

THE ORIGIN OF SIN IN IRENAEUS AND JEWISH
APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE

THE ORIGIN OF SIN IN IRENAEUS AND JEWISH
APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE

By

DONALD ROBERT SCHULTZ, A.B., M.A.

A Thesis

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies
in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements
for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

McMaster University

November, 1972

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (1972)
(Religion)

McMASTER UNIVERSITY
Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: The Origin of Sin in Irenaeus and Jewish Apocalyptic Literature

AUTHOR: Donald Robert Schultz, A.B. (Gonzaga University)
Lic. Phil. (Gonzaga University)
M.A. Theol. (Santa Clara University)
M.A. Rel. Sc. (McMaster University)

SUPERVISOR: Professor E. P. Sanders

NUMBER OF PAGES: ix, 196

SCOPE AND CONTENTS:

The thesis contends that Irenaeus depended directly and indirectly on an earlier Jewish tradition both for his interpretation of New Testament texts and for the final formulation of his own ideas on sin and its origin.

This earlier Jewish tradition is substantially available to us in the "Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament". Irenaeus drew on these writings as a hermeneutical key to the sense of Biblical texts. For him the Old Testament Apocrypha belonged to the Biblical canon, but the thesis mainly focuses on pseudepigraphal material which even from Irenaeus' standpoint was non-Biblical. The motifs from this literature which shaped his thinking about sin and its origin were apocalyptic.

The lines of argument establishing the thesis are various. The two principal lines turn, respectively, on (a) Irenaeus' explicit use of motifs peculiar to pseudepigraphal texts, and (b) the implicit use of such motifs in interpreting canonical Biblical passages. Thus, the thesis is

essentially a study in the history of ideas. There is, however, a third, supportive line of argument which belongs to literary criticism as such: There are a few instances in which it appears likely that there is a direct literary relationship between Irenaeus and one of the pseudepigrapha. The proof must remain tentative, since in even the best cases only Latin translations of Irenaeus and the pseudepigraphal writing are available, although Irenaeus wrote in Greek and probably read the pseudepigrapha in a Greek version. In these instances, however, it is possible at least to compare Latin translation with Latin translation in noting the verbal and other similarities. In other instances, in which the pseudepigraphal text being compared is extant only Syriac, Ethiopic, or Slavonic, or in which Irenaeus' writing is extant only in Armenian, the English translations are used. (In general, standard English translations of both Irenaeus and his pseudepigraphal sources are used in the thesis, in accord with the nature of its principal purposes and arguments.)

The thesis does not aim at providing a new view of the meaning of sin in the theology of Irenaeus, although the role of sin in Irenaeus' thought is necessarily analyzed in the course of the thesis. The most recent scholarly treatments of Irenaeus' doctrine of recapitulation and of the place and significance of Satan, Adam, and sin in that doctrine are seen to be accurate and satisfactory, although correction may be possible on one or two individual points. The intention of the thesis, however, is only to identify the sources of Irenaeus' various statements about the origin of sin rather than to offer a new interpretation of

Irenaeus' theology.

Though the thesis explicitly concludes only to Irenaeus' dependence on the pseudepigrapha for his thinking about sin and its origin, it raises the question of how dependent on such sources was the entire body of patristic thought which culminated in Augustine's formulation of "original sin".

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis would not have been attempted nor completed if it were not for the kindly assistance which I received during three years of graduate study and the following period of research and composition. I am greatly indebted to my supervisor, Dr. E. P. Sanders, who has not only directed my dissertation but has introduced me into the vast area of study out of which this thesis comes. His influence upon this work and my future study will always be recognized and appreciated.

An atmosphere which leads to serious and fruitful study is a necessary condition of graduate work. I am thankful for such an atmosphere which was created by all my teachers, advisors, and colleagues. Particularly, do I appreciate the great contribution of Dr. George P. Grant who is not only eminently qualified in the field of education, but also has superlative capabilities to advise and encourage students toward academic goals.

Further needs that one has in a university are of a different order, and to the Ontario provincial government and McMaster University I am most grateful. Without their financial assistance in the form of scholarships and teaching fellowships graduate study would have been impossible. Even with this generous aid, it was necessary for me and my family to depend upon the beneficent largess of William Shannon Parrish to provide needed funds and encouragement that I might complete what I had begun.

There are also clerical and editorial needs that one has in the endeavor of a thesis. Such work does not seem to have the natural rewards which are afforded an author and therefore should be granted deserving recognition. Among the many persons who have given me this needed assistance, I single out Elaine Jones, Susan Phillips, and Richard Mulvaney to be recipients of my most grateful appreciation.

Finally, I must give thanks to a very loving wife who has endured, during the past six years, many hardships on my account and for my sake.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION.....	1
I. HISTORY OF SIN AND ITS ORIGIN.....	7
Sin in the Old Testament - Pre-Exilic Period.....	7
Exilic Period.....	9
Post-Exilic Period.....	10
Theories of the Origin of Sin in the Intertestamental Period.....	13
The Watcher Theory.....	14
The Watchers and the Deluge.....	22
The Adam Theory.....	25
The Fall Development.....	33
The Yetzer Theory.....	36
Summary.....	42
Sin and its Origin in the New Testament.....	46
The Source of Irenaeus's Thought on Sin and its Origin.....	54
II. SIN AND RECAPITULATION.....	60
III. EXALTED AND SINFUL ADAM.....	70
Adam's Creation in the Image and Likeness.....	70
Adam in Bondage.....	79
Recapitulation.....	84
The Relationship between Adam's Sin and its Effects.....	90
Irenaeus and St. Paul.....	95
Corporate Sin "in Adam".....	102
Irenaeus and Apocalyptic on the "Pain of the Stroke".....	106
The Skill of God and Individual Responsibility in Irenaeus and 2 Baruch.....	109
Exalted and Glorious Adam.....	113
Eve's Culpability in Irenaeus and Apocalyptic Writings.....	118
IV. SATAN AND HIS ANGELS.....	124
The Apostasy of the Angels.....	124
The Means of Apostasy and its Effects.....	129
Irenaeus's Use of Apocalyptic "Seven Heavens".....	132
Irenaeus and the Apocalyptic Chain of Apostasy.....	137
"Unlawful Unions" and "Giants" in Irenaeus and Apocalyptic Literature.....	141
I Enoch and Irenaeus on Evil Teachings.....	145
Irenaeus's Apocalyptic Cause for the Deluge.....	148
I Enoch and Irenaeus on the "Fires of Hell".....	152

	Page
V. THE FUSION OF THE PARADISE NARRATIVE AND THE ANGELIC FALL STORY..	157
The Fusion.....	157
The Instrumentality of the Serpent in Irenaeus and Apocalyptic Literature.....	162
Irenaeus's Apocalyptic Cause (Envy) for Satan's Fall.....	166
VI. CONCLUSION.....	171
APPENDIX I.....	176
APPENDIX II.....	185
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	187
Sources.....	187
Books.....	189
Periodicals.....	194

ABBREVIATIONS

<u>A.H.</u>	Adversus Haereses
<u>CD</u>	The Damascus Document (Qumran Scroll)
<u>CBQ</u>	Catholic Biblical Quarterly
<u>ch.</u>	(plural, chs. or cc.) chapter
<u>Dial.</u>	Dialogue with Trypho
<u>DThC</u>	Dictionnaire de théologie Catholique
<u>HTR</u>	Harvard Theological Review
<u>HUCA</u>	Hebrew Union College Annual
<u>Ido-c</u>	Information Documentation on the Conciliar Church
<u>Irenaeus</u>	Hitchcock, <u>Irenaeus of Lugdunum</u> (see Bibliography)
<u>JTS</u>	Journal of Theological Studies
<u>LTTA</u>	Hitchcock, "Loof's Theory of Theophilus of Antioch as a source of Irenaeus" (see Bibliography)
<u>LA</u>	Robbin Scroggs, <u>The Last Adam</u> (see Bibliography)
<u>NTR</u>	Nouvelle revue théologique
<u>NTS</u>	New Testament Studies
<u>pref.</u>	preface
<u>LXX</u>	Septuagint
<u>IQH</u>	The Thanksgiving Psalms (Qumran Scroll)
<u>IQM</u>	The War Scroll (Qumran Scroll)
<u>IQS</u>	The Manual of Discipline (Qumran Scroll)
<u>REG</u>	Revue des Etudes grecques
<u>RHPR</u>	Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuse
<u>Rom</u>	Robbin Scroggs, "Romans VI, 7" (see Bibliography)
<u>RSR</u>	Recherches de Science Religieuse
<u>RSPhTh</u>	Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques
<u>RSV</u>	Revised Standard Version of the <u>Oxford Annotated Bible with the Apocrypha</u> (see Bibliography)
<u>SC</u>	Sources Chretienne
<u>Schulbetrieb</u>	W. Bouisset, <u>Judisch - Christlicher Schulbetrieb in Alexandria und Rom</u>
<u>SCM</u>	Student Christian Movement Press
<u>SJT</u>	Scottish Journal of Theology
<u>SPCK</u>	Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge
<u>Test.</u>	Testament of
<u>Benj.</u>	Benjamin
<u>Iss.</u>	Issachar
<u>Jos.</u>	Joseph
<u>Jud.</u>	Judah
<u>Naph.</u>	Naphtali
<u>Reub.</u>	Reuben
<u>Zeb.</u>	Zebulun
<u>ThLZ</u>	Theologische Literaturzeitung
<u>tr.; trans.</u>	translator; translated by; translation
<u>ZKT</u>	Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie
<u>ZThK</u>	Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche
<u>ZWTh</u>	Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie

INTRODUCTION

Drawing upon Jewish heritage and faced with doctrinal and philosophical problems of its day, the Christian Church formulated a doctrine called "original sin". From a certain perspective, the formation of this doctrine appears as a gradual process extending from the earliest days of Israelite history to the fourth century A.D., when Augustine finally coined the term originale peccatum.¹ Some elements which eventually went into this doctrine are found in the earliest pages of the Old Testament, but these elements were not moulded into a full-blown doctrine until Augustine wrote his Ad Simplicitatem. An investigation into the gradual formulation of "original sin" reveals that nowhere in the Old Testament was there any such doctrine nor even an attempt to trace sin back to its origin.

It should be noted that theories about the "origin of sin" and the doctrine of "original sin" are not identical results of theological speculation. That is, tracing sin back to its origin does not necessarily result in a doctrine of "original sin". In fact, it is anachronistic to use the term "original sin" prior to the period of St. Augustine. But the term does include concepts concerning sin's origin, which is the object of investigation in this thesis. Moreover, speculation on the origin of sin was a major contributing factor leading to Augustine's

¹Ad Simplicitatem 10.

formulation of originale peccatum. However, there are great problems regarding this term and doctrine because it is differently understood by various authors.² Yet, without affirming, denying, or attempting an explanation of the doctrine of "original sin", a definition for the purpose of this thesis can result by merely extracting the essential elements from the popular notions of the doctrine. F. R. Tennant, decades ago, proposed a meaning for the term:

that of inherited inborn "sinfulness", of a state of disharmony or corruption produced once and for all in human nature by the first transgression and transmitted by inheritance to all the human race.³

According to this definition, original sin means that man at birth has some innate hereditary tendency, or "bias toward evil", and that within his inner nature lies the tendency which leads him to sin. The cause of this "bias" is Adam, who brought about a change in his inner nature and passed it on to his offspring.

²For an introduction concerning the problems involved in a theological explication of Augustine's doctrine, see the following: H. Shelton Smith, Changing Conceptions of Original Sin (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1950); Patrick Burke, "Man Without Christ", Theological Studies XXIX (March, 1968), 17 f.; James L. Connor, "Original Sin: Contemporary Approaches", Theological Studies XXIX (June, 1968), 215-240; E. J. Bicknell, The Christian Idea of Sin and Original Sin (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1922); A. M. Dubarle, The Biblical Doctrine of Original Sin (New York: Herder and Herder, 1964); Piet Schoonenberg, S.J., Man and Sin (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1965); K. H. Weger, "The Debate on Original Sin", Ideas (October 26, 1967), 1-9. This list is far from complete because this thesis is not a theological study. Rather, it historically investigates speculations upon the origin of sin and does not intend to explain the doctrine of "original sin", the significance of the doctrine in St. Augustine's thought, or the importance that this investigation might have for modern theology. If some theologian finds this thesis relevant for an understanding of the doctrine of "original sin", it is up to him to make of it what he will.

³F. R. Tennant, The Fall and Original Sin (Cambridge: Cambridge Press, 1903), p. 168.

Another account was given more recently by Patrick Burke:

The first man, Adam, was created in a state of friendship with God and not subject to death, suffering, or concupiscence. But he sinned against God, thereby losing all these privileges, not only for himself, but for all his descendants. As a direct result of his sin, all men are conceived and born in a state of sin, of separation from God, unable to enter heaven, and subject to death, suffering, and concupiscence.⁴

Not all agree with these explanations of "original sin",⁵ but according to C. Ryder Smith those who do generally assert that the doctrine involves a theory of sin's origin as one basic element.⁶

This element of the doctrine, then, is the primary element of investigation in this thesis. Moreover, the particular intention of the thesis is to investigate the relationship between what is said about the origin of sin by Irenaeus (the earliest Church Father to deal with the question in anything like a systematic way) and Jewish speculation on the origin of sin. It will be useful first of all to give a general sketch of the history of thought concerning the origin of sin in order to set the subject of this thesis in its historical context. The sketch will indicate, in part, the conclusions of the present work in advance.

As we have already noted, speculation on the source of sin began late in Israelite history, so that, according to most authors, there is

⁴ Burke, op. cit., p. 4. See also, Peter De Rosa, Christ and Original Sin (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1967), pp. 80-83.

⁵ Schoonenberg, op. cit., pp. 7-8; Bicknell, op. cit., pp. 16-17; Harry Johnson, The Humanity of the Savior (London: The Epworth Press, 1962), p. 22; Wegner, op. cit., p. 8.

⁶ C. Ryder Smith, The Bible Doctrine of Sin (London: The Epworth Press, 1953), pp. 37 f.

no doctrine of "original sin"⁷ in the Old Testament nor any attempt to trace sin back to its origin. The first thorough attempt to identify the origin of sin appears to have been made by the author of the earliest sections of I Enoch, one of the earliest post-canonical Jewish books.⁸ Yet, the result of this attempt, and others which followed, was not a doctrine of "original sin" like the one which was finally formulated in Christianity. Rather, many ideas concerning sin and its origin were spawned in the inter-testamental period⁹ out of which traditional Christianity grew.

With the rise of Christianity, new scriptures came into prominence and were used along with the Old Testament as a source for Christian theology. Yet, the nature of these scriptures is such that they do not systematically set out the theological tenets of Christian thought in one unified whole. Rather, the scriptures are a collection of books which, from many different aspects, treat the subject of Christ, his

⁷ Although, as was previously said, it is anachronistic to use the term "original sin" in dealing with ideas prior to St. Augustine, the term does include several distinct elements which some authors find in the Old Testament.

⁸ This post-canonical literature is collectively called the "apocrypha and pseudepigrapha" of the Old Testament. The term embraces the non-canonical and non-Rabbinic Jewish literature dating from 200 B.C. to A.D. 100. See R. H. Charles, The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913), 2 vols. The dates of the various portions of I Enoch are discussed more fully below, p. 15, n. #38, in the context of a detailed emphasis of the views found in the book. Also, see Appendix II.

⁹ We are here using the term "inter-testamental" rather loosely, particularly regarding the end of this period. Admittedly, 2 Baruch and 4 Ezra were written some time after some of the New Testament writings, but as D. S. Russell, The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1964), p. 15, has indicated, the years 200 B.C. - A.D. 100 are the years in which the bulk of this

works, and his teachings. The New Testament does not contain a systematic explanation of the origin of sin.¹⁰

It was the work of the Apologists and then the early Church Fathers, both Greek and Latin, which began to spin the fabric that designed what is known as Christian theology. These Fathers relied heavily upon the scriptures to fashion their theological notions and patterned their thought upon the great controversies of the early Church. A basic doctrine within the theological framework of Christianity concerns the notion of sin and its origin. One of the first Fathers to contribute to a doctrinal formulation of sin and its origin was Irenaeus.

He was a Father of the early Church who is best known because of his attempts to refute the gnostic heresies of his century. He fought with the weapons of scripture and the earlier teachings of the Greek Apologists. Yet his use of scripture was not in a vacuum but within the context of a battlefield set by the traditions which preceded him. Those traditions¹¹ were in some cases the same as those out of which Christianity and the New Testament were fashioned. Therefore, it is the contention of this thesis that Irenaeus was dependent upon this intellectual milieu for his understanding and use of the New Testament in his battle against the "gnostics". That is, Irenaeus used ideas formulated in the inter-

apocalyptic literature was written. It is a period that witnessed a "revival of Jewish nationalism which was to have repercussions for centuries to come not only within the Jewish faith itself but also within the Christian Church".

¹⁰ On the role of Adam in Paul's thought, see pp. 94-101 , below.

¹¹ Although it is the primary point to be demonstrated in this thesis, the traditions referred to are the apocrypha and pseudepigrapha of the late Jewish literature. Yet to Irenaeus the whole body of

testamental period to cope with "gnostic" heresies. Still, most important to this thesis, he used this same inter-testamental background to formulate his ideas of sin and its origin. Elaboration upon this brief orientation will help clarify the questions, method, and purpose of the following chapters.

tradition preserved by the apostles, and by their disciples, and by the Elders, was authoritative. See John Lawson, The Biblical Theology of Saint Irenaeus (London: The Epworth Press, 1948), p. 36.

CHAPTER ONE

HISTORY OF SIN AND ITS ORIGIN

Sin in the Old Testament - Pre-Exilic Period

The cultures of Judaism and Christianity throughout the course of their histories developed multiple notions concerning sin and offered multiple explanations for its source. From the perspective of the Christian Church, this history can be considered as a continuous process, because Christianity had its most prominent roots in Judaism. Thus, the development extends from the most primitive notions of the Israelite people to Augustine's sophisticated doctrine of "original sin".

N. P. Williams offered a three-period scheme of Hebrew history designed to show the theological development regarding sin.¹ He claims that before any of the periods, in most primitive times, evil was viewed in a quasi-physical sense, not ethical, moral, or sinful. Evil was that which rose with material substances in the shedding of blood or in a faulty organic process, such as that in the generation of birth and death.² In the pre-exilic period (taking Deuteronomy as representative of the period) happiness was seen as the reward of virtue and suffering the punishment for sin.³ According to Piet Schoonenberg, sin was in the

¹N. P. Williams, The Ideas of the Fall and of Original Sin (New York: Longman's, Green Company, 1927), pp. 12 f.

²Ibid., p. 13.

³Deut. 5:91; 7:9-11; 11:26-30; 28:1-29. Cf. Gerhard von Rad,

pre-exilic period primarily a "turning away" from God.⁴ But the Deuteronomic view was to see idolatry as the supreme sin. This view encouraged the tendency to be content with the punctilious performance of individual acts regarding the Deuteronomic code. The code itself correlated sin and punishment in such a way that it gave impetus to an atomistic view of individual offenses.⁵ On the other hand, the monarchial period also fostered a corporate national guilt which began to weigh heavily upon the nation.⁶

Yet, in great part sin was related to some violation of ceremonial or priestly law.⁷ Walter Eichrodt has explained that the covenant obligations became no more than rigidly stipulated performances and that the God-man relationship was distorted into one of objective works, so that there existed a quasi-material holiness between God and the Israelite. If this relationship were broken it could be easily restored by automatically effective means of atonement.⁸ Gerhard von Rad also affirms that sin was an offense against the sacral order and was to be classed in a social category. Sin was something affecting the whole community, an impersonal force imposing an extremely objective notion of

Old Testament Theology (New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1962), I, pp. 262-272; Schoonenberg, op. cit., pp. 47-62.

⁴ Schoonenberg, op. cit., p. 125.

⁵ Walter Eichrodt, Theology of the Old Testament (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1967), II, p. 386.

⁶ Ibid., p. 396.

⁷ von Rad, op. cit., p. 264.

⁸ Eichrodt, loc. cit., p. 386.

guilt upon the Israelite.⁹ But the "prophets" in this period conceived and spoke of a causal relationship between sin and suffering in life.¹⁰ This teaching was an attempt to instill in the Jewish people a spiritual and ethical sense of sin because the prophets wanted men to perceive the serious injury to the personal relationship between God and man caused by sin.¹¹ This desire and the prophets' emphasis upon present experiences of sin did not make it necessary or even possible for them to look backward to the origin of sin.¹²

Exilic Period

The sense of sin in the exilic period underwent a change instigated by the prophets. Prophecy had finally deepened the sense of sin and guilt. Sin was shifted so clearly and completely into the interior life of man that it became a deep-rooted condition in man.¹³ Moreover, the prophets expanded the consequences of sin in each individual human being, so that a sinful condition existed in the whole Israelite nation. There existed, then, a vision of all mankind associated in sin.¹⁴ Sin became ethical, national, individual and universal.

⁹ von Rad, op. cit., pp. 265-268.

¹⁰ Is. 14:20-21, 40:2, 50:1; Jer. 3:24-25, 7:12, 9:13 f., 11:3, 14:16-20, 16:11-12, 22:22, 31:29-30, 32:17-18; Amos 1:3-2:5. This relationship is evident even in post-exilic Deutero-Isaiah, which attributes evil directly to God in His divine plan of retribution. Yet, the relationship between sin and suffering is somewhat strained in chapter 40:2 because men suffer far more than that which sin indicates.

¹¹ Eichrodt, loc. cit.

¹² Ibid., p. 408.

¹³ Ibid., pp. 389, 396.

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 397.

The national experiences, then, of the exile prepared a soil in which this pessimistic vision of man could take root. The confessions of sin in both corporate and individual prayers indicate that no exceptions were possible to the tendency toward sin.¹⁵

Post-Exilic Period

In the post-exilic period and in later Old Testament books, the affirmation that sin was universal continued to grow. It was a period in which the ethical teachings of the prophets produced in the troubled Israelite people a deepened and universal sense of sin.¹⁶ Job is known to have questioned Deuteronomy and the principle of divine retribution; he saw suffering levied against all, whether virtuous or not. This charge not only denied the principle of divine retribution but also made God the author of evil. Psalm 51 acknowledged that sin and evil were conceived as something contained in nature: "In sin my mother conceived me". The burden of guilt weighed heavily upon the Israelite community.¹⁷

Thus, Oesterly - Robinson are right in maintaining that after the exile, reflection and self-analysis gave the Hebrew people a concept of innate sinfulness and a belief in a tendency toward evil, deeply rooted in human nature.¹⁸ Such a concept required an explanation of how

¹⁵ Ibid., p. 399.

¹⁶ Williams, op. cit., pp. 18-20.

¹⁷ Eichrodt, op. cit., p. 410.

¹⁸ W. O. E. Oesterley and T. H. Robinson, Hebrew Religion (London: SPCK, 1930), p. 296. Cf. W. D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism (London: SPCK, 1955), pp. 44-45. See also, Tennant, op. cit., pp. 101-105. Tennant explains that the suffering of the "exile", coupled with

man came to possess this evil. Theories about the origin of sin, then, did not arise until a very late date in the post-exilic period, only after the teachings of the prophets had established the ethical sense of sin, the universal sense of sin, and man's innate natural sinfulness.¹⁹

Opinions vary, however, on exactly what the Old Testament does teach regarding sin and its origin. Although C. Ryder Smith denies that there is in the Old Testament a doctrine of "original sin", he does find a "doctrine of influence" which consists in a transmission of sin from man to man outside of procreation.²⁰ Both F. R. Tennant and N. P. Williams hold rather definite opinions that none of the essential elements needed for a doctrine of "original sin" are treated in the Old Testament and that the story of the Adamic fall could not or did not teach such a doctrine.²¹ W. D. Davies states that the idea of a fall played little, if any, part in the Old Testament teaching.²² Moreover, Patrick Burke says that it is doubtful that the doctrine of "original sin" is contained in any part of scripture.²³ Finally, it is the claim of Walter Eichrodt and Robert C. Dentan that the Old Testament did not even indulge itself

the introspectiveness brought about by the teachings of the prophets, gave the Israelites an intense awareness of sin, the compassion of God, the moral character of God, and an ethical sense of man's sin.

¹⁹ Eichrodt, op. cit., p. 390.

²⁰ C. Ryder Smith, op. cit., pp. 37 f.

²¹ Tennant, op. cit., pp. 89-100; Williams, op. cit., pp. 12 f.

²² Davies, op. cit., loc. cit.

²³ Burke, op. cit., p. 6.

in any speculation on the origin of sin.²⁴ Stress, then, has been placed upon the fact that no doctrine of "original sin" is found in the Old Testament, although confessions of universal human wickedness, without any inherent or inborn weakness, are contained in it.

Rather, the Old Testament proposes a causal relationship between sin and suffering. That is, before and during the exile there was a natural explanation for sin and misfortune which befell the Israelites. The explanation was contained in the notion of "solidarity" expressed in the "decalogue", which stated that the sins of the "fathers" would be visited on their children until the third and fourth generations.²⁵ A mutual responsibility and punishment of one generation for the sins of its predecessors was deeply burnt into the consciousness of Israel.²⁶

Yet, in the exilic and post-exilic periods, the principle of solidarity was questioned by both Ezekiel,²⁷ who asserted that the individual suffered for his own sins, and the author of Job,²⁸ who denied that suffering was necessarily caused by sin. Once sin was seen as universal,²⁹ it became difficult for the Israelite to accept the whole

²⁴ Eichrodt, op. cit., pp. 408-409. Cf. also, Robert C. Dentan, The Apocrypha, Bridge of the Testaments (Greenich, Conn.: The Seabury Press, 1954), p. 109. It is also a theologically significant fact that the profound conception of Genesis 3 not only is never referred to in the rest of the Old Testament but only seldom finds an echo in its thought. Moreover, nowhere in prophetic understanding was there a systematic exposition of a theme resulting from a reflection on the origin of sin.

²⁵ Exodus 20:5.

²⁶ A. S. Peake, The Problem of Suffering in the Old Testament (London: The Epworth Press, 1947), p. 18.

²⁷ Ezek. 18.

²⁸ Peake, op. cit., p. 89.

²⁹ Williams, op. cit., p. 19. Williams, citing from Ps. 130 and

of human nature rooted in sin as a creation of God.³⁰ Moreover, the necessity or purpose for universal evil in some future messianic kingdom became a perplexing problem.³¹ In addition, the question of the origin of sin became an acute religious problem, since the universality of sin could be seen as denying the goodness of creation and the possibility of complete peace and harmony in the future.

Theories of the Origin of Sin in the Inter-Testamental Period

Thus it was during the post-exilic period of prolonged turmoil that the apocalyptic writers flourished and the unrest of the times gave them constant cause to propagate their teachings³² and speculate upon the problems of the day. They turned their minds to the inspired documents of the past so that they might interpret and imitate them in seeking out an answer for the universal presence of sin.³³ They attempted to turn back to some self-determined rebellion of finite time where some creature, pitting his will against the divine will, brought sin into the world.³⁴ In so doing, apocalyptic writers assumed that a "fall" of some type

143, claims that the notion of universal sin in the post-exilic period received the value and priority of a dogma.

³⁰ Ibid., pp. 12-20. Cf. also, Davies, loc. cit.

³¹ Williams, op. cit., p. 7.

³² W. O. E. Oesterly, The Jews and Judaism During the Greek Period (New York: Macmillan Co., 1941), p. 71.

³³ Bicknell, op. cit., p. 16. He views the movement to trace sin back to its origin as an attempt to account for the apparently universal presence of sin. The true basis for the pseudepigraphical speculations on the origin of sin is to be found in the facts of an inner spiritual experience taken from a moral struggle, a great failure, and an experience of penitence.

³⁴ Williams, op. cit., pp. 7-8. Cf. also, Davies, loc. cit.

occurred far back in the pages of history. This speculation produced "fall theories" which found their full expression in the late Jewish apocalyptic literature of the inter-testamental period. Here, in late Judaism, a link between man's own sin and the sin of Adam and Eve was acknowledged. Sin was traced to a source and the result was that the descendants of the first human beings universally inherit not only death but also a tendency to sin.³⁵ God was thus exonerated of the charge of having created sin and it was then possible to conceive of sin, though presently universal, as something that would one day be eliminated.

The Watcher Theory

In this literature of late Judaism there are three basic and salient theories concerning the cause of man's sinfulness. First is the theory which sought the basis for evil in a contamination of the race from a fallen "order of being". This contamination was the direct result of the unnatural marriage between divine and human beings which was first narrated in Genesis 6:1-4:³⁶

When men began to multiply on the face of the ground, and daughters were born to them, the sons of God saw that the daughters of men were fair; and they took to wife such of them as they chose. Then the Lord said, "My spirit shall not abide in man forever, for he is flesh, but his days shall be a hundred and twenty years". The Nephilim were on the earth in those days, and also afterwards when the sons of God came into the daughters of men, and they bore children to them. These were the mighty men that were of old, the men of renown.

³⁵ Eichrodt, op. cit., pp. 411-412.

³⁶ Both the Old and New Testament texts which are found in English translation throughout this thesis are taken from the following work: Herbert G. May and Bruce M. Metzger (eds.), The Oxford Annotated Bible with the Apocrypha (RSV) (New York: Oxford University Press, 1965).

Evidently in late Jewish speculation on this passage the uniting of the order of flesh with that of spirit was considered a sinful action in itself. Enoch records the descent of the "watcher angels"³⁷ as a defilement.³⁸

³⁷ In late Jewish literature, speculation about the cause of evil in the world was based upon the mysterious legend of angels which is found in the account of Genesis 6:1-4, cited above. The Nephilim became known as "watchers" because they were originally the "Holy angels who watch" (I Enoch 20:1) and "who sleep not above in the Heavens" (I Enoch 39:12-13, 40:2, 61:12, 71:7). Initially, they were all good, residing in the "High, holy, and eternal heaven" (I Enoch 15:3-12), enjoying liberty (2 Baruch 56:10-16), and demonstrating beneficence to mankind (Jubilees 4:15). But at least two hundred of these "watcher angels" descended upon the earth, according to I Enoch 6:6-7:1 and 2 Baruch 56:13. For a history of the myth of the descent of the sons of God, see J. Morgenstein, "The Mythological Background of Psalm 82", HUCA 14 (1939), 76-114.

³⁸ Except for the Wisd. Sol. (see n. #92 below), all quotations from apocryphal and pseudepigraphal writings which are found in this thesis in English translation are taken from the work edited by R. H. Charles (see Introduction, n. #8). There might arise some question concerning the composite work of I Enoch and it might be asked to what extent the multiple sources of Enoch bring about a change of thought on the subject of sin and its origin. Charles, op. cit., II, pp. 163-167, discusses the composition of I Enoch, admitting that there are inconsistencies in the work. One of these inconsistencies is concerned with the origin of sin. That is, Charles is thinking of the various causes offered by Enoch for sin's entrance into the world. These are the seduction by the angels, their bearing evil offspring, their evil teachings, and the denial of these causes in the sense that man is the creator of sin (see Enoch 98: 4 f.). These same inconsistencies and causes of sin appear in the writings of Irenaeus. However, in I Enoch and Irenaeus there is nothing contradictory in these notions nor any development of one idea leading to the other. Rather, these ideas are placed side by side with one another because they came from different traditions which contributed to the composite work of Enoch and were borrowed by Irenaeus. The generally accepted divisions of I Enoch and their dates are as follows (see Charles, ibid.): cc. 1 - 36, ca. 170 B.C.; cc. 37 - 71, ca. 94 - 79 or 70 - 64 B.C.; cc. 72 - 82, ca. 110 B.C.; cc. 83 - 90, ca. 161 B.C.; except for cc. 106 - 107 (and other noachic fragments, cf. Charles, ibid., p. 168) 200 - 161 B.C.; cc. 91 - 108, ca. 95 - 79 or 70 - 64 B.C. This division into sections is widely accepted and has been largely confirmed by fragments of I Enoch found in the caves of Qumran. See A. Dupont-Sommer, The Essene Writings from Qumran (E. T. by G. Vermes; New York: Meridian, 1962), p. 299 and notes

and they were in all two hundred; who descended (in the days) of Jared on the summit of Mount Hermon... and all...took unto themselves wives...and they began to go into them and to defile themselves with them.³⁹

Wherefore have ye left the High, holy, and eternal heaven, and lain with women, and defiled yourselves.⁴⁰

In so doing, the "watchers" defiled themselves and mankind. Assuming many forms, these holy angels mixed the two orders of nature through sexual intercourse and effected a change or corruption of a nature that was previously undefiled. Enoch says that the angels "have gone to the daughters of men upon the earth and have slept with the women and have defiled themselves".⁴¹ Also he says that the angels "have united themselves with women and commit sin with them",⁴² defiling "themselves with them in all their uncleanness".⁴³ Elsewhere in apocalyptic literature there is confirmation of this defilement. Jubilees says that "these

1-4; J. T. Milik, "Problèmes de la Littérature Hénochique à la Lumière des Fragments Araméens de Qumrân", *HTR* 64 (1971), 333-378. The watcher legend is most prominent in cc. 1 - 36, which is one of the oldest sections by any account. Rowley (*The Relevance of Apocalyptic*³ [New York: Association Press, 1964], pp. 93-99) argues that Charles's dates for the oldest sections should be moved down a few years, to the Maccabean period. Milik, on the other hand, would date the oldest sections, including cc. 1 - 36, in the third century B.C. The precise dating is not crucial for the present work, and it is safest to think that the principal sections of I Enoch are from the first half of the second century B.C.

³⁹ I Enoch 6:6-7:1.

⁴⁰ I Enoch 15:3.

⁴¹ I Enoch 9:8. Cf. also, I Enoch 19:1-3.

⁴² I Enoch 106:14.

⁴³ I Enoch 10:11.

(angels) had begun to unite themselves so as to be defiled with the daughters of men".⁴⁴ Also the Testament of Naphtali briefly elaborates upon the defilement, saying "In like manner the watchers also changed the order of their nature whom the Lord cursed".⁴⁵

Not only does sinful defilement result from the union of angels and women, but sin also appears in the multiple reasons proposed for such a marriage. Lust, on the part of the "watchers", appears to be the most plausible reason in 1 Enoch and Jubilees. Jubilees states that "the angels of God saw them on a certain year of this Jubilee, and they were beautiful to look upon".⁴⁶ This only implies lust on the part of the angels; but the explicit reference to lust is found in Enoch, which says that "the angels, the children of heaven, saw and lusted after them".⁴⁷

Another theory, however, maintained that the "daughters of men" were responsible for the fall of the "watchers", since they plotted the seduction of the holy angels.

⁴⁴ Jubilees 4:22. This and other passages of Jubilees which are found in English translation throughout this thesis are taken from Charles, op. cit., II, pp. 1-82. The book of Jubilees was originally written in Hebrew between the dates 109 - 105 B.C. (see Appendix II) and is extant in Ethiopic and Latin which are translations from a lost Greek version. Some few Greek fragments exist. The author of this work shows knowledge of the older sections of 1 Enoch. See Charles, ibid., p. 7.

⁴⁵ Test. Naph. 3:5. Passages of the Testament which are found in English translation throughout this thesis are taken from Charles, op. cit., II, pp. 282-367. The Testament is questionably of Hebrew origin, was written between the years 109 - 106 B.C. (see Appendix II), and is extant in Armenian, Slavonic, and Greek (see Bibliography). The Greek versions are translations from two Hebrew recensions. Some few Hebrew fragments still exist and the book contains several Jewish and Christian additions.

⁴⁶ Jubilees 5:1.

⁴⁷ 1 Enoch 6:2.

For evil are women...they use wiles by outward attractions...and in their heart they plot against men: and by means of adornment they deceive first their minds (of men), and by the glance of the eye instil poison, and then through the accomplished act, they take them captive.... For thus they allured the "watchers" who were before the flood....They lusted after them and they conceived the act in their mind.⁴⁸

Yet 1 Enoch indicates that the women became "sirens" only after they were led astray by the "watchers".⁴⁹

Other reasons proposed for the fall of the angels were developed with less banality and more sophistication. One theory, with elements common to both the paradise narrative of Genesis 3 and the angel legend of Genesis 6, teaches that the "watchers" were subject to the evil supernatural leadership of Satan. 1 Enoch condemns the host of angels "in becoming subject to Satan and leading astray those who dwell on the earth".⁵⁰ Again, in the Life of Adam and Eve,⁵¹ the angels appear under

⁴⁸ Test. Reub. 5:1-6.

⁴⁹ 1 Enoch 19:2.

⁵⁰ 1 Enoch 54:6.

⁵¹ Vita Adae et Evaæ 15:1. Passages of the Vita which are found in English translation throughout this thesis are taken from Charles, op. cit., II, pp. 123-154. Apart from some interpolations, the book is of purely Jewish origin and contains various legends which were put together between the years 60 - 300 of the Christian era (see Appendix II). The book has sections which are extant in Armenian, Slavonic, Syriac, Ethiopic, Greek, Latin, and German. These versions are all translations made from various manuscripts. See Charles, ibid., pp. 125-128. All Latin quotations from the pseudepigraphal Vita Adae et Evaæ which are cited in this thesis are taken from the Latin edition of Wilhelm Meyer (ed.), Vita Adae et Evaæ, Abhandlungen der philosophisch-philologischen Classe der königlich bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften 14 (Munich: Königliche Akademie, 1878), pp. 185-250.

the dominion of the devil.⁵² Also in I Enoch 40:7 there is a vague reference to the Satans⁵³ which contrasts the holy supernatural order of archangels with the "watchers".⁵⁴

Beneath the speculation concerning the fall of the "watchers" lies the notion that their action was a violation of law or some commandment. The Damascus Document of Qumran explicitly stresses what is implicit in most other explanations of the fall. In speaking of the "watchers" who walked in the stubbornness of their hearts and fell from the heavens, this work gives primary consideration to the commandment of God.

Because they walked in the stubbornness of their hearts, the watchers of heaven fell; yea, they were caught thereby because they kept not the commandments of God...because they did their own pleasure and kept not the commandments of their maker.⁵⁵

⁵² Moreover, these angels or "watchers" possessed leadership under the dominance of what appears as a whole host of angels. See I Enoch 6:7-8, 8:1-3, 69:2-13. However, the devil possesses many different names throughout this literature. Satona, Satamail, Devil, 2 Enoch 31:4-6; Satan, I Enoch 54:6; plural form, I Enoch 54:6; plural form, I Enoch 40:7; Test. Dan 5:6; Devil, Apoc. Mos. cc. 16-17; Wisd. Sol. 2:24; Beliar, Test Benj. 6:1; Test. Levi 3:3, 18:12; Test. Iss. 7:7; Test. Dan. 5:1; Test. Reub. 6:3; Test. Zeb. 9:8; Test. Naph. 2:6; Jub. 1:20, 15:33; Belial, CD 4:13-15, 5:18, 6:9-10, 8:2, 12:2; Spirit of Darkness, Test. Levi 19; Test. Jos. 7:20.

⁵³ The obvious explanation for the use of the plural form, "Satans", is that the angels or "watchers" took on the name of their leader "Satan".

⁵⁴ Charles, op. cit., II, n. #7, p. 211.

⁵⁵ CD 3:4-7. This and subsequent Qumran quotations are taken from the work of Theodore H. Gaster, The Dead Sea Scriptures (New York: Anchor Books, 1964).

The pride of the "watchers" is relevant to much of the speculation concerning the transgression of God's commandment. This characteristic was definitely proposed as a cause for the fall of the angels. The Testament of Dan. understands I Enoch to equate the wickedness of Satan and his "spirits" with that of pride.

For I have read in the book of Enoch, the Righteous, that your prince is Satan, and that all the spirits of wickedness and pride will conspire...to cause them (the sons of Levi) to sin before the Lord.⁵⁶

However, the fallen angels and their leaders were considered the founders of all sin. They were spoken of in terms that equal the notion contained in the phrase "the root of all evil".⁵⁷ Furthermore, it appears in the War Scroll of Qumran that these angels were created for the purpose of spreading evil upon the earth.

And thou didst create Belial for the pit, the angel of hostility and repudiation, (together with) his (plan) and with his design that wicked deeds and sins might be committed.⁵⁸

⁵⁶ Test. Dan. 5:6. In a footnote, Charles, op. cit., II, p. 310 (Test. Levi 10:5) casts suspicion on the references to Enoch in the "Testaments".

⁵⁷ I Enoch 10:7-8.

⁵⁸ 1 QM 13:11-12. Although the Dead Sea Scrolls do not explicitly connect the evil angel(s) with the story of Gen. 6:1-4, it is appropriate to note here the attribution of evil in the world to the "angel of darkness" (1 QS 3:18 ff.). The Dead Sea Scrolls differ from other material of the period, however, in their stress on predestination. Thus some are destined to the "pit of Belial". On the other hand, in typical Jewish fashion, the Qumran authors did not surrender the idea of individual responsibility, and so could speak of the two spirits competing within man's heart (1 QS 4:23).

Yet, in I Enoch, Chapters 6-10, the "watchers" are condemned for their evil deeds; they will, in time, be eradicated from the face of the earth. Here, also, set down in quite descriptive terms, is the extent of damage which the "watchers" caused. Generally speaking, all manner of evil is attributed to these fallen angels and to their leader Azazel: "to him ascribe all sin".⁵⁹

Although the "watchers" and their leaders were considered primarily the ones who had initiated evil, it was taught in I Enoch and maintained in much of this literature that the offspring from the union between the "watchers" and the "daughters of men" were the proximate cause of the wickedness imposed upon mankind.

The angels who have connected themselves with women and their spirits (offspring) assuming many different forms are defiling mankind.⁶⁰

Likewise do the book of Jubilees⁶¹ and the Wisdom of Solomon⁶² testify to the wickedness which this progeny brought upon men.

Although I Enoch taught that the "giants" were responsible for the evil that exists amongst men, the same book proposes that wickedness resulted mainly by means of a worthless and unlawful revelation. The

⁵⁹ I Enoch 10:8. Cf. also, Jub. 5:2-4. This passage indicates to what extent the "watchers" were responsible for the damage done upon earth.

⁶⁰ I Enoch 19:1. Cf. also, I Enoch 7:3, 9:9-10, 10:15, 15:9-10, 106:13-17. Different names were given for the offspring of the fallen angels in this body of literature. Giants, I Enoch 6:1-10:15, 15:3-12, 69:12, 106; 3 Mocc. 2:4; Demons, I Enoch 19:1-3; Jub. 10:1-8, 7:27; Sons of Beliar, Jub. 15:33; unclean or evil Spirits, I Enoch 69:4-12; 15:3-12.

⁶¹ Jub. 5:1-4, 7:27, 10:1-8.

⁶² Wisd. Sol. 14:6. The "arrogant giants" who perished at the flood were doubtless the wicked offspring of the unholy union. Cf. also, CD 3:3-4:10 in reference to the wickedness of the evil offspring.

"watchers" and their leaders have wrought havoc on earth by two distinct means, in two completely different forms. Thus, I Enoch treats evil deeds of offspring and, in the following passages, asserts that evil results from certain diabolical teachings of the "watchers".

You (the watchers) have been in heaven. But all the mysteries had not yet been revealed to you and you knew worthless ones, and these in the hardness of your hearts, you made known to the women, and through these mysteries women and men work much evil on earth.⁶³

Azazel...a severe sentence hath gone forth against thee...because of the unrighteousness which thou has taught...and sin which thou has shown to men.⁶⁴

...heal the earth which the angels have corrupted
...through all the secret things that the watchers have disclosed and have taught their sons.⁶⁵

Furthermore, I Enoch⁶⁶ and the book of Jubilees,⁶⁷ to some extent, treat the particulars of that hidden revelation.

The Watchers and the Deluge

However, the use of the "watchers" legend to account for universal wickedness proved to be highly inadequate as an explanation for man's sinful condition. For the "watchers" were definitely the chief cause of bringing about the "deluge". This is indicated in I Enoch,⁶⁸ the book of Jubilees,⁶⁹ and the Testament of Naphtali.⁷⁰ Moreover, in the deluge

⁶³ I Enoch 16:3.

⁶⁴ I Enoch 13:1-4.

⁶⁵ I Enoch 10:7. Cf. also, I Enoch 64:1-2.

⁶⁶ I Enoch 69:4-12.

⁶⁷ Jubilees 8:3,

⁶⁸ I Enoch 106:15.

⁶⁹ Jubilees 7:21-25.

⁷⁰ Test. Naph. 3:5. Perhaps the Wisd. Sol. 14:6 also wishes to attribute the cause of the flood to this purpose.

all wickedness was destroyed, including the "watchers", the source of all evil. Such destruction is implied in the Testament of Rueben,⁷¹ and explicitly stated in the third book of Maccabees.⁷² Likewise, 2 Baruch 56:16 states that, "those who dwelt on the earth perished together with them (the angels who mingled with the women) through the waters of the deluge". In addition, I Enoch 10:2 predicted, "that the whole earth will be destroyed and a deluge is about to come upon the earth and will destroy all that is on it". Thus, it could be concluded that the role of the "watchers" was introduced merely to explain wickedness until the time of the deluge.⁷³ Or, it could be held that writers perceived difficulty in using the "watchers" to account for the evil which existed after the flood,⁷⁴ and then only did the authors decide to use the "watchers" as the chief cause for the deluge alone. The difficulty may be seen in Jubilees, which (though it retells the story of Genesis 3 according to the priority of the Old Testament) limits the effects of Adam's fall to Adam and the animal creation. R. H. Charles states that "Adam was driven from the garden (3:17 ff.) and the animal creation was robbed of the power of speech (3:28)".⁷⁵ He argues that Jubilees attributes all sin to the

⁷¹ Test. Reub. 5:6.

⁷² 3 Macc. 2:4.

⁷³ Tennant, op. cit., p. 238.

⁷⁴ Williams, op. cit., pp. 28, 85-91.

⁷⁵ Charles, op. cit., II, pp. 8-9. Tennant, op. cit., p. 238, also claims that Jubilees regards the fall of Adam as initiating a stream of cosmic effects and the derangement of nature which effects were brought to more imposing proportions in 2 Baruch and 4 Ezra.

"watchers" and the solicitations of demonic spirits (7:27).⁷⁶ The subsequent depravity of the human race is not traced to the fall of Adam but to the seduction of the daughters of men by the angels who had been sent down to instruct men (5:1-4). Charles further explains that "the evil engendered by the former [angels] was brought to an end by the destruction of all the descendants of the angels and of their victims by the deluge, but the incitement to sin on the part of the demons was to last to the final judgement (7:27, 10:1-15, 11:4 ff., 12:20)".⁷⁷

How post-deluge sin could be attributed to the "watchers" may be seen in Jubilees 8:3, where the author has an early descendant of Noah find a writing containing the teaching of the "watchers" which remained after the flood. The finder sins because of it, and thus reintroduces

⁷⁶ Charles, loc. cit. Both Tennant and Williams argue against Charles on this point. That is, Williams, op. cit., p. 28, states that "the original author of Jubilees had already cut the Gordian knot by abandoning the watcher-legend altogether, and fixing, for his fall-story, on an entirely different passage of scripture, namely, the paradise-narrative of Genesis 3". Likewise, Tennant, op. cit., p. 237, says that "The book of Jubilees...only uses the story (watcher-legend) to explain the degeneracy which called forth the Deluge; it rather turns to the paradise-narrative for an explanation of the evil world...." Charles's view has recently been supported, however, by M. Testuz, Les Idées religieuses du Livre des Jubilés (Paris: Librairie Minard, 1960), pp. 60 f. Testuz argues that the first transgression did not lead to the irruption of evil in the world. Adam was punished by losing immortality, Eve by having to bear children in pain; and both by expulsion from the garden; but nothing further was entailed. Evil in the world springs from the "watchers".

⁷⁷ Williams, ibid., claims that the interpolator of the book of Jubilees attempted to solve the problem of evil existing after the flood (when all the angels and their victims were drowned) "by asserting that post-Noachian wickedness was due to the ghosts of the drowned giants (the demonic spirits)".



sin into the world. In 10:1 ff., however, the "unclean demons" (who are the descendants of the "watchers", 10:5) are considered to be still active after the flood.⁷⁸ These two make-shift explanations of the continuance of sin after the deluge were obviously inadequate in the eyes of other authors, who sought further and more deep-rooted explanations for the origin of sin. Therefore, there was not only a shift of emphasis concerning the "watchers" and their role regarding universal corruption, but there was also a necessity created for authors at this time to seek an explanation for evil in a source other than the "watcher" legend.

The Adam Theory

Effort was taken by several late Jewish writers to explain the cause of evil by means of a second theory, that of the paradise narrative found in Genesis 3. The angelic fall sufficiently explained evil leading up to the deluge. Yet evil existing in the world after the flood needed further explanation, despite the efforts of the author of Jubilees. It is noteworthy that the "watcher" theory is especially prominent in the early parts of Enoch and in Jubilees, that is, between 200 and 100 B.C. Subsequent apocalyptic authors turned increasingly to Gen. 3 for an account of the origin of sin, although the "watcher" theory was not entirely given up. Instead, authors, in tracing evil to the paradise narrative, held fast to some aspects of the "watcher" legend by maintaining angelic influence in the fall of Adam and Eve. The Apocalypse of

⁷⁸ Jubilees 7:27.



Moses⁷⁹ gives a detailed account from the lips of Eve concerning the devil's deception of the serpent. That is, the devil deceived the serpent into seducing Eve.⁸⁰

F. R. Tennant⁸¹ claims that in the Apocalypse of Abraham (cc. 22 - 23)⁸² appears the fusion of the two streams of folk-lore based on Genesis 3 and Genesis 6. He says that the writer makes Genesis 3 the starting point for the history of the race and at the same time speaks of "the serpent like tempter". The tempter is not simply the serpent as related in Genesis 3 but is the central figure of the account found in Genesis 6. His name is "Azazel", one from among the leaders of the "watchers" who descended with the "watchers" and to whom should be ascribed all sin.⁸³ Elsewhere, the "tempter of Eve" is "Satonail"⁸⁴ or

⁷⁹ Presumably the earliest part of the Books of Adam and Eve dates perhaps to the early part of the first century A.D. See Charles, op. cit., II, pp. 126-129; A. M. Denis, Introduction aux Pseudépigraphes grecs (Leiden: Brill, 1970), pp. 6 ff.

⁸⁰ Apoc. Mos. 15-30 (especially cc. 16-17).

⁸¹ Tennant, op. cit., p. 237.

⁸² The Apocalypse of Abraham is extant only in a Slavonic version which is apparently a translation from a lost Greek version. See D. S. Russell, op. cit., p. 60. Tennant, op. cit., p. 192, claims that the book was originally written in Hebrew and with Williams, op. cit., pp. 33 ff., renders the date of its composition uncertain. But Russell, ibid., fixes the date of the book between the years A.D. 70 - 120 (see Appendix II). G. N. Bontwetsch translated the pseudepigraph into German in the series Studien zur Geschichte der Theologie und Kirche (Leipzig, 1918). An English translation was made a year later by G. H. Box, The Apocalypse of Abraham (London: SPCK, 1919). He claims that the extant Slavonic text is a translation from a lost Greek version which was itself a translation of an original Hebrew version. The book was written between A.D. 70 - 120, and although it has gnostic elements shows great affinity with other apocalyptic writings.

⁸³ I Enoch 10:8.

⁸⁴ 2 Enoch 31:6.



"Gadreel",⁸⁵ names which, like "Azazel", are prominent in some accounts concerning the descent of the "watchers" or fallen angels.

Noticeable, too, is that when the narrative of Genesis 3 began to be used in apocalyptic literature as a source for universal wickedness, the serpent was identified or exchanged for a "Satan", whose motive for man's seduction was envy. What was needed in order that this identification be made was a reversal of the order in which the two fall stories are recorded in Genesis. That is, in order for Satan to effect Adam's fall by means of the serpent, Satan's fall had to precede that of man's first parents. Jubilees follows the order of Genesis. Here Adam first sins and then Satan and his angels later fall, bringing about the deluge. But quite clearly in the Books of Adam and Eve⁸⁶ the devil is projected as the agent of Eve's deception, which betrays the existence of a previous belief in the fall of the devil and his angels. The order of sin in this book, then, begins with Satan and extends later to Adam. Therefore, when the tempter of the first parents (Gen. 3) becomes identified with the leader of the angelic fall (the late Jewish interpretation of Gen. 6), the obvious conclusion is that a fusion of these two distinct biblical stories has taken place.

In any case, evil is traced back to Adam and Eve with various attempts to explain the connection between Adam's sin and present evil existing in the human race. A great deal of literature, regarding Adam's fall, exalted the person of Adam for the apparent purpose of emphasizing the

⁸⁵ 1 Enoch 69:6.

⁸⁶ Vita Adae et Evaee 16:4, 33:2-3. Cf. also, Wisd. Sol. 2:24; 2 Enoch 31:4-6.



tragedy which would later befall him and his progeny.⁸⁷ Moreover, Adam's fall, an assumed fact throughout much of this late Jewish literature, is explicitly treated in its causes and consequences.

Notions concerning the cause and consequences of Adam's fall are diverse and inconsistent in these writings. Among the many strange and mysterious explanations for Adam's sin a certain importance must be given to the alliance which existed between Eve and Satan. For Adam is led to transgress through Eve because she was tempted by Satan and the theory involved in this Satan-Eve alliance is her deception by the serpent.⁸⁸

However, the most widely treated cause for Adam's fall is his transgression of a divine commandment and his uncontrolled, inordinate desire toward evil. 2 Baruch speaks of "the transgression wherewith Adam, the first man, transgressed"⁸⁹ and "this transgression is that of the commandment".⁹⁰ 3 Baruch elucidates the essence of the commandment⁹¹ and

⁸⁷ Robbin Scroggs, *The Last Adam* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966), pp. 15-38; Tennant, op. cit., p. 149.

⁸⁸ See Chapter V, pp. 163 ff.

⁸⁹ 2 Baruch 56:5. This and other passages of 2 Baruch which are found in English translation throughout this thesis come from Charles, op. cit., II, pp. 470-566. The book was originally written in Hebrew during the latter half of the first century of the Christian era (see Appendix II). It was translated into Greek and from Greek into Syriac. The Hebrew version is lost and only one small fragment of the Greek exists. Translations presently are extant in Syriac, Latin, and German. A great affinity exists between this work and that of 4 Ezra (see n. #93 below), so that one appears to respond to the other. But the question has not yet been settled concerning the first composition. See Charles, ibid., II, pp. 476-477: n. #114 below.

⁹⁰ 2 Baruch 4:3.

⁹¹ 3 Baruch 4:8. The English translation for this passage comes from Charles, op. cit., II, pp. 527-541. The book was questionably of Hebrew origin written during the beginning of the second century of the



the Wisdom of Solomon confirms that the cause of the first father's fall was that of a transgression.⁹² The treatment of Adam's fall by these authors is one that merely follows the text of Genesis.

In 4 Ezra, Adam's disobedience and transgression against God's many statutes is stressed as the cause for the world becoming "narrow and sorrowful and painful".⁹³ Yet, in another passage it is but a single command that Adam transgresses.⁹⁴ But, the idea of transgression and disobedience is not the only proposal of 4 Ezra concerning the cause of Adam's fall. Some passages indicate that Adam's sin came about through an "evil heart" or "evil seed".⁹⁵ Thus, Adam transgressed or was overcome by temptation because of the "evil heart" which he possessed from

Christian era. The only manuscript in existence is in Greek, found at the end of the 19th century. The book demonstrates little affinity with other books of Baruch but shows greater affinity with other apocalyptic writings. See Charles, ibid., pp. 527-528.

⁹² Wisd. Sol. 10:1. Passages of this book found in English translation throughout this thesis are taken from The Oxford Annotated Bible (RSV), pp. 102-107 (the section on the apocrypha). See n. #36 above. This book was originally composed in Greek during the latter part of the first century A.D. The extant versions are found in Greek, Latin, Syriac, Arabic, and Armenian. Both the dating and original version of the book are in doubt because of the composite nature of the work. It is generally accepted, however, that the origin of the book is partly Hebrew and partly Greek.

⁹³ 4 Ezra 7:11-12. This and other passages of 4 Ezra which are found in English translation throughout this thesis come from Charles, op. cit., II, pp. 542-624. The book is of a composite nature originally written in Hebrew and compiled into a single work about the year A.D. 120 (see Appendix II). There are numerous translations of Ezra which exist in Latin, Syriac, Ethiopic, Arabic, and Armenian (see Bibliography), all made from a lost Greek version. The relationship of this book to 2 Baruch appears to be that of rival schools of thought. See Charles, ibid., pp. 553-554, and nn. #90, 114.

⁹⁴ 4 Ezra 3:7.

⁹⁵ This idea is close to the Rabbinic notion of the Yetzer and is treated by various authors. See n. #126 below.



birth. 4 Ezra states that "a grain of evil seed was sown in the heart of Adam from the beginning".⁹⁶

The consequences of Adam's transgression can be listed under three headings, namely, death, physical infirmity, and sin as spiritual corruption. 2 Baruch conceives death as an effect of Adam's foul deed. But the death which man must suffer is not essentially different from that which he would have had to suffer if Adam had not sinned. What effect 2 Baruch adds to Adam's transgression is that the death which man must suffer is premature or untimely, and man must die before his appointed time. 2 Baruch relates these ideas saying, "Adam first sinned and brought untimely death upon all"⁹⁷ and "when he (Adam) transgressed, untimely death came into being".⁹⁸ 4 Ezra, however, does not qualify the death due to Adam's sin as does the author of 2 Baruch. Rather, his claim is simply that when Adam transgressed the command, God appointed "death for him and for his generations".⁹⁹

The physical infirmity attributed to Adam is treated again in 2 Baruch under such terms as grief, pain, and disease.¹⁰⁰ Moreover, a certain spiritual corruption is attributed to Adam by the author of 2 Baruch when he says:

⁹⁶ 4 Ezra 4:30.

⁹⁷ 2 Baruch 54:15.

⁹⁸ 2 Baruch 56:5. Cf. also, 17:3, 19:8, 23:4.

⁹⁹ 4 Ezra 3:7, 7:48, 7:92, 7:116-120, 8:31, 9:36. Cf. also, Wisd. Sol. 2:24 and 2 Enoch 30:16.

¹⁰⁰ 2 Baruch 56:6.



O Adam, what hast thou done to all those who are born from thee? And what will be said to the first Eve who hearkened to the Serpent? For all this multitude are going to corruption, nor is there any numbering of those whom the fire devours....¹⁰¹

Likewise, the author asserts spiritual damage resulting from Adam's transgression in the statement that "he (Adam) became a danger to his own soul".¹⁰² Also, in 4 Ezra, sin results among the inhabitants of the earth after Adam's fall,¹⁰³ and the fruit of Adam's evil heart is that of "ungodliness". This author certainly emphasizes that the evil on the earth after Adam's fall is more than just death and physical corruption. He states that "the evil heart has grown up in us which has estranged us from God and brought us into destruction".¹⁰⁴

There remains, however, throughout the whole of this literature the enormous question concerning the precise manner in which these consequences are transmitted to mankind. Nowhere does there appear a clearly defined statement regarding the exact relationship between Adam's transgression and all the consequences that it has upon mankind. Rather, the question appears to be answered in some passages by strong implication and in other passages the question is left open to the imagination. Thus, generally speaking, it is possible to understand that this literature proposes that the corruption caused by Adam's sin comes to his descendants either because man imitates Adam's transgression or because

¹⁰¹₂ Baruch 48:42-43.

¹⁰²₂ Baruch 56:10.

¹⁰³₄ Ezra 3:26.

¹⁰⁴₄ Ezra 7:48. Cf. also, 7:116.



he necessarily participates in Adam's fall.¹⁰⁵ 2 Baruch appears to teach the former in the following two passages:

For though Adam first sinned and brought untimely death upon all, yet of those who were born from him, each one of them has prepared for his own soul torment to come.¹⁰⁶

Adam is therefore not the cause, save only of his own soul, but each of us has been the Adam of his own soul.¹⁰⁷

The fourth book of Ezra has certain passages which could be understood as offering something similar to that of 2 Baruch, namely, man is corrupted by imitating Adam. Ezra states that, "the first Adam, clothing himself with the evil heart, transgressed...and likewise all who were born of him".¹⁰⁸ Yet 4 Ezra, taken in its totality, appears to teach something quite different from what 2 Baruch teaches regarding the transmission of corruption from Adam to mankind. Ezra speaks of the infirmity in man becoming inveterate¹⁰⁹ and the "evil seed", sown in Adam, producing much ungodliness.¹¹⁰ This "seed" grows up in each man¹¹¹ and is considered an innate evil.¹¹² But 4 Ezra also claims that each one clothes himself with the evil heart,¹¹³ which notion conflicts with his other statements, although it is consistent with the idea of imitating Adam as found in 2 Baruch. However, 4 Ezra does conceive a closer rela-

¹⁰⁵ We are here bypassing the question of whether man's necessary participation is conceived as a physical inheritance passed on in the act of propagation or as a quasi-mystical corporate participation of all of mankind "in Adam". On this, see below, pp. 102-105.

¹⁰⁶ 2 Baruch 54:15.

¹⁰⁷ 2 Baruch 54:19. Cf. also, 18:1-2.

¹⁰⁸ 4 Ezra 3:21-22.

¹⁰⁹ 4 Ezra 3:22.

¹¹⁰ 4 Ezra 4:30.

¹¹¹ 4 Ezra 7:48.

¹¹² 4 Ezra 7:92.

¹¹³ 4 Ezra 3:26.

tionship between Adam and his descendants than does 2 Baruch when he states:

O thou Adam, what hast thou done! For though it was thou that sinned, the fall was not thine alone, but ours also who are thy descendants.¹¹⁴

The Fall Development

Judaism, then, possessed these prominent explanations concerning the cause of man's sinfulness. Also, it appears that these speculations underwent a gradual change from the earliest writings until the latest.¹¹⁵ That is, the attempt to explain universal evil by an exegesis of Genesis 6:1-4 was the work of the earliest speculations. But the "watcher" theory, which came from such an exegesis, proved inadequate for the task. It has been understood that the "watchers" were initially introduced

¹¹⁴ 4 Ezra 7:118.

¹¹⁵ Dating of composition is a necessary factor here because thematic development involves a study of writings which are both early and late. Moreover, in any rich religious culture, there is an oral tradition which prevails from an earlier period than that of the written tradition. The beginning of the oral tradition is most difficult to determine and scholars disagree on the exact dating of the written tradition. Therefore, the dates given for diverse documents from different centuries are in no way precise but must be approximate dates for actual composition. However, the conclusions are correct concerning the "changing speculations on the cause of evil", if the authorities who have carefully examined this material are correct in their probable dating. The earliest "pseudepigraphal" writing is considered by Charles, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 170-171, to be 1 Enoch. This work is composed of various elements which were first written between 170 - 64 B.C. The latest "pseudepigraphal" writing is 4 Ezra which dates (in its final redaction) ca. A.D. 100 (see Appendix II), but some of the sources for this book were put into written form as early as A.D. 30; see Box in Charles, *ibid.*, II, p. 552. Many would argue that 2 Baruch is dependent on 4 Ezra and slightly later. See H. H. Rowley, *The Relevance of Apocalyptic*³, *op. cit.*, pp. 119-123. In any case, it is clear that there is a transition from the early books, in which theories about the "watchers" predominate, to later books, which focus on Adam in one way or another as the originator of sin. The lines are not hard and fast, however.

only to explain evil before the flood¹¹⁶ and when they all perished, difficulties arose in using the "watchers" to explain later wickedness.¹¹⁷ But, in any case, writers were forced to another answer for the problem. They concentrated their efforts on Adam's fall in the paradise narrative of Genesis 3. This new emphasis caused the Adam story to grow in significance as the "watcher" legend diminished and receded into the background. The fallen angels became the sole cause for the deluge and a partial explanation for the sin of paradise. Adam became the explanation for evil in the world generally, thus accounting for its continuation after the flood.

This development was a gradual process. From 1 Enoch to 4 Ezra both theories were interwoven with traces of two diverse ideas concerning the manner of sin's propagation. One of these notions was that of imitation (e.g., 2 Baruch). The other is harder to define, since what is written in 4 Ezra about the "evil seed"¹¹⁸ is difficult to determine. Whether Ezra's view of sin in Adam is a corporate or hereditary one will be discussed later.¹¹⁹ However, in 1 Enoch the legend of the "watchers" is used to account for the cause of widespread corruption and the Adam story is ignored as a key to the problem of evil. But in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, the "watchers" are not made the basis for any general problem of sin, although both fall stories appear in this book.

¹¹⁶ Tennant, op. cit., p. 238.

¹¹⁷ Williams, op. cit., pp. 28, 85.

¹¹⁸ See above, nn. #95, 103.

¹¹⁹ See pp. 102-105

In the Testaments of Reuben¹²⁰ and Naphtali¹²¹ the "watcher" legend is recorded while the Testament of Levi alludes to the paradise narrative,¹²² where Adam (living under a threatening sword) is barred from "the tree of life" and the "gates of paradise". The book of Jubilees also contains both stories of Genesis and certainly uses the "watcher" legend (Gen. 6) to explain the degeneracy which evoked the deluge. Whether Charles¹²³ is right in saying that "the subsequent depravity of the human race" is traced to this legend or whether Tennant and Williams are right in maintaining that the paradise narrative (Gen. 3) is used to explain evil in the world after the deluge¹²⁴ is a question not yet settled nor need it be for one to see that the book of Jubilees is the first of pseudographical writings to devote so much attention to the paradise narrative. Yet no fusion of these two stories is attempted by the author of Jubilees because he places these two narratives in the same order as that found in the Old Testament. However, the Books of Adam and Eve reverses the order of Genesis 3 and 6, combining the paradise narrative and the "watcher" legend and bringing about a confusion of the two totally distinct biblical stories. Thus, when the paradise narrative began to be used in terms of a universal fall, the serpent in the story became identified with Satan, betraying the previous angelic fall influence on

¹²⁰Test. Reub. 5:6.

¹²¹Test. Naph. 3:5.

¹²²Test. Levi 18:10-11.

¹²³See p. 23, above; n. #75.

¹²⁴See n. #76, above.

the later speculation. But the legend of the "watchers" was almost eclipsed by the time of 2 Baruch, which merely alludes to them. While, finally, in 4 Ezra the "watchers" vanish altogether.

The Yetzer Theory

The third theory involves the notion of the yetzer. This idea, prominent in Rabbinic literature and treated by other late Jewish writers, was considered the origin of evil existing in the world.¹²⁵ The yetzer, found in the book of Sirach 15:11-14, according to W. D. Davies, is a sinful desire, impulse, inclination, or urge.¹²⁶ As a theory concerning man's sinfulness, it arose directly from an exegesis of Genesis 6:5 and 8:21. In Genesis 6:5 it appears to be something in man for which he is responsible, but in 8:21 it is something given by God which resembles an inherent infirmity so that man from his youth, with a given disposition in his nature, has an excuse for his depravity. Thus, in the Rabbinic literature, sin is usually viewed as emanating from the evil impulse, the yetzer hara. And although this theory was developed independently of the Adamic-fall and its consequences,¹²⁷ it later came to be fused with Adam's fall by both Rabbinic and apocalyptic writers.

¹²⁵ Scroggs, op. cit., p. 33.

¹²⁶ For a more complete treatment of the yetzer see: Davies, op. cit., pp. 20-27; Joseph Bonsirven, Palestinian Judaism in the Time of Jesus Christ (New York: Holt, Rhinehart and Winston, 1964), p. 103; S. Schechter, Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1923), pp. 242-292; Tennant, op. cit., pp. 169-176; Williams, op. cit., pp. 60-72.

¹²⁷ Tennant, op. cit., pp. 170-175.



Various terms in the late Jewish literature represent the notion contained in the idea of the yetzer. Such terms are those connected with the heart which represent the volitional and intellectual elements in man.¹²⁸ Thus the expressions indicative of intent -- such as "inclination of the soul", "evil imagination", "evil disposition", "evil impulse", "hard heartedness", or "stubbornness of the heart" -- often signify the conception of the Rabbinic yetzer.¹²⁹ Such thoughts are prevalent apart from the writings of the Rabbis, for the book of Sirach states that "God created man from the beginning and placed him in the hand of his inclination".¹³⁰ Also, the Testament of Naphtali states that "there is no inclination or thought which the Lord knoweth not, for He created every man after his own image".¹³¹

The longest explanation concerning God's creation of the yetzer is in the Testament of Asher 1:3-9. Here God creates a double yetzer, one good (the yetzer hatob) and the other bad (the yetzer hara). This is but one theory concerning the yetzer, namely, that there exists by the hand of God both the evil and the good inclination. These two battle one another for supremacy. They move man from one side to the other on the scale of justice. The double yetzer theory opposes those theories which give man a single yetzer, a good or indifferent power badly in need

¹²⁸ Davies, op. cit., p. 21.

¹²⁹ 1 Enoch 5:4-9; 4 Ezra 3:20; Sirach 15:14-20, 21:11; Pirke Aboth 4:1-2; Jubilees 12:5; Zad. Frag. 3:2, 4; Test. Jos. 2:6; Test. Naph. 2:5; Test. Asher 1:3-9, 3:2; Test. Jud. 18:3; 1 QH 11:20, 5:6.

¹³⁰ Sirach 15:14.

¹³¹ Test. Naph. 2:5. Cf. also, Sirach 17:31.

of direction. Nonetheless, there did exist various combinations of both single and double yetzer theories which were striving with distinct means toward identical ends.¹³² 4 Ezra speaks of the "grain of evil seed" which was sown in the heart of Adam from the beginning. The teaching here is equivalent to that of a single yetzer. On the other hand, the "Hymn Scroll" of Qumran attributes the creation of both good and evil to God.¹³³ Also, the instruction on the "two spirits" found in the "Scroll of the Rule" makes God the author of both spirits.¹³⁴ In fact, much of the literature, including the Testament of Asher and the Scrolls of Qumran, attributed the creation of good and evil powers to God.

Several fine points were argued in Rabbinic circles concerning the yetzer and explanations on these points contributed greatly to an extensive amount of writing on the subject.¹³⁵ However, some of the theories concerning the yetzer involve a little more than fine points. In the book of Jubilees there is an apparent attempt at fusion of the yetzer and the "watchers", for the book teaches that the yetzer resulted from the "watchers".¹³⁶ Likewise, 2 Baruch and 4 Ezra explain the "evil inclination" as a result of Adam's fall. For it is from Adam's sin that "passions are produced"¹³⁷ and that the evil heart becomes inveterate.¹³⁸

¹³² Davies, op. cit., pp. 20-27.

¹³³ 1 QH 4:38.

¹³⁴ 1 QS 3:13-4:26.

¹³⁵ Davies, loc. cit.

¹³⁶ Jubilees 5:2, 7:24.

¹³⁷ 2 Baruch 56:6.

¹³⁸ 4 Ezra 3:30-26.

The yetzer, apart from its cause, was always considered something intrinsic to man's nature. That is, the impetus to man's evil deeds did not come from without, as was proposed in the "watcher" and Adam theories, but resided within man. Sirach speaks of the "inclination of flesh and blood"¹³⁹ and man's "natural tendency".¹⁴⁰ The Testament of Asher places the "inclination in our breasts"¹⁴¹ and the Testaments of Judah and Joseph give reference to the "inclination of the soul".¹⁴²

The important questions concerning the yetzer involve not only its cause or nature but also its relationship to evil. There were those who were satisfied to accept the explanation that God created the yetzer and, therefore, was responsible for the evil which would follow upon His creation.¹⁴³ That is, evil was directly attributed to God. But other explanations tended to exonerate Him as a cause of evil. He remained the author of the yetzer, a good and necessary power, which was intended for the propagation of the race and providing the necessities of life.

This power, however, was greatly in need of direction,¹⁴⁴ and because it failed to heed this direction it became the cause of evil. Thus, man possessed a power, rooted in his soul, which extended pressure in the direction of wickedness if it was not subdued. In the Testament of Asher, where there are two yetzers, the responsibility of direction

¹³⁹ Sirach 17:31.

¹⁴⁰ Sirach 21:11.

¹⁴¹ Test. Asher 1:5. Cf. also, Test. Gad. 5:3.

¹⁴² Test. Jud. 18:3; Test. Jos. 2:6.

¹⁴³ Davies, op. cit., pp. 22-23.

¹⁴⁴ Ibid.

falls upon the yetzer hatob (the good inclination).¹⁴⁵ In the Testament of Benjamin, it is the "angel of peace" who directs the "inclination" against the power of Beliar.¹⁴⁶ And in Pirke Aboth, the wisdom of man is that which enables a person to control his "evil disposition".¹⁴⁷

However, the most common notion among the Rabbis was that God gave man an evil yetzer and the law of the Torah by which he could control his "inclination".¹⁴⁸ Sirach expresses precisely this thought in saying: "He that keepeth the Law, controlleth his natural tendency".¹⁴⁹ But that which possibly summarizes the popular teaching concerning mastery over the yetzer is contained in the Testament of Asher, which encourages man to flee from wickedness, "destroying the evil inclination by your good works".¹⁵⁰

But when the yetzer failed to heed the proper direction, it rebelled against the law and, according to the Rabbis, was the source of all sin.¹⁵¹ Yet certain passages, apart from the writings of the Rabbis, tend to fuse the notions of evil spirits and the yetzer. As was noted above, the Testament of Benjamin sought proper direction for the yetzer in the "angels of peace". But this work also implies that the adverse

¹⁴⁵ Test. Asher 1:3-9.

¹⁴⁶ Test. Benj. 6:1.

¹⁴⁷ Pirke Aboth 4:1.

¹⁴⁸ Davies, loc. cit.

¹⁴⁹ Sirach 21:11.

¹⁵⁰ Test. Asher 3:2.

¹⁵¹ Davies, loc. cit.

effect could be given by the spirit of "Beliar".¹⁵² So teaches the Testament of Asher, which proclaims that the evil inclination is "ruled by Beliar".¹⁵³ Likewise, the Scroll of the Rule from Qumran states that the "inclination" of man can well be influenced by evil spirits. For man is "tempted by the dominion of Belial"¹⁵⁴ and "sins under the dominion of Belial".¹⁵⁵ Moreover, the Rule, while speaking about the two spirits in man, professes:

All dominion over the sons of perversity is in the hand of the angel of darkness...and because of the angel of darkness all the sons of righteousness go astray; and all their sin and iniquities and faults, and all the rebellion of their deeds are because of his dominion....¹⁵⁶

The effects which the evil yetzer had upon the world are also treated in much of this literature. It has already been shown in the Scroll of the Rule that the yetzer, under the angel of darkness, causes unrighteousness, faults, rebellions, iniquities, and sin.¹⁵⁷ In the Damascus Document, the "evil imagination" caused the "watchers" to fall, all flesh upon the earth to perish, the sons of Noah to go astray, the land to become desolate, and all children, kings, and mighty men of old to be delivered unto the sword.¹⁵⁸

⁴ Ezra explains that the yetzer, the "evil germ", drove out all

¹⁵²Test. Benj. 6:1.

¹⁵³Test. Asher 1:8.

¹⁵⁴1 QS 1:18.

¹⁵⁵1 QS 1:23.

¹⁵⁶1 QS 3:20-22.

¹⁵⁷1 QS 3:13-4:26.

¹⁵⁸CD 2:14-3:12.

goodness, causing only evil to remain.¹⁵⁹ And because of the "evil heart", the "inhabitants of the City committed sin, in all things", performing "ungodly deeds innumerable".¹⁶⁰ For 4 Ezra, the effects of the evil yetzer are ungodliness.¹⁶¹ It has estranged men from God, brought them to destruction, and shown them the path to death and perdition.¹⁶² Thus, the end result of the evil yetzer is primarily death and some manner of general corruption of mankind. The Testament of Asher, in speaking about the two ways, very succinctly summarizes the effects by stating:

If it incline to the evil inclination, all its actions are in wickedness... (for) even though it work what is good, he (Beliar) perverteth it to evil....¹⁶³

Summary

Thus, in this material are those three different theories which trace sin back to three distinct sources. The first source is concerned with the contamination of the race by the fall of angelic powers. This speculation arose primarily from a certain exegesis of Genesis 6:1-4 which treats the unnatural marriage of divine and human beings. Sin appears in the multiple reasons proposed for such a union. These include

¹⁵⁹ 4 Ezra 3:22.

¹⁶⁰ 4 Ezra 3:26-29.

¹⁶¹ 4 Ezra 4:30.

¹⁶² 4 Ezra 7:48, 7:92.

¹⁶³ Test. Asher 1:8-9. Also, the Didache 1-6 and the Epistle of Barnabas 18-20 give a detailed description of the evil resulting from the two ways which seem to be based upon earlier theories of the good and evil yetzers.

lust, pride, envy, the subjection of the angels to the power of Satan, and the violation of God's commandments. Those who entered into this sinful union had many names, but were most commonly called "watchers". They bore evil offspring to devour the goods of men and cause them other tribulations. The "watchers" also imparted unlawful and worthless knowledge throughout the whole of humanity, which in turn effected all manner of evil.

Second is the two-fold theory which found the source of man's sinfulness in the transgression of Adam and Eve as proposed in the narrative of Genesis 3. One is based on angelic influence which perceives the corruption of mankind as the result of the seduction of Eve by the serpent or Satan. The other is based on the fact that Adam first sinned by means of a wilful transgression against a known divine command. Thus sin was attributed to Adam because of Satan's envy and the seduction of Eve, his own disobedience against the commandment, or an evil disposition within his heart. The effects or consequences of Adam's fall were physical and premature death, spiritual weakness, and a total corruption of nature. How Adam's sin caused such dire effects was a matter of two-fold speculation. It was proposed that the sin of Adam was one which men also committed for themselves by imitation and through this individual responsibility men brought both physical and spiritual evil upon themselves. Thus Adam's transgression was not binding on all his descendants. But others found in Adam's sin the cause of an innate weakness. There were attempts to locate in Adam a corrupt disposition which becomes inveterate throughout the whole human race so that Adam's fall was the fall of all men. That is, man bears an innate infirmity from the first

transgression.

The third theory is that which involved the Rabbinic notion of the yetzer. This idea sought the source of human depravity in the evil impulse, imagination, or disposition: as first treated in Genesis 6:5 and 8:21. It was either a given disposition or sinful habit which is intrinsic to man. Sometimes it was traced back to God and sometimes it was the result of a hereditary condition, brought about by either the fall of the "watchers" or the fall of Adam and Eve. But there is no doubt that this evil impulse, the yetzer, was offered as a cause which brought about the wretchedness in which man finds himself. If God made the yetzer, he alone was deemed the author of evil. But it was suggested that God made two yetzers that fought a fierce battle within man, urging him to both evil and good ends. More often, however, man was deemed responsible for controlling his "evil tendency". In effect, the yetzer was a good or neutral power that needed direction. Various means were proposed for this purpose. The most common of these means was the Law or Torah. Yet the evil inclination often rebelled and was the source of all sin. Moreover, the yetzer could be influenced by malevolent spirits who were capable of producing the evil effects of unrighteousness, death, sin, and corruption of the flesh.

Still Judaism, in the time of 4 Ezra, c.a. A.D. 100, sought the cause of sin and wickedness in both the theories of the yetzer and the fall of the first two parents. The latter was a theory of some primitive moral catastrophe with universal sinfulness flowing from it. The former was a doctrine of an evil impulse planted by God in every human soul, separately and individually, causing all earthly corruption. But there

were obvious attempts in Judaism between 200 B.C. and A.D. 100 to synthesize the two theories. Efforts were made by those who stressed the yetzer theory to incorporate into their system the fall doctrine of Adam and Eve. Likewise did authors blend the fall theory with the doctrine of the yetzer, which synthesis is contained in both 2 Baruch and 4 Ezra.

2 Baruch admits that Adam's transgression was the starting point in a long series of external and material disasters, particularly in the premature occurrence of death. These ideas are well substantiated in chapters 48:42-43 and 56:5-6, where it is stated that "when he transgressed untimely death came into being". Also, in connection with the story of the "lustful angels", 56:10, the author of 2 Baruch gives further treatment concerning the evils that resulted through Adam's transgression. There is no obvious attempt to utilize the idea of the yetzer in these passages, unless the phrase, "passions of parents" in 56:6 is understood as the equivalent of the yetzer. But the freedom granted man in imitating Adam's sin, which is contained in 54:15, is very near the doctrine professed by the Rabbis.¹⁶⁴ Thus Adam's sin only introduced premature death and in no way effected his descendants' freedom of choice.¹⁶⁵

The author of 4 Ezra accepts the Rabbinic doctrine of the yetzer and also maintains that after the "fall", the "evil tendency" was passed on to the human race. Here definitely is a fusion of the yetzer with the

¹⁶⁴ See n. #106, p. 32.

¹⁶⁵ This opinion of 2 Baruch appears to be an attack upon and repudiation of the fall-theory as proposed in 4 Ezra. At least this teaching of 2 Baruch is controverted in 4 Ezra.

Adam-theory. That is, at the moment of Adam's creation, the yetzer was planted in his heart.

For the First Adam, clothing himself with the evil heart, transgressed and was overcome; and likewise also all who were born of him. Thus the infirmity became inveterate.¹⁶⁶

The evil heart, then, became fixed and habitual because of the fall. The starting point from which the world becomes painful and sorrowful is Adam's transgression. Ezra states that "when Adam transgressed...then the ways of the world became narrow and sorrowful".¹⁶⁷ Moreover, the evil heart and sin of Adam are communicated from Adam to his posterity in a manner which could cause the infirmity to be inveterate. Such appears to be the thought of 4 Ezra 7:118-119.¹⁶⁸

Although attempts were made on the part of some, other than 4 Ezra, to amalgamate the yetzer and "fall-theories", the complex organic fusion of such never achieved its fulness in Judaism. The only work which approximates a complete fusion of the yetzer with the "fall" doctrine is 4 Ezra. Yet much speculation had been done on the problem of universal sin and its origin.

Sin and Its Origin in the New Testament

Still original and universal sin is laid at the base of Christianity's justification for its own existence, and the universality of sinfulness is not something incidental but the very foundation upon

¹⁶⁶ 4 Ezra 3:21-23. Cf. also, 4:30.

¹⁶⁷ 4 Ezra 7:11-12.

¹⁶⁸ Cf. above, pp. 32-33.

which the subsequent structure of Christianity is built.¹⁶⁹ But the doctrine of "original sin" and the imputation of sin to Adam's posterity through his transgression rests upon tenuous New Testament authority.¹⁷⁰ In the New Testament, only the basis is laid for the acceptance of the Adamic-fall doctrine. This basis is found largely in the teachings of St. Paul, who made some use of the fall narrated in Genesis 3. In the rest of the Old Testament, the story of Genesis has little influence, and in the New Testament, apart from Paul, the fall story plays no significant part.

However, in the writings of Paul and the rest of the New Testament it is possible to trace various attitudes regarding sin and its origin. These attitudes were formed by the heritage of very late Old Testament times. For certainly, the writers of the New Testament books did not write independently but used ideas which were prevalent among the Jews during their lifetime.¹⁷¹

An investigation concerning the origin of sin and death in Christian scriptures reveals that divergent ideas conceived in an earlier age are found in the background of these scriptures. One of these ideas

¹⁶⁹ Burke, op. cit., p. 4.

¹⁷⁰ R. S. Moxan, The Doctrine of Sin (New York: George H. Doran Co., 1922), p. 2. Herbert Haag, Is Original Sin in Scripture (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1969).

¹⁷¹ De Rosa, op. cit., p. 98. William Barclay, "Great Themes of the New Testament", Expository Times LXX (March, 1959), 132-135. Robert Bartels, "Law and Sin in Fourth Esdras and St. Paul", Lutheran Quarterly I-II (August, 1949), 319. J. Cambier, "Péchés des Hommes et Péché d'Adam en Rom. V.12", NTS XI (1964), 235.

concerns the angels. The New Testament often affirms the existence of an angelic world. But part of this angelic world sins,¹⁷² because they "did not keep their own position but left their proper dwelling"¹⁷³ and indulged in unnatural lusts. Evil powers of a heavenly origin are perceived, then, as working destruction upon the world,¹⁷⁴ and it would appear that the legend of the "watchers" from the tradition of Enoch was not as yet completely forgotten.¹⁷⁵

Paul, in giving credence to the angelic world, perceives this world in a role mostly concerned with wickedness.¹⁷⁶ But his treatment of Satan, demons, and angels was not meant to serve in his writings as the origin of sin and death or to serve as a predominant factor in his teachings about Christ. Although the gospel references to Genesis 3 are only two,¹⁷⁷ and these are not in connection with sin or death, Paul makes use of the fall narrated in Genesis 3 not only by contrasting Adam with Christ but also by associating Adam with sin and death.

¹⁷² 2 Peter 2:4.

¹⁷³ Jude 6.

¹⁷⁴ Ephesians 6:12.

¹⁷⁵ 1 Enoch cc. 6-10. A reading of Genesis 6:1-6, followed by that of 1 Enoch reveals the meaning of 1 Corinthians 11:10, "That is why a woman ought to have a veil on her head, because of the angels". Here is proposed a caution against some further seduction by the lustful "watchers".

¹⁷⁶ 1 Cor. 5:5, 7:5; 2 Cor. 2:11, 6:15, 11:14, 12:7; 1 Thes. 2:18; 2 Thes. 2:9; 1 Tim. 1:20 (Satan). 1 Cor. 10:19-21 (Demons). Rm. 8:38; Gal. 1:8; 2 Thes. 1:6-9; 1 Tim. 5:21 (angels).

¹⁷⁷ Mt. 19:4-5; Mk. 10:6-8.

Therefore as sin came into the world through one man and death through sin, and so death spread to all men because all men sinned.¹⁷⁸

For as by a man came death, by a man has come also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive.¹⁷⁹

These passages demonstrate that their author understood some connection to exist between Adam, death, and sin. Yet that relationship is not explicit in Paul's writings.

In the Old Testament, sin was taught as the cause of death,¹⁸⁰ and in late Jewish literature Adam was often treated as the cause of sin. Thus, Adam also becomes the cause of death. Yet how sin is transferred from Adam to all men remains unanswered, at least in the above passages of Paul's letters. What is evident in the first passage is that Adam was the first sinner and in the following verse he became a sinner through a violation of some commandment¹⁸¹ or the law of the Torah.¹⁸² The limits of Adam's deed are not placed on his descendants but affect the whole of creation.¹⁸³ The law is an insufficient remedy for the prevention of evil, sin, and death¹⁸⁴ which befall man, who is born in bondage to corruption.¹⁸⁵

¹⁷⁸ Rom. 5:12.

¹⁷⁹ 1 Cor. 15:21-22.

¹⁸⁰ Tennant, op. cit., p. 162. Thackeray, op. cit., pp. 33-36. Scroggs, op. cit., p. 36. Dubarle, op. cit., 89, 96, 100. Cf. Deut. 30:15-20; Ezek. 18. Also, the book of Proverbs offers the theme that fidelity to the law brings life and sin brings death.

¹⁸¹ Rom. 5:14, 15, 17.

¹⁸² Scroggs, op. cit., p. 89.

¹⁸³ Rom. 8:18-23; 1 Cor. 15:21 f.

¹⁸⁴ Rom. 7:22-24, 8:3.

¹⁸⁵ 1 Cor. 15:42-50.

This corruption could possibly be understood as residing in man's nature and as an innate condition. That is, Romans 5:12, 19, in light of 4 Ezra, could be professing that, after the fall of Adam, a sinful nature was shared by all of mankind. Or the same texts could be understood in light of 2 Baruch to mean that the sin of Adam affects the human race, which suffers a weakened condition because each man sins by imitating the sin of Adam, becoming the Adam of his own death and soul.¹⁸⁶ Romans 2:6-11 would substantiate such an understanding of Romans 5.

Moreover, William Barclay argues that behind the writings of Paul lies the Rabbinic and apocalyptic notion of "solidarity", so that when Adam sinned, each man was guilty for that sin and its effects.¹⁸⁷ That is, all men were somehow contained in Adam, so that his sin was the sin of all men.¹⁸⁸ Also, there are indications in the New Testament and Paul's letters of a tradition that desired to exonerate Adam from any guilt for the first sin. This tradition places the blame upon Eve for mankind's general sinfulness and death.¹⁸⁹

Furthermore, multiple theories of the yetzer could be in the background of Paul's thought regarding the nature of man's bondage to corruption or the sinful strain contained in Adam's posterity. This notion of the "evil impulse", fostered by the Rabbis, could very well underlie the New Testament and Paul's treatment of sin, death, and Adam. Matthew

¹⁸⁶ 2 Baruch 54:15.

¹⁸⁷ 2 Baruch 18:1-2, 19:1-3, 54:15, 19.

¹⁸⁸ Barclay, op. cit., pp. 173-174.

¹⁸⁹ 2 Cor. 11:2 f. Cf. 1 Tim. 2:14. Also see, Barclay, ibid., pp. 172-174.

15:18-20 and Mark 7:21-23 have been understood in light of this late Jewish apocalyptic theory. In addition, James explicitly attributes temptation to a cause very similar to that of the "evil impulse" when he states that "each person is tempted when he is lured and enticed by his own desire".¹⁹⁰

Paul likewise does not seem to escape from the yetzer concept when he postulates in Romans the inefficiency of the law to overcome the "evil impulse" in man.¹⁹¹ The yetzer and the failure of the law bring death.¹⁹² Moreover, the notion of both a good and evil yetzer can be perceived in Paul's writings when he places them in constant struggle, one with the other, while the law, a God-given remedy, is unable to thwart the evil resulting from that struggle.¹⁹³ Thus Paul, in rejecting the Rabbinic cure for the yetzer, explains:

We know that the law is spiritual; but I am carnal, sold under sin. I do not understand my own actions. For I do not do what I want, but I do the very thing I hate. Now if I do what I do not want, I agree that the law is good. So then it is no longer I that do it, but sin which dwells within me. For I know that nothing good dwells within me, that is, in my flesh. I can will what is right, but I can not do it. For I do not do the good I want, but the evil I do not want is what I do. Now if I do what I do not want, it is no longer I that do it, but sin which dwells within me. So I find it to be a law that when I want to do right, evil lies close at hand. For I delight in the law of God in my inmost self, but I see in my members another law at war with the law of my mind and making me captive to the law of sin which dwells in my members.¹⁹⁴

¹⁹⁰James 1:14-15.

¹⁹¹Rom. 7:7-25.

¹⁹²Rom. 7:10-11.

¹⁹³Sifre Deut. 32; Kiddushin 30b.

¹⁹⁴Rom. 7:14-23.

It becomes apparent, then, that Paul desires to serve the law of God while his flesh serves the "evil impulse".

It also has been pointed out that 4 Ezra makes an attempt to fuse the yetzer and the Adamic-fall theory.¹⁹⁵ An acceptable doctrine taken from such a fusion could be understood as incipient to a doctrine of "original sin". That is, the evil yetzer which was planted in the heart of Adam became fixed and habitual because of Adam's fall. Then the yetzer was hereditary throughout the human race, so that it is communicated from Adam to his posterity by propagation. If Romans 7:7-25, 8:3-13 and Galatians 5:16-24 are read in light of the yetzer theory, while Romans 5 and Corinthians 15 are read in light of 4 Ezra, the conclusion could also be understood as a doctrine incipient to that of "original sin".

Therefore, similar notions concerning sin and its origin are found in the New Testament and in late Jewish inter-testamental literature. That sin is universal was a basic concept accepted by both traditions, so that a likeness exists between the words of 4 Ezra, "When was it that the inhabitants of the earth did not sin before thee?"¹⁹⁶ and the words of Paul, "For I have already charged that all men, both Jews and Greeks, are under the power of sin".¹⁹⁷ Likewise, when the book of Wisdom exclaims "Do not invite death by the error of your life"¹⁹⁸ and 4 Ezra states that "We and our Fathers have passed our lives in ways that bring

¹⁹⁵ See above, pp. 45-46. Also see, 4 Ezra 3:20-26.

¹⁹⁶ 4 Ezra 3:35.

¹⁹⁷ Rom. 3:9.

¹⁹⁸ Wisd. Sol. 1:12.

death",¹⁹⁹ they are speaking the thought of Paul, who proclaims that "the wages of sin is death".²⁰⁰ Also, that "creation was subjected to futility"²⁰¹ echoes the thought of 4 Ezra that "the ways of this world became narrow and sorrowful and painful and full of perils coupled with great toils".²⁰²

Yet when Paul wrote "therefore as sin came into the world through one man, and death through sin, and so death spread to all men because all men sinned",²⁰³ he was fostering a notion that there exists some connection between Adam, death, and sin. Moreover, such a connection is not without precedent in the literature contemporary with Paul, as 4 Ezra expresses a like connection when writing about Adam.

For a grain of evil seed was sown in the heart of Adam from the beginning and how much fruit of ungodliness has it produced unto this time, and shall yet produce until the threshing-floor come.²⁰⁴

Still, because of the varied traditions from which Paul could have written about Adam, sin, and death, difficulties arise in reading Paul on the subject. The precise relationship which Paul understood to exist between Adam, sin, and death cannot be definitively demonstrated. Thus, it must be concluded that any doctrine of "original sin" is at least doubtfully contained in the New Testament and that present scholarship affirms that the New Testament does not directly teach such a doctrine.

¹⁹⁹ 4 Ezra 8:31.

²⁰⁰ Rom. 6:23.

²⁰¹ Rom. 8:20.

²⁰² 4 Ezra 7:12-13.

²⁰³ Rom. 5:12.

²⁰⁴ 4 Ezra 4:30. Cf. also, 7:116-118.

One finds in Paul's thought a profession of universal sin which is somehow related to Adam. Yet Paul is not primarily concerned about this relationship, but rather that all men are under bondage to sin and need to be set free from such bondage. This requires a "saviour" equivalent to man's condition. That is, if the world is subject to universal bondage, sin, death, and condemnation, the "saviour" must universally bring freedom, grace, life, and righteousness. The doctrine of "original sin", then, was not the explicit teaching of the New Testament but was a result of theological development. In fact, it was the culmination of much speculation by the early Church Fathers on the ideas of sin and its origin.

The Source of Irenaeus's Thought on Sin and Its Origin

Irenaeus was one of the first important contributors in the early Church to what became the doctrine of "original sin". His five books, Against Heresies, and his Proof of the Apostolic Preaching contain lengthy discussions on sin and its origin.. His discussions certainly are not written devoid of tradition. That is, Irenaeus was very much aware of the theological development that was taking place in his day.²⁰⁵ He was also familiar with the Greek Apologists,²⁰⁶ the Old and New

²⁰⁵ Most of his awareness was concerning the teaching of his adversaries, the "gnostics", who were considered heretical and a great threat to Christianity.

²⁰⁶ Tennant, op. cit., p. 282; Williams, op. cit., pp. 177 f.; W. Bousset, Schulbetrieb (Göttingen: 1915), pp. 272-282; F. R. M. Hitchcock, Irenaeus of Lugdunum (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1914); Gustaf Wingren, Man and the Incarnation (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1959), intro.; J. T. Nielsen, Adam and Christ in the Theology of Irenaeus of Lyons (Assen: Van Gorcum and Co., 1968), pp. 86-94. However, F. R. M. Hitchcock, "Loof's Theory of Theophilus of Antioch as a source of

Testaments,²⁰⁷ and at least some of the ideas from 1 Enoch.²⁰⁸

However, an inquiry into Irenaeus's notions on sin reveals that he offers many and varied explanations for sin and its origin. Such explanations give rise to two very pressing questions. First, did Irenaeus depend upon an earlier Jewish tradition to interpret the New Testament and formulate ideas concerning sin and its origin? Second, did Irenaeus borrow from this Jewish tradition ideas on the origin of sin which were not contained in the New Testament?²⁰⁹

It is the purpose of this thesis to demonstrate that Irenaeus culled many of his thoughts on the subject of man's sinfulness from

Irenaeus", JTS XXXVIII (1937), 130-139, 255-266, warns against reading Irenaeus totally in light of the earlier Apologists because there could have been other sources common to both Irenaeus and the Apologists. In fact, Theodor E. Mommsen, "St Augustine and the Christian Idea of Progress", Journal of the History of Ideas XII (1951), 348-352, argues that Irenaeus and other early Church Fathers adopted both pagan and Jewish traditions for their theological speculations.

²⁰⁷ W. Sanday and C. H. Turner, Novum Testamentum Sancti Irenaei (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1923); Tennant, op. cit., pp. 274 f.; Nielsen, op. cit., pp. 68-82; Hitchcock, Irenaeus, pp. 183-240; Wingren, loc cit.; B. Hemmerdinger, "Observations Critiques sur Irénée, IV", JTS XVII (1966), 324-326; F. C. Burkitt, "Dr. Sanday's New Testament of Irenaeus", JTS XXV (1923-1924), 56-67; Hitchcock, "LTTA", pp. 134-139; H. von Campenhausen, "Irenaus und das Neue Testament", ThLZ XC (1965), 1-7; A. Benoit, "Ecriture et Tradition chez Saint Irénée", RHPR XL (1960), 32-49. This last reference claims that there are 629 Old Testament and 1065 New Testament allusions or citations found in the writings of Irenaeus.

²⁰⁸ Williams, op. cit., p. 190, asserts that "The watcher story in the Proof of the Apostolic Preaching #18 is clearly based on 1 Enoch 7:1". Also Hemmerdinger, op. cit., p. 309, makes the same assertion.

²⁰⁹ Benoit, op. cit., pp. 32-34, makes the distinction between tradition and scripture. He also says that Irenaeus depends more upon scripture than tradition in his battle against his gnostic adversaries. The primary question is not Irenaeus's use of scripture but his understanding and manner of its use which required some tradition possibly preceding and contemporaneous with the rise of Christianity.

source material other than the Old and New Testaments. Moreover, he used this other source material as an aid for understanding Paul and the rest of the New Testament on sin and its origin. That other source material is basically the traditions that are found in the late Jewish apocalyptic literature, which contain ideas so similar to those of Irenaeus that more than coincidence must be posited as a cause for likeness. In fact, some dependence and familiarity on the part of Irenaeus with non-canonical apocalyptic notions must be maintained.

The method of this thesis will be first to treat Irenaeus's doctrine of "recapitulation" in order briefly to discuss and expose his ideas of Adam and sin in relation to that theory. Second, the thesis will treat the most important themes which relate to Irenaeus's speculations on sin and its origin. These themes concern Adam, angels, and the fusion of these two motifs. Within the treatment of each of these themes will be first an exposition of Irenaeus's speculations; second, an association of Irenaeus with Paul and the New Testament, if any; and finally, a demonstration of Irenaeus's dependency upon apocalyptic traditions.

Also, some space should be devoted to the possibility that Irenaeus's writings betray literary dependence upon late Jewish apocalyptic literature, even though an argument presented from a comparison which relies largely on English translations of ancient manuscript's cannot always lead to certain results. To examine this possibility, it is necessary to rely principally upon English translations because few original segments of Irenaeus's writings or apocalyptic texts are extant. Some segments of Irenaeus's writings exist in the Greek language

but most of his writings are found either in Latin or Armenian versions.²¹⁰

A more complex situation arises in approaching apocalyptic literature because of the composite nature of the various writings and the lack of knowledge available concerning the original texts of these writings. At best only some few Greek fragments of apocalyptic works are extant and those are questionable as original versions.²¹¹ Generally speaking, some Latin, Armenian, Ethiopic, Slavonic, and Syriac versions of apocalyptic manuscripts do exist.²¹² From these versions, R. H. Charles and other prominent scholars have succeeded in collecting and translating various manuscripts into an English edition.²¹³ Such labour enables an English comparison to be made between Irenaeus and apocalyptic authors.

There is some validity to this comparison if those responsible for the translation are accurate, but, without question, the validity of such a comparison rests principally upon the scholarship of the translator. However, greater trust can be allotted such a comparison if it is realized that those who collected and translated apocalyptic writings

²¹⁰ Of the three separate works, Adversus Haereses, Proof of the Apostolic Preaching, and Fragmenta, there appear some Greek fragments for Adversus Haereses and Fragmenta. Adversus Haereses is mainly in Latin, while Proof of the Apostolic Preaching comes from an Armenian manuscript found in 1904. Cf. Smith, op. cit., p. 4.

²¹¹ The contributors to Charles's two volumes introduce each book of this collection discussing the various ancient manuscripts for each book. In each of these introductions questions arise concerning the originality of extant Greek manuscripts or whether many of these books had Greek originals. A very few Hebrew and Aramaic fragments have now been found in Qumran, but these are largely unpublished and in any case very limited.

²¹² Ibid. The fact is that comparatively few segments of these writings are found in Greek.

²¹³ See Introduction, n. #8, and Chapter One, n. #38.

and those who likewise accomplished the same for the texts of Irenaeus worked totally apart from one another.

One further point regarding the validity of the English translation for the texts of Irenaeus is the attestation of authors to the faithfulness which the Latin version of Irenaeus's writings displays concerning the lost original Greek version.²¹⁴ Moreover, to complete this English to Latin to Greek fidelity, endeavors presently are being carried on to reconstruct from the Latin, the original Greek text of Irenaeus,²¹⁵ which at this time have not created any significant changes in the already existing English translation.

Still, caution is advised in attempting such a comparison and in proposing any unwarranted conclusions based on such a comparison. Rather, the comparison for the purpose of determining direct literary dependence is made in an attempt to reinforce the argument that Irenaeus was dependent upon non-canonical apocalyptic writings.

Although it might be fruitful to compare all of Irenaeus's writings with those of apocalyptic authors, it is not necessary, at this time, to introduce material for comparison other than that material with which the

²¹⁴ Burkitt, op. cit., pp. 58-60. Cf. Chapter One, n. #196.

²¹⁵ A. Rousseau (ed.), Irénée de Lyon, Contre les Heresies, Livre IV (Greek retroversion with French translation), 2 vols. (S.C. 100) (Paris: Cerf, 1965). Cf. the intended volumes listed in Blackwell's catalogue. See also, James Steele Allison Cunningham, Irenaeus: Adversus Haereses I. A New Edition of the Latin Text (with the Extant Greek Fragments) (Ph.D. thesis), Princeton University, 1967. This work is not a Greek retroversion but a Latin translation based upon what the author considers a more acceptable Greek text than that used in other translations.

thesis presently deals. Only the texts of Irenaeus and apocalyptic writers which are being discussed in this thesis will fall under investigation. Sometimes, then, a repetition of texts, already cited, will result, but the discussion about these texts will not be repetitive. Moreover, this comparison of texts, for the purpose of showing Irenaeus's literary dependency upon apocalyptic writings, will be made within Chapters Three, Four, and Five which treat the three themes already mentioned, namely, Satan and his angels, Adam and Eve, and the fusion of these two independent speculations on sin's origin. Within each of these themes are certain ideas cloaked in words and phrases peculiar to both the writings of Irenaeus and apocalyptic authors. Such peculiar characteristics found in these two distinct traditions offer the conclusion that Irenaeus had more than a casual familiarity with late Jewish apocalyptic notions. Rather, the conclusion should be that Irenaeus, when formulating his theology, had before him, not one, but several disparate apocalyptic texts which he used in verbally formulating his ideas on the above themes. Those texts include 1 Enoch, the Books of Adam and Eve, the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, Jubilees, and 2 Baruch.²¹⁶

²¹⁶ All of the English texts from Adversus Haereses which are cited for the purpose of making literary comparisons are also found in Latin. Two texts are found in Greek, namely A.H. 5, 29, 2 (ibid.) and 4, 40, 3 (4, 66, 2). A.H. 4, 40, 3 (4, 66, 2) has no Greek parallels in apocalyptic literature. A.H. 5, 29, 2 (ibid.) has a Greek parallel in 1 Enoch 106: 13-16 and Test. Naph. 3:5 but nothing is gained by making a Greek comparison which is not gained by the English comparison. The English cited from Proof of the Apostolic Preaching has an Armenian parallel in the Apocalypse of Moses but again nothing is gained by the Armenian comparison which is not already gained by the English comparisons. The only texts cited for the purposes of comparison in a language other than English which are both possible and bear fruit are passages from A.H. 5, 34, 2 (ibid.) and the apocalyptic Vita Adae et Evaæ. Both of these sources are found in Latin and deal with the phrase "pain of the stroke". See Chapter Three, pp. 106-109.

CHAPTER TWO

SIN AND RECAPITULATION

Although the works of Irenaeus¹ have not attracted the amount of attention which has been accorded many of the earlier and late Christian authors during the past century, modern scholarship has succeeded in clarifying the main lines of his thought.² Moreover, past and recent scholarship has resulted in an increased interest in and appreciation of Irenaeus's writings.³ Once scholars read Irenaeus with a certain

¹The principal work is Adversus Haereses, books I-V, which is a collection of Irenaeus's theological arguments against the gnostics. The Proof of the Apostolic Preaching is a brief collection of catechetical statements concerning the Christian faith. A volume called Fragments from the Lost Writings of Irenaeus is a collection of disparate fragments. Editions used: A Stieren, Sancti Irenaei Episcopi Lugdunensis quae Supersunt Omnia (Leipzig: 1848-1853), vols. I-II; W. W. Harvey, Sancti Irenaei Episcopi Lugdunensis libros quinque adversus haereses (Cambridge: 1857), vols. I-II. Translations: A. Roberts and J. Donaldson, eds., The Ante-Nicene Fathers (New York: Charles Scribner's and Sons, 1899), vol. I; Joseph P. Smith, trans., Proof of the Apostolic Preaching (London: The Newman Press, 1952). The primary sources used in this thesis are the Adversus Haereses, which will be henceforth cited as A.H., and the Proof of the Apostolic Preaching, cited simply as Proof. Quotations from A.H. in English translation will be taken from Roberts's and Donaldson's edition. Quotations from Proof will be taken from Smith's edition. Since the English translation is based on Stieren's paragraph numbering system, those numbers will be first cited. References to Harvey's edition follow in brackets.

²For bibliographies, see Nielsen, op. cit., and Wingren, op. cit.

³Nielsen, op. cit., p. 8.

skepticism, finding in his works a number of theological discrepancies.⁴

Attempts to resolve these discrepancies met with little success.⁵ However, greater confidence has been the attitude of some recent scholars in their approach to the writings of Irenaeus. They find remarkable unity throughout his works and one maintains that his theology is fused into an harmonious whole.⁶ Such scholars find a positive as well as negative purpose in Irenaeus's refutation of the gnostics. These scholars maintain that the thread which leads to the center of Irenaeus's theology and brings all to a unified whole is his theory of "recapitulation".⁷

Irenaeus's use and understanding of Paul's letters, Romans and 1 Corinthians, combined with some passages from Ephesians, in this view, formed the basis upon which the Church Father constructed his Adam-Christ

⁴ H. H. Wendt, Christliche Lehre (Göttingen: 1882), pp. 26 f.; Adolf Harnack, History of Dogma (London: Williams and Norgate, 1886), II, pp. 272 f.; Tennant, op. cit., pp. 282-291; Julius Gross, Entstehungsgeschichte des Erbsündendogmas. Von der Bibel bis Augustinus (Munich: Reinhardt Verlag, 1960), I, p. 87.

⁵ Tennant, op. cit., pp. 285-287, explains Harnack and Wendt's failure to resolve Irenaeus's incompatible lines of doctrine concerning the "fall" and its effects. Cf. also, Wingren, op. cit., p. 27, who notes that many scholars followed Wendt and Harnack in emphasizing the apparent discrepancies in Irenaeus's thought.

⁶ Wingren, op. cit., intro., p. xv. Cf. also, Nielsen, op. cit., pp. 6-9.

⁷ Nielsen, loc. cit. Lawson, op. cit., pp. 140-144, to some extent delves into the etymology of κόσμος and maintains that it is a biblical word having its ultimate source in Eph. 1:10, where Christ is either the sum total of all things or all things are summed up in Christ. Cf. C. F. Burney, "Christ as the αρχή of Creation", JTS XXVII (1925-1926), 160-167.

typology,⁸ in which the first Adam is paralleled with the "second Adam".⁹

At least Irenaeus's exegesis of Romans 5:19 as found in Adversus Haereses 3, 21, 10 (3, 30),¹⁰ includes his understanding of 1 Corinthians 15:21-25 and Ephesians 1:10.¹¹ That is, the letters to Romans and 1 Corinthians treat the theme of first and second Adam while Ephesians uses the verb form of ἀνακαίωσις or recapitulatio.

This term, as used by Irenaeus, determines the whole οἰκοδομία dispositio, of God. The dispositio of God is an attempt to express in one word God's function and order of salvation. Such a dispositio, which comprises creation, salvation, and completion, is laid down in both

⁸ Nielsen, op. cit., pp. 11-23, 56-67. Cf. also, Gross, loc. cit., who says that Irenaeus was completely subjected to the Pauline Adam-Christ speculation. However, it seems that Gross misunderstands Paul in saying that we regain in Christ what we had lost in Adam. This is certainly the thought of Irenaeus but not the thought of Paul.

⁹ F. Schiele, "Die rabbinischen Parallelen zu 1 Kor. 15:45-50", Zeitschrift für Theologie XLII (1899), 20-31, concludes that Paul first uses the terms "first" and "second" Adam. He argues against Paul's having taken the conception from such sources as Philo, ancient Judaism, and the ancient tradition of the Urmensch. However, Scroggs, LA, pp. 75-112, offers sufficient evidence to establish Paul's source for "first" and "last" Adam from apocalyptic traditions between the Testaments.

¹⁰ "For as by one man's disobedience sin entered, and death obtained [a place] through sin; so also by the obedience of one man, righteousness, having been introduced, shall cause life to fructify in those persons who in times past were dead...so did He who is the Word recapitulating Adam in Himself rightly receive a birth, enabling Him to gather up Adam [into Himself]....It was that there might not be another formation called into being nor any other which should [require to] be saved, but that very same formation should be summed up [in Christ as had existed in Adam], the analogy having been preserved".

¹¹ Compare Rom. 5:19; 1 Cor. 15:21-22, 45-49; Eph. 1:10, 1:23 with A.H. 3, 16, 6 (3, 17, 6); 3, 18, 7 (3, 19, 6); 3, 19, 3 (3, 20, 3); 3, 21, 10 (3, 30); 5, 1, 2 (ibid.); 5, 14, 1 (ibid.).

the Old and New Testaments. The chief moment in the ~~πικερμία~~³ is that time when Christ "recapitulates" all things in Himself.¹² Thus, recapitulatio is a vital term and essential notion to understanding Irenaeus's theology.¹³

J. T. Nielsen, in his brief work, has drawn from the Adversus Haereses an Adam-Christ typology¹⁴ and, to some extent, has demonstrated the function of this typology in the theology of Irenaeus.¹⁵ Nielsen's claim is that Irenaeus posits the theme that Christ -- homo factus -- has recapitulated the human race in himself and that man has received in Christ what he lost in Adam's fall.¹⁶ That which Adam lost was principally the image and likeness of God.¹⁷ In the theology of Irenaeus, Adam and Christ are inseparably linked in the sense that the first Adam began a period of disaster. Adam, fallen through his disobedience, could not be made anew or remade of his own accord.¹⁸ The second Adam, Christ, a beginning of salvation, renovated the first Adam. "In order to conquer

¹² Nielsen, op. cit., pp. 56-60.

¹³ Ibid., p. 6. Nielsen's claim is that the Adam-Christ typology, the basis of recapitulation, is one of the "threads" leading to the center of Irenaeus's theology. Lawson, op. cit., p. 143, notes that Justin Martyr before Irenaeus used the term in his lost work against Marcion. At least Irenaeus attests to Justin's use of the term. See A.H. 4, 6, 2 (4, 11, 2).

¹⁴ Ibid., pp. 11-23.

¹⁵ Ibid., pp. 56-67.

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 11, Cf. A.H. 3, 18, 2 (3, 19, 2).

¹⁷ A.H. 3, 18, 1 (3, 19, 1): ut quod perdideramus in Adam, id est, secundum imaginem et similitudinem esse Dei.

¹⁸ Nielsen, op. cit., p. 11. Cf. A.H. 3, 18, 2 (3, 19, 2).

and cure the old, it (the period of disaster) had to be recapitulated by Christ".¹⁹ Thus Christ gathered together in Himself the old plasmatio²⁰ of Adam and brought it to its destination. "Through his suffering and his death upon the cross, Christ destroyed death, He eradicated mortality, and gave immortality".²¹

In the theology of Irenaeus, the history of mankind is the unfolding of God's plan toward a certain end, the coming of Christ.²² Thus the whole of history has one particular aim in bringing forth the God-man, Christ. He is the center of history and His coming and role are expressed in the term avakefaiwēs.²³ He recapitulates the long development of mankind in Himself, joining "the beginning with the end, and is Lord of both covenants".²⁴ From the beginning, then, God's plan was directed toward this event, so that Christ actually sums up the beginning, middle, and end of human history in his very person. The old Adam is made anew and brought to salvation. This contrast between Adam and Christ -- one leading to disaster and the other to salvation -- is the basis of the Adam-Christ typology and the heart of Irenaeus's theology.²⁵

¹⁹ Ibid., p. 64. Cf. A.H. 3, 21, 10 (3, 30).

²⁰ Ibid., p. 16. ²¹ Ibid., p. 65.

²² Ibid., p. 58. Cf. A.H. 3, 16, 6 (3, 17, 6). Here Christ is described as the center of the ekkōcōia.

²³ Ibid., "omnia in semetipum recapitulans".

²⁴ Ibid., p. 59. Cf. A.H. 4, 34, 4 (4, 56, 3): "He joined the beginning to the end, and is the Lord of both..."

²⁵ Ibid., p. 64.

Gustaf Wingren, in his lengthier exposition of Irenaeus's theology and theory of recapitulation, has employed a scheme which is expressed in the two headings "From life to death"²⁶ and "From death to life".²⁷ In the middle of this scheme comes Christ,²⁸ who is incarnate in the world. The two headings express what has happened and is happening to the world of mankind. That is, man, from the beginning, tended toward death; but through the intervention, mediation, and incarnation of Jesus Christ is moving toward life and immortality.

Wingren perceives in Irenaeus's writings the notions of creation, man's defeat, Christ's incarnation, Christ's struggle, His victory over Satan, the Church, the body of Christ, and finally, the consummation of creation in an eschatological kingdom.²⁹ According to Wingren, Irenaeus's exposition begins with man's creation as a child in the image and likeness of God. The event that follows creation is man's defeat at the hands of the devil. Then Christ's incarnation becomes the center of history. He recapitulates the first Adam and all of mankind in Himself. This is accomplished through Christ's birth, death, and resurrection. Recapitulation involves a victory over the enemy, Satan, whom He defeats once and for all time. This victory begins the restoration of creation to its pristine state and even beyond to a more perfect state than it was in the beginning. The final consummation of recapitulation will not

²⁶ Wingren, op. cit., pp. 3-75.

²⁷ Ibid., pp. 147-213.

²⁸ Ibid., pp. 79-143.

²⁹ Ibid., pp. 192-213. "The Consummation".

be realized until the end of history in an eschatological kingdom.³⁰

This comes about by means of Christ's lordship in the Church, the union of members in the body of Christ, and the work of the Holy Spirit. This occurs after the initial restoration of Christ's resurrection and is the movement titled by Wingren "From death to life". This movement is vital to the full recapitulation theory of Irenaeus, but not to the purpose of this thesis. Rather, that part of the theory which is an aid for understanding Irenaeus's ideas on sin and its origin is of prime importance because this thesis has a special interest in Irenaeus's speculations about sin.

Moreover, man's fall, sin, bondage, and death play an extensive role in the theology of Irenaeus. His theory of recapitulation is constructed on the foundation of a corrupt creation, and he necessarily devotes a great deal of his time to the subject of sin. Yet, Wingren perceives a limit to Irenaeus's speculations on sin, particularly on the cause of sin. He cites three texts from the Adversus Haereses which appear to substantiate Irenaeus's limited speculation. In the first text, A.H. 3, 28, 3 (3, 31, 4), Irenaeus definitely speaks about certain spiritual concerns which are hidden from the minds of men, such as "what was God doing before He created the world?" There is certainly no mention in this passage concerning the cause of sin or the devil's fall.

In the second text, A.H. 2, 28, 6 (2, 42, 3), Irenaeus speaks about certain matters that only God knows, such as the hour of judgment and how the Son was produced from the Father. Again, no mention is made

³⁰ Ibid., p. 82.

of the devil's fall nor is the text concerned in any way with the subject of sin's origin.

In the third text, A.H. 2, 28, 7 (2, 43, 2), Irenaeus states that "we must leave the cause why, while all things were made by God, certain of His creatures sinned and revolted from a state of submission to God". He goes on to say that this knowledge is not revealed. He further refers to the time when the answer will be given after the defeat of all God's enemies.

Although Wingren admits that Irenaeus recognizes the devil as a source for man's sinfulness, his claim, from the texts cited, is that Irenaeus maintained that the cause of the devil's fall from heaven is unknown.³¹ That is, Irenaeus did not wish to speculate upon the cause of the devil's fall,³² or he cut short the question of why the devil fell.³³

It seems, however, that the question was not cut so short that no speculation was made concerning the cause of the devil's fall; for even Wingren recognizes that Irenaeus attributed the fall of the devil to his "envy" of man, who had been created for a higher life than the angels. It would seem, then, that Irenaeus had some hidden knowledge which was not yet revealed when he made "envy" the reason for the devil's action against man. It was this envy that caused the devil to deprive man of his superiority by bringing about Adam's fall.³⁴

³¹ Ibid., p. 8.

³² Ibid., pp. 37, 41.

³³ Ibid., p. 42.

³⁴ Ibid.

Therefore, Wingren's claim that Irenaeus cut short any speculation upon the cause for the devil's fall or that the cause was unknown to Irenaeus is unwarranted in light of Irenaeus's speculation upon the devil's fall. Moreover, Wingren's conclusions appear to come from a misunderstanding of Irenaeus's claims. That is, the passage which does state that one must "leave the cause why...certain creatures sinned and revolted from a state of submission to God"³⁵ does not mean that the cause is hidden, nor does it cut short any attempt at an answer. Rather, what Irenaeus means to say here is that man cannot learn by reason why some of God's creatures fall out of envy while others persevere in loyalty to God. All of these creatures are from the same source. created by God, who is sinless. How could these creatures from an all-good God bring sin into the world and what purpose should that sin serve? Irenaeus, in his statement about what is hidden from man, is really stating that what is unknown is the answer to this last question.

Certainly Irenaeus, according to Wingren, did offer a reason for the devil's fall and even speculated a great deal upon the purpose of sin in setting out his theory of recapitulation. In one passage it even seems that sin was necessary so that the work of Christ would not be in vain.³⁶

Irenaeus, moreover, was not limited only to the devil as a cause of sin, for he speculated on other causes of sin's origin. Not all of

³⁵ A.H. 2, 28, 7 (2, 43, 2).

³⁶ A.H. 3, 22, 3 (3, 32, 1). Cf. also, Chapter Three, n. #99. However, Lawson, op. cit., p. 9, does not find in Irenaeus the notion that sin is a necessary part of man's development.

these speculations are found in Wingren's analysis of Irenaeus's theory of recapitulation, nor did all of these speculations originate in the mind of Irenaeus. That is, Irenaeus's purpose was not to speculate on the origin of sin, but he certainly used speculations about sin's origin in formulating his theory of recapitulation. In fact, as has been already stated, he incorporated three important themes on the origin of sin: Adam, angels, and the fusion of these two motifs. While it has been established that some of Irenaeus's ideas are related to St. Paul and the New Testament, it is the contention of this thesis that Irenaeus borrowed speculations on sin's origin from material which offered many varied explanations for the cause of man's sinfulness. The New Testament does not offer what Irenaeus borrowed, so that it is necessary to investigate other sources for Irenaeus's thought.³⁷ Such an investigation leads to the conclusion that Irenaeus not only speculated upon or used other speculations upon sin's origin, but was dependent upon ideas fashioned by apocalyptic writers of the late Jewish period.

³⁷ This investigation proceeds, then, in the face of Nielsen's claim that "The period of research into the various literary sources from which Irenaeus drew his work may be regarded as closed". Nielsen, op. cit., p. 6.

CHAPTER THREE

EXALTED AND SINFUL ADAM

Adam's Creation in the Image and Likeness

The creation accounts which are found in Genesis¹ offer at least two distinct motifs about the first man, Adam. One concerns man's created state as intended by God; the other concerns the entrance of sin into the world. These two motifs are of primary importance in understanding Irenaeus's thought about Adam because both of these motifs are involved in Irenaeus's theory of recapitulatio.

The first motif concerns Adam's creation. For Irenaeus, all things originated from God, not out of his being, but out of nothing.² Furthermore, the whole of creation was made by the "hands of God", which are the Son and the Spirit.³ Through these "hands" the Creator is constantly at work, even in the least of His creatures, which reproduce and continue His creation.⁴ Moreover, creation consists of a series of works which involve the whole of history and exists for man's sake, rather than

¹Genesis 1:1-2:4a and 2:4b-3:24.

²Wingren, op. cit., p. 4.

³A.H. 4, 20, 1 (4, 34, 1); 4, 7, 4 (4, 14). F. R. M. Hitchcock, LTTA, pp. 131-132, argues that both Irenaeus and Theophilus could have been dependent upon Philo or 4 Ezra for the notions contained in the phrase "hands of God".

⁴Wingren, op. cit., p. 10. Cf. A.H. 2, 30, 8 (2, 47, 2).

man for creation's sake.⁵ Thus, Irenaeus perceived that Adam was created in a highly exalted state of being. He was the main purpose of God's entire creation. Irenaeus asserts as much, saying "the Father being in no want of angels, in order to call the creation into being, and form man, for whom also the creation was made...."⁶

Adam's exalted state in creation conceivably exists implicitly in the Old Testament, but is definitely explicit in the writings of Irenaeus. This becomes evident in an examination of texts which discuss Adam's being created in the imago et similitudo Dei.⁷ Similitudo, for the most part, stands for both imago et similitudo in the writings of Irenaeus⁸ but the "image of God" makes Adam something very special in the whole creation.

But man He fashioned with His own hands...He gave his frame the outline of His own form...it was as an image of God that man was fashioned...so that the man became like God in inspiration as well as frame.⁹

⁵ Ibid., p. 91. Cf. A.H. 5, 29, 1 (ibid.). Also, in A.H. 5, 32, 1 (ibid.) Irenaeus understands Rom. 8:19-21 to be saying that creation is for the purpose of man. See also, Proof 11.

⁶ A.H. 4, 7, 4 (4, 14). Cf. also, 4, 14, 1-2 (4, 25, 1-2).

⁷ A.H. 4, 20, 1 (4, 34, 1).

⁸ Wingren, op. cit., p. 15. "This combination of words occurs in a very large number of places in Irenaeus, mostly in hendiadys. There are, however, passages where Irenaeus uses only one of the words, and there are other places where he makes a distinction in meaning between the two. The majority of the interpreters of Irenaeus's anthropology have concentrated on these latter passages with some loss in total understanding of their meaning". Cf., n. #60 below. Cf. A.H. 4, 33, 4 (4, 52, 1); 4, 22, 1 (ibid.). In these quotations Wingren claims that similitudo is being used synonymously with imago and similitudo. Lawson, op. cit., pp. 200-212, also discusses image and likeness being identical and distinct entities in the writings of Irenaeus. Here Irenaeus could be using Paul, if credence be given to the work of M. D. Hooker, "Adam in Romans I", NTS VI (1959-1960), 295-306, who says that Paul uses glory (εόξια) and image (εικών) almost synonymously.

⁹ Proof 11.

Furthermore, the image is conceived to be the very "Son of God". Irenaeus states that "as the image of God has He made man; and the image is the Son of God in whose image man was made".¹⁰ Thus the "image" is the Son who existed before creation; and all is created in the Son, the same Son who becomes flesh in Jesus Christ.¹¹ Adam, then, like every other being, is created in the image of the Son. Irenaeus further attests to this notion when he says that "the Son and the Spirit, by whom and in whom, freely and spontaneously, He (God) made all things".¹²

Also when Irenaeus says that man is created in the similitudo Dei,¹³ he is thinking of the Son and understands man to be destined in a certain manner for Him.¹⁴ He also understands that the imago et similitudo Dei made Adam the format of all creation and the pattern for all humanity.

¹⁰ Proof 22.

¹¹ Wingren, op. cit., p. 6.

¹² A.H. 4, 20, 1 (4, 34, 1).

¹³ Wingren, op. cit., pp. 14-26. The full meaning of these two terms is somewhat obscure, as can be detected from what Wingren has to say on p. 15. Cf. also, Tennant, op. cit., p. 285, where there appear several discrepancies concerning the image and likeness of God in the writings of Irenaeus. However, understanding the full meaning of these two terms is not necessary for the purpose of this thesis. It suffices if one understands that the imago et similitudo Dei is equivalent to the similitudo Christi and that man is created in the image and likeness of the Son. Yet, Wingren, p. 21, says "it is a better definition simply to say that the Son is the imago et similitudo of God and that man is created in God's 'image' and 'similitudo'".

¹⁴ Wingren, op. cit., pp. 19-20. Proof 22. Cf. also, Proof 11 and 35.

For with Him (God) were always present the Word and Wisdom, the Son and the Spirit, by whom and in whom...He made all things...saying, "Let us make man after Our image and likeness"; He taking from Himself (image and likeness) the substance of the creatures [formed] and the pattern of things made, and the type of all the adornments in the world.¹⁵

Hence also was Adam himself termed by Paul "the figure of Him that was to come" because the Word, the maker of all things, had formed beforehand for Himself the future dispensation of the human race.¹⁶

This person is our Lord...who has made the plough, and introduced the pruning hook, that is, the first semination of man, which was the creation exhibited in Adam.¹⁷

...those persons...[will] arrive at the pristine nature of man -- that which was created after the image and likeness of God.¹⁸

The earthly historical Christ, then, was the pattern in the mind of God when He fashioned the first man, Adam.¹⁹ Irenaeus states that "the Son was present with God's handiwork from the beginning".²⁰ But Adam, fashioned after the Son, also pre-figured Christ who was to come. Adam was the image of the human race, after whom all of humanity was to be fashioned.

¹⁵ A.H. 4, 20, 1 (4, 34, 1).

¹⁶ A.H. 3, 22, 3 (3, 32, 1).

¹⁷ A.H. 4, 34, 4 (4, 56, 3).

¹⁸ A.H. 5, 10, 1 (5, 10, 1-2).

¹⁹ Wingren, op. cit., p. 18. "While the earth was being formed; Christ, the homo futurus, was in the mind of God and matter took shape in accordance with this future pattern". Burney, op. cit., p. 175, makes this also Paul's understanding of Christ and argues that he borrowed the notion from the Rabbinic tradition.

²⁰ A.H. 4, 6, 7 (4, 11, 5).

Hence also was Adam himself termed by Paul, the figure of Him that was to come, because the Word, the Maker of all things, had formed beforehand for Himself the dispensation of the human race, connected with the Son of God.²¹

This description of Adam's nature, made in the image and likeness of God, is repeated throughout the writings of Irenaeus.²² Moreover, that Adam is both the father of the human race and God's intention for the whole of humanity is demonstrated when Irenaeus speaks of mankind being formed by the same "hands" which fashioned Adam²³ or when Irenaeus calls humanity "that formation which was after (according to) Adam".²⁴ He puts the matter even more explicitly when he says that "all men have that body which they derive from Adam".²⁵

In speaking of Adam, Irenaeus sometimes speaks of man and the first parent as a unity, so that the idea of Adam is actually all of mankind united with or contained in Adam.²⁶ The simple identification of man with Adam is made when Irenaeus refers to the time when the "Lord vivifies man, that is, Adam".²⁷ This unity is also found when Irenaeus

²¹ A.H. 3, 22, 3 (3, 32, 1).

²² A.H. 4, 38, 3 (4, 63, 1); 4, 38, 4 (4, 63, 3); 5, 2, 1 (ibid.); 5, 1, 3 (ibid.); 5, 6, 1 (ibid.); 5, 10, 1 (5, 10, 1-2).

²³ A.H. 5, 16, 2 (5, 16, 1-2).

²⁴ A.H. 5, 15, 3 (ibid.). Stieren renders secundum "after". It is better translated "according to".

²⁵ A.H. 5, 15, 4 (ibid.). Cf. also, 3, 23, 2 (3, 33, 1).

²⁶ Wingren, op. cit., p. 25. Cf. also, Gross, op. cit., pp. 91-93, who finds Irenaeus identifying mankind with both Adam and Christ, first and second Adam.

²⁷ A.H. 3, 23, 7 (3, 36).

implicates all men in the formation of Adam²⁸ and in Adam's sin, saying that "We had sinned in the beginning"²⁹ or "We had offended in the first Adam".³⁰

It is important to note³¹ that when Irenaeus identifies Adam and mankind, man is seen to sin because of Adam's sin in which all men were implicated. Yet, when Irenaeus is not identifying Adam and the human race, man is seen to sin of his own individual fault, of his own imperfection which is not related to the sin of Adam.³²

Although some statements tend to identify Adam with humanity, Irenaeus definitely perceives that Adam and humanity are distinct realities, especially in his discussion about Adam and man's salvation in chapters 22 and 23 of book three, Adversus Haereses. Yet, these statements do indicate a close relationship between Adam and the human race. Adam, as the first father, is the prototype of humanity and "the figure of Him that was to come".³³ Being both the image of humanity and the figure of Christ makes Adam the image of eschatological humanity, that which is made perfect in Christ. This appears in those texts which explain that what Christ sums up or restores in Himself is the formation of original Adam. Irenaeus states that "the very same formation should be summed up

²⁸ Proof 31. Cf. also, A.H. 5, 1, 3 (ibid.).

²⁹ A.H. 5, 17, 1 (ibid.).

³⁰ A.H. 5, 16, 3 (ibid.).

³¹ See p. 74.

³² A.H. 4, 39, 3 (4, 64, 2-3).

³³ A.H. 3, 22, 3 (3, 32, 1).

in Christ as had existed in Adam"³⁴ in order that the analogy be preserved. Several lengthy passages attest to the same thought:

At the beginning of our formation in Adam, that breath of life which proceeded from God, having been united to what had been fashioned, animated the man, and manifested him as a being endowed with reason; so also in (the times of) the end, the Word of the Father and Spirit of God, having become united with the ancient substance of Adam's formation rendered man living and perfect.³⁵

His hands (Christ and Spirit) formed a living man in order that Adam might be created again -- after the image and likeness of God.³⁶

He (Christ) truly redeemed us by His own blood... restoring to His own handiwork what was said of it in the beginning that man was made after the image and likeness of God.³⁷

If they (fallen human beings)...receive the Word of God...[they] arrive at the pristine nature of man -- that which was created in the image and likeness of God.³⁸

The Word (Christ) Himself had been made manifest to men;...declaring the original formation of Adam and the manner in which he was created.³⁹

The portrait of God's intention for all mankind, then, was realized once in the person of the exalted first Adam. This intention is to be consummated for all humanity in the second Adam, Christ, who sums up in

³⁴ A.H. 3, 21, 10 (3, 30). Cf. also, A.H. 5, 1, 2 (ibid.).

³⁵ A.H. 5, 1, 3 (ibid.).

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ A.H. 5, 2, 1 (ibid.).

³⁸ A.H. 5, 10, 1 (5, 10, 1-2).

³⁹ A.H. 5, 15, 3 (ibid.).

Himself both the first Adam and the entire human race.

He (Christ) who has summed up in Himself all nations dispersed from Adam downwards, and all languages and generations of men, together with Adam himself.⁴⁰

Adam, then, was created to be God's perfect man, to "become like God in inspiration as well as frame"⁴¹ so that at one moment in history, before the fall, man's intended nature was realized in a glorified Adam.

Irenaeus, however, maintaining the position of Tatian⁴² and Theophilus,⁴³ claimed Adam was but a child at creation.

It was possible for God Himself to have made man perfect from the first but man could not receive this perfection being as yet an infant.⁴⁴

The Lord (of the earth), that is, man was but a little one; for he was a child; and it was necessary that he should grow and so come to his perfection.⁴⁵

When created, then, man was a child who had not yet arrived at his final destiny. Although man was created in the imago et similitudo Dei, Irenaeus does not say that man was the image and likeness of God. Rather, Christ was the image and likeness of God. Thus, man was not as yet the imago et similitudo Dei.⁴⁶ It appears that Adam was to reach his designated perfection through growth. Irenaeus states that God at

⁴⁰ A.H. 3, 22, 3 (3, 32, 1).

⁴¹ Proof 11.

⁴² Oratio Contra Grecos, Ch. 7.

⁴³ Ad Autolycum 2, 24 f.

⁴⁴ A.H. 4, 38, 1 (4, 62, 1). Cf. also, 4, 38, 2 (4, 62, 1).

⁴⁵ Proof 12.

⁴⁶ Wingren, op. cit., p. 20.

the proper time bestowed "an incorruptible inheritance for the purpose of bringing man to perfection. For He formed man for growth and increase".⁴⁷

The end of growth or man's perfection is undoubtedly that for which man was made, namely, the image of God who is the Son of God, Christ. Moreover, the fulfillment and purpose of creation implies accordingly that man should grow in conformity with the Son and that creation is moving toward its consummation.⁴⁸

Although the first two human beings were, in the beginning, sinless and childlike, a gulf, made by the Creator Himself, separated man from God.⁴⁹ Man was created for eternal life, and if he would live in accordance with the commandment he would continue in this state of immortality.⁵⁰ In addition, he was created free to make choices concerning his growth and destiny.⁵¹ Thus, man's growth is an immediate consequence of God's act of creation, so that man, as a child, has a goal and objective, an essential factor to God's act of creation.⁵²

However, Irenaeus, in speaking about Adam, says that he was a child "not yet having his understanding perfected; wherefore, also he was

⁴⁷ A.H. 4, 11, 1 (4, 21, 1).

⁴⁸ Wingren, op. cit., p. 22.

⁴⁹ Ibid., p. 29. Cf. Proof 14-15.

⁵⁰ Ibid.

⁵¹ Ibid., p. 36.

⁵² Ibid., pp. 32-33. Cf. A.H. 4, 11, 2 (4, 21, 2).

easily led astray by the deceiver".⁵³ The "deceiver" is the devil, who also has been created by God. But the devil sinned and fell from lofty heights, becoming a real enemy of the Creator⁵⁴ and causing Adam, with all of mankind, to sin and become his captive.⁵⁵

Adam in Bondage

Here begins the second motif, which concerns the Adam who introduces sin into the world. A great contrast amounting almost to dualism is drawn between God and the devil and is a primary factor in the theology of Irenaeus. He conveys the idea of a violent struggle existing between the two active powers of God and Satan. Man is not only in a personal contest against the enemy, Satan, but he is also caught in the middle of that contention which exists between the two great powers.⁵⁶ Yet, God has unlimited supremacy over the devil, so that the freedom of the devil is limited and bound in a period of time⁵⁷ which is fixed by a decree of God.⁵⁸

However, Adam became the first sinner among men and introduced the world to sin and death.

...by one man's disobedience sin entered, and death obtained (a place) through sin.⁵⁹

⁵³ Proof 12.

⁵⁴ Wingren, op. cit., pp. 7-8, 39-42. Cf. A.H. 2, 28, 7 (2, 43, 1).

⁵⁵ Ibid., p. 43.

⁵⁶ Ibid., p. 49.

⁵⁷ Ibid., p. 7.

⁵⁸ Ibid. Cf. A.H. 4, 41, 1 (4, 66, 2); 5, 5, 2 (5, 5, 3); see also Proof 85 where the appointed time of the devil's destruction is yet to come.

⁵⁹ A.H. 3, 21, 10 (3, 30).

Immediately, Adam's growth stopped and he lost the image and likeness of God. Irenaeus says that "man was created after the image of God...wherefore he did easily lose the similitude".⁶⁰ The most obvious effect of Adam's deed is death, which becomes universal throughout the human race. In speaking of Eve, Irenaeus states that she "was disobedient...and having become disobedient, was made the cause of death to herself and the entire human race".⁶¹ Also, he says that "Adam had been conquered, all life having been taken away from him".⁶²

The universality of death brings to light another effect of Adam's disobedience, namely, the spread of sin to humanity. Irenaeus speaks about "sin which was set up and spread out against man and which rendered him subject to death".⁶³ Also, he explains how "They (Adam and Eve) did ...fall under the power of death because they did eat in disobedience; and disobedience to God entails death".⁶⁴ Thus, since death is the result of sin, and since all men do die, it follows that all men sin. They do so not only "in Adam"⁶⁵ but also on their own; but their individual sins remain the result of Adam's first transgression. Therefore, both sin and death are the universal effects of the first parent's disobedience.⁶⁶

⁶⁰ A.H. 5, 16, 2 (5, 16, 1-2). See nn. #8, 13, and particularly #99 for the distinction between "image" and "likeness".

⁶¹ A.H. 3, 22, 3 (3, 32, 1).

⁶² A.H. 3, 23, 7 (3, 36).

⁶³ Ibid.

⁶⁴ A.H. 5, 23, 1 (ibid.).

⁶⁵ See nn. #29, 30.

⁶⁶ Proof 31, 37; A.H. 4, 22, 1 (4, 36, 1).

Other effects resulting from this sin are physical ills, erotic passions, and a general distortion of that perfect world which God intended.

He (Adam), however, adopted a dress comfortable to his disobedience...and resisting the erring, the lustful propensity of his flesh (since he had lost his natural disposition...)...he girded a bridle of continence upon himself.⁶⁷

Man received commandments which he broke, and became a sinner; for the paralysis followed as a consequence of sins.⁶⁸

...the Lord came seeking for the same sheep which had been lost. What was it, then, which was dead? Undoubtedly it was the substance of the flesh; the same, too, which had lost the breath of life...as the apostle says..."mortify, therefore, your members..." and what these are he himself explains: "Fornication, uncleanness, inordinate affection, evil concupiscence, and covetousness".⁶⁹

He (God)...formed visual organs for him who had been blind (in that body which he had derived) from Adam.⁷⁰

For the Maker of all things, the Word of God, who did also from the beginning form man, when he found His handiwork impaired by wickedness, performed upon it all kinds of healing.⁷¹

⁶⁷ A.H. 3, 23, 5 (3, 35, 1).

⁶⁸ A.H. 5, 17, 2 (ibid.). Although the "paralysis" in this text is that of the man healed by Jesus in Mt. 9:2-8, Irenaeus understands the infirmity to be a result of sin.

⁶⁹ A.H. 5, 12, 3 (ibid.).

⁷⁰ A.H. 5, 15, 4 (ibid.).

⁷¹ A.H. 5, 12, 6 (5, 12, 5).

The first man, then, lost through his sin, fall, and captivity his natural character and his childlike mind. He lost the garment of holiness.⁷² Hence mankind also became sinful, fallen, captive to the devil, and remains in an unnatural state because sin and death are but a corruption of man's natural condition.

...the apostasy tyrannized over us unjustly and though we were by nature the property of the omnipotent God, alienated us contrary to nature.⁷³

Irenaeus is saying in this text that Adam's fall and man's bondage to the devil were acquired unjustly. Moreover, sin is never in itself anything human, but on the contrary, is the devil's seduction of man from that natural state in which God made him.⁷⁴ Irenaeus explicitly states as much by saying that "He made neither angels or men so by nature".⁷⁵ God created man and the devil seduced him. Now, all men, because of Adam, have been defeated by the devil and suffer evil which is unnatural to God's original creation and is a rebellion into which mankind is drawn.⁷⁶

'I have begotten and brought up children, but they have rebelled against me'...these children are aliens; 'strange children have lied unto me'.⁷⁷

Furthermore, sin has brought about a change in man's inner nature and that change is to a nature that is corrupt, in need of regeneration.

⁷² A.H. 3, 23, 5 (3, 35, 1). Cf. Wingren, op. cit., p. 31.

⁷³ A.H. 5, 1, 1 (ibid.).

⁷⁴ Wingren, op. cit., p. 8. Cf. also, p. 87.

⁷⁵ A.H. 4, 41, 1 (4, 66, 2).

⁷⁶ Wingren, op. cit., p. 45.

⁷⁷ A.H. 4, 41, 1 (4, 66, 2).

...man, with respect to that formation which was after Adam, having fallen in transgression needs the laver of regeneration.⁷⁸

In addition, man's bondage to Satan, sin, and death is traced to Adam and Eve, the first parents of the human race.

For at the first Adam became a Vessel in his (Satan's) possession, whom he did also hold under his power...wherefore, he who had led men captive was justly captured in return by God, but man who had been led captive, was loosed from the bonds of condemnation.⁷⁹

...being all implicated in the first formation of Adam, we were bound to death through disobedience.⁸⁰

...in the beginning by means of our first (parents) we were all brought into bondage by being made subject to death.⁸¹

Since Adam and man are not always considered separate entities,⁸² the statements about the fall of Adam constitute a description of the actual behaviour of all men,⁸³ so that all men freely choose disobedience, as did Satan and Adam.⁸⁴ Thus, man, of his own responsibility, has betrayed his destiny by succumbing to the temptation of anticipating his purpose. That is, Adam and man did not wait to grow in the image of God.

⁷⁸ A.H. 5, 15, 3 (ibid.).

⁷⁹ A.H. 3, 23, 1 (3, 32, 2).

⁸⁰ Proof 31.

⁸¹ A.H. 4, 22, 1 (4, 36, 1).

⁸² Wingren, op. cit., p. 25. Cf. also, pp. 74-75 above.

⁸³ Ibid., p. 46.

⁸⁴ A.H. 4, 39, 1 (4, 66, 1); 4, 41, 2-3 (4, 67 - 4, 68, 1).

Rather, they spurned the gift as it was given and brought their growth to a standstill. They are ruled by evil (unnatural) nature and have lost the Spirit as well as the similitudo Dei. Death has acquired its supremacy by reason of sin, and that sin is primary while death is its effect. However, both individual effects cause a rupture of man's communion with God.⁸⁵

Recapitulation

Man's whole salvation lies in the hope that Christ will come and release him from his destruction. Man's movement so far has been "from life to death", and if he is left alone he will remain in death. Only if the tyrant who holds man prisoner is defeated by one who is stronger than he will man be brought "from death to life".⁸⁶

Irenaeus proceeds from man's actual temptation and establishes as fact man's actual defeat. He then proceeds from man's actual bondage to establish man's actual deliverance, so that man becomes again able to choose to be free in Christ or in bondage to Satan.⁸⁷ That is, the Son of God (Christ) is stronger than the man who has been created in the image of God. The work of Christ is to reestablish man through the Spirit and restore him to his original state. If man rejects the Spirit, he (man) remains in the power of the devil. But if he accepts the Spirit, he regains again the imago et similitudo Dei.⁸⁸

⁸⁵ Wingren, op. cit., p. 57. Cf. A.H. 5, 12, 6 (5, 12, 5).

⁸⁶ Ibid., p. 75. ⁸⁷ Ibid., p. 38.

⁸⁸ Ibid., p. 24. Cf. A.H. 5, 9, 2 (5, 9, 1); 5, 10, 1 (5, 10, 1-2).

The principal need of the world which God has created is to be liberated from sin. Sin has no power over the man whom Mary bore. Men need only to acquire what the incarnate Son possesses in order that they be delivered from their bondage and return to the wholeness of creation.⁸⁹

God's lordship resides in the promised Christ, who is to trample the devil underfoot. Christ is also stronger than the tyrannical devil, who is unable to retain his hold on man. Man, therefore, has hope for a new life, despite the fact that by his own fault he has fallen from the state of health ordained by the Creator. He has allowed the power of death to set at work within himself.

Man is, in fact, determined by both God and Satan, by creation and sin. These two powers, in mutual conflict, have chosen man as the area of their struggle and it is by their conflict that man's actual situation is defined. Yet it is quite clear what comes from God, as it is clear what comes from the devil. From God man receives life and righteousness; from the enemy he receives death and condemnation.⁹⁰

Christ's work compensates for the fall of man and is diametrically opposed to man's defeat. Since sin and, as a consequence of sin, death have gained control over man through the victory of the serpent (Satan), Christ's victory over the serpent must, if it is to be a victory at all, mean the complete defeat of both sin and death.

The Son was then made man in the incarnation so that in creation is one who is the image of God, the only begotten Son.⁹¹ This Son was

⁸⁹ Ibid., p. 84.

⁹⁰ Ibid., p. 62.

⁹¹ Ibid., p. 20. Cf. A.H. 3, 22, 1 (3, 31, 1); 3, 22, 3 (3, 32, 1); 4, 6, 7 (4, 11, 5).

made incarnate in order to defeat man's adversary and to reveal the similitudo Dei.⁹² Christ takes on the struggle and fights to victory.⁹³ He triumphs, but only in due time will the devil be destroyed completely, because he still has power to draw men into destruction. The struggle continues, but the issue has been decided, so that when the Spirit, who also wages war against the devil, is poured forth, man's bondage comes to an end and faith and love exist in freedom.⁹⁴ Victory, over Satan, sin, death, destruction, and disobedience, attained through Christ's temptation, suffering on the cross, and resurrection, drove out all evil from the midst of humanity.⁹⁵ Such cleansing of humanity is brought about by Christ's also becoming a man,⁹⁶ so that by being truly human He frees mankind from inhumanity.⁹⁷

The power of God is impeded neither by the devil, sin, or death. Moreover, the victory over these enemies of God has been ordained by Him.⁹⁸ According to Wingren, interpreters say that sin, the death of Christ, and the devil's hopeless struggle to ultimate destruction are part of God's plan of salvation. That is, evil is forced to serve God's

⁹² Ibid., p. 21. Cf. A.H. 4, 33, 4 (4, 52, 1); 4, 22, 1 (ibid.).

⁹³ Ibid., pp. 113-143.

⁹⁴ Ibid., p. 65.

⁹⁵ Ibid., p. 114.

⁹⁶ Ibid., p. 53.

⁹⁷ Ibid., p. 24.

⁹⁸ Ibid., p. 7.

salvation and even man's sin has a part to play in his development.⁹⁹

God, however, ordains first to overpower sin and then to annihilate death. God uses one of His enemies, death, as an instrument to weaken existing sin. When man dies he sins no more and defeat of sin becomes the defeat of death. Death is the last enemy¹⁰⁰ and the cost of this adversary is death itself, suffered by God's own Son.¹⁰¹ Thus the

⁹⁹ Ibid., p. 42. Cf. A.H. 3, 22, 3 (3, 32, 1). "God having predestined that the first man should be of an animal nature with the view that he might be saved by the Spiritual one. For inasmuch as He had pre-existence as a saving Being, it was necessary that what might be saved should also be called into existence, in order that the Being who saves should not exist in vain". In light of the discussion on man's animal nature in A.H. 5, 6, 1 (ibid.), it would seem that God destined man to this imperfect state. That is, a man in the animal nature is imperfect, possessing the image of God but no similitude through the Spirit. Adam was born with the image and similitude, but he was predestined to lose the similitude and become of an animal nature. Thus, all men also have the image but not the similitude of God because all men "die in Adam as being of an animal nature". A.H. 5, 12, 3 (ibid.). Cf. also, Gross, op. cit., pp. 88-89, who discusses Irenaeus's use of "image" and "likeness" with "animal" and "spiritual" natures. Gross also states on p. 90 that "Adam as a child acted without forethought and received a mild reprimand". The slight degree of guilt or culpability associated with the sin of Adam, coupled with the positive value of Adam's disobedience might foster the notion that Adam's sin had some teleological significance. However, such a notion is at least controverted by Tennant, op. cit., p. 287, who claims that Irenaeus maintained that God tolerated Adam's disobedience, using its consequences toward good ends. Likewise, Williams, op. cit., pp. 195-198, finds no high degree of guilt or culpability in the fall of Adam, but also maintains God's tolerance of Adam's disobedience. Yet, Nielsen, op. cit., p. 62, says that the fall is to Irenaeus hardly more than an intermezzo, needful to set off the work of salvation which God has carried out in Christ. This last position is also close to Wingren, op. cit., p. 35, who understands that the fall is the beginning of growth in Irenaeus's thought. Cf. also Chapter Two, n. #36.

¹⁰⁰ Wingren, op. cit., p. 49. Robbin Scroggs, "Romans VI, 7", NTS X (1963-1964), 104-108, affirms (in the thought of Paul) that death is the last enemy because death brings release from the obligations of the Torah and frees men from any further culpability.

¹⁰¹ Wingren, op. cit., p. 39.

devil's struggle is rightly described as "a fight to the death".¹⁰²

Christ's work, then, is a recapitulation in reverse of Adam's fall, so that the whole course of evil is to be turned about toward the ɔikevoyaia, God's plan for salvation. This plan is accomplished within and throughout history in a time sequence, not an episode at one particular point of time. It is, rather, a continuous process in which the ɔikevoyaia of God is manifested by degrees.¹⁰³ Irenaeus's use of the term avakefalinwais or recapitulatio is meant to embody most simply this ɔikevoyaia in relation to the work of Christ.¹⁰⁴

The central event of Christ's work is his birth, because the Son of God became actual man. Consequent upon this event is all that follows in the conflict, death, and resurrection of Jesus.¹⁰⁵ Yet through Christ's birth, creation returns to its purity. The original form of creation is revealed perfectly developed and life enters into a world of death.¹⁰⁶

Yet there is nothing which Christ does that is not an integral part of recapitulation, until he delivers up the kingdom to the Father.¹⁰⁷ Recapitulation, moreover, is integrally related to Adam.¹⁰⁸ Christ clothes himself in the flesh of Adam, assuming the form of Adam, so that

¹⁰² Ibid., p. 42.

¹⁰³ Ibid., p. 81.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., p. 80. Cf. Eph. 1:10.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., p. 81.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., p. 80.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., p. 86.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., p. 85.

he recapitulates Adam's image and creation.¹⁰⁹ Man then receives his fulfillment when the Son becomes, through his human birth, a man like Adam. He who created enters his corrupt creation to renew it. The creative hands of "Christ and Spirit", "word and wisdom" are involved anew in creation. In particular, they are involved in refashioning man according to the image of God and in recapitulation of the previous creation of Adam.¹¹⁰ The Son becomes the second Adam, for whom the first Adam was destined from the beginning.¹¹¹ That second Adam assumed the old creation, infused it with God's undefeated life, and thereby renewed it.¹¹²

In recapitulation, the conflict was as necessary as Christ's coming in the incarnation. Since man had been overcome by temptation, Christ came to overcome temptation; and all that is said about man's defeat finds a reverse expression in what is said about the victory. What results is a unity of God and man, and this union is in itself a reversal of the disunity brought about by Satan. In the midst of conflict there is growth as Satan turns away from man so that man develops in freedom and receives eternal life. So also the death of Jesus cannot be isolated from Christ's earthly life and resurrection, because death unites these two factors in order that death might be destroyed.¹¹³ In Christ's

¹⁰⁹ Ibid.

¹¹⁰ Ibid., p. 88.

¹¹¹ Ibid., p. 90. Cf. above, p. 73.

¹¹² Ibid., p. 96.

¹¹³ Ibid., p. 120.

death the strength of the devil is spent, and with the resurrection the whole of the devil's alien domination is broken. Man presently lives directly from God, as did Adam in his initial creation before he sinned.¹¹⁴ Thus, Christ's birth, conflict, crucifixion, and resurrection are integrally related in Christ's victory over Satan¹¹⁵ and recapitulation is perceived as the rebirth of uncorrupted creation. When Adam's death is recapitulated, Adam's death is transformed into life, so that Adam and mankind become as they were in Adam from the beginning.¹¹⁶ Creation also becomes stronger than it was before it fell in bondage, because the power of Satan has been broken. The imago et similitudo Dei is restored.¹¹⁷ Yet, the consummation of recapitulation will not be fully realized until its eschatological perfection in the Parousia, when Christ comes to deliver up the kingdom to the Father and the last enemy, death, has been destroyed.¹¹⁸

The Relationship Between Adam's Sin and Its Effects

Even though Irenaeus perceives that sin and death began with mankind's first parents, the causal relationship between Adam's disobedience and the effects of that sin is not altogether clear. Man, because of his first parents, is both a sinner and subject to death. The dominant explanation of how the first couple are linked to the universal effects of

¹¹⁴ Ibid., p. 121. Cf. 5, 21, 3 (ibid).

¹¹⁵ Ibid., p. 122.

¹¹⁶ Ibid., p. 125. Cf. A.H. 3, 21, 10 (3, 30).

¹¹⁷ Ibid., pp. 126, 131.

¹¹⁸ Ibid., p. 193. Cf. A.H. 3, 23, 7 (3, 36); 5, 36, 2 (5, 36).

sin is a theory of corporate sin, although, as we shall see, this is complicated by an insistence on individual responsibility and extrinsic causes of sin. A theory of corporate sin seems to be implied when Irenaeus states that man, who sinned in Adam,¹¹⁹ is fashioned and formed¹²⁰ after Adam. Moreover, men are found in that imperfect body which they have derived from Adam.¹²¹

Contributing to this thought of corporate sin and the universal effects of such sin are Irenaeus's many expressions of man's innate infirmity. Irenaeus often speaks of man's infirm or weak nature,¹²² describing this weakness with such terms as ignorance,¹²³ lustful propensity of the flesh,¹²⁴ promptings of carnal concupiscence,¹²⁵ and blindness.¹²⁶ This weakness of nature¹²⁷ is definitely perceived as innate in man and no doubt brought about by man's disobedience "in Adam", so that man bears from that ancient transgression an infirmity parallel to that of any leper.¹²⁸

¹¹⁹ A.H. 5, 17, 1 (ibid.); 5, 16, 3 (ibid.).

¹²⁰ A.H. 5, 15, 2-3 (ibid.).

¹²¹ A.H. 5, 15, 4, (ibid.).

¹²² A.H. 4, 15, 2 (4, 26, 2); 4, 33, 2 (4, 51, 1); 4, 38, 4 (4, 64, 1); 5, 3, 1 (ibid.).

¹²³ A.H. 2, 20, 3 (2, 32, 2).

¹²⁴ A.H. 3, 23, 5 (3, 35, 1).

¹²⁵ A.H. 4, 31, 1 (4, 47 - 4, 48, 1); 5, 10, 1-2 (ibid.).

¹²⁶ A.H. 5, 15, 3 (ibid.).

¹²⁷ A.H. 3, 18, 6 (3, 19, 5); 5, 3, 3 (ibid.).

¹²⁸ Fragments 34.

Citing St. Paul, Irenaeus elaborates upon man's corrupted nature, saying "for I know that there dwelleth in my flesh no good thing".¹²⁹ This infirm condition comes to all men by way of sin and disobedience,¹³⁰ constantly keeping mankind in bondage to sin and death.¹³¹ It is a weakness that prompts man to further infirmity,¹³² so that the Creator perceives His handiwork greatly impaired by wickedness.¹³³ Such innate disease explained for Irenaeus whence man is shackled by the bonds of slavery to which he has become accustomed.¹³⁴

F. R. Tennant¹³⁵ and N. P. Williams¹³⁶ maintain, however, that Irenaeus remains silent upon the precise nature of mankind's union with Adam, the mode of transmission of Adam's sin, and the consequences of such sin. If Tennant and Williams are correct, there is not to be found in Irenaeus's writings any notion concerning an hereditary causal relationship between Adam's fall and man's sinful, corrupted condition. Still, these many texts would argue that Irenaeus understood Paul to be saying that man has received an intrinsically corrupt nature because of Adam's sin.¹³⁷

¹²⁹ A.H. 3, 20, 3 (3, 21, 2).

¹³⁰ A.H. 5, 15, 2 (ibid.).

¹³¹ A.H. 5, 14, 2 (ibid.); 3, 18, 7 (3, 19, 6); 5, 34, 2 (ibid.);
Proof 31.

¹³² A.H. 5, 3, 1 (ibid.).

¹³³ A.H. 5, 12, 6 (5, 12, 5).

¹³⁴ A.H. 4, 13, 2 (4, 24, 2).

¹³⁵ Tennant, op. cit., pp. 290-291.

¹³⁶ Williams, op. cit., p. 199.

¹³⁷ The thesis leaves aside here the question of what Paul actually meant by the terms flesh and spirit.

Yet such an idea is not easily reconciled with other statements of Irenaeus which indicate that the effects of Adam's disobedience are extrinsic to man's nature. Irenaeus states that no curse was placed against Adam but against the ground, so that God transferred the curse, which was meant to be in Adam's nature, to earth.

...immediately after Adam had transgressed...He pronounced no curse against Adam personally, but against the ground...God did indeed transfer the curse to the earth, that it might not remain in man.¹³⁸

This idea mainly associates the effects of Adam's transgression with his environment.

Several statements indicate environmental influence as a cause of man's wickedness. Irenaeus speaks about the "savage earth",¹³⁹ men being driven out of paradise into the sin that surrounds them,¹⁴⁰ and men who "are sinners from the womb who go astray as soon as they are born".¹⁴¹ Therefore, it appears that Irenaeus is at different times saying that man's nature is intrinsically corrupt, in bondage, weakened and infirm because of Adam's sin; nevertheless, it is not cursed but placed in bondage from without, a nature which does not inherit but is inherited.¹⁴² Man receives a nature by inheritance but no inherited

¹³⁸ A.H. 3, 23, 3 (3, 33, 2).

¹³⁹ A.H. 4, 34, 4 (4, 56, 3).

¹⁴⁰ A.H. 3, 23, 6 (3, 35, 2).

¹⁴¹ A.H. 3, 10, 1 (3, 11, 1). This last statement from Ps. 58:3 could be understood to place the cause of evil not upon any inherent quality in nature but rather upon some extrinsic cause. At least the statement is sufficiently ambiguous to serve as an argument on either side of the contention.

¹⁴² A.H. 5, 9, 4 (5, 9, 3-4). Cf. also, 5, 1, 3 (ibid.). This passage says that man does inherit death which is not necessarily considered a quality inherent in man.

corruption.

The latter notion would fit well into his teachings about individual culpability for sin and death. Man cannot blame God or his first parents for sin because sin is the responsibility of the individual who sinned in Adam. Irenaeus says that it was against God "whom we had sinned in the beginning",¹⁴³ and it was "God Himself whom indeed we had offended in the first Adam, when he did not perform his commandment".¹⁴⁴ Not only was man culpable and responsible for the first sin, but he is also responsible and culpable for every sin thereafter and is "the cause to himself of his own imperfection".¹⁴⁵ Adam, however, functions in some manner as an explanation for the serious condition in which the world finds itself. Moreover, Adam is portrayed as a sinful being, although he is related to an original, exalted first Adam and an eschatological second Adam who recapitulates or "sums up" all things in Himself.

He (Christ)...has summed up in Himself all nations dispersed from Adam downwards, and all languages and generations of men, together with Adam himself.¹⁴⁶

The second Adam, in his action of recapitulation, manifests the original formation of Adam, which is after the image and likeness of God.

The Advent, therefore, of Him...was not righteous...if He did not really become man, restoring to His (God's) own handiwork what was said of it in the beginning that man was made after the image and likeness of God.¹⁴⁷

¹⁴³ A.H. 5, 17, 1 (ibid.).

¹⁴⁴ A.H. 5, 16, 3 (ibid.).

¹⁴⁵ A.H. 4, 39, 3 (4, 64, 2-3).

¹⁴⁶ A.H. 3, 22, 3 (3, 32, 1). ¹⁴⁷ A.H. 5, 2, 1 (ibid.).

He (Christ) was manifested in the last times, to show the image like unto Himself.¹⁴⁸

This recapitulation and image of God is not quite the equation of Urzeit with Endzeit because the restoration made in the last times of eschatological humanity adds something to mankind's formation which was not contained in the formation of the first Adam. Man, therefore, is made perfect.

...so also in (the times of) the end, the Word of the Father and Spirit of God, having become united with the ancient substance of Adam's formation, rendered man living and perfect.¹⁴⁹

We shall return to the varying emphases on corporate sin and individual responsibility for sin.

Irenaeus and St. Paul

The question to be asked at this point is how much of Irenaeus's view of Adam can be considered as derived from Paul, because Irenaeus, like Paul, places in contrast Adam's sin and the work of Christ.

For as by one man's disobedience sin entered, and death obtained (a place) through sin; so also by the obedience of one man, righteousness, having been introduced, shall cause life to fructify in those persons who in past times were dead.¹⁵⁰

This contrast is made because Irenaeus's chief interest is in the second Adam, and the work of Christ can best be understood in contrast with Adam's disobedience and its effects. Where Adam brought sin and death, Christ brings righteousness and life. Where Adam brought bondage to

¹⁴⁸ Proof 22.

¹⁴⁹ A.H. 5, 1, 3 (ibid.).

¹⁵⁰ A.H. 3, 21, 10 (3, 30).

Satan, Christ brings freedom from that bondage.¹⁵¹ And although Christ is of primary interest, the first Adam, both in his exalted and sinful state, is of major importance to Irenaeus. By way of contrast to sinful Adam, Christ's work of restoration is made manifest. Yet Christ and Adam are not part of an absolute antithesis, for Irenaeus wishes to demonstrate a connection between first and second Adam. This connection is made by Irenaeus through original, exalted Adam who is recapitulated in Christ.

Recapitulation, then, for Irenaeus, is basically the link between the two motifs of exalted and sinful Adam. It is God's plan that Adam be once in his pristine glory, become sinful, and once again be restored to his original exalted state in the second Adam.¹⁵²

As was shown previously, Irenaeus's theory of recapitulatio was, no doubt, based at least in part upon Paul's theme of first and last Adam.¹⁵³ In Romans 5 and 1 Corinthians 15 Paul juxtaposes and contrasts Adam and Christ. Adam represents sin, death, trespass, transgression, disobedience, dishonour, and weakness, while Christ represents life, grace of God, free gift, obedience, righteousness, glory, and power.¹⁵⁴ Adam's portrait is one of sinful humanity, while Christ's portrait is that of eschatological, perfect humanity. Adam is an old creation which is passing away. Christ is the new creation.¹⁵⁵

¹⁵¹ A.H. 3, 23, 1 (3, 32, 2).

¹⁵² A.H. 3, 22, 3 (3, 32, 1). Cf. above, n. #99.

¹⁵³ 1 Cor. 15:45. See Chapter Two, pp. 60-63.

¹⁵⁴ Rom. 5:12-21.

¹⁵⁵ 2 Cor. 5:17.

Paul's emphasis on Adam's sin is chiefly intended to contrast Adam's disobedience with Christ's obedience. In order to speak of death, Paul speaks of Adam, but his major goal is "eternal life through Jesus Christ".¹⁵⁶ Paul does not want to show any positive relation between Christ and Adam. Rather, he contrasts the act of Adam which brings death to the act of Christ which brings life.

In addition, the contrast of first and last Adam is a contrast of present sinful humanity with true eschatological humanity. Paul's first Adam is related to the last Adam in the sense that Christ has come as second Adam to conquer and destroy sin. Thus Adam pre-figures Christ only in the sense that Adam's disobedience with its consequences is annulled by Jesus's obedience and free gift of grace.

But the free gift is not like the trespass. For if many died through one man's trespass, much more have the grace of God and the free gift in the grace of that one man, Jesus Christ.¹⁵⁷

The question of whether the new creation is in any way a return to an original creation or something superior is not discussed by Paul. His treatment of first and second Adam avoids completely the equation of Urzeit with Endzeit. His description of the age to come differs radically from the "present evil age",¹⁵⁸ but he remains absolutely and consistently silent upon the matter of "original creation" before its fall.

The new creation, then, is a restoration of what God always desired for man. Paul's Adam-Christ typology is placed in a context of

¹⁵⁶ Rom. 5:21.

¹⁵⁷ Rom. 5:15.

¹⁵⁸ Gal. 1:4.

redemption from sin which began with Adam. Adam was the first sinner, who introduced both sin and death into the world.

Therefore as sin came into the world through one man and death through sin, and so death spread to all men because all men sinned.¹⁵⁹

Death is the obvious effect of Adam's sin. It is also a universal effect, for it has spread to all men. Moreover, it appears as the result of sin so that Paul is saying that all men sin and as a result they suffer the effect of death. This becomes readily apparent when Paul says "the sting of death is sin".¹⁶⁰ Therefore both death and sin are universal effects of Adam's transgression.

Furthermore, if Adam is the cause of sin and death and represents the old creation, then, it might be concluded with others¹⁶¹ that one passage from Paul's letters teaches that Adam's disobedience caused a general distortion of God's creation.

...for the creation was subjected to futility, not of its own will, but by the will of him who subjected it in hope; because the creation itself will be set free from its bondage to decayWe know that the whole creation has been groaning in travail together until now; and not only creation but we ourselves who...groan inwardly.¹⁶²

However, sin, corruption, and death are not man's natural state in the writings of Paul, as he perceives creation as being "subjected to futility"

¹⁵⁹ Rom. 5:12.

¹⁶⁰ 1 Cor. 15:56. Rom. 1:23a, 2:12, 5:12-21, 6:16, 21b, 7:9b-11, 13, 24.

¹⁶¹ C. K. Barrett, From First Adam to Last (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1962), pp. 9 ff.

¹⁶² Rom. 8:20-23.

(Rom. 8:20) and in "bondage to decay" (Rom. 8:21). Man is perishable, dishonourable, and "sown in weakness".¹⁶³

Adam has the central place in the history of sin and death because he is the originator of man's bondage to both. Paul speaks of men being "slaves to sin"¹⁶⁴ and suffering the reign of death.¹⁶⁵ Yet Paul does not attempt to explain how Adam's disobedience causes sin and death among future generations. If all men die because all men sin, as is stated in Romans 5:12, it would appear that all men are guilty for their own sins and, therefore, their own death. Adam's sin, then, has entered into history but does not diminish each man's responsibility for his own sin and death.

Paul can also describe man's sinful state totally apart from Adam when he sees dwelling in his members a law which makes him "captive to the law of sin".¹⁶⁶ What brings death is not Adam's sin as was said in Romans 5:12 nor the law (which is good according to Romans 7:12), but sin which dwells in each man who is "carnal" and "sold under sin".¹⁶⁷ Paul, then, knows only Christ as an exhibition of God's intent for man. Adam, on the other hand, represents the non-intention of God for man, insofar as he led the whole cosmos into corruption. Adam is not exonerated for his deed, nor is he in any way a hope for eschatological humanity. Furthermore, Paul's concern in his Adamic-Christology is with future

¹⁶³ 1 Cor. 15:42-43.

¹⁶⁴ Rom. 6:20.

¹⁶⁵ Rom. 5:17, 20.

¹⁶⁶ Rom. 7:23.

¹⁶⁷ Rom. 7:14.

humanity in the new creation rather than with what man might have been in his original state before the fall. Therefore it is not very surprising to find no evidence in Paul's writing concerning Adam's pristine formation. Whatever notions Irenaeus has about Adam before his fall are ideas not derived from the writings of Paul.

However, Irenaeus did borrow some notions from Paul concerning Adam and Christ. He undoubtedly borrowed the basic scheme of first and second Adam in forming a basis for his Adamic-Christology and theory of recapitulation. Certainly Irenaeus understands with Paul that Adam was a sinner and the cause for sin and death being in the world. Likewise does Irenaeus maintain with Paul that sin is universal and the cause of death. But Irenaeus goes beyond Paul in clearly connecting the distortion of God's creation with Adam's sin, although the connection may have been suggested by Rom. 8:20-23. Neither author views these effects as the natural or intended state of God's creation. Rather, both perceive man in a weakened condition and in captivity to sin and death. Both men claim that the sad condition in which the world finds itself had a cause in the first couple, but Irenaeus makes a much clearer link between this transgression and mankind's sorry state than does Paul.¹⁶⁸

¹⁶⁸ Paul, according to Robbin Scroggs, LA, pp. 75-94, probably professes individual responsibility for sin and death, so that each man sins of his own accord and, therefore, dies of his own accord. Cf. also, Nielsen, op. cit., pp. 68-69, n. #2, which discusses the Hebrew concept of "corporate personality" and each man's responsibility for the sin of Adam. But Scroggs may well be wrong, according to Stanislaus Lyonnet, "Le péché originel et l'exégèse de Rom. 5:12-14", RSR 44 (1956), 63-84, who finds in Romans 5:12 ff. a spiritual corruption resulting from Adam's sin. On Irenaeus and Paul on this point, see further below, pp. 102-106.

Although there are some differences in Paul's and Irenaeus's view of man's wretched condition, the principal difference between these two authors' portrayal of man's present unnatural state results from their individual usage of first and second Adam. It was shown that Paul knows a first Adam who represents sin and death as well as a second Adam who represents righteousness and life. His first Adam is not a fallen Adam, however, because a fallen Adam requires an exalted Adam. Therefore, Paul can only contrast the first Adam with the last Adam. Irenaeus, on the other hand, knows an exalted, fallen, and sinful first Adam as well as a second Adam, Christ. The sinful first Adam is contrasted to both the exalted first Adam and the second Adam. Yet this theory of recapitulation is not simply a contrast of two Adams; it functions as a connection between exalted first Adam and eschatological second Adam. The actual recapitulation process is performed by the second Adam who unites in history the sinful first Adam and the exalted first Adam.

For Paul, there is no recapitulation connecting or uniting the two Adams because Paul did not speculate upon the state of first Adam. However, Robbin Scroggs maintains that Paul was aware of the speculation concerning exalted Adam which was contemporary in Jewish circles of Paul's day.¹⁶⁹ But, according to Scroggs, Paul transferred these Jewish ascriptions of Adam's excellence to his last Adam, Christ. Thus Irenaeus could not have derived his view of the exalted Adam from Paul, but must have been aware of the late Jewish speculations himself, since in Irenaeus the

¹⁶⁹ Scroggs, LA, p. 100. Cf. Burney, op. cit., pp. 175 f., who discusses Paul's use of Rabbinic tradition concerning the first-begotten of all creation. See also, Jacob Jervell, Imago Dei (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1960).

exaltation continues to be attributed to the first Adam.

An investigation into this literature on Adam will reveal in detail Irenaeus's dependency upon this Jewish speculation in forming some of his notions of exalted and sinful Adam in his theory of recapitulation.

Corporate Sin "in Adam"

First, as was said, the precise union of Adam and mankind is ignored by Paul. Yet this is not so in the writings of Irenaeus. Irenaeus offers a distinct explanation which links Adam's transgression with man's sinful condition. It may be described as a theory of corporate sin. The link between Adam's sin and man's sinfulness is a corporate one, so that Adam's sin was the sin of all mankind and the effects of that sin are universal to all men. All men receive an infirm or weakened nature, prone to sin, because that is the nature which Adam received when all men "sinned in Adam".

The ideas¹⁷⁰ mentioned earlier which closely unite mankind with Adam, perceive man to be fashioned after Adam and find in that formation the same infirmity which possessed Adam. These notions, foreign to Paul, can be found in late Jewish apocalyptic writings.

N. P. Williams understands the author of 4 Ezra to be teaching a doctrine of hereditary sin.¹⁷¹ That is, Adam transgressed the commandment and his nature became infirm. This infirmity became intrinsic to all men and becomes hereditary in the human race, so that it is communicated

¹⁷⁰ See above, pp. 72-75.

¹⁷¹ Williams, op. cit., pp. 79-81.

from Adam to his posterity by physical propagation. Williams cites four passages containing these thoughts.

For the first Adam, clothing himself with the evil heart, transgressed and was overcome; and likewise also all who were born of him. Thus the infirmity became inveterate; the law indeed was in the heart of the people, but (in conjunction) with the evil germ; so what was good departed, and the evil remained.¹⁷²

For a grain of evil seed was sown in the heart of Adam from the beginning and how much fruit of ungodliness has it produced unto this time, and shall yet produce until the threshing-floor come.¹⁷³

But when Adam transgressed my statutes, then that which had been made was judged, and then the ways of this world became narrow and sorrowful and painful and full of perils coupled with great toils.¹⁷⁴

And I answered and said: This is my first and last word: better had it been that the earth had not produced Adam, or else, having once produced him, (for these) to have restrained him from sinning. For how does it profit us all that in the present must live in grief and after death look for punishment? O thou Adam, what hast thou done! For though it was thou that sinned, the fall was not thine alone, but ours also who are thy descendants.¹⁷⁵

Williams's argument is that the first two passages clearly state that after Adam's transgression his nature became weakened. Not only did Adam suffer an "inveterate" infirmity, but this effect also fell upon his descendants and the world, which "became narrow and sorrowful and painful and full of perils coupled with great toils".

¹⁷²₄ Ezra 3:21-23.

¹⁷³₄ Ezra 4:30.

¹⁷⁴₄ Ezra 7:11-12.

¹⁷⁵₄ Ezra 7:116-118.

Adam is a starting point from which man is born into a weakened condition, as is stated in passage three. No mention is made in the third passage concerning the transmission of sin. Rather, it is stated that Adam's sin was merely the first in a long line of evils. However, the first and fourth passages imply the transmission of sin from Adam to his descendants, making the infirmity inveterate and the fall of Adam the fall of his descendants.

As support to Williams's understanding of 4 Ezra, there are other elaborate descriptions throughout this literature of man's inherent corruption from Adam's transgression, but most worthy of mention is that contained in 2 Baruch 56:6.¹⁷⁶

For (since) when he transgressed untimely death came into being, grief was named and anguish was prepared and pain was created, and trouble consummated, and disease began to be established, and Sheol kept demanding that it should be renewed in blood, and the begetting of children was brought about, and the passion of parents produced, and the greatness of humanity was humiliated and goodness languished.

Here is noted the rise of untimely death, all physical pain, anguish, disease, and passion which serves to humiliate humanity and destroy goodness.

No parallels to such thought are to be found in the writings of Irenaeus, if one is to understand 4 Ezra as does Williams in the above passages. But it is a difficult task to distinguish between a theory of inherited sin and one of corporate sin. In fact, the fourth passage cited from 4 Ezra, which, according to Williams, shows "hereditary sin"

¹⁷⁶ Cf. also, 4 Ezra 7:11 f.; Jub. 3:28; Apoc. Mos. 24.

may show "corporate sin" instead. Moreover, there is nothing in the book of 4 Ezra which would deny a theory of "corporate sin" and all four passages cited by Williams could well be interpreted in light of Irenaeus's notion of all men sinning "in Adam". Thus, the words of 4 Ezra "For though it was thou that sinned, the fall was not thine alone, but ours also who are thy descendants", could indicate that all men sinned and fell with Adam, suffering the universal effects of corporate guilt and sin. Such a notion is consistent with those ideas closely uniting mankind with Adam¹⁷⁷ in which Irenaeus implicates all men not only in the formation of Adam¹⁷⁸ but also in Adam's sin.¹⁷⁹

It might at first appear that Irenaeus's theory of corporate sin "in Adam" owes more to Paul than to 4 Ezra. It is not impossible that Irenaeus's view is the result of extending Paul's statement (1 Cor. 15:22) that "in Adam all die". It should be noted, however, that men, in Paul, do not sin in Adam. Sin comes into the world through Adam, but Paul explicitly opens the possibility that Adam's descendants might sin in a way which is not "like the transgression of Adam" (Rom. 5:14). Adam's trespass leads to condemnation for all men (Rom. 5:18) and results in "many" being made sinners (Rom. 5:19), but nowhere does Paul say that men sin in or with Adam. Irenaeus's statements that man "had sinned in the beginning" in Adam and "had offended in the first Adam"¹⁸⁰ do not have any precise

¹⁷⁷ See pp. 72-75.

¹⁷⁸ Proof 31; A.H. 5, 1, 3 (ibid.).

¹⁷⁹ A.H. 5, 17, 1 (ibid.); 5, 16, 3 (ibid.).

¹⁸⁰ See above, p. 75.

parallels in the earlier literature, but 4 Ezra's view that man fell with Adam seems to be as important a component part as is Paul's view that man's sin was consequent upon the first man's transgression.

Irenaeus and Apocalyptic on the "Pain of the Stroke"

A very striking notion of Irenaeus's concerning man's anguish, which he suffered after Adam's transgression, is that related to the phrase "pain of the stroke". He uses this phrase to explain how God "shall heal the anguish of his people and do away with the pain of the stroke".¹⁸¹ Obviously, this phrase represents mankind's suffering. But Irenaeus has much more to say about the "pain of the stroke" than that it is the cause of man's anguish, for he explains that "the pain of the stroke means that inflicted at the beginning upon disobedient man in Adam, that is, death".¹⁸² The phrase "pain of the stroke" is related to Irenaeus's theory of corporate sin in Adam, since it is clear that the "strokes" visited on Adam for his sin are also inflicted on all humanity.

The stroke of God is first mentioned in Isaiah where "the Lord binds up the hurt of His people, and heals the wounds inflicted by His blow".¹⁸³ This is partially the thought of Irenaeus; but the "stroke of God" in Irenaeus is related to Adam, his disobedience and death. (For reasons of comparison the texts on "God's stroke" will be put in Latin.)

¹⁸¹Cf. A.H. 5, 34, 2 (ibid.).

¹⁸²Ibid.

¹⁸³Isa. 30:25-26.

...quando sanabit contritionem populi sui, et dolorem
plagae sua sanabit. Dolor autem plagae est, per quam
 percussus est homo initio in Adam inobediens, hoc est
mors quam sanabit Deus resucitans nos a mortuis et
 restituens in patrum haereditatem.¹⁸⁴

The reference in Isaiah does not involve Adam, Eve, sin or death, but in apocalyptic literature such a connection is made and only there are the "strokes" mentioned in such a relationship. In the Apocalypse of Moses a brief explanation is made concerning the strokes of God.

Adam said to him...I have (much) sickness and trouble...Seth said to him...and how has this come upon thee? Adam said to him: When God made me and your mother through whom also I die...He charged us not to eat...She ate of the tree.... Then she gave also me to eat and God was wroth with us...and said...'I have brought upon thy body seventy-two strokes: The trouble of the first stroke is the pain of the eyes, the second stroke an affection of the hearing, and likewise in turn all the strokes shall befall thee'.¹⁸⁵

In the above passages, as well as in a lengthier account found in the Life of Adam and Eve,¹⁸⁶ the "pain of the stroke" is elaborated upon, associated with the disobedience of Adam, related to numerous pains, and, finally, death. The Apocalypse of Moses explains how God was angry with Adam for his disobedience and brought upon his body seventy-two strokes. Then followed the enumeration of those strokes with the conclusion that all the strokes shall befall Adam until finally "He (Adam)...will die".¹⁸⁷

¹⁸⁴ A.H. 5, 34, 2 (*ibid.*). See Appendix I for a comparison of texts.

¹⁸⁵ Apoc. Mos. 6:3-9:3.

¹⁸⁶ Vita Adae et Evaæ, cc. 31-35.

¹⁸⁷ Apoc. Mos. 13:6.

So also in the Vita Adae et Evaе, the Lord, God, was angry with Adam and Eve for their disobedience and brought upon Adam's body "seventy strokes" with diverse griefs. In this account, God speaks to Adam saying:

...eo quod dereliquisti mandatum meum et verbum
quod confortavi tibi non custodisti ecce inducam
in corpus tuum LXX plagas; diversis doloribus ab
initio capites...¹⁸⁸

The accounts of the strokes found in the writings of Irenaeus and the Vita Adae et Evaе have several points of agreement, some of which are verbatim in the Latin translations. Irenaeus uses inobediens in reference to Adam's deed whereas the apocalyptic author says dereliquisti mandatum. Both authors use initio to indicate the time of Adam's sin. The word for "strokes" is plagae in both accounts. Irenaeus, after some reflection, combines dolorem with plagae to qualify the "strokes" of God. The apocalyptic author does use various forms of dolor but in reference to that which results from the plagae. In fact, often does Adam in the apocalyptic account complain of the dolorem which he must suffer at the hands of the plagae. Within the space of seventeen verses, dolor or some form of that root is used no fewer than seven times and always in relation to the plagae. Moreover, the final result of these pains (dolor) and strokes (plagae) is that "his (Adam's) soul shall go off his body", the explanation for Irenaeus's mors (death).

Also, in the apocalyptic writings the "strokes of God" are treated in the context of God's healing the effects which the "strokes" have had upon mankind because of Adam. Therefore, the treatment of the strokes of God found in the Apocalypse of Moses, the Vita Adae et Evaе and Adversus

¹⁸⁸ Vita Adae et Evaе 34:1-2.

Haereses are strikingly similar, so that the strokes are related to Adam and Eve, their disobedience, and death. Furthermore, the strokes in the apocalyptic tradition are so often related to dolor that the phrase dolorem plagae (pain of the stroke), as coined by Irenaeus, took little, if any, reflection for its formulation after reading the two apocalyptic accounts.

Thus we have seen that it is likely that Irenaeus's notion of corporate sin as the explanation of how Adam's transgression affected mankind relies in part on 4 Ezra, while it is almost certain that his use of the phrase "pain of the stroke" in connection with Adam, sin, and death shows knowledge of the Vita Adae et Evaee and perhaps the Apocalypse of Moses.

The Skill of God and Individual Responsibility in Irenaeus and 2 Baruch

If for some purposes Irenaeus can emphasize man's corporate sin in Adam as the origin of sin, a view which would seem to diminish individual responsibility, he can at other times emphasize individual responsibility for sin. It appears that here, too, he utilizes Jewish apocalyptic literature. This appears in a passage in which he emphasizes that man, rather than God, is responsible for sin:

The skill of God, therefore, is not defective
 ...but the man who does not obtain it is the
 cause to himself of his own imperfection....
 Those persons, therefore, who have apostatized
 ...and transgressed...have done so through
 their own fault since they have been created
 free agents and possessed of power over them-
 selves...those who fly from the eternal light
 of God...are themselves the cause to themselves
 of their inhabiting eternal darkness, destitute
 of all good things, having become to themselves
 the cause of [their consignment to] an abode of

that nature.¹⁸⁹

The thought here is somewhat like that of Sirach 15:11-15, which proclaims that God is not the cause of man's wretchedness or sin but rather, man himself is the cause. Yet, Irenaeus, in this passage, is more likely echoing the thought of 2 Baruch who states:

For though Adam first sinned and brought untimely death upon all, yet those who were born from him, each one of them has prepared for his own soul torment to come...but now, as for you, ye wickedFor His works have not taught you, nor has the skill of his creation, which is at all time, persuaded you. Adam is therefore not the cause save only of his own soul, but each of us has been the Adam of his own soul.¹⁹⁰

What Irenaeus says is that God is not responsible for man's sin and torment but rather each person is responsible for his own eternal destiny. The imagery used is that of man fleeing from eternal light into eternal darkness. Each man is the cause to himself of his own perfection or imperfection. Each man, through his own fault, is his own cause or has become to himself the cause of his inhabiting eternal light or darkness, because such a cause cannot be attributed to the "skill of God".

These ideas certainly echo the thought of 2 Baruch, although the motive is different. Irenaeus wishes to exonerate God from responsibility for man's sin, while 2 Baruch exonerates Adam. This fact does not argue against Irenaeus's use of 2 Baruch here, however. Irenaeus, it is true, could not have used 2 Baruch as a source for his view of Adam, since Irenaeus and 2 Baruch position Adam quite differently in their schemes of

¹⁸⁹ A.H. 4, 39, 3 (4, 64, 2-3). See Appendix I for a comparison of texts.

¹⁹⁰ 2 Baruch 54:15-19.

creation. Moreover, it should be noted that when Irenaeus does exonerate Adam from guilt in transgression,¹⁹¹ it is to make a different point from 2 Baruch's and for reasons other than those offered by him. But the fact remains that Irenaeus, who blames all men for "sinning in Adam",¹⁹² can also speak words similar to those of 2 Baruch. That is, "man who is the cause to himself", "men, who through their own fault", "who have power over themselves", "who are themselves the cause" and "have become to themselves the cause", are phrases not too much unlike those of 2 Baruch who states that "each one of them has prepared for his own soul torment" and each of us has been "the Adam of his own soul". Yet, a remarkable similarity between these two writings occurs in an examination of Baruch's "torment to come". Such an examination can be made in the verses immediately following Baruch's plea for individual responsibility. Here is a description of the individual torment of those who turn away from the "bright lightening"¹⁹³ into the "darkness of black waters".¹⁹⁴ Thus, the sequence of thought in both Irenaeus and 2 Baruch is individual responsibility related to eternal light or darkness.

Still, the most striking similarity between these two writings is perceived in the two phrases "the skill of God" and "the skill of creation". The phrase "skill of God", which is used by Irenaeus, is a

¹⁹¹ See Chapter Two, n. #36; Chapter Three, n. #99; below, p.147. Irenaeus exonerates Adam from blame for his own transgression, 2 Baruch from blame for mankind's sinfulness.

¹⁹² See Chapter Three, nn. #29, 30.

¹⁹³ 2 Baruch 72:1.

¹⁹⁴ 2 Baruch 56:5.

reference stressing the person of God whereas 2 Baruch's the "skill of creation" is a reference stressing God's activity. As they are used in the two passages, it is readily perceived that Irenaeus stressed the person rather than God's activity because he wished to exonerate the person of God for man's individual imperfect actions.¹⁹⁵

However, it appears that Irenaeus, when using 2 Baruch in his argument for man's personal responsibility for his sinful and eternal state, had to change the phrase "skill of creation" to "skill of God" because Irenaeus perceived God's act of creation as something less than perfect. Furthermore, this change can easily be seen in the fact that prior to the passage which contains the phrase "skill of God" Irenaeus had discussed that "skill" thoroughly, which discussion is totally concerned with God's act of creation.

Irenaeus, then, exonerating God for man's individual imperfection, making man the cause of his own soul's fate in eternal light or darkness, uses the framework of 2 Baruch, who exonerates Adam for man's sinfulness and makes man the cause of his own soul's fate in the bright lightening or darkness of black waters. Irenaeus not only expresses these basic ideas in the same scheme as 2 Baruch and with similar imagery, but also reveals even greater literary dependence upon Baruch in his use of almost identical phrasing for God's creative act.

It would be too systematic to argue that Irenaeus's view of man's individual responsibility for sin conflicts with his view of corporate

¹⁹⁵ Although Irenaeus wishes to make God responsible for the fall of Adam, he does not wish to make God responsible for the sins of each individual. That responsibility falls upon Satan.

sin in Adam. He can say at the same time that man sinned in Adam and is individually guilty for doing so. The corporate aspect fits his overall doctrine of recapitulation (humanity falls in Adam and is renewed in Christ), while individual guilt must be maintained both to free God from the charge of having created sin and for parenetic purposes. Thus while 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch simply disagree about the relation between Adam's sin and the sin of individuals (4 Ezra attributing man's plight to Adam and 2 Baruch to individual sin), we cannot say that Irenaeus simply embodies that disagreement. There are, however, divergent emphases in Irenaeus, and it appears that in emphasizing corporate sin he may have drawn on 4 Ezra, while he almost certainly used 2 Baruch to emphasize individual responsibility. (We have also seen above that in discussing one aspect of corporate sin -- the punishment visited on Adam and his descendants -- he used the Books of Adam and Eve.)

Exalted and Glorious Adam

Irenaeus's dependence upon apocalyptic notions extends beyond the motif of a sinful Adam, because the motif of an exalted Adam as found in the work of Irenaeus betrays a fascinating similarity with the glorious Adam of apocalyptic writings. For Irenaeus, Adam was made in the image and likeness of God¹⁹⁶ "so that man became like God in inspiration as well as frame...having been made by God in order to be master of everything on earth".¹⁹⁷ In the whole of creation there was none superior to

¹⁹⁶ See above, pp. 71-76.

¹⁹⁷ Proof 11.

Adam, for he was "the pattern of things made and the type of all adornments in the world".¹⁹⁸ Adam was the father and figure of the human race¹⁹⁹ which descends and is fashioned after the first man.²⁰⁰

The glory which awaits the descendants of Adam is the same glory which Adam had at the beginning.

We do participate in the glory of the Lord who has both formed us, and prepared us for this, that when we are with Him, we may partake of His glory. Thus it was too that God formed man at the first.²⁰¹

This glory is the glory of God and is the life of man who beholds God.²⁰² Moreover, man's glory is "to continue and remain permanently in God's service".²⁰³ Thus Adam was created much like the angels who were the servants of God.²⁰⁴ Yet God made Adam even Lord over the angels.²⁰⁵ It was Adam "for whom...the creation was made"²⁰⁶ and he was the pattern for the whole human race.²⁰⁷ All men were to be fashioned after Adam and eschatological man. They would be recapitulated in the second Adam, Christ, and would be rendered "living and perfect".²⁰⁸ That recapitulation would be the "ancient formation of Adam",²⁰⁹ that "very same formation...as had existed in Adam"²¹⁰ before the fall. All men will be raised up in Christ and transformed to the former image, likeness, and

¹⁹⁸ A.H. 4, 20, 1 (4, 34, 1).

¹⁹⁹ See above, pp. 72-75.

²⁰⁰ A.H. 3, 22, 3 (3, 32, 1); 5, 16, 2 (5, 16, 1-2); 5, 15, 3 (ibid.); 5, 15, 4 (ibid.); 3, 23, 2 (3, 33, 1).

²⁰¹ A.H. 4, 14, 1-2 (4, 25, 1-2).

²⁰² A.H. 4, 20, 7 (4, 34, 7).

²⁰³ A.H. 4, 14, 1 (4, 25, 1).

²⁰⁴ Proof 11.

²⁰⁵ Ibid., 12.

²⁰⁶ A.H. 4, 7, 4 (4, 14).

²⁰⁷ A.H. 3, 22, 3 (3, 32, 1).

²⁰⁸ A.H. 5, 1, 3 (ibid.).

²⁰⁹ A.H. 5, 1, 2 (ibid.).

²¹⁰ A.H. 3, 21, 10 (3, 30).

glory of God.

Sirach says that "above every living thing was the beauteous glory of Adam".²¹¹ Adam is accepted as the "Lord and Ruler" of all creation.²¹² Likewise, in late Jewish apocalyptic literature, Adam is no less exalted above all creatures. In much of this literature, he is understood as the first patriarch of Israel and the father of the human race. In 1 Enoch 37:1, the lineage of the human race is traced to Adam.²¹³ Moreover, in the Dream Vision in chapters 85–90 of the same book, Adam appears under the imagery of a white bull which is the imagery of all the Patriarchs of Israel. The important point to be made concerning this imagery is that the people who are saved in the eschatological kingdom are also changed into Adam's image of the white bull. This says, in effect, that Adam is not only the father of the human race but also the image of eschatological humanity.

Sirach has referred to the "beauteous glory of Adam". Also, the clothing of Adam in apocalyptic thought was one of glory. This glory was lost and multiple attestations to the loss are made. The Apocalypse of Moses has both Adam and Eve proclaiming the loss of glory. Eve says that "I spoke to him [Adam] words of transgression [which have brought us down from our great glory]."²¹⁴ Also Adam, speaking to Eve, said "O wicked woman! What have I done to thee that thou hast deprived me of the

²¹¹ Sirach 49:16.

²¹² 4 Ezra 6:54; Apoc. Mos. 24:4; 2 Enoch 30:12.

²¹³ Cf. also, 1 Enoch 60:8; Wisd. Sol. 10:1; Jub. 2:33, 19:24–25; Apoc. Mos. 41:3; Vita Adae et Evaæ 27:3; 4 Ezra 6:53–56.

²¹⁴ Apoc. Mos. 21:2.

glory of God?"²¹⁵ Likewise, 2 Baruch, cc. 14-15 give a lengthy description of the loss of glory, adding at the end of the discourse "and that accordingly which is to come, a crown with great glory". Moreover, the glory of Adam's loss will be restored in the future eschatological kingdom. This restoration of glory is more obvious in other places which speak about the glory which the pious and righteous will possess in the eschatological kingdom.

For with many afflictions shall they be afflicted that inhabit the world in the last times, because they have walked in great pride. But do thou (rather) think of thy own case (Ezra's), and of them who are like thyself search out the glory.²¹⁶

And it shall come to pass, when that appointed day has gone by, that then shall the aspect of those who are condemned be afterwards changed, and the glory of those who are justified...also (as for) the glory of those who have now been justified...then their splendour shall be glorified in changes....When, therefore, they see those, over whom they are now exalted, (but) who shall then be exalted and glorified more than they, they shall...be transformed...into the splendour of angels.²¹⁷

In those days...He has destined me for blessing and glory.²¹⁸

In these passages, glory is man's final state and that glory is the glory which Adam had before the fall. Moreover, this glory, in one passage of 2 Baruch, is described as the splendour of angels. Several passages associate Adam's splendour with that of the angels. A lengthy account

²¹⁵ Apoc. Mos. 21:6.

²¹⁶ ₄ Ezra 8:51.

²¹⁷ 2 Baruch 51:1-5. Cf. also, 54:15, 21, 15:8.

²¹⁸ ₁ Enoch 39:9. Cf. also, 50:1, 58:2, 103:2 f.

in the Vita Adae et Evaе tells about the joy and luxury of Adam's state over which the Devil and his angels grieved. Elsewhere, angels guard Adam in Paradise²¹⁹ and the food which the first couple eat is that of the angels.²²⁰ However, the glory of Adam was to be created after the splendour of the angels, which was the case in 1 Enoch.

For men were created exactly like the angels,
to the intent that they should continue pure
and righteous.²²¹

An important point must be made that following upon Adam's creation like that of an angel, all righteous men will likewise be made like angels in the eschatological kingdom.

For in the heights of that world shall they
dwell, and they shall be made like unto the
angels.²²²

Thus Adam, who was created in glory, in the splendour of the angels, is the first father of the human race. He is the format for all of humanity, but he sins and loses his splendour and glory. So, also, all men likewise suffer the loss from Adam's fall. But Adam and all righteous men will be restored to Adam's former glory in the last times.

And I will transform thee to thy former glory.²²³

When again the resurrection has come to pass, I
will raise thee up and then there shall be given
to thee the tree of life.²²⁴

²¹⁹Apoc. Mos. 7:2.

²²⁰Vita Adae et Evaе 4:2.

²²¹1 Enoch 69:11. Cf. also, 2 Enoch 30:10-14 where Adam is created as a second angel.

²²²2 Baruch 51:10. Cf. also, 1 Enoch 104. "You shall have great joy as the angels of heaven".

²²³Apoc. Mos. 39:2.

²²⁴Apoc. Mos. 28:4.

I will raise thee (Adam) up in the resurrection with every man who is of thy seed.²²⁵

...but in the end of times, then shall all flesh be raised up from Adam till that great day -- all that shall be of thy holy people. Then shall the delights of paradise be given to them and God shall be in their midst... and there shall be given them a heart understanding the good and to serve God only.²²⁶

By way of summary, then, it is readily seen that both Irenaeus and late Jewish literature exalted and glorified Adam above all other creatures. Adam was Lord of all creation, the first father, and prototype of the entire human race. He was clothed in glory much like the splendour of the angels. But Adam lost that splendour and lost it for all men. Neither Adam nor mankind will be restored to that former glory until the last times of the eschatological kingdom.

For Irenaeus, the restoration was a process of recapitulation in the person of Christ. This recapitulation is constructed around the two apocalyptic motifs about Adam, namely, exalted and sinful Adam. Moreover, what Irenaeus needed to complete Paul's theme of first and second Adam, without destroying the analogy,²²⁷ was this late Jewish speculation concerning mankind's restoration to Adam's original glory in an eschatological kingdom. This theme, which Irenaeus apparently took from Jewish apocalyptic literature, forms an important part of his theory of recapitulation.

Eve's Culpability in Irenaeus and the Apocalypse of Moses

Irenaeus shows further dependence upon Jewish apocalyptic literature

²²⁵ Apoc. Mos. 41:3

²²⁶ Apoc. Mos. 13:3-5.

²²⁷ A.H. 3, 21, 10 (3, 30).

in various points of detail, one of which is the exoneration of Adam, which we previously mentioned. Robbin Scroggs is correct in saying that when Adam is exalted in late Jewish apocalyptic literature his role as sinner is somewhat muted or eclipsed and the origin of sin is ascribed to a different cause.²²⁸ Several apocalyptic authors found it an easy thing to place the blame upon Eve.²²⁹ Likewise, the exaltation of Adam and the switching of blame is also found in the writings of Irenaeus. He almost completely exonerates Adam of any blame for his deed when he claims that Adam "was a little one and his discretion still undeveloped, wherefore also he was easily misled by the deceiver".²³⁰ This exoneration led Irenaeus to make Eve the one who was disobedient and a cause of sin and death to the entire human race.

But Eve was disobedient...having become disobedient, was made the cause of death to herself and to the entire human race.²³¹

For this purpose, too, He (God) interrogates them that the blame might light upon the woman.²³²

...it was through a virgin who disobeyed that man was stricken and fell and died.²³³

The effects of Eve's transgression are the same effects that Irenaeus

²²⁸ Scroggs, LA, p. 21.

²²⁹ 1 Enoch 69; Sirach 25:24; Vita Adae et Evaee 3:2; Apoc. Mos. 8:2, 11; 2 Enoch 30:18, 31:6.

²³⁰ Proof 12.

²³¹ A.H. 3, 22, 4 (3, 32, 1). See Appendix I for a comparison of texts.

²³² A.H. 3, 23, 5 (3, 35, 1).

²³³ Proof 33.

often attributes to Adam. This exoneration of Adam and placement of guilt for sin and death upon Eve is found in the writings of Justin Martyr. In his dialogues with Trypho, Justin maintained that the "serpent beguiled Eve"²³⁴ and that "Eve brought forth disobedience and death".²³⁵ Irenaeus appears to follow Justin on this point and likewise betrays the inconsistency of Justin's thought when he attributes guilt and death to Adam.²³⁶

Possibly a reading of 1 Timothy, "Adam was not deceived but the woman was deceived and became a transgressor"²³⁷ could partially explain why Irenaeus sometimes singled out Eve as the culprit for man's tragic sinful character. Yet this single passage from scripture does not quite position Eve as the cause of man's wretched condition, nor does it necessarily place blame upon Eve as the cause of death to herself and the entire human race. The term merely states that Eve is a transgressor and not the cause of death to anyone. It does attempt to exonerate Adam from any guilt in paradise by stating that "he was not deceived", but this lone text of the New Testament could not be the foundation upon which Irenaeus would make Eve the cause of death to mankind. Moreover, the picture of Eve's transgression and its effects are fashioned by Irenaeus in a truncated description which suggests a much larger background for his thought. That background is extensive in apocalyptic literature. In

²³⁴ Dial. Trypho 79, 124.

²³⁵ Ibid., 100.

²³⁶ Ibid., 88, 103.

²³⁷ 1 Tim. 2:14.

fact, long before Irenaeus took up his pen the notion existed that woman in general,²³⁸ and Eve in particular,²³⁹ was responsible for the evils that befall mankind. Eve's account of her fall in the Apocalypse of Moses not only attributes death to the human race through her own fault, but also makes her a cause of all sin.

For I have sinned...and all sin hath begun through my doing.²⁴⁰

...(hand over to me his pain for it is I who sinned)...for this hath come to thee from fault of mine.²⁴¹

For it is on my account that this hath happened to thee, on my account thou art beset with toils and troubles.²⁴²

And Adam said to Eve: What hast thou done? A great plague hast thou brought upon us, transgression and sin for all our generations.²⁴³

And Adam said to Eve: Eve, what hast thou wrought in us? Thou hast brought upon us great wrath which is death (lording it over all our race).²⁴⁴

Such a strong tradition as exists in this apocalyptic literature led Irenaeus to expand upon the New Testament and at different times isolate Eve and then Adam as a cause of man's sin and death.

²³⁸ Test. Reub. 5:1.

²³⁹ Apoc. Mos. cc. 15-30; Vita Adae et Evaee 35:2-3.

²⁴⁰ Apoc. Mos. 32:2.

²⁴¹ Vita Adae et Evaee 35:2-3.

²⁴² Apoc. Mos. 9:2.

²⁴³ Vita Adae et Evaee 44:2.

²⁴⁴ Apoc. Mos. 14:2.

Moreover, from the same apocalyptic work²⁴⁵ which treats the "strokes of God", Eve is made a cause of sin and death and in the first person declares her culpability.²⁴⁶ The Vita Adae et Evaе also considers Eve as a cause of pain resulting from the "strokes" and the accusers are both Adam²⁴⁷ and Eve, herself.²⁴⁸

Irenaeus's explicit statement of Eve's culpability is made when he parallels the deed of Eve to that of Mary.²⁴⁹ However, not only does Irenaeus position Eve as a cause of sin and death, but he also offers her as the cause of the "strokes" in saying that because of her man "was stricken and fell and died". What strikes man is the "pain of the stroke", and even though Irenaeus does not explicitly connect Eve's action with that pain, his reflection upon the Books of Adam and Eve made him assert Eve's role in bringing about God's "pain of the stroke".

The disobedience of Adam, primary culpability of Eve, punishment of God's strokes, leading ultimately to death for the first parents and all their generations, treated with similar and sometimes identical expression, in the context of God's healing mankind, are characteristics peculiar to Irenaeus and apocalyptic authors. The treatment is such, then, that a general familiarity with these notions would not reasonably satisfy to answer the question why Irenaeus placed such ideas in the

²⁴⁵ The Books of Adam and Eve.

²⁴⁶ Apoc. Mos. 9:2.

²⁴⁷ Vita Adae et Evaе 44:2.

²⁴⁸ Ibid., 35:2-3.

²⁴⁹ Proof 33.

manner and fashion in which they are found. One explanation which does reasonably supply an answer to that question is that Irenaeus had carefully read apocalyptic authors on the subject of God's strokes, Adam's sin, and the culpability of Eve. Thus, we must suppose that his knowledge of the subject as treated by apocalyptic authors must have been more than a general familiarity with that tradition in order to explain why he mentioned identical notions, with similar expression, in the same context, about the same subject.

Yet the apocalyptic writers speculated upon many different origins for sin other than Eve. When they exalted Adam they found several other causes for sin. Likewise, when Irenaeus exalted and exonerated Adam, he attributed a cause of sin and death to sources other than Eve. These other speculations on the causes of sin, although first spawned by late Jewish apocalyptic writers, were adopted by Irenaeus. An investigation into these other sources of man's sinfulness will reveal Irenaeus's further dependency upon this apocalyptic tradition.

CHAPTER FOUR

SATAN AND HIS ANGELS

The Apostasy of the Angels

So far sin has been traced back to a source in Adam and Eve. Also, the reasons offered for man's poor conduct have been his infirm nature (a result of his corporate participation "in Adam") or his hostile environment, both caused by Adam's fall. Another cause for man's sinfulness is proposed by Irenaeus, namely, that man sins because of angelic powers. Sin is associated with a world of spirits, with Satan and his angels who cause men to perform vile deeds.¹

In Chapter Three (p. 79), it was mentioned that Satan was the cause of bringing Adam and Eve to transgression and, therefore, only indirectly effected a sinful humanity. However, Irenaeus often bypasses Adam in his treatment of Satan and angels, so that this evil spirit world directly brings about mankind's sinful condition. In effect, then, Irenaeus often but not always ignores Adam as a cause for a sinful humanity, which is contrary to several apocalyptic writers who use Adam

¹A.H. 1, 21, 1 (1, 14, 1). "This class of men have been instigated by Satan". Justin Martyr, before Irenaeus, in his "Dialogues" refers several times to angelic spirits in the context of Satan, serpent, and sin. Cf. Dial. 45, 79, 82, 85, 88, 94, 100, 103, 124, 125. However, his treatment of these creatures and sin is neither so extensive nor purposeful as the treatment given them in the writings of Irenaeus. See also, Wingren, op. cit., pp. 39-75.

as the principal cause of man's sinfulness² or who fuse the angelic fall with Adam's fall.³ Yet, he certainly bypasses Adam in discussing man's sinfulness before the flood. He states that "all the commixture of wickedness which took place previous to the deluge, [was] due to the apostasy of the angels".⁴ Whether the angelic world only directly effected a sinful human race up to the time of the deluge and ceased thereafter is not clear in Irenaeus's writings.⁵ However, his notions on the angels and the deluge do associate him with apocalyptic ideas.⁶

Irenaeus's bypassing Adam makes Satan a replacement for Adam as the originator of sin and the direct cause of man's wretched condition. Such speculation upon the fall of Satan and his angels is only to be found in the late Jewish apocalyptic literature from which, it is contended, Irenaeus derived his theories of sin, Satan, and man.

It cannot be contested that Irenaeus conceived of Satan and his angels with the same realistic existence which Adam enjoyed in paradise. Irenaeus takes great pains to prove that an elaborate spiritual hierarchy exists in a world which is completely the responsibility of God. That is, God created all angelic creatures and the seven heavens of angelic

² Baruch and Ezra use Adam as a starting point of man's sinfulness.

³ The Books of Adam and Eve fuse the two accounts, see pp. 15-20.

⁴ A.H. 5, 29, 2 (*ibid.*).

⁵ See below, pp. 148-150.

⁶ See Chapter One, pp. 22-24.

powers or beings which are engaged in the work of their creator. He first says that "He [God] created also seven heavens".⁷ Then he follows with other statements:

...they have glorified...Him who is the creator of the highest, that is, of super-celestial things, and the founder of everything on earth.⁸

But the earth is encompassed by seven heavens in which dwell powers and angels and archangels.⁹

The nature of these creatures, commonly referred to as angels and archangels, is that of rational beings¹⁰ without flesh.¹¹ They not only remain in the seven heavens where they were created, but also penetrate the earth¹² and the fires of hell.¹³ Therefore, Irenaeus perceived God's creation to be divided into heaven, earth, and hell. The good spirit world exists before the face of God in heaven. Thus, Irenaeus speaks of the "angels who continually behold the face of the Father"¹⁴ and "innumerable angels who surround the Creator".¹⁵ However, the evil spirit

⁷ A.H. 1, 5, 2 (1, 1, 9). The pains that Irenaeus takes to prove the existence of the "heavens" and God's dominance over them is a labour directed chiefly against the gnostics who thought otherwise. Cf. Nielsen, op. cit., pp. 39-42; Hitchcock, Irenaeus, pp. 321-339.

⁸ A.H. 3, 10, 3 (3, 11, 4).

⁹ Proof 9.

¹⁰ A.H. 4, 37, 1 (4, 59).

¹¹ A.H. 3, 20, 4 (3, 22);

¹² A.H. 2, 6, 2 (2, 4, 6); 4, 16, 2 (4, 27, 2).

¹³ A.H. 3, 23, 2 (3, 33, 2); 3, 3, 3 (3, 3, 2); 4, 40, 1 (4, 65).

¹⁴ A.H. 1, 13, 6 (1, 7, 5).

¹⁵ A.H. 2, 6, 3 (2, 4, 6). Cf. also, 3, 10, 1 (3, 11, 1); 2, 30, 7 (2, 47, 1); 4, 16, 2 (4, 27, 2); Proof 9.

world which is not resting in the fires of hell is actively engaged on earth for evil purposes.¹⁶

The role of Satan in man's sinfulness is a prominent one in Irenaeus's writings. He (Satan) takes on many different titles. He is referred to as the "strong man",¹⁷ the devil,¹⁸ and the apostate angel.¹⁹ However, it becomes evident that Irenaeus uses all of these names to signify a single creature who is angelic in nature and the chief adversary of God.²⁰

Sin is directly related to angelic powers and principally to the leader of these powers, Satan. He is the first to sin against God and later lead others to that sin or apostasy.²¹ Irenaeus claims that "It must be affirmed that He [God] had ascribed all who are of the apostasy to him who is the ringleader of the transgression".²² Satan, then, is the sole cause of apostasy and transgression.

¹⁶ See below, pp. 152-154.

¹⁷ A.H. 5, 22, 1-2 (ibid.).

¹⁸ A.H. 5, 24, 3 (ibid.).

¹⁹ A.H. 5, 21, 3 (ibid.); Proof 16.

²⁰ Wingren, op. cit., p. 44, says that the devil, Satan, and serpent refer to exactly the same reality, so that Irenaeus uses different names without making any real distinction between them. Cf. Fragmenta 16, the serpent is a demon. A.H. 4, pref., 4 (4, pref., 3); 4, 40, 3 (4, 66, 2); 5, 21, 2 (ibid.); 3, 23, 3 (3, 33, 2); Proof 16, the serpent is an apostate angel. A.H. 1, 27, 4 (1, 25, 2); 4, pref., 4 (4, pref., 3); 4, 40, 3 (4, 66, 2); 5, 23, 1 (ibid.), the serpent is a wicked angel. Satan is also identified with the serpent in some passages, but in others Satan hides himself in the disguise of the serpent or uses the serpent as an instrument for his evil work. Cf. A.H. 4, pref., 4 (4, pref., 3); 5, 23, 1 (ibid.); Proof 16. See also, pp.

²¹ "Apostasy" will have an equivalent meaning to that of sin or transgression when used in this thesis because Irenaeus uses the term in that sense.

²² A.H. 4, 40, 1 (4, 65).

Irenaeus explicitly states this about the devil "who first became the cause of apostasy to himself and afterwards to others".²³ The "others" and first to follow Satan in apostasy are a group of angels who revolted from a state of submission to God. Many passages speak of the apostasy. Irenaeus refers to "the Chief of the apostasy...and those angels who became apostates along with him",²⁴ "the angels who transgressed and became apostates",²⁵ and "the apostasy of the angels who transgressed".²⁶

Thus, the apostasy reaches from Satan to other angels who follow his lead in sin, transgression, and revolt. Moreover, the apostasy which began with Satan and continued through the apostate angels also extends to the whole of mankind. Irenaeus, speaking of all those whom God should punish in the eternal fires, lists "the angels who transgressed and became apostates, together with the ungodly, and unrighteous, and wicked, and profane among men".²⁷ Yet, this chain of apostasy and transgression beginning with Satan, extending down through the angels, and finally bringing man to that same apostasy logically traces the origin of sin back to Satan. It is understandable, then, that Irenaeus would proclaim Satan as the "ringleader of all transgression". Although the previous passages cited indicate that the apostasy extends to mankind,

²³ A.H. 4, 41, 3 (4, 68, 1).

²⁴ A.H. 3, 23, 3 (ibid.).

²⁵ A.H. 1, 10, 1 (1, 2).

²⁶ A.H. 1, 10, 3 (1, 4). Cf. also, 2, 28, 7 (2, 43, 2); 4, 16, 2 (4, 27, 2).

²⁷ A.H. 1, 10, 1 (1, 2).

we have yet to see how this transfer is accomplished.

The Means of Apostasy and its Effect

Irenaeus has a twofold description concerning the manner in which the apostasy is extended to mankind. One description concerns the fall of the angels which stems from an "unlawful union" of these creatures with offspring from the daughters of men.

And wickedness very long continued and widespread pervaded all the race of men until very little seed of justice was in them. For unlawful unions came about on earth as angels linked themselves with offspring of the daughters of men, who bore to them sons, who on account of their great size were called giants.²⁸

...that most infamous race of men...could not bring forth fruit to God since the angels that sinned had commingled with them (daughters of men).²⁹

It appears that the apostasy of angels results when the angels, against the desire of God, mix with men to initiate wickedness. Satan, as leader of the angels, causes the unlawful descent of the angels to earth so that they commingle angelic and human natures.³⁰

Another related but slightly different treatment of angels and their part in the apostasy of mankind is that which associates man's sinfulness with the "giants" produced from the commingling of angelic and human natures. Irenaeus refers to that "infamous race of men" who performed fruitless and wicked deeds. Here emphasis is placed on the "off-

²⁸ Proof 18.

²⁹ A.H. 4, 36, 4 (4, 58, 4).

³⁰ There is some inconsistency between the commingling that brings evil and Irenaeus's notion that the commingling of men and angels will be a good thing when the world is perfectly "recapitulated" in Christ. Cf. A.H. 5, 35, 1 (ibid.).

spring" of unlawful unions rather than on the union itself. Yet this infamous race was wicked because it resulted from the sin of angels mixing with men. What appears behind the words of Irenaeus is that the infamous race of men are the "giants" which are the product of sin rather than the origin of sin.

Elsewhere, the wickedness of men results from the teachings of angels. That is, the manner in which angels extend the apostasy to mankind is not through "unlawful unions" or offspring, but through evil teachings. These angels either innocently or maliciously descended upon the earth with unlawful, useless knowledge. Arts and crafts, sorcery and machinations of all types were possessed by them (fallen angels) and transmitted from one generation of men to another.

The angels, then, brought their wives as gifts teachings of evil, for they taught them the virtues of roots and herbs, and dyeing, and cosmetics, and discoveries of precious metals, love philtres, hatreds, armours, passions, constraints of love, the bonds of witchcraft, every sorcery and idolatry hateful to God. And when this was come into the world, the affairs of wickedness were propagated to overflowing, and those of justice dwindled to very little.³¹

Satan appears, then, as the apostate angel and leader of all transgression. He is the cause of apostasy to himself and others. Yet the wickedness of Satan and his angels is not always associated with the present human race, because Irenaeus accuses the apostate angels of all the wickedness leading to the deluge. He perceived the work of these angels as the chief reason for bringing about the flood which destroyed

³¹ Proof 18.

all evil up to the time of Noah.

...he (the Antichrist) sums up in His own person all the commixture of wickedness which took place previous to the deluge due to the apostasy of the angels.³²

...the deluge came upon the earth, sweeping away the rebellious world, for the sake of that most infamous generation which lived in the time of Noah...the deluge occurred because of the apostasy.³³

In the days of Noah, He (God) justly brought on the deluge for the purpose of extinguishing that most infamous race of men.³⁴

Another point concerning the apostasy of Satan, angels, and men deals with the destiny of those who participate in the apostasy.

Irenaeus derives from tradition, which he recognizes as valid, that eternal fires were prepared for the devil and his angels.

...the Church in Rome despatched a most powerful letter...declaring the tradition...[and] proclaiming the one God, omnipotent...who brought on the deluge...and who has prepared fire for the devil and his angels.³⁵

The fire was created for him who caused man to sin and caused the other angels to revolt and apostasy.

It is therefore one and the same God the father... who has prepared the eternal fire for the ring-leader of the apostasy, the devil and those who revolted with him...³⁶

³² A.H. 5, 29, 2 (ibid.).

³³ A.H. 5, 29, 2 (ibid.).

³⁴ A.H. 4, 36, 4 (4, 58, 4).

³⁵ A.H. 3, 3, 3 (3, 3, 2).

³⁶ A.H. 4, 40, 1 (4, 65).

Yet Irenaeus has something more to say about the tradition than its mere credal formation. Irenaeus, after citing Matthew's text "Depart from me, you cursed, into everlasting fires which my Father has prepared for the devil and his angels",³⁷ makes the statement that the eternal fire was not originally prepared for man.

...eternal fire was not originally prepared for man, but for him who beguiled man, and caused him to offend -- for him, I say, who is chief of the apostasy, and for those angels who became apostates along with him: which (fire) indeed, they shall justly feel who, like him, persevere in works of wickedness.³⁸

What Irenaeus offers on the one hand appears taken away on the other when he makes a statement contrary to the one just cited, for he says,

That eternal fire, (for instance) is prepared for sinners...since He (God) prepared eternal fires from the beginning for those who were (afterwards) to transgress (His commandments).³⁹

Nevertheless, it seems evident that he wishes to place the devil, his apostate angels, and sinful men into the fires which were created by God.

...the Lord has declared those men shall be sent [into the fires] who have been set apart by themselves on his left hand.⁴⁰

Irenaeus's Use of Apocalyptic "Seven Heavens"

This investigation connected with the spirit world as the possible origin of sin will now attempt to relate Irenaeus to some of the sources

³⁷ Mt. 25:41.

³⁸ A.H. 3, 23, 3 (3, 33, 2).

³⁹ A.H. 2, 28, 7 (2, 43, 2).

⁴⁰ A.H. 4, 40, 1 (4, 65).

for his thought. The first point to be made concerns Irenaeus's reference to the existence of "seven heavens" of angelic powers. The existence of these heavens was an idea common to both Irenaeus and his adversaries, the gnostics. In fact, Franz Cumont attests to the fact that the "seven heavens" was a common notion which came from Iran but which flourished throughout much of the Mediterranean world in the time of Christ.⁴¹ What Irenaeus has to say about these heavens, however, is something quite different from that of the gnostics. In fact, the heavens and their creation were an essential part of the contention that existed between Irenaeus and his adversaries.⁴² That is, the gnostics perceived the heavens as emanating from an original "primordial Father", whereas man was created by the demiurge.⁴³ Irenaeus, on the other hand, held fast to the creation of the heavens, earth, and all things through the hands of God. It would be a bold assumption to maintain, then, that Irenaeus's sole introduction to these heavens was through his gnostic adversaries. In fact, he would have dismissed any idea coming solely from gnostic thought. Rather, the less bold assumption would be that he believed in the existence of seven heavens independently of the gnostics.

This is not a New Testament concept, although Paul shows knowledge of multiple heavens when he refers to the "third heaven".⁴⁴ Also a single passage in the Old Testament⁴⁵ is at best a vague reference to these

⁴¹ Franz Cumont, Astrology and Religion among the Greeks and Romans (New York: Dover Publications Inc., 1960), p. 69.

⁴² Nielsen, op. cit., pp. 41-67.

⁴³ Ibid., pp. 39-41.

⁴⁴ 2 Cor. 12:2-4.

⁴⁵ Isa. 11:2.

heavens. However, the book of Jubilees refers to the seven great works (heavens) which God created on the first day,⁴⁶ the Testament of Levi gives a description of these heavens,⁴⁷ and the author of 2 Enoch visits each one as a favoured guest.⁴⁸

Irenaeus therefore need not have accepted the "seven heavens" from gnosticism or Iranian sources, since it was an idea flourishing in the literature of the late Jewish period. Moreover, the "seven heavens" of apocalyptic literature were created solely by God and were inhabited by angels and archangels, a claim also made by Irenaeus.

Furthermore, the statements regarding the "seven heavens" which are made by Irenaeus appear to involve literary dependence. Joseph Smith, S.J., in his translation of Irenaeus's Proof of the Apostolic Preaching,⁴⁹ thinks that Irenaeus took directly or indirectly the "seven heavens" from a Jewish tradition. He cites the Testament of Levi 3 and the Ascensio Isaiah 10 as the two traditions from which Irenaeus borrowed the idea.⁵⁰ When these and other passages are read in conjunction with Irenaeus's statements of the "heavens", there appears not only an undeniably similar sequence of thought but also a remarkable verbal agreement.

In A.H. 1, 52 (1, 1, 9), Irenaeus simply states that "He [God]

⁴⁶ Jub. 2:3.

⁴⁷ Test. Levi 3. Cf. also, Ascensio Isa. 10.

⁴⁸ 2 Enoch 3.

⁴⁹ See Chapter Two, n. #1.

⁵⁰ Smith, op. cit., pp. 147-148. See Appendix I for a comparison of texts.

created also seven heavens". In A.H. 4, 16, 2 (4, 27, 2) he locates these heavens when he says that "the earth is encompassed by seven heavens". (The emphasis in this and following passages is mine.) But in Proof 9 he elaborates upon this initial statement and also upon the nature of the heavens, saying "[heavens] in which dwell powers, and angels, and archangels giving homage to the almighty God who created all things".

Jubilees 2:2-3 explains that God created the heavens on the first day: "He (God) created the heavens". Later, Jubilees 2:4 affirms the creation of "seven" heavens: "for seven great works did He (God) create on the first day". Jubilees also locates those heavens "which are above the earth and the waters".⁵¹ The same book immediately attests to the homage paid to God, declaring, "and all the spirits which serve before Him (God), the angels". A lengthy description of these angels and the rest of creation follows.

However, the Testament of Levi 3:1-8 elaborates at some length regarding the nature of the "seven heavens": "...in the highest of all dwelleth the Great Glory, far above all holiness. In [the heaven next to] it are the archangels, who minister and make propitiation to the Lord...offering to the Lord a sweet smelling savour, a reasonable and a bloodless offering. And [in the heaven below this] are the angels who bear answers to the angels of the presence of the Lord. And in the heaven next to this are thrones and dominions, in which always they offer praise to God".

This passage is the only one outside of Irenaeus which associates

⁵¹ Jub. 2:3.

the seven heavens with angels, and archangels, and other heavenly beings who always are praising God. This passage which discusses the "seven heavens" describes these heavens in approximately the same manner as did Irenaeus. His statement about those who dwell in the "heavens" giving homage to God differs from that found in the Testament of Levi in only one obvious way. The Testament of Levi reads "thrones and dominions" where Irenaeus reads "powers".

The answer to this single difference in the two readings lies in Irenaeus's dependency upon Paul's letters while he uses apocalyptic writings to interpret Paul. Irenaeus knew that Paul (or a subsequent author of the pauline school) spoke about heavenly places in Ephesians 1:21 and Colossians 1:16. These two verses are very similar to one another, particularly when read from the Greek text.⁵² Yet, in neither of these passages does the author speak about "seven heavens", where dwell angels and archangels who constantly pay homage or praise to God. But Irenaeus knew that in the Testament of Levi all of these ideas were placed in relation to one another. Therefore, Irenaeus had both Paul's letters and the Testament of Levi before him when he wrote about the "seven heavens". With the words "thrones and dominions" from the Testament of Levi, Irenaeus turned to the letters of Paul which spoke about heavenly places. But instead of turning to Paul's text of Colossians 1:16 which reads "thrones and dominions", Irenaeus turned to the passage like it, namely, Ephesians 1:21, which reads "powers". Thus his explanation of

⁵² Eph. 1:21. "...Ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις ὑπεράνυτάχις ἀρχής καὶ ἀρχαῖς καὶ δύναμεσ καὶ κυριότητος". Col. 1:16. "τὰ πλευτα... ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς... εἴτε δύναμις εἴτε κυριότητες εἴτε ἀρχῆς καὶ εἴτε ἀρχαῖς".

the "seven heavens" taken from the Testament of Levi reads the same as Levi except for the substitution of "powers" from Eph. 1:21 for thrones and dominions in Levi which are also mentioned in the parallel text of Col. 1:16. Other answers for this difference in reading are that Irenaeus was not familiar with Col. 1:16 (which is unlikely) or that he had some preference for "powers" over "thrones and dominions".

Irenaeus and the Apocalyptic Chain of Apostasy

Not only does Irenaeus agree with Jubilees and the Testament of Levi in his description of the angelic beings who worship God in the heavens, he shows further dependence on apocalyptic literature when he describes how the fallen angels spread sin to humanity. That is, the chain of apostasy, beginning with Satan, extending down through the angels, and finally bringing man to that same corruption, did not come from a reading of the New Testament, which only briefly describes Satan's being cast out of heaven with his angels.⁵³ No explanation is offered by the New Testament for such action nor is there made any relationship between these events and man's sinful condition.

In the New Testament, angels sin⁵⁴ because they "did not keep their own position but left their proper dwelling" and because they indulged in unnatural lust.⁵⁵ The angels' "own position" of Jude appears consistent with Irenaeus's thought about the creation of angels in their

⁵³ 2 Pet. 2:4; Jude 6; Lk. 10:18; Jn. 12:31; Rev. 12:7-12.

⁵⁴ 2 Pet. 2:4.

⁵⁵ Jude 6.

own place.⁵⁶ Also, the sinning by indulging in "unnatural lust" can well be related to Irenaeus's "unlawful unions", but this brief and vague reference in the New Testament passage cannot serve as the sole source of the thought of Irenaeus. Furthermore, the notion of "giants" is not a New Testament concept, because the New Testament lacks any reference to these creatures. The Old Testament, however, does mention these "giants" as the offspring of "Sons of God" (who were later interpreted as angels) and men. It is obvious, then, that this motif about "unlawful unions" is the result of some speculation upon the previously cited account given in Genesis 6:1-4.⁵⁷ The giants "are the mighty men of old, the men of renown". However, the Old Testament does not necessarily associate these "mighty men" with evil. That is, the statement of Genesis 6:4 concerning the "men of renown" must be understood as having a causal relationship with the "wickedness" that follows in Genesis 6:5.

⁵⁶ A.H. 2, 2, 4 (2, 2, 3).

⁵⁷ Cf., p. 14. Gerhard von Rad, Genesis (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1961), pp. 109-114, discusses how the Nephilim came to be rendered in English "mighty ones", "strong ones", or "heroes". The LXX reading is gigantes and, therefore, the Nephilim became known as "giants". In this book, von Rad also argues that Genesis 6:5, the prologue to the flood, represents the narrator's own reflections, linking Genesis 6:4, the sins of angels, with the deluge that followed in the rest of the chapter. He states that "The Yahwist wanted to show man's general corruption. He wanted to represent the mixing of superhuman spiritual powers with man, a kind of 'demonic' invasion and point out a further disturbance caused by sin". Thus, according to von Rad, the Yahwistic narrator wished to say that there had occurred a deterioration of all creation. In addition, 6:5 is the author's own statement purposely written to link the deluge with the deterioration which took place in 6:4. The arguments of von Rad are threefold and the strongest one appears to be the last, which argues that deterioration is shown in 6:4 because God cut short the life of the "bastards" born from the marriage of angels and men. If von Rad

Irenaeus definitely understands these passages in this manner, but he need not have come to such an understanding without some assistance, because this speculation had already been worked out and set down in Jewish apocalyptic literature. Although Irenaeus elaborates substantially upon the brief New Testament texts regarding Satan, his thought on the subject appears quite fragmentary in light of the lengthier treatment found in the late Jewish apocalyptic tradition.

Enoch states that "the whole earth has been corrupted through the works that were taught by Azazel (Satan); to him ascribe all sin".⁵⁸ Here Satan is positioned as the head of all apostasy. Enoch, moreover, describes in detail the fall of the angels who swore on oath and bound themselves to their own defilement. This act was done under the leadership of Semjaza, who is later referred to as Satan.⁵⁹

'Come let us choose wives from among the children of men and beget us children'. And Semjaza, who was their leader, said unto them: 'I fear ye will not indeed agree to do this deed, and I alone shall have to pay the penalty of a great sin...' Let us swear an oath, and all bind ourselves by mutual imprecation not to abandon this plan but to do this thing.⁶⁰

Also, Enoch elaborates upon the corruption that resulted amongst men because of this apostasy of the angels.

is correct about the Yahwist's intentions, no other Old Testament author had demonstrated awareness of these intentions. Those who first indicated such purpose in Genesis 6 were the apocalyptic authors when they speculated upon the fall of the angels and their causing a great flood to come upon the earth.

⁵⁸ 1 Enoch 10:8.

⁵⁹ See Chapter One, n. #52.

⁶⁰ 1 Enoch 6:2-5. Cf. also, 1 Enoch 7:1-2.

And there arose much godlessness, and they committed fornication, and they were led astray, and became corrupt in all their ways.⁶¹

Jubilees likewise speaks of "the watchers (angels),⁶² who had sinned with the daughters of men; for these had begun to unite themselves so as to be defiled with the daughters of men".⁶³ Again, the Testament of Naphtali mentions that the "watchers...changed the order of their nature".⁶⁴ So too, Baruch, speaking about the angels, says "and some of them descended and mingled with the women".⁶⁵ Moreover, it is clear that the direction of sin began with Satan, passed through the angels, and finally found its resting place amongst men.

The Lord of spirits may take vengeance on them for their unrighteousness in becoming subject to Satan and leading astray those who dwell on the earth.⁶⁶

and the whole earth had been corrupted through the works that were taught by Azazel [Satan].⁶⁷

They shall be evil spirits upon the earth...and the spirits of giants afflicted, oppress, destroy, attack, do battle, and work destruction upon the earth.⁶⁸

The chain of apostasy from Satan to man, which appears in the

⁶¹1 Enoch 8:2-3.

⁶²See Chapter One, n. #37.

⁶³Jub. 4:22.

⁶⁴Test. Naph. 3:5.

⁶⁵2 Baruch 56:13.

⁶⁶1 Enoch 54:6.

⁶⁷1 Enoch 10:8.

⁶⁸1 Enoch 15:10-11.

writings of Irenaeus, was first conceived in late Jewish speculation.⁶⁹

It is this tradition which is responsible for Irenaeus's claim that Satan is the ringleader of apostasy. It is also this tradition that helps clarify Irenaeus's thought concerning the sin of Satan, angels, and men.

"Unlawful Unions" and "Giants" in Irenaeus and Apocalyptic Literature

Further clarification is achieved through an examination of the manner in which Satan's apostasy is extended to mankind. Irenaeus has two different descriptions of the angels defiling mankind. One description is concerned with "unlawful unions" of angels with offspring from the daughters of men. This "unlawful union" produces "giants" upon the earth which cause man's sinfulness and these giants which Irenaeus calls the "infamous race of men" performed fruitless and wicked deeds. Such is the thought of 1 Enoch.

And they bore great giants...who consumed all the acquisitions of men.⁷⁰

...and the women have born giants and the whole earth has thereby been filled with blood and unrighteousness.⁷¹

Destroy...the children of the watchers because they have wronged mankind.⁷²

Thus, both Irenaeus and apocalyptic writers treat the subject of "giants" and "unlawful unions".

⁶⁹ See pp. 25-27.

⁷⁰ 1 Enoch 7:3-4. See Appendix I for a comparison of texts.

⁷¹ 1 Enoch 9:9.

⁷² 1 Enoch 10:15.

Evil spirits have proceeded from their bodies because they are born from men and from the holy watchers as their beginning and primal origin: they shall be evil spirits on the earth and evil spirits shall they be called.⁷³

Elsewhere in the apocalyptic literature, similar statements attest to the wickedness of the "giants". Jubilees has lengthy and numerous statements concerning them.

And it came to pass when the children of men began to multiply on the face of the earth and daughters were born to them, that the sons of God saw them on a certain year of this Jubilee, that they were beautiful to look upon; and they took themselves wives of all whom they chose, and they bore unto them sons and they were giants. And lawlessness increased on the earth and all flesh corrupted its way....All of them corrupted their ways and their orders and they began to devour each other, and lawlessness increased on the earth...and all that were upon the earth had wrought all manner of evil...and against the angels whom he had sent upon the earth, He was exceedingly wrath...and against their sons went forth a command...that they should be smitten with the sword.⁷⁴

...the unclean demons began to lead astray the children of the sons of Noah, and to make to err and destroy them.⁷⁵

For I see...the demons have begun (their) seductions against you and against your children.⁷⁶

Although it was previously proposed that Irenaeus was alluding to the book of Enoch,⁷⁷ the question remains as to what extent Irenaeus

⁷³1 Enoch 15:9. Cf. also, 19:1, 106:13-17.

⁷⁴Jub. 5:1-4.

⁷⁵Jub. 10:1.

⁷⁶Jub. 7:27. Cf. also, Wisd. Sol. 14:6; CD. 3:3-4:10.

⁷⁷See Chapter One, n. #208.

was dependent upon this apocalyptic tradition. Did the early Church Father have the book of Enoch or other apocalyptic texts before him when he wrote about "unlawful unions" and the "giants" produced from such unions?

Neither the Old Testament nor apocalyptic authors use the phrase "unlawful unions". Moreover, the text from Genesis does not mention anything indicating that the union of angels and the daughters of men was unlawful. But there is no question that the author of Enoch and apocalyptic writers considered the union of angels with the daughters as unlawful. 1 Enoch considers this "union" one in which the angels "commit sin and transgress the law".⁷⁸ Likewise according to Jubilees the unions were those in which the angels (watchers) "sinned with the daughters of men".⁷⁹ The reason for these unions being unlawful in Jubilees is that "the watchers (angels) against the law of their ordinances went a whoring after the daughters of men".⁸⁰ More precisely does the Testament of Naphtali explain this unlawfulness saying that "the watchers (angels) changed the order of their nature whom the Lord cursed".⁸¹ That, then, which best describes these unions in apocalyptic writings is Irenaeus's phrase, "unlawful unions".

In conjunction with "unlawful unions" Irenaeus states that the "angels linked themselves with the offspring of the daughters of men".

⁷⁸ 1 Enoch 106:14.

⁷⁹ Jub. 4:22.

⁸⁰ Jub. 7:21.

⁸¹ Test. Naph. 3:5.

This is not the manner in which the union is expressed in the Old Testament because the Old Testament says that "the sons of God (angels) took to wife such of them (the daughters of men) as they chose" (Gen. 6:2) and that "the sons of God came into the daughters of men" (6:4).

However, 1 Enoch relates how the angels "have connected themselves with women",⁸² "and have united themselves with women".⁸³ Again Jubilees says that "these (watchers -- angels) began to unite themselves so as to be defiled with the daughters of men".⁸⁴ Irenaeus's expression of "Angels linking themselves with the offspring of the daughters" is closer to the wording of the apocalyptic accounts than to the Old Testament expressions "came into" or "took to wife". It was the apocalyptic expression, then, which seems to have influenced Irenaeus.

Furthermore, Irenaeus proceeds to say that the daughters of men "bore to them (angels) sons who on account of their exceeding great size were called giants".⁸⁵ Here Irenaeus gives the reason for the offspring being called gigantes in the Bible which he read. (The LXX translates nephilim in Gen. 6:4 as gigantes.) His mentioning "their exceeding great size", however, may be more than a simple inference from the LXX translation of nephilim. Enoch had already stated that "they (the daughters of men) bear great giants whose height was three-thousand

⁸² 1 Enoch 19:1.

⁸³ 1 Enoch 106:14.

⁸⁴ Jub. 4:22.

⁸⁵ Proof 18.

ells".⁸⁶ Elsewhere, Enoch says that through this union they (the daughters of men) "have begot children by them (angels) and they shall produce on the earth giants".⁸⁷ Also Jubilees states that "they (the daughters of men) bore unto them (angels) sons, and they were giants".⁸⁸ The emphasis on the great size of the offspring seems to owe more to Enoch than to any other source.

1 Enoch and Irenaeus on Evil Teachings

According to Irenaeus the other manner in which the angels brought about man's defilement was through evil teachings. A single reference in the New Testament concerning the "Doctrine of Demons"⁸⁹ might be a vague reference to the apostate angels or the "giants" produced from the union of angels and men. However, this New Testament passage does not adequately account for Irenaeus's elaborate treatment on the teachings of angels, nor does the New Testament serve as a background to Irenaeus's whole unified treatment of "unlawful unions", production of "giants", and evil doctrines. His source for these notions must come from a familiarity with a tradition similar to that found mainly in the first book of Enoch. It is in this work that the angels "took unto themselves wives"⁹⁰ ... "from among the children of men"⁹¹ ... "and

⁸⁶ ¹ Enoch. 7:2. Cf. also, Apoc. Abraham, c. 23 where Adam is of enormous size which is either an allusion to the "giants" produced by the apostasy of Azazel or merely an exaltation of Adam found also in other apocalyptic writings. See Scroggs, LA, pp. 15-38.

⁸⁷ ¹ Enoch 106:17.

⁸⁸ Jub. 5:2.

⁸⁹ ¹ Tim. 4:1.

⁹⁰ ¹ Enoch 7:1.

⁹¹ ¹ Enoch 6:2.

began to go in unto them and to defile themselves with them",⁹² so that "they (wives) became pregnant and they bore great giants".⁹³ It is here that "they taught them (wives) charms and enchantments, and the cutting of roots, and made them acquainted with plants".⁹⁴ Elsewhere in 1 Enoch are numerous passages describing man's defilement through the evil teachings of angels,⁹⁵ so that both the "doctrine of demons" mentioned in the New Testament and Irenaeus's elaboration upon demonic doctrines has clarification from a previous developed tradition. That tradition appears in 1 Enoch, and because there was such a tradition, Irenaeus was able to relate the teachings of angels with man's sinfulness. Only this background, which emphasizes the evils brought about by the teachings of angels, could permit Irenaeus to explain that wickedness brought upon the earth by the teaching of angels was propagated to overflowing. Moreover, the Old Testament makes no reference to the teachings of the angels as does late Jewish apocalyptic literature, which, without question, views the teachings as evil teachings.⁹⁶

By way of comparison one finds that Irenaeus enumerates those teachings as follows: "the virtues of roots and herbs, and dyeing and cosmetics, and discoveries of precious materials, love philtres, hatreds,

⁹² 1 Enoch 7:1.

⁹³ Ibid.

⁹⁴ 1 Enoch 8:3.

⁹⁵ 1 Enoch 8:1-2, 3-4, 9:4, 16:3, 69:4-12.

⁹⁶ 1 Enoch 9:6, 10:8-9, 13:2, 16:3.

amours, passions, constraints of love, the bonds of witchcraft, every sorcery and idolatry, hateful to God".⁹⁷

In one passage Enoch simply relates that one from the leaders of the angels (Azazel) "hath taught all unrighteousness on earth and revealed the eternal secrets which were preserved in heaven".⁹⁸ But Enoch then enumerates some of these teachings as various angels imparted or showed to men "evil counsel...blows of death...weapons of death...the shield and the coat of mail and the sword for battle and all the weapons of death...the bitter and the sweet...all secrets of their wisdom...writings with ink and paper...all the wicked smitings of the spirits and demons...smitings of the embryo in the womb...smitings of the soul...the bites of the serpent...smitings which befall the noon-tide heat...and the chief of the oath".⁹⁹

However, elsewhere in 1 Enoch another enumeration of the evil teachings imparted to men is made. This second listing corresponds quite closely to that of Irenaeus. Enoch states that "the angels taught them [the daughters of men] charms and enchantments and the cutting of roots and made them acquainted with plants...and made known to them metals (of the earth) and the art of working them, and bracelets and ornaments and the use of antimony, and the beautifying of eyelids and all kinds of costly stones, and all coloring tinctures...." Various

⁹⁷ Proof. 18. See Appendix I for a comparison of texts.

⁹⁸ 1 Enoch 9:6.

⁹⁹ 1 Enoch 69:4-12.

fallen angels also "taught enchantments and root cuttings", "the resolving of enchantments", "astrology", "constellations", "knowledge of the clouds", "signs of the earth", "signs of the sun", "course of the moon".¹⁰⁰

From the above passage, which lists the teachings of angels, and from Irenaeus's enumeration of the angels' evil teachings appear characteristics peculiar to the two traditions. Each one of the teachings listed by Irenaeus is similarly enumerated and expressed in 1 Enoch. And of those teachings listed, it is just as difficult to determine how the virtues of roots, dyeing, cosmetics and discoveries of precious materials are teaching of evil to Irenaeus as it is to determine that the cutting of roots, all coloring tinctures, bracelets, ornaments, use of antimony and the working of the metals of the earth are evil to the author of 1 Enoch.

Moreover, the sequence of thought found in Irenaeus, namely, unlawful unions where the angels united themselves with the daughters of men, who bore great giants, followed by the evil teachings of angels is the same sequence found in 1 Enoch with strikingly similar, if not identical, expression.

Irenaeus's Apocalyptic Cause for the Deluge

Earlier it was shown that Irenaeus fostered the notion that these angels and their apostasy brought about the deluge or were the only cause

¹⁰⁰ 1 Enoch 7:1-8:4.

for such.¹⁰¹ Furthermore, he states that "He (God) justly brought on the deluge for the purpose of extinguishing that most infamous race of men".¹⁰² Yet, Irenaeus is not consistent in his thought about the purpose of the deluge because some of the fallen angels continue presently to influence man toward evil ways. In speaking about heretics, he says that "this class of men have been instigated by Satan".¹⁰³ Elsewhere he explains how "men were saved both from the most wicked spirits, and from every sort of apostate power".¹⁰⁴ This was done "by calling upon Him (God)" at a time after the deluge and "before the coming of our Lord, Christ...and for this reason do the Jews even now put demons to flight".¹⁰⁵ At even greater lengths does he discuss present men who became influenced by the devil and his angels.

For this reason, therefore, He has termed these angels of the devil and children of the wicked one, who give heed to the devil and do his works ...but when they have apostatized and fallen into transgression, they are ascribed to their chief, the devil -- to him who first became the cause¹⁰⁶ of apostasy to himself and afterwards to others.

It would appear that Irenaeus sees the deluge as "sweeping away the rebellious world", yet the fallen angels still continue to exist. But such inconsistency is also to be noted among apocalyptic authors who continue to keep "demons" and "giants" actively influencing men after

¹⁰¹ See above, p. 125.

¹⁰² A.H. 4, 36, 3 (4, 58, 4). See Appendix I for a comparison of texts.

¹⁰³ A.H. 1, 21, 1 (1, 14, 1).

¹⁰⁴ A.H. 2, 6, 2 (2, 4, 6).

¹⁰⁵ Ibid.

¹⁰⁶ A.H. 4, 41, 3 (4, 68, 1).

the time of Noah.¹⁰⁷

Although the idea that the angels and their apostasy brought about the deluge is foreign to the New Testament, it is explicitly treated in the inter-testamental Jewish literature.¹⁰⁸ It is an apocalyptic notion which served as a focal point around which discussions on man's sinfulness centered.¹⁰⁹ Several works contain this thought concerning the angels and the deluge.¹¹⁰

Some of the angels of heaven transgressed...and have united themselves with women...and they shall produce on the earth giants...and there shall be a great punishment on the earth and the earth shall be cleansed from all impurity. Yea, there shall come a great destruction over the whole earth, and there shall be a deluge...¹¹¹

In like manner the watchers also changed the order of their nature, whom the Lord cursed at the flood, on whose account He made the earth without inhabitants and fruitless....¹¹²

For owing to these three things came the flood upon the earth, namely, owing to the fornication wherein the watchers against the law of their ordinances went a whoring after the daughters of men and took themselves wives of all which they chose: and they made the beginning of uncleanness...and the Lord destroyed everything from off the face of the earth; because of the wickedness of their deeds and because of the blood which they had shed in the midst of the earth He destroyed everything....¹¹³

¹⁰⁷ Jubilees 7:26-39, 10:1-15. Cf. also, 1 Enoch 89:10.

¹⁰⁸ Jubilees 7:21-25.

¹⁰⁹ See Chapter One, pp. 21-27.

¹¹⁰ Tennant, op. cit., p. 238. Williams, op. cit., p. 85.

¹¹¹ 1 Enoch 106:13-16.

¹¹² Test. Naph. 3:5.

¹¹³ Jubilees 7:21-25.

This notion that the "unlawful unions" of angels and the daughters of men brought about the deluge also argues for Irenaeus's literary dependency upon apocalyptic writings.

In the Old Testament the deluge follows upon the marriage of angels with the daughters of men but there is no explicit indication that the deluge resulted because of the marriage. Rather, the flood appears to result from man's wickedness which might have some implicit relationship to the marriage of angels and men.

Yet, Irenaeus's commixture of wickedness is mentioned precisely in relation to the "apostasy of angels" and this is the cause which brings about the deluge. That deluge sweeps away the "rebellious world" and the "infamous generation" or "infamous race of men who could not bring forth fruit to God since the angels that sinned had commingled with them". Likewise in 1 Enoch, Jubilees, and the Testament of Naphtali the flood is due to the fornication of the watchers [apostasy of the angels] who begat sons and made the beginning of all uncleanness. The flood is also for the purpose of destruction, destroying everything from off the face of the earth, cleansing the earth of wickedness, and rendering it without inhabitants and fruitless. In the apocalyptic account, the earth could not bring forth fruit after the deluge, while in Irenaeus's account the earth was destroyed because it could not bring forth fruit before the flood.

The sequence of Irenaeus's thought and that of apocalyptic authors concerning the deluge follows upon the marriage of angels and men as found in the Old Testament. Yet, as was said, the Old Testament does not explicitly relate the flood, its causes, and purpose to the "marriage"

as do Irenaeus and apocalyptic writers. This explicit relationship is peculiar to these two traditions and the most likely explanation is that Irenaeus depended upon apocalyptic writings for understanding both the Old and New Testaments.

1 Enoch and Irenaeus on the "Fires of Hell"

The final point concerns Irenaeus's contrary statements on the fires of hell. At one time he states that the eternal fires were prepared for the devil and his angels and were not originally prepared for man.¹¹⁴ At another, his claim is that from the beginning the fires were prepared for sinners who were to transgress God's commandments.¹¹⁵

It could be that logical reflection upon Matthew 25:41 and its context would bring Irenaeus to the conclusion that men are being sent to a place originally meant to serve another purpose. Thus, he would say that "the eternal fire was not originally prepared for man".¹¹⁶ Yet his elaboration upon the eternal fire related to its preparation is not warranted from New Testament texts alone. The fires that are prepared for the chief or ringleader of the apostasy, he who beguiled man; the fires that are prepared for angels who became apostates, those who revolted with the devil; the fires that are prepared for men who persevere in wickedness and are set apart on His (God's) left hand; the fires that are prepared for all those who afterwards transgress his commandment are

¹¹⁴ A.H. 3, 23, 3 (3, 33, 2).

¹¹⁵ A.H. 2, 28, 7 (2, 43, 2).

¹¹⁶ A.H. 3, 23, 3 (3, 33, 2).

embellishments upon the fires which are found in the first book of Enoch.

This place (a great fire) is the prison of the angels and here they will be imprisoned forever.¹¹⁷

And He will imprison those angels, who have shown unrighteousness, in the burning valley... and that valley of the angels who had led astray mankind burned beneath that land.¹¹⁸

And through its valleys proceed streams of fire where these angels are punished who had led astray those who dwell upon the earth.¹¹⁹

...and I...saw there a deep valley with burning fire. And they brought the kings and the mighty and began to cast them into this deep valley... these are being prepared for the hosts of Azazel so that they may take them and cast them into the abyss....And Michael, and Gabriel...shall take hold of them on the great day, and cast them on that day into the burning furnace.¹²⁰

The mighty and the kings who possess the earth ...shall say unto themselves: "Our souls are full of unrighteous gain, but it does not prevent us from descending from the midst there of into the burden of Sheol....This is the ordinance and judgment with respect to the mighty and the kings and the exalted and those who possess the earth before the Lord of Spirits. And other forms I saw hidden in that place.... These are the angels who descended to the earth and revealed what was hidden to the children of men and seduced the children of men into committing sin.¹²¹

¹¹⁷ 1 Enoch 21:10.

¹¹⁸ 1 Enoch 67:4-6.

¹¹⁹ 1 Enoch 67:7.

¹²⁰ 1 Enoch 54:1-6. Cf. also, 10:4-13.

¹²¹ 1 Enoch 63:1-64:2.

And he caused the sinners to pass away and be destroyed from off the face of the earth, and those who have led the world astray with chains shall they be bound, and in their assemblage-place of destruction shall they be imprisoned.¹²²

Their spirits (sinners upon earth) shall be cast into the furance of fire.¹²³

Woe to you, you sinners on account of the words of your mouth, and on account of the deeds of your hands which your godlessness has wrought, in blazing flames burning worse than fire shall you burn.¹²⁴

Know you that their souls will be made to descend into Sheol. And into darkness and chains and a burning flame.¹²⁵

These many passages found in Enoch concerning the judgment of angels and men reveal that originally the fires of hell were created for Satan and his angels. Later, God uses these fires to castigate kings and the mighty men on earth. Finally, he uses these fires of Sheol to punish all sinners. The fires of 1 Enoch are used for the chief of the apostasy (Azazel), the apostate angels, those who beguiled man, and all those who afterwards transgress his commandments.¹²⁶ Such a tradition as that found in 1 Enoch made Irenaeus stress that the eternal fire was not originally prepared for man. Moreover, his familiarity with apocalyptic tradition about the eternal fires and who would be subject to

¹²² 1 Enoch 69:27-28.

¹²³ 1 Enoch 98:3.

¹²⁴ 1 Enoch 100:9.

¹²⁵ 1 Enoch 103:7-8.

¹²⁶ This series of those who are to be punished by the fire in 1 Enoch may itself be the result of the combination of various levels of material in the work. In the earliest part of the book only the fallen angels are to be imprisoned in fire (n. #117, above). To them others are added in the latter sections of the book.

them enabled Irenaeus to elaborate beyond the limited notions of the New Testament.

The striking point to be made in this discussion of Satan and his angels is that Irenaeus sometimes bypasses Adam as a cause of man's sinfulness. This is not only contrary to the Adam theory as a source of man's sin but it is also contrary to the theory that Satan was the cause of Adam's fall alone.¹²⁷ However, it might be argued that Irenaeus borrowed his ideas of Satan and his angels directly from a reading of Genesis. Yet, there is no doubt that Irenaeus elaborates extensively upon the Genesis account of the fallen angels. In addition, that very same embellishment of Genesis which is found in the writings of Irenaeus is found in the earlier works of the apocalyptic writers. More important, it can be understood that in Jubilees and some sections of 1 Enoch Adam is also not mentioned as a source of man's sin, but it is attributed only to the fallen angels.¹²⁸ This direct connection between the fallen angels and man's sinfulness is not really congenial to Irenaeus's thought, to which the Adam-Christ scheme is basic. This makes it overwhelmingly likely that in the passages discussed in this chapter Irenaeus is directly dependent on late Jewish apocalyptic literature, especially 1 Enoch and Jubilees.

Late Jewish speculation, then, permitted Irenaeus to offer Satan and his angels as the cause and origin of sin. Moreover, Irenaeus, with

¹²⁷ See p. 125.

¹²⁸ See Chapter One, pp. 20-25.

several apocalyptic writers, traced sin to two separate causes. The first was Adam and Eve; the second, Satan and his angels.

A third explanation, however, of the origin of sin results when these two themes are fused together.¹²⁹ That is, the fall of Satan and his angels joins the paradise narrative of Adam and Eve, not necessarily offering another explanation for sin's origin, but shifting the blame from Adam to Satan. This fusion has been accomplished by both Irenaeus and apocalyptic authors, which further demonstrates Irenaeus's reliance upon apocalyptic notions.

¹²⁹ See Chapter One, pp. 20-27.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE FUSION OF THE PARADISE NARRATIVE AND THE ANGELIC FALL

STORY

The Fusion

Man's sinfulness, resulting from the fall of Adam and Eve through the instigation of Satan,¹ is a notion consequent upon the fusion of the paradise narrative of Genesis 3 and the angelic fall story of Genesis 6. The role of Satan and his angels is combined with the Adamic fall from paradise to explain the origin of man's sinfulness.

When this fusion takes place in the writings of Irenaeus, the guilt for man's sinfulness is shifted from Adam to Satan. That is, Irenaeus transfers the whole burden of blame for the first sin from Adam to Satan because Adam was but an irresponsible child when he transgressed.² This move is consistent with Irenaeus's desire to exonerate Adam of culpability regarding man's sinfulness.³ But this exoneration of Adam and transferral of guilt to Satan demonstrates a fusion of the two fall stories found in Genesis 3 and Genesis 6, which form the basis for the two apocalyptic speculations on sin's origin.⁴ That is, Irenaeus attri-

¹Cf. Chapter One, pp. 25-27.

²Proof 12.

³Cf. Chapter Three, pp. 118-121.

⁴Cf. Chapter One, pp. 25-27.

butes the origin of the race and sin to Adam and Eve. In A.H. 3, 21, 10 (3, 30); 3, 22, 4 (3, 32, 1); 5, 13, 4 (ibid.); and 5, 16, 3 (ibid.) Irenaeus relates sin solely to Adam and the "tempter" of Adam is not mentioned.

In other texts, the source of sin is traced to the devil and his apostasy (A.H. 4, 40, 1 (4, 65); 4, 41, 1-3 (4, 66, 2-4, 68, 1); Proof 18). Similarly, in these texts there is no mention of Adam or Eve and the apostasy is related solely to the fall of the angels. Elsewhere, Irenaeus offers Adam and Eve as the cause of sin, which makes the serpent the "tempter" in the fall of the first parents. (A.H. 3, 20, 1 (3, 21, 1); 3, 23, 1, 3 (3, 32, 2; 3, 33, 2); 4, pref., 4 (4, pref., 3); 5, 21, 2, 3 (ibid.); 5, 23, 1 (ibid.); 5, 24, 3, 4 (ibid.)). Some texts appear to identify the serpent and Satan (A.H. 1, 27, 4 (1, 25, 2); 4, 40, 3 (4, 66, 2); 5, 23, 1 (ibid.)), whereas in other passages Satan uses the serpent as an instrument in seducing Adam and Eve (A.H. 5, 26, 2 (ibid.); 4, pref., 4 (4, pref., 3)).⁵ The most obvious portrayal of fusion appears in Irenaeus's Proof of the Apostolic Preaching,⁶ where the apostate angel (the devil) first ruined himself and is placed in the primary position in bringing about Adam's fall. This happens by means of the serpent; and it would appear that the order of disobedience in the mind of Irenaeus began with the angel (Satan), extended to the bearer of the slander (the serpent), and finally ruined man by making Adam a sinner,

⁵ See pp. 162-166.

⁶ Proof 16.

which brings about the deluge. Further destruction results upon the earth through the apostasy of angels and their "unlawful unions".⁷ Thus results the fusion of the two distinct biblical stories of Genesis which further associates Irenaeus with apocalyptic notions.

Moreover, it is worthy to note that although Irenaeus fused the Adamic and angelic fall accounts, he did not do it for the same reasons as did apocalyptic authors. That is, apocalyptic authors moved from one speculation on sin's origin to the other because they had problems with the flood account.⁸ But Irenaeus fused the two stories because he wished to exonerate Adam from sin, make Satan the head and font of all sin, and shift all culpability upon the shoulders of the devil. It is not too much to say that, in the passages in Irenaeus now under discussion, one sees the first theologically consistent fusion of the stories in Genesis 3 and 6, and the one which dominated subsequent Christian theology. Adam is created good, but is tempted by a previously fallen angel, Satan, who through him gains power over the human race, a power which is broken only by Christ, the "second Adam", who successfully resists the tempter and opens the way to freedom and life. Satan, however, is not conceived of quite as an evil god, since Genesis 6 allowed him to be relegated to the role of a fallen angel.⁹ What Irenaeus needed for the

⁷ Proof 18.

⁸ See Chapter One, pp. 22-25.

⁹ A very interesting passage (A.H. 1, 15, 6 (1, 8, 17)) attests to Satan's role as that of a fallen angel. Here Irenaeus in condemning the gnostic, Marcus, cites a "divine elder" who is unknown to present readers of Irenaeus. This elder describes Marcus as being "skilled in consulting the stars" and in the performance of apostate works. In addition, it is Satan "by means of Azazel, that fallen and yet mighty angel" that makes Marcus an author of "impious actions". The thought contained in this

fusion of Genesis 3 and 6 was to reverse those two accounts, making Satan, because of his fall, induce the fall of humanity through Adam. The fusion in Irenaeus serves as much more than a way out of the difficulty created by the "watcher" or fallen angel theory. It becomes a systematically cogent statement of how sin first came into the world through the apostate angel (Satan), which protects the goodness of creation and which leads to the solution offered, as Irenaeus saw it, in Christianity. The main ingredients of Irenaeus's fusion of Genesis 3 and 6 were already present, however, in Jewish apocalyptic literature, where the two Genesis fall stories were reversed so that the latter would be seen to cause the former.

Irenaeus, as previously mentioned, often refers to Satan under various titles such as "devil", "apostate angel", or "serpent".¹⁰ In using these different titles, he explains Satan's role in bringing about Adam's fall. Irenaeus speaks of "the ancient and primary enmity against the serpent"¹¹ which was brought about by the apostate angel, Satan, the "ringleader of all transgression".¹² He is "the head and font of sin".¹³

citation is certainly borrowed by Irenaeus from the unknown elder who writes from some tradition. That tradition appears to be apocalyptic, as "Azazel" is one of the leaders of the "watchers" in 1 Enoch. However, Azazel used in relation to Satan who seduces Adam and Eve is not contained in the book of Enoch. This fusion of Azazel, one of the fallen angels, with Satan, the seducer of Adam, is the work of the Apocalypse of Abraham (cc. 22-23). Here also "consulting the stars" (c. 20) is an accepted practice for furthering one's knowledge. This work is somewhat gnostic according to G. H. Box (see p. 26, n. #82), but undoubtedly much of the literature of that time had gnostic elements without being classed as gnostic literature. Thus, Irenaeus was writing about Satan (Azazel) from an apocalyptic tradition when he cited the elder who was using a tradition which shared great affinity with the Apocalypse of Abraham.

¹⁰Cf. Chapter Four, n. #20.

¹¹A.H. 5, 21, 2 (ibid.).

¹²A.H. 4, 40, 1 (4, 65).

¹³Proof 16.

While speaking about Adam's fall he states that "the apostate angel of God...in the beginning...enticed man to transgress"¹⁴ and "effected the disobedience of mankind".¹⁵ Moreover, "The angel...[was] both himself stricken...and caused man to be cast out of paradise".¹⁶ Again, he says that "From the beginning did God permit man to be swallowed up by the ...author of transgression".¹⁷ This "rendered him [man] more ungrateful toward his Creator".¹⁸ Numerous other descriptions of Adam's disobedience, under Satan, are given by Irenaeus, which show how thoroughly Adam was conquered by sin following the first transgression.

Satan, or the devil, is often identified by Irenaeus with the serpent of the paradise narrative.

...they destroy multitudes...extending to their hearers the latter and malignant poison of the serpent, the great author of apostasy.¹⁹

This was the apostate angel and the enemy...and he turned the enmity by which (the devil) had designed to make (man) the enemy of God, against the author of it, by removing his own anger from man...and sending it instead upon the serpent.²⁰

But the curse in all its fullness fell upon the serpent which had beguiled them...into everlasting

¹⁴ A.H. 5, 21, 3 (ibid.).

¹⁵ A.H. 4, pref., 4 (4, pref., 3).

¹⁶ Proof 16.

¹⁷ A.H. 3, 20, 1 (3, 21, 1).

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ A.H. 1, 27, 4 (1, 25, 2).

²⁰ A.H. 4, 40, 3 (4, 66, 2).

fire...prepared for the devil and his angels.²¹

The serpent in these passages is the author of the apostasy, Satan, upon whom the curse of God in all its fullness fell.

The Instrumentality of the Serpent in Irenaeus and Apocalyptic Literature

However, Irenaeus inconsistently but clearly makes a distinction between the serpent and Satan with the claim that Satan is only cursed through the curse which is placed upon the serpent.²² What appears to be a simple identification of the serpent and Satan is rendered somewhat complex when Irenaeus places a causal connection between the apostasy of angelic powers and the fall of Adam. That is, Irenaeus maintains that the apostate angel, Satan, effected the disobedience of mankind by means of the serpent.

For as the serpent beguiled Eve...the apostate angel having effected the disobedience of mankind by means of the serpent, imagined that he had escaped notice.²³

What must be noted in Irenaeus's thought is that Satan is under some sort of disguise when he causes Adam or Eve to sin. That disguise is the serpent in the garden.

So God rebuked the serpent, who had been the bearer of the slander, and this curse fell upon the animal itself, and the angel, Satan, lurking hidden within it.²⁴

²¹ A.H. 3, 23, 3 (3, 33, 2).

²² A.H. 4, 40, 3 (4, 66, 2).

²³ A.H. 4, pref., 4 (4, pref., 3). Cf. also, 5, 21, 2 (ibid.).
See Appendix I for a comparison of texts.

²⁴ Proof 16.

Thus the devil, hidden within the serpent, tempted man by speaking to the woman. This makes the serpent the instrument which the devil used to cause the fall of Adam and Eve.

As also in the beginning, he (Satan) led man astray through the instrumentality of the serpent, concealing himself as it were from God.²⁵

Additionally, Irenaeus, citing John 8:44, states that "the devil is a liar from the beginning". He then further explains how well practiced in falsehood is Satan. Irenaeus's example is that of the paradise narrative when Satan, "lying against the Lord, tempted man, as the scriptures say that the serpent said to the woman".²⁶ Obviously Satan is using the serpent to speak to Eve and the serpent is the instrument of Satan. Thus Irenaeus characterizes the serpent's role as a vessel in the hands of Satan.

Nowhere in the Old Testament is the devil, or Satan, identified or linked with the serpent of the paradise narrative. This identification first appears in the late Jewish literature from which it is passed on to the New Testament. The New Testament simply makes the identification of Satan and the serpent, with no explanation concerning the instrumentality of the serpent.²⁷ Yet one passage might have some reference to Satan's seduction of Eve, "for even Satan disguises himself as an angel of light".²⁸ But this text standing by itself is too vague to support Irenaeus's thought.

²⁵ A.H. 5, 26, 2 (ibid.).

²⁶ A.H. 5, 23, 1 (ibid.).

²⁷ Rev. 12:9.

²⁸ 2 Cor. 11:14.

It is conceivable that Irenaeus could have used the New Testament identification of Satan with the serpent and then reflected upon the paradise narrative of Genesis to account for Satan's seduction of mankind's first parents, but such reflection would neither make Satan an apostate angel nor offer reasons for his falling before Adam. Irenaeus's account of the seduction and his elaboration upon the "instrumentality" of the serpent is almost certainly derived from the work of apocalyptic writers.

Furthermore, the identification and instrumentality of the serpent to Satan contain the play of two disparate thoughts. One is the role of Satan regarding the fall of the angels and the other is the role of Satan regarding the fall of Adam. The two ideas are not completely reconciled in the writings of Irenaeus, but rather mingle in the background of his thought when he speaks about man's sinful condition.

The fact that Irenaeus sometimes identifies the serpent with Satan and sometimes makes the serpent an instrument of Satan is best explained by maintaining Irenaeus's familiarity with the thought that is contained in the Apocalypse of Moses. Chapters 15-30 of this book give an elaborate account of Eve's fall, describing how she is seduced by the devil through the instrumentality of the serpent.

And the devil spoke to the serpent....Fear not, only be my vessel and I shall speak through thy mouth words to deceive him. And instantly he hung himself from the wall of paradise...then Satan appeared in the form of an angel...and I (Eve) bent over the wall and saw him like an angel. But he said to me...and I said to him ...the devil answered through the mouth of the serpent...and I took of the fruit and I ate... and forthwith I knew that I was bare of the righteousness with which I had been clothed...

I cried out in that very hour, "Adam, Adam, where art thou?"...when he came, I opened my mouth and the devil was speaking...and speedily I persuaded him and he ate....But he turned to the serpent and said, "Since thou has done this and become a thankless vessel....²⁹

Thus it appears likely that Irenaeus's saying that Satan used the serpent as an instrument, that he imagined that he had escaped notice thereby, and that he "lurked within" the serpent is dependent on the fuller account in the Apocalypse of Moses. In other writings of apocalyptic literature, Eve is tempted into committing a transgression and the tempter is obviously one of the fallen angels. Thus 1 Enoch accuses Gadreel, one of the leaders of the watchers, of leading Eve astray.³⁰ Also it is quite clear in the Vita Adae et Evaе that the devil is the agent of Eve's deception.³¹ The closest parallel, however, is between Irenaeus and the Apocalypse of Moses.

There are further similarities between Irenaeus's passages on the seduction of Eve and that of the Apocalypse of Moses. Thus when Irenaeus says that "God rebuked the serpent, the bearer of slander" and that "the curse fell upon the animal and Satan hidden within",³² he is probably echoing the account found in the Apocalypse of Moses, where God is said to have cursed the serpent for having served as the instrument of Satan ("a thankless vessel") (26.1). The term "vessel" for Satan in the Apocalypse of Moses seems to have been applied by Irenaeus to Adam,

²⁹ Apoc. Mos. cc. 16-26.

³⁰ 1 Enoch 69:6.

³¹ Vita Adae et Evaе 16:4, 33:2-3. Cf. also, Wisd. Sol. 2:24 and 2 Enoch 31:4-6.

³² See n. #24, above.

who "became a vessel in [Satan's] possession", since Satan held him "under his power" and thus made use of him,³³ just as he did of the serpent.

The principal difference between the two accounts is that in Irenaeus's view Satan's deception consisted in his hiding within the serpent, while in the Apocalypse of Moses the deception is carried further. There "Satan appeared in the form of an angel and sang hymns like the angels" to God. Thus when Eve looked at the serpent, she saw him "like an angel" (17:1 f.). If Irenaeus was dependent upon the Apocalypse of Moses or some related tradition, he appears to have simplified the deception somewhat.

In any case, it is not feasible to imagine that Irenaeus derived the combination of two distinct fall stories and the instrumentality of the serpent from the New Testament. Rather, it is from the writings of late Jewish apocalyptic speculation that Irenaeus borrowed and composed his thought so that he could say that Adam was injured by the serpent and that from the beginning the serpent became an instrument and Adam a vessel in Satan's possession.³⁴ Also, Satan as the apostate angel, effecting the disobedience of mankind by means of the serpent and imagining "that he had escaped notice", is obviously derived from apocalyptic literature.

Irenaeus's Apocalyptic Cause (Envy) for Satan's Fall

One final point which associates Irenaeus with late Jewish

³³ A.H. 3, 23, 1 (3, 32, 2).

³⁴ A.H. 3, 23, 1 (3, 32, 2). It is interesting to note that a parallel thought is contained in 3 Baruch 4:9 where the devil, out of envy, deceived Adam through his vine. Needless to say, the vine was thereafter cursed.

apocalyptic speculations concerns Satan's reason for causing Adam or Eve's transgression. The reason offered by Irenaeus for Satan's action against mankind is one of jealousy and envy, maintaining that mankind was led astray by the angel who had become jealous of the man. Irenaeus explicitly states this, and offers pride, the cause of envy, as the reason for the serpent's action.

Although the New Testament also identifies the devil and the serpent, it fails to offer any reason for Satan's hostility against man. It might be argued that this idea of invidia came from the book of Wisdom, which states "But through the devil's envy death entered the world".³⁵ However, Irenaeus adds much more to the simple statement of Wisdom, maintaining the reason for Satan's envy to be God's favours³⁶ and workmanship.³⁷

Envy as the cause of the devil's deception is the notion clothed in a lengthy account by Eve of her transgression, found in the Life of Adam and Eve.³⁸ In this account the devil envies the great joy and luxury that Adam and Eve were enjoying in paradise, a joy and luxury that Satan, himself, previously had but lost.

The devil spoke: 'O Adam! All my hostility, envy, and sorrow is for thee...and we were grieved when we saw thee in such joy and luxury and with guile I cheated thy wife'.³⁹

³⁵ Wisd. Sol. 2:24. Cf. Tennant, op. cit., p. 247.

³⁶ A.H. 4, 40, 3 (4, 66, 2). See Appendix I for a comparison of texts.

³⁷ Proof 16.

³⁸ Vita Adae et Evaee cc. 12-17.

³⁹ Ibid., 16:3-4.

The silence of the New Testament and the single reference in the book of Wisdom do not adequately serve as background to Irenaeus's teaching of a jealous Satan. The apocalyptic speculation, on the other hand, contains these ideas, which tend to clarify why Irenaeus and late Jewish writers could unite two completely disparate speculations on the origin of sin. That is, the association of Satan's fall with Adam's transgression needed some rational basis. That basis became the envy of Satan which was first proposed in late Jewish apocalyptic speculation and was later adopted by Irenaeus. Also, Satan's envy fits well with Irenaeus's teachings about the first exalted and glorious Adam, who would necessarily render Satan somewhat envious. Irenaeus, then, with the help of Paul, who places the devil over the fallen angels (Eph. 2:2), claims that the reason for the devil causing Adam's fall was one of envy: "Likewise, also, the devil, being among those angels, who are placed over the spirit of air...becoming envious of the man, was rendered an apostate from the divine law...and as his (the devil's) apostasy was exposed to man...he (the devil) set himself with greater and greater determination in opposition to man, envying his life, and wishing to involve him (man) in his (the devil's) own apostate power".⁴⁰ In addition, Irenaeus gives reasons for the devil's envy when he says "Man... being misled by the angel, who becoming jealous of the man and looking on him with envy because of man's many favours which He [God] had bestowed on the man, both ruined himself and made the man a sinner".⁴¹

⁴⁰ A.H. 5, 24, 4 (ibid.). Cf. Eph. 2:2.

⁴¹ Proof 16.

Some further attestation to Satan's envy and cause for such envy is seen as Irenaeus writes: "We learn that this was the apostate angel and the enemy because he was envious of God's workmanship and took in hand to render this workmanship an enmity with God. He turned the enmity by which [the devil] had designed to make (man) the enemy of God against the author of it...sending it upon the serpent".⁴² Here, again, the devil and serpent appear to be identified as well as in another passage which says "the pride of reason, therefore, which was in the serpent was put to nought".⁴³ That is, the pride of reason was in Satan but is here attributed to the serpent because of the simple identification.

Even though the book of Wisdom first records that "through the devil's envy death entered into the world",⁴⁴ the reason for such envy and the instrumentality of the serpent, at the hands of Satan, are not teachings from that book. Rather, the reason for the devil's envy as well as the instrumentality of the serpent are notions first written in the Books of Adam and Eve. The narration of Vita Adae et Evaee cc. 12-17 concerns the devil's banishment from heaven for refusing to worship Adam. After banishment, the devil and those who were banished with him "were overcome with grief" when they saw Adam "in such joy and luxury".⁴⁵ Thus, with envy and guile the devil caused Adam and Eve to be expelled from paradise as the devil had previously been expelled from his glory.

⁴² A.H. 4, 40, 3 (4, 66, 2).

⁴³ A.H. 5, 21, 2 (ibid.).

⁴⁴ Wisd. Sol. 2:24.

⁴⁵ Vita Adae et Evaee 16:4.

The "joy and luxury" of the first parents is here paralleled with the "glory of the devil" and his angels before their fall. However, the devil's account of Adam's "joy and luxury" which is recorded by the apocalyptic author parallels Irenaeus's "workmanship and favours" which God had bestowed upon the man. These parallel notions are for both Irenaeus and the apocalyptic author the reason for Satan's envy which caused the devil to bring about Adam's expulsion from paradise.

CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSION

In the apocalyptic account of Adam's fall is the combination of ideas including the instrumentality of the serpent, the jealousy of Satan, and the reasons for such envy. The Books of Adam and Eve place all three of these notions sequentially as does Irenaeus in his Proof of the Apostolic Preaching.¹ Moreover, Irenaeus not only follows the sequence of thought by first reversing the order of Genesis 3 and 6 as found in the apocalyptic work and then fusing the two accounts, but he writes with a certain affinity of expression. Such faithfulness to apocalyptic expression and thought order argues strongly for Irenaeus's literary dependency upon such a source.

This becomes more evident when it is realized that Irenaeus was not trying to cite apocalyptic authors but was rather using scriptural texts against his gnostic adversaries. Thus, he was only drawing conclusions from apocalyptic writings on subject matter he could relate to

¹ Although Irenaeus in Proof sequentially treats Genesis 3 (the fall of Adam and Eve) before Genesis 6 (the fall of the angels), the order found in the Old Testament, the fall of Adam in Proof presupposes the existence of a deceiver (Proof 12). That is, Adam is "misled by the angel" who had previously "rebelled and fallen away...[and] was called in Hebrew Satan" (Proof 16). The relationship of Satan to the fall of the angels and the "giants" (Proof 18) is not treated in this book, but the chain of apostasy beginning with Satan, leading to the angels and then to Adam is well established in the teachings of Adversus Haereses. See pp. 127-128, 157-162.

the Old and New Testaments. But his conclusions were expressed in words and phrases which he borrowed from apocalyptic authors. Therefore, "the seven heavens of angels, archangels, and powers", "the pain of the stroke", "unlawful unions", "vessel and envy of Satan", "commixture of wickedness", "giants", "cause of one's own imperfection", "evil teachings", and "skill of God" are summary words and phrases in part lifted by Irenaeus from apocalyptic language and in part coined by him on the basis of apocalyptic accounts.

Yet, no one single expression or idea which has been examined gives a complete picture concerning the extent of Irenaeus's dependence upon apocalyptic literature. But all of those expressions and ideas examined do offer a basis from which some estimation can be made. First, Irenaeus definitely was dependent upon apocalyptic ideas for interpreting the Old and New Testaments. Second, he also borrowed ideas solely from the apocalyptic tradition in formulating his theory of recapitulation, involving first and second Adam. Particularly is this true concerning sin, its origin, and its effects in a sinful humanity. Third, his use of apocalyptic tradition was not from a casual acquaintance with the tradition but rather from his careful reading and even studying, not one, but several apocalyptic texts as an aid to formulating his theology in an apocalyptic sequence of ideas, expressed in terms which he derived from the language of apocalyptic authors.

The two motifs of exalted and sinful Adam are the basis of Irenaeus's theory of recapitulation. They are also at the base of the doctrine of "original sin". Although these motifs appeared in the earliest pages of the Old Testament, the doctrine of "original sin" was

not finally formulated until an extensive amount of speculation had taken place upon sin and its origin.

The first speculation on sin's origin in Jewish circles was made during the inter-testamental period. Here sin was traced to several origins, found to be both extrinsic and intrinsic to man, propagated by example and hereditary factors, and was universally the cause of death. St. Paul and the rest of the New Testament writers reflect some of these late Jewish speculations on sin, but these thoughts in the New Testament serve only as a fragmentary basis upon which a greater theological development took place in the early history of the Christian Church.

The Fathers of the early Church made sin and its origin an essential part of Christian theology. Irenaeus was one of the first Fathers to contribute greatly to this development with his theory of recapitulation. But his notions of sin and its origin are essential to his theology and play a major role in his understanding of Christ's recapitulatory work. Thus Irenaeus devoted much of his labour speculating upon man's sinful nature and the origin of such a nature. In this way did Irenaeus's ideas on sin and its origin aid the development that culminated in the doctrine of "original sin".

Yet Irenaeus was not solely responsible for many of the ideas on sin which are found in his writings. Rather, for some of his ideas he was dependent upon the Old and New Testaments and the Greek Apologists who preceded him. He was also dependent upon apocalyptic ideas and literature which came into prominence, between the testaments, in the late Jewish period. His notions of exalted and sinful Adam were borrowed

from this source and, like late Jewish authors, he makes Adam and Eve a cause of sin. In addition, Irenaeus's further dependence upon apocalyptic notions can be observed when he attributes sin to other sources than that of Adam and Eve. One of these sources is Satan and his angels, which idea was the creation of late Jewish writers. Moreover, Irenaeus's multiple treatment of sin is as inconsistent as the treatment of sin found in late Jewish literature. Yet, Irenaeus's theories on sin do not really contradict his theology of "recapitulation". That is, sin plays a vital role in his theology, and although it is traced back to various causes as in apocalyptic writings, that which represents and is symbolic of sin in the writings of Irenaeus is united under the figure of "Satan". Thus, unlike Paul, who contrasts a sinful Adam with an exalted Christ,² Irenaeus contrasts an evil Satan with an exalted first and second Adam, uniting all evil under the head and font of all sin, Satan. Furthermore, Irenaeus's reliance upon Jewish sources becomes most evident when he uses apocalyptic speculations concerning Satan's primary role in causing man's fall. In addition, the particular modes in which sin is transferred from angels to men is an apocalyptic creation. So also, when Irenaeus joins the paradise narrative to the angelic fall, making Satan the principal representative of sin, his borrowed speculations from late Jewish authors are apparent, because such is neither the work of Paul nor other New Testament authors.

And although Irenaeus's theology might be unified into a single whole,³ there are inconsistencies in his work when he identifies mankind

² See Chapter Three, pp. 95-102. ³ See Chapter Two, pp. 61 ff.

with Adam and separates the two,⁴ when he asserts that the effect of Adam's sin is at one time intrinsic to human nature and only extrinsic to the same nature,⁵ when he traces sin to different causes and offers multiple descriptions concerning the manner in which sin is transmitted to all men.⁶ The many different ideas concerning sin and its origin which are found in Jewish apocalyptic sources explain Irenaeus's multiple treatment of the subject. Also, clarity and understanding are given to Irenaeus's varied treatment on the causes of sin when read in the light of this late Jewish literature. That is, Irenaeus's inconsistencies regarding his various sources of sin united under Satan are comprehensible when one accepts the fact that those many different sources for Irenaeus's theories on sin came from late Jewish apocalyptic literature.

Finally, it should be proposed, since Irenaeus was so dependent upon speculations outside the Old and New Testaments in formulating his arguments against the gnostics and projecting his ideas on sin, that possibly other early Church Fathers were likewise dependent upon sources outside the Old and New Testaments in formulating their ideas on sin.

⁴ See Chapter Three, pp. 74-75.

⁵ Ibid., pp. 90-94.

⁶ Sin has come to men through Adam, angels, giants, evil teachings, and unlawful unions.

APPENDIX I

The following are the primary texts used in the thesis to indicate literary relationship between Irenaeus and late Jewish apocalyptic writings.*

I. Pain of the Stroke (pp. 106-109, above)

Irenaeus

A.H. 5, 34, 2 (ibid.) extant ancient texts: Latin trans. only.

...He shall heal the anguish of His people, and do away with the "pain of the stroke". Now "the pain of the stroke" means that inflicted at the beginning upon disobedient man in Adam, that is, death: which (stroke) the Lord will heal when He raises us from the dead....

...sanabit contritionem populi sui, et dolorem plague suae sanabit. Dolor autem plague est, per quam percussus est homo initio in Adam inobediens, hoc est, mors, quam sanabit Deus resuscitans nos a mortuis....

Apocalyptic

Vita Adae et Evae 34:1-2 extant ancient texts: Latin trans.

...In that thou has left behind my commandments and hast not kept my word, which I confirmed to thee; behold I will bring upon thy body, seventy blows; with diverse griefs, shall thou be tormented....

...eo quod dereliquisti mandatum meum et verbum meum quod confortavi tibi non custodisti, ecce inducam in corpus tuum LXX plague; diversis doloribus ...torquebimini....

35:1

...and he (Adam) was seized with violent pains and he cried out with a loud voice: "What shall I do I am in distress -- so cruel are the pains with which I am beset....

...comprehensus (Adam) est magnis doloribus et clamans magnis vocibus dicebat: quid faciam infelix, positus in talibus doloribus....

*In the passages marked by an asterisk there are parallels between Irenaeus and apocalyptic writings in other translations than English (e.g., Armenian), but a comparison in such a translation is no more revealing, for the purpose of establishing literary dependence, than a comparison in English.

Apoc. Mos. 8:2 extant ancient texts:
Latin trans.*

Since thou hast abandoned my covenant,
I have brought upon thy body seventy-
two strokes: the trouble of the first
stroke is the pain of the eyes....

II. The Skill of God and Individual Responsibility (pp. 109-113, above)

Irenaeus

A.H. 4, 39, 3 (4, 64, 2-3) extant
ancient texts: Latin trans. only.

The skill of God, therefore, is not defective...but the man who does not obtain it is the cause to himself of his own imperfection. Nor (in like manner) does the light fail because of those who have blinded themselves, but while it remains the same as ever, those who are (thus) blinded are involved in darkness through their own fault. The light does never enslave anyone by necessity; nor, again, does God exercise compulsion upon anyone unwilling to accept the exercise of His skill. Those persons, therefore, who have apostasized from the light...and transgressed the law of liberty have done so through their own fault, since they have been created free agents, and possessed of power over themselves.

Apocalyptic

2 Baruch 54:15-19 extant ancient texts:
Syriac trans., and some Greek frag-
ments.

For though Adam first sinned and brought untimely death upon all, yet those who are born from him, each one of them has prepared for his own soul torment to come (...But now as for you, ye wicked, that now are, turn ye to destruction because ye shall speedily be visited, in that formerly ye rejected the understanding of the most High. For His works have not taught you, nor has the skill of His creation which is at all times persuaded you.) Adam is, therefore, not the cause, save only of his own soul, but each of us has been the Adam of his own soul.

III. The Primary Culpability of Eve (pp. 118-122, above)

Irenaeus

A.H. 3, 22, 4 (3, 32, 1) extant
ancient texts: Latin trans., and a Greek retroversion.

But Eve was disobedient; for she did not obey when as yet she was a virgin. And...having become disobedient, was made the cause

Apocalyptic

Vita Adae et Eva 35:2-3 extant ancient texts: Latin trans.

And when Eve had seen him weeping she also began to weep herself and said: "O Lord, my God, hand over to me his (Adam's) pain, for it is I who sinned".

of death, both to herself and to the entire human race.

Eva vero inobediens; non obaudivit enim, adhuc cum esset virgo. Quemadmodum...inobediens facta, et sibi, et universo generi humano causa facta est mortis...

And Eve said to Adam: "My Lord, give me a part of thy pains, for this hath come to thee from fault of mine".

...et cum vidisset eum Eva flentem coepit et ipsa flere dicens: domine deus meus in me transfer dolorem eius, quoniam ego peccavi. et dixit Eva ad Adam: domine mi, da mihi partem dolorem tuoram, quoniam a me culpa haec tibi accessit.

44:2

And Adam said to Eve: "What hast thou done? A great plague hast thou brought upon us, transgression and sin for all our generations...."

et dixit Adam ad Evam: quid fecisti? induxisti nobis plagam derelictum et peccatum in omnem generationem nostram....

Apoc. Mos. 9:2 extant ancient texts:
Latin trans.*

And Eve wept and said: "...give me half of thy trouble...for it is on my account that this hath happened to thee, on my account thou art beset with toils and troubles".

IV. Heavens of Angels, Archangels, giving Homage to Almighty God (pp.134-137, above)

Irenaeus

Proof 9 extant ancient texts:
Armenian trans. only.

But the earth is encompassed by seven heavens, in which dwell powers and Angels and Archangels, given homage to the almighty God....

Apocalyptic

Jubilees 2:24 extant ancient texts:
Ethiopic, Greek fragments and a Latin trans.

For on the first day He (God) created the heavens which are above the earth and the waters and all the spirits which serve before Him -- the angels of the presence...and of all the spirits of His creatures which are in the heavens and on the earth...and there upon we saw His works...for seven great works did He create on the first day.

Test. Levi 3:1-8 extant ancient texts: Greek, Armenian,* Slavonic trans. and some Hebrew fragments.

Hear, therefore, regarding the heavens which have been shown to thee... in the highest of all dwelleth the Great Glory, far above all holiness. In [the heaven next to] it are the archangels who minister and make propitiation to the Lord...offering to the Lord a sweet-smelling savour, a reasonable and a bloodless offering. And [in the heaven below this] are the angels who bear answers to the angels of the presence of the Lord. And in the heaven next to this are thrones and dominions in which always they offer praise to God.

V. Unlawful Unions and Giants (pp. 141-145, above)

Irenaeus

Proof 18 extant ancient texts:
Armenian trans. only.

For unlawful unions came about on earth as angels linked themselves with offspring of the daughters of men, who bore to them sons, who on account of their exceeding great size were called Giants.

Apocalyptic

1 Enoch 106:14-17 extant ancient texts: Ethiopic trans. and some Greek fragments.

...some of the angels of heaven transgressed...and behold they commit sin and transgress the law and have united themselves with women and commit sin with them...and have begot children by them. And they shall produce on the earth giants.

1 Enoch 7:1-3.

And all the others (angels)...began to go in unto them (daughters of men) and to defile themselves with them ...and they (the daughters) became pregnant and they bore great giants whose height was three thousand ells.

1 Enoch 19:1.

Here stand the angels who have connected themselves with women and their spirits assuming many different forms are defiling mankind.

Jubilees 5:2 extant ancient texts: Ethiopic, Greek and Latin fragments.

...the Angels of God saw them (daughters of men) on a certain year ...and they took themselves wives of all whom they chose and they bore unto them sons and they were giants.

4:22.

And he testified to the Watchers (angels)

who had sinned with the daughters of men; for these had begun to unite themselves so as to be defiled with the daughters of men.

7:21-22.

For owing to these things came the flood upon the earth, namely, owing to the fornication wherein the Watchers (angels) against the law of their ordinances went a whoring after the daughters of men and took themselves wives of all which they chose:...and they begat sons...and the Giants slew the Naphil....

VI. The Evil Teachings of Angels (pp. 145-148, above).

Irenaeus

Proof 18 extant ancient texts:
Armenian trans. only.

The angels, then, brought to their wives as gifts teachings of evil, for they taught them the virtues of roots and herbs, and dyeing and cosmetics and discoveries of precious materials, love-philtres, hatreds, amours, passions, constraints of love, the bands of witchcraft, every sorcery and idolatry, hateful to God....

Apocalyptic

1 Enoch 9:6 extant ancient texts:
Ethiopic trans. and some Greek fragments.

Thou seest what Azazel (leader of the fallen angels) hath done who hath taught all unrighteousness on earth and revealed the eternal secrets which were (preserved) in heaven.

1 Enoch 7:1-8:4.

...and they (angels) taught them charms and enchantments, and the cutting of roots, and made them acquainted with plants...and Azazel (one of the leaders of the angels) taught men to make swords, and knives, and shields and breast plates and made known to them metals (of the earth) and the art of working them, and bracelets, and ornaments and the use of antimony and the beautifying of eyelids, and all kinds of costly stones, and all coloring tinctures...Semjaza (a leader of the angels) taught enchantments, and root cuttings, Armanos (a leader) the resolving of enchantments, Baragijal (a leader) [taught] astrology, Kokabel the Ezeqeel the knowledge of the clouds. Araqiel the signs of the earth, Shamsiel the signs of the sun,

and Soriel the cause of the moon.

1 Enoch 69:4-12.

...Ashbeil: he imported to the holy sons of God evil counsel...Gadreel, he it is who showed...all the blows of death...and showed [the weapons of death...] the shield and the coat of mail, and the sword for battle, and all the weapons of death...Penemue: he taught the children of men the bitter and the sweet, and he taught them all the secrets of their wisdom. And he instructed mankind in writing with ink and paper...Kasdeja: this is he who showed...all the wicked smitings of spirits and demons, and the smitings of the embryo in the womb, that it might pass away, and [the smitings of the soul] the bites of the serpent, and the smitings which befall through the noontide heat....

VII. The Fallen Angels Cause the Flood (pp. 148-151, above).

Irenaeus

A.H. 4, 36, 4 (4, 58, 4) extant ancient texts: Latin trans. only.

...and in the days of Noah He (God) justly brought on the deluge for the purpose of extinguishing that most infamous race of men then existent, who could not bring forth fruit to God since the angels that sinned had commingled with them (the daughters of men)....

A.H. 5, 29, 2 extant ancient texts: Latin trans. and some Greek fragments.

...he (antiChrist) sums up in his own person all the commixture of

Apocalyptic

1 Enoch 106:14-17 extant ancient texts: Ethiopic trans. and some Greek fragments.*

...the angels of heaven transgressed ...and have united themselves with women...and have begot children... and they shall produce giants...and there shall be a great punishment on the earth....Yea, then shall come a great destruction over the whole earth, and there shall be a deluge and a great destruction for one year...Noah...and his sons shall be saved from the destruction of all the sin and all the unrighteousness which shall be consummated on the earth in his days.

Jubilees 7:21-25 extant ancient texts: Ethiopic trans. and some Greek and Latin fragments.

For owing to these things came the flood upon the earth, namely, owing

wickedness which took place previous to the deluge, due to the apostasy of the angels. For Noah was six hundred years old when the deluge came upon the earth, sweeping away the rebellious world for the sake of that most infamous generation which lived in the times of Noah.

to the fornication wherein the Watchers (angels) against the law of their ordinances went a whoring after the daughters of men and took themselves wives of all which they chose: and they made the beginning of uncleanness ...and the Lord destroyed everything from off the face of the earth; because of the wickedness of their (angels') deeds....

Test. Naph. 3:5 extant ancient texts: Armenian, Greek trans.* and some Hebrew fragments.

In like manner the Watchers (angels) also changed the order of their nature, whom the Lord cursed at the flood on whose account He made the earth without inhabitants and fruitless.

VIII. The Instrumentality of the Serpent (pp.162-166, above)

Irenaeus

A.H. 4, pref., 4 (4, pref., 3) extant ancient texts: Latin trans. only.

And at that time indeed, the apostate angel, having effected the disobedience of mankind by means of the serpent, imagined that he had escaped the notice of the Lord.

Apocalyptic

Apoc. Mos. 16:5-21:5 extant ancient texts: Latin trans.*

And the devil spoke to the serpent saying "...why dost thou eat of Adam's wares and not of Paradise? Rise up and we will cause him to be cast out of paradise, even as we were cast out through him". The serpent saith to him "I fear lest the Lord be wroth with me". The devil saith to him: "Fear not, only be my vessel and I will speak through thy mouth words to deceive him". And instantly he hung himself from the wall of Paradise and...Satan appeared in the form of an angel...and I (Eve) bent over the wall and saw him like an angel....The devil answered through the mouth of the serpent..."But arise (come) hither, harken to me and eat and mind the value of the tree...and he bent the branch on the earth and I took of the fruit and I ate....But he descended from the tree and vanished

A.H. 3, 23, 1 (3, 32, 2) extant ancient texts: Latin trans. and a Greek retroversion.

For at the first Adam became a vessel in his (Satan's) possession, whom he did also hold under his power (as well as the serpent).

Proof 16 extant ancient texts: Armenian trans. only.

So God rebuked the serpent, who had been the bearer of the slander, and this curse fell upon both the animal itself, and the angel, Satan, lurking hidden within it....

IX. The Envy of Satan (pp. 166-170, above)

Irenaeus

A.H. 5, 24, 4 (ibid.) extant ancient texts: Latin trans. only.

...so likewise also the devil being one among those angels...becoming envious of the man, was rendered an apostate from the divine law.

A.H. 4, 40, 3 (4, 66, 2) extant ancient texts: see above.

Hence we learn that this was the apostate angel and the enemy because he was envious of God's workmanship and took in hand to render this workmanship an enmity with God.

Proof 16 extant ancient texts: Armenian trans. only.

This commandment the man did not

...when your father (Adam) came I (Eve) spoke to him words of transgression....For when he came, I opened my mouth and the devil was speaking ...and speedily I persuaded him and he ate.

Apoc. Mos. 26:1 extant texts: Latin trans.*

But He (God) turned to the serpent (in great wrath) and said: "Since thou hast done this and became a thankless vessel...accursed art thou among all beasts.

Vita Adae et Evaee 33:2 extant ancient texts: Latin trans.*

The hour came when the angels had ascended to worship in the sight of God; forthwith the adversary (the devil) found an opportunity while the angels were absent and the devil led your mother (Eve) astray to eat of the unlawful and forbidden tree. And she did eat and gave to me.

Apocalyptic

Vita Adae et Evaee cc. 12-17 extant ancient texts: Latin trans.*

And with a heavy sigh the devil spoke: "O Adam! all my hostility, envy, and sorrow is for thee, since it is for thee that I have been expelled from my glory, which I possessed in the heavens in the midst of the angels and for thee was I cast out in the earth....It is for thy sake that I have been hurled from that place. When thou wast formed, I was hurled out of the presence of God and banished from the company of angels. When God blew into thee the breath of life and thy face and likeness was made in the image of God...then he (Michael) said, "Worship the image of God..." And I answered, "I have no (need) to worship

keep, but disobeyed God, being misled by the angel, who becoming jealous of the man and looking on him with envy because of God's many favours which he had bestowed on the man, both ruined himself and made the man a sinner, persuading him to disobey God's command.

Adam"....When the angels who were under me heard this, they refused to worship him...and God the Lord was wrath with me and banished me and my angels from our glory: and on thy account were we expelled from our abodes...and straight away we were overcome with grief, since we had been spoiled of so great glory. And we were grieved when we saw thee Adam in such joy and luxury. And with guile I cheated thy wife (Eve) and caused thee to be expelled through her (doing) from thy joy and luxury, as I have been driven out of my glory...."

APPENDIX II

DATES OF COMPOSITION

Sources used: Joseph Bonsirven, Palestinian Judaism in the Time of Jesus Christ; G. H. Box, The Apocalypse of Abraham; R. H. Charles, Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament; Otta Eissfeldt, The Old Testament; H. H. Rowley, The Relevance of Apocalyptic; D. S. Russell, The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic. (See the Bibliography for further information on these texts.)*

1 Enoch

Bonsirven, <u>intro.</u> , x	200 - 100 B.C.
Charles, pp. 170-171	170 - 64 B.C.
Eissfeldt, pp. 618-619	170 - 64 B.C.
Rowley, p. 99	164 - 64 B.C.
Russell, p. 37	164 B.C.

Jubilees

Bonsirven, <u>intro.</u> , x	200 - 100 B.C.
Charles, pp. 6-7	109 - 105 B.C.
Eissfeldt, p. 608	100 B.C.
Rowley, p. 105	166 - 143 B.C.
Russell, p. 37	150 B.C.

The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs

Bonsirven, <u>intro.</u> , x	200 - 100 B.C.
Charles, p. 289	109 - 106 B.C.
Eissfeldt, p. 636	200 B.C. - A.D. 70
Rowley, p. 74	165 B.C.
Russell, p. 37	150 - 100 B.C.

* For further information on the dating of the above writings, see A. M. Denis, Introduction aux Pseudépigraphes Grecs d'Ancien Testament (Leiden: Brill, 1970).

The Books of Adam and Eve

Bonsirven, <u>intro.</u> , x	A.D. 50
Charles, pp. 126-127	A.D. 60 - 300
Eissfeldt, p. 637	20 B.C. - A.D. 70
Rowley, p. 113	A.D. 60 - 300
Russell, p. 37	A.D. 70

Apocalypse of Abraham

Box, <u>intro.</u> , xv-xvi	A.D. 70 - 120
Rowley, p. 126	A.D. 70 - 120
Russell, p. 37	A.D. 70 - 120

4 Ezra

Bonsirven, <u>intro.</u> , x	A.D. 100
Charles, pp. 552-553	A.D. 120
Eissfeldt, p. 626	A.D. 81 - 96
Rowley, pp. 115-117	A.D. 70 - 100
Russell, p. 38	A.D. 90

2 Baruch

Bonsirven, <u>intro.</u> , x	A.D. 100
Charles, p. 420	A.D. 100
Eissfeldt, p. 630	A.D. 100 - 130
Rowley, p. 126	A.D. 70 - 120
Russell, p. 38	A.D. 90

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. SOURCES

Irenaeus

A. Adversus Haereses -- Fragmenta

Cunningham, James Steele Allison, Irenaeus: Adversus Haereses I - A New Edition of the Latin Text (with the extant Greek fragments) (unpublished Ph.D. thesis). Princeton University, 1967.

Harvey, W. W. (ed.), Sancti Irenaei Episcopi Lugdunensis Libros Quinque Adversus Haereses. 2 vols. Cambridge: 1857.

Roberts, A., and Donaldson, J. (eds. and trans.), The Anti-Nicene Fathers. vol. I. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899.

Rousseau, A. (ed.), Irénée de Lyon, Contre les Hérésies, Livre IV. (Greek retroversion with French trans.). 2 vols. (SC. 100). Paris: Cerf, 1965.

Stieren, A. (ed.), Sancti Irenaei Episcopi Lugdunensis Quae Supersunt Omnia. 2 vols. Leipzig: 1848-1853.

B. Proof of the Apostolic Preaching

Robinson, J. Armitage (trans.), St. Irenaeus, The Apostolic Preaching. London: 1920.

Smith, Joseph P. (trans.), Proof of the Apostolic Preaching. London: The Newman Press, 1952.

Ter-Mekerttschian, K., and Wilson, S. G. (eds.), S. Irenaeus, The Proof of the Apostolic Preaching, with Seven Fragments. Patrologia Orientalis, vol. XII. Paris: 1919.

C. Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha

Box, G. H., The Apocalypse of Ezra. London: SPCK, 1917.

, (ed.), The Apocalypse of Abraham [Assist. ed. J. I. Landsman] (trans. from the Savonic text). London: SPCK, 1919 ed.

Charles, R. H. (ed.), The Book of Jubilees (trans. from the Ethiopic text). London: Adam and Charles Black, 1902.

_____, The Book of Enoch (trans. from the Ethiopic text) [Enlarged and revised 2nd edition]. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912.

_____, The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913.

_____, The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. London: SPCK, 1917.

_____, The Apocalypse of Baruch [2nd ed.]. London: SPCK, 1918.

_____, The Book of Enoch. London: SPCK, 1947 ed.

Meyer, Wilhelm (ed.), "Vita Adae et Evaæ", Abhandlungen der philosophisch-philologischen Classe der Königlich bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, XIV. Munich: Königliche Adadamie, 1878, pp. 185-250.

D. The Dead Sea Scrolls

Dupont-Sommer, A., The Essene Writings from Qumran (trans. G. Vermes from 1959 French ed.). Cleveland and New York: The World Publishing Co. (Meridian Books), 1961.

Gaster, Theodore H., The Dead Sea Scriptures. New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc. (Anchor Books), 1964.

Ringgren, Helmer, The Faith of Qumran. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1963.

E. The Old and New Testaments

May, Herbert G. and Metzger, Bruce M. (eds.), The Oxford Annotated Bible with the Apocrypha. New York: Oxford University Press, 1965.

Nestle, D. Eberhard, Erwin Nestle, and Kurt Aland, Novum Testamentum Graece [23rd ed.]. Stuttgart: Privileg. Württ. Bibelanstalt, 1957.

II. BOOKS

Baron, Salo W. and Joseph L. Blau, Judaism. New York: The Liberal Arts Press, 1954.

Barrett, C. K., A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans (Harpers' New Testament Commentary). New York: Harpers, 1957.

_____, From First Adam to Last. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1962.

Barth, Karl, The Epistle to the Romans (trans. Edwin C. Hoskyns from 6th German ed.). London: Oxford Press, 1933.

Bicknell, E. J., The Christian Idea of Sin and Original Sin. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1922.

Bindley, T. Herbert, Religious Thought in Palestine in the Time of Christ. London: Methuen and Co., Ltd., 1931.

Bonsirven, Joseph, Palestinian Judaism in the Time of Jesus Christ (trans. William Wolf from 1950 French ed.). New York: Holt, Reinhart and Winston, 1964.

Bousset, W. Jüdisch-Christlicher Schulbetrieb in Alexandria und Rom. Göttingen: 1915.

Brunner, Emil, Man in Revolt (trans. Olive Wyon from 1937 German ed.). Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1947.

_____, The Letter to the Romans (trans. A. H. Kennedy from 1956 German ed.). London: Lutterworth Press, 1959.

Büchler, A., Studies in Sin and Atonement [11th ed. with prolegomenon by Frederick C. Grant]. New York: KTAV Publishing House, Inc., 1967.

Burkitt, F. Crawford, Jewish and Christian Apocalypses. London: Oxford University Press, 1914.

Burrows, Millar, More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls. New York: The Viking Press, 1958.

Charles, R. H., Eschatology. New York: Schocken Books, 1963 [1st Schocken ed. from 1st ed., 1899].

_____, Religious Development between Old and New Testaments. London: Williams and Norgate, 1914.

Cumont, Franz, Astrology and Religion Among the Greeks and Romans. New York: Dover Publications Inc., 1960.

- Danby, Herbert, The Mishnah. London: Oxford University Press, 1933.
- Davies, W. D., Paul and Rabbinic Judaism. London: SPCK, 1955.
- De Fraine, Jean, The Bible and the Origin of Man (trans. from revised 1956 Dutch ed.). New York: Desclée Co., 1964.
- Denis, A. M., Introduction aux Pseudepigraphes Grecs d'Ancien Testament. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970.
- Dentan, Robert C., The Apocrypha, Bridge of the Testaments. Greenwich, Conn.: The Seabury Press, 1954.
- De Rosa, Peter, Christ and Original Sin. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Co., 1967.
- Dubarle, A. M., The Biblical Doctrine of Original Sin (trans. E. M. Stewart from 1958 French ed.). London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1964 (= 1958).
- Eichrodt, Walter, Theology of the Old Testament (trans. J. A. Baker from 1957 German ed.). Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1967.
- Eissfeldt, Otto, The Old Testament (trans. Peter R. Ackroyd from 3rd German ed.). New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1965.
- Finkelstein, Louis, The Jews. 2 vols. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1949.
- Formby, C. W., The Unveiling of the Fall. London: Williams and Norgate, 1923.
- Feurer, George, Adam und Christ. Breiburg (in Britain): Herder, 1939.
- Goodspeed, Edgar J., The Story of the Apocrypha. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1939.
- Grant, Frederick C., Ancient Judaism and the New Testament. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1959.
- Green, Peter, The Pre-Mundane Fall. London: Mambray, 1944.
- Gross, Julius, Entstehungsgeschichte des Erbsündendogmas. Von der Bibel bis Augustinus. vol. I. Munich: Reinhardt Verlag, 1960.
- Haag, Herbert, Is Original Sin in Scripture. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1969.
- Harnack, Adolf, History of Dogma. vol. II. London: Williams and Norgate, 1886.

- Hirsch, Emmanuel, Shöpfung und Sunde. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1931.
- Hitchcock, F. R. M., Irenaeus of Lugdunum. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1914.
- Humbert, Paul, Etudes sur le récit du paradis et de la chute dans la Genèse. Neuchatel: Secretariat de l'Université, 1940.
- Jervell, Jacob, Imago Dei. Gottingen: Van den Hoeck and Ruprecht, 1960.
- Johnson, Harry, The Humanity of the Savior. London: The Epworth Press, 1962.
- Kleist, James A. (ed. and trans.), Teaching of the Twelve Apostles (Ancient Christian Writers Series, vol. VI). Westminster Md.: Newman Press, 1948.
- Lawson, John, The Biblical Theology of Irenaeus. London: The Epworth Press, 1948.
- Machen, J. Gresham, The Origin of Paul's Religion. New York: Macmillan, 1928.
- Mackintosh, Robert, Christianity and Sin. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1914.
- Mansoor, Menahem, The Dead Sea Scrolls. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1964.
- _____, The Thanksgiving Hymns. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1961.
- Marcus, Ralph, Law in the Apocrypha. New York: Columbia University Press, 1927.
- Montefiore, C. G., Rabbinic Literature and Gospel Teaching. London: Macmillan and Co., 1930.
- Moore, G. F., Judaism. 3 vols. (6th ed.). Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1950.
- Moxon, R. S., The Doctrine of Sin. New York: George H. Doran Co., 1922.
- Nielsen, J. T., Adam and Christ in the Theology of Irenaeus of Lyons (trans. G. E. van Baaren-Pope). Assen: Van Gorcum and Co., 1968.
- Nygren, Anders, Commentary on Romans (trans. Carl Rasmussen). Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1949.

Oates, Whitney J. (ed.), The Basic Writings of St. Augustine. 2 vols. (2nd ed.). New York: Random House, 1948.

Odeberg, Hugo, Pharisaism and Christianity. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1964.

Oesterley, W. O. E., The Books of the Apocrypha. London: Robert Scott Roxburghe House, 1914.

_____, An Introduction to the Books of the Apocrypha. London: SPCK, 1935.

_____, The Jews and Judaism During the Greek Period. London: SPCK, 1941.

_____, and G. H. Box, The Religion and Worship of the Synagogue. Bath: Sir Isaac Pitman and Sons Ltd., 1907.

_____, and T. H. Robinson, Hebrew Religion. London: SPCK, 1930.

Parkes, James, Jesus, Paul, and the Jews. London: SCM Press, 1936.

Peake, A. S., The Problem of Suffering in the Old Testament. London: The Epworth Press, 1947.

Pfeiffer, R. H., History of New Testament Times. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1949.

Purinton, Carl E., Christianity and its Judaic Heritage. New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1961.

Rad, Gerhardt Von, Genesis (trans. John H. Marks from 1956 German ed.). London: SCM Press, 1961.

_____, Old Testament Theology (trans. D. M. G. Stalker from 1957 German ed.). New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1962.

Reynders, B., Lexique Comparé du texte grec et des versions latine Arménienne et syriaque de l'adversus haereses de saint Irénée. 2 vols. Louvain: 1954.

Roberts, A., and J. Donaldson (eds. and trans.), The Ante-Nicene Fathers. vol. II. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899.

Robinson, H. Wheller, The Christian Doctrine of Man. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1926.

Rowley, H. H., The Relevance of Apocalyptic. London: Lutterworth Press, 1944.

- Rowley, H. H., The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1952.
- Russell, D. S., The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1964.
- Sanday, W., and C. H. Turner, Novum Testamentum Sancti Irenaei. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1923.
- Schechter, S., Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1923.
- Schoonenberg, Piet (S.J.), Man and Sin. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1965.
- Scroggs, Robbin, The Last Adam. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966.
- Selby, Donald Joseph, Toward the Understanding of St. Paul. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc., 1962.
- Smith, C. Ryder, The Bible Doctrine of Sin. London: The Epworth Press, 1953.
- Smith, H. Shelton, Changing Conceptions of Original Sin. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1950.
- Spalding, James C., Recent Restatements of the Doctrines of the Fall and Original Sin. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Columbia University, New York, 1950.
- Strack, Herman L., Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash. New York: Meridian Books, Inc., 1959.
- Tennant, F. R., The Fall and Original Sin. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1903.
- _____, The Origin and Propagation of Sin. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1902.
- Thackeray, Henry St. John, The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought. London: Macmillan and Co., 1900.
- Torrey, Charles Cutler, The Apocryphal Literature. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1945.
- Wendt, H. H., Christliche Lehre. Gottingen: 1882.
- Williams, N. P., The Ideas of the Fall and of Original Sin. New York: Longman's, Green and Co., 1927.
- Wingren, Gustaf, Man and the Incarnation (trans. Ross MacKenzie from 1947 Swedish ed.). Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1959.

III. PERIODICALS

Audet, T. A., "Orientations théologique chez saint Irénée", Traditio I (1943), 15-54.

Barclay, William, "Great Themes of the New Testament", The Expository Times LXX (March, 1959), 132-135, 172-175.

Bartels, Robert A., "Law and Sin in Fourth Esdras and St. Paul", Lutheran Quarterly I-II (August, 1949), 319-329.

Benoit, A., "Ecriture et Tradition chez saint Irénée", RHPR XL (1960), 32-49.

Black, Matthew, "The Pauline Doctrine of the Second Adam", SJT VII (1954), 170-179.

Brown, Raymond E., "J. Starcky's Theory of Qumran Messianic Developments", CBQ XXVIII (1966), 51-57.

Burke, Patrick, "Man Without Christ", Theological Studies XXLX (March, 1968), 4-18.

Burkitt, F. C., "Dr. Sanday's New Testament of Irenaeus", JTS XXV (1923-1924), 56-67.

Burnaby, John, "Original Sin", Theology LXXII (1959), 11-17.

Burney, C. F., "Christ as the $\alpha\chi\nu$ of Creation", JTS XXVII (1925-1926), 160-167.

Cambier, J., "Péchés des Hommes et Péché d'Adam en Rom. V, 12", NTS XI (1964-1965), 212-255.

Connor, James L., "Original Sin: Contemporary Approaches", Theological Studies XXIX (June, 1968), 215-240.

d'Ales, A., "La Doctrine de la récapitulation en saint Irénée", RSR VI-VII (1916), 185-211.

_____, "Le Mot πατούσιον dans la langue théologique de saint Irénée", REG XXXII (1919), 1-9.

de Aldama, J. A., "Adam typus futuri (S. Ireneo, Adverso haer. 3, 22, 3)", Sacrii Erudiri XIII (1962), 266-280.

Dubarle, A. M., "Le Péché Originel dans la Genèse", Revue Biblique LXIV (1957), 5-34.

Emment, C. W., "The Fourth Book of Esdras and St. Paul", The Expository Times XXVI-XXVII (1914-1916), 551-556.

- Feullet, A., "Le verset 7 du Miserere et le Péché Originel", RSR XXXII (1944), 5-26.
- Fitzmeyer, Joseph A., "The Aramaic 'Elect of God' Text from Qumran Cave VI", CBQ XXVII (1965), 348-372.
- Frey, J. B., "L'état originel et la chute de l'homme d'après les conceptions juives au temps de Jésus-Christ", RPhTh V (1911), 507-545.
- Gaudet, A. and M. Jugie, "Péché Originel", DThC XII (1933), 275-624.
- Grelot, Pierre, "Reflexions sur le problème du Péché Originel", NRT LXXXIX (1967), 337-375, 449-484.
- Hartman, Louis F., "Sin in Paradise", CBQ XX (1958), 26-40.
- Hemmerdinger, B., "Observations Critiques sur Irénée, IV", JTS XVII (1966), 308-326.
- Hitchcock, F. R. M., "Loof's Theory of Theophilus of Antioch as a Source of Irenaeus", JTS XXXVIII (1937), 130-139, 255-266.
- Holstein, H., "The Tradition of the Apostles according to Irenaeus", RSR XXXVI (1949), 229-270.
- _____, "Les témoins de la révélation d'après saint Irénée", RSR XLI (1953), 410-420.
- Hooker, M. D., "Adam in Romans I", NTS VI (1959-1960), 295-306.
- Jenkins, D. E., "The Make-up of Man according to Irenaeus", Studia Patristica VI, Part IV (1962).
- Jungel, E., "Das Gesetz zwischen Adam und Christus", ZThK LX (1963), 42-71.
- Lavalette, Henri de, "Péché Originel", RSR LX (April-June, 1967), 227-242.
- Lods, Adolphe, "Etudes sur le récit du paradis et de la chute dans la Genèse", RHPR XXV (1945), 71-78.
- Loof, F., "Theophilus von Antiochien adv. Marcionem und die anderen theologischen Quellen bei Irenäus", TU XLVI, Part II (1930).
- Lyonette, S., "Le Péché Originel en Rom. 5:12", RSR XLIV (1956), 63-84.
- McCord, James I., "Know Thyself", Interpretation III (1949), 142-153.

- Milik, J. T., "Problèmes de la Littérature Hénochique à la Lumière des Fragments Araméens de Qumrân", HTR 64 (1971), 333-378.
- Mommesen, Theodor E., "St. Augustine and the Christian Idea of Progress", Journal of the History of Ideas XII (1951), 348-352.
- Morgenstern, J., "The Mythological Background of Psalm 82", HUCA 14 (1939), 76-114.
- Robinson, J. A., "On a Quotation from Justin Martyr in Irenaeus", JTS XXXI (1930), 374-378.
- Schiele, F., "Die rabbinischen Parallelen zu 1 Kor. 15:45-50", ZWTh XLII (1899), 20-31.
- Scroggs, Robbin, "Romans VI, 7", NTS X (1963-1964), 104-108.
- Thornton, L. S., "St. Irenaeus and Contemporary Theology", Studia Patristica II (1957), 317-327.
- Unger, D., "Christ's Role in the Universe according to St. Irenaeus", Franciscan Studies XXVI (1945), 3-20, 114-137.
- Verriiel, A., "Le plan du salut d'après saint Irénée", RSR XIV (1934), 493-524.
- Von Campenhausen, H., "Irenäus und das Neue Testament", ThLZ X (1965), 1-7.
- Weger, K. H., "The Debate on Original Sin", Ido-c (October 26, 1967), 1-9.