TYLER A. STEWART

The Origin and Persistence of Evil in Galatians

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe
566

Mohr Siebeck

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament · 2. Reihe

566

Tyler A. Stewart

The Origin and Persistence of Evil in Galatians

Mohr Siebeck

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

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

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

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

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

Printed in Germany.

Margo, you remind me of all that is good.

Preface

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

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

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

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

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

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

Monticello, IL Tyler A. Stewart
December 2020

Table of Contents

Chapter 1

Introduction

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ed."[6] The fluidity of the concept requires clarification for the purposes of this study.

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

---

[6] Chris Tilling, "Paul, Evil, and Justification Debates," in *Evil in Second Temple Judaism and Early Christianity*, 190.

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

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

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

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

---

[10] F. C. Porter, "The 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: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1987); Jon D. Levenson, *Creation and the Persistence of Evil: The Jewish Drama of Divine Omnipotence* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1988); Antti Laato and Johannes Cornelis de Moor, eds., *Theodicy in the World of the Bible* (Leiden: Brill, 2003); Yair Hoffman and Henning Reventlow, eds., *The Problem of Evil and Its Symbols in Jewish and Christian Tradition*, JSOTSupp 366 (London: T&T Clark International, 2004); Crenshaw, *Defending God*; Gary Anderson, *Sin: A History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009); Ryan E. Stokes, "Rebellious Angels and Malicious Spirits: Explanations of Evil in the Enochic and Related Literature" (PhD diss., Yale University, 2010); J. Harold Ellen, ed., *Explaining Evil*, 3 vols. (Santa Barbara: Praeger, 2011); Paula Fredriksen, *Sin: The Early History of an Idea* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012); Brand, *Evil Within and Without*; Igal German, *The Fall Reconsidered: A Literary Synthesis of the Primeval Sin Narratives against the Backdrop of the History of Exegesis* (Eugene: Pickwick Publications, 2016); Jan Dochhorn, Susanne Rudnig-Zelt, and Benjamin G. Wold, eds., *Das Böse, der Teufel und Dämonen/Evil, the Devil, and Demons*, WUNT 2.412 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016); Fabienne Jourdan and Rainer Hirsch-Luipold, eds., *Die Wurzel allen Übels: Vorstellungen über die Herkunft des Bösen und Schlechten in der Philosophie und Religion des 1.–4. Jahrhunderts*, STAC 91 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014); Keith and Stuckenbruck, eds., *Evil in Second Temple Judaism and Early Christianity*; Joseph Lam, *Patterns of Sin in the Hebrew Bible: Metaphor, Culture, and the Making of a Religious Concept* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2016); Götte, *Von den Wächtern zu Adam*; Mark S. Smith, *The Genesis of Good and Evil: The Fall(out) and Original Sin in the Bible* (Lousiville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2019); Ryan E. Stokes, *The Satan: How God's Executioner Became the Enemy* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2019).

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

Close analysis of Paul's argument in Galatians reveals that both approaches to evil are inadequate. Regarding the first option, I argue that the dominance of Adamic tradition in Pauline theology is an oversimplification resulting from a myopic focus. Paul's view of the origin of evil is not solely dependent on Adamic tradition, as is commonly thought. Like many Second Temple Jews, Paul was influenced by Enochic traditions. Although generally unnoticed, I argue that Enochic tradition is prevalent in Galatians, especially Gal 3:19–4:11.[11] Part of the reason that Pauline scholars have not noticed the Enochic material in Galatians is because there is an assumed dichotomy between Adamic and Enochic traditions as separate templates in the scholarship on Second Temple Judaism.[12] The oversimplified concentration on Adamic

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

[14] Galatians is the only book in the New Testament to mention the word Ἰουδαϊσμός, typically translated "Judaism" (Gal 1:13, 14). This is not to discount the importance of the term Ἰουδαῖος which occurs 195 times in the NT, 24 of which are found in the Pauline corpus (Rom 1:16; 2:9, 10, 17, 28, 29; 3:1, 9, 29; 9:24; 10:12; 1 Cor 1:22, 23, 24; 9:20[x3]; 10:32; 12:13; 2 Cor 11:24; Gal 2:13, 14, 15, 28; Col 3:11; 1 Thess 2:14). Additionally, Paul is vehemently opposed to those who desire to compel the Galatians "to Judaize [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.

[15] 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 Cate-

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

[19] *Drudgery Divine*, 38.

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

1.1 Bultmann vs Käsemann: Anthropology or Cosmology

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

[28] Ernst Käsemann, "On Paul's Anthropology," in *Perspectives on Paul*, trans. Margaret Kohl (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971), 1–31, here 12 "Little can be said against Bultmann's attempt to present theology in the light of anthropology … especially when it proves so fruitful." This article was originally written in 1969 but similar appreciation of Bultmann's anthropological interpretation of Paul is already in Käsemann, "On the Subject of Primitive Christian Apocalyptic," in *New Testament Questions of Today*, trans. W. J. Montague (London: SCM Press, 1969), 108–37, here 131–32. This essay was originally published in 1962 as "Zum Thema der christlichen 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), 118–36.

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.2 The Adamic Template in Pauline Scholarship

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

---

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

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

[33] On the false dichotomy between cosmology and anthropology see: Emma Wasserman, *The Death of the Soul in Romans 7: Sin, Death, and the Law in light of Hellenistic Moral Psychology*, WUNT 2.256 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 51–60; James P. Davies, "Evil's Aetiology and False Dichotomies in Jewish Apocalyptic and Paul," in *Evil in Second Temple Judaism and Early Christianity*, 169–89.

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

Index of Ancient Sources

Hebrew Bible

Septuagint/Deuterocanonical Books

Old Testament Pseudepigrapha

New Testament

Dead Sea Scrolls

Philo

Josephus

Rabbinic Literature

Early Christian Literature

Graeco–Roman Authors

Index of Authors

Index of Subjects