Landas 22:1 (2008) 1-33

ADAM LANGUAGE IN GENESIS AND EARLY JUDAISM: A SURVEY

Bernardita Dianzon, F.S.P.

This paper examines the use of the Adam language in the Old Testament, for the purpose of determining how Paul's corporate reference to Adam is influenced by and rooted in Old Testament ideas and manner of articulation. It also includes a brief survey of the various speculations on Adam in the deuterocanonical (apocryphal) and pseudepigraphal literature—the body of writings which could give us a glimpse into the relevant background-ideas to Paul's Adam Christology, and could provide us with clues to the latter's connection with the "Son of Man."

Adam Language in the Old Testament

The term אָדָם occurs 562 times in the Old Testament.[1] It has both an individual and a collective aspect. The individual usage is quite infrequent, whereas the collective meaning is much more common.

[1]Fritz Maass, s. v. "אָדָם", in *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament* Vol. 1, eds. G. Johannes Botterweck and Helmer Ringgren (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1974), 75–87.

https://publications.lst.edu/

Practically, it is only in the Genesis accounts of creation and the fall that the word אָדָם is used to indicate an individual. Outside this section, the other texts where אָדָם refers to an individual are: Gen 4:1 "Now Adam knew Eve his wife, and she conceived and bore Cain, saying, 'I have gotten a man with the help of the Lord'"; Gen 5:4 "The days of Adam after he became the father of Seth were eight hundred years; and he had other sons and daughters"; Sir 49:16 "Shem and Seth were honored among men, and Adam above every living being in the creation"; Tob 8:6 "You made Adam and gave him Eve his wife as a helper and support. From them the race of mankind has sprung. You said, 'It is not good that the man should be alone; let us make a helper for him like himself'."[2]

Over and beyond these texts, the term אָדָם or הָאָדָם bears a distinctly corporate meaning: "humanity," "the human race," "all human beings," "everybody," or "some men." The concept "humankind" (אָדָם) of Gen 1:26 is undoubtedly treated as a collective subject, since its verb is plural ("let *them* have dominion"). The same is true with Gen 1:27 (הָאָדָם), where the author has in mind not only a single pair but the entire human race. The collective sense of אָדָם in Gen 6:7 is evident from its contrast with the collective בְּהֵמָה, "beasts." In regretting the creation of "man," God had in mind the entire human race as it existed at the time of the great flood. While employing the singular "man," the statement, "the inclination of *man's* heart is evil," points obviously to human beings in general. The same nuance is found in a number of other texts[3]:

1. Mic 6:8 "He has showed you, O *man*, what is good."
2. Job 14:1, 10 "*Man* that is born of a woman is of few days, and full of trouble …. But *man* dies, and is laid low; *man* breathes his last, and where is he?"

[2]Jean de Fraine, *Adam and the Family of Man*, trans. Daniel Raible (Staten Island, NY: Alba House, 1965), 134–35.

[3]De Fraine, *Adam*, 135–36.

https://publications.lst.edu/

3. Job 28:28 "And he said to *man*, 'Behold, the fear of the Lord, that is wisdom; and to depart from evil is understanding'."
4. Job 33:17 "that he may turn *man* aside from his deed, and cut off pride from *man*"
5. Job 34:15 "All flesh would perish together, and *man* would return to dust."
6. Prov 20:24 "A *man's* steps are ordered by the Lord; how then can *man* understand his way?"
7. Jer 10:23 "I know, O Lord, that the way of *man* is not in himself, that it is not in *man* who walks to direct his steps."
8. Isa 6:12 "… and the Lord removes *men* far away, and the forsaken places are many in the midst of the land."
9. Zeph 1:3 "'I will sweep away *man* and beast; I will sweep away the birds of the air and the fish of the sea. I will overthrow the wicked; I will cut off mankind from the face of the earth,' says the Lord."
10. Sir 15:17 "Before *man* are life and death, and whichever he chooses will be given to him."

When negated (no human being), the term assumes an even more inclusive meaning, as borne out by the following examples:[4]

1. All human beings are sinners: 1Kgs 8:46 "… there is *no man* who does not sin …."; Eccl 7:20 "Surely there is *not* a righteous *man* on earth who does good and never sins."
2. No human being has full control of one's destiny: Eccl 8:8 "*No man* has power to retain the spirit, or authority over the day of death."

אָדָם or הָאָדָם can function adjectivally, i.e., "human." To express this sense, the Hebrews often had recourse to the phrase "of a human being." The corporate character of the words אָדָם or הָאָדָם is clearly borne out by the adjectival expression. Thus they speak of "the custom

[4]De Fraine, *Adam*, 138.

https://publications.lst.edu/

of human beings" (1 Sam 7:19 and Neh 9:29); "human bone" (Num 19:16; Ezek 39:15; 1Kgs 13:2; 23:14, 20); "human cords" (Hos 11:4); and "thoughts of human beings" (Ps 94:11).[5]

The term אָדָם may mean not only mankind in general but also each individual member of that general class, in an indefinite sense. This can be expressed by such phrases as "someone," "any man" or "any man whatsoever." Sometimes the expression is a bit more explicit as in Eccl 7:28, "one man" (אָדָם אֶחָד). The indefinite use is more common in cases of legal prescriptions where אָדָם evidently means "anyone." The following texts illustrate this:[6]

1. Lev 1:2 "When *any man* of you brings an offering to the Lord, you shall bring your offering of cattle from the herd or from the flock."
2. Num 19:13 "Whoever touches a dead person, the body of *any man* who has died, and does not cleanse himself, defiles the tabernacle of the Lord."
3. Judg 16:7 "If they bind me with seven fresh bowstrings which have not been dried, then I shall become weak, and be like *any* other *man*."

Sometimes אָדָם means "some men," "a certain number of men" or "a group of men," as in this example from Isa 2:11—"The haughty looks of *some men* shall be brought low, and the pride of *some men* shall be humbled."[7]

The Meaning of "בֶּן־אָדָם"

The term "בֶּן־אָדָם" can mean many things, but in most cases it conveys a collective sense. "אָדָם" generically and quantitatively means all humanity or part of that whole (someone, some). Thus בֶּן־אָדָם bears

[5]De Fraine, *Adam*, 138.

[6]De Fraine, *Adam*, 139.

[7]De Fraine, *Adam*, 139.

https://publications.lst.edu/

the meaning of "a member of the human collectivity." It is never used to refer to a descendant of Adam as an individual.

The expression is encountered both in the singular and the plural. The singular (בֶּן־אָדָם) is attributively used, as in the following:

1. Num 23:19 "God is not man, that he should lie, or a *son of man* (i.e., human being), that he should repent."
2. Ps 146:3 "Put not your trust in princes, in a *son of man* (i.e., human being) in whom there is no help."

The plural (בְּנֵי אָדָם) has the same collective force, referring simply to all those who make up the human race or partake of the same human situation. For example, divine wisdom is said to find delight "in the sons of men" (Prov 8:31). The collective sense is often highlighted through the addition of the qualifier "all": "for thou, thou only, knowest the hearts of *all the children of men*" (1 Kgs 8:39).

Now and then, בְּנֵי אָדָם, whether singular or plural, is paralleled with "man," indicating that its meaning is synonymous to "man":[8]

1. Job 25:6 "How much less man, who is but a maggot, the *son of man*, who is only a worm."
2. Ps 8:5 "What is man that you should be mindful of him, or the *son of man* that you should care for him?"
3. Prov 8:4 "To you, O men, I call; my appeal is to the *sons of men*."
4. Mic 5:6 "… like raindrops on the grass, which wait for no man, nor tarry for the *sons of men*."

It is clear from the above examples that בְּנֵי אָדָם is never intended to be translated as "sons of Adam," for it does not refer to the descendants of Adam as such, but to humankind and to the human condition as a whole.[9]

[8]De Fraine, *Adam*, 141.

[9]De Fraine, *Adam*, 142.

https://publications.lst.edu/

Adam in the Genesis Narratives

Genesis 2:4b–4:1

A number of scholars, among whom are R. Scroggs,[10] P. Humbert,[11] and H. Gressmann,[12] support the view that the Adamic narrative in Gen 2:4b–4:1 is redacted from two different myths, one about creation, and the other about paradise. Although the problem of Pentateuchal sources is the center of current scholarly debates, this view should suffice for the simple purpose of this section. The creation story gives an account of human origin and pictures the first human being's exalted stature and positive relationship with God. This strand could be found in 2:4b–7, 9a, 15, 18–24; 3:20–21, 23; and 4:1. The paradise story, on the other hand, narrates the primeval act that brought about humanity's present state of predicament. This strand is contained in 2:8, 9b, 16f., 25; 3:1–19, 22, 24.

Von Rad suggests that the creation myth is used "to push the beginning of *Heilsgeschichte* back to creation and this can only mean that creation is itself an act of salvation."[13] Here, Yahweh's intention and the result of his acts harmonize. The myth concludes with the human beings fulfilling the ends God has set for them in creation—the man obediently working on the soil, and the woman joyfully bringing forth a son and praising God for the gift of new life. The form and function of the human being are revealed in the following characteristics:[14]

---

[10]Robin Scroggs, *The Last Adam* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1966), 1–14.

[11]Paul Humbert, *Études sur le récit du paradis et de la chute dans la Genèse* (Neuchatel: Secrétariat de l'Université, 1940), 48–81.

[12]H. Gressmann, "Die Paradiessage," in *Festgabe A. von Harnack* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1921), 24–42.

[13]Gerhard Von Rad, *Old Testament Theology* I (New York: Harper & Row, 1962), 138–39.

[14]Scroggs, *Last Adam*, 45.

https://publications.lst.edu/

1. Nature—only the human being, as distinguished from animals, receives the נְשָׁמָה, the breath of Yahweh, at its creation. This renders the human being unique and open to an intimate relationship with the Creator.
2. Wisdom—this important human trait is implied in the man's naming of the animals and of woman. The act indicates wisdom great enough to perceive the essence of things, since ancient thought equates name with essence.
3. Work—Gen 2:5 implies that man is destined to be a tiller of the soil. This destiny is apparently fulfilled naturally and without question in Gen 2:15 and 3:23.
4. Sexual awareness—sex and procreation appear to be central in the creation myth. The creation of the animals is explained by the necessity of finding a helper for man, and the narrative insinuates that the function of the helper is that of a sexual partner. Gen 2:23–24 presents the etiology of sex; 3:20 explains the woman's name in terms of her function of begetting; 4:1 describes the first birth cycle and illustrates that one of man's fundamental functions is to father the human race. In the narrative, sex is accepted and delighted in as one of the created goods of life.
5. Mortality—the creation myth does not show a preoccupation with immortality, as does the paradise myth. It simply describes the origin of the present order without implying a dichotomy between previous and present conditions. In all probability, the myth conceives of the first human being as subject to death.

The human being in the creation myth is distinct from the human being of the paradise myth. Unlike the former, who is presented as wise, the latter is without knowledge. Yet for all his ignorance, the human being of the paradise myth is not innocent of selfish or personal motivation. Rather, he shows no acceptance of Yahweh's good intentions, but regards divine authority as a yoke. When the opportunity to be free from the yoke presents itself, he grabs it, eager to create his own destiny. The only change experienced by the person as a consequence of this act of rebellion was the acquisition of new knowledge. The rest of

https://publications.lst.edu/

the changes occur in the environment. Death becomes the inevitable future of human beings; hard labor on cursed soil becomes the only chance of survival; the pangs of childbirth turn out to be the necessary outcome of the awareness and desire of sex.

Combining the two myths which are so contradictory in nature results, according to Humbert,[15] in the predominance of the theology of the paradise myth. While it brings about the union of two complementary theories of the divine, it also causes the juxtaposition of two contradictory theories of the human. Several characteristics of the human being have been changed or obscured by the fusion of the stories:[16]

1. In essence, man's original destiny is no longer procreating with woman, nor producing crops from the soil, for these have been turned into punishments instead, with the negative painful side of them being given the emphasis.
2. The intuitive acceptance of sex is obscured by the paradise myth. By collocating the naming of "Eve" (חַוָּה) and the narration of the first procreation to a time after the sin, explicit mention of the use of sex happens only after knowledge has been acquired through the fruit of the forbidden tree.
3. Since the two myths vary in their presentation of human character and disposition, their fusion has the effect of creating a "before" and an "after" in the human beings' attitude towards God and the world. The paradise myth, by itself, shows no indication of a positive and faithful human attitude towards God. It portrays how the initial provocation immediately results in the first disobedience. Instead, the creation myth shows a positively disposed man

[15]Humbert, *Récit du paradis*, 48–81.

[16]Scroggs, *Last Adam*, 9–10.

https://publications.lst.edu/

who responds warmly to God's acts of creation and finds joy in the company of the woman.

4. What is most ambiguous is the degree of human knowledge before sin. The creation myth shows man in possession of such wisdom as to enable him to name the animals and woman. This prevails over the paradise myth's portrayal of man as ignorant and naive. Thus, wisdom is seen more as a created good than an evil acquired through the eating from the tree of knowledge. The combined myths tend to emphasize more the act of disobedience and Yahweh's punishment as the main result of sin.

To summarize, the function and type of the man in the composite myth remains essentially that of the paradise story. He mediates not blessings and life, but hardship, suffering, death, and alienation from God. He is now a man created for dignity and glory, but who chooses instead autonomy from the Creator, causing an irreparable break in the relationship and ushering in the evils in human existence. It is to be noted that notwithstanding the gravity of the sin, no concept of "original sin" is to be found. The man introduces sin and brings about death, but there is complete silence about an alteration of man's nature, a degeneration, as it were, from a superior level to an inferior one, much less any mention of passing on this altered nature to his progeny.[17]

Genesis 1:26–30; 5:1–5

The traditions found in Gen 1:26–30; 5:1–5 are important both for Old Testament thought and as a source of later Jewish theology of the original man. Genesis 5 appears to be older than Genesis 1. אָדָם is apparently used as a proper name in Gen 5:1a. Gen 5:1b describes the creation of אָדָם, and of other human beings "in the likeness of God."

[17]Scroggs, *Last Adam*, 9–10.

https://publications.lst.edu/

Thus the model of man is אֱלֹהִים.[18] Gen 5:15 just proves that tradition accepts the myth of the first man, אָדָם, or better yet, of a first couple. In this tradition, the human being is exalted and honored. No trace can be seen of the first couple's deviating from the path God sets for them. They are blessed by the creator and live a lengthy, dignified life. Clearly the function of the human being is to rule over the created order, the animals and the earth. This task of ruling is assigned by God to the first couple because they represent humankind, and specifically, Israel. Just as the image of אֱלֹהִים is passed on through human procreation (Gen 5:3), so the human being's function as ruler is perpetuated throughout the generations. The anthropology here is described as "kingship of all humanity." This tradition is distinguished from Genesis 2–4 in that there is no mention here of Adam's sin.[19]

Speculations About Adam in Early Judaism

Other than the Genesis narratives, the number of Old Testament passages that deal with or even mention the myth of the original man are notably scarce. It can even be surmised that the myths did not elicit sufficient interest to trigger reflection among the writers of the Old Testament. It was up to later Jewish and Christian theologians to carry on the speculation about Adam and to raise the figure in importance, even if not always in a positive light. It is in this broad stream of Jewish writings, not in gnosticism, as has been suggested by some scholars,[20] that the relevant background literature to Paul's exegesis

[18]Usually translated in the Bible as singular when referring to the God of Israel, but also as plural when referring to the heavenly beings that make up the council of Yahweh.

[19]Scroggs, *Last Adam*, 10–14.

[20]N. T. Wright, *The Climax of the Covenant* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1993), 19; William David Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1980), 45; L. J. Kreitzer, "Adam," in *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*, eds. Gerald Hawthorne, et al. (Downer's Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1993), 10; A. J. M. Wedderburn, "Adam and Christ: An Investigation into the

https://publications.lst.edu/

in Romans and 1 Corinthians is to be found. Adam-christology is a Jewish phenomenon, unrelated to Gnostic *Urmensch* speculations about a glorious first creature. Through Adam language Paul describes the reality and assurance of the restoration of the human being's humanity. However, as N. T. Wright notes,

> … the use of "Adam" themes in the Jewish literature which may without controversy be considered as part of the background of the New Testament—i.e., the Old Testament, the Scrolls, and the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha—consistently makes one large and important point: God's purposes for the human race in general have devolved on to, and will be fulfilled in Israel, in particular. Israel is, or will become, God's true humanity. What God intended for Adam will be given to the seed of Abraham. They will inherit the second Eden, the restored primeval glory. If there is a "last Adam" in the relevant Jewish literature, he is not an individual, whether messianic or otherwise. He is the whole eschatological people of God.[21]

Adam theology, found in the Old Testament and intertestamental writings, fulfills the basic purpose of advancing a claim about Israel's place in God's purposes. As subsequent traditions affirm, Abraham will be God's means of undoing the sin of Adam.

Abraham and his family, as it were, inherit the role of Adam and Eve. Israel is God's true humanity. Thus *Jubilees* and the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* align Israel with Adam, and the Gentiles with the beasts over whom Adam rules. *I Enoch* regards Israel as Adam's true heir. The *Wisdom of Solomon* avers that the righteous will be restored to God's intended place for them as lords of creation. *IV Ezra* and *Baruch* likewise claim that Israel will be conferred with the rights of Adam's true heir. In *BenSira* 49:16, Adam's preeminence parallels that of the great kings David, Hezekiah and Josiah earlier in the chapter. In the literature of Qumran, the references to Adam serves as one of the

---

Background of 1 Corinthians 15 and Romans 5:12–21," Ph.D. dissertation (University of Cambridge, 1970).

[21]Wright, *Climax of the Covenant*, 20–21.

https://publications.lst.edu/

varied ways by which the sect appropriates to itself the status of being God's true Israel, the ones who constitute God's true humanity.

This is the overall context from which the Adam language sprang and developed. To ignore this context is to open oneself to the risk of distorted interpretation. To understand how Paul uses Adam language to convey his thought, this context must be seriously taken into account. This shall be the concern of the next subsections.

Main Lines of the Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphal Teachings[22]

The writings included in this survey, with the exception of the *Apocalypse of Moses* and the *Life of Adam and Eve*, are only those that represent Early Judaism, ca. 200 BCE–135 CE, prior to the proliferation of rabbinic, Gnostic and second century Christian literature. Exception has been made for the two works cited above because of their utmost importance for the study of Adam. Other writings that give relatively few references and allusions to Adam have not been included in this survey.

Wisdom Tradition: Sirach[23]

The following triple interpretation drawn from Genesis 13 can be found in the Book of Sirach:

1. Adam is Israel's glorious ancestor: "Shem and Seth were honored, and Adam above every living being in the creation" (Sir 49:16).
2. The first man lacked wisdom: "Just as the first man did not know her [Wisdom] perfectly, the last one has not fathomed her …" (Sir 24:28).
3. Genesis 1–3 portrays universal aspects of human life.

---

[22]James Charlesworth, ed., *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* I and II (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1985), *passim.*

[23]John Levison, *Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism* (Sheffield: Academic Press, 1988), 33–48.

https://publications.lst.edu/

The glorification of Adam in Sir 49:16 is a function of Ben Sira's desire to glorify Israel. In an attempt to create an impressive list of Israelites to illustrate the glory of Israel's past, it was but logical to present Adam, the first human and first Israelite as possessing a glory which excelled all. This Adamic splendor, however, does not go back to the Adam tradition.

Sir 24:28 instead presents the first human as lacking in wisdom. This is in contrast to Job's assertion that the first human possessed wisdom beyond all other people, an interpretation which, as we have seen, harmonizes with the creation myth's presentation of the first human. But again, Ben Sira's statement about Adam here is primarily intended for another purpose, that is, to emphasize the unsearchable quality of wisdom, rather than to make an assertion about the first human.

Ben Sira's most extensive use of Genesis 1–3 is for the purpose of defending the sovereignty of God over a world where evil and good contend. In portraying humanity, Ben Sira ignores the original context of Genesis 1–3 and simply extracts from it elements which he, however, transforms by eliminating their pejorative connotations. Thus **יצר** is portrayed as a neutral impulse; the tree of knowledge is presented as merely the capacity to distinguish between good and evil; death is regarded as part of God's original plan for the cosmos. Even mortality, as drawn from Gen 2:7[24] and 3:19,[25] becomes the basis for God's compassion. There is complete silence about sin, temptation, and expulsion from paradise. By such maneuvers, Ben Sira attempts to undergird his arguments concerning the sovereignty of God and the impertinence of challenging him.

[24]"Then the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living being."

[25]"In the sweat of your face shall you eat bread till you return to the ground, for out of it you were taken; you are dust and to dust you shall return."

https://publications.lst.edu/

Wisdom Tradition: Wisdom of Solomon[26]

Just like Ben Sira, the author of the Book of Wisdom makes adaptations of the Genesis story in accord with his own purpose and tendency. In 2:23 and 15:8–11, he alludes to Gen 1:26–27 and 2:7, respectively, in order to anchor the Sage's appeal to wisdom:

Wis 2:23	Gen 1:26–27
… for God created man for incorruption, and made him in the image of his own eternity …	Then God said: Let us make man in our image, after our likeness …. So God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created him …
Wis 15:8–11	Gen 2:7
… His heart is ashes, his hope is cheaper than dirt … because he failed to know the one who formed him and inspired him with an active soul and breathed into him a living spirit.	Then the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living being.

He demonstrates that people are limited by mortality (7:1),[27] and for this reason they must pursue wisdom. In the same way, he describes human dominion only for the sake of showing that people need wisdom to govern the world properly (9:1–3).[28] He introduces the first man as the first of the Israelite heroes whom wisdom preserved and upon whom, as an archetype, wisdom bestowed dominion and the capacity to

[26]Levison, *Portraits of Adam*, 49–62.

[27]"I also am mortal, like all men, a descendant of the first-formed child of earth; and in the womb of a mother I was molded into flesh."

[28]"O God of my fathers and Lord of mercy, who hast made all things by thy word, and by thy wisdom hast formed man, to have dominion over the creatures thou hast made, and rule the world in holiness and righteousness, and pronounce judgment in uprightness of soul …."

https://publications.lst.edu/

rule. Since Adam is a type of the just person, the blame for the entrance into the world of death (2:24)[29] and the flood (10:3–4)[30] are imputed to the devil and Cain, respectively. Like Ben Sira, the Sage interprets Genesis 1–3 both of Adam and of human beings in general.

Philo Judaeus[31]

Philo espouses a predominantly Hellenistic view of the dichotomy between body and soul, and he employs Genesis 1–3 as a vehicle for articulating that view. He consistently presents the human race and the first man as borderline, composite creatures, who are mortal with respect to the body and immortal with respect to the mind. In *De Opificio Mundi* 64–88, he demonstrates that the human race is superior to all other races by virtue of the possession of reason. Philo's description of the first man also reflects the deep influence of Hellenistic philosophy. The first man's ability to rule over the mortal world and to commune with the heavenly world is depicted by Philo according to the lineaments of the Stoic sage. The harmony with nature provides the rationale for the biblical portrait of Adam's rulership, for such harmony is depicted as "virtue." When the human race begins to live again according to reason, as Adam and the other great figures of the biblical tradition have done, they too can assume rulership.

---

[29]"But through the devil's envy death entered the world, and those who belong to his party experience it."

[30]"But when an unrighteous man departed from her [wisdom] in his anger, he perished because in rage he slew his brother. When the earth was flooded because of him, wisdom again saved it, by steering the righteous man by a paltry piece of wood."

[31]D. Tobin, *The Creation of Man: Philo and the History of Interpretation*, CBQ Monograph Series 14 (Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1983), *passim*; A. J. M. Wedderburn, "Philo's Heavenly Man," *Novum Testamentum* 15 (1973): 301–26; D. Jobling, "'And Have Dominion …' The Interpretation of Genesis 1:28 in Philo Judaeus," *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Period* 8 (1977): 50–82; Levison, *Portraits of Adam*, 63–88.

https://publications.lst.edu/

Quaestiones et Solutiones in Genesin contains Philo's interpretation of the "two men," in which he combines Platonic cosmology, Hellenistic anthropology and his own ethical theory. He distinguishes the molded "man" of Gen 2:7 from the "man" of Gen 1:27. The molded man was created on the seventh day, consists of soul and body, and is in need of teaching and instruction. The incorporeal man, who was created on the sixth day in God's image, is a self-hearing and self-taught being. From the Platonic point of view, the two men represent the ideal intelligible human being and its sensible copy. From the anthropological point of view, they represent the immortal mind, which is independent of the body, and the mortal soul, which is connected with the body. From the ethical point of view, they represent those who live virtuously according to the rational mind, and those dominated by the flesh, which is intertwined with the inferior, sensible world.

Philo allegorizes Genesis 2–3 by interpreting Adam as the rational mind, and Eve as sense perception. This allegory presupposes Hellenistic anthropology which distinguishes the rational mind from the body. Philo interprets the entire story as an account of how the rational mind is ensnared by pleasure through sense perception. When he demonstrates that virtue and not birth determines nobility, Philo readily lays the blame on the first man for succumbing to his bodily desires rather than his mind, and when he interprets the creation of woman, he faults her for the conception of pleasure which issues in unhappiness and mortality:

> Pleasure does not venture to bring its wiles and deceptions to bear on the man, but on the woman, and by her means on him … for in us the mind corresponds to man, the senses to woman; the pleasure encounters and holds parley with the senses first, and through them cheats with her quackeries the sovereign mind itself …. Reason is forthwith ensnared and becomes a subject instead of a ruler … and a mortal instead of an immortal. (*De Opificio Mundi* 165–66)

Philo shows a consistent preference for Greek conceptions when interpreting the other details of the story. The gender differentiation into male and female is interpreted as the division into genus and species. The divine inbreathing is understood as the impartation of a soul. The human race's kinship with the first man is traced to human

https://publications.lst.edu/

beings' possession of a rational mind. However, the faintness with which the first man's glory is reflected by the human race is blamed on the result of successive degeneration.

Parenetic History:[32] *Book of Jubilees*[33]

Since the Book of Jubilees is an exhortation to obey the Law and to shun gentile practices during the Maccabean period, it portrays Adam as the first of the virtuous patriarchs of Israel. To commend the Jewish heritage of the Law, the author exonerates Adam from guilt. The couple's eating from the forbidden tree is not said to have led to universal sin, but only to the loss of speech of the animals:

> On that day [when Adam went out from the garden of Eden] the mouth of all the beasts and cattle and birds and whatever walked or moved was stopped from speaking because all of them used to speak with one another with one speech and one language. (3:28)

Adam, like the other Patriarchs after him, is presented as a priestly figure: "And on that day when Adam went out from the garden of Eden, he offered a sweet-smelling sacrifice—frankincense, galbanum, stacte and spices—in the morning with the rising of the sun from the day he covered his shame" (3:27). This becomes the historical basis for laws of purification. Adam is even portrayed as offering incense at the holy of holies. This portrait of Adam has the sole purpose of providing a narrative basis for calling his contemporaries back to the Jewish heritage and to compliance with God's will expressed in the Law.

---

[32]Robert Henry Charles classifies *Jubilees* as "primitive history rewritten from the standpoint of law." Its concern is to review the critical events of the past in order to expose their significance for understanding the author's contemporary political, social, or cultural situation. Cf. *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English* II (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913), v.

[33]O. S. Wintermute, "Jubilees," in James Charlesworth, ed., *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* II (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1985), 35–142; Levison, *Portraits of Adam*, 89–97.

https://publications.lst.edu/

Rhetorical History: Flavius Josephus[34]

Since it is Josephus' intention to convince his Roman audience that Jewish history merits attention, he employs techniques of Greco-Roman historiography. The use of main characters as *exempla* to teach contemporary lessons is a fundamental feature of Greco-Roman histories. Thus Josephus portrays the figure of Adam in order to inculcate the lesson that God rewards the obedient and punishes the disobedient. To do this, Josephus carefully reorganizes, condenses, supplements, and omits portions of Genesis. Adam and Eve are made to represent those who forfeit a life of bliss (not immortality) and fall into catastrophe because of disobedience to God. By means of techniques of rhetorical historiography, Josephus transforms the Genesis account of Adam and Eve. One technique is to explore the psychological motivations of actions. The serpent is presented as deceiving Eve due to envy. Adam's hiding from God after eating from the forbidden tree is attributed to guilt of conscience. A second technique consists of inserting a lengthy speech which repeats Josephus' moralistic retributive theme in an attempt to commend the Jewish heritage to his Roman audience. Roman notions abound in Josephus' portrait of Adam. For example, Gen 2:7b is interpreted as God's implanting a spirit and soul into Adam's body. The description of bliss which Adam and Eve should have continued to enjoy calls to mind Hesiod's depiction of primeval ease. Adam is also portrayed as predicting a destruction by flood and fire, a notion affirmed by Greco-Roman tradition. By thus writing in a manner in which his audience can relate to his characters, Josephus raised Adam to a figure of universal importance.[35]

---

[34]T. W. Franxman, "*Genesis and the 'Jewish Antiquities' of Flavius Josephus*," *Biblica et Orientalia* 35 (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1979), *passim*; Henry St. John Thackeray, *Josephus: The Man and the Historian* (New York, NY: Ktav, 1967), *passim*; Levison, *Portraits of Adam*, 99–111.

[35]Levison, *Portraits of Adam*, 99–111.

https://publications.lst.edu/

Apocalypses:[36] *IV Ezra*[37]

The entire book consists of a dialogue in seven episodes between Ezra, the questioner, and Uriel, the divine respondent. The first three episodes are pervaded with pessimism and present Adam, the first man of the present age, as an entirely negative figure. The positive elements in the Genesis story, such as the existence in paradise, are intentionally suppressed. Human dominion of creation is regarded as a disadvantage because the mind, which enables the human race to rule, also permits people to anticipate their own condemnation. The author depicts creation in positive terms only to evoke God's mercy toward sinful and hopeless humanity.

Since the author expresses his insights through both Ezra and Uriel, his negative view of Adam could not be regarded as monolithic. Uriel unequivocally affirms individual responsibility and attributes to Adam solely the physical difficulties of the present age. He regards these difficulties as a test and a contest by means of which human beings can act responsibly in obedience and receive the reward of eternal life. Even if Uriel views Adam as the first person to succumb to the evil seed, he never considers the sin of Adam as the factor that determines the sinfulness of the entire human race.

---

[36]"Apocalypticism" is a modern designation widely used to refer to a worldview which characterized segments of early Judaism from ca. 200 BCE to 200 CE, and which centered on the expectation of God's imminent intervention into human history in a decisive manner to save his people, punish their adversaries, destroy the existing fallen cosmic order and bring it back to its original pristine perfection. Writings of this period which espouse such a worldview are classified as apocalypses. Cf. D. E. Aune, "Apocalypticism," in *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*, eds. Gerald Hawthorne, et al. (Downers Grove, IL: Inter Varsity Press, 1993), 25–35.

[37]B. M. Metzger, "Fourth Book of Ezra," in James Charlesworth, ed., *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* I (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1985), 517–59; Levison, *Portraits of Adam*, 113–27.

https://publications.lst.edu/

On the other hand, Ezra views Israel's present predicament and eschatological destiny in a wholly negative way. His pessimistic attitude ranges from simply regarding Adam as the first sinner, to indicting him for bringing inevitable sinfulness and eschatological ruin upon his progeny. There is no clarity as to whether he believes in hereditary sinfulness or individual responsibility. His categories become rather confused when he interprets the decree of death. On the one hand, he asserts that when Adam transgressed, God decreed death for him and his progeny. On the other hand, he equally avers that the flood is a punishment for the sin committed by that generation. Bent as he is on exonerating Israel from guilt by imputing sin to Adam's transgression and evil heart, he fails to convincingly blame physical death, sin, and eschatological damnation on Adam. In the end, he attributes sin to the evil heart, without clearly elaborating how Adam passed it on to his progeny.

Other views that are peculiar to IV Ezra are:

1. Adam is not an Israelite; Israel's election is explained not by means of Genesis 1, but by means of Isa 40:15–17. The author of IV Ezra writes thus:

> As for the other nations which have descended from Adam, you have said that they are nothing, and that they are like spittle, and you have compared their abundance to a drop from a bucket. And now, O Lord, behold these nations, which are reputed as nothing, domineer over us and devour us. But we your people, whom you have called your first-born, only begotten, zealous for you and most dear, have been given into your hands. If the world has indeed been created for us, why do we not possess the world as an inheritance? How long will this be so? (6:55–59)[38]

2. Adam will have no role in the *eschaton*;[39] any primeval splendor that persists belongs to the righteous, among whom Adam may not even be counted.

[38]Metzger, "Fourth Book of Ezra," 536.

[39]Scroggs, *Last Adam*, 30; Levison, *Portraits of Adam*, 127.

https://publications.lst.edu/

3. The author applies the language of Genesis 1–2 consistently to the human race and does not distinguish Adam of Genesis 2 as an individual.[40]

Apocalypse: II Baruch[41]

Both IV Ezra and II Baruch hold an apocalyptic view of history in which Adam is regarded as the transgressor whose sin brought about the present evil age. But unlike IV Ezra, II Baruch gives a clearer view of the result of Adam's transgression: (1) the loss of paradise and the celestial city; (2) physical death and Sheol; (3) eleven evils that characterize human existence, which are as follows:

1. "Untimely death" resulting from violence
2. "Mourning" as a ritual act concomitant with violent death
3. "Affliction" as a general anguish that characterizes the present evil age
4. "Illness" which subsumes the grief and pain associated with childbirth
5. "Labor" which has also to do with child bearing
6. "Pride" of the enemy upon the conquest of Israel
7. The realm of "death's request for blood," which most likely entails the inevitability of a violent death: "Sheol demands blood."
8. "Death of children" conveyed by the idea of the "snatching away" of the innocent
9. "Passion of the parents," which refers to the sexual urge that results in the conception of children

[40]Cf. "IV Ezra 6:45–59," in James Charlesworth, ed., *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* I (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1985), 536.

[41]A. F. J. Klijn, "II Baruch," in James Charlesworth, ed., *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* I (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1985), 615–52; Levison, *Portraits of Adam*, 129–44.

https://publications.lst.edu/

10. "The loftiness of men was humiliated," which implicitly harks back to Adam's physical splendor prior to his transgression
11. "Goodness" refers either to divine goodness, which vanished, or to human goodness which ceased to exist

This list represents II Baruch's view of the present age rather than early Jewish speculation about Adam's transgression.

At the theological level of interpretation, the author portrays Adam as the spiritual father of the wicked. But rather than imply that Adam's sin produced disobedience among his descendants, he avers that it is by reason of people's own failure to submit to the Creator that they become Adam's descendant. They choose to follow Adam's sinful way and to draw from his darkness rather than from the light of the Law. By this fact, they are those "born from him" who transgressed first. While IV Ezra and II Baruch agree that Adam is the ancestor of sinners, the latter employs this interpretation to argue for free will, whereas the former poses the possibility that Adam's sin affected all people morally. The question of hereditary sinfulness cannot be found in II Baruch. Individual responsibility determines the author's view of the effects of Adam's sin. But he goes even beyond this and presents Adam as the paradigm of free choice and individual responsibility. Herein lies the uniqueness of his interpretation. He takes a figure who was regarded as the possible source of moral depravity and transforms him into a paradigm of free choice. By such an argument, he silences IV Ezra's speculation on hereditary sinfulness. For him, when Adam transgressed, he merely brought physical effects to the present age; each person now chooses to inherit the age to come through his/her own obedience: "Adam is, therefore, not the cause, except only for himself, but each of us has become his own Adam" (54:19).[42]

The glory of the age to come is depicted as resulting from both the reversal of the curses of Gen 3:16–19 and the elimination of the afflictions that hold sway in the present evil age due to Adam's

[42]Klijn, "II Baruch," 640.

https://publications.lst.edu/

transgression. Paradise will be restored, evil body parts will be transformed and receive immortality rather than death, joy rather than affliction. The physical effects of Adam's sin will be reversed in the age to come for those who do not follow Adam's choice but choose freely to submit themselves to the Creator.

Vita Adae et Evae

Among the themes presented in the work *Vita Adae et Evae*,[43] the principal ones are: (1) God's mercy which is bestowed upon proper penitence; (2) Satan's enmity that continues to be directed against the *imago dei*; (3) The view that Adam is righteous and Eve guilty of bringing about the present predicament.

Adam, both during his life and after death, is the recipient of God's mercy. At every instance that mercy is obtained, the author makes it a point to give elaborate instructions on the proper observance of penitence.

Satan is portrayed as twice interrupting the human quest for God's mercy. In the first episode, he again deceives Eve, thereby causing her to pause from her act of penitence. In their conversation, Satan reveals that his enmity with human beings began when he refused to worship Adam as *imago dei*, and as a consequence, he and his angels were cast out by God and divested of glory. Thereafter, he incessantly pursues Adam with malice and treachery. In the second episode, Satan, in the form of a serpent, also attacks Seth. In this account, the serpent's use of the plural pronoun, *vos*, indicates that Seth and Eve, like Adam, possess the *imago dei*. The reader could infer from the episode that the author regards all people as *imagines dei*, and, therefore, as targets of Satan's enmity.

There is an unconcealed misogynistic element in the work. Adam is openly exonerated from guilt, his only fault being his passive submission to Eve, who is regarded as the real perpetrator of the

[43]M. D. Johnson, "Life of Adam and Eve," in James Charlesworth, ed., *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* II (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1985), 249–95; Levison, *Portraits of Adam*, 174–84.

https://publications.lst.edu/

culpable act. Through contrastive dialogue and actions, the author presents Adam in a positive light, but always at the expense of Eve. Adam is presented as sensible and pious, while Eve is made to appear foolish. Eve is presented as admitting full responsibility for the sin that brought about the fall. God refuses Eve mercy and only later concedes it to her, on account of Adam.

It would be a misconception to think of the primeval glory of Adam in terms of *imago dei*. For the author of *Vita*, this attribute of Adam remains even after the loss of paradise. In fact, it becomes one of the bases for God's mercy toward Adam.

Apocalypse of Moses[44]

The author's predominant purpose is to exhort the readers to guard themselves from sin in this present life, to revive their hope in God's mercy, and to assure them that God will grant resurrection and dominion to those who shun evil. All throughout the presentation, the author invokes the figure of Adam as the archetype of the sinner who obtains God's mercy at his death. Adam is thrice presented at his deathbed:

1. When he was in agony due to relentless pain, Eve and Seth are prompted to go forth in quest of the oil from paradise to alleviate his pain;
2. After the unsuccessful quest for oil, Eve returns and explains to Adam that his pains are due to the fact that he was one of the three who had passively fallen prey to the devil's deception.
3. Adam, at the point of death, feels confident that God will take care of his body. However, his fear persists that his spirit will continue to experience God's eschatological wrath. The angels intercede for him because he is God's image and the work of God's hands. On this account Adam receives God's pardon and the promise of resurrection.

[44]The title given to the Greek text of *Vita Adae et Evae*. Cf. Johnson, "Life of Adam and Eve," 249–95; Levison, *Portraits of Adam*, 164–74.

https://publications.lst.edu/

This portrayal of Adam as a forgiven sinner is a source of hope for the readers who experience pain, grief, and enmity in the present age, which is under the devil's rule and death's dominion. The author gives the assurance that the day is coming when God will overturn the devil, restore human dominion and raise all righteous people in the resurrection.

Topical Summary of Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphal Speculations on Adam

Two distinct uses of the protoanthropos myth were handed down by Old Testament writers to their successors: first, for the purpose of explaining the reality of sin and the world's present state of misery; second, for describing the human being's created state as willed by the Creator. These uses were further elucidated in the post-Old Testament period. The anthropological role of the myths was further developed, while new roles emerged as Adam motifs began to be used in eschatological writings. The description of Adam as originally intended by the Creator has become the description of humanity's final eschatological existence. *Urzeit* has become equated with *Endzeit*.

Death

The most obvious effect of Adam's transgression is death. Ben Sira sees it as consequent upon the warning in Gen 2:17: "You must surely die." Although Sir 17:1[45] alludes to death as a natural phenomenon, 25:24[46] definitely points to it as God's punishment, not a natural state of human beings. It is not, however, the man who gets the blame but the woman: "From a woman sin had its beginning, and because of her

[45]"The Lord created man out of earth, and turned him back to it again."

[46]"From a woman sin had its beginning, and because of her we all die."

https://publications.lst.edu/

we all die." IV Ezra and II Baruch work on the same motif but offer different insights on human responsibility for sin.[47]

Degeneration of the Human Condition in the World

Another upshot of Adam's transgression is the corruption of the perfect world intended by God. In Genesis, there follows from human sin a cycle of violence starting with Cain's fratricide. Ben Sira also speaks of the mental and spiritual anxiety which now lies as a "heavy yoke … upon the sons of Adam" (40:111). All physical ills are imputed on the first sin. II Baruch augments the list by including erotic passion, murder, and moral depravity.[48]

Sin

A further result of Adam's (or Eve's) misdeed is the prodigious spread of sin which has taken a foothold on humanity. By the time of IV Ezra and II Baruch, this belief, which has been held even by the earliest inter-testamental writer, is proclaimed with such vigor and intensity unheard of before. The fundamental premise propounded by most authors is that sin is a universal phenomenon and every human being is thereby a sinner. But while these authors may feel the necessity to single out the event by which sin entered into human history, they may not feel equally compelled to demonstrate the exact relationship between cause and effect. Thus, while Ben Sira affirms Adam and Eve to be the first sinners, he equally pushes for individual responsibility. The Wisdom of Solomon alludes to the story of Adam but does not lay on it nor on any other event the blame for sin and death. Rather, each person is believed to bring death upon himself or herself. A similar interpretation is presented in no uncertain terms by the author of II

[47]Scroggs, *Last Adam*, 18.

[48]Scroggs, *Last Adam*, 18–19.

https://publications.lst.edu/

Baruch, who asserts both the significance of Adam in the history of sin and the individual's full responsibility.

> For though Adam sinned first and brought untimely death upon all, yet of those who were born from him, each one of them has prepared for his own soul torment to come, and again each one of them has chosen for himself glories to come …. Adam is therefore not the cause, save only of his own soul, but each of us has been the Adam of his own soul. (54:15, 19)

The author of IV Ezra holds an entirely different and pessimistic view of responsibility for sin. He presents a tightly knit causal relationship between Adam's sin and that of his offspring, which is sometimes called a "doctrine of original sin." Here we find the most intense statement about Adam's being the protosinner: "Thou didst lay upon him [Adam] one commandment of thine; but he transgressed it, and immediately thou didst appoint death for him and for his descendants" (3:7a, b). This is a recurring theme that reaches its climax in the anguished exclamation: "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" (7:48). The author believes that among the effects of Adam's transgression is a change in his inner nature, which is transmitted by generation to his offspring.[49]

Exaltation of Adam

With just a few exceptions, the Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphal literature hold Adam in high esteem and assign to him roles that have nothing to do with being the bearer of sin and death. He is portrayed as the image of humankind as originally willed by God at creation, the humankind that will be reconstituted at the new creation. He is extolled as the protopatriarch. This glorification of Adam has the effect of toning down his role as the one who ushered death into humankind, so that even the guilt for transgressing God's commandment is imputed

[49]Scroggs, *Last Adam*, 19–20.

https://publications.lst.edu/

to another. Eve becomes an easy candidate for this notorious role. Satan, too, gets to play this role in second place. The story about the angels having relations with the daughters of human beings (Gen 6:13) is just as often cited as the Adam story, to account for the origin of sin. *Jubilees* is an example of this shift in emphasis and the attribution of the beginning of human corruption to the desire of the angels.[50]

First father of Israel

In describing Israel's history, Ben Sira glorifies Adam above all human beings:

> No one like Enoch has been created on earth,
> for he was taken up from the earth.
> And no man like Joseph has been born,
> and his bones cared for.
> Shem and Seth were honored among men,
> and Adam above every living being in creation
> [καὶ ὑπὲρ πᾶν ζῷον ἐν τῇ κτίσει Ἀδάμ]. (Sir 49:14–16)

Why is Adam held in such high esteem? The heading of the quoted section in the book of Ben Sirach indicates that these lines constitute a praise of "Our Fathers." In v. 16, Adam is linked to Shem and Seth, through whom the pure lineage of Israel was transmitted to Abraham. This context suggests that Adam is being regarded as the first patriarch, the head of Israel's race, and it is for this reason that he is held in high esteem.[51]

Image and Promise for Eschatological Humanity

The second reason for exalting Adam lies beyond his being acclaimed as the first patriarch of Israel. For some writers, Adam's nature also becomes the description of God's intent for humanity. Such intention is thought to have been realized with Adam at the time

[50]Scroggs, *Last Adam*, 21–22.

[51]Scroggs, *Last Adam*, 22–23.

https://publications.lst.edu/

of creation, and will find its ultimate fulfillment for all believers in the coming age. The exaggerated descriptions of Adam are tentative efforts at illustrating the inevitable uncertainty about what his state of perfection could have been like. Human beings who experience the precariousness of their present condition could only speculate at what God could have originally created. Yet far more than the speculation about the past is the fascination with the future and what God holds in store for the righteous. The existence in the age to come is portrayed by Jewish theologians along the lines of the original existence at creation. The glorification of Adam is not an idea alien to the Old Testament. The Genesis narratives already present us with some notion about God's intent for humanity. But post-biblical writers painted an embellished picture of Adam that turned him into a superhuman. The ensuing difference between biblical and post-biblical portrayals of Adam can be traced to the interrelation of Adamic motifs with descriptions of human beings' eschatological nature. Post-biblical speculations about the world to come went beyond the realm of the merely human, messianic rule in the old historical order. New ideas about eschatological anthropology emerged as a result. But if this anthropology is to be equated with the original divine intent for humanity, then Adam's existence could not have been any different from the future existence to be expected by the blessed in the age to come. *Urzeit* equals *Endzeit*, and the latter is viewed through the lenses of the former. Jewish writers hopeful about the future, imbued eschatological nature with characteristics, which eventually came to be applied to Adam, and thus Adam came to be exalted.[52]

One way by which Adam is exalted is by referring to him frequently as king. An interesting thing is to be noted here: the shift from "Adam" as proper noun to "adam" as common noun, from a particular individual to the generic classification, i.e., "human beings." It will be noticed that Ben Sira who, in 49:16,[53] is probably thinking

[52]Scroggs, *Last Adam*, 23–25.

[53]"Shem and Seth were honored among men, and Adam above every living being in the creation."

https://publications.lst.edu/

of Adam's kingship, transfers this function to humankind in 17:114.[54] In the same way, Wis 9:13[55] shows how easily the kingship of Adam is convertible to that of human beings. Here the author speaks of human beings' rulership in greater detail than he does about Adam's rulership in 10:1–2.[56] In these writings Adam, as king, embodies God's intent for humanity and points to the centrality of the human being in the created order.[57]

Another way by which Adam is exalted is by speaking of him as possessor of glory (כָּבוֹד). A slight problem arises with the use of the phrase כָּל כָּבוֹד אָדָם "all the glory of אָדָם," as in several of the Qumran materials connected with eschatological glory. In these references, it is not certain whether אָדָם refers to humankind or to the first human

[54]"The Lord created man out of earth, and turned him back to it again.[2] He gave to men few days, a limited time, but granted them authority over the things upon the earth.[3] He endowed them with strength like his own, and made them in his own image.[4] He placed the fear of them in all living beings, and granted them dominion over beasts and birds.[5–6] He made for them tongue and eyes; he gave them ears and a mind for thinking.[7] He filled them with knowledge and understanding, and showed them good and evil.[8] He set his eye upon their hearts to show them the majesty of his works.[9–10] And they will praise his holy name, to proclaim the grandeur of his works.[11] He bestowed knowledge upon them, and allotted to them the law of life.[12] He established with them an eternal covenant, and showed them his judgments.[13] Their eyes saw his glorious majesty, and their ears heard the glory of his voice.[14] And he said to them, "Beware of all unrighteousness." And he gave commandment to each of them concerning his neighbor."

[55]"O God of my fathers and Lord of mercy, who hast made all things by thy word,[2] and by thy wisdom hast formed man, to have dominion over the creatures thou hast made,[3] and rule the world in holiness and righteousness, and pronounce judgment in uprightness of soul …"

[56]"Wisdom protected the first-formed father of the world, when he alone had been created; she delivered him from his transgression, and gave him strength to rule all things."

[57]Scroggs, *Last Adam*, 23–25.

https://publications.lst.edu/

being in Genesis. Neither syntax nor context gives away the right interpretation. But the absence of other allusions to the Adamic myth in the Qumran materials makes the generic interpretation of אָדָם the weightier option. But whether or not אָדָם is specific or general, the glory that awaits the righteous in the age to come is identical with the glory of Adam before the fall. Similar affirmations are also scattered all over the Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphal literature. II Baruch unreservedly speaks of the remarkable glory to be inherited by the righteous at the eschatological age. In IV Ezra 8:51, Ezra, as the prototype of the righteous man of the future, is hereby exhorted to inquire about the glory of those who, like himself, are righteous.[58]

Two ideas are correlated in this interpretation: first, that Adam, before his fall, possessed a nature of glory; and second, that the righteous will possess glory as an eschatological gift. The answer to the question of which is prior to the other is important for delineating the function of Adam's glory. Scroggs believes that the concept of eschatological glory is prior to the concept of Adam's glorious nature before the fall. The concern of the Jewish theologians was not to perpetuate or expand upon the traditional Adamic myth, but to portray Jewish anthropology and Israel's eschatological future. The mythical figure Adam is invested with all the glorious characteristics believed to be proper for the righteous in the age to come, because the new human being cannot be but the recreation of what once truly existed in the *Urzeit*. The mythical Adam becomes the symbol of true humanity who, at the same time, embodies Israel's hope for the future.[59]

Adam and the Eschaton

It is usually believed that Adam would have a personal role in the eschatological events. But Scroggs has convincingly shown that the true subject of the Adamic motifs in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha

[58]Scroggs, *Last Adam*, 26–27.

[59]Scroggs, *Last Adam*, 29.

https://publications.lst.edu/

is not Adam as an individual, but human beings in general. The individual Adam is almost never mentioned in the description of the eschatological happenings. Three tendencies emerge: (1) the tendency to associate Adam with sin and death, and thus to portray the world to come as the reversal of Adam's work. It is the contrast between the present and future worlds that they throw into relief; (2) the tendency to use Adam as an illustration of the divine intent for humanity, and thus to highlight the parallelism rather than the contrast between the creation and the *eschaton*. But even in these works, the figure of Adam rarely comes out nor is he made to play an independent role in the eschatological events; (3) the tendency to correlate creation and salvation, and thus use the Adamic myth to insure the anthropological link between the two *kairoi*. For these works, the anthropology of creation equals the anthropology of salvation.

Only in two instances is Adam given a personal role in the *eschaton*:

1. The promises made to Adam hold the key to the meaning of the *Apocalyse of Moses*. When Seth and Eve beseech God to grant the ailing Adam some oil from the tree of life for his healing, Michael responds to Seth:

> Seth, man of God, do not weary yourself with prayers and entreaties concerning the tree which flowers with oil to anoint your father Adam. For it shall not be yours now, but in the end of times. Then shall all flesh be raised up from Adam till that great day—all that shall be of the holy people. Then shall the delights of paradise be given to them and God shall be in their midst. (13:24)

2. The second instance is found in Eve's description of the happenings that brought about the expulsion from paradise (28:3–4). We encounter here two references to an explicit promise to Adam, the first being given on condition that he avoid sin; the second reference is given without conditions.

Paul and Early Judaism's Speculations about Adam

Most of the Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphal materials are known to have been contemporary with or later than Paul. Their usefulness for our purpose does not lie so much in the possibility that Paul may

https://publications.lst.edu/

have read any of these materials available to him in the first century, but rather, in the fact that they help us today to recover the rich religious culture and communal environment whose main concerns and ways of thinking Paul would undoubtedly have known and shared. This approach is particularly possible for the Jewish community whose oral tradition was both persistent and well diffused throughout the centuries before and after Paul. Only by identifying the prominent lines of Jewish thought, especially those that are consistent throughout the period, can we single out the teachings that the community regarded as central enough to retain in its memory during the course of the centuries. These teachings, in turn, can provide us with some clues for deciphering Paul's Adam language. Consideration of this body of Jewish writings also puts us in touch with those ideas which Paul may have found objectionable and thus countered or ignored, and these can further our insight into his use of Adam language.

The following considerations drawn from Early Judaism's speculations about Adam will help us grapple with Paul's use of Adam language in 1 Corinthians, Romans and Philippians:

1. The human being, not Adam, is the true subject of the Adamic motifs in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha.
2. The Jewish theologians are not concerned seriously about Adam as a mythic personality but rather about the eschatological glory.
3. The mythical figure of Adam rarely appears and plays no independent role in the end-time events.
4. If the mythical Adam ever does play a role in the *eschaton*, it is as the symbol of true humanity.

It must be recognized, however, that Paul is a creative author whose writings exhibit a discernible tendency. His understanding of Adam is an independent contribution to biblical interpretation, which can be compared fruitfully with other individual authors who employ the figure of Adam to express their tendencies.[60]

[60]Levison, *Portraits of Adam*, 161.

https://publications.lst.edu/