (1 En. 90:13–19), judging them and

\textsuperscript{424} As Tiller (\textit{Animal Apocalypse}, 38–40) points out, however, the food offered at the second temple is “polluted and impure” (1 En. 89:73), so its construction is not necessarily a holy event in the author’s eyes.

\textsuperscript{425} Tiller (ibid., 28–36) goes so far as to identify particular animals within the work with individual nations, such as foxes with Ammonites, or the kites with the Ptolemies.
casting them into hell (1 En. 90:20–27).\footnote{426} In this section of 1 Enoch we see Deut 32 transmuted into apocalyptic imagery, and the focus shifts away from Israel’s misdeeds and punishment to that of the nations and their heavenly rulers,\footnote{427} but the conception of angels over nations remains.

*Jubilees and Sirach.* The book of Jubilees (2nd c. BCE; pre-Pauline) is an alternate telling of Gen 1:1–Exod 24:18.\footnote{428} Like the above Enochic works, it includes the familiar tale of Watchers who, despite being sent to teach humanity and bring righteousness to earth (Jub. 4:15), abandon their posts, sin with women, with the result that injustice runs rampant across the land. Their punishment it to be

\footnote{426} They are judged at the same time as the stars (the fallen angels of Gen 6). Nickelsburg (*1 Enoch 1*, 403–4) is probably right that they are not thought to be the exact same group, but the judgment moves from the one group right to the next. There at least seems to be a basic continuity between the “watchers” and the “shepherds,” different individuals, but quite possibly the same class of fallen angels.

\footnote{427} Cf. Daniel C. Olson, *A New Reading of the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch: “All Nations Shall Be Blessed,”* SVTP 24 (Leiden: Brill, 2013). Olson argues that the Abrahamic covenant is the proper lens with which to read this pseudepigraphon. At the ultimate culmination of history the boundary of national Israel disappears as a new Israel composed of all nations appears. This puts a positive (and, to speak anachronistically, Pauline!) spin on the writing’s view of the gentiles compared to that of most scholars. He defends his thesis at this point in the text by reasoning that, just as many Israelites in the story are blinded, so also many gentiles are sinners who oppress God’s people (pp. 190–91).

\footnote{428} The most intriguing parallel between Paul and Jub comes with his statement that the law “was ordained through angels by a mediator” (Gal 3:19; similar: Acts 7:53; Heb 2:2). The OT does not recount the law coming through angels, at least not directly, but Jub 1:27–29 does. This parallel notwithstanding, the similarities between Jub and Pauline corpus are too general to indicate any direct textual dependence.
“uprooted from all their dominion” (Jub. 5:6). None of this is surprising given the foregoing, but a particularly jaundiced interpretation of angelic patrons is given in ch. 15, in the midst of the Abrahamic stories (chs. 11–23). Israel benefits from having YHWH, rather than an angel, as their ruler (v. 32), but God entrusted the other nations to the Watchers “so that they might lead them astray from following” the true God (v. 31). Unlike Genesis or 1 Enoch, the Watchers’ sin and the nations straying, coordinate events, are divinely preordained. This is used to lionize Jewish uniqueness and confirm the sanctity of circumcision, entrusted to Abraham as the sign of his covenant with the Lord — incidentally, the same issues with which

---

429 The text here calls them “spirits,” but it is clear from Jub 10:2–9 that they are identical with the Watchers (so O. S. Winternational, “Jubilees,” in OTP, ed. Charlesworth, 2:87). Rather than a negative view of gentiles, Todd R. Hanneken (The Subversion of the Apocalypses in the Book of Jubilees, EJL 34 (Brill: Leiden, 2012), 64–70) contends that this passage instead denies an angelic origin of sin for Israel. Perhaps this is part of the motivation, but given its Maccabean Sitz im Leben, when a number of Jews preferred epispasm to shame or persecution from the Greeks (e.g., 1 Macc 1:15; Josephus, Ant. 12.241), a cynical view of the nations would be fitting (so James L. Kugel, A Walk through Jubilees: Studies in the Book of Jubilees and the World of Its Creation, JSJSup 156 [Leiden: Brill, 2012], 99–100).

430 Jubilees may picture the Watchers trying to gain control over Abraham as well, but failing. In a sense, “Prince Mastema,” the chief of the Watchers, plays the role of the “son of God” Satan from Job 1–2 when, in Jub 17:15–18:19, he incites God to test Abraham’s righteousness at the Akedah, the binding of Isaac. The fallen angel fails, and Abraham’s race retains its unique position under God.
Paul is concerned in Rom 4–5, only Paul binds Israel and the nations under the same problem and solution, while Jubilees rejoices in Israel’s uniqueness.\(^{431}\)

Less pessimistic is the contemporary work, Sirach (2nd c. BCE; pre-Pauline),\(^{432}\) whose quotation is affixed to the beginning of the chapter: “He appointed a ruler for every nation (ἔϑνος), but Israel is the Lord’s own portion” (17:17). Recounting God’s wisdom in creation (Sir 16:24–17:24), Ben Sira celebrates the allocation of each nation to a supernatural “ruler” (ἡγούμενος), but celebrates all the more God’s reserving Israel as a “portion” (μερίς) for himself.\(^{433}\) Most

---

\(^{431}\) If one were to plot Jewish views on universalism and exclusivism in Greco-Roman times, Jacques T. A. G. M. van Ruiten (Abraham in the Book of Jubilees: The Rewriting of Genesis 11:26–25:10 in the Book of Jubilees 11:14–23:8, JSJSup 161 [Leiden: Brill, 2012], 343) concludes, “the book of Jubilees occupies by far the most extreme position on the negative side of the spectrum.”

\(^{432}\) The best evidence that any Paulinist knows Sirach is one part of a quotation in 2 Tim 2:19 (“Let everyone who calls on the name of the Lord turn away from wickedness,” ἀποστήτω ἀπὸ ἀδικίας πᾶς . . .), which NA\(^{28}\) suggests is a quotation from Isa 26:13 and Sir 17:26 (“turn away from iniquity,” ἀπόστρεφε ἀπὸ ἀδικίας). Although similar, the verbs and their forms differ, and ἀπὸ ἀδικίας can be accounted for as a common phrase. The evidence is not sufficient to ensure literary dependence. Since there are a number of other possible allusions, and since Sirach was a popular book in the first century, it would not be surprising if Paul knows it, but I will again be conservative and list it as “pre-Pauline.”

\(^{433}\) It is conceivable that these “rulers” are human, but the weight of evidence is against it. Benjamin G. Wright (Praise Israel for Wisdom and Instruction: Essays on Ben Sira and Wisdom, the Letter of Aristeas and the Septuagint, JSJSup 131 [Leiden: Brill, 2008], 133, 142–46), referencing both Deut 32:9 and 1 Sam 8:4–9 (YHWH, rather than a human king, ought to be the people’s ruler), seems to take this “ruler” as human, since he states that Sir 17:17 creates a theological problem for Israel in light of gentile dominance over the Jewish people. Most commentators, however, take it to imply
commentators agree that the concept derives from Deut 32:8-9, and in fact the longer (and later) recension of the Greek adds, “In dividing the nations of all the earth” before the rest of Sir 17:17, the better to match Deut 32:8a.434

War Scroll. The book of Jubilees was popular with the Qumran community, so it is no surprise to see the same concept at play in various DSS. The clearest example comes in the War Scroll (1QM; also 1Q33, 4Q491–96, possibly other mss; 1st c. BCE / CE; pre-Pauline),435 which sets out an eschatological battle between the angelic patrons — so Skehan and Di Lella, Ben Sira, 283; Johannes Marböck, Jesus Sirach 1–23, HThKAT (Freiburg: Herder, 2010), 217.

434 So Severino Bussino, The Greek Additions in the Book of Ben Sira, trans. Michael Tait, AnBib 203 (Rome: Gregorian & Biblical Press, 2013), 223–26. These mss are referred to as Greek II, and probably date from the 1st c. BCE / CE. They also include vv. 16, 18 on each side of v. 17 (lacking in Greek I and the Hebrew), the latter of which dwells longer on Israel’s special status as “firstborn.”

435 A number of particulars are hard to determine, but the War Scroll seems to have reached its final form around the reign of Herod the Great with earlier, Hellenistic-era editions possible. Although Paul and the DSS are thematically and even verbally similar in places, there is no indication that he knew the War Scroll or any other Qumran-specific writing. The context of war makes it likely that the Scroll was composed during a period of gentile aggression, whether that of Antiochus Epiphanes in the 2nd c. BCE, Pompey in the 1st c. BCE, or Vespasian and Titus in the 1st c. CE — or it could reflect the fear or remembrance of such an invasion. The Scroll is dependent on Dan 11–12, which means it must at least post-date ca. 160 BCE. Yigael Yadin (The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness, trans. Batya Rabin and Chaim Rabin [London: Oxford University Press, 1962], 18–197, 243–46) has argued at length that Roman weaponry and formations are assumed by the Scroll (pp. 18–197), which he argued would push the work at least into the 1st c. BCE (pp. 243–46). However, not all have been convinced that it is Roman, and Russell Gmirkin (“The War Scroll and Roman Weaponry Reconsidered,” DSD 3 [1996]: 89–129) counters that it reflects earlier, 2nd c. BCE Roman military tactics, known by Jews from the Hasmonean-Latin connections.
“sons of light,” the righteous Israel, and the “sons of darkness,” the Kittim or gentiles.436 The former is called “God’s people” (עם אל) (1QM III.13),437 while the

436 It is not clear if “sons of light” is coterminous with every Israelite, at least those not apostate, or a restricted community of Israelites, perhaps as small as the Qumran community itself. The term is paired with the specific tribes of Levi, Judah, and Benjamin (1QM I.1–7) and later Israel in general, often led by the Levites (1QM II.7; III.13–17; V.1–2). The “sons of darkness” includes an impressive array of gentile nations: Edom, Moab, Ammon, Philistia, the “Kittim of Ashur” (Seleucids?), the “Kittim in Egypt” (Ptolemies?), and the “sons of Japhet” (father, roughly, of European peoples) (1QM I.1–7); Aram-Naharaim, Lud, Aram, Uz, Hul, Togar, Mesha, Arpachsad, Assyria, Persia, Elam, Ishmael, Ketura, “all the sons of Ham” and of Japhet (1QM II.10–14); the “seven peoples of futility” (i.e., the Canaanite nations) (1QM XI.8–9); Assyria, Japhet, and the Kittim (1QM XVIII.2); Kittim, Assyria, and the goyim (1QM XIX.10).

437 More descriptive is 1QM X.9–11: “who (is) like your nation, Israel, whom you chose for yourself from among all the nations of the earth, a nation of holy ones of the covenant, learned in the law, wise in knowledge, [. . .] hearers of the glorious voice, seers of the holy angels, with opened ears, hearing profound things?”
latter is often called the “lot” (גורל) or “army” (חיל) of Belial (1QM I.1 passim). The ensuing struggle implicates both mortals and immortals. Near the outset of the Scroll, we see “the assembly of the gods (אלים) and the congregation of men” fighting, and we hear “the shout of gods (אלים) and of men” (1QM I.10–11). The tide of battle flows back and forth, until “God’s great hand will subdue [Belial, and al] the angels (מלאכים) of his dominion and all the men of [his lot]” (1QM I.14–15). The heavenly and earthly wars coordinate in a specific way. God gives victory “to exalt the sway of Michael above all the gods (אלים), and the dominion of Israel over all flesh” (1QM XVII.7–8). This line, otherwise cryptic, fits with participatory domains: Israel is given power over all nations, just as their heavenly patron Michael

---

438 The at once angelic and human levels of the battle is clear through the battle scenes, both in cols. I–II and throughout cols. XV–XVIII, and it is implicit elsewhere, too, as in the thanksgiving afterward (cols. XVIII–XIX). In between the war sections there are brief descriptions of battle also, but most of it concerns the proper cultic and military preparation for battle, such as the proper trumpets (cols. II–III), banners (cols. III–V), formations (cols. V–IX), and cultic and military matters intermixed (cols. IX–XV), with occasional reference to battle. As they appear in the final version of 1QM, these sections are not meant as a digression. The reason for purity is given in 1QM VII.6, “the holy angels are together with their [i.e., the Jewish] armies.” The community believed that proper piety influenced the results of the heavenly war, and they participated in God’s ultimate victory as much by offering sacrifices as by brandishing swords.

439 In fact, in the Geza Vermes ET of the DSS in Marquette’s library (Vermes, Complete DSS, 181), an unknown reader has underlined this verse in pencil and scribbled “?” in the margin.
obtains his status above other gods.\textsuperscript{440} The War Scroll consolidates, on the one side, all nations, their kings, their heavenly patrons (the “assembly of gods”), as one massive army under Belial, and on the other side, YHWH, Michael and the angels, the Chief Priest and Levites, and righteous Israel. In this case a second heavenly tier, and a fourth overall, is added to the domains (implicit elsewhere, e.g., in Job 1–2), since Belial is over the “sons of God,” like YHWH is over Michael and other angels.\textsuperscript{441}

\textsuperscript{440} Hence Carmignac (\textit{La règle}, 240) speaks of the author putting “en paralélisme l’empire de Micaël sur les êtres divins et la domination d’Israël sur toute chair,” and Duhaime (“War Scroll,” 86) of the earthly communities as “human counterparts to these supernatural beings.” Similar: Schultz, \textit{Conquering the World}, 244.

\textsuperscript{441} The Scroll is not an isolated case. The language of “sons of darkness and light” and “lots of Belial and God” is scattered throughout the DSS, and the conviction that battles are fought in heaven as on earth is also common. Duhaime (“War Scroll,” 88) lists a number of examples from the DSS. Two other traits found in the DSS are worth noting. (1) The language of demonic and angelic “lots” can be tied to “sons of God” texts from earlier Jewish Scriptures. In 11QMelch, the title character and “[his] arm[ies, the na]tion of the holy ones of God” oppose “Belial and the spirits of his lot,” and these beings are interpreted as the “gods” of Ps 82:1 — later called “sons of God,” evidence of the ongoing visibility of this class of divine beings in Roman times — as well as the “peoples” of Ps 7:8–9 (11Q19 II.9–14). This again suggests patron deities set over nations using the concept of “sons of God.” This angelic understanding of Melchizedek is blended with messianic terms as well, using Isa 52:7 (“How beautiful . . . the messenger who announces peace”) and Dan 9:25 (“an anointed, a prince”) (11Q19 II.15–25). (2) The language of lots can be tied to the Watchers tradition. In 4QVision of Amram\textsuperscript{b} ar, humanity is divided between two beings ruling the lots of darkness and light (4Q544 1). The document is fragmentary, but the evil angel is called a “Watcher” and is named מָלֵךְ רְשֵׁע, “king of evil” (4Q544 2).
Revelation. The bellicose scenes described in 1QM will remind many of John’s Apocalypse (late 1st c. CE; contemporary to Paul), particularly Rev 12:7–12. This work brings us closest to Paul, chronologically and socially, since it is also by a first-century Christian Jew. In the middle of ch. 12, a war breaks out in heaven when a fearsome dragon, “that ancient serpent, who is called the Devil and Satan, the deceiver of the whole world” (v. 9), tries to scale heaven’s heights, but is repulsed by Michael and is subsequently cast down to earth (vv. 7–9). At this heavenly victory a hymn is sung. It celebrates that Satan, the “accuser,” can no longer accuse believers in God’s presence (v. 10). It encourages those in heaven to rejoice, since the devil has lost his place, but those below to lament and fear, since he has fallen to earth enraged (v. 12). In the surrounding context, both the heavenly scene and the rest of the hymn, the triumph comes by one of two powers, either by Michael’s sword (vv. 7–9) or by God’s design united with the Messiah’s authority (v. 10). It is an almost unanimous conviction that these two actions coincide: Michael defeats Satan when

[442] The debate over the date of Rev concerns which emperor is targeted by the imagery. The majority of scholars opt for Domitian (CE 81–96), but some defend Nero (CE 54–68), or at least argue that some portion of the work has this earlier setting: e.g., David E. Aune, Revelation, 3 vols., WBC 52 (Dallas and Nashville: Word and Nelson, 1997–1998), 1:lvi–lxx. Harder to place is the exact relation of John the seer’s sect of Christianity compared to that of Johannine and Pauline Christianity. Craig R. Koester (Revelation, AB 38A [New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014], 80–85) gives a good, brief overview of similarities and differences, but for the present it is important only that another early Christian utilizes something like participatory domains.
Jesus dies on the cross and raises in victory. Assuming this is correct, there is already a heavenly and earthly component to the battle, insofar as Jesus the Jew died a mortal death outside Jerusalem while Michael the celestial commander fought Satan on high. But it is not obvious that any particular community is involved. That aspect comes in v. 11: “[the martyrs] have conquered [Satan] by the blood of the Lamb and by the word of their testimony, for they did not cling to life even in the face of death” (v. 11). The believers join in the victory of Jesus and the archangel, defeating the earthly powers hostile to them — Rome and a society often mistrustful of this fledgling sect. In some ways the song appears to be an intrusion into the

---

443 So, e.g., G. B. Caird, A Commentary on the Revelation of St. John the Divine, HNTC (New York: Harper & Row, 1966), 153–54 (“Michael’s victory is simply the heavenly and symbolic counterpart of the earthly reality of the Cross”); Wilfrid J. Harrington, Revelation, SP 16 (Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1993), 133 (“although Michael is represented as casting Satan out of heaven, it really is the victory of Christ. . . . Everything that John sees in heaven is the counterpart of some earthly reality”); Mitchell G. Reddish, Revelation, SHBC (Macon, Ga.: Smyth & Helwys, 2001), 235 (“the defeat of Satan occurs at the death of Christ, not at some point in primeval history”); but cf. Grant R. Osborne, Revelation, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002), 469–71 (the “primordial fall is the primary thrust,” although past, present, and the eschaton may be telescoped together); Koester tentatively agrees with the majority view, calling it the “most plausible” interpretation, the others being that this is a flashback to primeval history or that it flashes forward to Satan’s eschatological fall. The difficulty with either of those is that there is no indications that the timeframe has changed. The vision in ch. 12 moves from Satan’s heavenly attack on the woman and her messianic child (vv. 1–6), his defeat by Michael and the hymn of praise (vv. 7–12), and his rage against believers on earth (vv. 13–17, continued in subsequent chapters). (Revelation, 550–51).

444 E.g., Richard Bauckham (The Theology of the Book of Revelation, NTTh [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993], 75–76) argues that their conquering “by the blood of the Lamb” envisions their blood mingling with Jesus’s, that their deaths merge into his, and Adela Yarbro Collins
narrative, but it is a common strategy of John first to give a traditional scene before interpreting it messianically, alternating between the visual and oral (e.g., Rev 5:5–6; 7:4, 9), and the other two verses of the hymn do just that: v. 10 (“the accuser . . . has been thrown down”) explains v. 9 (“Satan . . . was thrown down to the earth”) as does v. 12 (“But woe to the earth and the sea, for the devil has come down to you”).

The merging of the angelic war, the Christ event, and martyrs' victory is deliberate. The exact lineaments of the merging are not evident, but at minimum it occurs both in heaven and on earth, and it involves a principal angel, the Messiah, and a corporate group, which indicates some type of participatory domain, either the “supra-human” domain (Jesus and Michael ruling) or possibly a tripartite one (Michael in heaven, the messianic people on earth, and Jesus ascending from earth to heaven).

(\textit{The Apocalypse}, NTM 22 [Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1991], 88) writes, “The victory song of vss. 10–12 makes clear that the Apocalypse associates the story of Satan’s rebellion with the trials the first readers must undergo.”

\footnote{445} So Caird, \textit{Commentary on Revelation}, 153; Bauckham, \textit{Theology of Revelation}, 73–78; Reddish, \textit{Revelation}, 235. Reddish goes so far as to call the hymn the “key to John’s understanding of this scene.”

\footnote{446} Reddish, \textit{Revelation}, 236–37: “The apocalyptic worldview conceived of earthly realities having heavenly counterparts,” citing Michael’s role in Dan 10. Yet v. 11 adds “the contribution of the
Heaven and earth mirror each other throughout Revelation, and often individual figures above stand for communities below. The churches each have their own angel in chs. 2–3, for example, and chs. 17–22 are dominated by Babylon the Harlot and New Jerusalem the Bride, supernatural images of individual women that stand for cities and between them encompass all humanity. Closer by is the cosmic woman (“clothed with the sun, with the moon under her feet, and on her head a crown of twelve stars,” Rev 12:1), who symbolizes the people of God understood in light of Christ (“her children” are “those who keep the commandments of God and hold the testimony of Jesus,” v. 17), a vision that bookends Michael’s victory. The woman is pursued by this same dragon, first in heaven (Rev 12:1–6), and then after his loss to Michael, on earth (Rev 12:13–17). In these cases the role of the earthly community is more pronounced.

---

447 Koester (Revelation, 542–43) divides interpretations of the woman into four categories: the people of God before and after Jesus’s birth; the Christian church; Mary; and the Jewish community. Since she gives birth to the heavenly child (i.e., the Messiah), it is hard to think of her strictly as the church, but since her children are followers of Jesus, it is hard to think of her strictly as the Jewish community or as Mary, too. It is best to combine approaches. The woman represents a sectarian understanding of God’s people, the “true Israel” so to speak, limited to the messianic community after Jesus’s advent.
Yet 12:7–12 remains the best example of participatory domains in Revelation for two reasons. First, in many of the other cases it is possible, if not probable, that the heavenly beings are intended as personifications only, or perhaps as symbols from mythology that are put to a new purpose by John. For example, the tale of the heavenly woman whose offspring is pursued by a malignant serpent comes from a common stock of folklore, such as Python trying to slay Leto’s son Apollo.448 It may be that John has in mind demons as he retells pagan stories, but he could instead intend them as fictitious representations, evocative images, and nothing more. With Rev 12:7–12, however, this cannot be the case. Michael and Satan must be intended as real angels, if for no other reason than everywhere else in Jewish literature, including Revelation (e.g., 2:9, 13, 24; 3:9; 20:2, 7), they are living spirits with a palpable effect on earthly matters. The other reason for choosing Rev 12:7–12 is that it gathers together an impressive collection of significant traditions that we have been tracing: primeval history (“the serpent”); Satan and the “sons of God” (via “the

---

accuser” of Job 1–2); Michael as patron angel (e.g., Book of Watchers and War Scroll); and, of course, the Messiah.\textsuperscript{449}

More than the other writings surveyed, Revelation is close to the War Scroll. In both cases there is a war on two planes of reality; a chief demon with his angels is defeated by Michael with his angels; and humanity is divided between the two camps, good and evil, that correspond to these angelic champions.\textsuperscript{450} In both cases also, God elevates Michael above his demonic rival, which demonstrates the disproportion of the dualism, that Belial / Satan is not even Michael’s equal, let alone God’s.\textsuperscript{451} Finally, the righteous community seems to be a sectarian redefinition of Israel, restricted to those who understand the true essence of God’s people. To be sure, there are differences between Qumran and the seer: for Revelation there is a lag between the heavenly victory and its realization on earth that does not seem to mark

\textsuperscript{449} In his comments on Rev 12:7–12, as well as his excursus on the archangel Michael, Aune (\textit{Revelation}, 2:691–703) mentions these themes, listing passages such as Dan 7–12; 1QM; Job 1–2, as well as Deut 32:8; Ps 82; the Book of Watchers; Jubilees; and 11QMelchizedek, among many others. He states that the proper background for the war in heaven is the “conception in the OT and early Judaism, widely adopted in early Christianity, that each nation on earth was presented in heaven by an angelic being” (p. 2:691).

\textsuperscript{450} To be precise, in Rev 12:7–12 we only see the community that is associated with Michael, the martyrs who probably stand for all Christians. However, the dragon is developed in the rest of Rev 12–13, 17–20, to rule Rome and all nations.

\textsuperscript{451} Well noted by Osborne, \textit{Revelation}, 469.
the War Scroll, and while the Kittim of 1QM are constantly aggressors, the entrance of nations into the New Jerusalem in Rev 21:24, 26; 22:2 moderates the negative picture of gentiles in the Apocalypse. Nonetheless, near the same time as Paul, coming from similar apocalyptic communities bursting with messianic expectations, the War Scroll and Revelation again picture salvation as the triumph of righteous Israel and its patron Michael over an antagonistic demon and the rest of humanity.

*Later Works.* The theme continues well past Paul’s lifetime. For example, the *merkabah* Jewish work 3 Enoch or Seper Hekalot (5th/6th c. CE; post-Pauline) is a tour of the heavens given to R. Ishmael. In it the highest angel Metatron, who is the ascended Enoch (3 En 4–15) and “Prince of the Divine Presence” (3 En 3:1, etc.) bears “seventy names, corresponding to the seventy nations of the world” (3 En 3:2). Later, in the seventh heaven there are seventy-two “princes of the kingdoms” (3 En 18:2-3), and the heavenly law court includes seventy-two “princes of the kingdoms in the world, not counting the Prince of the World, who speaks in favor of

---

452 There is debate whether Revelation does in fact envision the nations joining the redeemed people. See most thoroughly Allan J. McNicol, *The Conversion of the Nations in Revelation*, LNTS 438 (London: T&T Clark, 2011). McNicol concludes that they are, in fact, converted.

453 Andrei A. Orlov (*The Enoch-Metatron Tradition*, TSAJ 107 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005]) traces the development of Metatron from the Mesopotamian figure Enmeduranki to Enoch’s role in the early Enochic works through 3 Enoch (pp. 86–147). His primary focus is 2 Enoch.
the world before the Holy One” (3 En 30:2). In this work as elsewhere, Michael is the “Prince of Israel” (3 En 44:10).

The concept of guardian angels protecting nations can be found in rabbinic literature at least as late as Exodus Rabbah (10th c. CE; post-Pauline). Besides Num. Rab. 9:14 (mentioned above), this — the other explicit use of Deut 32:8 in the Midrash Rabbah — supports an angelic interpretation of the Song of Moses. Its reasoning is dense, in part because it offers its solution as the last in a long sequence of possible explanations for Exod 23:20 (“I am going to send an angel in front of you”). A sage notes that in Deut 32:8–9 God had once kept Israel for himself, but now he is entrusting them instead to a guardian angel, and this puts the people on par with other nations. Although the end of Deut 32:8, which contains the phrase “sons of God,” is not quoted (it skips from the middle of Deut 32:8 to 32:9), the

454 The “seventy-two” instead of “seventy” owes to LXX Gen 10. Also, 3 En explicitly builds on Dan 7:10 for the law-court imagery, indicating that early medieval Jews read Dan 7 as a vision of angelic patrons over nations. (See next section.)

455 Hugo Odeberg (3 Enoch: Or, the Hebrew Book of Enoch, LBS [New York: Ktav, 1973], 147–70) divides the angelology of 3 En into three originally independent angelic sections (ch. 17, ch. 18, and chs. 19–22 with 25:1–28:6) and three other streams found in the rest of the work. If he is correct in this, the concept of angelic patrons stems from one of the three original sections, but by the final version of 3 En it has worked itself throughout.

456 The verse is taken to be a consequence of the golden calf incident (Exod 32), despite preceding it textually. God sending an angel is a punishment, not promise.
interpretation assumes supra-human participatory domains over nations.\footnote{Ps 82 (specifically v. 7: “you shall die like mortals”), one of the other “sons of God” passages, is quoted immediately prior to this discussion of guardian angels for the gentiles. Rabbinic literature has a penchant for linking texts by a common word or phrase, so perhaps “sons of God” has brought Ps 82 and Deut 32 together, even if it is not specifically mentioned.}

According to Exodus Rabbah, by worshiping another god, Israel forfeited its special protection by YHWH, and was dropped to the status of other nations by receiving only an angelic patron.

**Answering Two Objections**

There is, then, from the monarchy to Paul’s day and later a tradition of participatory domains associated with the “sons of God,” although different images are sometimes used. No matter the name given, though, it always concerns divine or angelic patrons over the nations, with Israel represented either by YHWH or the chief angel.

I can imagine two potential objections to participatory domains, which I will consider briefly.

*Participatory Domains Elsewhere.* First, it might be thought that participatory domains only apply to angels or gods, and thus the category is ill fitting for Adam and Christ. In this case we might turn to the “one like a son of man” in Dan 7:13 and
the cluster of traditions associated with it, especially the role of the eschatological judge, that became prevalent by the first century.458 Within Dan 7 the parallelism indicates that the human-like figure, who receives authority over the bestial figures, represents the people of Israel (cf. vv. 13–14 and vv. 22, 27), just as the beasts themselves represent pagan nations.459 Here we have a heavenly figure, a corporate group, and their conjoined destinies. The main uncertainty involved is whether the “one like a son of man” is a mere personification of the people or whether the prophet believes the figure exists as some sort of heavenly being.460 The latter seems

458 It is also in Daniel that a final reference to the “sons of God” comes, in the earlier portion, when a mysterious בר־אלהין joins the three Hebrew youth in the fiery furnace in Dan 3:25. Evidently, this is an angelic figure, perhaps a guardian angel.

459 This may be a subtle allusion to Gen 1:26–27 or Ps 8: humankind is meant to rule the animals, and thus balance is being restored by the Ancient of Days in this vision.

460 E.g., for Maurice Casey (Son of Man: The Interpretation and Influence of Daniel 7 [London: SPCK, 1979], 25) the one like a son of man “. . . is a pure symbol, that is to say, he is not a real being who exists outside Daniel's dream; he is only a symbolic being within the dream.” Casey gives two reasons. First, the climax of the interpretation comes in v. 27, but no mention of the human-like figure reappears, and thus we should not expect that the figure is some messianic savior. He has no role at the critical juncture. His second argument is from consistency: we do not take the beast-like figures to be real entities, and thus should not take the human-like figure as one either. Although both Jews and Christians would come to identify the “Son of Man” as the messiah, “The author evidently thought that in interpreting the man-like figure as the Saints of the Most High he was making his meaning clear.” In a more recent work (The Solution to the “Son of Man” Problem, LNTS 343 [London: T&T Clark, 2007], 82), he considers how Dan 7 is developed after the original prophet, he explicitly says he has not changed his view. By contrast, John J. Collins (Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel, Hermeneia [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993], 318) judges the
the more likely.\textsuperscript{461} In any case, in Dan 8–12 the angels are clearly actors on the scene, being moved by Daniel’s plea and intervening to restore Israel.\textsuperscript{462}

\textsuperscript{461} There are several indicators of this point. First, the existence of God and the angelic court (vv. 9–10) are not to be doubted, so there is no reason to doubt the beasts (vv. 2–8, 11–12) or “son of man” (vv. 13–14). The quality of the descriptions are much the same, and the action flows from the beasts to God, back to the beasts, and then ends with God and the “son of man.” One must invent seams in this narrative to partition off some of these actors as real and others a personified. Second, there is good precedent for heavenly beings taking strange forms, with the composite nature of the image indicating that the being transcends human reason. The descriptions of God, the angels, the beasts, and the “son of man” are poetic, to be sure, but the repetition of “like” displays skepticism about the competence of language to describe the divine realm, not about the existence of the beings themselves (as in the description of God in Ezek 1:26–28). Third, at various points in Dan 8–12 the prophet pictures angels in language similar to the “son of man” in Dan 7. Gabriel comes “having the appearance of a man” (8:15), is later called simply “the man Gabriel” (9:21). Later, Daniel sees either Gabriel or another angel as “a man clothed in linen, with a belt of gold from Uphaz around his waist,” beaming like jewels and lightning (10:5–6; see also 12:5–7). As we will consider momentarily, Dan 8–12 without doubt portrays the angelic figures as real beings, so to the degree Dan 7 comes from the same mindset (if not the same individual’s mind), we can read imagery back into Dan 7.

\textsuperscript{462} As indicated in the footnote above, it is unclear if Dan 8–12 is written by the same individual as Dan 7, but it at least comes from nearly the same point in time (the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes) and from the same community. Since the same cast of characters appear in Dan 8–12, at minimum it is the earliest interpretation of Dan 7. The role of the angels is particularly evident in the final vision (Dan 10–12). There are at least four heavenly figures: an \textit{angelus interpres}, Michael (Dan 10:13, 21), and the “princes” of Persia (Dan 10:13, 20) and Greece (Dan 10:20). These four beings must all be of the same basic type, two antagonistic towards Israel and two supportive, because the princes delay the interpreting angel twenty-one days until Michael comes to his aid (Dan 10:13), and later the two angels do battle against the princes (Dan 10:20–11:1). Given what has preceded in Dan 7–9, it is easy to identify the prince of Persia with the winged, four-headed leopard (Dan 7:6) and the two-horned ram (Dan 8:3–4), and the prince of Greece with the terrifying fourth beast (Dan 7:7–8) and the many-horned goat (Dan 8:5–14). Following the same logic, Michael is probably to be paired with the “one like a son of man” in Dan 7, and the now anonymous interpreting angel with Gabriel (named in Dan 8:16; 9:21). The heavenly wars, first with the prince of Persia and then of Greece, foretell the wars on earth, recounted at length in chapter 11. So again there are earthly communities
But at this point, the mediator is still an angel. The “one like the son of man” is angelic, probably Michael specifically. Over the intervening centuries, however, the “son of man” is increasingly identified with an ideal human figure. This is not to say that there was a defined “son of man” concept, nor that the phrase operated as a title, both of which have been contested for some time. Rather, many Jews of the Second Temple period were influenced by Dan 7, either its “son of man” language or its vision of an eschatological judgment scene, and they uses these images to describe a messianic role.

This is true of the four evangelists, albeit in different ways, especially when Jesus predicts the coming of the “Son of Man” with power and great glory, both before his trial (Matt 24:29–31; Mark 13:24–27) and at it (Matt 26:63–64; Mark 14:61–62). It is also true of John’s Apocalypse (Rev 1:12–16; 14:14–16) and of Stephen’s speech in the Acts of the Apostles (Acts 7:55–56). Outside of Christian circles, the Danielic “son of man” figure plays the leading role in the penultimate coordinating with heavenly beings, but in this case it is evident that the angels must be more than symbols. For one thing, Michael is named, and it is hard to doubt that he is thought to be a real being. For another, heaven and earth affect each other: Daniel’s prayer brings an angelic response (Dan 10:1–14), and Michael’s intervention on behalf of Israel is what brings victory on earth (Dan 12:1–12). John E. Goldingay (Daniel, WBC 30 [Dallas: Word, 1989], 306) describes Michael here as Israel’s “representative in the heavenly court who fights its battles, legal and military.”
vision of 4 Ezra (ch. 13; for Dan 7, see especially vv. 1–4, 11; for messianic import, vv. 25–38). The image is recurrent, but it seems to have detached from an angelic mediator and become associated instead with an ideal human, the messiah, although the two categories permit overlap.

The clearest use of the “son of man” as a messiah associated with a community comes in the Similitudes of Enoch (1 En. 37–71; late 1st c. BCE / early 1st c. CE). There is a certain complexity to the heavenly protagonist, as he is variously called the “Elect One,” “Righteous One,” “Messiah,” and “Son of Man” — and the wording of the last is not consistent in the Ethiopic. Nonetheless, he is an ideal type of Davidic king, fighting God’s war against the oppressive empires. His community shares in his attributes: forty times they are called “righteous” and

---

463 The Similitudes have been dated to vastly different eras in the past half century, but there is a growing consensus for its composition near the end of Herod the Great’s reign. So Nickelsburg and VanderKam, 1 Enoch 2, 58–63.

464 James C. VanderKam (“Righteous One, Messiah, Chosen One, and Son of Man in 1 Enoch 37–71,” in The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity, ed. James H. Charlesworth [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992], 169–91) analyzes the various names and synthesizes the composite picture given of the figure. The reliance of the Similitudes on Dan 7 is most apparent in the opening of ch. 46, where the “Head of Days” has hair white as wool and another individual in appearance like a human is called the “Son of Man.” In case the allusion is missed, in the next chapter books are opened in a courtroom setting as God sits on his throne of glory (1 En. 47:3).
“elect” thirty times. The naming of the community accords with their association with the messiah, and they share in his eternal reign (1 En. 39:6; 45:1–6; 49:1–50:5; 51:4–5; 53:6; 61:5; 62:7–8, 12–16) and find support in him (1 En. 48:4, 7). As in Dan 10–12, the battles on earth correspond to battles in heaven in 1 En. 56:5–57:3, and like the prophet’s prayer in Dan 10, so here the petitions of the martyrs prevail upon God to act in 1 En. 47. More could be said about the matter, but the foregoing is sufficient to indicate that by the first century the Danielic imagery of an eschatological “son of man” had transferred from angelic to messianic meaning.

The “son of man” participatory domains, compared to that of the “sons of God,” are something of a shoot from the same tree — or better, a cutting, taken from its original soil and transplanted elsewhere. Again heavenly mediators rule the peoples of the earth, but in time the “son of man” mediator became an ideal human

---


466 Sometimes salvation is instead particularly associated with God, the Lord of Spirits, as in ch. 58. Contrariwise, those who fail to recognize the Son of Man are damned (esp. 1 En. 62). In fact, the first issue considered after the introduction is the salvation of the elect ones when the Righteous One appears, and the annihilation of the rulers who refused to acknowledge God (ch. 38), and the third and final parable ends similarly (1 En. 69:27–29).
type, the messiah. Other versions existed beyond these two, but the first objection has been met: participatory domains are not exclusive to angelic mediators.

**Participatory Domains in Paul.** The second objection I imagine is whether the construct of participatory domains applies to Paul. As a Second Temple Jew, of course, he would share in many of the assumptions of his time. Beyond that, though, there is positive evidence that he thinks of Jesus Christ in terms of a heavenly patron reigning over a people who stands over against the gods over other nations. This can be deduced in particular from 1 Corinthians. “For just as the body is one and has many members, and all the members of the body, though many, are one body,” Paul writes to the Corinthian church, “so it is with Christ. For in the one Spirit we were all baptized into one body — Jews or Greeks, slaves or free — and we were all made to drink of one Spirit” (1 Cor 12:12–13). To be in the body of Christ is, on one level, to join a new people.

---

467 This language is reminiscent of one of Paul’s most famous declarations, “As many of you as were baptized into Christ have clothed yourselves with Christ. There is no longer Jew or Greek, there is no longer slave or free, there is no longer male and female; for all of you are one in Christ Jesus. And if you belong to Christ, then you are Abraham’s offspring (σπέρμα), heirs according to the promise” (Gal 3:27–29). To the Corinthians he speaks of being members of the body of Christ, and to the Galatians he uses the metaphor of clothing, but the emphasis in both cases is oneness in Christ through baptism. It is a oneness that, according to J. Louis Martyn (“Apocalyptic Antinomies in Paul’s Letter to the Galatians,” *NTS* 31 [1985]: 410–24) tears down the fundamental building blocks constituting humankind that were taken for granted in the ancient world (e.g., races, classes, and
The “body of Christ” was not merely a moralistic commonplace, an image for unity in diversity purchased secondhand from earlier ethicists. We have good reason to think that Paul believed there to be some real ontological presence of the risen Messiah in his churches, as is evident from the earlier discussion of food sacrificed to idols and Eucharist. First Corinthians 8:1–13 agrees in principle with the “strong” of Corinth that idol meat and temple meals are matters of indifference for the Christian (hence v. 8: “Food will not bring us close to God. We are no worse off if we do not eat, and no better off if we do”), but the primary goal is to shift the perspective of the “strong” in Corinth to the possibly irreparable effect on their eating might have on the “weak.” The topic returns in ch. 10, but now the point is the incompatibility of idol worship and communion. The prohibitions grow stronger. Now the Corinthians are to “flee from the worship of idols” (1 Cor 10:14), lest they fall under the same condemnation as the exodus generation, with the reasoning that sacred meals constitute participation in the deity with which they are associated (using κοινωνία, κοινωνός, and μετέχω).
Paul walks a fine line between opposing idolatry while not indulging every scruple about food. This is interesting on its own terms, but Paul’s underlying logic is even more important. Near the outset of the question of idolatry he puts his coming argument within this framework:

Hence, as to the eating of food offered to idols, we know that “no idol in the world really exists,” and that “there is no God but one.” Indeed, even though there may be so-called gods in heaven or on earth — as in fact there are many gods and many lords — yet for us there is one God, the Father, from whom are all things and for whom we exist, and one Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom are all things and through whom we exist. (1 Cor 8:4–6)

Given only these verses we might think that Paul completely agrees with the monotheism of the “strong.” Paul approvingly cites their phrases “no idol in the world really exists” (οὐδὲν εἰδωλον ἐν κόσμῳ) and “there is no God but one” (οὐδεὶς θεὸς εἷς). In v. 5 he calls them “so-called gods” (λεγόμενοι θεοί), and most modern translations take v. 6 to cast doubt on the reality of the “gods” and “lords” by placing them in quotation marks.468

However, in 1 Cor 10:20–21 the idols are “demons” (δαιμόνια) and one who partakes in idol meat shares in a demon just as much as a communicant of the bread and wine shares in Christ. Certainly, Paul grants, idols are not the true God (especially 1 Cor 10:19–20), but they are spiritual powers. Thus the NRSV is

468 E.g., RSV: “as indeed there are many ‘gods’ and many ‘lords’ ” (also NAB, ESV, NIV).
probably right to drop the quotation marks around Ἁεόι and κύριοι in 1 Cor 8:5. After accommodating to the Corinthian strong by calling the gods “so-called,” Paul clears his throat and articulates his position more directly. There are indeed many gods and lords in both heaven and earth which are neither empty fictions nor true sovereignties. They are inferior to the God and Lord of Christians, but are nonetheless are real beings. This is not the exclusive monotheism of one God alone in the skies, but a qualified monotheism or henotheism, with one God ruling over a myriad of spiritual powers. And the phrase “but for us” (ἀλλὰν Ἡμῖν) signals the allegiance of a people to its sovereign, to the one God and the one Lord Jesus Christ.

When writing his letter to the Corinthians, then, Paul articulates a version of participatory domains. The one God and one Lord are the patrons of the Christian community, while in a certain sense other “lords” and “gods” exist, but they are alien

469 My exegesis of 1 Cor 8 can accommodate several different views. For example, Hurtado (One God, 1–2, 97–99) begins with this passage and analyzes it again later in his work in order to demonstrate the binitarian shape of early Christian thought within a non-exclusivist Jewish monotheism. Meanwhile M. David Litwa (We Are Being Transformed: Deification in Paul’s Soteriology, BZNW 187 [Berlin: de Gruyter, 2012], 239–57) places Paul’s thought within wider Greek thinking of the divine. He prefers the terminology of “(political) summodeism,” in which YHWH is “the imperial ‘high God,’ who shares his divine power with the hierarchically subordinate Gods below him” (pp. 239–40). Allegiance of a political type is basic to his model, and he also uses 1 Cor 8 at several points to support it (e.g., p. 248).
deities for believers. Further, to be baptized into Christ is, on the deepest level, to leave behind other ethnic and social affiliations.

**Conclusion**

The idea of patron gods or angels ruling nations, often by the name “sons of God,” is a long and ongoing tradition, at least as old as the Israelite monarchy and as late as the Middle Ages, and thus one that was alive in Paul’s day. Direct evidence of this can be found in the War Scroll and Revelation, both written within decades of the apostle. In the Pentateuch and Wisdom books, as well as the Former and Latter Prophets, later traditions in the Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, the DSS, and rabbinic texts, many Israelites, followed by Jews and Christians both, saw these “sons of God” as either gods or angels, supernatural beings charged by the Creator God with watching over the nations.

In most cases the participatory domain in evidence is the supra-human model, though occasionally a tripartite model occurs. In a few instances, a fourth

---

470 For example, YHWH, Jephthah, and Israel against Chemosh, the king, and Ammon in Jdg 11, or Michael, the Aaronic priest, and the “sons of light” against Belial and his angels, gentile kings, and the “sons of darkness” in the War Scroll.
level opens up, when Satan or Belial rules the fallen “sons of God” or “Watchers,” or when God and his deputy Michael jointly rule Israel. Like the foreign peoples they lead, these national gods are often unfriendly, morally culpable for their charges’ evils. At other times they might be benign, and Michael in particular becomes a divinely ordained mediating angel over Israel. The people were prohibited from courting the other “sons of God,” but nonetheless often did. YHWH’s judgment was to let them have their way, go after foreign gods, and lose the benefits of their special status as people of the Most High God.

More than that, YHWH threatened to craft a new people out of “no people” and “a foolish nation” (Deut 32:21) to make Israel jealous. It seems from 1 Corinthians that Paul took up this concept and understood it in terms of the messianic community, which drew Jews and gentiles into the “body of Christ.” The same construct also underlies Paul’s use of Adam and Christ in his letter to the Romans.
CHAPTER 4 — FROM CATASTROPHIC SIN TO UNARTICULATED GLORY: “IN ADAM” AND “IN CHRIST” IN ROMANS

“For God has imprisoned all in disobedience so that he may be merciful to all.”
– Rom 11:32

Paul among His Fellow Jews

This, the final verse of theology proper in Romans, summarizes God’s work in history as imprisoning all people in disobedience for the purpose that (ἵνα) he might show mercy to all. This is the fixed endpoint to which the apostle’s logic ultimately leads, even if it comes through twists and turns, and it will be well to remember this verse as a lodestar for our understanding of Paul’s most famous letter.471

It is time to gather together the threads of this argument and return to Romans. After beginning with the riddles of Rom 5 communicated in Chapter 1, the last two chapters have surveyed a number of works written by Paul’s fellow Second Temple Jews, with glances back to the apostle where germane. In Chapter 2, I assessed views of Adam in Jewish antiquity, finding his major roles to be the patriarch of humanity, a paradigmatic pattern and moral warning, a bearer of

disaster (on some level, the cause of sin and death) and glorious figure (an angelic or
semi-divine being, as high as God’s second-in-command). While elsewhere Paul
utilizes the pattern and warning tropes (the second and third categories in my
typology), the Adam-Christ comparison in Romans draws on the last two categories
in conjunction with the first: Adam is the father of all nations, responsible for the
entrance of sin and death in the world, but he remains a superbly glorious figure,
not far removed from the angels.

My concern then was to show what type of figures in Jewish thought played
similar roles. For examples I turned in particular to angelic mediators (the “sons of
God”), with brief mention of messianic ones (the “son of man”). The sons of God are
set over nations in the Song of Moses, are often morally ambiguous, and sometimes
are culpable for the sins their nations commit. Daniel’s “one like a son of man,”
representing Israel specifically, is originally an angel much like the sons of God but
in later traditions is identified with the messiah, who is regularly a divine being
come to earth. Both of these models of “participatory domains,” as I have called
them, include a divine — and sometimes also a human — figure who is the heavenly
counterpart to an earthly community, and these two planes of reality mirror each
other for good or ill. These concepts are structurally similar to how Adam functions in Greco-Roman Jewish thought.

To be clear, I am not positing identification: There is no evidence that Adam is numbered among the “sons of God,” and although that title was often applied to Jesus by early Christians (Paul included), the evidence indicates a Davidic sense. That Adam was equated with the “son of Man,” as a number of exegetes thought in the middle of the twentieth century, is conceivable, derived from texts like Ps 8:5 [Eng.: 8:4] (“What is . . . the son of man [בן-אדם] that thou dost care for him?” RSV), which were imbued with messianic import by some early Christians (see especially Heb 2:5–18). However, my case does not rest on this. My intent, rather, is to show that there was, at Paul’s disposal, a way to conceptualize in one idea the triad of motifs found in Rom 5. Adam as the errant ruler of a participatory domain covers Adam as head, Adam as paradigmatic sinner, and Adam as glorious being.

With this we may return to Rom 5:12–21. In Chapter 1, I argued that the traditions Paul must have appealed to were so ever-present in the culture of early Christianity that the smallest spark would kindle illumination in their minds. Although we can never recreate the complex social ecology of their world, the
foregoing chapters give an approximation of it. The primary issue to consider is how the figure of Adam contributes to the logic of Paul’s letter to the Roman believers. According to the *status quaestionis*, the first man does little to structure Paul’s argument: he is a useful foil to Christ for a paragraph or two, but Paul does not put much theological weight on him. But both the official positions of the major Christian denominations and most interpreters prior to the last quarter of the twentieth century thought that Adam held a far more significant role. I side with earlier generations, and I contend that Paul conceives of both Adam and Christ as heading participatory domains. I will test my view against the three riddles I posed in Chapter 1: the fit of Rom 5–8 in Rom 1–11; the means of transfer of Adamic sin and messianic grace; and the significance of τύπος for the meaning of Rom 5:14. More broadly, the question could be phrased this way: Do Paul’s words, read against the backdrop of Adamic and participatory-domain traditions, luminesce?\(^{472}\)

My primary attention will be given to Rom 5:12–21, but Paul’s letter came as a whole to the church in Rome. For this reason, as part of the examination of my

\(^{472}\) Hays (*Echoes*, 31–32) writes of his seventh criterion for discerning an echo of the OT in the NT (“satisfaction”), that it is “difficult to articulate precisely without falling into the affective fallacy, but it is finally the most important test.” His previous six criteria are measurable and guard against subjectivism, but proposals must also be judged by whether they lead to an “aha!” moment.
theory I will apply it to other possible allusions and echoes of primeval history in Romans, which are centered in Rom 1 and Rom 5–8. There are risks in doing so.

Each section of the epistle has its own attendant debates, and it would be impossible to entertain them all in depth. Instead, for the sake of illustration, I will apply my theory with a light touch to current discussions in Romans and chart its implications, if accepted, throughout. For even if there are risks in venturing outside of ten verses in Rom 5, there are weightier liabilities in neglecting to do so. Having canvassed Jewish literature from the HB to the DSS, from the Pseudepigrapha to Philo and Josephus, I would be remiss not to consider, say, Rom 7. Further, if participatory domains are a suitable way to understand Paul’s explicit use of Adam, then they must yield a satisfactory and cohesive reading of Adamic themes in Romans as a whole.

In an appendix to The Meaning of Paul for Today, C. H. Dodd summarizes his view of Romans by giving a paraphrase of the whole epistle, expanding and contracting on Paul’s phrasing as he sees fit to best express the message to the mid-century, biblically interested, English-speaking world. In that same era, it was common for shorter commentaries to offer their perspectives interwoven with the

---

quoted biblical text, either in italics or boldface type. A combination of these two
approaches will be the most concise way to develop my interpretation in Rom 5:12–
21. In other passages where Adam or participatory domains are likely but debated,
such as Rom 1 and Rom 7, I will argue for my proposal, engaging the major
alternative proposals. I aim to be representative but not exhaustive. Even briefer will
be my treatment of sections of Romans in which the allusion to Genesis is largely
secure (such as the “image of his Son” in Rom 8:29), or ones that connect the major
passages but do not have much new by way of Adam (such as Rom 6). My leading
goal is to illustrate how the fivefold Adamic traditions and participatory domains
give a satisfactory and cohesive interpretation of the Epistle of Romans.

The Nations Estranged from Their Glory: Romans 1–4

The first three chapters of Paul’s letter seek to demonstrate the equality of Jew and
gentile before God, in both sinfulness (1:18–3:20) and justification (3:21–31), and
the fourth chapter makes Abraham, traditionally the patriarch of the Jewish nation,
the patriarch of all the faithful. After the standard epistolary greeting formulae (Rom
1:1–15) that already forecasts several important themes, such as Paul’s mission to the
gentiles (vv. 5, 13–14), the apostle gives what is widely regarded as the “thesis” of Romans.\footnote{It is noteworthy that Paul, who usually divides humanity into Jew and gentile or Jew and Greek (which amount to the same thing for him), abides by the Hellenistic division of humanity in Rom 1:14: “I am a debtor both to Greeks (Ἐλλήναι) and to barbarians (βαρβαροὶ) . . . .”} It is full of hope. The gospel “is the power of God for salvation to everyone who has faith, to the Jew first and also to the Greek. For in it the righteousness of God is revealed through faith for faith; as it is written, ‘The one who is righteous will live by faith’ ” (Rom 1:16–17). But his first step in illustrating the salutary effects of Christ’s work is heavy with gloom (Rom 1:18–3:20). Here we catch our first glimpse of Adam.

It has been suggested for a number of years that the fall narrative in Gen 3 is one of the passages underpinning the progressive alienation of humanity from God in Rom 1:18–32.\footnote{Even if Gen 3 is present, it is certainly not the only writing on Paul’s mind. Passages from Deuteronomy, Psalms, Jeremiah, and esp. the Wisdom of Solomon are likely influential. At minimum, Gen 1 is in view, since creation underlies the logic of humanity’s debt to the divine (vv. 20, 25).} In two influential articles in New Testament Studies in the 1960s, Morna D. Hooker has sought to demonstrate that Adam’s sin is being replayed in this passage.\footnote{Hooker, “Adam in Romans 1,” NTS 6 (1960): 297–306 (= idem, “Adam in Romans 1,” in From Adam to Christ: Essays on Paul [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990], 73–84); idem,}
idolatry. Paul says of those who have suppressed the knowledge of their Creator,

“they exchanged the glory of the immortal God for images in a likeness of an image of (ἐν ἀνθρώματι εἰκόνος) a mortal human being (φθαρτὸς ἄνθρωπος) or birds (πετεινά) or four-footed animals (τετράποδα) or reptiles (ἑρπέτα).”  

The primary reference is to Ps 106:20 [LXX: 105:20], but the psalm lacks εἰκών, and all the creatures named, including humanity, match those in Gen 1:20–26 — and follow the same sequence as Genesis, as opposed to the psalm. In fact, after “immortal God,” φθαρτός is the only word extraneous to Gen 1:20–27 (LXX).

Having established this lexical beachhead, Hooker notes that the misdeeds mentioned in Rom 1:19–25, 32 — knowing God yet failing to recognize him properly and violating his righteous decree — are “supremely true” of Adam, and she sees warrant, particularly on the strength of rabbinic parallels, to link Adamic sin to

---


477 I modify the NRSV to give a literal rendering of ἐν ἀνθρώματι εἰκόνος.

478 Speaking of the Golden Calf incident, the verse runs, “They exchanged the glory of God for the image of an ox that eats grass.” Also, to clarify, not all the creatures of Gen 1:20–26 are also found in this verse, but the four mentioned in Rom 1:23 are all found within seven verses in Genesis.

idolatry, lust, and the welter of evils in vv. 24–32.\textsuperscript{480} Returning to v. 23 with these additional Genesis resonances, Hooker argues that εἰκών is to be associated with φϑαρτὸς ἄνϑρωπος, not with the three types of animals; at the fall Adam exchanged God’s glory for a corruptible \textit{imago}.\textsuperscript{481} Hooker refined this basic view of Rom 1 throughout her career.\textsuperscript{482}

The reception of Hooker’s articles, and of others that hear echoes of Adam in Rom 1, has been mixed. Stowers is among the most vociferous critics. He calls her arguments “profoundly unconvincing.”\textsuperscript{483} He faults her for anachronism: not only are the Jewish texts she mentions late, but the later Christian schema of Jesus as the answer to the human problem is not Paul’s concern.\textsuperscript{484} Romans 1 “says nothing about Adam,” Stowers contends, and he presses his point by illustrating how poorly Adam matches the recorded actions:

\begin{quote}

\textsuperscript{480} Ibid., 77–80. Quotation is on p. 77.

\textsuperscript{481} Ibid., 80–84.

\textsuperscript{482} Hooker, “Introduction,” in Adam to Christ, 1–10. In her 1967 “Further Note,” she turns back to Ps 106 [LXX: Ps 105], and how it might have formed Paul’s threefold “giving over” in Rom 1, but she retains the Adamic interpretation. The “Introduction” makes frequent reference to Adam, in particular the idea that Christ and Adam offer competing “images” of God.

\textsuperscript{483} Stowers, Rereading of Romans, 86.

\textsuperscript{484} Ibid., 86–88. Stowers analyzes several pre-Pauline works (e.g., Wisdom, those of Philo), to show that their composite understanding of Adam “actually belies” the Adamic fall idea (p. 87).
\end{quote}
Adam did not have to deduce God's existence from the creation. He did not lose or pervert his knowledge of God and thereby succumb to sin, and God did not punish him by imposing servitude to passions and desires . . . . Adam and Eve did not fashion images of gods.\textsuperscript{485}

In all these cases, it is rather what the nations have done. Paul’s mind runs all the way to Gen 11, according to Stowers. In the Greco-Roman world “decline of civilization” narratives were common, and for Jews primeval history told of the fall of gentile nations into idolatry and sin rather than universal human sinfulness in Adam.\textsuperscript{486} Stowers also warns against “modern abstract individualism: Paul is not saying that every gentile (or every human person) first knows God and then turns away to idolatry and immortality.”\textsuperscript{487} It is incumbent, he argues, to dispense with the traditional understanding of the fall in order to understand Paul’s intent in Rom 1.

If the taxonomy of Adamic traditions I have offered in Chapter 2 holds, however, we may “un-exclude” this excluded middle. It is true that most, though not all, of Hooker’s examples are late, but Stowers himself downplays too much the

\textsuperscript{485} Ibid., 90–91.

\textsuperscript{486} Ibid., 85–97.

\textsuperscript{487} Ibid., 108.
effects of Adam’s sin in pre-Pauline sources. Given the theme of creation in
general and the particular wording of Rom 1:23, there is reason to anticipate
allusions to Adam. Further, the threefold “handing over” (παραδίδωμι) of humans to
“the lusts (αἱ ἐπιθυμίαι) of their hearts” (v. 24), “degrading passions (πάθη)” (v. 26),
and finally “a debased mind (νοῦς)” (v. 28) lines up reasonably well with a conviction
common among many hellenized Second Temple Jews that the essential sin of Eden
was desire, and that desire deceives the mind.

For these reasons, Hooker’s conclusions can be defended today, so long as we
turn to older, pre-rabbinic texts. That said, Stowers’s primary goal can also be
heeded, but it need not be at Adam’s expense. He is correct that Rom 1–3 describes
the progressive estrangement of the peoples of the world from God. Since Adam is
often depicted as the father of all nations — even, I have argued, in 4 Ezra, the one
work that many go to in order to find human sinfulness assigned on the individual

---

Hooker (“Adam,” 79 n. 25) does offer several pseudepigraphal references that are at least
near the first century, e.g., 4 Macc 18:7–8; Gk. LAE 19; 1 En. 69:4–6; 2 En. 31:6; Apoc. Ab. 23.
Stowers (Rereading of Romans, 87) claims, e.g., that Wisdom “contains no references to the
effects of Adam’s transgression,” and instead it seeks “to emphasize that death constitutes a natural
phenomenon.” There are verses that, on their own, might indicate this (e.g., Wis 7:1), but Wis 2:23–
24 says that God made humanity for incorruption, but that death came by the devil’s envy. However
embryonic, this is a fall narrative, since it assumes that immortality was there for the taking but was
ruined by Satan’s temptation.

We will, moreover, see ἐπιθυμία (“desire”) return in Rom 7.
level — Paul can evoke his image in Rom 1–3 to show that all tribes, including Israel (at least by 2:17), have gone astray and are infected by sin.\footnote{Traditionally scholars have seen Rom 1:18–32 as having gentiles in view and Rom 2 as having Jews, but Stowers argues that only with the named address to a Jew in Rom 2:17 does Paul make this transition. In Rom 2:1–16 Paul instead warns a Greek moralist. See esp. ibid., 126–58.}

This interpretation of Rom 1–3 assuages the apparent oddity of Rom 2. For in Rom 3:9–12, when Paul quotes Ps 14 [LXX: Ps 13] he seems to imply that everyone, without exception, has sinned, and this has often been taken to have been his endpoint since 1:18.\footnote{Rom 3:9–12: “What then? Are we any better off? No, not at all; for we have already charged that all, both Jews and Greeks, are under the power of sin, as it is written, ‘There is no one righteous, not even one; there is no one who has understanding, there is no one who seeks God. All have turned aside, together they have become worthless; there is no one who shows kindness, there is not even one.’ ” The individual focus (“no one,” “not even one”) comes up only in this psalm.} Yet scattered across Rom 2 are several verses in which Paul makes statements that sound to us very un-Pauline and incongruous with the logic of the section. The “doers of the law,” the apostle writes, will be eternally rewarded by God for their work (vv. 7, 10, 13–15), and righteous gentiles will be reckoned as the “true circumcision” (vv. 25–29). For those defending a traditional reading of Paul, these examples have been thought either to be given only in theory, never realized, to prove God’s fairness, or to forecast believing gentiles.\footnote{Moo (Romans, 125–77) ably defends a combination of these.}
Others have come to more drastic conclusions. Sanders cords off the passage because he finds it to be “homiletical material from Diaspora Judaism” which Paul changes “in only insubstantial ways.”  

For Räisänen Paul’s words are ready evidence for his indictment that Paul’s view of the law is flatly inconsistent.  

Campbell takes the position that Rom 1–3 is intentionally incoherent: Paul is mimicking a self-styled teacher whose false gospel the apostle needs to dismantle before he can deliver his own message.  

It is a measure of our unease at the place of Rom 2 in Paul’s thought that Klyne R. Snodgrass advances the thesis that “Romans 2 means exactly what it says,” and it seems a provocative position to adopt.

---


494 Räisänen (*Paul and Law*, 101–9): “The theological thesis in Rom 1.18–3.20 is that all are under sin and that, therefore, no one can fulfil the law. Inadvertently, however, Paul admits within that very section that, on another level of his consciousness at least, he does not share this idea. Paul’s mind is divided” (pp. 106–7).

495 Campbell, *Deliverance of God*, 519–600.

496 Klyne Snodgrass, “Justification by Grace — to the Doers: An Analysis of the Place of Romans 2 in the Theology of Paul,” *NTS* 32 (1986): 74. Rather than bifurcating mercy and good works in Paul, Snodgrass argues that God will indeed show grace to all who respond in obedience to the understanding they have. The good deeds throughout are more like “obedience” (an ever positive term for Paul) than “works of the law.”
If the leading idea of Rom 1–3 is indeed the sinfulness of every person, Rom 2 contains formidable aporiai. To write, or even to adopt secondhand, words so contrary to the rhetorical strategy of the section would be a crippling oversight. Yet given Rom 3:9–12, the universality of sin is a position that cannot be easily dismissed either. Rather, the issue has been framed amiss, and Stowers’s solution clears away the most difficult problems. Even if there were inveterate flaws in national character, as many ancients though, exemplary individuals from those nations may transcend them. So far as Rom 1–3 is concerned, Paul is indefinite on the position of every last individual before God. At one moment he seems to allow that great heroes escape the power of sin and at another moment that none does, but at all times he portrays the nations, even his own, as having gone astray from God.

I contend, then, that in Rom 1:18–3:20 Paul presents the long outworking of Adamic sin throughout the peoples of the earth, from primeval history to his own age. Paul’s gaze is fixed not so much on Adam himself, though. It is mostly on the earthly, corporate perspective of Adam’s participatory domain, but in Rom 1:18–25 the gentiles do imitate their ancient ancestor by ignoring the Creator and being
seduced by desires for created things. In Paul’s mind the decline of nations
commences with the fall of Adam.

A Subtle Shift: Romans 5:1–11

Having established to his own satisfaction that sin has taken root in all nations, Jew
and gentile alike, Paul proclaims that God equally justifies all nations in Christ since
the one God is the God of all peoples (Rom 3:21–31). He then cites Abraham, who is
not just a “model” or “example” of faith, as he is often characterized, but the
“patriarch” (πατήρ) of the believing community (Rom 4, especially vv. 11–12).

Insofar as there is a pivot in Rom 1:18–8:39, I agree with those who locate it
in Rom 5:1. As noted in Chapter 1, the language of this section is not entirely
distinct from that of Rom 1–4, but there are a number of subtle shifts. The first is
the frequency in Rom 5:1–11 of the first-person plural “we,” indicating Paul's
concern with applying the lessons of Rom 1–4 to the church (“Therefore, since we
are justified by faith . . .”). While sinfulness and justification had been the
dominating duality, it is now death and life. The Holy Spirit, love, grace, hope,
peace, and a handful of other words come to prominence, and they will return in
Rom 8. Most noticeably, ethnic language disappears. In its place are hints of two opposing realms, the “ungodly” (v. 6), “sinners” (v. 8), and “enemies” (v. 10), upon whom God’s wrath will come (v. 9), and those who by Jesus’s death and resurrection (vv. 6, 8–10) have been “justified” (v. 9), “reconciled,” and “saved” (vv. 10–11).

However, the ideas of Rom 1–4 are never far away. They appear not only in Rom 5:1–11 but also in Rom 5:12–21, only there with a new façade.

Excursus: Adam and Christ in 1 Corinthians 15

It is in Rom 5:12–21 that Adam is explicitly named, and therefore study of it is the centerpiece of this chapter. However, this is not the first time Paul has broached the Adam-Christ juxtaposition; we cannot expect to understand Rom 5 without any recourse to 1 Cor 15. Indeed, the Corinthian background is critical for Romans.

Paul writes from the port city of Cenchreae (Rom 16:1), near Corinth, and Romans

497 Incidentally, in making my “apology” for revisiting Rom 5 (in Chapter 1), I contended that by the time he wrote Rom 5, Paul had had the Adam-Christ typology on his mind for at least three years, i.e., since the composition of 1 Cor 15. But the idea may be well developed in the apostle’s mind before then. Gordon D. Fee (The First Epistle to the Corinthians, NICNT [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987], 750–51), describes the analogy as “a commonplace with Paul.” Richard B. Hays (First Corinthians, IBC [Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997], 263–64) and Roy E. Ciampa and Brian S. Rosner (The First Letter to the Corinthians, PNTC [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010], 763) suggest that Paul had taught the Corinthians the Adam-Christ comparison in person (ca. 52), because the brevity here presumes that they are knowledgeable with the concept.
takes up many of the ideas and themes from his correspondence with the Greek church. Charlotte Hartwig and Gerd Theißen have even hypothesized that Romans is written also, if indirectly, for the Corinthians, clarifying obscure points from his letters to them. Therefore, I will deal briefly with 1 Cor 15, before returning to Rom 5:12. That said, the topics of the two passages are distinct, and so although it is good to attend to 1 Cor 15, we must also take care to distinguish the concerns of the one letter from those of the other. First Corinthians 15 provides vital background for Rom 5, but it does not determine the latter’s meaning.

The source of Paul’s information on the matter is not clear, but the problem 1 Cor 15 addresses is: “Now if Christ is proclaimed as raised from the dead, how can


\[\text{\footnotesize 499} \text{ It remains an open question what bearing any one Pauline writing has in interpreting another. J. Christiaan Beker (Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in Life and Thought [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980], 11–19, and The Triumph of God: The Essence of Paul’s Thought, trans. Loren T. Stuckenbruck [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990], 3–36) has given us the language of “coherence” and “contingency” to describe how Paul’s thought contains several prominent, recurrent themes but, when a systemization of it is attempted, seems to frustrate a satisfying synthesis. Whether the differences among the letters bespeak changes in Paul, the varied situations of the churches, or his relation to his readers — unlike most of his other letters, Romans is not written to his own converts — the differences are real and cannot be ignored.}\]
some of you say there is no resurrection of the dead?” (1 Cor 15:12).\textsuperscript{500} Paul has gotten word that a number of the Corinthians deny the resurrection of believers. There is debate about what aspect they dispute, however. Anthony C. Thiselton lists four major theories: (1) they do not believe in any kind of postmortem existence; (2) they have an over-realized eschatology, believing the resurrection has already occurred (as in 2 Tim 2:18); (3) it is the bodily aspect of the resurrection that some find crude or philosophically untenable; and (4) more than one perspective is present at Corinth, requiring Paul to fight on at least two fronts.\textsuperscript{501} The issue of corporeality seems paramount (given vv. 35–58), but questions of sequence arise often enough (including vv. 23–28, 45–56) to consider it a subsidiary concern (view 4).\textsuperscript{502}

\textsuperscript{500} It is unlikely to come from the letter they sent Paul, since he has been responding to it with “now concerning” (περὶ δὲ: 1 Cor 7:1, 25; 8:1; 12:1; 16:1, 12), but no such words come here. It likely comes from an oral report, like that of “Chole’s people” (1 Cor 1:11; cf. 5:1) or from Stephanas, Fortunatus, and Achaicus (1 Cor 16:17–18). So, e.g., Fee, \textit{First Corinthians}, 714.

\textsuperscript{501} Thiselton, \textit{The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text}, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 1172–76. Thiselton finds views 2 and 3 probable, and so places himself in the final category.

\textsuperscript{502} A prominent defense of view 3 comes from Dale B. Martin, \textit{The Corinthian Body} (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 105–8. But this position should not be adopted at the expense of the second one; as Thiselton (\textit{First Corinthians}, 1176) writes, “It is difficult to deny that both the second and the third approaches contain important elements which seem convincing, even if not as exclusive or comprehensive accounts of the problem.” Only view 1 is unlikely, since most people in antiquity believed in some form of life after death, however shadowy it may be — so Craig L. Blomberg, \textit{1 Corinthians}, NIVAC (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994), 295.
1 Corinthians 15:20–28. Paul’s response comes in two parts (vv. 1–34, 35–58). After establishing the common ground he has with the church via a creedal formula about Jesus’s own death and resurrection (vv. 1–11), Paul seeks to refute their skepticism through a series of counterfactuals (vv. 12–19), followed by a positive statement about the fact of the resurrection of the dead (vv. 20–28), and ending with further contemporary implications (vv. 29–34).

It is in Paul’s confirmation of the bodily resurrection that the Adam-Christ comparison first comes. “But in fact Christ has been raised from the dead,” Paul assures his readers, adding that Jesus is “the first fruits (ἀπαρχή) of those who have died” (v. 20). The sense of ἀπαρχή here is a guarantee of more to come. So also with Adam and Christ: the apostle’s primary goal is cementing the representative

---

503 Most commentators approach the text in this general manner, but I follow Hays (First Corinthians, 254) in particular: vv. 1–34 demonstrate that the resurrection is “constitutive of the gospel,” and vv. 35–58 explain that it is the “transformation of the body” (not merely the reanimation of a corpse). Similarly, Ciampa and Rosner (First Corinthians, 739) find v. 12 and v. 35 to be the key verses underlying the chapter’s two sections. Sometimes vv. 1–11 are separated from vv. 12–34, with vv. 35–58 forming a third unit, but the effect is much the same: so Fee, First Corinthians, 714; Thiselton, First Corinthians, 1177–78.

504 So Hays, First Corinthians, 263; Thiselton, First Corinthians, 1224; Ciampa and Rosner, First Corinthians, 761–62. This fits the apostle’s other uses of the term (and is true to its OT background). In Rom 8:23 Christians in the present age have “the first fruits of the Spirit” (ἡ ἀπαρχή τοῦ πνεύματος); in Rom 11:16 Jews who have accepted Jesus as Lord are “the part of the dough offered as first fruits (ἡ ἀπαρχή),” indicating that “the whole batch is holy.” In this sense Thiselton likens ἀπαρχή to ἀρραβών (“guarantee,” “pledge”), used of the Holy Spirit in 2 Cor 1:22 and 5:5.
with those “in” him (v. 22: “for as all die in Adam, so all will be made alive in Christ”).\footnote{In Greek: ὥσπερ γὰρ ἐν τῷ Ἀδὰμ πάντες ἀποθνῄσκουσιν, οὕτως καὶ ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ πάντες ἀνέζωονται. A number of commentators note that those in Adam and Christ join the community in different ways: all are born into Adam, but only “those who belong to Christ” (v. 23), believers, are “in Christ.” So Fee, First Corinthians, 751; Hays, First Corinthians, 264; Thiselton, First Corinthians, 1227–28; Ciampa and Rosner, First Corinthians, 763–65. Not everyone agrees, however. C. K. Barrett (A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians, HNTC [New York: Harper & Row, 1968], 352) accepts the above position insofar as “the wording has been affected by the parallel clause” and that Adam’s and Christ’s “all” are not the same, yet he then permits the possibility of universal salvation, saying, “this may be implied.” William F. Orr and James Arthur Walther (I Corinthians, AB 32 [Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1976], 332) write that the “scope of the two states is problematical,” since in theory they should be equal.}

It is clear that Adamic humanity \textit{en masse} faces the same death the first man did; in the same way also, Paul argues, messianic humanity must be raised \textit{en masse} like Jesus was. The resurrection, not death, occupies Paul’s attention through v. 28. His point is that God’s purposes for creation would be stymied if those “in Christ” were not also raised along with him, for then death would not be a defeated enemy, subjected to Jesus. So in 1 Cor 15:21–22, Adam as a negative counterpart surfaces momentarily — in order to demonstrate the promise of general resurrection as a counterpoint to the ubiquity of death — and is quickly dispatched thereafter.

Yet continuity is implied as well.\footnote{Contra Thiselton (First Corinthians, 1226), who quotes Beker (Paul the Apostle, 100): “the Adam typology . . . operates not in terms of continuity but in terms of discontinuity.”} Some level of similarity is implicit in their common position as representative humans (v. 21: “For since death came through a
human being [δι᾿ ἀνθρώπου], the resurrection of the dead has also come through a human being [δι᾿ ἀνθρώπου”), although recourse to a “redeemed Redeemer” or “primal man” myth (beside Adamic legends) is hardly necessary.⁵⁰⁷

Continuity becomes more evident later, in the regal and martial language of vv. 24–28.⁵⁰⁸ Paul links an allusion to Ps 110:1 [LXX: 109:1] and Ps 8:6 [LXX 8:7] with the common phrase “under his feet” and the conceptual similarity of reigning over other powers (vv. 25, 27). But he has not left primeval history behind. Not only is Ps 8 a clear creation psalm, one that suggests a connection to Gen 1:26–28, but the two psalms by themselves leave unexplained how Paul can gloss death as “the last enemy” (v. 26).⁵⁰⁹ If, however, Genesis retains an echo, then death as eschatological enemy is simply reprising its role as protological foe. In this “mini-apocalypse” (vv.

---

⁵⁰⁷ As older commentators were apt to suggest: e.g., Hans Conzelmann, 1 Corinthians, trans. James W. Leitch, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975), 267–69, 283–88. (The German original is from 1969.) This includes his view of vv. 45–49.

⁵⁰⁸ In Rom 5:12–21 we will note the use of words associated with power. The same is true here: in vv. 23–24 alone we find τάγμα (“order,” “rank”), βασιλεία (“kingdom”), ἀρχή (“rule”), ἐξουσία (“authority”), and δύναμις (“power”), and this before coming to the discussion of Christ reigning and the other powers being subjugated to him.

⁵⁰⁹ Death is not in Ps 8. The concept arises in Ps 110, but only when the king makes corpses of nations. Death is a good thing: not an enemy to be defeated, but the result of defeating enemies.
23–28), the apostle interweaves three OT texts — Gen 1–3, Ps 110, and Ps 8 — and has Jesus fulfilling the role over creation that Adam was meant to play.\(^{510}\)

1 Corinthians 15:42–49. After affirming the fact of the resurrection, Paul pivots in v. 35 to answer a major potential objection: “How are the dead raised? With what kind of body do they come?”\(^{511}\) He gives the examples of a seed being sown and becoming a plant (vv. 36–38) and of different types of bodies, human and animal, earthly and celestial (vv. 39–41), after which he applies them to the perishable, present body and the imperishable, resurrected body (vv. 42–49). He ends by considering what it means for the living and dead (vv. 50–58).\(^{512}\)

\(^{510}\) Many commentaries limit the OT references in this section to the two psalms, but many others do mention Genesis in some regard: Barrett, *First Corinthians*, 360–61; Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 274; Blomberg, *1 Corinthians*, 298; Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 1235. Ciampa and Rosner (*First Corinthians*, 740–41, 760–79) mention it often in the whole section. They summarize, Paul’s “point is that Christ as the last Adam retrieved the situation the first Adam lost,” and “The glorious destiny of humankind to be crowned and receive dominion, which we fail to grasp, is fulfilled for us through Jesus” (776).

\(^{511}\) This might be two slightly different questions, the one asking either how it is possible or in what manner it will occur, and the second discussing types of bodily existence — so, e.g., Ciampa and Rosner, *First Corinthians*, 799–800.

\(^{512}\) Again, following Hays (*First Corinthians*, 254) in particular. He lists v. 58 as a separate section (“Therefore, my beloved, be steadfast . . . because you know that in the Lord your labor is not in vain”), one that recapitulates the whole chapter since he began by noting that without the resurrection Christian hope is in vain.
In Paul’s treatment of the nature of the resurrection, Adam reappears (vv. 45–49). The passage contrasts the body in two modes of existence: the σῶμα ψυχικόν is sown in disrepair (ἐν ϕϑορᾷ), dishonor (ἀτικίᾳ), and weakness (ἀσθενείᾳ), while the σῶμα πνευματικόν is sown in repair (ἐν ἀϕϑαρσίᾳ), glory (δόξῃ), and power (δυνάμει) (vv. 42–44). The σῶμα ψυχικόν is embodied by the first Adam, who became “a living being” (ψυχὴ ζῶσα), one from earth (ἐκ γῆς) and of dust (χοϊχός), while the σῶμα πνευματικόν is embodied by the last Adam, who became a life-giving spirit (πνεῦμα ζῳοποιοῦν), one from heaven (ἐξ οὐρανοῦ) and of heaven (ἐπουράνιος) (vv. 45–49). Humanity shares in these two, οἱ χοϊκοί with ὁ χοϊκός and οἱ ἐπουράνιοι with ὁ ἐπουράνιος (vv. 48–49).

513 English is not well equipped to translate the adjectives ψυχικός and πνευματικός in this section. “Soul” and “spirit,” even when they are differentiated, are both usually opposites of “body,” the immaterial versus the material, so “soul-like body” and “spiritual body” might sound like two ways of speaking metaphorically of an ethereal, incorporeal existence. This cannot be Paul’s point, if for no other reason than the σῶμα ψυχικόν a person now inhabits is certainly a physical existence. More than that, as Thiselton (First Corinthians, 1276–79) argues, Paul’s use of πνευματικός generally indicates something given or empowered by the Spirit, a meaning nowhere more evident than earlier in this same epistle, in 1 Cor 2:10–16 (see vv. 13, 15 for πνευματικός itself); this also fits the typical meaning of -ινος endings, which denote modes of being, as opposed to -ινος endings, which denote composition. So the NRSV’s “physical body” and “spiritual body” are apt to confuse Paul’s logic; better are the “natural body” and “spiritual body” that many translations prefer (NIV, ESV, KJV and NKJV, etc.). The apostle sees two forms of physical existence, one empowered by the natural human self, the other by the Holy Spirit. See below for more.

514 Or “a life-giving Spirit.” Dunn (Theology of Paul, 260–64) notes the uniqueness of this phrase in the Pauline corpus. On some level it relates Jesus to God’s Spirit (see, e.g., τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ
It is hard to fix precisely the error that Paul is trying to counter with this. As noted above, it seems that a bodily resurrection is the primary problem Paul addresses, but the would-be spiritual elite seem also to have claimed too much of the future life in the present (e.g., 1 Cor 4:8a: “Already you have all you want! Already you have become rich!”). An exegetical tradition akin to that of the Philonic doctrine of two Adams — the heavenly, incorporeal, Platonic ideal of Gen 1, over against the earthly, human Adam who is comprised of mind and dirt — fits these concerns and the language of the passage.\textsuperscript{515} Moreover, according to Philo the earthly man is at a further remove from the image of God.\textsuperscript{516} For the apostle’s opponents, then, the

\textsuperscript{515} A number of commentators think some in Corinth follow exegesis of Gen 1–3 similar to that of Philo, without saying they (or Paul) have actually read Philo: so Barrett, \textit{First Corinthians}, 374–75; Conzelmann, \textit{1 Corinthians}, 284–87; Blomberg, \textit{1 Corinthians}, 316; Hays, \textit{First Corinthians}, 273–74; Thiselton, \textit{First Corinthians}, 1282–85; Ciampa and Rosner, \textit{First Corinthians}, 819. Fee (\textit{First Corinthians}, 791) rejects the Philonic background because the Alexandrian interpreter does not concern himself with chronology, and Fee understands the timing of the two Adams to be integral to both sides of the debate.

\textsuperscript{516} This much seems clear in Philo, even if his doctrine of two Adams does not seem to be entirely consistent. In \textit{Opif.} 24–25 the heavenly Adam is made according to the image of God (\textit{κατ᾿ εἰκόνα ἡσύχιν} (Gen 1:27) — the \textit{εἰκόνα} itself is probably to be identified with the divine \textit{λόγος} — so that the earthly Adam, along with all sensible creation, is no more than “an image of an image” (\textit{εἰκὼν εἰκόνος}), but in \textit{Opif.} 69–71 it may be that at least the mind of the earthly Adam does share in the image of God. However Philo’s theology is systematized (and \textit{Opif.} 24–25 is probably closer to his mature view), it is certainly true that the heavenly man is one step closer to God’s image, but in some
heavenly Adam is ontologically first and incorporeal, closer to the *imago Dei*, and the goal of perfected humanity, making bodily resurrection in the future unnecessary, if not gauche.\(^5\)

Paul rejects this as something out of step with the gospel. To some degree Paul makes this a debate about the interpretation of Gen 2:7, which he quotes, with modification, in v. 45.\(^6\) It is the first Adam, Paul contends, that is merely a “living indirect way all earthly humans bear the *imago*, passed along from Adam to his sons (Gen 5:3). I include more material on Philo’s view of creation in my section, “Paradigmatic Pattern” (Chapter 2).

\(^5\) Two prominent advocates for this position are Sterling (“Wisdom among the Perfect,” 355–84) and Gerhard Sellin, *Der Streit um die Auferstehung der Toten: Eine religionsgeschichtliche und exegetische Untersuchung von 1 Kor 15*, FRLANT 138 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986). For example, in Sterling’s reconstruction, seven exegetical positions the Corinthians adopt can be explained with recourse to Philo: “1. They read or understood πνεύμα in the place of πνοή. 2. Based on πνεύμα and ψυχή they derived two beings: the πνευματικός and the ψυχικός. 3. They considered these two as ὁ πρώτος ἄνθρωπος and ὁ δεύτερος ἄνθρωπος. The order was important for them; however, it denotes a logical rather than a temporal order. 4. They associated the being ‘molded out of the dust of the earth’ with the ψυχικός person. 5. They held that the πνευματικός was the same as ὁ ἐπουράνιος. 6. The ἐπουράνιος and hence the πνευματικός bears the image of God. In this way they made a connection between Gen. 1:26–27 and 2:7. 7. On the basis of the secondary status of the psychic anthropos who is the somatic anthropos of Gen. 2:7a, they denied the bodily resurrection” (p. 361, with the Philonic support for these seven on pp. 366–67). Of course, some scholars disagree, including those well versed in both Paul and Philo. For example, see the relevant comments by Dieter Zeller, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*, KEK 5 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010).

\(^6\) A debate about interpretation: This is how it is typically portrayed. Orr and Walther (*I Corinthians*, 348) tout this passage as “a tour de force derived from Paul’s interpretation of the Genesis passage,” and Fee (*First Corinthians*, 788) calls it “a kind of midrashic interpretation of Gen. 2:7.” Sterling (“Wisdom among the Perfect,” 357–67) illustrates how the subtleties of the text might be indebted to a variety of pre-Pauline exegetical traditions, such as equating the πνοή (“breath”) of Gen 2:7 with the πνεύμα (“spirit,” “breath”) that Paul uses in v. 45.
soul” (ψυχὴ ζῶσα), echoing the “lesser” spiritual state of the ψυχικοί. But of course, if
the Corinthians are in fact reading Gen 1–2 like Philo, they would be saying the
Adam of Gen 2:7 is the second one. So if Paul’s move is primarily exegetical, he fails.

But his move is not determined by a scriptural debate. Rather, it is by the
death and resurrection of God’s Messiah. Paul breaks off the quotation after the first
Adam, and instead simply asserts that “the last Adam became a life-giving spirit” (v.
45b).\(^{519}\) Even if the resurrection occurred “in accordance with the Scriptures” (v. 4),
Paul came to believe only because the glorified Jesus appeared to him (v. 8), after
which he, like all those who have faith, received the Spirit of God (e.g., 1 Cor 2:6–16;
Gal 3:1–14).\(^ {520}\) The hinge in this passage turns not on the exegesis of Genesis but on

---

\(^{519}\) It is possible that Genesis remains partially in view here, as in the πνοὴ ζωῆς of Gen 2:7,
but if so, Paul is certainly adapting the text freely. Jesus is thought to attain the σῶμα πνευματικόν and
his role as πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν particularly at the resurrection (so Conzelmann, \textit{1 Corinthians}, 286–87;
Fee, \textit{First Corinthians}, 789; Hays, \textit{First Corinthians}, 272; Thiselton, \textit{First Corinthians}, 1286), but
Paul does not parse the events of Christ’s life finely here. It is his life, death, and resurrection together
that are in the apostle’s mind.

\(^{520}\) Ciampa and Rosner (\textit{First Corinthians}, 820), more than most commentators, note Paul’s
conversion experience as a significant factor in v. 45b.
the believer’s experience of Christ and the Spirit. Paul assays their position and finds it wanting christologically.

The apostle’s argument, therefore, significantly redefines the terms in use among the Corinthian “elite,” so much so that it verges on parody.\(^{521}\) They claim to be πνευματικοί, a special class endowed with the Holy Spirit who presently share in the first Adam, that is, the heavenly man of Gen 1 (this elitism no doubt causing or exacerbating the divisions in Corinth: 1 Cor 1:10–23; 8:1–13; 11:17–14:40), and who disparage the physicality of human life to the point of doubting the resurrection (and leading to other body-related issues: 1 Cor 5:1–13; 6:12–7:40; 11:2–16).\(^{522}\) Paul inverts their ideals so that only at the eschatological resurrection, in all its corporeal glory, will they become πνευματικοί, at least in full.\(^{523}\) And in doing so they will

---

\(^{521}\) Hays (First Corinthians, 273) is similar but more reserved: “It is possible that all of this is a subtle rebuttal to an interpretation of Genesis that was influencing those Corinthians who thought of themselves as pneumatikoi. Perhaps their reading was more like Philo’s, connecting the ‘heavenly man’ with their own exalted knowledge and wisdom; if so, Paul’s opposition between Adam and Christ seeks to reshape their understanding and to beckon them to look to the future transformation of their bodies.” I will focus on the πνευματικοί / ψυχικοί and the two Adams, but it is possible that the ἀσθένεια / δύναμις duality also mimics the Corinthians’ terms (as in 8:7–13?): so Ciampa and Rosner, First Corinthians, 815–16.

\(^{522}\) Thiselton (First Corinthians, 1287–88) mentions the allure the Adam of Philo, or even of Sirach, could have held for those fancying themselves spiritual and wise.

\(^{523}\) There is some question whether v. 49 is predictive or hortatory. Fee (First Corinthians, 787 n. 5, 794–95) and, more tentatively, Hays (First Corinthians, 273–74) provide reasons in support
participate not in the first Adam, the Adam of Genesis, but the second, Jesus Christ, the Adam who is truly heavenly and identified with God’s life-giving Spirit.\footnote{This is not the first time in the epistle that Paul has done this. In 1 Cor 2:6–16 Paul picks up the language of the spiritual “elite” that he has been disputing in 1 Cor 1:10–2:5 in a “strategy of ironic reversal” (Hays, \textit{First Corinthians}, 41–42) or “decisive reinterpretation” (Thiselton, \textit{First Corinthians}, 252), terms such as “wisdom” (σοφία: vv. 6–7), the “mature” or “perfect” (τελείοι: v. 6), and especially πνευματικός (v. 13), as well as the concepts of mystery and spiritual powers (vv. 7–8). The syntax of v. 13 is complex, but it is clear that for Paul the real πνευματικοί understand spiritual things (πνευματικά) only by the power of the πνεῦμα of God (v. 11) or from God (v. 12), as opposed to the πνεῦμα of this world (v. 12), which gives only the worldly wisdom that the Corinthians were seeking. Indeed, the wisdom of this age makes one a ψυχικὸς ἄνθρωπος (v. 14), one who lacks the Spirit and unable to understand the spiritual realities of God. As in 1 Cor 15:42–49, Paul is redefining those who claim the title πνευματικός as ψυχικοί instead, people outside the realm of Christ — or at least people insofar as they act as though part of the world instead of Christ — who seek wisdom as it is normally defined and cause divisions thereby. And he makes the actual πνευματικοί those who have understood the secret wisdom of God. The apostle will then turn to a new duality in 1 Cor 3, to the πνευματικός / σαρκικός (3:1) or σαρκικός (3:3), and in this case it is clear that both classes are in Christ, but the immature “carnal” ones have a misdirected focus. Many commentators follow this general approach to 1 Cor 2:6–3:4: Barrett, \textit{First Corinthians}, 68–82; Blomberg, \textit{1 Corinthians}, 63–65, 72–76; Hays, \textit{First Corinthians}, 41–50; Thiselton, \textit{First Corinthians}, 252–95. Conzelmann (\textit{1 Corinthians}, 56–72), by contrast, sees Paul’s uses of πνευματικός and ψυχικός of ch. 2 lining up with the πνευματικός and σαρκικός / σαρκικός of ch. 3, with the result that Paul is really dividing between classes in Corinth. The problem with this is that, if Paul is not being sarcastic, it refutes his anti-factional statements in 1:10–17 and 3:4–23. Other uses of πνευματικός in the Pauline corpus are for Spirit-imparted gifts or those who posses them (1 Cor 12:1; 14:1, 37; Gal 6:1; also Col 1:10), as well as Spirit-imparted blessings (Rom
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of φορέσωμεν (“let us bear”), which is stronger textually and the harder reading. Neither draws the implication that the Christian has a capacity to experience the heavenly and Spirit-empowered \textit{imago} now, but instead that living in light of the resurrection requires different ethics and focus. Almost all translations and most commentaries, though, prefer φορέσομεν (“we will bear”), envisioning a future day in which believers will share the same type of resurrected existence that Jesus has. The decision is based on the fact that ο and ω probably sounded nearly indistinguishable to a scribe recording the words (so Barrett, \textit{First Corinthians}, 369 n. 2; Thiselton, \textit{First Corinthians}, 1289) and on the internal logic of the passage. Hence Bruce M. Metzger, \textit{A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament}, 2nd ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994), 502: “Exegetical considerations (i.e., the context is didactic, not hortatory) led the Committee to prefer the future indicative, despite its rather slender textual support.” Φορέσομεν is to be preferred.
Only with this background securely in mind can we approach vv. 45–47 properly. At first blush it might sound like Paul himself is indebted to a reading not unlike Philo’s (the “heavenly man,” the “earthly man”), only reversing the order.\textsuperscript{525} But Paul is instead countering their twofold view of the first man, uniting the earthly Adam (Gen 2:7; v. 45) with the εἰκών-bearing (Gen 1:26–28) and -giving (Gen 5:3) Adam (v. 49), and making the second Adam a figure outside the pages of Genesis, one who appeared to Paul and whom Paul spent his life proclaiming.\textsuperscript{526}

---

\textsuperscript{525} Conzelmann (\textit{1 Corinthians}, 284), for example, writes, “It is plain that [Paul] stands in a given exegetical tradition. For this exegesis cannot be derived from the Old Testament text, and on the other hand it has not been freely constructed by Paul. To be sure, he transforms his tradition independently, according to his own Christology and eschatology.” This is a fair point, but Paul’s ingenuity deserves greater recognition.

\textsuperscript{526} Some see in v. 49a (but not v. 49b, on Christ) only a reference to the “image” of Gen 5:3, not Gen 1:26–28: so Barrett, \textit{First Corinthians}, 377–78; Ciampa and Rosner, \textit{First Corinthians}, 824–25. It should be noted, first, insofar as Gen 5:3 is in view at all, it substantiates my contention (below) that 1 Cor 15:42–49 only pictures Adam in light of his whole biblical career, not just his prelapsarian existence. Second, though, it is better to take Gen 1 and Gen 5 together, even for the first Adam. This works better with v. 49b, in which the messianic \textit{imago} must certainly be that of Gen 1, given Paul’s frequent use of the concept. It also works better with vv. 25–27, when an allusion to the authority given in Gen 1:26–28 is combined with Pss 8 and 110. Finally, it works better with the paragraph as a whole, since Paul seems to be combining all aspects of Adam’s life, and the use of χοῖκος at least ties back to the χοῦς of Gen 2:7. Despite the difference on v. 49a, though, I am quite close to Ciampa and Rosner, who see the image of Gen 1:26–27 as something now damaged but still present in humanity, and something that is being repaired and restored in Christ. I just see these two aspects combined in v. 49a and v. 49b.
Or it might appear that Adam, even newly formed, is no more than an earthly, very human character in Paul’s mind. But this is not the only time in which the apostle deprecates aspects of creation that are found before Gen 3: elsewhere I argued regarding 1 Cor 11:2–16 and Gal 3:28 that sin had leached its way back into the original creation. The same occurs here. The immediate context pictures the inevitability of death for those bearing Adam’s image (vv. 36–49), and earlier we saw that “all die in Adam” (vv. 22) — a condition that for Paul came to pass only because of Adam’s disobedience. Indeed, the complex of death, sin, and law (as in Rom 5:12–21) is climactic here (vv. 54–57). Throughout 1 Cor 15, Paul has taken the composite portrait of Adam in Gen 1–5 and labeled it “the first Adam.” The apostle does not tell us what Adam could have been, only what he, in the event, became.

In summary, Adam’s legacy according to 1 Cor 15 is the introduction of death as a spiritual power over humanity for those “in” him (vv. 20–28) and the bequest of an “image of dust” and σῶμα ψυχικόν to those related to him (vv. 42–49). At no point

---

527 See the section on the Pauline imago Dei in Chapter 2.

528 Contra Barrett, First Corinthians, 374 (“There is no reference here [= v. 45] to a fall of Adam” [emphasis original]). Hays (First Corinthians, 272) is at least close to the position I develop here when he describes the Adam of v. 45 as “the initiator of decay and death,” in contrast to Christ, “the initiator of a new order of humanity.”
is Adam considered apart from his fallen state, even when his original creation is mentioned. Paul does this to show all the better the greatness of Christ who fulfilled the intended Adamic rule over creation (vv. 23–28).\textsuperscript{529} He also does it to make secure the Corinthians’ hope in a physical, glorious resurrection of the dead in which they will receive the *imago* originally designated for humanity (v. 49; cf. Phil 3:21).

Although the issues that prompt this discussion (the certainty of the resurrection and its nature) differ from that of Rom 5:12–21 (the present state of Christians as a new community), the characterization of Adam is much the same. Paul will simply present it in a tighter form and with different emphases.

**Introduction to the Domains of Adam and Christ: Romans 5:12–21**

We return to Romans, particularly to Rom 5:12–21. The anchor of Adamic traditions in Romans comes in this passage, since it is here alone that Adam is explicitly named. Discerning echoes of Eden elsewhere in the letter requires a sliding scale of probability. We may argue that it is likely that primeval history crops up, for

\textsuperscript{529} Barrett (*First Corinthians*, 376) finds this restoration of Adamic rule in the later section as well, although on ground that seems increasingly shaky. He reads \( \delta \ δεύτερος \ άνθρωπος \ εξ \ ουρανού \) (v. 47) as implying a future event, when the Son of Man (who he makes equal to the second Adam) will return (as Dan 7:13 is refracted in 1 En. 46:1–3 and 4 Ezra 13:1–3), and sees part of his coming role to be recovering “the dominion originally assigned to man (Gen. i. 28; Ps. viii. 6).”
example, in Rom 1 (a position to which I have already subscribed), but only here is it
guaranteed. Therefore Rom 5 provides a tether, preventing speculations that drift far
from demonstrable evidence. All elements of my own proposal updating the Adam-
Christ juxtaposition in Romans are centered in these verses, at least in a rudimentary
if not well-developed form, and when I discover Adam in other passages, it is always
grounded in this typology. 530

Romans 5:12–21 is often thought to make one point, the vast difference
between the effects of Adam’s disobedience and Christ’s obedience, in a series of
parallel statements that are qualified by a digression or two. Jewett, for example,

530 I mention according Rom 5 its due weight within Romans by way of reminder, but it is an
open question what role other Pauline writings should give in interpreting the comparison of Adam
and Christ that is before us now. J. Christiaan Beker (Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in Life
Thought, trans. Loren T. Stuckenbruck [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990], 3–36) has given us the
language of “coherence” and “contingency” to describe how Paul’s thought contains several
prominent, recurrent themes but, when a systemization of it is attempted, seems to frustrate a
satisfying synthesis. Whether the differences among the letters bespeak changes in Paul, the varied
situations of the churches, or his relation to his readers (unlike most of his other letters, this one is
not written to his own converts), they are real and cannot be ignored. In this case 1 Cor 15 in
particular commends itself as a parallel, and as Charlotte Hartwig and Gerd Theißen (“Die
corinthische Gemeinde als Nebenadressat des Römerbriefs: Eigentextreferenzen des Paulus und
Kommunikativer Kontext des längsten Paulusbriefes,” NovT 46 (2004): 229–52) have argued, the
Corinthian background is critical for Romans. He writes from the port city of Cenchreae (Rom 16:1),
and they hypothesize that Romans is written also for the Corinthians, clarifying obscure points from
his letters to them. Still, the topic of Rom 5 is distinguishable from 1 Cor 15: to the Corinthians, Paul
is explaining the certainty and nature of the resurrection; to the Romans, he is focuses on the present
results of living under one of two figures. Since my concern is what role Adam plays in the contingent
letter of Romans, I will note 1 Cor 15 and other passages, but always secondarily.
characterizes the passage as “difficult to follow because the initial comparison . . . is interrupted by historical and theological clarifications before it is resumed.”

No doubt the rhetoric is disjointed in places, if nowhere else than at the anacoluthon that ends v. 12.

However, there is a touch more structure to Paul’s rhetoric. I follow a few scholars in diagramming the passage according to a chiasm. Paul (A) opens with an unfinished comparison between Adam and Christ that is dominated by Adam (v. 12), (B) gives consideration to the role of the law (vv. 13–14), and (C) gives a comparison of the domains of Adam and Christ (vv. 15–17). His summary paragraph resumes the thought of v. 12 and returns, in inverse order, to the (C’) comparison of Adam and Christ (vv. 18–19), (B’) the role of the law (v. 20), and (A’) a finishing comparison dominated by Christ (v. 21). I will examine these units in turn, interweaving excurses on the three aspects of participatory domains (the heavenly ruler, the earthly group, and their mirrored actions) and on the answers to the three

\[531\] Jewett, *Romans*, 370.

riddles set forth in Chapter 1. This section of exegesis on Rom 5:12–21 synthesizes
the argument of the project thus far.

**The Opening Comparison: Romans 5:12**

Having intimated two opposing realms in vv. 1–11, Paul now identifies them with
their leading figures, Adam and Christ. This is the force of *Therefore*. More will be
said at the end of the analysis on the exact placement of this passage within Rom 5–
8, so for now I will limit myself to agreeing with those who see the first half of Rom
5 implied by τοῦτο in διὰ τοῦτο. The apostle begins his incomplete comparison by
writing that *sin came into the world through one man*. Paul gives us the first hint of
the Adamic participatory domain, but in this case the territory under his sway is the
κόσμος. It is possible that this “world” is interchangeable with the “all” and “many,”
but as we have seen, the charge given to humanity to rule over the earth was
frequently of interest to Greco-Roman Jews.\(^{533}\) It is expressed not only in the *imago
Dei* (Gen 1) and Adam’s naming of the animals (Gen 2) but also by more inventive

---

\(^{533}\) There is direct evidence that κόσμος can mean “humans” for Paul. In 2 Cor 5:19 Paul
writes, “in Christ God was reconciling the world (κόσμος) to himself, not counting their trespasses (τὰ
παραπτώματα αὐτῶν) against them (αὐτοῖς) . . . .” This movement to plural pronouns only makes sense
if he has people in mind.
strategies that complement the Genesis account, such as associating Adam’s initials with the four directions — a maneuver that only holds in Greek. Further, from Rom 8:20–21 we can establish that Paul thinks “the creation (ἡ κτίσις) was subjected to futility” and is in “bondage to decay,” in a manner that is somehow linked to humanity. So in Rom 5:12 Adam’s misdeed let loose the nefarious power of sin in God’s good creation.

But sin, in Paul’s thought, does not come unaccompanied: *and death came through sin.* Sin is the origin, and the climax of its effects is death. With this statement Paul pledges himself to the pessimistic school of Jewish thought about the fall. At minimum, immortality was available to Adam and Eve, if not their natural birthright, but their transgression brought corruption. Death would have been

---

534 In 1 Cor 15:26 death is the “last enemy,” but in 1 Cor 15:56 (“the sting of death is sin”) Paul seems to reverse the order. In either case they form an inseparable pair.

535 Stowers (Rereading of Romans, 87–88) argues that this school develops only after 70 CE: “this interest [in connecting universal human sinfulness with primeval sin] stems from a profound pessimism generated by the catastrophe to Judaism caused by the destruction of Jerusalem. Paul lived on the other side of this divide. The Judaism of 4 Ezra and [2] Baruch would have been unimaginable to the apostle.” Although it is true that all the works I have put in the “theological knot” school of the fall (4 Ezra, 2 Bar., LAE, and T. Ab.) may date to a time after Paul (all are thought to be 1st or 2nd c. in their original form), that there are four distinct parallels to Pauline thought that developed within decades of the apostle’s death indicates either that the tradition already existed or that it was a reasonable extrapolation from current views. And indeed the “hard truth” interpretation, which certainly precedes Paul, had within it the seeds of a more extreme position. Further, according to Paul, when he met the risen Christ in a vision, his own religious thinking experienced an upheaval
held at bay, but its inherent connection with sin gave it access to the world, more specifically, to humanity. The corruption was not the first pair’s alone, but it has been visited upon their descendants: *and so death spread to all because all have sinned*, Paul writes.

**Excursus 1: The “Many” as Corporate Identity.** The earthly aspect of a participatory domain is a corporate entity, and this “all” is our first introduction to them in this passage. At this juncture only Adam’s people appears, but soon the Messiah’s will be described with the same terminology. This earthly group is called alternately the “many” (πολλοί) and the “all” (πάντες). It is apparent that the words are used interchangeably (cf. v. 18 and v. 19), but the extent of the communities is not immediately apparent. “All” might indicate every last person or groups *en masse*, with a handful of exceptions. The “many” might be a synonym employed for variety, or it could push us toward the sense of a “large majority.”

and significant restructuring (e.g., Gal 1:11–24; Phil 3:1–11). There is no reason why the Messiah’s death could not have led him to work back to an extreme position on Adamic sin, according to a “from solution to plight” pattern.

536 In another sense creation is also placed within Adam’s domain, but only his descendants are properly within his participatory domain as I have defined the term in the preceding chapter.

537 The possibility of exceptions to “all” come at every point of the comparison, even regarding “death spread to all.” Any good first-century Jew would presumably exclude Enoch and Elijah from this category.
Perhaps certain terms are implied that delimit the meaning: “all (who remain in Adam)” and “all (who receive the work of Christ),” as λαμβάνοντες in v. 17 might indicate. Or it is possible that “all” speaks of potentiality rather than actuality, at least on the side of Christ, that all are able to receive the free gift. The challenge is to achieve consistency of meaning for “all” and “many,” not only within Rom 5:12–21 but also in the wider logic of Romans.

Lost amid the various celebrated, and disputed, Pauline terms found in Romans, πᾶς is an unobtrusive thread running through the epistle.\textsuperscript{538} Πᾶς is to be found in many of Paul’s memorable sayings that mark out the scope of sin and salvation, belief and unbelief.\textsuperscript{539} Yet commentators often restrict or expand the reach

\textsuperscript{538} So Lloyd Gaston (Paul and the Torah [Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1987], 116): “One might say that the key word for understanding Romans is pas, ‘all’ or ‘every.’ ” Its importance does not rest on numbers. It is, of course, exceedingly common in Romans (at nearly seventy instances), but it is exceedingly common in the NT in general, occurring 1243 times, more often than “Jesus” (Ἰησοῦς: 917) and “Lord” (κύριος: 717) and almost as often as “God” (Θεός: 1317).

\textsuperscript{539} A number of other examples will follow, so for now let Rom 10:4 suffice: “Christ is the end of the law so that there may be righteousness for everyone who believes (πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων).” This verse is the fulcrum in Paul argument from Israel’s unbelief (Rom 9:30–10:3) into Christ as the means of righteousness for everyone (Rom 10:5–21), and it is also the hermeneutical key that explains his use of Deut 30:12–14 in Rom 10:6–8. Πᾶς comes in many contexts beyond those I now consider, as when Paul speaks to the whole church at Rome (e.g., Rom 13:1) or about “all things” (e.g., Rom 11:36). I am limiting myself to uses that describe humans — often πᾶς is used substantively for this purpose, but it is also combined with ἄνθρωπος or a participle, esp. πιστεύων, and occasionally with ψυχή (“soul,” 2:9), στόμα (“mouth,” 3:19), and σάρξ (“flesh,” 3:20) to the same effect. It is particularly significant when the question before Paul who is included in God’s saved people.
of the word from one chapter to the next. We might illustrate this by comparing 

Rom 3:23 (“all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God”) and Rom 11:26 (“all Israel will be saved”) to the uses of “all” in this section (especially v. 18). Generally speaking, the traditional interpretation is to interpret “all” in Rom 3:23 as every single person, restrict its positive reference in Rom 5:18 to those who believe (but keep Adam’s “all” to be every individual), and then take “all Israel” to be the nation generally, not every individual. For those espousing a two-covenant solution to Paul’s theology (Jesus for gentiles, Torah for Jews), Rom 11:26 is given as prime evidence that Paul envisions salvation for Jews apart from Jesus Christ, based solely on God’s irrevocable call to Abraham and his seed. But often they demur at seeing

---

540 So Moo, *Romans*, 226–27, 343–44, 722. At Rom 5:18 he differentiates, “every person, without exception, is ‘in Adam’ (cf. vv. 12d–14); but only those who ‘receive the gift’ (v. 17; ‘those who believe,’ according to Rom. 1:16–5:11) are ‘in Christ.’ That ‘all’ does not always mean ‘every single human being’ is clear from many passages.” Likewise, he writes of Rom 11:26, “Paul writes ‘all Israel,’ not ‘every Israelite’ — and the difference is an important one. ‘All Israel’ . . . has a corporate significance, referring to the nation as a whole and not to every single individual who is a part of that nation.”

“all” saved universally in Rom 5; it is achieved by faithful Jews and Christians. A universalist does have a clear way to take “all” consistently in these passages. Every individual is sinful in Adam (Rom 3 and Rom 5), and every individual is saved in Christ (Rom 5) — with the simple corollary that all Jews, as part of humanity, will be saved (Rom 11). Yet even here, πᾶς is not always given consistent meaning.

This argument extends only so far. It is certainly possible that Paul means one thing by “all” in one part of Romans, and something else in another. Πᾶς is not a technical word for him, as νόμος and πίστις are, and it often describes another idea, such as “all ungodliness” (πᾶσα ἀσέβεια) in Rom 1:18. However, in Rom 3, 5, and 11, πᾶς is marking off the same entities, those who are saved and those who are sinful.

The difficulty is particularly acute in Rom 5:12–21, where “all” are both subject to

---

542 I quoted Gaston (Paul and Torah, 116) above. Directly following his statement about the importance of πᾶς in Romans, he cautions, “But this must not be interpreted in a disinterested, even-handed, universalizing theological manner. I would understand it rather to function as a kind of ‘inclusive language’; it is used by Paul to include the formerly excluded, namely, the Gentiles.”

543 On this view, Rom 11:32 forms a fitting summary of the epistle’s theology: “For God has imprisoned all (τοὺς πάντας) in disobedience so that he may be merciful to all (τοὺς πάντας).”

544 C. K. Barrett, The Epistle to the Romans, 2nd ed., BNTC (London: Black, 1991), 70–71, 108–9, 206. Of Rom 5 he writes, tentatively, “Despite the fact that it is impossible to draw from [Paul’s language in v. 18] any simple arithmetical conclusion about the numbers of the saved and of the lost,” nonetheless it is “more probably true” that Paul envisions both condemnation and justification as “universal possibilities, even universal actualities.” Turning to Rom 11:26, though, he prefers the corporate designation “Israel as a whole” to the individualizing “each several Israelite” because, Barrett reasons, Paul “is thinking in representative terms.”
condemnation and death, yet are justified and promised eternal life. A consistent meaning would, at minimum, be preferable, so far as circumstances allow. Here I think it valuable to follow a suggestion made by Lloyd Gaston and Thomas H. Tobin.\textsuperscript{545} Skimming Romans looking for instances in which πᾶς describes groups of people in the context of salvation or justification, what becomes immediately apparent is how often “all” is placed adjacent to Paul’s ethnic terms.\textsuperscript{546} Admittedly there are isolated cases in which πᾶς indicates Jews or gentiles exclusively, but it

\textsuperscript{545} Gaston, \textit{Paul and Torah}, 116–34; Tobin, “Jewish Context,” 173–74. They apparently developed this understanding independently of each other. For Gaston, the force of “all” is esp. for gentile inclusion. He gives an example from the civil rights movement, that “all men are created equal” indicated “blacks are created equal” in particular (p. 225 n. 2). I agree with Tobin that Paul has both Jews and gentiles equally in view.

\textsuperscript{546} To wit, Rom 1:16: “For I am not ashamed of the gospel; it is the power of God for salvation to everyone who has faith (πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων), to the Jew first and also to the Greek”; 2:9–10: “There will be anguish and distress for everyone who does evil (πᾶσα ψυχή ἀνθρώπου τοῦ κατεργαζομένου τὸ κακόν), the Jew first and also the Greek, but glory and honor and peace for everyone who does good (πᾶς ὁ ἐργαζόμενος τὸ ἀγαθόν), the Jew first and also the Greek”; 3:9: “we have already charged that all (πάντες), both Jews and Greeks, are under the power of sin”; 4:11–12: “The purpose was to make [Abraham] the ancestor of all who believe (πάντες οἱ πιστεύοντες) without being circumcised . . . and likewise the ancestor of the circumcised . . .”; 4:16–17: “For this reason it depends on faith, in order that the promise may rest on grace and be guaranteed to all his descendants (πᾶν τὸ σπέρμα), not only to the adherents of the law but also to those who share the faith of Abraham (for he is the father of all [πάντες] of us, as it is written, ‘I have made you the father of many nations’);” 10:11–13: “For the Scripture says, ‘Everyone who believes (πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων) in him will not be put to shame.’ For there is no distinction between Jew and Greek; for the same Lord is Lord of all (πάντες), bestowing his riches on all who call (πάντες οἱ ἐπικαλούμενοι) on him. For ‘everyone (πᾶς) who calls on the name of the Lord will be saved’ ” (ESV for 10:11–13). To this list could be added Rom 3:23 in the context of vv. 21–25. In that passage “all (πάντες) have sinned,” but there is righteousness to “all who believe” (πάντες οἱ πιστεύοντες), and both the sinning and justification are in the context of Paul’s proclamation, “For there is no distinction,” i.e., no distinction between the sinfulness and the salvation of Jews and gentiles (vv. 29–30).
approaches a defined cast when the dynamics of salvation are considered. In Romans it seems that “all” is Paul’s shorthand for “both Jew and gentile.”

This meaning of “all” can be applied throughout Romans, whenever the question before Paul is some aspect of justification or salvation. It fits the “thesis” of Rom 1:16–17. If this phrase is substituted into the three representative passages listed above, it makes good sense in each of them. In Rom 3:23, “both Jews and gentiles have sinned.” This is consonant with the argument above that Rom 1–3 is about the sinfulness all Adamic nations face, including Israel. In Rom 11:26, “both Jewish and gentile ‘Israel’ will be saved,” that is, the whole olive tree (to redeploy Paul’s analogy), both the engrafted wild branches and the eschatologically restored native branches. And here in Rom 5 Paul’s point is that both Adam and Christ rule mixed ethnic communities, rather than the Messiah for Israel and Adam for the nations. In Rom 11:32, our “lodestar” verse, Paul would then be summing up his...

---

547 Jews only: “not all Israelites (πάντες οἱ ἐξ Ἰσραήλ) truly belong to Israel, and not all of Abraham’s children (Ἄβραὰκ πάντες τέκνα) are his true descendants” (Rom 9:6–7); gentiles only: “through [Jesus] we have received grace and apostleship to bring about the obedience of faith among all the Gentiles (πάντα τὰ ἔθνη)” (1:5); “Praise the Lord, all you Gentiles (πάντα τὰ ἔθνη), and let all the peoples (πάντες οἱ λαοὶ) praise him” (Rom 15:11, quoting Ps 117:1 [LXX: 116:1]); “through the prophetic writings [the mystery] is made known to all the Gentiles (πάντα τὰ ἔθνη)” (16:26, if orig.).
argument thus: God has imprisoned both Jews and gentiles in disobedience in order that he might have mercy on all peoples.

The position that πάντες is “both Jews and gentiles” rather than “all people without exception” is reinforced by the presence of πολλοί. “Many” suggests profusion without indicating exhaustive coverage. In Rom 8:29, for example, Jesus becomes “the first-born among many brethren (πολλοὶ ἂδελφοί)” (RSV), but there is no indication of universality. Or it is a way to differentiate between the singular and the plural. In a short paragraph reminiscent of 1 Cor 12 — and including the “one” and “many” pairing, as in Rom 5 — Paul instructs the congregation, “For as in one body (ἓν σῶμα) we have many members (πολλὰ ἐλή), and not all the members have the same function, so we, who are many (οἱ πολλοί), are one body (ἓν σῶμα) in Christ, and individually we are members one of another” (Rom 12:4–5). In Rom 4:17–18, πολλοί and πάντες are again found with ethnic language, albeit in an OT quotation. Abraham is twice called “the father of many nations” (πατὴρ πολλῶν ἐθνῶν), quoting Gen 17:5, and this runs parallel to Paul’s characterization of Abraham as “the father of us all” (πατὴρ πάντων ἡμῶν) in the preceding verse.
Paul’s goal in this passage, and in Romans in general, is to establish neither
universal sinfulness nor universal salvation. Rather, as in Rom 1–3 so also in Rom
5:12: corruption rules all nations, and sin runs rampant in each. But God has offered
a solution for all ethnic groups. No matter how pervasive sinfulness is, an even more
abundant grace comes to all peoples in Jesus Christ, to the Jew first and also to
Greeks, barbarians, and all nations.

Excursus 2: Shared Destiny of “One” and “Many.” A second aspect of
participatory domains is that the fortunes of an earthly group are bound up with
those of its patron. The world below corresponds to heaven above. More than that,
there is causality: cosmic feats are communicated to an earthly community, which in
turn shares in the results.

Most of these elements are obvious in Rom 5:12–21. The leading idea of the
passage is that the Adamic “many” and the messianic “many” share with their
respective “one” a common destiny. Since Adam and Christ are the central actors,
the influence of their work (death or life, judgment or justification) cannot be
doubted. In some way, Paul avers, the primeval disobedience and the eschatological
obedience determine the outcomes for human society. Individuals, by contrast, are
for the most part passive; “sin” and “death” are predominantly spoken of as forces rather than concrete instances. However, in Rom 5 Paul does not devote much space to the earthly reality, in particular, to human actions (as distinct from fate). To the degree that there is an affirmation of corporate sins, as well as deaths, they come at the end of v. 12, when Paul states that “death spread to all” and “all have sinned.”

The apostle has deliberately written Rom 5:12 to indicate correspondence. At minimum, we can speak of a mirroring between Adam and his society. The first half of the verse considers Adamic sin and death as cosmic powers, and the second half indicates concrete deaths (so also v. 15: “the many died”) and concrete sins (hints also in the plural nouns in vv. 14 and 16) in the earthly realm. Something more than correspondence seems to be implied, though. It seems that the κόσμος in this and the subsequent verse indicates not so much the created world as an abstract idea, as in Greek philosophy, or even the concrete reality, as described in Gen 1. It is especially earth as the theater of human lives and deaths, kindnesses and brutalities. Adam’s act of disobedience broke the hermetic seal, and now death and sin multiply unchecked among us.
So far I have skirted the sense of ἐϕ᾿ ᾧ. The perspective I have given in the paragraphs above can brook any of the major interpretations of the phrase’s meaning. If “because” (with the majority), Paul’s point is that, both on the cosmic, abstract level and on the earthly, concrete level, sin leads to death. In this case the phrase is among the indicators of correspondence, since Paul is grounding earthly deaths in earthly sins. Rather than dual causality, as this interpretation is generally assumed to imply, we can instead see it as earth mirroring heaven. If “with the result that” (as Fitzmyer suggests), the cosmic impact is assured. In this case Adam’s action is the “primary causality” of all human sins. If “upon which (= the earth)” (as Jewett suggests), Adam’s wrongdoing makes human sins almost inevitable. After all, it would be Adam who let this foreign power of sin into the world, and this is the realm in which all people commit their misdeeds.

I am disposed to agree with Fitzmyer. The progression of the verse is cleanest in this case, and it works well for the closest Pauline parallel. Further, although

---

548 Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 416–17. I describe his view (and Jewett’s) in more detail in Chapter 1.

549 Of course, if Augustine was right all along (which does not seem likely), and we Jews and gentiles both sin “in him,” in Adam, the connection is the tightest.

550 2 Corinthians 5:4: “For while we are still in this tent, we groan under our burden, with the result that (ἐϕ᾿ ᾧ) we wish not to be unclothed but to be further clothed, so that what is mortal may
Jewett disputes some of his listed Greco-Roman examples, nonetheless the two that Fitzmyer quotes in the text of his commentary do have a consecutive sense. To make the logic of the sentence fit even better, I would supply a second ἁμαρτία by ellipsis, linked to the second ἡμέρας, since these two are paired earlier in the verse. Thus I would paraphrase Paul’s incomplete thought: “Therefore, just as Sin entered the world through Adam, and with it Death, and so Death spread to all nations, (and with it Sin,) with the result that all nations sinned — .” No matter which of the major interpretations of ἐφ᾿ ᾧ one chooses, however, the Adamic and earthly realities of sin and death at least correspond. This is the most we can say about the corporate groups in Rom 5, since Paul speaks more of the two “ones” than their peoples, but Paul does give suggestive comments about the human reality. We will return to the earthly domain in Rom 7.

be swallowed up by life” (NRSV, modified to match Fitzmyer’s suggested sense). Admittedly, neither Phil 3:12 nor Phil 4:10 fits the mold, but they do not necessarily mean “because” either. Phil 3:12 could mean “that for which” rather than “because,” as in the KJV: “Not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect: but I follow after, if that I may apprehend that for which (ἐφ᾿ ᾧ) also I am apprehended of Christ Jesus.” And most translations take ἐφ᾿ ᾧ in Phil 4:10 not as “because” but “for whom,” i.e., “for me” (= Paul): “I rejoice in the Lord greatly that now at last you have revived your concern for me; indeed, you were concerned for me (ἐφ᾿ ᾧ), but had no opportunity to show it.”
Consideration of the Law: Romans 5:13–14

Having begun his comparison of Adam and Christ, Paul breaks off halfway to consider the role of the law. The impetus for this aside is that the simple juxtaposition, Adam–sin–death : Christ–grace–life, is not adequate, but its inadequacy does not necessarily derive from the reasons we might assume. Were we to imagine a Jewish interlocutor here (as in Rom 2:17), the objection might be,

> The law is the solution to these problems! Does not the psalm proclaim, “Happy are those whose way is blameless, who walk in the law of the Lord.” Later it says, “I treasure your word in my heart, so that I may not sin against you,” and “I will never forget your precepts, for by them you have given me life.” God gave Moses the commandments to curb the power of sin and lead us away from death.\(^{551}\)

This is not Paul’s concern at present. If I am right to picture him as altering his discourse to forestall a rejoinder (rather than to indulge in a diatribe as in other parts of Romans), the challenge comes from a shrewd but unconvinced interlocutor, like the figure who questions God’s justice in Rom 9:19–20. This imaginary individual questions how “sin” can exist without rules to break. So Paul first affirms, *sin was indeed in the world before the law*, but then he allows, *but sin is not reckoned when there is no law.*

---

\(^{551}\) Psalm 119 [LXX 118]:1, 11, 93. By the end of both 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch, the law is what overcomes human sinfulness, although in Ezra makes several objections to the contrary.
In the NT ἁμαρτία is consistently translated “sin,” but its general meaning in secular literature of the time is “failure” or “error.” Paul’s point is that “sin” can be understood as any departure from rightness, even without specific commands. Still, the apostle agrees with my imagined skeptic that there is a material difference between sin under the law and apart from the law. Only in the former case is sin “reckoned.” Ελλογέω, from ἐν λόγῳ πιθέναι, has the sense of “put in writing” or “mark down,” and Paul uses it in the commercial sense of charging Onesimus’s debts.

---


553 In a number of instances, Hellenistic Jews would tout Mosaic law as the ideal after which all other codifications of law were imitations, and they affirmed that non-Jews were able to apprehend the essence of God’s law. We might think of Philo or Wisdom in this regard, but a particularly clear reference (within an eschatological framework) comes in Sib. Or. 3.757–58: “The Immortal in the starry heaven will put in effect a common law (κοινὸς νόμος) for men throughout the whole earth.” Both John J. Collins (Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora, 2nd ed., BRS [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000], 162–64) and Rieuwerd Buitenwerf (Book III of the Sibylline Oracles and Its Social Setting, SVTP 17 [Leiden: Brill, 2003], 337) note that Torah is here presented as something that all nations possess via their conscience. Earlier in the letter Paul speaks of the present state of gentiles with similar words: “When Gentiles, who do not possess the law, do instinctively [or, more neutrally, ‘by nature’: ϕύσει] what the law requires, these, though not having the law, are a law to themselves. They show that what the law requires is written on their hearts, to which their own conscience also bears witness” (Rom 2:14–15).

554 In the words of Barrett (First Adam to Last, 15), “law is not necessary to the existence but only for the assessment of sin.” Barrett begins his reflections on Rom 5 here, in the “curious interim period” where there is no law, neither of the “simple Adamic kind” nor of the “detailed and complicated Mosaic kind.”
to his own account in Phlm 18. A baby, before it can comprehend right and wrong, does many things that are contrary to the desires of his parents and can even cause true harm. Reality does not make exceptions for accidents. If a crawling infant bumps a decorative vase so that it tips and shatters, value has still been lost. It remains, in this sense, an error. However, when a toddler, who does know to be careful of the decoration, ignores the command (and his mom’s fervent “No!”), the mistake is worse and will be accounted to him. He incurs a “debt” of guilt, so to speak, that the unknowing baby does not. Deliberate error requires its own consideration; hence the present verse.

The apostle then turns his mind to sin’s companion: Yet death exercised dominion from Adam to Moses. To return to my analogy, the overturned vase is lost no matter if there is intent or not, and further, the young child is at risk of injury by the resulting shards. For Paul, the world inherited by, say, Seth and Methuselah, was damaged quite apart from any guilt on their part. It is a lamentable fact of life. Then, reinforcing his earlier point, Paul adds that death held sway even over those whose sins were not like the transgression of Adam, who, until the giving of the law at Mount Sinai, was the only human to commit a purposeful sin — or to take up the

vocabulary Paul now introduces, a “transgression” (παράβασις), an overstepping of God’s command.\textsuperscript{556}

We may pause to address whether Paul is sketching the lines of his theology too hurriedly. He has already written in Rom 2:14–15 that gentiles understand by nature God’s law and can be judged by their internal sense of it. Would this not be equally true of the pre-Mosaic individuals, most notably the antediluvians who so abounded in wickedness that God was impelled to destroy the earth? And what of Eve, or the patriarchs, who also received divine instructions?

These issue can be answered in two ways. First, yes, Paul is collapsing biblical history into its most essential moments.\textsuperscript{557} No doubt were he speaking to the Roman Christians in person he might stop here, field questions, and add further nuances. He is, at the moment, already in the midst of an excursus, so he is obliged to be

\textsuperscript{556} Commentators debate whether there is a meaningful terminological distinction between “sin” and “transgression.” I side with those who judge that there is — so, e.g., Witherington, \textit{Romans}, 147–48. Witherington defines “transgression” as “a willfull violation of a known law.” No matter the semantics, though, Paul distinguishes two types of sin here, deliberate and ignorant. Also, as noted in Chapter 1, a number of ancient mss lack “not” (μὴ) before “sins,” inverting the meaning of the sentence. However, it is easier to explain μὴ being dropped by a scribe who has not understood Paul’s subtle differentiation of “sin” and “transgression” than a scribe adding it to Rom 5:14 when it was not there in the first place.

\textsuperscript{557} In justifying his treatment of Pauline theology through the figures of Adam, Abraham, Moses, and Christ, Barrett (\textit{First Adam to Last}, 5) writes, “Paul sees history gathering at nodal points, and crystallizing upon outstanding figures.” This seems to be occurring here.
concise. Second, though, the apostle’s simplification allows him to sort both eras and ἔθνη into a convenient rubric. In the category “under the law” falls Adam and the post-Mosaic nation of Israel. In the category “apart from the law” fall all nations before Moses and, presumably, all gentiles thereafter. This layering of Adam and Israel will reappear in Rom 7.

The final words in v. 14, who is a type of the one who was to come, occasion two coordinating excurses, one answering a “riddle” from Chapter 1, and the other on the heavenly figures of the two participatory domains.

Excursus 3: Solution to Adam as the “Type.” The narrowest “riddle” I posed in Chapter 1 was in what sense Adam constitutes a “type of the coming one” (τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος). There I sided with the consensus that Christ, not Moses, is the referent and with recent interpreters who caution that the NT is not yet witness to the hermeneutical strategy of typology in any strict sense. No doubt the NT authors had a concept of Israel’s “types” being fulfilled in the messianic age, as is evident from 1 Cor 10 (and Hebrews!), but this conviction did not come with a list of procedural guidelines, so to speak. That said, the word is not chosen at random, nor
is this a throwaway line. Here preeminently Paul suggests a degree of
commensurability between Adam and the Messiah.

As already noted in Chapter 1, the flow of recent scholarship has been toward
understanding this typology as provisional and functional: Adam is a type of Christ
insofar as both affect the “all” — and no more. There, many say, the comparison
ends. This growing conviction has occurred, not coincidentally, as the dating of
rabbinic and Gnostic sources has been pushed back, for in those works (in different
ways) a redeeming figure is fashioned in the pattern of the first man. I contend that
the loss of those two corpora does not vitiate a reconstruction of the Messiah as a
type of “second Adam” in the first century. In fact, several lines of evidence point to
that conclusion.

The first and most contested element is dating, finding support for the
contention that Paul and his audience knew the traditions that make Adam
comparable to the Messiah. Here I have in mind the “Adam as a glorious figure”
traditions from Chapter 2. It is true that the works that most elevate Adam come
late, after the time of Paul, such as the ones that promise that Adam will be divinized
(e.g., T. Adam 3:2–4; 2nd / 5th c. CE). A number of important pseudepigrapha, not
least the Life of Adam and Eve literature, derive from Paul’s general era, but they often lack definitive chronological indicators and may fall at any time within a century on either side of Paul. Further, most of them include textual additions from early medieval times. They are folkloristic, almost storehouses of ideas that come from various ages and that sit side by side in a more or less coherent narrative. No doubt some elements precede the written work, but some are added later, and sifting the one from the other involves uncertainty. Looking only at these pseudonymous sources, it might seem that they fare no better than rabbinic or Gnostic ones.558

Even, however, with the works that are post-Pauline, or arguably so, two things bear consideration. One is that the same methodological reserve has not stopped most scholars from comparing Rom 5 to 4 Ezra or 2 Baruch, two writings that demonstrably come after Paul’s lifetime, if only by a few decades.559 The second is that the glorious Adam traditions are by far the most widespread of Adamic lore in Greco-Roman times, as indicated by my taxonomy in Chapter 2. Whereas there are

558 E.g., Levison (Portraits of Adam, 152–54) concludes that there was no Adamic speculation through the early second century. Even for the LAE literature, which he covers separately, he says little about Adam’s original nature (pp. 186–87), despite the fact that he covers material in the Lat. LAE of Satan being commanded to worship Adam (pp. 177–78).

559 By comparison, many of the highest pictures of Adam and Eve come from works that may be contemporary with Paul, and if not are probably contemporary with 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch: e.g., Life of Adam and Eve, Testament of Abraham, 2 Enoch, and 3 Baruch.
at least a handful of texts for all of the five categories, there is a swell of examples in
the “glorious” one. If, per the later OT Pseudepigrapha, Adam’s primary legacy in
the second and subsequent centuries is a magnificent figure — wise, ruling the
world, the ideal human, and so great as to inspire the jealousy of angels — then
there is a good chance that this prestige was present in the first century.

In fact, when we consider the corpora I have surveyed as a whole, not just the
later writings, the roots of these conceptions are indeed present in the first century
or before, albeit in less developed forms. The idea that Adam is the greatest living
human can be found already in Sir 49:16, as well as Sib. Or. 1.22–37. In the Third
Sibyl, “Adam” is matched with the four cardinal directions, implicitly showing his
rule over creation (Sib. Or. 3.24–26), as later works make explicit, and his dominion
over the world is also spoken of in Jub 2–3 and Wis 10:1–2. Josephus knows of
Adam’s prophetic career in which he foretells the two destructions of the world (Ant.
1.70–71). Philo has a heavenly Adam who is the Platonic ideal of humanity, and even

\[560\] I included every reference of which I am cognizant for each area, so the results are not
tailored to expand this category. A degree of observational bias is inevitable, but the number of
references found for each category is not particularly close: there are probably two or three references
to Adam’s glory for every one about his role in causing disaster.
his earthly Adam is, as a consequence of his creation from a perfect world at the
hands of God, the greatest human ever made.

Adam’s glory, as understood in Paul’s day, is perhaps clearest from two
phrases. The first is in the DSS. Very often the Qumran community portrays
salvation as the recovery of “all the glory of Adam” (1QS IV.23; 1QH a IV.15; CD-A
III.20; similar: 4Q171 III.1–2; 4Q416 2.III.11–12; 4Q418 9.12). Since they, like many
Second Temple Jews (e.g., Dan 12:1–4; Mark 12:25 pars.), envisioned the eternal
state as an angelic one, if we reason from what will be found to what was lost, the
first couple must have been created angelomorphic. Adam and Eve were no ordinary
mortals.

The second phrase comes in Wisdom, a work Paul likely references as he pens
Romans. The author says that although God created humanity in his own eternal
image, death entered the world “through the devil’s envy” (φήνος διαβόλου) (2:23–24
RSV; cf. Josephus, Ant. 1.41–42). Satan’s envy becomes widespread in later
traditions, and it is understood to mean that Adam was to replace the not-yet-fallen
chief angel as God’s second-in-charge. While Wisdom does not go that far, explicitly at least, it does indicate that Adam was granted an esteem that Satan lacked or lost. And, as Philo has it, God “deemed [Adam] worthy of the second place (ἡξίου δευτερείων), making him His own viceroy (ὑπάρχος) and lord of all others (ἄλλων ἁπάντων ἡγεμών)” (*Opif.* 148). In certain ways, Adam was above the angels.

The first line of evidence, in sum, is that in Paul’s day the first man had already taken on all of the core pieces of his later glorious image, and the only question is how full the bloom was. There is room for debate, but the prelapsarian Adam was variously the perfect human being, a prophet and symbol of the mind, the ruler of creation, and great enough to be likened to the angels and to provoke a mighty spirit to his downfall.

That Adam was glorious, however, is not the same as his being specifically linked to the Messiah. The second line of evidence is based on the natural fittingness of eschatology reflecting protology. There are ample precedents of this in Second

---

561 The post-Wisdom sources are the LAE, esp. in the Lat.; 2 En. 31:3–6 (J); 3 Bar. 4:8 (Gk.); Apoc. Sedr. 5:1–2; and T. Adam 4:5. The first three are sometimes placed in the first century, and so there is a good chance that the full conception was present during Paul’s lifetime.

562 Hurtado (*One God*, 153–54 n. 56) notes this description as an example of exalted patriarchs in Second Temple literature. See more on Hurtado in the following paragraphs.
Temple literature, and it is certainly true of Paul, who speaks of the inbreaking eschatological reality as a “new creation” (2 Cor 5:17; Gal 6:15).\textsuperscript{563} This association stands apart from the fall-to-restoration paradigm of salvation. Even ignoring the role of Gen 3 in eschatology, there is no doubt that Gen 1–2 structures the imagination of Greco-Roman Jews when they envision eternity. It is not a great leap from this conviction to associate Adam, the centerpiece of the old creation, with the Messiah, the centerpiece of the new.

Third, the glorious characteristics of Adam line up reasonably well with those expected of the messiah — or, to speak more generally, of the eschatological mediator who will act on behalf of God’s people.\textsuperscript{564} To illustrate, I turn to two of the leading scholars on early Christology.\textsuperscript{565} As we noted in Chapter 3, Hurtado has

\textsuperscript{563} I give a number of examples in “Restoration of Paradise,” as part of the “Glorious Adam Traditions” in Chapter 2.

\textsuperscript{564} I speak of the “messiah,” but there were a variety of mediators in Jewish thought of the first century, and the expected roles for the messiah varied considerably. My point here is that, to the degree that the longing of Greco-Roman Jews was crystallized into God-appointed figures, what Adam once was would look quite similar to these same Jewish portraits of the first man.

\textsuperscript{565} Earlier studies of Christology often called particular attention to the royal or Davidic background of the term, usually infused secondarily with other OT roles, like a prophet or priest, and other OT images, like the Suffering Servant, the “one like a son of man,” and personified wisdom. It was regularly in the case of the “Son of Man” imagery that the Messiah was likened to a Second Adam of some sort. See, for example, Sigmund Mowinckel, \textit{He That Cometh}, trans. G. W. Anderson (New York: Abingdon, 1954), 370–73, 420–37; Cullmann, \textit{Christology}, 137–52, 166–81.
three categories of mediators in early Judaism — personified divine attributes (wisdom and λόγος), exalted patriarchs (especially Enoch and Moses), and principal angels (such as Michael) — and sees them as providing, under certain mutations, “the sort of resources in the Jewish tradition that were available to help the first Christians accommodate conceptually the exaltation of Jesus next to God.”

Dunn canvasses similar territory, and investigates early Christology via six (potential) titles: the Son of God, Son of Man, Last Adam, Spirit of God, Wisdom of God, and Word of God.

On both models Adamic imagery fits particularly into one of the common messianic patterns, either as a category unto itself (as in Dunn) or as an instance of an exalted patriarch (as in Hurtado). Beyond this, Adam can be associated

---

566 Hurtado, *One God*. The quotation is on p. 93.

567 Dunn, *Christology in the Making: A New Testament Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1980). Dunn is tentative about Jesus being portrayed as the “Spirit of God.” He writes, “If we can talk properly of a Spirit-christology in the NT we are talking about a two-stage christology,” that is, that the earthly Jesus is inspired by the Spirit and only at his resurrection becomes “the life-giving Spirit, the Lord of the Spirit” (p. 160). In the same chapter he denies that NT authors took Jesus to be an angel of any kind (pp. 149–59, 161–62).

568 Hurtado, *One God*, 64 and n. 56 on pp. 153–54; Dunn, *Christology in the Making*, 98–128. Hurtado places Adam among the exalted patriarchs, but only devotes a few lines to him. For Dunn, there is no Gnostic background to the title; rather, when Paul speaks of Jesus as the “Last Adam” he has in mind a heavenly and earthly Adam akin to those in Philo, but independent of the Alexandrian and without many of his particular nuances. He also judges that a christological use of Ps
secondarily with wisdom or the word (e.g., as a prophet in Josephus and νοῦς in Philo) and with angels (as in the DSS). The title “Son of Man” in Hebrew (בן אדם) invites comparisons with Adam, even if that connection had not yet been made in the mid-first century.\(^{569}\)

Lest I be misunderstood, I am not basing my case on a pre-Pauline tradition of a messianic “Second Adam.” It is possible that another Jew before the apostle had made the connection between the two figures, but there is little evidence for that position, except in a textually uncertain verse in the Similitudes (1 En. 46:2). Nor am I suggesting that there was one concept of God’s mediator, the Messiah, or a single picture of Adam in Jewish minds. Many images and ideas were attached to both and with certain recurring patterns, but nothing hard-and-fast.

The upshot of the foregoing is rather that the raw material for an Adamic Christology was present for Paul to use. By calling Adam a “type of the one who was to come,” the apostle is organizing Adamic lore and messianic expectations into an

---

\(^{569}\) Dunn, *Christology in the Making*, 7, 96–97, 110–13, 259–60. He argues that there was no pre-Christian “Son of Man” concept, and its use in the first generation of Christians it only bears Danielic background. After 70 CE in several independent sources it denotes a pre-existent individual, and only then does it have any Adamic or Primal Man sense.
alignment instantly recognizable to his readership. In saying this I agree with Dunn’s understanding of Paul’s Adamic Christology: Jesus succeeds where Adam failed, he died an Adamic death, and at his resurrection he becomes the archetype of resurrected humanity just as Adam was the archetype of mortal humanity.\(^{570}\)

But I also go a step further. The “glorious Adam” traditions are one of the ways Paul conceives of Jesus’s messianic status. In particular, they give Paul a vocabulary for articulating a Messiah who is both genuinely human and more than human, bodily but still enthroned at God’s right hand, an individual yet representative of all nations. Of figures within Jewish tradition, these points were only true of Adam, and Paul capitalizes on them to speak of a glorified “one” who unites “all.”\(^{571}\) I conclude that the apostle does indeed see a measure of ontological similarity between Adam and Christ.

But perhaps what I have said so far has seemed to swing the pendulum too far to the other side, as if I neglect the pessimism about Adam’s sin or have forgotten the repeated “how much more” in vv.15, 17. If I err on the side of resemblance, I do

---


\(^{571}\) Some of the other glorified patriarchs, particularly Enoch, might be human and more than human in Jewish thought, but he is not used as a representative of all as Adam is.
so to restore balance in our assessment of Adam’s role in Second Temple literature. If Paul turned his audience’s eye toward the negative results of Adam’s sin, in part that was because in his day they would have been wont to dwell on Adam’s resplendence. The pessimism was comparatively uncommon. We are in no such danger. More than that, though, I propose that Paul had a specific sense of τύπος in mind that accounts for both the likeness and the dissimilarity, both the glory and the doom. Among its regular meanings is “mold,” and this, I think, is the specific sense in Rom 5:14. Adam was once glorious and great, but at his sin he vacated much of it, and diabolical sin and death took over his role. The greatness of Jesus, according to Paul in Rom 5, is that he more than filled the gaping void left by Adam’s fall.

*Excursus 4: The “One” Heavenly Patron.* Having considered two of the three aspects of participatory domains (the “many” and shared destinies) above, and having argued that Paul’s typology establishes a meaningful ontological similarity between Adam and Christ, the result of this present excursus follows almost as a matter of course. Adam and Christ are the patrons of two rival participatory

---

572 On this I must confess my disagreement with Barrett (*First Adam to Last*), who writes, “If one sifts this material [i.e., Jewish writings], it seems that nothing in the story of Adam impressed Judaism so much as the devastating punishment inflicted on him in his fall . . . . His previous size, beauty, and wisdom were elaborated in order to stress the more forcibly the depths to which later generations of men had sunk.”
domains. I have already spoken of them as “cosmic” and “heavenly,” and my justification for doing so is grounded in this point. As I have argued in Chapter 3, “participatory domains” are a common feature in the thought world of Second Temple Judaism, especially for understanding the effect a singular individual (heavenly or human) can have on corporate groups. In the case of the pre-fall Adam and the post-resurrection Jesus, they reign over tripartite participatory domains and fulfill both the earthly “heroic” role (as real humans) and the heavenly “divine being” role (as glorified):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adamic Domain</th>
<th>Messianic Domain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prelapsarian Adam</td>
<td>Glorified Jesus (heaven)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Adam)</td>
<td>(Jesus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“all” / “many”</td>
<td>“all” / “many”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is the simple picture, but several details can be added. First, the scope is actually wider. If κόσμος in vv. 12–13 is indeed the rest of creation as the theater of human action, over which Adam was given dominion, then the “all” or the “many” does not exhaust his domain. To Adam’s side the “world,” all non-human creation, must be added. Since Jesus’s work is “all the more,” the same picture must obtain on
the other side as well, and this, I will argue, is what Rom 8:18–30 promises.\footnote{This is also what a near parallel promises. In 1 Cor 15:27–28 “all things” (πάντα or τὰ πάντα) are subjected to Christ at the end, and are then given over to God, so that God may be “all in all” (πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν). This is all created things, but particularly in view are demonic forces — “every ruler (ἀρχή) and every authority (ἐξουσία) and power (δύναμις)” — including death (1 Cor 15:24–26).} So we might add another level:

\begin{center}
\begin{tikzpicture}
  \node (Adam) at (0,0) {Adamic Domain};
  \node (Jesus) at (2,0) {Messianic Domain};
  \node at (1,1.5) {Prelapsarian Adam};
  \node at (1,-1.5) {Glorified Jesus};
  \node at (0,0.5) {(Adam)};
  \node at (2,0.5) {(Jesus)};
  \node at (0,-0.5) {original “world”};
  \node at (2,-0.5) {new “world”};
  \node at (1,2.5) {“all” / “many”};
  \node at (1,-2.5) {“all” / “many”};
  \node at (1,3.5) {Adamic Domain};
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  \node at (1,4.5) {(heaven)};
  \node at (1,-4.5) {(earth)};
  \draw [->] (Adam) -- (Jesus);
  \draw [->] (Adam) -- (Jesus);
\end{tikzpicture}
\end{center}

The impact on creation is not, for the moment, what the apostle stresses, and so I will not consistently include it.\footnote{A number of exegetes, e.g., Johnson (Reading Romans, 87), Barrett (First Adam to Last, 102–19), Scroggs (Last Adam, 59–74), place the Adam-Christ juxtaposition within the old creation-new creation juxtaposition.} However, it is in the background throughout.

Second, the above presents the ideal as it once was (in Adam) and as it will be again (in the Messiah). However, given the fall, neither holds in the fullest sense now. To the degree that Adam still rules, it is only as a shell of his former self. Indeed, what “reigns” (βασιλεύω) in his stead is “death” (vv. 14, 17) and “sin in
death” (v. 21), like twin malevolent spirits. When I gave an overview of the passage in Chapter 1, I noted that the default preposition for Adam in Rom 5 is “through” (διὰ), and this preposition is important. Adam opened himself, and his domain, to sin and death, and once they gained entry, they began to rule the world and all nations. In some sense fallen humanity lives “in Adam” (as in 1 Cor 15:22), but sin and death have in effect taken over his heavenly position, reducing his role to an earthly one.

Christ’s domain partially replicates this. In v. 21 we see that grace reigns on his side, but of course this wording expects no loss of Jesus’s position, as the parallel seems to of Adam. There is a sense in which the fallen Adam sinks below the influence of sin and death, or is possessed by them as demonic powers. Jesus, by contrast, is the one who overflows with grace and life (as in v. 15). The phrasing of the last instance of βασιλεύω (in v. 17) is unexpected, but we will come to it soon.

---

575 Joseph A. Fitzmyer (Paul and His Theology: A Brief Sketch, 2nd ed. [Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1989], 76–77), for example, speaks of sin, death, and law, as well as grace, “all to be personified as actors” in this passage, and Paula Fredriksen (Sin: The Early History of an Idea [Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012], 35 says that they constitute “cosmic agents” in his theology (emphasis original). The similarity to 1 Cor 15:24–26 is palpable. There these “personified actors” or “cosmic agents” are demonic, given that they are both “powers” and “enemies.”

576 This is why Paul repeatedly speaks of the very mortal existence of Adam (“a man of dust”) in 1 Cor 15:47–49.
For now, this is how the participatory domains appear in the fallen world after Christ’s appearance (with the place of the world left implicit):

![Diagram of participatory domains]

Such are the rival participatory domains in Rom 5:12–21. Their patrons are Adam and Christ, but Adam as infected with — even possessed by — sin and death, and Christ as the giver of grace and life. Their communities are the “all” or the “many,” individuals from all nations, both Jew and gentile. And their actions correspond. The peoples share in Adam’s misdeed and Christ’s gracious deed, imitating their heavenly patron. A few refinements yet remain, as we will find in the coming verses.

---

577 Christ’s domain is of the tripartite form, with the resurrected Jesus both the human and celestial patron of his community. The Adamic domain is as well, but his misdeed has let disorder in. Sin and death have essentially become the angelic heads of the domain, with only a shell remaining of the glorified Adam. Even over his descendants on earth he holds little sway.
The Comparison of Domains: Romans 5:15–17

Only in v. 15 does Paul come directly to the comparison of Adam and Christ, and he has yet to resume his anacoluthon from v. 12. The apostle portrays Jesus’s life as the converse of Adam’s and his person as more than fulfilling what Adam should have been. The morality of their deeds and the consequences thereof are antithetical, but the scope of their effect and their status as patrons over humanity are alike. The principal consideration at the outset is the relative degree of likeness and difference assumed in these sentences. For the majority of commentators, who take their prompt from the “much more” (πολλῷ μᾶλλον) in vv. 15 and 17, dissimilarity is especially prominent. Translations are apt to steer us in this direction. Most render it similarly to the NRSV: *But the free gift is not like the trespass* (v. 15a); *And the free gift is not like the effect of the one man’s sin* (v. 16a).

However, it is preferable to see similarity in the forefront. This is what we would expect, *a priori*, coming on the heels of Paul’s statement that Adam is a type

---

578 This is the prevailing view today. Historically a prominent example is Barth (*Christ and Adam*, 44): “the *pollō mallon*, the ‘how much more,’ which first appears in vv. 9–10 and is taken up again in the important vv. 15–17 . . . is the key to the relationship of the two sides and to the meaning of the contrast between them. The remarkable thing about it is that it both connects its two terms and subordinates the one to the other.” The phrase structures Barth’s thought through p. 59, where he comes to speak of the “essential disparity between Christ and Adam” (p. 58). He returns to “how much more” and the disparity to conclude his thoughts (pp. 91–94).
of the Messiah. As mentioned in Chapter 1, Chrys C. Caragounis has suggested that vv. 15–16 yield better results in the apostle’s developing argument if they are rhetorical questions, not declarative sentences.\footnote{Caragounis, “Romans 5,” 142–48. He gives several reasons. First, ἄρα οὖν in v. 18 indicates that it is an inference from what precedes rather than a simple restatement of it. Second, everyone is agreed that there is some element of similarity and of dissimilarity, but the vocabulary itself (such as παράπτωμα over against χάρισμα) already covers the difference well enough; the syntax need not do that, too. Third, the flow of the passage is quite muddled, and the point quite redundant, if vv. 18–21 do not develop a distinct idea from vv. 15–17. Fourth, the wording of vv. 15–16 is inelegant as declarations. After giving his understanding of the passage, which I adopt here with only small changes, he concludes that, although the “difference in the kind of effect produced is, of course, apparent throughout,” nonetheless “the ubiquitous burden of the passage is surely the parallelism between Adam and Christ.”} So we should again imagine Paul in a diatribal setting, provoking and answering questions. He begins (v. 15), \textit{But does not} (οὐκ) the free gift (χάρισμα) operate just like the trespass (παράπτωμα) did?\footnote{I quote Caragounis (ibid., 145) for v. 15a.} He expects his audience to assent, but he offers his reasoning, \textit{For if the many died through the one man’s trespass (παράπτωμα), much more surely have the grace (χάρις) of God and the free gift (δωρεά) in the grace (χάρις) of the one man, Jesus Christ, abounded for the many.}

While vv. 12–14 give consideration only to the domain of Adam, overtaken by sin and death, here we see the contrasts in Christ’s domain, which overflows with grace. The focal point is two deeds, Adam’s “trespass” and Christ’s “free gift,” which
— for the parallel to hold — must mean an “act of grace” or an “act producing a free gift.” In this verse I also note that, just as individual Jews and gentiles within the domain correspond to their patron Adam, so also concrete deaths (“the many died”) are the result of death holding sway over this realm of humanity.581

After mentioning the two deeds (v. 15), Paul turns to their outcomes (v. 16).

He again begins with a question likening their means of transfer: And is not (οὐκ) the free gift (δώρη) transmitted in the same way as sin was transmitted by the one who sinned (δι’ ἕνος ἁμαρτήσαντος)? In explaining his thought he invokes, for the first time in vv. 12–21, the vocabulary of the law court. Now, in both his question and his elucidation, Paul’s elliptical phrasing and terminology have produced a fair degree of debate.583 The two keys, so it seems to me, are (1) that Paul’s “one” and

581 Although ἄνατος here includes physical death, it must be more than that — and more than the personification of all physical deaths. Both death and sin “reign,” as if sovereign powers (vv. 14, 17, 21), and in the parallel passage death is the “last enemy” (1 Cor 15:26). The characterization of sin, and by consequence death, may also be suggested by primeval history: in Gen 4:7 God speaks of sin “lurking at the door,” with a desire to overtake Cain if Cain does not master it. Here it has mastered all of Adamic humanity. So argues N. T. Wright (“Echoes of Cain in Romans 7,” in The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology [London: T&T Clark, 1991], 226–30) for Rom 7, and it could apply here, as well. Whatever its conceptual origins, though, Paul makes death and sin not abstract ideas or empirical events but a diabolical tandem.

582 Again, quoting Caragounis (“Romans 5,” 145) for v. 16a.

583 Even within Rom 5:12–21 it is not the most discussed verse, but several things make it harder to determine the meaning of v. 16 than most of the surrounding verses, except vv. 12, 14.
“many” revolve around people not trespasses (ἐξ ἑνός / ἐκ πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων);

and (2) that the parallelism is built on chronology, a decree following an action (or actions) and resulting in a new state.

If this is correct, Rom 5:16 yields the following sense: For the judgment (God’s κρίμα at the fall) following one trespass (ἐξ ἑνός, the disobedience) brought condemnation (εἰς κατάκριμα, the curses, levied on Adam and his “all”), but the free gift (God’s χάρισμα, declaration of grace, at the cross) following many trespasses (ἐκ πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων, of Adamic nations) brings justification (εἰς δικαίωμα, the state of acquittal from the curses). This, at least approximately, is Paul’s meaning. Even commentators who understand the mechanics of Paul’s thought differently arrive at

There are no finite verbs in the verse, and τὸ δώρημα in v. 16a lacks a direct counterpart. In the given translation, Caragounis has supplied “sin,” and most translations add “effect” or “result.” The KJV, which does not take v. 16a to be a question, stays close to the Greek wording: “And not as it was by one that sinned, so is the gift.” Two terms are particularly debated in v. 16b. First, ἐξ ἑνός might be “from the one [man]” or “from the one [transgression].” Given the “many trespassions” later in the verse, I judge the latter more likely. Second, δικαίωμα is translated “justification,” “righteous deed,” or “righteous decree.” Although it is not the regular meaning of the word, even for Paul (cf. “righteous decree” in Rom 1:32; 2:26; 8:4 and “righteous deed” in Rom 5:18), he seems to consider it interchangeable with δικαιοσύνη in v. 17, so I prefer the sense of “justification.”
a similar conclusion. Condemnation looms over Adamic humanity, while the messianic community has found God’s favor.⁵⁸⁴

So then, in v. 12 the apostle has moved directly from sin to death, but here he adds a link in that fearful chain. Legal imagery, so far as Rom 5:12–21 is concerned, is a subsidiary bond between the cosmic powers of sin and death.⁵⁸⁵ In the heavenly, abstract level Adam’s one sin led to a declaration of judgment (and then to death, per v. 12), while on the earthly, concrete level the Adamic nations live under the resultant condemnation and engage in many trespasses (leading to their death, per v. 15).⁵⁸⁶ In Christ’s domain, by contrast, “justification” (here δικαίωμα, and δικαιοσύνη

⁵⁸⁴ For example, Jewett (Romans, 381–83) holds the opposite perspective on the exegetical matters within the verse. He argues that ἐξ ἑνός refers to Adam, given its recurrent use in the section. He also accords more weight to the common meaning of δικαίωμα in Hellenistic literature, suggesting that it signifies “God’s righteous decree of salvation in Christ.” Nonetheless, his final view of the verse is similar to what I suggest, that condemnation in Adam is contrasted with salvation in Christ.

⁵⁸⁵ I allude to the famous declaration of Albert Schweitzer (The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, trans. William Montgomery [New York: Holt, 1931], 225): “The doctrine of righteousness by faith is therefore a subsidiary crater, which has formed within the rim of the main crater — the mystical doctrine of redemption through the being-in-Christ.” Whatever one thinks of this judgment for Paul’s corpus overall, it holds for Rom 5:12–21.

⁵⁸⁶ The vocabulary for “sin” and “trespass” in this verse is somewhat unexpected. In v. 16a Adam is the “one who sinned,” despite Paul’s preference for “trespass” in relation to the first man. Of course, a “trespass” is a subset of “sin,” so he has just preferred for the wider category. More difficult to explain is the use of “trespasses” in v. 16b. This apparently describes all eras and all nations, not just those who have the law (Adam and post-Sinai Israel). It is possible that Paul is, in this one case, inconsistent, or perhaps he is reverting to his idea of an implicit law in Rom 2:14–15. Either way,
in v. 17) is added between “grace” and, as we will find in vv. 17, 18, and 21, “life.”

Yet in both domains, Paul’s query implies, the misdeed and the good deed are transmitted the same way.

The apostle follows his two rhetorical questions with an *a fortiori* argument (v. 17): *If, because of the one man’s trespass (παράπτωμα), death exercised dominion (βασιλέυω) through that one, much more surely will those who receive the abundance of grace (χάρις) and the free gift (δωρεά) of righteousness (δικαιοσύνη) exercise dominion (βασιλεύω) in life (ζωή) through the one man, Jesus Christ.* This is one of the fullest expressions of the continuing juxtaposition, containing many of the keys words of the section. Three features are particularly notable. First, this is the only time the “all” or “many” is given another name: οἱ λαμβάνοντες, “those who receive.” This, the only small indication in Rom 5:12–21 itself that “all” and “many” have a restricted sense, fits with the definition of “all” given above, namely, “both Jew and gentile.” Those who receive grace come from all nations.

---

587 Rom 5:13–14 is clear that a violation of known commandments differs from bad acts in general, and elsewhere in Rom 5:12–21 “trespass” denotes the former and “sin” the latter.

587 This is a key word for those who do not see universalism in Romans, e.g., Moo, *Romans*, 339–40. He writes, “The importance of this qualification can hardly be overemphasized. For it reminds us — lest we have forgotten Rom. 1–4! — that righteousness and life are for those who respond to God’s grace in Christ and that they are *only* for those who respond” (emphasis original).
Second, the differing tenses of βασιλεύω, the aorist and the future, indicate that the two domains are disjoined in time. Romans 5:14 already signals that Paul is thinking in terms of salvation history, not simply abstract categories like “humankind under the law” over against “humankind apart from the law.” This verse reinforces the impression. Death has reigned over all peoples — presumably a global aorist extending throughout history — but only in eternity — possibly anticipated within history — will “those who receive . . . exercise dominion in life.”

Third, Paul departs from strict parallelism in a revealing way. The subject of the first βασιλεύω is death, θάνατος (as in v. 14), so we expect that life, ζωή, will be the subject of the second. Instead, though, it is λαμβάνοντες who reign “in life” (ἐν ζωῇ), and this through the one man, Jesus Christ (διὰ τοῦ ἑνὸς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ).

Explanations for this departure from the parallelism vary. We can certainly gather that the eschatological community participates in the Messiah’s own reign, as part of

---

588 In his “Comments,” Dunn (Romans, 1:282), puts it in Epicurean terms: “The opposite to the coldly final rule of death is the unfettered enjoyment of life — the life of a king.” In his “Explanation,” though, he adds that it prevents us from thinking of “the participants of the two epochs as set there without having any say in the matter” (p. 1:295). By contrast, for Moo (Romans, 339–40) it indicates a discrepancy between the domains, illustrating that “righteousness and life are for those who respond to God’s grace in Christ,” while death “has the character of fate” (emphasis original). Jewett (Romans, 383–85) takes it as evidence of the provisional nature of the Adam-Christ juxtaposition: “This detail confirms that Paul’s interest is not in developing a doctrine of Adam’s sin but rather to employ the Adamic material as a foil to explain the abundant life in Christ that overturns the legacy of sin and death.”
what is transmitted to those in Christ. But if the whole community reigns, what do they “exercise dominion” over? Given the attention to primeval history in the section, the best answer is creation (Gen 1:26–28), the κόσμος that the first Adam failed to protect according to Rom 5:12–13. Believers will again join Christ and creation in Rom 8:18–30.

In Rom 5:15–17, the apostle has, from slightly different angles, juxtaposed how Adam’s sin and how Christ’s redemption are appropriated by the “many” in their domain. The negative side repeats what Paul has mentioned in vv. 12–14, only adding the divine verdict between sin and death. On the positive side, Paul is working within an orbit of words for “grace” (χάρις, χάρισμα) and “gift” (δωρεά, δώρημα) to describe a collection of steps in the ordo salutis, from the saving act (v. 15) to the salvation that resulted (v. 16) to its full realization in eternity (v. 17).

Jewett (Romans, 384–85) calls it “a stock motif in apocalyptic literature,” referencing Dan 7:22, 26–27; Wis 3:8; 5:15–16; 1QM 12:14–15; 1QpHab 5:4–5; Matt 19:28; Rev 20:4, 6; as well as 1 Cor 6:2. He adds that the verse “reflects the center of Paul’s interest,” namely, that there is absolute equality between believers in eternity, preparing for Rom 8:31–39. This appeal to equality is part of Jewett’s theory that Romans is written to achieve unity between a variety of house churches in Rome that were apt to divide into the weak and strong.

So Keener, Romans, 76. Keener ties together the eschatological kingdom of the Messiah’s community, the restored dominion of Adam and Eve, and notes Rom 8:29 for evidence.
Now, the expected antonym of “trespass” is “rectitude,” something proper or within set bounds, and the δικαίος word group does arise in terms of the salvation on offer in vv. 16–17. But the imagery for Christ’s deed itself is that of liberality, befitting his status as patron of a society. This is part of the “how much more”: Jesus not only did right, he did beyond what was required. Despite these differences, Paul’s primary goal at present is to liken the means of transfer: in the same way that the “all” are affected by Adam, so are they affected by Christ. Only by securing this premise can Paul return in v. 18 to his unfinished comparison from v. 12.591

**Excursus 5: Solution to the Means of Transfer.** We have achieved enough ground to solve another of the “riddles” proposed in Chapter 1, and one that I said remained unsolved as of the “Adam as Bearer of Disaster” section of Chapter 2, namely, what are the means of transfer from these “ones” to their “alls.” There can be no doubt that Adam’s status as ancestor of all humankind plays a significant role.

“Look to the rock from which you were hewn,” Deutero-Isaiah says to the

---

591 As noted above, this motivates the proposed rhetorical questions of Caragounis (“Romans 5,” 143–44) adopted here. The ἀρα οὖν in v. 18 presupposes that an argument has preceded, not that it is an assertion, and the development of ideas in vv. 15–21 is rather muddled if all of them do the exact same work.
beleaguered Judahites in exile, speaking of their forefather Abraham (Isa 51:1), and Paul might equally have said this to all nations concerning Adam.\textsuperscript{592}

Adamic patrimony provides only moderate purchase, however, in explaining the means of transfer. The “minimalist school” of Adamic pessimism, for example, thinks little of the impact. The taint of the first sin is superficial, repairable, and of lesser consequence than many other misdeeds in biblical history. Even among works that treat Gen 3 as a theological knot, 2 Baruch denies that Adam has any appreciable effect on our own choices to sin; rather, “each of us has become our own Adam” (2 Bar. 54:19). The first man’s weakness is his alone. Further, for those Second Temple authors who do see Adamic sinfulness being handed down, how this happens remains unclear. Children inherit genes and social relations, culture and education, values and ethics, habits and tendencies from their parents, any of which could account for the means of transfer. So Adam’s role as father of humanity explains the means of transfer only in part.

In the works that add another means by which the sin of Eden is transferred, some specific suggestions can be classified as irrelevant to Paul’s thought: there is no

\textsuperscript{592} I should add that, in the case of Isa 51, Abraham provides hope, whereas Adam explains the reign of sin and death.
indication that sexual intercourse (as in 2 En. 31:7 [J]) or drunkenness (as in 3 Bar. 4:16 [Gk.]) plays any role in Rom 5. Many Jewish works see death as coming from a combination of the first sin (Gen 3) and the dust from which humans are made (Gen 2). On the strength of the repeated characterization of Adam as “the man of dust” in 1 Cor 15:47–49, it is possible that for Paul the complex of sin and death derives from the stuff of which we are made.

The wording of Rom 5, however, makes this difficult to adopt on two counts. First, the topic of that subsection of 1 Cor 15 is the nature of the earthly and the resurrected bodies, not the transmission of sin. Second, there is no hint in Rom 5 that human earthiness accounts for sinfulness and death — there are no instances of “dust,” “earth,” “flesh,” “body,” or their cognates.\footnote{593 The earlier discussion of Adam in 1 Cor 15 (vv. 20–28), which, like Rom 5:12–21, does consider the conjunction of sin and death, likewise lacks these words.} It seems, instead, that Paul gives a second Adamic-messianic comparison related to present and eschatological corporeality, distinct from the one concerning the fall and restoration.

A more probable alternative comes in 4 Ezra. Here the metaphors are organic: sin is a “disease,” “an evil root” (both in 4 Ezra 3:22), and “a grain of evil seed” (4:30) that has overrun the human heart. Ezra allows that certain heroes have been
able to keep evil in check (4 Ezra 3:36), so Adam bequeathed to his descendants only a tendency, however strong, to sin. No nation, including Israel, has been able to keep wickedness out (especially 4 Ezra 3:35–36; 4:7–8), so it must be endemic among peoples. It is a social problem. As I have argued, Paul shares this concern, the concern to show that all nations are united in fallenness before God. Still, even if this joins Adamic headship as a partial reason for the transmission of sin in Rom 5, the leading imagery is as yet unexplained.

The heart of the section concerns power, as evidenced by the frequency of βασιλεύω.594 This leads us back to the Wisdom of Solomon. Wisdom does not attach the dire consequences to the first transgression (cf. Wis 10:1–2; Rom 5:15–18), and also relates death to the earthly origin of humanity (Wis 7:1), but in pre-Christian Judaism the single closest parallel to Rom 5:12–21 (especially v. 12) is Wis 2:23–24:

> for God created man (ὁ ἄνθρωπος, presumably Adam) for incorruption (ἀϕϑαρσία), and made him in the image (εἰκών) of his own eternity (ἀϊδιότης), but through the devil’s envy death

594 This is true, in fact, not only of Rom 5:12–21, but also of 1 Cor 15:20–28 and, indeed, of the whole Pauline corpus. In the passage from 1 Cor 15, we have Christ handing over a “kingdom” (βασίλεια) to God, after destroying “every ruler (ἀρχή) and every authority (ἐξουσία) and power (δύναμις)” (v. 24); reigning (βασιλεύω) until every enemy (ἐχϑρός) has been subdued under his feet (v. 25), the last of which is death (v. 26); so that all things (τὰ πάντα) are subjected (ὑποτάσσω) to Jesus and thence to God (vv. 27–28). Peter W. Macky (St. Paul’s Cosmic War Myth: A Military Version of the Gospel, WCLBS 2 [New York: Lang, 1998]) has sought to encompass Paul’s gospel within the concept of cosmic war. He draws on both the undisputed and the disputed epistles to make his case.
entered the world (θάνατος εἰσῆλϑεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον), and those who belong to his party (οἱ τῆς ἐκείνου μερίδος ἤντες) experience it. (RSV) 595

As in Paul’s thought, death invades as a outside force, let in by the first misdeed — although Wisdom speaks of the devil’s role rather than Adam’s. Death is communicated, as a matter of course, to those under Satan’s sway, those in his “lot” (μερίς). 596 This is the language of participatory domains, wherein the heavenly patron (in this case the dread spirit) determines the fate of those in his charge. 597 This is also the logic of Rom 5:12–21. Destinies are allotted according to membership in the cosmic reigns of Adam and Christ, sin and grace, death and life.

Participatory domains can account for the headship and social aspects of Adamic sin, too. The first man, as human patriarch, influences on a general level those who are born from him. It is his once-glorious, heavenly state — now

---

595 Of this passage Barr (Eden and Immortality, 17) writes, “All the foundations of the Pauline picture of Adam are here.”

596 Since all people die, it appears that humankind en masse is included, at least insofar as they are mortal human beings. The body / soul distinction is important here, as it is in many hellenized works. For the righteous, physical death is but a refining discipline and no great tragedy, since their souls are in God’s hands (Wis 3:1–9). Death is only a grave loss for the wicked (Wis 3:10–13). For Wisdom all human flesh is under the devil’s sway, but not all souls are.

597 The language of power returns when Wisdom describes the eternal fate of the righteous, who “will govern (κρίνω) nations and rule over (κρατέω) peoples, and the Lord will reign over (βασιλεύω) them forever” (Wis 3:8). As in Rom 5:17, in Wisdom God’s community reigns, although it is over the peoples. For Paul it is unspecified in Rom 5:17, but at least in Rom 8 it is over creation.
overtaken by sin and death but not entirely lost — that is more important to Paul, but his human role remains.\textsuperscript{598} Also, the social aspect prominent in 4 Ezra and indicated by Rom 5 describes only one half of the participatory domain, the community on earth. This does not negate influence from heaven. Participatory domains give a satisfactory explanation of the means of transfer of Adamic sin and messianic grace that elucidates both the wording and the logic of Rom 5:12–21.

\textbf{Summary of the Comparison via Chiasm: Romans 5:18–21}

Paul began Rom 5:12 with half of his comparison, but understood that the claim required qualification (on the role of the law, in vv. 13–14) and proof (that Adam’s and Christ’s influence operate the same way, in vv. 15–17) before he could complete

\textsuperscript{598} It might seem strange to posit two lines of influence, a temporal one on earth (Adam as human patriarch) and a glorious, if damaged, one in heaven (Adam as cosmic patron), but there are quite a few examples of Israel’s most famous patriarchs becoming glorified powers in heaven, without, of course, losing their historical importance. Aside from the examples of Adam given in Chapter 2, there is Abraham in his eponymous Apocalypse (1st / 2nd c. CE) and Moses in the \textit{Exagoge} of Ezekiel the Tragedian (2nd c. BCE). Enoch, though not a patriarch of Israel specifically, often occupies a high messianic or angelic position. In fact, in Ps.-Eupolemus (prior to 1st c. BCE; quoted in Eusebius, \textit{Praep. ev.} 9.17.8–9), the nations descend from various gods, and Enoch is equated with the Titan Atlas. So there is no reason to doubt that for Paul Adam could be both earthly ancestor and heavenly patron.
it. In v. 18 he is able to return to his initial thought, but by this point he has finished most of his argument. All that is required is a recapitulation by way of a chiasm.

Verse 18 completes v. 12 and is the essence of the section: *Therefore just as one man’s trespass (παράπτωμα) led to condemnation (κατάκριμα) for all, so one man’s act of righteousness (δικαίωμα) leads to justification and life (δικαίωσις ζωῆς) for all.* By and large, translations render δικαίωσις ζωῆς as two separate consequences, justification and life (as in the NRSV, above; cf. the KJV), but Paul thinks of it as a sequence: Christ’s righteous deed opens up the “justification of life,” that is, the justification that brings life (cf. v. 21). Of Adam’s realm he speaks only of “condemnation,” but earlier statements demonstrate that condemnation leads to death (vv. 12, 15, and 17). In a departure from the rest of the passage, the two “alls” are not πάντες, but πάντες ἄνθρωποι. Perhaps Paul adds “humans” for variety, but his sense is still “all types of people,” individuals from all nations.

Verses 18–19 correspond to vv. 15–17, but now they describe the results of Adam’s and Christ’s deeds, rather than how the effects are transmitted. Although life and death are the ultimate products, Paul spends a little more time on the penultimate steps, sinfulness and righteousness (v. 19): *For just as by the one man’s*
disobedience (*παρακοή*) the many were made sinners (*ἀμαρτωλοὶ*), so by the one

man’s obedience (*ὑπακοή*) the many will be made righteous (*δίκαιοι*). Paul returns to the language of “many,” and he attends to the peoples more in the sense that he describes their states individually (*ἀμαρτωλοὶ* and *δίκαιοι*) rather than abstractly (e.g., *κατάκρισις* and *δικαίωμα*, as in v. 16).

He also incorporates a new phrase for Adam’s and Christ’s actions, “disobedience” and “obedience.” This is an intricate detail, but it should not be ignored. In this epistle Paul’s consistent goal is to win “obedience” or the “obedience of faith” (*ὑπακοὴ πίστεως*) from the nations (Rom 1:5; 15:8; 16:26), and he encourages obedience (Rom 6:16) and praises it (Rom 16:19) among the Roman Christians.\(^{599}\) Such “obedience” corresponds to Jesus’s own momentous action.

The verbs are likewise important. As in v. 17, salvation history is implied by the movement from past (the many “were made” sinners) to future (the many “will be made” righteous). More importantly, up to this point in Rom 5:12–21 the dualism has appeared complete, as if the two communities were sealed off from each other, but *καθίστημι*, which here probably means “to bring into a certain state” or simply

\(^{599}\) Of these references Rom 16:19 and esp. Rom 16:26 are textually uncertain. The author of the closing doxology, if it was indeed added later by a scribe, has at least paid good attention to Paul’s wording earlier in the letter.
“to become,” adds a sense of transfer between groups.\textsuperscript{600} Of course, Rom 5:1–11 has much to say about how the enemies of God became reconciled to him through Christ. “Those who receive” in v. 17 also hints at a movement from one group to another. But in general Paul presents the domains of Adam and Christ as exclusive.

After considering again the two domains, Paul returns to Torah. In his earlier treatment (vv. 13–14), he argued that sin exists even without direct knowledge of broken commandments, but a special class of sin — a “transgression” (παράβασις, v. 14), “trespass” (παράπτωμα, vv. 15, 17–18, 20), or “disobedience” (παρακοή, v. 19) — is incurred when the violation is of a known ordinance, a situation faced only by Adam and Israel. His first consideration of the matter, though, was of those without the law; despite their ignorance, sin and death rule gentiles and those before Moses.

In his seven-word return to the topic, Paul considers the alternate situation. Here we can imagine Paul addressing the objection that the Mosaic code curtails sin. His initial words, colored subtly but noticeably dark, already indicate that the law will play a harmful role: \textit{But law came in (νόμος δὲ παρεισῆλϑεν)}, he writes at the start of v. 20. So often in Jewish thought the law was “given” at Mount Sinai, a treasure

\textsuperscript{600} Dunn (\textit{Romans}, 1:284), on the one hand, considers it to mean little more than γίνομαι, while Moo (\textit{Romans}, 345), on the other, believes that “misses the forensic flavor of the word.” He offers “inaugurated into.” These are also among the common senses given in LSJ, s.v. “καθίστημι.”
from on high, but here it merely “came in,” as if of its own accord. More than this, in context both παρά and ἔρχομαι have exclusively negative connotations. All the words he selects for known violations are παρά- words (παράβασις, παράπτωμα, and παρακοή), indicating something “amiss” or “out of bounds,” and the only other subjects that “come in” are sin (εἰσέρχομαι) and death (διέρχομαι) in v. 12.

The second half of the sentence confirms the suspicion that the Mosaic covenant is ineffectual to prevent evil deeds. As the NRSV has it, the law came in with the result that the trespass multiplied (ἵνα πλεονάσῃ τὸ παράπτωμα). Torah did not minimize the power of sin in Israel. Quite the reverse. Despite the NRSV’s translation, πλεονάσῃ τὸ παράπτωμα does not indicate multiplying instances of trespass, as of many, but the excessive increase of Adamic trespass personified, that is of one, a deathly power akin to sin. Just as Adam’s wrong led to Sin ruling all nations, so also his trespass of the commandment against eating led to Trespass ruling Israel, who like him had a divine law that marked out right from wrong:

---

601 Handley C. G. Moule (The Epistle to the Romans [London: Pickering & Inglis, 1925], 155) interprets παρέρχομαι etymologically, “It [= the law] came in ‘sideways,’ as to its relation to our acceptance; as a thing which should indirectly promote it, by not causing but occasioning the blessing” (emphasis original).
The NRSV also takes ἵνα in a mild sense, indicating only result, but regularly ἵνα with the subjunctive is purposive. Now, Paul’s view of the law is complex, and he will say much more in Rom 7. At minimum he means that the law transformed general “sin” into “trespass” specifically, if not also that the law encouraged violations. What is evident here is that the law stole into the world and trespass increased its hold on one segment of humanity. The precise foe faced by Israel and the gentiles differs, but “all” share in the consequences of Adam’s misdeed.

This, however, is less than half the calculus for Paul. While Adam’s domain initially received greater accounting (in vv. 12–14), at the end of the comparison Paul does more to detail Jesus’s impact. He returns at the end of v. 20 to the wider

---

602 Galatians 3 is another of the three or four most critical discussions of νόμος in Paul’s corpus. The resonances with Rom 1–4 and 7 are well known. However, in several regards it is also close to Rom 5:12–21, in that “one” and “many” are repeated concepts in Gal 3. The law’s multiplicity counts against it (Gal 3:19–20a), but both Christ (Gal 3:15–18) and God (Gal 3:20b) are “one.” Although believers are not directly called “many,” they are incorporated together into the (singular) “seed of Abraham” (Gal 3:29), significant in light of Gal 3:16. There is also an oblique imago reference of “there is no longer male and female” in Gal 3:28.
Adamic participatory domain (ruled by sin, not trespass specifically), and contrasts it with Christ’s: *but where sin increased*(πλεονάζω), *grace abounded all the more*(ὑπερπερισσεύω). In other points in the passage Christ’s effect is still to come, but here grace has already super-abounded, indicating that the eschatological state is partially realized in history.

Just as the law came in to (ἵνα) increase trespass in v. 20, in v. 21 grace’s overflow occurred *so that*(ἵνα), *just as sin exercised dominion*(βασιλεύω) *in death,* *so grace might also exercise dominion*(βασιλεύω) *through justification*(δικαιοσύνη) leading to *eternal life*(εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον). The final image is again about might. It recalls the cosmic powers of sin and death that reign through Adam, on the one hand, and the heavenly triad of grace, justification, and life that reign through Christ, on the other. While Adam is kept implicit in this verse, Christ is named, and although the title given has grown familiar with use, in context it is a particularly fitting way to end the section. Jesus is designated the authoritative patron of the his community. Grace reigns, Paul concludes, *through Jesus Christ our Lord*(κύριος).

**Excursus 6: Solution to the “Fit” in Romans.** Now that I have completed a detailed consideration of Rom 5:12–21, we are able to consider the final and widest
“riddle” from Chapter 1: how Rom 5:12–21 fits within the developing logic of Rom 1–11. All the important pieces have already been examined, so it is only a matter of assembling the component parts.

There is a shift from legal terminology in Rom 1–4 to the language of life and death in Rom 6–8, as well as from the third person to the first person in those same sections. The best place to locate the change is at Rom 5:1, “Therefore, since we have been justified by faith, we have peace with God . . . .” Nevertheless, as we have seen in this section, terms common to Rom 1–4 (e.g., “sinful,” “judgment,” “righteous,” and “justification”) continue to occupy important ground, but they are now subordinated to a wider vision of their respective ends, death and life. This is a step back to see more, not a turning of Paul’s vision to an entirely new subject.

If this is the case, though, the strangest change in vocabulary is the absence of any ethnic language in Rom 5–8. Above I followed the proposal of Gaston and Tobin that “all” is shorthand for “both Jew and gentile,” which is also indicated by the presence of “many” as a parallel. This I combined with the observation from Chapter 2 that Adam can be considered the father of peoples, not just of individuals, to line up a series of synonymous phrases. In terms of sin, “all” peoples and “many”
nations, “both Jews and gentiles” — the entirety of Adamic humanity — are under a
curse.603 This is the intent of Rom 1:18–3:20 together with 5:12–21, and the
connection is all the tighter if indeed it is right to discern allusions of Eden in Rom
1–3 (with Hooker) and to combine it with a “decline of nations” narrative (with
Stowers). In terms of redemption, Christ is forming a new community based on faith
that also includes all types of peoples, gathered from Israel and from the nations
(Rom 3:20–31), Christ himself being the heavenly patron of this new society (Rom
5:12–21).604

So while it is true that there is a movement toward universal categories in
Rom 5–8, we are to have in mind Jewish and gentile particularities when we hear
“all” or read “Adam.” Romans 5–8 are not orphaned chapters in an extended
meditation on God’s work among Israel and the nations, but rather concern these
same peoples, but now examined from a distance and in light of God’s
reorganization of humankind in Adam’s eschatological antitype, Jesus Christ.

603 Opening his argument that “all” indicates both gentiles and Jews, Gaston (Paul and Torah,
116) gives this aside: “It might be possible to argue something similar with respect to Paul’s use of
‘Adam,’ not only explicitly as in 5:12–21 but also implicitly in 1:18–32 and 7:7–13.” This I have
attempted to do.

604 Abraham is, in a sense, a subordinate ancestor of this same people (Rom 4), another “one”
who can represent many others, but he lacks the determinative potency of Christ and Adam.
Baptism and the Ethics of the Domains: Romans 6

Paul has now presented two participatory domains offset in time. Paul divides the nations before the Messiah into Israel and the gentiles, both under sin (although Israel is additionally under “trespass”). With Jesus’s advent, the arrangement begins to shift. Romans 5:1–11 spoke of erstwhile “enemies of God” being reconciled to him, and Rom 5:12–21 identifies these two groups with two patrons, Adam and Christ, and indicates that individuals’ sinfulness and righteousness, respectively, are the results of participating in their domains. Paul moves now to life within the messianic community, and in doing so also indicates that those who are “in Christ” have yet one foot “in Adam.”

At Rom 6:1 Paul broaches the issue of what impact the Adam-Christ juxtaposition has for an individual within the messianic community. His dialogue partner has heard the foregoing, not as concerning competing realms of “sin” and “grace” but as mere analogies for concrete sins and their forgiveness by God. Romans 5:20 (“where sin increased, grace abounded all the more”) sounds to the interlocutor like a balance sheet, and therefore the more the sin, the more the grace. This is the question Paul puts in his mouth: “Should we continue in sin in order that
grace may abound?” (Rom 6:1). Paul rebuffs the shrewd question by retaining the language of two rival domains.

He does this first by speaking of baptism as transference from Adam to Christ. In baptism believers symbolically die to sin (i.e., their deepest selves leave the domain ruled by sin), lest they continue to live “in it” (Rom 6:2). Instead they “walk in newness of life” (Rom 6:4) and are freed from the enslaving power of sin (Rom 6:6–7). Most importantly, they are joined to Christ’s own death and resurrection (Rom 6:3–5), which allows them to leave the realm of sin and enter that of grace.

But Christ, too, was apparently once under the power of death (Rom 6:9: “death no longer [οὐχέτα] has dominion over [κυριεύω] him”) and sin (Rom 6:10: “The death he died, he died to sin”), and only with his death and resurrection did he

---

Incidentally, this ἵνα clause is purposive, which increases the likelihood that the one in Rom 5:20 is also.

Later Christian theology is, of course, split in how it conceives baptism, whether as a “means of grace” or as an “ordinance,” and if a means, how that is communicated. In this passage Paul obviously unites it closely with salvation, much as he does the Eucharist in 1 Cor 11:17–34. On the other hand, he relatively deemphasizes baptism over against preaching the gospel in 1 Cor 1:13–17, and elsewhere it is faith that saves. Whatever his intent, Paul at least sees baptism as a fitting analogue to the movement from Adam to Christ, if not the means by which that is accomplished.
leave Adamic humanity and initiate the new.\textsuperscript{607} Believers then imitate Christ; hence Rom 6:6: “We know that our old self (ὁ παλαιὸς ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος)” — that is, Adamic humanity — “was crucified with him so that the body of sin (τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας)” — that is, the Adamic body politic, as opposed to the body of Christ — “might be destroyed (lit.: ‘made unproductive,’ καταργέω), and we might no longer be enslaved to sin.” There are debates about particular points within this phrasing, but there is general agreement that it does not deprecate the physical human body but concerns the movement from Adam to Christ.\textsuperscript{608}

Especially since “flesh” is so prominent in Rom 6–8, some may question my act of equating the “body of sin” with Adam’s community rather than σάρξ. My

\textsuperscript{607} In the words of F. F. Bruce (Paul: The Apostle of the Heart Set Free [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977], 332): “In the very sphere which sin dominated — the sphere of human nature — Christ won the victory over sin and broke its domination, and this victory is made effective in his people’s experience by the Spirit.” He is describing Rom 8, but it applies to Rom 6.

\textsuperscript{608} E.g., Fitzmyer, Romans, 436; Moo, Romans, 372–76; Jewett, Romans, 402–4. At most its negativity is directed at the unredeemed self and the body as esp. susceptible to sinfulness. One of the main questions is the degree to which individuals are considered. On the one hand, it could be that Paul is speaking to the Romans as many selves insofar as they have appropriated the Adamic domain and participate in the corporate reign of sin. On the other hand, it could be that the realm itself is in view. Given that the viewpoint is now the practices of people within the messianic community, I find the former position persuasive, that at baptism our share in Adam is, in principle, co-crucified with Christ and sin loses its power over us. This baptismal promise, however, is realized only partially and requires participation in the righteousness of Christ. Note that ὁ παλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος also occurs in Eph 4:20–24 and Col 3:5–11, there contrasted with ὁ καινὸς ἄνθρωπος, both in ethical exhortations much like Rom 6. Also, in Col 3, the “new person” is a renewed imago Dei.
justification for doing so is that its wording, like that of the “body of death” (Rom 7:24), is too similar to the “body of Christ” to ignore. If sin and death rule Adam’s sphere, then their “body” is the antithetical parallel of the “body of Christ,” which appears in Rom 7:4. Yet “body of sin” is sensibly related to “flesh” as well. Here the work of Matthew Daniel Croasmun is valuable. He contends that sin in Rom 5–8 has individual, social, and cosmic coloring. He defends the simultaneity of the three levels by appealing to the theory of “emergentism,” which derives from the scientific principle that certain systems are not reducible to their constituent parts and undergo both “upward” and “downward” causation. In applying this to Rom 5–8, he can account for “sin” on its various levels, viewing the “body of sin” as the antagonist of the “body of Christ.”

Croasmun has chosen a modern construct to interpret the levels of meaning of sin in Rom 5–8. Although its formulation is new, my construct, participatory

---


610 Ibid., 40–186. So, e.g., genes work “up” through various levels including cells and organs to the organism, but organisms in turn affect “down” not only their organs and cells but even their genes (pp. 79–85).

611 Ibid., 187–303. Croasmun extends his discussion also into gender and sociopolitical concerns.
domains, derives from ancient imagery. Participation was found not only in religious thought, but philosophical schools, and realms of power were part of the blueprint of ancient politics. This difference notwithstanding, I agree with Croasmun that the several layers are thought to be equally real and genuinely influence each other. For the ancient authors, none is a mere symbol or personification, yet there is a fluidity between the levels. In this case, the “body of sin” is a “fleshly” individual who sins, a community of sinners, and the malevolent force domineering in the heavens.

The positional departure from the body of sin is for now only partially realized, however. Believers are caught both in Adam and in Christ. Members of the messianic community still face physical death, and thus their reigning in life (as Rom 5:17 promises) is still to come. Jesus himself “will never die again” (Rom 6:9), but the apostle of course knows that believers will go on dying, at least until the parousia. More to the point here, to walk in newness of life, that is, in the messianic domain, requires both mental attention (Rom 6:11: “So you also must consider [λογίζομαι] yourselves dead to sin and alive to God in Christ Jesus”) and moral training (Rom 6:12: “Therefore, do not let sin exercise dominion [βασιλεύω] in your mortal bodies, to make you obey [ὑπακούω] their passions”). Christian ethics is
enacted in a struggle between allegiances to competing lords, and the apostle locates the truest self in Christ.612

Adamic Israel and the Law: Romans 7

The law was a minor but not unimportant consideration in Rom 5 (only vv. 13–14, 20). In Rom 6, it is localized in back-to-back sentences. Paul concludes the first half of this passage, “sin will have no dominion over you, since you are not under law but under grace” (v. 14). To begin the second half, he asks a variant of his initial question (i.e., that of v. 1), “What then? Are we to sin because we are not under law but under grace? By no means!” (v. 15, RSV). From these two statements it is clear that Torah, while itself holy, is to be found within Adam’s domain, overtaken by sin as much as the first man is. Indeed, it seems that law (or “Moses” in Rom 5:14)

---
612 This is evident by the vocabulary of Rom 6. Not only are the the forces of Rom 5:12–21 still present (death and life, sin and grace, implicitly Adam and explicitly Christ), the human relationship to them is phrased in terms of power relations: βασιλεύω, “to reign” (v. 12); δουλεύω, “to serve” (v. 6), δουλάω, “to enslave” (vv. 18, 22), and δοῦλος, “slave” (vv. 16 [bis], 17, 19 [bis, both neuter], 20); κυριεύω, “to be lord or master of” (vv. 9, 14) and κύριος, “lord” (v. 23); ὑπακούω, “to obey” (vv. 12, 16, 17) and ὑπακοή, “obedience” (v. 16 [bis]); and, as a contrast, ἐλευθερόω, “to free” (vv. 18, 22) and ἐλεύθερος, “free” (v. 20). It is also notable that Rom 6 ends with language very similar to the end of Rom 5. Whether considered primarily from above (Rom 5:12–21) or on earth (Rom 6), Jesus the Messiah is Lord over the realm of grace that leads to eternal life.
stands over Israel as Adam stands over humanity at large. In Rom 7 he gives his full attention to the matter.

The passage is directed, at least rhetorically, toward Paul’s fellow Jews. At the start he inserts parenthetically, “for I am speaking to those who know the law” (v. 1), so we are to imagine him limiting himself to a subset of Adam’s participatory domain, namely, Israel. Thus the transfer is from the Adamic Jewish community to Christ’s. As in Rom 6, it is accomplished by their “death” (as they identify with the crucifixion): “you have died to the law through the body of Christ,” — that is, they have left the Adamic “body of sin” of Rom 6:6 to join the messianic community — “so that you may belong to another, to him who has been raised from the dead in order that we may bear fruit for God” (Rom 7:4). This is a sphere of righteousness and, implicitly, of life, since the community belongs “to him who has been raised from the dead.” By contrast, just as sin came with death through Adam to the nations, so also the law let in these great foes: “our sinful passions, those that came

---

613 A number of scholars contend that Romans is written exclusively for gentiles, and thus an apparent appeal to a Jewish interlocutor is always merely rhetorical. See position (5) below.

614 The analogy Paul gives in Rom 7:1–3 works insofar as death ends the binding marital relationship. However, there is a switch. In the analogy the subordinate party, the wife, is freed by the death of the ruling party, the husband, whereas in the application (Rom 7:4–6), it is the subordinate party, the believer, who “dies” to the ruling party, the law.
through the law (τὰ παθήματα τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν τὰ διὰ τοῦ νόμου), were at work in our members to bear fruit for death” (Rom 7:5). Not only are life and death prevalent at the beginning of Rom 7, but so also are words for rule and authority. In many ways Rom 7:1–6 replays Rom 6, but this time for Israel instead of all nations.

From Rom 7:7 onward, all exegesis must grapple with the mysterious and much debated “I” who struggles with keeping the law. The dominating questions of the section are, first, “Who is the ἐγώ?” and second, “When does the ἐγώ struggle with the law?” Since the publication of W. G. Kümmel’s landmark study of Rom 7 in 1929, it cannot be taken for granted that it describes Paul’s present moral striving

---

615 The emphasis indicates where I have modified the NRSV translation, making it more literal, the better to match Rom 5:12.

616 Thus the law “is master” (κυριεύω) (v. 1). A “married” woman (etymologically: “a woman under a man,” ἡ ὑπανδρὸς γυνή) is “bound” (θέω) for life but “discharged” (καταργέω) from the law at death (v. 2) and “free” (ἐλευθέρα) from it (v. 3). So also believers are “discharged” (καταργέω) from the law, which had “captured” (κατέχω) them, and they now “serve” (δουλεύω) the newness of the Spirit (καινότης πνεύματος) rather than the oldness of the letter (παλαιότης γράμματος) — the last juxtaposition recalls the new and old person, Christ and Adam.

617 Many commentators offer a variant of these questions, e.g., Jewett (Romans, 441): “In the immense scholarly debate about this feature [= the rhetorical 'I'], two separate questions have remained entangled: Is the 'I' autobiographical or not? And which aspect of Paul’s life or some other life is in view?”
as a Christian. Some exegetes do hold this position, but it is increasingly rare (but see [2], below). Further, most regard the “I” as paradigmatic. If it does describe Paul’s own experience, it is at the same time about more than him.

From there positions diverge. I will illustrate this with the five leading proposals. The first two preserve autobiographical coloring to the passage, while not eliminating its representative aspect: (1) Some say that it describes Paul’s pre-Christian past, either as he experienced it then (so Beker) or as he considers it retrospectively, as a follower of Jesus (so Westerholm). (2) For Dunn, it reflects

---


620 Beker, Paul the Apostle, 236–43; idem, Triumph of God, 54–59; Westerholm, Perspectives, 396–98. To be more precise, for Beker it is Paul’s own anguish at the time, but as it is later understood within Christian categories. He writes, for example, “How could the Christophany have been so traumatic and so radical in its consequences unless it lit up and answered a hidden quest in his soul?” (Paul the Apostle, 237). For Westerholm, it is Paul’s Christian understanding of the human experience under the law in general, including a Christian’s own experience but centered on life
anguish in the believer’s life, which Paul felt even after his encounter with Christ. He characterizes the “I” of the passage as “divided,” caught in the eschatological tension of the “already-not yet,” between the realms of sin and that of Christ.

Alternatively, two positions tip the balance toward a historical reality. (3) Writing particularly of Rom 7:9–11, Käsemann contends that “the event depicted can refer strictly only to Adam,” and that the “supra-individual I” is not brought into the present but the opposite happens: “we are implicated in the story of Adam.” (4) N. T. Wright adds the giving of the law at Sinai to the fall in Eden as the twin stories before Christ. Both scholars agree with the position that I will adopt, that is, that Adamic echoes occur in the passage.

Dunn, “Rom 7,14–25 in the Theology of Paul,” TZ 31 (1975): 257–73; idem, Romans, 1:374–412; idem, Theology of Paul, 98–100, 472–77. Against what he takes to be the “main consensus exposition,” i.e., position (1), he objects, “If the experience indicated in [Rom] 7.5 belongs so completely to the convert’s past, why does Paul interrupt his exposition of the convert’s privileges and obligations by casting such a lengthy glance back over his shoulder?” (Theology of Paul, 473). As with Beker and Westerholm, Dunn discerns Adamic themes in the passage.

Käsemann, Romans, 196. Later he subscribes to the view of corporate personality, writing, “Every person after Adam is entangled in the fate of the proplast. The fate of every person is anticipated in that of Adam” (p. 197). See further pp. 191–212. There is widespread if not unanimous (see esp. [5], below) agreement that echoes of Adam are present in Rom 7. In addition to Käsemann, I have noted that Beker, Westerholm, and Dunn, as well as Wright (considered next), agree that Gen 3 is part of the background. The difference is that Käsemann gives the Adam story primacy. The same thesis has been advanced recently by Hermann Lichtenberger (Das Ich Adams und das Ich der Menschheit: Studien zum Menschenbild in Römer 7, WUNT 164 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004]).
related in Rom 7, finding that their “resonances . . . are profound.” Torah was meant to undo the sin of the garden, but Adam’s disastrous legacy prevented Israel from doing so.

The last viewpoint looks to Hellenistic ethics rather than to Jewish literature for comparisons. (5) Stowers has drawn attention to the Greek rhetorical technique of προσωποποεία, or “speech-in-character,” to envision a judaizing gentile’s inability to keep the Mosaic law. Paul is in the midst of typical Greek moral discourse, offering Jesus as a means of self-mastery over the vice of unbridled desire. A


625 Stowers (Rereading of Romans, 258–82) argues that all of Romans is directed to a gentile readership, concluding that scholars have been misled by Rom 7:1 (and similar passages) to construct a “phantom Jewish audience” (p. 277). It is, instead, intended for gentiles who are trying to adopt Jewish ways when Paul would have them instead stay gentile and follow Christ. (This framing of the issue, supported by a number of other scholars as well, is that Paul never requires Jews to give up Jewish ways; he only objects to gentiles becoming Jewish.) Stowers also denies the presence of Adam and Eve in Rom 7, just as he does in Rom 1 (p. 275). Emma Wasserman (The Death of the Soul in Romans 7: Sin, Death, and the Law in Light of Hellenistic Moral Psychology, WUNT 2/256 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008]) argues a similar point at length.

626 Many scholars discern “speech-in-character” in Rom 7, not only those in category (5). For example, Beverly Roberts Gaventa (“The Shape of the ‘I’: The Psalter, the Gospel, and the Speaker in Romans 7,” in Apocalyptic Paul: Cosmos and Anthropos in Romans 5–8, ed. Beverly Roberts Gaventa [Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2013], 77–91) has revived the proposal that the ἐγώ is best understood in the context of Psalms, in which the “I” often extends to all of Israel, whether in celebration or lament.
number of scholars combine several of these five approaches, and others judge that
the presentation of the law in Rom 7 cannot be synthesized with Gal 3 and Rom 1–
3. Nevertheless, these five gives us a good sense of the possible ways the ἐγώ of
Rom 7 is perceived.

The interpretation I offer is greatly indebted to the foregoing scholarship, but
perhaps allows us to redraw the contours of the debate. The Adamic traditions
adduced in Chapter 2 and the concept of participatory domains from Chapter 3 give
an efficient, and I argue not artificial, way to combine many elements from the main
approaches. To begin, there is good reason Rom 7:7–13 is often read against the
backdrop of Gen 3. Of Jesus, Paul says that he was “born under the law” and came to
save those “under the law” (Gal 4:4–5, both ὑπὸ νόμου), but in Rom 7 the ἐγώ once
lived “apart from the law” (χωρὶς νόμου) (v. 9). This could not be said of any Jews,

Sanders, *Paul, Law, People*, 70–81. In general he argues that God gives the law in order to
increase sin and transgression in the divine plan, but in Rom 7:7–13, sin uses the law against God’s
will to produce transgression, and in Rom 7:14–25 God and his law are completely severed from sin’s
“another law” which produces transgression. Paul’s logic itself is not clear, only his conclusions that
humankind’s plight is universal, that God does not save by the law, and that nonetheless the law is
somehow divinely commissioned. His attempts at reconciling these vary.

Here I am particularly close to Dunn (*Theology of Paul*, 98–100) and Wright (*Faithfulness

There is danger in combining approaches artificially. Jewett (*Romans*, 442), for example,
objects to one such attempt, calling it “almost bizarre in its complexity.” Notwithstanding this
concern, Paul’s wording encourages us to consider several of these approaches.
but it applies to Adam until Gen 2:17. The misdeed is spoken of in terms of desire (ἐπιϑυμέω: v. 7; ἐπιϑυμία: vv. 7–8) and deception (especially ἐξαπατάω v. 11) — the two moral warnings Jews most often took from the fall narrative. The end result was that “the very commandment that promised life proved to be death” (v. 10), fulfilling the threatened punishment that “on the day you eat of it you shall surely die” (Gen 2:17).

It is, in short, better to read Rom 7:7–12 in Adam’s voice than in Paul’s.

Yet the Sinaitic connection is also undeniable. In Rom 7:7 Paul quotes the last of the Ten Commandments, “Do not covet” (οὐκ ἐπιϑυμήσεις), and of course any sustained deliberation about “law” by a Jew could hardly avoid Mosaic legislation in particular. It might seem forced to posit both primeval history and the exodus

---

630 Some have attempted to associate the arrival of the commandment in Rom 7:9 with the age of moral reasoning or maturity, but the evidence indicates that Paul’s common phrase “under the law” (Rom 2:12; 3:19; 6:15; 1 Cor 9:20; Gal 3:23; Phil 3:6) includes the whole nation, esp. given Gal 4:4–5.

631 In line with Rom 5:12–21, Paul is reading death metaphorically, in that death comes as a power and wreaks havoc on the ἐγώ (as well as the κόσμος), but the entrance of death also guarantees a real physical death, even if that did not come on the “day” that Adam ate of it.

632 The Mosaic meaning of the Pauline νόμος is particularly clear in Gal 3:15–29 and Rom 13:8–10. For his purposes in Rom 7, Paul could not have designed a better command than οὐκ ἐπιϑυμήσεις. Not only is it from the most visible part of Torah, it allows him to associate the passage with the telltale sin of the garden. Additionally, it places the passage within the terminology of Hellenistic moral discourse, and possibly (though only secondarily) encompasses gentiles within the argument. As important as the levels of meaning it allows, Paul’s descriptions could not hold with any
narrative in Rom 7, but Paul himself has already prepared for this layering in Rom 5: the sins of those between Adam and Moses were not like Adam’s knowing transgression of a divine commandment, but the arrival of the law reopens that possibility (Rom 5:13–14), which is, in practice, fulfilled (Rom 5:20).

Additionally, there is a conceptual reason to expect this. Much of Paul’s effort in Rom 1–4 is to put Israel and the nations on common ground before God, and in the imagery revealed in Rom 5:12 this means they are all in the domain of Adam. So the Jewish nation is also, as much as the Greek, an Adamic nation. The conflicted ἐγώ represents both Adam faced with God’s commandment not to eat and Israel charged with abiding by Torah. In both cases, Paul laments, this ends in failure.

Eden and Sinai dominate Rom 7:7–11, which is narrated in the past tense and leads to the conclusion that “the law is holy, and the commandment is holy and just and good,” despite the fact that sin uses the law to work death, since the commandment exposes sin as sin (vv. 12–13). Beginning in v. 14, the “I” speaks in the present tense, as one who is “sold into slavery under sin.” The “I” or the “inmost self” (ὁ ἔσω ἄνθρωπος, v. 22) or the “mind” (νοῦς, vv. 23, 25) delights in the goodness other instruction within the Ten Commandments, since this is the one that indict the inner self and its motivations.
of the law and yearns to do it, but “flesh” (σάρξ) — that is, fallen corporeality particularly susceptible to ἐπιϑυμία — prevents this. More than that, the cosmic power of “sin” dwells within (vv. 20, 23). In some sense we are still hearing Adam’s tale, or that of Israel personified, but the movement to the present tense indicates the struggle of Adamic humanity under the law. This applies in particular to Jews, but could include gentiles to the degree that they understand by nature the law (as in Rom 2) or to the degree they might attempt to follow Torah (as in Stowers’s view).

More than that, even for Paul Christians are to fulfill the law in certain ways (e.g., Rom 13:8–10; 1 Cor 7:19), so their current struggle with sin might also be present in the passage. This state of ineffectual desire to follow the law is the result of living in the “body of death” (v. 24), the same sphere as the “body of sin” of Rom 6:6.

In sum, the “I” is a representative experience within Adamic humanity insofar as it falls under Mosaic law. It is the tale of Adam in the garden, the narrative of sinful Israel (familiar especially in the Prophets), and the story of individuals who strive to keep the law, viewed from their efforts within the domain of the first man.

---

633 The ringing shout of freedom in Rom 8:1–17 has convinced many that Rom 7 cannot describe a Christian’s present life. The difficulty in this is Rom 6, which operates from the assumption that the movement from the realm of sin to that of righteousness, from Adam to Christ, requires the believer actively to join Christ’s righteousness. It is better to see Rom 8 as a celebration of the status of the “new self” in Christ, without denying that the “old self” in Adam still must be put to death.
Both Adam and the law are, in principle, good, but they are both so overrun by sin and death to make their effect contrary to God’s intent. Romans 5:12–21 gives priority to Adam as head of a participatory domain, while Rom 1 and Rom 7 give particular voice to life within his community.

**The Restoration of Glory in the Second Adam: Romans 8**

Samuel Byrskog has traced Adamic influences on Romans in terms of the loss of glory in the first Adam and its restoration in the new Adam, Christ. This is, in many ways, what I have sketched so far. In Rom 1–4 Adam’s loss of stature is one way to speak of all nations going astray from God. Romans 5 sets out two realms dominated by two powers: Adam overtaken by sin and Christ overflowing with grace. Romans 6 describes a continuing transfer from one to the other for the

---

634 Byrskog, “Christology and Identity in an Intertextual Perspective: The Glory of Adam in the Narrative Substructure of Paul’s Letter to the Romans,” in *Identity Formation in the New Testament*, ed. Bengt Holmberg and Mikael Winninge, WUNT 227 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 1–18. Methodologically, Byrskog selects particular verses within the major sections of Romans (e.g., Rom 1:23; 2:23; and 3:23 in Rom 1–3), and compares them with Jewish “intertexts” (e.g., LXX Ps 105:20; Jer 2:11; and Deut 4:16–18 for the three above — often his passages are from Second Temple sources), and concludes that Adam plays a central role in the developing substructure of Romans. Romans 1–3 is the “loss of glory,” and Rom 5–8 is the “way to glory.” Similarly, Dunn (*Christology in the Making*, 101–5) begins his consideration of a “Last Adam” Christology sketching Adamic allusions in Romans, particularly how the human condition is framed by Adam’s figure, from Rom 1:18–25 to 3:23 (lacking the glory of God) to 5:12–19 to 7:7–11 to 8:19–22.
believing community; it is genuinely begun in baptism, but it is incumbent on
individuals to press toward the new reality. In Rom 7 we are back to Adam’s domain,
particularly the segment ruled by Mosaic Torah, and the moral crisis humanity faces
insofar as it remains in Adam.

Now, with the exultant cry in Rom 8:1 ("There is therefore now no
condemnation [κατάκριμα] for those who are in Christ Jesus"), we move to humanity
insofar as exists in the messianic domain. This sphere is the antithesis of the last
(Rom 7), just as Adam’s and Christ’s realms oppose each other in Rom 5:12–21. The
wording of Rom 7–8 grows out of Rom 5 (sin and death, righteousness and life, the
law), with an added pair, the flesh and Spirit.635 There are two allusions to the
“image of God” in this chapter, and the first describes Jesus being sent “in the
likeness of sinful flesh” (ὁ κοίμωμα σαρκὸς ἁρτίας) (v. 3). This is, of course, not
docetism. As in Rom 6:6–10, it is evident that Jesus once lived within Adam’s fallen
domain. Only with his crucifixion did he defeat sin and death, and only with his

635 It is possible to read Rom 7 in ways that belittle the human body, quite similar to certain
streams of Greek ethics that influenced Hellenistic Jews such as Philo. In this chapter the mind and
inner self war against the flesh and its tendency to sin. This, however, does not fit well with Paul’s
meaning of σάρξ, namely, fallen corporeality, which even goes beyond physicality. This is probable in
Rom 8:5–8, when the “mind of the flesh” (τὸ φρόνημα τῆς σαρκός) seems to locate even thought within
the territory of flesh (unless it means a mind bent toward the flesh). In any case, the rest of Rom 8
will develop the restoration of the physical cosmos (cf. 1 Cor 15), so Paul’s negative meaning of
“flesh” does not deprecate human physicality.
resurrection did he initiate the new realm of grace and life. Paul is stating the same idea here, that Jesus was sent in the broken *imago* to condemn sin and enable believers to fulfill the “just requirement” (δικαίωμα) of the law (vv. 3–4).636

In vv. 12–17 we are shown contrasting outcomes of the two domains. The initial picture is death and life (vv. 12–13), but then Paul sets out further what “life” entails. It is to be “children of God” (υἱοὶ θεοῦ, v. 14; τέκνα θεοῦ, v. 16), to receive “adoption” (υἱοθεσία, v. 15), that is, to be “heirs of God (κληρονόμοι θεοῦ) and joint heirs with Christ (συγκληρονόμοι Χριστοῦ),” and to gain the attendant glory of so lofty a position (v. 17). We recall from Rom 5:17 that those who receive God’s grace “exercise dominion in life through the one man, Jesus Christ.” In the fifth chapter the germ of the idea is presented, and here Paul gives far more detail as to what it means to dwell “in life.”

But Paul promised in Rom 5:17 not simply that Christians would “dwell” in life, but that they would “reign” in life. I argued there that Adam’s domain extends over the created world, the κόσμος (Rom 5:12–13), and so Rom 5:17 must assume

---

636 The experience of justification is called δικαίωμα in Rom 5:16, and Christ’s obedient action (over against Adam’s disobedience) is described as a δικαίωμα in Rom 5:18. Here the sense seems to be “righteous decree” rather than “justification” or “righteous deed.” There is considerable flexibility to the word in Paul’s mouth.
“reigning” to be a restoration of God’s charge to Adam to govern creation. Thus in Rom 8, having described the believers’ exalted state “in life,” it is natural for Paul to move to the status of creation (vv. 18–30). His confidence knows no bounds: “I consider that the sufferings of this present time are not worth comparing with the glory about to be revealed to us (εἰς ἡμᾶς)” (v. 18). He describes creation (κτίσις) groaning (v. 22) in eager anticipation (v. 19) as it awaits the unveiling of these “sons of God” (vv. 19, 21, recalling vv. 14–17). The reason, as Paul gives it, is that God subjected creation to futility (ἡ ματαιότης) and the bondage of decay (ἡ δουλεία τῆς φθορᾶς) (vv. 20–21) that it might also obtain “the freedom of the glory of the children of God” (v. 21). The apostle is pondering the divine forethought at the fall.

As in Rom 11:32, which I quoted at the start of this chapter (see also Gal 3:22), Paul contemplates why God let sin spread to all humanity — and, in this case, to all creation. His consistent answer is that, by placing everything under sin and death, God is free to offer mercy and life to all.

---

637 As Moo (Romans, 512 n. 21) notes, it is hard to capture the meaning of εἰς ἡμᾶς following ἀποκάλυπτω. Revealed “to us” might indicate that believers are to be mere spectators of the glory, but the sense instead is that “the glory reaches out and includes us in its scope.” Therefore Moo prefers the NEB: “which is in store for us.”

638 To be precise, the passage in Galatians is hybrid. All creation is bound to sin, but Paul only specifies that believers achieve the promise: “But the scripture has imprisoned all things [τὰ
It is plain that this glorious state has not yet been realized in full. Humanity remains “in Adam,” but Jesus’s followers are increasingly “in Christ.” Earlier we saw Jesus joining humanity in Adam’s sin-damaged *imago*. In Rom 8:29 believers are predestined to be “conformed to the image of [God’s] Son (συμμόρφωσιν τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ), in order that he might be the firstborn (πρωτότοκος) within a large family (ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς).” Paul combines the imagery of “sons of God” (Jesus being the υἱός and πρωτότοκος of God, and believers his ἀδελφοί) with the restored “image of God” in Jesus.\(^{639}\)

A number of these concepts occur again in the final promise of eschatological salvation (vv. 31–39). God gives to believers first and foremost Jesus, but secondarily τὰ πάντα, by which he means creation (v. 32). No one is able to condemn (κατακρίνω) God’s community (vv. 33–34), since the κατάκριμα that hangs over those in Adam (Rom 5:18) has been abolished by justification in Christ (Rom 8:1). Jesus’s rule over his people is so strong that no earthly threat (vv. 35–36) nor heavenly one (vv. 38–

\(^{639}\) Perhaps the use of πολλοί also subtly works in the “one and the many” theme.
39) — including that great enemy, death — can challenge his sovereignty. Through him Christians “super-conquer” (ὑπερνικάω) (v. 37). The apostle’s climactic description at the midpoint of Romans, before returning to the status of Israel, is the inviolability of Christ’s domain.

**Adam Elsewhere: Romans 9–16**

Paul has selected Adam as a symbol of Jew and gentile unified in sin, and thus once he returns to the relation of Jew to gentile as separate categories (Rom 9–11) the first man’s role recedes. However, the concept of many nations within the Adamic domain and a new people created “in Christ” are useful for analyzing the logic of the passage. Israel is implicated in Adam’s sinful domain, but nonetheless has a special place in God’s economy. How do they relate to the new messianic community? Paul answers that God has the prerogative to choose a new nation if he so chooses, but still that ethnic Israel will be gathered into Christ eschatologically.

Similarly, when the apostle concerns himself with the ethical instructions for the church (Rom 12–16), his commands and guidelines are concrete, not requiring the image of Adam. But from time to time similar primeval history or participatory
domains arise. The “one and the many” is a useful way for him to describe the church unified in the body of Christ but plural in its members. As I mentioned at the start of Chapter 2, Rom 16:17–20 contains a probable allusion to the curses, although there is doubt that it is original to Romans.\(^{640}\) I have already noted that it is a warning against deception, one of the major moral tropes derived from Gen 3, and that it equates the church with the woman’s offspring. However, on the far side of the Adamic taxonomy, another dimension becomes visible.

Romans 16:17–20 can also be read as an admonition against desire. In this case the schismatic teachers play the diabolical snake to the church’s Adam and Eve, and the serpentine influence is to persuade the whole party to partake of the appealing fruit: “For such people do not serve our Lord Christ, but their own appetites (lit.: ‘their own belly,’ ἡ ἑαυτῶν κοιλία), and by smooth talk and flattery they deceive the hearts of the simple-minded (ἄκακοι)” (v. 18). The serpent in the fall narrative certainly used “smooth talk and flattery” to deceive the first pair, who could consummately be termed ἄκακοι, which we might translate “ naïve of evil,” and he did

\(^{640}\) This assumes the originality of this section of Rom 16, which is not assured.
so by appeal to the appetite of their belly. Unlike the Adam of Rom 5:19 — but like Christ — Paul trusts the congregation’s “obedience” (ὑπακοή), so that they can be the opposite of the crafty tempter, namely, “wise (σοφοί) in what is good and guileless (ἀκέραιοι) in what is evil” (v. 19). It is only after they have imitated the second Adam’s obedience and avoided the temptation of the devil that the believers are promised a swift-coming victory over Satan, as foretold in the so-called protoevangelium (v. 20).

**Paul's Story of Adam: Conclusion**

The name “Adam” occurs but twice in Romans, both in 5:14, and yet his story is ever present in Romans. He is the only human who can be considered a counterpart of Christ. This comparison dominates Rom 5:12–21, and allusions to primeval history are woven throughout the epistle — especially in Rom 1, 7, and 8 — giving Paul, in the still relevant words of Matthew Black, “the scaffolding, if not the basic structure,

---

641 Further, as already noted, Philo finds it significant that the serpent is forced to crawl on its κοιλία in LXX Gen 3:14, since the belly is the seat of ἐπιθυμία, “desire,” the vice on which he preyed.

642 Most commentaries agree that there is an Adamic echo in Rom 16:20, but I am unaware of any that see its presence throughout Rom 16:17–20.
for his redemption and resurrection Christology,” as well his doctrines of sin and 
salvation, ethnicity and the church, anthropology and ethics. At the outset I fixed 
Rom 11:32 as the τέλος of Romans, and I might paraphrase it now, “At Adam’s fall 
God has imprisoned every nation under disobedience in order that he may be 
merciful to all, Jews and gentiles, who are in Christ.” This, I submit, is an efficient 
one-sentence epitome of Romans.

It is perhaps possible to imagine Paul’s thought devoid of Adam, but it would 
require some toil to construct. It is, however, impossible to think of the Christian 
document of Adam and Christ, of the fall and of salvation history as the undoing of 
original sin, without Paul. That is, arguably, the central narrative of Paul’s letter to 
the Christians in Rome.

---

CONCLUSION — LIGHT FROM THE DISTANT PAST: RECAPITULATION AND REFLECTION

“One short sleepe past, wee wake eternally,
And death shall be no more; death, thou shalt die.”
– Donne, *Holy Sonnet X*

An Apology for Reasonable Extrapolation

History comes to us as scraps of paper spared from decay, often by happenstance.

Much of what we know of Greco-Roman antiquity comes from a relatively small cadre of influential voices: Homer and Plato, Virgil and Cicero, Herodotus and Livy.

The state is similar, if more shadowy, for the earliest generations of Christians, those Jews, Greeks, and others who confessed Jesus as the Messiah but who as yet did not bear the name Χριστιανοί. It is impossible to know with certainty how many voices we hear in the NT, but like Greco-Roman sources, it is relatively few compared to the many now nameless, faceless believers. We are given portraits of Jesus in the Gospels. After him Paul and several “pillars” — James the Just and the apostles Peter and John (Gal 2:9) — dominated the movement.

---

644 Or, at any rate, rarely did so. The three NT uses (Acts 11:26; 26:28; 1 Pet 4:16) come from later books. The two in Acts are both associated with Paul, and so to the degree Acts is judged historically accurate, there is reason to see Paul knowing the term.
writings that were preserved by later generations were thought, by some group or
scribe, to hold singular prestige. Of course, by happenstance (and the bone-dry
conditions of several parts of the eastern Mediterranean basin), everyday papyri and
shards of clay have also been recovered, supplementing an otherwise elite
perspective on the world with the worries, interactions, and desires of common
people.645 There are also city ruins and monuments, public buildings and inscribed
decrees, among other realia, the artifacts of archeology that can illuminate sides of
life that writers often neglected to mention.

Nonetheless, even in the best of conditions — when authors were highly
visible in their own day, their writings treasured early on, and the conditions
amenable to the preservation and copying of manuscripts — tantalizing gaps remain.
In Pauline studies, there are at least two lost letters in the Corinthian
correspondence, and the order and tone of 2 Corinthians looks, to many,
piecemeal.646 When Polycarp writes to the Philippians in the early second century, he

---

645 Elite, that is, within a certain public. Paul, for example, would not have been elite in wider
society, but within the Christian movement he was.

646 In some reconstructions of the Corinthian correspondence, the “lost” letters are said to be
not missing but incorporated into 2 Corinthians.
speaks of Paul writing “letters” (ἐπιστολαί) to their church (Phil. 3:2). Either he is misinformed, or we lack another letter to them.

This is given as an illustration. The point is that there is much about Paul’s world that we do not and cannot know. We are continually forced to extrapolate from the evidence we have to explain the lingering silences. I note the spottiness of our data both as a concession to humility and a challenge to the recently ascendant skepticism about Rom 5:12–21. First, the concession: there is much we cannot know about Paul’s view of Adam. In the previous chapters I have appealed to a number of Second Temple works, many of which Paul did not know. I think it probable that Paul knew all the main streams of Adamic lore, including the “glorious Adam” traditions, and I think it reasonable to suggest that something like “participatory domains” best explains the means of transfer from Adam and Christ to the “many.” The ideas are recurrent and in variegated Jewish sources. A number of them precede Paul, and some we know he was acquainted with. However, in the end, my reconstruction must remain, by the nature of things, tentative.

My challenge is that not attempting a reasonable elucidation of Paul’s Adam-Christ comparison involves us in more problems than it solves. It would be, of
course, a fallacy to deduce “Paul did not have a theory of Adamic influence” from
“We do not know Paul’s theory of Adamic influence.” Only a few scholars approach
so bald a claim. More often the refrain is that Paul does not explain his reasoning,
he just asserts it. To us this sounds reasonable, but historically it presents a
dilemma. On the one hand, if Adamic traditions did not yet exist that could readily
be organized into something like “original sin,” then Paul could not offer a mere
assertion without leaving his audience clamoring for more. The only reason a bare
assertion sounds fine to us is because we have been accustomed to the concept and
can fill in the details ourselves. On the other hand, if Adamic traditions did already
exist that could readily be organized into something like “original sin,” then we have
every reason to investigate the available evidence to see what might be found. This I
have attempted to do.

647 The closest are Stowers, Rereading of Romans, 254 and Perkins, “Adam and Christ in the
Pauline Epistles.”

648 See “Adam’s Indeterminate Effect” and “Adam as Afterthought” in Chapter 1.
Review of the Argument

At times, then, we must pursue reasonable extrapolations from what evidence remains. In the Introduction I gave three criteria to determine the relevance of Second Temple Jewish traditions for Paul: availability, productivity, and “outcrops.”

In Chapter 1, I sought to document the proposed meanings for the Adam-Christ comparison in Rom 5, noting a gradual slide away from any confident position on the matter, beginning in the latter half of the twentieth century. I then proposed that we search again, if for no other reason than that the arduous and communal nature of letter-preparation in the ancient world would have obliged Paul to think in detail about all aspects of his epistle. He and his team, at least, thought Rom 5:12–21 sufficed to explain Adam’s likeness to Christ. I also posed three “riddles” that needed to be solved in Rom 5: its “fit” within the logic of Romans, the means of transfer of sin and salvation, and significance of τύπος in Rom 5:14.

Chapter 2 surveyed the kinds of Adamic lore present in Greco-Roman Judaism. I placed the various traditions into a fivefold taxonomy: Adam (1) as the head of humanity, (2) as paradigmatic pattern, (3) as moral warning, (4) as bearer of disaster, and (5) as a glorious figure. Paul shows knowledge of all five, but in Rom 5,
it is particularly Adam’s headship, his role in causing disaster, and his glory that are pertinent. In terms of the criterion of availability, Paul was definitely (e.g., Genesis itself) or probably (e.g., Wisdom of Solomon) acquainted with a few of these works. However, the difficulty with legends about primeval history is that they start late. Therefore, I deemed most of the works relevant because of the breadth of the traditions, most dating to within a century of Paul’s own time. In this regard it is the glorious Adam traditions that stand on the surest footing, being scattered across the most sources.

Having ascertained the three most important Adamic traditions for Rom 5, in Chapter 3 I sought to give a structural parallel for figures who are given headship, and who can visit great evil or great beneficence on whole corporate groups, as do Adam and Christ. Here I proposed the concept of “participatory domains,” whereby a heavenly figure functions, either positively or negatively, as patron to a people on earth, and the actions in heaven correspond to the fate of those on earth. My main illustration was the “sons of God,” alternately deities or angels (depending on the text), to whom God entrusted the nations; however I also noted that the developing “Son of Man” figure acted similarly. Although I appealed only to these two
conceptions, participatory domains are a widespread assumption among Second
Temple (and earlier) Jews. Here the case for availability was very strong. The single
most important text, the Song of Moses (Deut 32), greatly influenced Paul as he
wrote Romans, and many of the other texts were also known to him.

In Chapter 4 I applied to Romans the three Adamic traditions through the
lens of participatory domains. In the main Rom 5:12–21 was the centerpiece. I
commented on the passage and sought to demonstrate in three excurses the presence
of participatory domains within the text. Additionally, I answered the three “riddles”
from Chapter 1, finding τύπος to indicate a level of ontological similarity between
Adam and Christ, participatory domains to explain the means of transfer, and Adam
to be the father of nations, both Jews and gentiles — and thus Rom 5:12–21 is closer
to Rom 1–3 and Rom 9–11 than has often been recognized. In addition to Rom 5:12–
21, I also devoted some space to other parts of Romans that plausibly have Adamic
themes, to indicate how the theory applies to the entire epistle.

The second and third criteria are tested in Chapter 4. If the reader finds the
Adamic traditions and participatory domains to explain well Paul’s logic in Rom
5:12–21, especially its riddles, then “productivity” has been fulfilled. To be sure, that
judgment is subjective to some degree, but the three riddles chosen are not. They are longstanding debates in the interpretation of Romans. So the process of determining whether productivity has been satisfied does have an element of objectivity to it.

Also, at different points in Chapter 4 I gave consideration to many of the significant “outcrops” of Paul’s inner logic (Rom 1:16–17; 1:18; 3:23; 11:32), as well as those that arise in major sections of the epistle (Rom 5–8), and applied my theory to them. I commend it as a concept that can cohesively interpret Romans, even removing some perennial obstacles and difficulties in, e.g., Rom 2 and Rom 7.

So I have argued. Insofar as my proposal holds, there is one conclusion that stands above the rest: Paul had in his mind a specific theory of Adamic influence on humanity, one that he expected his Roman audience to know and one that he deemed helpful in comparing and contrasting the Messiah’s impact on the world. Without doubt, Paul is creatively arranging preexisting traditions into new patterns, but his statements in Rom 5 are not cut from whole cloth. His retelling of primeval history is new, but it is not unprecedented.

His retelling is also powerful. Of all the stories about Eden in the Second Temple world, there is an undeniable Pauline stamp to all Christian imagination of
creation, the world, and its restoration and summation in Christ. Paul has forever shaped how followers of Jesus Christ read the opening chapters of Genesis.

**Secondary Conclusions: Theology**

I have said that one conclusion stands above the rest, but if we have learned anything from Rom 5, it is that where there is a “one” a “many” can also be found. My primary conclusion is a historical one, but it has a number of implications for theology and Pauline studies.

*Original Sin.* The theological topic that is most obviously tied up with Rom 5 is original sin. As I have reconstructed it here, Paul does not espouse original sin according to the pattern it has taken in official Western Christian positions. The means of transfer differ: I find it most likely that Paul is thinking in apocalyptic terms, of something like two warring angels in heaven, rather than in the terms of Platonic philosophy, biology, or political, “federal” images. Further, as I understand him, the apostle never directly considers the status of every individual before God. His desire is to make the nations equal, so that Israel fares no better than the gentiles. Like all human knowledge, theology is historically conditioned, and the
emergence of Christianity as a party within Judaism that, at the same time, extended to other nations, produced a set of needs and pressures separate from those of later Christians who codified the doctrine of “original sin.”

Still, in differentiating Paul from later Christians my goal is neither to exonerate him from the distasteful doctrine of original sin (as many seem to regard it), nor to blame Augustine, or Luther, or whoever the guilty theologian du jour may be. Just as early Christian thought about Jesus, God, and the Holy Spirit began with certain seeds found in the NT (Jesus’s exaltation and the worship of him, trinitarian patterns of speaking, etc.) and were developed, debated, and refined through Nicaea and beyond, so also, from Paul’s day onward, Christians saw Adam’s misdeed as hanging over humanity with nearly inescapable power. To be sure, the imagery changed. New matters were discussed. But if you substitute an apocalyptic ἄγγελος for a Platonic ἰδέα in Rom 5, you are not far removed from original sin.

*Christology.* Adam’s counterpart is Christ, and the comparison tells us important things about both. The pessimism with which Paul approaches Adam (and, by consequence, humanity apart from grace) is more than offset by Jesus.

---

649 And, of course, the East and West still have differing official positions on the matter. Orthodoxy is, I wager, closer to Paul on the matter.
Τύπος, I have said, establishes a real ontological commensurability between the two figures, shared as yet by no other human — except Eve, but Paul unites the first couple in Rom 5. This similarity is at its closest with the prelapsarian Adam and the resurrected and ascended Christ. Among his christological statements, the unique addition an Adamic Christology gives is a figure who is genuinely human but also glorified as God’s second-in-command, above the angels, and one who holds authority over all nations.  

However, at his fall Adam vacated much of his glory, now replaced by sin and death, so that he remained only a shell of his former self. Christ filled that empty mold, the τύπος. To restore it was the harder deed. It required not only staying within proper bounds (mere rightness or a lack of trespass) but also overflowing grace for others. This in part explains the “how much more” of Rom 5. But it does not seem to exhaust Paul’s point. In his thought, eschatologically restored humanity reigns over creation in the way Adam and Eve were intended to (so Rom 5:17; 8:12–30), yet Jesus is the foremost of these “sisters and brothers.” And if the messianic

---

650 As I noted in Chapter 4, I concur with Dunn’s “Adamic Christology” but also expand it. Like Dunn (Christology in the Making, 98–128), I see Paul thinking of Christ as a second Adam who dies an Adamic death and then reverses the effects of the fall, initiating a new humanity. However, I expand the meaning of “Adamic Christology” to include a genuine similarity of substance in the pre-fall Adam and the resurrected Christ.
“many” does what Adam was given to do, this implies that at the eschaton the first man will be numbered with the rest, while Jesus will retain preeminence over the whole. The ontological commensurability shared between the unfallen Adam and the exalted Christ is the same commensurability that Jesus will share with his redeemed community. After all, as Paul reasons in 1 Cor 15:20–28, all things — including, no doubt, the first Adam — will be placed under Christ’s feet, except God himself.

The figure of Adam, therefore, feeds into Paul’s overall Christology, but participatory domains are a separable image, one that is a lens for Paul’s Adam-Christ juxtaposition but that can plausibly also be used for his role as messiah and Lord. Jesus’s position over a community on earth, on its own, would place him as an equal with great angelic mediators, like the “sons of God” who rule the nations. It is evident in Paul’s words, however, that Christ is more than just another angel. For

---

651 These are the two titles around which Wilhelm Bousset’s classic *Kyrios Christos: A History of the Belief in Christ from the Beginnings of Christianity to Irenaeus*, trans. John E. Steely (Nashville: Abingdon, 1970) revolves. (The original German edition is in 1913; the ET has been republished by Baylor University Press in 2013, with a preface from Hurtado.) Bousset theorizes that κύριος derives from Hellenistic rather than Palestinian Christianity, and that Paul and John are especially influential in the development of Christology. With the decline of history-of-religions approaches, the newer dating of Gnostic writings, and the reduced divide between Hellenism and Judaism, as well as the growth of “early high Christology” (e.g., Hurtado), Bousset’s approach is no longer widely influential. Still, the work retains a number of important arguments, and his conclusion of the “cultic” significance of “Lord” in the thought of Paul and other hellenized Christians is, I think, correct (pp. 129–38). To put it in my wording, to be in the participatory domain of Christ demands allegiance and devotion.
one thing, unlike the heavenly powers over nations, Rom 5 pictures Christ over “all,” which would constitute gross overreach were he not superior to those angels.

Further, the community that Christ rules is God’s chosen people, and Paul even merges God’s and Christ’s roles together in texts like 1 Cor 8:4–6.⁶⁵² In a number of writings we considered in Chapter 3, Israel’s heavenly patron is exalted over these other national angels or gods.⁶⁵³ Whatever the proper background of the Christ

---

⁶⁵² See the end of Chapter 3. These verses are key to the argument of Ronald Cox (*By the Same Word: Creation and Salvation in Hellenistic Judaism and Early Christianity*, BZNW 145 [Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007], 141–61), who sees Middle Platonism as the proper background for certain cosmological mediators in Hellenistic Judaism, early Christianity, and (to follow his terminology, including quotation marks) “Gnosticism.” Cox’s sees in early Christianity a “reparation of creation” soteriology distinct from the “fulfillment cosmology” of Hellenistic Judaism and the “undoing of creation” in “Gnosticism”; it derives, in his understanding, specifically from the Christ event (pp. 352–57 summarize his argument). He finds the resulting Christian position “intriguing”; “these NT passages adopt a conceptual framework (i.e., Platonic intermediary doctrine) the *raison d’être* of which is to preserve the transcendence of the Deity, and they use it to make claims about that Deity’s radical immanence. For the NT writers, the world, because of a particular moment in space and time, is where one meets God” (p. 357, the closing lines of the book).

This merging also creates the difficulty that Rom 9–11 addresses. Since this new messianic community is God’s people, yet ethnic Israel’s call cannot have been revoked, it seems that the one God has two peoples. Paul’s conclusion is that, at the moment, God’s people is bifurcated unnaturally, but that restoration will come in eternity.

⁶⁵³ This is explicitly stated of Michael in the War Scroll (1QM XVII.7–8), and of the “one like a son of Man” (very likely also Michael) in Dan 7:13–14.
hymn in Phil 2, the high exaltation and universal renown ascribed to Jesus at its end befits his role as a superior mediator. 654

Monotheism. My project may indicate, in fact, something more than Jesus’s status as a superior mediator. I will sketch only the tentative implications, because to defend this proposition at length would involve me in lengthy discussion. I have noted that some of the texts studied in Chapter 3 envision Israel as entrusted to the greatest angel, regularly Michael. However, others reserve God’s people for God himself. In Sir 17:17 God “appointed a ruler for every nation, but Israel is the Lord’s own portion.” Likewise, in the Song of Moses, “when he divided humankind,” the Most High “fixed the boundaries of the peoples according to the number of the gods” — that is, he allotted the nations to the “sons of God” — but “the LORD’s own portion was his people, Jacob his allotted share” (Deut 32:8–9). We know that the Song was influential on Paul while writing Romans, and thus it is at least possible that he has begun to merge Christ into his conception of God, an early and

---

654 I have for the most part avoided Phil 2 because there is so much debate about the presence of Adam in the passage, and also because it is not clear how much of it is Paul’s own wording. My only point here is that its picture of Christ is consonant with what I have found in Rom 5, and (with less attention) in 1 Cor 15. Many do still invest the passage with great significance, of course, as is evident in many of the chapters in Ralph P. Martin and Brian J. Dodd, eds., Where Christology Began: Essays on Philippians 2 (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1998).
implicit binitarianism. This, again, I add only as a suggestion. It is possible to reconstruct Paul’s logic with Jesus as a superior rather than a divine mediator.

*The Messianic Community.* I began these theological reflections with theological anthropology — original sin, humanity apart from grace — and I end it there as well, but this time with humanity in grace. For Paul this thread ties together salvation, ecclesiology, and ethics. The saved people is the church, and the church is a people being transformed. This is the flow of Rom 5–8: those who, though once enemies, have been reconciled to God (Rom 5:1–11) have been transferred from being in Adam to being in Christ (Rom 5:12–21). Baptism symbolizes this transfer, and in part it has already occurred, but the believing community still must put off

---

655 Inasmuch as this is such a debated topic, I might mention a recent volume with many of the important voices in the debate. Carey C. Newman, James R. Davila, and Gladys S. Lewis, eds., *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism: Papers from the St. Andrews Conference on the Historical Origins of the Worship of Jesus*, JSJSup 63 (Leiden: Brill, 1999) includes papers from Richard Bauckham, Loren T. Suckenbruck, Crispin H. T. Fletcher-Louis, Larry W. Hurtado, Adela Yarbro Collins, and Alan F. Segal, as well as Davila. There is no consensus as to when binitarianism (much less trinitarianism) begins, but increasingly it is agreed that Jewish monotheism allowed for a great many mediators, some very high, and worship of Jesus as God emerged from that context.

656 I am using “church” here in a post-Pauline way, indicating all those truly reconciled to God through Christ. For the most part Paul thinks of the church concretely: it is this or that group of Christians meeting weekly in Thessalonica or Corinth or Rome. However, even apart from Colossians and Ephesians it is clear from Rom 5 that he can conceive of the entire messianic community united together under Christ, even if he does not use the word ἐκκλησία for that idea. Also, the idea of the “visible” and “invisible” church is of course a later development, but 1 Cor 5 makes it clear he can conceive of some who attend not being right with God.
the “old man,” that is, Adam (Rom 6). This is a struggle, insofar as those in Christ remain in Adam (Rom 7). Fortunately, insofar as they are in Christ, nothing can sever them from God’s love in Jesus. Eschatologically they will be remade in Christ’s restored *imago*, sharing secondarily in the glories of Christ, equal to what Adam once was.  

This messianic community is clearly a “new people” (for Paul the prophesied “no people” that provokes Israel to jealousy in Deut 32:21), one drawn from all nations, made up of Jews and Romans, Greeks and barbarians. It holds resemblance to God’s people Israel, and it does not abolish the Jewish nation, “for,” as the apostle himself writes, “the gifts and the calling of God are irrevocable” (Rom 11:29). But in

---

657 Participation is, of course, an increasingly common way to picture Paul’s view of his Christian communities. Three recent works, from varied perspectives, bear witness to this: Michael J. Gorman, *Inhabiting the Cruciform God: Kenosis, Justification, and Theosis in Paul’s Narrative Soteriology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009); Constantine R. Campbell, *Paul and Union with Christ: An Exegetical and Theological Study* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2012); and Litwa, *Being Transformed*. Gorman makes joining Christ’s death and resurrection the central aspect of salvation, as believers also experience his kenosis in order to share his theosis. Justification is, for Gorman, a step in this process. In a methodological study, Campbell considers all instances of union-type language in Paul, from prepositions (ἐν Χριστῷ, εἰς Χριστόν, σὺν Χριστῷ, διὰ Χριστοῦ) to metaphors (body, temple, building, marriage, clothing), and concludes that the meta-theme includes a faith union and mutual indwelling; participation in Christ’s life, death, and resurrection; identification in the realm of Christ and their allegiance to him; and incorporation into the body of Christ, the church (see pp. 412–14). For Litwa, the background of Paul’s thought is Hellenistic, although Jewish Hellenistic. The Greeks commonly pictured humans being transformed into gods, and Litwa contends that Paul pictures Christians as being assimilated into Jesus’s divinity, even though there remains only one all-powerful, sole-ruling God.
Paul’s eyes with the resurrection of Jesus God created a new people. If the Song of Moses bids us to imagine God allotting the nations to the sons of God, Paul bids us to see God gathering from all nations a new community, one that he entrusts to the highest mediator, Jesus Christ.

By speaking of a new people in relation to Jews and gentiles, though, we have backed our way into the debate that has been at the epicenter of Pauline studies for the past four decades. The reader might wonder where my proposal fits in the present landscape of Pauline studies. This I offer briefly as the final reflection for my study of Paul.

**Secondary Conclusions: Pauline Studies**

In recent Pauline studies, Rom 5 has languished — or relatively so, as much as any part of Romans can — as the center of debate has shifted to the New Perspective on Paul and its critics. The topics of Jews and gentiles, works of the law, and faith have demanded attention, and so the passages of interest have been Rom 1–4 and 9–11, Gal 3, and Phil 3. Since this debate has not impinged directly on my own thesis, I have generally avoided it. However, my proposal does have some potential
implications for the continuing discussion, particularly as scholarship is seeking to move beyond the New Perspective.

*History of the New Perspective Debate.* The New Perspective on Paul might be said to have been conceived with Stendahl’s address to the American Psychological Association, published as “The Apostle Paul and the Introspective Conscience of the West,” born with Sanders’s now iconic, then iconoclastic, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, and come of age with Dunn’s two-volume commentary, *Romans.* It now basks in the golden light of maturity with Wright’s overflowing mixture of history and biblical theology, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God.*

Throughout the 1980s and 1990s the New Perspective won many converts, so that by

---


2002 one opponent, Seyoon Kim, feared that it had eclipsed Rudolf Bultmann in overall impact on Pauline studies.\textsuperscript{660}

There have been two primary wings of the New Perspective, Sanders and Räisänen, on the one hand, and Dunn and Wright, on the other.\textsuperscript{661} The singular contribution of Sanders, as almost everyone agrees, has been his vocal, penetrating defense of Second Temple Judaism against charges of legalism and religious pettiness. It is no coincidence that \textit{Paul and Palestinian Judaism} devotes 396 pages to Palestinian Judaism and only 112 to Paul.\textsuperscript{662} In this work Sanders coined the now common term “covenantal nomism” to describe Jewish soteriology and ethics, a view that grace precedes works and law-keeping presumes covenant.\textsuperscript{663} In this sense, then, the New Perspective on Paul is fundamentally rooted in a new perspective on


\textsuperscript{661} See esp. Räisänen, \textit{Paul and Law}.

\textsuperscript{662} Sanders’s interest is particularly early rabbinic Judaism. There are 206 pages on Tannaitic Judaism, 90 on the DSS, 90 on the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, and ten in summary.

\textsuperscript{663} Sanders, \textit{Paul and Palestinian Judaism}, 422. He defines covenantal nomism in eight points: “(1) God has chosen Israel and (2) given the law. The law implies both (3) God’s promise to maintain the election and (4) the requirement to obey. (5) God rewards obedience and punishes transgression. (6) The law provides for means of atonement, and atonement results in (7) maintenance or re-establishment of the covenantal relationship. (8) All those who are maintained in the covenant by obedience, atonement and God’s mercy belong to the group which will be saved.”
ancient Judaism. Sanders’s view of Paul has left many unsatisfied, however: “In short,” writes Sanders, “this is what Paul finds wrong in Judaism: it is not Christianity.”664 Räisänen is even less sanguine in his assessment of Paul. He starts with the “curious dilemma” that everyone praises Paul’s “clarity” and “profundity” while no one can agree on what precisely his views were on almost any topic, and thus “contradictions and tensions have to be accepted as constant features of Paul’s theology of the law” — and not only the law, as his many other books and articles illustrate, he is inconsistent on many other matters as well.665

Two early adopters of Sanders’s view of Judaism were Dunn, whose 1983 article gave name to the whole movement, and Wright, who gave a presentation on the topic while still in his doctoral studies at Oxford.666 They agree with their fellows in the New Perspective that Greco-Roman Judaism had been maligned; Dunn spoke

664 Ibid., 552; Sanders, Paul, Law, People; Sanders, Paul: A Brief Insight.

665 Räisänen, Paul and Law, 2–4 (“curious dilemma”), 11 (“contradictions and tensions”). Sanders (Paul: A Brief Insight, 196) agrees. He cautions that, although Paul was a “theologian,” he was not “systematic,” and he never reconciled his deep-seated convictions — e.g., God is good and loving toward all creation, God called Israel, yet salvation is only in Christ — with each other. Still, a warm appreciation for Paul, despite this and in distinction from Räisänen, is evident: “These underlying assumptions, and the passion with which he applied them, coupled with his bursts of ingenuity and the cuts and thrusts of his argument, make him a serious and compelling religious thinker” (ibid.).

of Sanders’s scholarship as “breaking the mould” in this regard. Neither, though, is happy with Sanders’s, much less with Räisänen’s, view of Paul. But if his contemporary Jews were not legalistic, what was Paul’s objection? In brief, their answer is that “works of Torah” — which they take to be a term for Jewish-specific ordinances, like circumcision, kashrut, and Sabbath — divide ethnic Israel from the nations, and that the coming of the Messiah undoes any national separation.

Other names could be mentioned in this conversation, such as Richard B. Hays, who champions a christological reading of the πίστις Χριστοῦ passages; or Francis Collins, who was once not far off from Räisänen, but found Paul’s coherence in a social goal: creating a unified Christian community distinct from Judaism.

What united all parties in the early days of the New Perspective was a desire to rehabilitate first-century Judaism and discredit the “Lutheran” reading of Paul.

Given this ambitious, even aggressive, objective, it is no surprise that opponents have never been wanting. The New Perspective on Paul has received a chilly reception in Reformed evangelicalism — one thinks of Moo, Frank Thielman,

\[667\] Ibid., 96–97.

Mark A. Seifrid, and D. A. Carson — and in some parts of Germany — for example, Jürgen Becker. Luminaries of an earlier generation, such as Käsemann and Cranfield, often reacted negatively to the New Perspective, at least to the degree they witnessed it. Westerholm has built much of his successful career sifting the New Perspective’s merits (especially regarding Judaism) and demerits (especially regarding its anti-Lutheranism). His *Perspectives Old and New on Paul* is the most persuasive account of the continued importance of a “Lutheran” approach to Pauline studies. It tracks twentieth-century scholarship’s uneasy relationship with a theology (he argues) that is common to Augustine, Luther, Calvin, and Wesley. He commends anew the view of these earlier Christians. With characteristically incisive wit, he states his view in an earlier version of the same work:

> Students who want to know how a Rabbinic Jew perceived humanity’s place in God’s world will read Paul with caution and Luther not at all. On the other hand, students who want to

---


671 Westerholm, *Perspectives*. 
understand Paul, but feel that they have nothing to learn from Martin Luther, should consider a career in metallurgy. Exegesis is learned from the masters.  

A historical challenge to the New Perspective’s view of Judaism has come from, of all people, one of Dunn’s students, Simon Gathercole. His dissertation-turned-monograph, *Where Is Boasting?* (2002), can be considered a direct rebuttal of *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*. As with its predecessor, *Boasting* compares Hellenistic-and Roman-era Jewish writings with Paul, but the later work comes to much different conclusions, namely, that ancient Jews did, at least in some cases, believe they could merit salvation by their works. In particular, they believed themselves to have earned a right to boast before God, but Paul would have none of this. (Re-enter Bultmann!) Hence, in Gathercole’s view, Paul’s objection: “For if Abraham was justified by works, he has something to boast about, *but not before God*” (Rom 4:2).

Such has been the academic engagement with Paul’s theology over the past forty years, dating back to 1977: entrenched battle lines, exegetical and historical forays back and forth, and consequently considerable haze. It is hard to progress in Pauline studies so long as the meanings of subjects as significant as justification,

---


salvation, and law are in doubt. Amid the dust-up, the newest development is a desire to move past the New Perspective on Paul. Campbell mostly ignores it in his writings as he strives for a constructive, new model of Pauline soteriology. It is found in A. Andrew Das’ proposed “newer perspective” (Paul switched from one locus of grace, Torah, to another, the Messiah). It is also evident in the terminology of the “radical new perspective” associated with Gaston, Pamela Eisenbaum, and John G. Gager (Paul preached the Messiah to gentiles and assumed Jews would continue to follow their ancestral ways). In his later writings, Dunn has stressed the additive aspect of the New Perspective, that it does not undercut Luther’s theology but expands it. Most telling is Watson’s Paul, Judaism, and the Gentiles, as it constitutes a “defection” from a previous adherent of the New Perspective.

---

674 Campbell, Quest, 13–15.


676 Gaston, Paul and Torah; Pamela Eisenbaum, Paul Was Not a Christian: The Original Message of a Misunderstood Apostle (San Francisco: HarperOne, 2009); Gager, Reinventing Paul. As I noted earlier, this is increasingly dispensing with the label “radical new perspective” and instead opting for “Paul within Judaism.”

The eye of many a Pauline scholar is now turning to a post-New Perspective era.

*My Proposal.* Though still blurry, as the dust is settling on this new landscape certain features are evident, among them these: ethnic relations are a significant part of Paul’s thought about justification, even if that does not exhaust the matter; Second Temple Jews were not concerned with perfect obedience, even if some may have boasted of general obedience; first-century Christianity remained, at least in its own eyes, within Judaism; and Christ himself constitutes Christian righteousness, whether this is imputed, apocalyptic, participatory, or something else.

As I mentioned above, Rom 5:12–21 backs into these topics, but all the leading features are all there: law, justification, and — as I have understood Adam — Jews and gentiles. On the whole my project is sympathetic to the New Perspective, but without negating all aspects of a traditional Lutheran (or Augustinian, or Reformed) view of Paul. I have made the Jew / gentile question pertinent even in the middle of Romans, and in that aspect I fall directly in line with the New Perspective.

---

678 Francis Watson, *Paul, Judaism, and the Gentiles: Beyond the New Perspective*, rev. ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007). While the first edition of this work, mentioned above, was solidly within the New Perspective, this substantially revised and expanded revision displays ambivalence about such a classification.
It seems to be the rare case indeed in which Paul speaks of salvation and justification apart from the status of gentiles alongside Jews in the people of God. Though from many nations, there is only one messianic people.

On law, however, the Reformed perspective continues to have certain aspects worth noting. No doubt “works of the law” includes boundary markers, but it does not seem to be exclusively this. A central element of Rom 7 is that the commandment against desire incites desire; this is ethics, not boundary markers. Torah does, in certain ways, delimit Israel from the nations, as I argued concerning Rom 5:13–14, 20, but it does not seem to be the case that circumcision, food laws, and Sabbath-keeping are the apostle’s only concerns.

Justification is harder to evaluate, in part because the several terms seem to vacillate between Christ’s action and the resultant state of believers. His articulation on the matter is more expressly given in Rom 1–4 and Gal 3. Romans 5:12–21 does not negate an “imputed” righteousness, and the traditional division of justification and sanctification remains a handy way to explain the sense that believers are, for Paul, genuinely already in Christ, even if they continue to sin. However, when Paul does step back to take in the cosmic sweep of salvation history, as he does in Rom 5,
justification becomes a subsidiary point, with sin and grace, death and life dominating his thought. I might put it this way: to the degree that a Lutheran view of justification fits within my project, it is the apocalyptic perspective of Käsemann, not the existential perspective of Bultmann.

A final concern is to what degree Pauline Christianity stayed within Judaism. This is a vexed question, in part because it has implications for two living religions. The apostle himself certainly thinks he is a faithful Jew his whole life long. Acts pictures Paul, at his trial before Agrippa II, still claiming the appellation of “Pharisee” (26:5), and there is nothing in his own corpus that indicates otherwise. He may have counted his membership among the Pharisees as “rubbish” compared to Christ, but that does not mean he revoked his position any more than he revoked membership in Israel (Phil 3:1–11). Further, in Rom 9–11 his language rises to an emotional pitch as he attempts to unite these two peoples, Israel and the messianic community, if only eschatologically. Johannes Munck some time ago employed this passage to argue that Paul’s mission to the gentiles was, in his own mind, a prelude

---

679 This is part of a wider field of research, which now often places the full division of Judaism and Christianity in the fourth century. See Oskar Skarsaune and Reidar Hvalvik, eds., *Jewish Believers in Jesus: The Early Centuries* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2007).
to the restoration of his own nation. Thus, even as the apostle to the gentiles, Paul’s work was directed toward the salvation of his fellow Jews.

Nonetheless, within the logic Paul presents in Rom 5:12–21, and of the epistle as a whole, he makes an eventual split of Christianity from the wider world of Judaism almost inevitable. It is no coincidence that many Jewish scholars who read him find him to be a “very unusual Jew,” and prefer to speak of his adoption of Christianity as a “conversion” (from Judaism) rather than a “call” (within Judaism). Even Samuel Sandmel, who speaks warmly of Paul (“I know of no more


681 Daniel Boyarin (A Radical Jew: Paul and the Politics of Identity, Contraversions 1 [Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994]), a Jewish scholar, argues in line with the New Perspective that Paul was a critic of Jewish exclusivism, but locates his motivation with the Greek ideal of the “one.” His Christology was, in a sense, a means to an end, rather than the motivation itself. Boyarin is ambivalent about this attempt, appreciating the desire for universalism but worried that a consistent application of the logic destroys all particularity. In Border Lines: The Partition of Judaeo-Christianity, Div (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004), he locates the separation of Judaism and Christianity into two religions as something accomplished by elites around the fourth century, contending that common Jews and Christians did not think of themselves as separate groups until they were forced to do so.

682 These two positions come respectively from Shaye J. D. Cohen (From the Maccabees to the Mishnah, 2nd ed. [Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2006], 29) and Alan F. Segal (Paul the Convert: The Apostolate and Apostasy of Saul the Pharisee [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990]). Segal’s argument is, to be sure, more nuanced than a simple preference for “conversion” over “call,” but throughout he seeks to show the radical nature of Paul’s change, so much so that it constituted something of a break from his past.
exciting man within my ken in all the history of religion”), nonetheless describes

Paul as a convert as well as a Jew. In Lawrence Schiffman’s words:

The ultimate parting of the ways for Judaism and Christianity took place when the adherents to Christianity no longer conformed to the halakhic definitions of a Jew. As these Gentile Christians, never converted to Judaism through the legal requirements we have discussed, became the dominant stream in the Christian communities which the Rabbis confronted, even in Palestine, the Rabbis ceased to regard the Christians as a group of Jews with heretical views and Christianity as a Jewish sect. Rather, the Rabbis began to regard the Christians as members of a separate religious community, and their teachings a perversion of the biblical tradition. From then on, Christians and Jews began a long history of interreligious strife which played so tragic a part in medieval and modern history.

Whatever Paul’s goals, his decision to champion a circumcision-free gospel led inexorably to a break with the rest of Judaism, even if it took decades or centuries to accomplish. In terms of my project, the same might be said of my interpretation that Christ has created a new people, even a new humanity. Paul holds together the new and old people of God, but as gentiles dominated the Christian movement more and more, it is little surprise that they came to see themselves as the new Israel.

---

683 Sandmel, *Genius of Paul*, 36–98. Quotation comes in the 1979 preface to the first Fortress edition (p. vi). (The work was first was published in 1958.) On his accounting, Sandmel finds Paul always engaging, but he is ambivalent about him. Following directly after the quotation above, he writes, “I cannot feel neutral when I read him for he can through unconsciously poetic passages raise me high, or he can irritate or even repel me through his abrasiveness.”

In saying this I mean neither to blame Paul for religious schism nor lionize him as the second founder of Christianity, a title I am convinced he would have deplored. My point, rather, is historical: that later intelligent readers of Romans, who did not share his living desire to remain within Judaism, followed its logic directly to a Christianity separate from Judaism — one that is indebted to Judaism, to be sure, and one that even hopes for ethnic Israel’s restoration. But practically speaking it is hard to celebrate a new people of God and not dispense with the old.

So Paul thought of himself as a faithful Jew throughout his life, but he also planted the seeds that led to the emergence of Christianity as a religion separate from Judaism.

***

This study began with the story of the garden of Eden in Gen 1–3, which I described as fertile. Paul’s retelling of primeval history in Rom 5:12–21 is also productive, in ways that imitate the original but also reinvent it. For Paul, the arrival of the Messiah and his surprising death and resurrection required an entirely new reading of Israel’s scriptures, one that led him to posit Jesus as Adam restored, inaugurating a new humanity made of Jews and gentiles that will one day reign in
life. For Paul, the history of salvation in its briefest terms is the sin of Adam and its consequent death for all, and the righteous death of Christ and its consequent life for all. Christ’s singular obedience brought the possibility of salvation to all people and demonstrated his proper place at God’s right hand.

This was and is Paul’s gospel and his hope.
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