Marquette University
e-Publications@Marquette

Dissertations (1934 -) Dissertations, Theses, and Professional Projects

"The Present Evil Age": The Origin and Persistence of Evil in Galatians

Tyler Allen Stewart
Marquette University

Follow this and additional works at: https://epublications.marquette.edu/dissertations_mu

Part of the Religion Commons

Recommended Citation
Stewart, Tyler Allen, ""The Present Evil Age": The Origin and Persistence of Evil in Galatians" (2019). *Dissertations (1934 -)*. 830.
https://epublications.marquette.edu/dissertations_mu/830

"THE PRESENT EVIL AGE": THE ORIGIN AND PERSISTENCE OF EVIL IN GALATIANS

by

Tyler A. Stewart, B.Th., M.Div.

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School,
Marquette University,
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Milwaukee, Wisconsin

May, 2019

ABSTRACT
"THE PRESENT EVIL AGE": THE ORIGIN AND PERSISTENCE OF EVIL IN GALATIANS

Tyler A. Stewart, B.Th., M.Div.

Marquette University, 2019

This dissertation investigates the origin and persistence of evil in Galatians within the context of Second Temple Judaism and early Christianity. The focus of investigation is narrative explanation(s) for evil. What story and/or stories were told to explain the original cause of evil and why it persists in the present?

The study begins with a history of research that separates current scholarly accounts of Paul's view of evil into two broad categories, Adamic template and Christological *novum*. According to the Adamic template, evil originates in Adam's sin and persists in human rebellion in the likeness of the Protoplast. According to the Christological *novum*, Paul's view of evil is merely a reflex of his Christology. My research challenges both categories.

I make four claims about evil in Paul, Second Temple Judaism, and early Christianity. First, Paul's argument in Galatians, especially Gal 3:19–4:11, is informed by Enochic tradition (chapters two and five). In Galatians Paul's view of evil is based on the Enochic narrative of rebellious angels. Second, among first century Jews, Adamic and Enochic traditions were not separated as inherently incompatible narrative explanations of evil (chapter three). Jewish authors commonly cited multiple traditions to articulate their theology of evil, producing a mixed template. Third, the function of Adamic and Enochic traditions are determined by the contexts in which they appear (chapters three and four). Adamic tradition, for example, does not indicate that evil is an essentially human problem from start to finish that absolves God (chapter three). Likewise, Enochic tradition does not blame superhuman forces for evil and abdicate human responsibility (chapter four). These traditions do not conform to strict patterns of meaning in the ways that modern scholarship often assumes. Fourth, an Enochic reading of Galatians 3:19–4:11 is supported by the early reception of Paul (chapter six). Among second century Christian apologists, especially Justin Martyr, Paul's arguments in Galatians are redeployed and explicitly combined with an Enochic narrative.

PREFACE

This is not the dissertation I anticipated writing at the outset of my doctoral studies. Aside from interest in another topic, I was resistant to writing on the *hauptebriefe*. I can vividly recall during the first semester remarking that I saw no need for another dissertation 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. Yet it was only after relearning Second Temple Judaism that this project became imaginable for me.

My reeducation began in a doctoral seminar on Jewish Demonology. At our first meeting, Dr. Andrei 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 a collection of profound and diverse theological texts. During the early stages of the seminar exploring Enochic traditions, I read the familiar text of Galatians as if for the first time. As I read, my mind percolated with connections between the letter and the Book of Watchers. Dr. Orlov encouraged me to clarify 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. He opened another door, guiding me in the complex philosophical theology of Philo of Alexandria. Dr. Cover also forced me to refine my thinking and writing by directing me to the form and content of the text. Additionally, Dr. Cover carefully read my work in various drafts exposing flaws and unproven assumptions in my arguments. 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 other committee members, Drs. Deirdre Dempsey and Joshua Ezra Burns. Dr. Dempsey not only sharpened my knowledge of the Hebrew scrolls from Qumran during coursework, she also models a pedagogy of unfailing kindness that empowers her students. Also, her keen editorial eye saved me from several embarrassing mistakes. Dr. Burns' encyclopedic knowledge of early Judaism and dry wit make his courses immensely profitable and enjoyable. Dr. Burns invited me to test new ideas without trying to reinvent everything. Although Dr. Michel Barnes did not ultimately serve on the committee for this project, his influence is undeniable. The theology faculty at Marquette provided me with an intellectually challenging and encouraging education.

One of the best features of the theology depart at Marquette is the community of graduate 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 Guidero, Ryan and Kate Hemmer, Dallas and Beth Flippin, and Jon and Annie Heaps. These people helped me think and write better, cared for my children, shared meals, and brought merriment into my life. Besides, they endured the ultimate test of friendship, helping my family move. Doctoral work is lonely and isolating but these friends made it enjoyable.

The greatest thanks I owe for completing this project is due to my family who have sacrificed so much to make my work possible. David and Sheila, my parents, have always encouraged my academic pursuits even when they did not understand my

motiviations. My wife Margaret, a warm-blooded Texan, deferred her career ambitions and the comfort of the familiar to live in a cold and foreign city. Despite the difficulties, she supported me financially and made a joyful home for our three children. To Margo, Charlotte, Graham, and Magnolia, thank you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE………………………………………………………………………………… i

INTRODUCTION…………………………………………………………………... 1

1.1 Bultmann vs Käsemann: Anthropology or Cosmology…………………………... 7

1.2 The Adamic Template in Pauline Scholarship………………………………….. 12

1.3 Christological *Novum*……………………………………………………………19

1.3.1 Sanders: Solution to Plight……………………………………………... 19

1.3.2 Martyn, de Boer, and Campbell: Christological Apocalypse……………... 22

1.3.3 Watson, Hays, and Wright: Christology and Scripture……………………29

Conclusion: The Present Study…………………………………………………… 36

CHAPTER TWO: REFRAMING EVIL IN GALATIANS……………………………. 40

2.1 The Relationship between Galatians and Romans………………………………42

2.2 The Inability of Romans to Explain Galatians 3:19……………………………...52

2.3. An Enochic Solution…………………………………………………………… 61

Conclusion……………………………………………………………………….... 70

CHAPTER THREE: DECONSTRUCTING THE ADAMIC TEMPLATE……………. 74

3.1 Formation of the Adamic Template…………………………………………...76

3.1.1 Ben Sira………………………………………………………………….77

3.1.1.1 Ben Sira and Evil…………………………………………………. 77

3.1.1.2 Ben Sira and Gen 1–3…………………………………………….. 81

3.1.2 Wisdom of Solomon……………………………………………………… 89

3.1.2.1 Wisdom 7:1……………………………………………………..92

3.1.2.2 Wisdom 9:1–2…………………………………………………..95

3.1.2.3 Wisdom 10:1–2…………………………………………………………95

3.1.2.4 Wisdom 15:8–17………………………………………………………100

3.1.2.5 Wisdom 2:23–24………………………………………………………102

3.2 The Adamic Template in Late Jewish Apocalyptic…………………………….107

3.2.1 Fourth Ezra…………………………………………………………………..110

3.2.1.1 The First Dialogue……………………………………………………. 113

3.2.1.2 The Third Dialogue……………………………………………………117

3.2.2 Second Baruch……………………………………………………………… 123

3.2.2.1 Second Baruch 3:1–4…………………………………………………. 125

3.2.2.2 Second Baruch 13:1–14……………………………………………… 126

3.2.2.3 Second Baruch 15:1–18:2…………………………………………….. 127

3.2.2.4 Second Baruch 48:42–43…………………………………………... 129

3.2.2.5 Second Baruch 54:15–19…………………………………………... 130

3.2.2.6 Second Baruch 56:5–14……………………………………………… 131

3.2.2.7 Second Baruch 73:3–5……………………………………………... 133

Conclusion…………………………………………………………………………. 137

CHAPTER FOUR: EVIL IN ENOCHIC TRADITION AND JUBILEES…………….140

4.1 Book of Watchers………………………………………………………………… 144

4.1.1 Shemihazah and Asael Narratives……………………………………….. 148

4.1.1.1 Etiology…………………………………………………………………..149

4.1.1.2 Paradigm………………………………………………………………… 153

4.1.1.3 Unresolved Ambiguities……………………………………………… 155

4.1.2 Book of Watchers (1 En. 1–36)…………………………………………….. 167

4.1.2.1 Previous Approaches.. 168

4.1.2.2 Etiology and Plural Responsibility.. 176

4.1.2.3 Human Agency in Reception History..................................... 183

4.2. Jubilees 185

4.2.1 Jubilees and the Origin and Persistence of Evil..................................188

4.2.2 Adamic Tradition (Jub. 3:8–31; 4:29–30) 198

4.2.3 Enochic Tradition (Jub. 5:1–19; 7:20–39; 8:1–4; 10:1–14)..................204

Conclusion 215

CHAPTER FIVE: AN ENOCHIC NARRATIVE IN GALATIANS 218

5.1 An Enochic Problem and the Opponents in Galatians...............................220

5.1.1 The Present Evil Age (Gal 1:4)...222

5.1.2 The Corruption of “All Flesh” (Gal 2:16) 226

5.1.3 Evil and the Opponents...232

5.2 A Christological Solution to an Enochic Problem......................................236

5.2.1 Angelomorphic Adoption 237

5.2.1.1 Galatians 1:16 247

5.3.1.2 Galatians 2:20 251

5.3.1.3 Galatians 3:26 254

5.3.1.4 Galatians 4:4–7 256

5.2.2 “Born from a Woman”...259

5.2.3 Spirit of God’s Son 262

5.3 The Apotropaic Function of the Law in Galatians 264

5.3.1 Protection from Transgressions 265

5.3.2 *Paidagōgos* 270

5.4 The Inadequacy of the Law 279

5.4.1 Temporal Validity 280

5.4.2 Angelic Mediation 285

Conclusion 293

CHAPTER SIX: PROOF FROM RECEPTION HISTORY 297

6.1 Justin Martyr: The Teacher and His Texts 298

6.1.1 *Apologies* 299

6.2.1 *Dialogue with Trypho* 303

6.2 Justin's Sources in *2 Apology* 5 305

6.2.1 Creation Tradition 308

6.2.2 Enochic Tradition 310

6.2.3 Philosophical Traditions 315

6.2.4 Paul 329

6.4 Justin's Mixed Template 337

Conclusion 349

CONCLUSION 351

APPENDIX: TEXTUAL VARIANT IN GALATIANS 2:20 356

WORKS CITED 360

Reference... 360

Primary Literature 361

Secondary Literature 364

INTRODUCTION

William Wrede insightfully observed over a century ago that according to Paul: "The character of this present world is determined by the fact that men are here under the domination of dark and evil powers."[1] Paul thinks that humanity, along with the whole cosmos, is in a dire situation and in need of divine rescue.[2] But how is this the case? How has creation been corrupted? Scholars are in a profound state of disagreement concerning this fundamental issue in Paul's theology, evil.

Evil is a slippery term. Drawing from the western philosophical tradition, scholars sometimes analyze evil according to moral, natural/physical, and metaphysical categories.[3] In some instances these philosophical distinctions have been applied to Second Temple Jewish literature.[4] Other times, only one category of evil becomes the focus of investigation.[5] Evil is a flexible enough concept to be applied to human opponents, superhuman beings (angels and demons), human sin, personified concepts (e.g. Sin and Death), idolatry, symbols, and metaphors.[6] In his analysis of evil in Paul,

---

[1] William Wrede, *Paul*, trans. Edward Lummis (London: Elsom, 1907), 92. Here Wrede cites Gal 1:4.

[2] See especially 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 1:4; 3:23; 4:3–11; Phil 2:15; 3:18–19; 1 Thess 1:9–10; 5:1–11.

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

[4] 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 speaks of "religious evil," but it is unclear how his definition differs from a subset of moral evil.

[5] 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 focuses only on "moral evil."

[6] 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).

Chris Tilling labels any kind of opposition to God as "evil," using it as "an umbrella term under which the material is to be collated."[7] The fluidity of the concept requires clarification.

The focus of this investigation is the origin and persistence of evil in Galatians in comparison with Second Temple Jewish literature. Essentially, this is an attempt to understand how Galatians compares to other Second Temple texts in explaining, by reference to mythology, the state of the cosmos in which sin (moral evil) and suffering (natural evil) occur.[8] It is generally assumed that in the Jewish monotheism of the Second Temple period evil is not essential to the cosmos but a distortion of the creator's intention.[9] 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).[10] This dissertation seeks to understand the origin and

---

[7] Chris Tilling, "Paul, Evil, and Justification Debates," in *Evil in Second Temple Judaism and Early Christianity*, 190. For Tilling, evil is "a receptacle" to be filled.

[8] Similarly, Monika Elisabeth Götte, *Von den Wächtern zu Adam: Frühjüdischen Mythen über die Ursprünge des Bösen and ihre frühchristliche Rezeption*, WUNT 2.426 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016), 5–6 focuses on evil within the broad worldview of early Jewish and Christian theological explanations without recourse to common philosophical categories. Instead, she focuses on the symbolic function of mythological narratives in the vein of Paul Ricoeur, *The Symbolism of Evil*, trans. Emerson Buchanan (Boston: Beacon Press, 1969). Ricoeur defines myth as "not a false narration by means of images and fables, but 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).

[9] See N. P. Williams, *The Ideas of the Fall and of Original Sin: A Historical and Critical Study* (London: Longmans, Green and 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 very much 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.

[10] 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*, 142–168.

persistence of evil in Paul's letter to the Galatians within the context of Second Temple Jewish literature and early Christian literature.

The subject of evil in Judaism and early Christianity has been one of perennial interest.[11] Among Pauline scholars there have been two common approaches, methods relate 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 cited to support this approach. The key resemblance between Paul and 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch is the central role of Adam in explaining evil. According to the first approach, a narrative of an Adamic origin of evil, in Rom 5:12–21 Paul follows a common line of interpretation in Second Temple Judaism that identifies Adam's Fall as the origin of evil.

---

[11] F. C. Porter, "The Yeçer 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 Freundorfer, *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: Mohr, 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 Ellens (ed.), *Explaining Evil: Psychology, Religion, and Spirituality*, 3 Vols. (Santa Barbara: Praeger, 2011); Brand, *Evil Within and Without*; 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); 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*.

The second approach to explaining the origin of evil has been to interpret Paul's view of evil as an afterthought to his Christological *novum*. 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. The 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 Rudolf Bultmann. Recently this perspective has become central to the "Apocalyptic School" of Pauline interpretation initiated by J. Louis Martyn. The coherent thread of these various 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 the place of evil in Paul's theology are inadequate. Regarding the first option, I argue that the dominance of Adamic traditions 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.[12] Part of the reason that Pauline scholars

---

[12] 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 Volume 3: Approaches, Responses, Solutions,* ed. J. Harold Ellens (Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger, 2011), 134–43, esp. 140–43. On Enochic tradition and Galatians see and 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

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.[13] Crucial to my argument is that the combination of these two seemingly disparate traditions appears in the writings of Second Temple Jews 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. It is an oversimplification to concentrate on Adamic traditions in isolation from Enochic traditions, but it is an oversimplification inherited from scholarship on Second Temple Judaism.

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.[14] In Pauline studies one of the central texts in this debate is the

---

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.

[13] 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 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).

[14] 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 recent 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).

contentious letter to the Galatians.[15] 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.[16] One result of this dual re-evaluation is 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.[17] 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.[18] To miss this point is

---

[15] 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 [ἰουδαΐζειν]," 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.

[16] Shaye J. D. Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties* (Berkley: 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 Categorization 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.

[17] 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).

[18] 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:

to fundamentally misunderstand Paul, distort his theology, and thereby misrepresent divine revelation.[19] Recognizing these difficulties, this dissertation attempts to offer a small contribution toward understanding Paul's relationship with his Jewish contemporaries on the origin of evil by analyzing the argument in Galatians 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 is to explain both how contemporary scholarship has inherited the singular focus on Adamic tradition for describing the origin of evil and why the question 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

---

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).

[19] 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). 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" (*Drudgery Divine*, 38).

[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, *Obeying 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:

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 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

---

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 Verlagsgesellschaft, 2011), 149–183; N. T. Wright, *Paul and his Recent Interpreters: Some Contemporary Debates* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2015), 155–186, esp. 162–167; 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).

[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*, 245–249; 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.

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 interpretation is, "Myth should be interpreted not

---

[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" (232).

cosmologically, but anthropologically, or better still, existentially."[27] Even when apocalyptic mythology is present in Paul's letters, myth that appears to attribute cosmic significance to evil, 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

---

[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*, 165–183, 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), 108–137, here 131–32. This essay was originally published in 1962 as "Zum Thema der christlichen Apokalyptik." 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), 118–136.

[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).

significance of man's relationship to the cosmos.[30] Käsemann came to this conclusion based on his reading of Romans 5:12–21.

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

---

[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, MI: Eerdmans, 1980), 176 where Käsemann interprets Rom 6:12 in light of Bultmann's exegesis of Paul's anthropological terminology.

[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" (p. 24); "The fall of man allowed the demonic cosmic scope" (p. 26). Cf. pp. 8, 23.

[32] Käsemann, *Commentary on Romans*, 150.

whole cosmos against the creator. The false dichotomy between anthropology and cosmology has been recognized, but 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 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]

---

[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 2R 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*, 169–189.

[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, incomplete (*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), 273–282.

[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], 128–151).

[36] Robin Scroggs, *The Last Adam: A Study in Pauline Anthropology* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966), 75; see also Williams, *Ideas of the Fall*, 123–138; 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

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

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

---

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], 100–127). 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.

[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-religions-geschichtliche Untersuchung zu Rom. 5, 12-21 (1. Kor. 15)*, WUMNT 7 (Neukirchen: 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-

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 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.

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), 82–5; 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): 355–384.

It has recently 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 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 from Sterling, "Wisdom among the Perfect" 355–384. See also Dale B. Martin, *The Corinthian Body* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 104–36.

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 and his work is widely influential. In addition to the explicit references, Dunn identifies significant allusions to Adamic traditions 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:

> 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

---

[40] James D. G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 90–101. Dunn writes, "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" (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), 166–181, 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, 90–5. 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).

[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

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 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

---

those who would identify with a "minimalist" position e.g. Pheme Perkins, "Adam and Christ in the Pauline Epistles," 128–151.

[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*, 166–181. 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 (Göttingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 69–71, citing 71.

[47] Van Kooten, *Paul's Anthropology*, 71–81. As Van Kooten observes, εἰκών 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 εἰκών 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 εἰκών with morphic language, terms with considerable conceptual overlap (Josephus, *C. Ap* 2.190–91). 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).

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

thought. In his seminal commentary 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

---

[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. 212–228.

[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), 120–135. 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

---

[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), 168–172 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; 7:118–21; 2 Bar 54:13–19; Primary Adam books; LAB 13:8–10).

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 Christological *novum* 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 attributed 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]

---

[56] Stuckenbruck, "How much Evil does the Christ Event Solve?," 142–68.

[57] E. P. Sanders famously described Paul's critique of Judaism in these terms (*PPJ*, 442–447, 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.

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 his theology was radically rethought by 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 of Christ's death to argue for the inadequacy of the law as his conclusion.[61] In this retrospective logic Paul begins with his Christology (the death of Christ) and reasons backward (the law must be inadequate). Third, Sanders dismissed the structure of Romans as determinate for the flow of Paul's thought by denying that the epistle reflected his preaching. In Sanders's words: "[Paul] did not start from man's need, but from God's deed. [. . .] he never

---

[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*, 137–141). 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.

[61] Sanders, *PPJ*, 443, 482. In fact, Sanders sees Paul's retrospective logic revealed most clearly in his view of the law (*PPJ*, 475–476). Sanders sees the same "dogmatic" argument in Gal 3:21, "there is *no* analysis of the human situation which results in the conclusion that doing the law leads to boasting and estrangement from God" (*PPJ*, 484; see also Sanders, *PL&JP*, 68, 150–51).

specifies the plight of man as what is preached. It is always the action of God in Christ."[62] Sanders found Paul's anthropology the most developed in the New Testament, but insisted that it is "*only the implication of his theology, Christology, and soteriology*" and the human plight is "a reflex of his soteriology."[63] For Sanders Paul's theology is "solution to plight" by problematizing a Lutheran caricature of Judaism and making Christology the center of Paul's thought.

The entire "solution to plight" framework was articulated in opposition to Rudolf Bultmann. Sanders laments, "It is perhaps the principal fault in Bultmann's treatment of Paul that he proceeded from plight to solution and supposed that Paul proceeded in the same way." Sanders even confesses writing "backwards" throughout the margins of Bultmann's *Theology of the New Testament*.[64] Although writing against Bultmann, Sanders maintains a deep appreciation for him. He agrees with Bultmann that Paul's most important theological insight is his anthropology and praises Bultmann for producing the most penetrating description of "the existential aspects of faith."[65] Where Sanders disagrees with Bultmann is not in his account of the anthropological problem, but making that problem the starting point of Paul's thought. For Sanders, Paul can construe the problem in various ways to illustrate his fundamental christological insight.[66] To focus on

---

[62] Sanders, *PPJ*, 444. It is worth noting that one of the primary conclusions of Bultmann's dissertation was that the diatribe style of Romans reflected Paul's preaching (*Der Stil der paulinischen Predigt und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe*, FRLANT 13 [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984]).

[63] Sanders, *PPJ*, 446 and 499 *emphasis* original.

[64] Sanders, *PPJ*, 474. Sanders describes plight to solution logic as "one of the traditional ways of setting up the discussion of Paul's theology" (442) and implicates Hans Conzelmann and Günther Bornkamm in the same fundamental mistake.

[65] Sanders, *PPJ* 508–9, quote from 510.

[66] Sanders, *Paul: The Apostle's Life, Letters, and Thought*, 621–669, esp. 653 identifies at least five different ways Paul construes the plight of humanity in Romans: universal human disobedience (Rom 1–3), Adam's sin as the source of all human sin (Rom 5), human enslavement to sin (Rom 6), human

any one of the various ways the problem is construed ultimately risks obscuring the central insight of Paul's theology (the christological solution) in favor of a peripheral argument (plight).

The argument for the retrospective nature of Paul's thought has, if not won the day, at least sidelined the discussion of evil. One of the few direct critics of the solution-to-plight thesis, Frank Theilman, argued that there is a demonstrable pattern in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple literature that runs "from plight to solution" informing Paul's statements about the law and the human plight.[67] Theilman's work, although generally well received, did little to overturn the growing acceptance of Sanders's argument.[68] Even among scholars who still advocate for a proactive role for Scripture in Paul's theology, Sanders's argument for retrospective logic is influential. In reaction to Bultmann, Sanders has moved Pauline scholarship away from discussing evil to focus on Christology. Sanders's reaction to Bultmann has been taken up by the "Apocalyptic School" of Pauline interpreters who have turned his exegetical argument into a theological commitment.

1.3.2 Martyn, de Boer, and Campbell: Christological Apocalypse

Although eschatologically orientated accounts of Paul's theology go at least as far back as Albert Schweitzer (1875–1965), it is in the work of Ernst Käsemann and his heirs that

---

bondage under the law and flesh (Rom 7:1–6), and human helplessness because of the domination of sin (Rom 7:14–25).

[67] Theilman, *From Plight to Solution*, 28. Other detractors from the solution-to-plight thesis include: Timo Eskola, *Theodicy and Predestination in Pauline Soteriology*, WUNT 100 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 273; Daniel Boyarin, *A Radical Jew: Paul and the Politics of Identity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), 44–45, 121; Wright, *Paul and His Recent Interpreters*, 77–8.

[68] See E. Elizabeth Johnson, review of *From Plight to Solution: A Jewish Framework for Understanding Paul's View of the Law in Galatians and Romans*, by Frank Theilman, JBL 110 (1991): 350–353.

an "apocalyptic" interpretation of Paul comes to fruition.[69] Perhaps Käsemann's most notable student, J. Louis Martyn (1925–2015), combined Sanders's solution-to-plight thesis with Käsemann's enthusiasm for apocalyptic. The result of Martyn's combination is that retrospective logic becomes an epistemological necessity of Paul's gospel.

J. Louis Martyn's case for the apocalyptic nature of Paul's theology was revealed in the most unlikely of places, a commentary on Galatians.[70] In a genre not typically known for new interpretations, Martyn's commentary is creative and imaginative. He invites his readers to come to Galatians "like coming in on a play as the curtain is rising in the third or fourth act" complete with "high drama," a complicated relationship between Paul and the Galatian churches, and shadowy outsiders who threaten this relationship.[71] Crucial to Martyn's reading is this third element, the outsiders whom he refers to throughout as "Teachers."[72] The Teachers serve as the foil to Paul's theology.

---

[69] Albert Schweitzer, *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*, trans. William Montgomery (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1953), esp. 52–74. See Matlock, *Unveiling the Apocalyptic Paul*, 186–246.

[70] J. Louis Martyn, *Galatians*, AB 33A (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997). The same year he published a collection of essays as a companion to his commentary: J. Louis Martyn, *Theological Issues in the Letters of Paul* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1997). Galatians is a surprising choice since the letter lacks material that Pauline scholars typically identify as "apocalyptic" (e.g. 1 Cor 15:20–28, 51–57; 1 Thess 4:13–5:11). J. Christiaan Beker thought of Galatians as an obstacle to an apocalyptic interpretation of Paul:"Galatians threatens to undo what I have posited as the coherent core of Pauline thought, the apocalyptic coordinates of the Christ-event that focus on the imminent, cosmic triumph of God" (*Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in Life and Thought* [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980], 58).

[71] Martyn, *Galatians*, 13.

[72] Martyn makes a point not to refer to the Teachers as "opponents" because he finds that label "reductionistic" on two counts: first, Paul considers the Teachers opponents of God not just himself, and second, Martyn thinks the Teachers had a Gentile mission independent of Paul that came into conflict as they encountered the Pauline churches in Galatia (Martyn, *Galatians*, 117).

In Martyn's reconstruction the Teachers view of evil is opposite Paul's in every way.[73] Building on explicit references and allusions to the Teachers in Galatians (1:6–9; 3:1–2, 5; 4:17; 5:7–12; 6:12–14), as well as works from Diaspora Judaism and "Christian-Judaism," Martyn reconstructs a portrait of the Teachers' theology, complete with an imagined sermon from their lips.[74] In Martyn's reconstruction the Teachers "find in the Law the absolute point of departure for their theology" such that "whatever they may be saying about Christ [. . .] the Law is itself both the foundation and essence of their good news."[75] The Teachers, in opposition to Paul, privilege Scripture over Christology.

The precedence of law over Christology significantly shapes how the Teachers understand evil. Commenting on Gal 1:4 Martyn sees Paul correcting an existing theological formula. The existing formula, that Jesus "gave himself for our sins" (Gal 1:4, 2:20; see also Rom 4:25; 8:32), has remarkable similarity to a known pre-Pauline tradition in 1 Cor 15:3.[76] Martyn thinks this pre-existing tradition was co-opted by the Teachers to reflect their law-centered view of justification which was "foreign to Paul's

---

[73] John Anthony Dunne points out that this sharp contrast is partially based on Martyn's interpretation of μεταστρέφω in Gal 1:7 ("Suffering and Covenantal Hope in Galatians: A critique of the 'Apocalyptic reading' and its proponents," *SJT* 68 [2015], 1–15, esp. 4–5).

[74] Martyn, *Galatians*, 117–26, 302–6. Particularly important for Martyn's reconstruction are the Diaspora texts Wisdom, Philo, and *Joseph and Asenath* and what he refers to Christian-Jewish texts the Pseudo-Clementine *Epistle of Peter to James* and *Ascents of James* as well as the canonical Epistle of James and Gospel of Matthew.

[75] Martyn, *Galatians*, 121 citing Gal 5:3–4. Martyn also cites the superiority of Mosaic law found in Philo, *Mos*. 2.12–44 and the notion of Mosaic law as the cosmic law found in Wisdom of Solomon (esp. Wis 6:17–20; 18:4). Later Martyn writes of the Teachers, "They view God's Christ in the light of God's Law, rather than the Law in the light of Christ. This means that, in their christology, Christ is secondary to the Law" (*Galatians*, 124).

[76] Martyn, *Galatians*, 88–89.

own theology."[77] The Teachers' doctrine of justification is contrasted with Paul's precisely in its anthropological focus. They understand justification as "a drama in which there are three actors: sinful human beings, Christ, and the God of the covenant who has accomplished in the blood sacrifice of Christ the true forgiveness of human sins."[78] For the Teachers, "justification" is concerned with an explicitly anthropologically centered view of evil, human sin.

Contrasted with the Teachers in every way, Paul's view of evil is explicitly cosmological. According to Martyn, evil can only be accurately perceived in the light of the cross. He comes to this conclusion, in part, by combining Sanders's solution-to-plight thesis with Karl Barth's doctrine of revelation: "It was from the event of Christ's crucifixion—perceived to be God's redeeming deed—that Paul came to know the true nature of the human plight."[79] Unlike the Teachers, Paul's theology privileges Christology over Law, and it must do so. Paul's gospel is "apocalyptic," meaning that it is an announcement of God's invasion of the present evil age through the sending of his son and the Spirit.[80] This invasion has created an "epistemological crisis."[81] A new christological age has invaded the old law age, but the Teachers are still thinking

---

[77] Martyn, *Galatians*, 90. He identifies Rom 3:25 as a similar formula but again corrected by Paul (Martyn, *Galatians*, 89).

[78] Martyn, *Galatians*, 272.

[79] Martyn, *Galatians*, 95 fn. 43. He makes the same connection between Sanders and Barth in Martyn, 266 fn. 163. See also J. Louis Martyn, "The Apocalyptic Gospel in Galatians," *Int* 54 (2000): 246–266, here 250 fn. 10. See the critique of Dunne "Suffering and Covenantal Hope in Galatians" 3–5. Also, Bruce McCormack, "Can we still speak of 'Justification by Faith'? An in-house debate with Apocalyptic readings of Paul," in *Galatians and Christian Theology*, 159–84; Philip G. Ziegler, "Some Remarks on Apocalyptic in Modern Christian Theology," in *Paul and the Apocalyptic Imagination*, eds. Ben C. Blackwell, John K. Goodrich, and Jason Maston (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2016), 199–216.

[80] Martyn, *Galatians*, 99.

[81] The gospel cannot be "visible, demonstrable, or provable in the categories and with the means of perception native to [. . .] existence determined solely by the present evil age" (Martyn, *Galatians*, 104). On this point see Martyn, *Theological Issues*, 89–110.

according to the categories of the law.[82] The true nature of the problem cannot be understood by the Teachers whose theology is based not on the solution (christological invasion) but a flawed notion of evil derived from the Mosaic law. By combining Sanders and Barth, Martyn makes retrospective logic an epistemological necessity of Paul's apocalyptic gospel.

This epistemological necessity is rooted in the cosmological significance Martyn attributes to evil. The Teachers' doctrine of justification is the plight-to-solution, anthropological formula of forgiving sin (Gal 1:4a), a three-actor drama. But Paul re-interprets this formula adding "in order to rescue us from this present evil age" (Gal 1:4b). This re-interpretation gives cosmological significance to justification introducing a fourth actor to the drama, "anti-God powers":

> With the appearance of these anti-God powers, the landscape is fundamentally changed, indicating that what has really gone wrong and what is really involved in God's making it right in the whole of the cosmos.[83]

This cosmological view of evil indicates that "the need of human beings is not so much forgiveness of sins as deliverance from malignant powers that hold them in bondage."[84] The epistemological necessity of the solution-to-plight thesis is based on Martyn's understanding of evil as a profoundly cosmological problem and not an anthropological problem as asserted by the Teachers and Bultmann.

---

[82] Central to Martyn's account of this epistemological crisis is τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου in Gal 4:1–11.

[83] Martyn, *Galatians*, 272. Martyn identifies these anti-God powers as the law (Gal 3:10, 13), Sin (3:22), and τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου (4:3). In the footnote to the sentence quoted above Martyn confirms Käsemann's interpretation of the controversial phrase δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ. Käsemann defines δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ as "God's sovereignty over the world revealing itself eschatologically in Jesus" (*New Testament Questions of Today*, 180).

[84] Martyn, *Galatians*, 273, see also 90, 97.

Martyn's bold, apocalyptic reconstruction of Paul's theology is by no means universally accepted.[85] However, his reading has been widely influential, particularly in the work of his former student Martinus C. de Boer. It was de Boer who did the heavy lifting in the primary literature of Jewish apocalyptic texts. In the most detailed work on Jewish apocalyptic literature from the "Apocalyptic school" de Boer identifies two tracks of Jewish apocalyptic, a "cosmological" track (Käsemann) and a "forensic" track (Bultmann).[86] Track 1 (cosmological) is found most purely in the Book of Watchers. According to track 1, the present age is under the rule of angelic powers who will be confronted by God in an eschatological battle.[87] Track 2 (forensic) is found most purely in 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch. According to track 2, the present age has been corrupted by Adamic humanity's willful rejection of the Creator. God responds to this rejection not with a cosmic battle but forensic judgment.[88] Even though de Boer admitted that the two

---

[85] See the criticisms of Jason Maston, "The Nature of Salvation History in Galatians," *JSPL* 2 (2012): 89–103; Wright, *Paul and His Recent Interpreters*, 167–86; Dunne, "Suffering and Covenantal Hope in Galatians," 1–15; J. P. Davies, "What to Expect when you're Expecting: Maternity, Salvation History, and the 'Apocalyptic Paul'," *JSNT* 38 (2016): 301–315.

[86] The "two tracks" first appeared in de Boer, *Defeat of Death*, 83–91 and has since appeared in several of his subsequent publications including: "Paul and Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology," in *Apocalyptic and the New Testament: Essays in Honor of J. Louis Martyn* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989), 169–190; "Paul and Apocalyptic Eschatology," in *Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism: Volume I: The Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity*, ed. John J. Collins (New York: Continuum, 1999), 345–83; *Galatians: A Commentary*, NTL (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2011), 31–5; "Apocalyptic as God's Eschatological Activity in Paul's Theology," in *Paul and the Apocalyptic Imagination*, 45–63, esp. 53–59. de Boer explicitly recognizes the influence of the Bultmann/ Käsemann debate in his portrait of the two tracks ("Paul and Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology," 181). Martyn invokes de Boer's two tracks model as "essential to the reading of Galatians," with the Teachers holding a forensic eschatology and Paul holding a cosmological eschatology (*Galatians*, 97–98, fn. 51).

[87] de Boer, "Paul and Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology," 174–5. de Boer cites the following texts as representative of Track 1: Gen 6:1–4; 1 En. 6–19; 64:1–2; 69:4–5; 86:1–6; 106:13–17; Jub. 4:15, 22; 5:1–8; 10:4–5; T. Reu. 5:6–7; T. Naph. 3:5; CD 2.17–3:1; 2 Bar. 56:12–15; LAB 34:1–5; Wis 2:23–24; Jude 6; 2 Pet 2:4.

[88] de Boer, "Paul and Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology," 175–6. de Boer cites the following texts as representative of Track 2: especially 4 Ezra 3:5–7, 20-21; 4:30-31; 7:118-19; 2 Bar. 17:2-3; 23:4; 48:42-43; 54:14, 19; 56:6; as well as 1 En. 69:6; Jub. 3:17-25; 4:29-30; LAB 13:8-9; Sir 25:24; Wis 10:1; 2 Cor 11:3; 1 Tim 2:13–14; 1 Cor 15:21–22; Rom 5:12–21. In track 2 judgment is not a cosmic battle but rather

tracks are merely "heuristic models," not always separate and occasionally overlapping, he identifies the value of the models in explaining texts that "qualify or reject, sometimes quite explicitly track 1."[89] He sees this qualification/rejection in Ben Sira (15:14–15; 21:27; 25:24), the Epistle of Enoch (1 En. 98:4–5), Psalms of Solomon (9:4–4), 4 Ezra (esp. 7:127–29), and 2 Baruch (56:11–15). His perception of the contrast between these two models forms the basis of his reading of Paul.

When de Boer applies the two-track heuristic to Paul, he finds a clear movement in the Apostle's thought toward track 1 (cosmological). Consider, for example, the way de Boer extends Martyn's reading of Galatians to the epistle of Romans. In Rom 1:1–5:11 de Boer finds track 2 (forensic) dominating. In contrast, track 1 (cosmological) is more prominent in Rom 6:1–8:38. In Rom 5:12–21 de Boer sees "the two tracks completely interpenetrate, though the passage marks the shift from predominantly forensic to predominantly cosmological categories in Paul's argument."[90] Like Martyn's reading of Gal 1:4, de Boer interprets Paul correcting the mistaken theology of the Roman (Jewish?) believers in Rom 5:12–21 by supplementing their forensic view of justification with his cosmological view.[91] Although de Boer admits that importance of Adamic traditions for the track 2 (forensic) view of evil, he argues that Paul's use of this tradition is merely an acquiescence to his Roman conversation partners. In de Boer's

---

"a courtroom in which all humanity appears before the bar of the Judge" ("Paul and Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology," 176).

[89] de Boer, "Paul and Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology," 177. de Boer sees the tracks converge in 1QS I–IV; 1QM; CD; Jub., and T. 12 Patr.

[90] de Boer, "Paul and Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology," 182.

[91] de Boer, *Defeat of Death*, 155–56, 161–65, 172–73.

view, Paul moves away from a forensic eschatology toward an apocalyptic cosmological eschatology.

It is not difficult to see that de Boer extended Martyn's "Apocalyptic" Paul based on Galatians to Romans and 1 Corinthians. Accordingly, de Boer mythologized death as an anti-god power, or as de Boer puts it: "a quasi-angelic, cosmological power."[92] Douglas Campbell likewise took Martyn's reading of Galatians and applied it to Romans, finding an equally threatening Teacher who is responsible for an inadequate soteriology that Paul recounts in Rom 1–3 only to correct in Rom 5–8.[93] Campbell also insists that Martyn's account of "Apocalyptic epistemology" is the "sine qua non of valid Pauline interpretation."[94] These "apocalyptic" readings all share Martyn's basic thesis that evil is a cosmological problem which can only be understood based on Paul's Christology.

1.3.3 Watson, Hays, and Wright: Christology and Scripture

Both Sanders and Martyn assume that Paul's Christology dominates his thought to such a degree that Scripture is overwhelmed by it. Other scholars have protested this assumption, arguing that an unequivocal preference for Christology is too dogmatic to be applied to Paul. Specifically, Francis Watson argues for a hermeneutical circle in which Christology and Scripture are mutually interpretive in the shaping of Paul's theology. Likewise, Richard Hays advocates that Paul rereads Scripture through the lens of

---

[92] de Boer, *Defeat of Death*, 139; see also 179; de Boer, "Paul's Mythologizing Program in Romans 5–8," in *Apocalyptic Paul: Cosmos and Anthropos in Romans 5–8*, ed. Beverly Roberts Gaventa (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2013), 1–20.

[93] Campbell, *Deliverance of God*, 495, 506–11. Campbell is followed by Chris Tilling, "Paul, Evil, and Justification Debates," in *Evil in Second Temple Judaism and Early Christianity*, 190–223, esp. 218–220.

[94] Douglas Campbell, "Apocalyptic Epistemology: The *Sine Qua Non* of valid Pauline Interpretation," in *Paul and the Apocalpytic Imagination*, 65–85. Campbell thinks knowing Christ "according to the flesh" in 2 Cor 5:16 "almost certainly means, from a created and fallen location 'in Adam'" ("Apocalyptic Epistemology," 66).

Christology. N. T. Wright adopts a similar method and applies this logic specifically to the question of evil in Paul's theology.

Francis Watson protests Sanders's description of Pauline hermeneutics as being inaccurately one directional.[95] Could Paul's robust scriptural commitments merely be overwhelmed by Damascus? Perhaps, but Watson argues to the contrary:

> Without scripture, there is no gospel; apart from the scriptural matrix, there is no Christ. The Christ who sheds light on scripture is also and above all the Christ on whom scripture simultaneously sheds its own light.[96]

Rather than a one directional determination, Watson suggests a hermeneutical circle between Christ and Scripture. Certainly, Watson sees Paul's Damascus road revelation shaping how the apostle reads Scripture, but he does not think the revelation can simply overrule Scripture. The two sources (Scripture and Christology) interpret one another to shape Paul's theology. In Watson's view, "Paul's doctrine of righteousness by faith is an exercise in scriptural interpretation and hermeneutics."[97]

Watson rejects a one-direction hermeneutical determination in a similar way to Richard Hays. While affirming an apocalyptic interpretation of Galatians that emphasizes the divine initiative for salvation and a two-age scheme, Hays rejects the notion that such an interpretation requires radical discontinuity with Israel's history. Instead, he argues:

> Paul's understanding of the new age in Christ leads him not to a *rejection* of Israel's sacred history but to a *retrospective hermeneutical transformation* of Israel's story in light of the story of God's startling

---

[95] Francis Watson commenting on an excerpt from Sanders (*PL&JP*, 46), writes: "christology determines how scripture is read, but christology itself is not determined by the reading of scripture" (*Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith* [New York: T&T Clark, 2004], 16).

[96] Watson, *Paul and the Hermenutics of Faith*, 17. Here Watson cites 1 Cor 15:3–4.

[97] *Paul and the Hermenutics of Faith*, 76. Watson interprets Paul's hermeneutic as a duality found in Scripture itself, identifying two conflicting voices within Scripture, voices that represent different perspectives of agency: "In its prophetic voice, scripture speaks of the (positive) outcome of God's future saving action; in the voice of the law, it speaks of the (negative) outcome of the human action that the law itself had previous promoted."

> redemptive actions . . . this requires a dramatic rereading of Israel's story, but what is required is precisely a *rereading*, not a repudiation.[98]

Hays and Watson both recognize that Paul begins with his Christology when he comes to Scripture, but he still comes to the Scriptures to shed further light on his Christology.

In his much-anticipated tome on Pauline theology, N. T. Wright nuances Sanders's solution-to-plight thesis, adopting an approach like Watson and Hays. Where Wright differs from Watson and Hays, however, is that he sees Scripture as Paul's starting point.[99] Wright acknowledges that Paul's original conception of the problem of evil was radically altered by his Damascus road revelation.[100] Still, he maintains that Paul's view of evil was fundamentally shaped by the chief problem of Second Temple Judaism, exile.

Consider how Wright applies this approach to evil. He begins by suggesting that any monotheistic theology is forced to address the problem of evil, and that there are two types of solutions to the problem. On the one hand, there are "analytical" solutions, which he defines as attempting to "understand what is going on." Then, on the other hand, there are "practical" solutions, which are more interested in "lessening or alleviating the actual evil and its effects, or rescuing people from it."[101] Wright claims that Jews in the Second Temple period typically provided analytical solutions by appealing to

---

[98] Richard B. Hays, "Apocalyptic *Poiēsis* in Galatians: Paternity, Passion, and Participation," in *Galatians and Christian Theology*, 200–219, here 204. See also Richard B. Hays, *The Conversion of the Imagination: Paul as Interpreter of Israel's Scripture* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005).

[99] Wright interprets Watson following Sanders's solution-to-plight thesis (N. T. Wright, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*, COQG 4 [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2013], 748 citing Watson, *Paul and the Hermenutics of Faith*, 426).

[100] Wright, *PFG*, 750–51. On the Damascus road Paul "was provided with a 'solution' to a problem far deeper and darker than the problem he had been addressing. [. . .] Paul was like a man who, on the way to collect a prescribed medication, studies the doctor's note and concludes from the recommended remedy that his illness must be far more serious than he had supposed."

[101] Wright, *PFG*, 737–739. The citations are from 737.

four different scriptural narratives, which were not necessarily mutually exclusive.[102] Ultimately, Wright claims, the Scriptures lacked a single "coherent account of why 'evil' existed in the good creation," and focused on practical theological solutions.[103] Wright argues that for most Second Temple Jews the pressing problem was exile and oppression under foreign rulers.[104] Against Sanders, then, Wright argues, "Paul already had 'a problem'; all devout Jews did."[105] Wright sees Paul's understanding of the problem of evil set firmly in the context of Second Temple Jewish concern for the problem of exile. In this way Wright is like Watson and Hays in affirming the enduring significance of Scripture and its interpretation in Second Temple Judaism for understanding Paul's theology. Where Wright differs, however, is in his view that "exile" provides the interpretive category for explaining Paul's view of evil.

In Wright's view, Christology reshaped Paul's understanding of the problem of evil, prompting him to rethink Gen 3. Wright sees Paul reconsidering the problem based on three features of his Christology: the cross, the resurrection, and the Spirit.[106] The cross

---

[102] Wright, *PFG*, 740 identifies the four narratives as: 1) Adam and Eve in Gen 3; 2) the "strange angelic powers" of Gen 6:1–4; 3) the Tower of Babel in Gen 11; and 4) the golden calf in Exod 32. Wright offers no exposition of Second Temple texts that appeal to these narratives. In connection with the first narrative (Adam and Eve) Wright references 4 Ezra 6 and 2 Bar; in connection with the fourth (Aaron) he cites *b. Sanh.* 102a (*PFG*, 742 fn. 363). The only secondary source Wright cites (*PFG*, 762 fn. 399) that offers an exposition of any of these sources is Frederick J. Murphy, *The Structure and Meaning of Second Baruch* (SBLDS 78; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985), which focuses solely on 2 Bar.

[103] Wright, *PFG*, 740. On the same page Wright claims: "The various accounts of evil functioned, not as scientific 'explanations', but as signposts to dark and puzzling realities. Human rebellion, idolatry and arrogance, mingled with shadowy forces form beyond the present world, had infected the world, humans and Israel itself. The narratives drew attention to different apparent elements within the problem, and left it at that."

[104] Wright, *PFG*, 744, 139–162; N. T. Wright, *The New Testament and the People of God*, COQG 1 (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 268–72. See also Odil Hannes Steck, *Israel und das gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten. Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung des deuteronomistischen Geschichtsbildes im alten Testament, Spätjudentum und Urchristentum*, WMAT 23 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1967).

[105] Wright, *PFG*, 749.

[106] Wright refers to Leander Keck's claim that Paul "radicalized the apocalyptists' problem" in "Paul and Apocalyptic Theology," 237–39 (*PFG*, 751 fn. 379). There is similarity between Wright's

reveals to Paul that "the 'problem' must have been far worse than he had previously imagined."[107] The problem is not limited to the Gentiles but has infected even Israel, going all the way back to Adam and Eve. Wright, like Sanders, bases Paul's re-formulation of the problem on a reading of Gal 2:15–21. Both Sanders and Wright interpret Gal 2:21 indicating that Paul's understanding of the law changed in the light of the Damascus road.[108] The resurrection reveals the cosmic scope of the problem, and here Wright points to 1 Cor 15:20–28, a crucial text for Käsemann's argument against Bultmann.[109] The Spirit reveals to Paul the inadequacy of the law and the "real problem" of "Sin and Death" which is traced all the way back to Adam.[110] Wright emphasizes numerous times that Paul rethinks the problem with reference to Adam and that this is a genuinely new insight:

> It is part of the 'newness' of the gospel that Paul should probe back into the scriptural story of human origins for clues as to what has gone so badly wrong, far more wrong than he had previously thought. Paul, so far as we can tell, was now out on his own, developing an apparently unprecedented theological account of human sinfulness traced back to Adam himself, providing the platform from which he could explain how it was that *Israel*, *too*, *was in Adam*, with Torah merely intensifying that plight.[111]

For Wright, then, Paul's Christology prompts him to reread Scripture and the result is a new understanding of the problem of evil that implicates all of humanity by reference to

---

position that Paul's Damascus Road revelation forces him to rethink the problem of evil drawing a conclusion about Adam in the same way the destruction of Jerusalem forced the authors of 2 Bar and 4 Ezra to do so with Tennant's interpretation of 4 Ezra (Tennant, *Sources of the Fall*, 222).

[107] Wright, *PFG*, 752.

[108] Wright, *PFG*, 753–55.

[109] Wright, *PFG*, 756–58.

[110] Wright, *PFG*, 762.

[111] Wright, *PFG*, 769; see also 752, 762. Wright goes on to claim that Adamic tradition is significantly present in Rom 1:18–25, 7:1–25, and 9:6–29.

Adam's sin. In Wright's reading the problem of evil is a mediation between Käsemann and Bultmann, evil is both cosmological and anthropological. Also, just like Käsemann and Bultmann, Wright maintains a singular focus on Adamic traditions to understand the origin of evil in Paul's thought.

In addition to asserting the centrality of Adamic tradition, Wright ardently criticizes de Boer's two tracks model for misrepresenting Jewish apocalyptic texts.[112] Wright lampoons de Boer's model as totally foreign to the descriptions of Jewish apocalyptic literature as described by "the major writers on Jewish apocalyptic in the last generation."[113] While the criticism that de Boer has misrepresented Jewish apocalyptic literature is not without merit, it is simply not true that de Boer's model lacks any similarity to experts in apocalyptic literature.[114] One of the foremost specialists on Jewish apocalyptic literature, Michael Stone, argues, "The two explanations of the state of the world, the Enochic and the Adamic, contrast with one another."[115] Similarly, Gabrielle Boccaccini identifies the Enochic view of the origin of evil as the catalyst for the schism between Zadokite and Enochic Judaism.[116] Even John Collins, whom Wright cites in his

[112] The harshest criticism has come from N. T. Wright, *Paul and His Recent Interpreters*, 158–67, but he is not alone. See J. P. Davies, "Evil's Aetiology and False Dichotomies in Jewish Apocalyptic and Paul," in *Evil in Second Temple Judaism and Early Christianity*, 169–189.

[113] Wright, *Paul and his Recent Interpreters*, 163. Wright specifically mentions John Collins and Christopher Rowland.

[114] See, for example, Stuckenbruck, "How much Evil does the Christ Event Solve?" 142–68.

[115] Stone, *Ancient Judaism*, 32. Based on the evidence from Qumran, Stone also writes: "Where the Enochic (and Noachic) pattern was prominent, the Adamic explanation is scarcely mentioned. When the Adamic explanation occurs in other contexts, the Enoch-Watchers tradition is in the background or absent."

[116] Gabrielle Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 72–79; Boccaccini, *Roots of Rabbinic Judaism*, 73–82, 89–103 esp. 90. Boccaccini is heavily indebted to Paulo Sacchi on this point. See Paolo Sacchi, *Jewish Apocalyptic and Its History,* trans. William J. Short, JSPSupp 20 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990), 72–87.

criticism of de Boer, recognizes that "the problem of evil has a generative role in the apocalyptic literature, and that the typical apocalyptic explanation of evil posits a supernatural source."[117] While these scholars do not use the language of "two tracks," they do speak of contrasting narratives about the origin of evil that were perceived, by at least some Jews, as conflicting.[118] Admittedly, de Boer's scheme may be flawed, but he is not alone in identifying different, and perhaps even conflicting, narratives about the origin of evil in Second Temple Judaism.

Wright is correct in his attempt to situate Paul's view of evil in the context of Second Temple Judaism. However, due in part to the nature of his sweeping project, his work lacks sufficient attention to the various ways Second Temple Jews thought of the origin and persistence of evil. As a result, Wright makes claims about evil in Second Temple Judaism that are simply not supported. How drastically does Paul differ from his contemporaries? What about the other scriptural narratives Wright identifies as analytical solutions to the problem of evil? How much of the re-imagining of the problem be attributed to Paul's Christology? Wright's call for rethinking the relationship between Paul's Jewish context and Christology in addressing the problem of evil is necessary. His analysis also shows that there is still a need for significant work to situate Paul's view of evil in the context of Second Temple Judaism.

---

[117] John J. Collins, "The Origin of Evil in Apocalyptic Literature and the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Seers, Sibyls and Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 287–99, here 288. See also John J. Collins, "Creation and the Origin of Evil," in *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Routledge, 1997), 30–51.

[118] Similarly, Martha Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 4–5, 74.

Conclusion: The Present Study

Understanding Paul's view of evil requires placing his arguments in the context of Second Temple Judaism. The Adamic template fails to adequately account for the diversity of Paul's letters as well as the variety of Adamic traditions in Second Temple Judaism. The approach to Paul's view of evil as merely a result of his Christological *novum* abstracts his thought from its Jewish context. Paul's view of evil is more complex than the Adamic template allows and more connected to Second Temple Judaism than the Christological *novum* recognizes.

The present study makes four claims related to Paul and Second Temple Judaism. First, Paul's argument in Galatians, esp. Gal 3:19–4:11 is informed by Enochic tradition (chapters two and five). Second, among first century Jews, Adamic and Enochic traditions were not separated as inherently incompatible (chapter three). Rather, Jewish authors commonly cited multiple traditions to articulate their theology of evil. The incorporation of multiple traditions creates a mixed template, a creative combination of traditions. Third, the function of Adamic and Enochic traditions are determined by the contexts in which they appear (chapters three and four). Adamic tradition, for example, does not necessarily indicate that evil is an essentially human problem that absolves God (chapter three). Likewise, Enochic tradition does not blame God for evil and abdicate human culpability (chapter four). These traditions do not conform to strict patterns of meaning in the ways that modern scholarship often assumes. Fourth, an Enochic reading of Galatians 3:19–4:11 is supported by the early reception of Paul (chapter six). Among second century Christian apologists, Paul's arguments in Galatians are redeployed and

explicitly combined with an Enochic narrative. These four claims represent the central arguments of this study.

The next chapter problematizes an Adamic reading of Galatians based on similarities between Galatians and Romans. Although there are profound similarities in content between the two letters, Galatians is earlier and must be read without recourse to Romans to explain Paul's logic. Not only is it methodologically suspect to appeal to Romans to clarify Galatians, but the details of Paul's argument Gal 3:19–4:11 differ from Romans regarding evil. These differences in Galatians are attributed, I argue, to the fact that Paul is indebted to the Enochic tradition in Galatians. Like many Second Temple Jews, Paul identifies superhuman, angelic beings aligned with the Mosaic law and the operations of the cosmos. These operations and the observance of the law are coterminous with the revelation of Jesus as the "Son of God" who has radically altered the cosmos through his redemptive death and resurrection.

This reading of Galatians is a departure from how Pauline scholars have typically understood Paul's view of evil based on the Adamic template. It is therefore necessary to review Adamic traditions in Second Temple Judaism, the subject of chapter three. An overview of Second Temple texts most commonly cited by Pauline scholars to substantiate the Adamic template will show that most of these Jewish texts do not support the narrative of an Adamic Fall as it is often conceived. Adamic tradition is typically combined with other traditions to explain evil. Also, Adamic tradition does not function to absolve God of evil and shift the blame to humanity. Elements of this narrative are popular among both Pauline specialists and scholars of Second Temple Judaism. The

third chapter deconstructs the Adamic template, the view that Adamic tradition defined Jewish thought regarding the origin of evil and assumed in Pauline scholarship.

Having problematized the Adamic template, the fourth chapter focuses on the widely influential Enochic tradition found in the Book of Watchers and Jubilees. The earliest extant expression of the influential Enochic tradition is found in the Book of Watchers (BW). A close analysis of the BW shows that evil originates with rebellious angels and persists in their demonic offspring. At the same time, and without further explanation, human beings are held responsible for their sins. In the reception of the BW in Jubilees, there is an attempt to clarify how angelic rebellion relates to human responsibility. The resulting view of evil is that obedience to the Mosaic law becomes apotropaic, protecting Abraham's heirs from superhuman evil.

The fifth chapter returns to Galatians to demonstrate the presence of Enochic and Jubilean traditions. I argue that Paul's view of cosmic corruption, the portrait of his opponents, and his Christology are shaped by the Enochic tradition. Paul's view of corruption and redemption has significant consequences for his view of the law. The valid function of the law was to offer protection from evil, a view found in Jubilees. Unlike Jubilees, however, Paul aligns the Mosaic law with the corrupt cosmos that is passing away in the advent of Christ. For Paul, the law's formerly valid protective function has ended. Chapter five argues that Paul's view of evil, his Christology, and his arguments about the Mosaic law were influenced by Enochic and Jubilean traditions.

The sixth and final substantive chapter shifts to the early Christian apologists, especially Justin Martyr. The second century apologists are important to this project in two ways. First, Justin and Athenagoras support the claim that Enochic tradition has

influenced Galatians. An Enochic interpretation of Galatians is not a radical innovation but validated by reception history. Second, Justin's corpus represents another example of the mixed template, combining Adamic and Enochic traditions to explain evil. As a result, Justin provides more evidence for the mixed template view of evil found in chapter three. Justin, like Paul and many other Second Temple Jews, articulates his theology of evil with a mixed template.

CHAPTER TWO: REFRAMING EVIL IN GALATIANS

As demonstrated in the introduction, there are two common approaches to explaining the origin and persistence of evil in Paul's thought, the Adamic template or Christological *novum*. Either the origin of evil is found in Paul's interpretation of Gen 3 or the problem of evil is eclipsed by his Christology. Because the Adamic template is based on exegesis of Rom 5:12–21 and then extrapolated as essential to Paul's theology, it is necessary to demonstrate where the Adamic template fails to explain Paul's arguments about evil elsewhere in his letters. The inability of the Adamic template to explain Paul's view of evil is particularly acute in Gal 3:19–4:11.

Perhaps one of the most notable attempts in last half century to identify an implicit narrative in Paul's argument in Galatians 3–4 is Richard B. Hays's case for a "narrative substructure" in which "salvation hinges upon the faithfulness of Jesus Christ."[1] More recently, N. T. Wright makes a similar, though much broader, argument for Paul's "implicit worldview" as a "storied worldview" that has a main plot and multiple subplots that narrate Paul's theology.[2] One of Wright's major subplots is the "Story of Torah," which can only be properly understood in relation to Adam's fall. In Wright's view, "Paul has the creation stories of Genesis 1 and 2, and the tragic story of

---

[1] Hays, *The Faith of Jesus Christ: The Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1–4:11*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 205. Hays summarizes his view of Paul's argument in Gal 3:1–4:11 as "Christians are justified/redeemed not by virtue of their own faith but because they participate in Jesus Christ, who enacted the obedience of faith on their behalf. Abraham is understood by Paul not as an exemplar of faith in Christ but as a typological foreshadowing of Christ himself, a representative figure whose faithfulness secures blessing and salvation vicariously for others" (166).

[2] Wright, *PFG*, 456–537. Wright identifies the main plot as "God and creation" (475–485), the "main subplot" as "the human vocation, plight, and solution" (485–94), a secondary subplot as "the story of Israel" (495–505) in which is "nested" the "story of Torah" (505–16).

human failure in Genesis 3, as a constant backdrop."[3] Hays notes the contrast between Galatians and Romans in that Adam never appears in Galatians.[4] There is a shared perspective in the two quintessentially Pauline letters that the cosmos is in a dire state and in need of divine rescue, but do the letters share the same view of how the world reached its present state?

Unfortunately, Paul never explicitly identifies the origin of evil in Galatians and his argument requires contemporary readers to reconstruct Paul's view based on his argument, a task inherent to interpreting the complex letter. Because Galatians is written in response to opponents, knowledge about whom is limited to the evidence of Paul's polemical rhetoric (esp. Gal 1:6–9; 3:1; 4:17; 5:7–10, 12; 6:12–13), it is necessary to read between the lines of the letter.[5] Furthermore, there is a proclivity to read Paul, and Galatians especially, in the light of a pattern, theme, narrative, or intertext that is not explicit but lies beneath the surface of the argument.[6] It is necessary to infer subtext in Galatians to understand Paul's response to the opponents.

---

[3] Wright, *PFG*, 486.

[4] Hays, *Faith of Jesus Christ*, 198 fn. 106. In describing Abraham's faith as the initial phase of the gospel story Hays notes: "On the face of the matter, then, the narrative framework of Paul's thought in Galatians seems to differ somewhat from that which is manifested in Romans 5 and 1 Corinthians 15, where the initial sequence concerns Adam. Is this a different story, or yet another sequence in the same epic?" Hays goes on to cite C. K. Barrett's view that Galatians 3 is telling the same story (*From First Adam to Last: A Study in Pauline Theology* [New York: Scribner, 1962], 46).

[5] The identity of Paul's opponents in Galatians is much debated: Bernard H. Brinsmead, *Galatians, Dialogical Response to Opponents*, SBLDS 65 (Chico: Scholars Press, 1982); John M. G. Barclay, "Mirror-Reading a Polemical Letter: Galatians as a Test Case," *JSNT* 31 (1987): 73–93; Barclay, *Obeying the Truth: Paul's Ethics in Galatians* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988), 36–74; In-Gyu Hong, *The Law in Galatians*, JSNTSupp 81 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 97–120; J. Louis Martyn, *Theological Issues in the Letters of Paul* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997), 7–24; Jerry L. Sumney, *'Servants of Satan', 'False Brothers' and other Opponents of Paul*, JSNTSupp 188 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 134–159; Mark D. Nanos, *The Irony of Galatians: Paul's Letter in First-Century Context* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002), 110–316; Thomas R. Schreiner, *Galatians*, ZECNT (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2010), 31–52.

[6] A. Andrew Das surveys and critiques several approaches, pleading for methodological rigor in identifying an implicit hermeneutical key to Galatians (*Paul and the Stories of Israel: Grand Thematic*

The goals of this chapter are to demonstrate the insufficiency of the Adamic template as the narrative to interpret Galatians 3:19–4:11 and to propose a solution. The argument unfolds in three stages. First, a brief overview of the relationship between Galatians and Romans will establish the methodological principle that Galatians as the earlier letter must be read first on its own terms without explanation from the later text of Romans. The common appeal to Romans to explain some of Paul's more enigmatic statements about the law and its relationship to evil are methodologically flawed. Second, I will argue that the Adamic template fails to explain the plural "transgressions" of Gal 3:19. Appealing to Romans to explain Galatians, then, not only misconstrues the chronological relationship between the letters, but also the textual details of Galatians. Third, an Enochic alternative to the Adamic template is suggested to offer a better explanation of the textual details of Galatians 3:19–4:11 in the context of Second Temple Judaism and Early Christianity. Paul's argument in Galatians 3:19–4:11 construes the origin and persistence of evil as well as the human and divine response(s) to evil with an Enochic perspective.

2.1 The Relationship between Galatians and Romans

There are numerous profound similarities between Galatians and Romans, a fact that has led some to suggest they were composed in close chronological proximity. In the nineteenth century Joseph Barber Lightfoot (1828–1889) collected many of the parallels

---

Narratives in Galatians [Minneapolis: Fortress, 2016]). Although not directly addressed by Das, one could add Susan Elliot's argument that the Anatolian cults of Cybele and Attis stand behind much of Paul's argument in Galatians (*Cutting Too Close for Comfort: Paul's Letter to the Galatians in its Anatolian Cultic Context*, JSNTSupp 248 [New York: T&T Clark, 2003]). A similar appeal to the Anatolian cultic context of the formerly pagan Galatians is found in Clinton E. Arnold, "'I Am Astonished That You Are So Quickly Turning Away!' (Gal 1.6): Paul and Anatolian Folk Belief," *NTS* 51 (2005): 429–49. See the evaluation and critique of Elliot and Arnold in Justin K. Hardin, *Galatians and the Imperial Cult: A Critical Analysis of the First-Century Social Context of Paul's Letter*, WUNT 2.237 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 5–10.

between the letters and argued that the resemblance between the two was uniquely close in the Pauline Corpus.[7] The goal of Lightfoot's comparison was to clarify the date of Galatians in the relative chronology of the letters.[8] He argued that Romans must post-date Galatians, a conclusion that has stood the test of time.[9] Later, John Knox argued for the priority of Paul's letters over Acts in determining the chronology of Paul's life and work.[10] Knox correlated Paul's references to the Jerusalem collection as a key to the chronological relationship between the chief letters (Gal 2:10; 1 Cor 16:1–4; 2 Cor 8–9; Rom 15:25–32).[11] Lightfoot placed Galatians and Romans in close chronological proximity based on similarities in content. Knox came to a similar conclusion by coordinating explicit references to Paul's travel plans and collection efforts in his own letters rather than the narrative of Acts.

There have been two recent attempts to develop Knox's approach and combine it with Lightfoot. First, Gregory Tatum supplements Knox's approach by analyzing similarities in content between the letters, arguing that the composition of Galatians

---

[7] Lightfoot, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*, 4th ed (London: Macmillan, 1874), 45–48. Lightfoot considered Ephesians and Colossians the only letters with closer resemblance to one another.

[8] Lightfoot went on to argue, "I cannot but think that we should be doing violence to historic probability by separating the Epistles to the Galatians and Romans from each other by an interval of more than a few months" (*Galatians*, 48).

[9] John Knox expresses support for the possibility that Galatians post-dates Romans to explain the conspicuous absence of travel plans in Galatians and Paul's references to his own suffering (Gal 5:11; 6:12) as imprisonment ("The Pauline Chronology," *JBL* 58 [1939]: 15–29, esp. 27–28). Prior to Knox, a minority advocated the priority of Romans: Carl Clemen, *Die Chronologie der paulinischen Briefe: aufs neue Untersucht* (Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1893), 49–54; W. Foerster, "Abfassungszeit und Ziel des Galaterbriefs," in *Apophoreta: Feschrift für Ernst Haenchen zu seinem 70. Geburtstag am 10. Dezember 1964,* BZNW 30 (Berlin: Töpelmann, 1964), 135–41. It is assumed here that Galatians was written before Romans.

[10] Knox, *Chapters in the Life of Paul* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1950).

[11] Knox, *Chapters in the Life of Paul*, 54–58. Crucial to this view is that Gal 2:10 refers to the Jerusalem collection, a common but debatable conclusion. See Bruce W. Longenecker, *Remember the Poor: Paul, Poverty, and the Greco-Roman World* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 157–219, esp. 184–89.

should be interposed between 1 Corinthians and Romans.[12] Second, Douglas A. Campbell argues that the similarities in content between Galatians and Romans combined with the description of the opponents (see also Phil 3:2–4:3) and the likely reference to the collection (Gal 2:10) suggest that Galatians was written around the same time as Philippians, both just prior to Romans.[13]

Many scholars have followed Lightfoot's argument that Galatians and Romans were written in close proximity and reflect similar perspectives due to profound similarities in content.[14] Perhaps the most extensive comparison of the two letters was undertaken in a dissertation by Udo Borse.[15] While Borse produced a comprehensive comparison of similarities between the letters, Udo Schnelle provides a convenient summary of the most compelling content-based evidence linking the composition of the letters, the structural similarities:[16]

---

[12] Gregory Tatum, *New Chapters in the Life of Paul: The Relative Chronology of his Career*, CBQMS 41 (Washington D. C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2006), 19–48. Furthermore, Tatum proposes Galatians was written between 2 Cor 10–13, which he identifies as the "Letter of Tears" (2 Cor 2:3–4), and 2 Cor 1–9 (49–72). Galatians is also key to identifying the place of Philippians after Galatians but before 2 Cor 1–9 (73–93). The partition theory for 2 Corinthians is a major update to the Lightfoot chronology, which assumed the unity of 2 Corinthians. For Tatum's relative chronology of the undisputed letters, "Locating Galatians is the crux of the matter" (124).

[13] Campbell, *Framing Paul: An Epistolary Biography* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014), 154–73. Campbell argues that Phil 3:2–4:3 was originally part of an earlier letter to the Philippians that was incorporated by Paul into the unified work of Philippians (*Framing Paul,* 125–33).

[14] The lack of evidence makes it difficult to establish with any kind of certainty when Galatians was written. But there is a persistent school of thought that places Galatians in close chronological proximity to Romans including: Charles H. Buck, "The Date of Galatians," *JBL* 70 (1951): 113–22; Gerd Lüdemann, *Paul, Apostle to the Gentiles: Studies in Chronology*, trans. F. Stanley Jones (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 262–63; Udo Borse, *Der Standort des Galaterbriefes*, BBB 41 (Köln: P. Hanstein, 1972), 120–35; Ulrich Wilckens, *Der Brief an Die Römer*, EKK6, 3 vols (Benziger ; Neukirchener Verlag, 1978), 1.47–48; Heikki Räisänen, *Paul and the Law*, 2nd ed. WUNT 29 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987), 8; Udo Schnelle, *Apostle Paul: His Life and Theology*, trans. M. Eugene Boring (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2005), 227–29.

[15] Borse, *Standort*, 26–7. Also, Lüdemann, *Paul*, 21–29.

[16] Schnelle, *Apostle Paul*, 228. Many of these structural similarities are also found in Wilckens, *Römer*, 1.48. For the comprehensive comparison see Borse, *Standort*, 120–35.

Galatians	Romans	Similarity
1:15–16	1:1–5	Apostleship
2:15–16, esp. 2:16	3:19–28, esp. 3:28	Righteousness through faith
3:6–25, 29	4:1–25	Abraham
3:26–28	6:3–5	Baptism
4:1–7	8:12–17	Slavery and Freedom
4:21–31	9:6–13	Law and Promise
5:13–15	13:8–10	Set free to love
5:17	7:15–23	Conflict between willing and doing
5:16–26	8:12ff.	Life in the Spirit

Perhaps the most arresting parallels occur in Paul's arguments for justification by faith (Gal 2:15–16 || Rom 3:19–28), his interpretation of the Abraham narrative (Gal 3:6–25, 29 || Rom 4:1–25), the descriptions of baptism (Gal 3:26–28 || Rom 6:3–5), and the arguments about slavery and freedom (Gal 4:1–7 || Rom 8:12–17).[17] These structural similarities are noteworthy and not to be easily dismissed. They are also particularly frequent in Galatians 3–4.

There are two major obstacles for putting Galatians and Romans in close chronological proximity based on content. First, there is no reason to assume that the similarities in content necessarily reflect a common period of composition. Unless it can be established that some content reveals the tendency of a specific period in Paul's

[17] On the exegetical pattern of Paul's exegesis in Rom 4:3–25 in light of commentary traditions see Michael B. Cover, *Lifting the Veil: 2 Corinthians 3:7–18 in Light of Jewish Homiletic and Commentary Traditions*, BZNW 210 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2015), 48–62.

ministry, chronology cannot be determined based on similarities in the content of the letters. Without the ability to plot the trajectory of Paul's thought chronologically, similarities in content cannot be correlated to a specific period of composition.[18] This raises the second difficulty. Despite the numerous similarities, there are also profound differences between Galatians and Romans. It is precisely the notable disparities between the letters that has led most scholars to place Galatians much earlier than Romans, years before in many cases.[19] The differences seem to indicate development or even correction of Paul's earlier thought. It is important, therefore, to provide a brief description of how scholars have explained these similarities and differences.

Those who place the letters in close chronological proximity account for the differences by appealing to the exigent circumstances of the Galatian letter. The source of the differences, in this case, is Paul's angry rhetoric (1:6–9; 3:1–5; 4:12–20; 5:2–12; 6:11–12).[20] Others simply view Paul as incoherent or inconsistent in regard to the particular differences between Galatians and Romans, especially Paul's view of the law

---

[18] See Campbell, *Framing Paul*, 11–13.

[19] Heinrich Schlier, *Der Brief an Die Galater*, KEK 10 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1949), 18; Johannes Weiss, *Earliest Christianity: A History of the Period AD 30–50*, 2 Vols. trans. Frederick C. Grant (New York: Harper, 1959 [1937]), 296–99; John William Drane, *Paul, Libertine or Legalist?: A Study in the Theology of the Major Pauline Epistles* (London: S.P.C.K, 1975), 140–43; Philipp Vielhauer, *Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur: Einleitung in das Neue Testament, die Apokryphen, und die Apostolischen Väter* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1975), 110–11; Robert Jewett, *A Chronology of Paul's Life* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979); Betz, *Galatians*, 11–12; F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Galatians*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 45–9, 55; R. N. Longenecker, *Galatians*, WBC 41 (Dallas: Word Books, 1990), lxxii–lxxxviii; J. Louis Martyn, *Galatians*, AB 33A (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997), 19–20; Calvin J. Roetzel, *Paul: The Man and the Myth* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999), 182–83; Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, *Paul: A Critical Life* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 180–82; James D. G. Dunn, *Beginning from Jerusalem*, CIM 2 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 720.

[20] Schnelle, 228; Borse, *Standort*, 139.

and the plight of humanity.[21] For many, perhaps the majority, these explanations have proven inadequate for placing Galatians in close proximity to Romans.

Numerous scholars put chronological distance between Galatians and Romans to alleviate the perceived contrast between the sharply negative view of the law in Galatians and the more positive perspective of Romans. John Drane makes this point in his Hegelian reconstruction of Paul's developing views from Galatians (thesis) through the Corinthian Correspondence (antithesis) and finally in Romans (synthesis).[22] Although few have followed his reconstruction, Drane's arguments for dating Galatians prior to Romans are still influential.[23]

Richard N. Longenecker argues that theological similarities between the letters can only be used to date the letter in conjunction with other historical data.[24] This other data inclines Longenecker to adopt an earlier date for the epistle. Then, in regard to the law, Longenecker follows Drane: Galatians must precede the Corinthian correspondence

---

[21] For the view that Paul was incoherent see Räisänen, *Paul and the Law*, 199–202, 228. More nuanced is the position of Sanders, *PL&JP*, 147–48. Specifically addressing chronology, Sanders has recently expressed enthusiasm for the sequence articulated by Gregory Tatum (Sanders, *Paul*, 446–50). See the response to Räisänen's accusations of inconsistency found in T. E. van Spanje, *Inconsistency in Paul? A Critique of the Work of Heikki Räisänen*, WUNT 2.110 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999).

[22] Drane, *Libertine or Legalist?* 135.

[23] Drane points to four reasons why Galatians must have been written some time before Romans (*Libertine or Legalist?* 140–43): First, Drane points to Paul's view of the priority of revelation in Gal 1:11–12 contrasted with his appeal to tradition in 1 Corinthians (11:23–26; 15:1–7). Second, Drane thinks it "almost impossible" that the negative view of the Law (esp. Gal 3:19) could be held at the same time as the composition of Romans. Third, according to Drane, Paul's ethical code in Gal 5:13–6:10, marked by the freedom of the Spirit, is rejected in polemics with Corinthian Gnostics and then given more nuance in Romans. Fourth, Paul's surprise at the Galatian problem (Gal 1:6) would be odd if he had already responded to opponents when he wrote 1 Corinthians.

[24] R. N. Longenecker, *Galatians*, lxxxiv. The other relevant issues for Longenecker are the location of Galatia (lxiii–lxxii) and how to relate the Jerusalem visits in Galatians with Acts, especially Gal 2:1–10 with Acts 11:27–30 and 15:1–30 (lxxii–lxxiii). The location is a thorny problem, but it does not appear to resolve the issue of date.

and Romans in order to explain the negative view of the Law in Galatians (Gal 3:19) that becomes more positive in Paul's later epistles (e.g. Rom 2:17; 7:12, 14, 22; 8:7; 9:4).[25]

Similarly, Hans Hübner accepts Drane's chronology in order to explain what he sees as significant development regarding the law from Galatians to Romans.[26] Hübner goes further than Drane and Longenecker, however, in asserting that Gal 3:19 portrays the law as "the product of demonic angelic powers."[27] Even without going as far as Hübner, Paul's argument in Gal 3:19 is described by Betz as "radically un-Jewish," explicable only as Paul's emotional rhetoric gone too far.[28] Still, for Betz, the different theological positions of Galatians and Romans commend distance between the letters and an earlier date for Galatians.[29] Drane, Longenecker, Hübner, and Betz put chronological distance between Galatians and Romans in order to explain Paul's apparently conflicting positions on the law. Even with radically different interpretations, these scholars posit development in Paul's theology between Galatians and Romans.

Some scholars argue that in Romans Paul is intentionally interpreting or even correcting Galatians. J. Louis Martyn, for example, accounts for the differences between

---

[25] R. N. Longenecker, *Galatians*, lxxxv citing Drane, *Libertine or Legalist?* 142–43.

[26] Hans Hübner, *Law in Paul's Thought*, trans James C. G. Greig (Edinburgh : T&T Clark, 1984), 5–10. Hübner follows Drane's chronology of Gal, 1 Cor, 2 Cor, Rom (*Law*, 9).

[27] Hübner, *Law*, 31. It is worth noting that Hübner speculates that perhaps Paul had Gen 3 on his mind in composing Gal 3:19, citing the "Jewish interpretations of the snake in Gen 3" found in the Primary Adam traditions (*Law*, 32, endnote 61).

[28] Betz, *Galatians*, 165. Betz cites Hans Joachim Schoeps, *Paul: The Theology of the Apostle in Light of the Jewish Religious History,* trans. Harold Knight (London: Lutterworth, 1961), 183: "It is clear that in the heat of the contest Paul had allowed himself to be driven to make assertions which on calmer reflection he could hardly have maintained seriously, if only not to run the risk of ridicule."

[29] Betz, *Galatians*, 12.

the letters by arguing that Romans is the earliest extant interpretation of Galatians.[30] In Martyn's view, Galatians must have strained Paul's relationship with Jerusalem (Gal 2:4–5; 4:25–26; see also Acts 21:18–21) and Antioch (Gal 2:12). Martyn thinks Paul's indifference toward the leadership of the Jerusalem church (Gal 2:6–9; 4:25), his view of the law (esp. Gal 3:19–20, 23; 4:3–5), and Israel (6:16) would have been fodder for Paul's opponents and driven a wedge between the Apostle and Jerusalem. Additionally, Martyn thinks the opponents were likely connected with the Jerusalem leadership. As a result, Paul was anxious about returning to Jerusalem (Rom 15:30–33) and used Romans to clarify his positions on the law and Israel.[31]

Martyn emphasizes that Romans functions as a clarification rather than correction of Galatians. For example, in Galatians Paul describes the law as an "enslaving tyrant," a view that is "carefully nuanced" in Romans by asserting the value of the law (Rom 7:12, 14), while continuing to press its tyrannical role when commandeered by sin (Rom 7:7–11). In both letters, the law is still ultimately unable to give life (Gal 3:21; 5:16; Rom 8:3).[32] Similarly, Martyn sees Paul's description of non-Jewish Christians as the "Israel of God" (Gal 6:16) clarified by Rom 9–11.[33] Despite the difference in articulation, Martyn

---

[30] Martyn, *Theological Issues*, 37–46; Martyn, *Galatians*, 30–34, 350–52, 457–66, 536–40. Based on 1 Cor 16:1–2 Martyn posits that Paul wrote a second, no longer extant, letter to the Galatians with instructions for the collection (*Galatians*, 29–30).

[31] Martyn, *Galatians*, 31.

[32] Martyn, *Galatians*, 31–32. It is worth nothing that Martyn describes Paul's tyrannical view of the law as "foreign to all strains of Jewish and (first-century) Jewish-Christian thought known to us" (*Galatians*, 32). The tyrannical view of the Law is found in Zimri's speech (Josephus *A.J.* 4.141–155) and may inform the logic of the Hellenistic reformers described 1 Macc 1:11. Pollmann argues both Josephus's source and the reformers of 1 Macc 1:11 drew on Greco-Roman criticisms of Law. See Ines Pollmann, *Gesetzeskritische Motive im Judentum und die Gesetzeskritik des Paulus*, NTOA 98 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012), 25–65. Still, she admits that this is rather unorthodox in extant sources and rejected even by those who mention it.

[33] Martyn, *Galatians*, 32–33.

sees Paul's theology as fundamentally the same in both letters, although more nuanced in the latter.

Thomas H. Tobin also views Romans as an interpretation of Galatians. Unlike Martyn, however, Tobin sees Paul intentionally correcting Galatians, reversing some of his earlier positions on the law and Israel. Tobin thinks that Paul "won" the argument with his opponents in Galatia (1 Cor 16:1–4; see also 2 Tim 4:10; 1 Pet 1:1), but at a great cost.[34] As Tobin sees it, the sharp rhetorical dualities of Galatians were too severe even for Paul. The Apostle's pride in following the law prior to his calling (Gal 1:14), the argument that the law is not opposed to the promises (Gal 3:19–25), and Paul's claim that the law is fulfilled (Gal 5:14), all recognize a valid function for Mosaic law, which Tobin views as incompatible with the sharp contrasts elsewhere in the letter.[35] Tobin sees the two positions regarding the law in Galatians (inherent contrast vs. temporal validity) as "ultimately irreconcilable."[36] Yet the arguments for inherent contrast between Mosaic law and faith in Christ were composed in the heat of rhetorical battle, with Paul marshalling arguments that "had a logic that may well have gone beyond what he had either intended or foreseen."[37] In writing Romans, three or four years later, Paul attempted to quell the

[34] Tobin, *Paul's Rhetoric*, 68. Based on Rom 15:25–27 others have speculated that Paul "lost" the argument with the Galatian opponents (Martyn, *Galatians*, 29, 222–28; Bradley R. Trick, *Abrahamic Descent, Testamentary Adoption, and the Law in Galatians: Differentiating Abraham's Sons, Seed, and Children of Promise*, NovTSupp 169 [Leiden: Brill, 2016], 5).

[35] Tobin, *Paul's Rhetoric*, 68–9. Tobin identifies the temporal perspective on the role of the law in Gal 3:19–25 as "quite different from the almost inherent and in-principle opposition of Paul's other arguments against circumcision and observance of the law" (69).

[36] Tobin, *Paul's Rhetoric*, 70. Tobin summarizes these irreconcilable frameworks for the law as: "dialectical" and "temporal" (*Paul's Rhetoric*, 77). He finds the dialectical framework more dominant in Galatians.

[37] Tobin, *Paul's Rhetoric*, 70.

concerns of the Roman believers regarding his rhetoric about the Mosaic law, the status of Israel, and the ethical implications of not following Mosaic law.

Martyn and Tobin share similar approaches to describing the relationship between Galatians and Romans, explaining the similarities and differences as later nuances or corrections of earlier positions. The advantage of this position is that it explains the numerous similarities between the letters while also allowing the differences to stand coherently, neither downplaying their significance nor assuming Paul to be incoherent. Furthermore, as John M. G. Barclay points out, several of Paul's nuancing arguments concerning the law in Romans are in the rhetorical context of diatribe (esp. Rom 3:31; 7:7, 13; see also Gal 3:21), "as if Paul were anxious to head off misreadings of his theology."[38] When it comes to the Mosaic law and Israel, issues that loom large in both letters, Romans appears to interpret, nuance, and perhaps even correct misreading of his earlier letter.

As Martyn, Tobin, and Barclay argue, the similarities and differences between Galatians and Romans are a result of Paul writing Romans later and clarifying or developing earlier positions outlined in Galatians. The implications of this position are that Romans is both useful and potentially problematic for understanding the earlier letter. On the one hand, Romans can offer an example of Paul (re)-interpreting his views.[39] On the other, it is problematic to read the arguments of Romans into Galatians,

---

[38] Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 453.

[39] This phenomenon is also at work in the Corinthian correspondence as argued by Margaret M. Mitchell, *Paul, the Corinthians, and the Birth of Christian Hermeneutics* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010), esp. 5–10.

importing later developments into earlier arguments.[40] The earlier letter must be allowed to stand on its own first and foremost. Only after carefully reading Galatians can the argument of Romans be brought into the discussion of Paul's argument in the earlier letter. It must be kept in mind that in Romans Paul addresses a distinct audience, whom he did not know (Rom 1:8–15; 15:22) and that Paul wrote Romans, at least in part, to gain financial support for a mission to Spain (Rom 15:22–33). It is likely, as Tobin argues, that Paul's heated rhetoric in Galatians generated concerns about his theology of Mosaic law and Israel, concerns that he hopes to allay in Romans. The question addressed here, however, is how does this relationship factor in the interpretation of Gal 3:19–4:11, especially regarding evil.

2.2 The Inability of Romans to Explain Galatians 3:19

In Galatians Paul explicitly connects the function of the law to evil and its institution to angels. As he puts it, the law "was added because of the transgressions . . . having been commanded through angels by the hand of a mediator" (Gal 3:19b). Much attention has been given to the meaning of the relationship between the Mosaic law and transgression, but rarely is the question raised, whose transgressions prompt the addition of the law?

The prevailing assumption among New Testament scholars is that Paul's view of evil's origin, persistence, and relationship to the Mosaic law is determined by his interpretation of Gen 3. In this case, the transgression linked to the giving of the law would be Adam's, or that of Adam's progeny. Crucial to this view is that Galatians is illuminated by Romans. E. P. Sanders, for example, admits that although he would

[40] Ulrich Wilckens, "Zur Enwicklung des paulinischen Gesetzesverständnisses," *NTS* 28 (1982): 154–190. Wilckens places Galatians shortly before Romans.

typically read Romans in light of Galatians, in the case of Gal 3:19, he reverses course "in order to help explain Paul's surprising view."[41] Likewise, Barclay describes the "cryptic notices" of Gal 3:19 and 3:21 as "filled out" by Romans.[42] The hermeneutical key to unlocking Gal 3:19–4:11, then, has often been to appeal to Romans, import Adam, and explain the origin and persistence of evil in relation to the law by reference to Gen 3. As has already been demonstrated, and as Sanders and Barclay admit, this misconstrues the chronological relationship between Galatians and Romans. Furthermore, differences in the respective arguments of the letters regarding the law's relationship to evil leave Paul's argument incoherent.

A crucial difference between Romans and Galatians regarding the law and evil occurs in a rather minor grammatical contrast. Galatians describes the law's purpose as linked to transgressions in the plural (Gal 3:19), whereas Romans explicitly mentions the singularity of Adam's transgression (Rom 5:14). The basic meaning of "transgression [παράβασις]" in the first century is violation of an established standard, which for Paul often means the violation of Mosaic law (Rom 2:23; 4:15).[43] It would be a mistake, however, to limit the meaning of "transgression" to violation of Mosaic law.[44] In Rom

---

[41] Sanders, *Paul*, 530. Sanders cites Rom 4:15; 5:13; 5:20 as illuminating parallels to Gal 3:19.

[42] Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 453, citing Rom 3:20; 4:15; 5:20; 7:7–25. Despite interpreting Gal 3:19 with Romans, Barclay appears to favor reading Gal 3:19 describing the Torah's function as revealing or limiting transgression rather than causing it (403 fn. 34). In the widely influential *TDNT*, τῶν παραβάσεων χάριν is described as "a crisp formulation" of Rom 5:20; 7:7, 13; 8:3 (J. Schneider, "παραβαίν, παράβασις, παραβάτης, ἀπαράβατος, ὑπερβαίνω," *TDNT* 5.736–745, here 740).

[43]The noun παράβασις only appears seven times in the NT (Rom 2:23; 4:15; 5:14; Gal 3:19; 1 Tim 2:14; Heb. 2:2; 9:15).

[44] Although the noun only appears three times in the LXX, παράβασις refers to violation of oaths and unrighteous acts generally (Ps 101:3 [LXX 100:3]; Wis 14:31; 2 Macc 15:10). The verbal form παραβαίνω is more frequent in the LXX, occurring sixty-eight times. Like the noun, the verb broadly describes the violation of a standard. It is often used to describe the violation of a marriage covenant with adultery (Num 5:12, 19, 20, 29; Sir 23:18; 42:10), the violation of the covenant relationship between God and Israel when Israel worships idols and/or other gods (Exod 32:8; Deut. 9:12, 16; 11:16; 28:14; see also

5:14 Paul refers to Adam's transgression which is without Mosaic law. Adam's transgression is the violation of God's command in the Garden, not the violation of Mosaic law.

In Romans the singularity of transgressor and transgression are important for Paul's argument. Paul employs four different nouns for human evil in this passage.[45] Even with shifting vocabulary, however, the singularity of the agent and action remains constant throughout the argument. The singular agent of sin (5:12) and his single act of "transgression" (5:14) is contrasted with the singular Christ "gift [χάρισμα/χάρις/δωρεά]" (5:15). Indeed, Paul mentions the singularity of the agent and/or action of transgression throughout Rom 5:12–21:

Reference	Text	Action/Agent
Rom 5:12	δι' <u>ἑνὸς</u> ἀνθρώπου Through <u>one</u> man	Agent - ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου
Rom 5:12	ἡ ἁμαρτία εἰς τὸν κόσμον εἰσῆλθεν καὶ διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ὁ θάνατος	Action - ἡ ἁμαρτία[46] τῆς ἁμαρτίας

Josh 23:16), and the nation of Israel "breaking" the covenant (Deut 17:20; 4 Kgdms 18:12; Hos 6:7; 8:1; Ezek 16:59; Ezek 17:15, 16, 18, 19; 44:7; Dan 9:5), "violating" the commands of God (Num 14:41; 27:14; Deut 1:43; Josh 7:11, 15; 11:15; 23:16; Sir 10:19; 39:31), or, in mostly later texts, the Torah (Isa 24:5; Sir 19:24; 2 Macc 7:2; 3 Macc 7:10, 11, 12; 4 Macc 9:1; 13:15; 16:24). In Philo the noun παράβασις always refers to the violation of Mosaic Law (*Somn*. 2.123; *Spec*. 2.242; *Legat*. 211). Similarly, Josephus uses παράβασις most often to describe the transgression of Jewish law (*A.J.* 3.218; 5.112; 8.129; 13.69; 17.341; 18.81), but also for the violation of human laws (*A.J.* 18.263, 268, 304; 19.302) or agreements (*A.J.* 2.322). In Philo the verbal form, παραβαίνω, includes both violation of Mosaic Law (*Leg*. 1.51; *Decal*. 176; *Spec*. 2.257; 3.30, 61) and, more generally, the violation of a known standard (*Congr*. 141; *Mos*. 1.31, 242; *Decal*. 141; *Legat*. 25).

[45] The nous are: ἁμαρτία (Rom 5:12[x2], 13 [x2], 20, 21), παράβασις (Rom 5:14), παράπτωμα (Rom 5:15[x2], 16, 17, 18, 20), and παρακοή (Rom 5:19). The only verbal term for human evil in the passage is ἁμαρτάνω (Rom 5:12, 14, 16; see also 2:12[x2]; 3:23; 6:15).

[46] Throughout Rom 5:12–21 ἁμαρτία always appears in the singular with increasing personification. But in the case of Rom 5:12 ἡ ἁμαρτία is connected to the action of Adam. See the emergent account of sin in Matthew Croasmun, *The Emergence of Sin: The Cosmic Tyrant in Romans* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2017), esp. 105–111.

	The sin entered the cosmos and through the sin death	
Rom 5:14	ἐπὶ τῷ ὁμοιώματι τῆς παραβάσεως Ἀδάμ In the likeness of the transgression of Adam	Action - τῆς παραβάσεως Ἀδάμ
Rom 5:15	οὐχ ὡς τὸ παράτωμα Not like the trespass	Action - τὸ παράτωμα
Rom 5:15	τῷ τοῦ ἑνὸς παραπτώματι In the trespass of the one	Agent – τοῦ ἑνός
Rom 5:16	δι’ ἑνὸς ἁμαρτήσαντος Through the one having sinned	Agent - δι’ ἑνός
Rom 5:17	τῷ τοῦ ἑνὸς παραπτώματι In the trespass of the one	Agent - τοῦ ἑνός
Rom 5:17	ὁ θάνατος ἐβασίλευσεν διὰ τοῦ ἑνός Death reigned through the one	Agent - τοῦ ἑνός[47]
Rom 5:18	δι’ ἑνὸς παραπτώματος Through one trespass	Action - ἑνὸς παραπτώματος
Rom 5:19	διὰ τῆς παρακοῆς τοῦ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου Through the disobedience of the one man	Agent - τοῦ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου
Rom 5:20	ἵνα πλεονάσῃ τὸ παράπτωμα In order that the trespass increase	Action - τὸ παράπτωμα
Rom 5:20	οὗ δὲ ἐπλεόνασεν ἡ ἁμαρτία And where the sin increased	Action - ἡ ἁμαρτία
Rom 5:21	ἐβασίλευσεν ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ The sin reigned in death	Action or Agent[48]

Paul is intent to contrast the single man’s (Adam’s) single act (ἁμαρτία, παράβασις, παράπτωμα, παρακοή) and its consequences (sin, death, and condemnation) with the Christ’s single act (χάρισμα [Rom 5:15, 16], ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ [Rom 5:15], ἡ δωρεὰ ἐν

[47] The second occurrence of τοῦ ἑνός in Rom 5:17 could, grammatically, be a reference to either Adam (agent) or the trespass (action). The repetition and the context of Rom 5:17 suggests that the first two instances of τοῦ ἑνός refer to the agent Adam since the third refers to the agent Jesus.

[48] By Rom 5:21, Sin has become a tyrant with its own agency.

χάριτι [Rom 5:15], δικαίωμα [Rom 5:16, 18], ὑπακοή [Rom 5:19]) and its ensuing consequences (righteousness, life, and justification).[49] There is much to debate about Rom 5:12–21, but the singular agent Adam and the disastrous consequences of his single action of transgression are abundantly clear.[50]

Paul's account of Adam's transgression does not address evil as such but only moral evil. In Romans Paul is concerned to refute those who accuse him of teaching "Let us do evil in order that good might come" (Rom 3:8). A similar accusation is raised immediately after Paul concludes his Adam/Christ comparison, "Shall we remain in sin, *in order that the grace increase* [ἵνα ἡ χάρις πλεονάσῃ]?" (Rom 6:1). As Tobin points out, the structure of Romans 6–7 is defined by five rhetorical questions concerning the relationship between ethics, grace, sin, and the law.[51] In Paul's view, the Mosaic law is undermined by human evil, which provokes an ethical conundrum about the standard of righteous life.[52] Paul's articulation of the human predicament in Rom 5:12–21 is related

---

[49] The focus on the lone figure of Adam contrasted with Christ is also apparent in 1 Cor 15:21–22, but there is no mention of a singular transgressive act.

[50] Precisely how Adam's sin relates to the rest of humanity is difficult to explain based on the grammar of Rom 5:12 and is not without theological significance. See, for example, John T. Kirby, "The Syntax of Romans 5:12: A Rhetorical Approach," *NTS* (1987): 283–286; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "The Consecutive meaning of ἐφ' ᾧ in Romans 5.12," *NTS* 39 (1993): 321–29; C. E B. Cranfield, "On Some of the Problems in the Interpretation of Romans 5:12," *SJT* 22 (1969): 324–341; Tobin, "Jewish Context of Rom 5:12–14," 170–72; Robert Jewett, *Romans: A Commentary*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), 375–76. Perhaps one of the more illuminating parallels to Paul's thought here is 2 Bar 54.15, 19.

[51] Tobin, *Paul's Rhetoric*, 191. The questions are in Rom 6:1; 6:15; 7:1; 7:7; and 7:13.

[52] Stowers, *Rereading Romans*, 34–36 rightly identifies the ethical function of the Mosaic Law, but I think incorrectly limits the audience of Romans to Gentiles. Cf. Tobin, *Paul's Rhetoric*, 219–250 who argues that Paul's arguments about the law are not limited to Gentiles. Tobin goes on to argue that Rom 3:20; 4:15; 5:13, 20 and 7:1–25 are concerned with demonstrating that "his view of the law is significantly different from what he wrote in Galatians [esp. 3:10, 13; 4:9]" (219). Philo raises the issue of human evil and knowledge (*Deus* 134; see also *Migr*. 130). The problem of human evil and the capacity for Torah obedience is not unique to Paul.

to concerns about the ethical implications of his gospel. How will humanity recognize moral evil as "transgression" without relying on the law of Moses?

The need to explain the ethical implications of his gospel is not only apparent before and after Rom 5:12–21 but also appears at two points in the passage itself. First, Paul's view of the law as revealing evil actions to be sin (Rom 3:20; 4:15) requires him to account for the persistence of evil prior to the giving of the Mosaic law (Rom 5:13–14). He argues that even when sin was not "accounted [ἐλλογεῖται]," prior to Sinai (Rom 5:13; see also 3:20; 5:20), death still reigned (5:14).[53] Death's reign extended to those "not having sinned in the likeness of the transgression of Adam [μὴ ἁμαρτήσαντας ἐπὶ τῷ ὁμοιώματι τῆς παραβάσεως Ἀδὰμ]" (5:14). Based on Rom 4:15, Paul's point in Rom 5:13–14 is that even for those who sinned without knowing the law, because it was not yet given, sin was still evil (see also Rom 1:18–32; 2:12–16).[54] Since this sin was prior to the Mosaic law it could not be accurately categorized as a "transgression [παράβασις]" like Adam's sin because "transgression" is, by definition, the violation of a known law or standard. Those committing evil after Adam but prior to the law (Rom 5:13–14), were unlike Adam, who knowingly violated God's command (see Gen 2:16–17; 3:17). Although ignorant of the law these sinners were still under death's reign. Paul explicitly argues that even before human evil could be recognized as "transgression" by the lights of Mosaic law, it was still evil.

---

[53] The verb ἐλλογέω occurs only twice in the NT (Rom 5:13; Phlm 18) and is otherwise attested only as a technical commercial term in inscriptions and papyri fragments (P. Lond. 2.349.4; BGU 140.32). See H. Preisker, "ἐλλογέω," *TDNT* 2.516. The accounting language is often coordinated with the notion of heavenly records found in Jewish texts: 1 En. 104:7; Jub. 30:19–23; T. Benj. 11:4; 2 Bar 24.1; see also Philo, *Deus* 134.

[54] Brandenburger, *Adam und Christus*, 203; de Boer, *Defeat of Death*, 165–66; Tobin, *Paul's Rhetoric*, 181.

Second, the entrance of the law did not stop the reign of death or sin's persistence. As Paul puts it in Rom 5:20, "but law entered in, in order that the trespass increase [νόμος δὲ παρεισῆλθεν, ἵνα πλεονάσῃ τὸ παράπτωμα]." This short text is complicated for at least two reasons. First, Paul's use of "enter in [παρεισέρχομαι]" is difficult to interpret. The verb has a negative connotation in Gal 2:4, the only other occurrence in the NT.[55] As a result, many scholars interpret Paul demoting the law and ascribing a negative connotation with this verb.[56] Others, however, have pointed out that the verb need not be negative (e.g. Philo, *Ebr*. 157; *QG* 1.51a), and therefore suggest that Paul is simply describing the entrance of the law.[57] Had Paul intended to merely describe the entrance of the law, he could have written εἰσῆλθεν, as he does in Rom 5:12 to describe the entrance of sin into the cosmos. How, then, should the different term be understood?

One of the more illuminating parallels to Paul is found in a roughly contemporary text, Heraclitus's *Homeric Problems*.[58] While Heraclitus can use παρεισέρχομαι with a negative connotation (*All*. 31.7), he can also use it quite positively in the same work (*All.* 62.1). In the positive sense, Heraclitus describes how "reason [νοῦς]," his allegorization

---

[55] Similarly, there is often a malicious intent associated with the stealthy entry this verb frequently describes: Polybius, *Hist*. 2.55.3; Plutarch, *Publ.* 17.2; *Lys*. 8.2; *Luc*. 9.6; *Cic*. 28.1; *Gen. Socr*. 596A; Lucian, *Gall.* 28; *Dial. meretr.* 12.3; Philo, *Opif.* 150; *Abr*. 96.

[56] J. Schneider, "παρεισέρχομαι," *TDNT* 2.682; Brandenburger, *Adam und Christus*, 249–50; Dunn, *Romans*, 1.285–86; Moo, *Romans,* 346–47; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 422; Jewett, *Romans*, 387. Origen associates a demotion of the purpose of the Mosaic law based on this text with Marcion (*Comm. Rom.* 5.6.2). Still, Origen ultimately sees 5:20 as a negative assessment. Crucial to Origen's interpretation of παρεισέρχομαι is his distinction between the "law of nature" (see also 2 Cor 3:3) and the "law of members." According to Origen, the "law" in 5:20 refers to the "law of the members," which resists the law of the mind (*Comm. Rom*. 5.6.3–4; see also Rom 7:23).

[57] Otfried Hofius, "The Adam-Christ Antithesis and the Law: Reflections on Romans 5:12–21," in *Paul and the Mosaic Law*, ed. James D. G. Dunn (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), 165–205, here 198–99.

[58] This text dates to the late first or early second century CE. See Donald A. Russell and David Konstan, *Heraclitus: Homeric Problems*, WGRW 14 (Atlanta: SBL, 2005), xi–xiii.

of Athena, visits Telemachus to teach the young man it is time to grow up, take responsibility, and embark on a search for his long-lost father (*All*. 62.1–63.9).[59] In a similar way, Paul describes the entrance of the law in Rom 5:20, entering the cosmic scene and revealing the truth of the situation. In Rom 5:20 Paul is describing the entrance of the law alongside the existing conditions of Adam's transgression, death's reign, and humanity's sin from the time of Adam to Moses (Rom 5:13–14). The law does not merely enter the cosmos, it "enters alongside" an already dire situation. This odd verb for the law's entrance, then, need not be given a negative connotation.

The second difficulty with Rom 5:20 is the meaning of the ἵνα clause: "in order to increase the trespass [ἵνα πλεονάσῃ τὸ παράπτωμα]." Although there are rare occurrences in the NT of the ἵνα followed by a subjunctive indicating result, the syntactical combination typically indicates purpose.[60] But, what does Paul mean by saying the law's purpose was "to increase the trespass"? Considering Rom 7:7–14, Paul can scarcely mean that the law causes human evil. It may be a re-statement of Paul's view that the law reveals the nature of human evil (Rom 3:20; 4:15; 5:13; 7:7–14).[61] Whatever exactly Paul means by this purpose clause, his argument identifies the law as incapable of

---

[59] "Reason" is also described as a "tutor [παιδαγωγός]" (*All*. 63.2), the same metaphor Paul uses for the Mosaic law in Gal 3:23–25.

[60] Smyth §§ 2193–2206; *BDF* § 369; *BDAG*, 477; C. F. D. Moule, *An Idiom-Book of New Testament Greek*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,1959), 142–46. A clear result clause would be constructed as ὥστε + indicative (ἐπλεόνασε) or infinitive (πλεονάσαι) as in Rom 7:6; 1 Cor 1:7; 2 Cor 1:8; etc. The clearest example of a ἵνα + subjunctive indicating result rather than purpose is probably John 9:2, but similar examples appear in the Pauline corpus: Rom 11:1; Gal 5:17; 1 Thess 5:4. Paul is notoriously difficult to pin down when it comes to the law and ἵνα clauses (Rom 3:19; 5:20; see also Rom 7:13). Still, John Chrysostom emphatically asserts that the ἵνα clause of Rom 5:20 indicates result and not purpose (*Hom. Rom*. 10).

[61] Ferdinand Hahn, "Das Gesetzesverständnis im Römer- und Galaterbrief," *ZNW* 67 (1976–77): 20–63, here 41–47. Moo, *Romans*, 347–48 provides a succinct summary of this and other interpretive options.

counteracting human evil because of the frailty of humanity. Human evil begins with Adam's transgression (Rom 5:12), persists from Adam to Moses (5:13–14), and even increases after the entrance of the Mosaic law (Rom 5:20). Paul's focus, then, is human evil and its persistence viewed from Adam's transgression to the Christ gift, with the Mosaic law revealing human evil for the sin that it is. In this perspective, the only remedy to human evil is the divine Christ-gift.

In contrast to the singular actor and action of transgression, Galatians links the purpose of the law to plural "transgressions" (Gal 3:19). Since the meaning of the word "transgression" describes the violation of an established standard, the "transgressions" of Gal 3:19 must refer to multiple acts of violation. The chronological distance between Romans and Galatians means that the logic of Rom 5:13–14 cannot be pressed too far in explaining Gal 3:19. However, if "transgression" refers to the violation of a known command, then Paul cannot be referring to multiple acts of *human* evil, because prior to the giving of Mosaic law these acts of human evil could not properly be categorized as "transgressions."[62] This is not to say that there was no sin, or human evil generally, between Adam and Sinai (see Rom 5:13–14). Rather, it is to recognize that if Paul is consistent with the term παράβασις, then, the agent(s) of multiple transgression(s) cannot

[62] One could possibly make the case that Paul is referring to the "transgressions" of Adam and Eve (see e.g. 1 Tim 2:14). For such an interpretation to be compelling, however, it would need to be established that Paul is intent to highlight the sin of Adam and Eve as multiple transgressions. A notion that is nowhere evident in Gal 3:19–4:11. Furthermore, even texts that use παράβασις to describe Adam and Eve's sin only do so in the singular. See, for example, George Syncellus's *Chronographia* 14.4–7, which alludes to Jubilees 3:28, 32 describing the ability of animals to speak πρὸ τῆς παραβάσεως τοῖς πρωτοπλάστοις (A. M. Denis, *Fragmenta Psedepigraphorum Quae Supersunt Graece*, PVTG 3 [Leiden: Brill, 1970], 79–80). In the Primary Adam books, Adam tells Eve they must announce to their children "the way of our transgression [τὸν τρόπον τῆς παραβάσεως ἡμῶν]" (GLAE 14.3) and later Eve prays "after having been deceived in the transgression we transgressed your commandment [ἐν τῇ παραβάσει πλανηθέντες παρέβημεν τὴν ἐντολήν σου]" (42:7). For the text of GLAE see Johannes Tromp, *The Life of Adam and Eve in Greek: A Critical Text*, PVTG 6 (Leiden: Brill, 2005). See also 3 Bar. 4.16; 9:7.

refer to humans because they have no law prior to Sinai to reveal the evilness of their action as "transgression." This is especially important because the argument of Gal 3–4 focuses on chronology: the law enters history only after the promise (Gal 3:17–18), and its function is limited to the period before the arrival of the "seed" (Gal 3:19)/"faith" (Gal 3:23, 25)/"Christ" (Gal 3:24)/God's Son (Gal 4:4–5). In Galatians, Paul's argument focuses on the law's significance in the chronological unfolding of the divine economy. Paul needs to explain the role of the law as both part of the divine economy and as inferior to the promise of his gospel. His starting point is not human evil, but rather the function of the law as it relates to evil and the structure of the cosmos.[63] Is the contrast between Adam's singular transgression in Romans and the multiple transgressions that prompt the law merely a difference in focus between the letters, inconsistent language, or is there another reason why Paul refers to multiple "transgressions" in Gal 3:19?

2.3 An Enochic Solution

I will argue that the reason Paul refers to multiple "transgressions" in Gal 3:19 is because he is not referring to human transgressions. Rather, he is referring to the much more common template of evil in Second Temple Judaism, angelic transgressions. This interpretation explains the plural "transgressions" and several other features of Galatians 3:19–4:11.

While the noun παράβασις does not frequently appear in extant Jewish and early Christian literature to describe non-human transgression, the verbal cognate παραβαίνω refers to angelic transgression in the Enochic tradition.[64] In the Enochic *Book of Watchers*

---

[63] The only reference to human evil in the entire passage is Gal 3:22.

[64] In T. Jud. 16.3 there is a reference to human transgression due to drunkenness, the source of which might be identified with the four "evil spirits [πνεύματα πονηρά]" inhabiting wine: "desire, heated

(1 En. 1–36), sinful humanity and rebellious angels are set in sharp contrast to God's created design for the cosmos. In the opening theophany of the work, God's created order is described as a place in which the "luminaries of heaven [. . .] all rise and set, each one ordered in its appointed time; and they appear on their feasts and do not *transgress* [מעברין/παραβαίνουσιν] their own appointed order" (1 En. 2:1).[65] George W. E. Nickelsburg points out that there is a common trope contrasting nature's regular obedience to divine order with humanity's disobedience to divine commands.[66] However, the contrast is not limited to human transgression. Later in the narrative the Watchers are referred to as "the stars of heaven that *transgressed the command of the Lord* [οἱ παραβάντες τὴν ἐπιταγὴν τοῦ κυρίου]" (1 En. 21:6; see also 18:15). Although the source-critical history of the text is complicated, in its final form it is rebellious angels who are

---

passion, debauchery, and sordid greed [ἐπιθυμίας, πυρώσεως, ἀσωτίας, αἰσχροκερδίας]" (16.1; see also T. Levi 10.2). Similarly, in the two ways tradition of *Epistle of Barnabas*, παράβασις is included in a list of soul-destroying vices (Barn. 20.1) presided over by the "angels of satan [ἄγγελοι τοῦ σατανᾶ]" (18:1) who is identified as "the ruler of the present age of lawlessness [ὁ . . . ἄρχων καιροῦ τοῦ νῦν τῆς ἀνομίας]" (18:2; see also Gal 1:4). Earlier in the Epistle, the original source of transgression is "through the Serpent with Eve [διὰ τοῦ ὄφεως ἐν Εὕᾳ]" (Barn. 12:5; see also 3 Bar. 9.7), a dual agency that combines Adamic and Enochic traditions (similarly Justin, *Dial*. 94.2; 112.3).

[65] All translations from 1 Enoch are from George W. E. Nickelsburg and James C. VanderKam, *1 Enoch: The Hermeneia Translation* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012) unless otherwise noted. J. T. Milik with Matthew Black, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976), 145–46 reconstructs the Aramaic of 4QEn[a] ii 1: "and in their constellations they appear and do not transgress their appointed order [ובמעדיהן מתחזין ולא מעברין בסרכן]." The Aramaic עבר appears in the unreconstructed text of 4Q204 Frag. 5 ii, 18 describing the transgressions of the Watchers (1 En. 106:13). For human transgression of commands (Num 22:18; Dan 9:11; CD 15:3–4) or covenant (Josh 7:11–15; 23:16). The fifth/sixth century CE codex Panopolitanus (𝔊[p]) reads: τοὺς φωστῆρας τοὺς ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, ὡς τὰ πάντα ἀνατέλλει καὶ δύνει, τεταγμένος ἕκαστος ἐν τῷ τεταγμένῳ καιρῷ, καὶ ταῖς ἑορταῖς αὐτῶν φαίνονται, καὶ οὐ παραβαίνουσιν τὴν ἰδίαν τάξιν. The Ethiopic translation reads: "how the lights in heaven do not change their courses, how each rises and sets in order, each at its proper time, and they do not transgress their law" (Michael A. Knibb and Edward Ullendorff, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments*, 2 Vols [New York: Oxford University Press, 1978], 2.60–61).

[66] George W. E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch Chapters 1–36; 81–108*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), 152–54 citing Jer 5:20–29; Sir 16:24–30; 1QS III, 15–IV, 26; T. Naph. 3.2–4.1; 1Q34[bis]3 2.1–4; *Pss. Sol*. 18.10–12. On this pattern see Lars Hartman, *Asking for a Meaning: A Study of 1 Enoch 1–5*, ConBNT 12 (Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1979), 51–70.

held responsible for introducing humans to dangerous teachings (1 En. 8:1) thereby fundamentally altering the cosmos (1 En. 80:2–8).[67] In the Book of Watchers, and the Enochic tradition in general, angelic transgressions fundamentally alter the cosmos.

The catastrophic consequences of angelic rebellion are not limited to Enochic literature. In Jubilees angels are portrayed as part of the fabric of the cosmos, created on the first day (Jub. 2:2). More broadly, a relationship between cosmology and angels is evident in the Hebrew Bible and quite common in Second Temple Judaism.[68] Combining Platonic mythology with Genesis, Philo identifies the reason for humanity's capacity for evil with the creative activity of angels.[69] Additionally, Philo is careful to attribute the agency of divine wrath to angels because God is only and always the source of good.[70] The significance of angelic transgression persisted in early Christian literature for centuries.[71] Angels, often associated with the divine ordering of the natural world in a variety of Jewish texts and traditions, are partly responsible for bringing evil into the cosmos.

The multiple transgressions of Gal 3:19, then, are not Adam's but rather those of rebellious angels. It is not surprising to see this explanation of the origin of evil in Paul

---

[67] In the Enochic tradition cosmic phenomena are controlled by angels esp. 1 En. 20:2; 60:17–21; 61:10; 65:8; 66:2; 72:1; 74.2; 75.3; 79:6; 82.8, 10. Maxwell J. Davidson, *Angels at Qumran: A Comparative Study of 1 Enoch 1-36, 72-108 and Sectarian Writings from Qumran*, JSPSupp 11 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992), 92–4.

[68] Ps 104:4; Job 38:7; Wis 13:2; Sir 16:26–30; 11Q5 XXVI, 9–15; *Pss. Sol.* 18:10; 1QH[a] IX, 10–22; 2 En. 29:3; 3 En. 18. See Michael Mach, *Entwicklungsstadien des jüdischen Engelglaubens in vorrabbinischer Zeit*, TSAJ 34 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992), 262–64; Davidson, *Angels at Qumran*, 206–8.

[69] Philo, *Opif*. 72–75; *Conf*. 168–183; *Fug*. 68–72; *Mut*. 30–31.

[70] Philo, *Conf*. 180–181; *Fug*. 66–67; *Decal*. 176–78; *Abr*. 143; see also *Leg*. 3.177.

[71] 1 Pet 3:19–20; 2 Pet 2:4; Jude 6; Justin, *1 Apol*. 5.1–6.1; *2 Apol*. 5.2–6; Tatian, *Orat*. 7–9; 19–20; Athenagoras, *Leg*. 24–25; Irenaeus, *Epid*. 18; *Haer*. 1.10.1; 4.16.2; 4.36.4; Tertullian, *Apol*. 22, 35; *Idol*. 4; *Cult. fem*. 1.2–3; *Or*. 22; *Virg*. 7; Origen, *Cels*. 5.52; *Comm. Jo*. 6.25. See chapter six for relevant secondary literature.

since he alludes to it elsewhere in his corpus. First, while rebuking Corinthian divisions, Paul writes, "Do you not know that we will judge angels?" (1 Cor 6:3). The judgment of angels, which Paul assumes to be common knowledge in the Corinthian church, is an important feature of Enoch's role in the judgment of the Watchers (esp. 1 En. 12:3–13:3; 15:2–3; 16:1–3).[72] Second, a number of interpreters as far back as Tertullian have argued that the Watchers narrative is behind Paul's command in 1 Cor 11:10 for women to cover their heads in worship "because of the angels."[73] Admittedly, an allusion to the Watchers mythology in 1 Cor 11 is disputed.[74] Although these Corinthian references are latent, the

[72] Johannes Weiss, *Der erste Korintherbrief*, KEK 5 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1910), 147–48; Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians*, SP 7 (Collegeville: Liturgical, 1999), 232; Anthony C. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 431; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, AB (New Haven: Yale University, 2008), 252; Roy E. Ciampa and Brian S. Rosner, *The First Letter to the Corinthians*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 228. Early Christian texts obviously influenced by the Enochic tradition are most commonly cited: Jude 6; 2 Pet 2:4. Other relevant parallels include: 1 En. 1:9; 54:5–6; 67–68; 38:6; 91:15; 95:3; 108:12–13; see also LXX Dan 7:22; Wis 3:8; 4:16.

[73] Otto Everling, *Die paulinische Angelologie und Dämonologie: ein biblisch-theologischer Versuch* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1888), 37–38; Martin Dibelius, *Die Geisterwelt im Glauben des Paulus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1909), 13–23; Martin, *Corinthian Body*, 242–245. Most explicitly drawing from the Watchers tradition are L. J. Lietaert Peerbolte, "Man, Woman, and the Angels in 1 Cor 11:2-16," in *Creation of Man and Woman*, TBN 3 (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 76–92 and Loren T. Stuckenbruck, "Why Should Women Cover Their Heads because of Angels? (1 Corinthians 11:10)," *Stone-Campbell Journal* 4 (2001): 205–34. More recent is Scott M. Lewis, "'Because of the Angels': Paul and the Enochic Traditions," in *The Watchers in Jewish and Christian Traditions* (eds. Angela Kim Harkins, Kelley Coblentz Bautch, and John C. Endres, Minneapolis: Fortress, 2014), 81–90. This interpretation appears as early as Justin Martyr (Justin, *1 Apol* 5.2; *2 Apol.* 5.3) and Tertullian (*Virg.* 7; *Idol.* 9; *Or.* 22), although reference to 1 Cor 11:10 is only explicit in Tertullian (*Virg*. 7). In some texts women are (partially) blamed for the angelic rebellion (T. Reu. 5.1–6).

[74] Annette Y. Reed, *Fallen Angels and the History of Judaism and Christianity: The Reception of Enochic Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 178 recognizes this as a disputed reference. Claudia Losekam, *Die Sünde der Engel: Die Engelfalltradition in frühjüdischen und gnostischen Texten*, TANZ 41 (Tübingen: Franke Verlag, 2010), 121–132 does not mention 1 Cor 11:10 at all in her analysis of the Watchers tradition in the NT, presumably excluding it as a citation. Götte, *Von den Wächtern zu Adam*, 130–33 concludes that 1 Cor 11:10 is "kaum eine Rezeption des Wächtermythos" (133). Certainly, if Paul is alluding to the Watcher tradition he has done so more indirectly than other early Christian writers. None of these analyses of the reception history of the Watcher tradition explores its possible significance for Galatians.

ubiquity of the Watcher tradition in both Second Temple Judaism and Early Christian texts makes it likely that Paul would not have felt the need to explain this reference.[75]

As will be shown in subsequent chapters, by the first century the Watchers narrative was both quite common and often appeared alongside the Adamic narrative in various texts explaining the origin and persistence of evil. Furthermore, the context of Galatians 3–4 fits this reading better than the Adamic narrative. In Galatians 3–4 Paul's argument about the law's inadequacy is based not on the human predicament but the state of the cosmos. Paul is concerned in Galatians to demonstrate the sufficiency of Christ as the means of salvation that adequately addresses the origin and persistence of evil, a salvation that cannot be rendered by the observance of Mosaic law. The inadequacy of the law in Galatians is not explained by recourse to human weakness beginning with Adam. Instead the inadequacy of the law is linked to its provisional role in the divine economy (Gal 3:21). This provisional role was suited to the structure of a cosmos wrecked by angelic transgressions. The rather minor difference between Adam's "transgression" (Rom 5:14) and the Watchers' "transgressions" (Gal 3:19) is, in fact, quite profound.

The Enochic interpretation of Galatians 3:19–4:11 does not hinge entirely on the plural transgressions of Gal 3:19. It is also supported by Paul's argument about the "elements of the cosmos." The relationship between the law, "the elements of the cosmos [τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου]," and angels has been a subject of intense interest and profound disagreement. The meaning of the phrase τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου has been especially

[75] In contrast, Paul's interpretation of Gen 3 would have required explanation because it was so unique when compared to extant contemporary Second Temple Jewish literature.

vexing.[76] It would be impossible and unnecessary to review the lengthy history of interpretation here.[77] Along with other parts of Paul's argument in Gal 3:19–4:11, the curious phrase "elements of the cosmos" can be illuminated by Enochic traditions. As many scholars have suggested, Paul's fundamental apocalypticism need not be divorced from philosophical traditions.[78] In this instance, Paul is utilizing a phrase from the philosophical lexicon and combining it with Enochic tradition.

It is clear that the phrase τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου refers to the basic elements of the world, which according to most accounts of ancient physics were air, fire, water, and

---

[76] The phrase occurs only in Galatians (4:3, 9) and Colossians (2:8, 20; see also στοιχεῖα in Heb 5:12; 2 Pet 3:10, 12). The disputed authorship of Colossians further complicates the meaning of the phrase. In addition to commentaries, studies include: Lawrence Edward Scheu, *Die "Weltelemente" beim Apostel Paulus (Gal 4,3, 9 und Kol 2,8.20)*, SST 37 (Washington D. C.: Catholic University of America, 1933); Bo Reicke, "The Law and This World according to Paul: Some Thoughts Concerning Gal 4:1–11," *JBL* 70 (1951): 259–76; Josef Blinzer, "Lexikalisches zu dem Terminus τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου bei Paulus," in *Studiorum Paulinorum Congressus Internationalis Catholicus*, 2 Vols. AnBib 17–18 (Rome: Pontifical biblical Institute, 1961), 2.429–43; Andrew J. Bandstra, *The Law and the Elements of the World: An Exegetical Study in Aspects of Paul's Teaching* (Kampen, Netherlands: J H Kok, 1964); Eduard Schweizer, "Slaves of the Elements and Worshipers of Angels : Gal 4:3, 9 and Col 2:8, 18, 20," *JBL* 107 (1988): 455–68; David R. Bundrick, "*Ta Stoicheia Tou Kosmou* (Gal 4:3)," *JETS* 34 (1991): 353–64; Dieter Rusam, "Neue Belege zu den *Stoicheia Tou Kosmou* (Gal 4,3.9; Kol 2,8.20)," *ZNW* 83 (1992): 119–25; Martyn, *Theological Issues*, 125–40; Clinton E. Arnold, "Returning to the Domain of the Powers: *Stoicheia* as Evil Spirits in Galatians 4:3,9," *NovT* 38 (1996): 55–76; Thomas Witulski, *Die Adressaten des Galaterbriefes: Untersuchungen zur Gemeinde von Antiochia ad Pisidiam*, FRLANT 193 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), 84–152; Martinus C. de Boer, "The Meaning of the Phrase *Ta Stoicheia Tou Kosmou* in Galatians," *NTS* 53 (2007): 204–24; Johannes Woyke, "Nochmals zu den 'schwachen und unfähigen Elementen' (Gal 4.9): Paulus, Philo und die stoicheia tou kosmou," *NTS* 54, no. 2 (2008): 221–34; Stefan Nordgaard, "Paul and the Provenance of the Law," *ZNW* 105 (2014): 64–79.

[77] There are helpful accounts of the history of interpretation in Blinzer, "Lexikalisches," 429–39; Bandstra, *Law and the Elements*, 5–72; Thomas Witulski, *Die Adressaten*, 84–127.

[78] On the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου and Greek philosophy see Christopher Forbes, "Pauline Demonology and/or Cosmology? Principalities, Powers and the Elements of the World in Their Hellenistic Context," *JSNT* 85 (2002): 51–73; Troels Engberg-Pederson, *Cosmology and the Self in the Apostle Paul: The Material Spirit* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 90–92. On the overlap between apocalyptic and philosophy more generally in Paul see David E. Aune, "Human Nature and Ethics in Hellenistic Philosophical Traditions and Paul: Some Issues and Problems," in *Paul in His Hellenistic Context* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995), 291–312; Henrik Tronier, "The Corinthian Correspondence between Philosophical Idealism and Apocalypticism," in *Paul Beyond the Judaism/Hellenism Divide*, ed Troels Engberg-Pederson (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001), 165–196

earth.[79] Ancient conceptions of motion and what a post-Cartesian cosmology might label "natural phenomena," that which animates the elements, varies from angels, the souls of heroes, to daimons, to deities.[80] Philo and the author of Wisdom of Solomon, both aware of Greek cosmology, mock Gentiles who worship the deities or angels that animate these elements.[81] As a result, many scholars interpret Paul's *τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου* as a reference not merely to the elements themselves but also the superhuman forces that animate the elements.[82] The correspondence between angels and elements makes sense of Paul's language and fits the angel infused cosmology of Second Temple Judaism.

---

[79] Blinzer, "Lexikalisches," 439–43; F. E. Peters, "Stoicheíon," in *Greek Philosophical Terms: A Historical Lexicon* (New York: NYU Press, 1967), 180–85; Schweizer, "Slaves of the Elements," 456–64; Delling, "στοιχεῖον," *TDNT* 7.672–77; Rusam, "Neue Belege," 119–25; de Boer, "Meaning of the Phrase *Ta Stoicheia Tou Kosmou*," 205–7; Woyke, "Nochmals zu den 'schwachen und unfähigen Elementen," 221–22; Nordgaard, "Paul and the Provenance of the Law," 78. See esp. Plato, *Tim* 43a, 48b; Cicero, *Nat. d.* 2.23–25, 28–30; Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 7.135–36; Philo, *Opif.* 52, 84, 131, 146; *Cher*. 127; *Det*. 7–8; *Her*. 146–52; *Mos*. 1.96–97; Plutarch, *Mor.* 361c; 367d; 875c; Josephus, *A.J.* 3.183; *B.J.* 1.377. In the mythology of the *Timaeus*, humanity is created by the sublunar gods mixing the four elements with the soul, the "immortal principle of the mortal living creature [ἀθάνατον ἀρχὴν θνητοῦ ζώου]" (*Tim.* 42e–43a).

[80] See esp. Plato, *Tim.* 40d, 43a; Philo, *Gig*. 6–9; *Mos*. 1.96–97; 1.155–156; 2.54–56; Cicero, *Nat. d.* 1.15; Josephus, *B.J.* 6.47; Plutarch, *Def. Or.* 13 [417ab]; *Fac. Lun*. 28–30 [943c–945c]; PGM 12.250; 17b.14; 2 En. 16:7. Although *στοιχεῖα* langauge is not found in the LXX translation, in the Deuteronomistic History worship directed toward the superhuman beings inhabiting cosmic phenomena is condemned (Deut 4:19; 17:3; 2 Kgs 17:6; 21:3) while the existence of these superhuman beings is assumed (1 Kgs 22:19; Judg 5:20; see also Job 38:7). For more on the *στοιχεῖα* in Greek philosophy see chapter six.

[81] Philo, *Spec*. 2.254–255; *Contempl.* 3–4; *Congr*. 104–5; see also *Decal.* 54; Wis 13:1–5. Martyn, *Theological Issues*, 130–31 finds the parallel to Wisdom 13 most instructive and cites Wis 7:17; 19:18; 4 Macc 12:13; *1 En.* 80:7. The same criticism found in Philo and Wisdom occurs in early Christian literature cited alongside Gal 4:3 including: Clement, *Protr*. 5.65; *Strom*. 1.11; Tertullian, *Marc*. 5.4.1.

[82] Everling, *Die paulinische Angelologie und Dämonologie*, 166–76; Dibelius, *Geisterwelt*, 78–85; Schlier, *Galater*, 190–92; Hong, *Law*, 162–65; Betz, *Galatians*, 204–5; Christopher Forbes, "Paul's Principalities and Powers: Demythologizing Apocalyptic?" *JSNT* 82 (2001): 61–88, esp. 81–83. A similar conclusion is reached regarding the phrase in Col 2:8, 20 by Gregory E. Sterling, "A Philosophy According to the Cosmos: Colossian Christianity and Philo of Alexandria," in *Philon d'Alexandrie et le Langage de la Philosophie*, eds. Carlos Lévy and Bernard Besnier (Turnhout: Brepols, 1998), 349–73, esp. 358–60. It is an important nuance that the *στοιχεῖα* refer to the elements and their animation, a nuance required by the lexical evidence, which makes Arnold's position that *τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου* are "demonic powers" unconvincing ("Returning to the Domain of the Powers," 57).

In some strands of Second Temple Judaism there is an explicit correspondence between the Mosaic law and the "Law of nature."[83] The correspondence between Mosaic law and the law of nature is especially notable in Philo.[84] On one occasion Philo explains the consequence of transgressing the Mosaic law intentionally is to become an enemy of "the entire heaven and the world [τοῦ σύμπαντος οὐρανοῦ τε καὶ κόσμου]" (*Mos*. 2.52). To illustrate this point Philo cites several examples from the Jewish Scriptures prefaced with an explanation that sometimes these punishments are extraordinary:

> Justice, the assessor for God, hater of evil [ἡ πάρεδρος τῷ θεῷ μισοπονήρος δίκη] does great works, the most forceful elements [τῶν δραστικωτάτων στοιχείων] of the universe, fire, and water, fell upon them [i.e. voluntary sinners], so that, as the times revolved, some perished by deluge, others were consumed by conflagration. The seas lifted up their waters, and the rivers, springfed and winter torrents, rose on high and flooded and swept away all the cites. (*Mos*. 2.53–54)

The personification of justice employs the "elements [στοιχεῖα]" to exact retributive justice. For Philo wrath must be carried out by angels as subordinate divine beings.[85] Philo rarely uses the title "assessor [πάρεδρος]" for justice.[86] On one such occasion, Philo explains that the decalogue lacks any reference to penalties for violation because God desired to encourage humans to voluntarily choose what is best (*Decal*. 176–177). Then, Philo clarifies that this does not mean evil will go unpunished for God has delegated this punishment to "his assessor, justice [τὴν πάρεδρον αὑτῳ δίκη]" one of his divine

---

[83] Generally, see Markus N. A. Bockmuehl, "Natural Law in Second Temple Judaism," *VT* 45 (1995): 17–44.

[84] John W. Martens, *One God, One Law: Philo of Alexandria on the Mosaic and Greco-Roman Law*, SPhAMA 2 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 83–101, esp. 95–99.

[85] Philo, *Conf*. 180–182 see also *Cher*. 35; *Agr*. 51; *Conf*. 174, *Mos*. 1.166; *Decal*. 145.

[86] Philo uses πάρεδρος five times (*Mut*. 194; *Ios*. 48; *Mos*. 2.53; *Decal*. 177; *Spec*. 4.201) while δίκη occurs 145 times.

subordinates (*Decal*. 177–178). Philo's logic is clear: human transgression of the law will result in wrath meted out by angels using the elements. The best protection from the destructive elements marshalled by the angel of justice is obedience to the law of Moses.

Paul's use of the phrase τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου is crafted from the philosophical lexicon to explain Jewish angels, Gentile deities, and daimons believed to animate the basic elements of the cosmos.[87] Whatever Paul intends to communicate with the phrase, he must mean more than mere physical elements because he personifies these elements as enslaving.[88] Additionally, he feels compelled to clarify that the elements are "by nature not gods [φύσει μὴ οὖσιν θεοῖς]" (Gal 4:8) and when compared to God they are "weak and beggarly [ἀσθενῆ καὶ πτωχὰ]."[89] Paul warns the Galatian believers that by observing

---

[87] Forbes, "Pauline Demonology And/or Cosmology," 73 concludes that Paul "is working creatively between the angelology and demonology of his Jewish heritage, and the world-view of the thoughtful Graeco-Roman philosophical amateur." In addition to philosophical traditions, see the insightful discussion of the possible significance of Anatolian folk belief represented on stelae erected in Anatolia discussed by Arnold, "Paul and Anatolian Folk Belief," 429–49. The value of these tablets is somewhat limited by the fact that the majority are from a later period. Most of the stelae cited by Arnold are found in George Petzl, *Die Beichtinschriften Westkleinasiens*, EpigAnat 22 (Bonn: Rudolf Habelt, 1994).

[88] The στοιχεῖα enslave [δουλόω] Jews (Gal 4:3) and are the recipients of Gentile service [δουλεύω] (Gal 4:8, 9; see also 1 Thess 1:9). Later in Paul's enigmatic allegory (Gal 4:21–5:1), he identifies Ishmael, Hagar, Sinai, and Jerusalem with slavery [δουλεία] (4:24) and service (4:25) in contrast to the freedom of the promise, Isaac, Sarah, and the Jerusalem above (4:26–31). The allegory precedes the direct address of Gal 5:1 "For freedom Christ has set us free. Stand firm, therefore, and do not submit again to the yoke of slavery." It seems difficult to deny that the enslaving στοιχεῖα are aligned with Torah obedience in Galatians. Elsewhere, Paul uses the language of slavery in a positive sense of service to God (Rom 12:11; 1 Thess 1:9; see also Eph 6:7), Christ (Rom 14:18; see also Col 3:24) and others (Gal 5:13; Phil 2:22) in the Spirit and not the letter (Rom 7:6). In Romans Paul explains baptism, in part, as a transition in slavery from sin as the master (Rom 6:6) to righteousness/God (6:18, 22).

[89] The phrase "by nature not gods" echoes prophetic descriptions of idols (Isa 37:19; Jer 2:11; 5:7; 16:20). It also bears notable similarity to 1 Cor 8:4; 10:19–20 and the Atomists' critiques of the gods (Plato, *Leg*. 889e–890a). It is possible that Paul is denying the essential divinity of the elements (Helmut Koester, "φύσις," *TDNT* 9.272). Betz, *Galatians*, 215 finds Plutarch's demonological euhemerism an insightful parallel (esp. *Is. Os*. 23–25 [359f–360f]). See also Forbes, "Demonology and And/or Cosmology," 58–71.

The adjectives "weak and beggarly" describe the elements in comparison to God, whom the Galatians have come to know and be known by (Gal 4:9). In the Pauline corpus humans are "weak" (Rom 5:6) and God's weakness is still stronger than human strength (1 Cor 1:25, 27). The adjective "beggarly [πτωχός]" elsewhere in the Pauline corpus always refers to the economically disadvantaged (Gal 2:10; Rom 5:26; 2 Cor 6:10).

Mosaic law they would effectively be returning to slavery to these elements (Gal 4:8–10).[90] Paul's view of evil's origin and persistence is connected to the structure of the cosmos inhabited by superhuman beings who enslave humanity.

The presence of the "elements of the world" in Paul's argument make little sense according to the Adamic template of the origin and persistence of evil. However, the Enochic tradition is once again instructive. Paul's concern for the Galatians is that by turning to Mosaic law for protection against the superhuman forces that animate the elements, they are operating according to a cosmic structure that has passed. The Mosaic law was instituted through mediators as a protection against the power of hostile superhuman forces. After the advent of God's Son, however, in Paul's view the Galatians seeking protection from evil in the Mosaic law is to deny the power of the life-giving spirit of God's son. Paul is not arguing the law is the product of evil angels. Rather, he is arguing that it was an angelic solution, a stop-gap, to a more pervasive problem that has been dealt with more fully and finally by the sending of God's son.

Conclusion

This chapter began by asking if Galatians and Romans share the same perspective about the origin and persistence of evil. It has been argued that they do not. The perspectives of Galatians and Romans on the origin and persistence of evil are not incompatible but they are different, reflecting different narratives and rhetorical purposes. Too often, however, the more explicit argument about the origin and persistence of evil found in Rom 5:12–21

[90] There have been attempts to identify the calendrical observance of Gal 4:10 with pagan tradition or the imperial cult rather than Jewish practices. See, for example, Troy W. Martin, "Pagan and Judeo-Christian Time-Keeping Schemes in Gal 4:10 and Col 2:16," *NTS* 42 (1996): 105–119; Witulski, *Die Adressaten,* esp. 158–68, 183–214; Hardin, *Galatians and the Imperial Cult*, 116–47. These arguments have won little acceptance due to the keen focus on Mosaic law throughout the letter.

has been read into the earlier letter to fill in the gaps of Paul's argument in Gal 3:19–4:11. This approach is fundamentally flawed and ought to be abandoned. Instead of reading Romans 5:12–21 into Galatians, it has been suggested that Paul's argument in Gal 3:19–4:11 assumes Enochic traditions. This is should not be surprising because Paul alludes to Enochic tradition elsewhere in his letters and it pervades Second Temple Jewish and early Christian literature.

Romans and Galatians have a uniquely intimate relationship among the undisputed Pauline letters. The similarities in content, however, should not obscure the different perspectives found within the letters regarding the law, Israel, and ethics. As Tobin, Martyn, and Barclay have argued, the similarities and differences are best explained by interpreting Romans as Paul's later work. In Romans Paul returns to some of the same issues already addressed in Galatians but with a different audience and set of rhetorical goals. The methodological implication of the relationship between the two letters is that the arguments of Romans should not be mapped onto Galatians without measured hesitation.

While Romans explicitly identifies the origin and persistence of evil with the single man Adam and his singular act of transgression, Galatians does not. In Rom 5 Paul's argument concerns human evil and its persistence viewed from Adam's transgression to the Christ gift, with the Mosaic law revealing human evil for the sin that it is. Nowhere in Galatians does Paul explicitly identify the origin of evil. However, the argument of Galatians 3:19–4:11 explains the provisional role of the law in the chronological unfolding of the divine economy (see Gal 3:21). The scope of evil in Galatians is broader than human sin, incorporating all the cosmos. In Galatians Paul's

starting point is not human evil but the function of the law in relation the structure of the cosmos.

The plural "transgressions" of Gal 3:19 make it difficult to read Rom 5:12–21 into the argument of Gal 3:19–4:11. A better explanation of Gal 3:19 is to interpret it as a reference to the angelic transgressions described most fully in the Enochic Book of Watchers (1 En. 1–36). The narrative of angelic transgression was extremely common in Second Temple Jewish and early Christian literature. The widespread influence of the Enochic tradition suggests that Paul need not have known the Book of Watchers directly. There is no evidence that Paul was explicitly citing the Book of Watchers. Instead, overlap between Gal 3:19–4:11 and the well-known Enochic tradition suggests that Paul was thinking within a common narrative framework in which angels were responsible, at least in part, for the corruption of the cosmos.

Another exegetical detail in Gal 3:19–4:11 that is best explained in the narrative framework of the Enochic tradition is Paul's reference to "the elements of the cosmos [*τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου*]" (Gal 4:3, 9). The Hebrew Bible and a wide array of Second Temple Jewish literature indicates that angels were considered part of the structure of the cosmos and their transgression resulted in catastrophic consequences. Paul's language, although drawn from the philosophical lexicon, assumes the same narrative framework. The plural "transgressions" of Gal 3:19 alongside the "elements of the cosmos" indicate that Paul's argument assumes a narrative of angelic transgressions.

A possible hesitation to interpreting Gal 3:19–4:11 within a narrative of angelic transgressions may be the assumption that the Adamic template is independent of Enochic tradition. This assumption in Pauline scholarship is inherited from scholarship

on Second Temple Jewish literature. It is often assumed that if an author utilizes Adamic tradition, then the same author will not utilize Enochic tradition, or do so only to subvert Adamic tradition. The result is that Adamic and Enochic traditions are considered fundamentally contradictory. According to Adamic traditions evil is thought to be a human problem stemming from human transgression and persisting in the human sin. According to Enochic tradition, evil is a cosmic problem stemming from angelic transgressions and persisting in superhuman forces. The next two chapters analyze how Adamic and Enochic traditions function in various texts. In most extant literature, Adamic and Enochic traditions appear together in a mixed template, a combination of traditions that explain the origin and persistence of evil as both superhuman and human.

CHAPTER THREE: DECONSTRUCTING THE ADAMIC TEMPLATE

The prevailing assumption among New Testament scholars is that Paul's view of evil is determined by his interpretation of Gen 3. As James L. Kugel asks:

> Who nowadays . . . does not automatically think of the story of Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden as telling about some fundamental change that took place in the human condition, or what is commonly called the Fall of Man?[1]

Although the narrative of Gen 3 is the central scriptural passage in much Christian theological reflection on evil, the evidence from the Hebrew Bible indicates that this passage was rarely cited or alluded to explain evil in early Judaism.[2] As John Collins cautions, "However pervasive the traditional understanding of the Fall eventually became it is salutary to bear in mind that in the beginning it was not so."[3]

The Adamic template is a construction of biblical scholarship that describes evil originating in human transgression and persisting in the human sin. The Adamic template

---

[1] Kugel, *Traditions of the Bible: A Guide to the Bible as it was at the Start of the Common Era* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998), 94.

[2] The interpretation of Genesis 3 as a Fall narrative is almost entirely absent from the Jewish Scriptures, although see the protological man traditions in Job 15:7–10; Ezek 28:12–19; 31:2–18; Isa 14:12–15. R. W. L. Moberly cautions against making internal reference within the Hebrew Bible the primary measure of a passage's significance and argues that the location of the passage testifies to its importance (*The Theology of the Book of Genesis* [New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009], 70–1).

On the significance of Genesis 3 in Christian theological reflection see: Gary A. Anderson, *The Genesis of Perfection: Adam and Eve in Jewish and Christian Imagination* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001); Rowan A. Greer, "Sinned we All in Adam's Fall?" in *The Social World of the First Christians: Essays in Honor of Wayne A. Meeks* (eds. L. Michael White and O. Larry Yarbrough; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995), 382–94. There has been a recent attempt to retrieve an Augustinian account of original sin in contemporary systematic theology in Ian A. McFarland, *In Adam's Fall: A Meditation on the Christian Doctrine of Original Sin* (Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010). Cf. the reading purposed by Moberly, *Theology of the Book of Genesis*, 70–87.

[3] John J. Collins, "Before the Fall: The Earliest Interpretations of Adam and Eve," in *The Idea of Biblical Interpretation: Essays in Honor of James L. Kugel*, eds. Hindy Najman and Judith H. Newman, JSJSupp 83 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 293–308, here 308. See also John J. Collins, "Creation and the Origin of Evil," in *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Routledge, 1997), 30–51.

is often considered a prevalent interpretation of Gen 3 that attributed profound significance to Adam's transgression. F. R. Tennant was instrumental in articulating the development of the Adamic template. In the conclusion of his seminal work, *The Sources of the Doctrines of the Fall and Original Sin*, Tennant identifies the source of Paul's view of evil as "Jewish speculation" found in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha from which Paul "derived, ready-made, his teaching as to the influence of the first man and his sin upon the race."[4] Despite the relative absence of Adam in accounting for evil in the HB, according to Tennant's narrative, Second Temple literature developed the Adamic template adopted by Paul. The goal of this chapter is to challenge Tennant's narrative and create space for an alternative, more complex view of Adamic tradition in Second Temple Judaism.

Before focusing on the interpretation of Genesis in Second Temple Judaism, however, it is important to point out the current disregard for reading Gen 3 as a narrative about the origin of evil among many scholars of the HB. James Barr, for example, argues that in its original context J gives no account of the origin of evil.[5] Rather, Barr reads Gen 3 as a story of human immortality almost gained but lost.[6] Furthermore, Barr claims that

---

[4] F. R. Tennant, *The Sources of the Doctrines of the Fall and Original Sin* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1903), 272.

[5] The consensus of modern scholarship is that first three chapters of Genesis combine two creation stories which reflect different sources the Priestly narrative of Gen 1:1–2:4a (P) and the Yahwist account of Gen 2:4b–3:24 (J). See John Van Seters, *Prologue to History: The Yahwist as Historian in Genesis* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1992); John J. Collins, *Introduction to the Hebrew Bible* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2004), 67–82; John Day, *From Creation to Babel: Studies in Genesis 1–11* (London: Bloomsbury, 2013), 1–50; Marjo C. A. Korpel and Johannes C. de Moor, *Adam, Eve, and the Devil: A New Beginning*, HBM 65 (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2014), 107–8, 115–116.

[6] James Barr, *The Garden of Eden and the Hope of Immortality* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), 4. Carol Meyers also argues that Genesis 3 is not an account of the origin of evil (*Discovering Eve: Ancient Israelite Women in Context* [New York: Oxford University Press, 1988], 86–88). Bernard Frank Batto reaches a similar conclusion comparing the Yahwist's narrative with the Babylonian Atrahasis myth (Batto. *Slaying the Dragon: Mythmaking in the Biblical Tradition* [Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1992], 45–46, 57–62).

the misreading of Gen 3 as a narrative about the Adamic origin of evil in nascent Christianity is "a peculiarity of St Paul."[7] Furthermore, his argument has gained widespread support.[8] Many modern scholars do not interpret Gen 3 as a narrative concerned with the origin of evil, but what of ancient readers? While Second Temple Jewish interpreters often turned to Gen 3 to articulate a theological anthropology, rarely did they appeal to the text to explain the origin and persistence of evil.

3.1. Formation of the Adamic Template

Evidence for the Adamic template is cited in the wisdom literature of Ben Sira (Sirach) and Pseudo-Solomon (Wisdom). In Second Temple Jewish scholarship, Sirach and Wisdom are cited as the earliest sources testifying to the Adamic template.[9] Yet it is difficult to discern how significant Adam's disobedience is for describing the origin of evil in these wisdom texts. While Adamic traditions are important in Sirach and Wisdom, attention to Adam (and Eve)'s sin is rare. Sirach and Wisdom represent a mixed template, combining various traditions and stories to explain the origin and persistence of evil.

---

[7] Barr, *Garden of Eden,* 5. See also Williams, *The Ideas of the Fall*, 115–118. Essentially following the narrative of Tennant, Barr identifies the same Adamic origin of evil in Wis 2:23–24 and 4 Ezra 3:21; 7:116–118 (Bar, *Garden of Eden*, 16–18).

[8] John Day claims that Barr's interpretation "appears to the be the majority scholarly view nowadays" (*From Creation to Babel: Studies in Genesis 1–11* [London: Bloomsbury, 2013], 46). Of course, "widespread" does not mean universal. Cf. R. W. L. Moberly, "Did the Serpent get it right?" *JTS* 39 (1988): 1–27; Moberly, "Did the Interpreters get it right?" *JTS* 59 (2008): 22–40.

[9] Tennant, *Sources of the Fall*, 107; Tennant, "The Teaching of Ecclesiasticus and Wisdom on the Introduction of Sin and Death," *JTS* 2 (1900–1901): 207–23; Lévi, *Le péché originel*, 5–6; A. M. Dubarle, "Le Péché originel dans les livres sapientiaux," *RThom* 56 (1956): 597–619; Louis Ligier, *Péché d'Adam et péché du monde: Bible, Kippur, Eucharistie* (Paris: Aubier, 1960); A. Büchler, "Ben Sira's Conception of Sin and Atonement," *JQR* 14 (1923): 53–83; Jean Hadot, *Penchant mauvais et volonté libre dans la Sagesse de Ben Sira* (Bruxelles: Presses universitaires de Bruxelles, 1970); Gabriele Boccaccini, *Middle Judaism: Jewish Thought, 300 B.C.E. to 200 C.E.* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), 99–104; Barr, *Garden of Eden*, 16–17; John J. Collins, *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1997), 80–95; Pancratius C. Beentjes, "Theodicy in Wisdom of Ben Sira," in *Theodicy in the World of the Bible*, eds. Antti Laato and Johannes C. de Moor (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 509–524; Brand, *Evil Within and Without*, 93–119.

3.1.1 Ben Sira

The Wisdom of Ben Sira is often identified as the earliest source for the Adamic origin of sin and death.[10] The book dates to roughly 190–180 BCE, before it was translated into Greek and prefaced with the prologue sometime before 117 BCE.[11] As a collection of Hebrew wisdom translated into Greek (Prologue 1–26), the book has an extremely complex textual history.[12] Although never explicitly quoting the Primeval History, Ben Sira often cites or alludes to Genesis 1–11.[13] These allusions are often found in passages that address the problem of evil.

3.1.1.1 Ben Sira and Evil

Ben Sira appears to give conflicting accounts of evil. In Sir 15:11–20, for example, Ben Sira explicitly denies identifying God as the source of sin while affirming human agency.[14] Later, in Sir 33:7–15, creation is described as a harmony of opposites in which

---

[10] Tennant, *Sources of the Fall*, 119; Tennant, "Teaching of Ecclesiasticus and Wisdom," 210; Wedderburn, "Adam and Christ," 2; Thompson, *Responsibility for Evil in the Theodicy of IV Ezra*, 8; Collins, "Before the Fall," 296.

[11] R. J. Coggins, *Sirach*, GAP (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 18–19; Patrick W. Skehan and Alexander A. Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira,* AB 39 (New York: Doubleday, 1987), 8–16; George W. E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah*, 2nd ed. (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005), 62–3.

[12] Skehan and Di Lella, *Wisdom*, 51–62; Pancratius C. Beentjes, *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew: A Text Edition of All Extant Hebrew Manuscripts and a Synopsis of All Parallel Hebrew Ben Sira Texts*, VTSupp 68 (Leiden: Brill, 1997); Jean-Sébastien Rey and Jan Joosten, eds., *The Texts and Versions of the Book of Ben Sira: Transmission and Interpretation*, JSJSupp 150 (Leiden: Brill, 2011). Since there is no complete Hebrew manuscript of Ben Sira, it is occasionally necessary to work from the Greek. The translations cited here are from either Benjamin Wright III, "Sirach," in *NETS* or Skehan and Di Lella's commentary.

[13] According to Levison, *Portraits of Adam*, 34 the references to Gen 1–3 include: *Sir* 15:14; 16:26–17:10; 17:30–18:14; 24:28; 33:7–15; 40:1–11, 27; 49:16. Eric Noffke finds four references to Adam and Eve: *Sir* 25:24; 33:10; 40:1; 49:16 ("Man of Glory or First Sinner? Adam in the Book of Sirach," *ZAW* 119 [2007]: 618–24, here 621–22). See also Maurice Gilbert, "Ben Sira, Reader of Genesis 1-11," in *Intertextual Studies in Ben Sira and Tobit: Essays in Honor of Alexander A. Di Lella, O.F.M.*, CBQMS 38, eds. Jeremy Corley and Vincent Skemp (Washington, DC: The Catholic Biblical Association, 2005), 89–99; Shane Berg, "Ben Sira, the Genesis Creation Accounts, and the Knowledge of God's Will," *JBL* 132 (2013): 139–57.

[14] Skehan and Di Lella, *Wisdom*, 82, 271–72; Collins, *Jewish Wisdom*, 81–3; Brand, *Evil Within and Without*, 95–106; Maurice Gilbert, "God, Sin and Mercy: Sirach 15:11–18:14," in *Ben Sira's God:*

God creates both good and evil (see also Eccl 7:13–14). The "harmony of opposites" doctrine was an important part of ancient Greek philosophy, especially among the Stoics.[15] The tension between Sir 15:11–20 and 33:7–15 has led numerous scholars to suggest a strong similarity between Ben Sira and Stoic providence.[16] However, Sharon Mattila argues that Ben Sira has no logical reconciliation for the apparently contrasting notions of human agency (Sir 15:11–20; see also 32:14–18; 37:17–18) and divine providence (Sir 33:7–15; see also 39:25), whereas Stoicism does.[17] The issue of potential Stoic influence need not be resolved here, but it is important for our purposes to note the apparent inconsistency and its possible relationship to ancient philosophy.

The tension between human freedom and divine providence is interpreted by some scholars as a sign of Ben Sira's polemic against the Enochic tradition. Most prominent in New Testament studies, Martinus C. de Boer interprets Sir 15:11–20 as a rejection of the cosmological track of Jewish apocalyptic that attributes the origin of sin

---

Proceedings of the International Ben Sira Conference: Durham – Ushaw College 2001, ed. Renate Egger-Wenzel (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2002), 118–135; Beentjes, "Theodicy in Wisdom of Ben Sira," 510–14.

[15] G. E. R. Lloyd, *Polarity and Analogy: Two Types of Argumetation in Early Greek Thought* (Indianapolis: Hackett, 1992 [1966]), 15–171. Plato uses polarity to substantiate a doctrine of the immortality of the soul (*Phaed*. 70e–72b). A similar doctrine in Philo, *Gig*. 1–5; *Ebr*. 186; *Her*. 213–214. The doctrine is attributed to the famous Stoic Chrysippus (Aulus Gellius, *Noct. att.* 7.1; Plutarch, *Stoic. Rep.* 35 [1050ef])

[16] Martin Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period*, 2 Vols. trans. John Bowden (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974), 1.141–149; David Winston, "Theodicy in Ben Sira and Stoic Philosophy," in *The Ancestral Philosophy: Hellenistic Philosophy in Second Temple Judaism* (Providence: Brown Judaic Studies, 2001), 44–56; Collins, *Jewish Wisdom*, 85–89; Ursel Wicke-Reuter, *Göttliche Providenz und menschliche Verantwortung bei Ben Sira und in der Frühen Stoa*, BZAW 298 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2000), 106–142, 224–273; Beentjes, "Theodicy in Wisdom of Ben Sira," 515–20.

[17] Sharon Lea Mattila, "Ben Sira and the Stoics: A Reexamination of the Evidence," *JBL* 119 (2000): 473–501, here 480–81. See also Brand, *Evil Within and Without*, 110–13; A. A. Long, "The Stoic Concept of Evil," *Phil. Q* 18 (1968): 329–43. On providence in Middle Platonic philosophy see chapter six.

to rebellious angels.[18] A similar interpretation is suggested by scholars who have no investment in de Boer's apocalyptic scheme. Helge Kvanvig, for example, sees Ben Sira's affirmation of human agency as "a polemic against the theology of the Watcher story."[19] Kvanvig further supports this claim by appealing to Ben Sira's opposition to esoteric knowledge (Sir 3:21–24; 20:30; 34:1–8; 41:4). The apocalyptic scheme of de Boer is supported by scholars of Second Temple Judaism who see an inherent conflict between the Adamic and Enochic traditions about evil, a conflict between a human (Adamic) or superhuman (Enochic) view of evil's origin and persistence.

Does Ben Sira engage in a polemic against a narrative of angelic evil? The dialogical form of the text has suggested to many that Ben Sira is refuting an actual position that attributed evil to God.[20] Problematic for those who suggest a polemic against the Watchers myth is Ben Sira's numerous citations or allusions to the Enochic tradition (Sir 16:7, 26–28; 17:32; 44:16; 49:14).[21] Most explicitly in reference to evil, Ben Sira refers to the giant offspring of the Watchers as the primary example of the wicked facing

---

[18] de Boer, "Paul and Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology," 177 citing Sirach (15:14–15; 21:27; 25:24) the Epistle of Enoch (1 En. 98:4–5), Psalms of Solomon (9:4–4), 4 Ezra (esp. 7:127–29), and 2 Bar (56:11–15).

[19] Helge S. Kvanvig, *Primeval History: Babylonian, Biblical, Enochic An Intertextual Reading*, JSJSupp 149 (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 337. Kvanvig cites Annette Reed and John Collins to support this interpretation (see Collins, "Creation and the Origin of Evil," 32–5).

[20] Hadot, *Penchant mauvais*, 93; Brand, *Evil Within and Without*, 96. In support of his argument Hadot cites Philo, *Det*. 122 interpreting Gen 5:29: "For Moses does not, as some impious people do, say that *God is the author of ills* [τὸν θεὸν αἴτιον κακῶν]." Although not noted by Hadot, a similar condemnation of those who deny human responsibility for sin appears in the Epistle of Enoch (1 En. 98:4b). See the discussion in Loren T. Stuckenbruck, *1 Enoch 91-108*, CEJL (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007), 345–47. Some passages in the HB could be read to imply that God is the source of at least some sins or evil: Exod 11:10; 2 Sam 24:1; Isa 45:7; Jer 6:21; Ezek 3:20; Amos 3:6.

[21] Randal A. Argall shows that Ben Sira very likely knows and alludes to the narrative of the Book of Watchers (1 En. 13:4; 15:3) in Sir 16:7 (*1 Enoch and Sirach: A Comparative and Conceptual Analysis of the themes of Revelation, Creation and Judgment*, EJIL 8 [Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995], 230). Argall also argues that Ben Sira's harmony of opposites cosmology (esp. 17:32) assumes something like the account of the luminaries in the Book of Watchers 6–11 (*1 Enoch and Sirach*, 137).

just punishment: God "did not forgive *the ancient giants* (נסיכי קדם/τῶν ἀρχαίων γιγάντων) who revolted in their might" (Sir 16:7).[22] Annette Y. Reed interprets these Enochic citations and allusions as a sign of the shared scribal culture between the authors/redactors of the Book of the Watchers and Ben Sira.[23] She goes on to argue that when the Watchers myth is utilized as a template of sin and judgment, as in the case of Sir 16:7, there is an implicit denial of the angels' role as "active agents in the spread of human sin."[24] According to Reed, the angelic origin of evil is reframed as a problem endemic to humanity. In this way, the Enochic tradition is subordinated to the Adamic template. Reed's assumption is that if evil has its origin in the human Adam it is therefore a human problem and not an angelic one, but if evil originates with angels, then, it is a superhuman problem. Reed, like others, assumes an isomorphic correlation between evil's origin and persistence. A human origin indicates a human persistence whereas a

---

[22] Translation from the NRSV. Skehan and Di Lella argue that the Hebrew text of MS A "princes (נסיך)" (see also Josh 13:21; Ezek 32:30; Mic 5:4; Ps 83:12) rather than "giants (נפילים)" (Gen 6:4; Num 13:33), while still an allusion to Gen 6:1–4 is a "conscious avoidance of the mythological overtones to the Genesis narrative so familiar from the Enoch literature" (*Wisdom*, 270). They also suggest an allusion to the kings of Babylon in Isa 14:4–21 and Dan 4:7–30 (Skehan and Di Lella, *Wisdom*, 273–74). If the original Hebrew text intended to avoid references to the Watchers mythology, this intention was lost on the Greek translators and undermined by the presence of Enochic tradition elsewhere in Ben Sira (esp. Sir 44:16; 49:14).

[23] Reed, *Fallen Angels*, 69–71. Like Kvanvig, Reed interprets Ben Sira's skepticism about esoteric knowledge (see also Eccl 3:21) as a polemic against apocalypticism but also recognizes a similar emphasis on illicit knowledge in the earliest strata of BW (1 En. 6–11). A similar interpretation is found in Gabriele Boccaccini, *Middle Judaism*, 105. Michael E. Stone complicates the notion that the esoteric knowledge characteristic of many apocalyptic texts is opposed by Wisdom theology since the apocalyptic texts are at least partially dependent on wisdom literature (esp. Job 28 and 38). See Michael E. Stone, "Lists of Revealed Things in the Apocalyptic Literature," in *Magnalia Dei: The Mighty Acts of God: Essays on the Bible and Archaeology in Memory of G. Ernest Wright* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1976), 414–52.

[24] Reed, *Fallen Angels*, 99. A paradigmatic interpretation of the Watchers narrative appears elsewhere including: CD II, 17–19; T. Reu. 5:4–6; T. Naph. 5:4–5; 2 Pet 2:4; Jude 6. The iteration of the Watchers myth in Jubilees is also relevant to this discussion, but Jubilees will be addressed in the next chapter. Reed sees the paradigmatic interpretation as a development of the Watchers narrative as appropriated in the Animal Apocalypse and Book of Dreams to downplay the angels' role in the origin of evil (*Fallen Angels*, 74–80).

superhuman origin indicates a superhuman persistence. The result of this assumption is that like de Boer and Kvanvig, Reed assumes an essential conflict between Enochic and Adamic traditions.

The interpretation that Ben Sira subverts Enochic tradition in favor of an Adamic template misconstrues how Adamic and Enochic traditions function in Second Temple Literature. Sirach 15:11–20 can only function as an attack on Enochic tradition if the Watchers narrative is understood to attribute evil to God. As will be demonstrated in the analysis of 4 Ezra, it is Adamic tradition in its purest form that comes closest to blaming God for evil. Similarly, as chapter four will demonstrate, Enochic tradition consistently affirms human culpability. Angelic evil consistently functions to absolve God of responsibility for evil without undermining human culpability. Furthermore, the Adamic tradition of Ben Sira and BW are very similar. While Ben Sira may have opponents in his sights in Sir 15:11–20, there is no reason to assume that his target is the Enochic tradition. The affirmation of human agency is reinforced by Ben Sira's argument that God holds all the wicked responsible for their sins, even angels (Sir 16:7). To interpret Ben Sira's apparently inconsistent view of the origin of evil as a rejection of Enochic tradition, as in the case of de Boer, Reed and Kvanvig, imports a presupposition that is undermined by Ben Sira's argument, the way Adamic and Enochic traditions function more broadly, and ignores other possible influences on the Sage.

3.1.1.2 Ben Sira and Gen 1–3

In the two most important passages for Ben Sira's view of evil (Sir 15:11–20; 33:7–15), Adamic traditions from Gen 1–2 are notable, but Gen 3 is absent. Refuting the notion that

God is responsible for sin (Sir 15:11–12), Ben Sira combines texts from distinct portions of the Primeval History:

> It was he who *from the beginning* [ἐξ ἀρχῆς/מבראשית] *made man* [ἐποίησεν ἄνθρωπον/ברא אדם] and left him in the hand of his *deliberation* [διαβουλίου/יצרו].[25]

The reference to the "beginning" is an allusion to Gen 1:1, the creation of man is based on the language of Gen 1:27, and the reference to "deliberation" or יצר comes from Gen 6:5 and 8:21.[26] It is important to note three features of Ben Sira's use of Adamic tradition in Sir 15:11–20. First, he collapses the narrative of the Primeval History to accentuate human responsibility. The יצר of Gen 6:5 is moved from its context in the flood narrative to be part of the universal creation of humanity in Gen 1.[27] Second, Ben Sira universalizes Adam's creation as the anthropological pattern for all of humanity.[28] Third, Ben Sira makes no reference to the disobedience of Adam and Eve from Gen 3 in Sir 15:11–20. The absence of Gen 3 is noteworthy since it is often assumed that the Adamic tradition

---

[25] Sir 15:14. Translation from Benjamin Wright III, "Sirach," in *NETS*. It was once thought that Sir 15:14 was an early witness to the rabbinic notion of the "evil inclination," but Hadot has shown that interpretation is untenable (*Penchant Mauvais*, 91–103). The medieval manuscripts of Sirach that supported such an interpretation have been shown to augment passages addressing the problem of evil to conform with this later theological development (Beentjes, "Theodicy in Wisdom of Ben Sira," 524; Brand, *Evil Within and Without*, 99–100). On the rabbinic *yetzr hara* see Ishay Rosen-Zvi, *Demonic Desires: Yetzer Hara and the Problem of Evil in Late Antiquity* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011), esp. 65–84 on the Amoraic literature

[26] Levison, *Portraits of Adam*, 34–35; Gilbert, "Ben Sira, Reader of Gen 1–11," 92; Shane Berg, "Ben Sira, the Genesis Creation Accounts," 152–54. Skehan and Di Lella, *Wisdom,* 271–72 note the references to Gen 1:1 and 6:5/8:21, but not 1:27. As Levison points out, there are clear allusions to Deut 30:15–20 in Sir 15:15–17. The verbal form of the noun יצר also appears in Gen 2:7, 8, 19 to refer to the man "formed" by God.

[27] Levison, *Portraits of Adam*, 35 argues, "this transposition requires a transformation of meaning. If God places an inclination in each person, then it must not be an evil inclination." There might be some lexical justification for this connection due to the appearance of the verb יצר in Gen 2:7. The lexical link is lost in the LXX which renders the verb יצר (Gen 2:7, 8) with πλάσσω and the noun יצר (Gen 6:5; 8:21) with "everything he considers in his heart [πᾶς τις διανοεῖται ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ]" (Gen 6:5) and "the deliberation of man [ἡ διάνοιατοῦ ἀνθρώπου]" (Gen 8:21).

[28] As John Collins puts it, "Adam is the paradigmatic human being rather than the first in a causal chain" (Collins, "Before the Fall," 299).

always indicates human culpability yet precisely when Ben Sira wants to argue for human culpability against those who might wish to deny it he makes no mention of Adam's sin. The same is true of Sir 33:7–15, which lacks any reference to Gen 3. Drawing attention to God's sovereignty in determining the works of his creation, there are notable allusions to Gen 2:7 (Sir 33:10, 13).[29] The absence of Gen 3 from these key texts is why Beentjes argues that Gen 2:8–3:24 is missing from Ben Sira's reflection on theodicy.[30] Still, Gen 3 is not entirely absent from Ben Sira's theological anthropology.

There are two particularly notable passages in Sirach that allude to Gen 3. First, in Sir 17:1–15 Ben Sira articulates a theological anthropology that accentuates human dignity and mortality. Much like Sir 15:14, Ben Sira combines passages from Primeval History. Particularly notable are the combinations in Sir 17:1–3, 7:

> The Lord from the earth created man, and makes him return to earth again. Limited days of life he gives them, with power over all things else on earth. He endows them with a strength that befits them; in God's own image he made them. . . With wisdom and knowledge he fills them; good and evil he shows them.[31]

Again, Ben Sira reads Adamic tradition templateatically, moving from the creation of Adam (singular in Sir 17:1) to anthropology in general (plural in Sir 17:2). Ben Sira's anthropology combines Gen 2:7 and 3:19 (Sir 17:1), Gen 6:3 and 1:27 (Sir 17:2–3), and

---

[29] The potter imagery of Sir 33:7–15 is from Jer 18:4, 6. Gilbert, "Ben Sira, Reader of Genesis 1-11," 95 detects an allusion to the curses on Canaan in Gen 9:25–27 in Sir 33:11–12. The Hebrew text of Sir 33:14 in MS E includes a reference to the polarity of light and darkness: ונוכח האור ח[שך]. Skehan and Di Lella, *Wisdom*, 401 identify this as an allusion to Gen 1:1–2.

[30] Beentjies, "Theodicy in Wisdom of Ben Sira," 524. In addition to 15:11–20 and 33:7–15, he also analyzes 40:10a and 5:1–8.

[31] Translation adapted from Skehan and Di Lella, *Wisdom*, 267–77. There is no extant Hebrew text for Sir 17. Still, the allusions to Primeval History are easily identifiable and not dependent on nuances of the Greek text.

Gen 2:9, 17 and Deut 30:15 (Sir 17:7).[32] This combination reconfigures the Primeval History, collapsing the narratives to articulate theological anthropology. The theological anthropology makes humans culpable for their sin, undermining Beenjtes claim that Gen 2:8–3:24 is absent from Ben Sira's theology of evil.

There are two features of Ben Sira's reconfiguration that are important for understanding his view of evil. First, Ben Sira sanitizes the Primeval History of any reference to the disobedience of Adam and Eve. The result of this reconfiguration is that both mortality and the knowledge of good and evil are built into creation itself and not explicitly a result of Adam's transgression. Ben Sira's view of human mortality built into creation is evident elsewhere in wisdom literature (Sir 40:1, 11; see also Eccl 3:20; 12:7; Job 14:1–2; 34:15).[33] Similarly, his view of knowledge of good and evil as inherent to creation is paralleled in 4QInstruction.[34] In his interpretation of Adamic tradition, Ben Sira removes any notion of Adam's disobedience. He also interprets the J narrative as a story of illumination rather than disobedience, identifying both mortality and knowledge of good and evil as intrinsic to creation. The result of this reconfiguration is a dual notion of human agency and divine sovereignty with no reference to Adam's transgression.

---

[32] Berg, "Ben Sira, the Genesis Creation Accounts," 150 provides a helpful chart of the citations and allusions in Sir 17:1–15. Since the knowledge of good and evil is portrayed as a gift in Sir 17:7, the primary referent would seem to be Gen 2:9 and only secondarily Gen 2:17. Cf. Karina Martin Hogan, *Theologies in Conflict in 4 Ezra: Wisdom Debate and Apocalyptic Solution*, JSJSupp 130 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 91 fn. 186. Hogan expresses doubt that Ben Sira is, in fact, interpreting Gen 2–3 in Sir 17:7: "It seems more likely that he is not interpreting the creation narratives *per se* but is imply drawing upon their language to describe the human condition." She interprets Sir 17:7 as a reference to "God-given moral sense" akin to 1 Kgs 3:9.

[33] This idea is also found in Josephus, *A.J.* 1.46.

[34] Chazon, "The Creation and Fall of Adam," 18–20. See esp. 4Q423 I, 1–2; see also 4Q417 1 I, 6–8, 16–18.

Second, Ben Sira's reconfiguration of the Primeval History bears remarkable similarity to the Book of Watchers (BW). In the latter half of BW, Enoch embarks on a series of cosmic journeys to the ends of the earth (1 En. 17–36).[35] The antediluvian hero is given unique access to cosmic mysteries (1 En. 19:3).[36] There are at least two journeys, one to the west (1 En. 17–19) and one to the east (1 En. 20–36).[37] In the second journey Enoch travels from Jerusalem to the Garden of Eden (1 En. 28:1–32:6). Enoch notices the "tree of wisdom" (1 En. 32:3) and comments on its beauty to his heavenly guide (1 En. 32:5).[38] In response the angel informs Enoch,

> This is the tree of wisdom from which your father of old and your mother of old, who were before you, ate and learned wisdom. And their eyes were opened, and they knew they were naked, and they were driven from the Garden.[39]

The "Tree of Wisdom" is obviously the "tree of the knowledge of good and evil" from Gen 2–3 (Gen 2:17; 3:6–7, 22–24).[40] Annette Reed, who sees an essential conflict between the Adamic and Enochic traditions on the origin of evil, interprets 1 En. 32:6 as

---

[35] On the cosmic geography of BW see Pierre Grelot, "La géographie mythique d'Hénoch et ses sources orientales," *RevQ* 65 (1958): 33–69; Marie-Theres Wacker, *Weltordnung und Gericht: Studien zu 1 Henoch 22*, FB 45 (Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1982); Jonathan Stock-Hesketh, "Circles and Mirrors: Understanding 1 Enoch 21–32," *JSP* 11 (2000): 27–58; Kelley Coblentz Bautch, *A Study of the Geography of 1 Enoch 17-19: "No One Has Seen What I Have Seen"* JSJSupp 81 (Leiden: Brill, 2003).

[36] These mysteries include the storehouses of the luminaries (17:2–3), the mountain of God (18:8; 25:3), the prison for rebellious angels (18:10–19:2; 21:7), and souls of the dead (22:3–7) among others.

[37] Stock-Hesketh, "Circles and Mirrors," 34 argues that there is a third journey (1 En. 33–36) inserted into the second journey.

[38] Compare Enoch's encounter with the "Tree of Life" on the mountain of God (1 En. 24:4–25:6), which will be moved to the Holy Place for consumption by the righteous at the final judgment (25:5–6).

[39] 1 En. 32:6. Translation from Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 320.

[40] As Nickelsburg points out, the Garden in 1 En. 32:3–6 has been influenced by the J creation story and Ezekiel 28:12–16 and 31:2–18 (*1 Enoch 1*, 327). The chief difference between Genesis and Ezekiel is the relationship between wisdom and sin. In Genesis attaining wisdom through eating the fruit is sinful (Gen 3:6–7, 22), whereas in Ezekiel wisdom is a divine gift corrupted by hubris (Ezek 28:17). Josephus also refers to the "tree of the knowledge of good and evil [עץ הדעת טוב ורע/ξύλον τοῦ γινώσκειν καλὸν καὶ πονηρόν]" (Gen 2:17) as the "plant of wisdom [φυτὸν τῆς φρονήσεως]" (*A.J.* 1.42)

a dismissal of the Adamic tradition. In her view, this reference to Adamic tradition "functions to counter the biblical account of the progressive alienation of humankind from God (Gen 1–11)."[41] Critically, Enoch's encounter with the Tree of Wisdom, like Sir 17:1–7, focuses as much on illumination as it does transgression. If any contrast between Ben Sira and the BW can be made regarding evil, the BW reflects more interest in Adam and Eve's disobedience than Ben Sira, who makes no mention of their alienation from Eden. Interpreting 1 En. 32:6 as a polemic against an Adamic origin of evil and Ben Sira as a polemic against an Enochic origin of evil is not only speculative but ignores the profound similarities between Ben Sira and the authors/redactors of BW concerning Adamic traditions.

The second reference to Gen 3 in Ben Sira has gained the most attention among New Testament scholars because it appears to be the first instance of a Jewish author interpreting Gen 3 as the origin of sin and death.[42] As a result, Sir 25:24 is often paralleled with Rom 5:12, 1 Cor 15:21–22, 2 Cor 11:3, and 1 Tim 2:13–15. The passage in Ben Sira reads, "In a woman was sin's beginning: on her account we all die."[43] Typically the woman is identified as Eve and her disobedience marks the entrance of death into the cosmos.

Levison has made a strong argument that Sir 25:24 is not interpreting Gen 3 nor does it attribute the origin of sin and death to Eve. Instead, he interprets the text as a "hyperbolic description of the effect an evil wife has upon her husband."[44] Levison points

---

[41] *Fallen Angels*, 51.

[42] Tennant, *Sources of Fall*, 111–115; Brandenburger, *Adam und Christus*, 26–27.

[43] Translation from Skehan and Di Lella, *Wisdom*, 343.

[44] John R. Levison, "Is Eve to Blame?: A Contextual Analysis of Sirach 25:24," *CBQ* 47 (1985): 617–23, citation from 621.

out that identifying Eve's disobedience with the origin of sin and death conflicts with Ben Sira's view of mortality and his reading of Gen 1–3 elsewhere (esp. Sir 17:1–10). Also, it is contextually problematic for Ben Sira to link the origin of sin and death to Eve in the middle of a passage focused on the wicked wife (Sir 25:16–26). Furthermore, 4QWiles of the Wicked Woman (4Q184) describes a "wicked woman" as the source of sin without reference to Eve: "She is the beginning of all the ways of iniquity."[45] Rather than read Sir 25:24 as a profound anomaly, Levison prefers an alternative interpretation which has an identifiable parallel in a roughly contemporary text.

Despite the strengths of Levison's argument, he has not persuaded many.[46] Even those sympathetic to his interpretation often maintain some reference to Eve in Sir 25:24.[47] Perhaps a parallel from Philo can shed light on the oddity of Sir 25:24. Philo preserves an exegetical tradition in his *Quaestiones et Solutiones in Genesin* describing Eve as "the beginning of evil" (*QG* 1.45). Philo offers this interpretation commenting on Gen 3:9 in response to two questions: "Why does He, who knows all things, ask Adam, 'where art thou?,' and why does He not also ask the woman?'" Philo's exegesis is aimed at combating an anthropomorphic interpretation, a strand of tradition that is quite early in

---

[45] 4Q184 Frag 1:8. On this fragment see Rick D. Moore, "Personification of the Seduction of Evil: 'The Wiles of the Wicked Woman,'" *RevQ* 10 (1981): 505–19; Matthew Goff, "Hellish Females: The Strange Woman of Septuagint Proverbs and 4QWiles of the Wicked Woman (4Q184)," *JSJ* 39 (2008): 20–45.

[46] Those rejecting Levison's reading include Skehan and Di Lella, *Wisdom*, 349; Gilbert, "Ben Sira, Reader of Gen 1–11," 91; Noffke, "Man of glory or first Sinner?" 618–19; Day, *From Creation to Babel*, 34 fn. 35.

[47] Claudia V. Camp, "Understanding a Patriarchy: Women in Second Century Jerusalem through the Eyes of Ben Sira," in *"Women like This": New Perspectives on Jewish Women in the Greco-Roman World* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991), 1–39, here 29–30; Collins, "Before the Fall," 297–298; Brand, *Evil Within and Without*, 113–14.

Alexandrian Jewish exegesis.[48] The fact that this interpretation is otherwise atypical for Philo strengthens the likelihood that a tradition existed that identified Eve as the origin of evil.[49] Perhaps this tradition about Eve as the beginning of evil was developed in conjunction with a sapiential tradition about the Wicked Wife.

Despite Levison's argument, then, it is difficult to deny some allusion to Eve's disobedience in Sir 25:24. The sapiential tradition about the wicked wife and Eve's primordial disobedience might easily be combined. Even assuming a reference to Eve in Sir 25:24, however, does not radically redefine Ben Sira's view of evil, sin, and death in abstraction from the entire work.

The evidence of Adamic tradition in Ben Sira examined here shows that Sir 25:24 is something of an oddity. There is no evidence in Ben Sira that Gen 3 functioned as a narrative account of the origin of evil. In fact, Gen 3 is decidedly muted when Ben Sira discusses evil and human culpability most explicitly (esp. Sir 15:11–20). When an allusion to Gen 3 does appear in Sir 17:1–15, it is used to articulate a theological anthropology in which humans can choose between the good and evil built into creation by God (see also Sir 33:7–15). Furthermore, there is no evidence to support the claim that Ben Sira opposed an Enochic account of the origin of evil. On the contrary, Ben Sira's reading of Gen 3 is remarkably like the reference to the Tree of Wisdom found in the Book of the Watchers (1 En. 32:6). The difference is that Ben Sira shows less interest in

---

[48] Thomas H. Tobin, *The Creation of Man: Philo and the History of Interpretation*, CBQMS 14 (Washington D. C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1983), 44–55. Tobin observes that the anti-anthropomorphic interpretations of the creation accounts are most heavily indebted to Plato's *Timaeus* and *Phaedrus*, the dialogues most "central to the development of Middle Platonism in the first century B. C." and these interpretations lack an intermediary figure common in later Middle Platonism (*Creation*, 49). Furthermore, Philo's anthropomorphic interpretations are paralleled in Philo's Jewish allegorical predecessor, Aristobulus (esp. Frag. 2 [Eusebius. *Praep. ev.* 8.9.38–8.10.17]).

[49] The significance of Eve is also notable in Sib. Or. 1.42–45 and 2 En. 31:6; 30:10, 17.

Adam's transgression than the BW. It is only in the idiosyncratic text of Sir 25:24 that an allusion to Eve's disobedience becomes significant for the origin of evil. Along with Philo (*QG* 1.45), Sir 25:24 testifies to a tradition that identifies Eve as the source of death. This cannot be interpreted as the dominant view for Ben Sira (or Philo) when compared to other arguments. Yet it is precisely the anomaly that New Testament scholars have identified as the key precedent for the Adamic template.

What is the significance of Sir 25:24 for the origin of evil when read in the context of the Sirach? First, Sir 25:24 indicates that there is no inherent conflict between the Adamic and Enochic views of evil in Ben Sira, at least not an incompatible one for the ancient author. Ben Sira shows awareness of both traditions. Second, Ben Sira's most significant reflections on the origin of evil (Sir 15:11–20; 33:7–15) parallel a tension between human culpability and divine providence found in ancient philosophy, most notably the Stoics. As a result, Ben Sira does not provide evidence for the Adamic template. Instead, he shows awareness of multiple traditions, Adamic, Enochic, and perhaps even philosophical. His eclecticism does not indicate a polemic against the Enochic tradition but rather a combination of traditions about evil that does not necessarily privilege one tradition over another. Ben Sira represents a mixed template.

3.1.2. Wisdom of Solomon

Although the date and provenance of Wisdom of Solomon are not certain, the book is important in tracing the origin and persistence of evil in Second Temple Judaism. Proposed dates for composition range widely from 220 BCE to 70 CE, but the Augustan era (ca. 31 BCE–14 CE) seems most likely.[50] The accumulation of evidence has led to the

[50] David Winston, *The Wisdom of Solomon*, AB 43 (Garden City: Doubleday, 1979), 20–25; Collins, *Jewish Wisdom*, 178–79; Lester L. Grabbe, *Wisdom of Solomon*, GAP (Sheffield: Sheffield

scholarly consensus that Wisdom originates in Alexandria.[51] The work is eclectic, combining a developing apocalyptic view of the afterlife (Wis 1:22; 3:7–9; 5:15–23; see also 1 En. 104:2–6; Dan 12:3; 1QM 1.8–9; 17:7) with a Greek cosmological view of the immortality of the soul (esp. Wis 8:19–20; 9:15; see Plato, *Resp.* 617e; *Phaed*. 66b) to articulate its eschatology.[52] Similar to Philo of Alexandria, Wisdom appropriates Hellenistic philosophy within a Middle Platonic framework.[53] In addition to apocalypticism and philosophical eclecticism, scholars have often argued that Wisdom was a source for Paul in Romans.[54] As a text from the Diaspora, written in Greek, combining apocalypticism and philosophy, Wisdom provides an important parallel to Paul, even if it is not a direct source.[55]

Academic Press, 1997), 87–90; Moynam McGlynn, *Divine Judgement and Divine Benevolence in the Book of Wisdom*, WUNT 2.139 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 9–13; Blischke, *Eschatologie in der Sapientia*, 44–7. Chysostome Larcher, *Le Livre de la Sagesse,* 3 Vols. EBib 1, 3, 5 (Paris: Gabalda, 1983), 1.146–61; Matthew Edwards, *Pneuma and Realized Eschatology in the Book of Wisdom*, FRLANT 242 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012), 24–37. James Davila pushes for a late date and possibly at the hands of a Christian author (*The Provenance of the Pseudepigrapha: Jewish, Christian, or other?* JSJSupp 105 [Leiden: Brill, 2005], 219–225). The key pieces of evidence for dating the book are the vocabulary and allusions to persecution (Wis 2:10–12, 19–20; 5:1) and the thirty-five words unparalleled in Greek literature prior to the first century identified by Winston (*Wisdom*, 22–23).

[51] James M. Reese, *Hellenistic Influence on the Book of Wisdom and Its Consequences*, AnBib 41 (Rome: Biblical Institute, 1970), 1–31, 147–52; Winston, *Wisdom*, 25; Collins, *Jewish Wisdom*, 178; Grabbe, *Wisdom*, 90–91; McGlynn, *Divine Judgement*, 9–13. Evidence includes: the prominence of Egypt (Wis 11–19, esp. 19:13–17), similarities to Philo of Alexandria (see Winston, *Wisdom*, 59–63), appropriation of Greek philosophy, and polemics against idolatry (13:10–15:17) and animal worship (15:18–19).

[52] John J. Collins, "Cosmos and Salvation: Jewish Wisdom and Apocalyptic in the Hellenistic Age," *HR* 17 (1977): 121–42; Reese, *Hellenistic Influence*, 62–71; Grabbe, *Wisdom*, 53–57; Shannon Burkes, "Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Wisdom of Solomon," *HTR* 95 (2002): 21–44; Matthew Goff, "Adam, the Angels and Eternal Life: Genesis 1-3 in the Wisdom of Solomon and 4QInstruction," in *Studies in the Book of Wisdom* (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 1–21, esp. 1–5.

[53] Winston, *Wisdom*, 33–34; Collins, *Jewish Wisdom*, 200–1; Ronald R. Cox, *By the Same Word: Creation and Salvation in Hellenistic Judaism and Early Christianity*, BZNW 145 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007), 58–60.

[54] See the history of the comparison in Joseph R. Dodson, *The "Powers" of Personification: Rhetorical Purpose in the Book of Wisdom and the Letter to the Romans*, BZNW 161 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2008), 4–13 and Jonathan A. Linebaugh, *God, Grace, and Righteousness in Wisdom of Solomon and Paul's Letter to the Romans*, NovTSupp 152 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 13–20.

[55] This is not to deny that Wisdom was a source for Paul.

Unlike Ben Sira, who sees death as a natural part of life created by God (esp. Sir 14:17; 17:1; 41:4), the author of Wisdom describes death as a corruption of creation (Wis 1:13–14; 2:23).[56] Like Ben Sira, Pseudo-Solomon grounds his theological anthropology in Gen 1–3. In Wisdom, immortality and incorruption are the divine intent for humanity (Wis 1:14; 2:23) and the ultimate lot of the righteous (Wis 3:1, 4; 5:15; 6:18–19; 8:13, 17; 15:3). Consequently, Wisdom must account for the existence of death, even giving voice to the "ungodly" who mistakenly reason that there is nothing beyond death (Wis 1:16–2:5, 21–22). It is not surprising, then, that Wisdom's view of the origin of sin and death has aroused substantial interest.[57]

Most pertinent for the Adamic template is the fact that Wisdom interprets Gen 1–3 to explain the origin of evil. There are five allusions to the creation narratives of Genesis in Wisdom (Wis 2:23–24; 7:1; 9:1–3; 10:1–2; 15:8–17).[58] The key text for Pauline scholars to identify the origin of evil in Adam's disobedience is Wis 2:23–24.

---

[56] John J. Collins, "The Root of Immortality: Death in the Context of Jewish Wisdom," *HTR* 71 (1978): 177–92 offers a comparison of Ben Sira and Wisdom on death. See also Collins, *Jewish Wisdom*, 187–89.

[57] Tennant, *Sources of the Fall*, 123–131; John P. Weisengoff, "Death and Immortality in the Book of Wisdom," *CBQ* 3 (1941): 104–33; R. J. Taylor, "The Eschatological Meaning of Life and Death in the Book of Wisdom I-V," *ETL* 42 (1966): 72–137; Collins, "Root of Immortality," 186–192; Yehoshua Amir, "The Figure of Death in the Book of Wisdom," *JJS* 30 (1979): 154–78; Beverly Roberts Gaventa, "The Rhetoric of Death in the Wisdom of Solomon and the Letters of Paul," in *The Listening Heart: Essays in Wisdom and the Psalms in Honor of Roland E. Murphy*, ed. Kenneth G. Hoglund (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987), 127–45; Michael Kolarcik, *The Ambiguity of Death in the Book of Wisdom 1-6: A Study of Literary Structure and Interpretation*, AnBib 127 (Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1991); Collins, *Jewish Wisdom*, 178–95; Karina Martin Hogan, "The Exegetical Background of the 'Ambiguity of Death' in the Wisdom of Solomon," *JSJ* 30 (1999): 1–24; A. P. Hayman, "The Survival of Mythology in the Wisdom of Solomon," *JSJ* 30 (1999): 125–39; Mareike Verena Blischke, *Die Eschatologie in der Sapientia Salomonis*, FAT 2.26 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 80–88, 114–16; Christian Kurzewitz, *Weisheit und Tod: Die Ätiologie des Todes in der Sapientia Salomonis* (Tübingen: Francke, 2010); Dodson, *"Powers" of Personification*, 56–68; Linebaugh, *God, Grace, and Righteousness*, 30–42.

[58] Levison, *Portraits of Adam*, 49–62; Legaretta-Castillo, *Figure of Adam*, 46–51. The reference to Adam in Wis 15 is typically limited to vv. 8–11. The use of *πλάσσω* (Wis 15:16) and the contrast between the idol maker as a living representation of the true God with the idol as a dead representation of a false god (15:17) extends the parameters of allusion.

But this brief text, like Sir 25:24, is an anomaly in comparison with Adamic tradition found throughout Wisdom of Solomon.[59] As a result, Wis 2:23–24 can only be properly interpreted after giving the rest of the work due consideration.

3.1.2.1 Wisdom 7:1

Adamic tradition is most frequent in middle section of the work, the so-called "Book of Wisdom" (Wis 6:22–10:21), appearing three times (Wis 7:1; 9:1–3; 10:1–2).[60] In the first instance, Pseudo-Solomon references Adam to draw attention to his own mortality:

> εἰμὶ μὲν κἀγὼ θνητὸς ἄνθρωπος ἴσος ἅπασιν καὶ γηγενοῦς ἀπόγονος πρωτοπλάστου
>
> I also am *a mortal man*, like everyone else, a descendant of the first-formed earthborn . . .[61]

The focus on mortality in Wis 7:1 is entirely dependent on the J creation account. The rare substantive adjective "first-formed [πρωτοπλάστος]," for example, is a nominalized form of the verb πλάσσω from LXX Gen 2:7.[62] Additionally, Adam is described as "earthborn [γηγενής]" since he was formed "from the earth [ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς]" (LXX Gen 2:7).[63] Like Ben Sira, the author of Wisdom sees mortality in the creation account of

---

[59] David Winston, "Theodicy in Wisdom of Solomon," in *Theodicy in the World of the Bible*, eds. Antti Laato and Johannes C. de Moor (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 525–545, on Wis 2:24 see 526–27.

[60] Collins, *Jewish Wisdom*, 179–82. See also Winston, *Wisdom*, 10–12; James M. Reese, "Plan and Structure in the Book of Wisdom," *CBQ* 27 (1965): 391–399; A. G. Wright, "Structure of the Book of Wisdom," *Bib* 48 (1967): 165–184.

[61] Wis 7:1a. Wisdom provides no names for the figures he draws on from the Hebrew Bible with the single exception of Solomon.

[62] The title πρωτοπλάστος occurs only twice in the LXX (Wis 7:1; 10:1) but is a frequent shorthand for Adam in the *Testament of Abraham* ([A] 11:9, 10, 11; 13:2, 5). See also Philo, *QG* 1.32; *QE* 2.46.

[63] The adjective γηγενής often refers to the ancient race born from the earth in Greek literature (Herodotus, *Hist*. 8.55; Aeschylus, *Suppl*. 250; Plato, *Pol*. 269b, 271a, b). Plato uses πλαστός to refer to this ancient race as well (*Soph*. 219a). γηγενής is rare in the LXX (Ps 48:3 [49:2]; Prov 2:18; 9:18; Jer 39:20 [32:20]), but Philo uses it as a shorthand reference to Adam (e.g. *Opif.* 132, 136; *Leg*. 1.33; *Abr*. 12, 56; *Virt*. 199, 203; *QG* 1.20, 21; *Leg*. 1.79), and occasionally to refer to other earthly creatures (*Opif.* 69, 82, 156; *Praem*. 9).

Genesis 2, apart from any reference to Adam's transgression. The implied logic of Wis 7:1 is explicitly stated by Philo in the Exposition on the Law. Mortality and perishability are inherent to being "earthborn [γηγενής]" (*Spec*. 2.124; *Opif*. 82; see also *QG* 1.51).[64] Interpreting Gen 2:7, Philo argues that a human being is a "composite [σύνθετον]" creature, a result of combining an "earthy [γεώδης]," "mortal [θνητός]" body with the "divine breath [πνεῦμα θεῖον]," which is the "immortal [ἀθάνατον]" soul (*Opif*. 135; see also Plato, *Phaed.* 79b–80a).[65] As Karina Martin Hogan argues concerning Wis 7:1, "The universality of physical mortality [. . .] is associated with the fact that the first man was formed from the earth (Gen 2:7)."[66]

The ubiquity of human mortality (Wis 7:1, 6; 15:17) seems to conflict with the argument for immortality and incorruption that is so central to the book. But in Pseudo-Solomon's view, immortality is limited to the souls of the righteous (Wis 3:1–4; see also 1:15) who receive immortality as a gift from wisdom (Wis 6:17–19; 7:25; 8:13, 17; 9:17–

---

[64] The association of human weakness with the dust is developed at Qumran into a notion of inherent sinfulness. See, for example, the phrase "creatures of clay" (1QH[a] 9.23; 12.30; 19.6; 20.29, 35; 22.12; 23.13) and the discussion in Brand, *Evil Within and Without*, 59–68.

[65] Gen 2:7 is one of the most frequently cited passages in the Philonic corpus and the Alexandrian appears to offer conflicting interpretations. The complexity of Philo's interpretation cannot be addressed here. However, *Opif*. 135, like Wis 7:1 but more explicitly, connects the physical body with mortality (see also *Somn*. 1.68). Although similar to and often conflated with *Opif.* 134–135, Philo's allegorical exegesis of Gen 2:7 in the Allegorical Commentary introduces two significant features not found in *Opif*. 134–135. First, Philo explicitly distinguishes between the "heavenly man" of Gen 1:26–27 and an "earthly man" of Gen 2:7 (*Leg*. 1.31), a distinction not explicit in the Exposition. Second, Philo refers to the man of Gen 2:7 as "a mind mingled with but not yet completely blended with body [εἰσκρινόμενον σώματι, οὔπω δ' εἰσκεκριμένον]" that is "the earthlike mind [ὁ νοῦς γεώδης]" (*Leg*. 1.32). The distinction between two minds is further developed in Philo's allegorical exegesis of Gen 2:8, 15 describing two trajectories of the soul's journey (see *Leg*. 1.42, 53–55, 88–89, 90–96, 2.4; see also *Conf*. 41, 62–63; 146; *Plant*. 44–46; *QG* 1.8b). On the relationship between *Opif*. 134–135 and *Leg*. 1.31–33 see Tobin, *Creation of Man*, 108–112. See also David T. Runia, *On the Creation of the Cosmos according to Moses*, PACS 1 (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 321–24.

[66] Hogan, "Exegetical Background," 16. This conforms with Ben Sira (17:1) and Philo (*Opif*. 134). The same interpretation is found in Kolarcik, *Ambiguity of Death*, 144, 169. See also Levison, *Portraits of Adam*, 55.

18; see also 18:4). Again, Philo provides an instructive parallel, distinguishing between physical death and the death of the soul.[67] Philo's lengthiest description of the "death of the soul" is found in his allegorical exegesis of Gen 2:17 (*Leg*. 1.105–108).[68] Philo raises and responds to the objection that although Adam and Eve are commanded to abstain from the Tree of Knowledge under penalty of death, after violating this command the couple continues to live and even beget children. Philo's response is to distinguish between two kinds of death, "one that of the man in general, the other that of the soul in particular [ὁ μὲν ἀνθρώπου, ὁ δὲ ψυχῆς ἴδιος]" (*Leg*. 1.105). The general, physical death is "the separation of the soul from the body" (*Leg*. 1.105; see also Plato, *Phaed*. 64c) common to all (*Leg.* 1.106) and natural (*Leg*. 1.107). Death of the soul, however, "takes place when the soul dies to the life of virtue and is alive only to that of wickedness" (*Leg*. 1.108).[69] Although Wisdom never makes an explicit appeal to this distinction, the shared exegetical traditions between Philo and Wisdom along with Pseudo-Solomon's otherwise

---

[67] Kolarcik, *Ambiguity of Death*, 77, 146; Hogan, "Exegetical Background," 17–19; Goff, "Adam, the Angels and Eternal Life," 8; Jason M. Zurawski, "Hell on Earth: Corporeal Existence as the Ultimate Punishment of the Wicked in Philo of Alexandria and the Wisdom of Solomon," in *Heaven, Hell, and the Afterlife: Eternity in Judaism, Christianity and Islam*, ed. J. Harold Ellens, 3 Vols (Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger, 2013) 1.193–226. John Collins protests that the Philonic distinction is not explicit in Wisdom and instead favors the view that both physical and spiritual death are in view in Wis 1:13–14 and 2:23–24 (*Jewish Wisdom*, 188). Collins goes on to interpret the physical death of the righteous as only "death" from the perspective of the fool (Wis 3:2) whereas physical death for the unrighteous is coterminous with the death of the soul. Even Collins, then, who rejects the "spiritual death" interpretation of Wisdom's view of mortality of humanity and immortality of the soul is forced to explain "physical death" with a spiritual or ethical qualification.

[68] Philo interprets Gen 2:17 elsewhere (*Plant*. 45; *Somn*. 2.70; *Virt*. 205; *QG* 1.16, 51), but *Leg*. 1.105–108 is the most complete account. On the concept of the "death of the soul" elsewhere in Philo see also *Fug*. 53–64; *Det*. 47–51; *Congr*. 54–57 and the secondary literature: D. Zeller, "The Life and Death of the Soul in Philo of Alexandria: The Use and Origin of a Metaphor," *SPhiloA* 7 (1995): 19–55; Wasserman, *Death of the Soul*, 60–76; John T. Conroy, "'The Wages of Sin Is Death': The Death of the Soul in Greek, Second Temple Jewish, and Early Christian Authors" (PhD diss., University of Notre Dame, 2008), 104–130; Conroy, "Philo's 'Death of the Soul': Is This Only a Metaphor?" in *SPhiloA* 23 (2011): 23–40.

[69] See also *Det.* 48, 70, 74; *Her*. 292; *Fug*. 55; *Somn.* 2.235; *QG* 1.51 *QE* 2.38

contradictory statements about mortality (Wis 7:1; 9:15) and immortality (Wis 1:13–14; 2:23) suggest he shares this view.

3.1.2.2 Wisdom 9:1–2

In the second appearance of Adam on the lips of Pseudo-Solomon, the author of Wisdom re-enacts Solomon's prayer for wisdom (Wis 9:1–18; par. 1 Kgs 3:3–9; 2 Chron 1:8–10). Pseudo-Solomon offers an exalted portrait of Adam, requesting the wisdom by which Adam was constructed and identifies Adam's purpose as ruling over creation (Wis 9:2). The description of Adam's construction includes an allusion to Gen 2:7 and the glorious reign attributed to Adam is based on Gen 1:26–27 and Ps 8.[70] There is no reference to sin, death, or disobedience. Rather, in Wis 9:1–2, the mortal, earthborn Adam of Gen 2:7 is identified as the image of God from Gen 1:26–27, created to rule.

3.1.2.3 Wisdom 10:1–2

In the third reference to Adam on the lips of Pseudo-Solomon we find mention of Adam's transgression for the first time:

> Wisdom protected *the first-formed father* [πρωτόπλαστον πατέρα] of the world, when he alone had been created; *she delivered him from his transgression* [ἐξείλατο αὐτὸν ἐκ παραπτώματος ἰδίου] and gave him strength to rule all things.[71]

The "first-formed father," as in Wis 7:1, is an allusion to Gen 2:7, here combined with the ruling motif of Gen 1:26 and Ps 8:6[5].[72] The same wisdom that created Adam (Wis

---

[70] The formation of Adam in 9:1 uses a generic construction verb (κατασκευάζω) that describes God's construction of humanity (9:2; 13:4) and creation (11:24), as well as human construction of idols (13:11; cf. Isa 40:19). Like πλάσσω in Wis 15:7–17, κατασκευάζω is used in Wis 13:1–19 to contrast the work of God with idol-makers.

[71] Wis 10:1–2. It is often observed that παράπτωμα also appears in Romans referring to Adam's sin (Rom 5:15, 16, 17, 18, 20). The verb for "deliver [ἐξαιρέω]" appears in Gal 1:4.

[72] Andrew T. Glicksman, *Wisdom of Solomon 10: A Jewish Hellenistic Reinterpretation of Early Israelite History through Sapiential Lenses*, DCLS 9 (Göttingen: de Gruyter, 2011), 111 has trouble

9:1) "protected and delivered" the protoplast from his transgression (Wis 10:1). How is Adam's protection and deliverance to be understood?

The precise meaning of Adam's deliverance is unclear but several proposals have been made. The first and least common interpretation is that Wis 10:1–2 is a summary of a proto-Gnostic myth.[73] The second option, common among those who read Philo and Wisdom together, is that Adam's deliverance refers to the delayed punishment of Adam and Eve after their disobedience.[74] The third option, common among those who read Wisdom in light of the Primary Adam books, is to interpret Adam's deliverance as a reference to his repentance and restoration.[75] Although options two and three have some support, neither is satisfactory. Instead I propose that Adam's deliverance describes the salvation of his soul from death and the protection of his ordained vocation to rule.

Since Philo is helpful for illuminating the terse poetic philosophy of Wisdom, it has been argued that he can clarify Wis 10:1–2. In Philo's reading of Gen 2:17 the Alexandrian feels compelled to explain why Adam and Eve do not die immediately after

---

reading a reference to Gen 1:26 in Wis 10:2 because he is beholden to a reading of Gen 1–3 that attributes cosmic significance to Adam's sin, a reading that is not warranted by the text of Wisdom. The allusion is rightly recognized by J. A. F. Gregg, *The Wisdom of Solomon* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909), 96; Larcher, *Sagesse*, 2.614; Helmut Engel, *Das Buch der Weisheit*, NSKAT 16 (Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1998), 169; Kolarcik, "The Book of Wisdom" in *The New Interpreter's Bible*, Vol 6. ed. Leander E. Keck et. al. (Nashville: Abingdon, 1997), 523.

[73] Brandenburger, *Adam und Christus*, 111–13 drawing on Erik Peterson, "La liberation d'Adam de l'Ανάγκη," *RB* 55 (1948), 199–214, esp. 210–11. Brandenburger's proto-Gnostic thesis has fallen on hard times. Given that all identifiably "Gnostic" texts post-date the NT scholars are skeptical of pre-Christian Gnosticism (see Carsten Colpe, *Die religionsgeschichtliche Schule: Darstellung und Kritik ihres Bildes vom gnostischen Erlösermythus* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961]; Edwin M. Yamauchi, *Pre-Christian Gnosticism: A Survey of the Proposed Evidences*, 2nd ed. [Grand Rapids: Baker, 1983]; Carl B. Smith II, *No Longer Jews: The Search for Gnostic Origins* [Peabody: Hendrickson, 2004]).

[74] Gregg, *Wisdom*, 96; Engel, *Weisheit*, 169; Hogan, "Exegetical Background," 24; Goff, "Adam, the Angels and Eternal Life," 11.

[75] Winston, *Wisdom,* 213*;* Glicksman, *Wisdom of Solomon 10*, 109. Larcher, *Sagesse*, 2.613 notes the potential parallel to the Primary Adam books as well.

partaking from the Tree of Wisdom (*Leg*. 1.105–108). Philo's exegesis explains the means of punishment for Adam's disobedience as the death of his soul:

> If he had been desirous of virtue, which *makes the soul immortal* [ἀθανατίζει τὴν ψυχήν], he would certainly have obtained heaven as his lot. Since he was zealous for pleasure, through which *spiritual death* [ψυχικὸς θάνατος] is brought about, he again gives himself back to the earth.[76]

Philo's reading of Gen 3 as the death of Adam's soul is also found in the allegorical commentary.[77] Seeking to avoid anthropomorphism, Philo interprets God's question to Adam "Where are you?" (Gen 3:9) not as a real question but a rhetorical rebuke:

> In the place of such great goods, what evils have you chosen? After God invited you to participate in virtue, you pursue evil? And after God provided for your enjoyment the tree of life, that is of wisdom, by which you can live, *you gorged yourself on ignorance and corruption* [ἀμαθίας καὶ φθορᾶς ἐνεφορήθης], preferring *misery* [κακοδαιμονίαν] the *soul's death* [τὸν ψυχῆς θάνατον] to *happiness* [εὐδαιμονίας] the true life?[78]

Although Philo is often useful for tracing similar exegetical traditions found in Wisdom, in this instance the two contradict. In Philo Adam's soul dies, whereas in Wisdom, Adam is rescued and protected. Philo's interpretation of Adam's fate does not explain Wis 10:1–2.

Another potential parallel to Wisdom is found in the Primary Adam books where Adam repents. But the parallels to the Primary Adam books are rather broad and more distinct than similar. Aside from the potential anachronism of using a later text to interpret an earlier one, in the Primary Adam books the repentance of Adam is explicit in

---

[76] *QG* 1.51.

[77] Philo contrasts Cain's voluntary departure from God with Adam's involuntary expulsion from the garden (*Post*. 10–11). The result is that Cain is "for ever beyond healing (ἀνιάτους εἰς ἀεί)" (*Post*. 11). Perhaps the "soul death" tradition began as an explanation for why Adam and Eve do not immediately die, but it has been fundamentally altered by the author of Wisdom.

[78] *Leg* 3.52. LCL translation of Colson and Whittaker altered.

a lengthy narrative (*Vita Ad.* 1–8). Also, the disobedience of Adam and Eve impairs humanity's ruling capacity over creation (GLAE 10:1–11:3) and Adam's restoration is eschatological (GLAE 13:2–5). These profound differences make the potential parallels less illuminating than they appear at first glance. How, then, should Adam's protection and deliverance from transgression in Wisdom be understood?

As suggested above, Adam is delivered from the ultimate death that results from transgression and his divinely ordained vocation to rule is protected.[79] The word for "deliver" in Wis 10:1 (ἐξαιρέω) appears only here in Wisdom, but the LXX uses it most frequently to translate נצל to describe rescue from mortal peril, often peril at the hands of enemies.[80] Additionally, ἐξαιρέω is used in the LXX to describe God's rescue of Israel in the Exodus (Exod 3:8; 18:4, 8, 9, 10; see also Acts 7:34) and Joseph's rescue from the murderous intent of his brothers (Gen 37:21–22). In Wisdom the word for the "rescue" referring to these same events is ῥύομαι (Wis 10:13, 15; 19:9).[81] The synonymous use of these terms suggests that Adam was delivered from a grave peril.[82] Yet the peril cannot be

[79] This interpretation comes closest to Levison, *Portraits of Adam*, 60–61 and Legaretta-Castillo, *Figure of Adam*, 50. John Collins does not elaborate on Adam's salvation in Wis 10:1–2 except to compare Wisdom's salvific role in Wis 10 to Isis's role in Greek religion (*Jewish Wisdom*, 203–4) and to interpret all of Wis 10 as "a cosmic allegory, that could in principle be appropriated by any righteous people" (*Jewish Wisdom*, 214) in contrast to the apocalyptic eschatology with a telos for Israel specifically (e.g. 1 En. 93:1–10; 91:11–17; CD 2:14–3:11).

[80] Rescue from (mortal) peril (Gen 32:12; 37:21–22; Pss 49:15 [50:15]; 91:15[90:15]; 116:8 [114:8]; 119:153[118:153]; Eccl. 7:26; Job 5:4, 19; 10:7; 36:21; Sir 29:12; 33:1), and from the hands of enemies (Pss 37:40[36:40]; 59:1 [58:2]; 64:1[63:2]; 71:2 [70:2]; 82:4 [81:4]; 140:1, 4 [139:2, 5]; 143:9 [142:9]; 144:7, 11[143:7, 11]).

[81] A synonym to ἐξαιρέω, ῥύομαι also typically translates נצל in the LXX. The synonym (ῥύομαι) refers to the rescue of Lot (Wis 10:6 [Gen 19:15–25]) and the rescue of Israel from serpents in the wilderness (Wis 16:8 [Num 21:4–9]).

[82] Levison, *Portrait of Adam*, 60 subordinates the meaning of ἐξαιρέω to διαφυλάσσω, with the resulting interpretation: "He prays not for deliverance after sinning but for help and protection from the possibility of error." Levison is correct to note the nuance of protection with reference to διαφυλάσσω but fails to account for the meaning of ἐξαιρέω.

mortality since Wisdom attributes physical mortality to Adam's earthy composition (Gen 2:7 in Wis 7:1). Rather, the peril Adam faced was that of judgment (Wis 1:16–2:5; 3:10–13a; 4:20; 5:17–23). According to Pseudo-Solomon, "Wisdom will not enter into a *malicious soul* [κακότεχνον ψυχὴν], or dwell in a body burdened of sin" (Wis 1:4). Also, "a lying mouth *kills the soul* [ἀναιρεῖ ψυχήν]" (1:11) and the "error of life [πλάνῃ ζωῆς]" seeks death (1:12). The result of Adam's disobedience ought to be his "ultimate death," that is "complete separation from God" or "death of the soul" as Philo describes it.[83] Adam needs rescue from soul death.

Unlike Philo who interprets Adam's disobedience as soul death, Pseudo-Solomon portrays Lady Wisdom coming to the protoplast's rescue.[84] Additional support for the interpretation that Wis 10:1–2 refers to the rescue of the soul is Philo's use of ἐξαιρέω. Philo interprets Exod 2:23 as a request for "salvation of the soul to deliver it for freedom [σῶστρα . . . τῆς ψυχῆς εἰς ἐλευθερίαν αὐτὴν ἐξέληται]" (*Conf.* 93).[85] Divine rescue from perilous danger for Pseudo-Solomon and Philo is not a deliverance from physical death but from the more ominous fate of soul death. According to Philo, Adam's soul dies. In contrast, Pseudo-Solomon describes Adam's rescue.

Not only does Pseudo-Solomon rescue Adam from the death of the soul, but he contrasts Adam's salvation with Cain's death, a death of the soul. In the context of

---

[83] Kolarcik, *Ambiguity of Death*, 175. The concept of "ultimate death" is Kolarcik's description of the fate of the wicked who reason falsely and pursue injustice. He prefers "ultimate" over "spiritual death" because it reflects the argument of the author of Wisdom that ultimate realities expose the faulty logic of the wicked in Wis 2:16; 3:17, 19; 4:19 (*Ambiguity of Death*, 77 fn. 19).

[84] See also Michael Kolarcik, "Creation and Salvation in the book of Wisdom," in *Creation in the Biblical Traditions*, eds. Richard J. Clifford and John J. Collins, CBQMS 24 (Washington DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1992), 102–4.

[85] Of the 13 uses of ἐξαιρέω in Philo, 9 are references to the rescue of the soul or mind from passions (*Sacr.* 117; *Det.* 16; *Conf.* 93; *Migr.* 14, 25; *Her.* 124, 271; *Spec.* 2.218; *Praem.* 124).

Wisdom 10, Adam's rescue and protection is contrasted with Cain's departure from wisdom (Wis 10:3). Furthermore, Wisdom blames Cain for the flood (Wis 10:4), an otherwise unparalleled accusation.[86] It would be a mistake, however, to interpret Wis 10:4 as a rejection of the Enochic tradition. Like Ben Sira (esp. Sir 16:7), Wisdom refers to the Enochic tradition (Wis 14:6). Pseudo-Solomon interprets Cain's fratricide as his death: "he perished with [Abel] in fratricidal rage [ἀδελφοκτόνοις συναπώλετο θυμοῖς]" (10:3).[87] Wisdom's argument is again illuminated by Philo. Cain's murderous actions are interpreted by the Alexandrian as self-slaughter in his allegorical interpretation of Gen 4:8 (*Det*. 47–48).[88] According to Philo, Cain's fratricide resulted in being "alive to the life of wickedness, dead to the good life" (*Det*. 49). Later in the same treatise, interpreting Gen 4:10, Philo explicitly describes Cain's fate as "soul death" (*Det*. 70, 74). Like Philo, the author of Wisdom interprets Cain's actions not as his physical death but the death of his soul through fratricide. The Adam/Cain contrast supports the interpretation that Adam, unlike Cain, was rescued from soul-death.

3.1.2.4 Wisdom 15:8–17

The final reference to Adamic traditions in Wisdom of Solomon occurs in the context of a sustained polemic against idolatry (Wis 13:1–15:17).[89] This polemic highlights the

[86] Kugel, *Traditions of the Bible*, 166 suggests that this may be linked to a tradition that Cain was killed by the flood citing *Gen Rabb*. 22:12; 1 En. 22:7.

[87] My translation follows Hogan, "Exegetical Background," 21–22. The aorist middle indicative of συναπόλλυμι implies that Cain perished with someone else. See the discussion of interpretive options in Larcher, *Sagesse*, 2.616–17.

[88] Philo even provides a textual correction. Instead of the LXX "*killed him* [ἀπέκτεινεν αὐτόν i.e. Abel]", Philo prefers that Cain "killed himself [ἀπέκτεινεν ἑαυτόν]" (*Det*. 47–48).

[89] It is worth noting that this polemic has often been suggested as an influence on Rom 1:18–2:11. See Linebaugh, *God, Grace, and Righteousness*, 93–121; Linebaugh, "Announcing the Human: Rethinking the Relationship Between Wisdom of Solomon 13–15 and Romans 1.18–2.11," *NTS* 57 (2011): 214–237.

irrationality of idolatry, which, like death, is a product of human evil (Wis 14:12–14; see also 1:13–16).[90] The argument of Wis 15:8–17 mocks the idol-maker through parody. The idol-maker "forms [πλάσσει]" vain gods out of the same earth from which he was made (Wis 15:8). The idol-maker celebrates the idols he "formed" (Wis 15:9) ignorant of the God who "formed" him (Wis 15:11), a clear allusion to Gen 2:7. The idol-maker's foolishness results in forfeiting his soul (Wis 15:8) and dishonoring his life (Wis 15:10). The idol-maker cannot "form" an idol like himself (Wis 15:16), that is a creature with a living soul (Wis 15:11). The work of the idol-maker's hands, unlike God's work in Gen 2:7, is dead (Wis 15:17). This mockery inverts Wis 9:1–2 where the earthborn Adam of Gen 2:7 is portrayed as a glorious expression of the divine image in Gen 1:26–27.[91] Although there is no explicit allusion to Gen 1:26–27 or Gen 2:7 in Wis 15:8–17, they are implied. The idol-maker was "formed" with a living soul (Wis 15:11 [Gen 2:7]), but rather than wisely representing the divine image (Gen 1:26–27) he foolishly "forms" false gods for financial gain (Wis 15:12). The polemic against the idol maker, like the contrast between Adam and Cain in Wis 10:1–4, signifies the profound difference between Adam and those facing judgment. Even though Adam was disobedient, this disobedience did not result in his ultimate death because of wisdom. The folly of the idol-maker, like Cain's fratricide, kills his soul.

Before analyzing Wis 2:23–24 we can draw a few preliminary conclusions about Adam and evil in Wisdom of Solomon. First, Adam's physical mortality is never connected to his disobedience but is assumed to be inherent to his nature as an embodied

[90] Winston, "Theodicy in Wisdom," 541.

[91] The polemic also resembles Isa 44:9–20 which has been influenced by Gen 2:7 as well.

earthy creature (Wis 7:1, 6; 9:15; 15:17). Second, Adam's purpose to rule as God's image (Gen 1:26–27) was not destroyed by his transgression nor prohibited from being passed to his offspring. Rather, Adam as God's image forms the basis for Pseudo-Solomon's general anthropology (Wis 7:1; 9:1–2; 15:8–17). Furthermore, Adam was rescued and protected from the death of the soul by Lady Wisdom (Wis 10:1–2), a possibility for all who seek her (Wis 6:12, 17–20; 8:13, 17; 15:1–3). This means that while Adam's transgression was not insignificant, it did not define him, nor does it mark a change in the cosmos for the author of Wisdom. Third, and perhaps most importantly, the prototype for human evil according to Wisdom of Solomon is not Adam but Cain (Wis 10:3–4). These conclusions, although coherent and consistent with one another, fit awkwardly when read against the typical interpretation of Wis 2:23–24.

3.1.2.5 Wisdom 2:23–24

As mentioned above, the key text for New Testament scholars to identify the origin of evil in Adam's disobedience prior to Paul is Wisdom 2:23–24. The text reads:

> ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ἔκτισεν τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐπ' ἀφθαρσίᾳ καὶ εἰκόνα τῆς ἰδίας ἰδιότητος[92] ἐποίησεν αὐτόν, φθόνῳ δὲ διαβόλου θάνατος εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον, πειράζουσιν δὲ αὐτὸν οἱ τῆς ἐκείνου μερίδος ὄντες.
>
> For God created the man for incorruptibility and made him in the image of his own proper being, but by a devil's envy death entered the world, and those of his party test him.[93]

---

[92] The Göttingen LXX reads ἰδιότητος rather than ἀϊδιότητος found in Rahlf's and the majority of textual witnesses. The decision follows Clement of Alexandria as testimony to a text that was edited for theological reasons. See Joseph Ziegler, *Sapientia Salomonis*, Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum Aucoritate Societatis Litterarum Gottingensis editum 12,1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962), 65. The variant is beyond the scope of this investigation, but my translation reflects the critical text of Ziegler. Winston, *Wisdom*, 121 points out a parallel with the alternate reading in Philo, *Opif.* 44.

[93] My translation has some substantial differences from standard translations. Consider for comparison: "But God created man for immortality, and made him an image of his own proper being; it was through the devil's envy that Death entered into the cosmic order, and they who are his own experience him" (Winston, *Wisdom*, 112–13). My translation differences follow the arguments of Jason M. Zurawski, "Separating the Devil from the Diabolos: A Fresh Reading of Wisdom of Solomon 2.24," *JSP* 21 (2012): 366–99, esp. 384–86. First, I interpret πειράζω to mean "try, tempt, put to test" as it normally does rather

Most important to Wisdom's view of evil are the references to divine intention for human immortality (Wis 2:23; 1:13), an account of the origin of death in the cosmos (Wis 2:24) and the mention of a devil (Wis 2:24). Wisdom 2:23–24 is interpreted as the first explicit instance of reading of Gen 3:1–24 as a fall narrative, attributing cosmic significance to Adam's disobedience as the origin of evil.[94] According to John P. Weisengoff this passage "completes the Genesis story on the entrance of sin into the world and reveals the deeper consequences of Adam's sin."[95] Additionally, scholars observe this as the entrance of a new idea into Israel's theology, namely a superhuman evil figure.[96] This stands in remarkable contrast to Adamic tradition as it appears in the rest of Wisdom. What, then, can be made of Wis 2:23–24?

Jason Zurawski makes a compelling case for rereading Wis 2:24. He argues that the author of Wisdom is not describing a superhuman evil nor "an original sin which fundamentally altered the structure of the cosmos and humanity's place in it."[97] Key to Zurawski's argument is the semantic range of the term διαβόλος, which he suggests refers to a more general adversary, a meaning more consistent with the use of the term at the time Wisdom of Solomon was composed.[98] Zurawski is not the first to suggest that the

---

than the otherwise unattested meaning of "experience." Second, I leave the antecedent of ἐκεῖνος in 2:24 ambiguous. Zurawski argues that the antecedent is "death [θάνατος]," as it is in Wis 1:16, rather than "devil [διαβόλος]. Third, I read the antecedent of the αὐτός in 2:24 as man, as it is in 2:23, rather than "death."

[94] Tennant, *Sources of the Fall*, 128.

[95] Weisengoff, "Death and Immortality," 127.

[96] Winston, *Wisdom*, 121; Larcher, *Sagesse*, 1.270; Collins, *Jewish Wisdom*, 190; Paolo Sacchi, *The History of the Second Temple Period* (New York: T&T Clark, 2000), 351; Blischke, *Eschatologie in der Sapientia*, 101–2. Frequently parallels to the Primary Adam books are suggested, for examples, see Kolarcik, "Book of Wisdom," 464–65 and Dodson, *"Powers" of Personification*, 63–4.

[97] Zurawski, "Separating the Devil from the Diabolos," 368.

[98] Zurawski, "Separating the Devil from Diabolos," 376–81 argues there is not a clear identification of the serpent with a malevolent supra-human "Devil" until 3 Baruch, Primary Adam books,

"devil" here is not a Satan figure. Not only is there no reference to "envy [φθόνος]" in Gen 3, but numerous scholars have suggested in light of Wis 10:1–4 that the adversary is a reference to Cain.[99] The Cain-as-adversary reading fits Wis 10:1–4 and it appears that Wis 2:24 was read as a reference to Cain by the author of 1 Clement.[100] Furthermore, Cain is a key figure in Philo's view of the origin of evil.[101] The two dominant views of the adversary in Wis 2:24 are either a Satan figure or Cain, but neither option is entirely satisfying.

Although the Cain interpretation is enticing there are several problems with this view.[102] First, there is no clear reason why the author of Wisdom would identify Cain as an adversary, nor how his readers would be able to make such a connection. Second, "envy [φθόνος]" is nowhere explicitly associated with Cain in earlier or contemporary texts.[103] Even Philo, who has a notable interest in envy as a vice and Cain as a paradigm of evil, never connects Cain with envy.[104] Zurawski, then, interprets the "adversary" in a

---

and the T. 12 Patr. He notes the presence of the fallen angel Gader'el in the deception of Eve found in the Enochic Book of Parables (1 En. 69:6–7) but makes no mention of Rev 12:9 or 4 Macc 18:8.

[99] Henri Bois, *Essai sur les origins de la philosphie Judéo-Alexandrine* (Paris: Libraire Fischbacher, 1890), 296–97; Gregg, *Wisdom*, 22–23; W. H. A. Learoyd, "The Envy of the Devil in Wisdom 2,24," *ExpTim* 51 (1939–40), 395–96; Levison, *Portraits of Adam*, 51–52; John Byron, *Cain and Abel in Text and Tradition: Jewish and Christian Interpretations of the First Sibling Rivalry*, TBN 14 (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 220–223.

[100] 1 Clem 3:4–4:7. See Jan Dochhorn, "Mit Kain kam der Tod in die Welt: Zur Auslegung von SapSal 2,24 in 1 Clem 3,4; 4,1-7, mit einem Seitenblick auf Polykarp, Phil. 7,1 und Theophilus, Ad Autol. II, 29,3-4," *ZNW* 98 (2007): 150–59. The traditions of evil originating with Adam and Eve's disobedience or Cain's fratricide come together in Theophilus, *Autol*. 2.29.

[101] This theme is explored throughout Philo's three allegorical treatises on Gen 4 (*Sacr*.; *Det*.; *Post*.). See also *Virt*. 198–200;

[102] See Hogan, "Exegetical Backround," 21.

[103] Cain is a paradigm of envy in 1 Clem 4:7, but this is based on Wis 2:24 in 1 Clem 3:4.

[104] Hogan, "Exegetical Background" 21 fn. 64 ultimately adopts a tentative position that Cain's murder of Abel culminates the disobedience of Adam and Eve citing precedent in Irenaeus (*Haer.* 1.30.9) and Theophilus (*Autol*. 2.29).

typological way, “the type of ungodly” who have corrupt logic throughout 2:1–20. The typological interpretation is strengthened by the parallels between Wis 2:23–24 and 1:13–15.[105] Also, a typological reading provides the best explanation for the absence of a definite article to identify a specific adversary.[106] The resulting interpretation is that an adversary could well include the serpent or Cain, but Wisdom is speaking more generally about the way in which humanity, created in God’s image, rejects wisdom through envy (Wis 6:23; see also Philo, *Prob*. 13) and embraces ultimate death.[107] By Zurawski’s lights Wis 2:23–24 does not identify the origin of evil in Adam’s disobedience or a superhuman “Satan” figure. Instead, evil is the result of every human’s choice, evil is to live according to folly rather than wisdom.

Zurawski’s rereading conforms well with the use of Adamic traditions throughout Wisdom of Solomon but two features of the text militate against his reading. First, the author of Wisdom identifies the man created for incorruption as God’s own image (Wis 2:23), a clear allusion to Gen 1:26–27.[108] Zurawski recognizes that the author appeals to Adamic traditions to articulate a more general anthropology but when this occurs there are often clear indicators. In Wis 7:1, for example, when Pseudo-Solomon highlights human mortality by appealing to Gen 2:7, the text explicitly recognizes mortality as a feature common to all (ἴσος ἅπασιν). Second, Pseudo-Solomon describes a change occurring in the cosmos: “death *entered* [εἰσῆλθεν] the world” (2:24). Zurawski suggests

---

[105] Zurawski, “Separating the Devil from Diabolos,” 389.

[106] Zurawski, “Separating the Devil from Diabolos,” 391–92.

[107] Zurawski, “Separating the Devil from Diabolos,” 391 the διαβόλου “is meant to depict the continued state of humanity in general and not a specific historical event.”

[108] It is the singular and definite ὁ ἄνθρωπος/αὐτός created for incorruption in God’s own image in Wis 2:23–24.

that εἰσῆλθεν is a gnomic aorist. This interpretation is grammatically possible, but I think contextually unlikely because a specific man has already been identified in Wis 2:23.[109] The specificity of the singular man (i.e. Adam) in Wis 2:23 is amplified by the surrounding context of plural verbs (Wis 2:21–22; 3:1). Despite a strong argument for a typological reading of Wis 2:23–24, the reference to the "image of God" makes it difficult to separate this text from a reference to Adam.

Even the best attempts to integrate Wis 2:23–24 into a coherent systematic reflection on Adamic traditions and the origin of evil in Wisdom of Solomon founders. Like Levison's reading of Sir 25:24, Zurawski's interpretation of Wis 2:23–24 provides coherence at the cost of straining the text. Both passages fit awkwardly with the broader arguments of their respective texts. Perhaps the drive toward coherence overlooks the fact that reflections on the origin of evil are not always coherent, at least not to contemporary sensibilities.

How then should Wis 2:23–24 be understood? The singular reference to the man in God's image makes it difficult to deny a reference to Adam in Wis 2:23–24. However, it would be a mistake to read too much into the reference to Adamic tradition, as many scholars have. Wisdom, even more than Ben Sira, has a mixed template regarding the origin and persistence of evil. First, there is a pronounced debt to Greek philosophy as evidenced in the references to the immortality of the soul (Wis 8:19–20; 9:15) and the "death of the soul" tradition so prominent in Philo (Wis 10:3). Second, Pseudo-Solomon draws attention to Adam's transgression (Wis 10:1–2) to illustrate the power of Lady

---

[109] ἄνθρωπος is often used generically in Wisdom (3:4; 4:1, 9; 7:1, 14, 20; 8:7; 9:13, 18; 11:23; 12:8, 12; 13:1, 10; 14:5; 15:16; 16:26), but never in the singular form with a definite article. Also, ἄνθρωπος appears in the anarthrous singular form in Wis 9:2 as a clear reference to Adam.

Wisdom to rescue and deliver. The corrupting consequences of Adam's transgression in Wis 2:23–24 are not irreparable for the cosmos, for Adam, or for his progeny. Third, Adam is set in contrast to the prototypical transgressor in Wisdom, Cain (Wis 10:3–4). Fourth, Adamic tradition occurs in the context of condemning idolatry (Wis 15:8–17). Like Cain, the idolater forfeits his soul through his folly. Fifth, like Sir 16:7, Pseudo-Solomon makes passing reference to the Enochic tradition (Wis 14:6). In Wisdom 2:23–24 Adam's transgression is, for the first time, attributed profound significance. However, in the larger context of Wisdom, Adam's transgression does not deny or overshadow other traditions related to the origin of evil. Like Ben Sira, the author of Wisdom testifies to a diverse collection of traditions related to evil, a mixed template.

3.2 The Adamic Template in Late Jewish Apocalyptic

Although the earliest sources for the Adamic template are Ben Sira and Wisdom, Pauline scholars cite 4 Ezra, 2 Baruch, and the Primary Adam books as crucial parallels. The use of the Primary Adam books as parallels, however, is historically problematic. While the Primary Adam books may reflect earlier traditions, they were not likely written until after Paul's letters and may reflect Pauline influence.[110] Aside from Ben Sira and Wisdom, the

---

[110] The Primary Adam books are dated sometime between 100 and 600 CE. See the discussion of the issues in Michael E. Stone, *A History of the Literature of Adam and Eve*, SBLEJL 3 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 53–58; Marinus de Jonge and Johannes Tromp, *The Life of Adam & Eve and Related Literature*, GAP (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 75–77; Jan Dochhorn, *Die Apocalypse des Mose: Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar*, TSAJ 106 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 150–51.

There are two main problems with treatments of the Primary Adam books among Pauline scholars. First, Pauline scholars rarely show awareness of the most up-to-date discussion concerning the date for the Primary Adam books. Often Pauline scholars are almost entirely dependent on the translation and introduction from M. D. Johnson, "Life of Adam and Eve," *OTP* 2.249–294. Yet Johnson allows for a much earlier date for the Primary Adam books than the evidence permits. Based on general similarities with Josephus (*Vita. Ad.* 50 || *A.J.* 1.67–71), rabbinic traditions, "and perhaps Paul," Johnson concludes "the most natural span for the original composition would be between 100 B.C. and A.D. 200, more probably toward the end of the first Christian century" (2.252), but a date prior to 100 CE lacks any support. Second, Pauline scholars often cite the Primary Adam books as if they were two separate works, Life of Adam and Eve and Apocalypse of Moses. This citation system makes it appear as if the Primary Adam books exist as separate traditions when in fact they represent one fluid tradition existing in several

Jewish apocalypses of 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch are the most commonly cited and earliest evidence in Jewish apocalyptic literature for the Adamic template.

Pauline scholars frequently cite these apocalypses as accurate representations of Jewish apocalypses in the Second Temple period. One of the early champions of an apocalyptic Paul, J. Christiaan Beker, insists on reading Paul in light of Jewish apocalyptic literature and yet he rarely cites apocalyptic texts, relying instead on secondary sources.[111] When Beker does cite Jewish apocalypses he limits himself to 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch.[112] James Dunn describes 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch as "two classical Jewish apocalypses" that are likely to reflect "Jewish theologizing at the time of Paul."[113] Martinus de Boer, the advocate of the apocalyptic Paul school who has done the most to substantiate an apocalyptic interpretation of Paul based on Jewish literature, cites Dunn's claim with approval.[114] Even J. P. Davies, who criticizes the apocalyptic Paul movement for not engaging apocalyptic literature, continues to work from the assumption that 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch are representative of Jewish apocalyptic literature in Paul's time.[115]

---

languages. Citing one tradition as two works gives the false impression that one tradition is two. This erroneously suggests that an Adamic Template was more widespread.

[111] Beker, *Paul's Apocalyptic Gospel: The Coming Triumph of God* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982), 30; Beker, *Paul the Apostle*, 135–36. Beker relies on Philipp Vielhauer, "Introduction," in *New Testament Apocrypha*, ed. Wilhelm Schneemelcher, trans. R. McL. Wilson. 2 Vols. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1963–65), 2:542–68 and Klaus Koch, *The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic: A Polemical Work on a Neglected Area of Biblical Studies and Its Damaging Effects on Theology and Philosophy*, SBT 2/22 (London: SCM Press, 1972), 18–35. Beker faces criticism on this point from R. Barry Matlcok, *Unveiling the Apocalyptic Paul*, 247–48, and J. P. Davies, *Paul among the Apocalypses? An Evaluation of the 'Apocalyptic Paul' in the Context of Jewish and Christian Apocalyptic Literature*, LNTS 562 (London: Bloomsbury, 2016), 13 fn. 59. Davies provides a clear guide to the adherents and tenants of the apocalyptic Paul school (*Paul among the Apocalypses?*, 1–35.

[112] *Paul the Apostle*, 145, 167. Noted by Davies, *Paul among the Apocalypses?*, 13 fn. 59.

[113] Dunn, *Theology of Paul the Apostle*, 88.

[114] de Boer, "Paul's Mythologizing Program in Romans 5–8," 18.

[115] *Paul Among the Apocalypses*, 35–7.

But how representative are these apocalypses in their theology of evil and how do they relate to Paul?

Both 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch are known to have been written in response to the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 CE.[116] This cataclysmic event must have impacted theological reflection about evil.[117] In regard to Adamic tradition, 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch represent a remarkable departure from earlier Jewish apocalyptic texts in attributing profound significance to Adam's sin. Alongside Rom 5:12–21 these apocalypses are cited as vital evidence that the Adamic template was common in the first century even though Paul is the only pre-70 source.[118] This is possible, but the circularity of the logic is obvious: Paul is used to justify interpreting Paul in the light of these later apocalypses. It is potentially anachronistic to use the later apocalypses marked by the tragic destruction of Jerusalem to interpret the earlier Apostle.

---

[116] Gwendolyn B. Sayler, *Have the Promises Failed? A Literary Analysis of 2 Baruch*, SBLDS 72 (Chico: Scholars Press, 1984), 119–51; George W. E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 270–285; Matthias Henze, "*4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*: The Status Quaestionis," in *Fourth Ezra and Second Baruch: Reconstruction after the Fall*, JSJSupp 164, eds. Matthias Henze, Gabriele Boccaccini with Jason M. Zurawski (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 3–27; Dereck Daschke, *City of Ruins: Mourning the Destruction of Jerusalem through Jewish Apocalypse*, BibInt 99 (Leiden: Brill, 2010).

[117] Jacob Neusner, "Judaism in a Time of Crisis: Four Responses to the Destruction of the Second Temple," *Judaism* 21 (1972): 313–27; Michael E. Stone, "Reactions to Destructions of the Second Temple: Theology, Perception and Conversion," *JSJ* 12 (1981): 195–204. Cf. Jonathan Klawans, "Josephus, the Rabbis, and Responses to Catastrophes Ancient and Modern," *JQR* 100 (2010): 278–309. Klawans cautions against anachronistically interpreting the destruction of Jerusalem through the modern lens of the Holocaust.

[118] Schweitzer, *Mysticism of Paul*, 89–90; Stone, *Ancient Judaism*, 53–4. Brandenburger appeals to Sir 25:24 and Wis 2:24 to substantiate his claim that 4 Ezra, 2 Bar, and GLAE contain earlier traditions (*Adam und Christus*, 49–58). More cautious is George W. E. Nickelsburg, "A New Testament Reader's Guide to *2 Baruch*: Or a *2 Baruch* Reader's Guide to the new Testament" in *Fourth Ezra and Second Baruch: Reconstruction After the Fall*, 271–293 esp. 280–81. Nickelsburg thinks that 4 Ezra and 2 Bar testify to a conversation about the significance of Adam's sin in the wake of the destruction of Jerusalem. However, Nickelsburg thinks that Paul's letter to the Romans indicates the discussion preceded the destruction.

In addition to chronological issues, the Adamic tradition in each apocalypse substantially differs from the other.[119] These different theologies of evil are sometimes overshadowed by their shared attention to Adam's sin. As the subsequent analysis will demonstrate, however, 4 Ezra is unique in limiting itself to Adamic tradition when explaining evil. In contrast, 2 Baruch is, like Sirach and Wisdom, a mixed template. Revisiting the theologies of evil in these apocalypses demonstrates that they do not support the Adamic template as a common feature of Second Temple Judaism mapped onto Paul.

3.2.1 Fourth Ezra

Fourth Ezra was composed around 100 CE, sometime after the destruction of Jerusalem but before the Bar Kokhba Revolt (132–135 CE).[120] The structure is clearly discernable, consisting of seven episodes, four dialogues and three visions, mediated to Ezra by the angel Uriel.[121] The text survives in eight different languages, testifying to the immense popularity of 4 Ezra especially among early Christians.[122] Michael Stone suggests that 4 Ezra's popularity is likely due to "the apparent affinity of its view of sin [. . .] with that of

[119] Pierre Bogaert, *L'Apocalypse syriaque du Baruch: Introduction, traduction du syriaque et commentaire*, SC 144–45, 2 Vols. (Paris: Cerf, 1969), 1.402–5; Sayler, *Have the Promises Failed?* 131–34

[120] Perhaps during the reign of Domitian (81–96 CE). This date assumes, as most scholars do, that the three heads (4 Ezra 12:22–28) of the Eagle Vision (4 Ezra 11:1–12:36) refer to Vespasian, Titus, and Domitian. See Michael E. Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990), 9–10, 363–64, 367–68; Bruce W. Longenecker, *2 Esdras*, GAP (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 13–16, 72–77; Hogan, *Theologies in Conflict*, 182–8. Cf. Lorenzo Di Tommaso, "Dating the Eagle Vision of 4 Ezra: A New Look at an Old Theory," *JSP* 10 (1999): 3–38.

[121] (1) 3:1–5:20; (2) 5:21–6:34; (3) 6:35–9:25; (4) 9:26–10:59; (5) 11:1–12:51; (6) 13:1–58; (7) 14:1–49. See the discussion of structure in Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 50–51. The attribution to "Ezra" in the wake of the "desolation of Zion" (4 Ezra 3:1) is a literary conceit intended to evoke, among other things, prophetic leadership in the wake of the destruction of Jerusalem (Jer 1:1–3; Ezek 1:1; 2 Bar 1:1–2). See John J. Collins, "Enoch and Ezra," in *Fourth Ezra and Second Baruch: Reconstruction after the Fall*, 83–97, here 91–2.

[122] Michael Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 1–9 argues that the work was likely composed in Hebrew but only survives in versions that originate from a Greek translation. In addition to some Greek fragments, textual witnesses are extant in Latin, Syriac, Ethiopic, Georgian, Arabic, Armenian, and Coptic.

Paul."[123] Whatever the reason for its popularity in the ancient world, in Pauline scholarship 4 Ezra is likely the most commonly cited text to explain Paul's view of evil.

The most remarkable and perplexing feature of 4 Ezra is the sustained attention to evil.[124] The first three episodes consist of dialogues between the Seer Ezra and the Angel Uriel in which Ezra expresses his exasperation and confusion over the destruction of Jerusalem (4 Ezra 3:2–3; 5:23–30) and a deep sense of injustice over Israel's oppression at the hands of wicked nations (3:28–36; 4:23–25; 6:55–59). The outcome of the dialogue episodes is ambiguous. Ezra's questions and Uriel's answers merely seem to heighten distress about the justice of God.[125] Furthermore, it is unclear which perspective the author identifies as his own: the prophet Ezra, the angel Uriel, both voices, or perhaps neither one.[126] The fourth episode marks a turning point in the narrative both in terms of form and content.[127] After the fourth episode, it becomes clear that the dialogue format

---

[123] Michael E. Stone and Matthias Henze, *4 Ezra and 2 Baruch: Translations, Introductions, and Notes* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2013), 6. All citations of 4 Ezra and 2 Bar are taken from this translation unless otherwise noted.

[124] Wolfgang Harnisch, *Verhängnis und Verheissung der Geschichte. Untersuchungen zum Zeit- und Geschichtsverständnis im 4. Buch Esra und in der syr. Baruchapokalypse*, FRLANT 97 (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1969), esp. 19–67; Thompson, *Responsibility for Evil*; Egon Brandenburger, *Die Verborgenheit Gottes im Weltgeschehen: as literarische und theologische Problem des 4. Esrabuches*, ATANT 68 (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1981), esp. 12–21; Michael E. Stone, "The Way of the Most High and the Injustice of God in 4 Ezra," in *Knowledge of God in the Graeco-Roman World*, EPRO 112 (Leiden: Brill, 1988), 132–42; Tom W. Willett, *Eschatology in the Theodicies of 2 Baruch and 4 Ezra*, JSPSupp 4 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989), esp. 65–72; Brand, *Evil Within and Without*, 128–134, 137–43; Robbie Griggs, "Apocalyptic Experience in the Theodicy of 4 Ezra," in *Evil and Second Temple Judaism and Early Christianity*, 282–98.

[125] Stone, "Reactions to Destructions of the Second Temple," 200–202.

[126] The question is pointedly raised by A. P. Hayman, "The Problem of Pseudonymity in the Ezra Apocalypse," *JSJ* 6 (1975): 47–56. Karina Martin Hogan, *Theologies in Conflict*, 1–40 provides an excellent history of scholarship.

[127] Loren T. Stuckenbruck, "Ezra's Vision of the Lady: The form and Function of a Turning Point," in *Fourth Ezra and Second Baruch: Reconstruction after the Fall*, 137–150. Stuckenbruck notes five noticeable shifts: First, Ezra's vision is no longer a debate with Uriel. The vision of the mourning woman prompts Ezra to a debate with himself (9:39; 10:4). Second, Ezra's attention is no longer focused on his own lament (3:1, 3; 5:14, 16, 21, 33–34; 6:36–37; 7:15; 8:14–15; 9:27) but that of the woman (9:40, 42). Third, for the first time Ezra is forced to be the respondent to the lament of someone forlorn with grief (10:2–4), a grief that bears remarkable similarity to his own (10:49–50). Fourth, Ezra takes on the role of

has been abandoned and Ezra is given revelations that prompt him to celebrate God's glorious wonders (13:57) and he serves as a vehicle of revelation (14:37–48). The movement of the text from dialogue to revelatory visions has made the central purpose of the book a matter of some debate.

Karina Martin Hogan has outlined three major approaches to determining the central purpose of the book and explaining the incongruous shift from dialogue to revelatory visions.[128] First, Richard Kabisch, in the fashion of nineteenth century biblical scholarship, championed a source-critical solution; he explained the shift from dialogue to revelations as a result of different sources.[129] The source-critical approach has been mostly abandoned since Egon Brandenburger made the case for literary unity.[130] Second, Brandenburger, following Wolfgang Harnisch, argued that the dialogues represent a theological debate from the author's time.[131] Third, and the most widely accepted

---

consolation to little effect (10:5–17, 19–24). Fifth, the woman is transformed into a city (10:25–28), the city—Zion (10:44).

[128] *Theologies in Conflict*, 9–35. This paragraph is heavily indebted to her history of scholarship.

[129] Richard Kabisch, *Das vierte Buch esra auf seine Quellen untersucht* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1889).

[130] Brandenburger, *Verborgenheit*, esp. 94–124; already argued by Earl Breech, "These Fragments I Have Shored against My Ruins: The Form and Function of 4 Ezra," *JBL* 92 (1973): 267–74. See also Michael P. Knowles, "Moses, the Law, and the Unity of 4 Ezra," *NovT* 31 (1989): 257–74; Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 21–23; Longenecker, *2 Esdras*, 22–24; Hogan, *Theologies in Conflict*, 35–40; Jonathan A. Moo, *Creation, Nature and Hope in* 4 Ezra, FRLANT 237 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), 30–34. A source-critical solution was adopted by E. P. Sanders prior to Brandenburger (*PPJ*, 418). After Brandenburger a source-critical solution was adopted by Walter J. Harrelson, "Ezra among the Wicked in 2 Esdras 3–10," in *Divine Helmsman, Studies on God's Control of Human Events, Presented to Lou H Silberman* (New York: Ktav, 1980), 21–40.

[131] Harnisch, *Verhängnis und Verheißung der Geschichte*. A modified version the theological debate solution is adopted by Hogan. She argues that Ezra and Uriel represent competing wisdom schools within Second Temple Judaism with different views of evil, neither of which is entirely satisfactory to the author of 4 Ezra who "aims to persuade the wise of the need to move beyond failed attempts to construct a rational theodicy, and to accept the revealed 'wisdom' of apocalyptic theology" (*Theologies in Conflict*, 5). In her reading the dialogues are an *aporia* meant to show the inability of rational inquiry to produce a sufficient response to the destruction and the visions "offer a way out of this intellectual quandary, showing that despair can be overcome by belief in divine revelation" (*Theologies in Conflict*, 40).

solution, is a literary-psychological approach first advocated by Hermann Gunkel.[132] According to the literary-psychological solution "the dialogue form . . . reflects the author's inner conflict."[133] Or as Michael Stone puts it, "the thread that holds the book together is the Odyssey of Ezra's soul."[134] Ezra is the hero who struggles with his own doubts about God's justice but is ultimately converted. The course of Ezra's odyssey is intended to mirror the experience of the reader, moving from doubt to confidence in God's justice.[135] Whatever motivates the shift from dialogue to vision, Uriel and Ezra represent contrasting perspectives about evil and Adam's disobedience.

3.2.1.1 The First Dialogue

Adamic tradition appears only in the first and third dialogues and is more prominent in Ezra's speech (4 Ezra 3:4–11, 20–27; 6:45–46, 53–59; 7:62–69, 116–126), than Uriel's (4:26–32; 7:11–14, 70–74, 127–31). In the first dialogue Ezra challenges God's justice in the wake of the destruction of Jerusalem (3:4–27). The Seer finds God guilty on two counts. First, God is responsible for creating Adam (3:4–6), but the protoplast is unable to follow divine commands due to the burden of an "evil heart" (3:21–22). The burden is passed to Adam's descendants who cannot follow Mosaic law (3:26). The consequence of Adam and his progeny's disobedience is death (3:8, 10).[136] Ezra never explicitly

---

[132] Hermann Gunkel, "Das vierte Buch Esra," in *Die Apokryphen und Psseudepigraphen des alten Testaments*, ed. E. Kautzsch (Tübingen: Mohr, 1900), 2.331–402.

[133] Hogan, *Theologies in Conflict*, 21.

[134] Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 32.

[135] Lorenzo DiTomasso, "Who is the 'I' of *4 Ezra*?" in *Fourth Ezra and Second Baruch: Reconstruction after the Fall*, 119–133; Robbie Griggs, "Apocalyptic Experience in the Theodicy of *4 Ezra*," in *Evil and Second Temple Judaism and Early Christianity*, 282–98.

[136] As Stone has argued, the author of 4 Ezra understands death in two senses (*Fourth Ezra*, 65–66). First, death refers to a physical reality, the departure of the soul from the body (4 Ezra 7:78; see also 7:75, 88, 100) which has resulted from Adam's sin (3:7). Second, death is portrayed as a form of divine

accuses God of making Adam incapable of following divine commands, but the implication is clear. Ezra brings the reader to the edge of accusation, blaming God for creating evil but stops just short. Second, Ezra holds God responsible for disproportionately punishing Israel while other nations are more sinful (3:31–36). In Ezra's voice Adamic tradition introduces the "evil heart" and the entrance of death into the cosmos.

The angel's response to Ezra undermines the prophet's capacity to comprehend answers to his questions. Twice Uriel challenges Ezra on the grounds that he is unable to understand the way of the Most High (4 Ezra 4:1–4, 13–18, 20–21).[137] When Ezra persists (4:5–12, 22–25), Uriel picks up Ezra's agricultural metaphor about the evil seed sown in Adam's heart (4:28–30; see also 3:22) to explain that just judgment is coming (4:26–32). Adamic tradition is initially raised by Ezra as a complaint against God but is ultimately utilized by Uriel to assert the necessity of an eschatological perspective.

Ezra and Uriel are largely in agreement concerning Adam's significance in the first vision, Adam's transgression as a disaster for humanity. Ezra begins a history of sin (4 Ezra 3:4–27) with Adamic tradition drawn almost exclusively from the J creation account (4 Ezra 3:4–7), especially Gen 2:7.[138] In a startling innovation, the author of 4 Ezra invests profound significance in Adam's sin and its consequences (see Gen 2:16–

---

judgment that is opposite of eternal life (4 Ezra 7:48, 92, 119, 131; 8:38; 7:137–3). See Harnisch, *Verhängnis und Verheissung*, 149 on eschatological death.

[137] Griggs claims the argument is more than a deflection of Ezra's complaint by appeal to authority ("Apocalyptic Experience," 288–90). Instead, he interprets Uriel's response as "the author's first basic move toward theodicy" ("Apocalyptic Experience," 289), by pushing Ezra to recognize the necessity of a heavenly perspective.

[138] 4 Ezra 3:4 includes an allusion to Gen 1, but the creation of Adam in 3:5–6 draws almost exclusively on Gen 2:7.

3:21): "Thou didst lay upon him one commandment; but he transgressed it, and immediately thou didst appoint death for him and for his descendants."[139] The author of 4 Ezra, drawing on Gen 3:19, attributes physical death to Adam's transgression, a notable innovation.[140] Michael Stone claims that the view of Adam's sin as the cause of death "is widespread in Jewish sources," but these sources all postdate the destruction of Jerusalem with the sole exception of the Apostle Paul (Rom 5:12–14; 1 Cor 15:21–22).[141] The most prominent similarity between Paul and 4 Ezra, in contrast to earlier Adamic tradition, is the significance of Adam's transgression as the source of death in the cosmos.

Not only does the significance of Adam's transgression in 4 Ezra stand in contrast to earlier texts, but so too does the function of Adamic tradition in the first dialogue. Ezra's first lament reverses a pattern of Adamic tradition found in wisdom literature.[142] In Sirach 44–50 and Wisdom 10, Israelite history is recounted to highlight positive examples of the faithful contrasted with wicked counterparts.[143] In both Sirach and Wisdom, Adam is highlighted as a positive and glorious exemplar (Sir 49:16; Wis 10:1–2; see also Job 15:7–9). In contrast, Ezra's history (4 Ezra 3:4–27) inverts the narrative

---

[139] 4 Ezra 3:7; see also 7:11.

[140] Commenting on 4 Ezra 3:7–10 Hogan observes "the most striking feature of Ezra's summary of Gen 2–3 is his assumption that human mortality is the result of Adam's sin" (Hogan, *Theologies in Conflict*, 113). See also Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 65–66.

[141] Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 64–66. Stone cites Sir 15:14, 17; esp. 25:24; 2 Bar 23:4; 54:15; 2 En. 30:16; and an extensive list of Rabbinic citations. See also Bradenburger, *Adam und Christus*, 45–58. As the above analysis has shown, Ben Sira does not connect the origin of death to Adam's sin, except in Sir 25:24. Also relevant to this point is Wis 2:23–24, which like Sir 25:24, is an anomaly. The concept of Adam as the source of death is clearly found in LAB 13:8; 37:3; GLAE 7:1; 14:1–2; 21:5–6; 4 Ezra 3:4–11; 7:116–118; 2 Bar 17:2–3; 19:8; 23:4; 56:5–10.

[142] Stone, "The Way of the Most High," 133; Longenecker, *2 Esdras*, 35–6; Shannon Burkes, *God, Self, and Death: The Shape of Religious Transformation in the Second Temple Period*, JSJSupp 79 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 194.

[143] Teresa R. Brown, "God and Men in Israel's History: God and Idol Worship in *Praise of the Fathers* (Sir 44–50)," in *Ben Sira's God: Proceedings of the International Ben Sira Conference: Durham – Ushaw College 2001*, ed. Renate Egger-Wenzel (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2002), 214–220.

by focusing on Adam's transgression, death (4 Ezra 3:7), and the mysterious cause of Adam's sin, the evil heart, which took root in his descendants (4 Ezra 3:20–22). By adopting a medium that typically extols Adam as an exemplar of obedience and reversing the narrative to draw attention to his transgression, Ezra implies that God has engineered a defective creation from the beginning.[144] This is a profound reversal of the typical purpose of Adamic tradition in earlier texts.

Later in the same dialogue, Ezra expands on the consequences of Adam's sin. The Seer introduces a new concept as the source of Adam's transgression, the "evil heart":

> For the first Adam, *burdened with an evil heart* [*cor enim malignum baiolans*] transgressed and was overcome, as were also all who were descended from him. Thus, the disease became permanent; the Torah was in people's heart along with the *evil root* [*malignitate radicis*], but what was good departed, and the evil remained.[145]

The "evil heart" is the source of Adam's sin in such a way that casts doubt on the moral agency of humans, a view that is intensified in the third dialogue (esp. 4 Ezra 7:48, 92, 118).[146] In later dialogues Uriel will insist that the wicked are judged as competent moral agents (4 Ezra 7:19–24, 72, 89, 92, 127–131; 8:56–62, esp. 8:56), a position that Ezra

---

[144] Longenecker, *2 Esdras*, 36 aptly describes Ezra's first speech as "one of the most daring criticism of God in any religious text." See also Burkes, *God, Self, and Death*, 194–95, 203,

[145] 4 Ezra 3:21–22; see also *2 Bar* 54:15, 19.

[146] Hogan suggests the "evil heart [*cor malignum/malum*]" (3:20, 21, 26; 4:4; 7:48; see also 4:30) is "probably a translation" of the rabbinic "evil inclination [יצר הרע]" (*Theologies in Conflict*, 114). The concepts are similar (Porter, "Yeçer HaRa," 151–52; Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 63–64). Others have cautioned against a connection between Ezra's "evil heart" and the Rabbis' "evil inclination" (Thompson, *Responsibility for Evil*, 332–39; Koch, "Esras erste Vision. Weltzeiten und Weg des Höchsten," *BZ* 22 (1978): 46–75, esp. 60–61 fn. 4; Rosen-Zvi, *Demonic Desires*, 74–80). Whatever is to be made of the possible connection between 4 Ezra's "evil heart" and the phrase יצר הרע, the Rabbinic concept differs from 4 Ezra. As Thompson and Stone have pointed out, 4 Ezra never directly attributes the "evil heart" to God. Stone also contrasts Ezra's non-attribution of the evil heart directly to God with Apoc. Abr. 23:14. There is a connection between the evil inclination and the heart in the Genesis flood narrative with God declaring, "the inclination of the heart of man is evil from his youth [יצר לב האדם רע מנעריו]" (Gen 8:21; see also Jer 3:17; 7:24; 11:8; 16:12; 18:12). A link between "inclination," "heart," and "evil" is forged in Gen 8:21. The concept of the "evil heart" is entirely foreign to Paul's Adamic tradition (Tobin, *Paul's Rhetoric*, 172–75).

will eventually affirm as well (14:34).[147] In the first dialogue, however, Uriel's response avoids the uncomfortable implication that Adam and his progeny lack moral agency. Instead, Uriel merely affirms the existence of "*a grain of evil seed* [*granum seminis maliseminatum*] . . . sown in Adam's heart from the beginning" which has produced much "ungodliness" and will continue to do so until final judgment (4:30).[148] Uriel's response accepts the evil heart and the significance of Adam's sin without addressing the source of evil. As a result, Ezra's implication that God is to blame for creating a defective humanity, unable to follow his commands, is unanswered. Both Ezra and Uriel identify the origin of death with Adam's transgression and recognize the "evil heart" as the source of the problem. Uriel never addresses Ezra's unstated implication that God, as the sole creator, is ultimately responsible for the evil heart.

3.2.1.2 The Third Dialogue

The third dialogue (4 Ezra 6:35–9:25) provides the most thorough engagement with Adamic tradition, but it is also the lengthiest and most complex of the three dialogues. Like the first episode, Ezra begins his lament with creation, but this time the Seer recounts the P narrative (4 Ezra 6:38–54). In Ezra's retelling Adam features prominently as the pinnacle of creation (6:46, 54). The purpose of the recitation of Gen 1 is to prepare for Ezra's accusatory lament. If Adam was made to rule creation (4 Ezra 6:55) and Israel is his heir (6:56; see also Isa 40:15–17), Ezra wonders when Israel will gain the rightful inheritance (4 Ezra 6:59). In response Uriel agrees that God made the world for Israel

[147] Brand, *Evil Within and Without*, 135 notes an interesting similarity between Uriel's position and 4 Macc 2:21–23 where the mind functions as an antidote to the passions. 4 Macc 2:21–23 contrasts Ezra's lament that the mind merely informs humans of their terrible predicament and impending torment (4 Ezra 7:62–69).

[148] The "evil root" of 3:22 is explicitly dealt with in the future for the righteous in the third dialogue (8:53).

(7:11) but refers to Adam’s transgression as a cosmic failure (7:11–12). Uriel, in effect, uses Ezra’s argument from the first dialogue (3:7, 20–22) against him in the third. According to Uriel, the problem with Ezra’s connection between Adam and Israel is that it fails to consider the significance of Adam’s transgression.[149] While recognizing the catastrophic consequences of Adam’s sin, the angel maintains the moral agency of Adam’s progeny. Additionally, Uriel informs the Seer that God will bring just judgment (7:26–44). Ezra and Uriel agree that Adam was created to rule. However, Uriel cites Adam’s transgression to undercut the Seer’s appeal to the P creation narrative to assert that Israel should presently rule the world.

Uriel’s response offers Ezra little comfort and the Seer once again expresses doubt about human capacity for obedience to God’s commands (4 Ezra 7:45–48). Uriel reveals to Ezra that God has made two ages (7:50), the one to come will bring reward for the few righteous (7:47, 75, 119; 8:52), including immortality (7:13, 31; 8:53), but torment for the wicked (7:61). This only makes Ezra feel worse and he opines that it would be better to be an ignorant beast, incapable of post-mortem existence, than a rational being aware of future torment (7:62–69; see also 4:12). Ezra is convinced that all men are “involved in iniquities and are full of sins and burdened with transgressions” (4 Ezra 7:68; see also 3:35; 4:38; 7:46). Ezra’s anthropological pessimism is so severe that he struggles to adopt a theological anthropology that does not indict God.

The Angel responds to Ezra’s lament by directly applying the “two age” eschatology as a solution to the Adamic problem (4 Ezra 7:50; see also 6:7–10, 34; 7:12–

[149] As Levison has pointed out, Uriel’s description of the effects of Adam’s sin are drawn, in part, from the curses of Gen 3:14–19 (*Portraits of Adam*, 121).

13, 29–31, 47, 75, 112–113; 8:1, 46). Already Uriel has informed Ezra that the inauguration of the new age will resolve the problem of the evil heart (6:25–28). Now Uriel applies the "two age" eschatology to Adam's transgression: "When the Most High made the world and Adam and all who came from him, he first prepared the judgment and the things that pertain to judgment" (4 Ezra 7:70). This startling response would seem to jeopardize any notion of human freedom by portraying God having already judged actions yet performed. But Uriel immediately follows this statement with an explanation that God's judgment is based on human choice (7:72–74). Uriel's apparently inconsistent commitments to pre-ordained judgment and human freedom respond to Ezra's laments even if they appear to lack coherence to the modern reader.[150] The Seer has complained that humans are worse off since they are not mindless beasts (7:62–63; see also 4:12), but Uriel extends Ezra's logic to claim that humans are responsible for their choices precisely because they are not mindless beasts (7:71). Ezra has lamented that God alone is responsible for creating Adam (3:4–6; 6:38–54) and then condemning him to death for the transgressions of his evil heart (3:7, 21–22), a burden shared by his descendants (3:26; 7:48). Uriel re-affirms God's sovereignty by appealing to the pre-ordained divine plan that has already judged the evil heart and the age it inaugurates.[151] The angel's response to Ezra's anthropological pessimism is to turn the Seer's arguments

---

[150] A similar accusation of inconsistency has been leveled against Ben Sira in his apparently contradictory accounts of human moral agency (15:11–20) and creation as a harmony of opposites (33:7–15). Consider the implications of Michael Stone's analysis of the concept of the "end" as a case study in how contemporary notions of coherence can be anachronistically mapped onto texts "of a non-Aristotelian type" (Stone, "Coherence and Inconsistency in the Apocalypses: The Case of 'the End' in 4 Ezra," *JBL* 102 [1983]: 229–43, esp. 242–43).

[151] Burkes, *God, Self and Death*, 196–99 draws a comparison between 4 Ezra and Daniel 7–12 in asserting the irreparable state of the cosmos. In Daniel the cause is the horn's combat with angelic princes, but in 4 Ezra the cause is Adam's transgression.

against him by simultaneously asserting God's justice in pre-ordained judgment and human responsibility for sin.

After a discussion of death and judgment (7:75–115), a discussion that ends with Uriel's assertion of the finality and perfection of God's judgment (7:112–115), Ezra returns to Adamic tradition for the last time. Little has changed for the Seer:

> This is my first and last word, that it would have been better if the earth had not produced Adam, or else, when it had produced him had taught him not to sin. For what good is it to all that they live in sorrow now and expect punishment after death? O Adam, what have you done? For though it was you who sinned, the misfortune was not yours alone, but ours who are your descendants. For what good is it to us, if an immortal age has been promised to us, but we have done deeds that bring death?[152]

Once again Ezra wonders if it would have been better had Adam not have been created (see also 4:12; 7:69), or if created then also "taught not to sin" (7:116). Ezra has conceded that Adam is responsible for himself, but the Seer continues to doubt the freedom of Adam's descendants who have been adversely affected by the protoplast's sin (4 Ezra 7:118; see also 3:20–22).[153] Uriel responds by affirming the agency of every human (7:127–28; see also 7:70–73; 2 Bar 54:19) and cites Moses' concluding exhortation from the covenantal code of Deuteronomy: "Choose for yourself life, that you may live!" (4 Ezra 7:129 [Deut 30:19]; see also 2 Bar 19:1). This is a rare citation from the Jewish Scriptures for the author of 4 Ezra but a common passage for asserting human agency.[154] In the end Ezra publicly affirms Uriel's Deuteronomic perspective (4

---

[152] 4 Ezra 7:116–119

[153] Burkes, *God, Self and Death*, 203 "The drumbeat of his complaints is that the entire human race suffers collectively from Adam's failure, and none are able to resist following the same doomed path."

[154] Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 260. Uriel refers to Deut 30:15 earlier in the third dialogue (4 Ezra 7:21), a text that was also cited by Ben Sira (15:17). Deut 30:19 is alluded to in Sir 17:7; Rom 10:5–9; 2 Bar 19:1–3; T. Mos. 3:11–12; Philo, *Deus* 50. On the importance of Deuteronomy 30 for debates about divine and human agency in Second Temple Judaism and Paul see Kyle B. Wells, *Grace and Agency in Paul and Second Temple Judaism: Interpreting the Transformation of the Heart*, NovTSupp 157 (Leiden: Brill,

Ezra 14:28–34, esp. 34). Nevertheless, in his final rehearsal of Adamic tradition, Ezra once again appeals to Adam's transgression to question the justice of God.

Like Ben Sira 15:11–20, the Adamic tradition of the third dialogue (4 Ezra 7:127–29) is cited by Martinus de Boer as evidence for the rejection of "cosmological" apocalyptic eschatology in favor of a "forensic" apocalyptic eschatology.[155] The logic of de Boer's claim is that since the author of 4 Ezra makes no reference to the Enochic tradition he is intentionally silencing the view that evil originates with rebellious angels. Unlike Ben Sira and Wisdom, the Watchers tradition is entirely absent from 4 Ezra. The startling absence of Enochic tradition may, in this case, be a polemic but this is a radically new development not a consistent trend. Furthermore, the absence of Enochic tradition from 4 Ezra does not support the Adamic template of evil as an essentially human problem from start to finish. It is quite the opposite the opposite.

The operative assumption behind de Boer's argument is that an account of the origin of evil based on rebellious angels mitigates human responsibility.[156] It is assumed that to accentuate human culpability 4 Ezra focuses on Adam's sin as the source of evil and denies the Enochic tradition. However, the argument of 4 Ezra illustrates that this assumption is incorrect. In Ezra's view, an Adamic etiology of evil lends itself to the problematic perspective that God is responsible for evil as Adam's creator. The repeated

---

2015). See also George W. E. Nickelsburg, "Torah and the Deuteronomic Scheme in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha: Variations on a Theme and Some Noteworthy Examples of its Absence," in *Das Gesetz im frühen Judentum un im Neuen Testament: Feschrift für Christoph Burchard zum 75. Geburtstag*, eds. Dieter Sänger and Matthias Konradt, NTOA 57 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 2006), 222–35, esp. 230–32.

[155] de Boer, "Paul and Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology," 179–80.

[156] This assumption was pioneered by Sacchi, *Jewish Apocalyptic*, 83–5, 95–112. It has been popularized by Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis*, 72–3; Boccaccini, *Roots of Rabbinic Judaism*, 90–91.

struggle of the prophet is how to come to terms with divine judgment when humanity has been burdened with an evil heart from the beginning. Ezra's Adamic tradition does not emphasize human responsibility to absolve God of blame. On the contrary, Adamic tradition when isolated from Enochic tradition in 4 Ezra fuels the prophet's critique of God's justice. Apart from some texts at Qumran that identify God as the creator of evil spirits, 4 Ezra comes closest to identifying God as the source of evil.[157] By locating the origin of evil in Adam's evil heart, 4 Ezra accentuates divine responsibility. Since God alone is responsible for the creation of Adam, God alone bears the burden of responsibility for humanity's evil heart.

The author of 4 Ezra does not adopt a mixed template to explain evil. The only narrative source that animates his theological reflection on evil is Adamic tradition. In this way, 4 Ezra is unique as a representative of the Adamic template. Appeals to Adamic tradition to explain evil are not entirely unprecedented when considering earlier wisdom texts (Sir 25:24; Wis 2:23–24). Yet 4 Ezra's singular focus on Adamic tradition is unique. In contrast to Ben Sira, Wisdom, and 2 Baruch, only 4 Ezra limits himself to Adamic tradition as the narrative source of theological reflection on evil.

Not only is 4 Ezra unique in focusing solely on Adamic tradition, the function of Adamic tradition in 4 Ezra conflicts with its function elsewhere. In 4 Ezra Adamic tradition is pushed to the conclusion that God is to be blamed for creating Adam and therefore evil. Such a conclusion was unacceptable to Ben Sira, Pseudo-Solomon, and the author of 2 Baruch. The Adamic template of 4 Ezra radically undermines the

[157] See especially the Treatise of the Two Spirits (1QS III, 13–IV, 26) and the treatment of this passage in Brand, *Evil Within and Without*, 257–74. See also 1QH[a] IV, 17.

interpretation that Adamic tradition served the rhetorical function of emphasizing human culpability to absolve God from evil. The Adamic template of 4 Ezra is used in the opposite way. According to 4 Ezra, the Adamic template accuses God of creating Adam with an evil heart, unable to obey divine commands and unjustly culpable for evil.

3.2.2 Second Baruch

The Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch, or Second Baruch, has long been overshadowed by its literary twin, 4 Ezra.[158] The two apocalypses are remarkably similar with some verbatim parallels.[159] Both works were written after the destruction of the second temple (70 CE) and utilize pseudepigraphy to evoke the memory of Jewish leaders in the aftermath of the destruction of the first temple (587 BCE).[160] They stand out among Jewish apocalypses in their use of use of dialogue.[161] Most importantly, the two apocalypses written in the wake

---

[158] Matthias Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism in Late First Century Israel: Reading* Second Baruch *in Context*, TSAJ 142 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 6–8, 148–186.

[159] Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 283–85; Klaus Berger with Gabriele Fassbeck and Heiner Reinhard (eds), *Synopse des vierten Buches Esra und der syrischen Baruch-Apokalypse*, TANZ 8 (Tübingen: Francke, 1992); Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 148–49.

[160] The date of 2 Bar, like 4 Ezra, is sometime after the destruction of Jerusalem (70 CE) and before the Bar Kokhba Revolt (132–135 CE). See Bogaert, *L'Apocalypse du Baruch*, 1.272–95; Gwendolyn B. Sayler, *Have the Promises Failed?* 103–18; Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 283; Daniel M. Gurtner, *Second Baruch: A Critical Edition of the Syriac Text with Greek and Latin Fragments, English Translation, Introduction, and Concordances*, JCTCRS 5 (New York: T&T Clark, 2009), 16–18; Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 25–32. The superscription (2 Bar 1:1) identifies the work with the scribe of Jeremiah, "Baruch, son of Neriah" (Jer 32:12–14, 16; 36:4–10, 13–19, 32; 45:1–5). On the corpora of texts associated with Baruch see J. Edward Wright, *Baruch Ben Neriah: From Biblical Scribe to Apocalyptic Seer* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2003). Henze suggests that the choice of "Baruch" as the pseudonym of the author allows the book to draw heavily on multiple discourses tied to founding figures, most notably Ezekiel, Moses, and Jeremiah (*Jewish Apocalypticism*, 89–113). See also Balázs Tamási, "Baruch as Prophet in *2 Baruch*," in *Fourth Ezra and Second Baruch: Reconstruction after the Fall*, 195–217; Mark F. Whitters, "Baruch as Ezra in *2 Baruch*," *JBL* 132 (2013): 569–84.

[161] The dialogue form serves different functions. In 4 Ezra, dialogue occurs only in the first three episodes (3:1–5:20; 5:21–6:34; 6:35–9:25) before the form is abandoned for more characteristically apocalyptic visions. In contrast, 2 Bar is one continuous dialogue broken up by other subgenres to frame the entire work (2 Bar 1:1–9:1; 13:1–20:6; 22:1–30:5; 48:26–52:7). See Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 34–43 for an overview of the subgenres and structure of 2 Bar. It is notable that Henze rejects a heptadic structure common to most other scholars: Bogaert, *L'Apocalypse du Baruch*, 1.58–67; Thompson, *Responsibility for Evil*, 123–24; Sayler, *Have the Promises Failed?* 161–62; Murphy, *Structure and*

of great tragedy offer substantial reflection on the problem of evil. The similarities and differences allow for synoptic comparisons that reveal redactional reshaping of traditional material.

The numerous similarities between 4 Ezra and 2 Bar in content and form betray a relationship that goes beyond mere coincidence.[162] Scholars agree that the apocalypses are intimately related but the nature of the relationship is much disputed.[163] Many scholars have argued that 2 Bar is dependent on 4 Ezra.[164] Others have advocated for the priority of 2 Bar.[165] Still others suggest a common source for both works.[166] Many have abandoned the question altogether, concluding that the direction of influence is simply impossible to determine.[167] Recently, Matthias Henze has argued that ancient modes of textual production, involving orality to a significant degree, requires re-imagining the relationship.[168] Whatever the exact nature of the relationship, it is important to recognize

---

Meaning of Second Baruch, 11–29; John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 213–16.

[162] As Henze points out, the similarities between 4 Ezra and 2 Bar are not found with the same consistency in other literature from this period including the Apocalypse of Abraham, LAB and the Book of Revelation. Henze concludes, "The analogies are so striking that it is difficult to imagine how the two texts could have developed independently of one another" (*Jewish Apocalypticism*, 178–79). Cf. Harnisch, *Verhängnis und Verheißung*, 240 who thinks the texts represent a similar outlook not a literary relationship.

[163] Berger, *Synopse*, 1–3. In Berger's estimation the question must be regarded as "vollig offen."

[164] Bruce M. Metzger, "The Fourth Book of Eza," in *OTP* 1.522; Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 224; Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 283–4.

[165] Bogaert, *L'Apocalypse du Baruch*, 1.26–27

[166] A. F. J. Klijn, "2 (Syriac Apocalypse of) Baruch," in *OTP* 1.620; Sayler, *Have the Promises Failed?*, 123–34; similarly Harnisch, *Verhängnis und Verheißung*, 240.

[167] Emil Schürer, *History* III.2, (1987), 753; Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 39.

[168] Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 181–86; Henze, "'4 Ezra' and '2 Baruch': Literary Composition and Oral Performance in First-Century Apocalyptic Literature," *JBL* 131 (2012): 181–200. Among others, Henze draws on the work of Martin S. Jaffee, *Torah in the Mouth: Writing and Oral Tradition in Palestinian Judaism 200 BCE–400 CE* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 15–61. In Henze's view, the similarities between 4 Ezra and 2 Bar "stem from a period in their composition that well precedes their final, redacted form" ("Literary Composition and Oral Performance," 183).

that while 2 Bar and 4 Ezra overlap in significant ways, they also display notable differences.

There are two important differences regarding evil. First, the Seer of 2 Bar is less pessimistic than his counterpart in 4 Ezra. While Ezra struggles to accept Uriel's arguments for the justice of God, ending the dialogues in an ambiguous aporia, Baruch accepts the perspective of his heavenly interlocutor without returning to the same objections.[169] Second, while both 4 Ezra and 2 Bar utilize Adamic tradition to explain the origin of evil, they do so differently. Also, unlike 4 Ezra, 2 Bar explicitly cites the Enochic tradition.[170] Although 2 Bar and 4 Ezra both utilize Adamic tradition to reflect on evil, they come to distinct conclusions.

3.2.2.1 Second Baruch 3:1–4

Unlike 4 Ezra, the first reference to Adamic tradition in 2 Bar does not appear on the lips of the human Seer but the angelic interlocutor.[171] After Baruch begs God not to destroy Zion (2 Bar 3:1–4) because such destruction would prevent Torah study (3:6) and undo creation itself (3:7), God reassures the Seer that he is chastising his people, not rejecting them (4:1). In fact, Zion is not the physical city of Jerusalem (4:2–3; see also 5:3). The true Zion was created and revealed to Adam "before he sinned, but when he transgressed the commandment, it was taken away from him, as was also Paradise" (2 Bar 4:3).

---

[169] This is not to deny that Baruch undergoes a transformation in perspective over the course of the dialogues. Baruch begins from a perspective that sees the destruction of the Temple is a catastrophic disaster that will undo creation itself (3:7–8; 10:9–12; 12:1–2). But, unlike the Seer of 4 Ezra, Baruch's voice in the dialogues is primarily concerned with asking questions to give the heavenly voice the last word.

[170] On the differences in their view of the origin of evil see R. H. Charles, *The Apocalypse of Baruch* (London: A. and C. Black, 1896), lxx–lxxi; Brand, *Evil Within and Without*, 138–43.

[171] Levison, *Portraits of Adam*, 130–44 identifies Adamic tradition in 2 Bar 4:1–7; 14:17–19; 17:1–18:2; 19:8; 23:4–5; 48:42–47; 54:13–19; 56:6–10.

Despite Adam's loss, God continued to show Zion to his people, specifically Abraham (2 Bar 4:4 [Gen 15:7–21]) and Moses (2 Bar 4:5 [Exod 19–31]).[172] In this first reference to Adamic tradition in 2 Bar, God refers to the protoplast as a paradigm of loss through transgression in contrast to Abraham and Moses. Adam's role as the paradigmatic transgressor and loser will become progressively more pronounced throughout the apocalypse (esp. 2 Bar 23:4; 48:42–43, 46; 54:15, 19). Unlike the first mention of Adam in 4 Ezra (3:4–11, 20–27), God is not implicitly blamed by the Seer for forming an imperfect creation. Rather, the burden of responsibility is entirely Adam's, the protoplast alone is responsible for his transgression and set in contrast to the Patriarchs not defined by transgression.

3.2.2.2 Second Baruch 13:1–14

Adamic tradition becomes even more prominent as the dialogue continues. After a second call narrative in which Baruch is commissioned to bear witness against the nations (2 Bar 13:1–11), the Seer asks about the fate of Israel (14:1–19). Just as Ezra retells the P creation narrative to establish that the world exists for the sake of Israel as Adam's heir (4 Ezra 6:38–56; Ps 8:6), so too does Baruch (2 Bar 14:17–19). Baruch expresses his confusion over the present state of affairs: "The world that was made for us [. . .] remains, but we, for whom it was [made], depart" (2 Bar 14:19; see also 4 Ezra 6:59). Baruch's deference is evident in his expression of trust in God's inscrutable

[172] Levison, *Portraits of Adam*, 130–31 thinks Adam is portrayed with "exalted status prior to his transgression." He finds exaltation in Adam's association with Abraham and Moses as well as Adam's reception of the revelation of Zion and paradise (see also 2 Bar 48:3). If Baruch intends an exalted portrait it is extremely subtle. This is not to say that the theological anthropology of 2 Bar is inherently negative. The author believes that God intended humanity for glory (2 Bar 51:3), but it was humiliated by Adam's transgression (56:6). On revelations to Adam as a sign of exaltation see LAB 26:6 and 2 En. 31:2.

judgments (2 Bar 14:8–9). While the P narrative is used for the same argument in 4 Ezra and 2 Bar, the latter lacks the accusatory edge.

3.2.2.3 Second Baruch 15:1–18:2

The divine response to human confusion over Israel's present status overlaps as well. Uriel conceded that the world was made for Adam and by extension Israel (4 Ezra 7:11) then reminded the Seer of Adam's transgression (4 Ezra 7:11–12). The heavenly voice in 2 Bar admits that world was made for Adam (2 Bar 15:1) but reminds the Seer that Israel and Adam transgressed divine instruction and will, therefore, face torment knowingly (2 Bar 15:5–6).[173] God validates Baruch's amazement at the transgression of Adam (15:1; see also 55:2), but in 2 Bar the Lord will not be blamed for judging humanity arbitrarily. God's judgments are not arbitrary or beyond comprehension for those who know Torah (2 Bar 15:5–6; 19:1; 48:40).[174] This stands in contrast to a repeated theme articulated by Uriel in the first dialogue, that the human Ezra is incapable of comprehending the logic of judgment (4 Ezra 4:1–4, 13–18, 20–21).[175] Baruch accepts this logic (2 Bar 54:14), but it does not nullify his astonishment over transgression (55:2). Both 4 Ezra and 2 Bar agree that the world was created for humanity based on a reading of the P creation narrative along with Ps 8:6, but the author of 2 Baruch more readily accepts the idea that judgment is justly based on the Mosaic law. Moreover, the author of 2 Baruch aligns Adam and Israel as transgressors of divine instruction.

---

[173] It is not entirely clear if 2 Bar 15:5–6 describes Adam or the generic Israelite transgressor and the ambiguity is intentional.

[174] Possession of the Torah means that Israel cannot plead ignorance (2 Bar 19:1–3; 59:2; 77:3; see also LAB 11:2).

[175] Although by the third dialogue it becomes clear that the same Deuteronomic logic in 2 Bar (esp. 19:1–3) structures divine judgement in 4 Ezra (7:127–29)

When God reminds Baruch that the world to come was made for the righteous (15:7–8), the prophet expresses no doubt over human agency and merely wonders who can inherit the world to come when the present years are "few and evil" (16:1). God responds by contrasting Adam and Moses to illustrate that length of life is irrelevant to inheriting the age to come. Adam's long life was no benefit to him because of his transgression (17:2–3). In fact, Adam's transgression "brought death and cut off the years of those who were born of him" (17:3). It is clear that the author of 2 Baruch, like the author of 4 Ezra, blames Adam for human mortality, a point that is emphasized twice more by God in dialogue with the Prophet (2 Bar 19:8; 23:4), then again in vision (56:5–8).[176] Adam's long life, marred by transgression, is contrasted with Moses's shorter life which brought the light of Torah to Israel (2 Bar 17:4; see also 18:1–2). Despite the similar recounting of the P narrative and the consequences of Adam's transgression, the ultimate function of the tradition is quite different in 2 Bar. Both apocalypses refer to Adam as the quintessential transgressor, but only 2 Bar has a model of obedience in Moses.[177] The model of obedience indicates that Adam's transgression was determined by human choice not inherent nature. Similarly, Adam's progeny, as in the cases of Abraham and Moses, are not without moral agency.

Baruch concedes that length of life does not determine obedience but observes that few have followed Moses while many are like Adam (2 Bar 18:1–2). Here Baruch uses the imagery of darkness and light, which will become more prominent later in the

---

[176] Explicitly blaming Adam for the origin of death only appears on Ezra's lips in 4 Ezra 3:7. In 4 Ezra 7:11 Uriel seems to accept the same position, but the text is not explicit.

[177] Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 335–36 points out that the antithetical parallelism of Adam/Moses is structurally similar to the Adam/Christ antithesis in Rom 5:12–14. There is no similar antithetical parallel to Adam in 4 Ezra.

apocalypse (2 Bar 56:5–59:12, esp. 56:9). Whereas Moses provides the light of Torah (2 Bar 46:2; 54:5; 59:1–12, esp. 59:2; see also LAB 11:1), most of humanity walks in the "darkness of Adam" (2 Bar 18:2; see also 56:5–15; 4 Ezra 14:20–21).[178] Matthias Henze suggests that the "darkness of Adam" expresses the same idea as the "evil root" in 4 Ezra (3:22; 8:53).[179] Insofar as both phrases express a compulsion to disobey divine commands, Henze is correct. But, unlike 4 Ezra, there is no doubt about the moral agency of humans in 2 Bar.[180] Ezra's doubts about human agency due to the "evil heart" amount to an implicit criticism of God's creative work. In 2 Bar there is no hint that the "darkness of Adam" is blamed on the creator. The conceptual similarity between the "evil heart/root" and the "darkness of Adam" should not obscure the radically different rhetorical function of the images.

3.2.2.4 Second Baruch 48:42–43

In the final dialogue section, Baruch responds to God's description of coming judgment with a lament akin to 4 Ezra:

> O What have you done, Adam, to all those who were born of you? And what will be said to the first Eve who obeyed the snake? For this entire multitude is going to corruption, and there is no number to those whom the fire consumes.[181]

Although the similarity to 4 Ezra is profound, there are two significant differences in Baruch's lament. First, Baruch explicitly mentions Eve along with Adam (see also 2 Bar

---

[178] Harnisch, *Verhängnis und Verheißung*, 202–208. Harnisch notes the importance of the citation of Deut 30:19 in 2 Bar 19:1 for the meaning of this imagery.

[179] Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 169, 181

[180] On human agency in 2 Bar see especially Harnisch, *Verhängnis und Verheißung*, 194–97. Human agency is affirmed throughout the text by God (2 Bar 15:6; 19:1–3) and Baruch (54:14–15, 19, 21; 85:7).

[181] 2 Bar 48:42–43; see also 4 Ezra 7:116–118.

19:8). In contrast, 4 Ezra makes no mention of Eve. Second, whereas Ezra's lament questions human moral agency, Baruch assumes it (2 Bar 48:46–47).[182] Again the content of both laments is similar, but each serves an entirely different function in its respective dialogue. The contrast has led some to suggest that 2 Bar 48:42–43 is an interpolation.[183] As has already been shown, however, 2 Bar often uses similar traditions as 4 Ezra to different ends. Baruch's lament is meant to recognize the severity of Adam's transgression and then pivot away from a description of the wicked being judged (2 Bar 48:29–41) and toward a depiction of the righteous resurrected (48:48–51:16). Although similar in language, Baruch's lament lacks the implicit accusation of divine injustice found in 4 Ezra.

3.2.2.5 Second Baruch 54:15–19

After receiving a vision of dark and light waters (2 Bar 53:1–12), Baruch prays for an interpretation (54:1–55:2). In Baruch's prayer (54:15–19) and the subsequent interpretation by the Angel Remiel (56:5–14) the final references to Adamic tradition appear. In the prayer for interpretation, Baruch notes the significance of Adam's transgression and affirms human agency:

> Even though Adam was first to sin and brought death upon all who were not in his time but rather [upon all] those who were born of him, each one of them prepared for himself the torment to come, and, furthermore, each of them has chosen for himself the praises to come. . . Adam is therefore

---

[182] Baruch sounds like Uriel (4 Ezra 7:70–74; 7:127–28). In God's speech immediately prior to Baruch's lament, human agency has already been asserted (2 Bar 48:40).

[183] Harnisch, *Verhängnis und Verheißung*, 74 esp. fn. 1; 190; Brandenburger, *Adam und Christus* 38 fn. 4. Both point to the doublet introduction to Baruch's words (2 Bar 48:42, 44) and the clumsiness of 48:44 as well as the ideological difference between this lament and the rest of 2 Bar on moral agency. The interpolation theory goes back to at least R. H. Charles, *Apocalypse of Baruch*, lxxx. Unlike Harnisch and Bradenburger, Charles' argument is based on ideological grounds alone. See also Tennant, *Sources of the Fall*, 217–20.

> not the cause, except only for himself, but each of us has become our own Adam.[184]

This assertion of human responsibility on the lips of the Seer is the most pronounced difference between Baruch and his counterpart in 4 Ezra. It also shows that there is no need to postulate an interpolation in 2 Bar 48:42–43.[185] The author of 2 Bar employs Adamic tradition to assert human freedom. Many scholars have even suggested that the author is giving a polemical response to those who blame their sin on the protoplast, perhaps like the voice behind the protests of the Seer in 4 Ezra.[186] Whether an intentional polemic or not, the difference between 4 Ezra and 2 Bar is most pronounced on this point. In 2 Bar, unlike its literary twin, Adam's transgression is not determinate for his progeny.

3.2.2.6 Second Baruch 56:5–14

The Angel Remiel interprets Baruch's vision as a periodization of history (2 Bar 56:3–4). In the first period, the black water is a result of Adam's transgression (56:5). The protoplast's sin introduces eleven disastrous consequences for his progeny, including: death, mourning, sorrow, and pain (56:6).[187] Like 4 Ezra, Adam's disobedience and its consequences in Gen 3 have enduring consequences for humanity. Unlike 4 Ezra, however, Adam bears responsibility for the entrance of death into the world and the possibility of angelic rebellion:

> From these black [waters] again black [waters] were born, and the darkness of darkness was made. For he became a danger to himself. Even to the

---

[184] 2 Bar 54:15, 19

[185] Henze, *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 215–16 describes the author's perspective in 2 Bar as one of "dual causality," in which Adam's sins have drastic effects (esp. 2 Bar 23:4–5; 48:42–43; 56:6) but this does not predetermine the actions of his progeny in any way (2 Bar 54:15, 19).

[186] Tennant, *Sources of the Fall*, 217; Harnisch, *Verhängnis und Verheißung*, 196; Levison, *Portraits of Adam*, 138–9.

[187] Levison, *Portraits of Adam*, 139–42 provides a complete list with comment on each consequence.

> angels he became a danger. Also, for at that time when he was created, they had freedom. And some of them descended and intermingled with women. Then those who did so were tormented in chains. But the rest of the multitude of the angels, of whom there is [no] number, restrained themselves.[188]

If there is any text that subordinates the Enochic origin of evil to the Adamic it is 2 Bar 56:9–14. This is a key text for Martinus de Boer and Annette Reed, who interpret the author of 2 Bar identifying Adam as the cause of the Watchers' fall.[189] Certainly, 2 Bar is unlike the Enochic tradition where humanity is led astray by the Watchers (esp. 1 En. 10:8; 19:1–2), and instead the angels follow the example of humanity.[190] This appears to be a reversal of the Enochic template found in the Book of Watchers, supporting de Boer and Reed's view of a fundamental incompatibility between the Adamic and Enochic traditions.

Does the author of 2 Bar intend to refute the Enochic tradition by incorporating it into an Adamic framework? Certainly, 2 Bar is unique in connecting Adam's transgression with the angelic rebellion in a way that clearly reverses the pattern of the Book of Watchers. However, to hold Adam responsible for the angel's sin is to misread 2 Bar. Adam and the Angels are both created with free will. Just as Baruch prayed, "Each of us has become our own Adam" (2 Bar 54:19), so too did the Watchers. Adam is the paradigm for rebellion both human and angelic. Rather than rejecting the Enochic

---

[188] 2 Bar 56:9–14

[189] de Boer, "Paul and Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology," 178: "It was in fact Adam who was responsible for the fall of these angels [. . .]. It is human transgression, not angelic rebellion, that has brought about and continues to bring about cosmic disorder." Reed, *Fallen Angels*, 111: "This text asserts humankind's responsibility for their own sins by blaming them even for the fall of the angels. [. . .]. The causal arrow points the other way: it was humankind who corrupted the angels."

[190] There is a notable similarity to Jubilees where the Watchers originally descend to judge and instruct humanity (Jub. 4:15) at God's direction (Jub. 5:6) but are later corrupted by humans (Jub. 4:21; 5:1–11). More on Jubilees in chapter four.

tradition outright, or silencing it, the author of 2 Bar utilizes the Watchers tradition for the same rhetorical function as Adamic tradition.[191] In the same way that the author of 2 Baruch appropriated the Adamic tradition found in 4 Ezra, he appropriates the Enochic tradition. In both instances he argues for the moral agency of creatures while refusing to blame God for evil. Adamic and Enochic traditions are employed to serve Baruch's argument that God is good and all rational creatures are responsible for their own evil.

3.2.2.7 Second Baruch 73:3–5

In the final phase of Remiel's interpretation of Baruch's vision, the Angel describes the restoration of the cosmos (2 Bar 72:1–74:4).[192] In the restored cosmos Baruch is informed of the eschatological removal of evil and its cause:

> And no one will again die untimely, nor will any peril suddenly befall. And judgments and blame and schisms and vengeance and blood and covetousness and envy and hatred and all those that are like these will go into condemnation when they will be removed, for it is these that have filled this world [or: age] with evils, and because of them the life of human beings has greatly been disturbed.[193]

Baruch identifies the source of evil not with Adam or angels but the vices themselves. The corruption of the cosmos is not determined by Adam's transgression in this passage. Rather, humanity has fallen victim to personified evils. Notably, these evils are not

---

[191] As seen above, the Enochic tradition is absent from 4 Ezra. There were strands of early Judaism that rejected the Enochic tradition outright, including: Philo (*Gig*. 7, 16, 58), Jewish interlocutors with early Christians (Justin, *Dial*. 79.1; Tertullian, *Cult. fem.* 1.3.3) and some rabbinic literature (Gen. Rab. 26.5). See Philip S. Alexander, "The Targumim and early exegesis of 'Sons of God' in Genesis 6," *JSJ* 23 (1972): 60–71; Martha Himmelfarb, "A Report on Enoch in Rabbinic Literature," *SBLSP* 13 (1978): 259–69; Reed, *Fallen Angels*, 136–38, 206–18; Wright, *Origin of Evil Spirits*, 51–95; Joshua Ezra Burns, "The Watchers Traditions in Targum and Midrash," in *The Watchers in Jewish and Christian Traditions*, eds. Angela Kim Harkins, Kelly Coblentz Bautch, John C. Endres (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2014), 199–216, esp. 208–212.

[192] Twice already Baruch has heard of the messianic age from his heavenly interlocutor (*2 Bar* 29:1–30:5; 39:7–40:3).

[193] 2 Bar 73:3–5.

identical to the results of Adam's transgression in the first black water (2 Bar 56:6).[194] Furthermore, this vision of the restored cosmos contrasts with 4 Ezra's account of the restored messianic age. In 4 Ezra Uriel explicitly refers to the removal of the evil "heart" (4 Ezra 6:26) and the evil "root" (4 Ezra 8:53–54) associated with Adam's transgression (4 Ezra 3:21–22; 4:30) to describe the coming age. In 2 Bar 73, however, it is not the evil heart, the evil root, nor even the "darkness of Adam" that is removed. It is the evils themselves that must be removed for the cosmos to be restored.

Remiel's description of personified evils removed in the Messianic age evokes similar personifications elsewhere. First, within the primeval narrative of Genesis, sin is personified. After Abel's offering is favored by God, the Lord warns Cain, "If you do not do well, sin is lurking at the door; its desire is for you, but you must master it" (Gen 4:7b). In this passage, sin is personified as an agent of wrath.[195] Perhaps surprisingly, Gen 4:7 is rare in Second Temple reflection on evil.[196] Instead of focusing on the personification of sin in Gen 4:7b, the tradition about evil based on Gen 4 focuses on Cain as a paradigmatic sinner.[197] Although 2 Bar 73:3–5 is not decisively connected to Gen 4, the description of evil is well-suited to the Cain story and its reception. Most notably, the mention of untimely death, schism, vengeance, blood, and envy are

[194] There only overlapping terms are "death" (56:6; 73:3) and "blood" (56:6; 73:4).

[195] Anne Marie Kitz, "Demons in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East," *JBL* 135 (2016): 447–64, esp. 453–58.

[196] Brand, *Evil Within and Without*, 235–36 identifies possible allusions to Gen 4:7b in the War Scroll at Qumran (1QM XII, 12b; XIII, 12b; XV, 9b–10a; XVII, 4b). Brand suggests that Gen 4:7 is not more prominent in Second Temple literature because it only explains the desire to sin among those who are already evil. Even though Philo is very interested in Cain as a prototypical sinner, his reading of Gen 4:7b is based on the Greek text in which the personification of sin is not clear (see *Agr.* 127; *Sobr*. 50; *Mut*. 195; *QG* 1.66).

[197] Byron, *Cain and Abel in Text and Tradition*, 207–44. Key texts include Wis 10:3–4; Philo, *Det*. 32, 74–8; *Post*. 9–11; *Fug* 61–4; Josephus, *A.J.* 1.61–66; 1 Jn 3:12; Jude 11; 1 Clem 3:4; 4:7; Irenaeus, *Haer*. 3.23.3–4; Theophilus, *Autol*. 2.29.

connected to Cain's fratricide. Perhaps the author of 2 Bar intends to evoke Gen 4 in his description of the evils removed when the cosmos is restored.

Second, there are numerous texts that personify vices as angels or spirits. The earliest example of this personification occurs in the Book of Watchers. When listing the names of the angels responsible for illicit instruction, the author/redactor of *BW* utilizes names that identify the angels with their illicit teaching (1 En. 8:3).[198] It is difficult to distinguish the vices from the angels who teach them. Additionally, in apotropaic prayers found at Qumran the "bastard spirit" offspring of the Watchers are identified with vices.[199] In *Songs of the Sage*, the Sage praises God to drive away "all the spirits of the ravaging angels and the bastard spirits, demons, Lilith owls and [jackals . . .] and those who strike unexpectedly to lead astray the spirit of knowledge" (4Q510 Frag. 1.4–6; see also 4Q511 Frag. 35.6–8).[200] These bastard spirits even cause sin in some prayers. In the Aramaic Levi Document, the patriarch prays:

> *Make far* [ארחק/μάκρυνον] from me, my Lord, *the unrighteous spirit* [τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἄδικον/רוח עויה], and evil thought and fornication, and *turn* pride *away from me* [דחא מני/ἀπόστρεψον ἀπ᾽ ἐμοῦ]. [. . .] Let not any satan have power over me, *to make me stray from your path* [πλανῆσαί με ἀπὸ τῆς ὁδοῦ σου/לאטעני מן ארחך].[201]

---

[198] See Knibb Ullendorff, *Ethiopic Enoch*, 2.81–4.

[199] See Brand, *Evil Within and Without*, 199–215. "Bastard Spirits" is an epithet for the Watchers' offspring in 1 En. 10:9 (see also 1QH[a] XXIV, 16, 26). Although appearing in a very different conceptual framework, a similar personification of the "spirit of deceit [רוח עולה]" occurs in the Treatise of the Two Spirits (esp. 1QS IV, 9–14; see also 1QM XIII, 10b–12a).

[200] Translation from Florentino García Martínez and E. J. C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 2 Vols (Leiden: Brill, 1997–98). The "bastard spirits" are listed alongside other demonic epithets (Isa 13:21; 34:14). Similar apotropaic examples are found in *4QIncantations* (4Q444); 11Q11 V, 5b–8a.

[201] ALD 3:5, 9. Text and translation from Jonas C. Greenfield, Michael E. Stone, and Esther Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document: Edition, Translation. Commentary*, SVTP 19 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 60–3. The Aramaic is reconstructed, except when the Aramaic is cited before the Greek text in brackets as in the case of "*make far* [ארחק/μάκρυνον]."

The unrighteous spirits and satans can cause the righteous to sin, so the Patriarch asks for divine protection. The use of the term "satan" as a class of demons that can cause sin is found elsewhere at Qumran.[202] Notably, it appears in the Enochic Book of Parables in reference the offspring of the watchers who cause sin (1 En. 65:6; see also 40:7). Philo, who describes the etiology of evil spirits of the Watchers tradition as "superstition" (*Gig*. 16), personifies the passions that lead righteous souls away from virtue (*Gig*. 17–18). Even the Alexandrian who rejects the Watchers' view of demons can describe the offspring of the "Sons of God" as vices (*Deus* 3–4). The personification of vice can be related to the Watcher tradition positively or negatively.

Does the author of 2 Bar intend to evoke the story of Cain or the personification of vices as rebellious angels or their bastard offspring? There is no conclusive evidence to indicate as much. However, as Matthias Henze has shown, 2 Bar lacks indication of sectarian or separatist notions.[203] As a whole, 2 Bar stands out in the way it creatively, "incorporates into one program various theological strands and traditions that previously were kept in segregation."[204] It would not be surprising, then, if the author of 2 Bar employed a similar strategy in addressing a fundamental problem in the wake of the destruction of the temple, the origin and persistence of evil.

Rather than focusing solely on Adamic tradition like 4 Ezra, the author of 2 Bar incorporated a variety of traditions to suit the central claim that the burden of responsibility for evil falls on morally competent creatures (human and angelic). The

---

[202] Greenfield, Stone, Eshel, *Aramaic Levi Document*, 129–30. 11QPs[a] XIX, 15; 1QH[a] XXII, 6)

[203] *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 231–40. Second Baruch is distinct from 4 Ezra in this way because 4 Ezra identifies esoteric writings as the source of wisdom and knowledge (4 Ezra 14:47) while 2 Bar locates their source in Mosaic law (2 Bar 59:7).

[204] *Jewish Apocalypticism*, 372.

eclecticism of 2 Bar should not be interpreted as a rejection of the Enochic tradition. Rather, like Ben Sira and Wisdom, 2 Bar evidences a collection of traditions, a mixed template. In the case of 2 Bar the traditions are combined to serve the same rhetorical function, to argue for the goodness of God and the agency of his creation in choosing good or evil.

Conclusion

The Adamic template as a common interpretation of Gen 3 that attributed profound significance to Adam's transgression as the sole or even primary origin of evil is false. For over a century, scholars have focused on four texts to substantiate an early and developed Adamic template in Second Temple Judaism: Sirach (esp. Sir 25:24), Wisdom of Solomon (esp. Wis 2:23–24), 4 Ezra, and 2 Bar. Re-examination of these texts reveals that eclecticism is more common than singular focus on Adamic tradition.

In terms of historical development, the evidence for Adamic tradition as the primary explanation of evil's origin prior to the destruction of Jerusalem is scant. The key witnesses to a pre-destruction Adamic origin of evil are Sir 25:24 and Wis 2:23–24. Closer inspection of Ben Sira and Wisdom reveals that these texts are unusual in the larger context of the works in which they appear. Broader analysis of Ben Sira's theology of evil indicates no inherent conflict between the Adamic and Enochic traditions concerning evil. Rather, Ben Sira's reflections on the origin of evil parallels the paradoxical view of providence and free will found in ancient philosophy, most notably the Stoics, more than a single exegetical tradition. Ben Sira is a mixed template principally concerned with affirming divine providence and human freedom.

In Wisdom of Solomon the eclecticism is even more explicit. First, there is a pronounced debt to Greek philosophy when referring to the immortality (Wis 8:19–20; 9:15) and the death of the soul (Wis 10:3). Second, Adam is set in contrast to the prototypical transgressor, Cain (Wis 10:3–4), and idolaters (Wis 15:8–17). Third, Pseudo-Solomon makes passing reference to the Enochic tradition (Wis 14:6). In Wis 2:23–24 Adam's transgression is, for the first time, imbued with profound significance. Like Ben Sira, the author of Wisdom testifies to a diverse collection of traditions related to evil. Furthermore, it is important to note that in both Ben Sira and Wisdom, Adam's transgression is not identified as the source of human mortality or sin. Wisdom is a mixed template exhorting adherence to divine wisdom to overcome evil in a variety of forms.

The eclecticism characteristic of Ben Sira and Wisdom is eclipsed by a singular focus on Adamic tradition in 4 Ezra. The author connects Adam's sin with the origin of physical death, a significant departure from Ben Sira and Wisdom. However, 4 Ezra links this development to a trope already found in the earlier wisdom texts. In Ben Sira and Wisdom, knowledge of good and evil was interpreted as something given to humanity by God. In 4 Ezra this view of Adamic tradition is combined with a focus on Adam's transgression. The result is that God is implicitly blamed for creating Adam incapable of being good. Contrary to common assumptions about how Adamic tradition functions to absolve God of evil and emphasize human freedom, it is in the singular focus on Adamic tradition that human agency is undermined, and God most harshly blamed for evil.

The diversity of traditions characteristic of Ben Sira and Wisdom that disappeared in 4 Ezra reappear in 2 Bar. The author of 2 Bar incorporated a variety of traditions to suit his central claim that the burden of responsibility for evil falls on morally competent

creatures (human and angelic). Like Ben Sira and Wisdom, the eclecticism of 2 Bar should not be interpreted as a rejection of the Enochic tradition but a mixed template. In the case of 2 Bar these traditions are combined to serve the same rhetorical function, to argue for the goodness of God and the moral agency of his creation. Agreeing with 4 Ezra, the author of 2 Bar identifies Adam's transgression as the origin of physical death. However, in agreement with Ben Sira and Wisdom, this does not negate human freedom.

Adamic traditions do not serve the rhetorical function of identifying evil as an essentially human problem, beginning with Adam and persisting in human choice. This raises new questions: How does Enochic tradition address the origin and persistence of evil? Does Enochic tradition identify evil as an essentially superhuman problem, beginning with angels and persisting in superhuman forces? Returning to Galatians, how does Paul compare to his contemporaries? Is the Apostle to the Gentiles like 4 Ezra, focusing solely on Adamic traditions, or a mixed template? The next two chapters address these questions. In the next chapter, close examination of the Book of Watchers and Jubilees demonstrates that rebellious angel traditions function to absolve God of evil without denying human culpability. Chapter three returns to Galatians to explore the influence of the rebellious angel mythology from the Enochic tradition. Like most authors in the Second Temple period, Paul is eclectic in his use of various traditions to explain the origin and persistence of evil. Like Ben Sira, Wisdom, and 2 Bar, Paul represents a mixed template.

CHAPTER FOUR: EVIL IN ENOCHIC TRADITION AND JUBILEES

The Adamic template alone is unable to explain the origin and persistence of evil in Second Temple Jewish literature. Multiple accounts of evil are expressed in these texts. D. S. Russell finds three different explanations for the origin of evil.[1] John Collins detects at least five different "mythic paradigms."[2] Michael Segal counts four views of evil's origin in Second Temple Judaism.[3] Allowing for the most diversity, Loren T. Stuckenbruck distinguishes seven ways in which Second Temple Jews could trace the origin of evil.[4] Drawing from philosophy of action, Miryam T. Brand identifies two

---

[1] D. S. Russell, *The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic*, OTL (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1964), 249–54. Russell's explanations are: 1) Fallen Angels (Gen 6:1–4; BW; Jub); 2) Fall of Adam (Gen 3; Jub. 3:17–35; 4 Ezra; 2 Bar; LAE); 3) Evil Inclination (Gen 6:5; 8:21; 4 Ezra 3:21–22).

[2] Collins, "The Origin of Evil in Apocalyptic Literature," 289–98. Collins' paradigms are: 1) Enochic Myth of the Watchers' Fall (BW); 2) Dualistic Myth (1QS; 4QAmram); 3) Primordial Chaos (Daniel); 4) Adamic Myth (4 Ezra; 2 Bar); 5) Conflation of Enochic and Adamic Traditions (Jubilees, 2 Enoch, GLAE, T. 12 Patr.). Annette Reed cites Collins but alters his paradigms (*Fallen Angels*, 101–102). According to Reed, Collins's five explanations are: 1) Corruption of humankind by fallen angels (*BW*); 2) Two Spirits Doctrine (Qumran); 3) Primordial Chaos (Daniel); 4) Disobedience of Adam and Eve (4 Ezra 3:14–22; 4:30; 7:118; Rom 5:12; 1 Cor 15:21–22); 5) "Wicked inclination in the human heart" (4 Ezra 3:21–22, 25–26; 4:30) "which anticipates the Rabbinic concept of the 'evil inclination [יצר הרע]'" (Ber. Rabb. 9:7; 26:4; b. Sukkah 52b; b. Ber. 61a; b. Qidd. 30b). Reed's categories are a surprising interpretation of Collins, who never mentions the "evil inclination." Also, Collins explicitly refers to conflated mythological paradigms, a category that Reed not only ignores but seems to fundamentally oppose

[3] Michael Segal, *The Book of Jubilees: Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology and Theology*, JSJSup 117 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 97–101. Segal follows the philosophical work of J. L. Mackie arguing that evil problematizes belief in the existence of an omnipotent and good God ("Evil and Omnipotence," *Mind* 64 [1955]: 200–212). Segal's four options for the origin of evil are: 1) evil was created by "supernatural, heavenly process" (1 En.); 2) evil was created by "earthly, human behavior" (Adamic tradition); 3) evil pre-exists creation and is independent of God (Gen 1–2; Lev 16); 4) evil was created by God (Isa 45:7; 1QS III, 13– IV, 26).

[4] Loren T. Stuckenbruck, "The Book of Jubilees and the Origin of Evil," in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees*, eds. Gabriele Boccaccini and Giovanni Ibba (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 294–308, here 294–295. Stuckenbruck identifies the following possibilities: 1) rebellious angels (BW [esp. 1 En. 6:1–8:3]; Astronomical Book [1 En. 80:1–8]; Animal Apocalypse [1 En. 85:3–87:4]; Apocalypse of Weeks [1 En. 93:3–4]; Birth of Noah [1 En. 106:13–17]; Book of Giants [4Q531 1:1–8]; 4QAges of Creation [4Q180–181]; Sib. Or. 3:110–158); 2) Adam's transgression (4 Ezra 7:116–126; 2 Bar 53:13–22; Rom 5:12); 3) Eve's disobedience (Sir 25:13–26); 4) antediluvian women (T. Reu. 5:1–6); 5) Humanity (Epistle of Enoch [1 En. 98:4–8]); 6) a combination of different traditions (Book of Parables [1 En. 65:1–69:29]; LAE 12:1–16:3; 3 Bar 4:7–10; 2 En. 30:17–31:18; 1 Tim 2:9–15); 7) created by God (1QS III, 13–IV, 26; Sir 11:14; 17:7; 33:10–15; 42:24). In my view there are two major advantages to

categories, "internal" and "external," to classify the source of human sin.[5] Monika Elisabeth Götte discovers six typological explanations for evil.[6] Despite differences in classification, it is quite clear that there was not one single explanation for the origin of evil in Second Temple Judaism but numerous possible options. If Adamic tradition does not explain Paul's argument in Galatians, might one of these alternatives? My proposed solution is that Paul's argument in Galatians, esp. Gal 3:19–4:11, presumes the corruption of the cosmos due to the transgressions of angels based on Enochic tradition.

An Enochic logic to Paul's view of evil would be characteristic of Second Temple Judaism and early Christianity. While there were multiple explanations for the origin and persistence of evil, the most common in the first century was the Enochic tradition about rebellious angels. This tradition is widely distributed in Second Temple texts and extends into early Christian texts over a remarkably long period of time.[7] As already argued in chapter one, because the Enochic tradition is so pervasive, it might be surprising if Paul was not, in some way, influenced by it. Yet explicit evidence for direct influence of Enochic tradition in Paul's letters is scarce.[8] My proposal is not that Paul explicitly cites

---

Stuckenbruck's taxonomy. First, he allows for the most diversity based on the primary texts rather than a preformed set of paradigms. Second, Stuckenbruck allows for the possibility of multiple traditions occurring in the same author/text.

[5] Brand, *Evil Within and Without*, 27.

[6] Götte, *Von den Wächtern zu Adam*, 1–36. Götte's typologies are: 1) Exclusive Monotheism (Isa 45:1–8; see also Isa 40:1–8; 40:25–26; 45:12; 51:9–11); 2) Watchers' Fall (esp. BW); 3) Dualism (4QAmram; 1QS III, 13–IV, 26); 4) Fall of Adam (Paul; 4 Ezra; 2 Bar); 5) Primeval Fall of Satan (LAE; 2 Enoch); 6) Evil Inclination (Sir 15:14; 11QPs[a] XIX, 13–16).

[7] Loren T. Stuckenbruck, *The Myth of Rebellious Angels: Studies in Second Temple Judaism and New Testament Texts*, WUNT 335 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 1–35. Stuckenbruck traces the tradition associated with Gen 6:1–4 in the Book of the Watchers, Animal Apocalypse, Book of Giants, Jubilees, Damascus Document (CD), Ben Sira, Wisdom of Solomon, 3 Maccabees, 3 Baruch, Genesis Apocryphon (1Q20), Ages of Creation (4Q180–181), Exhortation Based on the Flood (4Q370), Incantation (4Q444), Songs of the Sage (4Q510–511), Apocryphal Psalms (11Q11). For the reception of Enochic traditions in early Christianity see chapter six. Aside from Gen 6:1–4, this tradition is not found in the HB.

[8] See 1 Cor 6:3; 11:10.

Enochic literature or Jubilees. Rather, the narrative about transgressing angels influenced the Apostle's arguments in Galatians. Even if Paul had never read the BW or Jubilees, he knows the story about rebellious angels. The best approximation of the story Paul knows about cosmic corruption by rebellious angels is found in the Book of Watchers and Jubilees. The present chapter, then, examines the origin and persistence of evil in the Book of Watchers and Jubilees as principal examples of the story known to Paul.

Because evil is a significant feature of the Enochic literature, analysis of the theme and its reception is well-trod territory. The significance of evil's origin has been a major focus of Enochic studies for decades and continues draw attention in monographs and articles.[9] Still, there is substantial debate about what exactly the BW and Jubilees claim about evil, especially the origin of evil and human agency. In attempt to bring clarity to this debate and its significance for Paul's argument in Galatians, the present study traces the view(s) of evil found in two widely influential pre-Pauline texts, the Book of Watchers (BW) and Jubilees. In the BW, evil originates with rebellious angels who cause profound and enduring destruction in the cosmos. In Jubilees, the Enochic tradition is adapted into a new narrative, combined with the Hebrew Bible and other traditions. The result is a thoroughly integrated narrative in which evil originates with angelic transgressions, persists in their demonic offspring and human choice, and is resolved by the obedience of Abraham and his offspring. According to Jubilees, the appropriate divine and human response to the transgressions of angels is found in the

[9] Among the most recent works are: Götte, *Von den Wächtern zu Adam*; Veronika Bachmann, "Wenn Engel gegen Gott freveln – und Menschen mittun. Das Wächterbuch (1 Hen 6–36), als frühhellenistischer Diskussionsbeitrag zum ‚Bösen'," in *Das Böse*, eds. Martin Ebner, et al. JBTh 26 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2012), 85–114; Losekam, *Die Sünde der Engel*; Wright, *Origin of Evil Spirits*.

possession of and obedience to Mosaic law. Jubilees does not diminish the significance of superhuman beings in the origin and persistence of evil but rather clarifies the relationship between superhuman evil and human responsibility. The Enochic and Jubilean views of evil have significant parallels to Paul's argument in Galatians, which will be explored further in chapter five.

Before turning to the texts directly, a methodological nuance requires explanation. Matthew Goff has made an important qualification about evil in the BW. Goff argues that the primary focus of the BW is not the chronological origin of evil per se (i.e. first occurrence of evil in history), but more importantly the persistence of evil (i.e. the continuity of primordial evil in the present).[10] This qualification requires some further explanation. The term "origin" can indicate chronological beginning as Goff describes, or the term can refer to the "source," or "cause" of something.[11] It is in the latter sense of causal source that the term origin is used here. Furthermore, the present analysis is focused not only on the origin of evil, but also its persistence. Where evil originated in the past and why it persists in the present are not necessarily the same concern, although they are too often conflated in analysis of Second Temple Jewish literature. As will be noted throughout the subsequent analyses of BW and Jubilees it is important to identify and distinguish the origin and persistence of evil whenever possible.

---

[10] Matthew Goff, "Enochic Literature and the Persistence of Evil: Giants and Demons, Satan and Azazel," in *Das Böse, der Teufel und Dämonen – Evil, the Devil, and Demons*, eds. Jan Dochorn, Susanne Rudnig-Zelt and Benjamin Wold, WUNT 2.412 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016), 43–57, esp. 44–5.

[11] Similarly, the Greek noun ἀρχή can refer to chronological "beginning" (Plato, *Theaet*. 177c; *Leg*. 798a; Herodotus 3.153; 7.5; Luke 1:2; John 2:11; 6:64; 8:25, 44; 15:27; Acts 26:4) and/or the original source (Homer, *Il*. 22.116; *Od*. 8.81; Plato, *Tim.* 36a; *Leg*. 715a; Heb 3:14).

4.1 Book of Watchers

The Book of the Watchers is the first portion of the composite work known as 1 Enoch (chapters 1–36).[12] The work tells a story of angels, called “Watchers,” forsaking heaven to procreate with women and producing terrifying, gargantuan offspring. These angels also teach illicit knowledge to humans, introducing dangerous technologies. The transgressions of illicit reproduction and instruction have disastrous effects on the cosmos. Although the Watchers forsake heaven, and lead humanity astray (1 En. 6–11), the hero of the story, the human Enoch, ascends to the heavens and mediates on their behalf in the presence of God (1 En. 12–16) before engaging in heavenly journeys to explore the cosmos (1 En. 17–19, 20–36). The compelling narrative became vitally important for explaining the origin and persistence of evil in Second Temple Judaism. As James VanderKam observes, “No other document in the early Enoch tradition proved more important for later use and adaptation than the BW.”[13] Nowhere is the importance of the BW more pronounced than the narrative of rebellious angels.

Although a precise determination is impossible, the BW dates to the second or perhaps even third century BCE, containing traditions that may go back to the fourth century BCE or earlier. The work must have been written by 200 BCE based on the

---

[12] 1 Enoch is composed of at least five different works: 1) Book of Watchers (BW, 1 En. 1–36); 2) Book of Parables (BP, 1 En. 37–71); 3) Astronomical Book (AB, 1 En. 72–82), (4) Book of Dreams (BD, 1 En. 83–90), and (5) Epistle of Enoch (EE, 1 En. 91–108). The Apocalypse of Weeks is embedded in the Epistle of Enoch (1 En. 93:1–10; 91:11–17) and the Animal Apocalypse is embedded in the Book of Dreams (*AA* 85–90). See Devorah Dimant, “The Biography of Enoch and the Books of Enoch,” *VT* 33 (1983): 14–29, here 24; Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 43–7. Loren T. Stuckenbruck identifies the Birth of Noah (1 En. 106–107) and the account of eschatological judgment and reward in 1 En. 108 as separate sources, finding seven different works in 1 Enoch (“The Early Traditions related to 1 Enoch: From the Dead Sea Scrolls: An Overview and Assessment,” in *The Early Enoch Literature*, eds. Gabriele Boccaccini and John J. Collins, JSJSupp 121 [Leiden: Brill, 2007], 41–63, here 41).

[13] James C. VanderKam, *Enoch: A Man for All Generations* (Columbia: University of South Carolina, 1995), 31.

paleography of 4Q201 (4QEn^{a}), the earliest extant fragment of the work.[14] Józef Milik dated 4Q201 to "the first half of the second century," but maintained that the text "seems to have been made from a very old copy, dating form the third century at the very least."[15] Based on 4Q201, the BW existed in a written form by 200 BCE at the latest. It is more difficult, however, to determine the origin of the text.[16] Despite these uncertainties, it is generally agreed that the BW was written by the second or third century BCE and contains earlier traditions.

The BW is a composite text, composed of earlier traditions redacted into a single work. The narrative is related to Gen 6:1–4, as well as Mesopotamian and Greek mythologies.[17] Detailed analysis of BW has primarily focused on source-critical

---

[14] 4Q201 includes fragments from 1 En. 1–12. Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 139–60. However, Stuckenbruck has pointed out that Milik's account does not publish 4Q201 frag. 2–8 which provide evidence of 1 En. 13:8, indicating that the manuscript originally contained at least 1 En. 1–16 and quite likely the entirety of BW ("Early Traditions related to 1 Enoch," 45–6).

[15] Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 140–41. Milik is followed by James C. VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition*, CBQMS 16 (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984), 111–12. More recent analysis of the fragments of 4Q201 from Michaël Langlois mostly confirms Milik's date, if cautiously pushing it earlier. See Michaël Langlois, *Le premier manuscrit du Livre d'Hénoch: Étude épigraphique et philologique des fragments araméens de 4Q201 à Qumrân* (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 2008), 453. Langlois finds conflicting evidence that may suggest redaction throughout the time of the Archaemenid Empire (ca. 550–330 BCE), but cautions, "Il va de soi qu'une telle conclusion doit rester préliminaire" until the remaining Aramaic fragments of cave 4 can be studied.

[16] VanderKam thinks that 1 En. 33–36 utilizes the Astronomical Book (esp. 1 En. 76–77), but the date of AB is not easy to determine (VanderKam, *Enoch and Growth*, 114, 137). On the date of AB see VanderKam, *Enoch and Growth*, 79–82; George W. E. Nickelsburg and James C. VanderKam, *1 Enoch 2: A Commentary on the Book of Enoch chapters 37–82*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012), 338–41.

[17] James VanderKam and Helge S. Kvanvig have argued that Enochic material developed from Mesopotamian traditions (VanderKam, *Enoch and Growth*, 23–51; Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic: The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and the Son of Man*, WMANT 61 [Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988], esp. 319–342; Kvanvig, *Primeval History*, 413–26). See also Andrei A. Orlov, *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition*, TSAJ 107 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 24–39; Siam Bhayro, "Noah's Library: Sources for 1 Enoch 6–11," *JSP* 15 (2006): 163–77; Amar Annus, "On the Origin of Watchers: A Comparative Study of the Antediluvian Wisdom in Mesopotamian and Jewish Traditions," *JSP* 19 (2010): 277–320; Henryk Drawnel, "The Mesopotamian Background of the Enochic Giants and Evil Spirits," *DSD* 21 (2014): 14–38.

On the significance of Greek mythology for BW see: T. F. Glasson, *Greek Influence in Jewish Eschatology* (London: SPCK, 1961), 57–73; Birger A. Pearson, "A Reminiscence of Classical Myth at II Peter 2:4," *GRBS* 10 (1969): 71–80; George W. E. Nickelsburg, "Apocalyptic and Myth in 1 Enoch 6–11,"

reconstructions of layers of tradition.[18] Since Enoch is nowhere mentioned in the rebellious angel story in chapters 6–11, this is often identified as the earliest version of the text embedded with multiple layers. At least two originally separate layers of tradition, each associated with a different chief angel, are combined in chapters 6–11.[19] Even if it is impossible for contemporary scholars to separate the traditions, it is clear that at least two traditions about transgressing angels have been combined in 1 En. 6–11.[20] The evidence at Qumran indicates that these traditions were brought together quite early, with 4Q201 including material from chapters 1 through 12. Manuscript evidence and early reception history confirms that the BW was already a unified composition before the first century BCE.[21] The early redaction and later reception of the text as whole

---

JBL 96 (1977): 383–405; Jan N. Bremmer, "Remember the Titans!" in *The Fall of the Angels*, eds. Christoph Auffarth and Loren Stuckenbruck, TBN 6 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 35–61; Götte, *Von den Wächtern zu Adam*, 49–52.

[18] Devorah Dimant, "The Fallen Angels in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphic Books related to them" (PhD diss., Hebrew University, 1974 [Hebrew]); Dimant, "1 Enoch 6–11: A Methodological Perspective," *SBLSP* 13 (1978): 323–339; Paul D. Hanson, "Rebellion in Heaven, Azazel, and Euhemeristic Heroes in 1 Enoch 6–11," *JBL* 96 (1977): 195–233; Nickelsburg, "Apocalyptic and Myth," 383–405; David W. Suter, "Fallen Angel, Fallen Priest: The Problem of Family Purity in 1 Enoch 6–16," *HUCA* 50 (1979): 115–35; Carol A. Newsom, "The Development of 1 Enoch 6–19: Cosmology and Judgment," *CBQ* 42 (1980): 310–29; Corrie Molenberg, "A Study of the Roles of Shemihaza and Asael in I Enoch 6-11," *JJS* 35 (1984): 136–46; Wright, *Origin of Evil Spirits*, 29–37; Veronika Bachmann, *Die Welt im Ausnahmezustand: eine Untersuchung zu Aussagegehalt und Theologie des Wächterbuches (1 Hen 1-36)*, BZAW 409 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009), 9–14.

[19] Devorah Dimant argues that 1 En. 6–11 testifies to an earlier Hebrew text ("1 Enoch 6–11: A Fragment of a Parabiblical Work," *JJS* 53 [2002]: 223–37). Others have suggested theories of composition for BW with attention to the difference between the Shemihaza and Asael traditions. See, for example, Siam Bhayro, *The Shemihazah and Asael Narrative of 1 Enoch 6–11: Introduction, Text, Translation and Commentary with Reference to Ancient Near Eastern and Biblical Antecedents*, AOAT 322 (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2005).

[20] John J. Collins raises doubts about the ability of contemporary scholars to reconstruct the layers of the different traditions ("Methodological Issues in the Study of 1 Enoch: Reflections on the Articles of P. D. Hanson and G. W. Nickelsburg," *SBLASP* 13 [1978]: 315–22).

[21] John J. Collins, "The Apocalyptic Technique: Setting and Function in the Book of Watchers," *CBQ* 44 (1982): 91–111, here 95; Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, *Prophets of Old and the Day of the End: Zechariah, the Book of Watchers and Apocalyptic*, OtSt 35 (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 172–82. The fusion of these narratives by the first century is recognizable in the reception of the BW. First, in the Animal Apocalypse, written ca. 160–165 BCE, the punishment of the "first star" to rebel (1 En. 88:1) matches Raphael's judgment of Asael in BW (1 En. 10:4–5) before describing the judgment of the Shemihazah tradition angels, i.e. stars who engage in illicit sex (1 En. 88:3). Similarly, the four angels involved in

indicates that the BW merits analysis as a unified text.[22] Although it is difficult to reconstruct the layers of tradition, scholars have attempted to outline the theologies of evil in the earliest traditions and how these traditions are reshaped in the final redacted form of the text.

The present analysis traces the layers of tradition focused on the origin and persistence of evil. Due to the impossibility of reconstructing the redactional development of the text with any certainty, no single theory is proposed here.[23] Instead, redactional development is explored because of its importance for the view of evil in the BW. The analysis begins with the Shemihazah and Asael narrative (1 En. 6–11), an early composite tradition that identifies evil with illicit angelic reproduction and instruction resulting in cosmic destruction and corruption. Next, the narrative is placed in the context of the whole BW composition (esp. 1 En. 12–19). Each stage of investigation is aimed at clarifying the origin and persistence of evil.

---

judgment in AA (87:3–88:3) adopts the four archangels of 1 En. 9:1; 10:1– 22. By the middle of the second century BCE, then, the Asael and Shemihazah traditions were merged in the reception of BW. Second, in 4Q180 Azael is named as the chief angel of the Watchers' sexual rebellion, fusing the two traditions entirely (4Q180 frag.1.7–10). Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 257 dates 4Q180 in the early first century CE.

[22] Suter, "Fallen Angel, Fallen Priest," 115–35; Collins, "Apocalyptic Technique," esp. 104–7; Tigchelaar, *Prophets of Old*, 165–76; Reed, *Fallen Angels*, 26–27; Bachmann, *Welt im Ausnahmezustand*, 63–107.

[23] In contrast, Siam Bhayro argues for the most complex theory, a five-stage development, which attempts to identify the layers of tradition in their order of accumulation and the logic of each revision. He identifies the stages of development as follows: 1) Shemihazah Narrative (1 En. 6:1–6; 7:1–6; 8:4; 10:9–14); 2) Angelic Instruction revision (6:7–8; 8:3; 10:7; 10:20–11:2); 3) Asael Narrative (8:1–2; 10:4–6; 10:8); 4) Sons of Lamech Revision (10:1–3; 10:15–19); and 5) Angelic Prayer (9:1–11). See Bhayro, *Shemihazah and Asael Narrative*, 11–20.

4.1.1 Shemihazah and Asael Narratives (1 En. 6–11)

The text of 1 En. 6–11 is the most substantial and, apart from Gen 6:1–4, probably the earliest extant version of the angelic descent story.[24] Lacking any mention of Enoch, chapters 6–11 are recognized as an originally separate source which was later combined with 1 En. 12–16.[25] Furthermore, scholars have long suggested that 1 En. 6–11 is composed of at least two strata of traditions, each associated with a different chief angel. The earlier and more substantial stratum describes a heavenly rebellion led by the chief angel Shemihazah, descending with two hundred "Watchers" to have sexual intercourse with women (esp. 1 En. 6:3–7). The result of this intercourse is horrific offspring that plague the world (1 En. 7:1–6). Shemihazah's sin and the destructive offspring prompt divine judgment (1 En. 9:1–10:15) and the restoration of the cosmos (1 En. 10:16–11:2). In the Shemihazah tradition, evil is introduced into the cosmos from heaven by angelic transgressions.

The function of the Shemihazah narrative is disputed. Many scholars advocate an etiological interpretation. According to the etiological interpretation, the narrative explains evil as originating from a superhuman source which is beyond human ability and agency to overcome or counteract. Others argue for a paradigmatic interpretation. According to the paradigmatic interpretation, the story functions as a cautionary tale. The Watchers are paradigmatic "sinners" who are appropriately punished for their sinful

---

[24] Milik argued that the BW predates Gen 6:1–4 and that Gen 6:1–4 was an "abridged and allusive formulation" (*Books of Enoch*, 31). Milik has not been widely followed. John Day, for example, argues that BW is an interpretation of Gen 6:1–4 and does not predate it (*From Creation to Babel,* 77–97).

[25] Carol Newsom argues that 1 En. 12–16 was combined with the Shemihazah narrative prior to the addition of the Asael material ("Development of 1 Enoch 6–19," 315–21). Her reconstruction is compelling, but the redactional growth of 1 En. 6–11 or 6–19 cannot be reconstructed with exacting precision.

deeds. If the Watchers are an example, then evil originates as a deficiency of choice, entirely within the control of free agents (angelic and human). Depending on the hermeneutical framework applied to these texts, they can be read in divergent ways regarding the origin of evil and human culpability.

At some point, and for debated reasons, a second stratum of tradition was added to 1 En. 6–11 describing humans receiving instruction in illicit technologies from angels (1 En. 8:1–3).[26] The chief angel behind the illicit instruction is Asael (1 En. 8:1; 9:6; 10:4, 8). In the Asael tradition, evil originates from the angels' instruction in destructive and dangerous technologies. By nature of the story, the persistence of evil in the Asael tradition seems to implicate humans for their use of these technologies. After all, it takes a teacher and a student for instruction to occur. As will be demonstrated below, there are divergent views of human participation in the various textual traditions of the Asael material. As a result, the Asael tradition, like the Shemihazah narrative, can be read in different ways regarding the origin of evil and human agency.

4.1.1.1 Etiology

In a pair of seminal articles, Paul Hanson and George Nickelsburg argue for an etiological reading of the Shemihazah and Asael narratives. Their arguments have substantial overlap in both method and conclusions and yet diverge at significant points. Methodologically, Hanson and Nickelsburg interpret 1 En. 6–11 using historical-critical and source-critical analyses. They agree that the essential core of 1 En. 6–11 is the Shemihazah narrative whereas the Asael narrative is secondary. Although they agree on

[26] These illicit technologies include: metallurgy for the construction of instruments of war (1 En. 8:1a) and cosmetics (8:1b), pharmacology (8:3a), sorcery (8:3b), and astrology (8:3c).

the shape of the narrative and the source-critical method, they dispute the details of textual growth.[27] Because of their profound influence it is worth briefly recounting their arguments about the Shemihazah and Asael narrative as an etiology of evil.

Paul Hanson argues that 1 Enoch 6–11 is an expository narrative of Gen 6:1–4 that combined a common pattern from ANE mythology with apocalyptic eschatology in order to develop a "sectarian explanation of the origin of evil in the world and its ultimate eradication."[28] Not only does Hanson find the view of evil in the expository narrative "quite alien" to the "central message of Genesis,"[29] but he also thinks the text was produced by "victims of oppression . . . powerless to eradicate the evil they see engulfing them."[30] Without the ability to effect change within history, Hanson sees the author(s) behind the traditions looking beyond human history to the superhuman cosmos.[31] He

---

[27] Hanson, "Rebellion in Heaven," 197. Hanson's reconstruction of the development of the text occurs in three stages: 1) Shemihazah narrative (6:1–7:1c; 7:2–6; 9:1–5; 9:7–8b; 9:9–10:3; 10:11–11:2); 2) Azazel elaboration (10:4–8); 3) Euhemeristic elaboration (1 En. 8:1–2, 3, 7:1de; 9:6, 8c; 10:7d–8a). In contrast, Nickelsburg thinks the Shemihazah narrative (6:1–7:1c; 7:2–6; 9:1–5; 9:7–8b; 9:9–10:3; 10:11–11:2) was combined with an independent Asael tradition (1 En. 8:1–2, 3; 7:1de; 9:6, 8c; 10:4–10).

[28] Hanson, "Rebellion in Heaven," 232. Hanson identifies the ANE pattern as "rebellion, devastation, punishment, restoration." Among corresponding "rebellion in heaven myths" Hanson incorporates texts from the HB (Gen 6:1–4; Isa 14:5–21; Ezek 28:1–10, 11–19; 32:2–8) and Hurrian, Hittite, Babylonian, and Ugaritic texts.

[29] Hanson, "Rebellion in Heaven," 202. Hanson claims that in Genesis "evil stems from human rebellion against that sovereign God."

[30] Hanson, "Rebellion in Heaven," 219.

[31] Hanson's reconstruction is rooted in a historical and sociological analysis of the development of Apocalypticism in post-exilic Israelite religion. Hanson thinks apocalyptic eschatology was a post-exilic retreat from prophetic eschatology, which in his view integrated historical politics and theological vision. In contrast to prophetic eschatology, apocalyptic eschatology separates historical processes from the theological vision of salvation. See Paul D. Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic: The Historical and Sociological Roots of Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology*, rev. ed. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979), 280–86, 402–3. Hanson's debt to the sociological studies of Max Weber, Karl Mannheim, and Ernest Troeltsch is explicit (*Dawn of Apocalyptic*, 211–20). See also Philip F. Esler, "Social-Scientific Approaches to Apocalyptic Literature," in *The Oxford Handbook of Apocalyptic Literature*, ed. John J. Collins (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014), 123–44, esp. 126–28. The view that "apocalyptic" always arises from a context of crisis is no longer accepted by many scholars. See, e.g. Lester L. Grabbe, "The Social Setting of Early Jewish Apocalypticism," *JSP* 4 (1989): 27–47, esp. 30–31.

finds an apocalyptic symmetry to the exposition of Gen 6:1–4 while utilizing ANE myth to place the problem of evil and its solution outside the scope of human control.[32] In Hanson's redactional reconstruction the original Shemihazah narrative was elaborated by the Asael material in 1 En. 10:4–8.[33] The reason for the elaboration was to join the Shemihazah story, a narrative about the origin of evil and its eradication, with Leviticus 16, a text describing "the community's primary rite dealing with purgation."[34] Hanson's interpretation of the 1 En. 6–11 is primarily focused on the Shemihazah narrative as an innovative etiology of evil and its divine eradication to support a sectarian worldview. Central to Hanson's argument is the notion that is evil is superhuman in origin and solution, entirely beyond human control.

In the same year as Hanson, George Nickelsburg also published on the function and redactional development of 1 En. 6–11.[35] Nickelsburg agreed with Hanson regarding the earliest shape of the Shemihazah narrative.[36] He disagreed, however, regarding the process of redactional development and the details of the narrative's intended function. Rather than positing an original plot with two consecutive stages of elaboration,

---

[32] Hanson, "Rebellion in Heaven," 218–19: "all of the evil in the world stems from a heavenly event" thus "extirpation of evil would not occur form within the world order, but through cataclysmic extension of primeval events, culminating in a purging of the evil angels and spirits and the restoration of perfect order."

[33] Hanson, "Rebellion in Heaven," 220.

[34] Hanson, "Rebellion in Heaven," 221. Hanson finds a link between the name Asael and the Day of Atonement ritual in Leviticus 16, which describes the goats set apart for atonement, one for the Lord and other for "Azazel [עזאזל]" (Lev 16:8–10). According to Hanson's reconstruction, "the Azazel episode arose as an expository elaboration which sought to deepen the meaning of the Shemihazah azah story by relating it to the *yom kippur* text in Lev 16." ("Rebellion in Heaven," 224). Problematic for Hanson's argument is that all extant Aramaic fragments of the BW render the name "Asael" as either עסאל or עשאל. Wright argues that a connection between *Asael* and Azazel is not likely to be original to BW (*Origin of Evil Spirits*, 108–114).

[35] Nickelsburg, "Apocalyptic and Myth," 383–405.

[36] Nickelsburg, "Apocalyptic and Myth," 384; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 165.

Nickelsburg thinks the Shemihazah narrative was interpolated with an independent Asael tradition (1 En. 8:1–2, 3; 7:1de; 9:6, 8c; 10:4–10). He believes that the two traditions were united because they both combined an interpretation of Genesis with a subversive appropriation of Greek mythology. In the case of the Shemihazah narrative, Nickelsburg thinks the composer(s) combined popular Greek mythology (esp. *Titanomachia* and *Gigantomachia*) with Gen 6–9, in part, to subvert the divine claims of the Diodochoi (ca. 323–302 BCE).[37] Similarly, Nickelsburg thinks that the originally independent Asael tradition combined Gen 4:22–24 with the Prometheus myth.[38] The intended function of 1 En. 6–11, in both Shemihazah and Asael traditions, was to weaponize a combination of Greek mythology with an interpretation of Genesis to condemn oppressive Hellenistic overloads and offer Israelites hope for vindication in a blessed future. As in the case of Hanson, the Shemihazah and Asael narratives were combined primarily to function as an etiology of evil.

---

[37] Nickelsburg, "Apocalyptic and Myth," 395–97. Nickelsburg follows Glasson, *Greek Influence*. See also Pearson, "Classical Myth at II Peter 2:4," 71–80. A more restrained comparison is found in Bremmer, "Remember the Titans!" 35–61. Nickelsburg is tentative with his suggestion due to the lack of early primary evidence, but he writes, "Our author would be saying, 'Yes their fathers were divine; however, they were not gods, but demons—angels who rebelled against the authority of God.'" ("Apocalyptic and Myth," 397). Nickelsburg's reconstruction of the historical context of the Shemihazah narrative is based on the paleography of the Enochic manuscripts at Qumran as well as the content of the narrative ("Apocalyptic and Myth," 389–91). The profound violence of the Seleucid-Ptolemaic struggle for Palestine (217–198 BCE) and the wars of the Diodochoi (323–302 BCE) are both suitable historical contexts for BW, but Nickelsburg finds the wars of the Diadachoi more likely. See also Rüdiger Bartelmus, *Heroentum in Israel und seiner Umwelt*: *Eine traditionsgeschhichtlich Untersuchung zu Gen. 6,1–4 und verwandten Texten im Alten Testament und der altorientalischen Literatur*, ATANT 65 (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1979), 180–83.

[38] Nickelsburg, "Apocalyptic and Myth," 399–404. He cites the Prometheus myth as it appears in Hesiod (*Theog*. 507–616; *Op*. 42–105) and Aeschylus (*Prom*. 107, 230–240, 547). Most important for his case is the version of the myth in Aeschylus. See Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 191–93.

4.1.1.2 Paradigm

Working around the same time but independently of Hanson and Nickelsburg, Devorah Dimant came to different conclusions about the shape and function of the Shemihazah and Asael narrative.[39] Although she advocates source criticism, Dimant is not confident that the strata of the Shemihazah narrative can be neatly separated, particularly the apparent instructional motifs (1 En. 7:1de; 8:3; 9:8c; 10:7d).[40] Even more divergent from the shape, however, is Dimant's view of the function of these narratives. She thinks it is "unfounded" to interpret them as an etiology of evil because it focuses too much on what she considers a "secondary element," namely the Watchers' offspring as demons (1 En. 15:8–12; Jub. 10:1–14).[41] Rather than explaining the origin of evil, Dimant thinks the primary function of the Shemihazah narrative is to depict the fate of sinners. In the case of the Asael narrative, Dimant identifies "the typical role of one leading others to sin."[42] What connects the stories is not their etiological function but their paradigmatic expression of the violation of Noachide commands (Gen 9:4–6).[43] Unlike Hanson and Nickelsburg, Dimant interprets the function of 1 En. 6–11 as a paradigmatic expression of sin rather than etiology of evil.

---

[39] Dimant, "Methodological Perspective," 323–339. See also Brand, *Evil Within and Without*, 156–58.

[40] Dimant, "Methodological Perspective," 326. She identifies the Shemihazah narrative as 1 En. 6–7; 8:3–11; 9:7–10; 10:7, 9–10 and thinks 1 En. 9:1–5, 11 could be assigned to both Shemihazah and Asael (324).

[41] Dimant, "Methodological Perspective," 330. See also Brand, *Evil Within and Without*, 158–59, 167–68.

[42] Dimant, "Methodological Perspective," 327. While she is not convinced that the reason for connecting the Shemihazah and Asael narratives was Leviticus 16, she does think that 1 En. 10:8 is possibly an allusion to Lev 16:22.

[43] Dimant, "Methodological Perspective," 327–29.

Like Dimant, Corrie Molenberg advocates reading the Shemihazah and Asael narrative paradigmatically rather than etiologically.[44] In her view, the primary sin depicted in the Shemihazah narrative is "defilement."[45] Additionally, she points out that there is an instruction motif inherent to the Shemihazah narrative when the angel instructs Noah about how to survive the deluge (1 En. 10:2–3). This is perhaps the best explanation for why the Asael tradition was combined with the Shemihazah narrative. The appropriate angelic instruction offered to Noah (1 En. 10:2–3) may have attracted the illicit angelic instruction motif found in the Asael narrative (esp. 1 En. 7:1de; 8:1, 3, 9:6; 8b).[46] Molenburg recognizes that the Asael narrative does attribute profound significance to angelic instruction as the source of evil in the world (9:6; 10:8). But because the Asael narrative is the latest material added to 1 En. 6–11 she thinks the paradigmatic interpretation governs the reading of the Asael material. As a result, she finds continuity in the function of the two traditions which she argues, "was to teach man by angelic analogue of the eventual triumph of righteousness over sin."[47] Similar to Dimant, Molenburg argues that the Shemihazah and Asael narratives ought to be read paradigmatically, describing the rebellious angels as examples of sinners, the pattern to be avoided.

---

[44] Molenberg, "Roles of Shemihazah and Asael," 140. Considering the reference to Noah as the "Son of Lamech" (1 En. 10:1), Molenberg thinks Noah is meant to signify the prototype for the righteous whereas the Watchers and their offspring are meant to be understood as "sinners of the author's own time."

[45] Molenberg, "Roles of Shemihazah and Asael," 139 notes the focus on pollution related to sex (1 En. 7:1), dietary laws (1 En. 7:5; Gen 9:4–6; Lev 19:26; 17:10–14; Deut 12:16, 23; 15:23; 1 Sam 14:33), and the impurity of the earth (1 En. 9:1; see Gen 4:10).

[46] Molenberg, "Roles of Shemihazah and Asael," 141.

[47] Molenberg, "Roles of Shemihazah and Asael," 145.

4.1.1.3 Unresolved Ambiguities

Scholarship that focuses on 1 Enoch 6–11 as an originally independent composite of tradition is generally in agreement about the shape of the text but is significantly divided over three major issues. First, the function of the narrative (etiology or paradigm) is disputed. Second, human responsibility is unclear. Is evil entirely the result of superhuman agents, or are humans implicated as well? Third, how can some notable textual differences in the Greek witnesses to the Shemihazah and Asael narrative be resolved. These textual differences produce radically different views of human agency in the persistence of evil. Source criticism of the Shemihazah and Asael narratives leaves these three issues underdetermined.

A brief overview of the major parts of the Shemihazah tradition demonstrates that these three issues remained unresolved when the source is abstracted from the narrative in which it has been embedded. Structurally, the Shemihazah narrative has roughly four parts: 1) the plot to sin (1 En. 6:1–8), 2) the sinful descent and sexual transgressions (1 En. 7:1–6), 3) angelic intercession (1 En. 9:1–5, 7–8b, 9–11), and 4) the divine response (1 En. 10:1–3; 10:11–11:2).[48] The initial plot (1 En. 6:1–8) describes the Watchers as sinners prior to their descent. Shemihazah and his cohort of angels are aware that their desire for women and offspring (1 En. 6:2) is a "great sin [ἁμαρτίας μεγάλης]" (1 En. 6:3), so they swear an oath binding one another with a curse (1 En. 6:4–5) before descending on Mount Hermon (1 En. 6:5–6).[49] From the outset of the narrative there is no

[48] Hanson divides the text into four parts, although structured slightly differently ("Rebellion in Heaven," 198–201). Nickelsburg outlines six parts ("Apocalyptic and Myth," 384). Molenburg subdivides the narrative into three sections ("Roles of Shemihazah and Asael," 136–37). Any structure is somewhat subjective, but there is substantial agreement about the main features of the narrative.

[49] See the commentary by Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 1, 177. In the Hebrew Bible "great sin [חטאה גדלה]" refers to either adultery (Gen 20:9; see also Gen 39:9) or idolatry (Exod 32:21, 30, 31; 2 Kgs 17:21;

doubt about the nature of their descent, they are sinners. Also, the angelic rebellion begins in heaven. This portion of the story might support either a paradigmatic or etiological interpretation. Paradigmatically, the angels are examples of those who willfully sin, knowing the wickedness of their action(s) from the outset.[50] Etiologically, the significance of the angelic sin is that it begins in heaven, the most immediate sphere of God's reign.[51] In the first section of the Shemihazah narrative, both interpretations have some textual warrant.

The heinousness of the Watchers' descent, intercourse with women, and their destructive offspring is summarily described (1 En. 7:1–6). First the Watchers defile themselves (1 En. 7:1; 9:8; 10:11), produce impure offspring (1 En. 7:5; 9:9; 10:15) and defile the earth (1 En. 10:16, 20, 22). The purity concerns, which Molenburg claims are "the main theme of the Shemihazah story," support a paradigmatic reading of the text.[52] Second, the Watchers cause destruction through their giant offspring (1 En. 7:3, 4, 5; 9:1).[53] The "half-breed" sons have insatiable, cannibalistic appetites (1 En. 7:3–5) and

---

see also 1 En. 104:9). Elsewhere in Jewish literature similar phrases refer to incest (T. Reu. 1:10; T. Jud. 14:3, 5; Jub. 41:25). Parallels in the oath/curse scheme appear in 1 Sam 14:24–30; Acts 23:12–15.

[50] Dimant, "Methodological Perspective," 325. Dimant cites halakic terminology differentiating intentional and accidental sin. See Exod 21:13–14; Num 35:11, 15; 35:16, 20; m. Šabb. 11.6; m. 'Abot 4:13; m. Ker. 2:1. Intentionality is a significant feature of Philo's view of evil. See Michael Francis, "Borderline Bad: Philo of Alexandria on the Distinction between Voluntary and Involuntary Sin" (PhD diss., University of Notre Dame, 2015).

[51] The Rebellion in Heaven stands in contrast to the narrative in Jubilees where the angels only sin after descending to earth for positive purposes (Jub. 4:15; 5:1–2, 6).

[52] Molenberg, "Roles of Shemihazah and Asael," 139. Nickelsburg argues that the violence of the Watchers' offspring is more important since it is mentioned with greater frequency (*1 Enoch 1*, 184). It is difficult, however, to neatly divide the violence and the impurity (esp. 1 En. 7:5; 9:9; 10:15–16).

[53] Ethiopic manuscripts and 𝔊ᵖ support the reading that the Giants were born 3,000 cubits tall. In contrast, 𝔊ˢ, which Nickelsburg follows, reads "three kinds, first great giants. Then the giants bore Nephalim, and to the Nephalim were born Elioud [γένη τρία· πρῶτον γίγαντας μεγάλους. Οἱ δὲ γίγαντες ἐτέκνωσαν Ναφηλείμ, καὶ τοῖς ναφηλεὶμ ἐγεννήθησαν Ἐλιούδ]" (*1 Enoch 1*, 182). He goes on to argue, "However one interprets the Genesis text and its history the author of the Shemihazah story understood the three terms in Genesis as designations for three different groups, specifically successive generations, of

produce violence and destruction (1 En. 9:1, 9; 10:15).[54] Aside from the purity concerns, the overwhelming violence caused by heavenly powers invading the earth can support the etiological reading. The summary description of the sinful descent (1 En. 7:1–6) concludes, "Then the earth brought accusation against the lawless ones" (1 En. 7:6). The injustice of the Watchers and their destructive offspring threatens the stability of the cosmos and provokes cries for justice. Both functions appear plausible from the summary description of the Watchers' sin, a paradigm of defilement or an explanation for overwhelming violence.

The sin, its disastrous consequences, and petitions for justice prompt angelic intercession (1 En. 9:1–5, 7–8b, 9–11). The holy angels who remain in heaven take notice of the violence on earth (1 En. 9:1) and hear the cries of the souls of the dead petitioning for justice (1 En. 9:3). These cries induce the angels to bring the petition to God (1 En. 9:4–5, 7–8b, 9–11). The angelic intercession begins by emphasizing the sovereignty of God (1 En. 9:4–5).[55] Next, the holy angels describe the sin of the Watchers (1 En. 9:7–8b) and its consequences (1 En. 9:9–10) finally calling God to bring justice (1 En. 9:11). The

---

giants" (*1 Enoch 1*, 185). There are three categories/generations in 1 En. 86:4; 87:4; 88:2; 89:6; Jub. 7:22–23. Knibb, *Ethiopic Enoch* 2:77–8 questions the longer reading of 𝔊[s].

[54] See Matthew Goff, "Monstrous Appetites: Giants, Cannibalism, and Insatiable Eating in Enochic Literature," *JAJ* 1 (2010): 19–42. The Watchers' offspring are given numerous names highlighting their illegitimate nature, including: "Giants" [גברין/γίγαντες] (1 En. 7:2, 4; 10:16; see also 8:3; 15:3, 8, 11; 16:1), "half-breeds" [κιβδήλοι] (1 En. 9:9 𝔊[s] [𝔊[p] reads τιτᾶνας]; 10:9, 15), "bastards" [ממזריא/μαζήρεοι] (1 En. 10:9), "sons of fornication" [בני זנותא/οἱ υἱοὶ τῆς πορνείας] (1 En. 10:9), "Nephilim" [נפלין/Ναφηλείμ] (1 En. 7:2; see also 16:1). When the Shemihazah narrative is redacted the offspring become "evil spirits [πνεύματα τῶν πονηρά]" (1 En. 15:9).

[55] The density of language and titles used to describe the sovereignty of God is substantial in 1 En. 9:4. God is described as "Lord of the Ages [τῷ κυρίῳ αἰῶνας]" (𝔊[a] omits αἰῶνας) and addressed as "God of gods and Lord of lords and King of kings and God of the ages" (9:4; see 1 En. 63:4; 84:2; Deut 10:17; Ps 136:2–3; Dan 2:47; 2 Macc 3:14; 3 Macc 5:34; Philo, *Cher*. 99; Sir 36:22) who has an eternal throne (1 En. 14:18–23; Ezek 1:4–28; Jer 17:12) and an eternally holy and blessed name (Tob 3:11; 8:5; Pr Azar 3, 30; 1QapGen XX, 12). In 1 En. 9:5 God's sovereignty is emphasized by describing his role in creation and his knowledge of "all things."

angelic appeal emphasizes divine responsibility at two points. First, in summarizing the Watchers' sin within the petition, it is noted that Shemihazah's authority was granted by God (1 En. 9:7). Second, in the conclusion to the petition, the angel implores: "You know all things before they happen, and you see these things and you permit them, and you do not tell us what we ought to do to them with regard to these things" (1 En. 9:11).[56] The angelic prayer leaves no doubt that the Watchers' sins and the consequences are a threat to the just reign of God. The petition provides significant support to the etiological reading of the Shemihazah narrative because it places the burden of responsibility for evil beyond the sphere of human choice. The only way for this problem to be rectified is by divine intervention, an intervention that will correct the heavenly rebellion. The intercessory prayer, then, appears to support an etiological reading.[57]

The divine response to angelic intercession neutralizes the threat to God's justice and cleanses the cosmos (1 En. 10:1–3; 10:11–11:2). First, God commands an angel to instruct Noah about the coming judgment of the deluge (1 En. 10:1–3).[58] The righteous human, Noah, will be a "seed" for the righteous plant (1 En. 10:3).[59] Second, God instructs Michael to cleanse the earth of the Watchers, their offspring, and their impurities (1 En. 10:11–20). According to the Shemihazah narrative the sons of the

---

[56] 𝔊[s] reads "these things [αὐτά]" rather than "all things [πάντα]" at the beginning of 1 En. 9:11.

[57] If the angelic intercession is viewed through the paradigmatic lens, then, the it might indicate the assured judgment of the sinner. This seems less likely, however, considering the focus on divine responsibility in the prayer.

[58] The name of the angel in this case is disputed in the textual witnesses. See Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 216, 220.

[59] Molenberg argues that Noah is intended to function as a typological figure since he is twice described as "the son of Lamech" emphasizing his humanity (1 En. 10:1, 3) and he is also referred to as "the righteous one" and the source of a plant (10:3 ["Roles of Shemihazah and Asael," 140]).

Watchers perish in the flood (1 En. 10:11, 12, 15).[60] Unlike their sons, however, Shemihazah and his cohort of Watchers are bound "for seventy generations in the valleys of the earth, until the day of their judgment and consummation, until the everlasting judgment is consummated" (1 En. 10:12). Notably, the fate of imprisonment is not unique to the Watchers. In a telling narrative aside, the fate of all sinners is disclosed: "And everyone who is condemned and destroyed henceforth will be bound together with them until the consummation of their generation." (1 En. 10:14). This aside is strong evidence for the paradigmatic interpretation, allowing the Watchers and sinners to share the same fate (see also 1 En. 21:7–10; 27:2–3; 90:2–24; Matt 25:41; Rev 20:10, 15). Yet the details that Noah requires angelic instruction and the earth must be cleansed of the destructive offspring by the superhuman archangel might suggest an etiological interpretation. Throughout the Shemihazah material the etiological and paradigmatic interpretations are both plausible and resolution of the interpretive ambiguity remains unresolved by a source criticism alone.

Turning to the Asael tradition, the hermeneutical question of etiology or paradigm is not solved but further complicated. Central to the debate over etiology or paradigm is the issue of human agency. If the narrative is intended to function etiologically, then it makes a significant argument about the inability of human agents to overcome evil. If, however, the narrative is intended as a cautionary tale, providing a paradigm of sin, then

[60] This detail is significantly augmented to great effect in the redacational development of the BW (esp. 1 En. 12–16). In the Animal Apocalypse, the giants are annihilated in the flood (1 En. 89:6). The ambiguity of the HB/LXX on the persistence of giants in the postdiluvian world (Gen 10:8–12; Num 13:33; Deut 2:10–11; 3:11; Josh 12:4; see also Philo, *Gig*. 63–66; Josephus, *A.J.* 1.114) appears to leave open the possibility of the Watchers' offspring surviving the flood either because Noah was a giant (esp. Gen 10:8–12) or because some other giants survived (Num 13:33). See the euhemeristic tradition preserved in Alexander Polyhistor analyzed by Stuckenbruck, *Myth of Rebellious Angels*, 7–12.

the implicit message is that humans, like the Watchers themselves, are free agents entirely capable of avoiding sin. In the Asael tradition the issue of human agency is further complicated by textual variants.

Again, in the Asael tradition the role of human agency in the origin and persistence of evil is underdetermined. The instruction motif would seem to imply that humans are, in at least some way, responsible for the persistence of evil. Yet the textual evidence is disputed regarding human agency and evil.[61] At a crucial point in the Asael narrative, the illicit technologies of Asael are summarized and the 𝔊ˢ text concludes:

> καὶ ἐποίησαν ἑαυτοῖς οἱ υἱοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ ταῖς θυγατράσιν αὐτῶν καὶ παρέβησαν καὶ ἐπλάνησαν τοὺς ἁγίους
>
> and the sons of men did this for themselves and for their daughters, and they [i.e. their daughters] transgressed and deceived the holy ones.[62]

According to this text, human agents ("sons of men") are responsible for using illicit technologies.[63] Humans are also responsible for transgression and the deception of the angels.[64] Nickelsburg defends the Synkellos text as "not an accidental corruption," which

---

[61] The debate primarily focuses on the Greek textual witnesses since the Aramaic witnesses are too fragmentary at key points and the Ethiopic text is based on a Greek vorlage (See Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 14–16). There are two Greek witnesses to the BW. The earlier of the two dates to the fifth/sixth century CE, codex Panopolitanus (Cairo Papyrus 10759 or 𝔊ᵖ) containing almost entirety of the text of BW. The second Greek textual witness is "The Chronography ['Εκλογὴ Χρονογραφίας]" of George Synkellos (𝔊ˢ), written at the beginning of the ninth century CE using earlier sources. Synkellos preserves the following sections of *1 Enoch*, all of which are from the BW: 6:1–9:4; 8:4–10:14; 15:8–16:1. The most thorough treatment of the Greek witnesses available is Erik W. Larson, "The Translation of Enoch into Greek" (PhD diss., New York University, 1995). Nickelsburg generally considers 𝔊ˢ superior to 𝔊ᵖ, but he does not spell out the logic of his preference with any detail (*1 Enoch 1*, 13, 18). In contrast, Bhayro argues that 𝔊ˢ is less a translation than a compilation, reflecting later texts like Jub. 4–5, 7, giving preference to 𝔊ᵖ (*Shemihazah and Asael Narrative*, 223–25).

[62] 1 En. 8:1 𝔊ˢ.

[63] The agency of the "son of men" is emphasized with the reflexive pronoun "themselves [ἑαυτοῖς]" (1 En. 8:1 𝔊ˢ).

[64] The subject of παρέβησαν and ἐπλάνησαν is not entirely clear syntactically. The subject of these verbs could be the "sons of men" or "their daughters." Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 195 interprets the daughters as the subject of these verbs. In support of Nickelsburg's interpretation, it makes little sense contextually to

reflects a “very early tradition” because women bear responsibility for seducing the Watchers in other Jewish texts (esp. T. Reu. 5:5–6; see also Tg. Ps.-J on Gen 6:2; Ps. Clem. Hom. 8:13).[65] Kelly Coblentz Bautch has also suggested that traditions about Tubal-Cain and Naamah (Gen 4:22) make the Synkellos text a more plausible reading.[66] Still, the sparse textual evidence combined with the exceptional description of humans as responsible for transgression and deceiving the Watchers has led many scholars to reject the text of $\mathfrak{G}^{s}$.[67] Before making a judgment about the text of 1 En. 8:1, it is worth analyzing other explicit mentions of human agency and evil in the Asal narrative.

Greek witnesses also differ substantially regarding human agency and evil in 1 Enoch 8:2. The texts begin the same way, describing the state of ungodliness that has engulfed the world in summary fashion (see Gen 6:5, 12):

---

describe the “sons of men” as the agents who “deceived the holy ones” whereas women are described as agents of deception elsewhere in Second Temple Jewish literature.

[65] Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 195–6 also cites 1 En. 86:1–4; Jub. 4:15; 5:6; Ps. Clem. Hom. 8:11–15; Justin, *2 Apol*. 5. See also Reed, *Fallen Angels*, 177–84; Irenaeus, *Epid.* 18; Tertullian, *Cult. fem.* Cyprian, *Hab. virg.* 14; Clement, *Paed*. 3.2; *Strom*. 3.7.59.

[66] Kelly Coblentz Bautch, “Decoration, Destruction, and Debauchery: Reflections on 1 Enoch 8 in Light of 4QEn^{b},” *DSD* 15 (2008): 79–95. See Steven D. Fradde, *Enosh and His Generations: Pre-Israelite Hero and History in Postbiblical Interpretation* (Chico: Scholars Press, 1984), 202–12.

[67] See R. H. Charles, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English*, 2 Vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913) 2.192; E. Isaac, “1 (Ethiopic Apocalypse of) Enoch,” *OTP* 1.16; Matthew Black, *The Book of Enoch or I Enoch: A New English Edition with Commentary and Textual Notes*, SVTP 7 (Leiden: Brill, 1985), 18, 127; Max Küchler, *Schweigen, Schmuck und Schleier: drei neutestamentliche Vorschriften zur Verdrängung der Frauen auf dem Hintergrund einer frauenfeindlichen Exegese des Alten Testaments im antiken Judentum*, NTOA 1 (Freiburg: Universitätsverlag, 1986), 274; Götte, *Von den Wächtern zu Adam*, 53–4 fn. 60. Knibb, *Ethiopic Enoch* 2:81 points out the Ethiopic witnesses differ from both Greek textual traditions reading: “And the world was changed.” According to the Ethiopic tradition, the text emphasizes the cosmic effects of Asael’s teachings not human culpability. In this instance, the Ethiopic text may reflect the retelling of this story in the Animal Apocalypse (esp. 86:1–6). Without a more robust Aramaic text, it is difficult to arbitrate between the Greek witnesses. See the text-critical analysis in Bhayro, *Shemihazah and Asael Narrative*, 149.

1 En. 8:2 𝔊ᵖ	1 En. 8:2 𝔊ˢ
καὶ ἐγένετο ἀσέβεια πολλή, καὶ ἐπόρνευσαν καὶ ἀπεπλανήθησαν καὶ ἠφανίσθησαν ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτῶν.	καὶ ἐγένετο ἀσέβεια πολλὴ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ ἠφάνισαν τὰς ὁδοὺς αὐτῶν.
And there was much ungodliness, and they fornicated and were deceived and were made desolate in all their ways.	And there was much ungodliness on the earth and they made their ways desolate.

As in the case of 1 En. 8:1, according to the 𝔊ˢ text, humans are the agents of destruction with the active verb ἠφάνισαν, which stands in contrast to the passive form of the same verb in 𝔊ᵖ. According to 𝔊ᵖ, the women are active agents in fornicating with the angels (ἐπόρνευσαν), but they suffer as passive victims of deception (ἀπεπλανήθησαν) and desolation (ἠφανίσθησαν ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτῶν).[68] The Synkellos text (𝔊ˢ) of 1 En. 8:1–2 is remarkably different from the Panopolitanus codex (𝔊ᵖ) regarding human agency in sin. How does the remainder of the Asael narrative describe human agency?

Thrice in the Asael tradition the angels are blamed for "all" evil (1 En. 9:6, 8c; 10:8). First, incorporated into the angelic petition for justice, the angel blames Asael for the corruption of the earth:

> You see what Asael has done, who has taught all iniquity on the earth, and has revealed the eternal mysteries that are in heaven.[69]

---

[68] Bautch, "Decoration, Destruction, and Debauchery," 88 points out that both texts are "explaining how impiety flourished, and in the process echoing Gen. 6:11–12."

[69] 1 En. 9:6. The translation and text based on Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 202–4. Again, the Greek witnesses differ regarding 1 En. 9:6 and the only Aramaic witness (4Q201 iv.4–5) is too fragmentary to arbitrate. Nickelsburg opts for 𝔊ᵖ in this instance because the heavy repetition of 𝔊ˢ is atypical for an intercessory prayer. Also, the τῷ αἰῶνι of 𝔊ˢ appears to be a corruption of the genitive τοῦ αἰῶνος in 𝔊ᵖ. In either case, Asael is held responsible for introducing sin. The Ethiopic text in this instance is remarkably close to 𝔊ᵖ (see Knibb, *Ethiopic Enoch* 2.86).

Nickelsburg thinks that unlike the Shemihazah narrative, 1 En. 9:6 does not blame Asael in such a way that absolves humanity of responsibility and he cites 1 En. 8:2 to support this claim.[70] As we have already seen, however, 1 En. 8:1–2 is textually obscure about human responsibility. Furthermore, 1 En. 9:6 focuses on Asael's responsibility for "all" iniquity. A similar pronouncement is repeated in 1 En. 9:8c to describe results of the Watchers' instruction: "And they showed all sins to them [καὶ ἐδήλωσαν αὐταῖς πάσας τὰς ἁμαρτίας]."[71] The repetition of "all" in the Asael material is notable, seeming to indicate that even in the Asael tradition the Watchers are primarily responsible for evil.

In a third instance, when God is speaking in response to the holy angels' petition, instructions are given regarding how to punish Asael. Like Shemihazah and his cohort, Asael faces a two-stage punishment consisting of imprisonment (1 En. 10:4–5) followed by burning at the final judgment (1 En. 10:6). In addition to punishing Asael, the archangel Raphael is tasked with healing the earth. In Raphael's commission to heal the earth, God explicitly identifies the origin of evil with the Watchers (1 En. 10:7) and Asael (1 En. 10:8). It is worth citing the text in full:

> Heal the earth, *which the watchers have desolated* [ἣν ἀφάνισαν οἱ ἄγγελοι]; and announce the healing of the earth, that the plague may be healed, and all the sons of men may not perish because of the mystery that the watchers told and taught their sons. *And all the earth was made desolate by the deeds of the teaching of Asael, and over him write all the sins* [καὶ ἠρημώθη πᾶσα ἡ γῆ ἀφανισθεῖσα ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις τῆς διδασκαλίας Ἀζαήλ· καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῷ γράψον τὰς ἁμαρτίας πάσας].[72]

---

[70] Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 213 "Humankind is guilty of the iniquity that Asael has taught them and is not the victims of deeds perpetrated against them (cf. 8:2)."

[71] 𝔊ᵖ adds: "and they taught them to do hate-producing charms [καὶ εδίδαξαν αὐτὰς μίσητρα ποιεῖν]."

[72] 1 En. 10:7–8.

There is no doubt about the burden of responsibility in 1 En. 10:7–8. The desolation of the earth has been caused by the "angels" (10:7) and more specifically, "In the works of the teaching of Asael" (10:8). During Asael's imprisonment to await final judgment, God even commands "all sins [τὰς ἁμαρτίας πάσας]" to be written over him (10:8). This curious detail is difficult to explain. One important explanatory parallel to 1 En. 10:8 is the scapegoat tradition (Lev 16:21–22).[73] Yet Lev 16:21–22 makes no mention of writing, only placing sin over the scapegoat. Writing as a record of sin indicates permanence (Jer 17:1–13; see also Hab 2:2; Isa 8:1; 30:8), indictment (1 En. 14:1; see also Matt 27:37; Mark 15:26; Luke 23:38; John 19:19), and/or a record for judgment (1 En. 81:4; 98:7–8; T. Ab. [A] 12:7–8, 12, 17–18; 13:9; m. Abot 2:1; 2 En. 52:15).[74] A parallel with Lev 16:21–22 is certainly possible, undeniable in the reception of the BW (Tg. Ps.-J. Lev 16:21–23), but it does not explain the written inscription of sin over Asael. The written inscription most likely indicates a permanent record for use at final judgment demonstrating that Asael bears the burden of judgment for instructing humanity in the use of illicit technologies.

Throughout the Asael tradition there is a persistent theme of angelic responsibility for the origin of evil (1 En. 9:6, 8c; 10:8).[75] The frequent mention of angelic

---

[73] Hanson, "Rebellion in Heaven," 224; Dimant, "Methodological Perspective," 327; Lester L. Grabbe, "The Scapegoat Tradition: A Study in Early Jewish Interpretation," *JSJ* 18 (1987): 152–67, esp. 153–56.

[74] Nickelsburg suggests that the writing over Asael signifies either "an epitaph on his tomb" or "a bill of indictment for use at the final judgment" (*1 Enoch 1*, 222). Black posits a parallel in Job 13:26, the MT [תכתב עלי] is closer than the LXX [κατέγραψας κατ' ἐμοῦ κακά] (*Book of Enoch*, 135). See also Ps 149:9.

[75] The intensity and specificity of the blame laid on Asael leaves a careful reader to wonder if Shemihazah bears any responsibility. It could be argued that Asael bears responsibility for illicit instruction while Shemihazah bears responsibility for illicit sexual transgression. The need to specify Asael's culpability may be due to the nature of his transgression in illicit instruction, requiring human students.

responsibility lends contextual evidence to resolving the textual issues in 1 En. 8:1–2 in favor the Panopolitanus codex (𝔊ᵖ), which generally limits human responsibility for evil. The Synkellos text (𝔊ˢ), if correct, would be the only time the verb "transgress [παραβαίνω]" is used with a human subject in BW.[76] Similarly, the only other use of "deceive [πλανάω]" in BW (1 En. 8:1 𝔊ˢ) refers to the Watchers' offspring who persist in the postdiluvian world in form of evil spirits leading humans into idolatry (1 En. 19:1).[77] Similarly, in 1 En. 8:2 the verb "destroy [ἀφανίζω]" occurs in both textual witnesses, but only the passive form in 𝔊ᵖ reflects the perspective found elsewhere in the BW. Every other use of the verb in BW always describes the cause of destruction as a superhuman source.[78] This lexical data, although not conclusive, lends contextual support to the Panopolitanus codex (𝔊ᵖ) of 1 En. 8:1–2.

In addition to the lexical data, there is a plausible reason for Synkellos to alter the text of 1 En. 8:1–2.[79] The Watchers narrative does not determine Synkellos's view of evil's origin. In Synkellos's view, the Watchers are not angels at all but men from the line of Seth who have been deceived by the daughters of Cain (*Chron*. 14.1–21). This fits

---

[76] See παραβαίνω in 1 En. 2:1; 8:1; 18:15; 19:2; 21:6. παραβαίνω in 1 En. 8:1 𝔊ˢ is the only use of the verb in 1 En. 6–11, and ἀποπλανάω appears in 1 En. 8:2 𝔊ᵖ for the only time in any extant version of BW. One of the most common uses of παραβαίνω in the LXX refers to illicit sex/violation of the marriage covenant (Num 5:12, 19, 20, 29; Sir 23:18; 42:10; Hos 6:7; 8:1; see also Josephus, *A.J.* 17.341; Philo, *Spec*. 3.30, 61)

[77] ἐπλάνησαν in 1 En. 8:1 𝔊ˢ could be explained as a corruption of passive verb ἀποπλανάω in 1 En. 8:2 𝔊ᵖ. The proliferation of textual issues, however, makes it difficult to weigh the evidence of 1 En. 8:2 in resolving the issues in 1 En. 8:1. See also Kelly Colblentz Bautch, "What Becomes of the Angels' "Wives"? A Text-Critical Study of *1 Enoch* 19:2," *JBL* 125 (2006): 766–780 on the fate and culpability of the women.

[78] Wicked Watchers (1 En. 10:7–8; 12:4) and their offspring (1 En. 15:11; 16:1) cause destruction. Even good angels bring destruction as a form of judgment (10:14, 22). There is one instance in which the agent of destruction is somewhat ambiguous (1 En. 22:7), and like 1 En. 8.2 𝔊ᵖ the verb occurs in the passive voice.

[79] Bhayro, *Shemihazah and Asael*, 149.

with his assessment that Cain is the origin of evil and that evil persists through Cain's offspring.[80] The language of 1 En. 8:1–2 in Synkellos is so exceptional that it is difficult to accept that it was original to the Asael tradition. The context and lexical evidence combined with a clear motive for Synkellos to alter the text, makes the reading of the Panopolitanus codex more likely. The Asael tradition attributes responsibility for the origin of evil to angels, but this was suppressed to fit the Chronographer's theological agenda.

Both the etiological and paradigmatic interpretations of the Shemihazah narrative are plausible explanations of the Shemihazah and Asael narrative. Additionally, as will be demonstrated below, both readings occur in the reception history of BW. It is typically assumed that the etiological and paradigmatic readings are mutually exclusive, perhaps occurring in the same text because of redaction. However, the Shemihazah material can easily be interpreted to support either interpretive framework, even if some details seem more credible supporting one view over another.[81] Turning to the Asael material fails to alleviate this hermeneutical tension.

The primary significance of the hermeneutical determination about etiology or paradigm is the role of human agency in the origin of evil. It is crucial to recognize that the Shemihazah and Asael narrative (1 En. 6–11), when separated from the context of the BW, is ambiguous about the function of the narrative and human agency. While the instructional motif of the Asael tradition would seem to imply human agency in the

---

[80] Cain is described as the "inventor of evil [ἐφευρετὴς τοῦ κακοῦ]" (*Chron*. 9.5; see also Rom 1:30) and his offspring are associated with the persistence of evil (*Chron*. 20.3; 38.11). The Greek text is from Alden A. Mosshammer, *Georgius Syncellus. Ecloga chronographica* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1984).

[81] The intercessory prayer of the angels (1 En. 9:1–5, 7–8b, 9–11) appears to fit the etiology interpretation. The judgment of the Watchers (1 En. 10:1–3; 10:11–11:2), particularly the shared fate of the Watchers and sinners in judgment (1 En. 10:12, 14), seems to suit the paradigmatic framework.

persistence of evil, the text is clear that angels are responsible for the origin of evil resulting from illicit angelic instruction (esp. 1 En. 9:6, 8c; 10:7–8). This position is reaffirmed by text-critical analysis of the Greek witnesses to the Book of Watchers. In the end, source criticism of 1 En. 6–11 is inconclusive about the role of human agency in the origin and persistence of evil. It is only as these traditions are incorporated into the larger narrative of BW that they are utilized to address the origin and persistence of evil and the role of human agency.

4.1.2 Book of Watchers (1 En. 1–36)

When the Shemihazah and Asael narratives (1 En. 6–11) are interpreted in the literary context of the BW questions about the intended function of the narrative and its significance for human agency linger. Does the whole BW function as an etiology of evil (Hanson, Nickelsburg) or a paradigm of sin (Dimant, Molenburg)? Within the narrative, who bears the responsibility for evil, angels, humans, or both? Does the BW attempt to account for the origin and persistence of evil, if so how? In terms of methodology, what is the role of redaction criticism in answering questions about the function of the final narrative? These questions can only be resolved in the final form of the text.[82] The result of interpreting the entirety of the BW is that the BW becomes an etiology of evil that identifies angels as the origin of evil while holding angels and humans responsible for the persistence of evil.

[82] If it were possible to chart the development of the text with more certainty in relationship to a specific historical context, perhaps more could be claimed about the original meaning of the sources. Without access to more textual and historical details about the sources, underdetermined features of the texts seem impossible to resolve.

4.1.2.1 Previous Approaches

Carol Newsom argues that the function of 1 En. 6–11 cannot be determined apart from other parts of the BW. Newsom recognizes, along with others, that the corpus of 1 Enoch is "heavily imbued with wisdom material."[83] In BW alone, a significant amount of text consists of cosmological speculation (esp. 1 En. 14:8–23; 17:1–19:3; 33:1–36:4). Newsom explores the logic of combining the cosmological material of 1 En. 17–19 with the judgment passages found in 1 En. 6–16.[84] Following the Shemihazah narrative isolated by Hanson and Nickelsburg, she expands the redactional analysis beyond 1 En. 6–11 to include chapters 12–16. She argues that 1 En. 12–16 originally combined the pre-existing Shemihazah narrative with the Enochic tradition of chapters 12–16 prior to the addition of the Asael narrative.[85] Newsom argues that in 1 En. 12–16 the Watchers' transgressions are interpreted as "an irreparable breach in the heavenly ranks" which "released evil powers for the duration of the world."[86] Evil, then, is not merely an Urzeit corruption that will be resolved in the Endzeit. Rather, the persistence of evil spirits undermines the sovereignty of God over the present world order. Considering this problem, the extended cosmology functions to reassert divine power in the present world

---

[83] Newsom, "Development of 1 Enoch 6–19," 310. See also Jonathan Z. Smith, *Map is Not Territory: Studies in the History of Religions* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1993), 67–87; Stone, "Lists of Revealed Things," 414–52.

[84] Newsom argues that the nature of the problem of evil is "a rupture in the order of the universe" a problem that is not merely solved in the eschaton ("Development of 1 Enoch 6–19," 316).

[85] Newsom, "Development of 1 Enoch 6–19," 315–21. There are two passages relevant to the Asael narrative in 1 En.12–16 (13:1–2; 16:2–3), both of which Newsom argues were redactional additions to accommodate when the Asael narrative was added to 1 En. 6–11. She suggests three possible reasons for combining the Asael narrative into 1 En.12–16: 1) The Asael narrative was another story of antediluvian deterioration; 2) Enoch's role as a culture-bearer attracted the Asael narrative as a foil; 3) The Asael narrative is a story of angelic instruction corrupted (see Jub. 10:12–13) and Enoch also received angelic instruction.

[86] Newsom, "Development of 1 Enoch 6–19," 322–23.

order.[87] According to Newsom, then, the goal of 1 En. 6–11, especially as it was combined with chapters 12–16, was to assert the sovereign power of God and his orderly cosmos despite the persistence of evil in the form of the demonic offspring resulting from angelic transgressions (1 En. 15:8–16:1; 19:1). Although she demurs from the eschatological focus of Hanson and Nickelsburg, Newsom agrees that the text ought to be read as an etiology of evil. Crucial to Newsom's view of the text's function is expanding the analysis beyond the scope of 1 En. 6–11, including the cosmological material to explain the function of the BW.

Diverging from source-critical approaches that treat 1 Enoch 6–11 as an etiology of evil, David Suter proposes a paradigmatic interpretation of BW as a whole.[88] Suter argues that the proper context for understanding the narrative is a paradigm of evil concerned with family purity.[89] Suter points out that there is a pronounced interest in marital purity in Second Temple Judaism (Ezra 9–10; Neh. 10:30–31; 13:3, 23–29), which is heightened with respect to priestly marriages.[90] Suter coordinates the halakic concern for priestly impurity with the impurity resulting from the Watchers' transgressions (esp. 1 En. 15:3–4; see also 1 En. 7:1; 9:8; 10:11; 12:4; 15:3–4). Like Dimant and Molenburg, Suter argues that BW is intended as a paradigmatic representation of sinners, but he goes a step further by identifying the sinners as priests

---

[87] Newsom, "Development of 1 Enoch 6–19," 323–28. According to Newsom, the function of Enoch's heavenly tours is, like tours of royal palaces in the ANE (esp. 2 Kgs 20:13–15; 2 Sam 14:4–24; 1 Kgs 10:4–5), to demonstrate the power of the sovereign. On architecture as a demonstration of power see Ps 48:4–8.

[88] Suter, "Fallen Angel, Fallen Priest," 115. Suter is especially focused on 1 En. 6–16. See also Suter, "Revisiting 'Fallen Angel, Fallen Priest,'" *Hen* 24 (2002): 137–42.

[89] Suter, "Fallen Angel, Fallen Priest," 118–18 citing 1 En. 7:1; 9:8; 10:9, 11.

[90] See Lev 21:1–15; CD 5:6–11; ALD 6:3–4; 4QMMT 75–82; T. Levi 9:10; Josephus, *C. Ap.* 1.30–36; *A.J.* 3.276–277; Philo, *Spec. Leg*. 1.110–11; Pss. Sol. 8:12.

who have married outside of appropriate circles.[91] The sinful angels are interpreted as allegorical references to sinful priests. Suter claims that one of the advantages of his paradigmatic interpretation is that it coordinates the BW with "the traditionally Jewish Adamic myth, which deals with human responsibility for evil."[92] Focusing on the purity theme Suter argues that the BW is a paradigmatic narrative not intended to explain evil.

Perhaps the earliest dissenting voice against source criticism for determining the function of the BW was John Collins.[93] While Collins admits that the BW was composed from distinct traditions, he argues that the traditions only have meaning as part of larger formulations in complete documents.[94] Furthermore, Collins problematized the notion that a text must be confined to "single source of evil." He argues that "the phenomenon of evil" is complex enough to justify multiple "complementary" views of evil.[95] Instead

---

[91] George Nickelsburg argues that 1 En. 12–16 was written as a polemic against the priesthood ("Enoch, Levi, and Peter: Recipients of Revelation in Upper Galilee," *JBL* 100 [1981]: 575–600, esp. 584–87). Similarly, Tigchelaar thinks one of the functions of the text might be polemic against Manasseh's marriage to Nikaso as described by Josephus, *A.J.* 11.306–312 (*Prophets of Old*, 198–203). Martha Himmelfarb argues that the problem of intermarriage is not priests marrying Gentiles but priests marrying Jewish women forbidden by a particularly rigorous reading of Leviticus 21. See Martha Himmelfarb "Levi, Phinehas, and the Problem of Intermarriage at the Time of the Maccabean Revolt," *JSQ* 6 (1999): 1–24; Himmelfarb, *A Kingdom of Priests: Ancestry and Merit in Ancient Judaism* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006), 21–8; Himmelfarb, "Temple and Priests in the Book of the Watchers, the Animal Apocalypse, and the Apocalypse of Weeks," *The Early Enoch Literature*, 219–36. It is disputed which women were considered eligible for priestly marriage in the polemic, but these authors share the view that 1 En.12–16 is concerned with criticizing priestly marriages.

[92] Suter, "Fallen Angel, Fallen Priest," 116. Again: "With a paradigmatic interpretation that treats the actions of the angels as central, the myth of the fallen angels is structurally similar to the Adamic myth. [. . .] The two myths are more or less redundant: they communicate a similar message about the presence of evil in the world. Evil is the result of the willful departure of the creature from his assigned place in the divine order" ("Fallen Angel, Fallen Priest," 132).

[93] Collins, "Methodological Issues in the Study of 1 Enoch," 315–22, esp. 315–16.

[94] Collins, "Methodological Issues in the Study of 1 Enoch," 316.

[95] Collins, "Methodological Issues in the Study of 1 Enoch," 316. Collins makes this argument in the form of a rhetorical question: "Can we not allow that a single author might regard the phenomenon of evil as a sufficiently complex phenomenon to warrant a number of sources which might then be thought complementary?" He writes in response to Nickelsburg's separation of traditions that appear to identify the origin of evil with different sources ("Apocalyptic and Myth," 385). As will be shown below, Nickelsburg recognizes the co-existence of apparently conflicting traditions about the origin of evil in the final text of the BW (*1 Enoch 1*, 46–47).

of focusing on a single view of evil in the sources behind sections of the BW (esp. 1 En. 6–11, 12–16, 17–19), Collins examines "the coherence and function" of the final form of the text.[96] He argues that the introductory chapters (1 En. 1–5) frame the BW as an eschatological exhortation (1 En. 1) to live by the wisdom of nature's order (2:1–5:9).[97] In his analysis of the transitional chapters of 1 En. 6–16, Collins finds "an essential polyvalence of apocalyptic symbolism which enables it to be re-applied in new historical situations."[98] This polyvalence is intentional, standing in contrast to other apocalyptic texts that are explicitly addressed to historical contexts.[99] Enoch's heavenly journeys (1 En. 17–36) help identify the function of the BW: "the revelation of transcendent reality mediated to Enoch [. . .] provides a framework within which crises are shrunken in significance and become easier to endure."[100] According to Collins, the BW may contain multiple views of evil, combined to complement one another. The principal function of the BW is to remind readers of the transcendent power of God to overcome evil in all its forms.

In his most mature treatment of the origin and persistence of evil in the Enochic corpus, George Nickelsburg argues that there are two contradictory views of evil's origin which correspond to conflicting notions of human agency. According to Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch incorporates two essentially incompatible views of evil:

---

[96] Collins, "Apocalyptic Technique," 95.

[97] John J. Collins, "How Distinctive was Enochic Judaism?" *Meghillot: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls* 5–6 (2007): 17–34, esp. 29–30 argues that 1 En. 1–5 does not presume the Mosaic Law.

[98] Collins, "Apocalyptic Technique," 98.

[99] Examples of apocalyptic texts addressed to specific historical contexts include: Animal Apocalypse; Daniel 7–12; 4 Ezra; 2 Bar.

[100] Collins, "Apocalyptic Technique," 109.

> (1) Sin and evil are the function of a primordial heavenly revolt whose results continue to victimize the human race; (2) responsibility for sin and evil lies with the human beings who transgress God's law.[101]

According to Nickelsburg, 1 En. 6–16 takes the first position, evil originates with rebellious angels and persists in the operations of superhuman spirits. Humans are victims, lacking the ability to combat evil. However, Nickelsburg thinks that in the final redaction of BW the focus shifts to human responsibility (1 En. 1–5; 22–27; esp. 1:9; 5:4; 27:2).[102] Like Collins, then, Nickelsburg finds multiple perspectives regarding the origin and persistence of evil in the BW. Unlike Collins, however, Nickelsburg attempts to separate the different perspectives into separate stages of composition without attempting to harmonize.

Although recognizing the likelihood of multiple sources behind the narratives of 1 En. 6–11, Annette Y. Reed objects to source critics who "tacitly dismiss the redacted product as a muddled combination and conflation of originally coherent 'legends.'"[103] Like Collins, Reed argues that the combinations and redactional conflations produce a new textual form, a text that has meaning and coherence in the final arrangement. How, then, does she propose to make sense of BW as a coherent narrative?

Reed adopts Nickelsburg's source-critical conclusions to explain the function of the narrative. She argues that the BW has conflicting perspectives on the issue of culpability for evil, angelic (esp. 1 En. 7) vs. human (esp. 1 En. 8).[104] To rectify the

---

[101] Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 46.

[102] Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 47.

[103] Reed, *Fallen Angels*, 26. Reed focuses on three versions of the angelic sin: sexual impurity (esp. 1 En. 7), illicit knowledge (esp. 1 En. 8) and violence (esp. 7:3–5; 8:5; 9:9).

[104] Reed, *Fallen Angels*, 35 citing George W. E. Nickelsburg, "Reflections on Reflections: A Response to John Collins' Methodological Issues in the Study of 1 Enoch," *SBLSP* 13 (1978): 311–13.

conflict, Reed proposes two different ways to read the text. If read chronologically, Asael's illicit instruction is only a consequence of the Watchers' descent, making the Watchers entirely to blame for evil's origin. If, however, 1 En. 8 is interpreted as a "flashback," humanity is jointly culpable for evil.[105] These two different reading strategies, sequential chronology or flashback, produce different views of evil.[106] Reed goes on to trace the reception of the BW, arguing that the sequential chronology reading, an angelic origin of evil, was not widely influential.[107] In Reed's view, the final form of the BW generated the interpretive space for incompatible notions of the origin and persistence of evil that must be resolved one way or another. She argues that the reception of the BW indicates that the most common resolution was in favor of a "flashback" interpretation whereby humanity bears responsibility for the origin and persistence of evil.

Archie T. Wright remarks that in the history of scholarship, "there are nearly as many opinions on the intended function of *BW* as there are articles written on the work."[108] Like Collins and Reed, Wright is not convinced that source criticism can

---

[105] It is important to note that Reed follows the Synkellos reading of 1 En. 8:1–2, which is not likely to have been the original text, as argued above.

[106] Reed, *Fallen Angels*, 37. Reed summarizes: "If the corrupting teachings of Asael and other Watchers follow from their lust-motivated descent from heaven, the Watchers are wholly to blame for the degradation of earthly life and human mortality in early human history. But if Asael's teachings led to the descent of other angels, then humankind is no less culpable; Asael may have introduced violence and promiscuity, but his human students (and, more specifically, the corrupted women) embraced his teaching so enthusiastically that they in turn caused the fall of his angelic brethren."

[107] Reed, *Fallen Angels*, 84–121. Here 101.

[108] Wright, *Origin of Evil Spirits*, 37. After making this claim, Wright goes on to identify three main theories about the function of BW: 1) BW functions as a response to the oppression of Hellenistic kingdoms (Nickelsburg); 2) BW functions as an etiology of evil that re-asserts God's sovereignty (Hanson, Newsom, Collins), 3) BW functions as a polemic against the Jerusalem priesthood (Suter).

determine the function of the text.[109] Reading the whole of the BW as an elaborative interpretation of Gen 6:1–4 Wright makes his contribution by arguing that the primary function of BW is to explain the origin of evil spirits while asserting divine sovereignty.[110] Wright's argument focuses on a crucial feature of 1 En. 12–16, the fate of the giant offspring of the Watchers as "evil spirits" (1 En. 15:8–16:1; see also 19:2). In agreement with others, Wright sees the BW as an etiology, but an etiology concentrated on the persistence of evil in the form of evil spirits. In Wright's view, the author of BW "was concerned with a story about the past (origin of evil spirits), his present (the continued oppression of Israel by the spirits), and the future (the ultimate destruction of the spirits)."[111] In Wright's view the BW functions as an etiology of evil, explaining the origin, persistence, and eventual destruction of evil spirits.[112]

Monika Elisabeth Götte argues that the Watcher myth is the earliest extant detailed explanation of the origin of evil.[113] After detailed semantic study and narrative

---

[109] *Origin of Evil Spirits*, 153: "Whether there are one or two or many different sources within the BW is irrelevant, what does matter is that this story appears a whole in the third to second centuries B.C.E. and therefore should be read and interpreted in that form because of the wide-ranging influence it no doubted exerted." The sources are relevant, but since important information about the origin of the sources and the context of their redaction is missing it is nearly impossible to interpret the text based on redaction/source criticism.

[110] Wright, *Origin of Evil Spirits*, 49. Wright also follows Collins' view that there is a polyvalence to the BW making it adaptable to a variety of circumstances.

[111] *Origin of Evil Spirits*, 153.

[112] *Origin of Evil Spirits*, 164–65.

[113] Götte, *Von den Wächtern zu Adam*, 40: "eine erste ausführliche Antwort des antiken Judentums auf die Frage nach den Ursprüngen des Bösen gefunden werden kann." Götte follows many HB scholars who do not interpret Gen 3 as an etiology of evil (*Von den Wächtern zu Adam*, 167–171). She argues that Adamic tradition only begins to function as an etiology of evil in the wisdom literature of Ben Sira and Wisdom (*Von den Wächtern zu Adam*, 181–188), well after the Watcher mythology is well-established. See *Von den Wächtern zu Adam*, 277–79 wherein she provides a helpful chart of the reception of Adamic tradition in Second Temple Jewish and early Christian literature. Tennant thought that the Watchers narrative rather than Gen 3 "was the earliest basis for popular Jewish speculation as to the origin of the general sinfulness of the world" (*Sources of the Doctrines of the Fall*, 236).

analysis, Götte points out that humanity is almost entirely passive in the narrative.[114] From the perspective of humans, evil is a fated "disaster [Verhängnis]" and not "their own responsibility [ihrer eigenen Verantwortung]."[115] Götte interprets the origin of evil in BW as a breach of cosmic order due to the Watchers' "desire [Begehren]."[116] God's judgment in the past in the form of the deluge assures the final restoration of order in the future. Like Wright, Götte argues that the origin of evil explains the persistence of evil in the present world order, which will be fully rectified in the eschaton. She argues that it is quite significant that the earliest etiology of evil identifies the source as "heavenly beings [himmlische Wesen]."[117]

Scholars focused on the entirety of the BW wrestle with similar questions as source-critical scholarship on the Shemihazah and Asael Narrative. First, there is the issue of hermeneutical framework. Was the BW written to function as a paradigm of sin (Suter), an etiology of evil (Newsom, Reed, Wright, Götte), or a combination of both (Collins, Nickelsburg)? Second, the coherence of BW regarding culpability for evil is disputed. Who is to blame for evil, angels (Newsom, Wright, Götte), humans (Dimant, Suter), or some combination of the two (Collins, Nickelsburg, Reed)?

---

[114] Götte, *Von den Wächtern zu Adam*, 60–70. Götte traces several terms associating humans with evil: "sin [ἁμαρτάνω/ἁμάρτωλοι]" (1 En. 1:9; 5:6; 7:5), "ungodliness [ἀσεβέω/ἀσεβής]" (1 En. 1:9), "turn away [ἀφίστημι]" (1 En. 5:4), break "the commands" (1 En. 5:4), "sacrifice to demons [ἐπιθύειν δαιμονίοις]" (1 En. 19:1), "multiplying evils [πληθύνειν τὰ κάκα]" (1 En. 16:3), "hard-hearted [σκληροκάρδιοι]" (1 En. 5:4). Götte summarizes human culpability in the BW: "Zum Teil wird dieses auch unabhängig von den Lehren der Wächter verstanden. In Kontinuität zu den Lehren der Wächter führen sie das von jenen gelernte weiter, wodurch Unheil entsteht. Somit werden die Menschen in einem zweiten Interpretationsschritt zu Mittätern, die das initiierte Übel weiterführen." (*Von den Wächtern zu Adam*, 70).

[115] Götte, *Von den Wächtern zu Adam*, 55.

[116] *Von den Wächtern zu Adam*, 74–5. Contra Hanson, Götte does not think the rebellion was an attempted overthrow of divine power but a result of angelic concupiscence.

[117] *Von den Wächtern zu Adam*, 78.

4.1.2.2 Etiology and Plural Responsibility

The disputed approaches to the hermeneutical framework are resolved when the BW is interpreted as a unified text. In its final form, the BW functions as an etiology of evil that explains the superhuman origin of evil. The contested views of responsibility for evil are not easily resolved. While angels and their illicit offspring are responsible for causing evil, humans are also held accountable for evil. The apparent plurality of accountability has led to imprecise conclusions concerning the origin of evil. When addressing the origin and persistence of evil, it is necessary to clarify how evil's origin relates to its persistence in the cosmos.

First, it is necessary to address why the paradigmatic interpretation articulated by Suter is untenable when applied to the BW in its final form. While the paradigmatic interpretation plausibly explains the focus on purity and illuminates one likely application of the narrative in reception history, the function of the BW cannot be limited to the marital purity of priests.[118] If the narrative is merely intended to polemicize against certain priestly marriages, then it does so poorly because the text would not condemn improper marriages but prospect of priestly marriage entirely (1 En. 15:4). Additionally, the BW makes no explicit reference to the Mosaic Law that motivates the halakic concerns for marital purity.[119] Another major problem for Suter's thesis is the anachronistic claim that a paradigmatic reading of the BW provides continuity with the more standard view of evil expressed in the Adam myth. As already seen in the last

[118] In the reception of the Watcher narrative, the angels are often utilized as examples of particularly wicked sinners: CD 2:17–19; T. Reu. 5:4–6; T. Naph. 5:4–5; 2 Pet 2:4; Jude 6.

[119] Collins, "How Distinctive was Enochic Judaism," 30 notes that unlike Jubilees, Ben Sira 24, and Philo, the law of nature is nowhere conflated with the law of Moses in 1 Enoch. See also Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 50–1. Cf. Philo's view of the Mosaic Law as a copy of the "law of nature" (*Opif*. 3, 6; *Abr*. 3; *Mos*. 2.11, 14, 48).

chapter, there is little evidence that Adamic tradition was commonly interpreted as an etiology of evil and no evidence until after the BW was composed.[120] Not only is it inaccurate to describe Adamic tradition as the standard view of evil, it is also a misinterpretation of Adamic tradition to interpret the function of the Adam story as an argument for human responsibility. Finally, as Archie T. Wright argues, Suter's interpretation of the BW fails to address a vital feature of the text, the persistence of evil spirits.[121] Suter's thesis leaves too much of the BW inexplicable and misinterprets the relationship between Adamic and Enochic traditions. In its final form, the BW cannot be limited to a paradigmatic narrative and must function to explain the origin of evil spirits. But what does this etiology mean for culpability?

As noted above, Matthew Goff argues that the BW is not concerned with the origin but the persistence of evil.[122] Goff is correct insofar as the BW does not attempt to explain evil's chronological beginning.[123] However, the text provides a superhuman account of evil's origin in terms of causal source.[124] As shown above, there are multiple

---

[120] As pointed out above, Götte argues that the BW is the earliest extant etiology of evil (*Von den Wächtern zu Adam*, 40).

[121] *Origin of Evil Spirits*, 47.

[122] Goff, "Enochic Literature and the Persistence of Evil," 44–5.

[123] There is even a reference to Adam and Eve in the BW that acknowledges their expulsion from the Garden (1 En. 32:6). Although 1 En. 32:6 is more focused on illumination than transgression, the mention of their expulsion from Eden hints at wrongdoing. In this respect, 1 En. 32:6 shows more awareness of the transgression of the Protoplast than Ben Sira (esp. Sir 17:1–3, 7). See chapter three.

[124] The angelic transgression may be classified as the efficient cause of evil (see Plato, *Phaed*. 99A–B; Aristotle, *Phys*. 2.3–9.194b–200b). Causes were much discussed in ancient philosophy. It was the Stoics who gave the most attention to causation in relation to ethics (see esp. Cicero, *Fat*.), although see also (Aristotle, *Eth. nic*. 3.1.1110b; Seneca, *Ep*. 65.1–14; Sextus Empiricus, *Pyr*. 3.14). Cicero distinguishes between circumstances and causes: "'Cause' is not to be understood in such a way as to make what precedes a thing the cause of that thing, but what precedes it effectively" (*Fat*. 34). On causes and determinism in Hellenistic philosophy see Michael Frede, "The Original notion of Cause," in *Doubt and Dogmatism: Studies in Hellenistic Epistemology*, eds. Malcolm Schofield, Myles Burnyeat and Jonathan Barnes (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980), 215–49; Susanne Bobzien, *Determinism and Freedom in Stoic Philosophy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), esp. 18–21; R. J. Hankinson, "Explanation and Causation," in *The Cambridge History of Hellenistic Philosophy*, eds. Keimpe Algra et. al. (Cambridge:

references to the culpability of the Watchers in the Shemihazah and Asael narrative (1 En. 9:6–9; 10:7–8; also 6:3–5). Later in the narrative this theme is expanded. The evil caused by Shemihazah and Asael is summarized multiple times in the narrative to implicate the angels (1 En. 12:4; 13:2; 15:3–4; 16:3).[125] The Watchers "forsook [ἀπολίπειν]" highest heaven (1 En. 12:4; 15:3; see also 6:2–6), "slept [κοιμηθῆναι]" with women (1 En. 15:3; see also 7:1) "defiled [μιανθῆναι]" themselves (1 En. 12:4; 15:3–4; see also 7:1; 9:8), "took wives [ἐλάβον γυναῖκας]" (1 En. 12:4; 15:3), and "bore children" (1 En. 15:3; see also 7:2) who cause "great destruction" (1 En. 12:4; see also 7:3–5; 10:7–8; 15:11–12). Asael "showed [ἔδειξεν/ὑπεδείξεν]" unrighteous deeds, works of wickedness, and sin (1 En. 13:2; see also 8:1) and "revealed [ἐμήνυσεν]" illicit mysteries (1 En. 16:3; see also 9:6, 8; 10:7–8).[126] Asael's instruction is explicitly identified as the cause of human evil: "through this mystery the women and men are multiplying evils on

Cambridge University Press, 1999), 479–512; Hankinson, "Determinism and Indeterminism," in *Cambridge History of Hellenistic Philosophy*, 514–41. Akin to the BW's narrative, women are often portrayed as victims of outside forces (usually the passions) in performing evil. The most famous example is Medea, who functions as the philosophers' poetic example for disputing theories of rationality, volition, and action (Cicero, *Fat*. 35; *TD* 4.69; *Nat. d.* 3.65–68; Epictetus, *Disc*. 1.28.7–9; 2.17.19–22; Albinus, *Intr.* 24.2–3; Galen, *Hipp. et Plat.* 3.3.13–22; Diogenes Laertius, *Lives* 7.180). See John M. Dillon, "Medea Among the Philosophers," in *Medea: Essays on Medea in Myth, Literature, Philosophy, and Art*, eds. James J. Clauss and Sarah Iles Johnston (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997), 211–18. Also notable is Helen of Troy in Gorgias's *Encomium of Helen*. Although Gorgias's main point is not to exonerate Helen but to demonstrate the power of persuasive rhetoric, in the end Helen is not responsible because the cause of her action is outside of her control. Philosophical notions about causality, determinism, and free-will are explored in relation to first century Jewish sects by Josephus in *B.J.* 2.162–163; *A.J.* 13.172; 18.13.

[125] All the verbs and participles describing the Watchers actions in introducing evil in 1 En. 12:4; 13:2; 15:3; 16:3 use the aorist tense: ἀπολιπόντες . . . ἐμιάνθησαν . . . ἔλαβον ἑαυτοῖς γυναῖκας . . . ἀφανισμὸν μέγαν ἠφανίσατε τὴν γῆν (12:4); ἔδειξας . . . ὑπέδειξας (13:2); ἀπελίπετε . . . ἐκοιμήθητε . . . ἐμιάνθητε καὶ ἐλάβετε ἑαυτοῖς γυναῖκας . . . ἐγεννήσατε ἑαυτοῖς τέκνα (15:3); ἐμηνύσατε ταῖς γυναιξὶν ἐν ταῖς σκληροκαρδίαις ὑμῶν (16:3). The only exception to the repetition of aorist verbs and participles is the present tense ποιοῦσιν in 1 En. 12:4 "just as the sons of men do, so they themselves also do [καὶ ὥσπερ οἱ υἱοὶ τῆς γῆς ποιοῦσιν, οὕτως καὶ αὐτοὶ ποιοῦσιν]."

[126] In contrast to the evil showed to humanity by Asael, Enoch is shown heavenly visions (1 En. 1:2; 14:4, 8; 22:1; 24:1; see also 14:21; 15:1–2). Other verbs for Asael's activity in disclosing illicit instruction include διδάσκω (7:1; 8:1, 3[x8], 9:6; 10:7) and δηλόω (7:1; 9:6, 8).

the earth" (1 En. 16:3; see also Clement, *Strom*. 5.1.10.2). The origin of evil, in the sense of causality not necessarily chronology, is identified with the sexual transgressions and illicit instruction of the Watchers. The origin of evil in the BW is the transgressions of rebellious angels.

The persistence of evil in the BW, like its origin, also has a superhuman cause, the Watchers' illicit offspring. Since the illicit offspring are of two natures, human and angelic, they are condemned to remain on the earth as disembodied "evil spirits" emerging from the carcasses of the dead half-breeds (1 En. 15:3–10).[127] As disembodied spirits they plague humanity (1 En. 15:11–16:1) and deceive the world into worshipping "demons as gods" up until the time of final judgment (1 En. 19:1).[128] Although condemned, the fallen Watchers in the form of their disembodied sons, continue to plague the earth. After the deluge the activity of the disembodied evil spirits persist until final judgment:

> And the spirits of the giants <lead astray>, do violence, make desolate, and attack and wrestle and hurl upon the earth and <cause illness>. They eat nothing, but abstain from food and are thirsty and smite. The spirits (will) rise up against the sons of men and against the women, for they have come forth from men. From the day of the slaughter and destruction and death of the giants, from the soul of whose flesh the spirits are proceeding, they are making desolate without (incurring) judgment. Thus they will make desolate until the day of the consummation of the great judgment, when the great age will be consummated.[129]

---

[127] Nickelsburg comments that although "evil spirits" is "not especially common for demons [. . .] in the literature of this period it always refers to malevolent spirits who cause people to sin or afflict them with evil and disease" (*1 Enoch 1*, 272). He cites 1 Sam 16:14–23; 18:10; 1 En. 99:7; T. Sim. 3:5; 4:9; 6:6; T. Levi 5:6; 18:12; T. Jud. 16:1; T. Ash. 1:8; 6:5; Tob 6:7; Jub. 10:3, 13; 12:20; Luke 7:21; 8:2; 11:26 || Matt 12:43; Acts 19:12–16.

[128] On demons as gods see Ps 96:4–5; 106:36–38; Deut 32:8–9, 17; 1 Cor 8:6; 10:20; see also 1 En. 65:6. This tradition is explored in some detail in chapter six.

[129] 1 En. 15:11–16:1. There are several textual issues (Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 268, 273–74). The text has clearly been corrupted and Nickelsburg attempts to reconstruct the underlying Aramaic without recourse to textual evidence from Qumran. For example, Nickelsburg suggests that *νεμόμενα* ($\mathfrak{G}^{s}$), which makes no sense, is a translation of רעין, itself a corruption of the Aramaic word "lead astray [תעי]" (see 1

The evil spirits, like their angelic fathers, cause destruction (1 En. 10:8; 12:4; see also 8:2). Like their progenitors caused the origin of evil, the giants cause evil to persist.

In addition to the illicit offspring of the Watchers causing evil, however, humans are also responsible for sin. Although often overlooked, 1 En. 1–5 plays an important role in introducing the narrative of the BW. The BW is introduced as revelation for the elect righteous (1 En. 1:1, 3) who are promised a theophany from Mount Sinai for judgment (1 En. 1:4–9; see also 18:6–8; 25:3):

> Look, he comes with the myriads of his holy ones, to execute judgment on all, and to destroy all the wicked, and *to convict all flesh for all the wicked works that they have done* [(ἐ)λέγξαι πᾶσαν σάρκα περὶ πάντων ἔργων τῆς ἀσεβείας αὐτῶν ὧν ἠσέβησαν] and the proud and hard words that *wicked sinners* [ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἀσεβεῖς] spoke against them.[130]

The Shemihazah and Asael narrative (1 En. 6–11) and Enoch's petitionary ascent (1 En. 12–16) describe the judgment of the Watchers (1 En. 9:3; 10:6, 12) and their sons (16:1; 19:1). The opening theophany (1:9) and Enoch's heavenly journeys indicate that the final judgment will also include the souls of humans (1 En. 22:4, 10, 11, 13; 27:3, 4). Additionally, humans are guilty of being "wicked [ἀσεβής]" (1 En. 1:9; 5:6, 7, 8; 22:13) and "sinners [ἁμαρτωλοί]" (1 En. 1:9; 5:6; 22:10, 12, 13), and they will eventually face judgment for their sin (esp. 1 En. 22:13). The theophany is followed by an indictment

---

En. 16:1; Jub. 7:27; 10:2, 7–13; 11:5; 12:20). Still, the basic sense of the text is clear that the evil spirits cause harmful destruction.

[130] 1 En. 1:9. Fragments of the Aramaic text of 1 En. 1:9 are preserved in 4Q204 i.15–17 (4QEn^{c}), but little of the text can be determined. See Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 2 Vols. (Leiden: Brill, 1997–1998), 1.412–13. The Greek text of the Panopolitanus codex differs from the citation in Jude 14–15, which omits ἀπολέσαι πάντας τοὺς ἀσεβεῖς, among other minor differences. For Sinai as the location of theophany see Deut 33:2; LAB 11:4–5; Hartman, *Asking for a Meaning*, 42–4.

against those who disobey God (1 En. 2:1–5:4).[131] Wicked sinners are cursed (1 En. 5:5–7) while the elect receive wisdom enabling them to avoid transgression and sin (1 En. 5:8–9). The introduction to BW and Enoch's heavenly journeys indicate that humans are judged for their sins. The judgment of wicked humans implies culpability, but on what grounds?

The basis of judgment in the BW is not obedience to the Mosaic Law. Rather, the cosmic order established by God indicts transgressors.[132] All aspects of the cosmos are created to operate according to divine command (1 En. 2:1–5:4; see also 1 En. 72:1; 74:1; 75:1–3). The transgressions of the Watchers threaten God's sovereignty (1 En. 9:4–11) and perverts the created order (1 En. 15:1–6).[133] The only way for humanity to accurately perceive the cosmic order after the Watchers' sexual transgressions and illicit instruction is to receive heavenly wisdom (1 En. 5:8–9; see also 1 En. 82:4–8).[134] Enoch is the

---

[131] The indictment of morally competent human agents is especially clear in the direct address of 1 En. 5:4: οὐδὲ ἐποιήσατε κατὰ τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ. It is not clear what commands are envisioned in 1 En. 5:4 considering the general ambivalence about Mosaic Torah in the Enochic corpus. Still it is often claimed that 1 En. 5:4 combined with 1 En. 1:4 is a reference to the Torah: Hartman, *Asking for a Meaning*, 30–1, 123; Heinrich Hoffmann, *Das Gesetz in der frühjüdischen Apokalyptik,* SUNT 23 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999), 132; Andreas Bedenbender, *Der Gott der Welt tritt auf den Sinai: Entstehung, Entwicklung und Funktionsweise der frühjüdischen Apokalyptik*, ANTZ 8 (Berlin: Institut Kirche und Judentum, 2000), 228–30. Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 146–47, 149 reconstructs the Aramaic not as "his commands [פקודוהי]," but rather "his word [ממרה]." If 1 En. 5:4 and 1:4 refer to the Mosaic law, they are indirect references.

[132] Nature is invoked elsewhere in Jewish literature to testify against Israel (Isa 1:2–3; Jer 8:7), but this is often connected to nature's role as a witness to the Deuteronomic covenant (Deut 4:23–26; 30:19; 31:28; 32:1–3; Jer 2:12; 6:19; Mic 6:1–5; Ps 50; LAB 19:4). See also Hartman, *Asking for a Meaning*, 28–30 who identifies the closest parallel with 1 En. 2:1–5:3 as Sifre Deut. 306. The reception of the Torah at Sinai is mentioned only twice in 1 Enoch: Apocalypse of Weeks (1 En. 93:6) and the Animal Apocalypse (1 En. 89:29–32). The seminal event is given truncated significance in both passages. See Collins, "How Distinctive Was Enochic Judaism?" 31; Orlov, *Enoch-Metatron*, 255; VanderKam, "Interpretation of Genesis in 1 Enoch," 129–148; Boccaccini, "Evilness of Human Nature," 63–66.

[133] The perversion of cosmic order by the Watchers is a concern in the Astronomical Book (1 En. 80:2–8). See also 1 En. 106:13–14. It is debated if 1 En. 80:2–8 is original or a later addition that conflicts with 1 En. 72:1 and raises ethical concerns otherwise absent from AB. See Nickelsburg and VanderKam, *1 Enoch 2*, 360–65.

[134] See Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 50–54 on the significance of wisdom in the Enochic corpus.

recipient of this wisdom. In his ascent to petition on behalf of the Watchers (1 En. 12–16), Enoch beholds and describes the indescribable, the glory of heaven (1 En. 14:8–23) and even the divine throne (1 En. 14:18–23). After delivering God's response to the Watchers' petition, Enoch embarks on heavenly journeys (1 En. 17–19, 21–36), receiving unique revelation (1 En. 17:6; 19:3).[135] As Newsom argues, these journeys display God's power and justice (1 En. 36:4).[136] God's power is demonstrated in the grandeur of cosmic architecture and divine justice is displayed in Enoch's visits to places of judgment. Enoch sees the places of imprisonment and punishment reserved for transgressing angels (1 En. 18:14–16; 21:1–10) and the mountain of the dead where departed humans await final judgment (1 En. 22:1–13). The primary purpose of these cosmic revelations is to demonstrate God's power and justice as well as provide humans with access to appropriate heavenly wisdom after the Watchers' transgressions.

Although prediluvian humanity suffered as helpless victims of the Watchers' transgressions and illicit instruction, after the deluge humanity is not in the same situation. Humanity is given Enochic wisdom and forced to choose between the illicit instruction of demons and the legitimate wisdom offered by Enoch. The BW itself is an exercise in exhortation to follow the revealed wisdom of the "scribe of righteousness" and avoid the evils of demons. The choice between illicit technologies and angelic revelation involves human agents in the persistence of evil, if only secondarily. Even in a world corrupted by rebellious angels and inhabited by their destructive offspring, humans can be held responsible for their role in the persistence of evil.

---

[135] On Enoch as the recipient of revelation see 1 En. 5:6; 25:2; 82:1–3; 93:2, 10; 104:12–13.

[136] Newsom, "Development of 1 Enoch 6–19," 323–28; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 292; J. Edward Wright, *The Early History of Heaven* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 122–23.

4.1.2.3 Human Agency in Reception History

Evil in the Enochic corpus is complex because the foundational narrative of the BW implicates angels and their offspring in the origin and persistence of evil while simultaneously asserting human responsibility for sin. Although the BW provides no clear explanation of how exactly the superhuman origin and persistence of evil relates to human sin and responsibility, both views are found in the narrative. Perhaps, as Nickelsburg argues, this is primarily the result of redacting competing perspectives of sources into a new, single narrative. However, the concurrence of superhuman evil and human responsibility indicates that both perspectives were perceived as compatible enough to share the same textual space.

Elsewhere in the Enochic corpus these two views of evil continue to coincide. Particularly notable in this regard are the Book of Dreams (1 En. 83–90) and the Epistle of Enoch (1 En. 91–108). Both works acknowledge the foundational narrative of angelic rebellion, depicting a superhuman origin of evil (1 En. 84:4; 86:1–6; 93:4; 100:4; see also Sir 16:7, 26–28; 17:32). At the same time, human responsibility is emphasized (1 En. 89:32–33; 89:51–52, 54, 73–74; 98:4–8; see also Sir 15:11–20). Most explicit in terms of human responsibility is the Epistle of Enoch (esp. 1 En. 98:4–8). The author of the Epistle condemns sinners who justify themselves by abdicating responsibility for their sin and blaming it on a superhuman source, instead arguing:

> Sin was not sent to the earth, but the people have created it *by themselves* [ἀφ’ ἑαυτῶν / *’em-re’somu*], and those who commit it will be subject to a great curse.[137]

[137] 1 En. 98:4 Translation slightly augmented from Stuckenbruck, *1 Enoch 91–108*, 336. Nickelsburg reconstructs part of 1 En. 98:4 as “Lawlessness was not sent upon the earth; but men created it by themselves, and those who do it will come to a great curse” (*1 Enoch 1*, 468–69). There is a lacuna in the first four lines of 98:4 in the Chester Beatty Papyrus. The result is a text based only on the Ethiopic with a fragmentary Greek text. Nickelsburg reconstructs the Greek text of 1 En. 98:4 as “lawlessness [ἡ

Several scholars have identified this rebuke as a polemic against the earlier tradition of a superhuman origin of evil.[138] Loren Stuckenbruck, however, has cautioned against this hasty conclusion. Rather than interpreting 1 En. 98:4 as a "a blatant contradiction" of the foundational myth of the Enochic tradition, Stuckenbruck suggests that the author of the Epistle may be correcting "a potential misperception" of the tradition.[139] After all, the overarching concern of the Epistle is to condemn wealthy oppressors who might be prone to justify their behavior (1 En. 98:6–8). In effect, the Epistle includes the wealthy in the judgment of the Watchers (see also 1 En. 94:6, 9; 95:4; 97:3; 98:2), a strategy already found in the portrayal of final judgment in the BW (1 En. 22:1–13). Rather than scraping the story of the Watchers altogether, the author of the Epistle updates the script to include the wicked of his own context.

In the BW evil originates with rebellious angels, persists in their demonic offspring and humans are held responsible for their sin. The relationship between superhuman evil and human sin is never clearly explained in the BW, leaving open the possibility of emphasizing Angelic/demonic evil to absolve humans of responsibility for sin. This possibility is explicitly denied in the Epistle of Enoch. Even in the Epistle of Enoch, however, the relationship between human responsibility and superhuman evil is left unexplained. In the Book of Jubilees, however, the relationship between angelic

---

ἀδικία or ἡ ἀνομία]" rather than "sin [ἡ ἁμαρτία]" (*1 Enoch 1*, 476), but the typical Ethiopic word for sin [*xāṭi'ateni*] is used so that we might expect the Greek Vorlage to read ἡ ἁμαρτία (see Black, *Book of Enoch*, 375). Nickelsburg gives no explanation for the logic of his reconstruction.

[138] Sacchi, *Jewish Apocalyptic*, 146; Reed, *Fallen Angels*, 78. Collins recognizes the apparent contradiction but is more circumspect about how to interpret 1 En. 98:4 in relation to the remainder of the Enochic corpus (*Apocalyptic Imagination*, 67).

[139] Stuckenbruck, *1 Enoch 91–108*, 345–46. See also Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 476–77. Both Nickelsburg and Stuckenbruck point to Ben Sira 15:11–20 as a notable parallel to 1 En. 98:4.

rebellion and human sin is addressed by integrating the Watchers narrative into the history of Israel.

4.2. Jubilees

The Book of Jubilees provides one of the earliest interpretations of the Watchers narrative outside the Enochic corpus. Jubilees is a narrative describing God's covenant with Israel from creation to the reception of the law at Sinai. The narrative is framed as Sinai revelation (Jub. 1:1–29; 50:13) and substantially follows the biblical text (Gen 1–Exod 24). In fact, Jubilees adheres so closely to the biblical narrative that it has often been categorized by contemporary biblical scholars as "rewritten Scripture."[140] The suitability of such a category is disputed, but Jubilees is quite similar to the canonical narrative of Genesis and refers to the Mosaic law with deference (Jub. 2:24; 6:22; 30:12, 21; 50:6).[141] At the same time, Jubilees introduces interpretive additions, omissions, alterations, variations, and rearrangements in its retelling of biblical history.[142] Each of these interpretive strategies are relevant to the way evil is portrayed in Jubilees. Understanding the origin and persistence of evil in Jubilees requires analyzing the

---

[140] On the designation "rewritten scripture" see Sidnie White Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 1–18; Molly M. Zahn, "Rewritten Scripture," *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, eds. John J. Collins and Timothy H. Lim (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 324–37. Among the typical examples (e.g. Temple Scroll; Genesis Apocryphon; 4QReworked Pentateuch) Jubilees is perhaps most closely related to the scriptural narrative and therefore often cited as the prototypical example of re-written Scripture. See Molly M. Zahn, "Genre and Rewritten Scripture: A Reassessment," *JBL* 131 (2012): 271–88.

[141] Hindy Najman categorizes Jubilees as "Mosaic Discourse" rather than "Rewritten Bible" (*Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism*, JSJSupp 77 [Leiden: Brill, 2003], 1–69). See also James C. VanderKam, "Recent Scholarship on the Book of Jubilees," *CBR* 6 (2008): 405–31, esp. 409–10; Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture*, 63–82.

[142] See Jacques T. A. G. M. Van Ruiten, *Primeval History Interpreted: The Rewriting of Genesis 1–11 in the book of Jubilees*, JSJSupp 66 (Leiden: Brill, 2000) which provides a thorough synoptic comparison of Gen 1:1–11:19 and Jub. 2:1–10:36.

incorporation and reformulation of earlier traditions.[143] Jubilees integrates pre-existing traditions into a new narrative which requires attention to the sources and the final form of the text.

Evaluating the presence of pre-existing material in Jubilees raises two important and related issues, date and compositional process. The date of Jubilee's composition is disputed. Paleographical analysis of the earliest texts at Qumran indicate that the text must have been composed by 125–100 BCE.[144] James VanderKam has produced the most detailed discussion concerning the date of Jubilees since the discovery and publication of the Qumran fragments, arguing for book's composition in 161–152 BCE.[145] The issue of date is further complicated by the possibility that composition occurred in stages. Due to various contradictions within the narrative, Michael Segal has argued for multiple stages of composition before a final compilation/redaction.[146] There is no doubt that Jubilees

---

[143] Segal, *Book of Jubilees*, 98 rightly argues "Methodologically, the study of the view of evil in *Jubilees* should not be limited to *Jubilees* alone. It needs to also take into account the sources used by *Jubilees*, in order to ascertain when it follows these earlier sources, and when it expresses a new theological idea."

[144] The earliest fragment is 4Q216 see James C. VanderKam and J. T. Milik, "The First Jubilees Manuscript from Qumran Cave 4: A Preliminary Publication," *JBL* 110 (1991): 243–270. Additionally, the paleographic dating for the earliest manuscript of the Damascus Document (4Q266), which appears to cite Jubilees authoritatively (CD 16:3–4), is in the earlier half of the first century BCE.

[145] James C. VanderKam, *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees*, HSM 14 (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977), 207–85; VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, GAP (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 17–22. Cf. George W. E. Nickelsburg prefers an earlier date (ca. 168–160 BCE) due to his interpretation of Jub. 23 (*Jewish Literature*, 73–4). Himmelfarb opts for a date during the Hasmonean era around 140–130 BCE (*Kingdom of Priests*, 75–8). On the difficulty of dating Jubilees based on interpretive additions to the biblical text (esp. Jub. 23:14–32; 34–38) see Robert Doran, "The Non-Dating of Jubilees: Jub. 34–38; 23:14–32 in Narrative Context," *JSJ* 20 (1989): 1–11.

[146] Segal, *Book of Jubilees*, 35–41, 319–22. He also summarizes his position in Segal, "The Composition of Jubilees," in in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees*, eds. Gabriele Boccaccini and Giovanni Ibba (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 2009), 22–35. Earlier theories of multiple stages of composition were advocated by Michel Testuz, *Les idées religieuses du Livre des Jubilés* (Geneva: E Droz, 1960); E. Wiesenberg, "The Jubilee of Jubilees," *RevQ* 3 (1961): 3–40; Gene L. Davenport, *The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees*, StPB 20 (Leiden: Brill, 1971), 10–18. Cf. James C. VanderKam, "The End of the Matter? Jubilees 50:6–13 and the Unity of the Book," in *Heavenly Tablets: Interpretation, Identity, and Tradition in Ancient Judaism*, eds. Lynn R. LiDonnici and Andrea Lieber, JSJSupp 119 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 267–284.

redacted sources, but it is more difficult to make firm judgments about compositional stages based on reconstruction.[147] Additionally, James VanderKam disputes the severity of Segal's contradictions and argues that the remaining problems do not justify such an elaborate theory of redaction.[148] The issues of date and compositional process complicate analysis of Jubilees' use of earlier traditions in the formulation of the author/redactor's view of evil.

While the issues of date and compositional history remain unresolved, the present analysis focuses on the final form of the text. The focus on final form is based on two factors. First, the central period of interest for this study is the first century CE, a time at which Jubilees would have already existed in its final form. Second, it is not clear that the stages of composition can be accurately determined. Whatever the precise date and process of composition, the final form of the text was complete by the first century and merits analysis as a unified narrative.

The present study seeks to clarify the view of evil in Jubilees by examining the incorporation of earlier traditions into a single narrative. This study has three parts. First, a review of scholarship on evil in Jubilees demonstrates the complexity of the issue. Second, scrutiny of Adamic tradition in Jubilees reveals that this tradition is not a significant feature of the author's view of evil. Third, analysis of the Enochic tradition in Jubilees shows that the view of evil in Jubilees was definitively shaped by Enochic tradition. Typically, it is claimed that Jubilees downplays the significance of superhuman

---

[147] James L. Kugel builds on Segal's work and identifies twenty-nine interpolations (*A Walk through Jubilees: Studies in the Book of Jubilees and the World of Its Creation*, JSJSupp 156 [Leiden: Brill, 2012], 227–96). As far as the date of the interpolator, however, Kugel thinks it must have been before the earliest Qumran fragment (4Q216) and therefore likely to have preceded the formation of the Qumran community (*Walk through Jubilees*, 293–4).

[148] VanderKam, "Recent Scholarship on Jubilees," 412–16.

beings in the origin and persistence of evil by substantially changing the narrative found in the BW. It is argued here, however, that while Jubilees alters some details of the Enochic tradition, it does not subvert the superhuman origin and persistence of evil. Rather, Jubilees clarifies the relationship between superhuman evil and human responsibility, a view that is substantially like the BW, but more closely connected to the narrative of Genesis.

4.2.1 Jubilees and the Origin and Persistence of Evil

Scholars have come to vastly different conclusions concerning the subject of evil's origin and persistence in Jubilees. The dispute is due, in part, to the way in which Jubilees utilizes apparently conflicting traditions. As already noted, Jubilees follows the narrative of Genesis closely, retelling the story of Adam and Eve's transgression and subsequent expulsion from Eden (Jub. 3:8–31). As a result, some have concluded that the origin of evil is linked to Adamic tradition. At the same time, Jubilees includes a substantial amount of material from Enochic tradition (Jub. 5:1–19; 7:20–39; 8:1–4; 10:1–14). These two apparently conflicting traditions are further complicated by "Mastema," a superhuman leader of evil spirits (esp. Jub. 10:7–8).[149] The author of Jubilees incorporates these earlier traditions into an altogether new narrative. What is unclear, however, is how to determine the meaning of this new narrative for a coherent view of evil's origin and persistence.

---

[149] See J. W. van Henten, "Mastemah," *DDD*, 553–54; see also S. D. Sperling, "Belial," *DDD*, 169–71; Victor P. Hamilton, "Satan," *ABD* 5.985–989. The Hebrew noun "Mastema [משטמה]," derived from the verb "hate [שטם]" (Gen 27:41; 49:23; 50:15; Ps 55:4; Job 16:9; 30:21), occurs as a proper noun meaning "loathing" or "hostility" (Hos 9:7–8). The proper noun for "hostility" appears in the sectarian texts of Qumran describing Belial as the "angel of loathing" (1QM XIII, 11) and describing the *modus operandi* of the "angel of darkness" (1QS III, 23). Only texts dependent on Jubilees use Mastema as a title (4Q216; CD XVI, 5).

Scholarship on Jewish apocalyptic literature and the Book of Jubilees was significantly advanced by the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls. The scrolls demonstrated that the earliest Jewish "apocalyptic" text was the BW. Based on this insight, Paolo Sacchi sought to trace the development of apocalyptic thought from the BW forward. Sacchi argues that the central concept of Jewish apocalyptic is a superhuman origin of evil that undermines human agency.[150] Jubilees organizes the superhuman forces under the leadership of the satan figure, "Mastema."[151] Consequently, Jubilees serves an important role in the evolution of Jewish theology of evil, adopting the tradition of the BW about the superhuman origin of evil and supplementing it with the notion of a chief of demons governing the persistence of evil.

Sacchi's student, Gabriele Boccaccini, builds on his teacher's work to construct a theory about the origin of the Qumran community.[152] According to this theory, the Jewish group referred to in ancient literature as "Essenes" produced the Enochic literature and represent a mainstream party in Second Temple Judaism which Boccaccini calls "Enochic Judaism." According to his reconstruction, Enochic Judaism is identifiable by the "generative idea" that evil has a superhuman, prehistoric origin that incapacitates, at some level, human agency.[153] Boccaccini argues that the Qumran community was a radical sect that split from the mainstream of Enochic Judaism. Jubilees plays a crucial role in Boccaccini's theory because it shares the notion of a superhuman origin of evil

---

[150] Sacchi, *Jewish Apocalyptic*, 32–71; Sacchi, *History of the Second Temple Period*, 174–180; see also Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis*, 12–13, 72–73.

[151] Sacchi, *Jewish Apocalyptic*, 224–25.

[152] Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis*, 1–17.

[153] Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis*, 12–13. See Boccaccini's analysis of the references to the Essenes in Philo, Josephus, Pliny the Elder, and Dio Chrysostom (*Beyond the Essene Hypothesis*, 21–49). See also Boccaccini, "The Evilness of Human Nature," 63–82.

(Jub. 7:21–25) with two important developments.[154] First, Jubilees incorporates Mosaic tradition associated with a competitive party (Zadokite Judaism). The strategic incorporation has the effect of subordinating Mosaic (Zadokite) claims to the Enochic tradition. Second, Jubilees develops a strong doctrine of election in reaction to Hellenistic reforms. This doctrine will eventually develop to the dualistic determinism of the Qumran sect. Like his teacher, Boccaccini interprets Jubilees following the view in BW of evil's origin but developing a different account of evil's persistence.

James VanderKam has explored the influence of the BW and Genesis in the demonology and angelology of Jubilees, touching upon the issue of evil.[155] VanderKam has shown that while the author of Jubilees utilized the BW significantly, he also altered the narrative for his own purposes.[156] The primary purpose of Jubilees, in VanderKam's view, is to respond to Jews seeking to make a "covenant with the Gentiles around us" (1 Macc 1:11) which would dissolve the separations from surrounding (Hellenistic) culture required by obedience to the Mosaic law.[157] VanderKam thinks the author re-told the

---

[154] Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis*, 86–98.

[155] VanderKam, *Book of Jubilees*, 127–134; VanderKam, "The Angel Story in the Book of Jubilees," in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature*, 12-14 January, 1997, eds. Esther G. Chazon and Michael Stone, STDJ 31 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 151–70; VanderKam, "The Demons in the Book of Jubilees," in *Die Dämonen: die Dämonologie der israelitisch-jüdischen und frühchristlichen Literatur im Kontext ihrer Umwelt / Demons: The Demonology of Israelite-Jewish and early Christian Literature in context of their Environment*, eds. Armin Lange, Hermann Lichtenberger, and Diethard Römheld (Tübingen : Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 339–64.

[156] VanderKam, "Angel Story," 170; VanderKam, "Demons in the Book of Jubilees," 348–50.

[157] VanderKam, "The Origins and Purposes of the *Book of Jubilees*," in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees*, eds. Matthias Albani, Jörg Frey, and Armin Lange, TSAJ 65 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 3–24, esp. 19–22. VanderKam points to 1 Macc 1:11–13 as evidence of this attitude at the time when Jubilees was composed (also Jer 44:17–18). This provides a possible explanation for some of the main features of Jubilees, including: calendar (see also Dan 7:25), Torah obedience among pre-Sinai patriarchs, separation from Gentiles, and cultic concerns. Exactly what kind of separation from surrounding culture is required of Torah obedient Jews was an often-explored issue in Jewish literature of the Hellenistic era. However,

history of Israel as a story of separation from the impurity and evil of surrounding nations (see Jub. 1:9; 21:21, 23; 22:16; 30:13–15). Israel's unique role and separation from other nations is built into creation (Jub. 2:19–20, 23–24, 31) and re-affirmed throughout the narrative (esp. Jub. 15:30–32). In VanderKam's reading, the Watchers, who come to earth at divine command (Jub. 4:15; 5:6), are examples of the impurity that befalls those who mingle with Gentiles (see also Jub. 4:22; 7:21; 20:3–6; 25:7).[158] The demons born of the Watchers' transgressions reign over Gentiles but not over law obedient Jews (Jub. 10:1–14; 15:30–32; 22:16–18). Evil spirits persist in the postdiluvian world among Gentiles by divine permission to Mastema (Jub. 10:7–9). Nowhere does VanderKam tease out the implications of his interpretation for a coherent view of evil's origin and persistence. Still, he seems to indicate that Jubilees re-interprets the BW narrative into a paradigm of sin rather than an etiology of evil.

Although scholars have generally interpreted Jubilees as a unified text, Michael Segal attempts to reconstruct the textual history through stages of compilation. He argues that the text can only be understood by analyzing how the redactor re-interprets earlier material. The Adamic and Enochic traditions in Jubilees have, in Segal's view, mislead scholars into positing an origin of evil apart from God's creative activity. Segal argues that in Jubilees the function of the Adamic and Enochic traditions is transformed by the redactor. By adding the Mastema material (esp. Jub. 10:7–8) the redactor makes an entirely different point than typical Adamic or Enochic traditions about evil. Although

---

Jubilees does demonstrate concern for Sabbath (Jub. 2:25–27; 50:8–9, 12–13), circumcision (15:14, 25–26, 33–34) and endogamy (22:20–21; 30:10–16, 22).

[158] VanderKam, "Angel Story," 158, 170. This theme is re-emphasized when describing those who marry Gentiles (Jub. 25:1; 30:13–15; 35:14).

nowhere explicit in the text of Jubilees, Segal argues that Mastema is an angel created by God.[159] Additionally, Segal points out that the election of Israel and the fate of the Gentiles is predetermined (Jub. 1:19–21; 2:17–24; 15:25–34). Based on his view of Mastema as God's created angel and the elect as predetermined from creation, Segal argues that in Jubilees evil is "part of God's original plan when he created the world."[160] In Segal's view, the effect of incorporating Adamic and Enochic traditions is to subordinate them to the redactor's position that evil is created by God. Segal's analysis strengthens the connection between Jubilees and the dualism of the sectarian literature at Qumran (esp. 1QS 3:13–4:26). According to Segal, the view of evil in Jubilees, unlike either Adamic or Enochic tradition, identifies the origin of evil with God's creative activity, an interpretation that aligns the theology of Jubilees more closely with the dualism of the sectarian texts at Qumran.

Annette Reed argues that the origin and persistence of evil in Jubilees is not defined by angelic rebellion. In her view, Jubilees "moves the origins of sin into the sphere of human responsibility" in two ways. First, by incorporating Adamic tradition from Genesis 3 (Jub. 3:17–35).[161] Second, by locating the angelic sin on earth (Jub. 4:15; 5:1–2, 6), "sin remains a strictly earthly phenomenon."[162] Why, then, does Jubilees

---

[159] Segal, *Book of Jubilees*, 176–180. Since Mastema is also called a "satan" (Jub. 10:11), and functions like the "satan" figure in the HB (Job 1–2; Zech 3:1–2; see Jub. 17:15–18; 18:9, 12), Segal thinks it is logical to assume Mastema is an angel (see Job 1:6). Jubilees describes the creation of angels on the first day of creation (Jub. 2:2), but Mastema is not mentioned. In the Qumran fragments משטמה often stands in the attributive position to "Angel [מלאך]" or "Prince [שר]" (Dimant, "Case of Belial and Mastema," 247).

[160] Segal, *Book of Jubilees*, 263. He likens the position of Jubilees to Isa 45:7.

[161] *Fallen Angels*, 89.

[162] Annette Reed, "Enochic and Mosaic Traditions in Jubilees: The Evidence of Angelology and Demonology," in *Enoch and Mosaic Torah*, 353–68, here 359. See also Reed, *Fallen Angels*, 90–95. She finds no elaboration of a causal link between the Watchers' transgression and human sin (Jub. 7:21–23; cf. 1 En. 9:6, 8; 10:7–8; 12:4; 13:2; 15:3–4; 16:3).

incorporate the Watchers myth at all? Rather than an etiology of evil, Reed interprets Jubilees transforming the story into a polemic against exogamy.[163] She argues that one of the primary functions of angels in Jubilees is to serve as heavenly counterparts to Israel.[164] With Israel's elevated angelic status, the Watchers become examples of Israelite sinners who abandon the covenant (see esp. Jub. 5:6–7; see also 10:33; 21:21).[165] According to Reed, then, evil originates with human choice (primarily Israel's) and persists in Israel's disobedience to the covenant and assimilation to Gentiles.[166]

Loren Stuckenbruck explores Jubilees' revisions to the rebellious angel myth to explain the author's view of evil. Stuckenbruck draws attention to four specific modifications to rebellious angel myth and argues that these alterations have two major consequences.[167] The first consequence is that Jubilees does not provide an explicit etiology of evil. The narrative incorporates four other traditions from the Primeval History relevant to the origin and persistence of evil.[168] Still, Stuckenbruck views the

---

[163] Reed, "Enochic and Mosaic Traditions in Jubilees," 360–63. Both the sexual transgressions of the Watchers and the illicit instruction motif are transformed into polemics against intermarriage (Jub. 7:20–39; 8:5; see also Jub. 20:4; 22:20–22; 30:7–17). See also Cana Werman, "Jubilees 30: Building a Paradigm for the Ban on Intermarriage," *HTR* 90 (1997): 1–22.

[164] Reed, "Enochic and Mosaic Traditions in Jubilees," 356. Like Israel, angels are circumcised and observe Sabbath (Jub. 2:17–21; 15:27), they are also priests (30:18). Reed suggests that the portrait of angelic status given to Israel in Jubilees is an extension of Enoch's angelic status in BW (1 En. 13:4–6; 14:21; 15:2). Israel as "sons of God" are accorded angelic status (Jub. 2:19–20). See also Himmelfarb, *Kingdom of Priests*, 53–84.

[165] Reed, "Enoch and Mosaic Traditions in Jubilees," 357–58 argues that demons under Masemah's rule act as punishing agents of divine justice (Jub. 1:20; 10:11; 48:15; 49:2) and rule over Gentiles (1:11; 11:4; 15:3; 48) which incorporates demons into a Deuteronomic framework (see also Deut 32:8–9; Ps 106).

[166] Reed is not clear about how Gentiles become dominated by evil spirits.

[167] Stuckenbruck, *Myth of Rebellious Angels*, 25–32. The four decisive differences are: 1) the location of angels' transgression; 2) the means of punishing the Watchers and their offspring; 3) the etiology of demons; 4) angelic instruction motif.

[168] Stuckenbruck, "Jubilees and the Origin of Evil," 296–98, 306–7; Stuckenbruck, *Myth of Rebellious Angels*, 25. The four other relevant narratives are: 1) Adam and the Serpent in Eden (Gen 3:1–

rebellious angel myth as an explanation for "the way things are."[169] The second consequence is that Jubilees stresses human culpability. While both Jubilees and BW tell a story in which "evil powers are, in effect, already defeated," Jubilees "goes to greater lengths to avoid any inference that demonic causality undermines human, especially Israel's, responsibility."[170] By attending to the ways in which Jubilees alters the BW narrative and incorporates other traditions, Stuckenbruck identifies the rebellious angels as the primary cause of evil's origin and human freedom as the primary cause of evil's persistence.

Todd Hanneken argues that while Jubilees utilizes the formal features of the apocalyptic genre, the content of the narrative undermines the apocalyptic worldview.[171] One of the commonly identified features of an apocalyptic worldview, or "apocalypticism," is the prevalence and significance of superhuman beings for the origin and persistence of evil.[172] The apocalyptic tradition of the BW, which identifies rebellious

---

24 || Jub. 3:8–31), 2) Cain's fratricide (Gen 4:3–16 || Jub. 4:1–6, 31–32), 3) Noah's nakedness and cursing of Canaan (Gen 9:21–27 || Jub. 7:7–15; 8:8–9:15), 4) Tower of Babel (Gen 11:1–9 || Jub. 10:18–11:6).

[169] Stuckenbruck, "Jubilees and the Origin of Evil," 307; Stuckenbruck, *Myth of Rebellious Angels*, 32: "Jubilees does not actually deliberate about the origin of evil *per se*."

[170] Stuckenbruck, *Myth of Rebellious Angels*, 33.

[171] Todd R. Hanneken, *The Subversion of the Apocalypses in the Book of Jubilees*, EJIL 34 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012). He adopts the genre definition articulated by John J. Collins, "Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre," *Semeia* 14 (1979): 1–19. Collins defines the apocalyptic genre as "*a genre of revelatory literature with a narrative framework, in which a revelation is mediated by an otherworldly being to a human recipient, disclosing a transcendent reality which is both temporal, insofar as it envisages eschatological salvation, and spatial insofar as it involves another, supernatural world*" ("Apocalypse," 9).

[172] Russell, *Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic*, 249–54; Klaus Koch, *Rediscovery of Apocalyptic*, SBT 22 (London: SCM Press, 1972), 30; Sacchi, *Jewish Apocalyptic*, 72–108; Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis*, 12–13, 72–73; On apocalypticism as a worldview see Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 12–14; John J. Collins, "From Prophecy to Apocalypticism: The Expectation of the End," in *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism: Volume I: The Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity*, ed. John J. Collins (New York: Continuum, 1999), 129–161, esp. 134–147. According to Hanneken, "The apocalypses typically explain the human situation in terms of independent cosmic agents. Bad angels and demons explain the presence of evil and suffering, and even good angels can be temporarily impeded or otherwise inefficient" (*Subversion of the Apocalypses*, 53).

angels and their demonic offspring with the origin and persistence of evil, appears in Jubilees. Nevertheless, Hanneken argues that Jubilees "manipulates the details to convey its own view of the origin of evil."[173] Hanneken identifies ten features of Jubilees that subvert the notion of a superhuman cause for evil's origin and persistence.[174] As a result, "Jubilees blames humanity for the origin of evil."[175]

Miryam Brand provides the most nuanced analysis of Jubilees on the origin and persistence of evil. In her view, Jubilees contains a complex compendium of perspectives about evil that resist integration. Like Segal, Brand isolates several traditions associated with evil that represent different sources but she makes no attempt harmonize the traditions into a single coherent view. In fact, Brand thinks that such harmonization is arbitrary.[176] In her view, Jubilees incorporates at least six distinct views of evil, each of which stands on its own. First, in the retelling of Gen 6:1–4, Brand finds Jubilees (5:1–13) reworking the rebellious angel narrative into a paradigm of sinful creatures receiving just punishment.[177] Second, in Noah's testament (Jub. 7:20–33), Brand argues that the Watchers function as an explanation for the persistence of evil without denying human

---

[173] Hanneken, *Subversion of the Apocalypses*, 54. See also Hanneken, "Angels and Demons in the Book of Jubilees and Contemporary Apocalypses," *Hen* 28 (2006): 11–25.

[174] Hanneken, *Subversion of the Apocalypses*, 57–60, 61–4, 69–71, 77–82, 84–88 assembles ten features of Jubilees that downplay the role of superhuman beings in the origin and persistence of evil: 1) Watchers were created by God (Jub. 2:2); 2) Watchers sent to earth by God (Jub. 4:15; 5:6); 3) Enoch's primary role is testifying to humanity (Jub. 4:19, 23) not the Watchers (Jub. 4:22; cf. 1 En. 12:4–13:3; 16:2–4); 4) Identification of angelic instruction as legitimate (Jub. 4:15; cf. 1 En. 8); 5) the ninety-percent reduction of demons (Jub. 10:9; cf. 1 En. 15:8–16:1); 6) Israel's immunity from demons via Torah (Jub. 10:13; 23:26; 45:16) and cult (Jub. 5:17–18; 49:15); 7) Israel's direct supervision (Jub. 15:31–32; 16:17–18; 19:28–29); 8) Mastema's limited authority over idolatrous Gentiles (Jub. 11:5; 15:31; 19:28); 9) Mastema executes God's will (Jub. 48:1–4, 12; 49:2); 10) Superhuman beings (including angels, demons, and Mastema) are irrelevant to Israel's eschatological fate (Jub. 23; 50).

[175] *Subversion of the Apocalypses*, 51.

[176] *Evil Within and Without*, 170. She criticizes Segal's attempt to integrate the various perspectives into a single dualistic worldview (Brand, *Evil Within and Without*, 192 fn. 82).

[177] Brand, *Evil Within and Without*, 170–72.

responsibility (esp. Jub. 7:21–22, 27).[178] Third, in Noah's prayer (Jub. 10:1–6), demonic power is increased and human agency is disabled. The only way to combat demonic authority is through prayer and divine assistance.[179] Fourth, Jubilees subordinates the Watchers' demonic offspring to the divinely sanctioned chief "Mastema" (Jub. 10:7–9).[180] The result of this subordination is that demons do not function apart from God's control even as their existence is a violation of the created order.[181] With Mastema's divinely sanctioned authority, evil becomes a part of the divine plan but Mastema's demons and his actions stand in tension with God's purposes (esp. Jub. 11:4–5; 19:28–29). Fifth, Moses' prayer for the protection of Israel against the power of Belial represents another view of evil.[182] In this prayer, the external forces of the nations (Jub. 1:19) and Belial (Jub. 1:20) have the power to cause evil, but it can be counteracted by a change of heart (Jub. 1:21; see also Ps 51:12).[183] Sixth, and finally, in Abram's prayer to the creator (Jub.

---

[178] *Evil Within and Without*, 173–76. She cautions that the Watchers narrative is "not the *only* source of sin" in Jubilees, which includes the sin of Adam and Eve (Jub. 3:17–25) and Cain's fratricide (Jub. 4:2–4). But she does not interpret these stories (Jub. 3:17–25; 4:2–4) as explanations of sin "either as origin or paradigm" (*Evil Within and Without*, 173).

[179] *Evil Within and Without*, 176–179. On apotropaic prayers at Qumran (4Q510–511; 4Q444; 11Q11; ALD [4Q213a]) see Brand, *Evil Within and Without*, 198–217. Brand argues that a common function of the genre of apotropaic prayer is the overwhelming power of the demonic apart from divine assistance, but that this is atypical of prayers embedded in narratives (*Evil Within and Without*, 275–77). See also Loren T. Stuckenbruck, "Prayers of Deliverance from the Demonic in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Early Jewish Literature," in *Changing Face of Judaism, Christianity, and Other Greco-Roman Religions in Antiquity*, eds. Ian H. Henderson and Gerbern S. Oegema, JSHRZ 2 (Gütersloh: Gütersloher, 2006), 146–65.

[180] *Evil Within and Without*, 179–86.

[181] Brand, *Evil Within and Without*, 180. Brand identifies a similar tension with the Mesopotamian figure Lamashtu in the Atrahasis epic. See Karel van der Toorn, "The Theology of Demons in Mesopotamia and Israel," in *Dämonen/Demons*, 61–83.

[182] Brand, *Evil Within and Without*, 187–92.

[183] Brand, *Evil Within and Without*, 189 argues that this leaves open three possible causes of evil: 1) the nations, 2) Belial, 3) human choice. Segal, *Book of Jubilees*, 256 harmonizes Jub. 1:19–21 with 15:30–32. See also Devorah Dimant, "Israel's Subjugation to the Gentiles as an Expression of Demonic Power in Qumran Documents and Related Literature," *RevQ* 22.87 (2006): 373–88. Brand is emphatic, however, that Jub. 1:19–21 and Jub. 15:30–32 are not integrated into a single coherent view of evil in Jubilees (*Evil Within and Without*, 192).

12:19–21), the distinction between internal thought/inclination and evil spirits is blurred (esp. Jub. 12:20; see also Gen 6:5; 8:21).[184] Brand identifies six different views of evil in Jubilees that defy harmonization. In some instances, humans have free will (Jub. 5:1–13; 7:20–33; Jub. 10:7–9), while in others they appear to be subject to external, demonic forces (Jub. 10:1–6; 1:20), and in one instance both views appear to be combined (Jub. 12:19–21). According to Brand, then, evil is sufficiently complex to warrant multiple traditions, combined in Jubilees without regard for integration.

Jubilees is perhaps the most complex extant text in Second Temple Jewish literature regarding evil. The book utilizes multiple traditions (Adamic, Enochic), genres (narrative, apotropaic prayer), and superhuman characters (Watchers, Belial, and Mastemah) relevant to the origin and persistence of evil. It is disputed if and how to integrate these traditions, genres, and characters into a single coherent position on the origin and persistence of evil. Nearly all scholars recognize the role of redaction in the production of Jubilees, but can the stages of redaction be reconstructed as Segal claims? Should the attempt to articulate a coherent view be abandoned altogether as an artificial exercise, as Brand argues? Perhaps the most debated feature of the text is how to harmonize human agency and angelic rebellion, a tension that is also present in scholarship on the Enochic corpus.

The present analysis attempts to bring clarity to the view of evil in Jubilees by allowing for complexity and coherent unity. Because Jubilees is a single text, unified by an author/redactor/compiler at some point, it is inaccurate to describe an interpretation of

---

[184] Brand, *Evil Within and Without*, 193–95. Like Jub. 1:19–21, Brand thinks that Jub. 12:19–21 was originally an independent composition that does not easily integrate with other parts of the work.

the final text as arbitrary or artificial. It must be admitted, as Segal and Brand have argued, that the text is complex in combining previously separate traditions. But precisely because Jubilees was redacted into a single text, it merits consideration as a unified whole.[185] Moreover, Jubilees when compared to the Book of Watchers, for example, exhibits more narrative unity, making it difficult to separate sources. Additionally, the issue of how to harmonize human agency and angelic responsibility is not unique to Jubilees. As we have already seen, the same tension is already found in the Book of Watchers. The reformulation of Adamic and Enochic traditions into a single narrative in Jubilees is complex but not incoherent. Adamic tradition is not the original *cause* of evil for humanity, even if it is the first example of human transgression. Enochic tradition, on the other hand, is rewritten with an expansive role in the narrative of Genesis. This expansion continues the superhuman origin of evil and human responsibility found in the BW, even if it alters some details. By incorporating this tradition into the narrative of Genesis the author of Jubilees portrays evil as caused by a dual agency of superhuman beings and humans.

4.2.2 Adamic Tradition (Jub. 3:8–31; 4:29–30)

The author of Jubilees incorporates Adamic tradition about the protoplast being expelled from the Garden of Eden, but what significance does Adamic tradition hold for the origin and persistence of evil in the book? Some scholars have suggested that by including Adam's expulsion the author of Jubilees emphasizes the human origin of evil, diminishing the significance of the Watchers' transgression.[186] Yet there are several

[185] This is not to say that all the views of evil expressed in Jubilees are easily harmonized or that the original composers of the separate traditions would agree with one another or the final compilation.

[186] Collins, "Origin of Evil in Apocalyptic," 290–91; Reed, *Fallen Angels*, 89.

features of the Adamic tradition in Jubilees that problematize the notion that the protoplast's expulsion from the Garden addresses the origin of evil. As a result, many scholars do not consider Adamic tradition in Jubilees to be especially significant for the origin and persistence of evil.[187] How then does Adamic tradition in Jubilees relate to evil? To address this question, it is necessary to first examine the overall portrait of Adam in Jubilees. Second, analysis of the alterations, omissions, and additions to the narrative of Adam's expulsion from the Garden as found in Genesis, demonstrates that the author of Jubilees did not refer to Adam's transgression as the origin of evil, nor a significant event for the persistence of evil.

The portrait of Adam and Eve in Jubilees is remarkably positive.[188] In at least four ways the author of Jubilees presents an exalted portrait of Adam. First, while Adam is not identified as the image of God in Jubilees (cf. Gen 1:26–27), he is the first "leader of humanity," "blessed and holy" (Jub. 2:23) and testifies to the eternal law (Jub. 2:24).[189] Although Adam is not described as the "image of God," he is the source of the chosen people of God. The first way Jubilees presents an exalted portrait of Adam is by making him the first patriarch (see also Sir 49:16).

Second, Adam (and Eve) are depicted as examples of obedience to the Mosaic law prior to Sinai. Their obedience to Mosaic law is found in two halakic expansions of the Genesis narrative describing their time in Eden. In the first instance, resolving a

---

[187] Levison, *Portraits of Adam*, 158–59; Stuckenbruck, "Jubilees and the Origin of Evil," 296–97; Hanneken, *Subversion of the Apocalypses*, 54–55 fn. 5; Götte, *Von den Wächtern zu Adam*, 175–76.

[188] Levison, *Portraits of Adam*, 89–97; Betsy Halpern Amaru, "The First Woman, Wives, and Mothers in *Jubilees*," *JBL* 113 (1994): 609–626; Legaretta-Castillo, *Figure of Adam*, 66–71.

[189] All translations of Jubilees are from James C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, 2 Vols. CSCO 510–511 (Leuven: Peeters, 1989). Humanity does not bear the image of God until Noah emerges from the Ark (Jub. 6:8; see also Jub. 2:14).

chronological issue that results from combining the two creation stories of Genesis, Adam and Eve enter Eden after they are created (Jub. 3:9).[190] The delayed entrance is illuminated by reference to Levitical purity law (Jub. 3:8–14; see Lev 12:2–5). Since Eden is the holiest place on earth (Jub. 3:12; 8:19), Adam and Eve can enter only after the sufficient time of purification has passed. Their belated entrance is explicitly identified as an example of obedience to the law inscribed on heavenly tablets (Jub. 3:10). In the second instance, the halakic expansion is even more notable regarding evil's origin. After Adam and Eve are cursed (Jub. 3:23–25), they cover their nakedness (Jub. 3:21–22, 26–31) before offering a sacrifice (see Exod 20:26; 28:42–43; see also 2 Macc 4:12–14). Adam's nudity, a feature of the narrative that could be exploited to emphasize the severity of the Protoplast's transgression with consequences for his progeny, is instead an example of halakic instruction for faithful Jews to avoid nudity (Jub. 3:31).[191] Jubilees portrays Adam and Eve as obedient to the Mosaic law in multiple ways. Even the shame resulting from their transgression is reworked into a hortatory example of halakic purity.

Third, like other famous Patriarchs from Israel's distant past, Adam is the recipient of angelic revelation. After entering Eden, Adam is instructed by the Angels of the Presence about how to till and guard his crop (Jub. 3:15–16). Adam's angelically inspired agricultural knowledge is remarkably similar to Abraham's agricultural success later in the narrative, a success which is linked to Abraham's piety (Jub. 12:16–24). Even

---

[190] van Ruiten, *Primeval History Interpreted*, 107–11. In his comparison of the Eden narratives of Genesis and Jubilees, Jacques van Ruiten concludes that one of the governing principles guiding the author of Jubilees in rewriting Genesis 2–3 is a view of Eden as a sanctuary (Jub. 8:19). The other guiding principle is the harmonization of the two creation stories.

[191] See Stuckenbruck, "Jubilees and the Origin of Evil," 297.

after expulsion from Eden, the location of his angelic tutelage, Adam continues to work utilizing angelic instruction (Jub. 3:35). In Jubilees, only the most significant patriarchs are recipients of angelic revelation, including Enoch (Jub. 4:21), Noah (Jub. 10:10, 13–14), Abraham (Jub. 12:25–27), Jacob (Jub. 27:21–25; 32:16–26), and Moses (Jub. 1:29; 50:13). As a recipient of angelic instruction, even East of Eden, Adam is in rare company.

Fourth, Adam functions as the first of many priest-Patriarchs. Although commanded to leave Eden, Adam acts as a priest, offering incense in Eden (Jub. 3:27). Later in the narrative, Eden is explicitly identified as the holy of holies (Jub. 8:19). According to the HB and Josephus, an incense offering in the holy of holies is a prerogative reserved only for priests.[192] Like Enoch (Jub. 4:25), Noah (6:1–22), Abraham (13:4; 14:11–20; 15:2; 16:20–31), Isaac (24:23), and Jacob (Jub. 31:3; 32:27–29; 44:1), Adam functions as a priestly figure prior to the establishment of the priesthood.[193] Not only is he a priestly figure, but he is the first human to serve in a priestly role.

In contemporary theological imagination Adam is often thought of as a tragic figure, a source of profound loss to his progeny. But the portrait of Adam in Jubilees is far from tragic. In Jubilees Adam is heroic. He is the first patriarch of Israel, he obeys Mosaic law before Sinai, he receives instruction from angels, and he serves as a priest. This portrait fits the sectarian literature at Qumran where the Protoplast is associated with heavenly glory. The phrase "all the glory of Adam [כול כבוד אדם]" is used to describe the restored covenant community (1QS 4:23; 1QH[a] 4:15; CD 3:20) fulfilling the prophecy of

[192] Exod 30:34–38; Num 16:39–40; 2 Chron 26:16–20; Josephus, *A.J.* 9.223–27.

[193] Himmelfarb, *Kingdom of Priests*, 55–58.

Ezek 44:15 (CD 3:20–21) and prefiguring eschatological new creation (1QS 4:15–23).[194] Additionally, George Brooke identifies the phrase "sanctuary of Adam [מקדש אדם]" (4QFlor. [4Q174 1.6]) as a reference to Eden.[195] Like Jubilees, in the sectarian literature of Qumran, Adam was imagined as a glorious priest who walked in the heavenly temple of Eden.

Not only is Adam generally portrayed positively in Jubilees, but the narrative of Adam and Eve's transgression is rewritten as well (Jub. 3:17–31).[196] While the narrative of transgression closely follows Genesis (Gen 3:1–7 || Jub. 3:17–22), there is no mention of the serpent's cunning (Gen 3:1), nor God's instruction about which trees are appropriate for consumption (Gen 3:16–17). Additionally, there is no reference to Adam's shameful withdrawal from God's presence in Jubilees (Gen 3:8–11). Also, in Jubilees, God's anger is directed at the serpent and Eve (Jub. 3:23) and not Adam (Jub. 3:25). In the end, it is animals who suffer most drastically, losing the ability to speak (Jub. 3:28–29). Most importantly, the consequences of Adam's transgression have no enduring significance for humanity and only limited significance for Adam himself.

Later in the text Jubilees returns to the results of Adam's transgression. When reporting Adam's death (Jub. 4:29–30), the author of Jubilees combines a citation of

---

[194] The generic phrase "sons of Adam" appears with some frequency as a reference to humanity in the prayers of the community (1QH[a] 7:9; 9:27; 10:25; 12:30, 32; 13:11; 14:11; 18:26; 19:6; 5Q544 frag 1.11–12).

[195] George J. Brooke, "Miqdash Adam, Eden, and the Qumran Community," in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel: zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*, eds. Beate Ego, Arming Lange, Peter Pilhofer Kathrin Ehlers, WUNT 118 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), 285–301; See also Michael O. Wise, "4QFlorilegium and the Temple of Adam," *RevQ* 15 (1991): 103–32; Crispin H. T. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, STDJ 42 (Leiden: Brill, 2002), esp. 88–135.

[196] van Ruiten, Primeval History Interpreted, 71–111.

Genesis 2:17 with Psalm 90:4 (see also Gen 3:19; 5:5), to indicate the consequence of Adam's illicit consumption in Eden was death before 1,000 years.[197] As van Ruiten argues, one result of Jubilee's rearrangement of the Genesis material and combination with Ps 90:4 is that Adam's death is interpreted in such a way as to "remove the negative side of the Garden of Eden as much as possible."[198] Still, Adam's death is not described by the author as a "punishment" for transgressing the law, which stands in juxtaposition to the context of the information. Immediately after the report of Adam's death, Cain's death is described as "punishment" (Jub. 4:31–32; see also Gen 9:6; Exod 21:12; Lev 24:17–20). Rewriting the story, the author of Jubilees places reports of Adam and Cain's deaths in sharp contrast. Adam dies because of illicit consumption but Cain dies as punishment for transgressing the eternal law.

Adam is nowhere associated with the origin of evil in Jubilees. Generally, the portrait of Adam in Jubilees is laudable. Specifically, the story of Adam's transgression in Eden is retold by the author of Jubilees muting reference to evil. At the time Jubilees was composed, Adamic tradition may have already been associated with the origin of evil (Sir 25:24).[199] Yet the narrative of Jubilees does not mobilize Adamic tradition to make a point about evil. Adam does not originate evil chronologically nor causally. In terms of chronology, evil enters the narrative through a serpent deceiving Eve, both of whom,

---

[197] van Ruiten, *Primeval History Interpreted*, 168 points out that record of Adam's death is significant since prior to Abraham, only the deaths of Cain (4:31–32), Noah (10:15–17), and Haran (12:14), merit mention in the narrative.

[198] *Primeval History Interpreted*, 171. The combination of Gen 2:17 with Ps 90:4 also appears in Justin Martyr, *Dial*. 81.3

[199] The only text composed prior to Jubilees that might be interpreted a reference to an Adamic etiology of evil is Sir 25:24, which may be a reference to Eve. On this text, which is more complicated than it appears at first glance, see chapter 2.

unlike Adam, face God's anger (Jub. 3:23). Yet even the serpent and Eve, pale in comparison to Cain who prompts the Angel of the Presence to inform Moses about the practice of angels reporting all sin to God (Jub. 4:6; see also 1 En. 99:3; 100:10; 104:7–8). Causally, it is not clear that Cain's sin instigates evil for humanity. In the narrative of Jubilees, Adamic tradition does not function to explain the origin or persistence of evil in terms of chronology or causality.

4.2.3 Enochic Tradition (Jub. 5:1–19; 7:20–39; 8:1–4; 10:1–14)

What is the significance of the Enochic tradition in Jubilees regarding the origin and persistence of evil? Although Jubilees does not mention Shemihazah or Asael, it still seems quite likely that the author had access to the BW.[200] Based on this conclusion, the significance of Enochic tradition in Jubilees has been explained by analyzing how Jubilees incorporates and alters the narrative of the BW.[201] The present analysis focuses on three changes to the BW narrative: 1) the circumstances of the Watchers' descent, 2) the judgment of the Watchers and their offspring, and 3) the persistence of demons in the postdiluvian world. Revisions to the story concerning each of these groups merit consideration in assessing how Jubilees utilizes and reworks Enochic tradition to articulate its view of the origin and persistence of evil.

---

[200] Jubilees approves of Enochic revelation (Jub. 4:17–19, 21–22) and in addition to the *BW*, the author appears to demonstrate awareness of the Astronomical Book (Jub. 4:17), Apocalypse of Weeks (Jub. 4:18) and possibly the Epistle of Enoch (Jub. 4:19). See James C. VanderKam, "Enoch Traditions in Jubilees and Other Second-Century Sources," *SBLSP* 13 (1978): 229–51, esp. 231–41; John S. Bergsma, "The Relationship between Jubilees and the Early Enochic Books (Astronomical Book and Book of the Watchers)," in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees*, eds. Gabriele Boccaccini and Giovanni Ibba (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 2009), 36–51.

[201] Esp. Stuckenbruck, *Myth of Rebellious Angels*, 25–32; Segal, *Book of Jubilees*, 115–143; Hanneken, *Subversion of the Apocalypses*, 57–60, 61–4, 69–71, 77–82, 84–88.

Perhaps the most obvious and profound difference between the BW and Jubilees is circumstances of the Watchers' descent. While in the BW angelic sin begins in heaven and the Watchers' descent is itself evil (1 En. 6:1–6; see also 1 En. 86:1), in Jubilees the Watchers are commissioned to earth by God (Jub. 5:6), tasked to instruct humanity in righteousness (Jub. 4:15). Only after their divinely sanctioned descent do the Watchers violate their authority by fornicating with women (Jub. 7:21; 5:1–2, 6). The meaning of the change is somewhat disputed. Scholars have typically identified a twofold purpose for the positive portrait of angelic descent in Jubilees.[202] First, it functions to preserve the inviolability of the heaven by making evil an earthly phenomenon. Second, the Watchers are identified as a paradigm of sinners rather than an etiology of evil.[203] In contrast to this common view, Michael Segal argues that the redactor of Jubilees is not motivated by a theological concern to preserve heaven from evil since Mastema is evil and in heaven (esp. Jub. 17:15–16). Instead, Segal argues that the motivation for altering the BW narrative is to resolve an exegetical problem of chronology.[204] Todd Hanneken suggests that the alteration can serve both an exegetical-chronological purpose and a theological

[202] VanderKam, "Enoch Traditions in Jubilees," 244–45; VanderKam, "Angel Story in Jubilees," 154–55; Reed, *Fallen Angels*, 89–90; Stuckenbruck, *Myth of Rebellious Angels*, 26; Jacques van Ruiten, "Angels and Demons in the Book of Jubilees," in *Angels: The Concept of Celestial Beings – Origins, Development and Reception*, eds. F. V. Reiterer, T. Nicklas, and K. Schöpflin, DCLY (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007) 585-609, here 599; Losekam, *Die Sünde der Engel*, 89; Götte, *Von den Wächtern zu Adam*, 100–101. Stuckenbruck recognizes that the sanctity of heaven is asserted in the BW (1 En. 14:8–25) but it is not clear how this is reconciled with the sinful descent (1 En. 6:1–8).

[203] Esp. John C. Endres, "The Watchers Traditions in the *Book of Jubilees*," in *The Watchers in Jewish and Christian Traditions*, eds. Angela Kim Harkins, Kelly Coblentz Bautch, John C. Endres (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2014), 121–35.

[204] *Book of Jubilees*, 126–132. In Segal's view, the angelic sin must be no more than 110 years before the flood (Jub. 5:8) and not at the birth of Jared (Jub. 4:15; 1 En. 6:6). David Falk has analyzed chronological schemes for the Watchers' descent (BW, Birth of Noah, EE, Jub, 1QapGen) and concluded that Jubilees need not be motivated by exegetical necessity because Jared lives until the days of the flood (David K. Falk, "Dating the Watchers: What's at Stake?," *Hen* 31 (2009): 23–29, esp. 27). Yet Segal argues that the phrase "for during his days [כי במיו]" must refer to the time of Jared's birth not simply during his lifetime (Jub. 8:8; 10:18–19; see also Gen 10:25; 1 Chron 1:19).

concern to distance evil from heaven.[205] Whatever the original purpose of the change, the Watchers' divinely sanctioned descent in Jubilees stands in sharp contrast with the BW. The change conforms to both a chronological-exegetical motive and an overall pattern of emphasizing evil as an earthly phenomenon.

Divine judgment against the fornicating Watchers and their illicit offspring is adapted from the BW and, again, altered. While the BW describes the flood as punishment against the Watchers and their offspring (1 En. 10:2–3; see also 89:5–6; T. Naph 3:5), in Jubilees the flood is primarily aimed at human sin (esp. Jub. 5:3–5; 7:20–25; see also CD 2.17–21).[206] In fact, Jubilees seems to portray a prediluvian judgment in which the Watchers and their offspring are punished prior to the judgment of humanity in the flood (esp. Jub. 5:6–12). The prediluvian judgment combines at least two pre-existing traditions. First, the flood as the judgment of humanity follows the logic of the Genesis narrative in which evil is primarily a result of human agency (Gen 6:3, 13, 17; see also T. Reu. 5:6). Second, in the BW the giants are portrayed as destructively violent against creation and one another (1 En. 7:5; 10:9, 12; see also 1 En. 88:2–3). In Jubilees, the violence of the Watchers' offspring is transformed into the primary means of their judgment; it destroys their bodies (Jub. 5:7, 9; 7:22–24).[207] The obliteration of the Watchers' offspring culminates with the flood as the "great day of judgment" (Jub. 5:9,

---

[205] *Subversion of the Apocalypses*, 58. Hannken would likely argue that since Mastema excecutes God's will (esp. Jub. 48:1–4, 12; 49:2), he would not be considered evil in the sense that rebellious angels are.

[206] Stuckenbruck, *Myth of Rebellious Angels*, 27–29. It is worth noting that in the judgment against the Watchers in 1 En. 15:8–16:1, it is unclear exactly how the physical bodies of the offspring perish.

[207] Stuckenbruck, *Myth of Rebellious Angels*, 29–30 suggests that the destruction of the bodies of the giants is based on the application of Gen 6:3 to the flesh of the giants (Jub. 5:9), but, since the hybrid nature of the giants in 1 En. 15:4–10 is never explicit in Jubilees, this is uncertain.

11; see also 1 En. 10:12–16). While the primary emphasis in Jubilees 5 is the violence of giants, the flood is still connected with their destruction in the remainder of the text (Jub. 7:25; 10:3). Combining features of Genesis and the BW, Jubilees portrays a predominantly prediluvian judgment for the Watchers.

The judgment of the Watchers and their offspring provides crucial insight into the view of evil in Jubilees. In the BW, the corruption of the cosmos caused by the transgressions of the Watchers is remedied by cosmic renewal in the flood and the planting of Noah's seed (1 En. 10:16–11:2).[208] In Jubilees the flood, or the "great day of judgment," is how God renews human nature after the cosmic corruption caused by the Watchers and their offspring:

> He made a new and righteous nature for all his creatures so that they would not sin with their whole nature until eternity. Everyone will be righteous — each according to his kind — for all time.[209]

This bold description of a renewed nature has been difficult for interpreters to explain as a postdiluvian and not eschatological renewal.[210] R. H. Charles even emended the text, translating the passage in the future tense. He argued that the Greek or Ethiopic translator misread the Hebrew conversive perfect as a simple perfect and mistranslated the verbs into the past tense.[211] Yet Charles's emendation is almost universally rejected by

[208] Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 224 argues that the postdiluvian renewal of the cosmos is typological for eschatological renewal, an eschatology fleshed out by reference to new creation imagery of Isa 65–66.

[209] Jub. 5:12.

[210] Segal points out that the renewal of creation would appear to conflict with Gen 8:21 and human experience (*Book of Jubilees*, 133).

[211] R. H. Charles, *The book of Jubilees or the Little Genesis* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1902), 45.

contemporary interpreters.[212] Similar postdiluvian renewals appear in Philo and Josephus.[213] What, then, does the postdiluvian renewed nature mean for evil in Jubilees?

The logic of Jubilees regarding the origin and persistence of evil is remarkably close to the BW. Concerning the origin of evil, the destructive power of the Watchers' transgression was so fundamentally pervasive that God's response required not only the destruction of the old but a renewal of creation. This is not surprising considering that angels are part of the fabric of the cosmos, created on the first day (Jub. 2:2). Jubilees shares the same conviction found in the BW that angelic transgression alters the cosmos, causing profound evil. At the same time, the "new nature" tradition (Jub. 5:12) clarifies that the prediluvian angelic transgression that caused evil does not overwhelm human agency in the postdiluvian world. It has been argued above that the BW does not deny human responsibility, but it is sufficiently ambiguous that in the reception of the Enochic tradition it was necessary to clarify the importance of human agency in causing evil (1 En. 89:32–33; 89:51–52, 54, 73–74; 91:15). Jubilees displays the same concern to assert human responsibility and resolves the ambiguity of the BW by clearly identifying the judgment language against the Watchers in 1 En. 10:16–11:2 with the deluge. The result in both Jubilees and BW is that humans are held accountable for their sin and cannot merely blame angelic transgressions. The key difference between Jubilees and the BW, however, is found in the central role of Mosaic law in Jubilees. The way for humanity

---

[212] Davenport, *Eschatology of Jubilees*, 48; Klaus Berger, *Das Buch der Jubiläen*, JSHRZ 2.3 (Gütersloh: G. Mohn, 1981), 351; VanderKam, "Angel Story," 161–63; van Ruiten, *Primeval History Interpreted*, 197; Segal, *Book of Jubilees*, 132–35; Hanneken, *Subversion of the Apocalypses*, 55, 62, 148 fn. 33, 178 fn. 90; Stuckenbruck, *Myth of Rebellious Angels*, 28–29.

[213] Josephus, *A.J.* 1.75; Philo, *Mos*. 2.60, 65. Segal, *Book of Jubilees*, 134–35 dismisses these parallels because of Hellenistic influence unconnected to Jubilees. In Segal's view the postdiluvian renewal results from the redactional constraints of combining the Shemihazah and Asael traditions.

(limited to Israel) to be protected from the persistence of evil resulting from angelic transgressions is not a general divine "wisdom," as in the case of the BW (1 En. 5:8–9; see also 82:4–8). Rather, in Jubilees, it is the Mosaic law (Jub. 5:13–15; 10:13; 23:26; 45:16) and cult (Jub. 5:17–18; 49:15) that offers protection from superhuman evil. Enoch's revealed wisdom is identified as Moses's law in Jubilees and applied to the problem of evil's origin and persistence.

Despite the renewal of creation in Jubilees, superhuman evil persists in the form of demons.[214] In Noah's testament, he encourages his progeny to avoid the sins introduced by the Watchers: fornication, pollution, and injustice (Jub. 7:20–21). Even though the Watchers and their offspring were obliterated in the flood (Jub. 7:25) and human nature renewed (Jub. 5:12), Noah's children walk in unrighteousness, misled by demons (Jub. 7:26–27). In response Noah exhorts his children to avoid the Watchers' sins, assuming they are entirely capable of doing so (Jub. 7:28–34; see also 9:15). Immediately after Noah finishes the exhortation, one of his progeny, Kainen, sins by following the illicit instruction of the Watchers (Jub. 8:1–4). In the same "Jubilee" as Kainen's sin, the power of demons proliferates to the degree that demons deceive, blind, and kill (Jub. 10:1–2). In response, Noah prays for the protection of his offspring against demons (Jub. 10:1–6). The power of the spirits has increased enough to require the prayers of righteous Noah.

Although Jubilees reworks pre-existing traditions, it is important to not lose sight of the coherence of the narrative. Brand, for example, argues that Jubilees contains conflicting views of human agency and demonic causality of evil due to the combination

---

[214] Unlike the BW (1 En. 15:8–11), the origin of the demon is not explicitly linked to the offspring of the giants, but this can be inferred from Jub. 5:8–9 and 10:1–6.

of incompatible sources.[215] But she does not allow for the possibility of narrative development. Rather than merely combining traditions incoherently, the unfolding narrative of Jubilees can be read as a consistent story. When interpreted as a single narrative, Jubilees portrays a dual agency of human and demonic causality for evil in the postdiluvian cosmos.

As a unified narrative, Jubilees 7–11 describes the proliferation of evil through human agency in concert with demons. The evil caused by the Watchers, their offspring, and prediluvian humanity (Jub. 7:21–24) was destroyed in the deluge (Jub. 7:25) and humanity renewed (Jub. 5:12). Then, in the postdiluvian world, humans cause evil (Jub. 7:26) and demons begin to mislead (Jub. 7:27). Demonic deception only occurs after humans have already chosen evil. In response, Noah commands his sons to abide by the wisdom of Enoch (Jub. 7:34–39), a command he assumes they can follow because they are not controlled by demons. Immediately after this command, however, the narrator portrays Kainen accessing the Watchers' illicit instruction and causing evil (Jub. 8:1–4). In the unfolding narrative, human evil increases through Kainen's progeny (Jub. 8:8–9). The multiplication of evil seems to empower demons because demonic deception is expanded among Noah's grandchildren, who after Kainen's use of illicit instruction, can be blinded and killed by demons (Jub. 10:1–2). The text even specifies that Noah's grandchildren are afflicted by demons since Kainen is a descendant of Shem (Gen 11:10–13; 1 Chron 1:17–27; see also Luke 3:36). It seems that human disobedience and demonic causality are intertwined, working in synchronization.

---

[215] *Evil Within and Without*, 195–97. It is notable that Brand does not address Jub. 8:1–4 in assessing human agency and demonic causality of evil.

A dual agency in which demonic and human evil work in concert also helps explain why God agrees to the requests of Noah and Mastema. Initially, Noah's apotropaic prayer for his descendants is answered and good angels bind the evil spirits (Jub. 10:7), but there is a surprise plot twist. In the most unique change to the narrative of the BW, after angels are commanded to bind evil spirits the text introduces "Mastema, the leader of the spirits" (Jub. 10:8).[216] Mastema requests the assistance of these evil spirits for "destroying and misleading . . . because the evil of mankind is great" (10:9). Acquiescing to both Noah and Mastema, God commands a ninety-percent reduction of demons (Jub. 10:9, 11; cf. 1 En. 15:8–16:1). The reduction and persistence of demons indicates the power of superhuman evil in the postdiluvian age is joined with human sin.

To combat the deceptive demons Noah receives training in angelic pharmacology to protect his children. He is given angelic instruction in "all the medicines for their diseases with their deceptions so that he could cure (them) by means of the earth's plants" (Jub. 10:12; also 10:10). This sacred learning is codified, passed on to Shem (Jub. 10:13–14) and eventually these sacred books are passed to Levi (Jub. 45:15–16). As Todd Hanneken has argued, "The important point is that the study of revealed books

---

[216] Elsewhere in the narrative Mastema is hostile to humanity (Jub. 10:7–8; 11:10–11; 19:28), enticing humans to idolatry (Jub. 11:1–5; 48:9–10), calling for tests and attacks against Abraham (Jub. 17:15–18; 18:9, 12). Mastema is also referred to as a "satan" (Jub. 10:11), most likely a reference to an accusatory function in Jubilees (see Jub. 23:29; 40:9; 46:2; 50:5). Despite the negative role of this figure in the narrative, Mastema also performs activities attributed to God in the biblical narratives of Genesis and Exodus (Jub. 48:1–4, 12; 49:2) and is notably ineffective against Israel (Jub. 19:28–29; 48:15; 49:2–3). Mastema's authority is limited to idolatrous Gentiles (Jub. 11:5; 15:31; 19:28) and he has no bearing on Israel's eschatological fate (Jub. 23; 50). While Many scholars assume that "Mastema" and "Belial" (1:20; 15:33) are the same figure, Devorah Dimant argues that they are two separate beings who act in concert. See Dimant, "Between Qumran Sectarian and Non-Sectarian Texts: The Case of Belial and Mastema," in *Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture: Proceedings of the International Conference Held at the Israel Museum, Jerusalem (July 6-8, 2008)*, eds. Adolfo D. Roitman, Lawrence H. Schiffman, Shani Tzoref, STDJ 93 (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 235–56

grants immunity from demons."[217] The author connects Mosaic law and election to immunity from demonic forces, a theme which frames the entire work (Jub. 1:5–6, 24–25) and is most explicit in the halakic exhortation for all Israelites to be circumcised as the sign of their elect status (Jub. 15:30–33). According to Jubilees, the Mosaic law protected Israel from the deceptions of evil spirits, an answer to Noah's prayer.

What function does Mastema serve in the narrative? Why does God not simply grant Noah's request for protection and bind all demons? Mastema is the manifestation of human evil working in conjunction with angelic rebellion. This interpretation offers a simple explanation for the name "Mastema [משטמה]," as a personification of evil that is both an actual superhuman being with ontology and agency and a consequence emerging from human evil.[218] Demons exercise authority over humanity because of human disobedience (Jub. 10:7–9) that has its origin in illicit angelic instruction. Kainen's descendants proliferate evil with the Tower of Babel (Jub. 10:18–22). This catastrophic event makes the angelic pharmacology taught to Noah inaccessible to his descendants who lack knowledge of Hebrew (Jub. 12:25). Kainen's descendants then found another city, Ur, a cesspool of pollution, violence, and slavery (Jub. 11:1–3). Ur even boasts the

[217] *Subversion of the Apocalypses*, 63. See Jub. 12:25–27; 23:26

[218] Matthew Croasmun uses the philosophical theory of "emergence" to relate how causal explanations can be rendered at different levels of analysis without oversimplified reductionism (*The Emergence of Sin*, 22–56). Croasmun uses this theory to explain Paul's view of sin in Romans (102–39) as both a cumulative result human sins based on a deformed moral psychology (esp. Rom 1:20–23; 3:20) and an ontological cosmic power called "Sin" with its own agency (Rom 5:14, 17, 21; 6:9; 12, 14) and enslaving power (Rom 6:6, 16–20, 22; 7:6, 25; 8:15, 21). In the conclusion of his book, Croasmun gestures to a similarly emergent account of Satan (*Emergence of Sin*, 188–89). The theory of emergence holds promise in explaining causality/agency with multiple sources without assuming conflict. One problematic feature of the theory in application to ancient texts is that emergence theory seems to prioritize a fundamentally materialist conception of the cosmos (see *Emergence of Sin*, 26–29).

invention of idolatry (Jub. 11:4–6). The text of Jubilees is explicit that human sin and demonic power cooperate among the people of Ur:

> They began to make statues, images, and unclean things; the spirits of the savage ones were helping and misleading (them) so that they would commit sins, impurities, and transgression. Prince Mastema was exerting his power in effecting all these actions and, by means of the spirits, he was sending to those who were placed under his control (the ability) to commit every (kind of) error and sin and every (kind of) transgression; to corrupt, to destroy and to shed blood on the earth.[219]

The authority of Mastema and his horde of demons is substantiated by human choice. Demons simultaneously help and mislead. Superhuman evil and human sin cooperate in the narrative of Jubilees.

The only way to counteract the proliferation of evil caused by demons and human sin is the cooperation of human obedience and divine assistance. This cooperation is exemplified in the figure of Abraham. In Ur, the city where demons and disobedience reign, a child is born who can recognize demonic assistance for the deception that it is (Jub. 11:14–16). After praying for divine assistance (Jub. 11:17), the child begins to undo Mastema's work of destroying crops (Jub. 11:11–13, 18–24) and producing idols (Jub. 12:1–15). He even sees through the deceptions of the postdiluvian cosmos (Jub. 12:16–18), which prompts an apotropaic prayer for deliverance from demonic authority (Jub. 12:19–21). The resultant call of Abraham (Jub. 12:22–24) is a fitting culmination to the preceding narrative of dual agency. Abraham requires divine assistance (Jub. 2:20, 26–29) due to proliferation of demonic power that has resulted from gross human disobedience. Ultimately, it is human obedience in concert with divine assistance that defeats the concert of human sin and demonic power led by Mastema (Jub. 18:12; see

---

[219] Jub. 11:4–5.

also 19:21–25, 28–29; 48:1–4, 9–19). The cooperation of human sin and superhuman evil is neutralized by human obedience and divine revelation.

Jubilees alters and expands the narrative of the BW while thoroughly integrating it into the narrative of Genesis. There may have been multiple motives for the integration of the Enochic tradition with Genesis, but the net result has a notable effect on the theology of evil. Like the BW, evil originates with the rebellion of angels and persists in the activity of the Watchers' rebellion. However, Jubilees alters the BW narrative to emphasize the significance of human responsibility in the Watchers' rebellion and the proliferation of evil in the postdiluvian cosmos. The result of the new narrative in Jubilees is a theology of evil that follows the BW but more fully articulates the role of human responsibility. Evil is both superhuman and human, not because of Adam's transgression but because of the cooperation of human sin with angelic rebellion and demonic deception. The only way for humanity to combat evil in the scheme of Jubilees is to follow the Mosaic law, a possibility resulting from divine disclosure mediated by angels and human obedience to this revelation.

James Kugel describes Jubilees as, "Arguably the most important and influential of all the books written by Jews in the Second Temple period."[220] Its popularity and authority at Qumran is demonstrated in the number of manuscript fragments found among the Dead Sea Scrolls and the likely citation of the text in the Damascus Document (CD 16:3–4; see also 4Q228; 4Q225–27).[221] There is no way of knowing if Paul or his

[220] James L. Kugel, *A Walk through Jubilees: Studies in the Book of Jubilees and the World of Its Creation*, JSJSupp 156 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 1. See the brief summary of clear instances of Jubilees' influence in Jewish and Christian literature in VanderKam, *Book of Jubilees*, 143–48.

[221] On the Qumran fragments of Jubilees see James C. VanderKam, "The Manuscript Tradition of Jubilees," in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees*, eds. Gabriele Boccaccini and Giovanni Ibba (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 2009), 3–21 esp. 4–10. VanderKam acknowledges that the

opponents in Galatia had read Jubilees, nor is such a claim made here. Still, Jubilees provides an important witness to a text that utilizes multiple traditions about the origin and persistence of evil which have overlap with the kind of position Paul argues against in Galatians 3:19–4:11.

Conclusion

What's wrong the world? Where does evil originate and why does it persist? In the Book of Watchers, at least in its final form, evil originates with the rebellion of the Watchers and persists in the destructive activity of their angelic/human offspring. At the same time, humans are responsible for their sin. It is not clear exactly how superhuman evil relates to human sin, but responsibility for evil is not limited to superhuman agents. The divine response to the cosmic corruption of angels is the revelation of heavenly wisdom through the "Scribe of Righteousness," Enoch. The evil descent of the Watchers is countered by God sending angels to judge the wickedness of these angels and their offspring in the deluge. This primordial act of judgment functions as a sign of things to come. The past judgment of evil reaffirms God's sovereignty and the certainty of evil's condemnation. After the deluge, hope springs in the righteous plant of Noah. Furthermore, postdiluvian humanity is equipped with the wisdom of Enoch, allowing humans access to heavenly mysteries. Because this heavenly wisdom has been made available to humanity, they can be held accountable for their sin. The ambiguity about how superhuman evil relates to human responsibility could be interpreted to absolve humans of responsibility for their sin. This misreading of the Enochic tradition required clarification in subsequent

---

reference to Jubilees in CD 16:3–4 is disputed, but he still thinks the Damascus Document refers to Jubilees.

interpretation, especially in the Epistle of Enoch (1 En. 98:4–8). This clarification, however, is not contrary to the narrative of the Book of Watchers. Instead, it highlights a feature of human responsibility already present in the narrative of the BW.

In the Book of Jubilees, the narrative is even more complex because of the integration of Enochic traditions with Genesis. Whatever the original motive for this combination, the result is further clarity about the role of superhuman agents in the origin of evil and human responsibility. On the one hand, the author adopts and adapts the narrative from the BW about rebellious angels. The adaptations to the narrative are not insignificant, but they do not radically undermine the Enochic view of evil. Adam is not the origin of evil in the Book of Jubilees, despite the incorporation of Gen 3 into the narrative. Rather, the origin of evil in Jubilees is found in the rebellion of the Watchers and it persists in their illicit offspring. However, at each point of the retelling of the Watchers story, human responsibility is emphasized. The rebellion of the Watchers occurs on earth because women are involved. The judgment of the Watchers and their offspring occurs in the intermural violence prior to the flood. The separation of the deluge from the destruction of the giants is motivated by a concern for chronology and to indicate that the flood addresses human sin and cleanses human nature of the ill effects of cosmic rebellion. Similarly, the persistence of demons in the postdiluvian world is integrated into human sin. Only as humans sin do demons gain power. Eventually, human sin grants sufficient authority to the demonic that they can kill, blind, and attack humans. The response to this demonic-human cooperation is a divine-human cooperation in the person of Abraham and his offspring. Just as disobedience empowers the demonic, obedience is apotropaic.

In the next chapter, it will be argued that the Enochic traditions of the BW and Jubilees fill in the gaps of Paul's logic in Galatians, esp. Gal 3:19–4:11. Paul presumes the corruption of the cosmos due to the transgressions of angels. Additionally, he argues that the divine response to this corruption was to offer protection in the form of Mosaic law. Paul adopts and develops this view of evil and the Mosaic law while rethinking it around Christology. For Paul this Enochic narrative shows that the Mosaic law was always intended to function within a corrupt cosmos and not to entirely renew the cosmos. Paul's argument in Galatians 3:19–4:11 is thoroughly Jewish as it shares features of Enochic tradition about the origin and persistence of evil.

CHAPTER FIVE: AN ENOCHIC NARRATIVE IN GALATIANS

This chapter presents more evidence for an Enochic interpretation of Galatians that clarifies Paul's view of evil in comparison with BW and Jubilees. There are several features of Galatians that assume an Enochic narrative of evil and some of these features are directly tied to Paul's argument against the Galatians following the Mosaic law. Paul's connections between Enochic tradition and Mosaic law also have notable similarity to Jubilees. These Enochic and Jubilean features include:

1. Angelic transgressions as the origin of evil (Gal 3:19) [Enochic and Jubilean]
2. "The elements of the cosmos [τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου]" inhabited by angels (Gal 4:3, 8–9) [Enochic and Jubilean]
3. Cosmic corruption and enslavement (Gal 1:4; 2:16) [Enochic; Jubilean for Gentiles]
4. The Opponents as corrupt (Gal 1:6–8; 3:1; 4:8–9, 16–18; 5:4, 7–12, 19–21; 6:12–13)
5. The "Son(s) of God" (Gal 1:16; 2:20; 3:26; 4:6) [Enochic; Jubilean for Jews]
6. The role of women in cosmic corruption and redemption (Gal 4:4) [Enochic and Jubilean]
7. The role of the Spirit and Human Agency (Gal 4:6–7) [Enochic and Jubilean]
8. The law of Moses as subordinate to a prior and more universal revelation (Gal 3:15–18, 26–29) [Enochic]
9. The law of Moses as Apotropaic (Gal 3:23–25) [Jubilean]
10. The law of Moses mediated by angels at Sinai (Gal 3:19–20) [Jubilean]

Since the connection between angelic transgressions and the elements has already been explored in chapter two, this chapter is devoted to features 3–10. I argue that Enochic tradition about rebellious angels and cosmic redemption shaped Paul's view of evil and his Christological solution. At the same time, Paul's view of the Mosaic law as

problematic for the Galatians corresponds to and develops in a different direction the view of the Mosaic law found in Jubilees.

Paul's view of evil, although influenced by Enochic traditions, is not based on direct citation or allusion to a specific text from the Enochic corpus. Additionally, Paul's view of the law responds to a perspective like Jubilees, not Jubilees itself. There is no indication that Paul is interpreting BW or responding to Jubilees either from memory or with the texts readily available. Rather, the parallels between Galatians, Enochic tradition, and Jubilees are operative at the level of narrative overlap. Paul's story about what is wrong with the world, at least in Galatians, is an Enochic story. The role of the law in this story has both strong similarity to and disagreement with Jubilees. Paul's argument coheres with an Enochic narrative as the implicit logic of his argument about the law and his Christology in Galatians.

This chapter consists of four parts examining Enochic tradition and a Jubilean view of the law in Galatians. The first part expands on chapter two in order to demonstrate how Paul describes evil in the letter and the activity of his opponents based an Enochic narrative. The second part argues that Paul's Christology in Galatians is a solution to an Enochic view of evil. A radical change in the cosmic structure has been wrought by the arrival of Christ as the "Son of God," reversing the effects of the Watchers' transgressions and enabling the angelomorphic transformation of believers. The third part demonstrates that Paul, like many of his Jewish contemporaries, identifies the law's function as offering protection from evil (moral and superhuman). This view of the law is explicitly apotropaic in Jubilees. The fourth part seeks to explain why Paul connects the inadequacy of the law to the structure of the cosmos and the profound

chronological shift that has occurred in the advent of Christ. The result of this chronological shift is that the law's once valid apotropaic function according to the previous cosmic structure has ended. In Galatians Paul's view of the Mosaic law and his Christology have been influenced by Enochic and Jubilean traditions.

5.1 An Enochic Problem and the Opponents in Galatians

There are two problems in Galatians. First, and most obviously, Paul addresses opponents. The contextual problem of the letter concerns opponents who advocate obedience to the Mosaic law for the Galatians.[1] In a sense, the role of the Mosaic law in the Galatian churches is the central issue of the letter.[2] Although information is limited to Paul's rhetoric, it is clear that there was a group urging the Galatian believers to follow the Mosaic law, specifically advocating circumcision (Gal 5:2–4; 6:12–13; see also 2:3; 1 Cor 7:18) and keeping holy days (Gal 4:8–10).[3] Paul interpreted this teaching as a gross

---

[1] See Gal 1:6–9; 3:1; 4:8–11, 16, 17–18, 21, 29–31; 5:1–2, 4, 7–12; 6:12–13; see also Gal 2:4, 11–14

[2] The noun *νόμος* occurs 32 times in Galatians (Gal 2:16 [x3]; 2:19 [x2]; 2:21; 3:2, 5, 10 [x2], 11, 12, 13, 17, 18, 19, 21 [x3], 23, 24; 4:4, 5, 21 [x2]; 5:3, 4, 14, 18, 23; 6:2, 13). It is almost universally recognized in contemporary scholarship that by *νόμος* Paul means Mosaic law. Cf. Lightfoot, *Galatians*, 118.

[3] Paul labels the source of this opposition: "the disturber(s) [*οἱ ταράσσοντες/ὁ ταράσσων*]" (Gal 1:8; 5:10) and "the circumcisers [*οἱ περιτεμνόμενοι*]" (6:13). The actions of the opponents are: "Bewitch [*βασκαίνω*]" (Gal 3:1); "zeal [*ζηλόω*]" (4:17); "wanting to exclude [*ἐκκλεῖσαι θέλουσιν*]" (4:17); wanting the Galatians "under the law" (4:21); "hinder [*ἐγκόπτω*]" (5:7); "they want to make a good show in the flesh [*θέλουσιν εὐπροσωπῆσαι ἐν σαρκί*]" (6:12); "compel [*ἀναγκάζω*]" the Galatians to be circumcised (6:12); want the Galatians circumcised "to boast in your flesh [*ἐν τῇ ὑμετέρᾳ σαρκὶ καυχήσωνται*]" (6:13). On the opponents see esp. John M. G. Barclay, *Obeying the Truth: Paul's Ethics in Galatians*, SNTW (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988), 45–60; B. W. Longenecker, *Triumph of Abraham's God*, 25–34; Sumney, *Servants of Satan*, 156–59. Sumney argues that there is insufficient evidence to determine more about the opponents than that they advocate circumcision (esp. Gal 6:12–13; see also Gal 5:2–6, 11; 6:15) and food laws (Gal 4:8–10). Sumney considers the reference to food laws (Gal 2:11–14) a feature of the Antioch incident that cannot be definitively attributed to the opponents. Furthermore, Sumney argues that Gal 5:2–6 (see also Gal 4:21; 6:13) indicates that the opponents did not advocate obedience to the whole law, but rather that Paul made this argument as a *reductio ad absurdum* (Sumney, *Servants of Satan*, 141–42). It is difficult to imagine how a selective obedience to the Mosaic law could include circumcision and holy days but no other commands when circumcision appears to have been the final act of conversion (Josephus, *A.J.* 20.38–46; Justin, *Dial.* 8:2; Juvenal, *Sat.* 15.96–99; see also Josephus, *A.J.* 11.285; 13.257–258, 318–319; 15.254–

distortion of the divinely revealed gospel and worthy of condemnation (Gal 1:6–9). To persuade the Galatians that obedience to the law would be a grave mistake, Paul claims an irreconcilable contrast between justification according to "works of law" and justification by "faith of Christ" (esp. Gal 2:16). According to the Apostle, "works of the law [ἔργα νόμου]" do not justify (Gal 2:16), are not how the Galatians received the Spirit (Gal 3:2–5), and places those who do (ποιέω) them under a curse (Gal 3:10).[4] Paul even compares the Galatians' submission to the Mosaic law to a slavery akin to paganism,

---

255; 20.139, 145–146). A more likely interpretation of Gal 5:2 is that circumcision would be the culmination of a full commitment to the law (see e.g. Barclay, *Obeying the Truth*, 60–65; B. W. Longenecker, *Triumph of Abraham's God*, 30–33).

[4] The phrase ἔργα νόμου occurs only eight times in the Pauline corpus, always in Galatians and Romans (Gal 2:16 [x3]; 3:2, 5, 10; Rom 3:20, 28; see also τὸ ἔργον τοῦ νόμου in Rom 2:15). Prior to the Sanders revolution, the common understanding of "works of the law" in biblical scholarship since Luther was that it referred to the legalistic attempt to earn God's favor by performing the law (e.g. Bruce, *Galatians*, 137; Thomas R. Schreiner, "'Works of Law' in Paul." *NovT* 33 (1991): 217–44; see also Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 102–5). Famously, James D. G. Dunn has argued that "works of law" refers primarily to the Jewish practices that served as boundary markers (i.e. circumcision, Sabbath, food laws) between Jews and Gentiles (*Jesus, Paul and the Law: Studies in Mark and Galatians* [Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1990], 194–5, 219–25; Dunn, *Theology of Paul*, 354–59). Dunn's work, like E. P. Sanders', has been lauded for dismantling a caricature of Second Temple Judaism as essentially legalistic. However, Dunn has faced criticism for limiting "works" to boundary markers (Watson, *Paul and the Hermenutics of Faith*, 334–35). For his part, Dunn thinks he has been misunderstood and attempts to correct the misreading (*The New Perspective on Paul*, rev. ed. [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008], 23–28). The view that the law only refers to the boundary marking aspects and not the performance of the law is found in the work of Michael Bachmann (*Anti-Judaism in Galatians?: Exegetical studies on a Polemical Letter and on Paul's Theology*, trans. Robert L. Brawley [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008]). See the recent discussions of the phrase and its significance for construing Paul's theology in de Boer, *Galatians*, 145–148; de Boer, "Paul's Use and Interpretation of a Justification Tradition in Galatians 2.15–21," *JSNT* 28 (2005): 189–216; Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 373–75.

The lexical evidence for ἔργα νόμου is scarce. There is similar language in the Dead Sea Scrolls, including the phrase "the doing of the Torah [מעשי התורה]" (4QMMT [4Q398 frag. 14–17, 3; see also 1QS V, 23–24; VI, 18), which refers to halakic obedience (see J. C. R. de Roo, *"Works of the Law" at Qumran and in Paul*, NTM 13 [Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2007]). In LXX Exod 18:20 the Mosaic law reveals "the works, which they [i.e. Israel] will do [τὰ ἔργα, ἃ ποιήσουσιν/המעשה אשר יעשון]." Additionally, Paul uses νόμος and ἔργα νόμου interchangeably (e.g. Gal 2:21; 3:11, 12; 5:4), describes the necessity of doing (ποιέω) the ἔργα νόμου (Gal 3:10–12; see also Rom 4:10–12) and ὅλον τὸν νόμον (Gal 5:3). Paul also refers to circumcision in association with keeping (φυλάσσω) the νόμος (Gal 6:13). de Boer concludes "For Paul [. . .] 'the works of the law' are the actions performed or carried out in obedience to the many commandments of the Mosaic law as preserved in the Pentateuch" (*Galatians*, 146). See also 2 Bar 57:2.

aligning the teaching of his opponents with the στοιχεῖα (Gal 4:8–11). If the Galatians are circumcised, "Christ will be of no benefit [Χριστὸς ὑμᾶς οὐδὲν ὠφελήσει]" (Gal 5:2). Paul warns, "You will be removed from Christ [κατηργήθητε ἀπὸ Χριστοῦ]" (Gal 5:4a). Those who advocate obedience to the law for the Galatians are portrayed as evil opponents of the divinely revealed gospel.

The second problem Paul addresses in the letter is more fundamental, the origin and persistence of evil. The problem encompasses the "present age" (Gal 1:4), the structure of the cosmos (Gal 4:3, 9), and "all flesh" (Gal 2:16). Perhaps unwittingly the opponents in Galatia have misunderstood the nature of the problem and so perpetuate it in their own teaching (esp. 3:1; 4:8–11). The intertwining of these two problems is especially notable at three points in the letter. First, in the letter opening Paul describes the present time as "evil," aligning the Mosaic law with a corrupt age (Gal 1:4). Second, Paul's explanation of justification (Gal 2:16) describes the corruption of "all flesh" based on the flood narrative (Gen 6–9). Third, Paul's descriptions of his opponents scattered throughout the letter align them with superhuman evil forces (esp. Gal 3:1; see also Gal 4:8–11, 16–17; 5:7–12, 19–21; 6:12–13). Analysis of these passages reveals Paul's view of the origin and persistence of evil in Galatians is Enochic.

5.1.1 The Present Evil Age (Gal 1:4)

Although the letter opening is one of the most conventional sections of the Pauline letter form, the beginning of Galatians is both programmatic and extraordinary.[5] In what

[5] On the programmatic nature of Paul's letter opening in Galatians see David Cook, "The Prescript as Programme in Galatians," *JTS* 43 (1992): 511–519; Robert A. Bryant, *The Risen Crucified Christ in Galatians*, SBLDS 185 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001), 111–142; Jeffery A. D. Weima, *Paul*

usually amounts to a standard, almost perfunctory greeting, Paul incorporates a Christological tradition that makes evil an important feature of the letter from the beginning. He describes Jesus as

> τοῦ δόντος ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν, ὅπως ἐξέληται ἡμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος πονηροῦ κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν.
>
> The one having given himself for our sins, in order that he might rescue us from the present evil age according to the will of our God and Father.[6]

Scholars have long suspected that Paul is citing an earlier tradition, perhaps based on Isaiah 53.[7] The uncharacteristic vocabulary throughout Gal 1:4 makes it difficult to determine where the tradition ends and Paul's interpretation begins.[8] The purpose clause

---

the Ancient Letter Writer: An Introduction to Epistolary Analysis (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2016), 11–50, esp. 19–25, 39–40, 44–50.

[6] Gal 1:4

[7] Paul explicitly identifies the tradition as: Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς (1 Cor 15:3; see also Rom 4:25; 8:32; 1 Cor 11:23). Only 1 Cor 15:3 and Gal 1:4 use the identical phrase ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν. See François Bovon, "Une formule prépaulinienne dans l'épître aux Galates (Ga 1:4–5)," in *Paganisme, Judaïsme, Christianisme: influences et affrontements dans le monde antique: mélanges offerts à Marcel Simon* (Paris: de Boccard, 1978), 91–107; Betz, *Galatians*, 41–2; Victor Paul Furnish, "'He Gave Himself [Was Given] Up . . . .': Paul's Use of a Christological Assertion," *The Future of Christology: Essays in Honor of Leander E. Keck*, eds. Abraham J. Malherbe and Wayne A. Meeks (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 109–121, esp. 112–13; Martyn, *Galatians*, 88–91; Luc de Saeger, "'Für unsere Sünden': 1 Kor 15,3b und Gal 1,4a im exegetischen Vergleich," *ETL* 77 (2001): 169–91; de Boer, *Galatians*, 29–31. On the possible influence of Isa 53 (vv. 5–6, 10, 12) see Roy E. Ciampa, *The Presence and Function of Scripture in Galatians 1 and 2*, WUNT 2.102 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 51–60; Matthew S. Harmon, *She Must and Shall Go Free: Paul's Isaianic Gospel in Galatians*, BZNW 168 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010), 56–66.

[8] The verb for Jesus' salvific work in Gal 1:4 (ἐξαιρέω) appears nowhere else in the Pauline corpus (see Acts 7:10, 34; 12:11; 23:27; 26:17). As Bovon points out, a more characteristically Pauline term for Christ's activity would seem more appropriate, e.g. δικαιόω, σώζω, ῥύομαι, καταλλάσσω ("Une formule prépaulinienne," 92). Also, τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος πονηροῦ is uncharacteristic of Paul. Still, some insist that the purpose clause is Paul's interpretation of the tradition (Martyn, *Galatians*, 95–105 and de Boer, *Galatians*, 31–6). Todd A. Wilson argues that Paul intentionally uses the language of the Exodus (ἐξαιρέω, Exod 3:7–8; 18:4, 8, 9, 10) in Gal 1:4 as part of a typological pattern (also in ἐξαγοράζω Gal 3:13; 4:4–5; ἐλευθερόω 5:1) to portray the Galatians as "on the verge of apostatizing in the wilderness" ("Wilderness Apostasy and Paul's Portrayal of the Crisis in Galatians," *NTS* 50 [2004]: 550–71, here 570). On Exodus typology in Gal 1:4 see also Ciampa, *Presence and Function of Scripture*, 60–62.

interprets the meaning of Jesus' death as rescue from "the present evil age."[9] Whether or not the significance of Jesus' death is Paul's own (re)interpretation of the tradition, or from a pre-Pauline source is difficult to tell. What is more important, however, is the recognition that the present age is characterized as "evil" and that this characterization is essential to the argument of the letter.[10] In Gal 1:4 Paul makes the evil condition of the cosmos vital to the logic of his argument throughout the letter.

All of humanity, Jew and Gentile alike, are in a dire situation. There are several verbs describing Jesus' salvific action on behalf of humanity spread throughout Galatians that indicate the law has been aligned with the evil age:

Galatians	Salvific Action	Direct Object	Prepositional Phrase
1:4	ἐξέληται	ἡμᾶς	ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος πονηροῦ
3:13	ἐξηγόρασεν	ἡμᾶς	ἐκ τῆς κατάρας τοῦ νόμου
4:5	ἐξαγοράσῃ	τοὺς ὑπὸ νόμον	
5:1	ἠλευθέρωσεν	ἡμᾶς	(περιτομή [Gal 5:2–6])

Because the law is aligned with the evil age, humans require rescue, redemption, and freedom from it. The alignment clarifies why the law of Moses, although a divine gift, is

[9] ὅπως + subjunctive is a purpose clause (See Smyth § 2196). There is no exact parallel to the phrase τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος πονηροῦ in the undisputed Pauline letters (see Eph 5:15; 6:13), though there is a similar concept in Rom 12:2; see also 1 Cor 1:20; 2:6, 8; 3:18–19; 2 Cor 4:4; Eph 2:1–2, 7; John 12:31; 1 Jn 5:19; Heb 2:14–15.

[10] Vincent M. Smiles, *The Gospel and the Law in Galatia: Paul's Response to Jewish-Christian Separatism and the Threat of Galatian Apostasy* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1998), 68–75.

insufficient to "make alive" (Gal 3:21; see also Rom 7:10). Evil has so pervaded the cosmos that the law is powerless to breathe life back into creation.

While it is widely recognized that Paul's description of the present age as evil is indebted to Jewish apocalypticism, the original cause of this evil is disputed.[11] On the defensive against dualistic movements (e.g. Marcionites, Gnostics, Manichaeans), ancient interpreters were quick to identify human sin as the source of evil in Gal 1:4.[12] An anthropological source of evil connects Jesus' death, "for our sins [ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν]," with rescue from the evil age (Gal 1:4b). In the nineteenth century, comparisons of Paul's writing with Jewish apocalyptic literature prompted interpreters to identify the source of evil in Gal 1:4 as superhuman.[13] As the previous chapters have shown, a superhuman origin combined with the persistence of evil in human sin is compatible with

---

[11] In addition to commentaries see Stuckenbruck, "How Much Evil Does the Christ Event Solve?" 152–67. Stuckenbruck convincingly argues that this dualistic conception of time was characteristic of Second Temple apocalypticism. See also Davies, *Paul Among the Apocalypses?*, 72–112. Typically, the "two age" schema of 4 Ezra 7:45–50 is cited to illustrate a common distinction between two conflicting ages in Jewish apocalypticism.

[12] Martin Meiser, *Galater*, NTP 9 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007), 48–9; John Kenneth Riches, *Galatians through the Centuries*, BBC (Malden: Blackwell, 2008), 77–8. This view is summarized well by Augustine's commentary on Gal 1:4: "The present world is understood to be evil because of the evil people who live in it, just as we also say that a house is evil because of the evil people living in it" (*Exp. Gal*. 3.2). Translation from Eric Plumer, *Augustine's Commentary on Galatians: Introduction, Text, Translation, and Notes*, OECS (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 129.

[13] Riches, *Galatians*, 80–2. See Adolf Hilgenfeld, *Der Galaterbrief, übersetzt, in seinen geschichtlichen Beziehungen untersucht und erklärt* (Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1852), 113–14; Lightfoot, *Galatians*, 74; Sanders, *PPJ*, 465; Martyn, *Galatians*, 95–7; B. W. Longenecker, *Triumph of Abraham's God*, 42–8; de Boer, *Galatians*, 35. Cf. Bultmann, *Theology*, 256 who cautions that what is distinct about Paul's view of the superhuman evil power is that it "does not come over man, either the individual or the race, as a sheer curse of fate, but grows out of himself." Following Bultmann, Heinrich Schlier comments on Gal 1:4: "In „unseren Sünden" bindet uns die böse in unser Dasein hereinstehende Welt an sich. Denn „unsere Sünden" sind nichts anderes als die verschiedenen Formen unserer Hingabe und freiwillig-unfreiwilligen Bindung an die uns übermächtig bedrohende und verlockende Weltgegenwart. Im Beifall unserer Sünden kommt die Welt jeweils zur Aktualisierung ihrer bösen Macht" (*Galater*, 34).

Enochic tradition. Paul signals from the opening greeting that evil is an important component of the letter.

5.1.2 The Corruption of "All Flesh" (Gal 2:16)

In a passage often identified as the central thesis of the letter Paul argues the law was never intended to justify.[14] To support this claim, Paul claims to cite a shared tradition:

> εἰδότες [δὲ] ὅτι οὐ δικαιοῦται ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ἔργων νόμου ἐὰν μὴ διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐπιστεύσαμεν, ἵνα δικαιωθῶμεν ἐκ πίστεως Χριστοῦ καὶ οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων νόμου, ὅτι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου οὐ δικαιωθήσεται πᾶσα σάρξ.
>
> But knowing that a person is not justified from works of law but through faith of Jesus Christ, and we believed in Christ, in order that we might be justified from faith of Christ and not from works of law, because from works of law all flesh will not be justified.[15]

The introductory formula "knowing that [εἰδότες ὅτι]" indicates that Paul is citing something he expects his audience to recognize as familiar.[16] Like Gal 1:4, there is much debate about what consists of pre-Pauline material.[17] Additionally, due to the rhetorical

---

[14] According to rhetorical analysis Gal 2:15–21 is often identified to as the *propositio* (πρόθεσις) see Betz, *Galatians*, 113–14; R. N. Longenecker, *Galatians*, 82–83; Ben Witherington III, *Grace in Galatia: A Commentary on St Paul's Letter to the Galatians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 169–172; see also Richard B. Hays, *The Letter to the Galatians*, NIB 11 (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2000), 236; Peter Oakes, *Galatians*, Paideia (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2015), 80. Cf. Simon Légasse who identifies the thesis of the letter as Gal 1:11–12 (*L'épître de Paul aux Galates*, LD 9 [Paris: Cerf, 2000], 40).

[15] Gal 2:16.

[16] Betz, *Galatians,* 115 fn. 28; R. N. Longenecker, *Galatians*, 83; Martyn, *Galatians*, 264–73; de Boer, *Galatians*, 143–45; Christoph Burchard, "Nicht aus Werken des Gesetzes gerecht, sondern Glauben an Jesus Christus—seit wann?" in *Geschichte-Tradition-Reflexion: Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag*, 3 vols. eds. Hubert Cancik, Hermann Lichtenburger, and Peter Schäfer (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996), 3.405–415; Jerry L. Sumney, *Steward of God's Mysteries: Paul and Early Church Tradition* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2017), 78–81. Paul uses οἶδα later in the same letter to refer to the shared experience of his initial preaching in Galatia (Gal 4:13). He also frequently uses οἶδα to cite common knowledge elsewhere in his letters (Rom 2:2; 3:19; 5:3; 6:9; 7:14; 8:22, 28; 13:11; 1 Cor 8:1, 4; 12:2; 2 Cor 1:7; 4:14; 5:1, 6; Phil 1:16; 4:15; 1 Thess 1:4–5; 2:1, 2, 5, 11; 3:3–4; 4:2; 5:2; see also Eph 6:8–9; Col 3:24; 4:1; 2 Thess 3:7). Paul is fond of a rhetorical litotes construction in 1 Corinthians (1 Cor 3:16; 5:6; 6:2, 3, 9, 15, 16, 19; 9:13, 24).

[17] Martyn, *Galatians*, 263–69 argues that the tradition would have been something like: δικαιοῦται ἄνθρωπος διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ citing Rom 3:25–26; 4:25; 1 Cor 6:11 as parallel traditions (see also 1QS XI,

function of Gal 2:15–21 simultaneously addressing Peter in the Antioch conflict (Gal 2:11–14) and by extension the Galatians, it is unclear who exactly Paul expects to share this tradition.[18] Paul's rhetoric seems to indicate an astonished outrage at the way the Galatians have thoroughly misunderstood the gospel (esp. Gal 1:6–9; 3:1–5; 4:9–11) they once received so readily (Gal 4:15–20; 5:7). Whoever Paul expected to know this justification tradition, Paul combined the tradition with Jewish Scripture.

Paul substantiates his argument with allusion to the Jewish Scriptures, authoritative texts for all relevant parties (Peter, the Galatians, and the opponents).[19] An

---

12, 13–15; 1QH IV, 34–37). Martyn, *Galatians*, 262–3 claims that ἔργα νόμου originated with Paul's opponents as an addition to the cited tradition. de Boer, *Galatians*, 143–145 argues that the tradition includes all of Gal 2:16a: οὐ δικαιοῦται ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ἔργων νόμου ἐὰν μὴ διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. If Paul is citing a pre-Pauline tradition there are two especially compelling arguments for extending the quotation to include ἐὰν μὴ διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. First, Paul's use of the preposition διά in the phrase διὰ πίστεως stands apart from the context of Gal 2:16 because Paul switches to ἐκ πίστεως in the same verse. The switch is likely indicative of Paul's interpretation of the tradition since this is characteristically how Paul articulates his view of justification (Gal 2:16; 3:7, 8; 9, 11, 12, 22, 24; 5:5; Rom 1:17 [x2]; 3:26; 30; 4:16 [x2]; 5:1; 9:30, 32; 10:6; 14:23 [x2]), a view he supports with reference to LXX Hab 2:4 (Gal 3:11; Rom 1:17; see also Heb 10:38). Less frequently, Paul uses διὰ πίστεως elsewhere (Gal 3:14, 26; Rom 3:22, 25, 30, 31; see also Rom 4:13; Phil 3:9; Eph 2:8). The reason for διὰ πίστεως in the first part of Gal 2:16, then, would be that it forms part of the cited tradition. Second, the conjunction ἐὰν μή always begins an exception clause elsewhere in the Paulin corpus (Rom 10:15; 11:23; 1 Cor 8:8; 9:16; 14:6, 9; 15:36; see also 2 Thess 2:3, 5), but most scholars think that in the ensuing argument Paul does not interpret the conjunction as an indication of exception but rather as an adversative. This odd use of ἐὰν μή can be explained if Paul is citing a pre-existing tradition. On ἐὰν μή see Heikki Räisänen, "Galatians 2.16 and Paul's Break with Judaism," *NTS* 31 (1985): 543–53; James D. G. Dunn, *Jesus, Paul, and the Law: Studies in mark and Galatians* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1990), 195–98, 212; William O. Walker, Jr. "Translation and Interpretation of ἐὰν μή in Galatians 2:16," *JBL* 116 (1997): 515–20; A. Andrew Das, "Another Look at ἐὰν μή in Galatians 2:16," *JBL* 119 (2000): 529–39; Debbie Hunn, "Eὰν Μή in Galatians 2:16: A Look at Greek Literature," *NovT* 49 (2007): 281–90.

[18] Jerome Murphy-O'Conner argues that Paul "attributes to Christian Jews a theological position *that they should have defended*, not the one they actually maintained" ("Gal 2:15–16a: Whose Common Ground?" *RB* 108 [2001]: 376–85, here 380). Ian W. Scott argues that the tradition is shared by those involved with the Antioch incident (Gal 2:11–14), especially Peter but not the Galatians (Scott, "Common Ground? The Role of Galatians 2.16 in Paul's Argument," *NTS* 43 [2007]: 425–435). In Scott's view, Gal 2:21 indicates that the Galatians did not share the same tradition about justification.

[19] Ciampa argues that Paul alludes to LXX Ps 142:2, Gen 15:6, and Hab 2:4 in Gal 2:16 (*Presence and Function of Scripture*, 192–201). There can be no doubt that Gen 15:6 and Hab 2:4 are important for Paul's argument in Galatians (explicitly cited in Gal 3:6–9, 11; see also Rom 1:17; 4:1–25).

allusion to LXX Ps 142:2 is widely recognized in Gal 2:16 but rarely is any significance attributed to Paul's replacement of the Psalm's phrase "everyone living [πᾶς ζῶν/כל־חי]" with Paul's phrase "all flesh [πᾶσα σάρξ]."[20] Some doubt that "all flesh" is anything more than a different Vorlage, or simply a stronger expression for human frailty.[21] Martyn suggests that Paul's turn of phrase is motivated by polemic against the opponents' attempt to boast "in flesh" (Gal 6:13).[22] Surely Paul's choice of the word "flesh [σάρξ]" is connected to his argument against circumcision.[23] Is it possible, however, that Paul's textual adjustment to the Psalm is more consequential than an alteration to fit his argument against circumcision?

Although the lexical link is subtle, Paul's choice of the phrase "all flesh [πᾶσα σάρξ]" in Gal 2:16 links his view of the human plight to the flood narrative (Gen 6–9).[24]

---

[20] The allusion to LXX Ps 142:2 is widely recognized in conjunction with Rom 3:20: Lightfoot, *Galatians*, 115; Schlier, *Galater*, 94–5; Betz, *Galatians*, 118; R. N. Longenecker, *Galatians*, 88; Martyn, *Galatians*, 252–53; Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 51–2; Hays, *Conversion of the Imagination*, 50–60; Hays, *Galatians*, 240–41. There is a possible parallel to Ps 143:2 in 1QH[a] XVII, 14–15 "Truly, no one can be justified in your judgment [כי לא יצדק כול במשפטכה]." The same replacement of πᾶς ζῶν with πᾶσα σάρξ occurs in Rom 3:20 (see also 1 Cor 1:29). Some scholars attributed no significance to the shift of words. Ernest DeWitt Burton, for example, argued that πᾶσα σάρξ "is practically equivalent to ἄνθρωπος" (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians*, ICC 35 [Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1921], 124).

[21] Although Schlier cites 1 En. 81:5 as a potential parallel, he interprets the shift in language to indicate "einen starkeren Ausdruck fur die gesamte Menschheit" (*Galater*, 95). Hans-Joachim Eckstein argues that the shift "sollte ebenfalls nicht überbewertet werden" (*Verheißung und Gesetz: Eine exegetische Untersuchung zu Galater 2,15–4,7*, WUNT 86 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998], 28).

[22] *Galatians*, 253. The opponents' encouragement to follow the law of Moses and specifically circumcision is repeatedly connected with "flesh" (Gal 3:3; 4:23, 29; 6:12–13)

[23] After the flood narrative of Gen 6–9, the word σάρξ does not appear again in the LXX text of Genesis until the circumcision of Abraham as a sign of an eternal covenant (Gen 17:11, 13–14, 24). Genesis also specifies that Ishmael's flesh was circumcised (Gen 17:25; see also Gal 4:23, 29).

[24] The allusion to Gen 6:12 is briefly mentioned by Eduard Schweizer ("σάρξ," *TDNT*, 7.129). Also, Gen 6:12 appears in the marginal references of the NA[27] for both Gal 2:16 and Rom 3:20, but curiously disappears in marginal note to Gal 2:16 in the NA[28] while remaining in the margin for Rom 3:20. Hans Hübner interprets πᾶσα σάρξ as an allusion to Gen 6:17 indicating a similar interpretation to my view: "Schon bei der Sintflut war alles Fleisch verderbt, so daß es nur in dieser Konsequenz liegt, wenn hernach

The phrase “all flesh [πᾶσα σὰρξ]” in the nominative case is rare in the NT and not especially common in the LXX.[25] After retelling the disastrous descent of the “Sons of God” (Gen 6:1–4), the flood narrative describes the corruption of all creation with painstaking repetition.[26] To mention a few specific examples, God looks upon the earth and sees that “all flesh corrupted its way on the earth [κατέφθειρεν πᾶσα σὰρξ τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς]” (Gen 6:12).[27] The creator then tells Noah that the time for judgment “of every human [παντὸς ἀνθρώπου]” has arrived (Gen 6:13).[28] When Noah and his family emerge from the Ark and offer sacrifices, God promises:

'kein Fleisch' aufgrund seiner Gesetzeswerke gerechtgesprochen werden kann” (*Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments*: *Bd. 2 Die Theologie des Paulus und ihre neutestamentliche Wirkungsgeschichte* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993], 65). Although ultimately deciding that πᾶσα σάρξ is too common an expression in the LXX to be recognizable as from a specific source, Ciampa cites Bruno Corsani (*Lettera Ai Galati*, CSEANT 9 [Genoa: Marietti, 1990], 170) in support of a connection to Gen 6–9 (*Presence and Function of Scripture*, 183–84).

[25] The exact phrase in the nominative πᾶσα σάρξ occurs eight times in the NT (Matt 24:22 || Mark 13:20; Luke 3:6; Rom 3:20; 1 Cor 1:29; 15:39; Gal 2:16; 1 Pet 1:24) and twenty-one times in the LXX (Gen 6:12; 7:21; 8:17; 9:11; Ps 64:3; 144:21; Prov 26:10; Job 34:15; Sir 13:16; 14:17; 44:18; Zech 2:17; Isa 40:5, 6; 49:26; 66:16, 23; Ezek 21:4, 10, 12; Dan 4:12). The phrase appears in different cases including the genitive (πάσης σαρκός) twenty-three times (Gen 6:19; 7:15, 16; 9:17; Lev 17:11, 14[x3]; Num 16:22; 18:15; 27:16; Sir 1:10; 17:4; 39:19; 40:8; 45:1, 4; 46:19; Jer 39:27; Dan 2:11[x2]; Bel 5; see also John 17:2), dative (πάσῃ σαρκί) nine times (Gen 9:15, 16; Ps 135:25; Prov 4:22; Sir 33:21, 30; 41:4; Isa 66:24; Jer 12:12), and accusative (πᾶσαν σάρκα) nine times (Gen 6:17; 8:21; 9:15; Jdt 2:3; Sir 18:13; Joel 3:1; Jer 32:31; 51:35; Ezek 21:9; see also Acts 2:17).

[26] Gen 6:5, 11–13, 17; 9:11, 15, 17; see also Sir 44:18. The flood narrative repeats the theme of judgement (Gen 6:7; 7:21–24; 8:21) and divine mercy through the covenant with Noah (Gen 6:8, 18–21; 9:1–17). Philo describes a similarly negative view of “flesh” when interpreting the flood narrative (esp. Gen 6:3, 12). On Philo’s view of flesh see Egon Brandenburger, *Fleisch und Geist; Paulus und die dualistische Weisheit*, WMANT 29 (Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1968), 114–118, 140–54, 177–188. Philo is particularly negative about “flesh” precisely when interpreting Genesis 6:3, 12: see *Gig*. 29–57; *Deus* 140–144; *QG* 2.92, 99.

[27] See also Gen 6:11 “The earth was corrupt before God and the earth was full of injustice [ἐφθάρη δὲ ἡ γῆ ἐναντίον τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ ἐπλήσθη ἡ γῆ ἀδικίας].” Note the lexical link to LXX Ps 142:2 and Gal 2:16 with the phrase “before God [ἐναντίον τοῦ θεοῦ]”.

[28] The same Hebrew phrase is used for πᾶσα σάρξ (Gen 6:12) and παντὸς ἀνθρώπου (Gen 6:13) in the MT: “all flesh [כל־בשר].”

> Οὐ προσθήσω ἔτι τοῦ καταράσασθαι τὴν γῆν διὰ τὰ ἔργα τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὅτι ἔγκειται ἡ διάνοια τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπιμελῶς ἐπὶ τὰ πονηρὰ ἐκ νεότητος, οὐ προσθήσω οὖν ἔτι πατάξαι πᾶσαν σάρκα ζῶσαν, καθὼς ἐποίησα.
>
> I will not proceed hereafter to curse the earth because of the works of humans, for the mind of humankind applies itself attentively to evil things from youth; so I will not proceed hereafter to smite all living flesh, as I have done.[29]

Despite the evil that characterizes "the works of humans [τὰ ἔργα τῶν ἀνθρώπων]," God promises mercy on "all living flesh [πᾶσαν σάρκα ζῶσαν]." Paul's repeated phrase "works of the law" has some resonance with the flood tradition. The pessimistic view of the "flesh" and "works" in the flood narrative stands in close parallel to "flesh" and "works" in Galatians (especially Gal 2:16).[30] Additionally, in Galatians "all flesh [πᾶσα σάρξ]" (Gal 2:16b) is used in synonymous parallel with the singular noun "human [ἄνθρωπος]" (Gal 2:16a). Likewise, in the LXX text of Gen 6:12–13 and 8:21 "all flesh [πᾶσα σάρξ]" (Gen 6:12) is synonymous with "every person [παντὸς ἀνθρώπου]" (Gen 6:13; 8:21). By using the phrase "all flesh" in Gal 2:16 Paul alludes to the flood tradition in which "all flesh" is dependent on the mercy of God. Jewish Scripture tells the story of "all flesh" thoroughly corrupted and "works" incapable of redemption apart from God's mercy, a story of corruption that begins with transgressing angels.

---

[29] Gen 8:21 substituting "works" for "deeds" in the translation from Robert J. V. Hiebert, "Genesis," *NETS*, 11.

[30] A full investigation of Paul's use of "flesh" language in the context of Second Temple Judaism and Galatians is not possible here. See Eduard Schweizer, "σάρξ," TDNT 7.97–150, esp. 125–135; Brandenburger, *Fleisch und Geist*, 114–221; Robert Jewett, *Paul's Anthropological Terms: A Study of Their Use in Conflict Settings*, AGJU 10 (Leiden: Brill, 1971), 49–165; Barclay, *Obeying the Truth*, 178–215; Benjamin G. Wold, "'Flesh' and 'Spirit' in Qumran Sapiential Literature as the Background to the Use in Pauline Epistles," *ZNW* 106 (2015): 262–79.

The allusion to the flood narrative in Gal 2:16 connects the apocalyptic skepticism of Gal 1:4 to the inadequacy of the Mosaic law. In the context of the flood narrative, the earth's total corruption occurs in the aftermath of the descent of the "Sons of God" (Gen 6:1–4; see also 1 En. 6–9). In the Enochic tradition "all flesh" was defiled by the Watchers' transgressions, requiring divine judgment (Gen 6:1–5, 11–13, 17; 1 En. 6–19; Jub. 5:1–11; see also 1 En. 81:5). As Robert Jewett has noted, there is similarity between Gal 2:16 and Enochic tradition.[31] The opening theophany of BW describes a similarly pessimistic view of "all flesh" and "human works":

> Look, he comes with the myriads of his holy ones, to execute judgment on all, and to destroy all the wicked, and to convict *all flesh for all their wicked works* [πᾶσαν σάρκα περὶ πάντων ἔργων τῆς ἀσεβείας αὐτῶν] which they have done and the proud and hard words that wicked sinners spoke against them.[32]

Paul and BW, both alluding to the flood tradition, describe a pessimistic judgment of "all flesh" based on "works [ἔργα]."[33] When Enoch receives the message of divine judgment upon the Watchers for their rebellion, the transgressing angels are condemned for mixing spirit and flesh (1 En. 15:8). Enoch is also informed that the demonic offspring produced from this hybrid spirit/flesh will continue to corrupt the earth until final judgment (1 En. 16:1). According to BW, the Watchers' transgressions were not fully and finally

---

[31] Jewett, *Paul's Anthropological Terms*, 97 citing 1 En. 81:5. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 341 observes the connection between Psalm 143:2; 1 En. 81:5 and Rom 3:30 and tantalizingly suggests that connections between Romans (3:25–26; 4:7–8) and 1 Enoch (81:4) "should be noted and studied more carefully." Nickelsburg does not mention Gal 2:16.

[32] 1 En. 1:9 translation from Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 142, substituting "works" for "deeds." On 1 En. 1:9 see chapter four above. Another lexical link between Galatians and BW is the "curse [κατάρα]" (Gal 3:10, 13[x2] || 1 En. 5:5–7; see also 2 Pet 2:14). Paul's curse language is certainly based on Deut 27–28, but it resonates with the fate of those falling under divine judgment in 1 En. 5.

[33] Nickelsburg points out that 1 En. 1:9 is "noteworthy for its use in early Christianity" (*1 Enoch 1*, 149). In addition to the explicit citation in Jude 14–15, 1 En. 1:9 appears to influence 1 Thess 3:13; Mark 8:38.

remedied in the flood, superhuman evil persists in the demonic offspring of the Watchers.[34] According to Jubilees, immediately after the flood, God makes "a new and righteous nature for all his creatures so that they would not sin with their whole nature" (Jub. 5:12).[35] The angelic transgressions that originally caused the deluge corrupted "all flesh" so pervasively that a new nature was required to empower humanity to overcome evil. Paul, like BW, does not share the same sentiment as Jubilees that a renewed post-diluvian cosmos has arrived, allowing for obedience to the law. Paul does not think the law is able to "make alive" (Gal 3:21). The cosmic corruption caused by angelic rebellion aligns the law with the evil age (Gal 1:4), not because the law itself is evil. Rather, as will be elaborated below, the law was given by angels to protect "flesh" from evil originally caused by angels who corrupted "flesh." The law was an angelic/flesh solution to an angelic/flesh problem. In the advent of Christ as the true "son of God," Paul argues that the apotropaic function of the law has ended. Paul's view of cosmic corruption in Galatians is influenced by Enochic tradition.

5.1.3 Evil and the Opponents (Gal 3:1)

After the epistolary introduction (Gal 1:1–5) and an initial rebuke (Gal 1:6–9), Paul retells his personal history as it relates to the revelation of Jesus and the law of Moses (Gal 1:13–2:14/21).[36] When Paul finally returns to directly addressing the Galatians, he

---

[34] Stuckenbruck points out that the "already/not yet" view of evil's defeat is characteristic of the Enochic corpus ("How much does the Christ Event Solve?" 163–67 citing 1 En. 10; 15–16; 91:5–10; 106:13–107:1).

[35] See also Josephus, *A.J.* 1.75; Philo, *Mos*. 2.60, 65.

[36] Paul's story is retold in three phases: 1) Paul's calling and his relationship with ancestral traditions transformed by Christ (Gal 1:11–24); 2) the Jerusalem Council (Gal 2:1–10); 3) the incident at Antioch (Gal 2:11–14/21). It is not entirely clear if Gal 2:15–21 is addressed to Peter, the Galatians, or both.

indicts the opponents' attempts to persuade the Galatians to follow the Mosaic law as evil:[37]

> Ὦ ἀνόητοι Γαλάται, τίς ὑμᾶς ἐβάσκανεν, οἷς κατ' ὀφθαλμοὺς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς προεγράφη ἐσταυρωμένος;
>
> O foolish Galatians, who has bewitched you, before whose eyes Jesus Christ was publicly portrayed as crucified?[38]

Paul's use of the New Testament *hapax legomenon* "bewitch [βασκαίνω]" represents the opponents engaged in witchcraft.[39] The verb βασκαίνω is a technical term for the ancient spell cast with the eyes, the dreaded "Evil Eye."[40] Several scholars interpret Paul using

---

[37] Direct address appears throughout the letter (Gal 1:1–5, 6–10; 3:1–5; 4:8–11, 12, 13–20; 5:2–12; 6:11–16, 17, 18). Nils A. Dahl uses these direct addresses to reconstruct the epistolary structure of the letter ("Paul's Letter to the Galatians: Epistolary Genre, Content, and Structure," in *The Galatians Debate: Contemporary Issues in Rhetorical and Historical Interpretation*, ed. Mark D. Nanos [Black and Peabody: Hendrickson, 2002], 117–142).

[38] There is debate about what exactly Paul means by προεγράφη, whether the meaning is "previously written" or "publicly portrayed." Most interpreters opt for the public proclamation of the cross or perhaps Paul's embodiment of the cross (see Basil S. Davis, "The Meaning of ΠΡΟΕΓΡΑΦΗ in the Context of Galatians 3.1," *NTS* 45 [1999]: 194–212). Recently, Heidi Wendt has argued, to the contrary, that προεγράφη refers to predictive prophetic texts (Wendt, "Galatians 3:1 as an Allusion to Textual Prophecy," *JBL* 135 [2016]: 369–389). My translation makes no attempt to weigh in here but follows the majority of interpreters.

[39] Bruce W. Longenecker, "'Until Christ Is Formed in You': Suprahuman Forces and Moral Character in Galatians" *CBQ* 61 (1999): 92–108; B.W. Longenecker, *Triumph of Abraham's God*, 157; see also Jerome H. Neyrey, "Bewitched in Galatia: Paul and Cultural Anthropology," *CBQ* 50 (1988): 72–100.

[40] John H. Elliott, *Beware the Evil Eye: The Evil Eye in the Bible and the Ancient World*, 3 Vols. (Eugene: Cascade, 2016), 3.117–36. The likelihood of a technical meaning for βασκαίνω is increased by Paul's mention of the "eyes" in Gal 3:1; 15. Paul marvels that during his initial proclamation when the Galatians were confronted with Paul's "weakness of flesh [ἀσθένειαν τῆς σαρκός]" (4:13) the Galatians did not "despise [ἐξουθενέω]" nor "spit [ἐκπτύω]" at his weakness. Instead, Paul says they were willing to pluck out their own eyes to give to him (Gal 4:15). Pliny indicates that spitting was a common method of protection against the evil eye (*Nat*. 28.36, 39). Plutarch provides a lengthy discussion of the evil eye among the educated who recognize the power of the evil eye despite the superstitious associations of such a concept (*Quaest. conv*. 7 [*Mor*. 680b–683a]; see also *Dion* 2.5–6). Philostratus describes Apollonius of Tyana killing things with a mere look (*Vit. Apoll*. 6.12; see also Pliny, *Hist*. 5.2.16–18). In later Jewish Christian literature one of the στοιχεῖα ruling the present evil age is the evil eye (T. Sol. 18:39; see also m. Abot 5.19). The verb βασκαίνω is rare in the LXX (Deut 28:54, 56; Sir 14:6, 8). So too is the noun βάσκανος (Sir 18:18; 14:3; Prov 23:6; 35:22; 4 Macc 1:26; 2:15), which does not appear in the NT. Lacking the technical terms, the concept of the evil eye also appears the Gospels (Luke 11:34 || Matt 6:22–23; see also Matt 20:15).

this language metaphorically, or rhetorically.[41] In contrast, Heinrich Schlier, along with early interpreters (e.g. Chrysostom and Jerome), thinks Paul is describing the Galatians as having fallen under a spell of the demonic.[42] Hans-Joachim Eckstein argues that the language is not merely ironic or sarcastic because Paul thinks acceptance or rejection of the gospel is beyond human persuasion (Gal 1:6–7; 5:10; see also 2 Cor 4:3–4).[43] Even if Paul does not think the Galatians have fallen under a spell and only uses the language metaphorically, he describes the Galatians in danger of superhuman evil due to the opponents' teaching.

As Bruce Longenecker argues, Paul portrays the opponents as morally corrupt and aligned with superhuman evil.[44] Throughout the letter Paul makes disparaging remarks about the character and activity of the opponents (Gal 3:1; 4:8–11, 17, 21, 29–31; 5:1–2, 4, 7–12; 6:12–13). They are consumed with corrupt "flesh" (4:21, 29–31; 6:12–13), placing them in conflict with the Spirit (Gal 3:3; 4:21–31; 5:16–18; 6:8) and the cross (Gal 3:1; 5:24; 6:12–13). The opponents operate according to a cosmic structure that has passed away, that of the flesh.

---

[41] Betz, *Galatians*, 131; Witherington, *Grace in Galatia*, 201–4; de Boer, *Galatians*, 170.

[42] *Galater*, 119: "Die Galater sind in die Hände eines fremden Zauberers gefallen. Hinter der Predigt des Gesetzes durch jene Zerstörer des Evangeliums und der Gemeinden steht ein dämonischer Zwang. Die Galater sind nicht menschlich überredet worden, sondern sie sind in einen Bann geschlagen." See a helpful history of interpretation in Elliot, *Beware the Evil Eye*, 3.120–26. Susan Eastman makes a compelling case for interpreting *βασκαίνω* as an allusion to the curse of cannibalism in Deut 28:53–57 (see also Jer 19:9; Lam 4:10; Bar 2:3; Josephus, *B.J.* 6.201–219), which Paul has applied to the opponents who perpetuate the curse ("The Evil Eye and the Curse of the Law: Galatians 3.1 Revisited," *JSNT* 83 [2001]: 69–87).

[43] *Verheißung und Gesetz*, 83.

[44] B. W. Longenecker, "Suprahuman Forces and Moral Character," 100–5. Longenecker insightful observes, "Much of Paul's case in Galatians depends upon the connection that he establishes between (1) one's pattern of life and (2) the superhuman powers with which one is inevitably aligned and the respective 'worlds' in which those powers operate" ("Suprahuman Forces and Moral Character," 100).

By the time the reader arrives at "the works of the flesh [τὰ ἔργα τῆς σαρκός]" vice list (Gal 5:19–21), there is little surprise to find overlap with the opponents. This is not to suggest that the opponents are guilty of the entire list but that several features of the list are precisely aimed at the opponents.[45] The return to slavery under the στοιχεῖα which are "not gods" (Gal 4:8–11) is a form of "idolatry [εἰδωλολατρία]" (Gal 5:20).[46] The opponents are making Paul an "enemy [ἐχθρός]" of the Galatians (Gal 4:16), causing "enmity [ἔχθρα]" (Gal 5:19).[47] They "pay zealous court [ζηλόω]" to the Galatians for their own advantage (Gal 4:17), embodying fleshy "jealousy [ζῆλος]" (Gal 5:20). The "envy [φθόνος]" of the opponents is displayed in their use of the evil eye (Gal 3:1).[48] Paul even includes "magic [φαρμακεία]" among the "works of the flesh" (Gal 5:20).[49] The etiology for magical arts, and specifically φαρμακεία, is the rebellious descent of the Watchers found in BW (1 En. 7:1; 8:3).[50] Although the Evil Eye (Gal 3:1) is typically associated with "envy," Paul may have also considered it a form of φαρμακεία.[51] While some of the

---

[45] Paul's "works of the flesh [τὰ ἔργα τῆς σαρκός]" vice list (Gal 5:19–21) is most like "the works of darkness [τὰ ἔργα τοῦ σκότους]" vice list (Rom 13:12–13). See also Rom 1:29–31; 13:12–13; 1 Cor 5:10–11; 6:9–10; 2 Cor 12:20–21; Eph 4:31; 5:3–5; Col 3:5, 8; 1 Tim 1:9–10; 2 Tim 3:2–5; Titus 3:3.

[46] Although Paul does not use εἰδωλολατρία in a vice list elsewhere in the undisputed letters, εἰδωλολατρία occurs in Col 3:5; 1 Pet 4:3 and the cognate εἰδωλολάτρης is found in 1 Cor 5:10; 6:9.

[47] Nowhere else in the undisputed Pauline letters does Paul use ἔχθρα in a vice list.

[48] "Envy [φθόνος]" was the vice most closely associated with the evil eye (Philo, *Agr.* 112; Plutarch, *Dion* 2.5–6; Josephus, *A.J.* 10.250, 257). Envy occurs in the vice list of Rom 1:29–31.

[49] B. W. Longenecker argues that φαρμακεία is "suggestive of the way that Paul envisages the Galatian situation to involve spiritual realities that run contrary to the ways of God" (*Triumph of Abraham's God*, 155). Yet Longenecker does not explore the Enochic etiology of φαρμακεία.

[50] The Aramaic text is fragmentary but is often reconstructed as חרשה. The root חרש occurs in Hebrew (Isa 3:3), Syriac, and Ethiopic for "magic" (HALOT, 358). See also כשף (Exod 7:11; 22:18; Deut 18:10; 2 Kgs 9:22; 2 Chron 33:6; Isa 47:9, 12; Dan 2:2; Mic 5:11; Nah 3:4; Mal 3:5).

[51] The noun φαρμακεία is rare in Second Temple literature, only twice in the NT (Gal 5:20; Rev 18:23), eight times in the LXX (Exod 7:11, 22; 8:3, 14; Wis 12:4; 18:13; Isa 47:9, 12) where it refers to

vices in Paul's list are repeated elsewhere, Paul specifically tailors several features of the list to fit his opponents. This vice (φαρμακεία) is explained by Enochic literature and is found only in Galatians. The "works of the flesh" characterize the opponents as morally corrupt perpetrators of evil in league with superhuman evil.

The two problems of Galatians are not separate. The argument of Galatians assumes that evil has a superhuman origin and persistence. The origin of evil is the corruption of the flesh that occurred in the transgression of the Watchers (Gal 2:16) and persists in their illicit teaching (Gal 3:1; 5:20). While there is no explicit mention of the demonic offspring in Galatians, the influence of the angelic transgressors is notably applied to Paul's opponents. In a reversal of the claims of Jubilees, Paul does not think that the law of Moses provides apotropaic protection. On the contrary, he sees the law as aligned with the present evil age, the sphere of fleshy corruption and the teaching of the opponents. For Paul, apotropaic power is found in the cross (Gal 3:1; see also Gal 2:19; 5:25; 6:14). Paul's view of the origin of evil in Galatians is Enochic and this explains why he finds the teaching of the opponents as a misguided perpetuation of evil.

5.2 A Christological Solution to an Enochic Problem

The solution-to-plight paradigm articulated so forcefully by E. P. Sanders and adopted so rigorously by the apocalyptic school has trained Pauline scholars to think of Paul's Christological solution apart from the problem(s) it redresses. Increasingly, however, Paul's high Christology is interpreted as adopting and developing existing Jewish

---

sorcery somewhat broadly. In Philo (*Spec*. 3.94, 98) and Josephus (*A.J.* 15.47; *B.J.* 1.227, 452, 638) φαρμακεία is specifically associated with "poison." See also φάρμακον (Rev 9:1) and φάρμακος (Rev 21:8; 22:15)

categories about mediatorial figures.[52] The first part of this chapter explores how Paul's Christology redresses problems articulated by the Enochic tradition. Paul's Christology, like his view of evil and the law, shows the influence of Enochic tradition.

The Enochic narrative has influenced Paul's Christology in Galatians in at least three specific ways. First, and most significantly, Paul's description of Jesus as the "Son of God" and believers as "Sons of God" reflects Enochic traditions about the ascent/descent of angels and humans and the subsequent transformations that result. Second, Paul's reference to Jesus' birth "from a woman" functions as a narrative reversal of the evil caused by the Watchers' transgressions with women. Third, Paul's Christological pneumatology remedies the consequences of the Watchers' transgressions by providing believers with the Spirit of God's true son. According to Paul's argument, the spirit does not merely offer protection in a flesh-corrupted cosmos, like the Mosaic law, but inaugurates a "new creation" in which the Spirit of God dwells in believers. The descent of God's true son reverses the effects of the descent of the "sons of God" that prompted the flood and the corruption of all flesh.

5.2.1 Angelomorphic Adoption

Paul uses extraordinary language to describe the Galatian believers. He explains that all believers are "sons of God through faith in Christ Jesus [υἱοὶ θεοῦ διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ]" (Gal 3:26), and as believers baptized into Christ, they are also "the seed of Abraham [τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ σπέρμα]" (Gal 3:29). At the beginning of his commentary on the Abraham narrative (Gal 3:6–18), Paul has linked faith and sonship to Abraham (Gal

[52] Consider, for example, James A. Waddell, *The Messiah: A Comparative Study of the Enochic Son of Man and the Pauline Kyrios*, JCTCRS 10 (New York: Bloomsbury, 2011).

3:7).[53] When describing the transition that has occurred in baptism believers are "sons of God." Paul utilizes divine sonship language again in a passage often thought to contain pre-Pauline confessional material:

> ὅτε δὲ ἦλθεν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου, ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ, γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικός, γενόμενον ὑπὸ νόμον, ἵνα τοὺς ὑπὸ νόμον ἐξαγοράσῃ, ἵνα τὴν υἱοθεσίαν ἀπολάβωμεν.
>
> When the fullness of time came, God sent his son, born from a woman, born under law, in order to redeem those under law, in order that we receive adoption.[54]

We will return to Gal 4:4–5 below (5.1.3) to argue that the Christology here reverses the effects of the Watchers' transgressions, but for the moment attention is focused on the language of divine sonship as an allusion to the Enochic tradition. Paul goes on to elaborate on the adopted status of believers as "sons [υἱοί]" and "heirs [κληρονόμοι]" (Gal 4:6–7).[55] The divine sonship of Christ has enabled the adoption of believers, who are also

[53] In his examination of Rom 4:3–25 as an example of sustained exegesis conforming to a pattern of ancient commentary, Michael B. Cover notes that the Abraham narrative, with Gen 15:6 as the primary biblical lemma, structures Paul's argument in Gal 3:6–14[18] (*Lifting the Veil*, 48 fn. 53). The pattern of Paul's exegesis in Gal 3:6–18 is as follows: 1) Citation of Primary Lemma connecting πίστις/πιστεύω with εὐλογέω/εὐλογία and δικαιοσύνη/δικαιόω/δίκαιος (Gal 3:6 [Gen 15:6]); 2) Contextualizing Lemma connecting πιστεύω/πίστις with εὐλογέω/εὐλογία (Gal 3:8 [Gen 12:3; 18:18]); 3) Secondary Lemma connecting ἐπικατάρτος/κατάραν with ἔργα νόμου/ποιέω (Gal 3:10 [Deut 27:26]); 4) Secondary Lemma connecting δίκαιος with πίστις and ζάω (Gal 3:11 [Hab 2:4]); 5) Secondary Lemma connecting νόμος and ζάω with ποιέω (Gal 3:12 [Lev 18:5]); 6) return to the Secondary Lemma connecting ἐπικατάρτος/κατάραν with ἔργα νόμου/ποιέω (Gal 3:13 [Deut 27:26]); if extending the commentary to Gal 3:18 there is 7) a final Contextualizing lemma connecting ἐπαγγελία with σπέρμα (Gal 3:16 [Gen 13:15; 17:8; 24:7]).

[54] Gal 4:4–5.

[55] Paul also describes believers as "children of God [τέκνα θεοῦ]" in Romans (Rom 8:16–17, 21; 9:7–8) and Philippians (Phil 2:15; see also Eph 5:1). The language of "child [τέκνον]" is used more broadly in the Pauline corpus to describe parent-child relationships (1 Cor 7:14; 2 Cor 6:13; Eph 6:1, 4; Col 3:20–21; 1 Tim 3:4, 12; 5:4). Metaphorically, Paul identifies the believers in the churches he established as his "children," and he as their father (1 Cor 4:14; 2 Cor 12:14; 1 Thess 2:11), their mother in labor (Gal 4:19), or their wet-nurse (1 Thess 2:7). Similarly, Onesimus (Phlm 10) and Timothy are each referred to as a "child" to Paul (1 Cor 4:17; Phil 2:22; see also 1 Tim 1:2, 18; 2 Tim 1:2; 2:1). In Galatians, Paul uses τέκνον to develop the contrast between the parentage of slavery (Hagar/Sinai/Jerusalem/according to flesh) and the parentage of freedom (Sarah/Promise/according to Spirit) (Gal 4:21–31; τέκνον in 4:25, 27, 28, 31).

"sons of God."[56] This is remarkable as the only instance of a Christological title (e.g. Χριστός, Κυρίος, υἱος τοῦ θεοῦ) applied to believers and it occurs only in Galatians and Romans.[57] This Christological title and its application to believers is best explained by reference to the angelomorphic meaning of divine sonship language found in, among other places, Enochic tradition. The divine sonship of Christ and those adopted by faith in him describes how the disastrous effects of the Watchers' transgressions are overcome.

The origin and meaning of the phrase "Son of God" in Paul's letters has been much debated.[58] Since Jesus is described as God's son with relative infrequency in the Pauline corpus and presumably in pre-Pauline material (esp. Rom 1:3–4), Werner Kramer identified the title as merely a pre-Pauline tradition, largely unimportant to the Apostle.[59]

---

[56] Scott exhaustively surveys the term υἱοθεσία and concludes that it means "adoption" (*Adoption as Sons of God*, 13–57). The language of "adoption [υἱοθεσία]" is limited to Romans (8:15, 23; 9:4), Galatians (Gal 4:5), and Ephesians (Eph 1:5).

[57] Jesus is described as the "Son of God" with relative infrequency in the Pauline corpus (Rom 1:3, 4, 9; 5:10; 8:3, 29, 32; 1 Cor 1:9; 15:28; 2 Cor 1:19; Gal 1:16; 2:20; 4:4, 6; Col 1:13; 1 Thess 1:10). Only in Galatians and Romans is divine sonship extended to believers (Gal 3:26; 4:6–7; Rom 8:14, 19, 29). The full phrase "sons of God [υἱοὶ θεοῦ]" is especially rare for believers (Gal 3:26; Rom 8:14, 19). The Christological title "Son of God" was likely part of early Christian confessions (Matt 16:16; Mark 3:11; Luke 4:41; John 1:34; 11:27; 20:31; Acts 9:20; Heb 4:14; 1 John 4:15; 5:5, 10). The titular use of the term elsewhere in the NT makes the declaration of divine sonship for believers even more profound. Other passages imply sonship where Paul speaks of the fatherhood of God in relation to Christ (Rom 15:6; 2 Cor 1:3; 11:31; see also Rom 6:4; 1 Cor 8:6; 15:24; Gal 1:1; Phil 2:11; Col 1:3)

[58] Karl-Josef Kuschel, *Born Before All Time? The Dispute Over Christ's Origin*, trans John Bowden (New York: Crossroad, 1992) examines the conclusions of biblical critics in conversation with systematic theologians. On the christological title see: Werner R. Kramer, *Christ, Lord, Son of God*, trans. Brian Hardy, SBT 50 (London: S. C. M. Press, 1966), 108–128, 183–194; Ferdinand Hahn, *Titles of Jesus in Christology: Their History in Early Christianity* (London: Lutterworth, 1969), 279–317; Martin Karrer, *Jesus Christus im Neuen Testament*, GNT 11 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998), 184–212. See the recent history of interpretation in Michael Peppard, *The Son of God in the Roman World: Divine Sonship in Its Social and Political Context* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 9–30.

[59] Kramer, *Christ, Lord, Son of God*, 113, 183–85. Kramer identified two types of formulae: "adoption" (Rom 1:3–4) and "sending" (Gal 4:4–5; Rom 8:3). Crucial to the debate about "Son of God" and pre-Pauline tradition is the appearance of the phrase in the pre-Pauline tradition of Rom 1:3–4. See the summary of scholarship on this text in Joshua W. Jipp, "Ancient, Modern, and Future Interpretations of Romans 1:3–4: Reception History and Biblical Interpretation," *JTI* 3 (2009): 241–59; cf. Christopher G. Whitsett, "Son of God, Seed of David: Paul's Messianic Exegesis in Romans 1:3–4," *JBL* 119 (2000): 661–

In contrast, Wilhelm Bousset argued that the phrase was a Pauline invention, intentionally drawing on pagan notions of divine sonship to describe Jesus as "a supraterrestrial being who stands in the closest metaphysical connection with God."[60] Larry Hurtado follows Bousset's argument that the phrase was "central to Paul's beliefs," but denies a pagan conceptual background, opting instead for "the biblical and Jewish tradition."[61] Furthermore, based on references to the divine sonship of the King in the HB (esp. 2 Sam 7:14; Ps 2:7; 89:26–27) and the Dead Sea Scrolls, Hurtado thinks the Pauline concept was "part of the royal-messianic rhetoric of pre-Christian Judaism."[62] Andrew Chester and William Horbury agree with Hurtado that Paul's Christology is rooted in Second Temple Judaism.[63] In contrast to Hurtado, however, they find more continuity in

---

81; Matthew W. Bates, "A Christology of Incarnation and Enthronement: Romans 1:3–4 as Unified, Nonadoptionist, and Nonconciliatory," *CBQ* 77 (2015): 107–27.

[60] Wilhelm Bousset, *Kyrios Christos: A History of the Belief in Christ from the Beginnings of Christianity to Irenaeus*, trans. John E. Steely (Nashville: Abingdon, 1970), 206–10, here 207. He cites Rom 1:4 and 8:11 to substantiate this claim. A similar perspective is found in Bultmann, *Theology*, 1.128–29; also Schoeps, *Paul*, 149–59.

[61] Larry W. Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013), 101–8, here 102 and 103.

[62] Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ*, 103. Hurtado's focus on the Jewish background of the phrase "son of God" is indebted to Martin Hengel, *The Son of God: The Origin of Christology and the History of Jewish-Hellenistic Religion*, trans. John Bowden (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976), esp. 21–41 and John J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature* (New York: Doubleday, 1995), 154–72. Hurtado cites both the commentary on 2 Sam 7:14 in 4Q174 and the so called "Son of God" text (4Q246) in support of this claim. Although not focused on the specific phrase "Son of God," scholars have protested Hurtado's rejection of a Greco-Roman conceptual background in favor of a Jewish background for explaining early Christian conceptions of Jesus' divine sonship. See, for example, Peppard, *Son of God in the Roman World*, 9–30; M. David Litwa, *Iesus Deus: The Early Christian Depiction of Jesus as a Mediterranean God* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2014), 6–27, esp. 8–16. Peppard identifies the conceptual background of Augustan deification as relevant to Mark's portrait of Jesus as the "Son of God." Litwa's project seeks to examine the discursive practice of deifying Jesus in early Christianity in the context of ancient Mediterranean world. To this end, he analyzes several texts arguing that early Christian authors intentionally utilized common cultural conceptions of divinity and deification in the Greco-Roman world to portray Jesus as divine.

[63] William Horbury, *Jewish Messianism and the Cult of Christ* (London: SCM, 1998), 112–19; Andrew Chester, *Messiah and Exaltation: Jewish Messianic and Visionary Traditions and New Testament Christology* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 377–96. See Chester's appreciative critiques of Hurtado (Messiah and Exaltation, 107–118, 380–82).

Paul's Christology to angel veneration than merely royal messianism.[64] Since Wilhelm Michaelis attacked the idea of angel-Christology in the New Testament, it has only rarely been considered relevant to New Testament authors and deemed a late development.[65] Jean Daniélou coined the phrase "angelomorphic Christology" to describe the flexible application of typically angelic characteristics, status, or imagery to Jesus in early Christianity.[66] As such, "angelomorphic" describes similarity with angels, not isomorphic identification.[67] In light of these debates, the background and significance of the Christological title "Son of God" is still somewhat of an open question but one rarely addressed in studies focused on Galatians. As a result, the meaning of divine sonship in Galatians merits further consideration. I argue that Paul's "son of God" language in Galatians describes the reversal of the Watchers' transgressions.

---

[64] Horbury identifies the "Son of God" title as reminiscent of Israel's kings (citing Pss. 2, 45, 89, 110), but maintains the title is more than a royal human (*Jewish Messianism*, 145). Chester analyzes the "son of God" language in Rom 8:3–4 and Gal 4:4 and concludes that it is "reasonable to set these passages in Paul in relation to angelological traditions as well" (390). On angelomorphic Christology more generally see the history of research in Crispin H. T. Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology*, WUNT 2.94 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 1–10; Charles A. Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology: Antecedents and Early Evidence*, AGAJU 42 (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 7–25.

[65] Wilhelm Michaelis, *Zur Engelchristolog im Urchristentum: Abbau der Konstruktion Martin Werners* (Basel: Henrich Majer, 1942) written against Martin Werner, *Die Enstehung des christlichen Dogma* (Tübingen: Katzmann, 1941). This is reflected in, for example, the influential work of Dunn, *Christology in the Making*, 161–62.

[66] Jean Daniélou, *The Theology of Jewish Christianity: The Development of Christian Doctrine before the Council of Nicaea Volume 1*, trans. John A. Baker, (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1964), 146. On the significance of the terminology see Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts*, 13–17; Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology*, 27–29.

[67] While "angel christology" is "the explicit identification of Jesus as an angel," angelomorphic Christology refers to "the identification of Christ with angelic forms and functions, either before or after the incarnation, whether or not he is specifically identified as an angel" (Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology*, 28). A distinction between angelic identity and function as applied to Christ is already present in Tertullian, *Carn. Chr.* 14. In Tertullian's argument the title "Son of God" refers to a category of being that is ontologically superior to an angel.

There are two major problems with the way divine sonship language has been examined in Galatians. First, while scholars have extensively explored the possible backgrounds to the phrase "Son of God" as a Christological title and the meaning of Paul's adoption metaphor, rarely have they attempted to explain why the exalted Christological title is applied to believers and what this application means for the Christological title.[68] Second, the focus on the conceptual background or the pre-Pauline origins of the "Son of God" language too often pre-determines the meaning of the phrase apart from the content of Paul's arguments. Once a determination is made about the conceptual background of "son of God" language, that background governs the meaning of the phrase for Paul entirely. These methodological problems have inhibited understanding divine sonship language in Galatians.

One particularly influential example of the background superseding exegesis is found in Larry Hurtado's massive exploration of early Christology. Hurtado identifies the conceptual background of divine sonship as royal messianism, a common view. Yet while he recognizes that divine sonship frequently refers to angels, he claims:

> The more influential uses of the language . . . are in references to the Davidic king, and still more frequently to righteous individuals . . . and Israel collectively . . . as son(s) and the 'firstborn' of God.[69]

---

[68] This important point was made quite clearly in an unpublished dissertation: Charles A. Wanamaker, "The Son and the Sons of God: A Study in Elements of Paul's Christological and Soteriology Thought" (PhD diss., University of Durham, 1980). Wanamaker explains in the preface: "The divine sonship of believers in Paul could not be understood apart from the divine Sonship of Christ" ("Son and Sons of God," x). Yet the significance of the Christological title in Gal 1:16 and 2:20 is simply not addressed in the two most recent monographs on believers as "Sons of God": Brendan Byrne, *'Sons of God' – 'Seed of Abraham': A Study of the Idea of Sonship of God of all Christians in Paul against the Jewish Background*, AnBib 83 (Rome: Pontifical Institute, 1979) and Scott, *Adoption as Sons of God*. When Gal 1:16 is cited by Byrne it is included as a reference to "exaltation" along with Rom 1:4 (*Sons of God*, 207, 208, 213). Similarly, Gal 1:16 is overshadowed by the tradition of Rom 1:3–4 in Scott, *Adoption as Sons of God*, 225, 227, 236, 243. Neither scholar addresses Gal 2:20 in any detail.

[69] *Lord Jesus Christ*, 103 citing Davidic king texts (2 Sam 7:14; Ps 2:7; 89:26–27), righteous individuals (Wis 2:18; 5:5; Sir 4:10; Pss. Sol. 13:9; 18:4), and collective Israel (Exod 4:22; Deut 14:1; Isa

Aside from the fact that Hurtado's assertion is not supported by an argument, this conclusion forces Paul's language into a conceptual category apart from the contexts in which it appears. In effect, Hurtado dismisses the possibility of an angelomorphic meaning for the phrase in all Pauline contexts based on his assertion about the "influential" background of the language.

The royal messianic interpretation of "Son of God" language is certainly important and not to be ignored.[70] Yet an angelomorphic meaning of divine sonship language is also found in the Hebrew Bible, Second Temple Judaism, and early Christianity.[71] In fact, the phrase "sons of God" most commonly refers to angels in the HB and LXX.[72] Specifically, in Gen 6:2 the "Sons of God" are identified as angels who

---

1:2; Jer 3:22; Hos 1:10; 11:1; Wis 12:21; 16:10, 26; 18:4, 13). Also focusing on a Royal Messianic background are: Wright, C*limax of the Covenant*, 43–44; Dunn, *Christology in the Making*, 33–46, esp. 38–44; Peppard, *Son of God in the Roman World*, 137–38. Scott, *Adoption as Sons of God*, 186 concludes that a "traditional messianic" framework for divine adoption based on 2 Sam 7:14 is found in Gal 3–4. The key text for de Boer's view of the Christological title is also 2 Sam 7:14 (*Galatians*, 94)

[70] Adela Yarbro Collins and John J. Collins, *King and Messiah as Son of God: Divine, Human, and Angelic Messianic Figures in Biblical and Related Literature* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 48–74 explores "son of God" language in the Hellenistic period emphasizing royal messianism, but they also show that this messiah occasionally has "angelic status" (*King and Messiah*, 74). Although, they also argue that the angelic status is more commonly associated with "man" or "son of man" language.

[71] For Second Temple texts see Byrne, *Sons of God*, 10–13, 19–23, 38–48, 57–59; Horbury, *Jewish Messianism*, 119–22. For angelomorphic interpretations of "son of God" language in early Christianity see Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology*, 187–200 citing Justin, *Dial*. 125.3; Origen, *Princ*. 1.3.4. Also on angelomorphic christology see: Joseph Barbel, *Christos Angelos, die Anschauung von Christus als Bote und Engel in der gelehrten und volkstümlichen Literatur des christichen Altertums. Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Ursprungs und der Fortdauer des Arianismus*, Theophaneia 3 (Bonn: Hanstein, 1941); R. N. Longenecker, *Christology of Early Jewish Christianity*, SBT 17 (Naperville: Allenson, 1970), 26–32; Loren T. Stuckenbruck, *Angel Veneration and Christology: A Study in Early Judaism and in the Christology of the Apocalypse of John*, WUNT 2.70 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1995); Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts*; Darrell D. Hannah, *Michael and Christ: Michael Traditions and Angel Christology in Early Christianity*, WUNT 109 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), Jonathan Knight, "The Origin and Significance of the Angelomorphic Christology in the Ascension of Isaiah," *JTS* 63 (2012): 66–105.

[72] The LXX variously translates the Hebrew בני האלהים (Gen 6:2; Job 1:6; 2:1; 38:7; Ps 29:1; 4QDeut 32:8) and Aramaic בר־אלהין (Dan 3:25) with either ἄγγελος (Job 1:6; 2:1; 38:7; Dan 3:92 OG; LXX Deut 32:8), υἱοὶ [τοῦ] θεοῦ (Gen 6:2; Dan 3:92 Θ; LXX Pss. 28:1; 88:7). See also Ps 82:6/LXX Ps 81:6. These texts refer to angels or the so-called "divine council." Other relevant HB texts include Deut 4:19; 1 Kgs 22:19–22; Ps 82:1; 86:8; 89:6–7; 103:20–21; 148:2. See Michael S. Heiser, "Co-regency in Ancient

corrupt "all flesh."[73] Furthermore, divine sonship language often conflates the categories that Hurtado isolates.[74] It is worth taking a closer look at some of these conflations. First, Wisdom of Solomon describes the "righteous individual" as numbered among the "sons of God and the holy ones [ἐν υἱοῖς θεοῦ καὶ ἐν ἁγίοις]" (Wis 5:5; see also 3:7–8).[75] Although Hurtado cites this text as a description of the "righteous individual," this individual also participates in the heavenly host. Another example of conflation occurs in Philo's allegorical exegesis. Philo contrasts the "sons of men" who build the tower of Babel (Gen 11:5) with "sons of God" (*Conf*. 142–149).[76] Unlike the tower-building "sons of men" who worship many gods and identify "pleasure" as the telos of the soul (*Conf*. 144; see also 42–43; 108–110, 133), sons of God are "those having enjoyed the knowledge of the One [οἱ δὲ ἐπιστήμῃ κεχρημένοι τοῦ ἑνος]" (*Conf*. 145).[77] Like the

---

Israel's Divine Council as the Conceptual Backdrop to Ancient Jewish Binitarian Monotheism," *BBR* 26 (2015): 195–225.

[73] Enochic tradition is especially relevant to "son of God" language referencing angels, although the language of "Son of God" shifts to a specific title for the angels as "Watchers" or "children of heaven": LXX Gen 6:1–4; 1 En. 6:2; 13:8; 14:3; 39:1; 69:4–5; 106:5–6; Josephus, *A.J.* 1.73; Philo, *Gig*. 6; *Conf*. 145–146; LAB 3:1.

[74] David is explicitly compared to an "angel" already in 2 Samuel (14:20; 19:27). See Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology*, 175–76; Kevin P. Sullivan, *Wrestling with Angels: A Study of the Relationship between Angels and Humans in Ancient Jewish Literature and the New Testament*, AGAJU 55 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 107–9; M. David Litwa, *We are Being Transformed: Deification in Paul's Soteriology*, BZNW 187 (Göttingen: de Gruyter, 2012), 109–15. Other relevant texts for an angelomorphic view of the king are relevant to David (1 Sam 29:9; LAB 61:8–9), the Davidic throne (Zech 12:7–9; LXX Isa 9:5; Justin, Dial. 126.1) and Melchizedek (Ps 110:4; 11QMelch 2.7–14, 24–25).

[75] On the possible overlap between angelomorphic and Israelite categories of divine sonship see Byrne, *Sons of God*, 64–67; Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, 1–32. On the possibly blurry distinction between angel and elect in Second Temple Judaism see 1 En. 39.5; 69:11; 104:2, 6; 106:1–12; Jub. 1:23–25; 2:21, 28; Dan 12:2–3; 1QH III, 19–23; 2 Bar. 51:5–13; T. Dan 5:13; T. Job 33:2–9; 40:3. See also Litwa, *We are Being Transformed*, 179–82.

[76] Philo's exegesis of Gen 11:5 extends from *Conf*. 134–151.

[77] In support of his claim in *Conf*. 145 Philo cites Deuteronomy (14:1; 32:18; 32:6) and a description of Stoic opposition to Epicurean philosophy: "they [i.e. Sons of God] hold moral beauty to be the only good, and this serves as a counterwork engineered by veteran warriors to fight the cause which makes pleasure the end and to subvert and overthrow it." Philo only uses πολύθεος fifteen times in his

illusive Sage of Stoicism, it would be exceedingly rare to enjoy such knowledge so the Alexandrian encourages:

> But if there be any as yet unfit to be called a Son of God, let him hasten *to be ordered under* [κοσμεῖσθαι κατὰ] God's First-born, the Word, who holds the *eldership among the angels* [τὸν ἀγγέλων πρεσβύτατον], their ruler as it were. [. . .] For if we have not yet become fit to be thought sons of God yet we may be sons of His incorporeal image, the most holy Word. For the Word is the eldest born image of God.[78]

Philo's view of angels and the Logos is complex, to say the least.[79] In this instance the Logos is identified as the firstborn "son of God" and an angel (*Cher* 35; *Conf*. 28; *Somn*. 1.142), who mediates the otherwise intractable distance between humanity and God through hierarchical participation (*Her*. 205; *Fug*. 100–105; *Deus* 182).[80] In this instance, then, divine sonship involves participation in the angelic hierarchy (see also *Spec.*

---

extant corpus (*Opif*. 171; *Ebr*. 110; *Conf*. 42, 144, *Migr*. 69[x3], *Her*. 169; *Fug*. 114; *Mut*. 205; *Decal*. 65; *Virt*. 214, 221; *Praem*. 162; *QE* 2.2).

[78] Philo, *Conf*. 146–147. If Philo is drawing on the image of the Stoic Sage, then nearly everyone is excluded from being called a "son of God" apart from the mediation of the Logos (see also *Conf*. 95–97). It seems likely that Philo is drawing on the Stoic Sage tradition due to the shared definition of "wisdom" that Philo offers earlier in the same commentary: "the *knowledge* [ἐπιστήμη] of things divine and human and their causes" (*Congr*. 79; see also Cicero, *Off*. 2.5; Seneca, *Ep*. 89.5; Sextus Empiricus, *Math*. 9.13). The Stoics did not consider themselves to be sages according to René Brouwer, *The Stoic Sage: The Early Stoics on Wisdom, Sagehood, and Socrates* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 92–135.

[79] See Roberto Radice, "Philo's Theology and Theory of Creation" in *The Cambridge Companion to Philo*, ed. Adam Kamesar (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2009), 124-45, esp. 135–44; John Dillon, "Philo's Doctrine of Angels," in *Two Treatises of Philo of Alexandria: A commentary on De gigantibus and Quod Deus sit immutabilis*, BJS 25 (Chico: Scholars Press, 1983), 197–205; V. Nikiprowetzky, "Note sur l'interprétation littérale de la loi et sur l'angélologie chez Philon d'Alexandrie," in *Études Philoniennes* (Paris: Cerf, 1996), 133–143; David Winston, *Logos and Mystical Theology in Philo of Alexandria* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1985), 9–25, esp. 15–25; Cox, *By the Same Word*, 87–139. Dillon argues that Philo's angelology is dependent on Middle Platonic demonology ("Philo's Doctrine of Angels," 197–200). See chapter six on demons in Middle Platonism (6.2.3).

[80] Ronald Cox compares the mediating role of Philo's Logos in *Conf*. 146–47 to the mediating role of Christ in Col 1:15 and the Johannine prologue (*By the Same Word*, 174–75, 265–266). Justin Martyr conflates the Logos with God's son and an angel in *1 Apol*. 63.5. It is instructive to consider how Philo portrays the deification of Moses as "participation" (M. David Litwa, "The Deification of Moses in Philo of Alexandria," *SPhiloA* 26 [2014]: 1–27) or "assimilation" (Wendy E. Helleman, "Philo of Alexandria on Deification and Assimilation to God," *SPhiloA* 2 [1990]: 51–71).

1.318).[81] There are several passages in early Christianity that identify divine sonship with an angelomorphic Christ.[82] Additionally, there are humans in Second Temple Judaism who are either compared to angels, or even described in angelomorphic language.[83] As David Litwa has shown, there is plenty of material in Second Temple Judaism depicting humans taking on angelomorphic characteristics.[84] In light of this evidence, an angelomorphic interpretation of divine sonship language is potentially relevant for Paul. Additionally, it should be expected that an angelomorphic meaning is conflated with other interpretive categories for "Son(s) of God." This is not to suggest, however, that the phrase is necessarily angelomorphic, but that this is very much a "live option" and cannot be dismissed when reading Paul. What, then, does Paul mean by divine sonship and adoption in Galatians? I argue that in Galatians these concepts are angelomorphic.

---

[81] Even angels are merely unembodied souls (*Gig*. 12–16), problematizing a hierarchy, the Logos still serves a leadership role and provides a means of ascent for embodied souls.

[82] Esp. Justin, *Dial*. 56.4, 10; 56.14, 15; 116.2; 126.1–2; Shepherd of Hermas, 89.1–2, 6–8 (*Sim*. 9.12.1–2, 6–8). It is notable that Shepherd draws most consistently on the Pauline corpus in articulating an angelomorphic Christology: 1 Cor 10:4; Col:15; 2 Cor 3:17; Gal 4:6. See Bogdan G. Bucur, "The Son of God and the Angelomorphic Holy Spirit: A Rereading of the Shepherd's Christology," *ZNW* 98 (2007): 121–42, esp. 127–29.

[83] Arguing for widespread angelomorphic traditions in Second Temple Judaism see Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts*, 109–215; Gieschen, *Angelomorphic Christology*, 70–123, 152–183. For a critical analysis of angelomorphic traditions about humans in Second Temple Judaism see Sullivan, *Wrestling with Angels*, 85–141. Among the humans who are compared to or portrayed in angelic language are: Adam (Gen 1:26–27; 5:3; CD III,18–20; 4Q504; 1 En. 69:11; 2 En. 30.11 [J]; T. Abr. 11:4, 9; GLAE 20:2; 21:2; 21:6; LAE 13.1–3; Gen. Rabb. 8:10; cf. disputed texts: Sir 49:16; Wis 10:1; Philo, *QG* 2.56), Enoch (Gen 4:21; 1 En. 12.1–3; 22:6–10; 71:11, 14–17; Jub. 4.21–23; Sir 49:14–15; 2 En 22:1–10; 3 En 15:1); Noah (1 En. 106:1–6; 89:1; 1Q20); Joseph (Pr. Jos. Frag. A; Jos. Asen. 22:7–8); and Moses (Exod 7:1; Ezek. Trag. 68–89, esp. 86–88; Philo, *Mos*. 1.155–158; 4Q377 2 II).

[84] Litwa, *We are Being Transformed*, 86–116. He describes this as "deification," by which he means "sharing in those distinctive qualities which make (a) God (a) God" (*We are Being Transformed*, 32).

5.2.1.1 Galatians 1:16

Paul's own story of transformation is marked by the revelation of God's son. The first appearance of "Son of God" language in Galatians occurs in Paul's argument that the source of his gospel is divine and not human (Gal 1:11–24). Paul recounts receiving the "revelation of Jesus" (Gal 1:12; see also 1 Cor 9:1; 15:8; 2 Cor 12:1, 7), being called through grace (Gal 1:15) for God's purpose "to reveal his son in me [ἀποκαλυψαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐμοί]" (Gal 1:16).[85] Carey Newman argues that Paul is alluding to Isa 49:3, describing a heavenly ascent "in which the special agent of God was equated with the Glory of God."[86] Interpreted in this sense, Paul becomes the vehicle through whom the Son of God is revealed (2 Cor 4:1–6).[87] This accords well with the stated purpose of the revelation, "to proclaim [the Son] among the nations" (Gal 1:16).[88] Whether or not Paul intends to evoke Isa 49:3 and portray himself as the "servant" to make God's glory visible to the nations (Gal 2:7; see also Gal 1:24), it is clear that the revelation of God's Son radically changes Paul's life.[89] The transformation wrought by the revelation of the

---

[85] The dative phrase ἐν ἐμοί could be translated as "in me" or "to me." See Betz, *Galatians*, 70–1; de Boer, *Galatians*, 92–93. The same phrase occurs in Gal 2:20, making "in me" the more plausible translation in my view.

[86] Cary C. Newman, *Paul's Glory Christology: Tradition and Rhetoric*, NovTSupp 69 (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 205–207, here 207. The relationship between Gal 1:11–17 and 2 Cor 12:1–5 is contested by William Baird, "Visions, Revelations, and Ministry: Reflections on 2 Cor 12:1–5 and Gal 1:11–17," *JBL* 104 (1985): 651–662. Baird is certainly correct that Gal 1:11–17 is formally a call narrative (Jer 1:4–10). However, Paul's language of "revelation" (Gal 1:12, 16) connects the call form to a vision (2 Cor 12:1, 7). As Newman points out, this has already occurred in Ezekiel 1 (*Paul's Glory Christology*, 205).

[87] On the relevance of 2 Cor 4:1–6 see: Burton, *Galatians*, 408; Wanamaker, "The Son of God and Sons of God," 79–88.

[88] The subject of proclamation is somewhat ambiguous with the pronoun αὐτός, but like 2 Cor 1:19 and Rom 1:9, it makes sense to read the pronoun as a reference to Christ.

[89] The problem with Paul becoming the vehicle of revelation is that according to the syntax of Gal 1:16 the revelation was a past event whereas the preaching is a present activity. Grammatically, then, the preaching is a consequence of the revelation not the revelation itself. See de Boer, *Galatians*, 92; Oakes, *Galatians*, 58.

Son is both moral and cognitive. Morally, Paul no longer pursues his former behavior (Gal 1:13–14, 22–23). Cognitively, Paul's self-understanding and worldview has been re-shaped by divine revelation (Gal 1:1; 1:15–17). For Paul, the revelation of the God's son prompts transformation.

The radical change in Paul is from a superhuman source. Paul declares that his gospel is neither "according to a human [κατὰ ἄνθρωπον]" (Gal 1:11), nor "from a human [παρὰ ἀνθρώπου] but through a revelation of Jesus Christ [ἀλλὰ δι' ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ]" (Gal 1:12).[90] This juxtaposition indicates that the source and content of the revelation is a superhuman figure. The same juxtaposition of human vs. superhuman messenger is found in the opening line of the epistle in which Paul identifies the source of apostleship: "not from humans nor through a human [οὐκ ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων οὐδὲ δι' ἀνθρώπου] but through Jesus Christ [ἀλλὰ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ] and God the Father" (Gal 1:1). In both Gal 1:1 and 1:11–12, Jesus is identified as a superhuman messenger. In this context Paul has also sternly warned, "even if we or an angel from heaven" were to proclaim another gospel it would be anathema (Gal 1:8). Paul thinks of Jesus, the "Son of God," in superhuman, angelomorphic terms. In Gal 4:14 Paul rebukes the Galatians for turning from the gospel they once readily accepted and describes the way they warmly received him: "You welcomed me as an angel of God as Christ Jesus [ὡς ἄγγελον θεοῦ ἐδέξασθέ με, ὡς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν]" (Gal 4:14). Jesus has already been identified as a superhuman messenger (Gal 1:1; 1:11–12) in parallel contrast to an angel from heaven

---

[90] Paul even specifies that the means of receiving the gospel was neither tradition (παρέλαβον) nor teaching (ἐδιδάχθην) in Gal 1:12.

delivering another gospel (Gal 1:8). In Gal 4:14, Jesus is placed in a similarly exalted status as "an angel of God," indicating that Paul can think of angels and Jesus in similar terms.[91] What is often missed, however, is the significance of Jesus' divine sonship as a superhuman designation.

There is a notable parallel to Paul's argument about the non-human source of his apostleship (Gal 1:1) and gospel (Gal 1:11–12) in Philo of Alexandria. In the first half of Philo's ethical treatise concluding the Exposition (*Praem.* 7–78), the exegete-philosopher recounts the rewards and punishments of God's people in the past. In his description of Jacob's rewards (*Praem.* 36–48) Philo elaborates on the significance of Jacob's name change to "Israel." He interprets "Israel" to mean "God-seer [ὁρῶν θέον]" indicating that Jacob recognizes that God is (*Praem.* 44). Philo goes further to identify the source of this knowledge/name-change:

> *Learned not from any other source* [οὐ παρ' ἑτέρου τινὸς μαθών], *not from things on earth* [οὐχὶ τῶν κατὰ γῆν], *not from things in heaven* [οὐχὶ τῶν κατ' οὐρανόν], *not from the elements* [οὐχὶ τῶν ὅσα στοιχεῖα], whether mortal or immortal compounds, but after having been called *from him alone* [παρ' αὐτοῦ μόνου] who wanted to *show forth* [ἀναφῆναι] his own existence to the suppliant.[92]

Philo is emphatic that the source of Jacob's name-change and vision was not a subordinate creature from heaven or earth. Rather God made himself known "God

[91] There may be an implied progression from "angel of God" to "Christ Jesus" as argued by Fee, *Pauline Christology*, 231. What is notable for our interests, however, is that angel and Christ are placed in similar categories. Gieschen interprets Gal 4:14 to place Jesus and Paul in angelomorphic categories (*Angelomorphic Christology*, 315–25). Dunn argues that Gal 4:14 is not comparing Christ to an angel based on Gal 3:19 (*Christology in the Making*, 155–56). What Dunn misses, however, is that even if Christ is superior to angels (Gal 3:19), Paul still places Christ in the category of a superhuman being (see also the contrast in Gal 1:8).

[92] Philo, *Praem* 44. LCL translation of Colson and Whittaker altered. See also Matt 16:17; 1 Thess 2:13.

through God, light through light" (*Praem*. 46). Exactly how such revelation occurs is not entirely clear when Philo's many descriptions of the "vision of God" are compared.[93] What is clear in this instance, however, is Philo's emphatic denial that the source of Jacob's vision/name-change as any other than God. The idea parallels Paul's claim that the source of his apostleship (Gal 1:1) and gospel (1:11–12, 16) is superhuman revelation.

The revelation of the Son of God culminates Paul's argument for the divine source of his gospel (Gal 1:16) indicates that the Christological title "Son of God" describes a superhuman being.[94] The revelation that Paul receives is of a categorically different kind than a human teacher or tradition. The gospel Paul proclaimed is from a divine source and the subject too is divine, the Son of God. In the context of Paul's argument in Gal 1:11–17, divine sonship language reflects an angelomorphic background more than strictly royal messianism.[95]

---

[93] The object of the vision is varied: τὸ ὄν (*Ebr*. 152[?]; *Mut*. 81–82; *Mos*. 1.158; *Opif.* 69–71; *Abr*. 79–80, 107, 119–132; *Spec*. 1.41–50 [?]), the Logos (*Conf*. 95–97; *Somn*. 1.64–67), the powers (*Mut*. 15–24; *QG* 4.2, 4–5, 8; *Spec*. 1.41–50 [?]; *Abr*. 107, 119–132). See Ellen Birnbaum, "What does Philo mean by 'Seeing God'? Some Methodological Considerations," in *SBL Seminar Papers* 34 (1995): 535–52; Scott D. Mackie, "Seeing God in Philo of Alexandria: The Logos, the Powers, or the Existent One?" *SPhiloA* 21 (2009): 25–47; Mackie, "Seeing God in Philo of Alexandria: Means, Methods, and Mysticism," *JSJ* 43 (2012): 147–179; Michael Cover, "The Sun and the Chariot: The *Republic* and the *Phaedrus* as Sources for Rival Platonic Paradigms of the Psychic Vision in Philo's Biblical Commentaries," *SPhiloA* 26 (2014): 151–167.

[94] Christopher Rowland, *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity* (London: SPCK, 1982), 375–78, esp. 378.

[95] Again, royal messianism need not excluded an angelomorphic meaning. Royal messianism may well be part of the background of Paul's divine sonship language in Gal 1:16 but the context the argument highlights Jesus' status as a superhuman being more than a royal messiah.

5.2.1.2 Galatians 2:20

The next occurrence of divine sonship language is severely complicated. First, appearing at a crucial point in the letter, Gal 2:20 is often overlooked by other exegetical issues in the context of Gal 2:15–21.[96] Second, Paul's argument is terse and has proven difficult for contemporary scholars to interpret. These complications make it challenging to determine the meaning of divine sonship in Gal 2:20 and its larger significance for the letter.[97]

Galatians 2:20 has been neglected due to the weighty issues in the context of Gal 2:15–21. Paul uses his dispute with Peter at Antioch over table fellowship (Gal 2:11–14) as the setting for his argument that justification is not "from works of law" but rather "through faith of Christ Jesus" (Gal 2:16). Unfortunately, Gal 2:20 is often overshadowed by debates about the meaning of justification, works of law, and the genitive phrase "faith of Jesus."[98] Yet as Scott Shauf has compellingly argued, Gal 2:20 is the "capstone of the argument," responding to the objection of Gal 2:17 and providing a picture of justification.[99] Paul argues, in response to the objection raised in Gal 2:17, that he would

[96] Scott Shauf, "Galatians 2.20 in Context," *NTS* 52 (2006): 86–101; Michael J. Gorman, *Inhabiting the Cruciform God: Kenosis, Justification, and Theosis in Paul's Narrative Soteriology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 64–5.

[97] Additionally, the phrase "Son of God [υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ]" is textually uncertain in Gal 2:20. Some textual witnesses read θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ, including: 𝔓[46] B D* F G b MVict. See the appendix for a defense of the Nestle-Aland reading supported by the bulk of textual evidence.

[98] There is simply not space to address the copious debate over the meaning of the genitive phrase πίστις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (Gal 2:16[x2], 20; 3:22; Rom 3:22, 26; see also Phil 3:9; Eph 3:12). On πίστις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ see the collection of essays in Michael F. Bird and Preston M. Sprinkle (eds.), *The Faith of Jesus Christ: Exegetical, Biblical, and Theological Studies* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2009). Although the debate has received much attention, the significance of the distinction may be overblown (Vouga, *Galater*, 59). Those who emphasize the theological significance of Christ's agency in salvation typically prefer the subjective genitive while those who maintain some reference to human agency in the process of salvation opt for the objective genitive. The point of Paul's argument, however, is not about agency (human or divine). Rather, the distinction Paul is concerned with in contrasting works of law and faith of Jesus is the soteriological significance of Christ's death and resurrection and the implications for practicing Jewish law.

[99] Shauf, "Galatians 2.20 in Context," esp. 97–101; B. C. Lategan, "Is Paul Defending his Apostleship in Galatians? The Function of Galatians 1:11–12 and 2:19–20 in the Development of Paul's

be a "transgressor" if he tried to return to the law (Gal 2:18).[100] Paul explains why this is the case for himself (Gal 2:19), and applies the same logic to all believers regardless of their previous relationship to the law (Gal 2:20):

> ἐγὼ γὰρ διὰ νόμου νόμῳ ἀπέθανον, ἵνα θεῷ ζήσω. Χριστῷ συνεσταύρωμαι· ζῶ δὲ οὐκέτι ἐγώ, ζῇ δὲ ἐν ἐμοὶ Χριστός· ὃ δὲ νῦν ζῶ ἐν σαρκί, ἐν πίστει ζῶ τῇ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντός με καὶ παραδόντος ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ.
>
> For through law I died to law, in order that I live to God. I have been crucified with Christ. I no longer live, but Christ lives in me; and what I now live in flesh, I live by faith in the Son of God who loved me and gave himself for me.[101]

There are two features of this passage that place the "Son of God" language in the realm of angelomorphic transformation to resolve an Enochic problem. First, the description of the Son of God as one who "gave himself [παραδόντος ἑαυτὸν]" recalls the prologue of the epistle, describing Jesus as "giving himself [δόντος ἑαυτὸν]" to rescue believers from "the present evil age" (Gal 1:4). The "Son of God" rescues believers from evil, paradoxically, by enabling participation in Christ's death on the cross. Second, this participation occurs "in flesh [ἐν σαρκί]" and "by faith [ἐν πίστει]" (Gal 2:20).[102] The repetition of the verb "live [ζάω]" (Gal 2:19, 20[x4]) explicates the believer's dual

---

Argument," *NTS* 34 (1988): 411–30. Paul responds to the possible objection that his separation of faith from "works of the law" makes Christ a "servant of sin" (Gal 2:17). On the translation and history of interpretation of Gal 2:17 see Marion L. Soards, "Seeking (*zētein*) and Sinning (*harmartōlos* & *harmartia*) according to Galatians 2:17," in *Apocalyptic in the New Testament: Essays in Honour of J. Louis Martyn*, eds. Joel Marcus and Marion L. Soards, JSNTSupp 24 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1989), 237–254.

[100] Returning to the law is precisely the goal of Paul's opponents in Galatians and the meaning of Peter and Barnabas's actions as Paul construes them in Gal 2:11–14, esp. 2:14

[101] Gal 2:19–20.

[102] It is the "faith of Christ [πίστεως Χριστοῦ]" that justifies all flesh (Gal 2:16; 3:24). The Galatians received the Spirit "from hearing of faith [ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως]" (Gal 3:2, 5; see also 5:5). Those living "of faith" are Abraham's sons (Gal 3:7) and even "sons of God" (Gal 3:26).

existence in the flesh but animated by faith in the Son of God through union with his death (see also Gal 3:11–12). Participation in Christ's death (Gal 2:19; 6:14) and life through faith (Gal 2:20; 3:11–12) inhabited by the Spirit (Gal 4:6; 5:5, 16, 25), plots Paul's own story (Gal 1:15–16; see also esp. Phil 3:4–11; 2 Cor 4:11; 5:14–15) and the story of all believers (Gal 4:6; 4:19; see also Rom 6:10–13; 8:12–13; 14:7–8).[103] According to Gal 2:20 the Son of God's death on a cross enables participation in that death by faith and rescues the believer from the present evil age. The death of the Son of God transforms life in the flesh into an angelomorphic life by faith.

While participatory soteriology has received increasing affirmation from Pauline scholars, there is still debate about what it means.[104] In Gal 2:20, in particular, the union with Christ is often categorized as an inexplicable, subjective, and/or mystical experience.[105] While it may in fact fit these hazy categories, struggles to explain the union

---

[103] Shauf, "Galatians 2:20 in Context," 97–8. On this theme in Paul's theology see Robert C. Tannehill, *Dying and Rising with Christ. A Study in Pauline Theology*, BZNW 32 (Berlin: Töpelmann, 1967); Gorman, *Inhabiting the Cruciform God*, esp. 40–104; Daniel G. Powers, *Salvation through Participation: An Examination of the notion of the believer's corporate unity with Christ in early Christian Soteriology*, CBET 29 (Leuven: Peeters, 2001), esp. 119–25; Campbell, *Deliverance of God*, 176–88; Constantine R. Campbell, *Paul and Union with Christ: An Exegetical and Theological Study* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2012), 201–208 identifies συσταυρόω (Gal 2:19; Rom 6:6) as one of a number of *σύν*-compound terms in the Pauline corpus to express the union of Christ with believer (see also Rom 6:4, 5, 6, 8; 8:17 [x2]; Eph 2:5, 6 [x2]; Col 2:12 [x2]; 3:1); Grant McCaskill, *Union with Christ in the New Testament* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), 220–21; Eastman, *Paul and the Person*, 126–150.

[104] See the history of interpretation in C. Campbell, *Paul and Union with Christ*, 29–59; Richard B. Hays, "What is 'Real Participation in Christ?': A Dialogue with E. P. Sanders on Pauline Soteriology," in *Redefining First-Century Jewish and Christian Identities: Essays in Honor of Ed Parish Sanders*, eds. Fabian E. Udoh et. al, CJAS 16 (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 2008), 336–51. Troels Engberg-Pederson, *Paul and the Stoics* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2000), 146–49 argues that this should be understood as "self-identification," which he sees as formally Stoic. In conversation with contemporary continental philosophy and neuroscience see Eastman, *Paul and the Person*, 151–175.

[105] Schweitzer, *Mysticism*, 3, 125; C. Campbell, *Paul and Union with Christ*, 52. On Gal 2:20 Wanamaker writes, "Paul cannot define the meaning of Christ in the believer because it is an experience which goes beyond words to the inner essence of the Christian's life. It is an experiential reality which shapes the believer's ethical and spiritual life" ("Son and the Sons of God," 175). Similarly: R. N. Longenecker, *Galatians*, 92–3; Betz, *Galatians*, 124; Cf. Martyn who emphatically rejects "mystical union with the divine nature" as the "dominant motif" (*Galatians*, 258).

with Christ are also related to the inadequacy of modern categories bifurcating the natural and supernatural, physical and spiritual.[106] Modern scholars tend to follow these Cartesian dichotomies, even though they do not apply to ancient cosmology or anthropology.[107] David Litwa has proposed "deification" as a helpful category for explaining Paul's participatory soteriology in a way that is native to Apostle's culture (both Jewish and Greco-Roman). Litwa even hints that "Son of God" language lends itself to this interpretation.[108] In this vein, Paul's "Son of God" language in Gal 2:20 becomes more explicable. Paul is describing the believer's union with Christ as an assimilation, a "deification," or perhaps an angelomorphic transformation.[109]

5.2.1.3 Galatians 3:26

The third appearance of divine sonship language in Galatians occurs in Gal 3:26 where, for the first time in his letters, Paul extends the divine sonship to believers. Most scholars interpret the extension of divine sonship to believers as a reference to the adoption metaphor of the Exod 4:22 (also Deut 1:31; 14:1; Wis 18:3).[110] While there is no need to deny the significance of the Exodus adoption typology, this interpretation fails to explain

---

[106] Dale B. Martin, *The Corinthian Body* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 4–6; Martin, *Inventing Superstition: From the Hippocratics to the Christians* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004), 13–16.

[107] Stanley K. Stowers, "What is 'Pauline Participation in Christ"?" in *Redefining First-Century Jewish and Christian Identities*, 352–71, esp. 354–57.

[108] *We are Being Transformed*, 5, 187, 207. Each reference to divine sonship language is suggestive and never fleshed out in detail. Arguing along similar lines, although focusing on Hellenistic connotations of divine sonship is James D. Tabor, "Paul's Notion of many 'Sons of God' and its Hellenistic Contexts," *Helios* 13 (1986): 87–97; Tabor, *Things Unutterable*, 11–14

[109] Litwa identifies cognitive, moral, and physical transformation as key aspects of Paul's view of assimilation to God (*We are Being Transformed*, 193–225). Gal 2:20 includes one of the most peculiar aspects of Paul's view of assimilation to God, "subordinating the interests of the self for the benefit and salvation of others" (*We are Being Transformed*, 216).

[110] Scott, *Adoption as Sons of God*, 145– 51; Peppard, *Son of God in the Roman World*, 186–40.

the focus on angels and the cosmos found in Galatians 3:19–4:11.[111] It also fails to explain how Jesus as "Son of God" relates to believers as "Sons of God." An angelomorphic interpretation combined with other categories of divine sonship proves helpful for interpreting Gal 3:26.

Paul applies the Christological title "Son of God" to retell his own story (Gal 1:16; 2:20) and to the identity of Galatian believers (Gal 3:26).[112] He combines the title with the "seed of Abraham" (Gal 3:29). Based on this combination Brendan Byrne concludes that "Son of God" is basically the same as "righteous Israel."[113] While Byrne is correct to emphasize the identification of the "Sons of God" with Israel, he ignores the possibility that Paul has conflated "righteous Israel" with an angelomorphic notion of divine sonship. Already in Gal 1:16 and 2:20, the Christological title describes a heavenly being who unites with believers. Like Gal 2:20, the divine sonship in Gal 3:26–29 is based on a union with Christ through faith.[114] The means to describe this union are disputed, and without dismissing other notable conceptual frameworks, there is an angelomorphic significance of the union in Gal 3:26–29.[115] As David Burnett and Matthew Thiessen have argued, the Abrahamic promise of Gen 15:5 was often interpreted qualitatively in Second Temple Jewish literature, promising incorporation into

---

[111] Scott admits that his reading does not account for the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου: "neither this nor any other interpretation . . . seems to satisfy the context" (*Adoption as Sons of God*, 160–61).

[112] Byrne highlights the prominent position of πάντες in Gal 3:26 (*Sons of God*, 166–67).

[113] Byrne, *Sons of God*, 174.

[114] Notice the repetition of the union prepositions: Sons "in [ἐν] Christ Jesus" (Gal 3:26), "baptized in [εἰς] Christ" (Gal 3:27), "one in [εἰς] Christ" (Gal 3:28), "you are of Christ [ὑμεῖς Χριστοῦ]" (Gal 3:29).

[115] Caroline Johnson Hodge explores the significance of patrilineal kinship as a means describing the union with Christ (*If Sons, Then Heirs: A Study of Kinship and Ethnicity in the Letters of Paul* [New York: Oxford University Press, 2007], 93–107). She argues that the Spirit functions as the material entity uniting Gentiles to Christ (*If Sons, Then Heirs*, 67–77).

angelic life.[116] The transformation of believers to angelic life, as promised to Abraham (Gal 3:6), occurs through the Spirit (Gal 3:14). The Spirit, in effect, transforms believers into heavenly beings as they participate in the divine sonship of Christ (Gal 4:6).[117] The danger facing the Galatians is that by turning to "works of law" they are rejecting the "spirit" in favor of the "flesh" (Gal 3:2–5), an irreconcilable dichotomy in Paul's view (Gal 5:16–18; 6:8). In Paul's argument the Spirit transforms believers into the likeness of the angelomorphic "Son of God," allowing them to participate in his divine sonship through cognitive (Gal 5:25; see also 1 Cor 2:10–14; Phil 2:12–15), moral (Gal 5:16–17; see also Rom 8:4–10; 2 Cor 3:18), and eventually physical transformation (Gal 5:5; 6:8; see also Rom 8:11, 13–14; Phil 3:20–21).[118] The effects of the Watchers' transgressions are undone in the angelomorphic transformation of believers.

5.2.1.4 Galatians 4:4–7

Having surveyed divine sonship language in Galatians, we return to Gal 4:4–7. There have been two consistent points of interest in scholarly analyses of Galatians 4:4–7. First, scholars have long debated the possibility that an early confessional formula behind in Gal 4:4–5 (see also Rom 8:3–4; John 3:16–17; 1 John 4:9, 10).[119] Second, since James

---

[116] David Burnett, "'So Shall Your Seed Be': Paul's use of Genesis 15:5 in Romans 4:18 in Light of Early Jewish Deification Traditions," *JSPL* 5 (2015): 211–36, esp. 215–20; Matthew Thiessen, *Paul and the Gentile Problem* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2016), 135–40. Relevant Second Temple texts include: Jub. 25:15–16; Sir 44:21; Philo, *Her*. 86–87; *QG* 4.181; Apoc. Ab. 20.3–5; T. Mos. 10:9; LAB 18.5. See also Litwa, *We are Being Transformed*, 147–151.

[117] Thiessen writes: "Paul implies that the reception of the divine *pneuma* divinizes them. [. . .] Like the angels, those in Christ become pneumatic beings" (*Paul and the Gentile Problem*, 155). This interpretation need not require a Stoic materialist view of the pneuma.

[118] Litwa, *We are Being Transformed*, 212–23

[119] Kramer, *Christ, Lord, Son of God*, 113; Ulrich Luz, *Das Geschichtsverständnis des Paulus*, BEvT 49 (München: Kaiser, 1968), 282–3; Klaus Wengst, *Christologische Formeln und Lieder des Urchristentums*, SNT 7 (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1972), 59; Eduard Schweizer, "Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Hintergrund der Sendungsformel," *ZNW* 57 (1966): 199–210; Schweizer, "υἱός,"

Dunn challenged the notion, scholars have debated whether or not Gal 4:4 implies Christ's pre-existence.[120] As such, analysis of this text has typically been undertaken in service to larger questions in the development of early Christology. Whether or not Paul is citing a pre-Pauline tradition in Gal 4:4–7, the "Son of God" is portrayed as an angelomorphic figure who enables participation in angelic life through faith.

According to Dunn, in Gal 4:4–6 Paul describes "the man Jesus whose ministry in Palestine was of divine commissioning and whose uniquely intimate relation with God was proved (and enhanced) by his resurrection" and now offers to others "the relationship of sonship which he had himself enjoyed during his ministry."[121] Crucial to Dunn's argument is that the "sending" (ἐξαποστέλλω) does not necessarily refer to the divine commission of a superhuman being.[122] In fact, Dunn thinks the closest parallel to Gal 4:4

TDNT 8.374–76, 383–84; Schweizer, "What do we really mean when we say, '*God sent his Son. . .*,'?" in *Faith and History: Essays in Honor of Paul W. Meyer*, ed. John T. Carroll, et al. (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990), 298–312; Betz, *Galatians*, 206; Kuschel, *Born Before All Time?*, 272–73; R. N. Longenecker, *Galatians*, 166–67; Hays, *Faith of Jesus*, 73–82; Martyn, *Galatians*, 406–8; de Boer, *Galatians*, 262–65.

[120] Dunn, *Christology in the Making*, 38–44. Prior to Dunn pre-existence was generally assumed to be implied by Paul's argument. See Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, 206–10; Bultmann, *Theology* 1.175–76, 295, 304–5; Albrecht Oepke, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Galater*, 2nd ed. THNT 9 (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1957), 96; Kramer, *Christ, Lord, Son of God*, 114; Hahn, *Titles of Jesus in Christology*, 304–5; R. G. Hamerton-Kelly, *Pre-Existence, Wisdom and the Son of Man: A Study of the Idea of Pre-Existence in the New Testament*, SNTSMS 21 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973), 111–12; Borse, *Galater*, 143. Dunn's argument that against pre-existence in Pauline Christology has not gone uncontested: Carl R. Holladay, "New Testament Christology: A Consideration of Dunn's *Christology in the Making*," *Semeia* 30 (1984): 65–82, esp. 74–5; Alan Segal, "Pre-Existence and Incarnation: A Response to Dunn and Holladay," *Semeia* 30 (1984): 83–94; Brendan Byrne, "Christ's Pre-Existence in Pauline Soteriology," *TS* 58 (1997): 308–30. Other relevant texts on pre-existence in the Pauline corpus include 1 Cor 8:6; 2 Cor 8:9; Phil 2:6–11; Col 1:15–20.

[121] Dunn, *Christology in the Making*, 38–44, here 40 and 44. On Dunn's influence in this regard see Kuschel, *Born Before All Time?*, 274–77. Dunn's exegesis is primarily concerned with denying that Paul's argument in Gal 4:4 articulates the doctrine of the incarnation, particularly any notion of pre-existence (*Christology in the Making*, 38). Dunn begins his book by citing numerous definitions of "incarnation" including epigrams from Athanasius (*Inc* 54), Gregory of Nazianzus (*Ep.* 101.7), and Anselm (*Cur Deus Homo* 2.6). In this context, by "doctrine of incarnation" Dunn means "the pre-existence of the Son of God, the man Christ Jesus" (*Christology in the Making*, 43).

[122] Dunn cites Moses (Exod 3:12; Ps 105:26; Mic 6:4), Gideon (Judg 6:14), the prophets (Judg 6:8; Obad 1; Hag 1:12; Mal 3:1[?]) and even Paul himself (Acts 22:21) as examples (*Christology in the Making*,

is the Parable of the Tenants found in the Synoptic gospels (Mark 12:1–11 || Matt 21:33–46 || Luke 20:9–19) and not the numerous texts describing God sending angels, Wisdom, the Spirit, or the Logos.[123] While other scholars have found the parallel with Wisdom 9:10, 17 most illuminating, Dunn demurs that Wisdom is "always a female figure" and never identified with divine sonship language in pre-Pauline literature.[124] The problem with Dunn's argument, however, is that it presumes divine sonship refers to a mere human. This presumption ignores Paul's use of divine sonship language in Galatians, privileging a reconstruction of pre-Pauline material as the definitive background for determining the meaning of the language.[125] Paul has already established at the outset of the epistle that the "Son of God" is from heaven (Gal 1:16), like an angel (4:14).[126]

---

39). Schweizer also recognizes a sense of divine commissioning for humans in Judaism (Exod 3:10–11; Isa 6:8; Jer 1:6–7) and Greek philosophy (Epictetus, *Disc*. 3.22.69; 3.23.46; 4.8.31; 1.24.6; 3.22.56, 59 ["What do we really mean?" 299–300]).

[123] Dunn, *Christology in the Making*, 40. In this parable the father "sends [ἀπέστειλεν]" his son (Mark 12:6 || Matt 21:37; πέμπω in Luke 20:13). Other potential parallels include: God sending angels (Exod 23:20; Dan 3:25; Mal 3:1[?]; Tob 12:14–15), Wisdom (Wis 9:10), the Spirit (Wis 9: 17), and/or the Logos (Philo, *Agr*. 51; Ezek. Trag. 99; see also Plutarch, *Is. Os*. 53–59 [372–375]; *Quaest. Conv*. 8.2–3 [719e]).

Interpreting Gal 4:4–6 in light of Gal 3:13–14, Daniel Schwartz argues that Paul's choice of ἐξαποστέλλω in Gal 4:4 is determined by an allusion to the scapegoat of Lev 16 (Daniel R. Schwartz, "Two Pauline Allusions to the Redemptive Mechanism of the Crucifixion," *JBL* 102 [1983]: 259–68, esp. 260–63; Vouga, *Galater*, 101). See ἐξαποστέλλω in LXX Lev 14:7, 53; 16:10, 21, 22, 26.

[124] Dunn, *Christology in the Making*, 39. Dunn dismisses Paul's identification of Christ as the "wisdom of God" as a later development (1 Cor 1:24, 30; see also 1 Cor 8:6; Col 1:15–17) and thinks Paul did not have a Logos Christology. Those who focus on Wisdom/Logos Christology to explain Gal 4:4 include: Schweizer, "υἱός," *TDNT* 8.375–6; Schweizer, "Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Hintergrund," 207–8; Hamerton-Kelly, *Pre-Existence*, 111–12; Bruce, *Galatians*, 194–5; R. N. Longenecker, *Galatians*, 167–170; Martyn, *Galatians*, 406–8; de Boer, *Galatians,* 263. Marytn and de Boer argue that Paul's sending formula is "apocalyptic" by which they mean an invasion into the cosmos, which would seem to require pre-existence.

[125] Dunn appeals to Rom 1:3 as a pre-Pauline formula in which "*there is no thought of a pre-existent sonship*" (*Christology in the Making*, 33–36, here 35). Dunn (and Hurtado) assume that Paul's use of divine sonship language is determined by the context of royal messianism.

[126] Early Christian interpreters were not burdened with this presumption and had no problem identifying the "Son of God" as a pre-existent, angelomorphic, Logos. See, for example, John 1:1; Heb 1:2;

The language of divine sonship, which appears at crucial points in the letter to the Galatians, has thus far been inadequately explained. On the one hand, scholars have attempted to locate the meaning of the Christological title in is purported origins in royal messianism without reference to what this means for describing believers as "sons of God." On the other hand, when the meaning of Paul's divine sonship language for believers has been analyzed, it is done completely apart from the Christological title. When the application of divine sonship language is applied to both Jesus and believers, as they are by Paul in Galatians (and Romans), it must be explained how one relates to the other. It has been argued here that Paul's divine sonship langauge in Galatians refers to an angelomorphic figure (Gal 1:16; 2:20; 4:4), who like Philo's Logos mediates the relationship between God and humanity (Gal 2:20; 4:6). By participating in the divine sonship of Christ (Gal 3:26; 4:6), believers are transformed, and it reorients their relationship to the rest of the cosmos.

5.2.2 "Born from a Woman"

Perhaps the most unusual feature of Paul's argument in Gal 4 is the description of Jesus being "born from a woman [γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικός]" (Gal 4:4). While the mention of Jesus' birth "from a woman" was important for early Christian theology of the incarnation, it is virtually ignored by contemporary readers.[127] H. D. Betz considers the phrase a useless leftover from Paul's creedal source, "taken up here by Paul in full and

---

Rev 19:13–15; Ignatius, *Eph*. 7.2; Justin, *1 Apol*. 21.1; 32.10–14; 63:3, 14–15; *Dial*. 45.4; 48:2; 84:2; 85:2; 126.2; 127.4. Dunn would identify this as a later development.

[127] Basil argues from this text that it shows "the God-bearing flesh was joined together from the common lump of humanity [ἐκ τοῦ ἀνθρωπείου φυράματος ἡ θεοφόρος σὰρξ συνεπάγη]" (*de spiritu sancto* 5.12; similarly, Tertullian, *de carn*. 20.2). Tertullian cites Gal 4:4 when arguing for the virgin birth of Christ (*de carn.* 23.5). On the reception of this text see Meiser, *Galater*, 179–89, esp. 181.

without regard to its usability in the argument."[128] Rather than follow Betz and limit the significance of the phrase to a pre-Pauline source, most interpreters consider birth from a woman a reference to Jesus' humanity or perhaps his pre-existence.[129] Dunn argues the point is to identify Jesus with Adam.[130] None of these suggestions shows how Jesus' birth from a woman relates to the argument of Galatians.

Attention to the structure of the text reveals that the mention of the woman in Gal 4:4 parallels the adoption of believers in Gal 4:5. Since Lightfoot, scholars have recognized a chiastic structure to Gal 4:4–5:[131]

ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ	God sent his son
γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικός	born from a woman
γενόμενον ὑπὸ νόμον	born under law
ἵνα τοὺς ὑπὸ νόμον ἐξαγοράση	in order to redeem those under law,
ἵνα τὴν υἱοθεσίαν ἀπολάβωμεν.	in order that we receive adoption

[128] Betz, *Galatians*, 207. R. N. Longenecker provides a helpful review of source-critical approaches to this text (*Galatians*, 166–70). R. H. Fuller, "The Conception/birth of Jesus as a Christological Moment," *JSNT* (1978): 37–52, esp. 40–43 also focuses on reconstructing a pre-Pauline formula in Gal 4:4.

[129] Those who interpret the reference to Jesus' humanity include: Schlier, *Galater*, 196; R. N. Longenecker, *Galatians*, 171; Martyn, *Galatians*, 390, 407; Eckstein, *Verheißung und Gesetz*, 235–36; Moo, *Galatians*, 265; Witherington, *Grace in Galatia*, 288; de Boer, *Galatians*, 263; Oakes, *Galatians*, 137. Cited parallels include: Sir 44:9; 1 Esd 4:16; Tob 8:6; Wis 7:1–3; Rom 1:3; Jn 8:58; Josephus, *A.J.* 2.216; 7.21; 16.382 and ילוד אשה in 1QH XIII, 14; 1QS XI, 21. None of these are particularly close parallels to what Paul says in Gal 4:4. The closest is the description of Solomon in Wis 7:1 where even though Solomon is a mighty king with wisdom he is still merely a human descendent of Adam (Wis 7:5–6). Cf. Fee, *Pauline Christology*, 215–16 who argues for this passage as a reference to pre-existence.

[130] Dunn, *Christology in the Making*, 41. This makes the least sense because Adam was never born from a woman.

[131] *Galatians*, 168.

The structure of this text indicates that Jesus' birth "from a woman" is aligned with the adoption of believers just as his being "under the law" is aligned with redemption.[132] The identification of the "Son of God" with a woman is important for redressing the state of humanity unable to receive adoption. The importance of a woman in the corruption of the cosmos has a notable parallel in the Enochic tradition.

Paul's reference to Jesus' birth from a woman is illuminated by the Watchers narrative. Jesus' divine mission is contrasted with the angelic transgressions. As Amy Richter has pointed out, one of the core features of the Enochic tradition is the illicit sexual contact between angelic Sons of God and women.[133] In BW, the Sons of God rebel in heaven (1 En. 6:1–6) and "enter" women on earth (1 En. 7:1; see also Gen 6:2; 1 En. 86:1–4).[134] As we have already seen, there are conflicting traditions about the culpability of these women (1 En. 8:1–2; T. Reu. 5:5–6).[135] Women had a significant role in the corruption of the cosmos through their illicit sexual interactions that produced giant demonic offspring.

In Galatians when the "fullness of time has come" God sends his Son to be born "from a woman" (Gal 4:5). The mission to redeem humanity involves the Son of God and a woman because the original corruption of "all flesh" and the cosmos occurred through

---

[132] There is a similar identification of Jesus with the human plight associated with "flesh [σάρξ] and redemptive reception of the Spirit in Rom 8:3–4.

[133] Amy Richter argues that the function of the women in Jesus' genealogy in Matthew is to signal the way Jesus redeems the Watchers' transgression (*Enoch and the Gospel of Matthew*, 1–41).

[134] 𝔊[p] of 1 En. 7:1 reads: καὶ ἤρξαντο εἰσπορεύεσθαι πρὸς αὐτὰς καὶ μιαίνεσθαι ἐν αὐταῖς. The Aramaic of 4Q202 (4QEn[b] II, 17) is difficult to reconstruct (Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 166; *DSSSE*, 1.404).

[135] See chapter four (4.1.1.3)

Sons of God and women.[136] Both the Enochic tradition and Paul connect heaven and earth through "Son(s) of God" and women. Paul's mention of Jesus' birth, then, is not merely a superfluous feature of pre-Pauline material that should have been left on the cutting floor. It signals the way in which Jesus's redemption effects the cosmos, redressing the Watchers' transgressions.

5.2.3 Spirit of God's Son

Paul's view of cosmic corruption in Galatians is based on the transgressions of the Watchers and so too are the problems his Christology redresses. Recall that the divine response to the "Sons of God" mating with women in is to limit the presence of the divine spirit in human flesh during the present age:

> καὶ εἶπεν κύριος ὁ θεός, Οὐ μὴ καταμείνῃ τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τούτοις εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτοὺς σάρκας, ἔσονται δὲ αἱ ἡμέραι αὐτῶν ἑκατὸν εἴκοσι ἔτη.
>
> And the Lord God said, "My spirit shall not abide in these humans for the age, because they are flesh, but their days shall be one hundred twenty years."[137]

Archie Wright recognizes that Gen 6:3 is difficult to interpret, but that the primary theme of this text is that the Spirit of God would no longer dwell in humans due to their flesh.[138] Indeed, the contrast between "flesh" and "spirit" is stark in Galatians (Gal 3:2–5; 5:16–17; 6:8), with Paul aligning his gospel with the Spirit (Gal 3:2, 5, 14; 5:18, 22–25) and

---

[136] In Jubilees the Watchers initially descend to earth "to teach mankind and to do what is just and upright upon the earth" (Jub. 4:15) but fall into fornication on the earth (Jub. 5:1; 7:21; see also T. Reu. 5:5–6).

[137] Gen 6:3 augmented translation from Robert J. V. Hiebert, "Genesis," *NETS*, 9. Hibert translates εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα as "forever," but I have opted to translate it "for the age."

[138] *Origin of Evil Spirits*, 75–9. Philo interprets the text to mean that humans ought to depart from fleshy bodies and pursue virtue and reason (esp. *Gig*. 34; see also *Her*. 285–286; *Virt*. 78–126; *QG* 3.16; *Spec*. 4.168).

the opponents concern for circumcision with the flesh (Gal 3:3; 5:16–21; 6:12–13; 4:29). Paul participates in the cross of Christ (Gal 2:19–20; 6:14) which reorients his life in the flesh (Gal 2:20) and his relationship to the "the present evil age" (Gal 1:4) and the "cosmos" (Gal 6:14). Likewise, Paul expects all believers to participate in the cross to receive the Spirit and be reoriented to the present age and cosmos. Paul contrasts what the flesh "desires [ἐπιθυμέω]," i.e. the "works of the flesh" (Gal 5:17–21), with the "fruit of the Spirit" (Gal 5:22–23). Then, he declares:

> οἱ δὲ τοῦ Χριστοῦ [Ἰησοῦ] τὴν σάρκα ἐσταύρωσαν σὺν τοῖς παθήμασιν καὶ ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις. Εἰ ζῶμεν πνεύματι, πνεύματι καὶ στοιχῶμεν.
>
> Those of Christ [Jesus] crucified the flesh with the passions and the desires. If we live by the Spirit, we also are ordered to the Spirit.[139]

Paul thinks the cross destroys the flesh even as believers continue in bodies (see Gal 2:20) and are conformed to a new cosmic structure in which the Spirit of God dwells in them. In Galatians the Son of God being born from a woman and dying on a cross redresses the cosmic corruption of the flesh by the transgressions of the Sons of God.

The results of Jesus' and the Watchers' actions are parallel opposites. Initially, the transgressions of the Watchers produce illegitimate offspring that destroy the earth (1 En. 7:1–3; 10:9–10, 15; Jub. 5:2). After the initial judgment of the Flood, the disembodied spirits of their illegitimate sons enter humans to attack them, causing disease, blindness, and destruction.[140] The Watcher's fall is so severe, that they must ask the human Enoch to

---

[139] Gal 5:24–25.

[140] 1 En. 15:11–12; 19:1; Jub. 10:1, 8; Justin, *2 Apol* 5; see also 1 Cor 8:4–6; 10:20–22. Although the distinction between demons and evil spirits is blurred in some traditions (e.g. Jub. 10–2; 17:16; Tob. 6:8; T. Sol. 5.3; 17:1), Dale Martin argues that offspring of the women and angels are "evil spirits" (1 En. 15:11–16:1; 19:1–2) not technically "demons" ("When Did Angels Become Demons," 666–71).

serve as their intercessor (1 En. 15:2). They no longer have access to God in prayer. With their destructive spirits attacking humanity, the Watchers distance themselves and humanity from God.

In parallel contrast, Jesus as the Son of God faithfully gives himself to rescue humanity from the "present evil age" (Gal 4:5; 1:4; 2:20; see also Rom 5:10; 8:32). After his exaltation in resurrection, the "spirit of God's son" is sent into the hearts of believers so that they can share in his sonship (Gal 4:6; Rom 8:9–11, 15). This indwelling Spirit gives believers legitimate sonship enacted through direct prayer (Gal 4:5; see also Rom 8:14–15, 26–27). In both narratives the cosmos is altered, and humanity affected. Enoch was glorified in the descent of the Sons of God into women, believers are glorified in the descent of the Son of God from a woman.

5.3 The Apotropaic Function of the Law in Galatians

Alongside the sharp dichotomy between law and faith, Paul continues to claim that the law is from God.[141] After a dense argument for the superiority of faith in Christ against "works of law [*ἔργων νόμου*]" (Gal 3:1–18), Paul raises a logical question, "Why then the law [*τί οὖν ὁ νόμος*]?" (3:19a). If "works of law" do not justify (Gal 2:16; 3:11), the law places those doing it under a curse (Gal 3:10–11), and the law was only added after the Abrahamic promise (Gal 3:17), Paul rhetorically asks, "Is the law, therefore, against the promises of God?" (Gal 3:21). Responding with characteristic vigor he exclaims, "By no

[141] It is not surprising that Paul's view of the Law has baffled scholars such that he has been accused of self-contradiction and inconsistency. Heikki Räisänen writes: "I am not able to find in the relevant literature *any* conception of the law which involves such inconsistencies or such arbitrariness as does Paul's" (Räisänen, *Paul and the Law*, 228). See also E. P. Sanders, *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1983), 147–48. Elsewhere in the Pauline corpus, the Apostle praises the Law (Rom 7:12, 14) and recognizes its authority for his arguments (Rom 3:21, 31), and claims that the law is eclipsed by the advent of Christ (Rom 10:4; 2 Cor 3:6–9, 14–15).

means [μὴ γένοιτο]!" Not only are Paul's arguments throughout Gal 3:6–18 based on the Mosaic law, the Apostle also expects the Galatians to "fulfill [πληρόω]" the law (Gal 5:14; see also 6:2).[142] Despite the insistence that the Galatians avoid following the Mosaic law, then, the law is still a divine gift (Gal 3:21). The primary positive function of the law is to offer protection from evil. In Gal 3:19–4:11 Paul simultaneously defends the valid purpose of the law to offer protection from evil before the advent of Christ while claiming that obedience to the law afterward results in slavery to evil. The logic of this argument is best explained with reference to Enochic tradition.

5.3.1 Protection from Transgressions

Paul's enigmatic phrase for explaining the purpose of the law is that "it was added because of transgressions [τῶν παραβάσεων χάριν προσετέθη]."[143] This phrase has been interpreted in conflicting ways.[144] Perhaps the most common view among contemporary scholars is that the law was given in order to cause, produce, or provoke transgressions.[145]

---

[142] Paul cites or clearly alludes to Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Deuteronomy and Habakkuk: Galatians 3:6 [Gen 15:6]; 3:8 [Gen 12:3; 18:8], 3:10 [Deut. 27:26; also Deut. 28:58; 30:10], 3:11 [Hab 2:4], 3:12 [Lev 18:5], 3:13 [Deut 27:26; 21:23], 3:16 [Gen 13:15; 17:8; 27:4]; 3:17 [Exod 12:40–41].

[143] τί οὖν ὁ νόμος; τῶν παραβάσεων χάριν προσετέθη has overwhelming textual support. The UBS committee renders an "A" class decision and Metzger suggests that the alternative readings are "idiosyncratic" resulting from "inattentive copyists" (Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 2nd ed. [New York: United Bible Societies, 1994], 525). Similar text critical conclusions are reached in Daniel B. Wallace, "Galatians 3:19–20: A *Crux Interpretum* for Paul's View of the Law," *WTJ* (1990): 225–245, here 233–34. Jason Staples argues that poor copying explains the παραδόσεων reading (D*, vg, Jerome, Pelagius, Augustine), but is less likely for πράξεων. See the analysis of the variant readings in Jason Staples, "Altered Because of Transgressions? The 'Law of Deeds' in Gal 3,19a," *ZNW* 106 (2015): 126–135.

[144] Pollmann provides a helpful summary of interpretive options (*Gesetzeskritische Motive im Judentum*, 223–26).

[145] Lightfoot, *Galatians*, 144; Burton, *Galatians*, 188; Oepke, *Galater*, 81; C. E. B. Cranfield, "St Paul and the Law," *SJT* 17 (1964): 43–68, here 46, followed by Bruce, *Galatians*, 175. Also, Betz, *Galatians*, 165–66; Beker, *Paul the Apostle*, 55–6; Hübner, *Law in Paul's Thought*, 26–30; M. Wolter, "παράβασις, εως, ἡ," *EDNT* 3.14; Hong, *Law in Galatians*, 150–51; Martyn, *Galatians*, 354–55; Légasse,

This interpretation is based on the preposition χάριν and Paul's teaching about the law elsewhere in his letters (esp. Rom 4:15; 5:20; also Rom 3:20; 5:13; 7:5, 7–24; 1 Cor 15:56). As has already been argued in chapter two, appealing to Romans to explain Galatians is both potentially anachronistic and fails to account for the grammatical differences of a singular "transgression" (Rom 5:14) and multiple "transgressions" (Gal 3:19). The resulting interpretive weight placed on χάριν is simply too great to sustain this interpretation.

There are two especially strong arguments against interpreting the postpositive improper preposition χάριν in the sense of causing, producing, or provoking transgressions.[146] First, there is a notable parallel use of χάριν in the Jewish apologetic work, Letter of Aristeas.[147] According to the narrative, the Gentile Aristeas asks the High Priest why, since there is only one creator, some animals are deemed "unclean" (Let. Aris. 129). In response the High Priest provides a lengthy defense of the Torah as entirely reasonable (Let. Aris. 130–171). In this defense, the High Priest allegorizes Mosaic law to demonstrate its ethical genius.[148] He also warns:

Galates, 254–55; de Boer, *Galatians*, 230–31; Douglas Moo, *Galatians*, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2013), 233–34; Schriener, *Galatians*, 240.

[146] In contemporary translations χάριν is consistently translated "because of" (NRSV, ESV, NIV, NASB). The preposition appears only here in Paul's undisputed letters, but also occurs in Eph 3:1, 14; 1 Tim 5:14; Titus 1:5; Lk 7:47; 1 Jn 3:12; Jude 16; LXX 2 Chron 7:21; Dan 2:13.

[147] Letter of Aristeas was likely written in the latter half of the second century BCE. See Benjamin G. Wright III, *The Letter of Aristeas: 'Aristeas to Philocrates' or 'On the Translation of the Law of the Jews'*, CEJL (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2015), 21–30.

[148] Let. Aris.144–157. Similar allegorical interpretations of purity laws appear in Philo, *Spec*. 4.100–131; 4 Macc 1:33–34; 4:16–27. Philo rejects the view that an allegorical reading entails not literally following the laws, at least the laws related to Sabbath, feasts and Temple cult (*Migr*. 89–90). See also Barn. 10.1–12.

> Do not come to the contemptible conclusion that Moses legislated these matters *on account of* [χάριν] a curiosity with mice and weasels or similar creatures.[149]

There are several parallels to Galatians. In both texts the preposition χάριν is used to clarify the purpose of the Mosaic law against misunderstanding by Gentiles. In the narrative of Aristeas the misunderstanding is the notion that the law is unreasonable. In Galatians the misunderstanding is that the law, coming after the promise to Abraham and therefore inferior to it (Gal 3:17–18), is opposed to the promise (Gal 3:21). The parallel between Gal 3:19 and Let. Aris. 144 also demonstrates that the "cause, produce, provoke" translation of χάριν must be supported by context rather than assumed based on the preposition alone. The context of Galatians describes the law having a supervisory, even if enslaving, role in the divine economy as a guide, guardian, and steward (Gal 3:24–25; 4:1–2). Like the High Priest in the Letter of Aristeas, Paul wants to clarify the purpose of the law not as creating, provoking, or producing transgressions any more than the High Priest is claiming that Moses gave the law to create, provoke, or produce a preoccupation with mice or weasels.

The second argument against interpreting χάριν as "provoke" is that no extant ancient interpreter read the text this way.[150] Despite different theological preoccupations,

---

[149] Let. Aris. 144. Translation from Wright, *Letter of Aristeas*, 271. I have altered Wright's translation of τὸν καταπεπτωκότα λόγον "the exploded conclusion" to "the contemptible conclusion."

[150] Jason Staples suggests that the "causing" interpretation may be found in Marcionite and Valentinian interpretations of Gal 3:19 ("Altered because of Transgressions," 129–31). The only examples he cites that explicitly mention Galatians 3:19 (Heracleon and Theodotus) do not focus on the meaning of the preposition χάριν or the law at all, but rather the role of angels. See the focus on the "seed" language of Gal 3:19–20 in Elaine Pagels, *The Gnostic Paul: Gnostic Exegesis of the Pauline Letters* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975), 107. Likewise, Irenaeus' polemic against the Marcionites is focused on the "seed" not the "law of works [ὁ νόμος τῶν πράξεων]" (*Haer*. 5.21.1–2). When Irenaeus turns to the role of the law, he focuses on its power to protect against Satan (*Haer*. 5.21.3).

it must be admitted that ancient interpreters read and spoke Greek with much greater fluency than contemporary readers. John K. Riches argues that interpreting the law as producing transgression was an innovation of Luther in 1519.[151] Although the "cause, produce, provoke" interpretation is common in Pauline scholarship since Luther, it is relatively recent in the history of interpretation. What, then, did ancient interpreters think Paul meant?

There are two major alternative options found among early Christian interpreters.[152] According to Cyril of Alexandria (375–444 CE) Gal 3:19 means that the law identifies sin as "transgression." Cyril cites Gal 3:19 and proceeds to describe the function of the law as "conviction of sin, demonstrating those sinning as cursed."[153] Like some contemporary readers, then, Cyril identifies the function of the law as revealing or demonstrating that sin is transgression.[154] This "revelatory" function fits well with Rom

---

[151] *Galatians*, 192–93. See Luther's 1519 Commentary on Galatians in which he rejects Jerome's interpretation that "through the Law transgressions are to be held in check [*transgressiones cohiberentur, huic resistit*]" in favor of his view: "The Law was laid down for the sake of transgression, in order that transgression might be and abound, and in order that thus man, having been brought to knowledge of himself through the Law, might seek the hand of a merciful God [*Lex propter transgressionem posita est, ut transgressio sit et abundet, atque sic per legem homo in sui cognitionem perductus quaerat manum miserentis dei*]." See exposition of Luther on Gal 3:19 by Stephen J. Chester, *Reading Paul with the Reformers: Reconciling Old and New Perspectives* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2017), 114–16.

[152] James D. G. Dunn suggests yet another option, that the law was given to provide atonement for sin prior to the advent of Christ (*Galatians*, BNTC [London: Black, 1993], 188–190). This interpretation is novel and, as far as I am aware, unique to Dunn.

[153] My translation: ἔλεγχος ἁμαρτίας, ἐπαράτους ἀποφαίνων τοὺς ἁμαρτάνοντας (*Hom. Pasch*. 29.2 [PG 77.965A]). Martin Meiser summarizes Cyril, "Das Gesetz soll Sünden sichtbar machen" (*Galater*, NTP 9 [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007], 154). Cyril's citation of Gal 3:19 is immediately followed by a citation of Rom 5:20, prefaced by καὶ πάλιν. Cyril sees the provisional function of the law in both Gal 3:19 and Rom 5:20 as revealing/convicting, not producing or causing transgression/sin.

[154] Schneider, "παραβαίνω, παράβασις, παραβάτης, ἀπαράβατος, ὑπερβαίνω," *TDNT* 5.740; BDAG 1078; Udo Borse, *Der Brief an die Galater*, RNT (Regensburg: Verlag, 1984), 134; Wallace, "*Crux Interpretum*," 236–39; Frank J. Matera, *Galatians*, SP 9 (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1992), 128; Witherington, *Grace in Galatia*, 255–56; Trick, *Abrahamic Descent*, 202–3. Some scholars offer a combination of the "causing" and "revealing" interpretations: Schlier, *Galater*, 152–54; R. N. Longenecker

7:7–14 and helps to make sense of Paul's claim that "scripture [γραφή] imprisons all things under sin" (Gal 3:22; see also Gal 3:10). Still, it is not entirely clear the revelatory function found in Romans relates to the supervisory role of the law that predominates the metaphors of Gal 3:24–25 and 4:1–2. While more likely than "provoke," the "reveal" interpretation is dependent on Romans.

The most common interpretation of Gal 3:19 in ancient sources is that transgressions are the prior condition that prompted God to give the law. In this view, the law was given "because of transgressions," with the intent to protect or restrain/limit transgressions. Clement of Alexandria (ca. 150–211/215 CE), in a rather lengthy discourse on the law (*Strom.* 1.26–27) cites Gal 3:19 (*Strom*. 1.26.167.1–2) arguing that the law guides to the divine (1.26.167.1; see also *Paed*. 3.12.94.1). Clement extols the virtues of Mosaic law, which "*trains* [παιδεύει] for piety, proscribes what is to be done, restricts each one from sins" (*Strom*. 1.27.171.4). Clement goes on to identify the "highest and most perfect good" of the law, "when one is able to lead back anyone from the practice of evil to virtue and well-doing, which is the very function of the law" (*Strom*. 1.27.173.1). Similarly, John Chrysostom (347–407 CE) comments on Gal 3:19, "the Law might be placed upon them [i.e. Jews] as a bridle, guiding [παιδεύων], regulating [ῥυθμίζων], and preventing transgressing [κωλύων παραβαίνειν], if not all, at least some of the commandments."[155] Although they have different views of the law, for

thinks the phrase is sufficiently ambiguous to encompass both "causing" and "revealing," but he finds revealing more likely (*Galatians*, 138–39).

[155] Chrysostom, *Comm. Gal.* 3:19 (PG 61.654). Translation augmented from NPNF 13.28. Similar interpretations are found in Pelagius, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Theodoret of Cyrus (Meiser, *Galater*, 154). See also John of Damascus (PG 95.481B). Alluding to Galatians 3:19–22, Tertullian describes a useful provisional role for the Jewish law (*Ux.* 1.2).

many interpreters the function of the Mosaic law in Gal 3:19 was to protect God's people from getting themselves into evil, a view held by many modern interpreters as well.[156]

Interpreting Gal 3:19 as a description of the law's protective function is not only common among ancient interpreters, this interpretation is also most appropriate for the context of Paul's argument. The "protect" interpretation corresponds to the παιδαγωγός illustration since the primary meaning of metaphor is to describe the protective function of the law.

5.3.2 *Paidagōgos*

The meaning of Paul's metaphorical description of the law as a παιδαγωγός (Gal 3:24) has generated significant attention.[157] Ancient sources portray the *paidagōgos* as a

[156] Charles H. Giblin, "Three Monotheistic Texts in Paul," *CBQ* 37 (1975): 527–47, here 539–40; David J. Lull, "'The Law Was Our Pedagogue': A Study in Galatians 3:19–25," *JBL* 105 (1986): 481–98, here 483–85; Frank Thielman, *Paul and the Law: A Contextual Approach* (Downers Grove: IVP, 1994), 132–33; Christoph Burchard, "Noch ein Versuch zu Gal 3,19, und 20," in *Studien zur Theologie, Sprache und Umwelt des Neuen Testaments*, ed. Dieter Sänger, WUNT 107 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 184–202, here 199–202; B. W. Longenecker, *Triumph of Abraham's God*, 122–28; François Vouga, *An die Galater*, HNT 10 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 82–3; Hays, *Galatians*, 266; Robert L. Brawley, "Contextuality, Intertextuality, and the Hendiadic Relationship of Promise and Law in Galatians," *ZNW* 93 (2002): 99–119, here 106–8; Oakes, *Galatians*, 122–23. In his earlier work Sanders recognized this interpretation as the "simplest reading," but did not feel compelled to conclude one way or another to explain Paul's argument (*Paul, Law, and Jewish People*, 66–67). In his more recent work, however, Sanders agrees with Luther that the law "was given to create transgressions" (*Paul: Life, Letters, Thought*, 530)

[157] In addition to the commentaries see: Richard N. Longenecker, "The Pedagogical Nature of the Law in Galatians 3:19–4:7," *JETS* 25 (1982): 53–61; David J. Lull, "Law Was Our Pedagogue," 481–98; Norman H. Young, "*Paidagogos*: The Social Setting of a Pauline Metaphor," *NovT* 29 (1987): 150–76; A. T. Hanson, "The Origin of Paul's Use of PAIDAGOGOS for the Law," *JSNT* 34 (1988): 71–76; T. David Gordon, "A Note on Παιδαγωγός in Galatians 3.24-25," *NTS* 35 (1989): 150–54; D. F. Tolmie, "Ὁ ΝΟΜΟΣ ΠΑΙΔΑΓΩΓΟΣ ἩΜΩΝ ΓΕΓΟΝΕΝ ΕΙΣ ΞΡΙΣΤΟΝ: The Persuasive Force of a Pauline Metaphor (GL 3:23–26)," *Neot* 26 (1992): 407–16; Michael J. Smith, "The Role of the Pedagogue in Galatians," *BSac* 163.650 (2006): 197–214; Dieter Sänger, "Das Gesetz is unser Παιδαγωγός geworden bis zu Christus' (Gal 3,24)," in *Das Gesetz im frühen Judentum und im Neuen Testament Feschrift für Christoph Burchard zum 75. Geburtsag*. eds. Dieter Sänger and Matthias Konradt (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006), 236–60.

common and important figure in the formation of young men in the ancient world.[158] As such, it is clear that Paul's metaphor communicates the temporal authority of the Mosaic law.[159] In the arrival of Christ the law's authority, like that of a *paidagōgos* when a boy reaches maturity, has ended (Gal 3:25). What is not clear, however, is whether the metaphor is intended to portray the law's temporal authority positively or negatively.

Before determining Paul's rhetorical goal in crafting the metaphor, it is necessary to provide a brief overview of the *paidagōgos*' function.[160] The noun παιδαγωγός is difficult to translate because it describes a common role in the formation of boys in the ancient world, but one that has no clear analogue in contemporary western education.[161] The *paidagōgos* was typically an older household slave, or hired servant, charged with the protection and care of boys after they left the custody of their nurses and until they entered adult life (ca. ages 6–16).[162] The *paidagōgos*' role consisted primarily of

---

[158] H. I. Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity*, trans. George Lamb (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1956), 143–44; Stanley F. Bonner, *Education in Ancient Rome: From Elder Cato to Younger Pliny* (Berkley: University of California Press, 1977), 34–46; Raffaella Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), 47–50; Cribiore, *The School of Libanius in Late Antique Antioch* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007), 117–20. The portrait of literary sources is generally confirmed by epigraphic evidence: Christian Laes, "Pedagogues in Greek Inscriptions in Hellenistic and Roman Antiquity," *ZPE* 171 (2009): 113–22.

[159] The temporal markers are evident throughout the passage: "Before the faith came [πρό τοῦ δὲ ἐλθεῖν τὴν πίστιν] . . . until the faith about to be revealed [εἰς τὴν μέλλουσαν πίστιν]" (3:23), "until Christ [εἰς Χριστόν]" (3:24), "but after the faith having come [ἐλθούσης δὲ τῆς πίστεως] we are no longer under the *paidagōgos*" (3:25). The focus on temporary authority of the law begins in 3:19 ("until the seed come [ἄχρις οὗ ἔλθῃ τὸ σπέρμα]") and continues in 4:1–11.

[160] The most informative works are Lull, "Law Was Our Pedagogue," 481–98 and Young, "*Paidagogos*," 150–76. Longenecker, "Pedagogical Nature of the Law," includes more (late) Jewish sources in his analysis. This paragraph draws primarily from Lull and Young.

[161] Lull, "Law Was Our Pedagogue," 489. BDAG, 748 gives the following definitions: "one who has responsibility for someone who needs guidance, *guardian*, *leader*, *guide*." While these options articulate the function of the παιδαγωγός it fails to account for the standard function of this figure in life of many boys in the ancient world. Rather than translate παιδαγωγός with an incompatible English word, I have chosen to transliterate it.

[162] Plato, *Lys*. 208c; *Symp*. 183c; *Leg*. 808b–e; Philo, *Sacr*. 15–16; *Her*. 294–299; Epictetus, *Disc.* 3.19.5; Plutarch, *Dem*. 5.2; *Mor*. 439f; 452d; 589f; Ps.-Plutarch, *Lib. ed*. 4a–b, 12a–b; Libanius, *Or*. 34.29;

discipline and protection rather than formal instruction.[163] These men protected their boys from both physical and moral harm. Although writing in the fourth century, Libanius (314–398 CE) provides a succinct description of *paidagōgoi* as "guards [φρουροί]," "protectors [φύλακες]," and "a *wall* [τεῖχος]" (*Or*. 58.7). As moral disciplinarians, *paidagōgoi* were often perceived by their young charges as violent killjoys.[164] Yet while there were surely instances of unscrupulousness (*Rhet. Her*. 4.10.14), there is also abundant evidence that *paidagōgoi* often served their roles well, devoting themselves to their charges and eventually receiving honors for their service.[165] When the boys reached maturity *paidagōgoi* were no longer necessary. These figures functioned as the protectors and disciplinarians of young boys until they entered adulthood. How, then, does Paul intend this metaphor to describe the law's temporal authority?

Martinus de Boer argues that Paul's *paidagōgos* metaphor is negative, portraying the law as "a jailer, depriving human beings of their freedom."[166] In contrast, it is argued here that the metaphor is meant to explain the legitimate function of the law to protect

---

58.7. Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind*, 47 notes that there is only one reference to a female pedagogue in extant papyri (*P. Oxy*. L.3555).

[163] One of the primary roles of the παιδαγωγός was accompanying the boys to and from their teachers (Aeschines, *Tim*. 9–10; Aristides, *Or*. 12.83; Plutarch, *Marc*. 9.4; Lucian, *Vit. auct.* 15). Plutarch was fond of referencing a Spartan pedagogue who, when asked about his role, explained "he intended to make a boy entrusted to him delight in honourable and be vexed at dishonorable things" (*Mor*. 452d; see also 439f). In some cases, however, the pedagogue did instruct, or offer significant assistance in the process of instruction (Josephus, *A.J*. 10.186; P.Oxy. VI.930; Libanius, *Or*. 44; 58.9).

[164] Plato, *Lys*. 223a; Philo, *Flacc*. 14–15; *Sacr*. 51; *Det*. 145; *Migr*. 116; Plutarch, 37d; 73a–b; Ps.-Plutarch, *Lib. ed*. 4a–b.

[165] Young, "*Paidagogos*" 165–168. See esp. Xenophon, *Eph*. 1.14; Epictetus, *Disc*. 1.11.22–23; Plutarch, *Alex*. 25.4; *Mor*. 179e; *Rhet. Ad her*. 4.52.65; Libanius, *Or*. 58.8–11.

[166] *Galatians*, 241. This negative view is shared by Burton, *Galatians*, 199–200; Betz, *Galatians*, 178; Martyn, *Galatians*, 362–63; Hong, *Law in Galatians*, 159–60; Sänger, "Das Gesetz is unser Παιδαγωγός," 254–60.

God's people prior to the arrival of Christ. The law's limited authority, then, is portrayed positively insofar as it is temporally legitimate in protecting God's people.

De Boer's case for a negative view of the metaphor is twofold. First, he points out that Paul presents the illustration from the perspective of the children under the *paidagōgos*' care (cf. 1 Cor 4:15). As such, de Boer argues, Paul's metaphor assumes that believers remember their time under the law's supervision as one of tyrannical captivity. As already noted, *paidagōgoi* could be quite harsh (esp. Philo, *Sacr.* 51; *Flacc*. 14–15; *Migr*. 115–16). However, honors were often bestowed upon good *paidagōgoi* by their former wards. Upon reaching maturity, especially in the case of a good *paidagōgos*, a man would often recognize his former overseer with distinction.[167] The perspective of Paul's metaphor is that of the mature man, the former ward, no longer under the care of a *paidagōgos* and now able to recognize the value of his protection.[168] Similarly, Philo of Alexandria interprets Gen 46:34 to chide the Egyptians for spurning the discipline of the shepherd's rod,

> For right reason which is our pilot and guide to things excellent is an abomination to all who love the passions, *just as really foolish children hate their teachers and tutors* [καθάπερ οἱ τῶν παίδων ἀφρονέστατοι τοὺς διδασκάλους καὶ παιδαγωγοὺς] and every form of reason which would warn them and bring them to wisdom.[169]

---

[167] Michael F. Bird, *An Anomalous Jew: Paul among Jews, Greeks, and Romans* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016), 154–55 makes the same point citing the example of Alexander the Great who risked his life for his pedagogue Lysimachus (Plutarch, *Alex*. 24.6).

[168] Douglas Campbell recognizes that Paul's description of the law as a *paidagōgos* is from the perspective of the former ward. He goes on to argue that this substantiates a solution-to-plight logic (*The Deliverance of God: An Apocalyptic Rereading of Justification in Paul* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009], 884–85).

[169] Philo, *Sacr*. 51.

In Philo's view the protective discipline of a *paidagōgos* is only a burden to the foolish. Even boys who are beaten by their *paidagōgoi* are better off than those without them (*Det*. 145), because *paidagōgoi* protect their charges from wrongdoing (*Mut*. 217). Not only does the metaphor imply a positive function for the law, but the enduring value of the law for both Paul and the Galatians makes it difficult to imagine that Paul's metaphor is meant to portray the law as an unscrupulous tyrant.[170] The problem with the law, as Paul argues, is not its tyrannical discipline but its inability to make alive (Gal 3:21).[171] De Boer's attempt to explain the metaphor from the perspective of the confined ward inaccurately focuses on the perspective of the immature, petulant child rather than the mature adult. Paul's point is that an adult no longer needs a protector and moral disciplinarian like a believer no longer needs the law. However, Paul is not deprecating the law as an oppressive jailer.

Since the function of the ancient *paidagōgos* was protective care, there must be good reason for denying protection as the point of the metaphor. The most common reason for denying that Paul's metaphor describes the law's protective function is also de Boer's second argument for interpreting the *paidagōgos* negatively, context. The syntactical structure of Gal 3:24 indicates that the *paidagōgos* metaphor is meant to explain the previous verse.[172] J. Louis Martyn offers a particularly negative translation of

---

[170] Paul makes two key programmatic statements about the law in Galatians, both of which indicate a positive, if provisional, view of the law: Gal 2:19; 3:21; see also 5:14.

[171] Pollmann compares Paul's pessimism about the ability of humans to obey the Mosaic law in Romans (3:10–18; 7:15–24) to the pessimism of 4 Ezra and the Hodayot (*Gesetzeskritische Motive im Judentum*, 195–210). She also points out that "flesh" is a term for creaturliness at Qumran, but it does not factor significantly her view of Paul's critique of the law in Romans (*Gesetzeskritische Motive im Judentum*, 93).

[172] Gal 3:24 is a result clause: ὥστε + γέγονεν (indicative verb).

Gal 3:23, “Before faith came, *we were confined under the Law’s power, imprisoned during the period* that lasted until, as God intended, faith was invasively revealed.”[173] In Martyn’s translation the main verb “we were confined [ἐφρουρούμεθα]” and the present passive participle “imprisoned [συγκλειόμενοι]” are interpreted negatively. Yet this translation decision is contestable. As David Lull has argued, the negative imprisonment of the coordinate circumstantial participle (συγκλειόμενοι “imprisoned”) can just as likely be interpreted as the time during which the main verb (ἐφρουρούμεθα) occurs.[174] In this case, Paul may be describing the law’s guarding, protective function during the time of imprisonment, that is prior to the revelation of faith.[175] This interpretation makes better sense of the main verb φρουρέω, which refers to “guarding” in a positive, protective sense

---

[173] Martyn, *Galatians*, 353 *emphasis* added. In his rendering of the highlighted phrase de Boer’s translation is more literal but also negative: “we were confined under the law, being shut up.”

[174] Despite Trick’s nuanced argument that συγκλείω refers to the law driving Jews toward Christ (*Abrahamic Descent*, 210–17), the use of the same verb in Gal 3:22 makes it difficult to imagine reading the participle in 3:23 positively (cf. Rom 11:32). In the LXX the verb often describes the dire situation of a womb being “closed” (Gen 16:2; 20:18; 1 Kgdms 1:6) or being surrounded by an enemy (LXX Ps 30:9 [31:8]; 1 Macc 3:18; 4:31; 6:18, 49; 11:65; 15:25). Likewise, Josephus uses the verb to describe besieged armies (*Ant*. 7.129; 12.328; *J.W.* 1.65; 6.258) and imprisoned people (*A.J.* 17.175; *B.J.* 1.659; 2.641; 5.533). Of extant Jewish sources in Greek, only Philo uses the term in a positive sense, describing how the good man “secludes himself” for the improvement of his soul (*Abr*. 23). However, the Alexandrian uses the same word to warn against the foolishness of secluding oneself entirely (*Spec*. 1.320). At the very least this verb describes confinement, most often negatively. Paul argues that the Law cannot make alive (Gal 3:21), “But the scripture imprisoned all things under sin [ἀλλὰ συνέκλεισεν ἡ γραφὴ τὰ πάντα ὑπὸ ἁμαρτίαν]” (3:22a). Why Paul uses γραφή in 3:22 and not νόμος is not entirely clear. He may have in mind a specific text (Lightfoot, *Galatians*, 147). Longenecker, *Galatians*, 144 thinks Paul is possibly referring to Deut 27:26 from Gal 3:10. But this would make ὑπὸ κατάραν equivalent to ὑπὸ ἁμαρτίαν, an equivalence that is not entirely obvious. If Paul has a specific text in mind, the more likely option in my view, is Ps 143:2/Gen 6:12 based on Gal 2:16 and Rom 3:9–20. If this is the case, then, Paul would be speaking of the law’s protection during the time of flesh. Another possibility is that ἡ γραφή refers not to a specific text but to “the writing” of God at Sinai (Exod 24:12; 31:18; 32:15–16; 34:1, 29; Deut 4:13; 9:10–11, 15; 10:1–2, 4), this interpretation would fit with the interpretation of the angels and mediator suggested above.

[175] Lull, “Law Was Our Pedagogue,” 486–88. Similarly, Matera, *Galatians*, 136; Dunn, *Galatians*, 197; Oakes, *Galatians*, 125–27. See also Smyth §§ 2054–2069 who notes that the force of the circumstantial participle in the absence of a modifying adverb is determined by context.

elsewhere in Paul's letters (Phil 4:7; see also 2 Cor 11:32; 1 Pet 1:5).[176] Galatians 3:23 is important for understanding the nuance of Paul's metaphor but it does not, as de Boer argues, describe the law's temporal authority negatively.

The most common functions of the ancient *paidagōgos* were protection and discipline. It would be expected, then, for Paul to use the *paidagōgos* metaphor to describe the law's protective, disciplinary function. Moreover, there is precedent in Jewish sources for identifying the law as having a protective function. In the summary of Sinai prefacing Moses' recapitulation of the ten commandments, an explanation of the law's protective function is provided: "Out of heaven he let you hear his voice, that he might *discipline* [παιδεῦσαί] you. And on earth he let you see his great fire, and you heard his words out of the midst of the fire" (Deut 4:36).[177] The protective function of the is explicit in Deuteronomy and law continues in Second Temple Judaism.

In the narrative of account of the translation of the law into Greek, a Gentile who perceives food purity laws as illogical inquires about their purpose and the High Priest explains:

> So that we might not become perverted, being polluted by nothing or associating with worthless people, he fenced us around on every side by purifications and through food and drink and touch and hearing and sight that depend on laws.[178]

---

[176] Φρουρέω is most often a positive "guard." See Philo, *Mos.* 1.235; *Decal*. 74; Josephus, *A.J.* 9.42; 11.345; 13.26, 39; 14.59, 278, 296, 297; 14.338; 15.185, 264; *B.J.* 1.141, 175, 253; 2.19, 485, 507, 550; 3.12, 311, 430; 4.268, 516; 5.50, 69, 102; Plato, *Leg*. 758b; 763d; Herodotus, *Hist*. 3.90; 4.133; 7.217; Sophocles, *Oed. tyr*. 1479; Euripides, *Cycl*. 690; Aeschylus, *Prom*. 31. Still, there are instances of this "guarding" being tyrannical (Polybius, *Hist*. 18.4.6; Josephus, *A.J.* 14.297; *B.J.* 1.10) or negatively confining (Josephus, *A.J.* 14.335; *B.J.* 1.539, 660; 2.75, 478, 632; 3.180, 343, 398, 455, 504; 4.220, 228, 253, 272, 277, 410; 5.30; PGM 1.3093).

[177] Later in Deuteronomy, God's disciplinary love is likened to a father's love for his son (Deut 8:5). The Hebrew word the LXX translates with παιδεύω is יסר.

[178] Let. Aris. 142. Translation from Wright, *Letter of Aristeas*, 267.

Even in its apparently arbitrary commands, Mosaic law offers protection. Here a Jew explains for the benefit of a Gentile why the law is reasonable, the law protects its adherents from moral corruption.

Second, in Josephus' apologetic treatise he provides an encomium to the law (*C. Ap*. 2.145–286). One of his arguments for the superiority of the Mosaic law over other ancient law-codes is that the Mosaic law perfectly combines the practical/ethical (ἦθος) and theoretical/reasonable (λόγος) (*C. Ap*. 2.171–74). In this argument Josephus likens the law to being "under a father and master [ὑπὸ πατρὶ . . . καὶ δεσπότῃ]" (*C. Ap*. 2.174).[179] Accordingly, the Jewish law is a uniquely reasonable and practical guide for moral instruction. While the word *paidagōgos* does not appear, Josephus' illustration is similar in meaning to Paul's. The logic is analogous in Josephus and Paul: like a parent, or a *paidagōgos*, the law protects. Later in the encomium Josephus praises Mosaic legislation for protecting the Jewish way of life from corruption while also welcoming "all who desire to come and live *under the same laws with us* [ὑπὸ τοὺς αὐτοὺς ὑμῖν νόμους]" (*C. Ap*. 2.209–210).[180] Here again, Jewish law serves a protective function while inviting outsiders to come and enjoy its protection. The Letter of Aristeas and Josephus,

---

[179] John M. G. Barclay, *Flavius Josephus Commentary Volume 10: Against Apion*, (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 268 points out that the law is portrayed in Greek literature as a household authority (Herodotus, *Hist*. 4.223; Plato, *Leg*. 715D, 762E).

[180] This is the closest verbal parallel to the Pauline phrase ὑπὸ νόμον (Gal 3:23; 4:4–5, 21; 5:18; cf. Rom 6:14–15; 1 Cor 9:20) in extant Jewish sources. See Joel Marcus, "'Under the Law': The Background of a Pauline Expression," *CBQ* 63 (2001): 72–83, here 74–75. Based on *Ag. Ap.* 2.209–210 and Midrashic interpretations of Exod 19:17 and Deut 4:11, Marcus thinks the phrase is from Paul's opponents but co-opted into the Apostle's rhetorical arsenal by focusing only on the negative aspects of these Midrashic traditions. Cf. Todd A. Wilson, "'Under the Law' in Galatians: A Pauline Theological abbreviation," *JTS* 56 (2005): 362–92. Wilson argues that the phrase is a Pauline abbreviation for ὑπὸ τὴν κατάραν τοῦ νόμου, a phrase not found in the text of Galatians but reconstructed by combining 3:10 and 3:13.

follow Deuteronomy testifying to a tradition that the Mosaic law offered protection from an immoral life.

In addition to Deuteronomy, Letter of Aristeas, and Josephus, it is common in a variety of Second Temple texts to identify Mosaic law as a bulwark against moral corruption and a source of protection against cosmic corruption. As already seen in the case of Jubilees, obedience to the law is apotropaic, offering protection from superhuman beings.[181] Miryam Brand insightfully observes that despite the variety of views about evil's origin and persistence in Second Temple Judaism, one particularly consistent theme is that "the desire to sin, whether innately human or the result of demonic influence, can be fought with the law."[182] In the Enochic tradition of BW and Jubilees, as well as Philo, evil's origin and persistence is related to angels as a means of distancing God from evil. Furthermore, the best protection against the cosmic disorder caused by these rebellious angels in Jubilees is obedience to the law of Moses.

In addition to the common function of the law in Second Temple Judaism as disciplinary protection, the protective function of the law is signaled again in Gal 4:1–2. Paul likens the period of God's children being under "under law" to children being under the supervision of "guardians [ἐπιτρόπους]" and "administrators [οἰκονόμους]." Contrary to recent attempts to identify this analogy with Exodus imagery of "taskmasters," John Goodrich has marshalled an impressive array of literary and epigraphic sources to compellingly argue that the conceptual background of this metaphor is Greco-Roman

---

[181] As discussed in chapter two, there is a correspondence between the "law of nature" and the angel of justice to bring judgment on the wicked through the elements in Philo (*Mos*. 2.53–54; *Decal*. 176–178).

[182] Brand, *Evil within and Without*, 280.

guardianship law.[183] Like legal guardians, Paul describes the role of the law as protecting the heir from ruin. Again, according to this metaphor the law protects.

Paul's *paidagōgos* metaphor conveys the apotropaic function of the Mosaic law from Sinai to the arrival of the Abrahamic promise in Christ. Paul's use of the *paidagōgos* metaphor describes the temporal legitimacy of the law in protecting God's people. The protective function of the law is a common notion in Second Temple Judaism, often referring to protection from immorality (human evil). Protection from immorality, however, should not be divorced from protection against superhuman evil. In the context of Jewish apocalypticism the protection of the law extends to protection from superhuman beings. Where Paul departs from his contemporaries' view of the law's protective function is by limiting the period of the law's protective authority. Even the limits of the Mosaic law found in Galatians have parallels to the Enochic tradition.

5.4 The Inadequacy of the Law

Although Paul defends the valid function of the Mosaic law to protect, he also argues that in the advent of Christ this valid function has decisively ended. This conclusion, although Christological, is not without precedent in Enochic tradition. Two types of arguments Paul employs to limit the law's validity to a limited period are paralleled in Enochic tradition. Furthermore, the role of angels in mediating the law helps explain why the law

---

[183] John K. Goodrich, "Guardians, not Taskmasters: The Cultural Resonances of Paul's Metaphor in Galatians 4:1–2," *JSNT* 32 (2010): 251–284; Goodrich, "'As long as the heir is a child' The Rhetoric of Inheritance in Galatians 4:1–2 and P.Ryl. 2.153," *NovT* 55 (2013): 61–76; cf. James C. Walters, "Paul, Adoption, and Inheritance," in *Paul and the Greco-Roman World*, ed. J. Paul Sampley (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2003), 42–76, esp. 55–65. Goodrich's primary interlocutor is James M. Scott, *Adoption as Sons of God: An Exegetical Investigation into the Background of ΥΙΟΘΕΣΙΑ in the Pauline Corpus*, WUNT 2.48 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992).

is aligned the corrupt cosmos. In these significant ways, Paul's arguments about the inadequacy of the law are paralleled in Enochic tradition.

5.4.1 Temporal Validity

Paul claims that the law only has temporal validity to protect on two grounds that have substantial overlap with the Enochic tradition. First, the chronological priority of the promise to Abraham (Gal 3:6–9, 15–18) indicates that the law's protective role has ended with the arrival of Abraham's seed. Second, the universal scope of the gospel (esp. Gal 3:28–29) has brought the Spirit. Each of these arguments is paralleled in the Enochic tradition.

First, regarding the chronological argument. Paul argues that justification by faith is prior to Torah. He connects his gospel to the promise to Abraham in Genesis 12:13:

> προϊδοῦσα δὲ ἡ γραφὴ ὅτι ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοῖ τὰ ἔθνη ὁ θεὸς, προευηγγελίσατο τῷ Ἀβραὰμ ὅτι *ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν σοὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη.*
>
> After forseeing that God justifies the Gentiles from faith, the scripture proclaimed in advance to Abraham that "all the Gentiles shall be blessed in you."[184]

Later he argues that the promises spoken to Abraham have priority over Torah:

> διαθήκην προκεκυρωμένην ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ μετὰ τετρακόσια καὶ τριάκοντα ἔτη γεγονὼς νόμος οὐκ ἀκυροῖ εἰς τὸ καταργῆσαι τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν
>
> The Law having come four hundred and thirty years later does not invalidate the covenant already validated by God.[185]

---

[184] Gal 3:8 citing Gen 12:3.

[185] Gal 3:17 citing Exod 12:40–41. See also Gen 15:13.

In Paul's view Sinai is ancillary to the promise given to Abraham, which he understands to be fulfilled in Christ (Gal 3:16, 19). This argument is explicit in Gal 3:19 when Paul writes: "the Law was *added*."[186] Utilizing an earlier portion of Genesis, Paul interprets his gospel as chronologically prior and, in this way, superior to the law of Moses.

In addition to chronological priority, Paul is emphatic that the universal revelation of the gospel cannot be limited to one particular people.[187] He understands his personal calling, announcing Christ to the Gentiles, to be a revelation [ἀποκάλυψις] directly from God (Gal 1:1, 10–12, 16; 2:2, 7) and any threat to the universality of this revelation to be anathema (Gal 1:6–9; 2:14). The terms of election are defined by faith in Christ (Gal 2:16; 3:26–29; 5:6) and not observance of the law (esp. Gal 2:16). As a result, election is now open to Gentiles through the promise given to Abraham (Gal 3:9). This revelation is so universal Paul can claim that ethnic, social, and gender binaries are subordinated in Christ (Gal 3:28). The temporal validity of the law is based on the chronological priority of the Abrahamic promise and the universality of redemption and outpouring of the Spirit to include Gentiles.

Paul's view of the Torah having limited authority is rather odd in comparison with most extant sources from the Second Temple period. In the Second Temple period

[186] Pollmann compares Paul's view of the Mosaic law as secondary to the Abrahamic promise with Philo's criticism of the laws of other nations as secondary to the law of Moses in *Ios.* 28–31 (*Gesetzeskritische Motive im Judentum*, 127–179, 229–32).

[187] The universalization of Torah is also a feature of Ishmaelite midrash according to Marc Hirshman, "Rabbinic Universalism in the Second and Third Centuries," *HTR* 93 (2000): 101–15, esp. 103–7. It has also been recently noted that Paul's exegesis (esp. in Galatians) shares several formal parallels with the hermeneutical activity of the school of Rabbi Ishmael. See Michael B. Cover, ""Paulus als Yischmaelit? The Personification of Scripture as Interpretive Authority in Paul and the School of Rabbi Ishmael," *JBL* 135 (2016): 617–37, esp. 622–34.

Mosaic law was increasingly recognized as the pinnacle of divine revelation.[188] Despite the preeminence of Mosaic law, the Enochic tradition locates the authority of its revelation in Enoch, not Moses. Many scholars have noted that 1 Enoch subordinates Mosaic law to Enochic revelation.[189] The logic of the preference for Enoch over Moses appears to be twofold. The antediluvian hero supersedes Moses in chronological priority and as a source of universal revelation.

It was an axiom of ancient apologetic literature that chronological priority indicates superiority.[190] Moses is not entirely absent from Enochic literature, but he is

---

[188] George W. E. Nickelsburg, "Enochic Wisdom: An Alternative to the Mosaic Torah?" in *Hesed Ve-Emet*, ed. Jodi Magness and Seymour Gitin, BJS 320 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998), 123 citing examples of the elevation of Mosaic Law in Second Temple literature: Sir 24:23; Bar 3:36–4:1; Jubilees; 1QS I, 3; V, 8; CD XV, 12; XVI, 1–2; 4QMMT 91; Dan 9:11; Bar 1:20; 2:2; 1 Macc 1–2; 2 Macc 6–7. Philo provides an illuminating perspective in describing Mosaic Law as a copy of the "law of nature" (*Opif*. 3, 6; *Abr*. 3; *Mos*. 2.11, 14, 48). See Martens, *One God, One Law*, 95–99; Najman, *Seconding Sinai*, 70–107.

[189] G. H. Dix argues that 1 Enoch functioned as a rival Pentateuch ("The Enochic Pentateuch," *JTS* 27 [1925]: 29–42). Dix has been rightfully challenged (Jonas C. Greenfield and Michael E. Stone, "The Enochic Pentateuch and the Date of the Similitudes," *HTR* 70 [1977]: 51–65). Still, most scholars find the non-Mosaic perspective of 1 Enoch an indication of subordination, including: Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis*, 68–79; Boccaccini, "Evilness of Human Nature," 63–82; Philip S. Alexander, "From Son of Adam to Second God: Transformations of the Biblical Enoch," in *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible* (Harrisburg: Trinity International Press, 1998), 87–122, esp. 107–110; Alexander, "Enoch and the Beginnings of Jewish Interest in Natural Science," in *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought*, eds. C. Hempel, A. Lange and H. Lichtenberger (Leuven: Peeters, 2002), 223–42, esp. 232–36; Nickelsburg, "Enochic Wisdom,"123–32; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 50–1; James C. VanderKam, "The Interpretation of Genesis in 1 Enoch," in *The Bible at Qumran*, eds. P. W. Flint and T. H. Kim (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 129–48, esp. 142–6; Andreas Bendenbender, "Traces of Enochic Judaism within the Hebrew Bible," *Hen* 24 (2002): 39–48; Orlov, *Enoch-Metatron Tradition*, 254–60; Collins, "How Distinctive was Enochic Judaism?" 17–34; Helge S. Kvanvig, "Enochic Judaism – a Judaism without the Torah and the Temple," in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees*, eds. Gabriele Boccaccini and Giovanni Ibba (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 2009), 163–177.

It is increasingly recognized that the rivalry thesis has been overblown. Kelley Coblentz Bautch provides a balanced summary of the debate (*Geography of 1 Enoch*, 289–99). There is only one outright attack on the notion to Enochic literature subordinates Mosaic Law: Paul Heger, "*1 Enoch*—Complementary or Alternative to Mosaic Torah?" *JSJ* 41 (2010): 29–62. Focusing specifically on BW, Veronika Bachmann provides a cautious challenge ("The Book of the Watchers (1 Enoch 1-36): An Anti-Mosaic, Non-Mosaic, or Even Pro-Mosaic Writing?" *JHS* 11 [2011]: 1–23). In the past scholars often worked under the assumption that 1 Enoch implies the authority of Mosaic law. For example, Hoffmann, *Das Gesetz in der frühjüdischen Apokalyptik*, 122–47; Sanders, *PPJ*, 346–62.

[190] Arthur J. Droge traces the claim about the antiquity of Moses and consequent superiority of Jewish literature in Jewish and Christian apologetic literature (*Homer or Moses?: Early Christian*

significantly downplayed. The reception of the Torah at Sinai is mentioned in the Apocalypse of Weeks (1 En. 93:6) and the Animal Apocalypse (1 En. 89:29–32), but in both instances this seminal event is given truncated significance.[191] Shortly after the passing reference to Torah in the Apocalypse of Weeks (1 En. 93:6), Enochic revelation is highlighted as the means of abating the apostasy of future generations (93:10), not Mosaic law.[192] In the Animal Apocalypse, zoomorphic symbolism portrays Moses on Mount Sinai (1 En. 89:29–31), but the law is never mentioned. Furthermore, Sinai is portrayed chiefly as the location of theophany (1 En. 89:30–31; also 1 En. 1:4, 9), and the Golden-Calf episode takes center stage in this passage (1 En. 89:32–34 [Exod. 32:1–24]). These conspicuous absences of the law while not indicating open hostility, certainly temper the significance of Mosaic law.[193] Additionally, these passages highlight the fact Moses was not unknown in Enochic circles and yet Enochic tradition deliberately choose to invoke a more ancient authority.

Not only is Enoch's chronological priority significant, so too is the fact that Enoch's revelation is not limited to Israel. Enoch is portrayed as receiving his revelation in heaven (1 En. 12–36) before passing on his heavenly wisdom to his son, Methuselah (1 En. 81–82, 91), and eventually the last generation (1 En. 1:1; 92:1). Enochic literature self-identifies as divinely revealed wisdom that will prepare future generations for the

---

Interpretations of the History of Culture, HUZT 26 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1989]). This axiom may find its roots in Plato's critique of the Greek culture lacking a written history (*Tim.* 22a–23c) since Josephus draws on Plato's critique as part of his apology (*C. Ap.* 1.6–7, 12; 2.1).

[191] On possible references to Sinai and Mosaic law in 1 En. 1:4; 5:4 see chapter four.

[192] Kvanvig, "Enochic Judaism," 176–77.

[193] Collins, "How Distinctive Was Enochic Judaism?" 31; Orlov, *Enoch-Metatron*, 255; VanderKam, "Interpretation of Genesis in 1 Enoch," 129–148; Boccaccini, "Evilness of Human Nature," 63–66.

coming judgment (1 En. 1:1; 82:1–2; 93:10; 104:12) and there is no mention of Mosaic law in this regard. Enoch is not only prior to Moses in chronology but he is also a source of heavenly wisdom for all of humanity.

Chronological priority and universality of Enochic revelation are moderated in Jubilees. Jubilees utilizes Enochic revelation to lend greater authority to Moses, likely indicating a felt need to harmonize these competing revelatory sources. In Jubilees the law is written on "heavenly tablets" given to Moses by an angel of the presence on Mount Sinai, bypassing Enoch.[194] This is the same angel who teaches Abraham the Hebrew language which gives the Patriarch access to the books of Enoch and Noah (Jub. 12:25–27). In addition to portraying Torah as inscribed in heaven, Jubilees shows the patriarchs prior to Moses following the law, which is represented as a continuation of Enochic revelation (Jub. 7:39; 10:17; 12:25–27).[195] In Jubilees the chronological priority of Enochic revelation is subsumed to Mosaic law by describing the Torah as the revelation given to Enoch and Moses from a shared heavenly source. Furthermore, in Jubilees the problem of a universal standard of judgment is solved by portraying the cosmos operating according to Mosaic law. Even the angels keep Sabbath (Jub. 2:18) and are circumcised (Jub. 15:27). Israel alone participates in the universal operations of the cosmos. While Gentiles are deceived and led astray by evil spirits (Jub 15:31), the Torah allows Israel to live by the order of the universe (Jub. 15:32–34). In Jubilees features of Enochic

---

[194] On the "heavenly tablets" in *Jubilees* (3:10, 31; 4:32; 5:13; 6:17, 29, 31, 35; 15:25; 16:3, 9, 28; 18:19; 19:9; 23:32; 24:33; 28:6; 30:9, 19–20, 22; 31:32; 32:10, 15, 28; 33:10; 49:8) see Florentino García Martínez, "The Heavenly Tablets in the Book of Jubilees," in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees*, trans. M. T. Davis, eds. M. Albani, et al., TSAJ 65 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1997), 243–60; Hindy Najman, "Interpretation as Primordial Writing : Jubilees and Its Authority Conferring Strategies," *JSJ* 30 (1999): 379–410.

[195] Noah (Jub. 6:1–3, 17–31; 7:34–39) and especially Abraham (Jub. 13:25–27; 15:1–4; 16:20–31; 22:1–4).

superiority, chronological priority and universality, are mobilized to lend authority to Mosaic law.

Paul shares with the Enochic tradition a preference for a chronologically prior and more universal revelation than the Mosaic law. This stands in sharp relief to Jubilees, where the superior elements of Enochic revelation are incorporated into Mosaic revelation. Paul's view of the Mosaic law shares common features with the Enochic tradition by advocating for a source of revelation that is chronologically prior and more universal than Sinai.

5.4.2 Angelic Mediation

Although it is not uncommon to depict an angel involved in the giving of the law at Sinai, celestial beings are explicitly absent from the narratives of Exodus and Deuteronomy.[196] Furthermore, it is not obvious why Paul refers to this tradition and how it relates to the unspecified "mediator [μεσίτης]" (Gal 3:19–20). The majority of scholars interpret Paul's mention of angels as a way to demean the law, illustrating the law's inferiority to the promise, or even distancing God from giving the law altogether.[197] Others have contended

---

[196] This tradition is found in numerous places (LXX Deut 33:2; Ps 68:18; Jub. 1:27–29; Philo, *Somn*. 1.142–143; Josephus, *A.J.* 15.136; Acts 7:53; Heb 2:2; GLAE preface; Papias, Frag. 24.4; see also Philo, *Abr*. 115), including elsewhere in the NT (Acts 7:53; Heb 2:2). See also LXX Deut 32:8; 4Q37 XII. On the reception and rejection of the Angels at Sinai tradition in Rabbinic literature see Terrance D. Callan, "The Law and the Mediator: Gal 3:19b-20" (PhD diss., Yale University, 1976), 169–73; James L. Kugel, *The Bible as it Was* (Cambridge: Belknap, 1997), 373–86; Hindy Najman, "Angels at Sinai: Exegesis, Theology and Interpretive Authority," *DSD* 7 (2000): 313–33, esp. 325–332. The narratives of Exodus and Deuteronomy are not clear concerning God's presence at Sinai. In some instances, the Lord or heaven descends to Sinai (Exod 19:3, 20; 2 Sam 22:10; Ps 18:9, 13; 144:5; Aristob. 2.12–17 [Eusebius, *Praep*. 8.10; *Strom*. 6.3.32.4–33.1]; 4 Ezra 3:18–19; LAB 23:10; Mek. R. Ish. *Boḥodesh* 9). Other times, the Lord speaks from heaven (Exod 20:21; Deut 4:36), these traditions are combined in Neh 9:13. In other texts, the mountain ascends into heaven (Sir 45:1; 2 Bar 59:3–4; Tg. Ps.-J on Exod 19:17; Mek. R. Ish. *Boḥodesh* 3; Pirqe R. El. 41).

[197] Terrance Callan, "Pauline Midrash: The Exegetical Background of Gal 3:19b," *JBL* 99 (1980): 549–67, esp. 554. The angels' role in giving the law has been interpreted to 1) indicate the inferiority of the law in relation to the promise (Betz, *Galatians*, 168–70; Bruce, *Galatians*, 176–77; R. N. Longenecker, *Galatians* 139–40); 2) distance God from the source of the law (Bultmann, *Theology*, 174; Burton,

that mention of angelic mediation is meant to positively convey the divine authority of the law as in Acts 7:53.[198] The identity of the mediator has been disputed.[199] However, the evidence is overwhelming that the "mediator" of Gal 3:19–20 refers to Moses.[200] Many find Paul employing traditions about the presence of angels and the role of Moses in the giving of the law, traditions that typically conveyed the glory of the law, subverted.[201] If this is the case, it suggests that Paul is attacking his opponents' view of the law's authority due to the law's angelic institution and Mosaic mediation. Paul's attack is not a denial of angelic mediation of the Mosaic law but rather a form of exegetical redeployment, turning a powerful argument for his opponents against them to support his

---

Galatians, 189; Schlier, *Galater*, 157–58; Räisänen*, Paul and the Law*, 130–31; Martyn, *Galatians*, 366; de Boer, *Galatians*, 228); 3) distance God from the sin-producing effects of the law (Bandstra, *Law and the Elements*, 151–57; Hong, *Law in Galatians*, 154–55); 4) identify evil angels as the source of the law (Schweitzer, *Mysticism*, 71; Lloyd Gaston, "Angels and Gentiles in Early Judaism and in Paul," *SR* 11 (1982): 65–75; Hübner, *Law*, 31; Schoeps, *Paul*, 182); 5) identify multiple angelic authors as the source of "the confused state of the text" (Watson, *Paul and the Hermenutics of Faith*, 280).

[198] Cyril of Alexandria, *Hom. Pasch*. 29.2; Suzanne Nicholson, *Dynamic Oneness: The Significance and Flexibility of Paul's One-God Language* (Cambridge: James Clarke & Co, 2011), 135–36; Douglas J. Moo, *Galatians*, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2013), 235. Both Nicholson and Moo view the mention of angels as peripheral to Paul's main argument.

[199] On Moses as the mediator: Basil, *de spiritu sancto* 14.33; Lightfoot, *Galatians*, 146; Albrecht Oepke, "μεσίτης," *TDNT* 4.618–19; Betz, *Galatians*, 170–73; Callan, "Pauline Midrash," 555–64; R. N. Longenecker, *Galatians*, 140–41; Martyn, *Galatians*, 357; Hays, *Galatians*, 267; Watson, *Paul and the Hermenutics of Faith*, 279; Nicholson, *Dynamic Oneness*, 148–50; Schreiner, *Galatians*, 242–43; de Boer, *Galatians*, 227–228; Oakes, *Galatians*, 124. Other suggestions for the mediator are an angel or Christ (esp. Eusebius, *Marc*. 1.1.28–35; Chrysostom, *Comm. Gal*. 3:19). On the history of interpretation see Meiser, *Galater*, 155–56. It has also been suggested that Paul speaks of multiple mediators. Albert Vanhoye, for example, argues that Gal 3:19–20 refers to Moses mediating on behalf of Israel and an angel mediating on behalf of the angelic host ("Un médiateur des anges en Ga 3:19–20," *Bib* 59 [1978]: 403–11).

[200] Although the noun does not occur in the LXX referring to Moses (see Job 9:33), Moses mediates the law on Israel's behalf (esp. Exod 20:19; Deut 5:22–28; 18:16). Additionally, Moses is explicitly identified as a "mediator" in the Assumption of Moses 1.14; 3.12 and Philo (*Somn*. 1.143; *Mos*. 2.166). It is particularly in his role at Sinai that Moses is a "mediator" (Philo, *Somn*. 1.143; As. Mos. 3.12; cf. Lev 26:46), which is clear in the narratives of Exodus (19:3–13, 16–25; 20:18–21; 24:1–18; 31:18) and Deuteronomy (5:4–5, 22–27). See also סרסור applied to Moses in *Exod Rab*. 33.1; 43.1; *Deut Rab*. 3.12.

[201] Schlier, *Galater*, 156–58; Callan, "Pauline Midrash," 553; Hays, *Galatians*, 267; Matera, *Galatians*, 128; Oakes, *Galatians*, 124.

own view.[202] Why does Paul mention the role of angels and a mediator in giving the law? How does it relate to the origin and persistence of evil? As we have already seen, obedience to the law is apotropaic in Jubilees. It is only through the angelic revelation mediated to Moses that humanity can find protection from evil. Paul admits the angelic mediation of the law and its protective function, but now claims that protection is insufficient. In the arrival of Christ, the flesh no longer needs protecting because God is sending his Spirit for a new creation.

Celestial beings are not as prominent in Paul's letters as elsewhere in early Christian literature, but they still populate his cosmos.[203] Paul offers little in the way of explanatory description of the origin of these beings; they are simply presumed. The mere fact that Paul refers to angels, demons, and Satan without explanation is noteworthy. Some scholars have attempted to elucidate the meaning of angelology and demonology in

---

[202] Suggested by R. N. Longenecker, *Galatians*, 177; Martyn, *Galatians*, 356–7.

[203] Paul explicitly refers to celestial beings less than we find in the synoptic gospels, Acts, or John's Apocalypse. ἄγγελος occurs only fourteen times in the Pauline corpus (Rom 8:38; 1 Cor. 4:9; 6:3; 11:10; 13:1; 2 Cor 11:14; 2 or 12:7; Gal 1:8; 3:19; 4:14; Col 2:18; 2 Thess. 1:7; 1 Tim 3:16; 5:21) compared with fifty-four times in the canonical Gospels, twenty-one times in Acts, and sixty-seven times in Revelation. Similarly, only five of sixty-three NT references to δαιμόνιον appear in the Pauline corpus (1 Cor 10:20[x2], 21[x2]; 1 Tim 4:1), διάβολος occurs only in deutero-Pauline material (Eph 4:27; 6:11; 1 Tim 3:6, 7; 2 Tim 2:26), πνεῦμα is never used in a morally tinged "evil spirit" sense (although see Rom 11:8; 1 Cor 2:12; Eph 2:2; 1 Tim 4:1), σατανᾶς appears only ten times (Rom 16:20; 1 Cor 5:5; 7:5; 2 Cor 2:11; 11:14; 12:7; 1 Thess 2:18; 2 Thess 2:9; 1 Tim 1:20; 5:15). Paul also uses the phrase "God of this age" (2 Cor 4:4; cf. Eph 2:2). Other relevant language includes: ἀρχάγγελος (1 Thess 4:16; see also Jude 9), τοὺς κοσμοκράτορας τοῦ σκότους τούτου (Eph 6:12; see also T. Sol. 8.2; 18.12), ὁ περάζων (1 Thess 3:5), ὁ πονήρος (Eph 6:16; 2 Thess 3:3), and Βελιάρ (2 Cor 6:15). The Apostle also uses "principalities and powers" language to refer to cosmic entities: ἀρχαί (Rom 8:38; 1 Cor 15:24; see also Eph 1:21; 3:10; 6:12; Col 1:16, 18; 2:10, 15; Titus 3:1) ἄρχοντες (Rom 13:3; 1 Cor 2:6, 8; see also Eph 2:2), ἐξουσίαι (1 Cor 15:24; see also Eph 1:21; 3:10; 6:12; Col 1:13, 16; 2:10, 15), δυνάμεις (Rom 8:38; 1 Cor 15:24; see also Eph 1:21), θρόνοι (Col 1:16), κυριότης (Eph 1:21; Col 1:16; see also 2 Pet 2:10; Jude 8). It is worth noting that the so-called "depersonalized language" occurs only in Rom 8:38 and 1 Cor 15:24 in the undisputed Pauline material. Similar language occurs in the Greek translations of Enochic literature referring to angels (1 En. 61:10; 2 En. 20:1) as noted by Clinton Arnold, *Powers of Darkness: Principalities and Powers in Paul's Letters* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1992), 90.

Paul's thought, but it remains largely unconnected to any traditional or philosophical foundations.[204] As a result, accounts of Paul's angelology and demonology are rarely connected with Paul's thinking about evil in general.[205] Celestial beings play an important role in a variety of Jewish traditions to explain the origin and persistence of evil. The same is true in Paul's case in Galatians. Paul's contribution to this common theme is that

---

[204] A number of books and articles have been written to address the still undecided role of these superhuman beings in Paul's theology, especially notable are the following: Everling, *Die paulinische Angelologie und Dämonologie*; Dibelius, *Die Geisterwelt im Glauben des Paulus*; G. B. Caird, *Principalities and Powers: A Study in Pauline Theology*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956); Jung Young Lee, "Interpreting the Demonic Powers in Pauline Thought," *NovT* 12 (1970): 54–69; Pierre Benoit, "Pauline Angelology and Demonology: Reflexions on Designations of Heavenly Powers and on Origin of Angelic Evil according to Paul," *RelSB* 3 (1983): 1–18; Clinton Arnold, *Powers of Darkness*; Forbes, "Paul's Principalities and Powers," 61–88; Forbes, "Pauline Demonology and/or Cosmology?," 51–73; Richard H. Bell, *Deliver Us from Evil: Interpreting the Redemption from the Power of Satan in New Testament Theology*, WUNT 216 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007); Dominika A. Kurek-Chomycz and Reimund Bieringer, "Guardians of the Old at the Dawn of the New: The Role of Angels According to the Pauline Letters," in *Angels: The Concept of Celestial Beings – Origins, Development and Reception*, eds. Fredrich V. Reiterer, Tobias Nicklas, Karin Schöpflin (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007), 325–55; Albert L. A. Hogeterp, "Angels, the Final Age and 1–2 Corinthians in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Angels: The Concept of Celestial Beings – Origins, Development and Reception*, eds. Fredrich V. Reiterer, Tobias Nicklas, Karin Schöpflin (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007), 377–92; Guy Williams, *The Spirit World in the Letters of Paul the Apostle: A Critical Examination of the Role of Spiritual Beings in the Authentic Pauline Epistles*, FRLANT 231 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009); Sang Meyng Lee, *The Cosmic Drama of Salvation: A Study of Paul's Undisputed Writings from Anthropological and Cosmological Perspectives*, WUNT 2.276 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 152–57; Michael Becker, "Paul and the Evil One," in *Evil and the Devil*, ed. Erkki Koskenniemi and Ida Frölich, LNTS 481 (New York: T&T Clark, 2013), 127–141; Robert Ewusie Moses, *Practices of Power: Revisiting the Principalities and Powers in the Pauline Letters* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2014); Derek R. Brown, *The God of This Age: Satan in the Churches and Letters of the Apostle Paul*, WUNT 2.409 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015).

[205] I refer to "angelology and demonology" in the broadest sense, to refer to Paul's views about angels, demons, Satan and other celestial beings populating heaven(s) and earth. These terms are admittedly problematic. As Dale Martin has pointed out, the translators of the LXX never translate מלאך with δαίμων/δαιμόνιον, apparently distinguishing between two classes of being. Martin argues that this distinction is maintained until Tatian (*Orat*. 7–8) and Tertullian (*Idol*. 4.2; 9.1–2; *Apol*. 22). See Martin, "When Did Angels Become Demons?" *JBL* 129 (2010): 657–77. The earliest etiology of demons in Jewish literature is that they are the offspring of the Watchers (Jub. 10:1–11; T. Sol. 5:3; 17:1; see also "evil spirits" in 1 En. 15:8–16:1; 19:1–2; Tob 6:8). As Martin recognizes ("When did Angels Become Demons?" 671–72), Philo explicitly claims that what "other philosophers have named 'demons [δαίμονας],' Moses has customarily called angels [ἀγγέλους]" (*Gig*. 6; see also *Somn*. 1.141). Martin argues, however, that the equation of angels with demons in Philo is based on Greek philosophy and is therefore different that the later Christian mythology of Tatian or Tertullian. On philosophy and demonology see chapter six.

he draws attention to human incapacity to perform the law as linked to the law's angelic origin and the corruption of the cosmos.

Paul's description of angelic emissaries and Mosaic mediation at Sinai serves his argument that the law has a provisional role which has now passed. Paul does not argue, as some have suggested, that the law was introduced by rebellious angels in the first place.[206] The ultimate source of the law is God.[207] Still, Paul's argument that the law comes through angels and a mediator demonstrates its inferiority to the promise which has now arrived in Christ.[208] As Terrance Callan has noted, there are two especially notable events in the life of Moses that identify him as a mediator in Jewish tradition.[209] First, Moses is identified as the mediator for Israel at Sinai after the initial reception of the ten commandments (Exod 20:19; Deut 5:22–28; 18:16). Second, Moses is the mediator who intercedes on behalf of Israel after the Golden Calf episode and obtains a second set of tablets (Exod 32–34; Deut 9:7–10:11). Francis Watson is correct in

---

[206] Schweitzer, *Mysticism*, 71; Gaston, "Angels and Gentiles," 65–75; Hübner, *Law*, 31; Schoeps, *Paul*, 182. The law is attributed to evil angels as a "Gnostic" position in early Christian texts: Clement, *Exc*. 53.2; Basilides in Irenaeus, *Haer*. 1.24.5; Sethite position in Irenaeus, *Haer*. 1.30.1–15; Ps.-Clem. *Hom*. 18.12; Epiphanius, *Pan*. 28.1; Ps.Hippolytus, *Ref*. 7.38.1

[207] The implied subject of the passive participle form of *διατάσσω* in Gal 3:19 is God. Furthermore, Gal 3:21 refutes the notion that the divine origin of the law conflicts with the divine promise to Abraham.

[208] On mediation as inferior to direct interaction see Callan, "Pauline Midrash," 555–559; LXX Isa 63:9; 1QH 6:13–14; Jub. 2.17–20; 15:30–32; 16:17–18; 19:29; Sir 17:17; Philo, *Deus* 109–110; *Somn*. 1.142–143; Josephus, *A.J*. 3.89; John 1:17–18; Mek. R. Ish. *Boḥodesh* 2; Pirqe R. El. 24; Irenaeus, *Epid*. 88, 94. It is not that angels are necessarily evil, but they are always inferior to God's direct presence. See, for example, the logic of Exod 33:1–6. After the Golden Calf episode God promises to send Israel into the Promised Land with an angel (Exod 33:2) but God will not go with Israel (Exod 33:3), prompting great mourning (Exod 33:4–6).

[209] "Pauline Midrash," 559.

asserting that if the origin of the law can be identified for Paul, it is in "the moment of Moses' descent from the mountain bearing the inscribed stone tablets."[210]

Both Callan and Watson focus primarily on the tablets in Moses's hand after the Golden Calf narrative.[211] Yet in Gal 3:19–21 there is no clear allusion to this second reception of the Law (Exod 32–34; Deut 9:7–10:11), except possibly Paul's mention of the mediator's hand.[212] The "hand of the mediator" is slim evidence. There are numerous variations on the phrase "in the hand of Moses" in the LXX which indicate this was a common way to refer to Sinai without specifying the Golden Calf narrative.[213] Although these two incidents of law-giving are perhaps difficult to separate in Paul's mind, there is little evidence to support a reference to the Golden Calf in Gal 3:19–21.

There are several features of Gal 3:19–21 that suggest Paul is describing the initial reception of the law before the Golden Calf (Exod 20:18–21; Deut 4:13; 5:4–5, 22–28; 18:16; see also 4Q158 Frag 6:1–7). First, Paul's mention of the law being

---

[210] Watson, *Paul and the Hermenutics of Faith*, 281.

[211] Callan, "Pauline Midrash" 561–564; Watson, *Paul and the Hermenutics of Faith*, 281–98. The Golden Calf episode is the exegetical locus of Paul's argument in 2 Cor 3.

[212] Callan, "Pauline Midrash" 561–62 points out that the phrase "in the hand [ביד] of Moses" in MT of Exod 34:29 would most obviously be translated with Paul's words in Gal 3:19: ἐν χειρί. The fact that the LXX rendering of Exod 34:29 reads ἐπὶ τῶν χειρῶν leads Callan to propose Paul may be alluding to the Hebrew text. Referring to Moses' reception of the law, 4QWords of the Luminaries refers to the "law which [you] comman[ded] in the hand of Mose[s] [ביד מוש]ה]" (4Q504 Frag 4:8). Earlier in the same fragment, 4QWords of the Luminaries refers to the "wicked deeds" of the fathers who were "stiff-necked" (4Q504 Frag 4:7), a likely allusion to the Golden Calf episode (Exod 32:9; 33:3, 5; 34:9). The necessity of appealing to the Hebrew text to identify an allusion to Exod 34:29 in Gal 3:19 makes the connection less likely.

[213] Lev 26:46, for example, refers to "the law, which the Lord gave between himself and the sons of Israel on Mount Sinai *in the hand of Moses* [ἐν χειρὶ Μωυσῆ]" (see also Num 36:13). There is a repeated refrain in Numbers: "through the voice of the Lord in the hand of Moses [διὰ φωνῆς κυρίου ἐν χειρὶ Μωυσῆ]" (Num 4:37, 41, 45, 10:13; see also Num 4:49; 9:23), although this does not specify Sinai. It is rather common to refer to Mosaic law with some variation of "in the hand of Moses" (Josh 21:2; 22:9; Judg 3:4; 3 Kgdms 8:53, 56; 1 Chron 16:40; 2 Chron 33:8; 2 Esd 19:14 [Neh 9:14]; 2 Esd 20:30 [Neh 10:29]; Bar 2:28)

introduced through multiple “angels” (Gal 3:19). The presence of natural phenomena including a “cloud” (Exod 19:9, 16, 18; 20:21; 24:16; Ps 18:11; 97:2), “fire” (Deut 4:11), and “thunder and lightning” (Exod 19:16, 19) at Sinai could be understood as signs of angelic beings (Ps 104:4; 148:8; Jub. 2:2; 1 En. 60:11–23; LAB 11:4).[214] In the narrative of Exodus both the “cloud” and “fire” are explicitly identified with angelomorphic manifestations.[215] This tradition is developed most significantly in the figure of the “Angel of the Presence [מלאך הפנים]” found in Jubilees (see also MT Isa 63:9).[216] According to Jubilees, this is not a single angel but a group or class of angels (Jub. 2:18; 15:27; 48:13). The most prominent function of these angels is writing the law for Moses (Jub. 1:27; 6:22; 30:12, 21; 50:1–2, 6, 13).[217] In the final exhortation of Jubilees, Moses encourages the Israelites to keep the Sabbath, “as it was written in the tablets which he [the angel of the presence] placed in my hands” (Jub. 50:13). Jubilees makes much of the angels’ role in producing the law and placing it in Moses’s hand but omits the Golden

---

[214] Theodor Zahn, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Galater*, KNT 9 (Leipzig: Deichert, 1905), 174 makes this point based on his reading of Exodus and the Psalter without reference to the Second Temple literature. See also Schlier, *Galater*, 156–57.

[215] In the theophany of Exod 3: “the angel of the Lord appeared to [Moses] *in a flame of fire* [בְּלַבַּת־אֵשׁ/ἐν φλογὶ πυρός]” (Exod 3:2; cf. 13:21–22; 24:17; 40:38; Philo, *Mos*. 1.66). Just before the sea crossing, “the angel of God who was going before the Israelite army moved and went behind them; and the pillar of cloud moved from in front of them and took its place behind them” (Exod 14:19; 23:20–23; Num 20:15–16 cf. Exod 13:21–22; 33:2; 40:38). The cloud is also often associated with the glorious presence of God (Exod 16:10; 24:15–16, 18; 33:9; 34:5; 40:34, 35, 36, 37; Jub. 1:2). This cloud is variously described as concealing an “unseen angel” (Philo, *Mos*. 1.166), identified as “Wisdom” (Sir 24:3–4; Wis 10:17), a “good spirit” (Neh 9:19–20), God’s “holiness” and “glory” (4Q506 Frag 6:10–11).

[216] See James C. VanderKam, “The Angel of the Presence in the Book of Jubilees,” *DSD* 7 (2000): 378–93. The angel of the presence appears in Jub. 1:27, 29; 2:1, 2, 18; 6:19, 22, 35, 38; 12:22–24, 25–27; 15:27, 33; 16:5; 18:9–11; 30:12, 17, 21, 48:4, 13; 50:1–2, 6, 13.

[217] In each of these instances the role of the angel of the presence is described in the first person singular, but it is clear in the narrative that there are multiple “angels of presence.” The plurality may refer to the two pillars found in the Exodus narrative. Whatever the case, this is a particularly high class of angels, one of only two that keep Sabbath and are created circumcised (Jub. 2:18; 15:27).

Calf narrative altogether. The plural "angels" and "hand of the mediator," then, find their closest parallel in Jubilees, which omits reference to the Golden Calf episode.

Second, Paul specifies the inadequacy of Moses as a mediator: "the mediator is not of one, but God is one [ὁ δὲ μεσίτης ἑνὸς οὐκ ἔστιν, ὁ δὲ θεὸς εἷς ἐστιν]" (Gal 3:20). This verse has baffled interpreters and produced a dizzying array of interpretive options.[218] There are at least six different interpretations commonly adopted in contemporary scholarship.[219] The most likely, in my view, is that the law was mediated to Moses by a plurality of angels who bear responsibility for its inadequacies. Whatever the precise meaning of Paul's terse locution, he appears to draw from the Shema (Deut 6:4; cf. 1 Cor 8:4–6; Rom 3:29–30), which occurs immediately after the initial reception of the commandments at Sinai when Israel seeks Moses to mediate on their behalf (Deut 5:22–33). Appealing to the Shema, Paul identifies an inadequacy of Moses's angelic sources at Sinai, which might suggest Paul is concerned with the initial reception of the law in Moses' hand.

Third, while denying the conclusion that the law is opposed to the divine promise, Paul identifies the fundamental inadequacy of the law as its inability to "make alive" (Gal

---

[218] Lightfoot comments "The number of interpretations of this passage is said to mount up to 250 or 300" (*Galatians*, 146).

[219] Consider this brief summary of positions: 1) duality of parties in which the problem of mediation is that it is indirect and conditioned on the fidelity of both parties whereas the divine promise is direct and unconditional (Lightfoot, *Galatians*, 146; Burton, *Galatians*, 190–92; R. N. Longenecker, *Galatians*, 141–43; Schreiner, *Galatians*, 242–43); 2) the plurality of persons in which the problem of mediation is that the mediator represents a party of angels rather than the one God (Oepke, "μεσίτης," *TDNT* 4.619; Schlier, *Galater*, 161; Giblin, "Three Monotheistic Texts," 537–43; Martyn, *Galatians*, 357; Vouga, *Galater*, 84; Watson, *Paul and the Hermenutics of Faith*, 280; de Boer, *Galatians*, 227–28) ; 3) mediation is itself inferior to direct dealing with the one God (Betz, *Galatians*, 171–73); 4) the divided loyalty of the mediator between God and the people stands in tension with the simple oneness of God (Callan, "Pauline Midrash," 567; Oakes, *Galatians*, 124); 5) Moses is not the mediator of the "one" family of God, both Jew and Gentile in Christ (Wright, *Climax of the Covenant*, 168–172; Hays, *Galatians*, 269–68); 6) Moses is not part of the one God but Christ is (Nicholson, *Dynamic Oneness*, 157–58).

3:21).[220] This inability of the law has already been linked with its alignment with flesh corrupted in the flood tradition (Gen 6–9) in Gal 2:16. Here Paul connects the law not just with flesh but also with angels. While the author of Jubilees uses angelic mediation of the law to bolster the law's authority, it becomes for Paul a means of aligning the law with an age that is passing away in the arrival of Christ.

As we have already seen, numerous Jewish authors attribute, on some level, the origin and persistence of evil to celestial beings (1 En. 1–36; Jub. 5:1–19; 10:1–13; Philo, *Opif*. 72–75; *Decal*. 176–178).[221] This is not to say that all these texts have the same view of these celestial beings, but that in some way or another these texts link the origin and persistence of evil to a cosmological scheme in which angels bear significant responsibility. Paul's contribution to this common theme is that he draws attention to humanity's fleshy incapacity to perform the law as linked to its angelic origin in the initial reception at Sinai.

Conclusion

According to Paul's logic in Galatians, observing the Mosaic law was, before the arrival of the promise, the appropriate human response to the persistence of evil. The law offered protection in a cosmos corrupted by angelic rebellion. The law was never intended to deal with the origin of evil. It was only intended to curb its persistence in a corrupt cosmos

[220] The only other time Paul uses the verb ζωοποιέω in the context of discussing the origin of the law is 2 Cor 3:6 where the second reception of the Law is in view (cf. Rom 4:17; 8:11; 1 Cor 15:22, 36, 45). The argument of 2 Cor 3:6 goes further than Gal 3:21, the letter is not only unable to make alive but kills.

[221] Although not the focus here, there is abundant reflection on the role of celestial beings in the persistence of evil in the DSS (CD IV, 12–19; V, 17–6.3; VIII, 1–3; XII, 2–6; 1QM XIII, 10–12; XIV, 8–11; 1QS III, 13–IV, 26; 4Q385a; 4Q387–390; 4Q511 48–49 4Q543–549). See Brand, *Evil within and Without*, 147–274.

with fleshy humans. The sending of the "Son of God" is a response to the origin of evil that reconfigures the appropriate human response to evil's persistence. In Galatians 3:19–4:11 Paul explains the insufficiency of the law by marginalizing it as an adequate solution to the origin of evil. This reflects the influence of Enochic tradition.

In Galatians the cosmos is corrupted by angelic transgressions. In such a cosmos, humans need rescue (Gal 1:4). The rebellion of angels has brought about disastrous effects for the cosmos and specifically for human flesh (Gal 2:16). Paul knows the cosmos has been corrupted (Gal 1:4) and he expects the Galatians to recognize the effects of this corruption on "all flesh" (Gal 2:16). Paul argues that the law no longer offers protection because of the cosmic shift that has occurred in the revelation of the Son of God in the gospel. Whereas the law was offered protection in a cosmos that was corrupted by angelic transgression and for humans consisting of mere flesh and blood, Christ inaugurates new creation (Gal 6:15). In the new creation the Watchers' transgressions are reversed and God's Spirit dwells in humans (Gal 4:6–7; cf. Gen 6:3). This radical shift has occurred through the angelomorphic Son of God.

In the sending of the Son of God a divine response to the origin of evil has been initiated. Paul describes the arrival of Christ as a radical inversion of the corruption of the cosmos. According to the Enochic tradition, the cosmos is corrupted when angelic "Sons of God" engage in illicit sexual relationships with women and produce demonic offspring that inhabit and terrorize humans. According to Paul, the cosmos is redeemed when the angelomorphic "Son of God" is born from a woman to redeem believers and sends his Spirit to dwell in them, allowing participation in the angelomorphic life through moral, cognitive, and eventually physical transformation. In Paul's view, this radical inversion

of cosmic corruption occurs through the sacrificial love of the Son of God who is crucified by the corrupt cosmos and cursed by the law designed to function within such a cosmos. For a believer to continue to operate according to the law, then, would be address the persistence of evil without attending to its origin. In Galatians Paul's view of the Mosaic law and his Christology have been influenced by Enochic tradition.

Paul describes the law in Gal 3:19–4:11 as an apotropaic but temporary measure in the divine economy. The law is given for the disciplinary protection of God's people in a cosmos broken by angelic rebellion and human flesh. The protective function of the law is common in a variety of Second Temple texts and it offers the best explanation of the *paidagōgos* metaphor. Paul's use of the *paidagōgos* metaphor describes the temporal legitimacy of the law in protecting God's people. This once legitimate function for the law, however, has now passed in the coming of Christ Jesus.

The provisional role of the law is also identified at the origin of the law at Sinai. Paul upends a common tradition about angelic mediation which was often meant to elevate the status of the law (perhaps the position of his opponents). He does not argue that the same rebellious angels who corrupted the cosmos initiated the law. Instead he mentions angelic mediators and Moses to indicate the inadequacy of the law as a solution to the origin of evil. The law is relevant to the persistence of evil in a corrupt cosmos, but it is inadequate to address the origin of evil itself. Instituted through angels, the law simply cannot address cosmic corruption that has pervaded "all flesh."

Since the cosmos was altered by the transgressions of angels, it is unsurprising that an angelically mediated law is insufficient to correct the problem. Paul's curious "elements of the world [τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου]" language is a further explanation of the

same basic point. The law was intended to function within a cosmos that had already been corrupted. The law in Paul's view, to use a crude architectural metaphor, is a blueprint for building on a broken foundation with crooked planks of wood. Such a structure has a limited function until the more basic issues can be addressed. The law then functions as a solution to the persistence of evil until such a time when the origin of evil would be addressed.

This reading of Galatians places Paul firmly in the context of Second Temple Judaism. Next, we turn to Justin Martyr for an exploration of the reception of Paul's argument in Galatians. While BW and Jubilees provide crucial context for Paul's argument, Justin provides interpretive hindsight. In Justin and his fellow second century apologists, Paul's argument in Galatians 3:19–4:11 is explicitly connected to the Watchers mythology. In the reception of Galatians, then, the origin and persistence of evil is significant for interpreting Paul's letter.

CHAPTER SIX: PROOF FROM RECEPTION HISTORY

Innovative interpretations of ancient texts should be accepted with caution. Despite the growing number of scholarly voices clamoring to interpret Paul in the context of Second Temple Judaism, the influence of Enochic tradition in Galatians and Paul's theology of evil may seem too novel to be credible. In addition to the arguments of previous chapters, then, it is worth considering the reception of Galatians and Paul's theology of evil in early Christianity. The influence of Enochic tradition on the interpretation of Galatians and the mixed template are not an invention of the modern scholar's interest in originality and comparison but have ancient precedent.

This chapter turns to the early reception of Paul to further validate the Enochic reading of Galatians. In *2 Apol.* 5 Justin Martyr explains the origin and persistence of evil using the Enochic tradition about rebellious angels. Exploring Justin's sources reveals that Gal 3:19–4:11 was combined with Enochic tradition. While scholars have long recognized the presence of Enochic tradition in *2 Apol*. 5, the influence of Galatians has not been explored. If Justin's Enochic view of evil's origin and persistence has been influenced by Galatians, then the apologist provides insight into how Paul's early interpreters understood him.

In addition to supporting an Enochic interpretation of Galatians, Justin's theology of evil provides further evidence for the mixed template in early Christianity. Annette Y. Reed argues that Justin's view of evil in the *Apologies* differs substantially from the *Dialogue with Trypho*. Most notably, she argues that in the *Apologies* Justin makes no reference to Adamic tradition which stands in stark contrast to the *Dialogue with Trypho*.

In her words, "Whereas Adam and Eve are nowhere mentioned in either of the *Apologies*" in the *Dialogue* Justin "appeals to Genesis 2–3 to account for human wickedness."[1] For Reed, Justin is another example of the conflict between Adamic and Enochic theologies of evil. While Adamic tradition is more characteristic of the *Dialogue* and Enochic tradition is more typical of the *Apologies*, Reed's interpretation of this difference is incorrect. Justin's use of these traditions does not indicate an essential conflict. Justin's use of Adamic and Enochic traditions reflect his respective rhetorical goals and audiences in each work.

This chapter begins with a brief introduction to Justin's major works and their rhetorical goals. Next, a detailed examination of the traditions combined by Justin in *2 Apol*. 5 reveals an eclectic thinker synthesizing Greek philosophy and Jewish apocalypticism, a synthesis that has already begun with Paul. Finally, analysis of the function of Adamic and Enochic traditions in Justin's works demonstrates that the Apologist is another example of the mixed template so prevalent in Second Temple literature. Justin provides further evidence for an Enochic reading of Gal 3:19–4:11 and illustrates the reception of the mixed template in early Christianity.

6.1 Justin Martyr: The Teacher and His Texts

Justin portrays himself as a Gentile philosophical teacher of a school in Rome.[2] At the time of his conversion Justin styled himself a Platonic philosopher (*2 Apol.* 12.1; *Dial.*

---

[1] Reed, "The Trickery of the Fallen Angels and the Demonic Mimesis of the Divine: Aetiology, Demonology, and Polemics in the Writings of Justin Martyr," *JECS* 12 (2004): 141–71, here 145.

[2] Born in Flavia Neapolis (*1 Apol.* 1.1), near the ancient Northern Israelite city of Shechem and geographically a Samaritan (*Dial.* 120.6), he was uncircumcised (*Dial.* 28.2; 29.3) and unacquainted with Jewish Scripture prior to conversion (*Dial*. 7.1–8.1). Justin self-identifies as a Greek (*Dial.* 41.3) and claims a philosophical education (*Dial.* 2.1–6)

2.6).[3] Opinions vary about the level of his philosophical education, but Justin presents himself as a teacher of a philosophical school and was commemorated as such in early Christianity.[4] Furthermore, he explicitly identifies Jewish writings as the source of his "only sure and useful philosophy" (*Dial.* 8.1; see also *Dial.*1.3; 2.1).[5] Since Justin taught his philosophy based on Jewish texts as part of a school in Rome, his use of Jewish Scripture provides significant insight into the theology of educated Christians in Rome during the second century.[6]

6.1.1 *Apologies*

Justin composed his apologies in Rome near the middle of the second century (ca. 147–154 CE).[7] Ostensibly he composed *1 Apology* as a Christian defense against Roman

[3] Justin's work as a teacher of philosophy after his conversion is widely attested (*Dial.* 1.1; 8.2; *Acts of Justin* AB 3.3; Tertullian, *Adv. Valen.* 5.1; Eusebius, *Hist. eccl*. 4.10.8). This is further confirmed by Tatian's claim to be Justin's student (*Orat*. 18.2; 19.1–2; see also Irenaeus, *Haer*. 1.28.1). The nature of Tatian's relationship to Justin is explored by Jörg Trelenberg in his critical edition of the *Oratio* (Trelenberg, *Oratio ad Graecos: Rede an die Griechen*, BZT 165 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012], 195–203). Trelenberg concludes that Tatian must have had access to Justin's writings and in at least that sense can positively be identified as his student.

[4] On the dispute about the nature and extent of Justin's philosophical education see Charles Nahm, "The Debate on the 'Platonism' of Justin Martyr," *SecCent* 9 (1992): 129–51 and Runar M. Thorsteinsson, "By Philosophy Alone: Reassessing Justin's Christianity and His Turn from Platonism," *EC* 3 (2012): 492–517.

[5] Unless otherwise noted, all English translations of Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho* are from Thomas B. Falls, *St. Justin Martyr: Dialogue with Trypho*, rev. Thomas P. Halton, ed. Michael Slusser, SFC 3 (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2003).

[6] Oskar Skarsaune is correct that "there is a considerable a priori probability that Justin should be seen as transmitting an exegetical school tradition" (*The Proof from Prophecy: A Study in Justin Martyr's Proof-Text Tradition: Text-Type, Provenance, Theological Profile*, SuppNovT 56 [Leiden: Brill, 1987], 3). See the socio-historical study of Justin's school in H. Gregory Snyder, "'Above the Bath of Myrtinus': Justin Martyr's 'School' in the City of Rome," *HTR* 100 (2007): 335–62. See also Tobias Georges, "Justin's School in Rome-Reflections on Early Christian 'Schools,'" *ZAC* 16 (2012): 75–87. On Justin's *paideia* in the context of the Second Sophistic see Laura Nasrallah, "Mapping the World: Justin, Tatian, Lucian, and the Second Sophistic," *HTR* 98 (2005): 283–314.

[7] Denis Minns and P. M. Parvis identify the most likely date between 147 and 154 CE for the *Apologies* (*Justin, Philosopher and Martyr: Apologies,* OECT [New York: Oxford University Press, 2009], 44). Despite limited information about Justin's life, the date of the *Apologies* is not particularly difficult to determine. Based on the rulers mentioned: Antonius Pius, Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus (*1 Apol.* 1) as well as L. Munatius Felix (*1 Apol.* 29), Marcion (*1 Apol.* 26; 58), and Justin's approximate reference to his

opposition (*1 Apol.* 1.1–3.5), dispelling common charges and misunderstandings (*1 Apol.* 6–12).[8] But Justin goes significantly beyond this purpose (*1 Apol.* 12.11) to offer an elaborate defense of the rationality and superiority of Christianity. While *1 Apology* has an obvious defensive posture, there are also invitations for outsiders to join (*1 Apol*. 6.2; 12.11).[9] Whether or not Justin effectively reached a non-believing audience, at least one of his stated purposes in writing *1 Apology* involved an invitation to outsiders.[10]

Justin's reasons for writing the apologies involves substantial debate about their originally intended function(s) and destination. Justin directly addresses the imperial court in the *1 Apology* (*1 Apol*. 1.1). In *2 Apology* he uses technical terminology for "official petitions."[11] The stated audience and technical terminology has led several

---

writing 150 years after Christ's birth (*1 Apol.* 46). The mention of Q. Lollius Urbicus in *2 Apol*. 1.1 places *2 Apology* shortly after *1 Apol* (see Miroslav Marcovich, *Iustini Martyris: Apologiae Pro Christianis*, PTS 38 [Berlin: de Gruyter, 1994], 11).

[8] Minns and Parvis, *Philosopher and Martyr* follow this line closely: "Justin's primary purpose was [. . .] to petition for the relief of what he thought was unjust prosecution of Christians by state authorities" (45).

[9] David Rokéah, *Justin Martyr and the Jews,* JCPS 5 (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 3 "Justin's uniqueness among apologists lies in the fact that he does not limit himself to defending Christianity against the attacks of the pagans, but broadens his scope to include a presentation of Scripture as the foundation of the Gospels. While all other apologists are engaged in clearing up misunderstandings and superstitions [. . .] most lead the reader only to the door of the Church, Justin opens the door for the reader and ushers him into the Church's inner sanctum."

[10] Minns and Parvis, *Philosopher and Martyr*, 24–25. They point out that, decades after Justin, Tertullian complained, "No one comes to our books unless he is already a Christian" (*Test*. 1). The debate about the function and intended audience of Jewish and Christian apologetic literature goes back to Victor Tcherikover, "The Ideology of the Letter of Aristeas," *HTR* 51 (1958): 59–85.

[11] Runar M. Thorsteinsson, "The Literary Genre and Purpose of Justin's Second Apology: A Critical Review with Insights from Ancient Epistolography," *HTR* 105 (2012): 91–114, here 103. See also Paul Keresztes, "The 'So-Called' Second Apology of Justin," *Latomus* 24.4 (1965): 858–69, esp. 867–89; William R. Schoedel, "Apologetic Literature and Ambassadorial Activities," *HTR* 82 (1989): 55–78, esp. 75–78; Wolfram Kinzig, "Der 'Sitz im Leben' der Apologie in der alten Kirche," *ZKG* 100 (1989): 291–317. The technical terms include: σύνταξις (*2 Apol.*1.1), λόγοι (*2 Apol.*12.6; 15.2) and, most importantly "petition [βιβλίδιον]" (*2 Apol.*14.2; see also *2 Apol*. 2.8; *1 Apol*. 29.2–3). Eusebius describes Justin's *2 Apology* as a βιβλίδιον as well (*Hist. eccl*. 4.16.1). On the well-documented practice of imperial petition see Fergus Millar, *The Emperor in the Roman World, 31 BC-AD 337* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1977), 240–52, 537–49, 556–66; W. Williams, "The Publication of Imperial Subscripts," *ZPE* 40 (1980): 283–94.

scholars to assume that Justin's apologies were written with the intent to reach the emperor.[12] However, the tone and content of Justin's apologies have restrained this expectation. Several recent studies have concluded that the imperial audience is a literary conceit.[13] It is not entirely clear if the *Apologies* were intended to be read by the emperor or if Justin merely portrays his teaching as such.

The intended function(s) of the *Apologies* raises another disputed question, how the two relate to one another.[14] This debate is not especially pertinent to the discussion of Justin's view of evil since he refers to the *1 Apology* in *2 Apology*.[15] The cross-referencing indicates that the *Apologies* should be read together. The major difference between the two works is that the *2 Apology* contains no explicit citations of Jewish Scripture.[16] The suppression of citations to Jewish or Christian texts is a notable departure

---

[12] Arnold Ehrhardt, "Justin Martyr's Two Apologies," *JEH* 4 (1953): 1–16, esp. 5; Paul Keresztes, "Literary Genre of Justin's First Apology," *VC* 19 (1965): 99–110, esp. 108–109; Robert M. Grant, *The Greek Apologists of the Second Century* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1988), 54–55; Minns and Parvis, *Philosopher and Martyr*, 24–25. Thorsteinsson argues that only the *2 Apology* was intended to function as an actual petition ("The Literary Genre and Purpose of Justin's Second Apology," 102–6, 114).

[13] Charles Munier, "A propos des Apologies de Justin," *RevScRel* 61 (1987): 177–86, esp. 182; P. Lorraine Buck, "Justin Martyr's Apologies: Their Number, Destination, and Form," *JTS* 54 (2003): 45–59. Problematic passages in the *1 Apol.* include: 2.2–3; 3.5; 5.1; 9.4–5; 11.1; 12.3, 6, 11; 14.1; 40.16–19; 28.2, 3. Buck identifies problematic passages in the *2 Apol.* concerning form (3.1–5; 9.1–4; 14.1–2) and content (5.3–4).

[14] See the positions in Thorsteinsson, "The Literary Genre and Purpose of Justin's Second Apology," 93–96; Paul Parvis, "Justin, Philosopher and Martyr: The Posthumous Creation of the Second Apology," in *Justin Martyr and His Worlds*, eds. Sara Parvis and Paul Foster (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), 22–37; Buck, "Justin Martyr's Apologies," 45–59.

[15] Thorsteinsson points out that Justin writes "as we said before [ὡς προέφημεν]" four times in the *2 Apology*, three of which seem to refer to the arguments of *1 Apology* (*2 Apol*. 6.5 [*1 Apol.* 10.1]; *2 Apol*. 6.5 [*1 Apol*. 23.2; 63.10, 16]; *2 Apol*. 8.1 [*1 Apol*. 46.3]) and one reference can be explained as an internal cross-reference (*2 Apol.*9.1 [*2 Apol.*7.5–7]). While these references indicate that the *2 Apol.* presupposes the existence of *1 Apol.*, Thorsteinsson argues that "nowhere does the reader of *2 Apol*. need further explanation in order to be able to gasp the meaning of the text" ("The Literary Genre and Purpose of Justin's Second Apology," 96).

[16] In contrast to the *2 Apol*., in the *1 Apology* Justin explicitly cites Jesus twenty-one times (*1 Apol*. 15.1–4, 7–8, 9, 10–17; 16.1–4, 5, 6, 7, 8–14; 17.1–3, 4; 19.7; 38.1 [Isa 65:2]; 38.2–3 [Isa 50:6–8]; 38.4–8 [Ps 22:19b + 17c + Ps 3:5]; 49.1–4 [Isa 65:1–3]), Isaiah nineteen times (*1 Apol*. 32:12–14 [Num 24:17b + Isa 11:1b + Isa 51:5b]; *1 Apol.* 33:1–4 [Isa 7:14 + Matt 1:20–21]; *1 Apol.* 35:2 [Isa 9:6]; *1 Apol.* 35:3–4 [Isa

from *1 Apology* and may suggest that *2 Apology* was intended to be a more official document.

Whatever Justin's original intentions may have been, there is no conclusive evidence that Justin's *Apologies* reached the upper echelons of Roman polity. Nevertheless, Justin's *Apologies* were widely influential in the development of Christian theology. His influence is clearly discernable in later Christian writers, especially in Irenaeus, Tertullian, Tatian, and Athenagoras.[17] Eusebius also bespeaks Justin's important role in early Christianity.[18] Justin's reception indicates that regardless of original intentions, his actual audience included educated Christians. For such an audience Justin cites authoritative texts, tradition, and reason as his authorities.

65:2 + 58:2b]; *1 Apol.* 37.1–2 [Isa 1:3–4]; *1 Apol.* 37.3–4 [Isa 66:1]; *1 Apol.* 37.5–9 [Isa 1:11–15 + 58:6–7]; *1 Apol.* 44.2–11 [Isa 1:16–20]; *1 Apol.* 47 [Isa 1:7 + Jer 2:15; 50 [LXX 27]:3)]; "prophecy" in *1 Apol* 48.1–2 [Isa 35:4, 6, 5 + 26:19 + Matt 11:5]; *1 Apol* 48.4–6 [Isa 57:1–2]; *1 Apol* 49.1–4 [Isa 65:1–3]; *1 Apol* 50.1–11 [Isa 53:12; 52:13–53:8]; not clearly attributed *1 Apol* 52.7–9 [Isa 66:24]; *1 Apol* 53.6b–7 [Isa 1:9 = Rom 9:29]; wrongfully attributed to Isaiah *1 Apol* 53.10–12 [Jer 9:26]; *1 Apol* 54.8 [Isa 7:14]; *1 Apol* 63.1–2 [Isa 1:3]; *1 Apol* 63.13 [Isa 1:3]), Moses twelve times (*1 Apol*. 32:1–11 [Gen 49:10–11]; *1 Apol*. 44.1 [Deut 30:15, 19]; *1 Apol.* 53.8–9 [Gen 19]; *1 Apol.* 54.4–7 [Gen 49.10–11]; *1 Apol.* 59.1–6 [Gen 1:1–3]; *1 Apol.* 60.1–6 [Num 21:6–9]; *1 Apol.* 60.7 [Gen 1.2]; *1 Apol.* 60.8–9 [Deut 32:22 + 2 Kgdms 1:10]; *1 Apol.* 62.3–4 [Exodus 3:5 + Deut 5:27]; *1 Apol.* 63.6–11 [Exod 3:2 + 3:14 + 3:6 + 3:10]; *1 Apol.* 63.17 [Exod 3:2 + 3:14 + 3:6 + 3:10]; *1 Apol.* 64.1–4 [Gen 1:1–3]), and David five times (*1 Apol*. 35.5–6 [Ps 22:17 + 19]; *1 Apol.* 40.1–4 [Ps 19:3–6]; *1 Apol* 40.5–17 [Ps 1:1–6 + 2:1–12]; *1 Apol* 41.1–4 [1 Chron 16:23, 25–31 + Ps 96[LXX 95]:1–10]; *1 Apol* 45.2–4 [Ps 110:1–3]). Justin also explicit cites the following prophets once: Micah (*1 Apol*. 34.1–2), Zephaniah (*1 Apol,* 35.10–11), Jeremiah (*1 Apol,* 51.8–9), Ezekiel (*1 Apol.* 52.5–6) and Zechariah (*1 Apol,* 52.10–12).

[17] His profound influence may be why Robert Grant describes Justin as "the most important second century apologist" (*Greek Apologists*, 50).

[18] See *Hist. eccl*. 4.11.8–10; 4.16.1–9; 4.17.1–14; 4.18.1–10. Eusebius provides a list of Justin's writings, several of which no longer survive (*Hist. eccl*. 4.18.2). Justin mentions his now lost *Syntagma* in *1 Apol.* 26.8. See also Irenaeus, *Haer*. 4.6.2; 5.26.2; Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 4.11.8; 4.18.9. Eusebius refers to two apologies by Justin (*Hist. eccl.* 2.13.2; 4.16.1–2; 4.17.1; 4.18.2). Once when quoting the *2 Apology*, Eusebius identifies the text as the "First apology" (*Hist. eccl*. 4.17.1; see also 4.8.5) while another time he calls it "a second book" (*Hist. eccl*. 4.16.1).

6.1.2 *Dialogue with Trypho*

Composed sometime after the *Apologies* (ca. 147–154) but before Justin's death (ca. 163–167), the *Dialogue with Trypho* was likely written around 155–160.[19] The text consists of a two-day dialogue between Justin and a Jewish teacher named Trypho.[20] Justin identifies Trypho as a Jewish refugee of the Bar Kokhba revolt (*1 Apol.* 31.6; *Dial.* 9.4), but a more precise identification remains a mystery.[21] The question about Trypho's identity is often linked to the substantial debate concerning Justin's primary intended audience for the *Dialogue*.[22] Regardless, the *Dialogue* is the longest and most important text for Christian interpretations of Jewish Scripture in the second century.

After an introduction to Justin's philosophical journey, which is largely devoted to his encounter with a "respectable old man" who converts him (*Dial.* 3.1–8.1), Trypho exhorts Justin to become a Jew (*Dial.* 8.3).[23] In response, Justin claims that Trypho's

---

[19] Since Justin refers to *1 Apol*. 26.3 in *Dial.* 120.6 (see also *2 Apol*. 15), the *Dialogue* postdates the *Apologies*. See Adolf von Harnack, *Geschichte der altchristlichen litteratur bis Eusebius*, 2 bd. (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1897), 2.281–84; E. R. Goodenough, *The Theology of Justin Martyr* (Jena: Frommann, 1923), 88.

[20] Justin "Trypho [. . .] a Hebrew of the circumcision, a refugee from the recent war, and at present a resident of Greece, mostly Corinth" (*Dial.*1.3). Eusebius claims the dialogue took place in Ephesus (*Hist. eccl*. 4.18.6).

[21] Refuting the identification of Trypho with Tarphon see N. Hyldahl, "Tryphon und Tarphon," *ST* 10 (1956): 77–88. See also Demetrios Trakatellis, "Justin Martyr's Trypho," *HTR* 79 (1986): 287–97 and T. J. Horner, *'Listening to Trypho': Justin Martyr's Dialogue Revisited*, CBET 28 (Leuven: Peeters, 2001), 15–32.

[22] Options for the intended audience include: 1) Jews (Theodore G. Stylianopoulos, *Justin Martyr and the Mosaic Law*, SBLDS 20 [Missoula: Scholars Press, 1975], 33–44); 2) pagans (Stylianopoulos, *Justin Martyr and the Mosaic Law*, 169–95); 3) Gentiles interested in Judaism (Jon Nilson,"To Whom Is Justin's Dialogue with Trypho Addressed," *TS* 38, no. 3 [1977]: 538–46; Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy* 258–9; Miroslav Marcovich, *Iustini Martyris: Dialogus cum Tryphone*, PTS 47 [Berlin: de Gruyter, 1997], 64–5); 4) Christians (Charles H. Cosgrove, "Justin Martyr and the Emerging Christian Canon: Observations on the Purpose and Destination of the Dialogue with Trypho," *VC* 36 [1982]: 209–32; Tessa Rajak, "Talking at Trypho: Christian Apologetic as Anti-Judaism in Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho the Jew*," in *Apologetics in the Roman Empire: Pagans, Jews, and Christians* [eds. Mark Edwards, Martin Goodman, and Simon Price, New York: Oxford University Press, 1999], 59–80, esp. 79–80).

[23] It is worth noting that Trypho's encouragement is to "be circumcised, then observe the precepts concerning the Sabbath, the feasts, and God's new moons; in brief, fulfill the whole written law, and then,

teachers do not understand their own Scriptures and he explains the purpose of the *Dialogue*:

> I will prove to you, here and now, that we do not believe in groundless myths nor in teaching not based on reason, but in doctrines that are inspired by the Divine Spirit, abundant with power, and teeming with grace.[24]

The remainder of the work is devoted to an explanation and defense of a Christian reading of the Jewish Scriptures in the form of a dialogue. At one point, Justin claims that all his "proofs" are from the Jewish Scriptures (*Dial.* 32.2). Opening with a nod to the philosophical tradition, the *Dialogue* is chiefly concerned with articulating and defending a Christian reading of Jewish Scripture.

There are some indications that the *Dialogue with Trypho* was intended to function within a school. Justin reflects on the literary creation of the *Dialogue* (*Dial.* 56.18) and indicates a catechetical function (80.3). Justin depicts himself confounding the Jews with the true interpretations of Scripture (*Dial.* 85.6), in this way fulfilling the prophetic words of Jesus and Isaiah (*Dial.* 85.7–8 [Matt 5:44; Isa 66:5–11]).[25] Justin even

---

probably, you will experience the mercy of God" (8.3). Justin considers these the marks of a Jewish identity.

[24] *Dial.*9.1. Greek text from Marcovich: παρεστῶτι γὰρ δείξω <σοι> ὅτι οὐ κενοῖς ἐπιστεύσαμεν μύθοις οὐδὲ ἀναποδείκτοις λόγοις, ἀλλὰ μεστοῖς πνεύματος θείου καὶ δυνάμει βρύουσι καὶ τεθηλόσι χάριτι. Later in the *Dialogue* Justin writes, "Let me preach to you, O Trypho, and to those wanting to become proselytes, a *divine word* [θεῖον λόγον], which I heard from that man [i.e. the old man]" (23.3, my translation of Marcovich, *Dialogus*).

[25] Justin interprets the story of Elisha's floating axe-head (2 Kgs 6:1–7) as a reference to the building of a school which provides a direct analogy to the way in which the cross of Christ and baptism "made us a house of prayer and worship [οἶκον εὐχῆς καὶ προσκυνήσεως ἐποίησε]" (*Dial.* 86.6). Justin claims to be the heir of apostolic interpretation, handed down from Christ to the apostles (*1 Apol.* 50.12; 67.7; see also *Dial.* 76.6; 106.1) who were then sent into the world (*1 Apol.* 39.3; 42.2; 45.5; 50.12; 53.3). David E. Aune writes, "The chief factor which determined the results of Justin's exegesis of the Old Testament was that body of Christian tradition which he inherited from his Christian predecessors and which he maintained virtually without alteration" (Justin Martyr's Use of the Old Testament," *BETS* 9 [1966]: 179–97, here 179). Skarsaune emphasizes Justin's self-understanding as a recipient of an exegetical tradition (*Proof from Prophecy*, 11–13).

portrays a Jewish student thanking the Christian teacher for the best explanation of Num 21:6–9 (*Dial.* 94.4). Ultimately, Justin claims the source of his interpretation is Jesus himself (*Dial.* 100.1–2 [Matt 11:27]). These internal references suggest an instructional setting in which the teacher guides his students through the texts of the school.

In form and content, the *Apologies* differ substantially from the *Dialogue with Trypho*. These differences are likely a result of the fact that these works had different rhetorical functions. The *Dialogue*, with its academic prologue and running exposition of Jewish Scripture was likely intended to function with a school as a guide to reading Jewish Scripture. The *Apologies*, on the other hand, articulate and defend Christian teaching in the context of the intellectual marketplace of Rome in the second century. These different rhetorical goals are reflected in the way Justin describes the origin and persistence of evil in the respective works.

6.2 Justin's Sources in *2 Apology* 5

I argued in chapter two that Paul's στοιχεῖα language (Gal 4:3, 9) is a creative combination of popular philosophical terminology and Enochic tradition. In popular philosophy, the στοιχεῖα are the four elements of the cosmos commonly recognized in ancient physics as air, fire, water, and earth. Paul's argument in Galatians assumes that these elements are animated by superhuman beings. These superhuman beings, it has been argued, are the rebellious angels of the Enochic tradition who have transgressed divine order (Gal 3:19) and enslave humanity (Gal 4:3, 8–9). Paul uses philosophical terms to describe angelic activity, combining ancient physics with Enochic tradition. This same synthesis occurs even more explicitly in Justin's combination of ancient philosophy and Enochic tradition.

In his *2 Apology* Justin utilizes the same Enochic tradition and, I will argue, discernable influence from Gal 3:19–4:11. Justin is not making the same argument as Paul, but he is indebted to the apostle. There are features of Justin's argument in *2 Apol.* 5 that are derived from at least four different traditions. First, and most obviously, Justin draws from Jewish Scripture (esp. Gen 1:26–27; 6:1–4; Ps 8). Second, Justin follows an Enochic tradition (esp. 1 En. 19:1–2). Third, Justin combines Enochic tradition with Middle Platonic philosophy. Fourth, there are features of Justin's narrative about the origin and persistence of evil that are best explained with Gal 3:19–4:11 as his source. Justin's combination of Scripture, Enochic tradition, and philosophy has been refracted through Galatians. If Justin is dependent on Paul's argument, as I argue he is, then Justin likely thought Paul was using Enochic tradition. The reception of Paul supports the Enochic reading of Galatians 3:19–4:11.

Justin weaves a narrative account of the origin and persistence of evil in *2 Apol*. 5 from several different threads. His narrative includes strands of material from creation tradition, Enochic tradition, popular Greek philosophy, and Paul's letter to the Galatians. Before tracing the threads, it is necessary to cite Justin's narrative in full:

> [5.2] After making the whole cosmos and *subjecting earthly things to humans* [τὰ ἐπίγεια ἀνθρώποις ὑποτάξας] and *arranging the heavenly elements* [τὰ οὐράνια στοιχεῖα . . . κοσμήσας] for the growth of crops and change of seasons and establishing for them [i.e. the heavenly elements] a divine law, which it is clear he had done for the sake of humans, God *handed providential care over humans and over things beneath heaven to angels* [τὴν μὲν τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ τῶν ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανὸν πρόνοιαν ἀγγέλοις . . . παρέδωκεν] whom *he established* [ἔταξε] over them [i.e. humans and elements].[26]

[26] My translation highlights the main subject [ὁ θεός], verb [παρέδωκεν], direct object [τὴν πρόνοιαν] and indirect object [ἀγγέλοις] of the lengthy sentence filled with circumstantial participial phrases. Cf. the translation of Minns and Parvis, *Philosopher and Martyr*, 282–85. As is common convention, I follow the order of *2 Apol.* as testified in Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 4.16.3–6 in which chapter 3 of

> [5.3] *But the angels, after having transgressed this appointed order* [οἱ δ' ἄγγελοι, παραβάντες τήνδε τὴν τάξιν], *succumbed to intercourse with women* [γυναικῶν μίξεσιν ἡττήθησαν], and *begot* [ἐτέκνωσαν] children who are called *demons* [δαίμονες].
>
> [5.4] Moreover, *they enslaved* [ἐδούλωσαν] the human race to themselves, partly through magical writings, partly through fear and the punishments which they inflicted, partly through instruction about sacrifices and incense and libations, of which they became in needed after *they were enslaved by passions of desires* [τὸ πάθεσιν ἐπιθυμιῶν δουλωθῆναι]. And they sowed among humans murders, wars, adulteries, licentiousness, and *every kind of evil* [πᾶσαν κακίαν].
>
> [5.5] For this reason both poets and storytellers wrote, *not knowing the angels and the demons born from them* [ἀγοοῦντες τοὺς ἀγγέλους καὶ τοὺς ἐξ αὐτῶν γεννηθέντας δαίμονας] who practice these things against men, women, cities, and nations, they [i.e. poets and storytellers] reported about the god himself and the sons who were begotten as if from him by the sowing of seed and from those who were called his brothers and their children as well, Poseidon and Pluto.[27]
>
> [5.6] For they [poets and storytellers] called each by the name which each one of the angels gave to himself and to his children.

This is a crucial passage for Justin's view of evil's origin and persistence, especially as it relates to demons.[28] In addition to Jewish Scripture, Justin draws on two apparently disparate strands of tradition, Jewish apocalyptic cosmology and Middle Platonic demonology.[29] There are two terms that come from Justin's source(s) but are not

---

Codex A appears to be chapter 8. The result is that *2 Apol.* 5 is the *2 Apol*. 4 of Codex A. Cf. Minns and Parvis follow the order of Codex A (*Philosopher and Martyr*, 54–56).

[27] My translation follows the Greek text of Marcovich, *Apologiae*, 144 including the names Ποσειδῶνος καὶ Πλούτωνος, which creates grammatical difficulties. Cf. Minns and Parvis, *Philosopher and Martyr*, 284–85 fn. 3.

[28] Heinrich Wey, *Die Funktionen der bösen Geister bei den griechischen Apologeten des zweiten Jahrhunderts nach Christus* (Winterthur: Keller, 1957), 3–6. The other key text in the Apologies is 1 Apol. 5.1–6.1.

[29] Fredrick E. Brenk, *In Mist Apparelled: Religious Themes in Plutarch's* Moralia *and* Lives, Mnemosyne Supp 48 (Leiden: Brill, 1977), 2 prefers "daimonology" to "demonology" to avoid the association of demons with devilish creatures, which was a Christian development. Still, I maintain the use

explained with reference to Jewish creation tradition, Enochic tradition, or Greek demonology: 1) the “elements [στοιχεῖα]” (*2 Apol*. 5.2) and 2) the attempt by fallen angels and their demonic offspring to “enslave [δουλόω]” humanity (*2 Apol*. 5.4). These features of Justin’s argument are derived from Galatians. Before showing Justin’s debt to Paul it is necessary to trace Justin’s non-Pauline influence in his account of evil’s origin and persistence.

6.2.1 Creation Tradition

There can be no doubt that Justin draws from the Jewish Scriptures in *2 Apol.* 5. Aside from the obvious use of Gen 6:1–4 in *2 Apol*. 5, Justin’s account of creation and its anthropocentric focus in *2 Apol*. 5.2 draws on a combination of Gen 1 and Ps 8 (Gen 1:26, 28; Ps 8:5–8 [MT/LXX 8:6–9]). In Second Temple Jewish literature, the motif of Adam’s rule was often described by combining Ps 8:6[7] and Gen 1:26.[30] In some cases Adam’s rule was even extended to the superhuman cosmos (4 Ezra 6:46, 54; LAE 14:1–

---

of demonology because Justin is arguing that these creatures are evil, an argument that he is drawing from his Jewish sources and combining with Greek philosophy.

[30] As pointed out by Esther Glickler Chazon, “The Creation and Fall of Adam in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Book of Genesis in Jewish and Oriental Christian Interpretation: A Collection of Essays* (Louvain: Peeters, 1997), 13–24, esp. 15, 16, 22, 24. The influence of Psalm 8:6[7] on Second Temple interpretations of Gen 1:26 is also noticeable in the replacement of רדה (Gen 1:26) with משׁל (Ps 8:6[7]) in *4QWords of the Luminaries* (4Q504 frag. 8 I.4–9), *4Paraphrase of Genesis and Exodus* (4Q422 I.8–9), and *4QInstruction* (4Q423 frag. 2.2).

The combination of Gen 1:26 and Ps 8 is evident in the Greek textual tradition as well. The LXX translation of Gen 1:28 reads: καὶ ηὐλόγησεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς λέγων Αὐξάνεσθε καὶ πληθύνεσθε καὶ πληρώσατε τὴν γῆν καὶ κατακυριεύσατε αὐτῆς καὶ ἄρχετε . . . Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotian all change the wording of the OG “κατακυριεύσατε αὐτῆς” to “ὑποτάξατε αὐτὴν” with various translations of the LXX’s καὶ ἄρχετε. This translation difference reflects the influence of ὑποτάσσω from Ps 8:6[7]. This is notable due to the different Hebrew words in Gen 1:26 (כבשׁ) and Ps 8:6[7] (משׁל).

This combination is evident in Second Temple literature including: Sir 17:1–4; Wis 9:1–4; 10:1–2; 1 Cor 15:21–22, 45–49; 4 Ezra 6:38–56; 2 Bar. 14:17–19; T. Ab. 1:4–12 [A]; 2 En. 30:10–12; LAE 14:3.

3; 2 En. 30:10–12). Like Justin in *2 Apol.* 5.2, however, Philo of Alexandria explicitly limits Adam's rule to the non-celestial cosmos:

> The Father, when he had brought him into existence as a living being sovereign by nature, not only in fact but by express mandate *appointed him king of all creatures under the moon* [καθίστη τῶν ὑπὸ σελήνην ἁπάντων βασιλέα], those that move on land and swim in the sea and fly in the air. For all things mortal in the three elements of land and water and air *did He make subject to Him* [πάντα ὑπέταττεν αὐτῷ], but exempted *the heavenly beings* [τὰ κατ' οὐρανὸν] as having obtained a portion more divine.[31]

With notable similarity to the philosophically informed Jewish exegete, Justin incorporates the ruling motif of Adamic tradition into his narrative of evil's origin and persistence by limiting Adam's rule to the sublunar cosmos.

The parallels between Justin and Philo's thought are intriguing but not exact. Scholars continue to debate if Justin had access to Alexandrian's oeuvre.[32] The similarities between the two may indicate that Justin had familiarity with similar interpretations of Genesis but not necessarily direct access to Philo. Whether Justin knew Philo's work or not, from the foregoing evidence it should be concluded that Justin is inheriting exegetical traditions not merely the Scriptures.

---

[31] Philo, *Opif.* 84. Colson and Whitaker, LCL augmented. For a full treatment of Gen 1:28 in Philo see D. Jobling, "'And Have Dominion...'. The Interpretation of Genesis 1,28 in Philo Judaeus," *JSJ* 8 (1977): 50–82.

[32] See a summary of the debate in David T. Runia, *Philo in Early Christian Literature: A Survey*, CRINT 3 (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 97–105. Runia cautiously suggests that Justin was acquainted with Philo early in his career, but time and Justin's independent theological development obscured the similarities. Maren Niehoff thinks it is likely that Justin had access to Philo, but admits the evidence prohibits proof of direct dependence (Maren R. Niehoff, "Justin's *Timaeus* in Light of Philo's," in *SPhiloA* 28 [2016]: 375–92). Some of Philo's works may have been known to Josephus in Rome near the end of the first century (Josephus, *A.J.* 18.259–260). See Gregory E. Sterling, "'A Man of Highest Repute': Did Josephus know the Writings of Philo?" *SPhiloA* 25 (2013): 101–13.

6.2.2 Enochic Tradition

In *2 Apology* 5 Justin's narrative is directly influenced by Enochic tradition. The source of his Enochic tradition, however, is disputed. E. R. Goodenough speculated that Justin was "following Christian tradition from Palestinian Judaism."[33] In support of his speculation, Goodenough points to a fragment of Papias that he believes was "taken from a statement of a similar, if not the same, tradition."[34] This Papias fragment is recorded by Andrew of Caesarea (563–637 CE) commenting on Revelation 12:7–8:

> Some of them—obviously meaning those angels that were once holy—*he assigned to rule over the orderly arrangement of the earth* [τῆς περὶ τὴν γῆν διακοσμήσεως ἔδωκεν ἄρχειν], and commissioned them to rule well. [. . .] But as it turned out, their *administration* [τάξιν] came to nothing.[35]

The similarities to *2 Apol.* 5 include 1) angelic order to rule over the earth 2) by divine arrangement resulting in 3) an "order [τάξις]" that is violated (see *2 Apol*. 5.3).[36] Aside from the fact that this commentary is late evidence, most likely written in 611 CE, the Papias fragment provides only general similarity.[37] The parallels are more conceptual than lexical, except in the case of the noun "order [τάξις]." Following Goodenough, Oskar Skarsaune thinks it likely that Justin's Enochic tradition was "mediated" by a

---

[33] *Theology of Justin*, 200.

[34] Goodenough, *Theology of Justin*, 200. He also cites Ps.-Clementine, *Hom*. 8.12–16. See also *Recog*. 1.29. Aside from the difficulty of dating the Ps.-Clementine literature, the parallels are less exact than Papias.

[35] Papias, Frag. 11 cited from Michael W. Holmes, *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*, 3rd ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 748–49.

[36] Both texts also use a form of the verb δίδωμι: παρέδωκεν in *2 Apol.*5.2 and ἔδωκεν in Papias, Frag. 11. Andrew of Caesarea connects Eph 2:2 to the Papias fragment to argue that the Devil received authority over the air, one of the four elements. The connection, however, appears to be Andrew's rather than derived from Papias.

[37] For a discussion of the date see Eugenia Scarvelis Constantinou, *Andrew of Caesarea: Commentary on the Apocalypse*, FC 123 (Washington, D. C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2011), 15–16.

Christian source.[38] Yet there is good reason to think that 1 Enoch functioned, in at least some circles, a Christian text.

The Book of Watchers was widely cited as Scripture in early Christian literature.[39] Additionally, Annette Y. Reed argues that Justin is directly dependent on the Book of the Watchers and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (esp. T. Naph. 3:5).[40] Justin's narrative not only follows the structure of the BW (esp. 1 En. 1–19), as Reed points out, but there are three lexical links between Justin and the BW.[41] First, both Justin and the

---

[38] Oskar Skarsaune, "Judaism and Hellenism in Justin Martyr, Elucidated from his Portrait of Socrates," in *Geschichte-Tradition-Reflexion: Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag*, Band III: *Frühes Christentum*, ed. H. Cancik, H. Lichtenberger and Peter Schäfer (Tübingen: Mohr, 1996), 585–611, here 592.

[39] Esp. Jude 14–15; Tertullian, *Cult. fem*. 1.3.1; *Idol*. 4.2; Irenaeus, *Haer*. 4.16.2. In addition to explicit citation, there is also clear evidence that the Watchers narrative was widely influential (1 Pet 3:19–20; 2 Pet 2:4; Jude 6). See James C. VanderKam, "1 Enoch, Enochic Motifs, and Enoch in Early Christian Literature," in *The Jewish Apocalyptic Heritage in Early Christianity*, eds. James C. VanderKam and William Adler, CRINT 4 (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996), 33–127, esp. 62–88; W. Wagner, "Interpretations of Genesis 6:1–4 in Second-Century Christianity," *JRH* 20 (1996): 137–55; Reed, *Fallen Angels*, 147–55, 160–89; Dragoş-Andrei Giulean, "The Watchers' Whispers: Athenagoras's Legation 25, 1–3 and the Book of the Watchers," *VC* 61 (2007): 258–81; Losekam, *Die Sünde der Engel*, 151–353; Silviu N. Bunta, "Dreamy Angels and Demonic Giants: Watcher Traditions and the Origin of Evil in Early Christian Demonology," in *Fallen Angels Traditions: Second Temple Developments and Reception History* (Washington, D. C: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2014), 116–38; Götte, *Von den Wächtern zu Adam*, 58–161, esp. 141–61.

[40] Reed, "Trickery of the Fallen Angels," 146 fn. 9 and 10. Reed also suggests that Justin would have regarded BW as a Christian text. (149–50 fn. 17). Oskar Skarsaune argues that Justin makes use of T.12 Patr. elsewhere (Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 253–255, 270–72, 281, 291, 344–45, 428–29). Randall Chesnutt cautions that it is impossible to claim with certainty that Justin had direct access to the BW but thinks it very likely ("The Descent of the Watchers and its Aftermath according to Justin Martyr," in *The Watchers in Jewish and Christian Traditions*, eds. Angela Kim Harkins, Kelly Coblentz Bautch, John C. Endres [Minneapolis: Fortress, 2014], 167–180, here 171). Monika Elisabeth Götte describes Justin's use of Enochic tradition as "außerordentlich genau am henochischen Wächterbuch orientiert, indem die wesentlichen Elemente von 1 Hen 6–16 zur Sprache kommen" without attempting to identify Justin's source (*Von den Wächtern zu Adam*, 142).

[41] The difficulty with lexical links between the Greek text of the BW and Justin is that we do not know exactly when the BW was translated into Greek. The earliest Greek manuscript for the BW dates to the fifth/sixth century CE. However, Erik W. Larson argues that the translation occurred ca. 150–100 BCE ("Translation of Enoch," 198–203). Not only was a Greek text of the BW already available to Jude and possibly evident at Qumran before 68 CE, there are several similarities between LXX Daniel and $\mathfrak{G}^{p}$ in Greek renderings of Aramaic phrases that suggest the two texts were translated around the same time. On the disputed identification of Greek fragments at Qumran see Ernest A. Muro, "The Greek Fragments of Enoch from Qumran Cave 7 ('7Q4, 7Q8, & 7Q12 = 7QEn Gr = Enoch' 103:3-4, 7-8)," *RevQ* 18 (1997):

BW use the noun "order [τάξις]" to describe the divinely ordained structure of the cosmos (*2 Apol.* 5.2; 1 En. 2:1; see also ἐπιταγή in 1 En. 5:2; 21:6). The angelic "order [τάξις]" of nature is found outside of the BW (GLAE 36:1–38:4; see also Job 38:12; Hab 3:11). Yet whenever the angelic order is transgressed, the source is the Watchers mythology (see T. Naph 3:5; Papias, Frag. 11). Justin rarely uses the noun τάξις and when he does it is typically in a scriptural citation or unrelated to the structure of the cosmos.[42] Because τάξις is not typical vocabulary in this sense, Justin's description of an angelic "order [τάξις]" most likely comes from his source. If his source is the BW, then Justin likely had 1 En. 2:1 at hand.

Second, Justin and the BW use the verb παραβαίνω to describe angels transgressing the divine order of the cosmos (*2 Apol.* 5.3; 1 En. 18:15; 19:2; 21:6). This is a remarkable parallel to the BW and, as we have already noted, Paul uses the noun form of this verb in Gal 3:19.[43] Like τάξις, when Justin uses παραβαίνω it is almost exclusively derived from a source.[44] There are only three instances of Justin using this verb (παραβαίνω) when not obviously citing a source (*Dial.* 141.1; *2 Apol.* 5.3; 9.1). In one such case (*Dial.* 141.1) Justin is responding to the objection of those who claim that transgression is inevitable. The context, then, may indicate that Justin's word choice is

---

307–12; cf. George W. E. Nickelsburg, "The Greek Fragments of '1 Enoch' from Qumran Cave 7: An Unproven Identification," *RevQ* 21 (2004): 631–34.

[42] As a citation of Ps 110:7 (*Dial*. 19.4; 32.6; 32.1, 2[x2]; 63.3; 83.2, 3; 113.5; 118.1). Unrelated to cosmic structure (*Dial*. 42.4; 90.4; 134.4). The only other time Justin uses τάξις in the Apologies is describing the Spirit as third in "order" to the Father and the Son (*1 Apol*. 13.3).

[43] The verb παραβαίνω is often used to describe human transgression in early Christian texts (Matt 15:2, 3; Acts 1:25; 1 Clem 53.2; Barn. 9.4; Herm. Sim. 8.3.5; cf. Irenaeus, *Haer*. 1.4.1).

[44] Justin typically only uses παραβαίνω when citing a scriptural source (*Dial*. 16.1 [Deut 10:16–17]; 44.3 [Isa 66:23–24]; 130.2 [Isa 66:24]; 140.3 [Isa 66:24]).

dictated by the terms of a debate or an opponent rather than Justin himself. The language of angelic transgression in *2 Apol*. 5.3 most likely comes from Justin's Enochic source.

Third, Justin describes the angels' sexual transgression in language that may also come from the BW. He describes how the angels ruling humanity and the elements "succumbed to intercourse with women [γυναικῶν μίξεσιν ἡττήθησαν]" (*2 Apol.*5.2). This is the only time in *2 Apology* that Justin uses the noun "intercourse [μίξις]," although he uses the verbal cognate (μίγνυμι) to describe the sexual union of gods with women in Greek mythology (*2 Apol*. 12.5).[45] The use of the verb is based on the tradition already cited in *2 Apol.* 5.2 that the gods of Greek mythology are the deceptive demonic offspring produced by angelic transgression.[46] In the Greek text of the BW (𝔊ᵖ), μίγνυμι is used twice to describe the Watchers' transgressions (1 En. 10:11; 19:1).[47] The lexical similarity to 1 En. 19:1 is especially notable since this text also describes demons leading humans

[45] The noun μίξις appears eight times in Justin's corpus (*Dial.* 10.1; 69.2; *1 Apol*. 26.7; 27.3; 29.2; 61.10; 64.5; 2 Apol.5.3) and the verbal cognate μίγνυμι five (*Dial.*69.2; *1 Apol.* 26:7; 27.3[x2]; *2 Apol.* 12.5). Elsewhere in Justin's corpus the noun for "intercourse [μίξις]" is technical terminology for the erroneous accusations of illicit sexual behavior levelled against Christians by uninformed pagans (*Dial.* 10.1; *1 Apol*. 26.7; 29.2), and the sexual union of gods and humans in Greek mythology (*Dial.* 69.2). See also Athenagoras, *Leg*. 21.1–5 who mocks the depiction of the Greek gods as having "passion of anger and desire [πάθη ὀργῆς καὶ ἐπιθυμίας]" (*Leg*. 21.1).

[46] The identification of pagan gods with demonic inspiration appears throughout the *1 Apology* (5.2; 21:1–6; 25.1–3; 54.1–10; 64.1–6). Justin refers to the sexual activity of the gods and demons with the verb "debauch [μοιχεύω]" (*1 Apol*. 5.2; 21.5). Elsewhere Justin uses μοιχεύω citing Matt 5:28 and articulating Christian sexual ethics (*1 Apol.* 15.1, 5). The noun form of this verb (μοιχεία) occurs only twice in Justin, both times in connection with the activity of demons (*Dial*. 93.1; *2 Apol*. 5.4). Justin clarifies that the birth of the Logos in contrast with pagan gods, was "without intercourse [ἄνευ ἐπιμιξίας]" (*1 Apol.* 21.1). Justin also describes the pagan gods as participating in "sexual frenzy" (οἰστράω [*1 Apol.* 25.1], οἶστρος [*1 Apol*. 25.2]).

[47] Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 225 follows the Synkellos text (𝔊ˢ) for 1 En. 10:11 which uses the συν- prefix compound verbal form συμμίγνυμι. The the Aramaic text of 4QEn^{b} ar iv.9 [4Q202] is אתחברו (*Books of Enoch*, 175–76; *DSSSE*, 1.406). In the HB, the verb חבר often appears in contexts describing political alliances (Gen 14:3; 2 Chron 20:35–37; Ps 94:20; Dan 11:6, 23), even alliance with idols (Hos 4:17). The verb also appears in contexts describing sorcery (Deut 18:11; Ps 58:6; Isa 47:9, 12; see also 1QH 5:28). The nominal form refers to a "consort" once in the HB (Mal 2:14).

into idolatry, another parallel to Justin (*2 Apol*. 5.4).[48] The evidence suggests that the description of the angels' transgressions as explicitly sexual is derived from the BW, perhaps from 1 En. 19:1.

Justin does not write about sex abundantly, so the overlap of language might be partially attributed to the subject matter itself. In *2 Apol.* 2, however, Justin describes the conversion of a woman to Christianity that causes a split with her husband. The fundamental division apparently concerned sexual practices. Prior to conversion both partners were given to wanton sexual activity.[49] After becoming a Christian, the woman wanted her husband to stop engaging in unrestrained sexual activity, which he refused. According to Justin, the husband preferred "licentiousness [ἀσέλγεια]" (*2 Apol*. 2.3).[50] On a trip to Alexandria the husband "attempts to use every opening for pleasure [πόρους ἡδονῆς ἐκ παντὸς πειρωμένῳ]" (*2 Apol.* 2.4). The vulgar double-entendre is obvious. While Justin does not write about sex with great frequency, he is capable of a variety of terms and euphemisms indicating that the use of μίξις and μίγνυμι are more likely to be drawn from his source or tradition than merely coincidental.

The overlap of specific language in *2 Apol*. 5 and the Book of the Watchers suggests that Justin is dependent on an Enochic source. If a specific passage from the BW was in Justin's mind or in a testimony source, then, the most likely candidate is 1 En.

[48] Nickelsburg asserts that 1 En. 19:1 "is employed by Justin Martyr" (*1 Enoch 1*, 287).

[49] The woman and her husband are described using the verb ἀκολασταίνω (*2 Apol*. 2.1; see also Plato, *Resp*. 555d). Justin also describes the woman's former sexual activity with servants and hired hands euphemistically: "she was easily practicing [εὐχερῶς ἔπραττε]" (*2 Apol*. 2.7).

[50] Justin uses two other terms for sexual activity between the husband and wife: συγκατακλίνω (*2 Apol.* 2.4) and ὁμόκοιτος (*2 Apol.* 2.6). These terms are rather tame by comparison with the surrounding context.

19:1–2.[51] Of course, it is possible that Justin was working from a mediating source that is no longer extant. But, the parallels between Justin and the BW are stronger than any other known text. Even if Justin did not have direct access to the Greek text of the BW, he employs Enochic tradition in *2 Apol*. 5.

6.2.3 Philosophical Traditions

The fact that Justin cites Plato several times in his corpus indicates that Middle Platonic philosophy is important to his theology.[52] Heinrich Wey has argued that Justin was indebted to the mythological narrative of the *Timaeus* filtered through Stoicism.[53] According to Wey, Justin combines his Enochic source with a (middle-)Platonic narrative.[54] Although Enochic tradition is primary for Justin, there are three features of *2 Apol.* 5 that overlap with Middle Platonic traditions.[55] First, in Justin's description of the

---

[51] 1 En. 19:1–2 would not explain, however, Justin's use of παραβαίνω. See also Tertullian, *Idol.* 4.2–3; Athenagoras, *Leg*. 25.1.

[52] Justin's philosophical heroes are Socrates (*1 Apol.* 5.3–4, 18.5, 46.3; *2 Apol.*3.6 [8.6], 7.3 [6.3], 10.5) and Plato (*1 Apol*. 8.4, 18, 20, 44, 59, 60; 2 Apol.12, 13; *Dial*. 1–8). In the *Apologies* Justin cites Greek philosophical literature and poetry: *1 Apol.* 3.3 [Plato, *Resp*. 473c–d]; *1 Apol.* 5.3 [Xenophon, *Mem*. 1.1.1; see also Plato, *Apol.* 24b–c]; *1 Apol*. 8.4 [*Phaedr*. 249a]; *1 Apol*. 39.4 [Euripides, *Hipp*. 607; see also Plato, *Apol* 28]; *1 Apol.*44.8 [Plato, *Resp*. 617e]; *1 Apol.* 60.1, 5 [Plato, *Tim*. 36a–b]; *2 Apol*. 3.6 [8.6] [Plato, *Resp.* 595c]; *2 Apol.* 3.2 [8.2] [Plato, *Resp*. 473c–d]; *2 Apol.* 10.6 [Plato, *Tim*. 28c]; *2 Apol.* 10.4 [Xenophon, *Mem*. 1.1.3]; *2 Apol.* 11.3 condenses "Choice of Hercules" (Xenophon, *Mem*. 2.1.21–34; see also Plutarch, *Comm. not.* 1065c; Lucian, *Peregr*. 33). In the case of the *Dialogue*, Justin's references to Greek philosophers is limited to the prologue (1–8) where he cites Plato (*Dial*. 4.1 [*Phaed.* 66a; see also *Resp*. 533d; *Soph*. 254a]; *Dial*. 4.2 [*Phil*. 30d]; *Dial.* 5.4 [*Tim.* 41ab]) and alludes to Homer (*Dial.* 1.3 [*Il*. 6.123; 15.247; 24.387]; 3.1 [*Il*. 6.202]). See another possible allusion to the poets in *Dial*. 13.1 [Homer, *Il*. 1.314; Euripides, *Iph. taur*. 1039, 1193]). On Justin's Platonism in general see Thorsteinsson, "By Philosophy Alone," 507–516.

[53] *Funktionen der bösen Geister*, 7–12. Reed concurs, "In adopting the interpretation of angelic sin as a breach of cosmic order, Justin was no doubt influenced by Platonic precedents (esp. *Timaeus* 41ff.)" ("Trickery of the Fallen Angels," 147).

[54] Wey provides a chart comparing narrative features in Justin, the Book of Watchers, and Plato's *Timaeus* (*Funktionen der bösen Geister*, 126–27).

[55] Chesnutt argues that "the determinative matrix of Justin's demonology is Enochic" and not Greco-Roman literature ("The Descent of the Watchers," 169). But there is no reason to imagine Justin's sources in a zero-sum game theory. Justin uses both Enochic and Greco-Roman philosophical sources, the influence of one does not detract from the other.

divine order, angels are tasked with "providence [πρόνοια]" over the sublunar cosmos. Second, Justin's description of the evil offspring of the angels as "demons" (*2 Apol.* 5.3–4) parallels Middle Platonic demonology. Third, Justin's description of demons as the source of the poets' traditions about the gods (*2 Apol*. 5.5–6) is also found in the *Timaeus*.

Justin rarely refers to providence in his corpus. The noun πρόνοια and its verbal cognate προνοέω each appear only three times.[56] Although providence is recognized as a common topic of Greek philosophical theology by Trypho and Justin (*Dial*. 1.3–4), the Christian teacher has little to say about it.[57] On the rare occasion when providence is discussed in his extant corpus, the content is not particularly philosophical. Justin uses the philosophical language of providence to describe how Jesus or the early Christians were prophesied about in Jewish Scripture. Consider, for example, Justin's interpretation of Zech 3:1–4:

> Although the Devil stands nearby ever ready to oppose us and anxious to ensnare all of us for himself, the angel of God (namely, the power of God which was sent to us through Jesus Christ) rebukes him, and he departs from

[56] πρόνοια (*Dial*. 1.3; 118.3; *2 Apol*. 5.2). προνοέω (*Dial*. 1.4; 116.2; *1 Apol*. 44.11). The terms are more frequent in the later apologist Athenagoras who is more conversant with Greek philosophy: πρόνοια (*Leg*. 8.4; 19.3; 22.12; 24.3 [x2]; 25.2; *Res*. 14.5; 18.1[x2], 2; 19.1), προνοέω (*Leg*. 1.3; 8.8[x3]; 19.3; 25.2). Theophilus uses πρόνοια frequently (*Autol*. 1.3.10; 1.5.4; 1.6.8; 2.4.5; 2.8.13, 25, 46; 2.38.9, 18; 3.2.17; 3.3.10; 3.7.21, 26, 27, 46, 48, 49, 50; 3.9.2; 3.17.5; 3.26.22). The synonym ἐπιμέλεια appears in Athenagoras (*Leg* 12.2; 18.2, 3) but not Justin. Although, Justin uses the synonymous verbal form ἐπιμέλομαι once in a similar sense (*Dial.*1.4) and μέλω where one might expect προνοέω in the *Apologies* (*1 Apol*. 28.4; 44.11; *2 Apol*. 9.1), but not in the same philosophical contexts in the *Dialogue* (*Dial*. 6.1; 8.2; 10.2). In the LXX, πρόνοια appears only nine times (Wis 14:3; 17:2; Dan 6:19; 2 Macc 4:6; 3 Macc 4:21; 5:30; 4 Macc 9:24; 13:19; 17:2) and προνοέω appears only once to refer to divine providence (Wis 6:7).

[57] The other theological issue that concerns philosophers, according to Trypho is divine μοναρχία (*Dial*. 1.3). Nowhere else in his extant corpus does Justin use the term μοναρχία, although Eusebius attributes a work to Justin on this topic (*Hist. eccl*. 4.18.4) and there is an extant treatise on μοναρχία falsely attributed to Justin (Ps-Justin, *De monarchia*). As an example of an early Christian philosophical view of πρόνοια in contrast to Justin's scriptural view see Theophilus, *Autol*. 2.8. See also the combination of μοναρχία and πρόνοια in Theophilus, *Autol*. 2.8.6; 2.38.7.

> us. And we have been, so to speak, snatched from the fire, when we were purified from our former sins, and [delivered] from the fiery torment with which the devil and all his assistants try us. From such dangers does Jesus, the Son of God, again snatch us. He has also promised, if we obey his commands, to deck us out in garments which he has set aside for us, and *to provide* [προνοῆσαι] an eternal kingdom. (*Dial*. 116.1–2)

Justin's exegesis of Zech 3:1–4 is typological, common when the name "Joshua [Ἰησοῦς]" occurs in the LXX.[58] In this instance "Joshua" is both the Gentile believer in "Christ, the High Priest" (*Dial*. 116.1, 3) and the High Priest Joshua (*Dial*. 115.3; 116.3). The filthy garments are the former sins of believing Gentiles (*Dial*. 116.1, 2, 3) as well as Joshua's marriage (*Dial*. 116.3; see Ezra 10:18; b. Sanh. 93a).[59] In Justin's exegesis, providence is an eschatological promise for Gentile believers who have received the "power of God," a reference to the Holy Spirit.[60] Nowhere in Justin's exegesis of Zech 3 is there anything resembling a discussion of divine providence found in philosophical texts or other Christian apologetic texts.[61] Rather, Justin offers a specific example of divine providence as displayed in the fulfillment of Jewish Scripture, a notion of providence that coheres with what he says elsewhere (*1 Apol*. 44.11; *Dial*. 118.3). Justin's description of providence is not typically philosophical but scriptural.

---

[58] Justin's typological identification of the Ἰησοῦς with Christ Jesus see *Dial*. 75.1–2; 89.1; 90.4–5; 91.3–4; 106.3; 113.1; 115.2; 132.1, 3.

[59] Justin also identifies the filthy garments as the accusations of Jews against Christians in *Dial*. 117.3.

[60] On "power" language as a reference to the Spirit in Justin see Bogdan C. Bucur, "The Angelic Spirit in Early Christianity: Justin, the Martyr and Philosopher," *JR* 88 (2008): 190–208. The Spirit as the connection between Christ and the believer is a Pauline topos as well (Gal 4:4, 6; Rom 5:5; 8:11–17).

[61] See Myrto Dragona-Monachou, "Divine Providence in the Philosophy of the Empire," *ANRW* 36.7.4417–90. Providence is a central feature of the second book of *De natura deorum* (esp. *Nat. d.* 2.73–167). Many of Cicero's stoic arguments also appear in Philo, *De Providentia* (See also *Deus* 47–48, 127–139; *Cher*. 128). See also Alcinous, *Epit*. 12.1; Apuleius, *Dogm. Plat*. 1.12. In the context of Christian apologetic see Athenagoras, *Leg*. 22.12; Theophilus, *Autol*. 2.8.

Justin's typically scriptural view of providence makes the appearance of "providence [πρόνοια]" in *2 Apol*. 5.2 conspicuous. It is especially notable since the term is central to Justin's argument. Grammatically, the direct object of the main verb in *2 Apol*. 5.2 is the "providence [πρόνοια]" over the elements given to angels. Providence entrusted to subordinate divine beings has significant resonance with Middle Platonic interpretations of the *Timaeus.*

According to Plato's creation myth in the *Timaeus*, the cosmos is caused by the divine Demiurge (*Tim*. 29d–30c).[62] As a result, Plato claims that the cosmos exists "because of the providence of God [διὰ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ . . . πρόνοιαν]" (*Tim*. 30c).[63] The Demiurge's creative activity involves the creation and commission of subordinate gods (*Tim.* 39e–41d; see also *Resp*. 508).[64] Plato includes reference to the origin of these "other deities" or "other demons [ἄλλων δαιμόνων]" (*Tim*. 40d). Recognizing that "to speak and know the origin" of these deities is "too great a task," Plato consents to rely on the ancient accounts of the poets, presumably Homer and Hesiod (*Tim*. 40d).[65] Although the

---

[62] This is a narrative told as a "likely myth [εἰκότα μῦθον]" (*Tim*. 29c). Francis M. Cornford, *Plato's Cosmology: The* Timaeus *of Plato* (Indianapolis: Hackett, 1997), 30–31 points out that this language is found in Parmenides' poetry and is like Hesiod's muses (*Theog*, 27; see also Homer, *Od*. 19.203). Cornford argues that Plato is offering a cosmology that rivals Democritus.

[63] In the context of Plato's narrative in the *Timaeus*, the creation of the young gods occurs immediately after the formation of the "elements [στοιχεῖα]" (*Tim.* 39e–40d). This led to a connection between the elements and the gods in some Middle Platonic systems as seen below.

[64] Plato's ἄλλων δαιμόνων are the creatures who dwell in the element of fire (*Tim.* 40d).

[65] In addition to the fact that the names of the gods are from Homer and Hesiod (*Tim*. 40e–41a), Plato identifies the source of these names with these two poets elsewhere in his dialogues (*Crat*. 400d, 402b–e). Cornford, *Plato's Cosmology*, 138 argues "Plato stops short of the agnostic position which may well have been taken up by Socrates himself; he does not flatly deny that the traditional gods exist." See also Plato*, Phaedr*. 246c; *Leg*. 904a. In Homer, demons often represent the gods in leading humans, frequently to sinister ends (see *Il*. 3.420; 9.600; 11.792; 15.403, 418; 21.93; *Od*. 4.275; 7.248; 14.386; 16.370; 24.149). Fredrick Brenk summarizes the portrait of demons in Homer well: "the *daimon* acts very much like a god except that it tends to be unidentifiable and evil" (Fredrick E. Brenk, "In the Light of the Moon: Demonology in the Early Imperial Period," in *ANRW* 16.3.2068–2145, here 2074). In Hesiod,

poets' stories "lack either probable or necessary *demonstration* [ἀποδείξεων]" (*Tim.* 40e), Plato accepts the poetic accounts "following custom [ἑπομένους τῷ νόμῳ]" (*Tim.* 40e).[66] Elsewhere Plato is extremely critical of the poetic accounts of the gods (*Resp*. 378b; 381d–382a; *Leg*. 810c–812a), but admits they are difficult to censure because of their antiquity (*Leg*. 886c; see also *Epin*. 988c). After the generation of these deities, the Demiurge tasks them with the creation and maintenance of the sublunar cosmos (*Tim.* 41a–e). In the *Timaeus* mythology demons and pagan gods are elided without much clarity.

Plato's most explicit description of the demon's nature is found in the *Symposium*.[67] In the climactic speech in a series of speeches on "love [ἔρως]," Socrates relates a discourse on the subject from the Priestess Diotima (*Symp*. 201d–212c). She explains that love is "a great demon [δαίμων μέγας]" and "every demon is between God and mortal [πᾶν τὸ δαιμόνιον μεταξύ ἐστι θεοῦ τε καὶ θνητοῦ]" (*Symp*. 202e). Diotima goes on to describe the power of demons:

> Interpreting and transporting human things to the gods and divine things to men; entreaties and sacrifices from below, and ordinances and requitals from above: being midway between, it makes each to supplement the other,

---

demons are the men of the golden age who were transformed by Zeus into demons as guardians over mortals (*Op*. 121–126; see also *Theog*. 991). Although Middle Platonists often made a distinction between the gods and *daimones* (Plutarch, *Def. Or*. 417a–f; Apuleius, *De Deo Socr*. 2–3), Maximus of Tyre identifies the actions of Homeric gods as *daimones* (*Orat*. 8.5–6; 9.1).

[66] Plato, *Timaeus* 40e. Bury, LCL translation augmented. Bury translates ἑπομένους τῷ νόμῳ "we must follow custom." Cornford argues that the critique here is aimed "not at the pious beliefs of the common man, but at the pretensions of 'theologians' to know the family history of the anthropomorphic deities" (*Plato's Cosmology*, 139).

[67] On the development of demonology in Platonism see Walter Burkert, *Greek Religion*, trans. John Raffan (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1985), 179–181, 329–332; Fredrick E. Brenk, "In the Light of the Moon: Demonology in the Early Imperial Period," in *ANRW* 16.3.2068–2145; Martin, *Inventing Superstition*, 51–108; Andrei Timotin, *La démonologie platonicienne: Histoire de la notion de* daimōn *de Platon aux derniers néoplatoniciens*, PA 128 (Leiden: Brill, 2012).

> so that the whole is combined in one. Through it are conveyed all divination and priestcraft concerning sacrifice and ritual and incantations, and all soothsaying and sorcery. *God with man does not mingle* [θεὸς δὲ ἀνθρώπῳ οὐ μίγνυται]; but through this is the means of all society and converse of men with gods and of god with men, whether waking or asleep. [. . .] *Many and multifarious are these demons, and one of them is Love* [οὗτοι δὲ οἱ δαίμονες πολλοὶ καὶ παντοδαποί εἰσιν, εἷς δὲ τούτων ἐστὶ καὶ ὁ Ἔρως].[68]

The demon in Diotima's discourse is an intermediary between the gods and humans (see also *Leg*. 713d; *Pol*. 617e; *Tim*. 40d, 42e).[69] As Andrei Timotin points out, *Symp*. 202e became the *locus classicus* among Platonists for describing the place and function of demons in the cosmos.[70] Combined with Plato's account of the creation of the elements (*Tim.* 39e–40a) and the traditional gods (*Tim*. 40d–e), Plato's heirs developed a cosmology with demons occupying a place between gods and humans.[71] In Middle Platonism, demons often function as part of a tri-part division of providence.[72] Ps.-Plutarch and Apuleius, for example, both advocate a three-part division of providence based on Plato's *Timaeus*.[73] According to Ps.-Plutarch, primary providence belongs to the Demiurge, secondary providence to the heavenly gods, and tertiary providence to "the

---

[68] *Symp*. 202e–203a. Lamb, LCL translation augmented to draw attention to δαίμων language. On *Symp.* 202e–203a see Timotin, *La démonologie platonicienne*, 37–52.

[69] Elsewhere in the Platonic corpus, demons are described as guardians of mortals (*Crat*. 397e–398c; *Pol*. 271c–274d; *Leg*. 713d–e) and Plato has a personal δαίμων (*Apol*. 27c–28a; see also *Resp*. 617de; 620de; *Phaed*. 107d). Later in the *Timaeus*, Plato seems to align the superior part of each soul (νοῦς) with a δαίμων (*Tim*. 90a–c). For a wholistic account of *daimons* in Plato see Timotin, *La démonologie platonicienne*, 37–84.

[70] *La démonologie platonicienne*, 85.

[71] Timotin, *La démonologie platonicienne*, 86–99. See Ps.-Platonic *Epinomis* (esp. 984b–985b); Xenocrates according to Plutarch (*Def. Or.* 416c–f; *Fac*. 943e–944a), Apuleius (*De deo Socr*. 8, 13; *Flor*. 10; *Dogm. Plat*. 1.11)

[72] See Benjamin Todd Lee, *Apuleius'* Floridia*: A Commentary* (New York: de Gruyter, 2005), 112–120.

[73] Ps.-Plutarch, *De fat*. 572f–574a; Apuleius, *Dogm. Plat*. 1.12. Ps.-Plutarch explicitly cites Plato, *Tim*. 29d–30a [*De fat*. 573cd], 42d [*De fat*. 573ef]. See also Apuleius, *De deo Socr.* 6; *Flor*. 10; Cicero, *Nat. d*. 2.98–99.

demons stationed in the terrestrial regions as watchers and overseers of the actions of man [περὶ γῆν δαίμονες τεταγμένοι τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων πράξεων φύλακές τε καὶ ἐπίσκοποί εἰσι].” (*De fat*. 573a). Even when the three-part division is not employed, as in the case of Justin’s contemporary Middle Platonist, Maximus of Tyre, demons serve an intermediary, providential role in the cosmos:[74]

> God himself, settled and immobile, *administers the heavens and maintains their ordered hierarchy* [οἰκονομεῖ τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν ἐν οὐρανῷ τάξιν]. But he has a race of secondary immortal beings, the so-called *daimones*, which have their station in the space between earth and heaven. These *daimones* are inferior in power to God, but superior to men; they are the gods’ servants and men’s overseers, more closely related than men to the gods, but *more closely concerned* [ἐπιμελέστατοι] than the gods with men.[75]

Similarly, in the Handbook produced by Alcinous, demonic providence is further elaborated in connection with the “elements [στοιχεῖα]”:

> There are . . . *other divinities* [ἄλλοι δαίμονες], whom one could also term ‘*created gods* [γενητοὺς θεούς]’, present in each of the *elements* [στοιχείων], some of them visible, in ether, and fire, and air, and water, so that no part of the world should be without a share in soul or in a living being superior to mortal nature. To their administration the whole sublunar and terrestrial sphere *has been assigned* [ὑποτέτακται].[76]

[74] On Maximus’ life see the introduction by M. B. Trapp, *Maximus of Tyre: The Philosophical Orations* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), xi–xii. The evidence is scant but Maximus likely visited Rome in his youth (ca. 150 CE) then again in his sixties during the reign of Commodus (ca. 180 CE). The early visit to Rome would place him in the city at the same time as Justin.

[75] *Orat*. 8.8. Although Maximus does not use the technical term πρόνοια, he describes providential activity and goes on to cite Homer, *Od*. 17.485–486, a passage commonly cited in discussions of divine justice and providence (see Plato, *Resp*. 381d; *Soph*. 216c; Philo, *Somn*. 1.233; Clement, *Strom*. 4.155.3). On the significance of the intermediary role of *daimones* see Maximus, *Orat*. 9.2–3. In 9.3 Maximus uses the opposition of the four elements as an analogy for the oppositions of ensouled beings in the cosmos.

[76] Alcinous, *Epit*. 15.1. Translation slightly augmented from John Dillon, *Alcinous: The Handbook of Platonism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 25. On δαίμονες pervading the στοιχεῖα see also *Epin.* 984b–c; Apuleius, *De deo Socr.* 6–12*;* Philo, *Gig*. 6–9; Augustine, *Civ. Dei* 7.6; Calcidius, *in Tim.* 139–146.

For Justin's Middle Platonist contemporaries Plato's "demons (δαιμόνες)" operated in a cosmic order that mediated between the divine and human realms.

There are several significant parallels between Plato's mythology of the generation of pagan gods and Justin's account of angelic rebellion in *2 Apol*. 5. First, superhuman begins are "demons [δαιμόνες]" in both texts (*Tim.* 40d; *2 Apol*. 5.2).[77] Plato does not use the term "angels," but in the Allegorical Commentary, Philo claims that Moses's "angels [ἄγγελοι]" are the other philosophers' "demons [δαίμονες]" (Philo, *Gig*. 6, 16; *Somn*. 1.141).[78] So it is quite possible that Plato's demons (*Tim* 40d) are Justin's angels (*2 Apol*. 5.2). Writing around 176/177 CE, Athenagoras explicitly cites Plato's *Timaeus* (40ab) to argue that there is an important distinction between the "uncreated God" and "demons" (*Leg*. 23.5–6).[79] Unlike Plato, Justin's cosmology is informed by Enochic tradition with the result that demons are the illegitimate offspring of angels. Even though he introduces "angels" to the cosmology, Justin shares with Plato and the Middle Platonists of the first and second century an identification of superhuman beings between humanity and the creator as demons.

Justin's angels and Plato's demons are charged with care over mortal creatures (*2 Apol*. 5.2; *Tim*. 41d). In Plato's mythology the demons are even instructed to create

---

[77] Later in the *Timaeus* Plato explains how the intellectual, ruling part of the soul should be conceived of: "We declare that God has given to each of us, as his *daimon* [ὡς ἄρα αὐτὸ δαίμονα θεὸς ἑκαστῳ δέδωκε]" (*Tim.* 90a). The person who cultivates a philosophical life magnifies the divine part of her soul and magnifies her daimon (*Tim*. 90c).

[78] Philo alludes to Plato's most famous description of daimons as creatures between divine and mortal (*Symp*. 202e–203a) in *Gig*. 16.

[79] On the date of Athenagoras' *Legatio* see William R. Schoedel, *Athenagoras:* Legatio *and* De Resurrectione, OECT (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972); Grant, *Greek Apologists*, 100; Miroslav Marcovich, *Athenagoras* Legatio Pro Christanis, PTS 31 (New York: de Gruyter, 1990), 1–3.

mortals (*Tim*. 41c–d, 42d–e; see also Alcinous, *Epit*. 16.1). Philo of Alexandria combines Plato's myth of the young gods fashioning mortals with his interpretation of Gen 1:26–27, but Justin explicitly rejects such an interpretation in favor of a Christological explanation of the Genesis text:

> I do not consider true that teaching which is asserted by what you call a sect, nor can the proponents of that heresy *prove* [ἀποδεῖξαι] that he spoke those words to angels, or that *the human body was the result of angels' work* [ἀγγέλων ποίημα ἦν τὸ σῶμα τὸ ἀνθρώπειον].[80]

Although aware of an exegetical tradition like Philo's combination of Gen 1:26–27 with the *Timaeus*, Justin rejects it as a narrative lacking "proof [ἀπόδειξις]." Still, in *2 Apol.* 5.2 Justin maintains that angels were tasked with the providential care over the sublunar cosmos.[81] Unlike Plato, however, who attributes moral evil solely to individual human souls (esp. *Tim.* 42d), Justin finds these rebellious angels culpable as well (*2 Apol*. 5.4). Justin's view differs from Plato in that the Christian teacher denies rebellious angels or demons a role in creation and argues that rebellious angels are, in part, culpable for moral evil.

Even Justin's description of the evil activities of demons has some resonance with Middle Platonic demonology. Although Platonic and Aristotelian cosmologies seem to preclude the existence of superhuman evil, the virtue of demons is disputed.[82] Aristotle's

---

[80] *Dial*. 62.3. I have augmented Falls' translation here. Although Philo's combination of the *Timaeus* and Gen 1:26–27 occurs in several places (*Opif*. 72–75; *Conf*. 168–183; *Fug*. 68–72; *Mut*. 30–32) in *Conf*. 179 Philo comes closest to identifying the work of the angelic creators as the body. See also Irenaeus, *Haer*. 4.20.1; Gen. Rab. 8.3–4.

[81] In this instance, Justin's version of the Enochic story is more akin to Jubilees (esp. Jub. 4:15; 5:6) than BW.

[82] Plato's student Xenocrates held the position that demons are evil. See Dillon, *Middle Platonists*, 31–32; Timotin, *La démonologie platonicienne*, 93–99.

heir as the head of the Lyceum, Theophrastus (370–285 BCE), provides the earliest description of "the superstitious man [ὁ δεισιδαίμων]" as someone who is irrationally afraid of the divine (*Char*. 16.1–14).[83] In later Middle Platonic sources, however, demons can be evil or at least perceived as such by those who suffer divine vengeance (e.g. Maximus, *Orat*. 8.8).[84] Plutarch's massive corpus provides fuel for the debate about whether demons are evil according to Middle Platonists. Like Theophrastus, Plutarch mocks superstition as the fear that the gods and demons "are the cause of pain and injury" (*Superst*. 165b]).[85] Elsewhere in his corpus, however, Plutarch portrays demons as evil.[86] In one example, "wicked demons [δαιμόνες φαῦλοι]" are responsible for human sacrifice:

> Powerful and impetuous *divinities* [δαίμονες], in demanding a human soul which is incarnate within a mortal body, bring pestilences and failures of crops upon states and stir up wars and civil discords, until they succeed in obtaining what they desire.[87]

Demonic inspiration of human sacrifice parallels the evils committed by demons in *2 Apol*. 5.4.[88] Demons are the source of illicit sacrifices elsewhere in Justin and other Middle Platonic texts.[89] Whether or not this is Plutarch's actual position is beside the

---

[83] See Martin, *Inventing Superstition*, 21–35.

[84] See Brenk, *In Mist Apparelled*, 256–75. See one description of δαιμόνες as "servants and clerks . . . guardians of the sacred rites of the gods and prompters in the Mysteries, while others go about as avengers of arrogant and grievous cases of injury" (*Def. Or*. 417b).

[85] See Brenk, *In Mist Apparelled*, 9–15; Martin, *Inventing Superstition*, 94–98.

[86] In Plutarch's philosophical discourses: *Is. Os*. 361b–e; *E. Delph.* 394a–c; *Def. Or*. 416c–417e; *Fac*. 944c–d. See also his biographical writings: *Pel*. 21; *Num*. 8.3–4b; *Dion* 2.3–4; *Caes*. 69.

[87] Plutarch, *Def. Or*. 417c.

[88] See also *1 Apol.* 5.2; 57.1.

[89] On demons as the source of sacrifices and idols see Justin, *1 Apol*. 5.2; 9.1; 12:5; 62.1–2; *Dial*. 19.6; 27.2; 73.6; 131.1; Plutarch, *Superst*. 167de; Apuleius, *De deo Socr*. 6; Lucian, *Sacr*. 9; *Icar*. 27; Porphyry, *De abstin*. 2.42.3; Athenagoras, *Leg*. 26.1; Tertullian, *Apol*. 22.6; 23.14; *ad Scap*. 2.8; *de idol*. 6.3; *Adv. Marc*. 5.5.10; Origen, *C. Cels*. 3.29; 4.32; 7.5; 7.6; 7.64; 8.18; 8.30, 8.60; Eusebius, *Praep. ev*. 4.23.3; 5.2.1; 5.10.1.

point. Plutarch provides evidence that demons were considered a source of evil in some strands of Middle Platonic philosophy.

Philo of Alexandria often interprets references to angels in Jewish Scripture as divine providence.[90] The angel in the burning bush, for example, symbolizes "*God's providence* [προνοίας τῆς ἐκ θεοῦ]" (*Mos*. 1.66–67).[91] Philo even personifies "justice" as an angel in the Exposition.[92] In his apologetic treatise *In Flaccum*, Philo describes how God protects the righteous with "justice [δίκη]" (*Flacc*. 104, 146).[93] In the Allegorical Commentary, Philo interprets the Angel of the Lord blocking Balaam's path (Num 22:30–31) as an agent of wrath: "The armed Angel, the reason of God . . . the source through whom both good and ill come to fulfillment" (*Cher*. 35; see also *Mos*. 1.273).[94] In his interpretation of Gen 6:1–4 in the Allegorical Commentary, Philo attempts to dispel "superstition [δεσιδαιμονίαν]" (*Gig*. 16) that might easily arise from interpreting Gen 6:2 (e.g. 1 En. 6–19). Philo combines his interpretation of Gen 6:2 with Ps 77:49 to explain that "evil angels [ἄγγελοι πόνηροι]" are souls who seek pleasure rather than virtue (*Gig*. 17–18). In the Exposition, Philo's angels/demons symbolize providence for the good of the righteous and the punishment of the wicked. Philo's allegory, however,

---

[90] Peter Frick has argued that providence is integral to Philo's thought, providing coherence to his theology by bridging divine transcendence and immanence without compromise. See Peter Frick, *Divine Providence in Philo of Alexandria*, TSAJ 77 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), 193.

[91] See also *Mos*. 1.166.

[92] See *Mos*. 1.166; 2.53–54; *Decal*. 176–178. See also *Conf*. 180–182; *Cher*. 35; *Agr*. 51; *Conf*. 174.

[93] Even the villainous Flaccus, when he gets his comeuppance, recognizes divine providence at work (*Flacc*. 170).

[94] It is interesting that the HB identifies the "Angel of the Lord" in this passage as a "satan [שטן]" (Num 22:22, 32). The LXX translates this role as "devil [διάβολη]" (LXX Num 22:32) and the activity as "to accuse [ἐνδιαβάλλω]" (Num 22:22).

rejects a common understanding that angels or demons, as independent agents, can cause evil.

The distinction between the creator and subordinate deities/demons is not limited to Justin's contemporary Middle Platonists' view of providence. From another Christian apologist, there is an interesting parallel to Justin's Middle Platonic argument in Athenagoras:

> So also we have recognized that there are other powers which are concerned with matter and operate through it. One of them is opposed to God [. . .] The spirit opposed to him was in fact created by God just as the rest of the angels were also created by him, and he was entrusted with the administration of matter and material things. These angels are called into being by God to exercise *providence* [προνοίᾳ] over the things set in order by him, so that God would have universal and general *providence* [πρόνοιαν] over all things whereas the angels would be set over particular things.[95]

Athenagoras introduces this teaching in a summary of Christian doctrine as common tradition ("we say" *Leg*. 24.2). Like Philo and Justin, Athenagoras draws on Platonic tradition to articulate the role of angels in providential care over the sublunar cosmos. Both Justin and Athenagoras argue that something has gone awry in the cosmological order due to the rebellious transgressions of angels, a cosmic state that Philo does not accept.

Third, for Justin and Plato, the offspring of the gods supply the poets' myths (*Tim.* 40d–41a; *2 Apol.* 5.5–6; see also *1 Apol*. 23.3; 25.3; 54.1). While Plato admits that these myths lack "demonstration [ἀπόδειξις]" (*Tim.* 40e) and elsewhere criticizes the poetic accounts of the gods (*Resp*. 378b; 381d–382a; *Leg*. 810c–812a), Plato thinks it an

[95] *Leg*. 24.2–3. Translation from Schoedel, *Athenagoras*, 59.

impossibility "to disbelieve the children of gods [θεῶν παισὶν ἀπιστεῖν]" (*Tim*. 40e).[96] Justin exploits Plato's admission that Greek mythology lacks demonstration to portray Greek poetry as dubiously sourced. Justin repeatedly argues that pagan mythology, in contrast to Christian prophecy, lacks demonstration:

> Those handing down the myths invented by the poets supply no *demonstration* [ἀπόδειξιν] at all for the youths who learn them by heart. *These things we demonstrate to have been said by the working of the wicked demons for the deception and misdirection of the human race* [ἃ ἐπὶ ἀπάτῃ καὶ ἀπαγωγῇ τοῦ ἀνθρωπείου γένους εἰρῆσθαι ἀποδείκνυμεν κατ' ἐνέργειαν τῶν φαύλων δαιμόνων].[97]

Jewish Scripture is distinguished from the undemonstrated myths of the poets (see esp. *1 Apol*. 20.3).[98] Justin goes to great lengths to argue for the "proof" that the ancient Jewish Scriptures are about Jesus (esp. *1 Apol*. 30.1; 63.10) and worshiping him is entirely rational (*1 Apol*. 14.4). Unlike the poet's demonically inspired myths about pagan gods, Justin argues that the Jewish Scriptures testify proofs to the deity of Jesus as the true son of God.[99]

[96] Plato has two major criticisms of the poets' portraits of the divine. First, the gods are portrayed as evil (*Resp*. 377e–380c). Second, the gods are portrayed as changing (*Resp*. 380d–383a). In the conclusion of the second point, arguing that the divine cannot change, Plato concludes, "Both demons and the divine are completely without falsehood [πάντῃ ἄρα ἀψευδὲς τὸ δαιμόνιόν τε καὶ τὸ θεῖον]" (*Resp*. 382e). Perhaps Plato's acceptance of the poets' mythology in *Tim*. 40 is ironic.

[97] *1 Apol.* 54.1. See also *1 Apol*. 20.3; 23.3.

[98] See also Cicero, *Nat. d.* 2.62–63; 3.61–64; Athenagoras *Leg*. 20.1–21.1.

[99] Reed and Chesnutt identify the combination of pagan gods with demons as the Apologist's innovation on Enochic tradition (see esp. 1 En. 19;1; 99:7 [Reed, "Trickery of the Fallen Angels," 148 fn. 13; Chesnutt, "The Descent of the Watchers," 171–72]. While Justin is the first source to explicitly fuse demons as the offspring of fallen angels with pagan gods, Jews were already identifying foreign deities as "demons" (LXX Deut 32:17; LXX Pss. 95:5; 105:37; 1 Cor 10:20–21) and Plato identifies the gods of pagan mythology with the same language (*Tim*. 40d), although without the negative identification of a δαίμων as the evil offspring of angels.

Justin's combination of Enochic tradition and Greek philosophy illustrates the remarkable overlap between these traditions. Using the an Enochic source Justin exploits Plato's admission that Greek mythology lacks demonstration. Justin argues that some teachings are shared between Christians and Greek poets and philosophers.[100] Unlike philosophers and poets, Christians provide proof of their sacred writings and this a profound difference (*1 Apol.* 20.3). Justin's disdain for mythology is due to the lack of "proof" (*1 Apol.* 54.1), a criticism derived from Plato's *Timaeus*. In fact, Justin is emphatic that these myths are the work of demons (*1 Apol.* 23.3; 54.1–2). For Justin, the proof of prophecy is convincing because it describes events before they happen (*1 Apol.* 42.2). Reading Enochic and philosophical traditions together allowed Justin to attack pagan mythology and lionize Christian Scripture.

Justin combines Enochic tradition with Middle Platonic philosophy in three significant ways. First, Justin's angelic "providence [πρόνοια]" over the sublunar cosmos is analogous to Middle Platonic accounts of providence attributed to demons. Second, the evil character of the demonic offspring of the rebellious angels parallels some descriptions of demons as evil among Middle Platonists. Third, Justin's attack on Greek mythology as sourced by demons finds a subtle parallel in the *Timaeus*. Justin exploits this parallel to attack Greek mythology. These three elements of Justin's narrative are drawn from Middle Platonic philosophy and combined with Enochic tradition. This

---

[100] Justin explicitly mentions the common view that an afterlife of some kind exists (*1 Apol.* 18), Platonic cosmogony (*1 Apol.* 20.4), Stoic eschatological conflagration (*1 Apol.* 20.4; cf. *2 Apol.*8.1), and the foolishness of idolatry mocked by Menander (*1 Apol.* 20.5). He also argues, however, that these similarities are the result of philosophers borrowing from Moses (*1 Apol.* 44:8–9; 60.1) and demons imitating true prophecy (*1 Apol.* 54.1). On the argument that Plato borrowed from Moses see Droge, *Homer or Moses?* 59–64.

combination of Jewish tradition and Greek philosophy in explaining the origin and persistence of evil, while expanded by Justin, already has begun in Paul's argument in Galatians 3:19–4:11.

6.2.4 Paul

There are two features of Justin's narrative in *2 Apol.* 5 that do not primarily derive from Jewish Scripture, his Enochic source, or philosophical tradition. First, Justin describes angels ruling over the "the heavenly elements [*τὰ οὐράνια στοιχεῖα*]" (*2 Apol*. 5.2). Second, the transgressing angels and their demonic offspring "enslaved [*ἐδούλωσαν*] the human race" (*2 Apol*. 5.4). These two features of Justin's narrative most likely reflect Pauline influence.

Paul and Justin are by no means alone in connecting the elements and superhuman forces. In Jewish texts angels are portrayed as part of the fabric of the cosmos.[101] Additionally, several Middle Platonic texts articulate a cosmology in which demons inhabit the elements.[102] Why, then, should these features of *2 Apol*. 5 be considered a link between Justin and Paul? By describing the "elements" as "enslaving" humanity, Justin makes a claim not paralleled in Middle Platonic or Jewish texts. The most likely source for this language is Galatians, a letter that Justin demonstrates familiarity with elsewhere in his corpus.

Justin's use of the phrase "the heavenly elements [*τὰ οὐράνια στοιχεῖα*]" (*2 Apol*. 5.2) is almost certainly derived from a source since he rarely uses the term "element

---

[101] Ps 104:4; Job 38:7; Jub. 2:2; Wis 13:2; Sir 16:26–30; 11Q5 26:9–15; *Pss. Sol.* 18:10; 1QH[a] 9.10–22; 1 En. 60:12–21; 2 En. 29:3.

[102] See Ps.-Plato, *Epin.* 984b–c; Alcinous, *Epit*. 15.1; Apuleius, *De deo Socr.* 6–12*;* Philo, *Gig*. 6–9; Varro (Augustine, *Civ. Dei* 7.6); Calcidius, *in Tim*. 139–146.

[στοιχεῖον]" elsewhere in his corpus (*Dial*. 23.3; 62.2; *1 Apol*. 60.11). Furthermore, when Justin uses this language elsewhere it is never connected with angels or demons. Once Justin uses στοιχεῖον generically to refer to the "rudimentary" shapes of letters (*1 Apol*. 60.11). In the remaining three instances, Justin refers to the elements as the constituent parts of the created cosmos (*Dial* 23.3; 62.2; *2 Apol.* 5.2).[103] Only in *2 Apol.* 5.2 is there any connection between the elements and superhuman beings.[104] The rarity of the term combined with the specific content of *2 Apol*. 5 suggests that Justin is drawing on a tradition.

Second, there is a similar connection between the elements and superhuman beings found in Justin's contemporary Athenagoras. In a summary of Christian teaching about the cosmos, Athenagoras writes:

> We say there is both a host of angels and ministers [καὶ πλῆθος ἀγγέλων καὶ λειτουργῶν φαμεν] . . . commanded [by God] to be concerned with the elements, the heavens, and the world with all that is in it and the good order of all that is in it [διέταξεν περί τε τὰ στοιχεῖα εἶναι καὶ τοὺς οὐρανοὺς καὶ τὸν κόσμον καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῳ καὶ τὴν τούτων εὐταξίαν]. (*Leg.* 10.5)

Athenagoras describes this as standard Christian teaching in language echoing *2 Apol.* 5.2. Later in the same apologetic treatise, Athenagoras refutes various forms of idolatry arguing for the superiority of Christian tradition about the "elements":[105]

---

[103] See also Justin's use of "matter [ὕλη]" as the material of idols (*Dial*. 69.4; *1 Apol*. 9.2) as well as the substance from which God creates the world (*1 Apol*. 10.2; 59.1; 67.8).

[104] Cf. Philippe Bobichon, *Justin Martyr: Dialogue avec Tryphon: Édition critique, traduction, commentaire*, Paradosis 47, 2 Vols. (Fribourg: Academic Press Fribourg, 2003), 963–65. Bobichon correctly recognizes a connection between the στοιχεῖα and angels in *2 Apol*. 5.2, but fails to demonstrate how the στοιχεῖα of *2 Apol*. 5.2 necessitates identifying angels in the use of the term in *Dial*. 23.3; 62.2.

[105] William H. P. Hatch finds a similar view of the στοιχεῖα in the Syriac text *The book of the Laws of the Countries* attributed to Bardaisan ("τὰ στοιχεῖα in Paul and Bardaisan," *JTS* 28 [1927]: 181–82). See also Götte, *Von den Wächtern zu Adam*, 147–48.

> We do not neglect worshipping God, the cause of bodily motion, *and fall back upon the beggarly and weak elements* [ἐπὶ τὰ πτωχὰ καὶ ἀσθενῆ στοιχεῖα καταπίπτομεν], worshipping passible matter because of the air which they regard as impassible. [. . .] I do not ask of matter what it does not have; *nor do I neglect God to serve the elements* [οὐδὲ παραλιπὼν τὸν θεὸν τὰ στοιχεῖα θεραπεύω] which can do no more than what they have been commanded. (*Leg*. 16.3–4)[106]

Athenagoras explicitly alludes to Paul's description of the "elements [στοιχεῖα]" as "not gods" (Gal 4:8) and "weak and beggarly [ἀσθενῆ καὶ πτωχά]" (Gal 4:10) in the context of a philosophical argument against idolatry.[107] Athenagoras cites a common tradition that angels are part of the structure of the cosmos and their transgressions wreak havoc and cause idolatry (*Leg*. 24).[108] Although Justin's στοιχεῖα language does not explicitly cite Galatians as in the case of Athenagoras, both apologists draw from Galatians 3:19–4:11.

Third, Paul describes the "elements [στοιχεῖα]" enslaving (Gal 4:3, 9–10) and Justin has the demonic offspring of the angels who rule over the elements enslaving humanity (*2 Apol*. 5.2, 4). Justin uses the verb "enslave [δουλόω]" twice in *2 Apol*. 5.4 but nowhere else in his extant corpus, a strong indicator that Justin is citing a source. The synonymous verb "serve [δουλεύω]" occurs elsewhere in Justin to describe human service to demons.[109] In his exegesis of LXX Psalm 95:5 in the *Dialogue* Justin writes:

---

[106] See also Athenagoras, *Leg*. 22.2, 5, 9, 12.

[107] Athenagoras also refers to the teachings of "Plato" and the "Peripatetics" to support his argument (*Leg*. 16.3; see *Tim*. 33d; 34a; Alcinous, *Epit*. 12.1), citing Plato explicitly (*Leg*. 16.4 [*Polit*. 269d–3]).

[108] See also 1 En. 19:1; 80:7; 99:6–7; T. Naph. 3:5; T. Reub. 5:6; Jude 6; Tertullian, *Idol.* 4.2–3; Irenaeus, *Haer*. 1.10.1.

[109] Justin always uses δουλεύω as part of citation of Jewish Scripture (*Dial*. 13.7; 28.6; 34.4; 83.4; 134.3[x3], 5; 136.1; *1 Apol*. 40.17; 50.4) except once (*1 Apol*. 44.12). In the NT and other early Christian literature δουλεύω occasionally refers to service to false gods (Matt 6:24 || Luke 16:13; Gal 4:8–9; 1 Thess 1:9; Diogn. 2.5).

> As David says: “*The gods of the Gentiles are demons* [οἱ θεοὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν δαιμόνια]” (LXX Ps 95:5). And the power of his Word has persuaded many to abandon the demons, *to whom they were enslaved* [οἷς ἐδούλευον], and through him to believe in the almighty God *because the gods of the Gentiles are demons* [ὅτι δαιμόνιά εἰσιν οἱ θεοὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν].[110]

Elsewhere in his corpus Justin identifies pagan gods as demons based on exegesis of LXX Ps 95:5, but only mentions slavery to these demons in *Dial.* 83.4.[111] Why does Justin add slavery to demons as part of his interpretation, a feature not found in the text of LXX Ps 95?

The only other references to human slavery to demons in Justin’s corpus are found in *1 Apology*. Early in his explication of Christian theology, Justin warns his readers against the deceptions of demons who attempt to make humans their “slaves and servants [δούλους καὶ ὑπεράτας]” (*1 Apol*. 14.1). Later, in the context of an argument about divine foreknowledge and free will (*1 Apol*. 43–44), Justin again describes how demons try to enslave. He argues that foreknowledge (*1 Apol*. 43.1; 44.11) does not negate “free choice [προαίρεσις ἐλεύθερος]” (*1 Apol*. 43.3–8). Instead, he maintains that foreknowledge and free choice are taught by Moses (*1 Apol*. 44.1 [Deut 30:15, 19]), and Isaiah (*1 Apol*. 44.2–7). Then, following a common Jewish and Christian apologetic trope, Justin claims that Plato borrowed from Moses to make the same point (*1 Apol*. 44.8 [*Resp*. 617e]). Despite the Scriptures and the philosophers, recognition of foreknowledge and free will has been obscured by the violent deceptions of demons:

---

[110] *Dial*. 83.4.

[111] *1 Apol*. 44.1; *Dial.* 55.2; 73.2–3; 79.4; 83.4; see also Ireaneus, *Haer*. 3.6.3; 3.12.6. Also relevant to Justin’s demonology and Jewish Scripture is his interpretation of Deuteronomy 32: *Dial*. 119.1–2 [Deut 32:17]; 130.4; 131.1–2 [Deut 32:43].

> *But according to the activity of the wicked demons* [κατ' ἐνέργειαν δὲ τῶν φαύλων δαιμόνων] death was decreed against those who read the books of Hystaspes or of Sibyl or of the prophets, so that, through fear, the demons should turn the humans reading away from receiving the knowledge of good things, and they [i.e. demons] might restrain them [i.e. humans] as slaves to themselves, which they were not strong enough to do forever.[112]

In Justin's view, demons attempt to mislead humanity by preventing recognition of true reason. In the past demons resorted to violence to stop the reception of reason espoused by Socrates (*1 Apol*. 5.3–4). Demons do the same in Justin's time, attacking Christians who are fully informed by the incarnation of the Logos (*2 Apol*. 8.2–3). What is the source of Justin's view of demons as enslaving?

Because Justin identifies the gods of Greek mythology as demons, one possible source for his view of human service to demons is Jewish idol polemic. Examples of idol polemic are well-known and numerous, scattered throughout the HB (esp. Isa 44:9–20; Jer 10:1–16), Second Temple literature (esp. 1 En. 99:7; Jub. 11–12; Wis 13–15), and the NT (esp. 1 Cor 8:4; 10:20–21).[113] Especially important are instances that describe humans

---

[112] *1 Apol*. 44.12. My translation does not follow the conjectured emendation proposed by Minns and Parvis, *Philosopher and Martyr*, 196–97. Justin refers to the activity (ἐνέργεια/ἐνεργέω) of demons as the persecution of those who live according to reason (*1 Apol*. 5.3; *2 Apol*. 7.2–3; 8.2–3), the deceptions of false prophets (*1 Apol*. 26.2, 4), and Greek mythology (*1 Apol*. 54.1; 64.1).

[113] See John Barton, "'The Work of Human Hands' (Ps 115:4): Idolatry in the Old Testament," *Ex Auditu* 15 (1999): 63–72; Joel Marcus, "Idolatry in the New Testament," *Int.* 60 (2006): 152–64; Stephen C. Barton (ed.), *Idolatry: False Worship in the bible, Early Judaism and Christianity* (New York: T&T Clark, 2007); Andrei A. Orlov, "'The Gods of My Father Terah': Abraham the Iconoclast and the Polemics with the Divine Body Traditions in the Apocalypse of Abraham," *JSP* 18 (2008): 33–53; Emma Wasserman, "'An Idol is Nothing in the World' (1 Cor 8:4): The Metaphysical Contradictions of 1 Corinthians 8:1–11:1 in The Context of Jewish Idolatry Polemics," in *Portraits of Jesus: Studies in Christology*, ed. Susan E. Myers, WUNT 2.321 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebek, 2012), 201–27; Nijay K. Gupta, "'They Are Not Gods!': Jewish and Christian Idol Polemic and Greco-Roman Use of Cult Statues," *CBQ* 76 (2014): 704–19; Trent A. Rogers, *God and the Idols: Representations of God in 1 Corinthians 8-10*, WUNT 2.427 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016).

enslaved to false gods or idols.[114] There is one especially notable text that may be relevant to Justin's view.[115] In LXX Ps 105:36 Israel's idolatry is described as a form of slavery: "They served their idols which became a snare to them."[116] This passage was likely known to Justin who frequently cites the next verse (LXX Ps 105:37) to indict Jewish idolatry for the atrocity of sacrificing children to demons.[117] In one instance (*Dial*. 73.6), Justin's citation occurs in the context of an exposition after a lengthy citation of LXX Ps 95:1–13 (*Dial*. 73.3–4). It is possible, then, that Justin's description of human slavery to demons was derived from LXX Ps 95:5 combined with LXX Ps 105:36. This possibility is hampered by several factors. When Justin cites LXX Ps 105:37, he consistently employs it as a criticism of Jewish idolatry not a description of the state of humanity in general. Additionally, Justin nowhere cites or clearly alludes to LXX Ps 105:36. What is more, the word for slavery in *2 Apol.* 5.4 (δουλόω) is different than the word for slavery in LXX Ps 105:36 (δουλεύω). The source of Justin's view of demons enslaving humanity, at least as it appears in *2 Apol.* 5.4, was very likely influenced by idol polemic. Nevertheless, idol polemic alone was not Justin's source in *2 Apol*. 5.4.

---

[114] In the LXX, δουλεύω describes slavery to other gods (Exod 23:33; 1 Kgdms 8:8; 12:10; 26:19; 3 Kgdms 9:6, 9; 16:31; 22:54; 4 Kgdms 10:18; 17;41; 2 Chron 7:22; 24;18; 33:3, 22; Jer 11:10; 13:10; 16:11, 13; 22:9; 25:6; 42:15) and idols (LXX Ps 106:36; Wis 14:21; Jer 8:2).

[115] Another passage of interest is Jer 8:2. In Jer 8:2 the dead kings of Judah are indicted for idolatry and promised that their buried corpses will be disinterred and "spread before the sun and the moon and *all the host of heaven* [ולכל צבא השמים/ πᾶσαν τὴν στρατιὰν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ], which they have loved and *served* [עבדום/ἐδούλευσαν], which they have followed, and which they have inquired of and worshiped." See also Deut 4:19; 17:3; 2 Kgs 23:5; Ep. Jer 60–65. These texts identify cosmic phenomena as objects of worship and service, like *2 Apol*. 5.2, 4, but Justin does not cite them elsewhere in his corpus.

[116] MT Ps 106:36: ויעבדו את־עצביהם ויהיו להם למוקשׁ. LXX Ps 105:36: *καὶ ἐδούλευσαν τοῖς γλυπτοῖς αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐγενήθη αὐτοῖς εἰς σκάνδαλον.*

[117] See *Dial*. 19.6; 27:1; 73.6; 133.1; see also *Dial.*46.6 [Isa 57:5]. If Justin's citation of LXX Ps 105:37 is from a *testimonia* source, then he may not have been aware of the surrounding context. This tradition about offering sacrifices to demons appears elsewhere in Second Temple and early Christian literature (Jub. 1:11; 22:17; Bar. 4:7; 1 Cor 10:20; Rev 9:20).

The most likely source for Justin's view of demons enslaving humanity is Galatians because of the identical lexical similarities combined with the content of the respective texts. Justin's use of στοιχεῖα (*2 Apol*. 5.2) and δουλόω (*2 Apol.* 5.4) point to Galatians 3:19–4:11.[118] Although δουλόω is rare in the LXX, NT, and early Christian literature, it appears in Gal 4:3 to describe the state of humanity prior to arrival of Christ as "enslaved under the elements of the cosmos."[119] While human slavery to the elements has some similarity with idol polemics elsewhere in Jewish and Christian literature, it uniquely converges with the same language as *2 Apol*. 5.2–4 in Galatians 4:1–11.[120] Also, both Paul and Justin have in view the tragic consequence of angelic "transgressions" for the whole cosmos (Gal 3:19; *2 Apol*. 5.3). Human slavery to the elements animated by hostile angelic progeny points to Gal 3:19–4:11 as one of Justin's sources in *2 Apology* 5.

Fourth, the likelihood of Galatians as Justin's source is increased when analyzing how Justin utilizes Galatians elsewhere in his corpus. Based on his extensive study of Justin's citations, Oskar Skarsaune has concluded that Justin "had permanent or

[118] The slavery language is unique to Galatians even though there is a similar conceptual view of τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου in Colossians: στοιχεῖα "ensare [συλαγωγέω]," are aligned with the "tradition of humans [παράδοσις τῶν ἀνθρώπων]" (Col 2:8), "according to the regulations and teachings of humans [κατὰ τὰ ἐντάλματα καὶ διδασκαλίας τῶν ἀνθρώπων]" (Col 2:21), and "for the satisfaction of the flesh [πρὸς πλησμονὴν τῆς σαρκός]" (2:23). See Eduard Lohse, *Colossians and Philemon*, Hermeneia, trans. William R. Poehlmann and Robert J. Karris (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971), 94–99, 126–27. The language of Colossians is developed to address Christological concerns, but it is indebted to Galatians. See Andreas Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*: *Das Bild des Apostels und die Rezeption der paulinischen Theologie in der frühchristlichen Literatur bis Marcion*, BHT 58 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1979), 117.

[119] In the LXX δουλόω never refers to human enslavement to superhuman beings (Gen 15:13; 1 Macc 8:11; Prov 27:8; Wis 19:14) although it can refer to being enslaved to passions (4 Macc 3:2; 13:2; see also Philo, *Leg*. 2.29, 49–50; *Prob*. 159; T. Jud. 15.1; T. Jos. 7:8). In the NT δουλόω describes enslavement to Egypt (Acts 7:6), righteousness (Rom 6:18), God (Rom 6:22), metaphorical enslavement to others (1 Cor 7:15; 9:19), wine (Titus 2:3), corruption (2 Pet 2:20; see also Barn. 16:9). In Diogn. 2:10 Christians are described as "not being enslaved to such gods" in the context of idol polemic (Diogn. 2.1–10).

[120] Justin's convergence of demons and idols elsewhere has Pauline echoes see *1 Apol*. 5.2; 9.1 [1 Cor 10:20–21]; *Dial*. 30.3 [1 Thess 1:9–10]; *Dial*. 55.2 [1 Cor 8:4–6]

occasional access to complete scrolls" of several biblical texts.[121] Justin's citations of Jewish Scripture are often directly influenced by the NT without citation.[122] While Justin was clearly influenced by the NT and other Christian sources, his goal is "prove" his argument from the ancient Jewish Scriptures and connect those Scriptures to Jesus. Appealing to more recent sources would only detract from his claims that his proofs are from the fulfillment of ancient texts unlike Greek mythology which lacks any proof at all.

When it comes to Paul's letters, Justin never explicitly cites Paul but rather adopts and adapts the Apostle's scriptural arguments.[123] Skarsaune is utterly confident that Paul had direct access to Galatians: "No doubt, Justin had Galatians 3 before his eyes when writing *Dial*. 95f, and in this instance the Pauline material occurs at a pivotal point in Justin's argument."[124] On more than one occasion, Justin adopts and adapts Paul's

---

[121] Oskar Skarsaune, "Justin and His Bible," in *Justin Martyr and His Worlds*, eds. Sara Parvis and Paul Foster (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), 53–76, here 58. Skarsaune explicitly argues Just had access to scrolls of the following: Genesis through Joshua, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, the Twelve Prophets, Psalms, Proverbs, and Daniel.

[122] Justin shows direct awareness of the synoptic gospels, Romans (esp. *Dial.* 23.4; 27.3; 42.1–2), Ephesians (*Dial.* 39.4; 87.6), Revelation (*Dial.* 81.4), and possibly Acts (*Dial.* 22:2–5; 22:11). The exception to avoiding citation is the "memoirs of the apostles," which he cites with relative frequency (*Dial.* 100.4; 101.3; 102.5; 103.6; 103.8; 104.1; 105.1; 105.5; 105.6; 106.1; 106.3; 106.4b; 107.1; see also 49.5).

[123] See Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*, 365–67; Rodney Werline, "The Transformation of Pauline Arguments in Justin Martyr's 'Dialogue with Trypho,'" *HTR* 92 (1999): 79–93.

[124] Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 99. See esp. *Dial.* 95.1–96.1 [Gal 3:10–14]. See also Gal 3:13 in *Dial*. 32.1; 89.2; 90.1; 94.5; 111.2; 131.2. cf. Paul Foster, "Justin and Paul," *Paul and the Second Century*, eds. Michael F. Bird and Joseph R. Dodson, LNTS 412 (New York: T&T Clark, 2011), 108–125. Foster argues that the evidence is inconclusive that Justin was dependent on Paul. Foster's minimalism is well illustrated in his approach to *Dial.* 95.1. Rather than accept Paul used Gal 3:10 in *Dial*. 95.1, Foster thinks it is possible that Paul and Justin "were both dependent on a recension of the LXX that has not otherwise survived" or that Deut 27:26 "circulated as part of a *testimonia* collection" (122). These other options are theoretically possible, but the cumulative weight of the evidence is that Justin used Paul's arguments but chose not to cite him because Paul's name did not advance Justin's rhetorical goals.

argument about Abraham's faith from Gal 3.[125] In one instance, Justin even creates his own allegorical interpretation of Jacob's marriages to Leah and Rachael (*Dial*. 134.3–5) that bears remarkable resemblance to Paul's allegory of Abraham's sons/wives in Gal 4:21–31.[126] When Justin uses Paul's letters, and especially Galatians, he is adapts the arguments rather than directly appealing to the Apostle's authority.

Justin's practice of adapting Paul's arguments about Jewish Scripture to suit his own rhetorical goals also occurs in *2 Apol*. 5. Justin and Athenagoras interpret Enochic tradition is noticeably influenced by Paul's language. Interpreting an Enochic tradition Justin uses Paul's language about the "elements" and their attempt to "enslave" humanity combined with Greek philosophical traditions to attack Greek mythology. In *2 Apol.* 5 Justin adopts and adapts Gal 3:19–4:11 to suit his own rhetorical goals.

6.3 Justin's Mixed Template

One of the central arguments of this study is that a sharp dichotomy between Adamic and Enochic traditions concerning the origin and persistence of evil in Second Temple texts is problematic. In contrast, Second Temple Judaism often employs a mixed template of Adamic and Enochic traditions to describe the origin and persistence of evil. Justin serves as another example of the mixed template, combining Adamic and Enochic traditions.

Annette Y. Reed is emphatic that Justin's view of evil in the *Apologies* differs substantially from the *Dialogue with Trypho*. Most notably, she argues that in the

---

[125] Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 93, 114; Werline, "Transformation of Pauline Arguments," 84–86. Interpreting Gen 15:6 through Paul (Gal 3:6; Rom 4:6) in *Dial*. 119.5–6 ; Gen 12:1–3 through Paul (Gal 3:7–9) in *Dial*. 119.5; 120.1.

[126] Justin alludes to Plato in his allegory interpreting Leah's "weak eyes" as corresponding to the "eyes of the soul" of Jews as "exceedingly weak" (*Dial*. 134.5 [see Plato, *Resp*. 519b; 533d]; see also *Dial*. 3.7–4.1). Irenaeus repeats Justin's allegory identifying Rachael as the church but makes no mention of Leah's eyes (*Haer*. 4.21.3).

Apologies Justin makes no reference to Adamic tradition, in contrast to the *Dialogue*. In her words, "Whereas Adam and Eve are nowhere mentioned in either of the *Apologies*" in the *Dialogue* Justin "appeals to Genesis 2–3 to account for human wickedness."[127] Reed argues that Adamic tradition is absent from Justin's *Apologies* and that the omission is no mere oversight. Rather, she interprets Justin's focus on the rebellion of angels and their demonic offspring in the *Apologies* as a deliberate attempt to subvert the view of evil articulated by the Adamic tradition. As Reed puts it:

> By 'skipping' the story of Adam and Eve's expulsion from Eden, *2 Apol*. 5 effectively omits any hint of human culpability in contributing to the distance between corrupt humankind and their beneficent creator.[128]

Reed interprets the Adamic tradition to indicate that evil is a human problem in origin and persistence. At the same time, in her view, the Enochic tradition describes evil as superhuman in origin and persistence.[129]

Justin has a mixed template view of evil based for three reasons. First, Adamic tradition is present in *1 Apology*. Second, the Adamic tradition of the *Apologies*, although less frequent, does not conflict with Adamic tradition in the *Dialogue*. Third, Enochic tradition functions alongside Adamic tradition in the *Dialogue*. Adamic and Enochic traditions are mixed in Justin's theology to serve the same rhetorical function, to claim that evil originates and persists in the free choices of morally competent agents (human

---

[127] Reed, "Trickery of the Fallen Angels," 145. Reed is followed by Chesnutt, "The Descent of the Watchers," 177 and Götte, *Von den Wächtern zu Adam*, 262–64.

[128] Reed, "Trickery of the Fallen Angels," 153.

[129] See also Skarsaune, "The author of *1 Enoch* 1–36 interpreted Gen 6:1–4 (not Gen 3) as the story of the decisive fall into sin" ("Judaism and Hellenism in Justin Martyr," 593). Chesnutt, "The Descent of the Watchers," 177–79.

and angelic). In the focus on free will, the closest parallel to Justin's theology of the origin and persistence of evil is 2 Baruch.

While Justin draws primarily on Enochic tradition to explain the origin and persistence of evil in the *Apologies*, Adamic tradition is not entirely absent. Although the names "Adam" and "Eve" do not appear in the *Apologies*, Justin refers to Adam to defend the moral competence of humanity:

> For God did not make human begins like the other things, such as trees and quadrupeds, capable of doing nothing *by choice* [προαιρέσει]: for in that event they would not be worthy of recompense or praise [. . .]. The holy prophetic Spirit taught us these things, saying through Moses that God spoke *to the first-formed man* [τῷ πρώτῳ πλασθέντι ἀνθρώπῳ]: "Behold, before your face is good and evil. Choose the good."[130]

The "first-formed man" is Adam.[131] The Protoplast functions as the prototypical human, addressed with the words of Moses (Deut 30:15, 19).[132] As noted in chapter two, the same Deuteronomic passage is connected to Adamic tradition in Second Temple literature to assert human agency.[133] Justin is citing an Adamic/Deuteronomic exegetical tradition to argue for the culpability of all humans for their choices in *1 Apol*. 44.1. This passage is significant for two reasons. First, it shows although Enochic tradition is predominant in the *Apologies*, it does not preclude Justin from citing Adamic tradition to argue for human culpability. Second, it shows that Adamic tradition in the *Apologies* functions in

---

[130] *1 Apol*. 43.8–44.1. I have augmented the translation of Minns and Parvis, *Philosopher and Martyr*, 193.

[131] See also LXX Gen 2:7; Wis 7:1; 10:1; T. Abraham [A] 11:9, 10, 11; 13:2, 5; Philo, *QG* 1.32; *QE* 2.46.

[132] Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 369. Skarsaune hypothesizes that Justin's citation is part of a baptismal exhortation, adapted from its original setting in "Jewish proselytizing practice." He cites Philo, *Deus* 50 to support this hypothesis.

[133] Sir 15:15–17; 17:1–3, 7; Philo, *Deus* 49–50; 2 Bar 19:1–3; see also 4 Ezra 7.20–21, 129.

much the same way as it does in Ben Sira or 2 Bar, to argue that humans are morally competent agents. The same rhetorical function of Adamic tradition is also found throughout the *Dialogue.*

Although Adamic tradition is more prominent in the *Dialogue with Trypho* than the *Apologies*, Adamic tradition in the *Dialogue* is consistent with the tradition in *1 Apol*. 44.1.[134] Throughout Justin's corpus Adamic tradition consistently serves the same rhetorical function, to assert the moral agency of humans and angels. While explaining the reason for Jesus' baptism, for example, Justin offers an elaborate description of moral agency based on Adamic tradition:

> [Jesus was baptized] for the sake of the human race, who from Adam had fallen under death by the deceit of the serpent, *each of them doing evil by his own cause* [παρὰ τὴν ἰδίαν αἰτίαν ἑκάστου αὐτῶν πονηρευσαμένου]. For God, wanting both angels and humans to act *in free choice and self-determination* [ἐν ἐλευθέρα προαιρέσει καὶ αὐτεξουσίους], enabled each the ability to act, he did, if they should choose good things, to keep them both immortal and unpunished, but if *they should do evil* [πονηρεύσωνται], to punish each as it seems to him. (*Dial.* 88.4–5)[135]

Justin's language for describing the agency of angels and humans (ἐλευθέρα προαιρέσει καὶ αὐτεξουσίους) is adapted from the philosophical lexicon.[136] It is Stoic language with especially close parallel to the first century Roman Stoic, Epictetus (ca. 50/60–135 CE).[137]

---

[134] See *Dial.* 19.3; 40.1; 62.3; 81.3; 84.2; 88.4; 94.2; 99.3; 100.3; 103.6; 124.4; 129.2; 131.1; 132

[135] I have significantly augmented the translation of Falls based on the Greek text of Marcovich: ὑπὲρ τοῦ γένους τοῦ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὃ ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀδὰμ ὑπὸ θάνατον κατὰ πλάνην τὴν τοῦ ὄφεως ἐπεπτώκει, παρὰ τὴν ἰδίαν αἰτίαν ἑκάστου αὐτῶν πονηρευσαμένου. βουλόμενος γὰρ τούτους ἐν ἐλευθέρᾳ προαιρέσει καὶ αὐτεξουσίους γενομένους, τούς τε ἀγγέλους καὶ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, ὁ θεὸς πράττειν ὅσα ἕκαστον ἐνεδυνάμωσε [δύνασθαι] ποιεῖν, ἐποίησεν, εἰ μὲν τὰ εὐάρεστα αὐτῷ αἱροῖντο, καὶ ἀφθάρτους καὶ ἀτιμωρήτους αὐτοὺς τηρῆσαι, ἐὰν δὲ πονηρεύσωνται, ὡς αὐτῷ δοκεῖ ἕκαστον κολάζειν.

[136] Justin uses ἐλεύθερος in *1 Apol*. 43.3, 4 to maintain human freedom and prophetic foretelling (similarly Maximus of Tyre, *Orat*. 13.2; see also Alcinous, *Epit*. 26.2; Augustine, *Civ. Dei* 1.127).

[137] On ἐλευθέρα προαίρεσις see Epictetus, *Diss*. 2.23.9–28; see also 1.12.9; 2.1.21; 2.1.24; 4.1.1. On αὐτεξούσιος see Epictetus, *Diss*. 2.2.3; 4.1.56; 4.1.62; 4.1.68; 4.1.100; see also Musonius Rufus, *Diss*.

Susanne Bobzien argues that in extending freedom to all humanity (and angels) rather than limiting it to the rare sage, Justin has emptied the language of its technical Stoic sense.[138] In *2 Apol.* 7, Justin uses the same language of self-determination to contrast Christian doctrine of final judgment with Stoic "fate [εἱμαρμένης]":[139]

> Because God made the race of both angels and humans *self-determining* [αὐτεξούσιον] from the beginning, they will reap the just retribution in eternal fire for whatever wrong they do.[140]

Justin's subversive adaptation of Stoic philosophical language in the *Dialogue* is combined with the narrative of Gen 3 to assert the culpability of humans as competent moral agents.[141] In both the *Apologies* and the *Dialogue*, Adamic tradition functions in the same way.

16.97; Philo, *Prob*. 57. In contrast to Justin's claim that humans and angels have moral "self-determination [αὐτεξούσιος]," Philo typically limits αὐτεξούσιος to God alone (esp. *Ebr*. 43; *Her*. 301; see also *Leg*. 3.73; *Cher*. 88; *Plant*. 46; *Her*. 85, *Spec*. 1.14). I have translated the rare term αὐτεξούσιος as "self-determination" because it describes a freedom from external factors (see e.g. Josephus, *A.J.* 4.146; Diodorus Siculus, *Hist*. 14.105.4; Epictetus, *Diss*. 4.1.100–101). On Epictetus's life and context see A. A. Long, *Epictetus: A Stoic and Socratic Guide to Life* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 10–37.

[138] Bobzien, *Determinism and Freedom*, 345. Bobzien argues that for the early stoics εὐλεύθερος was limited to the sage who is "free" by nature of having right beliefs (*Determinism and Freedom*, 339–41). Epictetus shifts emphasis to describe "freedom" as psychological state of mind (associated with ἀταραξία, ἀπάθεια, ἀκώλυτος in 2.1.21; 3.5.7; 3.15.12; 4.1.27–28) that depends on recognizing what is in one's realm of control and only desiring within that realm (*Determinism and Freedom*, 341–43). Justin's argument is parallel to the Middle Platonist Alcinous who adopts Stoic language to argue that "fate" does not undermine or contradict human freedom (*Epit*. 26.1–3).

[139] On "fate" in Stoicism see Bobzien, *Determinism and Freedom*, 44–58. In *1 Apol*. 43.7 Justin offers a Platonic redefinition of "unalterable fate [εἱμαρμένην ἀπαράβατον]" as judgment according to works (see also Alcinous, *Epit*. 26.1; Eusebius, *Praep. ev*. 15.15; cf. Alexander of Aphrodisias *Fat*. 2).

[140] *2 Apol*. 7.5. Justin articulates a similar position on human culpability (δυνάμενον αἱρεῖσθαι) in *1 Apol*. 28.3–4; see also *1 Apol*. 10.3.

[141] Justin is harshly critical of the Stoics (*Dial*. 2.3; *1 Apol*. 20.2; *2 Apol*. 7.3–9), even while admitting some similarities in Stoic and Christian doctrine (*1 Apol*. 20.4)

Justin's argument in *Dial*. 88.4–5 is the portrayal of both humans and angels as culpable for evil (πονηρεύομαι).[142] Already in the *Dialogue*, Trypho has accused Justin of blasphemy for accepting the Watchers tradition that claims angels "have done evil (πονρευσαμένους) and apostatized from God" (*Dial*. 79.1).[143] In response, Justin cites a catena of scriptural proofs to defend the scriptural authority of the Watchers tradition (*Dial*. 79.3–4).[144] Included among the several scriptural proofs for the Enochic tradition is Gen 3:13–14 (*Dial*. 79.4). Additionally, as Oskar Skarsaune and others have pointed out, Trypho's objection to the Watchers tradition twice refers to an earlier discussion that is no longer extant in the text of the *Dialogue* (*Dial*. 79.1, 4), indicating a significant lacuna in the text at the beginning of the second day of dialogue (*Dial*. 74).[145] There are other cross-references to this lacuna (*Dial*. 80.2; 85.6; 105.4; 142.1) and four of the six cross-references concern angels and demons (*Dial*. 79.1, 4; 85.6; 105.4). Originally, then, the text of *Dial*. 74 most likely included an elaborate teaching on demonology based on

---

[142] Reed dismisses the presence of Enochic tradition in the *Dialogue* by claiming that: "Justin clearly distinguishes between Satan's fall 'from the beginning' and the later descent of the angels, grouping them only to express the content of the present-day demonic population and to stress angelic free will" (*Fallen Angels*, 168 fn. 16). See also Reed, "Trickery of the Fallen Angels," 157 fn. 36. Unfortunately, Reed offers no evidence to support the claim that Justin offers a clear distinction between Satan's fall and the Watchers' descent. On the contrary, Justin repeatedly conflates these narratives (see esp. *Dial.* 79.1–4; *1* Apol. 28.1)

[143] Justin uses πονηρεύομαι to describe the evil actions of humans (*Dial*. 30.1; 64.2–3; 98.4; 104.1) and superhuman beings (*Dial.* 45.1; 88.4–5; 141.1; *1 Apol*. 64.5), occasionally both (*Dial*. 45.1; 88.4–5; 141.1). There is evidence of Rabbinic polemic against the Watchers mythology (Gen. Rab. 26.5). See Reed, *Fallen Angels*, 136–38, 206–18.

[144] Justin cites Isa 30:1–5 [*Dial*. 79.3; see also *Dial.*115.2–3]; Zech 3:1–2 [*Dial*. 79.4; see also *Dial*. 103.5; 116.1–3]; Job 1:6; 2:1 [*Dial*. 79.4; see also *Dial.* 103.5]; Gen 3:13–14 [*Dial*. 79.4; see also *Dial*. 91.4]; Exod 7:11–12 [*Dial*. 79.4; see also 69.1]; LXX Ps 95:5 [*Dial*. 79.4; see also *Dial*. 55.2; 73.1–4; 74.2–3; 83.4; *1 Apol*. 41.1–4].

[145] Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 213–15; Marcovich, *Dialogus,* 5–6. Bobichon attempts to reconstruct the scriptural texts cited in the lacuna (*Dialogue avec Tryphon*, 49–72).

the Enochic tradition, perhaps something like *2 Apol*. 5.[146] Even without the lacuna, Adamic tradition does not conflict with Enochic tradition in the *Dialogue* since Justin explicitly cites Adamic tradition to support the validity of the Enochic tradition (*Dial*. 79.4). Returning to *Dial*. 88.4–5, the Adamic tradition is explicitly combined with Enochic tradition to make the same argument about culpability and responsibility extending to humans and angels. Such a combination is typical of the *Dialogue* and the *Apologies*.

The combination of Adamic and Enochic tradition is explicit and pervasive enough in Justin's *Dialogue* to classify as an example of the mixed template. Most often, Justin combines Adamic and Enochic tradition to portray the serpent of Gen 3 in the role of chief rebel angel, like Shemihazah or Asael in the Enochic tradition. The conflation of the Serpent with the leader of rebellious angels is most explicit in 2 Enoch, although has its roots in earlier material.[147] Justin uses various titles for the chief angel, but the most common is "Serpent [ὄφις]."[148] Based on *Dial*. 79.1–4, the Serpent as the leader of evil angels combines Adamic and Enochic tradition. The identification of the Serpent with Satan as a proper name for the leader of evil superhuman beings is also found in *1*

[146] Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 213–14; Goodenough, *Theology of Justin*, 199–200. Goodenough thinks the text was altered for theological reasons, but Skarsaune suggests that it is precisely at the beginning of the second codex of the *Dialogue* (*Dial*. 74) that one should expect to find damage to the text.

[147] See 2 En 18:3; 29:3–5; 31:3–6. In earlier Enochic tradition, the rebellious angel Gader'el is involved in the deception of Eve (1 En. 69:6–7; see also GLAE 7:1–3; 15:1–21:6; 4 Macc 18:8). It is not explicit, but the conflation of the Serpent with a rebel angel is already be present in Paul's letters (Rom 16:18–20; 2 Cor 11:3–4, 14–15) and Revelation (Rev 12:9; 20:2). Justin certainly reads Rev 12:9 as a reference to the Serpent of Gen 3 (*Dial*. 45.4; see also *1 Apol*. 28.1.

[148] The Serpent as a superhuman evil figure see *Dial.* 39.6; 45.4; 70.5; 79.4; 88.4; 91.4; 94.2; 100.4–6; 103.5; 124.3; 125.4; *1 Apol*. 28.1. Other titles include: "Devil [διάβολος]" (*Dial*. 69.1; 78.6; 79.4; 82.3; 103.5–6; 115.2; 116.1–3; 125.4; 131.2; *1 Apol*. 28.1) and "Satan [σατανᾶς]" (*Dial.* 76.5; 103.5–6; 125.4; *1 Apol*. 28.1).

Apology where an elaborate Enochic tradition is explicit (e.g. *1 Apol*. 5): “For *the chief leader of the evil demons* [ὁ ἀρχηγέτης τῶν κακῶν δαιμόνων] is called by us Serpent, and Satan, and the Devil” (*1 Apol*. 28.1).[149] This another example of Adamic tradition in the *Apologies* mixed with the Enochic tradition, the Serpent of Gen 3 is identified as the chief leader of evil demons. When Justin interprets Adamic tradition in the *Dialogue*, he is not avoiding Enochic tradition but mixing it with his view of the serpent.

The serpent of Gen 3 is repeatedly identified by Justin as a superhuman figure with angels following him.[150] In the context of responding to a question from Trypho about salvation and the necessity of obedience to Mosaic Law, Justin describes the purpose of the incarnation: “In order that the *serpent, the evildoer from the beginning* [ὁ πονηρευσάμενος τὴν ἀρχὴν ὄφις], and the angels followed by him be destroyed” (*Dial*. 45.4).[151] The Serpent’s evil activity is chronologically prior to Adam’s sin, but the Serpent’s evil does not nullify the culpability of Adam. On the contrary, Justin frequently describes the serpent, Adam, and humanity in general as competent moral agents all in the same context.

---

[149] Elsewhere in his corpus, Justin uses the noun ἀρχηγέτης to describe the way that each heretical sect takes the name of its “chief leader,” e.g. Marcionites, Valentinians, Basilidians, etc. (*Dial*. 35.6) and that Simon Bar Kokhba was the “leader of the rebellion” (*1 Apol*. 31.6). In Philo ἀρχηγέτης refers to an originating leader. For example, Adam is identified as “the chief leader [τὸ ἀρχητέτης] of the race” (*Opif*. 79; 136; 142; *Mut*. 64), and Jacob’s sons are the “chief leaders” of the twelve tribes (*Fug*. 73). Josephus identifies Elamites as the “chief leaders” of the Persians (*A.J.* 1.143). The term describes more than a mere “leader” is refers to a generative or originating leader.

[150] It is interesting that *1 Apol*. 28.1 specifically identifies the Serpent as the founder of “evil demons” not “angels.”

[151] Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 397–99 points out that Justin has combined Rev 12:9 and 1 John 3:8; see also Barn. 12.5–7; Deut 21:22.

When Adamic tradition is employed in combination with the Enochic tradition in Justin, the function of this tradition is to emphasize the free moral agency of creatures (human and angelic). Following a Johannine trope (Num 21:8–9; John 3:14), Justin interprets the bronze serpent in the wilderness as a "sign [σημεῖον]" for the "cross [σταυρός]", which breaks "the power of the serpent *who effected the transgression of Adam* [τοῦ καὶ τὴν παράβασιν ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἀδὰμ γενέσθαι ἐργασαμένου]" (*Dial*. 94.2).[152] Here the serpent has a somewhat causal role in Adam's transgression but not to the exclusion of Adam's culpability. Justin goes on to identify the bites of the serpents as "evil actions, idolatries, and other injustices [αἱ κακαὶ πράξεις, εἰδωλολατρεῖαι καὶ ἄλλαι ἀδικίαι]" (*Dial.* 94.2), linking various human sins to superhuman influence.[153] Just as Adam was influenced by the superhuman efforts of the serpent, his progeny faces the "bites of serpents." Superhuman efforts to incite evil do not negate human culpability for Adam or his progeny, a point Justin repeats several times. Culpability is emphasized in the context of Adamic tradition when Justin asks why God did not destroy the serpent from the beginning (*Dial*. 102.3). Justin's answer is an appeal to the independent agency given to angels and humans:

> Because he knew that it was good, he created both angels and men *self-determining* [αὐτεξουσίους] to perform acts of justice, and he set the limits of time during which he knew it would be good for *them to have such self-determination* [τὸ αὐτεξούσιον ἔχειν αὐτούς].[154]

---

[152] On Justin's interpretation of Num 21:8–9 see also *Dial*. 91.4; 112.1–2; 131.4; *1 Apol*. 60.1–11.

[153] See also 1 En. 8:1–2; 2 Bar 73.1–7; 2 Apol 5.4

[154] *Dial*. 102.4. In this passage Justin also differentiates between "general and particular judgments [καθολικὰς καὶ μερικὰς κρίσεις]" for the purpose of protecting "self-determination [αὐτεξούσιος]" (*Dial*. 102.4). As an example of a "particular judgment" Justin refers to the confusion of tongues at the Tower of Babel (Gen 11:6; see also Philo, *Conf*. 11–13).

Humans and angels, Adam and the rebel angels of Enochic mythology, all receive moral freedom and are culpable for their actions.

When Justin contrasts Eve and Mary (*Dial*. 100.5–6), the contrast is predicated on the notion that the Eve, as a woman, was "the way through which the disobedience from the serpent took the beginning" (*Dial.* 100.4). Likewise, this disobedience is destroyed through another woman, Mary (*Dial.* 100.4). In the case of Eve, "the word of the serpent was conceived and bore disobedience and death" (*Dial.* 100.5; see also James 1:15). The Virgin Mary, however, gave birth to the Son of God

> Through whom God destroys both the serpent and those angels and humans who have come to resemble the serpent but deliverance from death for those who repent of their sins and believe in Christ.[155]

Once again, angels and humans are responsible for their own disobedience, facing judgment for their evil, even as they are constrained by the effects of the Serpent's disobedience.

Interpreting Ps 82:7 [LXX Ps 81:7], Justin combines human disobedience and superhuman deception. Justin explains the reference to "men" and "one of the princes" in Ps 82:7 [LXX 81:7] as a reference to:

> *the disobedience of humans* [τὴν παρακοὴν τῶν ἀνθρώπων], I say of Adam and Eve, and the fall of the one of the rulers, this one called the serpent, *having fallen a great fall through the deception of Eve* [πεσόντος πτῶσιν μεγάλην διὰ τὸ ἀποπλανῆσαι τὴν Εὔαν].[156]

Justin goes on to interpret the Psalm to explain how the Spirit continues to operate in the present:

[155] *Dial*. 100.6

[156] *Dial*. 124.3

> The Holy Spirit convicts humans who were like God, passionless and deathless, if they kept his precepts, and worthy by him to be called his sons, and these humans, becoming like Adam and Eve, *work death for themselves* [θάνατον ἑαυτοῖς ἐργάζονται].[157]

Justin admits that there are elements of his interpretation of Ps 82 that are contestable, but he thinks it is obvious that "each is to be judged and convicted, as were Adam and Eve [καὶ παρ' ἑαυτοὺς καὶ κρίνεσθαι καὶ καταδικάζεσθαι μέλλουσιν, ὡς καὶ Ἀδὰμ καὶ Εὔα]." (*Dial*. 124.4). The Adamic tradition is used to explain human evil, but this does not exclude the superhuman activity of a chief leader of angels and a cohort of rebellious followers. The superhuman activity of rebel angels and human disobedience illuminate how humanity is convicted by the Spirit. In the final appeal of the *Dialogue*, Justin once again reiterates his view of moral culpability extending to angels and humans while combining the Adamic and Enochic tradition:

> Although wanting angels and humans to follow his will, God wanted to make them *self-determining* [αὐτεξουσίους] to practice virtue, [. . .] and with a law that they should be judged by him, if they do anything contrary to sound reason. Thus, unless we repent, both men and angels, shall be found guilty of our sins.[158]

Justin presumes that the serpent of Genesis 3 is an angel with competent moral agency who has other angelic followers. These rebellious angels, just like humans, are culpable for their evil actions.

The cooperation of human evil and angelic rebellion is not limited to the *Dialogue* but extends to the *Apologies* as well. Aside from the Enochic tradition in *2 Apol*. 5, the cooperation of human and superhuman agents is most apparent in one of Justin's

---

[157] *Dial*. 124.4

[158] *Dial*. 141.1

summaries of Christian theology.[159] Justin recognizes the bad press about Christians and attributes it to the cooperation of demons and human desire:

> The wicked demons, *taking as their ally the evil desire in each person* [σύμμαχον λαβόντες τὴν ἐν ἑκάστῳ κακὴν . . . ἐπιθυμίαν], which by its nature is universal and various, *scattered* [κατεσκέδασαν] many lies and godless accusations, none of which touch us.[160]

In the same way that Justin describes the Serpent and the Protoplast as mutually culpable for evil in the *Dialogue with Tryhpo*, here Justin portrays demons working in cooperation with human desire. The Seer of 2 Bar prayed, "Each of us has become our own Adam" (2 Bar 54:19), including the Watchers (2 Bar 56:9–14). Likewise, Justin describes Adam, his progeny, and the Watchers as morally competent creatures, capable of good and culpable for their own evil.

Justin serves as another example of the mixed template. He explicitly combines Adamic and Enochic traditions. The closest parallel to Justin's view of evil's origin and persistence in Second Temple Judaism is 2 Bar's "dual causality," in which Adam's sins do have drastic effects (esp. 2 Bar 23:4–5; 48:42–43; 56:6; *Dial*. 100.4–5; 124.3; *1 Apol*. 28.1; 44.1) but this does not predetermine the actions of his progeny in any way (2 Bar 54:15, 19; *Dial*. 88.5; 100.6; 102.4; 124.4; 141.1; *1 Apol*. 10.6; 43.3–4; 44.1; *2 Apol*. 7.5). Unlike 2 Bar, Justin has a more pronounced focus on Enochic tradition (*1 Apol*. 5.1–6.1; *2 Apol*. 5.2–5; *Dial*. 45.4; [lacuna 74]; 79.1–4; 94.2). The crucial similarity between 2 Bar and Justin Martyr, however, is the focus on the free will of human and angelic creatures.

---

[159] Götte acknowledges that *2 Apol*. 5 recognizes human cuplability for evil choices (*Von den Wächtern zu Adam*, 142).

[160] *1 Apol*. 10.6

Although she has overstated the case by arguing for too sharp a separation between Adamic and Enochic tradition, Annette Reed is correct to observe a tendency in Justin's works. Enochic tradition is the primary source of evil's origin in the *Apologies* (esp. *1 Apol*. 5.2–6.1; *2 Apol*. 5.2–6), with Adamic tradition serving a secondary role (*1 Apol*. 28.1; 44.1; *2 Apol*. 7.5) to argue for free will (*1 Apol*. 44.1; *2 Apol*. 7.5; see also *Dial*. 88.4–5). Throughout the *Dialogue*, Adamic tradition is primary, but not isolated from Enochic tradition (*Dial*. 45.4; 94.2; 102.3–4; 100.5–6; 124.3; *1 Apol*. 28.1). Not only does the *Dialogue* presume the validity of Enochic tradition (*Dial*. [74 lacuna]; 79.1–4), Justin explicitly cites Adamic tradition (Gen 3:13–14) to support Enochic tradition (*Dial*. 79.4; see also *1 Apol*. 28.1). Justin's mixed template portrays the origin and persistence of evil as human and angelic.

Conclusion

This chapter has argued two points about the origin and persistence of evil. First, the early reception of Paul in the Apologists, Justin Martyr and Athenagoras, support an Enochic interpretation of Galatians 3:19–4:11. Second, the mixed template combination of Adamic and Enochic traditions best explains Justin's theology of the origin and persistence of evil. These two features of Justin's theology are significant because Justin is a recipient of early Christian tradition as well as an important conduit for passing the tradition on through his school in Rome. Justin is not an outlier, but an important figure in the development of early Christian theology.

The above analysis of Justin's sources in *2 Apol.* 5 has argued that Justin's theology of evil is drawn from four different streams. First, Justin's view of evil's origin is based on Jewish Scripture interpreted within the framework of pre-existing exegetical

traditions (*2 Apol*. 5.2; see Gen 1:26–28; 6:1–4; Ps 8). Second, Justin's narrative in *2 Apol*. 5 not only follows the structure of the BW (esp. 1 En. 1–19), but shares lexical parallels (τάξις, παραβαίνω, μίξις). These linguistic connections between *2 Apol*. 5 and the BW suggests that Justin is directly dependent on an Enochic tradition (perhaps 1 En. 19:1–2). Third, Justin's narrative corresponds to some strands of Middle Platonic accounts of "providence [πρόνοια]," the evil character of demons, and demons as the source of Greek mythology. Fourth, Justin's practice of adapting Paul's arguments to suit his own rhetorical goals occurs in *2 Apol*. 5. Justin interprets Enochic tradition through Paul's argument in Galatians signaled by his adoption of two key terms from Galatians, "elements [στοιχεῖα]" and "enslave [δουλόω]." Justin combines various sources to describe the origin and persistence of evil in *2 Apol*. 5.

Justin not only draws on Paul's argument in Galatians 3:19–4:11 in *2 Apol*. 5, he also provides another example of the mixed template. Justin combines Enochic and Adamic tradition to articulate his view of the origin and persistence of evil. According to Justin evil is born of the choice. However, this choice is not without external influence. Adam is both a victim of the deceptive Serpent, an evil angel, and a willing participant in his own deception. Likewise, angels corrupt the cosmos, but their transgressions are caused by their own free choice. For Justin, both Adamic and Enochic traditions identify the origin of evil not with the creator but creatures. Similarly, evil persists in both the superhuman activity of demons and human cooperation. In Justin's view, evil demons corrupt and deceive without overruling human culpability.

CONCLUSION

What answer would Paul have given if asked, "Why is the present age 'evil'?" The introductory first chapter explained that there are two common ways New Testament scholars have answered this question. Since the end of the nineteenth century, Paul's view of evil has been explained using the Adamic template. According to the Adamic template, there was a common interpretation of Gen 3 developed in Second Temple Judaism that attributed profound significance to Adam's sin as evil's original cause and human rebellion in the likeness of Adam as evil's persistent cause. The Gen 3 interpretation is followed by Paul in Rom 5:12–21, indicating that he follows the Adamic template. The theological function of the Adamic template is that it locates the origin and persistence of evil in humanity and absolves God of responsibility. The Adamic template explains that the present age is evil because of human sin from start to finish.

In the latter half of the twentieth century a radical shift occurred in scholarship. E. P. Sanders argued that Paul's theology was fundamentally retrospective, a Christological *novum*. The significance of Sanders' work for explaining evil was that it became peripheral, a result of Paul's Christology and not a formative influence. Sanders argued that, as a Jew, Paul had no problem in need of solving. In fact, Paul only identified a problem that his Christology could solve after the Damascus road revelation. Sanders' argument for retrospective logic has since become standard for the apocalyptic Paul school. In the work of J. Louis Martyn and others, only Paul's Christology could reveal the depth and nature of evil. The result of the Christological *novum* is that Paul's view of evil is defined by his Christology and not contemporary Jewish categories based on the

Mosaic law. The Christological *novum* explains that the present age is evil because Christ reveals it to be so.

Chapter two problematized the application of the Adamic template to Galatians based on similarities to Romans and proposes an alternative. I reasoned that the chronological priority of Galatians makes it anachronistic to interpret the earlier letter based on Romans. Moreover, Romans does not explain the exegetical details of Galatians. Specifically, the connection between the law and multiple "transgressions" (Gal 3:19) as well as the enslaving "elements of the cosmos" (Gal 4:3, 9) presume a different implicit narrative of evil behind Paul's argument, an Enochic narrative.

An Enochic narrative in Paul may seem unlikely because scholarship tends to separate Adamic tradition from Enochic tradition as representing competing templates. The logic goes: if an author/text employs Adamic tradition, the same author/text will not use Enochic tradition unless subversively. Chapter three deconstructed the logic of the Adamic template as an oversimplification. By reexamining the Jewish texts cited most often to support the Adamic Template (Sir 25:24; Wis 2:23–24; 4 Ezra; 2 Bar), I disputed two features of it. First, rather than identifying Adamic tradition as the only, or even primary, narrative reflection on the origin and persistence of evil in these texts, I argued that Sirach, Wisdom, and 2 Bar represent a mixed template. According to the mixed template, multiple narratives and traditions are combined to explain the origin and persistence of evil. Recognizing the mixture undermines the assumption that Adamic and Enochic traditions represent conflicting templates. Second, Adamic traditions do not necessarily identify evil as an essentially human problem beginning with Adam and persisting in human choice. Precisely when Ben Sira emphasizes human culpability for

sin (Sir 15:11–20), there is no mention of Adam's sin. When the Adamic narrative is the only explanation for evil in 4 Ezra, human agency is undermined, and God implicitly blamed for evil. The Adamic template does not account for the diversity of theological reflection on the origin and persistence of evil in the texts that are most often cited to support it and the Adamic tradition does not consistently portray evil as an essentially human problem.

Having established the mixed template, chapter four examined evil in the Book of Watchers and Jubilees. In the Book of Watchers, evil originates with rebellious angels and persists in their demonic offspring. At the same time, humans are responsible for their sin, challenging the common view that an Enochic view of evil undermines human agency. In Jubilees, the Enochic tradition is adapted into a new narrative, combined with Genesis and other traditions. The adaptation in Jubilees portrays a superhuman and human cooperation in causing evil. Humans and angels are both responsible for evil's origin and persistence. The response to evil is a divine and human cooperation in the person of Abraham and his offspring following Mosaic law. Just as disobedience empowers the demonic, obedience to the Mosaic law is apotropaic. These Enochic traditions offer insight into Paul's arguments in Galatians.

Chapter five returned to Galatians to explore the influence of Enochic tradition on the letter. I argued that Paul's view of cosmic corruption, the portrait of his opponents, and his Christology is shaped by the Enochic tradition. The "present evil age" (Gal 1:4), the corruption of "all flesh" (Gal 2:16), and the evil of the opponents (esp. Gal 3:1) are a result of angelic rebellion. The arrival of Christ as the "Son of God" reverses the effects of the Watchers' transgressions and enables the angelomorphic transformation of

believers (Gal 4:4–5). By faith corrupt flesh is co-crucified with Christ and the Spirit of the Son of God indwells redeemed humanity. This Enochic view of corruption and redemption has significant consequences for Paul's view of the law. Paul, like many of his Jewish contemporaries, identifies the law's once valid function as offering protection from evil (Gal 3:19), a view of the law found in Jubilees. Unlike Jubilees, however, Paul aligns the Mosaic law with the corrupt cosmos that is passing away in the advent of Christ (Gal 3:24–25). For Paul, the law's formerly valid apotropaic function has ended. The exploration of Galatians revealed that Paul's view of evil, his Christology, and his arguments about the Mosaic law were influenced by Enochic tradition.

Chapter six provided further proof of an Enochic interpretation of Galatians based on reception history. I contended that the influence of Enochic tradition on Galatians and the mixed template are not an invention of modern scholarly interest in originality and comparison but have ancient precedent. I argued that in *2 Apol*. 5 and other early Christian texts, Enochic tradition is combined with Gal 3:19–4:11 to explain the origin and persistence of evil. Additionally, I claimed that Justin's corpus represents a mixed template, akin to 2 Bar in combining Adamic and Enochic traditions to identify the origin and persistence of evil with the free will of angelic and human creatures.

This dissertation has argued that the narrative explanation for evil in Galatians does not conform to the Adamic template or the Christological *novum*. Paul's view of evil in Galatians is Enochic. The present age is evil because angels have transgressed and corrupted the cosmos. Evil persists in the cooperation of human sin and superhuman beings. Paul's solution for this cosmic corruption is participation in Christ which stands in contrast to obedience to the Mosaic law. Paul's view of evil as a problem in need of

solving and his Christological solution must have been reshaped by the Damascus road. Still, Paul's theology of evil and Christology are thoroughly Jewish, indebted to the categories and patterns of thought found among his contemporaries. The idea that evil has corrupted the cosmos through angelic rebellion is one of the most pervasive explanations for evil in Second Temple Judaism. What makes Paul's theology of evil Jewish is not his Adamic Tradition. In fact, Paul's Enochic view of evil in Galatians is more like his contemporaries than the Adamic tradition found in Romans.

Not only was Paul's view of evil shaped by Enochic tradition, so too was his Christology. Obviously, Paul's Christology differentiates him from his Jewish contemporaries. Paul's solution to cosmic corruption caused by rebellious angels differs from other Jewish solutions, but not entirely so. Consider two examples. First, in Jubilees the solution to cosmic corruption caused by angelic rebellion is obedience to the Mosaic law. Paul would agree that prior to Christ, the law offered protection from evil. Where he differs from the author of Jubilees is that "new creation" occurs not in the post-diluvian cosmos allowing for obedience to the law (Jub. 5:12) but in the cross of Christ who allows for fulfillment of the law (Gal 6:15; 5:14). Paul's shift in chronology places obedience to the law on the corrupt side of cosmic history. Second, Philo describes participation in divine sonship through the mediation of the Logos (*Conf*. 146–147). Paul also sees "adoption" as a suitable metaphor to explain participation in the Son of God. Where Paul differs from Philo, however, is that participation in Christ displaces obedience to the Mosaic law. In Galatians, Paul's theology of evil and his Christology are both thoroughly Jewish and innovatively reshaped by the revelation of Christ.

APPENDIX: TEXTUAL VARIANT IN GALATIANS 2:20

Rather than "Son of God [υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ]" in Gal 2:20, some early manuscripts read: "God and Christ [τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ]." The manuscript evidence is divided. Although the bulk of witnesses favor the Nestle-Aland text, important early witnesses (including 𝔓46) support the variant.[1] Metzger argues that the variant "can scarcely be regarded as original" on the grounds of intrinsic and transcriptional probabilities.[2] Intrinsically, Metzger points out, "Paul nowhere else expressly speaks of God as the object of a Christian's faith." Regarding transcriptional evidence, Metzger proposed a two-stage error whereby "the Son [τοῦ υἱοῦ]" was dropped from the text due to scribal error.[3] After this first error, "and Christ [καὶ Χριστοῦ]" was inserted to make sense of the corrupted text.[4] Metzger's suggestion of a two-stage corruption for this variant has been well received, until recently.[5]

---

[1] The early witnesses for θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ include: 𝔓46 B D* F G b MVict. There are also early and more numerous witnesses for υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ: ℵ A C D1 K L P Ψ 0278. 33. 81. 104. 365. 630 1175. 1241. 1505. 1739. 1881. 2464 𝔐. The evidence of 𝔓46 is significant. According to James Royse, 𝔓46 is probably reflecting its *Vorlage* in this case (James R. Royse, *Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri*, NTTSD 36 [Leiden: Brill, 2008], 357).

[2] Metzger, *A Textual Commentary*, 524.

[3] Metzger thinks the scribe's eyes accidentally skip over τοῦ υἱοῦ due to the repetition of the οῦ diphthong (parablepsis). In this case, the eyes skipped from the diphthong of first definite article **τοῦ** over the same diphthongs on υἱοῦ τοῦ to the final diphthong of θεοῦ with the result that ΤΟΥΥΙΟΥΤΟΥΘΕΟΥ was read as **ΤΟΥ**ΥΙΟΥΤΟΥ**ΘΕΟΥ** and shorted to ΤΟΥΘΕΟΥ. If the text employed the *nomen sacrum* ΘΥ it would be less likely, but still not impossible, shortening **ΤΟΥ**ΥΙΟΥΤΟΥ**ΘΥ** to ΤΟΥΘΥ. The *nomina sacra* abbreviations of θεοῦ and Χριστοῦ are found in 𝔓46, which reads: ΤΟΥΘΥΚΑΙΧΡΥ. "P.Mich.inv. 6238; Recto." http://quod.lib.umich.edu/a/apis/x-3614/6238_161.tif. University of Michigan Library Digital Collections. Of course, it is unknown when the *nomina sacra* were first used. See Larry W. Hurtado, *The Earliest Christian Artifacts: Manuscripts and Christian Origins* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 95–134.

[4] Important to Metzger's argument is the twelfth century manuscript (330), which reads τοῦ θεοῦ. This is rather late evidence for a very early variant reading.

[5] Wanamaker, "The Son and the Sons of God," 176 fn. 1; Betz, Galatians, 125 fn. 104; Bart D. Ehrman, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 86–7; Matera, *Galatians*, 96; de Boer, *Galatians*, 141. R. N. Longenecker considers the Nestle-Aland text more likely based on intrinsic

After centuries of neglect, a few scholars are now opting for the alternative reading, "God and Christ."[6] In his monograph on the textual history of Galatians, Stephen Carlson disagrees with Metzger's assessment of intrinsic probability and his account of the text's transmission. In regard to intrinsic probability, Carlson finds "fuller phraseologies" of the "God and Christ" reading elsewhere in the Pauline corpus.[7] He notes examples of faith being directed toward God (Gal 3:6; Rom 3:6; 1 Thess 1:8; Rom 4:23–24), although not in the same grammatical construction.[8] Additionally, Carlson points out that the fully articulated genitive phrase, "the Son of God [τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ]" does not occur elsewhere in the undisputed letters with the result that "commentators have struggled to account for the phrasing of the Nestle-Aland reading."[9] Thus, Carlson finds the variant "God and Christ" the more probable reading.

---

evidence sine θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ would be a Pauline hapax legomenon, and externally reception of the text favors the Nestle-Aland text (*Galatians*, 94).

[6] Peter Head, "Galatians 2.20: 'I live by faith in God and Christ . . .'" *Evangelical Textual Criticism*, 15 March 2006, http://evangelicaltextualcriticism.blogspot.com/2006/03/galatians-220-i-live-by-faith-in-god.html; Jermo van Nes, "'Faith(fulness) of the Son of God'?: Galatians 2:20b Reconsidered," *NovT* 55 (2013): 127–39, esp.130–135; Stephen C. Carlson, *The Text of Galatians and Its History*, WUNT 2.385 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015), 96–101.

[7] Carlson, *Text of Galatians*, 100 fn. 65 citing Rom 1:7; 1 Cor 1:3; 2 Cor 1:2; Gal 1:3; Phil 1:2; 1 Thess 1:2; Phlm 3; cf. Eph 1:2; 6:23; 2 Thess 1:2; 1 Tim 1:2; 5:21; 2 Tim 1:2; 4:1; Tit 1:4; 2:13. Carlson must mean 1 Thess 1:1 not 1:2. Nearly all of the examples Carlson cites are from the peace greetings, which reads, with minor variation depending on the letter: θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (Gal 1:3). None of these examples has a definite article before θεοῦ, making the parallels less compelling. The only exceptions are from the Pastoral Epistles (1 Tim 5:21; 2 Tim 4:1; Tit 2:13).

[8] This is not a crucial issue for Carlson, who thinks that either reading is best understood as a subjective genitive (*Text of Galatians*, 97, 99–100).

[9] Carlson, *Text of Galatians*, 98, see also fn. 53. As Carlson notes, the fully articulated genitive phrase does occur in Eph 4:13. Paul most commonly refers to Jesus' divine sonship by modifying υἱός with the third person singular genitive pronoun αὐτοῦ (Rom 1:3, 9; 5:10; 8:29; 1 Cor 1:19; Gal 1:16; 4:4, 6; 1 Thess 1:10; see also Col 1:13) or some variation: τὸν ἑαυτοῦ υἱὸν (Rom 8:3), τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ (Rom 8:32). Paul also uses the simple absolute ὁ υἱός (1 Cor 15:28) and full versions of the phrase: τοῦ ὁρισθέντος υἱοῦ θεοῦ (Rom 1:4); ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ γὰρ υἱὸς Ἰησοῦς Χριστός (2 Cor 2:19). None of these is identical to the majority reading of Gal 2:20.

Perhaps Carlson overstates the evidence for intrinsic probability, since most commentators have no trouble with the “Son of God” reading. His more compelling argument is transcriptional probability.[10] Since divine sonship language is found in Paul, and especially elsewhere in Galatians (Gal 1:16; 3:26; 4:4, 6, 7), it is conceivable that a scribe would correct the anomalous “God and Christ” reading. Carlson even suggests a motive for the change. The “God and Christ” variant could be interpreted as identifying Christ as God since there is not a second definite article to clearly differentiate the two.[11] What is unclear in Carlson’s argument, however, is why scribes would correct “God and Christ” with a phrase that occurs in only one other place in the Pauline corpus (Eph 4:13). The closest parallels to Gal 2:20 in terms of argument do not use the phrase “Son of God.” Rather, these passages almost always use the more common title “Christ” (Rom 6:8–13; 8:10; Phil 1:22; Eph 3:17) or in one instance “Lord” (Rom 14:8), but never “Son.” Thus, while Carlson critiques Metzger’s account of a two-stage error for its complexity, he has not provided a viable alternative explanation. Although possible, it does not seem likely that a scribe would correct “God and Christ” to “Son of God” since “Christ” is the more common title with clear parallels in similar arguments within the Pauline corpus.

It is difficult to make a strong determination about the better reading. Both texts have significant manuscript support and yet are rarely attested in Paul’s letters. Metzger’s

---

[10] See, for example, Gabriella Berényi, “Gal 2,20: A Pre-Pauline or a Pauline Text?,” *Bib* 65 (1984): 490–537. Arguing against identifying a pre-Pauline tradition behind Gal 2:20, Berényi argues that there is nothing out of harmony with Paul’s style in Gal 2:20.

[11] Carlson, *Text of Galatians*, 98–99. See Smyth § 1143. Carlson argues that “Christ” is a proper name, thus not requiring the definite article based on Sharp’s Rule.

two-stage account of the transcriptional error is complicated but plausible. Carlson's alternative view that the text was corrected for theological reasons is also possible but it fails to explain why the rare title "Son of God" would be employed to replace "God and Christ," since "Christ" would be the obvious Christological title for this Pauline argument.[12] Forced to choose between two difficult options, Metzger's proposal provides a better explanation for the alternative reading, even if it is a complicated one. The Nestle-Aland reading, therefore, is the most likely reading.

[12] If Carlson is correct and "God and Christ" is the original reading which was replaced to avoid the notion of divine passibility, then it indicates that "Son of God" was the Christological title that most clearly identified Christ as divine without equating the two. This would mean that the variant "Son of God" would have been understood as "angelomorphic," describing a suprahuman being.

WORKS CITED

Reference

Balz, Horst, and Gerhard Schneider, eds. *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament.* 3 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990–1993.

Bauer, Walter, Fredrick W. Danker, William F. Arndt, and Wilbur Gingrich. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 3rd ed. Revised and edited by Fredrick W. Danker. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

Blass, Friedrich, Albert Debrunner, and Robert W. Funk. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Freedman, David Noel, ed. *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992

Hawthorne, Gerald F., and Ralph P. Martin, eds. *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1993.

Kittel, Gerhard, and Gerhard Friedrich, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–1976.

Koehler, Ludwig, Walter Baumgartner, and Johann J. Stamm. *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Translated and edited under the supervision of Mervyn E. J. Richardson. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2001

Liddell, Henry George, Robert Scott, and Henry Stuart Jones. *A Greek-English Lexicon.* 9th ed. with revised supplement. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.

Schürer, Emil. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.-A.D. 135)*. Revised and Edited by Géza Vermès, Fergus Millar, and Martin Goodman. 3 Vols. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1979.

Smyth, Herbert Weir. *Greek Grammar*. Revised by Gordon M. Messing. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956.

Temporini, Hildegard, and Wolfgang Haase, eds. *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung*. Part 2, *Principat*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1972–.

Toorn, Karel van der, Bob Becking, and Pieter van der Horst, eds. *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*. 2nd ed. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Primary Literature

4 Ezra and 2 Baruch: Translations, Introductions, and Notes. Translated by Michael E. Stone and Matthias Henze. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2013.

A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church. Edited by Philip Schaff and Henry Wace. 28 vols. in 2 series. 1886–1889.

Alcinous: The Handbook of Platonism. Translated by John Dillon. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Andrew of Caesarea: Commentary on the Apocalypse. Translated by Eugenia Scarvelis Constantinou. FC 123. Washington, D. C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2011.

Beentjes, Pancratius C. *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew: A Text Edition of All Extant Hebrew Manuscripts and a Synopsis of All Parallel Hebrew Ben Sira Texts*, VTSupp 68. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Black, Matthew. *The Book of Enoch or I Enoch: A New English Edition with Commentary and Textual Notes*, SVTP 7. Leiden: Brill, 1985.

Charles, R. H. *The Apocalypse of Baruch*. London: A. and C. Black, 1896.

Charles, R. H. *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English*, 2 Vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913.

Charles, R. H. *The Book of Jubilees or the Little Genesis*. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1902.

Charlesworth, James H. ed. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 2 Vols. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1983.

Denis, A. M. *Fragmenta Psedepigraphorum Quae Supersunt Graece*, PVTG 3. Leiden: Brill, 1970.

Greenfield, Jonas C. Michael E. Stone, and Esther Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document: Edition, Translation. Commentary*, SVTP 19. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

Gurtner, Daniel M. *Second Baruch: A Critical Edition of the Syriac Text with Greek and Latin Fragments, English Translation, Introduction, and Concordances*, JCTCRS 5. New York: T&T Clark, 2009.

Josephus. Translated by Henry St. J. Thackery et al. 10 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926–1965.

Justin Martyr. The First and Second Apologies. Translated by Leslie W. Barnard. ACW 56. New York: Paulist Press, 1997.

Justin Martyr: Dialogue avec Tryphon: Édition critique, traduction, commentaire. Translated by Philippe Bobichon. Paradosis 47. 2 Vols. Fribourg: Academic Press Fribourg, 2003.

Justin Martyr: Dialogue with Trypho, Translated by Thomas B. Falls, Revised by Thomas P. Halton, ed. Michael Slusser, SFC 3. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2003.

Marcovich, Miroslav. *Athenagoras Legatio Pro Christanis*, PTS 31. New York: de Gruyter, 1990.

———. *Iustini Martyris: Apologiae Pro Christianis*, PTS 38. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1994.

———. *Iustini Martyris: Dialogus cum Tryphone*, PTS 47. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1997.

Martínez, Florentino García and E. J. C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 2 Vols. Leiden: Brill, 1997–98.

Maximus of Tyre: The Philosophical Orations. Translated by M. B. Trapp. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Mekilta De-Rabbi Ishmael. Translated by Jacob Zallel Lauterbach. The Schiff Library of Jewish Classics. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1933-1935.

Milik, J. T. with Matthew Black, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976.

Minns, Denis and P. M. Parvis, *Justin, Philosopher and Martyr: Apologies,* OECT. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Mosshammer, Alden A. *Georgius Syncellus. Ecloga chronographica*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1984.

Nickelsburg, George W. E. and James C. VanderKam, *1 Enoch: The Hermeneia Translation*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012.

Patrologia Graeca, Edited by J.-P. Minge. 161 vols. Paris, 1857–1886.

Philo. Translated by G. H. Whittaker, F. H. Colson and Ralph Marcus. 12 Vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1929–1962.

Pietersma, Albert and Benjamin G. Wright. eds. *A New English Translation of the Septuagint: And the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included Under that Title*. Revised Edition. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Plato. Translated by R. G. Bury et al. 12 Vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1914–2013.

Plumer, Eric. *Augustine's Commentary on Galatians: Introduction, Text, Translation, and Notes*. OECS. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Plutarch. Moralia. Translated by Frank Cole Babbitt et al. 14 Vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927–2004.

Rahlfs, Alfred and Robert Hanhart. *Septuaginta: Id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes edidit Alfred Rahlfs*. rev. ed. Stuttgart: Deusche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006.

Russell, Donald A. and David Konstan, *Heraclitus: Homeric Problems*, WGRW 14. Atlanta: SBL, 2005.

Schoedel, William R. *Athenagoras: Legatio and De Resurrectione*, OECT. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972.

Schuller, Eileen M. and Carol A. Newsom, *The Hodayot (Thanksgiving Psalms): A Study Editon of 1QH*[a], EJIL 36. Atlanta: SBL, 2012.

The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the Writings of the Fathers Down to A.D. 325. Edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. 10 vols. 1885–1887.

The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations, 3rd ed. Translated by Michael W. Holmes. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.

The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments. Translated by Michael A. Knibb and Edward Ullendorff. 2 Vols. New York: Oxford University Press, 1978.

Trelenberg, Jörg. *Oratio ad Graecos: Rede an die Griechen*, BZT 165. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.

Tromp, Johannes. *The Life of Adam and Eve in Greek: A Critical Text*, PVTG 6. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

VanderKam, James C. *The Book of Jubilees*, 2 Vols. CSCO 510–511. Leuven: Peeters, 1989.

Wevers, J. W. *Genesis*. Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum Aucoritate Societatis Litterarum Gottingensis editum 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974.

Ziegler, Joseph. *Sapientia Salomonis*, Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum Aucoritate Societatis Litterarum Gottingensis editum 12,1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962.

Secondary Literature

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

Alexander, Philip S. “The Targumim and early exegesis of ‘Sons of God’ in Genesis 6.” *JSJ* 23 (1972): 60–71.

———. “From Son of Adam to Second God: Transformations of the Biblical Enoch.” Pages 87–122 in *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible*. Harrisburg: Trinity International Press, 1998.

———. “Enoch and the Beginnings of Jewish Interest in Natural Science.” Pages 223–42 in *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought*, eds. C. Hempel, A. Lange and H. Lichtenberger. Leuven: Peeters, 2002.

Amaru, Betsy Halpern. “The First Woman, Wives, and Mothers in *Jubilees*.” *JBL* 113 (1994): 609–626.

Amir, Yehoshua. “The Figure of Death in the Book of Wisdom.” *JJS* 30 (1979): 154–78.

Anderson, Gary A. *The Genesis of Perfection: Adam and Eve in Jewish and Christian Imagination*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001.

———. *Sin: A History*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.

Annus, Amar. “On the Origin of Watchers: A Comparative Study of the Antediluvian Wisdom in Mesopotamian and Jewish Traditions.” *JSP* 19 (2010): 277–320.

Argall, Randal A. *1 Enoch and Sirach: A Comparative and Conceptual Analysis of the themes of Revelation, Creation and Judgment*. EJIL 8. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.

Arnold, Clinton E. *Powers of Darkness: Principalities and Powers in Paul's Letters*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1992.

———. “Returning to the Domain of the Powers: *Stoicheia* as Evil Spirits in Galatians 4:3,9.” *NovT* 38 (1996): 55–76.

———. “‘I Am Astonished That You Are So Quickly Turning Away!’ (Gal 1.6): Paul and Anatolian Folk Belief.” *NTS* 51 (2005): 429–49.

Aune, David E. “Justin Martyr’s Use of the Old Testament.” *BETS* 9 [1966]: 179–97.

———. “Human Nature and Ethics in Hellenistic Philosophical Traditions and Paul: Some Issues and Problems.” Pages 291–312 in *Paul in His Hellenistic Context*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995.

Bachmann, Michael. *Anti-Judaism in Galatians?: Exegetical studies on a Polemical Letter and on Paul’s Theology*. Translated by Robert L. Brawley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.

Bachmann, Veronika. *Die Welt im Ausnahmezustand: eine Untersuchung zu Aussagegehalt und Theologie des Wächterbuches (1 Hen 1-36)*, BZAW 409. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009.

———. “The Book of the Watchers (1 Enoch 1-36): An Anti-Mosaic, Non-Mosaic, or Even Pro-Mosaic Writing?” *JHS* 11 (2011): 1–23

———. “Wenn Engel gegen Gott freveln – und Menschen mittun. Das Wächterbuch (1 Hen 6–36), als frühhellenistischer Diskussionsbeitrag zum „Bösen“.” Pages 85–114 in *Das Böse*, eds. Martin Ebner, et al. JBTh 26. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2012.

Baird, William. “Visions, Revelations, and Ministry: Reflections on 2 Cor 12:1–5 and Gal 1:11–17.” *JBL* 104 (1985): 651–662.

Bandstra, Andrew J. *The Law and the Elements of the World: An Exegetical Study in Aspects of Paul’s Teaching*. Kampen, Netherlands: J H Kok, 1964.

Barbel, Joseph. *Christos Angelos, die Anschauung von Christus als Bote und Engel in der gelehrten und volkstümlichen Literatur des christichen Altertums. Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Ursprungs und der Fortdauer des Arianismus*, Theophaneia 3. Bonn: Hanstein, 1941.

Barclay, John M. G. “Mirror-Reading a Polemical Letter: Galatians as a Test Case.” *JSNT* 31 (1987): 73–93.

———. *Obeying the Truth: Paul’s Ethics in Galatians*. SNTW. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988.

———. *Flavius Josephus Commentary Volume 10: Against Apion*. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

———. *Paul and the Gift*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015.

Barr, James. *The Garden of Eden and the Hope of Immortality*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.

Barrett, C. K. *From First Adam to Last: A Study in Pauline Theology*. New York: Scribner, 1962.

Bartelmus, Rüdiger. *Heroentum in Israel und seiner Umwelt*: *Eine traditionsgeschhichtlich Untersuchung zu Gen. 6,1–4 und verwandten Texten im Alten Testament und der altorientalischen Literatur*, ATANT 65. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1979.

Barton, Stephen C., ed. *Idolatry: False Worship in the bible, Early Judaism and Christianity*. New York: T&T Clark, 2007.

Barton, John. "'The Work of Human Hands' (Ps 115:4): Idolatry in the Old Testament." *Ex Auditu* 15 (1999): 63–72.

Bates, Matthew W. "A Christology of Incarnation and Enthronement: Romans 1:3-4 as Unified, Nonadoptionist, and Nonconciliatory." *CBQ* 77 (2015): 107–27.

Batto, Bernard Frank. *Slaying the Dragon: Mythmaking in the Biblical Tradition*, Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1992.

Baumgarten, Jörg. *Paulus und die Apokalyptik: Die Auslegung apokalyptischer Überlieferungen in den echten Paulusbriefen*, WMANT 44. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1975.

Becker, Michael. "Paul and the Evil One." Pages 127–141 in *Evil and the Devil*, ed. Erkki Koskenniemi and Ida Frölich, LNTS 481. New York: T&T Clark, 2013.

Bedenbender, Andreas. *Der Gott der Welt tritt auf den Sinai: Entstehung, Entwicklung und Funktionsweise der frühjüdischen Apokalyptik*, ANTZ 8. Berlin: Institut Kirche und Judentum, 2000.

———. "Traces of Enochic Judaism within the Hebrew Bible." *Hen* 24 (2002): 39–48.

Beentjes, Pancratius C. "Theodicy in Wisdom of Ben Sira." Pages 509–24 in *Theodicy in the World of the Bible*, eds. Antti Laato and Johannes C. de Moor. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Beker, J. Christiaan. *Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in Life and Thought*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980.

———. *Paul's Apocalyptic Gospel: The Coming Triumph of God*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982.

Bell, Richard H. *Deliver Us from Evil: Interpreting the Redemption from the Power of Satan in New Testament Theology*. WUNT 216. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.

Benoit, Pierre. "Pauline Angelology and Demonology: Reflexions on Designations of Heavenly Powers and on Origin of Angelic Evil according to Paul." *RelSB* 3 (1983): 1–18.

Berényi, Gabriella. "Gal 2,20: A Pre-Pauline or a Pauline Text?" *Bib* 65 (1984): 490–537.

Berg, Shane. "Ben Sira, the Genesis Creation Accounts, and the Knowledge of God's Will." *JBL* 132 (2013): 139–57.

Berger, Klaus with Gabriele Fassbeck and Heiner Reinhard. eds. *Synopse des vierten Buches Esra und der syrischen Baruch-Apokalypse*, TANZ 8. Tübingen: Francke, 1992.

Berger, Klaus. *Das Buch der Jubiläen*, JSHRZ 2.3. Gütersloh: G. Mohn, 1981.

Bergsma, John S. "The Relationship between Jubilees and the Early Enochic Books (Astronomical Book and Book of the Watchers)." Pages 36–51 in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and Giovanni Ibba. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 2009.

Betz, Hans Dieter. *Galatians: A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Churches in Galatia*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979.

Bhayro, Siam. *The Shemihazah and Asael Narrative of 1 Enoch 6–11: Introduction, Text, Translation and Commentary with Reference to Ancient Near Eastern and Biblical Antecedents*. AOAT 322. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2005.

———. "Noah's Library: Sources for 1 Enoch 6–11." *JSP* 15 (2006): 163–77.

Bird, Michael F. *An Anomalous Jew: Paul among Jews, Greeks, and Romans*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016.

Bird, Michael F. and Preston M. Sprinkle. eds. *The Faith of Jesus Christ: Exegetical, Biblical, and Theological Studies*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2009.

Birnbaum, Ellen. "What does Philo mean by 'Seeing God'? Some Methodological Considerations." in *SBL Seminar Papers* 34 (1995): 535–52.

Blinzer, Josef. "Lexikalisches zu dem Terminus τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου bei Paulus." in *Studiorum Paulinorum Congressus Internationalis Catholicus*, 2 Vols. AnBib 17–18. Rome: Pontifical biblical Institute, 1961. 2.429–43.

Blischke, Mareike Verena. *Die Eschatologie in der Sapientia Salomonis*, FAT 2.26. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.

Bobzien, Susanne. *Determinism and Freedom in Stoic Philosophy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Boccaccini, Gabriele. *Middle Judaism: Jewish Thought, 300 B.C.E. to 200 C.E.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991.

———. *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.

———. *Roots of Rabbinic Judaism: An Intellectual History, From Ezekiel to Daniel*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.

———. "The Evilness of Human Nature in 1 Enoch, Jubilees, Paul, and 4 Ezra: A Second Temple Jewish Debate." Pages 63–82 in *Fourth Ezra and Second Baruch: Reconstruction after the Fall*, eds. Matthias Henze and Gabriele Boccaccini, JSJSupp 164. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

Bockmuehl, Markus N. A. "Natural Law in Second Temple Judaism." *VT* 45 (1995): 17–44.

———. *The Epistle to the Philippians*, BNTC. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1998.

Bogaert, Pierre. *L'Apocalypse syriaque du Baruch: Introduction, traduction du syriaque et commentaire*, SC 144–45, 2 Vols. Paris: Cerf, 1969.

Bois, Henri. *Essai sur les origins de la philosphie Judéo-Alexandrine*. Paris: Libraire Fischbacher, 1890.

Bonner, Stanley F. *Education in Ancient Rome: From Elder Cato to Younger Pliny*. Berkley: University of California Press, 1977.

Bornkamm, Günther. *Paul*. Translated by D. M. G. Stalker. New York: Harper and Row, 1971

Borse, Udo. *Der Standort des Galaterbriefes*. BBB 41. Köln: P. Hanstein, 1972.

———. *Der Brief an die Galater*. RNT. Regensburg: Verlag, 1984.

Bousset, Wilhelm. *Kyrios Christos: A History of the Belief in Christ from the Beginnings of Christianity to Irenaeus*. Translated by John E. Steely. Nashville: Abingdon, 1970.

Bovon, François "Une formule prépaulinienne dans l'épître aux Galates (Ga 1:4–5)." in *Paganisme, Judaïsme, Christianisme: influences et affrontements dans le monde antique: mélanges offerts à Marcel Simon*. Paris: de Boccard, 1978.

Boyarin, Daniel. *A Radical Jew: Paul and the Politics of Identity*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.

Brand, Miryam T. *Evil Within and Without: The Source of Sin and Its Nature as Portrayed in Second Temple Literature*. JAJSupp 9. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013.

Brandenburger, Egon. *Adam und Christus: exegetisch-religions-geschichtliche Untersuchung zu Rom. 5, 12-21 (1. Kor. 15)*. WUMNT 7. Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1962.

———. *Fleisch und Geist; Paulus und die dualistische Weisheit*. WMANT 29. Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1968.

———. *Die Verborgenheit Gottes im Weltgeschehen: as literarische und theologische Problem des 4. Esrabuches*. ATANT 68. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1981.

Branick, Vincent P. "Apocalyptic Paul." *CBQ* 47 (1985): 664–75

Brawley, Robert L. "Contextuality, Intertextuality, and the Hendiadic Relationship of Promise and Law in Galatians." *ZNW* 93 (2002): 99–119

Breech, Earl. "These Fragments I Have Shored against My Ruins: The Form and Function of 4 Ezra." *JBL* 92 (1973): 267–74.

Bremmer, Jan N. "Remember the Titans!" Pages 35–61 in *The Fall of the Angels*. Edited by Christoph Auffarth and Loren T. Stuckenbruck. TBN 6. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

Brenk, Fredrick E. *In Mist Apparelled: Religious Themes in Plutarch's* Moralia *and* Lives, Mnemosyne Supp 48. Leiden: Brill, 1977.

———. "In the Light of the Moon: Demonology in the Early Imperial Period." in *ANRW* 16.3.2068–2145. Part 2, *Principat*, 16.3. Edited by H. Temporini and W. Haase. New York: de Gruyter, 1987.

Brinsmead, Bernard H. *Galatians, Dialogical Response to Opponents*. SBLDS 65. Chico: Scholars Press, 1982.

Brooke, George J. "Miqdash Adam, Eden, and the Qumran Community." Pages 285–301 in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel: zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*. Eds. Beate Ego, Arming Lange, Peter Pilhofer, and Kathrin Ehlers. WUNT 118. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999.

Brouwer, René. *The Stoic Sage: The Early Stoics on Wisdom, Sagehood, and Socrates*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

Brown, Derek R. *The God of This Age: Satan in the Churches and Letters of the Apostle Paul*. WUNT 2.409. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015.

Brown, Teresa R. "God and Men in Israel's History: God and Idol Worship in *Praise of the Fathers* (Sir 44–50)." Pages 214–220 in *Ben Sira's God: Proceedings of the International Ben Sira Conference: Durham – Ushaw College 2001*, ed. Renate Egger-Wenzel. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2002.

Bruce, F. F. *The Epistle to the Galatians*, NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982

Bryant, Robert A. *The Risen Crucified Christ in Galatians*, SBLDS 185. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001.

Büchler, A. "Ben Sira's Conception of Sin and Atonement." *JQR* 14 (1923): 53–83.

Buck, Charles H. "The Date of Galatians." *JBL* 70 (1951): 113–22.

Buck, P. Lorraine. "Justin Martyr's Apologies: Their Number, Destination, and Form." *JTS* 54 (2003): 45–59.

Bucur, Bogdan G. "The Son of God and the Angelomorphic Holy Spirit: A Rereading of the Shepherd's Christology." *ZNW* 98 (2007): 121–42.

———. "The Angelic Spirit in Early Christianity: Justin, the Martyr and Philosopher." *JR* 88 (2008): 190–208.

Bultmann, Rudolf. *Der Stil der paulinischen Predigt und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe*, FRLANT 13. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984 [1910].

———. *Theology of the New Testament*. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2007 [1951–1955].

———. "The New Testament and Mythology: The Mythological Element in the New Testament and the Problem of its Re-interpretation." Pages 1–44 in *Kerygma and Myth: A Theological Debate*, ed. Hans Werner Bartsch. Translated by Reginald H. Fuller. New York: Harper and Row, 1961.

———. "Romans 7 and Paul's Anthropology." Pages 33–48 in *The Old and New Man in the Letters of Paul*. Translated by Keith R. Crim. Richmond, VA: John Knox Press, 1967.

Bundrick, David R. "*Ta Stoicheia Tou Kosmou* (Gal 4:3)." *JETS* 34 (1991): 353–64.

Bunta, Silviu N. "Dreamy Angels and Demonic Giants: Watcher Traditions and the Origin of Evil in Early Christian Demonology." Pages 116–38 in *Fallen Angels Traditions: Second Temple Developments and Reception History*. Washington, D. C: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2014.

Burchard, Christoph. "Nicht aus Werken des Gesetzes gerecht, sondern Glauben an Jesus Christus—seit wann?" Pages 3.405–415 in *Geschichte-Tradition-Reflexion: Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag*, 3 vols. eds. Hubert Cancik, Hermann Lichtenburger, and Peter Schäfer. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996.

———. “Noch ein Versuch zu Gal 3,19, und 20.” Pages 184–202 in *Studien zur Theologie, Sprache und Umwelt des Neuen Testaments*, ed. Dieter Sänger, WUNT 107. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.

Burkert, Walter. *Greek Religion*. Translated by John Raffan. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1985.

Burkes, Shannon. “Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Wisdom of Solomon.” *HTR* 95 (2002): 21–44.

———. *God, Self, and Death: The Shape of Religious Transformation in the Second Temple Period*, JSJSupp 79. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Burnett, David A. “‘So Shall Your Seed Be’: Paul’s use of Genesis 15:5 in Romans 4:18 in Light of Early Jewish Deification Traditions.” *JSPL* 5 (2015): 211–36.

Burns, Joshua Ezra. “The Watchers Traditions in Targum and Midrash.” Pages 199–216 in *The Watchers in Jewish and Christian Traditions*, eds. Angela Kim Harkins, Kelley Coblentz Bautch and John C. Endres. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2014.

Burton, Ernest DeWitt. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians*, ICC 35. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1921.

Byrne, Brendan. *‘Sons of God’ – ‘Seed of Abraham’: A Study of the Idea of Sonship of God of all Christians in Paul against the Jewish Background*, AnBib 83. Rome: Pontifical Institute, 1979.

Byrne, Brendan. “Christ’s Pre-Existence in Pauline Soteriology.” *TS* 58 (1997): 308–30.

Byron, John. *Cain and Abel in Text and Tradition: Jewish and Christian Interpretations of the First Sibling Rivalry*, TBN 14. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

Caird, G. B. *Principalities and Powers: A Study in Pauline Theology*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956.

Callan, Terrance D. “The Law and the Mediator: Gal 3:19b-20.” PhD diss., Yale University, 1976.

———. “Pauline Midrash: The Exegetical Background of Gal 3:19b.” *JBL* 99 (1980): 549–67.

Camp, Claudia V. “Understanding a Patriarchy: Women in Second Century Jerusalem through the Eyes of Ben Sira.” Pages 1–39 in *“Women like This”: New Perspectives on Jewish Women in the Greco-Roman World*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991.

Campbell, Constantine R. *Paul and Union with Christ: An Exegetical and Theological Study*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2012.

Campbell, Douglas A. *The Deliverance of God: An Apocalyptic Rereading of Justification in Paul*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.

———. *Framing Paul: An Epistolary Biography*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014.

———. "Apocalyptic Epistemology: The *Sine Qua Non* of valid Pauline Interpretation." Pages 65–85 in *Paul and the Apocalyptic Imagination*. eds. Ben C. Blackwell, John K. Goodrich, and Jason Maston. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2016.

Carlson, Stephen C. *The Text of Galatians and Its History*. WUNT 2.385. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015.

Chazon, Esther Glickler. "The Creation and Fall of Adam in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 13–24 in *Book of Genesis in Jewish and Oriental Christian Interpretation: A Collection of Essays*. Louvain: Peeters, 1997.

Chesnutt, Randall. "The Descent of the Watchers and its Aftermath according to Justin Martyr." Pages 167–180 in *The Watchers in Jewish and Christian Traditions*. eds. Angela Kim Harkins, Kelley Coblentz Bautch and John C. Endres. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2014.

Chester, Andrew. *Messiah and Exaltation: Jewish Messianic and Visionary Traditions and New Testament Christology*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.

Chester, Stephen J. *Reading Paul with the Reformers: Reconciling Old and New Perspectives*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2017.

Ciampa, Roy E. and Brian S. Rosner, *The First Letter to the Corinthians*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010

Ciampa, Roy E. *The Presence and Function of Scripture in Galatians 1 and 2*. WUNT 2.102. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.

Clemen, Carl. *Die Chronologie der paulinischen Briefe: aufs neue Untersucht*. Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1893.

Coblentz Bautch, Kelley. *A Study of the Geography of 1 Enoch 17-19: "No One Has Seen What I Have Seen"*. SuppJSJ 81. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

———. "What Becomes of the Angels' "Wives"? A Text-Critical Study of *1 Enoch* 19:2." *JBL* 125 (2006): 766–780.

———. "Decoration, Destruction, and Debauchery: Reflections on 1 Enoch 8 in Light of 4QEn[b]." *DSD* 15 (2008): 79–95.

Coggins, R. J. *Sirach*, GAP. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.

Cohen, Shaye J. D. *The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties*. Berkley: University of California Press, 1999.

Collins, Adela Yarbro and John J. Collins, *King and Messiah as Son of God: Divine, Human, and Angelic Messianic Figures in Biblical and Related Literature*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.

Collins, John J. "Cosmos and Salvation: Jewish Wisdom and Apocalyptic in the Hellenistic Age." *HR* 17 (1977): 121–42.

———. "Methodological Issues in the Study of 1 Enoch: Reflections on the Articles of P. D. Hanson and G. W. Nickelsburg." *SBLASP* 13 (1978): 315–22.

———. "The Root of Immortality: Death in the Context of Jewish Wisdom." *HTR* 71 (1978): 177–92.

———. "Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre." *Semeia* 14 (1979): 1–19.

———. "The Apocalyptic Technique: Setting and Function in the Book of Watchers." *CBQ* 44 (1982): 91–111.

———. *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature*. New York: Doubleday, 1995.

———. *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*, 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.

———. "From Prophecy to Apocalypticism: The Expectation of the End." Pages 129–61 in *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism: Volume I: The Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity*. ed. John J. Collins. New York: Continuum, 1999.

———. "Creation and the Origin of Evil." Pages 30–51 in *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls.* New York: Routledge, 1997.

———. *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1997.

———. "The Origin of Evil in Apocalyptic Literature and the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 287–99 in *Seers, Sibyls and Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism*. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

———. "Before the Fall: The Earliest Interpretations of Adam and Eve." Pages 293–308 in *The Idea of Biblical Interpretation: Essays in Honor of James L. Kugel*. eds. Hindy Najman and Judith H. Newman, JSJSupp 83. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

———. *Introduction to the Hebrew Bible.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2004.

———. "How Distinctive was Enochic Judaism?" *Meghillot: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls* 5–6 (2007): 17–34.

———. "Early Judaism in Modern Scholarship." Pages 1–29 in *Early Judaism: A Comprehensive Overview*. eds. John J. Collins and Daniel C. Harlow. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.

———. "Enoch and Ezra." Pages 83–97 in *Fourth Ezra and Second Baruch: Reconstruction after the Fall*. eds. Matthias Henze and Gabriele Boccaccini, JSJSupp 164. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

Collins, Raymond F. *First Corinthians*. SP 7. Collegeville: Liturgical, 1999.

Colpe, Carsten. *Die religionsgeschichtliche Schule: Darstellung und Kritik ihres Bildes vom gnostischen Erlösermythus.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961.

Congdon, David W. "Eschatologizing Apocalyptic: An Assessment of the Present Conversation on Pauline Apocalyptic." Pages 118–136 in *Apocalyptic and the Future of Theology: With and Beyond J. Louis Martyn*, ed. Joshua B. Davis and Douglas Harink. Eugene: Cascade Books, 2012.

Conroy, John T. "'The Wages of Sin Is Death': The Death of the Soul in Greek, Second Temple Jewish, and Early Christian Authors." PhD diss., University of Notre Dame, 2008.

———. "Philo's 'Death of the Soul': Is This Only a Metaphor?" in *SPhiloA* 23 (2011): 23–40.

Cook, David. "The Prescript as Programme in Galatians." *JTS* 43 (1992): 511–519

Cornford, Francis M. *Plato's Cosmology: The* Timaeus *of Plato*. Indianapolis: Hackett, 1997.

Corsani, Bruno. *Lettera Ai Galati*, CSEANT 9. Genoa: Marietti, 1990.

Cosgrove, Charles H. "Justin Martyr and the Emerging Christian Canon: Observations on the Purpose and Destination of the Dialogue with Trypho." *VC* 36 (1982): 209–32

Cover, Michael B. "The Sun and the Chariot: The *Republic* and the *Phaedrus* as Sources for Rival Platonic Paradigms of the Psychic Vision in Philo's Biblical Commentaries." *SPhiloA* 26 (2014): 151–167.

———. *Lifting the Veil: 2 Corinthians 3:7–18 in Light of Jewish Homiletic and Commentary Traditions*. BZNW 210. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2015.

———. ""Paulus als Yischmaelit? The Personification of Scripture as Interpretive Authority in Paul and the School of Rabbi Ishmael." *JBL* 135 (2016): 617–37.

Cox, Ronald R. *By the Same Word: Creation and Salvation in Hellenistic Judaism and Early Christianity*. BZNW 145. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007.

Cranfield, C. E. B. "St Paul and the Law." *SJT* 17 (1964): 43–68.

———. "On Some of the Problems in the Interpretation of Romans 5:12." *SJT* 22 (1969): 324–341.

Crawford, Sidnie White. *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.

Crenshaw, James L. *Defending God: Biblical Responses to the Problem of Evil*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Cribiore, Raffaella. *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001.

———. *The School of Libanius in Late Antique Antioch.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007.

Croasmun, Matthew. *The Emergence of Sin: The Cosmic Tyrant in Romans*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2017.

Cullmann, Oscar. *The Christology of the New Testament*, Rev. ed. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963.

Cummins, S. A. *Paul and the Crucified Christ in Antioch: Maccabean Martyrdom and Galatians 1 and 2*. SNTSMS 114. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Dahl, Nils A. "Paul's Letter to the Galatians: Epistolary Genre, Content, and Structure." Pages 117–142 in *The Galatians Debate: Contemporary Issues in Rhetorical and Historical Interpretation*. Edited by Mark D. Nanos. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2002.

Daniélou, Jean. *The Theology of Jewish Christianity: The Development of Christian Doctrine before the Council of Nicaea Volume 1*. Translated by John A. Baker. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1964.

Das, A. Andrew. "Another Look at ἐὰν μή in Galatians 2:16." *JBL* 119 (2000): 529–39.

———. *Paul and the Stories of Israel: Grand Thematic Narratives in Galatians*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2016.

Daschke, Dereck. *City of Ruins: Mourning the Destruction of Jerusalem through Jewish Apocalypse*. BibInt 99. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

Davenport, Gene L. *The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees*, StPB 20. Leiden: Brill, 1971.

Davidson, Maxwell J. *Angels at Qumran: A Comparative Study of 1 Enoch 1-36, 72-108 and Sectarian Writings from Qumran*. JSPSupp 11. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992.

Davies, J. P. "Evil's Aetiology and False Dichotomies in Jewish Apocalyptic and Paul." Pages 169–189 in *Evil in Second Temple Judaism and Early Christianity*. WUNT 2.417. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016.

———. *Paul among the Apocalypses? An Evaluation of the 'Apocalyptic Paul' in the Context of Jewish and Christian Apocalyptic Literature*, LNTS 562. London: Bloomsbury, 2016.

———. "What to Expect when you're Expecting: Maternity, Salvation History, and the 'Apocalyptic Paul'." *JSNT* 38 (2016): 301–315.

Davies, W. D. *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology*, Revised edition. New York: Harper & Row, 1948.

Davila, James. *The Provenance of the Pseudepigrapha: Jewish, Christian, or other?* JSJSupp 105. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

Davis, Basil S. "The Meaning of ΠΡΟΕΓΡΑΦΗ in the Context of Galatians 3.1." *NTS* 45 (1999): 194–212.

Day, John. From Creation to Babel: Studies in Genesis 1–11. London: Bloomsbury, 2013.

de Boer, Martinus C. *The Defeat of Death: Apocalyptic Eschatology in 1 Corinthians 15 and Romans 5*. JSNTSuppS 22. Sheffield, JSOT Press, 1988.

———. "Paul and Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology." Pages 169–90 in *Apocalyptic and the New Testament: Essays in Honor of J. Louis Martyn*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989.

———. "Paul and Apocalyptic Eschatology." Pages 345–83 in *Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism: Volume I: The Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity*, ed. John J. Collins. New York: Continuum, 1999.

———. "Paul's Use and Interpretation of a Justification Tradition in Galatians 2.15–21." *JSNT* 28 (2005): 189–216.

———. "The Meaning of the Phrase *Ta Stoicheia Tou Kosmou* in Galatians." *NTS* 53 (2007): 204–24.

———. *Galatians: A Commentary*, NTL. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2011.

———. "Paul's Mythologizing Program in Romans 5–8." Pages 1–20 in *Apocalyptic Paul: Cosmos and Anthropos in Romans 5–8*. Edited by Beverly Roberts Gaventa. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2013.

———. "Apocalyptic as God's Eschatological Activity in Paul's Theology." Pages 45–63 in *Paul and the Apocalyptic Imagination*. eds. Ben C. Blackwell, John K. Goodrich, and Jason Maston. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2016.

de Jonge, Marinus and Johannes Tromp, *The Life of Adam & Eve and Related Literature*, GAP Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.

de Roo, J. C. R. *"Works of the Law" at Qumran and in Paul*, NTM 13. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2007.

Di Tommaso, Lorenzo. "Dating the Eagle Vision of 4 Ezra: A New Look at an Old Theory." *JSP* 10 (1999): 3–38.

———. "Who is the 'I' of *4 Ezra*?" Pages 119–133 in *Fourth Ezra and Second Baruch: Reconstruction after the Fall*, eds. Matthias Henze and Gabriele Boccaccini, JSJSupp 164. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

Dibelius, Martin. *Die Geisterwelt im Glauben des Paulus*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1909.

Dibley, Amy Genevive. "Abraham's Uncircumcised Children: The Enochic precedent for Paul's Paradoxical Claim in Galatians 3:29." PhD diss., University of California Berkeley, 2013.

Dillon, John. "Philo's Doctrine of Angels." Pages 197–205 in *Two Treatises of Philo of Alexandria: A commentary on De gigantibus and Quod Deus sit immutabilis*, BJS 25. Chico: Scholars Press, 1983.

———. "Medea Among the Philosophers." Pages 211–18 in *Medea: Essays on Medea in Myth, Literature, Philosophy, and Art*, eds. James J. Clauss and Sarah Iles Johnston. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997.

Dimant, Devorah. "The Fallen Angels in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphic Books related to them." PhD diss., Hebrew University, 1974 (Hebrew).

———. "1 Enoch 6–11: A Methodological Perspective." *SBLSP* 13 (1978): 323–339.

———. "The Biography of Enoch and the Books of Enoch." *VT* 33 (1983): 14–29.

———. “1 Enoch 6–11: A Fragment of a Parabiblical Work.” *JJS* 53 (2002): 223–37.

———. “Israel’s Subjugation to the Gentiles as an Expression of Demonic Power in Qumran Documents and Related Literature.” *RevQ* 22.87 (2006): 373–88.

———. “Between Qumran Sectarian and Non-Sectarian Texts: The Case of Belial and Mastema.” Pages 235–56 in *Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture: Proceedings of the International Conference Held at the Israel Museum, Jerusalem (July 6-8, 2008)*. eds. Adolfo D. Roitman, Lawrence H. Schiffman and Shani Tzoref. STDJ 93. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

Dix, G. H. “The Enochic Pentateuch.” *JTS* 27 (1925): 29–42.

Dochhorn, Jan. *Die Apocalypse des Mose: Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar*, TSAJ 106 Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.

———. “Mit Kain kam der Tod in die Welt: Zur Auslegung von SapSal 2,24 in 1 Clem 3,4; 4,1-7, mit einem Seitenblick auf Polykarp, Phil. 7,1 und Theophilus, Ad Autol. II, 29,3-4.” *ZNW* 98 (2007): 150–59.

Dochhorn, Jan, 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.

Dodson, Joseph R. *The “Powers” of Personification: Rhetorical Purpose in the Book of Wisdom and the Letter to the Romans*, BZNW 161. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2008.

Doran, Robert. “The Non-Dating of Jubilees: Jub. 34–38; 23:14–32 in Narrative Context.” *JSJ* 20 (1989): 1–11.

Dragona-Monachou, Myrto. “Divine Providence in the Philosophy of the Empire.” *ANRW* 36.7.4417–90. Part 2, *Principat*, 36.7. Edited by H. Temporini and W. Haase. New York: de Gruyter, 1994.

Drane, John William. *Paul, Libertine or Legalist?: A Study in the Theology of the Major Pauline Epistles*. London: S.P.C.K. 1975.

Drawnel, Henryk. “The Mesopotamian Background of the Enochic Giants and Evil Spirits.” *DSD* 21 (2014): 14–38.

Droge, Arthur J. *Homer or Moses?: Early Christian Interpretations of the History of Culture*. HUZT 26. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1989.

Dubarle, A. M. “Le Péché originel dans les livres sapientiaux.” *RThom* 56 (1956): 597–619.

———. *The Biblical Doctrine of Original Sin*. Translated by E. M. Stewart. New York: Herder and Herder, 1964.

Dunn, James D. G. *Romans*. 2 Vols. WBC 38. Dallas: Word, 1988.

———. *Christology in the Making: A New Testament Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation*. 2nd ed. London: SCM Press, 1989.

———. *Jesus, Paul, and the Law: Studies in mark and Galatians*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1990.

———. *Galatians*, BNTC. London: Black, 1993.

———. *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.

———. "Adam in Paul." Pages 120–135 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.

———. *The New Perspective on Paul*. Revised Edition. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.

———. *Beginning from Jerusalem*. CIM 2. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.

Dunne, John Anthony, "Suffering and Covenantal Hope in Galatians: A critique of the 'Apocalyptic reading' and its proponents." *SJT* 68 (2015): 1–15.

Eastman, Susan Grove. "The Evil Eye and the Curse of the Law: Galatians 3.1 Revisited." *JSNT* 83 (2001): 69–87.

———. *Paul and the Person: Reframing Paul's Anthropology*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2017.

Eckstein, Hans-Joachim. *Verheißung und Gesetz: Eine exegetische Untersuchung zu Galater 2,15–4,7*. WUNT 86. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.

Edwards, Matthew. *Pneuma and Realized Eschatology in the Book of Wisdom*. FRLANT 242. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012.

Ehrhardt, Arnold. "Justin Martyr's Two Apologies." *JEH* 4 (1953): 1–16.

Ehrman, Bart D. *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Ellens, J. Harold, ed. *Explaining Evil: Psychology, Religion, and Spirituality*, 3 Vols. Santa Barbara: Praeger, 2011

Elliot, Susan. *Cutting Too Close for Comfort: Paul's Letter to the Galatians in its Anatolian Cultic Context*. JSNTSupp 248. New York: T&T Clark, 2003.

Elliott, John H. *Beware the Evil Eye: The Evil Eye in the Bible and the Ancient World*, 3 Vols. Eugene: Cascade, 2016.

Endres, John C. "The Watchers Traditions in the *Book of Jubilees*." Pages 121–35 in *The Watchers in Jewish and Christian Traditions*. eds. Angela Kim Harkins, Kelly Coblentz Bautch, and John C. Endres. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2014.

Engberg-Pederson, Troels. *Paul and the Stoics*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2000.

———. *Cosmology and the Self in the Apostle Paul: The Material Spirit*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Engel, Helmut. *Das Buch der Weisheit*. NSKAT 16. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1998.

Eskola, Timo. *Theodicy and Predestination in Pauline Soteriology*. WUNT 100. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.

Esler, Philip F. "Social-Scientific Approaches to Apocalyptic Literature." Pages 123–44 in *The Oxford Handbook of Apocalyptic Literature*. ed. John J. Collins. New York: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Everling, Otto. *Die paulinische Angelologie und Dämonologie: ein biblisch-theologischer Versuch*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1888.

Falk, David K. "Dating the Watchers: What's at Stake?" *Hen* 31 (2009): 23–29.

Fee, Gordon D. *Pauline Christology: An Exegetical-Theological Study*. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 2007.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. "The Consecutive meaning of ἐφ' ᾧ in Romans 5.12." *NTS* 39 (1993): 321–29.

———. *Romans: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 33. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008 [1993].

———. *First Corinthians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 32. New Haven: Yale University, 2008.

Fletcher-Louis, Crispin H. T. *Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology*, WUNT 2.94. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997.

———. *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, STDJ 42. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

Foerster, W. "Abfassungszeit und Ziel des Galaterbriefs." Pages 135–41. in *Apophoreta: Feschrift für Ernst Haenchen zu seinem 70. Geburtstag am 10. Dezember 1964*. BZNW 30. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1964.

Forbes, Christopher. "Paul's Principalities and Powers: Demythologizing Apocalyptic?" *JSNT* 82 (2001): 61–88.

———. "Pauline Demonology and/or Cosmology? Principalities, Powers and the Elements of the World in Their Hellenistic Context." *JSNT* 85 (2002): 51–73

Foster, Paul. "Justin and Paul." Pages 108–25. *Paul and the Second Century*. Edited by Michael F. Bird and Joseph R. Dodson, LNTS 412. New York: T&T Clark, 2011.

Fradde, Steven D. *Enosh and His Generations: Pre-Israelite Hero and History in Postbiblical Interpretation*. Chico: Scholars Press, 1984.

Francis, Michael. "Borderline Bad: Philo of Alexandria on the Distinction between Voluntary and Involuntary Sin." PhD diss., University of Notre Dame, 2015.

Frede, Michael. "The Original notion of Cause." Pages 215–49 in *Doubt and Dogmatism: Studies in Hellenistic Epistemology*. Edited by Malcolm Schofield, Myles Burnyeat and Jonathan Barnes. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980.

Freundorfer, Joseph. *Erbsünde und Erbtod beim Apostel Paulus: eine religionsgeschichtliche und exegetische Untersuchung über Römerbrief 5, 12-21*. NTAbh 13. Münster: Aschendorff, 1927.

Frick, Peter. *Divine Providence in Philo of Alexandria*. TSAJ 77. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999.

Furnish, Victor Paul. "'He Gave Himself [Was Given] Up . . . .': Paul's Use of a Christological Assertion." Pages 109–121 in *The Future of Christology: Essays in Honor of Leander E. Keck*. Edited by Abraham J. Malherbe and Wayne A. Meeks. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.

Gaston, Lloyd. "Angels and Gentiles in Early Judaism and in Paul." *SR* 11 (1982): 65–75.

Gaventa, Beverly Roberts. "The Rhetoric of Death in the Wisdom of Solomon and the Letters of Paul." Pages 127–45 in *The Listening Heart: Essays in Wisdom and the Psalms in Honor of Roland E. Murphy*. Edited by Kenneth G. Hoglund. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987.

Georges, Tobias. "Justin's School in Rome-Reflections on Early Christian 'Schools,'" *ZAC* 16 (2012): 75–87.

Giblin, Charles H. "Three Monotheistic Texts in Paul." *CBQ* 37 (1975): 527–47.

Gieschen, Charles A. *Angelomorphic Christology: Antecedents and Early Evidence*, AGAJU 42 Leiden: Brill, 1998.

Gilbert, Maurice. "God, Sin and Mercy: Sirach 15:11–18:14." Pages 118–135 in *Ben Sira's God: Proceedings of the International Ben Sira Conference: Durham – Ushaw College 2001*. Edited by Renate Egger-Wenzel. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2002.

———. "Ben Sira, Reader of Genesis 1-11." Pages 89–99 in *Intertextual Studies in Ben Sira and Tobit: Essays in Honor of Alexander A. Di Lella, O.F.M.* CBQMS 38. Edited by Jeremy Corley and Vincent Skemp. Washington, D. C.: The Catholic Biblical Association, 2005.

Giulean, Dragoş-Andrei. "The Watchers' Whispers: Athenagoras's Legation 25, 1-3 and the Book of the Watchers." *VC* 61 (2007): 258–81.

Glasson, T. F. *Greek Influence in Jewish Eschatology*. London: S.P.C.K. 1961.

Glicksman, Andrew T. *Wisdom of Solomon 10: A Jewish Hellenistic Reinterpretation of Early Israelite History through Sapiential Lenses*. DCLS 9. Göttingen: de Gruyter, 2011.

Goff, Matthew. "Hellish Females: The Strange Woman of Septuagint Proverbs and 4QWiles of the Wicked Woman (4Q184)." *JSJ* 39 (2008): 20–45.

———. "Adam, the Angels and Eternal Life: Genesis 1–3 in the Wisdom of Solomon and 4QInstruction." Pages 1–21 in *Studies in the Book of Wisdom*. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

———. "Monstrous Appetites: Giants, Cannibalism, and Insatiable Eating in Enochic Literature." *JAJ* 1 (2010): 19–42.

———. "Enochic Literature and the Persistence of Evil: Giants and Demons, Satan and Azazel." Pages 43–57 in *Das Böse, der Teufel und Dämonen – Evil, the Devil, and Demons*. eds. Jan Dochorn, Susanne Rudnig-Zelt and Benjamin Wold. WUNT 2.412. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016.

Goodenough, E. R. *The Theology of Justin Martyr*. Jena: Frommann, 1923.

Goodrich, John K. "Guardians, not Taskmasters: The Cultural Resonances of Paul's Metaphor in Galatians 4:1–2." *JSNT* 32 (2010): 251–284.

———. "'As long as the heir is a child' The Rhetoric of Inheritance in Galatians 4:1–2 and P.Ryl. 2.153." *NovT* 55 (2013): 61–76.

Gordon, T. David. "A Note on Παιδαγωγός in Galatians 3.24-25." *NTS* 35 (1989): 150–54.

Gorman, Michael J. *Inhabiting the Cruciform God: Kenosis, Justification, and Theosis in Paul's Narrative Soteriology*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.

Götte, Monika Elisabeth. *Von den Wächtern zu Adam: Frühjüdischen Mythen über die Ursprünge des Bösen and ihre frühchristliche Rezeption*. WUNT 2.426. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016.

Grabbe, Lester L. "'Better watch your back, Adam': Another Adam and Eve in Tradition in Second Temple Judaism." Pages 273–82 in *New Perspectives on 2 Enoch: No Longer Slavonic Only*. SJ 4. Edited by Andrei A. Orlov and Gabrielle Boccaccini. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Grabbe, Lester L. "The Scapegoat Tradition: A Study in Early Jewish Interpretation." *JSJ* 18 (1987): 152–67.

———. "The Social Setting of Early Jewish Apocalypticism." *JSP* 4 (1989): 27–47.

———. *Wisdom of Solomon*, GAP. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.

Grant, Robert M. *The Greek Apologists of the Second Century*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1988.

Greenfield, Jonas C. and Michael E. Stone, "The Enochic Pentateuch and the Date of the Similitudes." *HTR* 70 (1977): 51–65.

Greer, Rowan A. "Sinned we All in Adam's Fall?" Pages 382–94 in *The Social World of the First Christians: Essays in Honor of Wayne A. Meeks*. Edited by L. Michael White and O. Larry Yarbrough. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995.

Gregg, J. A. F. *The Wisdom of Solomon.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909.

Grelot, Pierre. "La géographie mythique d'Hénoch et ses sources orientales." *RevQ* 65 (1958): 33–69.

Griggs, Robbie. "Apocalyptic Experience in the Theodicy of 4 Ezra." Pages 282–98 in *Evil in Second Temple Judaism and Early Christianity*. WUNT 2.417. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016.

Gunkel, Hermann. "Das vierte Buch Esra." Pages 2.331–402 in *Die Apokryphen und Psseudepigraphen des alten Testaments*. Edited by E. Kautzsch. Tübingen: Mohr, 1900.

Gupta, Nijay K. "'They Are Not Gods!': Jewish and Christian Idol Polemic and Greco-Roman Use of Cult Statues." *CBQ* 76 (2014): 704–19.

Hadot, Jean. *Penchant mauvais et volonté libre dans la Sagesse de Ben Sira*. Bruxelles: Presses universitaires de Bruxelles, 1970.

Hahn, Ferdinand. *Titles of Jesus in Christology: Their History in Early Christianity*. London: Lutterworth, 1969.

———. "Das Gesetzesverständnis im Römer- und Galaterbrief." *ZNW* 67 (1976–77): 20–63.

Hamerton-Kelly, R. G. *Pre-Existence, Wisdom and the Son of Man: A Study of the Idea of Pre-Existence in the New Testament*, SNTSMS 21. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973

Hankinson, R. J. "Determinism and Indeterminism." Pages 514–41 in *The Cambridge History of Hellenistic Philosophy*, eds. Keimpe Algra et. al. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

———. "Explanation and Causation." Pages 479–512 in *The Cambridge History of Hellenistic Philosophy*. eds. Keimpe Algra et. al. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Hannah, Darrell D. *Michael and Christ: Michael Traditions and Angel Christology in Early Christianity*. WUNT 109. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999.

Hanneken, Todd R. "Angels and Demons in the Book of Jubilees and Contemporary Apocalypses." *Hen* 28 (2006): 11–25.

———. *The Subversion of the Apocalypses in the Book of Jubilees*. EJIL 34. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012.

Hanson, A. T. "The Origin of Paul's Use of PAIDAGOGOS for the Law." *JSNT* 34 (1988): 71–76.

Hanson, Paul D. "Rebellion in Heaven, Azazel, and Euhemeristic Heroes in 1 Enoch 6–11." *JBL* 96 (1977): 195–233.

———. *The Dawn of Apocalyptic: The Historical and Sociological Roots of Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology*, rev. ed. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979.

Hardin, Justin K. *Galatians and the Imperial Cult: A Critical Analysis of the First-Century Social Context of Paul's Letter*. WUNT 2.237. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.

Harmon, Matthew S. *She Must and Shall Go Free: Paul's Isaianic Gospel in Galatians*. BZNW 168. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010.

Harnisch, Wolfgang. *Verhängnis und Verheissung der Geschichte. Untersuchungen zum Zeit- und Geschichtsverständnis im 4. Buch Esra und in der syr. Baruchapokalypse*. FRLANT 97. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1969.

Harrelson, Walter J. "Ezra among the Wicked in 2 Esdras 3–10." Pages 21–40 in *Divine Helmsman, Studies on God's Control of Human Events, Presented to Lou H Silberman*. New York: Ktav, 1980.

Hartman, Lars. *Asking for a Meaning: A Study of 1 Enoch 1–5*. ConBNT 12. Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1979.

Hatch, William H. P. "τὰ στοιχεῖα in Paul and Bardaisan." *JTS* 28 (1927): 181–82.

Hayman, A. P. "The Problem of Pseudonymity in the Ezra Apocalypse." *JSJ* 6 (1975): 47–56.

———. "The Survival of Mythology in the Wisdom of Solomon." *JSJ* 30 (1999): 125–39.

Hays, Richard B. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.

———. *The Letter to the Galatians*. NIB 11. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2000.

———. *The Faith of Jesus Christ: The Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1–4:11*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.

———. *The Conversion of the Imagination: Paul as Interpreter of Israel's Scripture*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.

———. "What is 'Real Participation in Christ?': A Dialogue with E. P. Sanders on Pauline Soteriology." Pages 336–51 in *Redefining First-Century Jewish and Christian Identities: Essays in Honor of Ed Parish Sanders*. eds. Fabian E. Udoh et. al. CJAS 16. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 2008.

———. "Apocalyptic *Poiēsis* in Galatians: Paternity, Passion, and Participation." Pages 200–219 in *Galatians and Christian Theology: Justification, the Gospel, and Ethics in Paul's Letter*. Edited by Mark W. Elliot, Scott J. Hafemann, N. T. Wright, and John Fredrick. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2014.

———. "Humanity prior to the Revelation of Faith." Pages 61–78 in *Beyond Bultmann: Reckoning a New Testament Theology*. Edited by Bruce W. Longenecker and Mikeal C. Parsons. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2014.

Head, Peter. "Galatians 2.20: 'I live by faith in God and Christ . . .'" *Evangelical Textual Criticism*. 15 March 2006.

http://evangelicaltextualcriticism.blogspot.com/2006/03/galatians-220-i-live-by-faith-in-god.html.

Heger, Paul. "*1 Enoch*—Complementary or Alternative to Mosaic Torah?" *JSJ* 41 (2010): 29–62.

Heiser, Michael S. "Co-regency in Ancient Israel's Divine Council as the Conceptual Backdrop to Ancient Jewish Binitarian Monotheism." *BBR* 26 (2015): 195–225.

Helleman, Wendy E. "Philo of Alexandria on Deification and Assimilation to God." *SPhiloA* 2 (1990): 51–71.

Hempel, Charlotte. "The *Treatise on the Two Spirits* and the Literary History of the *Rule of the Community*." Pages 102–20 in *Dualism in Qumran*. Edited by Géza G. Zeravits. LSTS 76. New York: T&T Clark, 2010.

Hengel, Martin. *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period*. 2 Vols. Translated by John Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974.

———. *The Son of God: The Origin of Christology and the History of Jewish-Hellenistic Religion*. Translated by John Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976.

Henze, Matthias. *Jewish Apocalypticism in Late First Century Israel: Reading* Second Baruch *in Context*. TSAJ 142. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.

———. "'4 Ezra' and '2 Baruch': Literary Composition and Oral Performance in First-Century Apocalyptic Literature." *JBL* 131 (2012): 181–200.

———. "*4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*: The Status Quaestionis." Pages 3–27 in *Fourth Ezra and Second Baruch: Reconstruction after the Fall*, JSJSupp 164, eds. Matthias Henze, Gabriele Boccaccini with Jason M. Zurawski. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

Hick, John. *Evil and the God of Love*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

Hilgenfeld, Adolf. *Der Galaterbrief, übersetzt, in seinen geschichtlichen Beziehungen untersucht und erklärt*. Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1852.

Himmelfarb, Martha. "A Report on Enoch in Rabbinic Literature." *SBLSP* 13 (1978): 259–69.

———. *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

———. "Levi, Phinehas, and the Problem of Intermarriage at the Time of the Maccabean Revolt." *JSQ* 6 (1999): 1–24.

———. *A Kingdom of Priests: Ancestry and Merit in Ancient Judaism*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006.

———. "Temple and Priests in the Book of the Watchers, the Animal Apocalypse, and the Apocalypse of Weeks." Pages 219–36 in *The Early Enoch Literature*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and John J. Collins, JSJSupp 121. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Hirshman, Marc. "Rabbinic Universalism in the Second and Third Centuries." *HTR* 93 (2000): 101–15.

Hodge, Caroline Johnson. *If Sons, Then Heirs: A Study of Kinship and Ethnicity in the Letters of Paul*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Hoffman, Yair and Henning Reventlow, eds. *The Problem of Evil and Its Symbols in Jewish and Christian Tradition*. JSOTSupp 366. London: T&T Clark International, 2004.

Hoffmann, Heinrich. *Das Gesetz in der frühjüdischen Apokalyptik,* SUNT 23. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999.

Hofius, Otfried. "The Adam-Christ Antithesis and the Law: Reflections on Romans 5:12–21." Pages 165–205 in *Paul and the Mosaic Law*. Edited by James D. G. Dunn. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001.

Hogan, Karina Martin. "The Exegetical Background of the 'Ambiguity of Death' in the Wisdom of Solomon." *JSJ* 30 (1999): 1–24.

Hogan, Karina Martin. *Theologies in Conflict in 4 Ezra: Wisdom Debate and Apocalyptic Solution*, JSJSupp 130. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Hogeterp, Albert L. A. "Angels, the Final Age and 1–2 Corinthians in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 377–92 in *Angels: The Concept of Celestial Beings – Origins, Development and Reception*. Edited by Fredrich V. Reiterer, Tobias Nicklas and Karin Schöpflin. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007.

Holladay, Carl R. "New Testament Christology: A Consideration of Dunn's *Christology in the Making*." *Semeia* 30 (1984): 65–82.

Hong, In-Gyu. *The Law in Galatians*. JSNTSupp 81. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.

Hooker, M. D. *From Adam to Christ: Essays on Paul*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Horbury, William. *Jewish Messianism and the Cult of Christ*. London: SCM, 1998.

Horner, T. J. *'Listening to Trypho': Justin Martyr's Dialogue Revisited*. CBET 28. Leuven: Peeters, 2001.

Horsley, Richard A. “How Can Some of You Say That There Is No Resurrection of the Dead: Spiritual Elitism in Corinth.” *NovT* 20 (1978): 203–31.

Hübner, Hans. *Law in Paul’s Thought*, trans James C. G. Greig. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1984.

———. *Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments*: *Bd. 2 Die Theologie des Paulus und ihre neutestamentliche Wirkungsgeschichte*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993.

Hultgren, Stephen. “The Origin of Paul’s Doctrine of the Two Adams in 1 Corinthians 15.45–49.” *JSNT* 25 (2003): 343–70.

Hunn, Debbie. “Ἐὰν Μή in Galatians 2:16: A Look at Greek Literature.” *NovT* 49 (2007): 281–90.

Hurtado, Larry W. *The Earliest Christian Artifacts: Manuscripts and Christian Origins*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.

———. *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013.

Hyldahl, N. “Tryphon und Tarphon.” *ST* 10 (1956): 77–88

Jaffee, Martin S. *Torah in the Mouth: Writing and Oral Tradition in Palestinian Judaism 200 BCE–400 CE*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Jervell, Jacob. *Imago Dei: Gen 1,26f im Spätjudentum, in der Gnosis und in den paulinischen Briefen*. FRLANT 58. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960.

Jewett, Robert. *Paul’s Anthropological Terms: A Study of Their Use in Conflict Settings*. AGJU 10. Leiden: Brill, 1971.

———. *A Chronology of Paul’s Life*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979.

———. *Romans: A Commentary*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007.

Jipp, Joshua W. “Ancient, Modern, and Future Interpretations of Romans 1:3-4: Reception History and Biblical Interpretation.” *JTI* 3 (2009): 241–59

Jobling, D. “‘And Have Dominion...’. The Interpretation of Genesis 1,28 in Philo Judaeus.” *JSJ* 8 (1977): 50–82.

Johnson, E. Elizabeth. Review of *From Plight to Solution: A Jewish Framework for Understanding Paul’s View of the Law in Galatians and Romans*, by Frank Theilman. *JBL* 110 (1991): 350–353.

Kabisch, Richard. *Das vierte Buch esra auf seine Quellen untersucht*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1889.

Karrer, Martin. *Jesus Christus im Neuen Testament*, GNT 11. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998.

Käsemann, Ernst. *New Testament Questions of Today*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969.

———. "On Paul's Anthropology." Pages 1–31 in *Perspectives on Paul*. Translated by Margaret Kohl. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971.

———. *Commentary on Romans*. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980.

Keck, Leander E. "Paul and Apocalyptic Theology." *Int* 38 (1984): 229–41

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

Keresztes, Paul. "Literary Genre of Justin's First Apology." *VC* 19 (1965): 99–110.

———. "The 'So-Called' Second Apology of Justin." *Latomus* 24.4 (1965): 858–69.

Kinzig, Wolfram. "Der 'Sitz im Leben' der Apologie in der alten Kirche." *ZKG* 100 (1989): 291–317.

Kirby, John T. "The Syntax of Romans 5:12: A Rhetorical Approach." *NTS* (1987): 283–286.

Kister, Menahem. "'In Adam': 1 Cor 15:21–22; 12:27 in their Jewish Setting." Pages 685–90 in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez*. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

———. "Romans 5:12–21 against the Background of Torah-Theology and Hebrew Usage." *HTR* 100 (2007): 391–424.

———. "'First Adam' and 'Second Adam' in 1 Cor 15:45-49 in the Light of Midrashic Exegesis and Hebrew Usage." Pages 351–65 in *The New Testament and Rabbinic Literature*. JSJSupp. 136. Leiden: Brill, 2010. 351–65

Kitz, Anne Marie. "Demons in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East." *JBL* 135 (2016): 447–64.

Klawans, Jonathan. "Josephus, the Rabbis, and Responses to Catastrophes Ancient and Modern." *JQR* 100 (2010): 278–309.

Knight, Jonathan. “The Origin and Significance of the Angelomorphic Christology in the Ascension of Isaiah.” *JTS* 63 (2012): 66–105.

Knowles, Michael P. “Moses, the Law, and the Unity of 4 Ezra.” *NovT* 31 (1989): 257–74.

Knox, John. “The Pauline Chronology.” *JBL* 58 (1939): 15–29

———. *Chapters in the Life of Paul*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1950.

Koch, Klaus. *The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic: A Polemical Work on a Neglected Area of Biblical Studies and Its Damaging Effects on Theology and Philosophy*, SBT 2/22. London: SCM Press, 1972.

———. “Esras erste Vision. Weltzeiten und Weg des Höchsten.” *BZ* 22 (1978): 46–75.

Kolarcik, Michael. *The Ambiguity of Death in the Book of Wisdom 1-6: A Study of Literary Structure and Interpretation*. AnBib 127. Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1991.

———. “Creation and Salvation in the book of Wisdom.” Pages 97–107 in *Creation in the Biblical Traditions*. Edited by Richard J. Clifford and John J. Collins. CBQMS 24. Washington D. C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1992.

———. *The Book of Wisdom*. NIB 6. Nashville: Abingdon, 1997.

Korpel, Marjo C. A. and Johannes C. de Moor, *Adam, Eve, and the Devil: A New Beginning*. HBM 65. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2014.

Kramer, Werner R. *Christ, Lord, Son of God*. Translated by Brian Hardy. SBT 50. London: SCM Press, 1966.

Küchler, Max. *Schweigen, Schmuck und Schleier: drei neutestamentliche Vorschriften zur Verdrängung der Frauen auf dem Hintergrund einer frauenfeindlichen Exegese des Alten Testaments im antiken Judentum*. NTOA 1. Freiburg: Universitätsverlag, 1986.

Kugel, James L. *The Bible as it Was*. Cambridge: Belknap, 1997.

———. *Traditions of the Bible: A Guide to the Bible as it was at the Start of the Common Era*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998.

———. *A Walk through Jubilees: Studies in the Book of Jubilees and the World of Its Creation*. JSJSupp 156. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Kurek-Chomycz, Dominika A. and Reimund Bieringer, “Guardians of the Old at the Dawn of the New: The Role of Angels According to the Pauline Letters.” Pages

325–55 in *Angels: The Concept of Celestial Beings – Origins, Development and Reception*. Eds. Fredrich V. Reiterer, Tobias Nicklas and Karin Schöpflin. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007.

Kurzewitz, Christian. *Weisheit und Tod: Die Ätiologie des Todes in der Sapientia Salomonis*. Tübingen: Francke, 2010.

Kuschel, Karl-Josef. *Born Before All Time? The Dispute Over Christ's Origin*. Translated by John Bowden. New York: Crossroad, 1992.

Kvanvig, Helge S. *Roots of Apocalyptic: The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and the Son of Man*. WMANT 61. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988.

———. "Enochic Judaism – a Judaism without the Torah and the Temple." Pages 163–177 in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and Giovanni Ibba. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 2009.

———. *Primeval History: Babylonian, Biblical, Enochic An Intertextual Reading*. JSJSupp 149. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

Laato Antti and Johannes Cornelis de Moor (eds.) *Theodicy in the World of the Bible*. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Laes, Christian "Pedagogues in Greek Inscriptions in Hellenistic and Roman Antiquity." *ZPE* 171 (2009): 113–22.

Lam, Joseph. *Patterns of Sin in the Hebrew Bible: Metaphor, Culture, and the Making of a Religious Concept*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2016

Langlois, Michaël. *Le premier manuscrit du Livre d'Hénoch: Étude épigraphique et philologique des fragments araméens de 4Q201 à Qumrân*. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 2008.

Larcher, Chysostome. *Le Livre de la Sagesse,* 3 Vols. EBib 1, 3, 5. Paris: Gabalda, 1983.

Larson, Erik W. "The Translation of Enoch into Greek." PhD diss., New York University, 1995.

Lategan, B. C. "Is Paul Defending his Apostleship in Galatians? The Function of Galatians 1:11–12 and 2:19–20 in the Development of Paul's Argument." *NTS* 34 (1988): 411–30.

Learoyd, W. H. A. "The Envy of the Devil in Wisdom 2,24." *ExpTim* 51 (1939–40), 395–96.

Lee, Benjamin Todd. *Apuleius'* Floridia*: A Commentary*. New York: de Gruyter, 2005.

Lee, Jung Young. "Interpreting the Demonic Powers in Pauline Thought." *NovT* 12 (1970): 54–69.

Lee, Sang Meyng. *The Cosmic Drama of Salvation: A Study of Paul's Undisputed Writings from Anthropological and Cosmological Perspectives*. WUNT 2.276. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.

Legarreta-Castillo, Felipe de Jesús. *The Figure of Adam in Romans 5 and 1 Corinthians 15: The New Creation and Its Ethical and Social Reconfiguration*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2014.

Légasse, Simon. *L'épître de Paul aux Galates*, LD 9. Paris: Cerf, 2000.

Levenson, Jon D. *Creation and the Persistence of Evil: The Jewish Drama of Divine Omnipotence*, San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1988.

Lévi, Israel. *Le péché originel dans les anciennes sources juives*. 2nd ed. Paris: Leroux, 1909.

Levison, John R. "Is Eve to Blame?: A Contextual Analysis of Sirach 25:24." *CBQ* 47 (1985): 617–23.

———. *Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism: From Sirach to 2 Baruch*, JSPSupp 1. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988.

Lewis, Scott M. "'Because of the Angels': Paul and the Enochic Traditions." Pages 81–90 in *The Watchers in Jewish and Christian Traditions.* Eds. Angela Kim Harkins, Kelley Coblentz Bautch. and John C. Endres. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2014.

Lietaert Peerbolte, L. J. "Man, Woman, and the Angels in 1 Cor 11:2-16." in *Creation of Man and Woman*. TBN 3. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

Lightfoot, Joseph Barber. *St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*, 4th ed. London: Macmillan, 1874.

Ligier, Louis. *Péché d'Adam et péché du monde: Bible, Kippur, Eucharistie*. Paris: Aubier, 1960.

Lindemann, Andreas. *Paulus im ältesten Christentum*: *Das Bild des Apostels und die Rezeption der paulinischen Theologie in der frühchristlichen Literatur bis Marcion*, BHT 58. Tübingen: Mohr, 1979.

———. "Anthropologie und Kosmologie in der Theologie des Paulus." Pages 149–183 in *Theologie und Wirklichkeit: Diskussionen der Bultmann-Schule*. eds. Martin Bauspiess, Christof Landmesser, Friederike Portenhauser. Theologie interdisziplinär 12. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlagsgesellschaft, 2011.

Linebaugh, Jonathan. "Announcing the Human: Rethinking the Relationship Between Wisdom of Solomon 13–15 and Romans 1.18–2.11." *NTS* 57 (2011): 214–237.

———. *God, Grace, and Righteousness in Wisdom of Solomon and Paul's Letter to the Romans*. NovTSupp 152. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

Litwa, M. David. *We are Being Transformed: Deification in Paul's Soteriology*. BZNW 187. Göttingen: de Gruyter, 2012.

———. "The Deification of Moses in Philo of Alexandria." *SPhiloA* 26 (2014): 1–27.

———. *Iesus Deus: The Early Christian Depiction of Jesus as a Mediterranean God*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2014.

Lloyd, G. E. R. *Polarity and Analogy: Two Types of Argumetation in Early Greek Thought*. Indianapolis: Hackett, 1992 [1966].

Lohse, Eduard. *Colossians and Philemon*, Hermeneia. Translated by William R. Poehlmann and Robert J. Karris. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971.

Long, A. A. "The Stoic Concept of Evil." *Phil. Q* 18 (1968): 329–43.

———. *Epictetus: A Stoic and Socratic Guide to Life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Longenecker, Bruce W. *2 Esdras*, GAP. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.

———. *The Triumph of Abraham's God: The Transformation of Identity in Galatians*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1998.

———. "'Until Christ Is Formed in You': Suprahuman Forces and Moral Character in Galatians" *CBQ* 61 (1999): 92–108.

———. *Remember the Poor: Paul, Poverty, and the Greco-Roman World*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.

Longenecker, Richard N. *Christology of Early Jewish Christianity*, SBT 17. Naperville: Allenson, 1970.

———. "The Pedagogical Nature of the Law in Galatians 3:19–4:7." *JETS* 25 (1982): 53–61.

———. *Galatians*, WBC 41. Dallas: Word Books, 1990.

Losekam, Claudia. *Die Sünde der Engel: Die Engelfalltradition in frühjüdischen und gnostischen Texten*, TANZ 41. Tübingen: Franke Verlag, 2010.

Lüdemann, Gerd. *Paul, Apostle to the Gentiles: Studies in Chronology*. Translated by F. Stanley Jones. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.

Lull, David J. "'The Law Was Our Pedagogue': A Study in Galatians 3:19–25." *JBL* 105 (1986): 481–98.

Luz, Ulrich. *Das Geschichtsverständnis des Paulus*, BEvT 49. München: Kaiser, 1968.

Mach, Michael. *Entwicklungsstadien des jüdischen Engelglaubens in vorrabbinischer Zeit*. TSAJ 34. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992.

Mackie, J. L. "Evil and Omnipotence." *Mind* 64 (1955): 200–212.

Mackie, Scott D. "Seeing God in Philo of Alexandria: The Logos, the Powers, or the Existent One?" *SPhiloA* 21 (2009): 25–47.

———. "Seeing God in Philo of Alexandria: Means, Methods, and Mysticism." *JSJ* 43 (2012): 147–179.

Marcus, Joel. "'Under the Law': The Background of a Pauline Expression." *CBQ* 63 (2001): 72–83.

———. "Idolatry in the New Testament." *Int.* 60 (2006): 152–64

Marrou, H. I. *A History of Education in Antiquity*. Translated by George Lamb. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1956

Martens, John W. *One God, One Law: Philo of Alexandria on the Mosaic and Greco-Roman Law*. SPhAMA 2. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Martin, Dale B. *The Corinthian Body*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.

———. *Inventing Superstition: From the Hippocratics to the Christians*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004.

———. "When Did Angels Become Demons?" *JBL* 129 (2010): 657–677.

Martínez, Florentino García. "The Heavenly Tablets in the Book of Jubilees." Pages 243–60 in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees*. Translated by M. T. Davis. Eds. M. Albani, et al. TSAJ 65. Tübingen: Mohr, 1997.

Martyn, J. Louis. *Galatians*. AB 33A. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997.

———. *Theological Issues in the Letters of Paul.* Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1997.

———. "The Apocalyptic Gospel in Galatians." *Int* 54 (2000): 246–266.

Mason, Steve. "Jews, Judaeans, Judaizing, Judaism: Problems of Categorization in Ancient History." *JSJ* 38 (2007): 457–512.

Maston, Jason "The Nature of Salvation History in Galatians." *JSPL* 2 (2012): 89–103.

Matera, Frank J. *Galatians*, SP 9. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1992.

Matlock, R. Barry. *Unveiling the Apocalyptic Paul: Paul's Interpreters and the Rhetoric of Criticism*. JSNT SuppS 127. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.

Mattila, Sharon Lea. "Ben Sira and the Stoics: A Reexamination of the Evidence." *JBL* 119 (2000): 473–501.

McCaskill, Grant. *Union with Christ in the New Testament*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2013.

McCormack, Bruce. "Can we still speak of 'Justification by Faith'? An in-house debate with Apocalyptic readings of Paul." Pages 159–84 in *Galatians and Christian Theology: Justification, the Gospel, and Ethics in Paul's Letter*. Edited by Mark W. Elliot, Scott J. Hafemann, N. T. Wright, and John Fredrick. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2014.

McFarland, Ian A. *In Adam's Fall: A Meditation on the Christian Doctrine of Original Sin*. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.

McGlynn, Moynam. *Divine Judgement and Divine Benevolence in the Book of Wisdom*, WUNT 2.139. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001.

Meiser, Martin *Galater*, NTP 9. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007.

Metzger, Bruce M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 2nd ed. New York: United Bible Societies, 1994.

Meyers, Carol. *Discovering Eve: Ancient Israelite Women in Context*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Michaelis, Wilhelm. *Zur Engelchristolog im Urchristentum: Abbau der Konstruktion Martin Werners*. Basel: Henrich Majer, 1942.

Millar, Fergus. *The Emperor in the Roman World, 31 BC-AD 337*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1977.

Mitchell, Margaret M. *Paul, the Corinthians, and the Birth of Christian Hermeneutics*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

Moberly, R. W. L. "Did the Serpent get it right?" *JTS* 39 (1988): 1–27.

———. “Did the Interpreters get it right?” *JTS* 59 (2008): 22–40.

———. *The Theology of the Book of Genesis*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Molenberg, Corrie. “A Study of the Roles of Shemihaza and Asael in I Enoch 6-11.” *JJS* 35 (1984): 136–46.

Moo, Douglas J. *The Epistle to the Romans*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.

———. *Galatians*, BECNT. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2013.

Moo, Jonathan A. *Creation, Nature and Hope in* 4 Ezra, FRLANT 237. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011.

Moore, G. F. *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era*. 3 Vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962.

Moore, Rick D. “Personification of the Seduction of Evil: ‘The Wiles of the Wicked Woman,’” *RevQ* 10 (1981): 505–19.

Moses, Robert Ewusie. *Practices of Power: Revisiting the Principalities and Powers in the Pauline Letters*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2014.

Moule, C. F. D. *An Idiom-Book of New Testament Greek*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959.

Munier, Charles. “A propos des Apologies de Justin.” *RevScRel* 61 (1987): 177–86.

Muro, Ernest A. “The Greek Fragments of Enoch from Qumran Cave 7 (‘7Q4, 7Q8, & 7Q12 = 7QEn Gr = Enoch’ 103:3-4, 7-8).” *RevQ* 18 (1997): 307–12.

Murphy, Frederick J. *The Structure and Meaning of Second Baruch*. SBLDS 78. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985.

Murphy-O’Connor, Jerome. “Christological Anthropology in Phil 2:6–11.” *RB* 83 (1976): 25–50.

———. *Paul: A Critical Life*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.

———. “Gal 2:15–16a: Whose Common Ground?” *RB* 108 [2001]: 376–85.

Nahm, Charles. “The Debate on the ‘Platonism’ of Justin Martyr.” *SecCent* 9 (1992): 129–51.

Najman, Hindy. “Interpretation as Primordial Writing : Jubilees and Its Authority Conferring Strategies.” *JSJ* 30 (1999): 379–410.

———. “Angels at Sinai: Exegesis, Theology and Interpretive Authority.” *DSD* 7 (2000): 313–33.

———. *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism*. JSJSupp 77. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Nanos, Mark D. ed. *The Galatians Debate: Contemporary Issues in Rhetorical and Historical Interpretation*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2002.

———. *The Irony of Galatians: Paul’s Letter in First-Century Context*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002.

Nasrallah, Laura. “Mapping the World: Justin, Tatian, Lucian, and the Second Sophistic.” *HTR* 98 (2005): 283–314.

Neusner, Jacob. “Judaism in a Time of Crisis: Four Responses to the Destruction of the Second Temple.” *Judaism* 21 (1972): 313–27.

Newman, Cary C. *Paul’s Glory Christology: Tradition and Rhetoric*. NovTSupp 69. Leiden: Brill, 1992.

Newsom, Carol A. “The Development of 1 Enoch 6–19: Cosmology and Judgment.” *CBQ* 42 (1980): 310–29.

Nicholson, Suzanne. *Dynamic Oneness: The Significance and Flexibility of Paul’s One-God Language*. Cambridge: James Clarke & Co, 2011.

Nickelsburg, George W. E. “Apocalyptic and Myth in 1 Enoch 6–11.” *JBL* 96 (1977): 383–405.

———. “Reflections on Reflections: A Response to John Collins’ Methodological Issues in the Study of 1 Enoch.” *SBLSP* 13 (1978): 311–13.

———. “Enoch, Levi, and Peter: Recipients of Revelation in Upper Galilee.” *JBL* 100 (1981): 575–600.

———. “Enochic Wisdom: An Alternative to the Mosaic Torah?” Pages 123–32 in *Hesed Ve-Eme.* eds. Jodi Magness and Seymour Gitin, BJS 320. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998.

———. *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch Chapters 1–36; 81–108*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001.

———. “The Greek Fragments of ‘1 Enoch’ from Qumran Cave 7: An Unproven Identification.” *RevQ* 21 (2004): 631–34.

———. *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah*, 2nd ed. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005.

———. "Torah and the Deuteronomic Scheme in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha: Variations on a Theme and Some Noteworthy Examples of its Absence" Pages 222–35 in *Das Gesetz im frühen Judentum un im Neuen Testament: Feschrift für Christoph Burchard zum 75. Geburtstag*. eds. Dieter Sänger and Matthias Konradt, NTOA 57. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 2006.

———. "A New Testament Reader's Guide to *2 Baruch*: Or a *2 Baruch* Reader's Guide to the new Testament" Pages 271–293 in *Fourth Ezra and Second Baruch: Reconstruction after the Fall*, JSJSupp 164, eds. Matthias Henze, Gabriele Boccaccini with Jason M. Zurawski. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

Nickelsburg, George W. E. and James C. VanderKam, *1 Enoch 2: A Commentary on the Book of Enoch chapters 37–82*, Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012.

Niehoff, Maren R. "Justin's *Timaeus* in Light of Philo's." in *SPhiloA* 28 (2016): 375–92

Nikiprowetzky, Valentine. "Note sur l'interprétation littérale de la loi et sur l'angélologie chez Philon d'Alexandrie." Pages 133–143 in *Études Philoniennes*. Paris: Cerf, 1996.

Nilson, Jon. "To Whom Is Justin's Dialogue with Trypho Addressed." *TS* 38 (1977): 538–46.

Noffke, Eric. "Man of Glory or First Sinner? Adam in the Book of Sirach." *ZAW* 119 (2007): 618–24.

Nordgaard, Stefan. "Paul and the Provenance of the Law." *ZNW* 105 (2014): 64–79.

Novenson, Matthew V. "Paul's Former Occupation in *Ioudaismos*." Pages 24–39 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.

Oakes, Peter. *Galatians*, Paideia. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2015.

Oepke, Albrecht. *Der Brief des Paulus an die Galater*, 2nd ed. THNT 9. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1957.

Orlov, Andrei A. *The Enoch-Metatron Tradition*, TSAJ 107. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.

———. "'The Gods of My Father Terah': Abraham the Iconoclast and the Polemics with the Divine Body Traditions in the Apocalypse of Abraham." *JSP* 18 (2008): 33–53.

Pagels, Elaine. *The Gnostic Paul: Gnostic Exegesis of the Pauline Letters*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975.

Parvis, Paul. “Justin, Philosopher and Martyr: The Posthumous Creation of the Second Apology.” Pages 22–37 in *Justin Martyr and His Worlds*. Edited by Sara Parvis and Paul Foster. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007.

Pearson, Birger A. “A Reminiscence of Classical Myth at II Peter 2:4.” *GRBS* 10 (1969): 71–80.

———. *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.

Peppard, Michael. *The Son of God in the Roman World: Divine Sonship in Its Social and Political Context*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Perkins, Pheme. “Adam and Christ in the Pauline Epistles.” Pages 128–51 in *Celebrating Paul: Festschrift in Honor of Jerome Murphy-O’Connor, O.P., and Joseph A. Fitzmyer, S. J*. Edited by Peter Spitaler. CBQMS 48. Washington, D. C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2011.

Peters, F. E. “Stoicheíon.” in *Greek Philosophical Terms: A Historical Lexicon*. New York: New York University Press, 1967.

Peterson, Erik. “La liberation d’Adam de l’Ανάγκη.” *RB* 55 (1948), 199–214.

Petzl, George. *Die Beichtinschriften Westkleinasiens*, EpigAnat 22. Bonn: Rudolf Habelt, 1994.

Piper, John. *The Future of Justification: A Response to N. T. Wright*. Wheaton: Crossway Books, 2007.

Pollmann, Ines. *Gesetzeskritische Motive im Judentum und die Gesetzeskritik des Paulus*. NTOA 98. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012.

Porter, F. C. “The Yeçer HaRa: A Study in the Jewish Doctrine of Sin.” Pages 91–156 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.

Porter, Stanley E. “The Pauline Concept of Original Sin, in Light of Rabbinic Background.” *TynBul* 41 (1990): 3–30.

Powers, Daniel G. *Salvation through Participation: An Examination of the notion of the believer’s corporate unity with Christ in early Christian Soteriology*. CBET 29. Leuven: Peeters, 2001.

Radice, Roberto. “Philo’s Theology and Theory of Creation.” Pages 124–45 in *The Cambridge Companion to Philo*. Edited by Adam Kamesar. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2009.

Räisänen, Heikki. “Galatians 2.16 and Paul’s Break with Judaism.” *NTS* 31 (1985): 543–53.

———. *Paul and the Law*. 2nd ed. WUNT 29. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987.

Rajak, Tessa. “Talking at Trypho: Christian Apologetic as Anti-Judaism in Justin’s *Dialogue with Trypho the Jew*.” Pages 59–80 in *Apologetics in the Roman Empire: Pagans, Jews, and Christians*. Edited by Mark Edwards, Martin Goodman, and Simon Price. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Reed, Annette Y. “The Trickery of the Fallen Angels and the Demonic Mimesis of the Divine: Aetiology, Demonology, and Polemics in the Writings of Justin Martyr.” *JECS* 12 (2004): 141–71.

———. *Fallen Angels and the History of Judaism and Christianity: The Reception of Enochic Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

———. “Enochic and Mosaic Traditions in Jubilees: The Evidence of Angelology and Demonology.” Pages 353–68 in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and Giovanni Ibba. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 2009.

Reese, James M. “Plan and Structure in the Book of Wisdom.” *CBQ* 27 (1965): 391–399.

———. *Hellenistic Influence on the Book of Wisdom and Its Consequences*. AnBib 41 Rome: Biblical Institute, 1970.

Reeves, John C. “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/.

Reicke, Bo. “The Law and This World according to Paul: Some Thoughts Concerning Gal 4:1–11.” *JBL* 70 (1951): 259–76.

Rey, Jean-Sébastien and Jan Joosten, eds. *The Texts and Versions of the Book of Ben Sira: Transmission and Interpretation*. JSJSupp 150. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

Riches, John Kenneth. *Galatians through the Centuries*. BBC. Malden: Blackwell, 2008.

Richter, Amy E. *Enoch and the Gospel of Matthew*. PTMS 183. Eugene: Pickwick, 2012.

Ricoeur, Paul. *The Symbolism of Evil*. Translated by Emerson Buchanan. Boston: Beacon Press, 1969.

Ridderbos, Herman. *Paul: An Outline of this Theology*. Translated by John Richard de Witt. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975.

Roetzel, Calvin J. *Paul: The Man and the Myth*, Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999.

Rogers, Trent A. *God and the Idols: Representations of God in 1 Corinthians 8-10*. WUNT 2.427. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016.

Röhser, Günter. *Metaphorik und Personifikation der Sünde: antike Sündenvorstellungen und paulinische Hamartia*. WUNT 25. Tübingen: Mohr, 1987.

Rokéah, David. *Justin Martyr and the Jews*. JCPS 5. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

Rosen-Zvi, Ishay. *Demonic Desires: Yetzer Hara and the Problem of Evil in Late Antiquity*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011.

Rowland, Christopher. *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity*. London: S.P.C.K. 1982.

Royse, James R. *Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri*. NTTSD 36. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Runia, David T. *Philo in Early Christian Literature: A Survey*. CRINT 3. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.

———. *On the Creation of the Cosmos according to Moses*. PACS 1. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

Rusam, Dieter. "Neue Belege zu den *Stoicheia Tou Kosmou* (Gal 4,3.9; Kol 2,8.20)." *ZNW* 83 (1992): 119–25.

Russell, D. S. *The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic*. OTL. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1964.

Sacchi, Paulo. *Jewish Apocalyptic and Its History.* Translated by William J. Short. JSPSupp 20. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990.

———. *The History of the Second Temple Period.* New York: T&T Clark, 2000.

Saeger, Luc de. "'Für unsere Sünden': 1 Kor 15,3b und Gal 1,4a im exegetischen Vergleich." *ETL* 77 (2001): 169–91.

Sanders, E. P. *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977.

———. *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1983.

———. *Paul: The Apostle's Life, Letters, and Thought*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2015.

Sänger, Dieter. "Das Gesetz is unser Παιδαγωγός geworden bis zu Christus' (Gal 3,24)." Pages 236–60 in *Das Gesetz im frühen Judentum und im Neuen Testament Feschrift für Christoph Burchard zum 75. Geburtsag*. Edited by Dieter Sänger and Matthias Konradt. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006.

Sayler, Gwendolyn B. *Have the Promises Failed? A Literary Analysis of 2 Baruch*. SBLDS 72. Chico: Scholars Press, 1984.

Scheu, Lawrence Edward. *Die "Weltelemente" beim Apostel Paulus (Gal 4,3, 9 und Kol 2,8.20)*. SST 37. Washington D. C.: Catholic University of America, 1933.

Schlier, Heinrich. *Der Brief an Die Galater*. KEK 10. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1949.

Schnelle, Udo. *Apostle Paul: His Life and Theology*. Translated by M. Eugene Boring. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2005.

Schoedel, William R. "Apologetic Literature and Ambassadorial Activities." *HTR* 82 (1989): 55–78.

Schoeps, Hans Joachim. *Paul: The Theology of the Apostle in Light of the Jewish Religious History*. Translated by Harold Knight. London: Lutterworth, 1961.

Schreiner, Thomas R. "'Works of Law' in Paul." *NovT* 33 (1991): 217–44.

———. *Galatians*. ZECNT. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2010.

Schwartz, Daniel R. "Two Pauline Allusions to the Redemptive Mechanism of the Crucifixion." *JBL* 102 (1983): 259–68.

Schwartz, Seth. "How Many Judaisms Were There? A Critique of Neusner and Smith on Definition and Mason and Boyarin on Categorization." *JAJ* 2 (2011): 208–38.

Schweitzer, Albert. *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*. Translated by William Montgomery. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1953.

Schweizer, Eduard. "Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Hintergrund der Sendungsformel." *ZNW* 57 (1966): 199–210.

———. "Slaves of the Elements and Worshipers of Angels: Gal 4:3, 9 and Col 2:8, 18, 20." *JBL* 107 (1988): 455–68.

———. “What do we really mean when we say, ‘*God sent his Son. . .*,’?” Pages 298–312 in *Faith and History: Essays in Honor of Paul W. Meyer*. Edited by John T. Carroll, et al. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990.

Scott, Ian W. “Common Ground? The Role of Galatians 2.16 in Paul’s Argument.” *NTS* 43 (2007): 425–435.

Scott, James M. *Adoption as Sons of God: An Exegetical Investigation into the Background of ΥΙΟΘΕΣΙΑ in the Pauline Corpus*. WUNT 2.48. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992.

———. “A Comparison of Paul’s Letter to the Galatians with the Epistle of Enoch.” Pages 193–218 in *The Jewish Apocalyptic Tradition and the Shaping of New Testament Thought*. Edited by Benjamin E. Reynolds and Loren T. Stuckenbruck. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2017.

Scroggs, Robin. *The Last Adam: A Study in Pauline Anthropology*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966.

Segal, Alan F. “Pre-Existence and Incarnation: A Response to Dunn and Holladay.” *Semeia* 30 (1984): 83–94.

Segal, Michael. *The Book of Jubilees: Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology and Theology*. JSJSup 117. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

———. “The Composition of Jubilees.” Pages 22–35 in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and Giovanni Ibba. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 2009.

Sellin, Gerhard. *Der Streit um die Auferstehung der Toten: eine religionsgeschichtliche und exegetische Untersuchung von 1 Korinther 15*. FRLANT 138. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986.

Shauf, Scott. “Galatians 2.20 in Context.” *NTS* 52 (2006): 86–101.

Skarsaune, Oskar. *The Proof from Prophecy: A Study in Justin Martyr’s Proof-Text Tradition: Text-Type, Provenance, Theological Profile*. SuppNovT 56. Leiden: Brill, 1987.

———. “Judaism and Hellenism in Justin Martyr, Elucidated from his Portrait of Socrates.” Pages 585–611 in *Geschichte-Tradition-Reflexion: Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag*, *Band III: Frühes Christentum*. Eds. H. Cancik, H. Lichtenberger and Peter Schäfer. Tübingen: Mohr, 1996.

———. “Justin and His Bible.” Pages 53–76 in *Justin Martyr and His Worlds*. Edited by Sara Parvis and Paul Foster. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007.

Skehan, Patrick W. and Alexander A. Di Lella. *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*. AB 39. New York: Doubleday, 1987.

Smiles, Vincent M. *The Gospel and the Law in Galatia: Paul's Response to Jewish-Christian Separatism and the Threat of Galatian Apostasy*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1998.

Smith II, Carl B. *No Longer Jews: The Search for Gnostic Origins*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2004.

Smith, Johnathan Z. *Drudgery Divine: On the Comparison of Early Christianities and the Religions of Late Antiquity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990.

———. *Map is Not Territory: Studies in the History of Religions*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1993.

Smith, Michael J. "The Role of the Pedagogue in Galatians." *BSac* 163.650 (2006): 197–214.

Snyder, H. Gregory. "'Above the Bath of Myrtinus': Justin Martyr's 'School' in the City of Rome." *HTR* 100 (2007): 335–62.

Soards, Marion L. "Seeking (*zētein*) and Sinning (*harmartōlos* & *harmartia*) according to Galatians 2:17." Pages 237–254 in *Apocalyptic in the New Testament: Essays in Honour of J. Louis Martyn*. Edited by Joel Marcus and Marion L. Soards. JSNTSupp 24. Sheffield: JSOT, 1989.

Staples, Jason. "Altered Because of Transgressions? The 'Law of Deeds' in Gal 3,19a." *ZNW* 106 (2015): 126–135.

Steck, Odil Hannes. *Israel und das gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten. Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung des deuteronomistischen Geschichtsbildes im alten Testament, Spätjudentum und Urchristentum*. WMAT 23. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1967.

Steenburg, D. "The Worship of Adam and Christ as the Image of God." *JSNT* 39 (1990): 95–109.

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

Sterling, Gregory E. "'Wisdom among the Perfect': Creation Traditions in Alexandrian Judaism and Corinthian Christianity." *NovT* 37 (1995): 355–384.

———. "A Philosophy According to the Cosmos: Colossian Christianity and Philo of Alexandria." Pages 349–73 in *Philon d'Alexandrie et le Langage de la Philosophie*. Edited by Carlos Lévy and Bernard Besnier. Turnhout: Brepols, 1998.

———. "'A Man of Highest Repute': Did Josephus know the Writings of Philo?" *SPhiloA* 25 (2013): 101–13.

Stock-Hesketh, Jonathan. "Circles and Mirrors: Understanding 1 Enoch 21–32." *JSP* 11 (2000): 27–58.

Stokes, Ryan E. "Rebellious Angels and Malicious Spirits: Explanations of Evil in the Enochic and Related Literature." PhD diss., Yale University, 2010.

Stone, Michael E. "Lists of Revealed Things in the Apocalyptic Literature." Pages 414–52 in *Magnalia Dei: The Mighty Acts of God: Essays on the Bible and Archaeology in Memory of G. Ernest Wright*. Garden City: Doubleday, 1976.

———. "Reactions to Destructions of the Second Temple: Theology, Perception and Conversion." *JSJ* 12 (1981): 195–204.

———. "Coherence and Inconsistency in the Apocalypses: The Case of 'the End' in 4 Ezra." *JBL* 102 (1983): 229–43.

———. "The Way of the Most High and the Injustice of God in 4 Ezra." Pages 132–42 in *Knowledge of God in the Graeco-Roman World*. EPRO 112. Leiden: Brill, 1988.

———. *Fourth Ezra*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990.

———. *A History of the Literature of Adam and Eve*, SBLEJL 3. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.

———. *Ancient Judaism: New Visions and Views*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011.

Stowers, Stanley K. *A Rereading of Romans: Justice, Jews, and Gentiles*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994.

———. "What is 'Pauline Participation in Christ'?" Pages 352–71 in *Redefining First-Century Jewish and Christian Identities: Essays in Honor of Ed Parish Sanders*. eds. Fabian E. Udoh et. al, CJAS 16. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 2008.

———. "Paul's Four Discourses about Sin." Pages 100–127 in *Celebrating Paul: Festschrift in Honor of Jerome Murphy-O'Connor and Joseph A. Fitzmyer*. Edited by Peter Spitaler. CBQMS 49. Washington, D. C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2011.

Stuckenbruck, Loren T. *Angel Veneration and Christology: A Study in Early Judaism and in the Christology of the Apocalypse of John*. WUNT 2.70. Tübingen: Mohr, 1995.

———. "Prayers of Deliverance from the Demonic in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Early Jewish Literature." Pages 146–65 in *Changing Face of Judaism, Christianity,*

and Other Greco-Roman Religions in Antiquity. eds. Ian H. Henderson and Gerbern S. Oegema, JSHRZ 2. Gütersloh: Gütersloher, 2006.

———. "The Early Traditions related to 1 Enoch: From the Dead Sea Scrolls: An Overview and Assessment." Pages 41–63 in *The Early Enoch Literature*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and John J. Collins, JSJSupp 121. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

———. "The Book of Jubilees and the Origin of Evil." Pages 294–308 in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and Giovanni Ibba. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 2009.

———. "Why Should Women Cover Their Heads because of Angels? (1 Corinthians 11:10)." *Stone-Campbell Journal* 4 (2001): 205–34.

———. *1 Enoch 91-108*. CEJL. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007.

———. "Ezra's Vision of the Lady: The form and Function of a Turning Point." Pages 137–150 in *Fourth Ezra and Second Baruch: Reconstruction after the Fall*, JSJSupp 164, eds. Matthias Henze, Gabriele Boccaccini with Jason M. Zurawski. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

———. *The Myth of Rebellious Angels: Studies in Second Temple Judaism and New Testament Texts*. WUNT 335. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.

———. "How Much Evil does the Christ Event Solve? Jesus and Paul in Relation to Jewish 'Apocalyptic' Thought." Pages 142–168 in *Evil in Second Temple Judaism and Early Christianity*, WUNT 2.417. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016.

Stylianopoulos, Theodore G. *Justin Martyr and the Mosaic Law*. SBLDS 20. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1975.

Sullivan, Kevin P. *Wrestling with Angels: A Study of the Relationship between Angels and Humans in Ancient Jewish Literature and the New Testament*. AGAJU 55. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

Sumney, Jerry L. *'Servants of Satan', 'False Brothers' and other Opponents of Paul*. JSNTSupp 188. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.

———. *Steward of God's Mysteries: Paul and Early Church Tradition*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2017.

Suter, David W. "Fallen Angel, Fallen Priest: The Problem of Family Purity in 1 Enoch 6–16." *HUCA* 50 (1979): 115–35.

———. "Revisiting 'Fallen Angel, Fallen Priest'." *Hen* 24 (2002): 137–42.

Tabor, James D. “Paul’s Notion of many ‘Sons of God’ and its Hellenistic Contexts.” *Helios* 13 (1986): 87–97.

Tamási, Balázs. “Baruch as Prophet in *2 Baruch*.” Pages 195–217 in *Fourth Ezra and Second Baruch: Reconstruction after the Fall*, JSJSupp 164. eds. Matthias Henze, Gabriele Boccaccini with Jason M. Zurawski. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

Tannehill, Robert C. *Dying and Rising with Christ. A Study in Pauline Theology*. BZNW 32. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1967.

Tatum, Gregory. *New Chapters in the Life of Paul: The Relative Chronology of his Career*. CBQMS 41. Washington D. C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2006.

Taylor, R. J. “The Eschatological Meaning of Life and Death in the Book of Wisdom I-V.” *ETL* 42 (1966): 72–137.

Tcherikover, Victor. “The Ideology of the Letter of Aristeas.” *HTR* 51 (1958): 59–85.

Tennant, F. R. “The Teaching of Ecclesiasticus and Wisdom on the Introduction of Sin and Death.” *JTS* 2 (1900–1901): 207–23.

Tennant, F. R. *The Sources of the Doctrines of the Fall and Original Sin*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1903.

Testuz, Michel. *Les idées religieuses du Livre des Jubilés*. Geneva: E Droz, 1960.

Thackeray, Henry St. John. *The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought: An Essay to which was awarded the Kaye Prize for 1899*. New York: Macmillan, 1900.

Theilman, Frank. *From Plight to Solution: A Jewish Framework for Understanding Paul’s View of the Law in Galatians and Romans*. SuppNovT 61. Leiden: Brill, 1989.

———. *Paul and the Law: A Contextual Approach*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1994.

Thiessen, Matthew. *Paul and the Gentile Problem*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2016.

Thiselton, Anthony C. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.

Thompson, Alden Lloyd. *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.

Thorsteinsson, Runar M. “By Philosophy Alone: Reassessing Justin’s Christianity and His Turn from Platonism.” *EC* 3 (2012): 492–517.

———. “The Literary Genre and Purpose of Justin’s Second Apology: A Critical Review with Insights from Ancient Epistolography.” *HTR* 105 (2012): 91–114.

Tigchelaar, Eibert J. C. *Prophets of Old and the Day of the End: Zechariah, the Book of Watchers and Apocalyptic*. OtSt 35. Leiden: Brill, 1996.

Tilling, Chris. “Paul, Evil, and Justification Debates.” Pages 190–223 in *Evil in Second Temple Judaism and Early Christianity*. WUNT 2.417. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016.

Timotin, Andrei. *La démonologie platonicienne: Histoire de la notion de* daimōn *de Platon aux derniers néoplatoniciens*. PA 128. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Tobin, Thomas H. *The Creation of Man: Philo and the History of Interpretation*. CBQMS 14. Washington D. C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1983.

———. “The Jewish Context of Rom 5:12-14.” *SPhiloA* 13 (2001): 159–75

———. *Paul’s Rhetoric in its Contexts: The Argument of Romans*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2004.

Tolmie, D. F. “Ὁ ΝΟΜΟΣ ΠΑΙΔΑΓΩΓΟΣ ἩΜΩΝ ΓΕΓΟΝΕΝ ΕΙΣ ΞΡΙΣΤΟΝ: The Persuasive Force of a Pauline Metaphor (GL 3:23–26).” *Neot* 26 (1992): 407–16.

Trakatellis, Demetrios. “Justin Martyr’s Trypho.” *HTR* 79 (1986): 287–97.

Trick, Bradley R. *Abrahamic Descent, Testamentary Adoption, and the Law in Galatians: Differentiating Abraham’s Sons, Seed, and Children of Promise*. NovTSupp 169. Leiden: Brill, 2016.

Tronier, Henrik. “The Corinthian Correspondence between Philosophical Idealism and Apocalypticism.” Pages 165–196 in *Paul Beyond the Judaism/Hellenism Divide*. Edited by Troels Engberg-Pederson. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001.

van der Toorn, Karel. “The Theology of Demons in Mesopotamia and Israel.” Pages 61–83 in *Die Dämonen: die Dämonologie der israelitisch-jüdischen und frühchristlichen Literatur im Kontext ihrer Umwelt / Demons: The demonology of Israelite-Jewish and early Christian literature in context of their environment*. Edited by Armin Lange, Hermann Lichtenberger, and K. F. Diethard Römheld. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.

Van Kooten, George H. *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. Göttingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.

van Nes, Jermo. "'Faith(fulness) of the Son of God'?: Galatians 2:20b Reconsidered." *NovT* 55 (2013): 127–39.

Van Ruiten, Jacques T. A. G. M. *Primeval History Interpreted: The Rewriting of Genesis 1–11 in the book of Jubilees*. JSJSupp 66. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

———. "Angels and Demons in the Book of Jubilees." Pages 585–609 in *Angels: The Concept of Celestial Beings – Origins, Development and Reception*. Eds. F. V. Reiterer, T. Nicklas, and K. Schöpflin. DCLY. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007.

Van Seters, John. *Prologue to History: The Yahwist as Historian in Genesis*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1992.

van Spanje, T. E. *Inconsistency in Paul? A Critique of the Work of Heikki Räisänen*. WUNT 2.110. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999.

VanderKam, James C. *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees*. HSM 14. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977.

———. "Enoch Traditions in Jubilees and Other Second-Century Sources." *SBLSP* 13 (1978): 229–51.

———. *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition*. CBQMS 16. Washington, D. C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984.

———. *Enoch: A Man for All Generations*. Columbia: University of South Carolina, 1995.

———. "1 Enoch, Enochic Motifs, and Enoch in Early Christian Literature." Pages 33–127 in *The Jewish Apocalyptic Heritage in Early Christianity*. Edited by James C. VanderKam and William Adler. CRINT 4. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996.

———. "The Origins and Purposes of the *Book of Jubilees*." Pages 3–24 in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees*. Edited by Matthias Albani, Jörg Frey, and Armin Lange. TSAJ 65. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997.

———. "The Angel Story in the Book of Jubilees." in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12-14 January, 1997*, eds. Esther G. Chazon and Michael Stone, STDJ 31. Leiden: Brill, 1999. 151–70.

———. "The Angel of the Presence in the Book of Jubilees." *DSD* 7 (2000): 378–93.

———. “The Interpretation of Genesis in 1 Enoch.” Pages 129–48 in *The Bible at Qumran*. Edited by P. W. Flint and T. H. Kim. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.

———. *The Book of Jubilees*. GAP. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.

———. “The Demons in the Book of Jubilees.” Pages 339–64 in in *Die Dämonen: die Dämonologie der israelitisch-jüdischen und frühchristlichen Literatur im Kontext ihrer Umwelt / Demons: The demonology of Israelite-Jewish and early Christian literature in context of their environment*. Edited by Armin Lange, Hermann Lichtenberger, and K. F. Diethard Römheld. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.

———. “The End of the Matter? Jubilees 50:6–13 and the Unity of the Book.” Pages 267–284 in *Heavenly Tablets: Interpretation, Identity, and Tradition in Ancient Judaism*. Edited by Lynn R. LiDonnici and Andrea Lieber. JSJSupp 119. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

———. “Recent Scholarship on the Book of Jubilees.” *CBR* 6 (2008): 405–31.

———. “The Manuscript Tradition of Jubilees.” Pages 3–21 in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees*. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and Giovanni Ibba. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 2009.

VanderKam, James C. and J. T. Milik, “The First Jubilees Manuscript from Qumran Cave 4: A Preliminary Publication.” *JBL* 110 (1991): 243–270.

Vanhoye, Albert. “Un médiateur des anges en Ga 3:19–20.” *Bib* 59 (1978): 403–11).

Vielhauer, Philipp. “Introduction.” in *New Testament Apocrypha*. Edited by Wilhelm Schneemelcher. Translated by R. McL. Wilson. 2 Vols. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1963–65.

———. *Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur: Einleitung in das Neue Testament, die Apokryphen, und die Apostolischen Väter*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1975.

von Harnack Adolf, *Geschichte der altchristlichen litteratur bis Eusebius*. 2 vols. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1897.

Vouga, François. *An die Galater*. HNT 10. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.

Wacker, Marie-Theres. *Weltordnung und Gericht: Studien zu 1 Henoch 22*. FB 45. Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1982.

Waddell, James A. “Biblical Notions and Admonitions on Evil in Pauline Literature.” Pages 134–43 in *Explaining Evil Volume 3: Approaches, Responses, Solutions*. Edited by J. Harold Ellens. Santa Barbara: Praeger, 2011.

———. *The Messiah: A Comparative Study of the Enochic Son of Man and the Pauline Kyrios*, JCTCRS 10. New York: Bloomsbury, 2011.

Wagner, W. "Interpretations of Genesis 6:1–4 in Second-Century Christianity." *JRH* 20 (1996): 137–55.

Walker, Jr. William O. "Translation and Interpretation of ἐὰν μή in Galatians 2:16." *JBL* 116 (1997): 515–20.

Wallace, Daniel B. "Galatians 3:19–20: A *Crux Interpretum* for Paul's View of the Law." *WTJ* (1990): 225–245.

Walters, James C. "Paul, Adoption, and Inheritance." Pages 42–76 in *Paul and the Greco-Roman World*. Edited by J. Paul Sampley. Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2003.

Wanamaker, Charles A. "The Son and the Sons of God: A Study in Elements of Paul's Christological and Soteriology Thought." PhD diss., University of Durham, 1980.

———. "Philippians 2:6-11: Son of God or Adamic Christology?" *NTS* 33 (1987): 179–93.

Wasserman, Emma. *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.

———. "'An Idol is Nothing in the World' (1 Cor 8:4): The Metaphysical Contradictions of 1 Corinthians 8:1–11:1 in The Context of Jewish Idolatry Polemics." Pages 201–27 in *Portraits of Jesus: Studies in Christology*. Edited by Susan E. Myers. WUNT 2.321. Tübingen: Mohr Siebek, 2012.

Watson, Francis. *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith*. New York: T&T Clark, 2004.

Wedderburn, A. J. M. "Adam and Christ: An Investigation into the Background of I Corinthians 15 and Romans 5:12–21." PhD diss., The University of Cambridge, 1971.

Weima, Jeffery A. D. *Paul the Ancient Letter Writer: An Introduction to Epistolary Analysis*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2016.

Weisengoff, John P. "Death and Immortality in the Book of Wisdom." *CBQ* 3 (1941): 104–33.

Weiss, Johannes. *Der erste Korintherbrief*, KEK 5. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1910.

Weiss, Johannes. *Earliest Christianity: A History of the Period AD 30–50*. 2 Vols. Translated by Frederick C. Grant. New York: Harper, 1959.

Wells, Kyle B. *Grace and Agency in Paul and Second Temple Judaism: Interpreting the Transformation of the Heart*. NovTSupp 157. Leiden: Brill, 2015.

Wendt, Heidi. "Galatians 3:1 as an Allusion to Textual Prophecy." *JBL* 135 (2016): 369–389.

Wengst, Klaus. *Christologische Formeln und Lieder des Urchristentums*, SNT 7. Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1972.

Werline, Rodney. "The Transformation of Pauline Arguments in Justin Martyr's 'Dialogue with Trypho.'" *HTR* 92 (1999): 79–93.

Werman, Cana. "Jubilees 30: Building a Paradigm for the Ban on Intermarriage." *HTR* 90 (1997): 1–22.

Werner, Martin. *Die Enstehung des christlichen Dogma*. Tübingen: Katzmann, 1941.

Westerholm, Stephen. *Perspectives Old and New on Paul: The "Lutheran" Paul and His Critics*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.

Wey, Heinrich. *Die Funktionen der bösen Geister bei den griechischen Apologeten des zweiten Jahrhunderts nach Christus*. Winterthur: Keller, 1957.

Whitsett, Christopher G. "Son of God, Seed of David: Paul's Messianic Exegesis in Romans 1:3–4." *JBL* 119 (2000): 661–81.

Whitters, Mark F. "Baruch as Ezra in *2 Baruch*." *JBL* 132 (2013): 569–84.

Wicke-Reuter, Ursel. *Göttliche Providenz und menschliche Verantwortung bei Ben Sira und in der frühen Stoa*. BZAW 298. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2000.

Wiesenberg, E. "The Jubilee of Jubilees." *RevQ* 3 (1961): 3–40.

Wilckens, Ulrich. *Der Brief an Die Römer*. EKK 6. 3 vols. Benziger; Neukirchener Verlag, 1978.

———. "Zur Enwicklung des paulinischen Gesetzesverständnisses." *NTS* 28 (1982): 154–190.

Willett, Tom W. *Eschatology in the Theodicies of 2 Baruch and 4 Ezra*. JSPSupp 4. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989.

Williams, Guy. *The Spirit World in the Letters of Paul the Apostle: A Critical Examination of the Role of Spiritual Beings in the Authentic Pauline Epistles*. FRLANT 231. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009.

Williams, Logan. “Disjunction in Paul: Apocalyptic or Christomorphic? Comparing the Apocalypse of Weeks with Galatians.” *NTS* 64 (2018): 64–80.

Williams, N. P. *The Ideas of the Fall and of Original Sin: A Historical and Critical Study*. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1927.

Williams, W. “The Publication of Imperial Subscripts.” *ZPE* 40 (1980): 283–94.

Wilson, Todd A. “Wilderness Apostasy and Paul’s Portrayal of the Crisis in Galatians.” *NTS* 50 (2004): 550–71.

———. “‘Under the Law’ in Galatians: A Pauline Theological abbreviation.” *JTS* 56 (2005): 362–92.

Winston, David. *The Wisdom of Solomon*. AB 43. Garden City: Doubleday, 1979.

———. *Logos and Mystical Theology in Philo of Alexandria*. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1985.

———. “Theodicy in Ben Sira and Stoic Philosophy.” Pages 44–56 in *The Ancestral Philosophy: Hellenistic Philosophy in Second Temple Judaism.* Providence: Brown Judaic Studies, 2001.

———. “Theodicy in Wisdom of Solomon.” Pages 525–545 in *Theodicy in the World of the Bible*. Edited by Antti Laato and Johannes C. de Moor. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Wise, Michael O. “4QFlorilegium and the Temple of Adam.” RevQ 15 (1991): 103–32.

Witherington III, Ben. *Grace in Galatia: A Commentary on St Paul’s Letter to the Galatians*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.

Witulski, Thomas. *Die Adressaten des Galaterbriefes: Untersuchungen zur Gemeinde von Antiochia ad Pisidiam*. FRLANT 193. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000.

Wold, Benjamin G. “‘Flesh’ and ‘Spirit’ in Qumran Sapiential Literature as the Background to the Use in Pauline Epistles.” *ZNW* 106 (2015): 262–79.

Woyke, Johannes. “Nochmals zu den ‘schwachen und unfähigen Elementen’ (Gal 4.9): Paulus, Philo und die stoicheia tou kosmou.” *NTS* 54, no. 2 (2008): 221–34.

Wrede, William. *Paul*. Translated by Edward Lummis. London: Elsom, 1907.

Wright III, Benjamin G. *The Letter of Aristeas: ‘Aristeas to Philocrates’ or ‘On the Translation of the Law of the Jews’*. CEJL. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2015.

Wright, A. G. “Structure of the Book of Wisdom.” *Bib* 48 (1967): 165–184.

Wright, Archie T. *The Origin of Evil Spirits: The Reception of Genesis 6.1–4 in Early Jewish Literature*. WUNT 2.198. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.

Wright, J. Edward. *Baruch Ben Neriah: From Biblical Scribe to Apocalyptic Seer*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2003.

Wright, J. Edward. *The Early History of Heaven*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Wright, N. T. *Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991.

———. *The New Testament and the People of God*. COQG 1. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.

———. *Justification: God's Plan and Paul's Vision*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2009.

———. *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*. COQG 4. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2013.

———. *Paul and his Recent Interpreters: Some Contemporary Debates*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2015.

Yamauchi, Edwin M. *Pre-Christian Gnosticism: A Survey of the Proposed Evidences*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1983.

Young, Norman H. "*Paidagogos*: The Social Setting of a Pauline Metaphor." *NovT* 29 (1987): 150–76.

Zahn, Molly M. "Rewritten Scripture." Pages 324–37 in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by John J. Collins and Timothy H. Lim. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.

———. "Genre and Rewritten Scripture: A Reassessment." *JBL* 131 (2012): 271–88.

Zahn, Theodor. *Der Brief des Paulus an die Galater*. KNT 9. Leipzig: Deichert, 1905.

Zeller, Dieter. "The Life and Death of the Soul in Philo of Alexandria: The Use and Origin of a Metaphor." *SPhiloA* 7 (1995): 19–55.

Zetterholm, Magnus. *Approaches to Paul: A Student's Guide to Recent Scholarship*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2009.

Ziegler, Philip G. "Some Remarks on Apocalyptic in Modern Christian Theology." Pages 199–216 in *Paul and the Apocalyptic Imagination*. eds. Ben C. Blackwell, John K. Goodrich, and Jason Maston. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2016.

Zurawski, Jason M. "Separating the Devil from the Diabolos: A Fresh Reading of Wisdom of Solomon 2.24." *JSP* 21 (2012): 366–99.

———. "Hell on Earth: Corporeal Existence as the Ultimate Punishment of the Wicked in Philo of Alexandria and the Wisdom of Solomon." Pages 1.193–226 in *Heaven, Hell, and the Afterlife: Eternity in Judaism, Christianity and Islam*. Edited by J. Harold Ellens, 3 Vols. Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger, 2013.