JONATHAN D. WORTHINGTON

Creation in Paul and Philo

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe 317

Mohr Siebeck

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament · 2. Reihe

317

Jonathan D. Worthington

Creation in Paul and Philo

The Beginning and Before

Mohr Siebeck

Jonathan D. Worthington, born 1978; 2005 Master of Divinity; 2006 Master of Theology at Reformed Theological Seminary (Jackson, Mississippi, USA); 2010 PhD in New Testament Studies at Durham University (Durham, England); Director of University and Youth Ministries in Bon Accord Free Church of Scotland in Aberdeen, Scotland.

e-ISBN PDF 978-3-16-151862-1
ISBN 978-3-16-150839-4
ISSN 0340-9570 (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 2. Reihe)

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at *http://dnb.d-nb.de*.

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

Printed in Germany.

This work is dedicated to
Lynsey,
my most treasured of God's creations.
Hebrews 6:10

Preface

Is there a relationship between protology (one's interpretation of creation) and what can be called "pre-protology," i.e., one's interpretation of God's pre-creational purposes? This question, which lies at the heart of this book, was sparked in a café in 2007 in Aberdeen, Scotland. Having already done some research into creation ("from nothing") in early Judaism and Christianity, I was aware of the tendency of Philo of Alexandria to interpret Genesis 1–2 in connection with God's "pre-existent" thoughts, a doctrine partially culled from Plato's *Timaeus*, but partially (and importantly) from Genesis 1–2 itself. While then reading Ephesians 1 over a cup of coffee, a curious flicker ignited: Would the understanding of God's "predestining" activity discussed in this passage – in which God "chose us in Christ *before* the foundations of the world," i.e., before Genesis 1 – have been related to a Pauline interpretation of Genesis 1 itself. Though tantalizing, such a query seemed to fall outwith my project. I placed the small curiosity under the mental bushel nebulously labeled "for a future project."

As I sipped my coffee, I had no idea that throughout the next few years of research Paul's use of the wording and motifs of Genesis 1–2 and 5 in 1–2 Corinthians and Romans (not Ephesians 1), as well as Philo's in *De opificio mundi*, would render it impossible to keep that curiosity from shining out. For example, Paul uses the "image"-motif from Gen. 5:3 in Rom. 8:29, but there he is not explaining what God had done in creation (as in 1 Cor. 15:48a and 49a), nor even what God does in the new creation (as in 1 Cor. 15:48b and 49b), but specifically what God had "*pre*-marked out" ("pre-destined") before the original creation. Was it from the text of Genesis itself that Paul gleaned testimony not only to the Beginning but also to the Before, perhaps in a manner not wholly dissimilar to Philo? What was going on hermeneutically as well as theologically? Is it significant that in 1 Corinthians, in which Paul uses Genesis 1, 2, and 5 at many significant points, he employs the central theme and wording of that great creation passage – or, rather, that great "before creation" passage – in Proverbs 8 to express that God's wisdom was "pre-marked out" ("pre-destined") before the ages for our glory (1 Cor. 2:7)? At more points than those just mentioned my attempts to wrestle with Paul's perception of God's *creational* activity were repeatedly interupted by his communication of God's *pre-*

creational intentions. As I focused on *how* Paul culled his protology from that sacred text that he shared with Philo – i.e., the beginning of Genesis – that flicker from the Aberdonian café had to be placed on a stand; indeed, it became the very flame that burns at the heart of this book. (A close contingent of this heart is the nexus between eschatology – the End – and protology.) This book explores the Beginning and Before, and a bit Beyond.

Many people have my gratitude regarding the present study. Any flaws remain mine alone, and what value and propriety this book does contain would not be the same without Professor Dr. Francis Watson's care for it in its form as a PhD dissertation at Durham University, England. His sharp insights, gentle prods, and humble challenges were always of timely help. Also, Professor Dr. Jörg Frey and Dr. Henning Ziebritzki, along with the editorial staff of Mohr Siebeck, deserve my thanks for seeing something of worth in this work and for investing in it by making it part of *WUNT* II series. Professor Dr. John Barclay and Dr. Jutta Leonhardt-Balzer deserve my thanks for their helpful suggestions concerning this and further connected research. A particular and warm gratitude extends to two scholars, Dr. Jason Maston and Dr. Brian Mattson, whose friendship and theological erudition greatly improved both my thesis and person, and whose families have been a true family to mine.

A deep and abiding gratefulness is indebted to my parents, Everett and Kirby Worthington, who for many years have been committed to my further education and who have practiced that commitment in no insignificant way! Also to Lynsey's parents, Vince and Jill Franz, my appreciation goes for constantly opening their hearts and home to us. Our life in Aberdeen, Scotland would also not be as rich and full as it has been without the faithful and exceedingly hospitable community of Bon Accord Free Church of Scotland, who have put up with me for 5 years as their Director of University and Youth Ministries. Singling out Donald and Anne Smith simultaneously recognizes their particular care for us while it does not deny the love of all others for whom we are so greatly appreciative. It is humbling to consider those literally around the world who have prayed for us and for my work these years.

Anya, my daughter born during an early stage of this study, should be thanked as one of my greatest sources of delight during the stresses and intensity of this research. And now Lydia, born during the final stage of this book's completion, reminds me of the powerful yet delicate creativity of our God. It is with all of my heart that my deepest and most profound thanks and love within the whole realm of creation extends to my wise wife, Lynsey. Though *soli Deo gloria* through Jesus Christ, my Lord!

Aberdeen, April 2011 Jonathan D. Worthington

Table of Contents

Introduction

Beginnings

Beginnings are important to the apostle Paul. His own beginning in the knowledge of the resurrected Christ gave to him a sense of humility and divinely purposed vigor in life and mission (1 Cor. 15:8–10). The beginning of the Galatians' faith and life in the Spirit set the standard, Paul urges them, according to which their lives should follow (Gal. 3:2–3). The beginning of the Mosaic Law in relation to the beginning of the Abrahamic promise – the Law beginning four centuries after the promise – shaped Paul's understanding of their whole relationship (Gal. 3:17–19). The beginning of sin and death through Adam's disobedience in Genesis 3 is clearly important for Paul's construal of the common human plight "in Adam" and of the gracious salvation "in Christ" (1 Cor. 15:21–22; Rom. 5:12–21). But what about *before* that fatal beginning of sin in the world, that world from which its inhabitants were supposed to perceive the eternal power and divine nature of their Creator, and worship him (Rom. 1:20)? Was the ultimate Beginning of all things – creation itself – at all important in Paul's thinking and letter-writing?

This book focuses on Paul's letters to the Corinthian and Roman Christians. Within those few correspondences alone, Paul quotes, alludes to, and builds upon the beginning of Genesis on numerous occasions. In order to humble the Corinthians, Paul turned their attention to God as creative Cause (1 Cor. 11:12c; cf. 2 Cor. 5:18a) and to the Father's causation of creation through Christ (1 Cor. 8:6). Also for the Romans, though in their case with the intention of deepening their understanding of guilt and praise, Paul introduced the general notion that God created all things (Rom. 1:20 and 11:36, respectively).[1] Yet Paul also brought to his readers' attention God's more specific creations: of light (2 Cor. 4:6), of seeds and plants (1 Cor. 15:37–38), and of bodies throughout heaven and earth (1 Cor. 15:40) including sun, moon, and stars (1 Cor. 15:41), and fish, birds, and beasts (1 Cor. 15:39). Paul used the language and motifs of the Begin-

[1] A much more inclusive presentation of the "creation motifs" in Romans 1–8 can be found in Adams, 2000, 153–55; cf. *idem*, 2002, 19–43.

ning to explain God's creation of humans as God's image (1 Cor. 11:7b; cf. 2 Cor. 4:4), God's fashioning of Adam from the dust (1 Cor. 15:44–47), and God's assembling of the human (i.e., Adamic) body (1 Cor. 12:12–26) with its own peculiar flesh (1 Cor. 15:39) and even glory (1 Cor. 15:40b; cf. 11:7–9). It was from the texts of the Beginning that Paul drew the gender-dynamics of difference and interdependence (1 Cor. 11:7–12) as well as the ontic nature of sexual union (1 Cor. 6:16). He even presented to both the Corinthians and Romans God's built-in anthropological principle by which all further humans were propagated according to Adam's image (1 Cor. 15:48–49; cf. 2 Cor. 3:18; Rom. 8:29).[2] All of these references to various aspects of the ultimate Beginning are *in addition* to Paul's more pronounced and well-known treatment of Adam's sin and its consequences according to Genesis 3.

What themes are connected to these texts of creation? Paul's uses of the Beginning (before sin) mentioned above touch on such important, interconnected subjects as Christology, anthropology (including bodily ontology, gender relations, and sexual ethics), ecclesiology, and eschatology. By this fact alone it seems that a systemic treatment of Paul's understanding of creation could have wide ramifications. A more modest observation is that if all of these statements are indeed based on Genesis – and I shall argue throughout the study this very point concerning a selection from these texts – then Paul provides comments not only on Genesis 1–2 as a whole and in general, but also on the particular texts of Gen. 1:2–3, 11–12, 14–19, 20–21, 24–25, 26–28, 2:7, 18, 21–23, 24, and 5:3 – and that is only within his Corinthian and Roman correspondences! It is tempting to immediately compile all of his treatments of these texts into a sort of Pauline commentary on creation. This book takes a step prior to such an endeavor.

This is not an exhaustive study of Paul's theology of creation. Rather, through select passages from those mentioned above I will tease out some of Paul's underlying interpretive tendencies when he employs terms and motifs from his scriptural texts of creation. Paul has more to say about creation than is often thought, though the depth and complexity of his protology is easily missed because of the brief and scattered nature of his references and allusions. However, by placing Paul's references to creation next to the formal and developed commentary on Genesis 1–2 written by one of his contemporaries, Philo of Alexandria (c. 20 BCE–50 CE), more about Paul's own reading of creation can be discerned and legitimately compared with Genesis' creation texts than may be possible by only study-

[2] Though this principle was first enacted in Gen. 5:3, and thus in one sense has a *post*-sin origin, Paul initially treats it as a simple matter of human ontology (1 Cor. 15:48a, 49a; see chapter 3 below). Since it was built by God within the fabric of Adam's and Eve's frames *before* sin, it can legitimately be treated as a pre-sin creation text.

ing Paul. Though there are important differences between Philo's and Paul's treatments of creation, and these will be explored at the end of each major section below, a broad hermeneutical similarity can be discerned between these two interpreters, as can a similar treatment of particular texts.

The proposal is this: *Paul's interpretation of creation, like Philo's in his commentary, contains three interwoven aspects: the beginning of the world, the beginning of humanity, and God's intentions before the beginning*. Note what the thesis is and is not. The central proposition is not that Paul's interpretation of creation is like Philo's. They display too many significant differences to make such a simplistic claim. The observation is that Paul's interpretation of creation has three interwoven aspects: two of the Beginning (of the world and of humanity) as well as the Before. A subordinate (but important) observation is that this general hermeneutic of creation is also found in Philo's commentary on Genesis 1–2.

Three basic questions are raised by the assertions above, and they each must be answered before we begin to analyze the three strands of Paul's and Philo's interpretations of creation in the chapters that follow. Firstly, how is this study related to other attempts to comprehend Paul's view of creation? Secondly, why approach this fuller treatment of Paul's understanding of creation by comparing his and Philo's readings? And finally, how will this study of Paul's and Philo's three-strand hermeneutic of creation unfold?

Recent Treatments of Paul's View of Creation

Scholars who have commented on Paul's view of creation in general and/or Paul's view of Adam in particular have often misconstrued his outlook due to underdeveloped engagement with each of the ways he interprets the protological texts and concepts. The majority of applicable details from these presentations of Paul's view of creation and of Adam are more effectively engaged throughout this book itself since they typically arise concerning particular texts of Paul (e.g., 1 Cor. 15:45; 2 Cor. 4:4, 6; Rom. 8:29) rather than as systematic treatments of his exegesis of the early texts in Genesis. A few general examples will suffice in order to demonstrate from different angles that a deeper and broader engagement with Paul's handling of the creational texts themselves will fill in an existing gap in scholarly discussion.

Though virtually everyone would agree that Paul believed that in fact God did create the world, there has been little attention paid to Paul's understanding of creation before Genesis 3. As we will see, some say (somewhat casually) that Paul really did not think much about creation and exis-

tence prior to sin. Not fitting into that perspective, Herman Ridderbos considered creation "fundamental" to Paul's thinking about sin and the gospel "even though little separate attention is paid" to the original creation in his letters.[3] In light of the "little separate attention" that Paul supposedly grants to creation, Ben Witherington is not surprised that "commentators have often noted how very little Paul has to say about creation or creatures prior to the Fall."[4] Ridderbos' modifier "separate" has been dropped, and now it appears that Paul did not say much of anything about creation, whether in connection with other doctrines or not. Apparently in agreement with the commentators, Witherington explains:[5]

> When Paul talks about creation, he is speaking of creation as it now exists, groaning under the burden of futility to which the Fall subjected it. When Paul reflects on the world, he is almost always reflecting on a world gone wrong or a world the form of which is passing away (1 Cor. 7:31).

Due to Paul's emphasis on the power and pervasiveness of sin, on Adam as sinner, and on "this present age" as evil and passing away, it is indeed tempting to convert the (alleged) notion that Paul *says* very little about creation prior to the Fall into the notion that, as Witherington favorably records of the plurality of commentators, Paul "*has very little to say* about creation." Twenty years prior to Witherington, J. Reumann had suggested "that Paul's expectation of an imminent end scarcely made creation a matter of importance to him."[6] If so, then indeed Paul would likely have very little to say about anything prior to the fundamental event of the universe: Adam's disobedience.

These few examples represent little more than passing comments on Paul's view of creation. When there has been a greater effort to say more about how Paul construes the creation of the world, attention has typically focused upon two statements in Paul's undisputed letters: Rom. 4:17c and 1 Cor. 8:6. From 1 Cor. 8:6 it is argued that Paul believed "all things" were created "through Christ" (cf. Col. 1:15–16).[7] From Rom. 4:17c it is argued that he believed God "called non-being into being" – i.e., some sort of

---

[3] Ridderbos,1975, 105. The term "separate" is unfortunate, for it implies that any attention to creation that is related to another topic is somehow less meaningful. It may tend toward an unwarranted restriction of the Pauline evidence.

[4] Witherington, 1994, 9.

[5] Witherington, 1994, 9.

[6] Reumann, 1973, 90. Cf. the favorable appraisal of Reumann's sentiments in Aymer, 1985, 82.

[7] E.g., Cox, 2007, 141–61 (on 1 Cor. 8:6), 161–92 (on Col. 1:15–20); Gibbs, 1971, 59–73 (on 1 Cor. 8:6), 94–114 (on Col. 1:15–20).

creatio ex nihilo by divine *fiat*.[8] In the study below I will not discuss either of these texts.

Although 1 Cor. 8:6 is most likely a reference to creation (as well as to redemption)[9] – to its (their) source, goal, and mediation – I have not selected it for his study because it does not betray a treatment of specific texts within the beginning of Genesis. Likewise in relation to Rom. 4:17c, even if this is a reference to creation (see below) it is similarly too broadly construed to be of relevance for this particular study of Paul's interpretive moves regarding the text. In my opinion, rather than referring to creation Paul's statement in Rom. 4:17c – "the God who called non-existing things as existing things" (καλοῦντος τὰ μὴ ὄντα ὡς ὄντα) – is most adequately explained as a gloss of Gen. 17:5, which Paul just quoted in v. 17a, and particularly as a gloss of God's use of the perfect tense within that quote. That is, God claimed "I *have* established [τέθεικα] you father of many nations," though he had not yet actualized even one child, let alone "many nations." But Abraham believed in this God who "called the non-existent things [*sc*. no-children and no-nations] *as* [ὡς] the existent things [*sc*. the already established 'many nations']." This construal makes the best sense out of both Paul's language and context. Yet even though Rom. 4:17c is not a reference directly to God's act of creation, God's assumed enactment of this "call" can certainly be *compared* to a creative act. Indeed, in his letter to the Corinthians Paul himself unites childbirth (to which he is referring in Rom. 4:17c) to the creation account of Genesis 1–2, putting both under the same rubric of the all-powerful causation of the Creator: "all things are from God" (1 Cor. 11:12; cf. vv. 7–12).[10]

---

[8] Many derive creation from Rom. 4:17c: e.g., Becker, 2007, 165, 167, 168; Wright, 2002, 498; Adams, 2002, 35; Schwarz, 2002, 168; Byrne, 1996, 159–60; Haffner, 1995, 47; Stuhlmacher, 1994, 74; Witherington, 1994, 233; Ziesler, 1989, 132; Dunn, 1988, 236–37; Käsemann, 1980, 122–23; Cranfield, 1975, 244–45. This is critiqued by, e.g., Schreiner, 1998, 237; Moo, 1996, 282; Morris, 1985, 209; Murray, 1959, 146–47; Sanday and Headlam, 1896, 107.

[9] Contra Murphy-O'Connor, 1978A, 253–67, who argues against a creational understanding of 1 Cor. 8:6 (cf. Kuschel, 1992, esp. 285–91). His treatment has not been well received by many: cf., e.g., Thiselton, 2000, 635–38; Fee, 2007, 90 n. 15; Cox, 2005, 172; Dunn, 1998B, 267.

[10] Ironically, it is only when one understands Rom. 4:17c as a gloss of Abraham's situation to which God spoke that a greater ultimacy of "nothingness" (and consequently of God's affect on it) may be derived from Paul's use of it here than otherwise could be derived if this were a direct reference to creation itself. In the ancient world, creation of "non-being into being" typically did not assume an ultimate or absolute "nothing" (*nihil*): see 2 Mac. 7:28a (cf. v. 28b and v. 23 with v. 28a); Plato, *Soph*. 265c; Philo: *Spec*. 4.187; *Migr*. 183; *Mos*. 2.100 (though these references in Philo should be compared with his use of an ultimate "nothing" in *Plant*. 7; *Somn*. 1.63–64; *Mos*. 2.267). So e.g., May, 1994 (on Philo specifically see pp. 9–21); cf. Radice, 2009, 144–45; Schwarz, 2002, 173; Runia,

Neither 1 Cor. 8:6 nor Rom. 4:17c betrays a treatment of a specific text of Genesis. Therefore, although general ideas about Paul's view of creation can be either exegeted or derived from these confessions, Paul's specific *reading* of the creation text cannot be discerned from either. Yet these two have been the most common texts of discussion when contemplating Paul's view of creation.

Recently, P. Bouteneff set himself to analyze "how Paul might have understood creation and how that understanding may be derived from aspects of the Hexaemeron [i.e., 'six day,' Genesis 1] account."[11] Though he feels unable to attribute to Paul "a fully formed 'theology of creation'," Bouteneff does see certain aspects of Paul's reading of Genesis as highly significant, "groundbreaking," "seminal."[12] But on actual analysis of Paul's understanding of Genesis 1 itself, he too only mentions Rom. 4:17c and 1 Cor. 8:6.[13] In fact, the main significance Bouteneff presents in Paul's interpretation of creation actually does not have to do with the creation of the world, but with the fallen person of Adam.[14]

Because of the enormous scope of Bouteneff's task, he cannot be faulted with treating only a few carefully selected passages in Paul.[15] (Faults within his conclusions based upon his few texts, however, can be found – see below.) I single out Bouteneff because his claims of what is

---

2001, 152–53 (cf. *idem*, 1986, 289); Fergusson, 1998, 12; Clifford and Collins, 1992, 13 (cf. Clifford, 1994, 141); Sacks, 1990, 4; Goldstein, 1983, 307; Winston, 1979, 38–40; Wolfson, 1947, 1.300–10.

The result of this general setting of the use of "nothing" in Paul's day is that if Rom. 4:17c actually were a direct reference to creation itself, we would not know whether "non-being" was ultimate or not, and the thought context of Paul's broader time-period would tempt us toward a non-ultimate "nothing." But since "non-being things" (an interesting plural) refers to the non-existence of children – which is absolute – had by Abraham and Sarah, God's relationship to *that* "non-being" should be seen as more ultimate than his relationship to the "nothing" or "non-being" of other explicitly creational contexts. Granted, Paul's reference is still not to the actual divine *activity* of bringing nations into being, but rather to his claim in Gen. 17:5. But Paul surely believes that what gives God's "call" power is the fact that God then *caused* what he claimed. Thus Paul's understanding of *God's causation*, a causation which in this context brings an *absolute* "non-being" into "being" exactly as he claims – an understanding that can be *derived* from Rom. 4:17c – is ironically closer to a robust view of *creatio ex nihilo* than would be discernible if Paul were explicitly speaking in Rom. 4:17c of God's activity in Genesis 1–2.

[11] Bouteneff, 2008, 36.

[12] Bouteneff, 2008, 33.

[13] Bouteneff, 2008, 37–38.

[14] Bouteneff, 2008, 33, 38–43.

[15] Bouteneff analyzes the "ancient Christian readings of the biblical creation narratives" from the creation texts themselves, through their use in OT, early Jewish, and NT writings, through Tertullian, Origen, and the Cappadocian fathers, finally ending with Gregory of Nyssa in the 390s CE.

desired do demonstrate what has been lacking, even though this deficit continues in his own work. He wanted to demonstrate "how Paul might have understood creation" (which, like others, he did only through 1 Cor. 8:6 and Rom. 4:17c) and "how that may be derived from aspects of the Hexaemeron account." I agree that the latter is particularly desirable, but even Bouteneff's treatment leaves a wide door of opportunity into which this present study will enter in detail. A full-length discussion of Paul's interpretation of the creation of the world will simultaneously challenge the broad generalizations regarding Paul's lack of regard for the original creation and add understanding where it has merely been lacking. In chapter 2, "The Beginning of the World," I seek to provide just such a fuller analysis of Paul's reading of God's creation of the cosmos according to Genesis 1. This will also have the benefit of providing Paul's own broader hermeneutical framework for his understanding of God's more particular creation of Adam and humanity.

Some treatments of Paul's more specific view of Adam (rather than of creation as a whole) sound a similar tone to Reumann's and Witherington's mentioned above. While it is true that Robin Scroggs (among many others) has offered the brief idea, deduced from Rom. 3:23, that like many of his contemporaries Paul acknowledges a "glory once enjoyed by Adam,"[16] even this verdict is tempered by this perspective:[17]

> Taken with the events of Christ and the church, Paul is directly concerned with the new creation which God is bringing to man and the cosmos. He is only secondarily interested in the old creation which is passing away.

What this subordination of interest – "secondarily interested" – means for Scroggs comes out in his subsequent practical approach and then in his confession. In practice, when Scroggs expounds the "old creation" he only discusses the post-sin creation, thereby not showing much of an interest himself in Paul's view of Adam (or creation) before sin.

This approach to Paul's view of Adam is reminiscent of C.K. Barrett's practice only a few years prior. Barrett thought it important "to ask what Saul the Jew will have made of the figure of Adam," but he then began his own search with Paul's understanding of "the myth of Eden" regarding the "Fall" rather than of the prior creation of Adam. Even though Barrett considered his research to have "traced [Paul's] story from its beginning,"[18] Paul's "beginning" was "when Man upset the balance of God's creation" and how "creation is *now* perverted and subjected to vanity; the reign of

[16] Scroggs, 1966, 73 (cf. 73 n. 42). Cf. Dunn, 1980: "By virtue of his creation in the image of God [Adam] was given a share in the glory of God, the visible splendor of God's power as Creator" (102).

[17] Scroggs, 1966, 72 (on the new creation see pp. 61–72). Cf. Whiteley, 1964, 17.

[18] Barrett, 1962, 92.

evil beings."[19] But what about *before* Adam's disobedience and his introduction of cosmic disaster? Is Paul interested? Though Scroggs is surely right that "the context of Paul's whole theology indicates that the Apostle wrestles mightily with Gen. 1–3,"[20] in practice he, like Barrett, only really looks at Paul's view of the Adam of Genesis 3 in any depth.

Barrett himself had presented not many more than two general comments concerning Paul's view of pre-sin Adam: "Adam was created by God for life,"[21] and Adam had "minor sovereignty" (i.e., over animals).[22] Barrett's confession was clear, however, about what Paul did *not* claim about the pre-sin Adam: "the first man, Adam, is *never* said by Paul to bear the image of God."[23] (It should be noted that this claim was more easily asserted since Barrett judged that 1 Cor. 11:7 was simply "not relevant" to his study of what Paul "will have made of the figure of Adam,"[24] even though that passage is built on the assumption that the man of Genesis 2 – i.e., Adam – *was* precisely "God's image and glory"; see chapter 3 below).

In a similar manner to Barrett, even though Scroggs mentions in passing the glory which Adam must have enjoyed prior to his sin, in confession he is confident of Paul's attitude toward the pre-sinful Adam:[25]

> The Apostle is consistently *silent* about Adam's status prior to his sin. The reason for this must be… that Paul knows *only* Christ as the exhibition of God's intent for man and thus has *nothing* to say about what Adam was before the fall or might have been had he not sinned.

Again Scroggs confesses: "*Nowhere* in [Paul's] Epistles is Adam the perfect man before his sin. Paul knows *only* the Adam of sin and death."[26] Paul "knows *only*" the sinful Adam and "knows *only*" Christ as "the exhibition of God's intent." One may wonder if Paul's ignorance of the pre-sin (i.e., the created) Adam is due to a lack of contemplating Genesis 1–2 – despite Scroggs' earlier (unsubstantiated) claim that he can discern in Paul's letters a "mighty wrestling" with Genesis 1–3 – or is due to Paul seeing God's creation of Adam in Genesis 1–2 as sinful and not exhibiting "God's intent." The former is more likely the case for Scroggs, though he does not draw out the implications of these bold claims.

A similar analysis of Paul's view of Adam can be found in S. Kim. Parallel to Barrett and Scroggs, Kim also points to a primary negativity to-

---

[19] Barrett, 1962, 13.
[20] Scroggs, 1966, 97–98.
[21] Barrett, 1962, 19.
[22] Barrett, 1962, 88.
[23] Barrett, 1962, 88 (emphasis added).
[24] Barrett, 1962, 97.
[25] Scroggs, 1966, 91 (emphasis added); cf. p. 59.
[26] Scroggs, 1966, 100 (emphasis added). Cf. Dunn, 1973, 136 (and 136 n. 28).

ward Adam in Paul's writings, but he actually does tie this attitude more closely to Paul's reading of a pre-sin text. Kim writes:[27]

> For Paul Adam is *always* a sinner. For him Adam means simply the fallen first man. He knows no glorious Adam before his fall as some Rabbis fantastically depicted. What Adam was before his fall *does not interest him*. In contrast to Christ in whom Paul saw the image and glory of God and the eternal life restored, Adam is from the beginning the fallen *Stammvater* [i.e., progenitor] of fallen humanity. That is why even in Gen 2.7 Paul can see only the ignoble, weak and mortal Adam.

Does this mean that Paul saw Gen. 2:7 as God's creation of a "fallen first man," a "sinner"? In harmony with Barrett's and Scroggs' presentation of Paul's view of the creation of Adam and with Reumann's and Witherington's presentation of Paul's view of the creation of the world, Kim does not think that Paul "knows" or is "interested in" the pre-sin creation. Not only does Paul say nothing but he even "knows" nothing about Adam as a good created human.

James Dunn argues that "Adam plays a larger role in Paul's theology than is usually realized…. Adam is a key figure in Paul's attempt to express his understanding both of Christ and of man."[28] Adam-Christology is "one of the principal load-bearing beams in the superstructure of Pauline Christology."[29] Paul's pervasive "in Christ" language is even essentially connected to his Adam-Christology.[30] Dunn writes, "Adam christology can thus be seen to form an extensive feature in Paul's theology. More importantly, it provides an integrating framework both for Paul's christology and for his entire gospel."[31] In light of this (extreme) importance attributed to Paul's use of Adam for his theology, it certainly would seem "necessary," as Dunn argues, "to trace *the extent of the Adam motif* in Paul if we are to appreciate the force of his Adam christology."[32]

Before one gets too excited about the prospect of someone actually tracing "the extent of the Adam motif" in Paul, however, G. Fee counters that "neither the nature nor the extent of so-called Adam Christology is a matter on which all are agreed."[33] While critical of a "maximalist" recognition

---

[27] Kim, 1980, 264 n. 1 (emphasis added).

[28] Dunn, 1980, 101; affirmed by van Kooten, 2008, 70.

[29] Dunn, 1998A, 231.

[30] Dunn, 1998A, 233; cf. Ridderbos, 1975, 60–61.

[31] Dunn, 1998A, 233. Cf. Black, 1954: "The Second Adam doctrine provided St Paul with the scaffolding, if not the basic structure, for his redemption and resurrection christology" (173; also quoted with favour by Dunn, 1980, 308 n. 39).

[32] Dunn, 1980, 101 (emphasis added).

[33] Fee, 2007, 513. Even more critically, Fee writes of the "overblown emphasis on a so-called Adam Christology" which "goes considerably beyond the biblical account itself and thus takes Paul's Christology where Paul himself does not go" (272).

of "Adam Christology" represented by Dunn (as well as by N.T. Wright),[34] but also of a "minimalist" approach that only sees Adam in Paul's three explicit uses of his name (1 Cor. 15:21–22, 45–47, and Rom. 5:12–21), Fee dubs his approach "middling" and includes Paul's references to "image" in 1 Cor. 15:49, 2 Cor. 3:18, 4:4–6, and Rom. 8:29. Fee adds that Paul's notions of "new creation," "image of God," and "second Adam" are "so important" as an aspect of "Pauline soteriology."[35]

Yet even Dunn's "maximalist" and Fee's "middling" approaches to Paul's concept of Adam leave a lot to be desired for a treatment of Paul's understanding of the original creation of humanity. It is not surprising that Fee does not deal with 1 Cor. 11:7–12 at all, for while it is protological (and pre-sin) it is not Christological, and his task is specifically Christological. Fee does briefly mention a general loss or "distortion" of the divine image by Adam.[36] But the only other hint which Fee gives toward Paul's understanding of the original Adam or creation regard his brief statements about 1 Cor. 15:49: "the goal of the first creation will be finally realized in the second"[37] and the "ultimate goal of salvation" is "re-creation into the divine image."[38] While this may be true, because this "Adamic" aspect of Fee's study does not engage much with Paul's view of the *first* Adam it presents a wide berth for a study that does.

In Dunn's tracing of "the extent of the Adam motif" in Paul, he argues that "Paul's understanding of man as he now is is heavily influenced by the narratives about Adam in Gen. 1–3."[39] This is reminiscent of Scroggs' assertion (see above). Although Dunn had previously and self-consciously followed Scroggs in claiming that "it is the risen Jesus who is the image of God, *not* any *Urmensch*, let alone the first Adam"[40] and that "Adam in Paul is *always* fallen man,"[41] his subsequent work seems to take more account of what Paul actually writes (or at least implies) about the pre-sin Adam. Adam is one of Paul's metaphors for "man's salvation,"[42] and that salvation, as Dunn summarizes it, is "the fashioning or reshaping of the believer

---

[34] Fee, 2007, 513–14. See Dunn, 1980, 98–128; *idem*, 1998B, 199–204; Wright, 1992, 18–40, 57–62, 90–97. Fee's comments here are also approved and somewhat employed by van Kooten, 2008, 70–71.

[35] Fee, 2007, 486.

[36] Fee, 2007, 114–19 (on "Jesus as Second Adam" in 1 Corinthians), 486.

[37] Fee, 2007, 119. On 2 Cor. 3:18, 4:4, 6 see pp. 180–85, and on "Jesus as Second Adam" in Romans see pp. 271–72.

[38] Fee, 2007, 484–88.

[39] Dunn, 1980, 101.

[40] Dunn, 1973, 136 (quoting Scroggs, 1966, 91, at 136 n. 28).

[41] Dunn, 1973, 136 n. 28.

[42] See Dunn, 1980, 101–13.

into the image of God."[43] For Paul's pre-sin Adam Dunn deduces harmony with and knowledge of God (Rom. 1:18–25),[44] glory (Rom. 3:23),[45] and image-bearing (1 Cor. 15:49; 2 Cor. 3:18; Col. 3:10; Eph. 4:24).[46] Dunn even almost takes into consideration 1 Cor. 11:7 in relation to this last observation, but he then relegates it to an "untypical" thought of Paul.[47] (Dealing with 1 Cor. 11:7 in more detail, as we will in chapter 3, actually would have helped Dunn in this particular task of analyzing "the extent of the Adam motif in Paul").

Dunn thus draws out of various Pauline phrases more implications for Paul's view of the pre-sin Adam than many others had done. Yet Dunn's claim to have "examined the influence *of the creation* and fall narratives on Paul's understanding of man"[48] still leaves significant room for an even fuller treatment of what Paul thinks about God's creation of Adam. Dunn's portrayal of Paul's view of pre-sin Adam certainly allows for deeper exploration of how this aspect of the Beginning relates to Paul's broader reading of God's creation of the entire world according to Genesis 1.

Bouteneff treats Paul's understanding of Adam as well. As we saw above, Bouteneff's treatment of Paul's reading of the Hexaemeron account as a whole turned out to be more limited than even he had expressly desired.[49] With Paul's understanding of Adam too, Bouteneff only briefly explores Paul's more particular interpretation of Adam *as created,* dealing only with Paul's use of Gen. 2:7c in 1 Cor. 15:45. There Bouteneff shows how Paul contrasts the man made from dust with Christ, and he concludes (helpfully) that "our resurrection in immortality is neither bodiless nor ours by right or by nature but is entirely ['in Christ']."[50] After this one statement, however, and in line with the emphasis in Barrett, Scroggs, Kim, Dunn, and Fee, Bouteneff mainly treats Paul's use of Adam as a sinner. Such an *emphasis* in each interpreter is legitimate enough, for the majority (i.e., two out of three) of Paul's explicit uses of "Adam" by name (1 Cor. 15:21–22 and Rom. 5:12–21) do treat him as the bringer of the sinful sting of death. But the claims that are then made concerning Paul's view of Adam, claims that are based on incomplete treatments of what Paul writes, tend to outrun the noted evidence and run in the wrong direction in relation to the wider evidence.

---

[43] Dunn, 1980, 105. Cf. Fee's "ultimate goal of salvation" as "re-creation into the divine image" (2007, 484–88).

[44] Dunn, 1980, 101.

[45] Dunn, 1980, 102–03, 106 (cf. *idem,* 1988, 1.178–79; *idem,* 1998A, 231–32).

[46] Dunn, 1980, 105.

[47] Dunn, 1980, 105, 308 n. 31.

[48] Dunn, 1980, 105.

[49] Bouteneff, 2008, 36.

[50] Bouteneff, 2008, 44; see 43–44.

To give another example of this last criticism, Bouteneff draws a conclusion that harmonizes with the chorus above (i.e., with Barrett, Scroggs, early Dunn, and Kim) concerning Paul's understanding of the pre-sin beginning in Adam:[51]

> [*R*]*ather than* Adam being a model or image for humanity or even the first real human being, it is Christ who is both. Christ is the first true human being, and *Christ is the image of God and the model for Adam*. Indeed, there is *no* mention of the person of Adam as created in God's image. Genesis 1:26 and 2:7 are distinct for him: Paul's Adam is *not* so much the first human being as he is the first human to sin.

Bouteneff appears to qualify this last statement. He admits that Paul "sees that the human person is in God's image (1 Cor. 11:7)." But he immediately counters that even so "Paul does not write of Adam as glorious or image-bearing but, *rather*, as the 'man of dust' (1 Cor. 15:47)."[52] Bouteneff adds another falsely dichotomized alternative (used by Barrett, Scroggs, Dunn, and Kim; see above): *rather* than Adam being "glorious or image-bearing," for Paul "it is *Christ* who is the image of God (Col. 1:15; Heb. 1:3) and to whose image humanity must conform (Rom. 8:29)."[53]

It is true that the goal and hope of a Christian is to be conformed to Christ's "image" and not to that of the first Adam (1 Cor. 15:49, see chapter 3). But does Paul's labeling of Christ's status as "image of God" or of Adam's status as "man of dust" really imply that Adam, in his creation, was thereby for Paul *not* "glorious or image-bearing"? This question (among others) is best answered by a more robust engagement with Paul's material than has heretofore been presented, an engagement that takes into consideration Paul's complex and diversely-related comments as well as the sacred source upon which he bases them.

How is this study related to other attempts to understand Paul's view of creation? As seen above, some scholars hail the fruitfulness of exploring Paul's view of the creation of Adam and of the world while others imply that such a pursuit would be futile. The lack of detail in any of these scholars mentioned above regarding Paul's full treatment of either the beginning of humanity or of the beginning of the world opens the way for the usefulness of the present study. Paul's language of creation in his letters to the Corinthian and Roman Christians suggests more than has been previously offered, and it corrects or qualifies what many have proposed. Yet it is not only the case that a fuller engagement with Paul's own language of creation will be of such benefit. As I will now argue, it is also the case that a comparison between Paul's somewhat scattered treatments of scriptural texts of creation and the contemporary but more formal and systematic

---

[51] Bouteneff, 2008, 45 (emphasis added).
[52] Bouteneff, 2008, 45 (emphasis added).
[53] Bouteneff, 2008, 45 (emphasis original).

treatments of the same creational texts by Philo of Alexandria can help us recognize, highlight, and analyze important and intertwined complexities in Paul's perspectives on creation.

Paul as a Reader of Scripture in Comparison with Philo

The mention of a comparison between Paul's and Philo's readings of creation raises our second question: why are we approaching this fuller treatment of Paul's understanding of creation in such a manner? In general, studying Paul's interpretation of scripture is helpful for interpreting his thought. He often refers to scripture as proof of a point and he often shapes a particular statement on a (or some) text(s). So, for example, regarding the relationship between Paul's scripture interpretation and his Christology, Francis Watson rightly explains: "In Paul, scripture is not overwhelmed by the light of an autonomous Christ-event needing no scriptural mediation. It is scripture that shapes the contours of the Christ-event."[54] In this regard, and with a particular eye toward our specific purpose, even though Christ is much more important to Paul than is Adam, nevertheless Paul can explain *Christ* as "the last *Adam*" (1 Cor. 15:45). This is a textual claim as well as a Christological one; it is virtually meaningless without the knowledge of what, for example, "Adam" means for Paul.

Paul and Philo share a common footing when standing up to announce their perspectives to their own readers. Concerning both men, the Jewish scripture "condition[s] [their] perception of the world"[55] and is "the 'determinate subtext that plays a constitutive role' in shaping [their] literary production" as well.[56] In light of this, a deep engagement with their readings is necessary for discerning their views of reality.[57]

Though it is generally agreed that Philo is important to an understanding of NT interpretation, the exact relationship between Philo, Paul, their writings, and some sort of shared background is still debated.[58] Some have

[54] Watson, 2004, 17.

[55] Hays, 1989, 16 (also quoted favorably in Watson, 2004, 17–18).

[56] Hays, 1989, 18.

[57] Watson (2004) rightly observes that Paul's interpretation is a two-way street, "an interaction rather than a unilinear movement" (5), that "the Christ who sheds light on scripture is also and above all the Christ on whom scripture simultaneously sheds its own light" (17; see 14–17). Throughout this study I will demonstrate this sort of reciprocal hermeneutic; my present emphasis on the direction from scripture to Christ and reality does not undercut the importance of the return direction.

[58] Since a fuller bibliography and engagement with various studies will be found throughout our study, a mere sample of recent applicable scholarship will be listed here. For Philo as generally important for NT and Pauline studies cf. Hurtado, 2004, 73–92 (on