

TYLER A. STEWART

The Origin and Persistence of Evil in Galatians

*Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe*

566

Mohr Siebeck

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament · 2. Reihe

Herausgeber / Editor

Jörg Frey (Zürich)

Mitherausgeber/Associate Editors

Markus Bockmuehl (Oxford) · James A. Kelhoffer (Uppsala)

Tobias Nicklas (Regensburg) · Janet Spittler (Charlottesville, VA)

J. Ross Wagner (Durham, NC)

566



Tyler A. Stewart

The Origin and Persistence of Evil in Galatians

Mohr Siebeck

Tyler A. Stewart, born 1984; 2008 BTh; 2012 MDiv; 2019 PhD; since 2017 Assistant Professor of New Testament at Lincoln Christian University (Lincoln, IL).
orcid.org/0000-0002-6462-1610

ISBN 978-3-16-159873-9/eISBN 978-3-16-159874-6
DOI 10.1628/978-3-16-159874-6

ISSN 0340-9570/eISSN 2568-7484
(Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 2. Reihe)

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2022 Mohr Siebeck Tübingen, Germany. www.mohrsiebeck.com

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that permitted by copyright law) without the publisher's written permission. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations and storage and processing in electronic systems.

The book was printed on non-aging paper by Laupp & Göbel in Gomaringen and bound by Buchbinderei Nädele in Nehren.

Printed in Germany.

Margo, you remind me of all that is good.

Preface

I never meant to write this book. During the first semester of my doctoral studies, I can vividly recall remarking that I saw no need for another book on Galatians or Romans, at least not one from me. Four years later, I have written on Galatians in the context of Second Temple Judaism. While I am to blame for this hubris, it was only after relearning Second Temple Judaism at Marquette University that this book came to be.

My reeducation began in a doctoral seminar led by Dr. Andrei Orlov. At our first meeting, Dr. Orlov told a light-hearted but prescient parable: “I will open for you a door to a new world, the world of Pseudepigrapha.” With a wry smile he added, “Then, I will push you inside and lock the door behind you.” Dr. Orlov taught me to know and appreciate Jewish Pseudepigrapha as more than mere background to the New Testament. During the early stages of the seminar exploring Enochic traditions, I read the familiar Greek text of Galatians as if for the first time. As I read, my mind percolated with connections between Paul and the Book of Watchers. Dr. Orlov encouraged me to refine my ideas and the resulting seminar paper became the first iteration of this project.

The next semester, Dr. Michael Cover came to Marquette as a Paul and Philo specialist. It was immediately apparent to me that his expertise and patient guidance would be invaluable. He opened yet another door, guiding me in the complex philosophical theology of Philo of Alexandria. Dr. Cover also forced me to refine my thinking and writing about Paul in crucial ways. Although I am ultimately to blame for any faults that remain, this project would not have happened without the expertise, guidance, and generosity of my co-directors, Drs. Orlov and Cover.

In addition to my advisors, I must thank the theology faculty at Marquette, especially Deirdre Dempsey, Joshua Ezra Burns, Michel René Barnes, and Julian V. Hills. One of the best features of the theology department at Marquette is the community of students. I owe thanks especially to Nick and Beth Elder, Christopher Brenna, Matthew Olver, Shaun Blanchard, Stephen Waers, Andrew and Anna Harmon, David Kiger, Kirsten Laurel, Ryan and Kate Hemmer, Dallas and Beth Flippin, Jon and Annie Heaps, and Joe and Charis Gordon. These people helped me think and write better, cared for my children, shared meals, and brought general merriment into my life.

What started as a doctoral dissertation has become a book, a process that was more formidable than I expected. It would not have happened without the help of several people. I owe thanks to Elena Müller for her initial interest and shepherding the manuscript to publication. Thanks to Jörg Frey for accepting this volume into a series that I have long admired. Without the help of Jacob Cerone, it would have taken much longer for this work to see publication. Last, but by no means least, thanks to my research assistant, Alyssa Zimmer.

The greatest thanks I owe for completing this project is due to my family who have sacrificed so much for me. My parents, David and Sheila, have always supported their children and I am grateful. My wife Margo, a warm-blooded Texan, deferred career ambitions and the comfort of the familiar to live in a cold and foreign city. Despite the difficulties, she made a joyful home for our family. To Margo, Charlotte, Graham, Magnolia, and Banks, thank you.

Monticello, IL
December 2020

Tyler A. Stewart

Table of Contents

Preface	VII
<i>Chapter One: Introduction</i>	1
1.1 Bultmann vs Käsemann: Anthropology or Cosmology	7
1.2 The Adamic Template in Pauline Scholarship	10
1.3 Christological <i>Novum</i>	16
1.3.1 Sanders: Solution to Plight	17
1.3.2 Martyn, de Boer, and Campbell: Christological Apocalypse.....	19
1.3.3 Watson, Hays, and Wright: Christology and Scripture.....	24
1.4 Conclusion: The Present Study	29
<i>Chapter Two: Reframing Evil in Galatians</i>	33
2.1 The Relationship between Galatians and Romans	35
2.2 The Inability of Romans to Explain Galatians 3:19	42
2.3 An Enochic Solution.....	49
2.4 Conclusion.....	56
<i>Chapter Three: Deconstructing the Adamic Template</i>	59
3.1 Formation of the Adamic Template	61
3.1.1 Ben Sira.....	62
3.1.1.1 The Source of Evil in Ben Sira	62
3.1.1.2 Ben Sira and Gen 1–3.....	65
3.1.2 Wisdom of Solomon.....	71
3.1.2.1 Wisdom 7:1	73
3.1.2.2 Wisdom 9:1–2	76
3.1.2.3 Wisdom 10:1–2	76
3.1.2.4 Wisdom 15:8–17	79

3.1.2.5	Wisdom 2:23–24	80
3.2	The Adamic Template in Late Jewish Apocalyptic.....	84
3.2.1	Fourth Ezra.....	86
3.2.1.1	The First Dialogue	88
3.2.1.2	The Third Dialogue.....	91
3.2.2	Second Baruch.....	95
3.2.2.1	Second Baruch 3:1–4.....	97
3.2.2.2	Second Baruch 14:1–19.....	97
3.2.2.3	Second Baruch 15:1–18:2.....	98
3.2.2.4	Second Baruch 48:42–43.....	99
3.2.2.5	Second Baruch 54:15–19.....	100
3.2.2.6	Second Baruch 56:5–14.....	101
3.2.2.7	Second Baruch 73:3–5.....	102
3.3	Conclusion.....	105
 <i>Chapter Four: Evil in Enochic Tradition and Jubilees</i>		107
4.1	Book of Watchers	110
4.1.1	Shemihazah and Asael Narratives (1 En. 6–11)	113
4.1.1.1	Etiology	115
4.1.1.2	Paradigm.....	117
4.1.1.3	Unresolved Ambiguities	118
4.1.2	Book of Watchers (1 En. 1–36).....	127
4.1.2.1	Previous Approaches	128
4.1.2.2	Etiology and Plural Responsibility	134
4.1.2.3	Human Agency in Reception History	139
4.2	Jubilees	141
4.2.1	Jubilees and the Origin and Persistence of Evil.....	143
4.2.2	Adamic Tradition (Jub. 3:8–31; 4:29–30)	151
4.2.3	Enochic Tradition (Jub. 5:1–19; 7:20–39; 8:1–4; 10:1–14).....	155
4.3	Conclusion.....	163
 <i>Chapter Five: An Enochic Narrative in Galatians</i>		165
5.1	An Enochic Problem and the Opponents in Galatians	166
5.1.1	The Present Evil Age (Gal 1:4)	168
5.1.2	The Corruption of “All Flesh” (Gal 2:16)	171
5.1.3	Evil and the Opponents (Gal 3:1).....	176
5.2	A Christological Solution to an Enochic Problem	180
5.2.1	Angelomorphic Adoption.....	180

5.2.1.1	Galatians 1:16	188
5.2.1.2	Galatians 2:20	190
5.2.1.3	Galatians 3:26	193
5.2.1.4	Galatians 4:4–7	195
5.2.2	“Born from a Woman”	197
5.2.3	Spirit of God’s Son.....	199
5.3	The Apotropaic Function of the Law in Galatians	201
5.3.1	Protection from Transgressions	202
5.3.2	Paidagōgos	206
5.4	The Inadequacy of the Law.....	213
5.4.1	Temporal Validity	213
5.4.2	Angelic Mediation.....	217
5.5	Conclusion	224
 <i>Chapter Six: Evidence from Reception History</i>		227
6.1	Creation Tradition.....	229
6.2	Enochic Tradition	231
6.3	Philosophical Traditions	235
6.4	Pauline Tradition	245
6.5	Conclusion	252
 <i>Chapter Seven: Conclusion</i>		253
Appendix: Textual Variant in Galatians 2:20		257
Bibliography		261
Index of Ancient Sources.....		297
Author Index.....		345
Index of Subjects		352

Chapter 1

Introduction

At the beginning of his most contentious letter, the Apostle Paul describes Jesus as “having given himself for our sins, so that we might be rescued from the present evil age” (Gal 1:4a). According to Paul, humanity and the whole cosmos are in a dire situation, in need of divine rescue.¹ But how is this the case? How has creation been corrupted? Paul’s interpreters are in a profound state of disagreement concerning this fundamental issue in Paul’s theology—evil.

Evil is an ambiguous concept. In the western philosophical tradition, evil is analyzed in different categories of moral, natural/physical, and metaphysical.² In some instances, these philosophical distinctions have been applied to Jewish and Christian literature.³ Other times, only one category of evil is the focus of investigation.⁴ Evil is a flexible enough concept to apply to human opponents, superhuman beings (angels and demons), human sin, personified concepts (e.g. Sin and Death), idolatry, symbols, and metaphors.⁵ In his analysis of evil in Paul, Chris Tilling labels any kind of opposition to God as “evil,” using it as “an umbrella term under which the material is to be collat-

¹ See also Rom 1:18–32; 3:21–26; 5:6–11; 10:12–17; 1 Cor 1:18–25; 15:17–19; 2 Cor 4:1–6; Gal 3:23; 4:3–11; Phil 2:15; 3:18–19; 1 Thess 1:9–10; 5:1–11.

² See, for example, John Hick, *Evil and the God of Love* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 12–14.

³ Alden Lloyd Thompson, *Responsibility for Evil in the Theodicy of IV Ezra: A Study Illustrating the Significance of Form and Structure for the Meaning of the Book*, SBLDS 29 (Missoula: Scholars Press 1977), 5–19; James L. Crenshaw, *Defending God: Biblical Responses to the Problem of Evil* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 15–16. Crenshaw also refers to “religious evil,” but it is unclear how this differs from a subset of moral evil.

⁴ Miryam T. Brand, *Evil Within and Without: The Source of Sin and Its Nature as Portrayed in Second Temple Literature*, JAJSupp 9 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013), 26–27. Brand focuses only on “moral evil.”

⁵ See, for example, the range of essays in Chris Keith and Loren T. Stuckenbruck, eds., *Evil in Second Temple Judaism and Early Christianity*, WUNT 2.417 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016).

ed.”⁶ The fluidity of the concept requires clarification for the purposes of this study.

The focus of this investigation is the origin and persistence of evil in Galatians and Second Temple Jewish literature. This literature does not neatly fit the philosophical categories of the western tradition. Rather, Second Temple literature utilizes myth to explain the state of the cosmos in which sin (moral evil) and suffering (natural evil) occur.⁷ It is generally assumed that, in the Second Temple period, evil is not essential to the cosmos but a distortion of the creator’s intention.⁸ The reality of evil, an important topic in Second Temple Literature, raises several questions: What was the original cause of this distortion? Why does evil continue in the present? How can it be remedied? Analysis of evil is not merely focused on the primordial past (origin), but also the present state of the world (persistence) and the imagined future (salvation).⁹ This study explores the origin and persistence of evil in Paul’s letter to the Galatians in the context of Second Temple Jewish and early Christian literature.

⁶ Chris Tilling, “Paul, Evil, and Justification Debates,” in *Evil in Second Temple Judaism and Early Christianity*, 190.

⁷ Monika Elisabeth Götte focuses on the symbolic function of mythological narratives in the vein of Paul Ricoeur (*Von den Wächtern zu Adam: Frühjüdische Mythen über die Ursprünge des Bösen und ihre frühchristliche Rezeption*, WUNT 2.426 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016], 5–6; Ricoeur, *The Symbolism of Evil*, trans. Emerson Buchanan [Boston: Beacon Press, 1969]). Ricoeur defines myth as “a traditional narration which relates to events that happened at the beginning of time and which has the purpose of providing grounds for the ritual actions of men of today, and in a general manner, establishing all forms of action and thought by which man understands himself in his world” (*Symbolism of Evil*, 5). On myth theory and biblical scholarship see Debra Scoggins Ballentine, *The Conflict Myth and the Biblical Tradition* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2015), 1–21.

⁸ See N. P. Williams, *The Ideas of the Fall and of Original Sin: A Historical and Critical Study* (London: Longmans, Green & Co, 1927), 7–8. Although the dualism in the Treatise of the Two Spirits (1QS III, 13–IV, 26) might challenge this assumption, it is debated how dualistic the Qumran sect was. See Charlotte Hempel, “The *Treatise on the Two Spirits* and the Literary History of the *Rule of the Community*,” in *Dualism in Qumran*, ed. Géza G. Zeravits, LSTS 76 (New York: T&T Clark, 2010), 102–20. See also Emma Wasserman’s argument that the dualistic oppositions at Qumran are part of a rhetorical trope to elicit commitment to a particular ideology rather than an expression of metaphysical realities (*Apocalypse as Holy War: Divine Politics and Polemics in the Letters of Paul*, AYBRL [New Haven: Yale University Press, 2018], 92–105).

⁹ See Loren T. Stuckenbruck, “How Much Evil does the Christ Event Solve? Jesus and Paul in Relation to Jewish ‘Apocalyptic’ Thought,” in *Evil in Second Temple Judaism and Early Christianity*, 142–68.

The subject of evil in Judaism and early Christianity has been one of perennial interest.¹⁰ Among Pauline scholars there have been two common approaches, each related to reading Paul in the context of Second Temple Judaism. First, and perhaps most commonly, many Pauline scholars appeal to Adamic traditions to explain the origin of evil. This is a logical choice since Paul explicitly refers to Adam when describing the entrance of sin and death into the cosmos (1 Cor 15:21–22; Rom 5:12–21). Jewish apocalyptic literature is often cited to support this approach. The key resemblance between Paul and the Jewish apocalypses of 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch is the central role of Adam in explaining evil. According to the first approach, an Adamic origin of evil, in Rom 5:12–21 Paul follows a common interpretation of Gen 3 that identifies Adam’s Fall as the origin of evil.

¹⁰ F. C. Porter, “The Yeḡer HaRa: A Study in the Jewish Doctrine of Sin,” in *Biblical and Semitic Studies: Critical and Historical Essays by the Members of the Semitic and Biblical Faculty of Yale University* (New York: Scribner’s, 1901), 91–156; F. R. Tennant, *The Sources of the Doctrines of the Fall and Original Sin* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1903); Israel Lévi, *Le péché originel dans les anciennes sources juives*, 2nd ed. (Paris: Leroux, 1909); Williams, *The Ideas of the Fall*; Joseph Freunderfer, *Erbsünde und Erbtod beim Apostel Paulus: Eine religionsgeschichtliche und exegetische Untersuchung über Römerbrief 5, 12–21*, NTAbh 13 (Münster: Aschendorff, 1927); A. M. Dubarle, *The Biblical Doctrine of Original Sin*, trans. E. M. Stewart (New York: Herder and Herder, 1964); Günter Röhser, *Metaphorik und Personifikation der Sünde: Antike Sündenvorstellungen und paulinische Hamartia*, WUNT 25 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1987); Jon D. Levenson, *Creation and the Persistence of Evil: The Jewish Drama of Divine Omnipotence* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1988); Antti Laato and Johannes Cornelis de Moor, eds., *Theodicy in the World of the Bible* (Leiden: Brill, 2003); Yair Hoffman and Henning Reventlow, eds., *The Problem of Evil and Its Symbols in Jewish and Christian Tradition*, JSOTSupp 366 (London: T&T Clark International, 2004); Crenshaw, *Defending God*; Gary Anderson, *Sin: A History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009); Ryan E. Stokes, “Rebellious Angels and Malicious Spirits: Explanations of Evil in the Enochic and Related Literature” (PhD diss., Yale University, 2010); J. Harold Ellen, ed., *Explaining Evil*, 3 vols. (Santa Barbara: Praeger, 2011); Paula Fredriksen, *Sin: The Early History of an Idea* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012); Brand, *Evil Within and Without*; Igal German, *The Fall Reconsidered: A Literary Synthesis of the Primeval Sin Narratives against the Backdrop of the History of Exegesis* (Eugene: Pickwick Publications, 2016); Jan Dochhorn, Susanne Rudnig-Zelt, and Benjamin G. Wold, eds., *Das Böse, der Teufel und Dämonen/Evil, the Devil, and Demons*, WUNT 2.412 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016); Fabienne Jourdan and Rainer Hirsch-Luipold, eds., *Die Wurzel allen Übels: Vorstellungen über die Herkunft des Bösen und Schlechten in der Philosophie und Religion des 1.–4. Jahrhunderts*, STAC 91 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014); Keith and Stuckenbruck, eds., *Evil in Second Temple Judaism and Early Christianity*; Joseph Lam, *Patterns of Sin in the Hebrew Bible: Metaphor, Culture, and the Making of a Religious Concept* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2016); Götte, *Von den Wächtern zu Adam*; Mark S. Smith, *The Genesis of Good and Evil: The Fall(out) and Original Sin in the Bible* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2019); Ryan E. Stokes, *The Satan: How God’s Executioner Became the Enemy* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2019).

The second approach to explaining the origin of evil has been to interpret Paul's view of evil as an afterthought to his Christology. This approach assumes that Paul only thinks about the problem of evil working from the solution given to him on the road to Damascus; his view of evil is determined most significantly by his Christology. In this view, the problem (evil) is subordinated to the solution (Christology), which is perceived as Paul's more central theological insight. This Christological *novum* approach has guided Pauline scholarship since Sanders's epochal work, but its roots furrow deeper, and it has blossomed in new interpretive directions. The roots of this position stretch back to at least Rudolf Bultmann. More recently, this perspective has become central to the "Apocalyptic School" of Pauline interpretation initiated by J. Louis Martyn. The coherent thread linking these scholars is that Paul's Christology differentiates him so fundamentally from his contemporaries that it is a mistake to interpret his view of evil using their categories.

Close analysis of Paul's argument in Galatians reveals that both approaches to evil are inadequate. Regarding the first option, I argue that the dominance of Adamic tradition in Pauline theology is an oversimplification resulting from a myopic focus. Paul's view of the origin of evil is not solely dependent on Adamic tradition, as is commonly thought. Like many Second Temple Jews, Paul was influenced by Enochic traditions. Although generally unnoticed, I argue that Enochic tradition is prevalent in Galatians, especially Gal 3:19–4:11.¹¹ Part of the reason that Pauline scholars have not noticed the Enochic material in Galatians is because there is an assumed dichotomy between Adamic and Enochic traditions as separate templates in the scholarship on Second Temple Judaism.¹² The oversimplified concentration on Adamic

¹¹ The presence of Enochic traditions in Paul's view of evil is mentioned but not explored with any detail by James A. Waddell, "Biblical Notions and Admonitions on Evil in Pauline Literature," in *Explaining Evil*, 3 vols. ed. J. Harold Ellens (Santa Barbara: Praeger, 2011), 3.134–43, esp. 140–43. On Enochic tradition and Galatians see Amy Genevive Dibley, "Abraham's Uncircumcised Children: The Enochic precedent for Paul's Paradoxical Claim in Galatians 3:29" (PhD diss., University of California Berkeley, 2013); James M. Scott, "A Comparison of Paul's Letter to the Galatians with the Epistle of Enoch," in *The Jewish Apocalyptic Tradition and the Shaping of New Testament Thought*, eds. Benjamin E. Reynolds and Loren T. Stuckenbruck (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2017), 193–218; see also Logan Williams, "Disjunction in Paul: Apocalyptic or Christomorphic? Comparing the Apocalypse of Weeks with Galatians," *NTS* 64 (2018): 64–80.

¹² John C. Reeves differentiates between Adamic and Enochic traditions about evil as the "Enochic template" on the one hand, and the "Adamic template" on the other (John C. Reeves, "Research Projects: Sefer 'Uzza Wa-'Aza(z)el: Exploring Early Jewish Mythologies of Evil," <https://pages.uncc.edu/john-reeves/research-projects/sefer-uzza-wa-azazel-exploring-early-jewish-mythologies-of-evil/>.) Reeves includes two mediating templates between Enochic and Adamic (the 'Uzza/Azael template in its Jubilean and Zoharic streams). His use of templates is adopted by Amy E. Richter in her comparative analysis of evil in 1 Enoch and Matthew (Amy E. Richter, *Enoch and the Gospel of Matthew*, PTMS

tradition in isolation from Enochic tradition in Pauline scholarship, then, has been inherited from scholarship on Second Temple Judaism. Crucial to my argument is that the combination of these two seemingly disparate traditions often appears in Jewish literature prior to Paul and continues in early Christianity long afterward. Paul, like many of his Jewish contemporaries, represents a mixed template of Adamic and Enochic traditions.

The second option, the Christological *novum* approach, is based on hermeneutical and theological assumptions as much as exegesis. Perhaps the most persistent question in Pauline scholarship since World War II has been how the Apostle relates to his Jewish contemporaries.¹³ In Pauline studies, one of the central texts in this debate is the contentious letter to the Galatians.¹⁴ After more than half a century of debate, scholars are still deliberating over Paul's relationship to his Jewish contemporaries and one of the central texts in the debate is the letter to the Galatians.

This debate is methodologically difficult and theologically controversial. While biblical scholars have been contesting Paul's relationship to his contemporaries, there has been a re-evaluation of how to define Judaism and Jewish identity in the ancient world.¹⁵ One result of this dual re-evaluation is

183 [Eugene: Pickwick, 2012], 1–2). Although not using the language of templates, Michael E. Stone accepts the contrast between Adamic and Enochic explanations for evil (*Ancient Judaism: New Visions and Views* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011], 31–58).

¹³ Two of the seminal books to spark this debate are W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology*, rev. ed. (New York: Harper & Row, 1948) and E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977). For an analysis of Pauline scholarship as an evaluation of this question see Magnus Zetterholm, *Approaches to Paul: A Student's Guide to Recent Scholarship* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2009), he begins, "With regard to Pauline scholarship it is probably no exaggeration to suggest that Paul's relation to Judaism aptly frames the most important discussions of the twentieth century" (*Approaches to Paul*, 1).

¹⁴ Galatians is the only book in the New Testament to mention the word Ἰουδαϊσμός, typically translated "Judaism" (Gal 1:13, 14). This is not to discount the importance of the term Ἰουδαῖος which occurs 195 times in the NT, 24 of which are found in the Pauline corpus (Rom 1:16; 2:9, 10, 17, 28, 29; 3:1, 9, 29; 9:24; 10:12; 1 Cor 1:22, 23, 24; 9:20[x3]; 10:32; 12:13; 2 Cor 11:24; Gal 2:13, 14, 15, 28; Col 3:11; 1 Thess 2:14). Additionally, Paul is vehemently opposed to those who desire to compel the Galatians "to Judaize [ἰουδαῖζειν]," another term appearing only in Galatians (2:14). See the insightful analysis of this language by Matthew V. Novenson, "Paul's Former Occupation in *Ioudaismos*," in *Galatians and Christian Theology: Justification, the Gospel, and Ethics in Paul's Letter*, eds. Mark W. Elliot, Scott J. Hafemann, N. T. Wright, and John Fredrick (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2014), 24–39.

¹⁵ Shaye J. D. Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 13–106; Gabriele Boccaccini, *Roots of Rabbinic Judaism: An Intellectual History, From Ezekiel to Daniel* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 8–14; Steve Mason, "Jews, Judaeans, Judaizing, Judaism: Problems of Cate-

that analyzing Paul in the context of “Judaism” is like aiming at a moving target. Not to mention that the work of comparison is fraught with methodological difficulty.¹⁶ Furthermore, deep theological convictions are tied to the interpretation of Paul’s letters. For many interpreters, what separates Paul from his Jewish contemporaries is his understanding of salvation by grace.¹⁷ To miss this point is to fundamentally misunderstand Paul, distort his theology, and thereby misrepresent divine revelation.¹⁸ One gets the impression that assertions about the uniqueness of Paul’s theology are often attempts to invest incomparable value to it, in which case, as Jonathan Smith has pointed out, “an act of comparison is perceived as both an impossibility and an impiety.”¹⁹ Recognizing these difficulties, this study offers a small contribution toward understanding Paul’s relationship with his Jewish contemporaries on the issue of evil by analyzing Galatians (esp. Gal 3:19–4:11) in comparison with specific Jewish texts.

The remainder of this chapter provides a history of scholarship on the question of evil’s origin and persistence in Pauline scholarship. As with any history of Pauline scholarship, the scope must be limited. The goal of this history is to explain the pervasiveness of the two prevailing approaches. On the one hand, I examine how contemporary scholarship has inherited the singular focus on Adamic tradition for describing the origin of evil. On the

gorization in Ancient History,” *JSJ* 38 (2007): 457–512; Seth Schwartz, “How Many Judaisms Were There? A Critique of Neusner and Smith on Definition and Mason and Boyarin on Categorization,” *JAJ* 2 (2011): 208–38; John J. Collins, “Early Judaism in Modern Scholarship,” in *Early Judaism: A Comprehensive Overview*, eds. John J. Collins and Daniel C. Harlow (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 1–29.

¹⁶ See Jonathan Z. Smith, *Drudgery Divine: On the Comparison of Early Christianities and the Religions of Late Antiquity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990), esp. 36–53. Consider Smith’s definition of comparison: “A comparison is a disciplined exaggeration in the service of knowledge. It lifts out and strongly marks certain features within difference as being of possible intellectual significance, expressed in the rhetoric of their being ‘like’ in some stipulated fashion. Comparison provides the means by which we ‘re-vision’ phenomena as *our* data in order to solve *our* theoretical problems” (*Drudgery Divine*, 52).

¹⁷ For an overview of this debate from the perspective an advocate for this position see Stephen Westerholm, *Perspectives Old and New on Paul: The “Lutheran” Paul and His Critics* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004). For a recent re-evaluation of this question that incorporates the insights of those who reject a portrait of Second Temple Judaism as “legalistic,” but maintains a view that Paul’s fundamental difference from his contemporaries is his notion of grace see John M. G. Barclay, *Paul and the Gift* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015).

¹⁸ See, for example, the acrimonious debate between John Piper and N. T. Wright on these issues: John Piper, *The Future of Justification: A Response to N. T. Wright* (Wheaton: Crossway Books, 2007) and N. T. Wright, *Justification: God’s Plan and Paul’s Vision* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2009).

¹⁹ *Drudgery Divine*, 38.

other hand, I examine why the question of evil has been subordinated to Christology in many contemporary accounts of Paul's theology.

1.1 Bultmann vs Käsemann: Anthropology or Cosmology

Reflection on the origin of evil in contemporary Pauline scholarship has typically been framed in terms of a debate between Rudolf Bultmann (1884–1976) and his student Ernst Käsemann (1906–1998).²⁰ In Bultmann's view evil is anthropological whereas for Käsemann evil is cosmological. The two agreed, however, that the clear source of this problem in Paul's mind was Adam.

Rudolf Bultmann argued that evil is a product of the perverted human will and therefore anthropological. As he describes it:

Evil ... is perverse intent, a perverse pursuit, specifically a pursuit which misses what is good – i.e. misses 'life,' what man at heart is after – and it is evil, because the good it misses is also that which is required of man. But to miss what is required is also sin, rebellion against God, who as Creator is the origin of life.²¹

Bultmann conceived of Pauline theology as fundamentally anthropological. He begins his account of Paul's theology with the claim: "Every assertion about God is simultaneously an assertion about man and vice versa. For this

²⁰ The debate has been framed this way in a number of works since the 1970s: Jörg Baumgarten, *Paulus und die Apokalyptik: Die Auslegung apokalyptischer Überlieferungen in den echten Paulusbriefen*, WMANT 44 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1975), 2, 240–43; Leander E. Keck, "Paul and Apocalyptic Theology," *Int* 38 (1984): 229–41, esp. 232–33; Vincent P. Branick, "Apocalyptic Paul," *CBQ* 47 (1985): 664–75; Martinus C. de Boer, *The Defeat of Death: Apocalyptic Eschatology in 1 Corinthians 15 and Romans 5*, JSNT 22 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988), 21–37; John M. G. Barclay, *Obedying the Truth: Paul's Ethics in Galatians*, SNTW (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988), 192–202; R. Barry Matlock, *Unveiling the Apocalyptic Paul: Paul's Interpreters and the Rhetoric of Criticism*, JSNT SuppS 127 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 186–246; Andreas Lindemann, "Anthropologie und Kosmologie in der Theologie des Paulus," in *Theologie und Wirklichkeit: Diskussionen der Bultmann-Schule*, eds. Martin Bauspiess, Christof Landmesser, Friederike Portenhauser, *Theologie interdisziplinär* 12 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2011), 149–83; N. T. Wright, *Paul and His Recent Interpreters: Some Contemporary Debates* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2015), 155–86, esp. 162–67; Matthew Croasmun, *The Emergence of Sin: The Cosmic Tyrant in Romans* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2017), 4–15; Susan Grove Eastman, *Paul and the Person: Reframing Paul's Anthropology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2017), 1–22.

²¹ Rudolf Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2007), 232; repr. of *Theology of the New Testament*, trans. Kendrick Grobel, 2 vols. (New York: Scribner, 1951–1955).

reason and in this sense Paul's theology is, at the same time, anthropology."²² Based on this view, Bultmann explains Paul's theology in two stages, (1) humanity prior to faith and (2) humanity under faith. It is in the first stage where Bultmann identifies the source of evil as human failing. He sees the perversion of the will most clearly articulated by Paul in Rom 7:7–25 where, according to Bultmann, the apostle describes the human person's existential conflict.²³ Evil, then, is something faced by every individual in the choice to either obediently recognize the Creator as Lord or to turn to something created, including the self.²⁴ For Bultmann, evil is a problem of human sin and therefore anthropological.

Bultmann's interpretation is rooted in his existential hermeneutic of demythologizing. His goal was to interpret the "myth" of the New Testament, which he considered unbelievable in the nineteenth century, to make the Christian message acceptable in the modern world.²⁵ This hermeneutic significantly influences the way in which Bultmann conceives of evil. In Bultmann's reading of Paul, "the proto-sin" is individualistic and existential: "Apostasy which repeats itself in every Now in the face of that possibility of knowing God which is open to every Now."²⁶ This existential insight governs the way Bultmann reads two key texts, Rom 5:12–21 and 1 Cor 15:20–28.

A master exegete, Bultmann is too careful to overlook passages that appear to attribute cosmic significance to evil beyond the human will, so he demythologizes them. Bultmann explains Rom 5:12–21 and 1 Cor 15:20–28 as Paul borrowing from the gnostic and Jewish apocalyptic mythology of his environment. The reason Paul adopted this mythology was "to express man's understanding of himself in the world in which he lives." The implication for

²² Bultmann, *Theology*, 191. He concludes with: "Thus, every assertion about Christ is also an assertion about man and vice versa; and Paul's Christology is simultaneously soteriology."

²³ Bultmann, *Theology*, 245–49; Bultmann, "Romans 7 and Paul's Anthropology," in *The Old and New Man in the Letters of Paul*, trans. Keith R. Crim (Richmond, VA: John Knox Press, 1967), 33–48.

²⁴ Bultmann, *Theology*, 250–51. Bultmann also draws heavily on Rom 1:18–3:20 to make this point.

²⁵ Rudolf Bultmann, "The New Testament and Mythology: The Mythological Element in the New Testament and the Problem of its Re-interpretation," in *Kerygma and Myth: A Theological Debate*, ed. Hans Werner Bartsch, trans. Reginald H. Fuller (New York: Harper and Row, 1961), 1–44. On the centrality of demythologizing for Bultmann's *Theology of the New Testament* see Richard B. Hays, "Humanity prior to the Revelation of Faith," in *Beyond Bultmann: Reckoning a New Testament Theology*, eds. Bruce W. Longenecker and Mikeal C. Parsons (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2014), 61–78, esp. 72.

²⁶ Bultmann, *Theology*, 251. Or as he puts it earlier in the same work: "the ultimate sin reveals itself to be the false assumption of receiving life not as the gift of the Creator but procuring it by one's own power, of living from one's self rather than from God" (*Theology*, 232).

interpretation is that, “Myth should be interpreted not cosmologically, but anthropologically, or better still, existentially.”²⁷ Even when apocalyptic mythology that appears to attribute cosmic significance to evil arises in Paul’s letters, Bultmann interprets its source as non-Pauline (Gnosticism/Jewish Apocalyptic) and its meaning as fundamentally anthropological.

Ernst Käsemann, unlike his teacher, attributes cosmic significance to evil. Käsemann agreed with Bultmann’s assessment of Paul’s theology as anthropological, but he thought the insight need to be pushed further.²⁸ Käsemann took Bultmann’s claim about anthropology and radicalized it, arguing that Pauline anthropology is apocalyptic cosmology:

Man for Paul is never just on his own. He is always a specific piece of world and therefore becomes what in the last resort he is by determination from the outside, i.e. by the power which takes possession of him and the lordship to which he surrenders himself.²⁹

While Bultmann found Paul’s anthropology focused on the individual’s choice to rightly identify his creator, Käsemann finds Paul’s anthropology demonstrating the crucial significance of man’s relationship to the cosmos.³⁰ Käsemann came to this conclusion based on his reading of Romans 5:12–21.

²⁷ Bultmann, “New Testament and Mythology,” 10. Bultmann dismisses 1 Cor 15:20–28 as irrelevant to Paul’s thought because it is borrowed from “Gnostic cosmology and eschatology” (*Theology*, 228). Likewise, Romans 5:12–19 is “unquestionably under the influence of the Gnostic myth,” but Paul “avoids slipping off into Gnostic thinking by not letting Adam’s sin be caused by something lying behind it” i.e. matter, Satan, or evil inclination (*Theology*, 251). Bultmann outlines his view of Gnosticism in *Theology*, 165–83, and describes its influence on Paul’s view of evil (*Theology*, 174–75).

²⁸ Ernst Käsemann, “On Paul’s Anthropology,” in *Perspectives on Paul*, trans. Margaret Kohl (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971), 1–31, here 12 “Little can be said against Bultmann’s attempt to present theology in the light of anthropology ... especially when it proves so fruitful.” This article was originally written in 1969 but similar appreciation of Bultmann’s anthropological interpretation of Paul is already in Käsemann, “On the Subject of Primitive Christian Apocalyptic,” in *New Testament Questions of Today*, trans. W. J. Montague (London: SCM Press, 1969), 108–37, here 131–32. This essay was originally published in 1962 as “Zum Thema der christlichen Apokalyphtik.” Despite their differences, in many ways Käsemann was Bultmann’s most faithful student. See David W. Congdon, “Eschatologizing Apocalyptic: An Assessment of the Present Conversation on Pauline Apocalyptic,” in *Apocalyptic and the Future of Theology: With and Beyond J. Louis Martyn*, ed. Joshua B. Davis and Douglas Harink (Eugene: Cascade Books, 2012), 118–36.

²⁹ Käsemann, “Primitive Apocalyptic,” 136. Käsemann admits that the term “apocalyptic” is ambiguous, but it he uses it “to denote the expectation of an imminent Parousia” (109, fn. 1).

³⁰ Käsemann, “Anthropology,” 23 “Anthropology must ... be cosmology just as certainly as, conversely, the cosmos is primarily viewed by Paul under an anthropological aspect, because the fate of the world is in fact decided in the human sphere.” Also, Ernst Käsemann, *Commentary on Romans*, trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), 176 where Käsemann interprets Rom 6:12 in light of Bultmann’s exegesis of Paul’s anthropological terminology.

It is precisely because of Adam that Käsemann sees Paul's theology as anthropology projected to cosmology. In his essay "On Paul's Anthropology," Käsemann repeatedly points out that because of Adam's sin the cosmos has been altered, placed under the dominion of the demonic.³¹ Käsemann's key text for this interpretation is Rom 5:12–21. While explaining Rom 5:12 in his *Commentary on Romans*, Käsemann argues:

Anthropology is here the projection of cosmology.... Because the world is not finally a neutral place but the field of contending powers, mankind both individually and socially becomes an object in the struggle and an exponent of the power that rules it.³²

The world is no longer a neutral place for Käsemann precisely because of the cosmic significance of Adam's sin. In a text that Bultmann considered a cultural acquiescence to Paul's environment, Käsemann found an essential feature of his theology.

Although they came to different conclusions about the significance of evil for Paul, Bultmann and Käsemann shared a focus on Adamic tradition as the vehicle of expression for the Apostle's view of evil. Bultmann saw evil as a fundamentally anthropological problem, human failure to recognize the creator. Käsemann pushed Bultmann's anthropological claim to cosmic significance, evil as the rebellion of the whole cosmos against the creator. While scholars see a false dichotomy between Bultmann's anthropology and Käsemann cosmology, the focal point of their interpretations as Adamic tradition continues to exercise profound influence.³³

1.2 The Adamic Template in Pauline Scholarship

It would hardly be an overstatement to recognize that Adamic tradition continues to dominate the horizon of Pauline scholarship when describing the origin of evil.³⁴ There are numerous monographs and chapters devoted to

³¹ "Since the fall of Adam man's heart and will and thinking have been corrupted and have fallen into the power of demonic forces" ("Anthropology," 24); "The fall of man allowed the demonic cosmic scope" ("Anthropology," 26). See also "Anthropology," 8, 23.

³² Käsemann, *Commentary on Romans*, 150.

³³ On the false dichotomy between cosmology and anthropology see: 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), 51–60; James P. Davies, "Evil's Aetiology and False Dichotomies in Jewish Apocalyptic and Paul," in *Evil in Second Temple Judaism and Early Christianity*, 169–89.

³⁴ "Adamic tradition" refers not only to the stories of creation and fall as they appear in Gen 1–3, but also creation traditions in the HB and Second Temple Literature such as Psalm 8, Sirach, Wisdom of Solomon, Philo, 4 Ezra, 2 Bar, Primary Adam books, Testament of Abraham, 2 Enoch and the Apocalypse of Abraham. Even John R. Levison's masterful study of Adamic traditions in Second Temple Judaism is, as he admits, incom-

Adamic traditions in Second Temple Judaism and their significance for understanding Paul's theology.³⁵ Robin Scroggs articulated the centrality of Adamic traditions for Pauline scholars quite well when he wrote, "In all of Paul's writings no serious competitor to Adam as the originator of man's bondage to sin and death can be found."³⁶

The dominance of Adamic tradition for Paul's theology has been significantly overemphasized and must be considerably nuanced. There are four major problems with the interpretation of Adamic traditions in Pauline scholarship. First, too much has built on too little. Paul explicitly cites Adamic traditions in his undisputed letters twice. These citations are not insignificant, but they are limited. Second, based on a paucity of references Pauline interpreters construct a narrative that structures Paul's theology. Third, the narrative of an Adamic origin of evil is mapped onto Paul's thought without the need for textual justification. Since it is assumed that the way Paul thinks about evil is based on Adamic tradition, this narrative is employed to interpret Paul's thought on the subject. Fourth, an Adamic origin of evil in Paul is

plete (*Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism: From Sirach to 2 Baruch*, JSPSupp 1 [Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988], 29–31). See Lester L. Grabbe, "'Better watch your back, Adam': Another Adam and Eve in Tradition in Second Temple Judaism," in *New Perspectives on 2 Enoch: No Longer Slavonic Only*, SJ 4, eds. Andrei A. Orlov and Gabrielle Boccaccini (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 273–82.

³⁵ In addition to the review of literature by John Levison (*Portraits of Adam*, 13–23), a more recent *Status Quaestionis* on the Adam Typology in Paul is provided by Felipe de Jesús Legarreta-Castillo (*Figure of Adam*, 5–31). Among others Legarreta-Castillo shows the significance of Adam in Paul's theology for Rudolf Bultmann, W. D. Davies, E. P. Sanders, C. K. Barrett, A. J. M. Wedderburn, James D. G. Dunn and N. T. Wright. There is an insightful minimalist reading of Adamic tradition in Paul provided by PHEME PERKINS ("Adam and Christ in the Pauline Epistles," in *Celebrating Paul: Festschrift in Honor of Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, O.P., and Joseph A. Fitzmyer, S. J.* ed. Peter Spitaler, CBQMS 48 [Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2011], 128–51).

³⁶ Robin Scroggs, *The Last Adam: A Study in Pauline Anthropology* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966), 75; see also Williams, *Ideas of the Fall*, 123–38; Dubarle, *Biblical Doctrine of Original Sin*, 142–200; Gabrielle Boccaccini, "The Evilness of Human Nature in 1 Enoch, Jubilees, Paul, and 4 Ezra: A Second Temple Jewish Debate," in *Fourth Ezra and Second Baruch: Reconstruction after the Fall*, eds. Matthias Henze and Gabriele Boccaccini, JSJSupp 164 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 63–82, esp. 69–72. A rare exception to this common view is Stanley Stowers who thinks that the centrality of Adamic traditions for understanding Paul's view of sin needs to be re-evaluated (Stanley K. Stowers, "Paul's Four Discourses about Sin," in *Celebrating Paul: Festschrift in Honor of Jerome Murphy-O'Connor and Joseph A. Fitzmyer*, CBQMS 49 [Washington, D. C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2011], 100–27). Stowers argues that the focus on Adam's Fall is based on a metanarrative articulated by Augustine and then anachronistically mapped onto Romans ("Paul's Four Discourses," 104–6). Stowers articulates a similar attack on an "Augustinian" reading of Romans in *A Rereading of Romans: Justice, Jews, and Gentiles* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994), 3–6.

linked to Second Temple Jewish texts without sufficient nuance. Each of these problematic features require elaboration.

Although obvious, it is often conveniently forgotten that explicit reference to Adam in the undisputed letters occurs only in Romans and 1 Corinthians (Rom 5:12–21; 1 Cor 15:21–22, 45–49; see also Rom 16:20; 1 Cor 11:7–12; 2 Cor 11:3; 1 Tim 2:11–15). These references have led to numerous speculative attempts to identify the background or source of the Adamic tradition in Second Temple Judaism.³⁷ The earliest example of an explicit Adamic tradition in the Pauline corpus is Paul’s elliptical reference in 1 Cor 15:21–22. Since this Adamic tradition is both remarkably condensed and central to his argument, scholars have long suspected Paul of citing a pre-existing tradition.³⁸ The Adamic traditions in 1 Cor 15 are not prompted by Paul, but rather

³⁷ Henry St. John Thackeray, *The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought: An Essay to which was awarded the Kaye Prize for 1899* (New York: Macmillan, 1900), 29–57; Freundorfer, *Erbsünde und Erbtod*, 65–93; Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*, 31–35, 44–57; Egon Brandenburger, *Adam und Christus: Exegetisch-religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Röm. 5, 12–21 (1. Kor. 15)*, WUMNT 7 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1962), 68–131; Scroggs, *Last Adam*, 16–58; A. J. M. Wedderburn, “Adam and Christ: An Investigation into the Background of I Corinthians 15 and Romans 5:12–21” (PhD diss., The University of Cambridge, 1971); James D. G. Dunn, *Christology in the Making: A New Testament Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation*, 2nd ed. (London: SCM Press, 1989), 98–128; John R. Levison, *Portraits of Adam*; Thomas H. Tobin, “The Jewish Context of Rom 5:12–14,” *SPhiloA* 13 (2001): 159–75; Felipe de Jesús Legarreta-Castillo, *The Figure of Adam in Romans 5 and 1 Corinthians 15: The New Creation and Its Ethical and Social Reconfiguration* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2014).

³⁸ Those who identify the source of this tradition in Hellenistic Judaism include: Birger A. Pearson, *The Pneumatikos-Psychikos Terminology in 1 Corinthians: A Study in the Theology of the Corinthian Opponents of Paul and Its Relation to Gnosticism*, SBLDS 12 (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1973), 82–85; Richard A. Horsley, “How Can Some of You Say That There Is No Resurrection of the Dead: Spiritual Elitism in Corinth,” *NovT* 20 (1978): 203–31; Gerhard Sellin, *Der Streit um die Auferstehung der Toten: Eine religionsgeschichtliche und exegetische Untersuchung von 1 Korinther 15*, FRLANT 138 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986), 63–71; Gregory E. Sterling, “Wisdom among the Perfect: Creation Traditions in Alexandrian Judaism and Corinthian Christianity,” *NovT* 37 (1995): 355–84.

It has been argued that the closest parallel to Paul is found not in Hellenistic Judaism but rather Rabbinic Judaism: Stephen Hultgren, “The Origin of Paul’s Doctrine of the Two Adams in 1 Corinthians 15.45–49,” *JSNT* 25 (2003): 343–70, esp. 328. Also utilizing Rabbinic material to illuminate the 1 Cor 15:21–22 is Menahem Kister, “‘In Adam’: 1 Cor 15:21–22; 12:27 in their Jewish Setting,” in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 685–90; Kister, “‘First Adam’ and ‘Second Adam’ in 1 Cor 15:45–49 in the Light of Midrashic Exegesis and Hebrew Usage,” in *The New Testament and Rabbinic Literature*, JSJSupp 136 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 351–65; Kister, “Romans 5:12–21 against the Background of Torah-Theology and Hebrew Usage,” *HTR* 100 (2007): 391–424. See also

articulated in response to exegetical traditions which had generated misgivings about bodily resurrection among the Corinthians.³⁹ Not only are there few references to Adamic tradition in Paul's letters, but the references in 1 Corinthians are prompted by Paul's opponents. This leaves only Rom 5:12–21 as an explicit Adamic tradition initiated by Paul's own argument.

The relative dearth of explicit references to Adamic tradition has not stopped scholars from making Adam essential to Paul's theology. James Dunn is a particularly good example of this practice. In addition to the explicit references, Dunn identifies significant allusions to Adamic tradition throughout Romans (1:18–25; 3:23; 7:7–25; 8:19–22).⁴⁰ Furthermore, Dunn makes Adamic tradition pivotal to his interpretation of Phil 2:6–11, a text frequently interpreted in light of Adamic tradition that lacks explicit reference to the protoplast.⁴¹ Perhaps most significantly, Dunn identifies Adamic traditions as fundamental to Paul's thought even when not explicit:

Stanley E. Porter, "The Pauline Concept of Original Sin, in Light of Rabbinic Background," *TynBul* 41 (1990): 3–30. Porter argues, however, that Paul's formulation is quite different and independent of Rabbinic literature.

It was once popular to identify the source of this tradition as some form of "Gnosticism": Bultmann, *Theology*, 169; Brandenburger, *Adam und Christus*, 70–72; de Boer, *Defeat of Death*, 96–105.

³⁹ Defending the centrality of the resurrection for his gospel (1 Cor 15:1–2), Paul articulates the importance of the resurrection for early Christian kerygma (1 Cor 15:3–11) and then responds to those who deny the resurrection (1 Cor 15:12–34) as well as the cosmological assumptions that motivate such a denial (1 Cor 15:35–49). Particularly compelling is the argument of Sterling, "Wisdom among the Perfect" 355–84. See also Dale B. Martin, *The Corinthian Body* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 104–36.

⁴⁰ James D. G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 90–101. According to Dunn, "One of the most striking features of Romans is the fact that Paul repeatedly calls upon Gen 1–3 to explain his understanding of the human condition" (*Theology*, 90–91).

⁴¹ Dunn, *Christology in the Making*, 114–21. This line of interpretation is not uncommon: Oscar Cullmann, *The Christology of the New Testament*, rev. ed. (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963), 166–81, esp. 174–81; Herman Ridderbos, *Paul: An Outline of this Theology*, trans. John Richard de Witt (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975), 73–75; Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, "Christological Anthropology in Phil 2:6–11," *RB* 83 (1976): 25–50; Charles A. Wanamaker, "Philippians 2:6–11: Son of God or Adamic Christology?" *NTS* 33 (1987): 179–93; M. D. Hooker, *From Adam to Christ: Essays on Paul* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 88–100; D. Steenburg, "The Worship of Adam and Christ as the Image of God," *JSNT* 39 (1990): 95–109; N. T. Wright, *Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), 57–62, 90–95. See the sober analysis of Markus Bockmuehl, *The Epistle to the Philippians*, BNTC (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1998), 131–33. Bockmuehl finds the evidence inadequate for Paul to allude to Adam, but he points out that Irenaeus interpreted Phil 2:6–11 with reference to Adamic tradition (*Haer.* 5.16.2–3; see also *Haer.* 3.22.1, 3–4).

The Adam motif is a substantial strand in the warp and woof of Paul's theology, and even when not explicit its influence spreads out widely and throws a considerable light on his understanding of the Christian gospel.⁴²

Dunn's position is "maximalist" in regard to Adamic Christology in Paul, but he is by no means alone in his estimation of the significance of Adam for Paul's theology.⁴³ Paul's anthropological dichotomies, for example, are often interpreted in light of Adamic traditions.⁴⁴ N. T. Wright also considers Adamic tradition central to Paul's theology.⁴⁵ In addition to Dunn and Wright, George Van Kooten finds Adam Christology "very dominant in Paul."⁴⁶ Specifically, Van Kooten identifies Adamic tradition behind Paul's "image" and morphic language.⁴⁷ Numerous scholars, then, identify Adamic traditions as essential to Paul's theology based on only a couple of explicit references in Romans 5 and 1 Corinthians 15.

What is most troubling about the centrality of Adamic traditions in Pauline scholarship is when they are mapped onto Paul's thought without textual

⁴² Dunn, *Christology in the Making*, 107.

⁴³ Gordon D. Fee, *Pauline Christology: An Exegetical-Theological Study* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2007), 513 outlines three positions on identifying Adamic traditions in Paul's letters: First, the minimalist position limits its influence to Rom 5 and 1 Cor 15, where Adam is explicitly mentioned. Second, a maximalist position (e.g. Dunn and Wright). Third, Fee's view, is a middling position "which does not limit itself only to explicit references but is less inclusive as to what else in Paul's writing actually makes a comparison of Christ with Adam viable." It is important to point out, however, there are those who would identify with a "minimalist" position e.g. PHEME PERKINS, "Adam and Christ in the Pauline Epistles," 128–51.

⁴⁴ The old man/new man (Rom 6:6; see also Col 3:9–10; Eph 4:22–24), inner man/outer man (2 Cor 4:16; Rom 7:22; see also Eph 3:15), and spiritual/natural (1 Cor 2:13–15; 3:1; 15:44–49). See L. J. Kreitzer, "Adam and Christ," in *DPL*, 9. This interpretation goes at least as far back as Cullmann, *Christology of the New Testament*, 166–81. See also Van Kooten, *Paul's Anthropology*, 357–92. This is not to say that Adamic traditions cannot be informing these categories. The criticism is that Adamic tradition is sometimes assumed without demonstration.

⁴⁵ N. T. Wright, *Climax of the Covenant*, 18–40. More on Wright below.

⁴⁶ George H. Van Kooten, *Paul's Anthropology in Context: The Image of God, Assimilation to God, and Tripartite Man in Ancient Judaism, Ancient Philosophy and Early Christianity*, WUNT 232 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 69–71, citing 71.

⁴⁷ Van Kooten, *Paul's Anthropology*, 71–81. As Van Kooten observes, εἰκῶν also only appears in Romans and the Corinthian letters (Rom 1:23; 8:29; 1 Cor 11:7; 15:49; 2 Cor 3:18; 4:4; see also Col 1:15; 3:10). He builds on the connection between Adam and εἰκῶν in 1 Cor 15:49 and the "glory of Adam" references from Qumran (esp. 1QS IV, 23; 1QH^a IV, 15). Additionally, both Rom 8:29 and 2 Cor 4:4 combine εἰκῶν with morphic language, terms with considerable conceptual overlap (Josephus, *C. Ap.* 2.190–191). Van Kooten argues that Paul's morphic language (esp. Rom 8:29; 12:2; 2 Cor 3:18; Phil 2:6–7; 3:21) supports "one of the central tenants of his theology – his Adam Christology" (*Paul's Anthropology*, 91).

warrant. In a narrative assessment of Paul, Edward Adams identifies a coherent “story of God and creation” in Romans, but not Galatians because the latter lacks any reference to an Adamic fall.⁴⁸ In other expositions of Galatians, Adamic tradition is cited to explain Paul’s thought. In his seminal commentary, for example, Hans Dieter Betz bases his understanding of Paul’s anthropology, and particularly humanity’s problem with sin, on Rom 5:12–21.⁴⁹ Similarly, Bruce Longenecker, appeals to Romans 5:12–21 to explain Paul’s view of evil in Galatians.⁵⁰ Adam has been identified behind Paul’s conception of sin in Gal 2:15–21.⁵¹ Despite the paucity of explicit references, Adamic traditions are given a central place in the structure of Paul’s theology especially concerning the origin of evil. This has influenced interpretations of Galatians where Adamic traditions are absent from the text itself.

Not only are explicit references to Adamic traditions rare in Paul’s letters, but there is an oversimplified reading of Second Temple texts to justify the narrative of an Adamic origin of evil. Consider Dunn’s claim that “postbiblical texts indicate that by Paul’s time the role of Adam’s disobedience had become a major factor in generating explanations for the human condition.”⁵² Against Dunn and the vast majority of NT scholars, Henry Ansgar Kelly argues that when it comes to Adamic traditions, “Paul’s thoughts must be *contrasted* with those of other writers of his time rather than likened to

⁴⁸ Edward Adams, “Paul’s Story of God and Creation: The Story of How God Fulfills His Purposes in Creation,” in *Narrative Dynamics in Paul: A Critical Assessment*, ed. Bruce W. Longenecker (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002), 19–43.

⁴⁹ Betz, *Galatians: A Commentary on Paul’s Letter to the Churches in Galatia*, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979), 256 fn. 27. Betz includes in the same footnote: “Gal is different from Rom in that it does not contain reflection on man’s primordial state of existence.” Earlier in the commentary Betz appeals to Rom 5:12–21 to elucidate Gal 3:22–23 after cautioning against harmonizing Galatians with Romans (p. 176).

⁵⁰ Bruce W. Longenecker, *The Triumph of Abraham’s God: The Transformation of Identity in Galatians* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1998), 40–43. To Longenecker’s credit, his reading of Rom 5:12–21 does not overwhelm his astute exegesis of Gal 4:1–11 (46–63), but Adamic tradition still frames the entire discussion.

⁵¹ S. A. Cummins, *Paul and the Crucified Christ in Antioch: Maccabean Martyrdom and Galatians 1 and 2*, SNTSMS 114 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), esp. 212–28.

⁵² Dunn, *Theology of Paul the Apostle*, 86. Dunn’s work is cited because it is both influential and reflective of the state of discourse. See a summary in James D. G. Dunn, “Adam in Paul,” in *The Pseudepigrapha and Christian Origins: Essays from the Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas*, JCTCRS, eds. Gerbern S Oegema and James H. Charlesworth (New York: T&T Clark, 2008), 120–35. The significance of Jewish Adamic traditions for Paul’s view of evil reflects common assumptions since Thackeray, *Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought*, 30–40.

them.”⁵³ Pauline scholars have paid insufficient attention to the nuances of Adamic tradition and the problem of evil in Second Temple Judaism.

Certainly, Adamic traditions did factor significantly in explaining the origin of evil, but nearly all the evidence connecting Adam’s disobedience to evil’s origin post-dates the fall of Jerusalem. John Levison has debunked the once prevailing notion that Paul cited a common and well-developed Adam myth.⁵⁴ Others have shown that Adamic traditions were employed variously to articulate theological anthropology.⁵⁵ Yet it was only after the destruction of Jerusalem that Adamic tradition made Adam’s disobedience the primary explanation for evil.

Pauline Scholarship has constructed an Adamic template to explain evil. According to this template, an Adamic explanation of evil derived from Second Temple Judaism structures Paul’s theology of evil. It is perhaps not surprising that this narrative conforms well with later Christian theology that gives increasing significance to Adamic tradition for describing the origin of evil. Loren Stuckenbruck has shown that appeals to Jewish apocalyptic literature in Pauline scholarship have often served a theological agenda to portray the superiority of Christianity over Second Temple Judaism in addressing the effects of evil in the cosmos.⁵⁶ At least since the time of Rudolf Bultmann, Pauline scholars have been solely focused on Adamic traditions to understand the origin of evil in Paul’s thought.

1.3 Christological *Novum*

The Adamic template is, in part, sustained by a prevailing interpretation of Paul’s theology as a Christological *novum*. This approach does not deny the importance of Adamic tradition, it merely focuses on Christology as more primary. The rise of this approach and its enduring popularity can be attribut-

⁵³ Henry Ansgar Kelly, “Adam Citings before the Intrusion of Satan: Recontextualizing Paul’s Theology of Sin and Death,” *BTB* 44 (2014): 13–28.

⁵⁴ Levison identifies this problematic reading in Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*, 36–57; Jacob Jervell, *Imago Dei: Gen 1,26f im Spätjudentum, in der Gnosis und in den paulinischen Briefen*, FRLANT 58 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960); Brandenburger, *Adam und Christus*, 15–157; Robin Scroggs, *The Last Adam*, 16–58; Dunn, *Christology in the Making*, 98–128.

⁵⁵ Thomas H. Tobin, *Paul’s Rhetoric in its Contexts: The Argument of Romans* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2004), 168–72 identifies three different functions of articulating a theological anthropology in Second Temple Judaism: descriptive anthropology (Sir 14:17; 15:14; 17:1–24, 30–32; 18:17–14; 24:28; 33:7–13; 40:1, 11; Wis 2:23–24; 7:1–6; 9:1–3; 15:11), exemplary anthropology (Philo, *Opif.* 151–170; Josephus, *A.J.* 1.68–69, 72), and etiological anthropology (Sib.Or. 1:22–86; Jub. 2:13–4:6, 29–30; 4 Ezra 3:7–10, 21–27; 7:118–121; 2 Bar 54:13–19; Primary Adam books; LAB 13:8–10).

⁵⁶ Stuckenbruck, “How much Evil does the Christ Event Solve?,” 142–68.

ed to E. P. Sanders. It is worthwhile to outline Sanders's position and its importance for the "apocalyptic school."

1.3.1 Sanders: Solution to Plight

Since E. P. Sanders's *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* changed the landscape of Pauline studies in 1977, scholars have paid little attention to the problem of evil in Paul's theology. The reason for this shift was Sanders's argument that Paul's Christological soteriology was retrospective, working "from solution to plight."⁵⁷ Sanders recognized that the structure of Romans operates from plight to solution and that it would be logical for the problem to shape the solution, but he maintained that "Paul's thought did not run from plight to solution, but rather from solution to plight."⁵⁸

Sanders's argument is based on three points. First, following Krister Stendahl's claim that Paul was not afflicted with Luther's introspective conscience, Sanders privileged Phil 3:6 over Rom 7:7–25 as an autobiographical account of Paul's pre-conversion mindset. As a result, Sanders found no existential angst in Paul over his condition prior to conversion.⁵⁹ In Sanders's view, Paul saw no fundamental flaw in his religion prior to conversion, but he radically rethought his theology after the Damascus road revelation (Gal 1:11–17; see also Acts 9:1–29; 22:3–21; 26:9–20). It was only in the light of this Christological revelation that Paul articulated a problem with his former Judaism at all.⁶⁰ Second, Sanders found Paul revealing the direction of his thought in Gal 2:21. Here Sanders discovered Paul starting from the premise

⁵⁷ E. P. Sanders famously described Paul's critique of Judaism in these terms (*PPJ*, 442–47, and *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People* [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1983], 68). Sanders's most recent work continues in this line of thought: "[Paul's] conclusions usually come before his arguments – as is the case with most of us" (E. P. Sanders, *Paul: The Apostle's Life, Letters, and Thought* [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2015], xxviii, also 621).

⁵⁸ Sanders, *PPJ*, 443.

⁵⁹ Sanders, *PPJ*, 443. See Krister Stendahl, "The Apostle Paul and the Introspective Conscience of the West," *HTR* 56.3 (1963): 199–215.

⁶⁰ Sanders, *PPJ*, 444 fn. 7 attributes this insight to Bultmann's student, Günther Bornkamm, *Paul*, trans. D. M. G. Stalker (New York: Harper and Row, 1971), 120–21. Bornkamm points to 2 Cor 3:14 to draw this insight, a passage which factors more significantly in Sanders's later account of this issue (*PL&JP*, 137–41). The claim that Paul's theological insight is fundamentally christological is already present in Bultmann, *Theology*, 188 and before him in G. F. Moore, *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era*, 3 vols (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962), 2.93–94. Moore's volume was originally published in 1927. See the insightful history of research in Frank Theilman, *From Plight to Solution: A Jewish Framework for Understanding Paul's View of the Law in Galatians and Romans*, *SuppNovT* 61 (Leiden: Brill, 1989), 1–27.